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Chapter 1: Introduction

Everybody is familiar with the word colonization. Several countries in the world have exercised their power and influence over other areas for long periods. During this process the colonizers came in contact with other groups of people, which we call the ‘colonized’. There is a long history of doing research on the concept of colonialism. The first problems arise with the difference between ‘colonialism’ and ‘colonization’. While a lot of people see these two words as referring to the same, there is actually a large difference between the two concepts. Briefly, ‘colonization’ is the active part where the interest is focused on the actual movements of goods and people. The concept of colonialism, on the other hand, is more concerned with the way in which colonial situations were maintained.¹ These differences will be discussed more in depth later on in this thesis. It seems that it is possible to separate two kinds of approaches to colonialism. The first one is the earlier approach and the second one is called the post-colonial approach. In the earlier approach, researchers erroneously inclined to compare all colonial processes with the known colonialism from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In addition to this, they forgot to place each colonial process in its own context which, as a consequence, made every colonial process the same. It is because of this that people thought that the Greek colonists had the same motives for their expansion as the colonisers in the seventeenth century.² In the post-colonial approach, however, researchers learned more and more that we have to use the concept of colonialism with a keen eye on context in order to prevent interpreting things from a modern point of view.

It is notable that in earlier studies the focus lay on the phase where the colonizers were already ‘integrated’ into the new society. In addition to this, the colonized disappeared into the background and was considered as culturally and morally less developed.³ Researchers took no notice of the already existing settlements, culture and customs of the colonized⁴, which probably has to do with the development of interest in particular aspects of a society. Over the last years, however, the interest in the colonized has increased and in particular the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized has become subject of debate. In my thesis, I want to focus on the first phases of Greek colonization and on the relationship between the colonizers and colonised. What do modern authors write about these phases and relationships?

² Gosden 2004, 12.
³ Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 83.
The Greek colonization is one example of a colonization process and it is a much-discussed phenomenon. From the eight century on the Greeks expanded their influence among others to the southern part of Italy and Sicily. In this context, colonization is the development whereby an indigenous settlement, which consisted of huts, develops into a planned Greek city.\(^5\)

1.1 Phrasing of a question
In this thesis, I will focus on modern theories on colonialism in which I make a distinction between early and post-colonial approaches. What kind of theories do these approaches have and are there similarities between them? Furthermore, as theories determine the way in which we look at certain things: what effect does the modern formulation of theories have on the way we interpret old and newly discovered sites? Does it add anything new to what we already know or do we take things too far and fit in facts so that they match the theory we prefer? Finally, I will focus on the Greek colonization of South-Italy and Sicily, using three case studies. In this context the first phases date from the eight to the beginning of the sixth century. What can we say, using the above-mentioned theoretical approaches, about colonial situations at different sites in South Italy and Sicily during the Greek period? Which interpretive differences exist between the old\(^6\) and the more recent literature on the subject? What kind of colonization are we dealing with and is it ultimately possible to form a general concept of colonialism?

1.2 Formulation of the problem
Colonization is a lengthy process, in which a lot of changes and developments occur. In European history we can distinguish several colonization processes through time. In this thesis we look closer at the Greek colonization, but there has also been the Roman colonization and the later colonization by Western and non-Western countries. Within these developments, the Greek colonization is seen as one of the earliest ‘communities’ to expand their territory. The problem with the research of these kinds of colonial situations, as already mentioned above, is that we tend to see things with a modern eye. When we have to name the reasons for the Greek colonialism, we tend to apply modern concepts onto an ancient phenomenon.\(^7\)

\(^6\) With old literature, I mean the first reports and literature about early investigated sites dating before the seventies.
\(^7\) Gosden 2004, 1- 6.
This research is to a large extent a literary study, and it aims to look critically at what has been written about colonization so far. As stated earlier, there are several colonization processes through time. Most of the modern literature is dedicated to ‘later’ colonialism in for example the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and, consequently, this colonialism is often viewed as the same kind of process as the Greek one. In my opinion this is jumping to conclusions, since each colonial process has its own features. It is possible to compare them, but we always have to place them within a framework of time and place.

The colonization process can be studied in multiple ways, which includes, amongst others, a major role for archaeology and anthropology. Archaeology can give us a lot of information through excavations of different sites, but it also has its problems. When we look at the colonial process in South-Italy and Sicily, our knowledge about it is limited due to different reasons: many sites were excavated a long time ago and have been poorly published, with the result that we nowadays know little about these sites and their developments. In addition, research has been focused up to the last years on the sites themselves, in which regional research has often been neglected. This impedes to consider colonization as a process that also includes land use and regional settlement systems. Finally, our knowledge is limited as a result of a number of practical problems. Some sites are difficult to investigate because they are covered by a thick layer of sediment. In some areas, for example in Sicily, little is known because the number of archaeological sites is low and the ones which are known are badly preserved.

In examining colonization, researchers also make use of ancient literary sources in addition to archaeological evidence. The use of this literature, however, involves a lot of risks. There is not much ancient literature preserved from the early periods of colonization, and the ancient literature concerned with these periods that we do have, is mainly written by Greeks and Romans who lived during a later period (after the colonization process) and describe the process from their own perspective. It is well-known that quite some ancient authors wrote their stories in such a way that they could serve as a kind of propaganda. One can think, for instance, of Caesar’s *De Bello Gallico* in which he gives his account of the Gallic War and his own prominent place in it, written from a quasi-objective third-person perspective. This kind of ancient literature does not give a realistic but rather a distorted picture of the past. We should, therefore, be careful with the use of these ancient sources.

---

8 Burgers & Crielaard, 78.
9 Yntema 2000, 5.
1.3 Research
In my thesis I will discuss the different theories on colonialism and the specific problems involved. In addition, I will discuss three archaeological sites in South Italy and Sicily and study what has been written about these sites. The aim of this thesis is to study whether old and new theories do interpret sites differently and what kind of influence new theories have on the interpretation of old and newly discovered sites. Eventually, this will contribute to an improvement of the concept of colonialism.

In chapter 2, I will discuss problems of defining the words ‘colonization’ and ‘colonialism’. Furthermore, I will place different models of colonialism next to each other and compare them. The next two chapters essentially form a pair: chapter 3 will discuss the earlier approaches to colonialism. What kinds of theories and ideas are there and what sort of influence do they have on the interpretation of sites? Chapter 4 will focus on postcolonial approaches. In what ways do these approaches differ from the earlier ones and what conclusions may we draw from them? Is it possible to say that our knowledge of colonialism has improved in comparison to previous approaches?

Chapter 5 is a case study in which the results of the first four chapters are operationalized. I discuss three colonial sites in South-Italy and Sicily. I have chosen for the following sites: Morgantina (Sicily), L’Amastuola (South-Italy) and Incoronata (South-Italy). I have made this choice, because I am already familiar with these sites and I think that in this way I am able to be more critical about the different interpretations which have been made through time. Eventually, in chapter 7 I will present my concluding remarks.

All dates mentioned in this thesis, are dated before Christ, unless otherwise stated.
Chapter 2: The concept of colonialism

Colonialism is a phenomenon which has been studied for a long period. In Classical archaeology, most of the attention has traditionally been given to south Italy and Sicily with its colonies (Magna Graecia). Already in the ancient sources, sites in south Italy and Sicily were labelled as colonies (ἀνακία) and archeologically these sites differ from the Italic settlements in their structure and finds. Colonialism can not be seen as an uniform concept that can be enclosed in one single model, which has left the same sort of archaeological evidence all over the world. The concept comprises different local situations which may share aspects. These aspects differ through time and are embedded in multiple networks. To be able to make a model of colonialism, we need to study and explain which differences there are between different forms and what has made them different from other examples we know.

Anthropologists have three ways in which they approach colonialism. They see it as the evolutionary process which eventually ends in modernization, as a sort of strategy in which domination and exploitation play major roles or as a continuous process of struggle and negotiation. In reality, the ideas we have about colonialism is a combination of these three ways of conceptualizing colonialism.

2.1 The development of the term colonialism

The word ‘colonialism’ emerged for the first time in 1853 and it signified the idioms characteristic of a colony. In 1886, it was for the first time used as referring to the colonial system as we now know it. ‘Colonialism’ derives from the word ‘colonial’, and the latter term was used in the late eighteenth century to indicate material culture belonging to colonies. The word colony has a long history. It first appeared in 1548 and signified: ‘a settlement in a new country, forming a community subject to a parent state’. Colony derives from the Latin word colonia, which related colony to cultivation.

In the history of research of colonial phenomena there are problems. The first set of problems arise with the difference between ‘colonialism’ and ‘colonization’. While a lot of

---

10 Van Dommelen 1998, 34.
12 Van Dommelen 1998.
13 I must add that the colonial system we know today also involves multiple forms of colonialism, as colonialism from 1850 to 1930 differed considerably from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries one.
14 Gosden 2004, 1.
15 According to Gosden (2004) it already appeared in the Bible in 1382, but it appeared to be an isolated example of the words’ use.
16 Gosden 2004, 1.
people see these two words as the same, there is actually a huge difference between the two concepts. ‘Colonization’ is the active part and denotes the actual movements of goods and people while the concept of colonialism is more concerned with the way in which colonial situations were maintained. Still, a lot of people believe that the word colonialism can only be used when dealing with colonies. This seems easy, because we only have to decide if we are dealing with a colony or not. However, then we have to answer the following questions: what is a colony? By whom is a colony established? A colony is a settlement characterized by a material culture which differs from the existing culture. But then the next problem arises: to what degree should the material culture differ from the cultural background of the area so that we are able to name it a colony? Colonies were established by people with a different material culture, language, habits etc. than the already existing local population. There were multiple reasons for colonization like trade, military reasons, control of local resources or the desire to enlarge the living area of a society. It depends on the viewer’s context which reason he or she thinks was valid. For example, in the older theories scholars saw the colonizers as dominant whereas we nowadays also focus on the indigenous people. This change of ideas actually did not alter the idea about the phenomenon colonialism and it only existed when colonies did. Moreover, it also remained unclear when we are precisely dealing with a colony. In separating the colonies from the non-colonies, Finley focused his attention on the amount of control which was operated by the homeland on a settlement.

2.2 Difficulties with colonialism

We tend to see developments in history through our modern eyes. That is why we compare Greek colonialism with ‘our’ western colonial experiences. Still, it can be very useful for our understanding of colonial settlements in the ancient world to study more recent colonial situations. Besides, in the nineteenth and twentieth century colonialism had an important role in western society and this had in its own way impact on contemporary scholarship. This impact and if it nowadays still exists should be assessed. However, the colonization process in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries AD, with its large scale exploitation, is quite different.

18 Gosden 2004, 2-6  
19 Gosden 2004, 2  
20 Burgers & Crielaldaard 2007, 83.  
22 Gosden 2004, 3-5.
from the smaller scale Greek colonization and should therefore not be the framework for analogies.  

The term colonialism is strongly related to the term imperialism. Imperialism is often used when we discuss the western presence in Asia or the Roman activity in Europe and the Mediterranean. According to van Dommelen colonial situations can be separated on basis of two features: there has to be a presence of one or more groups of foreign people in an area at distance from their own place of origin. The second feature is the existence of dissimilar socio-economic relationships of political domination or economic exploitation between the colonizers and the colonised. But even with these features, it seems to be clear that it is still difficult to define a specific colonial situation, because the situations can be very divergent. Colonialism can be roughly described as: ‘the process of establishing and maintaining a colonizing group and their dominant or exploitative relationships with the colonized region and its inhabitants. Needless to say, divergent underlying colonial intentions as well as different local responses all contribute to the variability of colonial situations’. In this context, imperialism is a specific form of colonialism, in which there are aspects of domination and exploitation without any colonial settlements. The British presence in India is an example of this kind of colonialism. Imperialism can be described as ‘the sustaining of an empire, which has been defined as a relationship, formal or informal, in which one state controls the effective political sovereignty of another political society’. Gosden actually does imply that there are colonial settlements present. In his definition imperialism is a form of colonialism in which multiple colonies are tied together into one political structure. These two concepts do not differ a lot, and it is therefore that they are interchangeably used. Still, the use of the term imperialism is restricted to the colonial situations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and it can be characterized as a symptom of those periods. To avoid confusion the term imperialism should not be used for situations before the nineteenth century.

23 As we will see in the next paragraphs, the type of colonization in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries AD differed a lot with the Greek type, which also means that it is described in different terms, which will not be applicable on the Greek colonization.
25 Van Dommelen 1998, 16.
26 Van Dommelen 1998, 16.
27 Van Dommelen 1998, 16.
28 Van Dommelen 1998, 16.
29 Gosden 2004, 5.
Besides to imperialism, colonialism is also related to culture contact. This term is actually harder to explain, while there is no such thing as an isolated culture; each culture is related to others. Culture contact is separated from colonialism by way of the nature of the contact. Colonialism is, unlike other forms of contact, associated with power formed by material culture which can change people and their culture. This should be seen apart from colonization, because it is a cultural phenomenon and does not imply the need for resources. This also defines the problem with naming colonies; when there is trade between indigenous people and the Greeks or even imitation of certain objects this does not directly imply a colony, it may also have been caused by a process of assimilation termed ‘Hellenisation’.

When we discuss Greek colonialism, the term Hellenisation often crops up because indigenous sites may have adopted a Greek-colonial material culture. It is related to culture contact, because it is an intensive form of it in which a culture is deeply influenced by and adapts to a more dominant culture. Hellenisation as well as the later Romanisation both played a role in the colonial process. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century the modern European colonial experiences caused a renewed interest in the Roman and Greek archaeology in which the Romans and Greeks were seen as the source of civilisation. During this process indigenous inhabitants adapted the Greek culture (Hellenisation) or Roman culture (Romanisation).

Gosden actually has another definition of colonialism. According to him, colonialism already exists before there is even a colony. In this context colonialism is ‘a particular grip that material culture gets on the bodies and minds of people, moving them across space and attaching them to new values.’ These values are connected to a symbolic centre (for example Greece) and the power from that centre to the colony is transferred by means of artefacts and habits, rather than through economic or military power from an actual centre. According to Gosden the Greek settlements in the Mediterranean were in first instance not

30 Close to culture contact is the term acculturation. Acculturation is the adoption of elements of a foreign culture when two population groups are in prolonged direct contact with each other. Most of the time, these exchanges are mutual, but it can happen that the group which forms the minority will adopt more elements. It is quite possible that there have been sites, which were interpreted as colonies, while they were not colonised at all, but only had long-term contact.
31 Gosden 2004, 5.
33 Webster 1997, 330-331.
34 For more literature on Romanisation: Webster 1997; Webster 2003; Mattingly 1996.
35 Gosden 2004, 3.
36 Gosden 2004, 3; See also Osborne 1998, 259-265.
directly established and controlled by Greek city states, but were a large gathering of people around a new centre who actually adopted Greek culture without directly being Greek. In this new symbolic centre (for example a colony) a kind of circulation arose in which multiple ideas, artefacts and people came from different sources and were all interchanged. Colonialism is not about the colonizer who changes the colonized, but it is a long drawn-out process having a strong relationship with material culture. It seems that in the world of archaeology, there is not a plain definition of the concept colonialism and it is therefore important to analyse the use of the concept.

In the concept of colonialism, networks have a major role. As each society exists of multiple individual networks researchers can analyse these, but still, we have to be careful with these analyses, because one easily overlooks certain aspects when focussing too much on the individuals in these networks. Irad Malkin, in his article "Networks and the Emergence of Greek Identity," discusses pre-colonial contact between the Greeks and the indigenous population. These ideas are based on a model in which, prior to the actual colonization, there already was contact\textsuperscript{37} between the Greeks and the indigenous groups of people. These contacts function within a complex network of different populations. Networks are important motors for development in society and can comprise large parts of the world. According to Malkin historical studies have long been dominated by 'arborism'.\textsuperscript{38} This 'movement' advocated analysis in terms of spatial hierarchy based on concepts of center and periphery. In addition to these hierarchies we must, according to Malkin, also take into account that there were more contacts and that the Mediterranean network was only one of them. Each Greek colonial settlement had a network with its hinterland, but in a wider sense also with its 'mother city', sanctuaries and other settlements. To determine these networks, it is necessary to define when something is Greek and when doing this one ends up in determining ethnicity. Determining ethnicity is needed to understand more of colonialism, because we are then able to make a better distinction in the different phases of the colonial process. This will improve our knowledge on the different development stages of the colonization process. Still, it will be difficult to define ethnicity when we only have artifacts and a few literary ancient sources. Malkin uses Hellenism as an example, which could spread through political and religious networks. Ancient historians, like Herodotus and Thucydides, believed that Hellenic identity had formed through a process of diffusion of culture and language.\textsuperscript{39} According to Hall\textsuperscript{40},

\begin{small}
\textsuperscript{37} This contact existed in multiple ways like trade, politics and religion.  
\textsuperscript{38} Malkin 2005, 57.  
\textsuperscript{39} Malkin 2005, 58.  
\end{small}
Hellenic identity rose at the beginning of the classical period.\footnote{Hall 2002.} In this period the term ‘Hellas’ spread from a small area in northeastern Greece throughout Greece along with the religious organization of Greek communities that revolved around the oracle of Delphi.\footnote{In this aspect Hellenization differs from colonization. Hellenization takes place in a later period, during the Hellenic period (323 – 146). Previous to this period, Alexander the Great conquered many areas to the east and south of Greece and spread the Greek culture in these areas. Hellenization stands in this period for the adjustment of other cultures to the Greek culture. Greek colonization took place from the ninth century on (in Southern Italy and Sicily) and did not directly have the aim to spread Greek culture. In addition, in these areas, there arose a mixture of (two) cultures instead of adjustment to the Greek culture.} This oracle played also a large role in the Greek colonization. So in sum, networks did play a major role in the colonial process, because the Greeks and the indigenous populations could easily exchange their culture through these networks. In the pre-colonial period, networks enabled contact based on, for example, trade. This early contact will have been conductive for the development of the colonization process in later periods.

In the eighth and seventh centuries, the territory of the Greeks immensely expanded by the creation of new settlements. The rapid pace of the establishment of settlements and its religious and political contacts between cities and surrounding areas provided a ‘Greek’ unity in the Mediterranean region.\footnote{Hall 2002, 134-154; The geographical conception of Hellas was articulated through Delphi, but seen in a broader way ‘Hellenes’ was spread by a growing community: Hall 2002, 168-171. See also: Malkin 2005, 61-64.} Once settlements had been firmly established, the Greek settlers began to distinguish themselves more and more, because at that point the differences between them and other (indigenous) populations became evident and many Greeks compared their overseas adventures with the poetry of Homer. The colonization must have influenced the way the Greeks saw themselves. All of them experienced the same tensions about identity, independence and dependence of local populations. Malkin concludes that in a certain way colonialism is the cause of the emergence of Hellenism, because the Greeks learned that the cultural variety among them was far less than previously thought.\footnote{Malkin 2005, 59.} This feeling of similarity could only be felt when people were far away from each other; in other words spread over multiple colonies. According to Malkin, colonialism should be seen in a network of social, political, cultural and religious processes which are relevant for societies and individuals.\footnote{Malkin 2005, 61.}

Still, while doing research into these networks, it is very important to study each local colonial situation on its own terms and not in a standardized colonial framework. When
studying the situation in the local context it is important to examine if any networks were involved and if they were, to what degree and what they looked like.

In addition to these networks, the concept of hybridization is important when we deal with colonial situations because it refers to the way in which groups of people deal with their identity in colonial situations.

2.3 The influence of identity on European theories about colonialism

As we will see in the next chapters (three and four), colonialism is approached in different ways. An important factor is the way in which researchers look at colonial developments in the past. With regard to this, identity plays a major role. According to van Dommelen\textsuperscript{46}, the ‘colonial’ developments in the Mediterranean play an important role in European thinking and we have created a sort of European identity through the years. This European identity must have shaped our ideas on how we think we should study ancestral civilisations. Nationalist ideas can only have played a small part in respect to this identity, because most of the European countries established international archaeological schools across the Mediterranean. Still, we know from Spain and Italy that they are more nationalist than other countries and that their interest and focus is on the archaeology of their own country. In Greece, for example, the relationships between the national identity and the archaeology are ambiguous because of Greece being as both ancestral and contemporary to Europe.\textsuperscript{47} In this way, they will study colonialism differently and focus on other aspects than researchers with a less national approach and in the end will develop dissimilar theories. Rome has long occupied a central place in the European identity until the focus shifted towards Classical Greece in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{48} From that moment on, ancient Greece was seen as unique and superior, which also influenced our European thought on colonialism.

When studying identity, researchers also have to study its relation with culture and indirectly with civilisation. Identity is an important aspect in the study of colonialism, because it can determine the kind of colonial situation. With information on identity researchers are able to make a distinction in different colonial phases. When archaeologists find artefacts, particular characteristic of Greek culture\textsuperscript{49}, in a indigenous settlement it can be an indication for the presence of a (partial) Greek identity. Based on the amount of, for example, Greek type pottery, archaeologists can interpret when particular colonial phases occurred in a settlement.

\textsuperscript{46} Van Dommelen 1998, 22.
\textsuperscript{47} Van Dommelen 1998, 22.
\textsuperscript{48} Van Dommelen 1998, 22-23.
\textsuperscript{49} For example the pottery type \textit{skyphoi} is often related to Greek drinking ceremonies, referring a Greek culture.
Still, it is important to be careful with relating artefacts to a particular identity, because it is quite possible that the boundaries between the different identities are not as plain as we determine them. Paulo Orlandini, for example, bases his interpretation of the site Incoronata on pottery finds. In his interpretation he separated pure indigenous material from pure Greek material. When indigenous and Greek material were found in the same pit, he stated that a Greek pit cut into a pre-existent indigenous context. In this way, he could divide the settlement in two phases, starting with a pure indigenous phase which was followed by a pure Greek phase. He related the pottery to an identity and in this way to a particular phase of the settlement. Still, the presence of Greek type pottery does not directly involve the presence of a Greek identity. In addition, Orlandini made the mistake that he did not consider the possibility that the two pottery types could also mean a new type of settlement and eventually a new type of identity. In addition, we may wonder whether the people in ancient times were as aware of their identity as we are nowadays.

According to Friedman there are three possible situations in which the status of identity differs and it is in this aspect interesting which type of identity is involved in the colonial process:

a) when a group of people is only weakly integrated in a larger ‘system’, the local culture is a part of a total organization of life activities. In these situations, the local culture and identity are in the background because there is no continuity between the cultural past and the present;

b) when the group is fully integrated in the larger ‘system’ its culture and identity is mostly dependent on the (ethnic) symbols of this system. Nationalism plays a major role and culture is crucial in almost all the activities of the group of people. This type is typical for European situations;

c) when the group is again fully integrated in the larger ‘system’ (like with b), it may have a cultural model of life processes including material reproduction which is the focus of the total group. This is the case when an old culture stays intact during a new period; like for example when indigenous traditions are kept during a Greek period.

In my opinion, all three types of Friedman’s identity occur in the process of colonization, but I do not believe that they are an addition to our knowledge of the colonization process. Therefore I have decided not to further discuss these types of identity or apply them on my

---

50 Appendix 1.3, page 114- 115.
51 Friedman 1989, 255.
case studies. Besides, this way of dividing identity in three groups fits later examples of colonization better, as Friedman uses the German nationalist identity in the sixties as an example.\textsuperscript{52} Friedman indeed mentions national movements of which one cannot speak, in my opinion, in the ancient world.

According to Pels\textsuperscript{53} and Thomas\textsuperscript{54}, to be able to study the socio-cultural aspect of colonialism, we need to study colonialism in a theoretical and practical way. The practical part of the study is, according to Thomas\textsuperscript{55}, the creation of a situation in which we can experience life during a colonial period. It seems that Thomas is arguing that the only way we would be able to understand the colonial process, is by imitating a colonial situation. Then, it is possible to study the relationships of power and exploitation and in the end you can frame these aspects indirectly in the daily life of a colonial society. These aspects are all connected to unconscious activities during daily life. However, I do not believe that the practical side of Thomas’ theory would help us to understand more about the colonial process, because it will be impossible to imitate a situation in which we would be able to understand how the Greeks and indigenous populations experienced colonialism.

2.4 A model of colonialism

When studying colonialism we have to deal with multiple dimensions of social exchange of objects, clothes, buildings, the arrangement and position of bodies when they are buried, landscape, tools used during daily life and religious aspects.\textsuperscript{56} To study these different aspects as good as possible, we have to use the knowledge of different disciplines so that we are able to make a right interpretation of the colonial past. Archaeology is an important discipline, because it covers a long range of time. Colonialism always leaves behind traces, in multiple forms (literature, material culture, landscape) which in the most circumstances can be studied by archaeologists.\textsuperscript{57} Besides archaeology also anthropology plays a major role in this research. When studying colonialism, multiple disciplines focus on different aspects of the concept. Eventually, all disciplines try to establish a model which can be applied on most of the examples of colonialism. These models take into account that situations differ locally.

\begin{itemize}
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Chris Gosden developed a model for the concept of colonialism which is a comparative framework, but has variations in time and space. The model is set up to show the general image of colonialism and it is made in a way in which local variations can be applied.

Gosden’s model is largely based on material culture and human relationships with this culture and in his view a model of colonialism needs to have the following characteristics:\(^{58}\):

- the model should focus on the nature of power and its relationships;
- it should start from material culture and human relationships with the world;
- it should allow for an understanding of agency, arising from the premise that it is very rare that anyone or any group is completely powerless.

To understand his model, it is necessary to place it in a theoretical framework. In this framework we need to think about things that we nowadays take for granted when we look at our own societies. In our modern society, the idea of the individual in a society and its own addition to this society is normal. Still, we tend to believe that in a lot of other societies there were ‘dividuals’ as Gosden and Strathern\(^ {59}\) call them. An individual has relations with other people and things and shares these with his society; a ‘dividual’ is composed of relations and is created by the society.\(^ {60}\) In this idea, the person is not different from the society, but it is a smaller version of the society with the same relations and objects. LiPuma\(^ {61}\) largely agrees with Strathern, but he thinks that every society has individual and ‘dividual’ aspects. For example, a man is never totally male and a woman never totally a female, but they have both male and female characteristics that are hidden depending on the current social situation.\(^ {62}\) It depends on the context whether people are individuals or ‘dividuals’. As Gosden explains:

‘Individuality arises from the autonomous physiological systems of the human body, the fact that the body serves as the ground and signifier of the person and his or her intentionality. Relational or dividual aspects of personhood exist in all societies by virtue of the fact that subjects and objects vary across contexts and that identity and self-construction are a result of socially created relationships.’\(^ {63}\) It is then important to analyse which ‘form’ is present, which can be done by questioning whether the focus is on the individual aspect of personhood or on the relational nature of society. This whole analysis is not about dividing individuals

\(^{58}\) Gosden 2004, 24.
\(^{60}\) Gosden 2004, 32.
\(^{61}\) LiPuma, 1998.
\(^{62}\) Gosden 2004, 34.
\(^{63}\) Gosden 2004, 35.
from ‘dividuals’, but to demonstrate that these two terms overlap and that both have a relationship with material culture.

From this point of view, it is clear that it is not possible to reduce colonial situations and relations by only analysing individuals and ‘dividuals’. The networks of relationships are very important and the variety of them, in which both people and objects are included. The objects are part of the (culture of) people which circulate within the social networks and have influence on other people and objects.  

By analysing objects it is possible to see developments in which people move from their own local group into a new ‘cultural’ group. The development of Oinotrian-Euboean pottery in the Sibera tide is an example of these movements.  

On this view, there is, according to Gosden, not always colonialism with colonies, because it often exists of people being moved by objects to above-mentioned symbolic centres (For example Greece). The Uruk period is an example of this, because it is an example of behaviour where people are moved by objects leading to new structures of production and social division, without the development of an actual colony.  

In this way people, things, objects and power are strongly related in colonial situations.

Gosden’s model focuses on the relationships between people and material culture and in what way these relationships are changed. He has based his model on a typology of three ‘kinds’ of colonialism, namely Terra nullius, Middle ground and Colonialism within a shared cultural milieu (table 1, page 20). Gosden has chosen to subdivide colonial situations in these three categories, but this does not mean that these categories are clear boundaries. Colonialism is a process which is simply not dividable in categories, because there always will be exceptions. In addition to this, it is possible that in one local situation all three types emerge where one follows on the other or where there is only one form current.

The three types of colonialism describe a situation characterized by a certain relationship between material culture and people. Terra nullius stands out because it is applicable best to modern forms of colonialism. In such contexts, indigenous inhabitants are often killed or removed from their area and this is above all a matter of domination and resistance. The reason for this kind of colonialism is most of the time the search for new raw materials and land. Even rules were developed stating how colonizers could own land which was not ‘used’
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64 Gosden 2004, 36; Gell 1998.
65 This pottery type probably is a combination of two cultures in which indigenous (Oinotrian) pottery shows clear influences from Euboean pottery. For more information: Jacobsen, Mittica & Handberg, 2007; Jacobsen, Handberg, Mittica, 2008/2009.
67 See also table 3.2 on page 37 in Gosden 2004.
by indigenous inhabitants.68 This form of colonialism is often short-lived (dependent on the context), but with a huge impact and its image nowadays still dominates our ideas about colonialism. Gosden’s ideas on the middle ground are inspired by the theories of White.69 In his theory, the indigenous people could be influenced by European colonizers in two ways: acculturation or a decline and later on destruction of their culture. White extended this idea by saying that during contact between indigenous people and Europeans a new culture always came into existence, which included influences from both cultures but were not identical to one of them. This whole concept was centred around the ‘middle ground’, which is not a geographical place but a system of values: ‘(...) but concerned values, such that the values attached to people and things could be played with and mutually understood, a pragmatic commensurability of value systems.’70 Examples of the middle ground form of colonialism are the Great Leakes of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries and the late Iron Age situation in southern Britain. In late Iron Age Britain, society was changed by mutual influences among the Britons and the Romans.71 Both cultures adopted material culture from the other culture. The third form of colonialism (colonialism in a shared cultural milieu) has all to do with culture contact. Most of the colonial relations came into being from shared cultural values. An example of a colonial situation like this is the Greek colonization in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, which is one of the first colonial situations ever. The reasons for these colonial contacts vary from trading contacts for the gaining of food and raw materials to the foundation of cities for an overflow for surplus population. Colonialism within a shared cultural milieu is near to culture contact in which the only difference is the presence of power. This was not a kind of power which we see in later colonial situations in the seventeenth century, but an elite power based on cultural values.72 Elites were connected with each other by networks and could differentiate themselves from the indigenous people and other lower ‘classes’ of their own population group by cultural possessions. These elite networks have played a major role in the colonization process, because they enabled the first contact between the Greeks and the indigenous inhabitants by their mutual contacts. Preceding the colonial process, there already was contact between the Greeks and indigenous inhabitants based on trade. It is then an important question why the Greeks went and eventually colonized these areas? Was it because of important trade relations, to spread their culture or to enlarge their

68 Pagden 1998, 34-54.
69 See White 1991.
72 Gosden 2004, 33.
power? Within these aspects, elite networks could have played a major role, because they had mutual contact and could have easily spread their influence, culture and customs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Power</th>
<th>Spectrum of Colonialism</th>
<th>Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colonisation within a shared cultural milieu</strong></td>
<td><strong>Greatest experiment and creativity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Terra nullius</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial relations between state and non-state polities created within a (partially) shared cultural milieu. Allows for forms of power operating within understood norms of behaviour – difficult to distinguish colonial and non-colonial types of relationship. Limits of colonisation created by area over which culture shared and spread, not military power.</td>
<td>Accommodation and regularised relations through a working understanding of others’ social relations. All parties think they are in control. Often creates new models of difference, not acculturation. Difficult for any party to sustain fixed categories of difference. Can have profound effect on those colonising.</td>
<td>Lack of recognition of prior ways of life of people encountered leads to excuse for mass appropriation of land, destruction of social relations and death through war and disease. Exists where fixed categories of difference. Only in recent periods is colonisation through purely violent means possible, mainly owing to the effects of disease and demography.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples**
- All early forms from Mesopotamia to the Greeks; Aztecs; Incas; early Chinese; Vikings; Tongans.
- Round peripheries of Greek colonies and Roman empire; early modern contacts in N. America, Africa, India, the Pacific.
- The Mongols, Spaniards in Mexico and Peru; but mainly creation of settler societies in North America, Russia, Australia and New Zealand from middle eighteenth century.

**Local views**
- New strangers not necessarily marked out as radically different from other strangers. Reception depends on the categories used to classify strangers and can challenge existing categories. Strangers may have been seen as spirits, but not necessarily as gods. Advantages sought in material and spiritual terms. Great social experiment and ferment of discussion.
- New forms of social and cultural capital seen as novel sets of resources by local elite (and often non-elite) which can be used for own ends. Non-elite excluded from the colonial network, creating new forms of inequality.
- Armed invasion and mass death seen not as final, but as a phase in a longer process of resistance and cultural upheaval. Loss of land seen as ‘widowed landscapes’. Perception of active resistance to prevent cultural and physical destruction.

*Table 1: A typology of forms of colonialism. From: Gosden 2004. P. 26, table 3.1*
Besides Gosden, there are more authors who have theories about the concept of colonialism. Nijboer is in his article on teleology and colonization in antiquity and recent times mostly critical about early articles and books about colonialism in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea region. When we study colonialism we should be careful with teleology, because we often tend to name objects and processes with ethnic terms when this is not appropriate. Nijboer mentions Francavilla Marittima (Calabria, South-Italy) as an example. This site is seen as Greek when researchers call the sanctuary an Athenaion, the pottery workshop a Kerameikos etc. According to Nijboer a colony is the outcome of a long process, which first includes a prospecting phase followed by a foundation. In his article, he reflects on the ways in which we should study colonialism and which mistakes have been made in the past. According to him colonialism should be studied from a wider historical angle, because in this way we can gain more information about the whole concept of colonialism. That is why it is necessary to compare multiple colonial situations with each other, in order to see what the unique characters of each of them are. Nijboer shows how the colonization process works by way of three examples. The colonial process exists, according to him, of three phases: prospecting, foundation and at last the colony itself, which means a town exploiting its hinterland. The prospecting phase was important (although we do not know how long this phase lasted), because then the colonizers decided where to go to and for what purposes. During this phase we have evidence of trade in indigenous sites, but without clear features of permanent settling of overseas groups. According to Nijboer, the prospecting phase can include temporal settlements on the coast. The second phase – foundation - started when the colonizers decided that the ‘colonized area’ was actually useful. When we study colonialism, we often find foundation dates which we can interpret as the date on which the colonizers decided to found a permanent settlement overseas. With respect to this we have to bear in mind that in most cases the colonizers depended on the social-economic situation of the colonized. Phase three is not always clear to define, but in most examples it is the phase in
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75 These examples consist of a discussion of Early Greek imports and their local imitations in Iron Age Italy, evidence for the rise of Cape Town (South Africa) and the Dutch enclave at Deshima (Japan) during the seventeenth – nineteenth centuries AD. For a further outline of these examples see Nijboer 2010/2011. These examples can be classified into Gosden’s model. Nijboer’s model is related to Gosden’s model, because the study into the various development phases of the colonization process (Nijboer’s model) enable to make a better distinction of the different types of colonization (Gosden’s model).
76 The last phase (Colony in which a town exploits his hinterland) knows a lot of variations. It depends on the context of the site to what extend this phase took place. In addition, Nijboer emphasizes in his article that he does not focus on the more land-locked local communities, but more on the seafaring groups (footnote 12, page 287).
which a town is in fact exploiting its hinterland. Still, it is difficult to define when we can name a certain settlement a colony. It is not said that the prospecting or foundation phase automatically leads to a colony; it could lead to a permanent settlement or to no foundation at all. To be able to distinguish the different phases multiple disciplines, including archaeology, are needed to define each different group of people and their material culture. While doing this, we have to be careful that we do not make the mistake to see the archaeological evidence in a teleological way and make the wrong interpretations. This can be reduced by making a clear record of all the excavated finds and features.

Even though Nijboer has his own ideas about colonialism, he also uses the typology of Gosden to define colonial situations. Because of this we are able to compare the different types of colonization and then, in particular, the development of the different phases in the colonization process. In the early examples of colonialism (Greek, Phoenicians, Romans) we often see a combination of the Middle ground with colonisation within a shared cultural milieu and in the later examples (seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) we are often dealing with examples of *Terra nullius.*

Table presents a summary of the multiple models on colonialism and the main focus of these models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Dommelen</td>
<td>Colonialism is a phenomenon in which foreign people are present in an area with local people. In this model the colonizers have a dominant and exploitive relationship with the colonized and their territory</td>
<td>Focus on how to define colonial situations and the difficulty of the concept of colonialism. Also a focus on the relationship between colonialism and identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td>Colonialism is strongly related with identity, culture and indirectly with civilisation</td>
<td>Focus on the interpretation and defining of different sorts of identity which has a major role in the colonial process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malkin</td>
<td>Colonialism is based on a system of networks</td>
<td>Focus on social ‘systems’ all over the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosden</td>
<td>Model based on a three-types typology of colonialism</td>
<td>Focus on the relation between people and material culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathern</td>
<td>A colonial society exists of ‘dividuals’ which are created by the society and are small versions of this society</td>
<td>Focus on the role of individuals and ‘dividuals’ in society and the relationship between them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiPuma</td>
<td>A colonial society has aspects of individuals and ‘dividuals’ in which both have overlaps</td>
<td>Focus on the role of individuals and ‘dividuals’ in society and the relationship between them and material culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijboer</td>
<td>Model based on three stages of colonial process</td>
<td>Focus on the different stages of the colonial process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Summary of the models and ideas on colonialism.*
In this chapter, we have seen that there are multiple ideas concerning the concept of colonialism. If we, for a moment, leave out the differences between the models, a concept of colonialism emerges in which there is contact between multiple groups of people on the basis of networks in which material culture, people, religion and other things are exchanged. Still, each author focuses on a different aspect of colonial situations. A common feature is that all authors see links between different groups of people and their relationship with material culture. Material culture is the visible proof of the relationship between different groups of people and in this way we attach a large value to it. In my opinion, colonialism is a phenomenon in which different groups of people came into contact with each other. In what way this exactly happened differs locally and in time and this also counts for the kind of colonialism (violently, peaceful or a combination of the two). The process of colonialism has largely to do with the encounter of different identities. This part of the process is difficult to study, because the defining of different identities is intricate. Whether an artefact is Greek or not depends on a lot of aspects and this interpretation depends on the researcher and his theories (and the context in which these theories arise). The world consists of multiple networks and according to Malkin these play an important role in the colonial process, because there was already contact between the indigenous people and the Greeks preceding the colonial process. Defining the borders of these networks is not as easy as it seems because of the difficulties with identity. According to Malkin these colonies also play an important role in the rise of Hellenism, because it could spread due to political and religious networks.

The study of colonialism also brings along difficulties. A large part of these have to do with the use of concepts. When we are dealing with colonial situations and describe them in our research, it is important to assure that the concepts we use are defined clearly and do not have a double meaning. We have seen examples of these problems concerning the meaning of the word colonialism, but also with the decision whether a settlement is a colony or not. Besides this problem we tend to see the ancient colonial process too much with modern eyes. In this way we use modern concepts when describing colonial situations in the ancient past. It is, for example, often seen that researchers describe colonial situations with the term imperialism when we are dealing with political domination. Still, as we have seen previous in this chapter, there is still a lot of uncertainty about the meaning and the use of this term and
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according to Gosden\textsuperscript{80} and van Dommelen\textsuperscript{81} we should not use this term when dealing with ancient forms of colonialism. This modern eye also causes different approaches in the study of colonialism, because some of the European countries have a clear nationalist way of studying colonial situations. This difference in approach and, in relation to this, in focus on certain aspects causes dissimilar theories.

All through the history of studying colonialism, different researchers have developed their own ideas and models based on different aspects of the colonization process. The focus of the study changed through time and was depended of the time and place in which they were studied. The development of the different theories and their contents will be studied in the next two chapters. In these chapters we will also evaluate whether the discussed models are early ways of looking at colonial situations or whether they were influenced by postcolonial theories about colonialism.

\textsuperscript{80} Gosden 2004, 5.
\textsuperscript{81} Van Dommelen 1998, 16.
Chapter 3: Earlier approaches to colonialism

In Mediterranean archaeology clear descriptions of the concept of colonialism are rare. The concept of colonialism was only introduced with the work of Stoler, Morris, Shanks and Said, who focused more on the use of the concept. Earlier approaches were very much influenced by modern colonialism. This means that in traditional research on colonialism of the Classical world scholars tended to analyse colonial situations making use of more or less contemporary or sub recent experiences. Because of this, these scholars - in particular British and French archaeologists - had a one-side preoccupation with the coloniser in which the focus is on the coloniser and their developments. The areas in which they settled and the inhabitants of these areas were deemed less important or not important at all. In this way, a one-sided history was constructed in which different Greek settlements and developments were compared while the specific relationships with the hinterland and the local people were neglected. Van Dommelen mentions as an example the Greek presence in Syria which is related to other Greek settlements, but not to its Syrian hinterland.

3.1 Different views on colonialism

In earlier approaches, we can make a distinction into three points of view: the colonial, the evolutionary and the dualist one. The colonial point of view came into being in the nineteenth century when there existed a western colonial mentality. This mentality consisted of a strong European sense of identity and caused a one-sided focus on Greek and Roman presence in the Mediterranean. This is mostly seen in research reports from the sixties. An example of this view is the colonial situation on the Ionian coast of South Italy where indigenous settlements were studied in the light of the Greek colony Sybaris, which was reportedly founded in the eight century. The discovery of public buildings, containing spolia of two temples, dating to period of Roman Copiae and a series of private houses dating
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to the sixth century received most of the attention.\textsuperscript{91} Sybaris was a dominant factor on the Ionian coast during the sixth century. There is actually a discussion on the question when this dominant role rose and according to Pier Giovanni Guzzo this dominant role could be dated back to the late eight century when the colony was founded.\textsuperscript{92} According to him indigenous sites in this area (including Timpone della Motta (Francavilla Marittima), Torre Mordillo and Amendolara) were rapidly falling under colonial control as shown by Greek ceramics dating to the first half of the seventh century in the settlements and necropoleis.\textsuperscript{93} Temple structures in these sites were interpreted as frontier sanctuaries which defined the colonial territory.\textsuperscript{94} He even interpreted indigenous finds in Greek settlement layers on the Timpone della Motta to be an indication of indigenous labour in the service of the Greeks.\textsuperscript{95} In his articles Guzzo focuses on Greek aspects of the colonial period and the period preceding the colonial one and in doing so the indigenous settlements and their developments disappeared into the background. To what degree the native and Greek population did integrate is nowadays still not totally clear.\textsuperscript{96}

The evolutionary point of view has all to do with the fact that Western countries believed that they had brought civilisation to the colonized areas. Once again, we see a clear influence of modern thought on colonial situations. A clear example is the idea that indigenous society could only develop through the contacts they had with the ‘higher’ and developed colonial cultures.\textsuperscript{97} This is also noticeable in the vocabulary used in articles: researchers write about the ‘Hellenization’ of southern Italy instead of ‘urbanization’.\textsuperscript{98} In reaction to this, a dualist form of colonialism was formulated in which the process of colonialism is divided in two: the colonizers and the colonized. Pels\textsuperscript{99} describes this approach as ‘the tendency to portray the making of colonial society in terms of two distinct cultural and social entities standing in a relationship of opposition and conflict.’ In this approach it is important that the two groups make up an autonomous community without contradictions and conflicts using obscure terms as ‘the Greeks’ or ‘the Romans’. By doing so people automatically make a distinction between the colonizer and colonized in which the colonizer is seen as the dominant factor who imposes its culture onto the colonized.\textsuperscript{100} In this way, the

\textsuperscript{91} Attema, Burgers en van Leusen 2010, 121.
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focus is still not on the relationship between the two groups but, as always, on the colonizers. This focus, but then on the indigenous inhabitants, also exists in the archaeological approach, but this only enlarges the gap between the colonizers and the colonized.\textsuperscript{101} An example of this focus is the study of Bénabou\textsuperscript{102} on Roman Africa in which he focused too much on the indigenous population which caused a polarized representation of the colonial situation. Colonial dualism focuses on culture as a well-defined and clear phenomenon, which causes an image of colonial situations as a clash between two identities.\textsuperscript{103} Furthermore, it is not possible to use terms like ‘the Greeks’, because there has never been ‘a Greek’ or a group of people that was so homogenous that it could be named ‘Greek’.

Gosden focuses in his book on the relationship between archaeology and colonialism and approaches colonialism mostly from the archaeological angle. According to Gosden there are two other approaches to colonialism that have been, and nowadays still are, influential on archaeology: world systems literature and post-colonial theory.\textsuperscript{104} The main positive thing about world systems literature is that it covers a long period of human history and developments of variable systems. A huge disadvantage is that the theorists did not develop clear theories about the relationship between human history and the role of material culture and in addition to this tried to explain human history in modern terms. The opposite approach is that of the post-colonial insofar as theorists focused on the colonized and the local cultures. In this focus on the colonized and local cultures an anthropological approach plays a major role, because anthropologists study the way in which same things can have different values within two groups of people. Gosden adheres to these ideas because they focus on the role of material culture by studying the exchange between colonisers and colonized and the types of exchanges.\textsuperscript{105} Both approaches –world systems literature and post-colonial theory – are inspired by older thoughts and theories. One of these are the ideas of Marx, although Gosden believes that the focus on production and its value to colonial situations should be complemented with the study of how objects are used to construct human relations within and between cultures.\textsuperscript{106}
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3.2 Cultural-historical models

A few authors believe that the development of capitalism should be seen in relation with European colonialism. In this way the Marxist approach could be an addition to the study of colonialism, because it focuses on the way things are used to construct relations between people, things and cultures. This focus on the relationship between objects and people is consistent with the model of Gosden. According to Marx the growth of capitalism in Europe was made possible because of its colonial links in which these links were the new source of labour and raw materials. I doubt whether his ideas can contribute to our knowledge on the process of colonialism, because he concentrates on colonialism as being the beginning of the development of capitalism, instead of on the process of colonialism itself. Besides Marx, also Lenin compared capitalism with the process of colonialism. Lenin connected capitalism with colonialism, because he believed that by studying the growth of the capitalist market he was able to understand the grounds for ancient colonialism. However, Lenin did not include the possibility that the motives leading to capitalism and to colonialism are largely incomparable. In addition to this, it seems that Marx as well as Lenin created their theories with more modern colonial situations in their mind. Ancient colonialism is often not even connected with terms like for example imperialism. As mentioned before in chapter two imperialism is a form of colonialism appearing in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and in this way it becomes difficult to place the framework of Marx’s and Lenin’s theories on ancient colonialism. Therefore, I have decided to not consider the Marxist approach in my case studies.

Besides this, the Marxist approach also focuses on the role of the individual in social complexity. This role of the individual has been used in the analysis of social changes from for example Palaeolithic hunter-gatherers and Mesoamerican civilizations. In these social complexities, social status is important and according to Marx this social status can be recovered from for example burials. Still it is doubtful whether individuals really did have a major influence in the colonial process, or if we are dealing with groups of people creating
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this influence on the colonial process. In addition to this, it is very difficult to trace individuals in a material culture and archaeological remains.

The ideas of Whitehouse and Wilkins have similarities with those of Marx and Lenin. In their article ‘Greeks and natives in southeast Italy: approaches to the archaeological evidence’, they discuss the concept of core-periphery. This concept is based on the notion that when, in this case, the Greeks expanded their culture and economy it needed to engulf regions to ensure the success of this expansion. According to Whitehouse and Wilkins, this was one of the reasons that the Greeks and the natives came in contact and this could happen in two ways: control over the natives by the Greeks (1) or a coexistence between the natives and Greeks (2). They studied their theory by examining the settlements Taras and Metapontion in southeast Italy. In this study they examine the material culture, but they do this by focusing on the appearance of Greek architecture and artefacts in native areas.

Wallerstein had a different opinion than Marx and Lenin because he thought it was impossible to understand the process of capitalism and colonialism on global scale when theorists focused on Europe only. In his view the whole world was set up of relations, based on the exchange of materials and labour, in which Europe was the centre and the rest of the world its periphery. Europe ‘created’ colonies after 1500 AD and was able to collect raw materials and create trade markets with the periphery formed by America and Asia. In this way, Europe was able to collect cheap raw materials and sell valuable products on a world scale. This modern world system of Wallerstein is unique in our history, because economic influence spread in advance of political control. When reading his book, what strikes one most is that he explains his theory using examples from later colonial situations. It seems then that his system is more or less unusable to understand more of ancient colonial situations. In a few world systems (such as the Chinese world empire), previous to this modern system, the spread of economic and political power were more or less the same. This is actually not the case with Greek colonialism, because there was already contact between the Greeks and the indigenous inhabitants based on trade (economic power), previous to the colonial period. The world systems approach works with multiple disciplines to understand long-term trends in human history. There exist multiple variants on the world systems approach of
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which the approach of Frank and Gills is an example. Frank and Gills thought up a variant of Wallersteins’ ideas and pointed out how smaller systems expanded to world systems. They believe in a 5000-year-long world system starting with the early cities of the Uruk period in southern Mesopotamia. According to them the smaller system would have to comply with the following characteristics to fit in a world system: ‘a) extensive and persistent trade connections; b) including especially center-periphery-hinterland relations and hegemony/rivalry relations and processes; and c) sharing economic, political, and perhaps also cultural cycles’. In my opinion these criteria have similarities with the colonial process according to Nijboer (chapter 2), but then in a more modern version. Characteristic A seems to be consistent with the prospecting phase, characteristic B with the foundation phase and characteristic C with the phase where there actually has arisen a colony.

The world system of Frank and Gills exists of countries which are related to each other based on trade and production. Gosden agrees with Frank and Gills, because he believes that the origin of colonial relations lies in the cities of Uruk. In the world system of Frank and Gills, Europe did not play a role until the rise of the Roman Empire around the second century. With this fact, Gosden wants to make clear that Europe is not the origin of the first world system, but that the system has a much deeper history. This influences the way of looking at colonial situations, because the development of the world system started in territories which had always been seen as periphery. Which area was important and which one acted more like a periphery changed through time and in this way different civilisations came into being (figure 1). Which aspect is focused upon is variable; besides trade and production also the nature of the material culture is important and the values which are attached to it. These values are not directly defined in economic terms as these values are part of a broader set in which human relations are created and maintained.

120 Frank and Gills 2000, 4- 5; Gosden 2004, 13.
121 Frank and Gills 2000, 5.
122 See also chapter 2, page 21- 22.
123 Gosden 2004, 14.
125 Gosden 2004, 14- 17.
3.3 Summary
In sum, the approach of a world system can be helpful but it also has its weaknesses. It is true that it may give a clear image of the long-term development of world systems, but in doing so it also gives a homogenising image in which local situations are left out. Gosden stresses

---

126 Gosden 2004, 17.
that it is important not to equate the values of material culture, because: ‘The successive coming into being of copper, bronze and iron technologies entailed changing networks of exchange, types of production and relationship with the material world and may have changed the principles on which world systems operated, rather than simply extended their range’. Moreover, populations and their cultures all over the whole world are connected with each other through multiple networks. However, we are all aware that human beings and their social and material world are constantly developing and changing through time and so their networks. In this way the principles on which the world system operated will also have changed. According to Gosden these changes are based on shifting relationships between people and their material culture. He also states, rather unclearly, that the world system theory is more like a description than an actual theory or model because it is based on already existing models.

All in all, I find most aspects of these early approaches a good start to look closer at the developments of colonial processes. In this, the world systems approach provided an useful overview of long-term human history. This enabled researchers to compare different (colonial) situations and their developments all over the world. One of the aspects of the Marxist approach is the focus on the role of individuals in social complexity. As mentioned before, it will be difficult to trace individuals in a material culture, but it is an interesting point to study whether individuals did have an influence on, in this case, the colonial process. Whitehouse and Wilkins created the concept of core-periphery in which they still focused too much on the Greek side of the colonial process. Still, the difference between their theory compared to the colonial and evolutionary point of view is that they do emphasize on the relationship between the Greeks and local inhabitants instead of on the differences between the two population groups.

The less useful part of the earlier approach is the focus on the distinction between the colonizers and the colonized (mostly by the colonial, evolutionary and dualist points of view). The focus on the Greeks and their culture, in particular, created a false image of the colonization process as an one-sided process in which the Greeks brought civilization to the colonized areas. In addition, the ideas of Marx and Lenin do not provide a model which is

127 Gosden 2004, 17.
128 Gosden 2004, 17.
130 I have to mention here, that at the moment I do not have an idea how we would be able to distinguish individual influences in material cultures or archaeological remains.
131 See chapter 3.2, page 29.
usable for Greek colonialism. Their idea of relating capitalism to colonialism is not very useful, because the two concepts work on different (time) levels in which the motives leading to colonialism are largely incomparable with those of capitalism.

The fact is that these earlier approaches are clearly influenced by the time and context in which they were developed. I actually do not believe that it is possible to create an image of history without being influenced by the world or context we live in. As such we will always criticize earlier ideas and models, because people will always try to improve on earlier models. I do believe it is useful to be critical on earlier theories and models, because in this way we can increase our understanding of history but also about the way we study our past and which things influence our ways of studying and interpreting. Still, it is not always said that these older models are wrong and not suitable anymore in the future. Older models may be as good as new ones and therefore it is useful to try and compare older models and ideas with new theories. This in order to be able to make new interpretations and to gain a better understanding of our history and our specific case Greek colonial past. Which ‘modern’ theories exist and whether it is useful to combine these with the older theories we will see in the next chapter.
Chapter 4: Rethinking colonialism: postcolonial approaches

The term postcolonial does not directly imply that it can only be used by researchers living in a decolonized period; it is just a term to divine a period of time in which particular theories and models are used. Many people argued that this new period of time, when colonies were few but familiar, required new theories on the process of colonialism. In the postcolonial approach, the main focus is on the reinterpretation of old theories on colonialism. Researchers believed it was important to look at the cultural dimension of colonialism and to see in what way this was related to power and domination and how the colonized fit in this perception. In addition to this, the postcolonial approach mainly focuses on the problem of how to represent colonial situations. During the postcolonial research, the anthropological point of view plays a major role because it traditionally has interest in colonial situations.

4.1 Development of the postcolonial approach

First of all, we need to give an overview of the changes in the definition of ‘colonialism’ from the early to the later approaches. Before the eighties, archaeologists limited the use of the term colonialism to the presence of foreign people and foreign objects in a certain area. This definition is too vague and we need to add more factors as such enlarging the usefulness of the concept. Not only must a group of foreign people have settled in a colonized area, there must also exist an asymmetrical social-economic relationship between the colonizers and the colonized. As such the actual establishment of new cities (colonies) is less important. When we look at theories about colonialism, it is possible to see a marked change at the beginning of the twentieth century. In France archaeologists and anthropologists started, in reaction to decolonization, to develop a critical opinion towards the way archaeological studies looked at colonialism. According to them, archaeological studies failed in their research on colonialism to think about the colonized region and its original inhabitants, focussing too much on the colonizers. In the postcolonial approach, we see a shift of focus towards the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized and this was clearly an addition to previous interpretations. In the last three decades, colonialism has often been studied from a Marxist point of view which had its influence on the postcolonial approach. However, we should separate this (Marxist) approach from the main ideas (see paragraph 4.2) in the ‘postcolonial

phase’. In the Marxist approach the focus is on power and domination and eventually the idea arose that domination was a primary factor in colonial situations.\textsuperscript{134} Scholars tend to focus on the aspect of domination in the colonial process only and represent it as a general concept.\textsuperscript{135} Moreover, the particular colonial situations and their local contexts are neglected and, related to this, also the colonizers, colonized and the relationship between the two. This Marxist approach is comparable with the ideas of Antonio Gramsci, who did research into the ideological and cultural aspects of domination.\textsuperscript{136} In his work he mainly focused on early twentieth century Italy and on the dominant aspects of hegemony which excluded the autonomy of the people being dominated. The postcolonial approach arose in response to these theories and had as aim to shift the focus in the study of colonialism to the relationship between the indigenous inhabitants and the Greeks, the relationship of a colony with its hinterland and on the comparisons of similar colonial developments (in a certain area).

In the period of the postcolonial approach, there also were theories and models in the field of subaltern studies. This was a movement of researchers who were interested in postcolonial and post-imperial societies and in general in the development of the world.\textsuperscript{137} In doing so, they were especially interested in what happened in the common part of society instead of the elite part. The ideas of the subaltern studies are deeply influenced by Antonio Gramsci and share ideas with the Marxist approach, although they, contrary to the Marxist approach focused on the non-elite.\textsuperscript{138} This focus on the non-elite is also present in the archaeological studies of Carter, Burgers and Crielaard (Incoronata and L’Amastuola), because they are more interested in the common life and the relationship between the indigenous society and the Greeks instead of the Greeks only and their superior role.\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{134} Miller, Rowlands & Tilley 1989, 3.
\textsuperscript{135} Van Dommelen 1998, 24.
\textsuperscript{136} Van Dommelen 1998, 28–29; Jackson Lears 1985. In his work, Gramsci used the concept of \textit{hegemony} of which there does not exist a specific definition. The concept can be described as ‘intellectual and moral leadership’ and Gramsci compared this to domination (political rule). With respect to this, it is not an individual who is in a leading position, but a group of people. According to van Dommelen, one can describe \textit{hegemony} as ‘a conception of the world that is implicitly manifest in art, in law, in economic activity and in all manifestations of individual and collective life’, which is a dominant way of looking at the world. Gramsci focused on early twentieth century Italy and saw the dominant role of Venice over its hinterland as an example of hegemony. The concept of hegemony is not directly applicable to the case studies in this thesis, therefore I will not further discuss the concept of hegemony. For more information on hegemony see van Dommelen 1998 and Jackson Lears 1985.
\textsuperscript{138} Gosden 2004, 18–19.
\textsuperscript{139} See chapter five and appendix 1.2 and 1.3.
Post-colonial theory developed from the decline of formal colonial structures and the way of thinking that started after the Second World War. According to Prakash, people have focused too much on the dominant power of the colonizers and the resistance of the colonized while studying colonialism. In his thinking it is important to be straightforward about the usage of certain terms while discussing colonialism. This in order to diminish false boundaries between the colonizer and the colonised. This also means that the disciplines which study colonialism should be able to get loose from certain set categories, ideas and terms which have developed during different forms of colonialism and to start viewing each form of colonialism on its own. One can think of terms like black, white, civilized or uncivilized and tribe or nation. Prakash defines a good point, because terms such as black and white can be very misleading, because they create an image of a colonial situation which is not always correct or applicable on each colonial site. Another aspect Prakash finds important is that, to be able to understand colonialism, we need to put all forms of colonialism in a history time line. This will improve our understanding of the developments of the colonial process, because we are then able to discern similarities and differences between various colonial situations.

4.2 Characteristics of the postcolonial approach

Postcolonial theory denies the fact that culture would play only a minor role in the process of colonialism. The old view of colonialism is one in which the colonizers overwhelmed the colonized. This resulted in a static view on culture since the colonizers’ culture is regarded as dominant. Reality actually shows that things are different once we appreciate that colonialism is a mixture of cultures with all participants having their own share in this culture. While postcolonial theorists rather focus on the cultural aspects of colonialism, older views focused on economic and political aspects.

The most striking aspect of the postcolonial approach however is the fact that the researchers criticized the central view which Europeans had of their own continent and the negative image they created of the east as static, exotic and old continents. In reaction to this Frank focused his studies on Asia and made it the centre of the world, but his study still
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140 Prakash 1995, 5.
141 Prakash 1995, 5- 6.
142 Gosden 2001, 243. Renewed excavation in Incoronata showed that instead of a destruction of the indigenous settlement a situation rises in which both indigenous people and Greeks live together within a shared cultural milieu (appendix 1.3). A similar situation seems to be the case at L’Amastuola (appendix 1.2).
143 Gosden 2004, 19.
144 Frank 1998.
maintained the focus on a continent instead of studying the relationships between multiple cultures and their material culture. Frank’s starting point is well considered, but he made the mistake by focusing on another continent, instead of studying each continent as equal. I believe that in the study of colonialism, it is important to study each culture as being equal without assuming that one culture is more developed and therefore more dominant. This will minimize the possibility of misinterpreting populations and their material culture.

Another important characteristic of the postcolonial approach is that it tried not to study colonialism by focusing on one aspect, but by studying different aspects in a more general way. The colonial process can be subdivided in multiple phases and aspects, which can all be studied separately. Still, these aspects are all connected to each other and will have influenced one another and should therefore, in my opinion, be studied as being an entity. Gosden mentions in his book\textsuperscript{145} that the Marxist approach focused too much on the economic side of the colonial process, while the French theory, of which Foucault\textsuperscript{146} is an example, focused too much on discourse and regimes of knowledge.\textsuperscript{147} Foucault studied the relation between power and knowledge and he believed that people were created as part of a system of knowledge, power and discourse which created their world and everything in it which gave shape and meaning to their world.\textsuperscript{148} These ideas of Foucault had a major influence on the postcolonial theory and its ideas about the world, because many researchers (including Said) elaborated on his ideas.\textsuperscript{149}

Another postcolonial theorist is Gayatri Spivak who was largely inspired by Derrida, who was interested in the manner in which meaning is constructed.\textsuperscript{150} Derrida focused on all kinds of ‘texts’\textsuperscript{151}, including written texts, in which he wanted to find the meaning of the text. In this he concentrated on the author’s intentions of his texts, but also on the not intended things

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{145} Gosden 1999, 197 – 203.
\item \textsuperscript{146} In my opinion, Foucault should not be considered as a post-colonial theorist, although he did have a major influence on post-colonial theories. His theory largely focused on the role of power and knowledge in the colonial process. In his study he compared various types of power all over the world, but he pessimistic believed that in history, we moved from one regime of domination into another. His theory about the concept of colonialism is too much focused on power and domination, which does not correspond to (most of ) the ideas of the post-colonial theorists.
\item \textsuperscript{147} Gosden 1999, 197-198.
\item \textsuperscript{148} Foucault 1979, 194. In this theory people move from one domination into another. According to him the world has changed over the last centuries and this can be seen in the material culture which is the visible symbol of these changes.
\item \textsuperscript{149} Gosden 1999, 198. According to Said (Said 1978; Gosden 1999) the image about the east was created and maintained by the west. In this he largely agrees with Foucault, because in his book ‘Orientalism’ (Said 1978) he writes about the east following a study of its people and culture. In this he agrees with Foucault on the fact that there is simply a division between the west and east in which the west is socially and organizational better developed and superior.
\item \textsuperscript{150} Gosden 1999, 199.
\item \textsuperscript{151} Gosden 1999, 199-200.
\end{itemize}
(things that seem unimportant, but are in reality a vital part of the whole). By using this method, we can deconstruct the ideas (western) people have about colonialism and see and understand the real developments of meanings and people’s thoughts. Earlier archaeological researchers (Maraggi\textsuperscript{152} of L’Amastuola and Dunbabin\textsuperscript{153} of Sicilian Greeks) used ancient sources and interpreted them in a way that would fit their theory, while they did not study by whom and with what purposes the text was written. Spivak\textsuperscript{154} uses Derrida’s ideas to delve deeper into the production of the truth: ‘Deconstructing classic colonial texts and revealing their logics will prevent radical politics unwittingly reproducing the habits of thought they seek to undermine’.\textsuperscript{155}

Spivak is interested in different colonial situations and she also concentrated on the fact that there are multiple local colonial situations; she thinks relationships between different people and their material culture are important and can tell us a lot. Because there are several forms of colonialism, it is not possible to compare all of these and we have to remember that one certain aspect of one form not necessarily has to be present in the other form. Still, Spivak also agreed with certain aspects of the Marxist approach, especially when it comes to economic aspects in relationships.

Like Spivak also Bhabha wanted to create a better and more factual image of the colonial history of the world. Bhabha agrees with Frank that the attention is too much focused on the west and its developments and it is seen as the norm with which we should compare all other situations. Colonialism is not about two different cultures meeting with each other and holding on to their own identity, but it is about a creation of hybrid cultures as a result of colonial contact.\textsuperscript{156} Bhabha as well as Spivak and Said formed their theories on the basis of evidence from the nineteenth century, so it is the question whether or not they are influenced by Eurocentrism thoughts.\textsuperscript{157} After all, it remained difficult to form a theory about a feature we are not always familiar with. Most of the time, the colonizer’s culture remained foreign in the eyes of the researcher.

\textsuperscript{152} Maraggi 1996.
\textsuperscript{153} Dunbabin 1948.
\textsuperscript{154} Spivak 1978, 208-211.
\textsuperscript{155} Gosden 1999, 200.
\textsuperscript{156} Gosden 2001, 241; Gosden actually does not fully agree with Bhabha because he believes that indigenous people could have remained parts of their own identity.
\textsuperscript{157} Bhabha substantiates his theory with examples from colonial India only (Bhabha 1994, 95). Gosden 1999, 202. It is the question whether these thoughts (for example the concept of knowledge and power, the focus on Europe as being the centre of civilisation) can be applied to the colonial world.
According to the postcolonial approach, researchers need to focus on the local histories and not limit themselves to the global concept. They need to realise that the image created in the past was not always realistic and true and often seen through the eyes of the coloniser.

Gosden has created his own postcolonial approach and thinks that local differences in colonial situations can be studied best by putting them in a broad comparative framework.\textsuperscript{158} By doing this, he takes the risk of applying too much of his own thoughts on local situations, but this cannot be avoided if one wants to bring out the differences between multiple forms of colonialism. Gosden also thinks that the focus is too much on power and knowledge and this focus tends to misinterpret the value of material things. Material things and their values which are attached to them are crucial for the study and understanding of different forms of colonialism.

Now that we have discussed the characteristics of the postcolonial approach, we can continue with the similarities and differences between the earlier- and the postcolonial approaches.

4.3 Comparing earlier approaches with postcolonial approaches

In the study of colonialism, the postcolonial approach can be separated from earlier approaches based on roughly three issues which are also partly discussed by van Dommelen. Firstly, the main focus is on local colonial situations instead of developments and situations on a large scale. But still, local colonial situations will always be part of a bigger colonial network.\textsuperscript{159} In the study of Incoronata, Carter first focused on the settlement itself and later on tried to see the situation at Incoronata in a broader aspect by comparing the settlement with sites in the area.\textsuperscript{160} Secondly, the postcolonial approach tries to prevent making dualistic interpretations of the colonial situations and in addition to this focuses on the social relationship and material interaction between the colonizers and colonized in the daily and ritual context. Especially material culture plays a major role in the study of colonial situations. This also means that archaeologists became critical on the way sites were supposed to be excavated. The old methods were inaccurate and often resulted in incomplete reports, which had to be avoided in the future. In most cases, archaeologists look at the material culture of a site to learn more about the culture and people. It is actually certain that in colonial situations this material culture is never inflexible. People use objects in their own way and objects are

\textsuperscript{158} Gosden 2004, 20.
\textsuperscript{159} Van Dommelen 1998, 293.
\textsuperscript{160} See also appendix 1.3, page 113-118.
given value through social interaction. In this way, it is possible that we all give our own interpretation of an object. To give the best possible interpretation of these objects, it is necessary to compare similar objects from different contexts with each other. The third aspect of the postcolonial approach is the importance it attaches to the comparative study of literary sources on colonizers and colonized. These sources also include ancient literature in which the colonizers describe themselves and the colonized indigenous people.

In addition to these three points it is striking that the postcolonial approach is very critical towards earlier approaches and interpretations. The whole idea of the new ‘modern’ approach was that old theories and methods of working should be criticized and renewed. During the postcolonial period, the relationship between the concept of history, culture and colonialism needed to be contextualized. Culture has influence on history and plays a major role in colonial situations, but history on itself has also influence (during colonial situations) on the development of culture. Secondly, as a result of these new ways of approaching colonial situations, scholars actually started to think about the way of studying. Different situations were interpreted by multiple approaches, to collect an image as complete as possible. This was important because the colonial process consists of many aspects (religious, economic, political and cultural) which are studied by multiple disciplines. In this way, the different disciplines could complement and learn from each other. Postcolonial researchers were able to criticize the research done by their predecessors and learn in this way about the possibilities and mistakes which were made in the past. While studying colonialism, the context of all facts is important. It is therefore that we always have to see things in their own context of time and place. But sometimes, it is necessary to remove this context, to actually understand the situation. Like Pels wrote in his article: ‘To understand a discourse, one must step back and compare tropes and topoi derived from disparate times and places, that is, decontextualize first to better understand the relevant context of a specific set of utterances or symbols’.  

Malkin as well studied this context and besides his study on networks (chapter two) he also focused on the way we should study colonial situations. According to Malkin the postcolonial theories can learn from studying Greek colonization. Another aspect he points to is the fact that postcolonial theorists can give historical dept to their theories instead of sticking to the fifteenth to twentieth centuries. In his article on postcolonial concepts and

\[161\] Pels 1997, 168.
\[162\] Chapter two, page 12-14.
\[163\] Malkin 2004, 341-343.
ancient Greek colonization\textsuperscript{164} he tries to demonstrate that ancient colonialism can be used to understand and explain modern colonialism by comparing ancient Greek colonialism with modern colonialism. In doing so, we often think in a binary way by defining the Europeans as the same sort of people as the ancient Greeks.

When we compare the earlier approaches to the postcolonial approach we see a development in the way of studying the concept. This development did not stand on its own, but is embedded in the development of our own history. With this I mean that each theory should be seen in its own context in time and place. In the earlier approaches we can conclude that most of the attention is on the colonizers and their material culture. This changes in the postcolonial approach were there is much more attention for the relationship between the colonizers and the colonized and the more broader development of colonial situations. The question is the whether the postcolonial approaches have substituted earlier approaches.

4.4 The postcolonial approach: An addition on our analytical possibilities on colonialism?
Now that we have discussed the postcolonial approach, we can discuss whether this approach is an addition to our analytical possibilities of colonial situations or that it is just another way of studying the material. During the period that the postcolonial approach came into being, people lived in a world familiar with colonial situations from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and researchers believed that it was time for new ideas and theories about colonialism.

Gosden describes in his book a familiar problem with studying colonialism: ‘(...) one of the problems with understanding colonialism is that our basic concepts of personhood, property, power and identity derive from colonial encounters from the seventeenth century onwards, so that we need to understand this intellectual history in order to start to construct new avenues of thought’.\textsuperscript{165} So in a certain way, Gosden tells us that we first have to be able to understand this colonial concept, before we can start to try understand ancient colonialism. When we do understand the ‘modern colonization’ we have to get our mind loosened from our ideas on the ‘modern’ versions of colonialism and then study each (local) form which includes using the right terms and contexts. Thereafter we will be able to compare the different forms and understand more about the reasons for and developments of colonialism. This aspect is also brought up by Jorge Klor De Alva who mentions that we use theories and equipments of the

\textsuperscript{164} Malkin 2004.
\textsuperscript{165} Gosden 2004, 20.
twentieth century to understand the colonialism of the nineteenth century. This is an example of what I have discussed earlier in this chapter when we use modern terms for ancient contexts. I do not want to state that this is always wrong, but we have to keep in mind that we are discussing a situation in the ancient world which did not have the same aspects as later situations.

Whether the postcolonial approach is a valuable addition on our analytical possibilities on colonialism is debatable. On a general note, a new way of approaching colonialism is always an addition to our analytical possibilities. This is because we can always learn more when we approach a feature like colonialism from a new angle. Having said this, I have to admit that the new way of looking at colonial situations also brought problems along with it. As the word ‘postcolonial’ already indicates, it is an approach that developed after the colonial periods. There is actually a huge difference between colonialism in the ancient past and in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Still, scholars tend to interpret all colonial situations like one and the same and with ideas in our heads concerning later colonial situations. Because of this, we already have a kind of model in our mind when we start studying the evidence from, for example, archaeological sites and ancient sources. In later forms of colonial situations, we are (most of the time) dealing with richer western countries which seek power in other continents. In these situations there were also features like slaves and racial and cultural differences which were actually at the root of European and American colonization. When we study the ancient colonial situations we tend to apply these terms and fit them into our theories and models. That is why we have to study each colonial form first on its own and in its contemporary historical context. The positive point here is that another characteristic of the postcolonial approach is its critical position against existing ideas and models, which made scholars more aware of the danger of letting our minds being influenced by modern standards and ideas.

Now we tend to describe the postcolonial approach as a new and better way of looking at colonialism. Still, there will be theorists who still use ‘old’ ideas and models on which they insist. In spite of this, one can still call the postcolonial approach novel and improving our theoretical framework. On the whole however I find it unjust to call the older evolutionary, dualistic and colonial approaches altogether wrong and antiquated.
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166 Jorge Klor De Alva 1995, 264.
167 It is not possible to mention one single colonial period, but the term ‘postcolonial’ defines a period in which colonial situations no longer exist.
168 See also Pels 1997, 172-174.
When deciding which approach is the most useful we have to look at how these approaches influence our interpretations of sites. Nowadays, we often restudy settlements and go over the finds again. As we will see in the next chapter, sites are often excavated and interpreted in the same period as they were first discovered. These excavations often linger for a long time and this means that new researchers, with other theories, will shed their light on the finds. In other situations a site and its remains are re-examined by later researchers. As we have seen in this chapter, the earlier approaches have a divergent focus compared to the postcolonial approaches. When both approaches are used to study the site it must have resulted in different interpretations. The interpretations of the earlier approaches will focus on the Greek phase of the colonial period and create an image in which the indigenous people are dominated by the Greeks and have adopted the Greek culture. The same site will be interpreted otherwise by the postcolonial researchers, because they will focus on the relationship between the indigenous people and the Greeks. Furthermore they will be interested in the wider image of the colonial process (relationship with the hinterland and comparable developments in the same area) and in the period previous to the colonial period. However, it is not correct to call the older (colonial) interpretations wrong, because of their deviant focus in their study. As said before these colonial approaches did focus mostly on the development of the site itself with an emphasis on the Greek phase. This often resulted in a wrong image where the indigenous inhabitants were being dominated by the Greeks, but instead of focussing on the ‘bad’ results we should focus on the positive results. Because of their focus on the Greeks and the site itself, we nowadays know a lot about the Greeks and their material culture. In addition, we more or less understand how a settlement developed into a colony because of the emphasize on the context of sites. Later on, the postcolonial approach focused on the relationship between the Greeks and the indigenous inhabitants and the colonial developments on a regional scale. I believe that, because of the focus by earlier approaches on the Greek phase, it enables scholars today to better understand the colonial relationship between the two population groups. In addition, the knowledge of colonial sites (enabled by earlier approaches) will enable scholars to make a better comparison between various colonial sites. Therefore I do believe that the colonial approach and the postcolonial can be complementary. Still, each approach will have its influence on the interpretation of sites. It is therefore very interesting to compare theories on sites through time and examine how theories influence these interpretations of sites. The degree of this influence and the differences between the interpretation of a site by earlier and by postcolonial approaches will be discussed in the next chapter.
In sum, I find the postcolonial approach a valuable addition to our analytical possibilities on colonialism, but it should be applied in combination with the older theories and models. Possibly a number of theories and models will be proven wrong (with new evidence from fieldwork for example) or simply are (depending on when they were created) out of date. On the other hand however, a lot of old theories are still valuable for the analysis of colonial situations. Over the last centuries we have learned that we have to be careful with the use of terms and models. When we have a certain model or theory it may not always be suitable and there is the danger of interpreting each situation in such a way that it eventually fits our models. It is important when we are dealing with for example an archaeological site, to first collect all the evidence and information there is and then interpret our findings. After that we have to compare these findings and find one or more suitable models for analysing the situation.
Chapter 5: Greek colonialism in South Italy and Sicily

5.1 Introduction
In the previous chapters I have discussed a number of theories on colonialism. In this chapter I will discuss three sites that were affected by Greek colonization. During the late eighth to fifth centuries a number of Greek colonies existed along the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. South-Italy and Sicily were both influenced by Greek colonization starting in the eighth century, and these were the first areas where Greeks started to establish settlements. There were many reasons for the Greeks to go overseas and establish cities outside their ‘homeland’: these include trade, religion and political and social motives. Preceding the historical colonial settlements, the Greeks had already been in contact with the indigenous people through trade.\(^{169}\) The actual colonization is, generally speaking, characterized by a transition from an indigenous settlement, consisting of a hut settlement, to a planned Greek settlement.

The sites which I will discuss are Morgantina, L’Amastuola and Incoronata. Morgantina is situated on Sicily and the other two sites in South-Italy.\(^{170}\) Different theorists have studied the material culture and architectural remains of these sites and created models of interaction. This is one of the reasons I have chosen for these sites, because there are old and new theories about their finds and interpretations. For each site the different theories will be discussed and in the end we will be able to decide whether the postcolonial approach is a valuable addition to the older theories or not. My aim is to make a comparison between the old and new theories and discuss the effects of modern theories on our way of interpreting sites excavated in the past and in more recent times. For further information on the history of the excavations of the three sites the reader is referred to the appendix.

5.2 Morgantina
Excavations at Morgantina were started in the early twentieth century A.D. by Paolo Orsi, who was the first to find remains of the Great Steps, parts of a wall and the remains of a Roman House.\(^{171}\) Unfortunately, there is not much left of his excavations and reports, because he did not publish all his finds and interpretations.

\(^{169}\) Antonaccio 2005, 97.
\(^{170}\) I have chosen for these three sites, because I am already familiar with these sites. In this way I will be able to be more critical towards the different theories and models which are applied to the findings at these sites.
\(^{171}\) Stillwell & Sjöqvist 1957, 151; Lyons 1996, 6.
Using excavation reports, books and articles on Morgantina, it is none the less possible to give an overview of the multiple ideas, theories and models that exist about the developments at Morgantina, during the period of Greek colonization. The first reports on Morgantina describe the excavations from 1950 until 1980 and focus on the finds and first interpretations. These just describe the exact progress of the campaigns and their preliminary results and conclusions without interpretations. The first discoveries consisted of the Agora and its buildings and later on the cemeteries. The fact that these were the first, and also impressive, finds at Morgantina is clear from the way in which they are described. In each excavation report Sjöqvist and Stillwell conclude with an interpretation of the historical development of the settlement. In this interpretation they mention the existence of a protohistorical settlement and its transition into a colonial phase somewhere during the sixth century. They do not discuss this colonial phase extensively, but do mention that from the late sixth, early fifth century on a new settlement arose with an urban building plan. Stillwell and Sjöqvist compare the remains of Morgantina with other sites on Sicily in order to be able to create a context for the site. They, however, do not develop a model or theory on the basis of the finds of Morgantina. They just describe the finds and draw preliminary interpretations and indicate that later articles and books will attempt to provide the theories and models.

When dealing with different researchers, it is important to take the context of the researcher into account. Stillwell and Sjöqvist did research in the early twentieth century and what strikes the most, while reading their preliminary reports, is their focus on the Greek elements of the site. During these research periods, we often see a focus on the Greek phases of the settlement, as these leave a lot of visible, interesting and often large remains. The presence of earlier settlement phases was unnoticed or largely ignored. This also happened in the first reports of the excavations where Stillwell and Sjöqvist do name the appearance of a


173 These excavations were focused on the Archaic and Roman Republican periods. The first interpretations were that an early settlement was destroyed by fire around 640, which dated the end of the Archaic period (Sjöqvist 1958, 156). At the beginning of the fourth century, the site came to life again shown by new building activities (see also appendix 1.1.1, page 84).

174 Stillwell & Sjöqvist 1957; Sjöqvist 1958; Stillwell 1959. In their excavation reports, they focused on the description of the finds without making any interpretations. Stillwell and Sjöqvist were mostly interested in the development of the Agora and its buildings (Archaic period).

175 Sjöqvist 1962, 138.

176 Appendix 1.1.2, page 88-96.
protohistoric site, but do not further discuss it due to the few and badly reserved remains. This also has to do with the fact that the Greeks were thought to be more interesting than the indigenous inhabitants, especially when dealing with colonial sites. We have few reports and articles of the early twentieth century that report on the indigenous sites in Italy or Sicily, when it was followed or replaced by a (colonial) Greek site.\textsuperscript{177} Another aspect is the fact that the colonial phase is hardly mentioned.\textsuperscript{178} It seems as if the protohistoric settlement abruptly disappeared, and was followed by an archaic settlement housing the first Greek colonists and then, about a century later, by the coming into existence of a Greek urban settlement. Sjöqvist explains this phenomenon using ancient literary sources which describe the abandonment of the protohistoric settlement and the rise of the Greek settlement.\textsuperscript{179}

Leighton is the first to fully discuss the protohistorical settlement on the Cittadella.\textsuperscript{180} He uses the information described in the preliminary reports and enriches the interpretations with his own theories. He believes there already existed an indigenous settlement during the tenth century, which was situated on the top of the Cittadella and on the slopes of the Serra Orlando ridge. The evidence for this settlement is limited, and the interpretations are based on a few trenches (in which remains have been found of multiple huts) and on cemeteries. In his book on the protohistorical settlement he elaborates on the excavations and the remains of the huts and different tombs. Recently, Leighton published a new book on the prehistoric houses.\textsuperscript{181} The available evidence shows that the protohistoric settlement consisted of multiple single huts or maybe small clusters of huts spread over the hilltop and its slopes.\textsuperscript{182} The huts were cut in the bedrock of the hill and followed the natural lines of this hill. They were used contemporaneously, shown by similar contents in the form of multiple floor levels, internal changes and deep floor deposits.\textsuperscript{183}

The difference with the preliminary reports is that we now receive quite a lot of information about the pre-Greek habitation on the Cittadella. Over the years, the excavators have collected remains of this phase, but in the reports it was only mentioned briefly and not discussed further. Another interesting aspect is the fact that Leighton does mention the colonial phase and its influences on the settlement. In the sixth century, the first colonists appeared at

\textsuperscript{177} When dealing with this kind of sites, the focus is mostly on the (colonial) Greek phase instead of the preceding indigenous phase.\textsuperscript{178} Appendix 1.1.1, page 85-87.\textsuperscript{179} Sjöqvist 1958, 156.\textsuperscript{180} Appendix 1.1.1 and 1.1.4.\textsuperscript{181} Leighton 2012.\textsuperscript{182} Appendix 1.1.1, page 86-87.\textsuperscript{183} See appendix 1.1.1 page 87.
Morgantina as is clear from imported Greek pottery in the settlement and cemeteries and the new types of tombs in the cemeteries.\footnote{Appendix 1.1.4, page 96-100. See also Leighton 1993, 97-101; Lyons 1996.} Preceding this colonial phase, the most common type of burial is in a chamber tomb. Three tombs of this type have been found in Necropolis IV and could, on the basis of fibula types, be dated to the middle of the eighth century, prior to the Greek colonization of Sicily. In addition to this there has not been found any Greek imported pottery in the chamber tombs, but this could be coincidental according to Leighton.\footnote{Leighton 1993, 106.} Chamber tombs are characteristic for indigenous sites and we have until now no records of Greek type chamber tombs. Chamber tombs with sarcophagi and fossa graves built into them show Greek influence on this indigenous burial type.\footnote{Lyons 1996, 18.} Besides these types, also other Greek types of burial appear in the form of fossa graves and tile-built graves.\footnote{Appendix 1.1.4, page 98-100.} The size of the chamber tombs does change, from a small chamber in the Iron Age to large ones in the sixth and fifth centuries.\footnote{Lyons 1996, 7, 19, 125.} In addition to the size, the tombs seem to develop more and more Greek elements in these periods such as the covering of graves with roof tiles. Besides the size of the tombs, the grave gifts also change, from a few pieces of pottery to large amounts of local and imported pottery and personal items, and the number of persons buried in one chamber seems to decrease.\footnote{Appendix 1.1.4, page 100.}

From the chronology of the remains, Leighton concludes that the Cittadella was abandoned in the fifth century after which a new settlement was built in the fourth century. Leighton’s approach is different compared to the one from Stillwell and Sjöqvist as he includes the colonial phase and its influences on the character of the settlement in which we recognize a postcolonial way of thinking.

Antonaccio\footnote{Antonaccio 2005.} is, like Leighton, clearly a researcher of the twenty-first century. Reading her articles on Morgantina, it is clear that she approaches the evidence of Morgantina from an angle that is different from her predecessors. She is intrigued by colonialism and all the processes related to it. In her eyes, the earlier researchers have put their focus too much on the Greek and Roman aspects of the settlement.\footnote{With earlier researchers I mean Stillwell and Sjöqvist (see page 46-47), although we have to keep in mind that in their time we often see a focus on the Greek and Roman periods. Orsi did research into the protohistoric phase, but a lot of his excavation reports are lost.} This is also evident in the preliminary reports where Morgantina appears as a Greek city, which is also supported by the ancient literary
sources. According to Antonaccio, the colonial phase has always been seen as a small part of the development of Greek culture and society, while it actually was of fundamental importance.\textsuperscript{192} The early excavators did not notice that indigenous habitation continued throughout the Greek phase of the settlement, while being strongly affected by the Greeks.\textsuperscript{193}

Antonaccio sees Morgantina as a hybrid settlement in which the indigenous inhabitants and Greeks lived together. She clearly has no ‘preference’ for a certain population group and sees the indigenous and Greeks as equal. Stillwell and Sjöqvist, however, regard the settlement as Greek from the sixth century on, based on the material culture of the site.\textsuperscript{194} Antonaccio disagrees with this interpretation because the material is neither wholly Greek nor wholly indigenous, but hybrid.\textsuperscript{195} In this hybrid settlement, the indigenous culture has crossed and merged with the Greek culture. Another aspect is the way in which she places Morgantina in the context of Sicily and its wider developments.\textsuperscript{196} The earlier reports totally focus on the developments of the settlement itself and pay little attention to the wider context. Antonaccio also includes the development of colonialism itself and other processes involved in this.\textsuperscript{197} She compares the development of different colonial sites all over Sicily and concludes that inland settlements were influenced in a different way by the Greeks than the coastal settlements. The difference is that the inland settlements continued to be inhabited by indigenous populations, while the coastal settlements often turned into fully Greek settlements.\textsuperscript{198} Antonaccio also discusses the way in which we interpret whether something is indigenous or Greek.\textsuperscript{199} Most of the time, this is based on the material culture of a site, but making interpretations in this way contains risks. To give an example: the presence of Corinthian pottery does not mean the presence of Corinthian colonists in the settlement.

If we compare the interpretations of the first researchers with those of Leighton and Antonaccio we see a lot of differences. Both Leighton and Antonaccio do include the indigenous phase of Morgantina into their interpretations.\textsuperscript{200} In this, they do not focus on one certain phase or development but include each aspect of the site and are clearly interested in the colonial phase and its influences and developments. This aspect is the most important difference from research done in the past. Nowadays, we have a new way of approaching the

\textsuperscript{192} Antonaccio 2005, 98.
\textsuperscript{193} Also noticable in the cemeteries: appendix 1.1.4; Antonaccio 2005, 99.
\textsuperscript{194} Appendix 1.1.2, page 88- 94.
\textsuperscript{195} Antonaccio 2005, 100.
\textsuperscript{196} Antonaccio 2005, 97-98.
\textsuperscript{197} Other processes like networks and the role of elites; Antonaccio 2005, 97.
\textsuperscript{198} Antonaccio 2005, 98.
\textsuperscript{199} Antonaccio 101-106.
\textsuperscript{200} See also appendix 1.1.1, page 82- 88.
classical world and in this colonialism plays a major role.\textsuperscript{201} In the study of colonialism, the focus is on both the indigenous and the Greek inhabitants. The context in which the colonial process took place is now important and this means that researchers study multiple aspects like networks, identity and hybridity and their influence on the development of colonial settlements. In addition to this, a wider context is created in which we study the local colonial processes so that we are able to create a broader image of the colonial process in Sicily and South Italy. The new way of approaching colonialism does not mean that we only focus on colonial phases and the developments during these phases; it also means that we start to become critical about the way we studied colonialism in the past and how we should study it.

5.3 L’Amastuola

As one can read in Appendix 1.2 (from page 102 on) L’Amastuola is situated in South-Italy and is a good site for our research on colonialism, because it has been preserved well and the surrounding area is suitable for regional studies.\textsuperscript{202} Moreover, it consists of remains from both the indigenous and the Greek habitation phases. When we look at the excavation history of L’Amastuola, we can see that there are two major theories which have shed their light on the finds at the site. The first theory is formed by Maruggi\textsuperscript{203} and the second one by Burgers and Crielaard and by Yntema\textsuperscript{204}.

A major issue in this discussion is the way in which colonialism took place. Concisely defined, there are two possible models. The first one is a rather violent colonialism in which the Greeks are dominant and subject the indigenous people. The second model is one in which the Greeks and the indigenous people have peaceful interactions in the same area and preceding this phase there was a phase in which the two groups already were having contact in the form of trade.\textsuperscript{205} In this model the indigenous society was already highly developed when the Greeks arrived.\textsuperscript{206}

Grazia Angela Maruggi started her research in 1988 and excavated the tombs which were located about one kilometre south of the L’Amastuola hill. In 1991 she went on with her

\textsuperscript{201} Antonaccio 2005, 97.
\textsuperscript{202} Appendix 1.2, page 102.
\textsuperscript{203} Appendix 1.2, page 106-107.
\textsuperscript{204} Appendix 1.2, page 107-110.
\textsuperscript{205} We also know this phase as the postcolonial phase. Besides contact based on trade, this could also be based on social and religious grounds; Yntema 2000, 4.
\textsuperscript{206} Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 78; Yntema 2000.
research on the south terrace of L’Amastuola where she found evidence for indigenous and Greek habitation on which she based the three phases of habitation (figure 9 in appendix 1.2). Maruggi is convinced that the site is dividable in three phases of which the first one is the indigenous phase. From phase two onwards L’Amastuola is a Greek settlement which replaced the indigenous settlement.207 Maruggi follows here the ancient literature which describes a violent transition from an indigenous to a Greek settlement. She formed her theory in the early nineties, so she is clearly a theorist of the earlier approaches to colonialism. This does not mean that she is automatically wrong in her theories, but rather that, from a present-day point of view, her theoretical apparatus is logically somewhat limited and superseded. However, we have to keep in mind that in her time, the focus on the Greek phase of the colonial process and the use of ancient literature as a source was normal. In her article she gives an overview of the excavation208 and its finds and in the end her interpretation of these finds. It has struck me that she is mostly focussing on the larger finds and by this I mean graves and larger Greek buildings, through which she automatically focuses on the Greek phase of the settlement.209 She does mention the indigenous huts and pottery, but this is all the information we receive about it. In addition to this, when we focus on her interpretation of the site the most substantial interpretation is the dividing of the settlement into three phases: the data of the settlements correspond with the data of the graves.210 In this she is convinced of the destruction of the indigenous settlement and a dominating Greek phase afterwards. While reading her article it seems like she already sort of had this theory in mind when she was analyzing the finds, and she largely denies the indigenous evidence at the site and dates it all to the first indigenous phase. Even indigenous pottery which belonged to the strata connected to phase two and three (the Greek phases) was interpreted as ‘residue material’ from the first indigenous phase.211 It is therefore logical that in the end she interprets L’Amastuola as a Greek site with a few sporadical indigenous finds. Later excavations by the ACVU212, however, support the idea of indigenous presence, even in phase two and three213 which I shall discuss later on in this section. In her way of focusing one-sided on the Greek phases of the settlement she fits in the colonial point of view of the earlier approaches (Chapter 3, paragraph 3.1). Maruggi does not directly mention her

207 For an expanded description of these phases, see appendix 1.2 on page 95-96.
210 Appendix 1.2, page 102-107; see also Maruggi 1996, 214-216.
211 Maruggi 1996, 213-217; Appendix page 104-108.
212 Archeologisch Centrum van de Vrije Universiteit.
213 Appendix 1.2 page 104-106.
preference for the Greeks, but in her way of naming and listing the finds and (largely) denying the indigenous finds, she defines the Greek phase as the dominant and developed phase of the settlement which corresponds to the evolutionary point of view (Appendix 3.1).

During the periods, in which Maruggi studied the site of L’Amastuola, the focus of archaeological research was on the colonizers’ remains and not so much on the indigenous part. This also excluded the focus on the relationships between the two groups, because the only relationship which was studied was the manner of transition from indigenous to Greek habitation. In this respect, she does not further consider the process of colonialism and its history.

These ideas largely changed in the later approaches to colonialism. Burgers and Crielaard have put forward new theories on L’Amastuola and their focus is more on the interaction between Greeks and indigenous populations and the character of this relationship. Besides this, they also focus more on archaeological sources and re-examine ancient literature with these archaeological sources. This new way of doing research caused, according to Burgers and Crielaard, a new perspective on the process of colonialism. Instead of being a single action, Greek colonization is seen as a long process and a form of migration. This new perspective needed new excavations and these had to focus on the first phases of the colonial process, because we still had limited information from these phases. In addition to this, research on a regional scale was necessary in order to be able to understand relationships between indigenous and Greek people in a wider context, which made survey an important aspect of the excavations.

Burgers and Crielaard clearly have another view on the settlement of L’Amastuola: they had the information which Maruggi collected and they re-examined this material and started new excavations. In general, Burgers and Crielaard thought the focus of archaeological research was too much on the Greek and Roman culture and this had to be changed into a focus on indigenous habitation and the relationships between indigenous people and the Greeks. Besides these aspects there had to be more research on social groups and the relationships

---

214 Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 106.
215 The necropolis of the settlement is the best context to study this relationship: appendix 1.2, page 103- 106 and page 108- 109. See also Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 78 and Yntema 2000, 1- 5.
216 Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 78.
between the colonies and their periphery. These colonial relationships were much more
differentiated than previously thought.  

This change of focus in archaeological research is also noticeable in their interpretation of
L’Amastuola. Instead of focusing on the Greek remains, Burgers and Crielaard concentrate
much more on the different relationships between habitation groups and their material
culture. This is shown by their study of the necropolis, where an indigenous type stone stele
was found in a Greek-type grave. Secondly, an indigenous hut containing both indigenous
and Greek pottery was still in use during the seventh century (the so-called Greek phase).
Thirdly, indigenous-type pottery (found in the necropolis) was kept in use during the Greek
phase, which indicated a ‘mixed’ society in stead of a dominant Greek population replacing
an indigenous settlement. With these changes of focus they fit in the ideas of the postcolonial
theory: each population group was important and especially the relationships between them.
Material culture played a major role in these relationships and Burgers, Crielaard and Yntema
all focus on the material culture and what it can say about a settlement and its inhabitants.
This is in line with the ideas of Gosden who focuses on the relationship between people and
their material culture (Chapter 3, page 27-28).

Yntema’s study did have major similarities with that of Burgers and Crielaard. Besides the
focus on the relationship between the Greeks and the indigenous inhabitants, Yntema focused
on the general development of the settlement by studying the necropolis and traces of the
settlement. He believed that the situation at L’Amastuola could be better understand if we
studied the chronology of the site and focused on the phases in which the material culture
(rapidly) changed. Still, there are a few differences between the interpretation of Burgers and
Crielaard on the one hand and the interpretation of Yntema on the other. Yntema much more
follows the ideas of Maruggi in keeping to the three phases and in believing that there was a
sudden end of the indigenous phase which he interprets on the base of pottery finds. Basing
himself on the evidence of later excavations, he thinks that the indigenous settlement did
continue but with a part of it becoming Greek.

222 Appendix 1.2, page 107.
223 Yntema 2000, 17.
224 Appendix 1.2, page 109. See also Yntema 2000, 17.
225 Yntema 2000, 17.
Until now, the focus of the excavations has been on the southern part of the hill. Perhaps when we, in the future, concentrate on a different area we may find more habitation phases and perhaps more finds which can learn us more about the settlement, its inhabitants and its connections with the hinterland. Concluding, when we compare the theories of Maruggi with the theories of Burgers & Crielaard and Yntema we can clearly see the differences. Maruggi uses ancient sources and includes them in her theory on L’Amastuola, while Burgers and Crielaard are suspicious about these sources and call them unreliable. Instead of focusing on literature on colonialism, they want to know more about the context and motives leading to colonialism. The period in which the different theorists produced their theories was clearly influential on their interpretations: Maruggi focused on the Greeks and their culture and found the indigenous culture far less important, while Burgers, Crielaard and Yntema focused on this indigenous habitation and their relationship with the Greeks and their material culture. Nowadays it may be said that Maruggi did oversee a lot of facts and therefore made wrong interpretations, but when we place her thoughts in her own context and time it is logical that she interpreted the site in this way. When we read old excavation reports and articles, it is important to read them against the background of their time of writing and the research context, as this may explain the way of thinking. After all, I believe that we can learn from each theory even if it is old and superseded, because each theory has its valuable facts and interpretations.

5.4 Incoronata

As can be seen in appendix 1.3 Incoronata is situated on a plateau in South-Italy in the chora of Metaponto. Just like L’Amastuola it provides remains of all the habitation phases and its material culture. The excavations at Incoronata started in 1970 and the site has since then been excavated multiple times. Once again there exist different theories about the developments of the settlement.

The first theory is formed by Paulo Orlandini who started the excavations at the site and wrote the first excavation reports and articles. Shortly after him Dinu Adamesteanu formed his theories on Incoronata. Orlandini was interested in the ancient sources written about the ancient settlement and these describe a violent situation in which the Greeks replaced an

---

228 Yntema 2000, 3.
indigenous settlement. According to his field reports there were clear finds for this violent situation, although it has never been clear which finds form the evidence for this situation. Orlandini divided Incoronata into two different sites based on material from various pits: an indigenous settlement followed by a colonial Greek settlement. The indigenous settlement, shown by pits containing purely indigenous material, dates from the eight century. This settlement was destroyed by the Greeks around 700, as is shown by pits containing a mixture of indigenous and Greek material.

In his way of interpreting the finds, it is clear that he focused on the Greeks and their material culture, and that he was strongly convinced that the Greeks were the dominant population who drove away the indigenous habitation. This is shown by the way he clearly divides the settlement and the material into two phases.

Adamesteanu values, like Orlandini, ancient sources of which predominantly foundation dates are important. In his articles on Incoronata he mainly describes the excavations and the finds during the different campaigns, while leaving out a clear interpretation.

After new excavations Joseph Coleman Carter formed a theory on the basis of new finds, but he also included the old finds. Carted was not directly fond of one theory as he believed there were two possibilities when it comes to the relationship between the Greeks and the indigenous inhabitants. According to ancient sources a few situations are known in which indigenous people and Greeks have a peaceful relationship. In most cases, however, there is a violent relationship in which the natives receive citizenship from the colonists. Still, Carter assumes that these relationships could change during contacts between the two groups on the basis of their needs. Attention should therefore be paid, as each local situation is different and there is a danger of generalizing the facts.

The indigenous inhabitants were much more developed and organized than previously thought and different groups had mutual relationships. Instead of focusing on the Greek developments, Carter focused on the indigenous habitation and their developments and the

---

229 These ancient sources do not describe the situation at Incoronata, but describe how Sybaris grew because the colonists shared citizenship (Diodorus Siculus). Antiochus described the situation at Metaponto where Achaeans colonists resettled an abandoned site (Carter 1993, 344). Orlandini was interested in these sources and adopted the hypothesis that Greek settlements replaced indigenous settlements.

230 Appendix 1.3, page 111-112.

231 Appendix 1.3, page 112-113; Carter 2006, 59/60.

232 Adamesteanu 1974, 11-12.

233 Carter received a lot of information from Sarah Leach who studied the material from the campaigns 1977 and 1978.

234 Carter 1993, 343-344.

235 Carter 1993, 344.
subsequent colonial phase. In this colonial phase, the focus was on the indigenous part of the community and on the relationship between the indigenous and the Greeks. After new studies of the finds, Carter concluded that a lot of the indigenous material could be dated to the same period as the Greek material. In addition to this, the population of Incoronata cultivated vegetables, grain and grapes. This happened in the indigenous phase, but also in the so-called colonial Greek phase which means that the indigenous habits of eating were kept in use.\textsuperscript{236}

In the case of Incoronata, networks have played a major role. Previous to the actual colonization there was already contact based on trade, shown by Greek pottery found in indigenous layers. In addition, the site was abruptly abandoned after the habitation period. It turned out that the habitation switched from inland to settlements on the coast.\textsuperscript{237} In the first period after the arrival of the Greeks the indigenous communities stayed in their settlements that were situated inland. After a while, trade became important and in reaction to this a location at the coast is preferred. It seems that networks based on trade played a major role in the abandonment of the site Incoronata.

Now, according to Yntema, it was not odd that Orlandini interpreted the site as fully Greek, because the first part of the site to be excavated was ‘Incoronata greca’.\textsuperscript{238} After this Greek interpretation, researchers went on with this theory and sort of assumed that all the indigenous pottery dated from before the seventh century. We nowadays know that there is a smaller settlement on the small part of the hill, where traces of habitation date from until the late eight century. These traces decrease in the early seventh century, while traces at ‘Incoronata greca’ increase. Yntema believes that there existed an indigenous site on the small part of the hill when the Greeks arrived. Eventually, the settlement was replaced to the other part of the hill and became a settlement with a mixed population (the settlement known as Incoronata ‘greca’).\textsuperscript{239}

Yntema notes another problem in the interpretation of the finds at Incoronata. The greater part of the theories are based upon settlement remains (hut and house plans) and pottery,\textsuperscript{240} but it is questionable, however, whether these sources provide the right evidence we need. The change of hut plan (from rounded-oval to rectangular) and the increase of Greek pottery

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{236} Appendix 1.3, page 114.
\item\textsuperscript{237} Appendix 1.3, page 118.
\item\textsuperscript{238} Yntema 2000, 11.
\item\textsuperscript{239} Yntema 2000, 11-13.
\item\textsuperscript{240} Appendix 1.3, page 115-116.
\end{footnotes}
should support the idea of Greek presence. Still, Greek pottery does not have to imply directly that it is solely used by Greeks. Similarly, indigenous pottery does not have to be used exclusively by indigenous inhabitants of the site. As for the hut plans, like Carter already mentioned, a certain population group was not committed to one type of hut or house plan.\textsuperscript{241} I do not want to deny the fact that there were Greeks present at Incoronata, but I do want to underline that there is the danger of generalizing certain habits or features onto a population group.

The interpretation of Incoronata by Orlandini differs a lot when compared to later researchers like De Siena\textsuperscript{242}, Carter and Yntema. It seems to me that when a researcher believes in a certain theory, this theory largely influences and forms his way of looking at evidence. When we take the abandonment of Incoronata as an example, it is clear that Orlandini sticks to his violent interpretation and believes that the settlement was abandoned because of the Greeks. Carter and Yntema are much more interested in the relationships between different population groups and their surroundings and create a different interpretation. They believe that the abandonment was connected with the upcoming trade with the Greek colonists. During the pre-colonial phase indigenous settlements were situated inland and these settlements were replaced after the indigenous had come into contact with the Greeks, which also happened in Incoronata. The site Incoronata was abandoned for a location nearer to the coast. These facts, then, emphasize that we have to keep in mind that although we have a theory there are always possibilities that fall outside the lines of this theory, but can still be true.

5.5 Concluding: the effect of theories and models on the interpretation of sites
As we have seen in the previous paragraphs, it depends on the researchers and their theory what kind of interpretation is given to a settlement. I do strongly believe that the researcher himself and also the context of the researcher do have an influence on the way he or she interprets a site and its finds. We have seen the differences in interpretation between the earlier approaches and the later approaches. An interpretation depends on what kind of aspects a researcher takes into account and what value is given to these aspects.

As we have seen in chapter three, earlier approaches mostly focused on the differences between the colonizers and the colonized, where the focus was on the colonizers. This resulted in theories in which the idea arose that the colonizers were dominant and the source

\textsuperscript{241} Yntema 2000, 13; Carter 1993, 348.
\textsuperscript{242} Appendix 1.3, page 117- 118.
of civilization. These aspects can all be recognized when reading the (excavation) reports and articles by Stillwell and Sjöqvist (Morgantina), Maruggi (L’Amastuola) and Orlandini (Incoronata). These researchers all have a, maybe unintended, focus on the Greek phase in the colonial process at their sites. In their study they do see that an indigenous settlement preceded the Greek colony, but they all believe that it was a matter of a violent change in which indigenous culture was replaced by Greek culture. This interpretation can be partly placed in the model of Gosden in which the Greek colonization would fit into the *Terra nullius* ‘group’. Still, I believe that the Greek form of colonialism should not be considered into this type, because it was much less dominant and violent than other colonial forms of this type. Their way of thinking resulted in an interpretation of the sites in which a pure indigenous settlement was replaced by a pure Greek settlement around 700. In this they focus on the Greek phase of the process and place the indigenous habitation on the background. The different phases are often based on pottery finds, which means that they relate identities with these finds. Earlier approaches believed that Europe was the centre of civilization and in a certain way the beginning of the world. This is noticeable in the interpretations by Maruggi and Orlandini, because they depict the indigenous inhabitants as unorganized and undeveloped and the Greeks as the highly developed population familiar with civilization. In addition, it strikes me that both Maruggi as Orlandini have as starting point the hypothesis that indigenous settlements were violently replaced by Greek settlements as reported by ancient literature. The context of their research is a period (eighteenth and nineteenth centuries AD) in which scholars believed that all ancient literature was a reliable source and therefore they largely based their theories on this hypothesis.

These ideas change in the postcolonial approach were the focus shifts to the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized, the relationship of the colony with its hinterland and on the developments on regional scale. This focus is similar to Gosden’s model, in which he defines the type of colonialism based on these relationships. This new focus results in a rapid change in the interpretation of sites. Where Stillwell and Sjöqvist focused on the Greek phase of Morgantina and its material culture; Leighton reopened the study of the protohistoric phase in which he focused on the prehistoric long-houses. In stead of making an distinction between indigenous-type material and Greek-type material, he established the relationship between the two population groups and their material culture, because he also wanted to know more about the first colonial phases. In the case of L’Amastuola Burgers and Crielaard focused on the

---

243 See chapter three, page 28.
necropolis to emphasize that the indigenous habitation did not end at the beginning of the seventh century. Their study focused on pottery and grave types and they compared their finds with other (similar) sites in the area, which is a characteristic of the postcolonial approach. Like Burgers and Crielaard, also Carter focused, in his study of Incoronata, on pottery and structures. He noticed that indigenous-type pottery and structures were kept in use during the Greek phase, which supported the idea of a ‘mixed’ population. By studying changes in the material culture, they were able to define the different stages of the colonial process (Nijboer’s model) and the type of colonialism. In addition, researchers were interested in comparing developments on a regional scale to be able to develop a more general model of colonialism.

When we compare the interpretations of the earlier excavators with those of the postcolonial excavators, we see some similarities but mostly a lot of differences. The similarities in the case of L’Amastuola and Incoronata the possibility to make some sort of a distinction in different phases in which the population changes. However, Maruggi and Orlandini have clear boundaries in their phases in which one population is replaced by the other. I do believe that the distinction in different phases is a good starting point, although these phases are a lot less strict then the ones of Maruggi and Orlandini and end in a mixed settlement in stead of a pure Greek one. Both approaches relate identity to material culture in the form of, for example, pottery. This means that when we have a material culture which changes from purely indigenous material into purely Greek material, we tend to describe it as a situation in which Greek culture replaces an indigenous culture. It is true that, to able to understand more of the colonization process, we have to try to make these distinctions in material culture. However, I want to stress that we have to keep in mind that identities will never have been so plain as we interpret them to be. So it is obvious that in this case, Greek-type material does not always have to indicate the presence of Greek culture.

The difference between the two approaches is, that the earlier researchers focused more on the development of the site itself, where the postcolonial researchers were more interested in developments on a regional scale in which they compared various sites. All in all, we see in all three case studies a shift in focus of study. From a clear focus on the Greek phase and its material culture into a more general study which emphasizes the relationship between the two population groups and their developments.

Theories and models do have a large influence on the interpretation of sites. Old colonial sites will have been studied with a focus on the Greek finds. When we re-examine these sites,
researchers will have different conclusions and eventually a different interpretation of the same site. In addition to this, we all have our own theories, concepts and methods. Sometimes we notice this contextual influence, but often we do not. It is therefore important to be aware of this context and to keep trying to make as objective an interpretation as possible. So, when reading earlier reports or articles on a site, it is important to also take into account the history and context of the writer/researcher. Furthermore, we have to be aware that it is very easy to fit in new finds into an already existing theory without testing whether it is reliable or not. Not every situation will fit into our theories and it is essential in this respect that we are aware of this fact, because we otherwise will keep stretching our theories to let each find fit in.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

In this thesis I have tried to gain an insight in colonialism in South Italy and Sicily. I did this by first focusing on the development of the concept of colonialism and the problems involved in it. Thereafter I studied the different theories on colonialism and explained the similarities and differences between them. Finally, I showed by discussing three case studies what effect different theories may have on the interpretation of archaeological sites.

I started my study by focusing on the concept of colonialism and studying the way in which it developed. One of the problems with the concept of colonialism is that the concept itself is still vague. Anthropologists, for example, have three ways in which they approach colonialism: as an evolutionary process which ends in modernization, as a strategy in which domination and exploitation play major roles, or as a continuous process of struggle and negotiation. It turned out that the ideas we have about colonialism are a combination of these three ways, in which colonialism is a long-termed process of exploitation and sometimes dominant features. In addition, the term colonial also provides difficulties, as it seems hard to define whether a settlement is a colony or not. To what extent should the material culture of a settlement differ from the cultural background of the area, so that we are able to name it a colony? The main problem in the study of colonialism is the way in which colonial situations have been studied. Nowadays, we are familiar with colonial situations from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and we tend to apply our modern terms (such as imperialism) and ideas from these colonial forms on the ancient colonial situations with the consequence that these ancient colonial situations are interpreted in a modern framework.

The term colonialism is strongly related to the term imperialism, which was used to describe, for example, the western presence in Asia. Still, there is a lot of discussion with regard to the use of the term imperialism when dealing with ancient colonial situations. Van Dommelen stressed that imperialism was a form of colonialism, involved with power and domination, during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Greek colonization did not have that kind of power and domination and to avoid confusion over the term imperialism, it should not be used for situations before the nineteenth century.

Gosden created a model in which material cultures play a major role in the colonial process. He believed that all Greek settlements in the Mediterranean were not directly established by Greek city states at first, but were a large gathering of people around a symbolic centre (for
example Greece). In this centre it is not about the colonizer who changes the colonized, but it is about the process of colonialism and its relationship to material culture.

In this colonial process, networks play a major role, because they enable contact between the Greeks and the indigenous inhabitants preceding the actual colonization. These networks work on different scales of which the Mediterranean network is only a small part. To define these networks, one ends up determining ethnicity which is needed to be able to distinguish the different phases in the colonial process. Still, it turned out to be difficult to define ethnicity when we only have artifacts and a few literary ancient sources.

Besides ethnicity, identity plays a major role in the study of colonialism as well. Over the last years, we have created a sort of European identity. This European identity must have shaped our ideas on how we think we should study ancestral civilisations. Nationalist ideas can only have played a small part in respect to this identity, because most of the European countries established international archaeological schools across the Mediterranean. Still, we know from Spain and Italy that they are more nationalist than other countries and that their interest and focus is on the archaeology of their own country. When studying identity, researchers also have to study its relation with culture and indirectly with civilisation. Identity is an important aspect in the study of colonialism, because it can determine the kind of colonial situation. With information on identity researchers are able to make a distinction between different colonial phases. Still, it is important to be careful with relating artefacts to a particular identity, because it is quite possible that the boundaries between the different identities are not as plain as we determine them. Paulo Orlandini, for example, based his interpretation of the site Incoronata on pottery finds. He related the pottery to an identity and in this way to a particular phase of the settlement. Still, the presence of Greek type pottery does not directly involves the presence of a Greek identity.

In order to be able to have a better understanding of the colonial process, scholars tend to create a model in which basically every colonial situation should fit. One of those models is Gosden’s model. He developed a comparative framework with variations in time and space, which focuses on the relationships between people and material culture. In this framework three types of colonialism occur: *Terra nullius*, Middle ground and Colonialism within a shared cultural milieu. These three types do not have clear boundaries, which means that it is possible that in one local colonial situation all three types emerge. Besides Gosden, Nijboer developed a model as well in which he defined the three phases of the colonial process: prospecting, foundation and at last the colony itself. These phases can be distinguished by studying the material culture from multiple disciplines. After having studied multiple models,
it strikes me that most of the models focus on the material culture and its relationship with people. However, these models were strongly influenced by the context of the researchers. The focus of the models changed through time and was dependent on the time and place in which they were studied.

There are many different ways in which colonialism can be studied. In my thesis I have made the distinction between pre- and postcolonial approaches. The earlier approaches are characterized by a focus on the Greek presence in the Mediterranean, which was caused by researchers being familiar with colonial situations dating to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the idea of Europe as the centre of the world. This resulted in a study in which the indigenous settlement was neglected, creating an image of a colonial process where the indigenous settlement was replaced by a purely Greek settlement.

Most aspects of the early approaches are a good way to look closer at the developments of colonial processes. In this, the world systems approach provided an useful overview of long-term human history, which enabled researchers to compare different (colonial) situations all over the world. The less useful part of the earlier approach is the focus on the distinction between the colonizers and the colonized. The focus on the Greeks and their culture, in particular, created a false image of the colonization process as an one-sided process. In addition, the ideas of Marx and Lenin do not provide a model which is usable for Greek colonialism. Their idea of relating capitalism to colonialism is not very useful, because the two concepts work on different (time) levels in which the motives leading to colonialism are largely incomparable with those of capitalism.

The postcolonial approach was much more interested in the relationship between the colonizers and the colonized and the relationship between the colony and its periphery. This resulted in a different way of studying the material culture of a settlement, because the focus was no longer on the Greek phase only. In addition, the representation of colonial situations became important, which resulted in a critical view on earlier articles and archaeological reports. As a result of these new ways of approaching colonial situations, scholars actually started to think about the way of studying. Different situations were interpreted by multiple approaches, in order to collect an image as complete as possible. The goal was to create a general concept of colonialism, which takes into account the possibility that local situations can deviate.

When both approaches are used to study the site, different interpretations must have been the result. However, it is not correct to call the older (colonial) interpretations wrong simply
because of the deviant focus in their study. As said before, these colonial approaches did focus mostly on the development of the site itself with an emphasis on the Greek phase. In combination with the focus of the postcolonial approach, which is on the relationship between the Greeks and the indigenous inhabitants and the colonial developments on a regional scale, we are able to understand the most of the colonial process.

Subsequently, I studied the way in which theories influence the interpretations of old and new sites by comparing different interpretations of the same site. The case studies I have used are Morgantina (Sicily), L’Amastuola (South Italy) and Incoronata (South Italy). In the case of Morgantina we see a clear development in the formulation of theories about the site. The early excavation reports focus on the developments of the excavation and give little or no clear interpretation of the finds. The first interpretation by Stillwell and Sjöqvist was of a protohistoric settlement being replaced by an Archaic settlement in the late sixth/early fifth centuries. In their reports they mainly focused on this Greek phase and its finds and architecture. They did name the presence of an earlier phase, but did not examine it further. This interpretation gives an image of a settlement that became important from the moment it entered the colonial phase. This image existed until the nineties of the previous century after which Leighton wrote his book on the protohistorical phase of the settlement. From then on a new interpretation was created in which the protohistorical phase is discussed in great detail. Leighton does agree with a rise of an Archaic settlement in the early fifth century, but he emphasizes that preceding this phase there was an indigenous phase which was increasingly influenced by the Greeks from the sixth century on. Antonaccio elaborates on this idea through her interpretation of Morgantina as a hybrid settlement in which an indigenous population lived together with the Greeks. In her interpretation, she involves the development of Morgantina on a more regional scale by comparing the site with other sites on Sicily. Comparing the early hypotheses with the later hypotheses, there is a clear difference in the interpretation of Morgantina. While the early interpretation gives the idea of Morgantina as an Archaic site which could only develop by the presence of the Greeks, the later interpretation gives the idea of a hybrid situation in which a protohistorical settlement developed under the influence of the Greeks into an Archaic settlement in the early fifth century.

---

244 Leighton 1993.
245 Chapter five, page 47-49.
246 Antonaccio 2005, 97-98.
L’Amastuola was first studied by Maruggi who divided the settlement into three phases in which an indigenous phase was completely destroyed and replaced by a Greek settlement (figure 9, appendix 1.2). Her interpretation is comparable with the one of Stillwell and Sjöqvist, because she only mentions the indigenous finds and focuses completely on the Greek phase and its developments. This interpretation changed after the renewed excavations from the year 2003 on. Burgers and Crielaard instead focused on the relationship between the indigenous population and the Greeks. In addition, the study of the colonial process itself became more important, as well as the development of colonial situations on a wider scale in the area of L’Amastuola. By comparing these interpretations, one can see a development in which the focus moves from the Greek phase to the relationship between the indigenous population and the Greeks and between the colonial settlement and its periphery. Still, the ‘old’ interpretation of Maruggi is partly sustained by Yntema, who believes that the settlement of L’Amastuola can be divided into three phases. In general, the settlement of L’Amastuola is believed to be settled by an indigenous population until the seventh century. In that century, the Greek influence increases and the settlement develops into an indigenous-Greek settlement.

The settlement of Incoronata was first excavated by Orlandini who also wrote the first reports and theories about the site. He believed that an indigenous settlement was destroyed and replaced by a purely Greek settlement. His interpretation was based on the study of pits in which he found purely indigenous material dating to the eighth century separated from purely Greek material dating from the seventh century. New excavations in the late seventies showed that there were pits containing indigenous and Greek material dating to the same period (the seventh century).

Yntema agrees with Orlandini that the settlement of Incoronata can be divided into two phases. The first phase is the indigenous settlement in the eighth century. This habitation decreases in the early seventh century contemporary with the arrival of the Greeks. Simultaneously with the decrease of the first settlement, a second settlement with a mixed indigenous-Greek population rose on another part of the hill.247 So, the interpretation of Orlandini does differ from the one of Burgers, Crielaard and Yntema, but here we have to take into account that Orlandini based his interpretation on the finds he made in the Greek phase of the settlement.

---

When we reflect on the case studies, it is possible to study which models are used in the interpretation of sites. The earlier approaches were mostly focused on the distinction between the indigenous and Greek phase. This can be seen similar to the model of Nijboer in which he defines different phases of the colonial process, although Nijboer’s distinction in the different phases is much more elaborated. In the earlier approach, the Greeks were seen as dominant and highly developed, which was also caused by the general idea that Europe was seen as the centre of civilization. In their study they do see that an indigenous settlement preceded the Greek colony, but they all believe that it was a matter of a violent change in which indigenous culture was replaced by Greek culture. This interpretation can be partly placed in the model of Gosden in which the Greek colonization would fit into the *Terra nullius* ‘group’. Still, I believe that the Greek form of colonialism should not be considered into this type, because it was much less dominant and violent than other known colonial forms of *Terra nullius*. Later researchers (of the postcolonial approach) are much more focused on the relationships between people and their material culture and in what ways these relationships are changed. This idea is largely Gosden’s model, in which he defines the type of colonialism based on these relationships. As we have seen in the case of L’Amastuola, Burgers and Crielaard focused on the changes in the material culture of the site. By studying these changes, they were able to define the different stages of the colonial process (Nijboer’s model) and the type of colonialism. In addition, researchers were interested in comparing developments on a regional scale to be able to develop a more general model of colonialism.

Secondly, taking all the three case studies together it is clear that the approach does have an influence on the interpretation of a site regarding colonization. After new excavations the interpretation often changed and was elaborated compared to the earlier one. However, it is not correct to name the old theories wrong, because they will contain aspects which can also be used in new theories and models. Still, when we compare two similar sites, of which one is excavated in the nineteenth or early twentieth century and the other one a few years ago, there will be a large difference in the interpretation of the sites, although they may have developed in the same way. Nowadays it is still a problem to fill up this gap, but I believe that it is already a start that we are actually aware of this gap.

Ancient Greek colonial situations are characterized by a process in which an indigenous settlement slowly changes, under the influence of Greeks, into a hybrid indigenous-Greek settlement. This theory was developed during the last years, because previously the idea existed that the colonial process was much more dominant, being a process in which the
indigenous settlement was destroyed by the Greeks. This dominant (and sometimes violent) idea of colonialism arose, because in our own ‘modern’ world we are familiar with this form of colonialism from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and as a result place this framework onto the ancient Greek colonial situations.

Through the years we have tried to form one single model of the process of colonialism. In the past, this often turned out to be wrong, because we forgot to see each local situation in its own context. This resulted in a situation in which every colonial site was divided into a certain model without keeping the local differences in mind. I believe it is possible to form a general model of colonialism, but while doing this we do have to be aware that it is a general model. This means that there are different types of colonialism, each having its own context. The boundaries of these types are not strict, which means that it is possible that in one local situation all three types emerge where one follows on the other or where there is only one form current. In the end, there will be a large framework which can be placed onto all the ancient colonial situations. This framework, however, risks the chance that aspects of local situations will be overlooked, but this cannot be avoided if one wants to bring out the differences between multiple forms of colonialism.\textsuperscript{248} Finally, we will be able to create a general concept of colonialism in which we always have to keep in mind that local situations can be at variance with this general concept.

\textsuperscript{248} Each general model will overlook some local aspects of a colonial situation. This is also the case in Gosden’s model, because it is simply not possible to develop a model which contains each aspect of the colonial process at each local situation. I believe that when we develop a model which contains each type of colonialism in history (without strict boundaries between these types), we would have a very good starting point. As said before, we then have to keep in mind that small local variations can occur.
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Appendix

Appendix 1: History of excavation

1.1 Morgantina
Morgantina is situated inland on Sicily, close to the geographical centre of the island. It was situated on a ridge between the Cornalunga and Gela River which made it a strategic location.

The settlement of Morgantina, which is now known by the modern name of Serra Orlando, was situated on a ridge. At the east end of this ridge was an isolated hill called the Cittadella which was most probably the location of the earliest settlement, certainly of archaic times.

The site was excavated between 1950 and 1958 and since 2003 new excavations have taken place. The results of these excavations make it possible to reconstruct the development of the settlement. In the early Iron Age a prehistoric settlement existed on the top of the hill, the Cittadella. During the sixth century, this settlement became influenced by the Greeks and later on there may also have been a politically dominant role for the Greeks.

During the mid fifth century the site was contested by the Greeks and Sikels, after which in 459 the settlement was captured by the Sikel leader Douketios. The archaic city on the Cittadella was abandoned towards the middle of the fifth century. The new settlement flourished in the third century and during this period the city expanded. This expansion ended in the year 211, when Rome captured the city. The Agora continued to be used and during this period the Romans reused and partly reconstructed the Greek buildings. This was followed by a decline in the first century it was abandoned.

1.1.1 The protohistoric settlement
Most of the excavation reports focus on the Greek phase of Morgantina and its further developments. Still, we have enough evidence that there was a protohistoric settlement.

---

²⁵⁰ Appendix 1 contains a summary of the excavations at Morgantina, L’Amastuola and Incoronata. I want to stress that it does not describe all the evidence which is found. It summarizes the most important finds, developments and interpretations of the three sites. For the extended reports, I refer to the preliminary reports and other literature to which I shall refer in these notes.
²⁵¹ Stillwell & Sjöqvist 1957, 151.
²⁵² Stillwell & Sjöqvist 1957, 151.
²⁵³ As can be seen in the graves, building plan and pottery; discussed further along this appendix.
²⁵⁴ Bell & Holloway discuss this politically dominant rule in their article, however, they do not mention on which evidence they based their interpretations. Bell & Holloway 1988, 314-315; Diodorus 11.78.1.
²⁵⁵ Diodorus 11.78.1.
predating the Greek one situated on the Cittadella: the Ausonian settlement\textsuperscript{256}. This was also the site of the main inhabited area of the archaic site. The Cittadella features fourteen springs on its slopes; enough for the water supply of the protohistoric settlement. This availability of water in combination with a good location on a high hill makes it easy to understand why people chose to built their settlement on this hill.

Only a small part of the settlement has been excavated and a lot of the areas have remained unexplored and therefore remain unknown. Moreover, a large part of the settlement was in later periods destroyed by the foundations of new buildings. The available evidence shows that the protohistoric settlement consisted of multiple single huts or maybe small clusters of huts spread over the hilltop and its slopes. Still, it is clear that there was a lot of space between the different huts or multiple clusters. Due to the few remains, it is impossible to define the number of huts in one cluster. In addition to this it is not sure whether there were more huts, if all of these huts were contemporary and what kind of size the Ausonian population had. The huts were cut in the bedrock of the hill and followed the natural lines of this hill. According to Leighton the shortest sides of the huts were cut in the bedrock to minimize the cutting in the hill and create a regular interior wall.\textsuperscript{257}

Research of the context of the huts and the superimposition of their floor levels, has made researchers suggest that there was a long habitation period predating the urban settlement in the archaic period. There are two possibilities: the first one is a situation in which the habitation switched from hut to hut all over the hill for a long period, depending on the circumstances. The second possibility is that the huts were used contemporaneously, since the contents of the huts are similar.\textsuperscript{258} This latter possibility seems reasonable, because the huts contain multiple floor levels, internal changes and deep floor deposits, also known in Lipari, which suggests that these huts were used for a long period.\textsuperscript{259}

Recently a new book on the protohistoric settlement was published by Leighton.\textsuperscript{260} The huts found on the Cittadella contained the typical Ausonian form and are, compared to protohistoric huts in other places in Italy and Western Europe dating from the Middle and Late Bronze Age, larger and shaped differently (figure 1).\textsuperscript{261}

\textsuperscript{256} Leighton wrote the following about the term Ausonian: ‘L. Bernabò Brea gave this name to the protohistoric culture of Lipari on the basis of the tradition which described the movement of Liparus, son of Auson, the leader of the Ausoni, from peninsular Italy (Leighton 1993, 152).

\textsuperscript{257} Leighton 1993, 138; Leighton 2012, 48- 49.

\textsuperscript{258} Leighton 1993, 139.

\textsuperscript{259} Leighton 1993, 139.

\textsuperscript{260} Leighton 2012. The book focuses on the protohistoric phase and in particular the excavation of the longhouses (Leighton 2012, 39- 89).

\textsuperscript{261} Leighton 1993, 143- 145; The closest parallels have been found in Lipari.
Figure 1: Examples of Ausonian buildings from the Cittadella, the acropolis of Lipari and the Metapiccola hill of Lentini. From: Leighton 1993. Figure 39, page 144

These so-called ‘long houses’ \(^{262}\) contained a levelled floor which was lower than the surrounding area and in this way people created a sunken floor. \(^{263}\) This sunken floor was served to keep the house warm in winter and cool in summer. The walls consisted of limestone blocks with on the inside a timber-laced cover. Wattle and daub was used to fill up the spaces between these timbers to protect the interior from rain. The form of the roof is

\(^{262}\) See also Leighton 2012, 39-89.
\(^{263}\) Leighton 2012, 48-50.
insecure and researchers believe there are two possibilities: the first one is a framework with slopes in the same direction as the hill facilitating the drainage of water; the second one is a gabled roof which leans on supports that were placed on the hut’s floor.\textsuperscript{264} As for roofing material, probably straw thatching (possibly in combination with clay thatching as protection against wind) was used.\textsuperscript{265} The contents of the long-houses are very similar and they suggest that various household activities were practised in these huts.\textsuperscript{266} Some of the long-houses also contained stoves built against a short tract of masonry, which will have been used for preparation of food.\textsuperscript{267} So far there is no direct evidence, in the form of kilns or misfired pottery, for the manufacture of pottery on the site during this period.\textsuperscript{268} Leighton believes that the coarse ware was produced locally for own consumption as is also known from other Ausonian settlements.\textsuperscript{269} It is unknown how these huts were built, but it required a lot of strength and good tools, and multiple metal finds indicate knowledge about tools.\textsuperscript{270} Until now, it has not been possible to differentiate the long-houses in terms of social status, because it is not known whether there are more dwellings on other sides of the hill.\textsuperscript{271} Besides, it is difficult to estimate wealth of a house based on the preserved artefacts.

After the protohistoric period, habitation continued in a second phase: the late Iron Age. The late Iron Age corresponds to the early colonial period of which habitation levels have been found above the Ausonian deposits.\textsuperscript{272} The inhabitants in these period continued to use the ‘long houses’ (or maybe a modified version of them) until the archaic period, when more urban forms of settlement were introduced. However, the location of the huts changed to the top of the hill and the fact that remains of superimposed walls were found suggest that the settlement underwent rapid changes. Until now we do not have much evidence of the period from the late seventh to the early sixth century. More research into the very beginning of the colonial period should be done in the future.

\textsuperscript{264}In three huts there is evidence of these supports. Leighton 1993, 142; Leighton 2012, 67.
\textsuperscript{265}Leighton 2012, 68.
\textsuperscript{266}The finds include pottery for cooking and storage (cooking stands, millstones, dolia, jars, amphorae, cups and bowls) and objects for domestic activities (loomweights, stone tools, bone implements). See also Leighton 2012, 71- 74.
\textsuperscript{267}Leighton 2012, 51.
\textsuperscript{268}There have been found some ovens, but these are believed to have been used as food cooking ovens in view of their size and their location. However, it is possible that they have been used for firing pottery (Leighton 2012, 59).
\textsuperscript{269}Leighton 1993, 147.
\textsuperscript{270}Leighton 1993, 145; Leighton 2012, 74- 75.
\textsuperscript{271}However, long-house 16W seems to be a house with a high social status, because of its size (construction time) and large amount of building materials although size does not always have to mean status and may also be an index for the size of the household (Leighton 2012, 75- 76).
\textsuperscript{272}Leighton 1993, 151; According to Sjöqvist Greeks were attracted to Morgantina due to the possibility of growing grain, olives, vines and timber (Leighton 1993, 132).
1.1.2 The Archaic settlement

However, researchers have found evidence of the period in which the first buildings appear set within an urban plan. The Greek settlement was situated on a ridge, with on the east side the Cittadella hill. Between this hill and the western end of the town, lies an open space of 250 by 150 metres which was interpreted as Agora. This Agora is nowadays surrounded by steep ravines which were, according to Stillwell and Sjöqvist\textsuperscript{273}, once entrances to the settlement. The Agora (figure 2) formed the city’s orientation: in the Archaic period towards the east (Katane) and later on toward the Doric southeast (Syracuse).\textsuperscript{274}

\textsuperscript{273} Stillwell & Sjöqvist 1957, 151.
\textsuperscript{274} Bell & Holloway 1988, 314.
1.1.2.1 The Agora

Trial trenches were made around the agora and across the agora from east to west. A remarkable construction of steps was found which was about 52 metres wide. It consisted of three sides forming an irregular polygon and had the shape of a quasi-theatral arrangement. The steps were made of local limestone of which the block surfaces were not smoothed, which suggests that the steps were never fully completed. This is also suggested by the irregular form of the steps. The purpose of the structure is debatable; but, Stillwell and Sjöqvist are convinced that it functioned as a passage between upper and lower levels of the Agora and for public assemblies. Due to the find of coins the steps could be dated to the end of the fourth and the early third century.

In the fourth century, the agora was divided in two terraces which formed the upper and lower agora. The upper agora was delimited by three large stoas (figure 2) and contained a fountain house and a smaller stoa while the lower agora was delimited by two public granaries and contained a sanctuary and rows of shops. Between these two terraces were the great steps which functioned as an ekklesiasterion, the centre of the agora. The lower agora contained multiple public buildings of which we nowadays still have remains. At the south eastern part of the agora was a Hellenistic kiln (figure 2b) with at the northern side the east granary (figure 2d). Close to this granary, researchers found remains of the southern city wall (figure 2e); the south shops (figure 2f) and the west granary (figure 2g). At the western side of the lower agora stood a theatre with next to it a walled temenos (figure 2i) with a fountain on its corner. Between the theatre and the walled temenos ran a street leading to the West Hill, the inhabited part of the agora.

The next paragraphs will discuss the west granary (figure 2g), the east granary (figure 2d), the South shops (figure 2f), the central shops (figure 2m), the great steps (figure 2o) and the fountain house (figure 2p); all mentioned above.

---

275 An outwork; an independent structure opposite and parallel to the main fortification wall, designed to prevent the onslaught of enemies.
276 Stillwell & Sjöqvist 1957, 152.
The west granary was about 32.9 metres long and 7.5 metres wide and contained walls of rubble masonry on low foundations. The floor contained two hearths and was covered with iron nails, tiles and coins that showed that it went out of use at the end of the third century.\textsuperscript{277} The East granary (figure 3) was similar to the west granary but more solidly built and contained large storage rooms and smaller rooms with an unknown function. Sjöqvist was the first to interpret these buildings as a storage place for grain, by looking at the exterior and interior buttresses.\textsuperscript{278} The exterior buttresses functioned as an extra strength to protect the walls from pressure of the grain placed inside.\textsuperscript{279} The internal buttresses functioned as support for the raised floor on which the grain rested, because it could not be kept on ground floor due to the local climate (figure 3).\textsuperscript{280}

\textit{Figure 3: Reconstruction of the east granary. Drawing by J. Mygatt. From: Bell & Holloway 1988. Figure 11, page 323}

Morgantina has rows of shops of which the central shops are situated between the Theatre street and the central sanctuary. The other row of shops, situated to the south below the west granary, consisted of six rooms. These shops, the South shops, contained objects that indicated that the shops were used to sell pottery.\textsuperscript{281} Some of the rooms were later on, as is shown by animal bones with multiple hack marks, used for butchering animals. The central shops consisted of six rooms which were all abandoned in the third century, on the evidence

\textsuperscript{277} Bell & Holloway 1988, 322.  
\textsuperscript{278} Sjöqvist 1960, 130.  
\textsuperscript{279} Rickman 1971, 247-248.  
\textsuperscript{280} Bell & Holloway 1988, 323- 324.  
\textsuperscript{281} Bell & Holloway 1988, 325- 331.
of coins and pottery.\textsuperscript{282} The northern extension of the central shops had the same orientation as the central ones and also contained six rooms. Comparable with the South shops these rooms were later in time used as a butcher’s shop.\textsuperscript{283} This extension runs into the open space where the great steps end (figure 2). At the time of the construction of the great steps, about the second quarter of the third century, this northern extension was removed shown by the fact that the whole area was levelled.\textsuperscript{284}

In the northeast corner of the agora an unusual fountain house (figure 2p; figure 4) was found which provided a lot of information on the use of water. The house is a rectangular structure containing two large basins. The walls and floors of these basins were covered with hydraulic plaster. The inner basin was inaccessible and probably functioned as a cistern, while the outer one was accessible on three sides.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fountain_house.png}
\caption{Plan of Fountain House; Drawing by W.H. Hendrix. a) drainage outlet; b) space between outer wall and the east stoa, filled up with earth; c) outer basin; d) inner basin. From: Bell 1988. Figure 22, page 330}
\end{figure}

The water supply was formed by a spring behind the fountain house and the rainwater that fell on the fountain house’s roof. Multiple objects with a votive character have been found in the

\textsuperscript{282} Bell & Holloway 1988, 327.
\textsuperscript{283} Multiple animal bones have been found in which scapulae, jaws and other parts which provide less meat are in the majority. These are the refuse of a butcher.
\textsuperscript{284} Bell & Holloway 1988, 331.
spring that suggests that the spring was the centre of a cult.\textsuperscript{285} The fountain house could be dated by its building techniques, the later changes in these building techniques and by the connection between the house and the adjoining structures. It was built against the north wall of the east stoa and will not be later than 275–250. In addition to this, sherds found in the fountain house date no later than the end of the third century so the structure must be dated in the second or third quarter of the third century. The second phase begins in the first half of the second century and the final phase in the first quarter of the first century.\textsuperscript{286} The fountain house supplied water for the needs of the agora, which must have included water for animals and the cleaning of the agora itself and its buildings.\textsuperscript{287}

The agora was surrounded by a city wall of which there have been found a few remains. At the southern part of the agora remains have been found and due to excavation we know that this wall continued to the south and then turned north westward to a square tower (figure 2j), which dates from the fourth century and was transformed into a shrine in the first century.\textsuperscript{288} It then continues to the West Hill and runs into the southwest agora bastion, which functioned as an observation tower. To the south of the square tower a terrace wall was found which had damaged an earlier potter’s workshop. Two small kilns were found that consisted of a small passage into a round combustion chamber with a firing chamber above it separated by a clay floor pierced with holes. There probably was a third kiln, but this one was badly preserved and no interpretations could be made. The kilns could be dated to the fifth century due to remains of matt-painted pottery with brown concentric circles and wavy lines which is characteristic of local Sikeli ware.\textsuperscript{289} Furthermore Attic sherds dating to the fifth century were found in the area adjoining the kilns. One of these sherds contained a graffito in Doric dialect, which can mean that, if the graffito was incised locally, there were Greeks in Morgantina during the Sikeli period (459–450).\textsuperscript{290}

After the various excavation campaigns, Bell was able to divide Morgantina in six development phases with each its own structures\textsuperscript{291}:

- Phase 1 (fifth century)
  The first city plan with a public area;

\textsuperscript{285} Bell & Holloway 1988, 333.
\textsuperscript{286} For a detailed description of the different phases of the Fountain house: Bell 1988, 331–336.
\textsuperscript{287} Drinking water was supplied by smaller basins (figure 1r).
\textsuperscript{288} Bell & Holloway 1988, 317–318.
\textsuperscript{289} Bell & Holloway 1988, 319 and 320, figure 6.
\textsuperscript{290} Bell & Holloway 1988, 319–321.
\textsuperscript{291} Bell & Holloway 1988, 338-340.
Pottery kilns on the south slope;
To this period probably also belongs the House of the Silver Hoard (figure 1t) and the first houses on the hillside above the theatre.
- Phase 2 (fourth century – ca. 275)
  West granary;
  Central sanctuary;
  South and Central shops;
  To this period also belongs the Southwest tower as a part of the early city wall. The first phase of the theatre possibly belongs to this period.
- Phase 3 (second quarter of the third century)
  East stoa;
  Central steps;
  Naïskos;
  The first phase of the east granary and the north stoa also belong to this period. There exists doubt whether the Bouleuterion and the Doric stoa belong to this period or the next one.
- Phase 4 (second half of the third century- 211)
  West stoa;
  East stoa annex;
  Enlargement of the Central steps and the east granary.
- Phase 5 (second century)
  Macellum (figure 1y);
  Southwest temenos;
  Monumental base;
  Rebuilding of the Northwest stoa and the construction of the Hellenistic kiln.
- Phase 6 (first century)
  Rebuilding of the fountain house;
  Transformation of the Southwest tower into a shrine

The architectural design of the agora was completed in the middle Hellenistic period. It seems that most of the buildings are built according a plan. The buildings of phase three and four have a lot in common with the architecture of a Greek polis.\textsuperscript{292}

\textsuperscript{292} Bell & Holloway 1988, 339.
1.1.3 Acropolis

From the year 1957 onwards the focus of the excavations was also on the acropolis (Cittadella) and its buildings and surroundings. The acropolis is situated on the north-eastern tip of a steep hill and the peak of the hill is surrounded by multiple lower plateaus to the southwest and northeast. On the top of the hill researchers have found architectural remains which could be dated to four periods: the sixth and fifth centuries, the beginning of the fourth century, the third century and late Roman Republican times. The archaic period is represented by multiple traces of houses which are poorly preserved. However, the walls suggest a rectangular system of regular house plans.

The archaic settlement came to an end about 460 through destruction by fire of which we see traces in the form of layers of ash and carbonized matter. The next settlement dates from the end of the fifth century as testified by new building activities. New and larger houses are built which differ slightly from orientation with the archaic houses. These houses were renovated in Hellenistic times and continuously used until the beginning of the second century. The acropolis never rose again to its ancient importance and remained half abandoned.

The acropolis contains a fortification wall from the late sixth or early fifth century and during research on this wall, remains of a settlement from before the Greek colonization of Morgantina (sixth century) were found in the stratigraphy. These remains consisted of indigenous pottery in combination with pre-Greek Sicilian pottery and in a lower section of the stratigraphy a floor of a hut with a hearth and mill stone in situ. This lower section also contained coarse hand-made ware with and without incised decorations. The undecorated sherds belong, according to Bernabò Brea, to the type Ausonian II, a ware of Apennine type which can be dated to the twelfth and eleventh centuries. We do not know whether this settlement was an open settlement or had an organized defence, although it seems reasonable to believe that the Greeks wanted to protect their own territory. There is still a lot of information not known about this earlier settlement and more research on this part is needed.

---

293 The Roman phase is of little significance and the third century was a restoration phase without a building program; Sjöqvist 1958, 155.
294 Sjöqvist 1960, 128.
The inhabitants of Morgantina had built a wall to protect the vulnerable sides of their settlement, although it was almost on all sides defended by nature. The main entrance is at the northern side of the city, while the other three entrances were at the southern side of the Agora, at the western side facing the cemetery and on the eastern side facing the Acropolis. This whole wall was rebuilt again after the destructive fire; this wall dates from the second quarter of the third century.

1.1.4 Necropoleis

During the excavations multiple necropoleis have been found and through them we know a lot about the tomb types, burial customs and grave gifts of Morgantina. These necropoleis were all situated on the slopes of the Cittadella and the Serra Orlando ridge outside the city walls.

Necropolis IV is situated on the north and northwest slopes of the Cittadella and contained a cluster of chamber tombs of which three were oven-shaped (tombs 4-6) that could be dated to the Late Iron Age. The plan of the tombs was elliptical with a curved ceiling and the entrance was sealed off by a rock. Tomb four and five both contained one layer of burial, while tomb six contained two layers. These three tombs could be dated, on the basis of fibula types, to the middle of the eighth century, prior to the Greek colonisation of Sicily. There are no finds of Greek imported pottery that may suggest that these tombs were even prior to the colonial period although it is quite possible that the inhabitants of the Cittadella were later in the adoption of Greek imported pottery.

Necropolis II was the largest one of all necropoleis and runs from the southeast slope via the east slope to the northeast slope. The northeast part contained multiple chamber tombs, (figure 5) sarcophagi, rock-cut pits and enchytrismos burials (infants in large vessels). The east side contained the most burials of all in chamber tombs, sarcophagi, fossa graves and urn cremations. The southeast slope contained chambers tombs, enchytrismos burials, fossa graves and soil burials. The southwest slope was not totally excavated and therefore

---

297 Sjöqvist 1960, 126.
298 Sjöqvist 1960, 126.
300 Lyons 1996, figure 1, page 4-5.
301 Lyons 1996, 117.
303 Leighton 1993, 106.
304 A soil burial is the inhumation of a body in a shallow grave in the soil. It was a common form of burial in most of the colonial cemeteries and Lyons believes it was practised by the poorer part of the society who were not able to create more elaborate burials; Lyons 1996, 27.
did not provide much evidence. It contained a fossa grave from the sixth century, a chamber tomb and a Hellenistic sarcophagus. This Necropolis was in use, dated on basis of tomb types and grave gifts, from the middle sixth to the middle fifth century.\footnote{Lyons 1996, 9-10.}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chamber-tomb.png}
\end{center}

\textit{Figure 5: Example of a chamber tomb at Morgantina. Tomb 4.}
\textit{From: Sjöqvist 1958. Plate 29, figure 11.}

On the north slope, to the east necropolis V is situated. A lot of chamber and oven tombs \textit{(tombe a forno)}\footnote{These so-called oven tombs are oven-shaped chamber tombs; Leighton 1993, 97-110.} have been found that dated from the seventh to sixth centuries. One tomb contained burial gifts that could be dated to late fifth century; the only tomb that dated to the period after the abandonment of the Cittadella.\footnote{These grave gifts included pottery that could be dated to the third quarter of the fifth century. The pottery consisted of Attic pottery (miniature black-glazed squat lekythos and black-figured cup-skyphos), Sikeliote pottery (bolsal and lamp) and local pottery (two hydria and an oinochoe). Besides the pottery there were also found four loomweight. Lyons 1996, 12.}

Besides necropolis IV, also necropolis VI contained Archaic graves which were situated on the eastern slopes of the Serra Orlando ridge. Five chamber tombs have been found which were badly preserved. One of these tombs dated from the sixth to fifth centuries with evidence for reuse in the fourth century.

Morgantina contained various burial rites of which inhumation in a rock-cut tomb is the traditional one and it seems to be used as a burial rite from the eight until the fifth century, continuing in the fourth century.\footnote{Lyons 1996, 116.} These chamber tombs differ widely in form all over Sicily from elliptical, semi-elliptical and circular forms to rectangular, trapezoidal or irregular forms. Apart from the form of the tomb also the burial rite itself changed, which is mostly
noticeable in the amount and sort of grave gifts and the number of persons buried. From the Later Bronze Age on, the number of persons in one chamber seems to decrease. First chambers with twenty persons were normal; in the Iron Age, chambers containing between one and six persons are common. This number of persons in one chamber also seems to be the case in Morgantina. This is a typical indigenous way of burying people, because we do not see this often in Greek colonial graves. The Greeks buried their death in single graves, although we do find two or more persons in one single grave especially in the case of family and infant burials.\footnote{Lyons 1996, 116.}

The only time we find single graves is in the case of fossa, tile and soil graves, which were often used to burry children. Single inhumation of adults seems to be for persons with a lower status as is shown by tomb 40 and 49 that contained no grave goods.\footnote{Lyons 1996, 116- 117.}

The burial rite from the Iron Age seems to be continued from the seventh to the fifth century, with the exception of the orientation of the bodies. During the Iron Age the bodies have the same orientation, while the bodies of the Archaic burials do not have a fixed orientation. A lot of tombs show a mixed burial that suggests the tomb was reused over centuries in which the older skeletons were removed to the side of the tomb to make space for the new body.\footnote{Lyons 1996, 119- 120.} It often appears that the skulls have been retained while the rest of the skeleton is lost or burned, which may refer to the head as being a symbolic of individual identity.\footnote{Lyons 1996, 119- 121.}

Cremation is an usual burial rite at Morgantina, but due to bad documentation we know little of the contents of the urns. Most of the cremation burials date to the sixth century. The fact that we have found few cremations follows the pattern of interior sites in contrary with coastal sites where cremation is much more commonly used.\footnote{Lyons 1996, 121- 122.} The social and cultural situation in a site must have had, according to Lyons, a large influence on the spreading and adaption of burial rites: ‘The percentage of cremation burials at a given site depends on both chronological and topographical factors, which in turn may reflect social, economic, and religious divisions within the population.’\footnote{Lyons 1996, 123.}

The Archaic necropolis of Morgantina contained chamber tombs, fossa graves, tile-built graves, sarcophagi, wooden coffins, inhumations in pottery vessels, urn cremations and soil cremations. These types occur from the second half of the sixth century to the fifth century.
Chamber tombs are characteristic for indigenous sites and we have until now no records of Greek type chamber tombs. Chamber tombs with sarcophagi and fossa graves built into them show Greek influence on this indigenous burial type.\textsuperscript{315} After the chamber tomb, the most common burial type is the fossa grave which consists of a trench covered by stone slabs or terracotta roof tiles. Morgantina has multiple types of fossa graves and these became more common during the fourth century. The appearance of tile-built tombs is definitely a Greek influence, because it occurs in the sixth and fifth centuries colonial burials.\textsuperscript{316} The tomb consisted of single tile that formed the floor, on which the skeleton was placed, and a covering tile as roof.

In Morgantina three types of sarcophagi occur: stone slab, terracotta and rock-cut, which are known to occur mostly in colonial settings.\textsuperscript{317} The enchytrismos burials were little represented at Morgantina and consisted of two infant burials in pottery. This also applies to the urn cremations, which are rare in archaic necropoleis. It seems to be a colonial tradition, instead of an indigenous one, appearing in numerous colonial settlements on Sicily.\textsuperscript{318} The rock-cut chamber tombs dominate at Morgantina, while the other types seem to be foreign and occur during the period in which there exists contact with the Greek colonists. Still, the chamber tombs are kept in use during the whole period. The fact that all these burial types occur during more or less the same period, suggests that these necropoleis belonged to an indigenous Sikul population and the first Greek colonists.\textsuperscript{319}

Researchers have studied the development of the tombs to see whether these change during the period from the Iron Age to the colonial phase. The size of the chamber tombs does change, from a small chamber in the Iron Age to large ones in the sixth and fifth century.\textsuperscript{320} Besides the size, the tombs seem to develop more and more Greek elements in these periods such as the covering of graves with roof tiles. The typical indigenous rock-cut tombs and fossa graves are kept in use, while other tomb types such as sarcophagus became more and more familiar.

There have not been found many graves dating from the eight and seven centuries. According to Lyons this is in contrast with the ample evidence of the settlement from those periods and she believes that some of the burials will have gone lost or simply have not been found yet.\textsuperscript{321}

\textsuperscript{315} Lyons 1996, 18.  
\textsuperscript{316} Lyons 1996, 22.  
\textsuperscript{317} Lyons 1996, 22- 23.  
\textsuperscript{318} Lyons 1996, 26.  
\textsuperscript{320} Lyons 1996, 7, 19, 125.  
\textsuperscript{321} Lyons 1996, 12.
The sixth and fifth centuries are well presented on the east slope of the Cittadella contemporary with the developments of the settlement and the growing influence of the Greeks. Reuse of sixth century tombs in the fourth century suggests a cultural continuity in the burial practices.\textsuperscript{322}

Besides the burial rite and the tomb types, the grave gifts also seem to change through time.\textsuperscript{323} In the Iron Age we often see grave gifts in the form of a few pieces of pottery, glass and some personal bronze and iron items.\textsuperscript{324} In the colonial phase this changed into large amounts of local and imported pottery, jewellery, terracotta figurines and objects that were used in daily life. This change in grave gifts probably had to do with the social and cultural changes in society during this period.\textsuperscript{325}

Besides Greek grave gifts in the tombs, indigenous gifts are still in use during these colonial phases. It is difficult to decide when we are dealing with a Greek person or not. When we find Greek pottery in tombs, it does not directly imply that there were Greeks living in this settlement. To make such an interpretation we have to have direct evidence of Greek presence in the form of Greek habits like religious votifs or the ceremonial drinking of wine. Lyons describes another direct indication, when she describes local pottery with Greek inscriptions. This kind of pottery with Greek inscription suggests that there was knowledge of the Greek language and this is indirectly evidence for the presence of Greeks in the society.\textsuperscript{326}

\subsection*{1.1.5 Pottery}

The pottery found in the Archaic strata is of four kinds: Attic imports, late Corinthian imports, indigenous Siculan matt-painted ware of Orsi’s type Siculan III and IV, and a ware which imitates Attic forms and glaze, but still retains a character of its own. According to Sjöqvist\textsuperscript{327} the last group of pottery represents early Greek colonists, although he does not explain this interpretation in his field report.

The cemeteries contained multiple types of pottery. The imported pottery consisted of Attic pottery in the form of lekythoi, amphora and skyphoi. More than half of the imported Attic pottery was used for storage, mixing, pouring and drinking of wine.\textsuperscript{328} Besides this kind of

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textsuperscript{322}] Lyons 1996, 13.
  \item[\textsuperscript{323}] For a full description of the types of grave goods: Lyons 1996, 125-129.
  \item[\textsuperscript{324}] Leighton 1993, 97-106.
  \item[\textsuperscript{325}] Lyons 1996, 28.
  \item[\textsuperscript{326}] Lyons 1996, 133.
  \item[\textsuperscript{327}] Sjöqvist 1958, 156.
  \item[\textsuperscript{328}] Lyons 1996, 31.
\end{itemize}
pottery a lot of plates have been found. The biggest part of imported pottery consisted of Corinthian pottery which occurred in grave tombs and single burials and it was often found in combination with local pottery. This pottery occurred in the form of lekythoi, aryballoi, amphora and a pyxis and all were used to contain small amounts of liquids. Most of the pottery could be dated to the sixth and early fifth century. The most common type was the drinking cup of which the decoration changed through time from a type with a lot of decoration to a type with almost no decoration.

Besides all of this imported pottery, researchers have found Sikeliote pottery that was produced in the colonies on Sicily. They occur mostly in the cemeteries but also sporadically in the settlement. The Sikel pottery could be divided in two types: (1) the black-glazed, semiglazed and banded wares and (2) the imitated Corinthian pottery. The first type is subdivided in those three forms on basis of their decoration in which the black-glazed pottery’s surface is fully glazed; the semiglazed surface is partly glazed and the banded wares contain glazed bands in the manner of Greek wares. The imitated Corinthian pottery is far less common, but spread over a long period. It occurs mostly in the form of skyphoi and drinking cups.

The local produced pottery consisted of matt-painted pottery, impasto and banded ware and was mostly found in the cemeteries. In the cemeteries we have found more local pottery than imported Greek pottery, even in the later colonial periods. In addition to this, the main part of the pottery consisted of pottery which can be related to storage, mixing and drinking of wine; an indirect reference to the Greek symposium. Most of the imported pottery was used for this symposium, which suggests the adaption of Greek habits in society. This suggests a society in which both the indigenous and the colonial settlers were present.

---

329 Lyons 1996, 38
330 Lyons 1996, 39
331 Lyons 1996, 53
332 Lyons 1996, 53
333 Lyons 1996, 31
1.2 L’Amastuola

L’Amastuola is situated in South Italy near the coast of the bay of Taranto (figure 6). The site is located higher than its environment and it has steep hills which would have made the settlement visible and difficult to reach. On the south side of these hills is a plateau, the south terrace, where most of the excavations have taken place. This terrace is demarcated by terrace walls and to the south east of these walls there is a second, lower situated, terrace. L’Amastuola is a good example for our knowledge of colonialism, because it has remains from all the different phases of habitation.\textsuperscript{334} Excavations were started in 1988, by Grazia Angela Maruggi who largely focused on the tombs situated to the south of the L’Amastuola hill, followed by new research led by the University of Amsterdam (Netherlands) and the Soprintendenza Archeologica della Puglia (Italy) which learns us more about the site and the relationships between indigenous people and the Greeks.\textsuperscript{335} The site is rarely mentioned in ancient literary sources\textsuperscript{336} and therefore the evidence of L’Amastuola is mainly collected from remains of the settlement and the necropolis. In this way it is possible to study the continuation of the habitation at L’Amastuola.

\textbf{Figure 6: Regional map of South-Italy. It shows that L’Amastuola and Incoronata both are situated inland. From: Burgers & Crielaard 2011. Figure 1-1, page 22}
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The first excavations at L’Amastuola mainly focused on the graves which were situated south of the hilltop. The area of the necropolis is naturally divided by several gorges, by which Maruggi divided the necropolis in three parts. This place seems to have been the main area of the burials although there have been found several other burials during the survey. 337 About a thousand graves, varying in depth, were identified of which thirty were undisturbed and contained grave goods. Roughly speaking there were two types of tombs found at L’Amastuola of which the first type were simple rectangular pits dug in the rock and covered by slabs of local tufa stone. The second type was formed by sharp rectangular pits with a greater depth. The tombs located in the areas A, B and C formed homogeneous groups which were spread quite diversely (figure 7). The smaller graves were dug side by side between the larger tombs and almost all the graves have the same orientation.338 The space was optimally used and according to Waagen339 this was also an indication that the location of the graves was chosen with the knowledge of the presence of ancestral graves. This could mean that the necropolis was divided into family groups of burial.

In Area A, 59 graves were found orientating north south, of which many were disturbed by erosion and vegetation. Area A looks like a strip orientating southwest – northeast, which cannot be reconstruct to its original size due to bad remains and vegetation. Area B consists of two parts, one with 85 separate graves on a hill; the other with 55 graves in the south-west from the first part, placed on a lower terrace.340 The area was bounded by ravines to the east and west. The graves orientate southwest – northeast although the graves in the south seem to be more differentiated and scattered around.

Finally, area C contained 58 burials which were placed along the sides of a high terrace. Most of the graves are situated in the north and east of the area and almost all the tombs are orientated southeast – northwest.

---

337 Waagen 2011, 108.
340 Waagen 2011, 110.
Although there are still problems with analyzing all the tombs, the data seem to give a clear picture of the necropolis. Based on the spatial organization and the difference in tomb types it can be supposed that multiple generations of family groups were buried in different areas. These different areas give the idea that the graves were organized around a household. The division on the different terraces of an area can indicate organization within a social group.341

There are differences in size between the pits and the controfosse tombs, in which the pits vary more in size and form (figure 8).342 The different sizes are linked to the size of people buried. This information can tell little about the social differences between the inhabitants of L’Amastuola.

341 This is a preliminary conclusion and will need more research in the future; Waagen 2011, 111-114.
342 Waagen 2011, 113. A controfosse tomb is a type of tomb in which a rectangular shape is already dug in the stone. The tomb itself is then dug out in this rectangular shape.
The difference between pit and tomb actually does show this social difference, because tombs are the result of more work and can be linked to people with a higher social position in society.\(^{343}\) There has to be done more research on the necropolis but for now we can conclude that the inhabitants of L’Amastuola had extended families organized in larger groups possibly linked by ties of kinship.

In these grave tombs a lot of pottery was found that dates from middle proto-Corinthian to middle Corinthian, which means that the grave tombs date from the second half of the seventh century to the early sixth century. Next to this pottery there were also found fragments of

\(^{343}\) Waagen 2011, 113/114.
black gloss skyphoi, which suggests that the necropolis was still in use during the fifth century.\textsuperscript{344} According to Maruggi, the excavator of that time, the necropolis was purely Greek.\textsuperscript{345}

Maruggi led the first excavations and divided the site into three phases based on the finds at the site (figure 9).\textsuperscript{346}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure9.jpg}
\caption{The three phases of development of the settlement L'Amastuola according to Maruggi. From: Burgers & Crielaard 2007. Figure 4, page 82}
\end{figure}

Phase one (dated between 730/720 and 690/680) is represented by a fortification wall that followed the south side of the terrace and by a part of a wall which belonged to a hut.\textsuperscript{347} This phase is the indigenous phase, as there are no indications for the presence of Greeks or Greek

\textsuperscript{344} Maruggi 1996, 202; Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 81.
\textsuperscript{345} Maruggi 1996, 201-202.
\textsuperscript{346} Maruggi 1996, 201-216.
\textsuperscript{347} Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 81.
artefacts. Phase two (dated from 680 onwards\textsuperscript{348}) is characterized by the arrival of the Greeks and is divided into sub phases in which multiple Greek buildings are built. These buildings are single-room buildings which consist of dry stone foundations which had walls on top of these foundations.\textsuperscript{349} One of these buildings contained remains of a hearth with irregular small stones.\textsuperscript{350} Researchers have also found a platform, located east of the most southern building. It consisted of stones of different sizes and may have functioned as a basis for activities that took place in the courtyard.\textsuperscript{351} Buildings \(\beta\) and \(\gamma\) (figure 9) probably had domestic functions, while building \(\alpha\) (figure 9) functioned as storage facility. In the third and final phase (dated to the end of the seventh century) a large square building was built next to the other buildings.\textsuperscript{352} Maruggi was convinced that the indigenous remains dated from the indigenous phase and were being kept in use by the Greeks during the later phases, while the indigenous settlement was destroyed.\textsuperscript{353}

During campaigns in the years 2003 to 2005 new research was done on the necropolis and the three building phases of L’Amastuola.\textsuperscript{354} This research consisted of excavation, surveys and geophysical prospecting. The fortification wall of the first phase could be dated in the first half of the seventh century and in the southeast part of settlement researchers found a wall and an oval hut.\textsuperscript{355} This hut contained pottery which consisted of one fragment of Greek pottery and a lot of indigenous matt-painted pottery. A few of these fragments were burned and in addition to this a few fragments of burned bone were found too. The indigenous pottery could be compared to fragments of the region of Matera which date from the seventh century. This meant that the oval hut was still in use during the seventh century. Later on in these campaigns an other small building was found which contained Greek pottery in the form of storage jars and fragments of a hydria. The foundation of this building was levelled with roof tiles, burned loam and indigenous and Greek colonial pottery which dated from the eight to seventh centuries.\textsuperscript{356}

As is mentioned before, Maruggi was strongly convinced that the indigenous society was destroyed by the Greeks. Still, there are no clear indications for this situation because in the seventh century there are still elements which indicate local practises. The form of the

\textsuperscript{348} This could have been contemporary with the first expansion of the colony of Taras.
\textsuperscript{349} Maruggi 1996, 207-209.
\textsuperscript{350} Maruggi 1996, 209.
\textsuperscript{351} Maruggi 1996, 211.
\textsuperscript{352} Maruggi 1996, 212-213.
\textsuperscript{353} Maruggi 1996, 216; Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 81.
\textsuperscript{354} For a full report on the excavation and it finds I refer to Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 85-94.
\textsuperscript{355} Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 86.
\textsuperscript{356} Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 90.
fortification wall is known from other indigenous settlements and later research made clear that the wall was built in the Greek period. Besides the wall there also have been found three horseshoe shaped hut plans which contained local matt-painted pottery and were kept in use in later periods than the defined indigenous phase (phase one).

In 2004, researchers started to make an inventory of the artefacts found in the necropolis. An important find was a stone stele which was found out of situ in two pieces in a Greek-type grave (figure 10). The stele was 1.75m high and the stone used occurred locally in the area. The stele contains decoration in the form of simply zigzag motives, which is also known from indigenous settlements near L’Amastuola where they occur in elitist contexts. The use of stele in a necropolis is actually an indigenous custom and this suggests that important indigenous people were buried in a necropolis with paramount Greek-type graves. These graves were kept in use and respected during the colonial Greek phase and this indicates that the Greek and indigenous people lived together in a peaceful situation.

Figure 10: The Stone stele found in the necropolis of L’Amastuola. It was 1.75m high and 0.15cm thick. From: Burgers & Crielaard 2007. Figure 38, page 101

Besides the graves the researchers also focused on the pottery, which dates from the eight till the fifth centuries. The Greek pottery consisted of Geometric pottery from Corinth. Besides
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this, Attic red figured pottery and a few skyphoi from Metaponto were found. The indigenous pottery consisted of impasto and matt-painted pottery. The indigenous pottery dates from the eight till the sixth century. It is being kept in use during the Greek phase, but then often made with Greek tools. Besides the Greek, there are multiple other foreign influences on the locally and regionally made pottery. The Greek pottery is dominant, but still the indigenous pottery stays in use which indicates a ‘mixed’ society. This mixed society lingered on until the first half of the fifth century when there were evident changes in the necropolis, settlement and land use. According to Burgers and Crielaard these changes suggest that the settlement of L’Amastuola was incorporated into the chora of Taras, which expanded their colonial area.

The first excavations at L’Amastuola suggested that an earlier indigenous settlement was violently destroyed by Greek colonists. This was identical with evidence from ancient literary sources in which the oracle of Delphi made a promise to the Spartan party that was settling in Taras in 706: *I have given to you Satyrion and Taras, a rich country to dwell in and to be a plague to the Iapyges*’. The fact that the Spartans could be like ‘a plague to the Iapyges’ suggests that they were able to expel the indigenous inhabitants of L’Amastuola. L’Amastuola came into being in the eight century and researchers divide the existence of the site into three phases, where eventually the indigenous society was destroyed during phase two when the Greeks arrived. Before the existence of L’Amastuola there were already multiple indigenous sites of which we have found only little remains. Surveys in the environment of the settlement showed that during the second quarter of the eight century multiple indigenous settlements were established in this area. These different indigenous groups were well-developed and the Greeks arrived in a process of migration and territorial expansion of these indigenous societies.

The settlement of L’Amastuola is characterized by a material culture which consists of indigenous hut plans and Greek house plans, burial customs and artefacts. The society was a combination of Greeks and indigenous inhabitants, which we have learned from the graves in
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Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 104.
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Notice that I name the Greeks as if it was one single population, which in reality existed of multiple populations with their own city states. I do use the term ‘Greeks’ to keep my point clear; a study of the multiple Greek populations is another research which will not be further discussed in this thesis.
Burgers 2009, 15.
which we have found indigenous material in Greek-type graves.\textsuperscript{367} Besides Greek material, there is also found much indigenous material dating from the eight century. This indigenous material consists of impasto and fine matt-painted pottery, three hut plans and a raised earthen rampart which functioned as fortification. During the Greek phase it seems that the centre of the settlement moved to the site instead of being situated on the hilltop.\textsuperscript{368} This can be the reason why researchers believed that the indigenous phase was destroyed.\textsuperscript{369}

In the ancient literature, the situation in L’Amastuola is defined as violent, although this literature dates from a later period\textsuperscript{370} and it is questionable whether it is reliable or not. This violent description of L’Amastuola is rebutted by the archaeological remains. As I have mentioned earlier, the Greek phase started, according to theorists, in the eight century. The fact is that we have also found indigenous material that dates from the seventh and sixth century which means that the society was still using the indigenous material culture during the Greek phase. Besides this purely indigenous material, there is also some indigenous material with a strong Greek influence.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{367} Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 77. \\
\textsuperscript{368} Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 96. \\
\textsuperscript{369} Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 81, 97. \\
\textsuperscript{370} Burgers & Crielaard 2007, 84.
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1.3 Incoronata

The settlement of Incoronata is, like L’Amastuola, situated in South Italy in the chora of Metaponto on a plateau, which was well visible in its environment (figure 6, appendix 1.2). The site was discovered in the year 1970 and since then has been excavated multiple times. Incoronata is a good site for our knowledge of colonialism because it represents each habitation phase and its material culture is well preserved. The plateau of Incoronata consists of three spurs and measures about 3.5 hectares.

Just like the settlement of L’Amastuola, in the course of time researchers also focus on doing survey in the area of Incoronata to learn more about the periphery and its relationships with the settlement.

Incoronata has long been excavated and this also means that there are multiple theories about the site and its developments. One of the first excavators was Paulo Orlandini who also wrote the first excavation reports and articles on Incoronata. Later on, Dinu Adamesteanu wrote about the settlement and its finds.

Like Maruggi, Orlandini was interested in the ancient literature on sites like Incoronata. This literature describes a violent situation in which the indigenous habitation was driven away by the colonial Greeks. He was convinced that the finds of Incoronata belonged to two separated sites, an indigenous site and a Greek site. In his excavation reports he writes about an indigenous settlement which was destroyed by Greek traders, who afterwards established a Greek settlement. While describing this violent transition, he mentions that there are finds which support this theory, but it is not clear to which evidence he refers.

Stea largely agrees with Orlandini and states that, at Incoronata, a Greek emporion developed into a colonial polis before it was abandoned in 630.

The western spur of Incoronata ‘Greca’ contained structures that could be divided into three categories: pits of varying size (from quite small to a meter and a half in diameter), larger, rectangular pits and semi-interred structures with sunken floor surfaces, some with stone foundations above. The pits were interpreted by Orlandini as indigenous pits if they contained only indigenous pottery. Pits containing both indigenous and Greek pottery were considered to be Greek rubbish pits and the rectangular structures were interpreted as oikoi although they
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contained indigenous pottery as well. One of these *oikoi, oikos* H, contained a large quantity of pottery. Orlandini wondered how such a small structure could have accommodated such a large amount of pottery and why the inhabitants of the structure needed this variety in pottery. The pottery consisted of indigenous and Greek material. Orlandini interpreted the finds and stated that the plateau was first inhabited by an indigenous society in the eight century, shown by the pits containing purely indigenous material. Around 700 the Greeks arrived and destroyed the indigenous settlement shown by the pits containing indigenous and Greek material.  

In his research he made a clear division between indigenous en Greek material. He found indigenous pits and badly remained hut plans and Greek (storage) pits and house plans. These houses consisted of a single room with a rectangular shape, of which we know more examples from Megara Hyblaea and L’Amastuola. Orlandini concluded that all the Greek material was from a later date than the indigenous material. When he did find indigenous material in Greek pits, he stated that the Greek pit cut into a pre-existent indigenous context.  

In 1977 and 1978 excavations were carried out on the east southern spur of the plateau. Most of the archaeological evidence was similar to that found by Orlandini. Circular and oval pits containing indigenous, Greek and mixed materials and a rectangular structure were found. The pits contained pottery that was comparable to that from the *oikoi* on the western spur: a limited amount of indigenous Bradano late Geometric pottery dating from the late eight to early seventh centuries, imported Proto-Corinthian, local imitations of Proto-Corinthian and Proto-Corinthian Geometric wares and an amount of variable colonial wares. One of the pits, pit B, contained many complete or near-complete vessels and a few metal objects and will have functioned as a storage. The nearby pit D contained a few complete vessels and the fragmented pottery consisted of coarse and cooking wares, colonial ware and indigenous impasto.
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The rectangular structure contained walls made of mud brick, resting on a stone base. There is not much comparative evidence, but Carter believes that the inspiration of the structure could have been Greek, but the construction technique could certainly have been indigenous.\(^{382}\)

To the northwest of the rectangular structure remains of a building and votive objects were found that date from the sixth century.\(^{383}\) The votive objects consisted of figurines, miniature votive vessels and ‘Ionic’-type cups.\(^{384}\)

---

**Figure 11: Three pits in the settlement of Incoronata.** The northern pit contained for the most part Greek material and next to it was a northeastern pit which contained for the most part indigenous material. The southern pit contained indigenous as well as Greek material. From: Carter 1993. Figure 6, page 347

Later research actually conflicted with the ideas of Orlandini about the indigenous material in Greek pits. One of the pits contained indigenous and Greek pottery (figure 11). This pit could not have cut into a pre-existent indigenous layer, because this layer had never been there. If Orlandini was right, this indigenous material had to date earlier than the Greek material. All
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\(^{382}\) This could also have been the case at the Timpone della Motta (Francavilla Marittima, Italy), see Maaskant-Kleibrink 2000, 177-179; Carter 2006, 73.

\(^{383}\) This building dates from a later period than the settlement; after the inhabitation period, the area of Incoronata was used as a place for multiple small rural sanctuaries.( Carter 2006, 74-78).

\(^{384}\) Figure 2.39, 2.40 and 2.41 in Carter 2006, 77.
the three pits date from the same period, which means that the material was used in the same period.  

Besides pottery there were also found seeds in these pits which can provide us information about the eating habits of the community and whether these changed after the Greeks arrived. The indigenous population cultivated vegetables, corn and grapes.  

These crops were still cultivated in the Greek period with the addition of olives. This means that the Greeks respected the eating habits of the indigenous community and did not destroy the whole indigenous community and its culture.

Besides the pits, researchers found a stone structure which contained a mixture of indigenous and Greek pottery, which I will describe later. The structure had a sunken floor, which is typical of pre-Greek structures in this area from the Bronze Age onwards. Orlandini presumed that we are dealing with Greeks when we find rectangular house plans, even though we know indigenous examples of them from the Black Sea Region.

The pits contained Greek imported pottery of which Proto-Corinthian fragments dominated. Besides this import there are fragments of locally made so-called ‘colonial’ vessels, which are often large and decorated with Geometric patterns which we also see in Greek pottery workshops (figure 12). This Greek pottery dates from the first half of the seventh century. The indigenous part of the pottery is represented by Bradano Geometric and Sub-geometric with the typical ‘tent’ pattern (figure 12).
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According to Orlandini all the indigenous pottery dates from an earlier period than the Greek pottery. Yntema rebutted this statement with his book on indigenous pottery. Yntema studied Bradano Sub-geometric pottery and claimed that this type of pottery also occurred in the seventh century which means that it occurred during the so-called Greek phase. This indigenous material occurs in the same period as Greek pottery (large storage jars, Attic SOS amphora and Corinthian type A amphora). The abundance of these types of pottery in a settlement where the indigenous settlement is continuous since the ninth century is, according to Adamesteanu, evidence for the existence of a mixed settlement. The occurrence of indigenous and Greek material dating from the same period took place near the stone structures as well. Along the indigenous fragments were fragments of an undecorated jar which in form looked like the Sub-geometric pottery described by Yntema, so it could be dated in the seventh century. Once again, indigenous pottery was in use during the supposed Greek period of the settlement.

Incoronata produced a lot of pottery in the form of hybrid Sub-geometric pottery which is also known as ‘colonial ware’. Besides this type of pottery there is also evidence for the
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production of *perirrhanteria* (figure 13), which were used for ritual purposes. Orlandini was convinced that this pottery was produced in a pottery workshop in Incoronata or somewhere in the immediate surroundings, although this pottery workshop has not been found so far.\textsuperscript{394} The *perirrhanterion* functioned as a water dish which was used for purifying the body before entering a temple or sanctuary.

![Figure 13: Perirrhanterion from Incoronata. It is made of terracotta and had a ritual function. From: Carter 2006. Figure 2.10A, page 61](image)

This pottery proves that there was some kind of an artistic link between Incoronata and Doric Greece in the first half of the seventh century, because the *perirrhanterion* occurred in multiple sites in Greece.\textsuperscript{395} The typical relief decoration is also known from Crete, Rhodes and Corinth. Besides this *perirrhanterion*, hybrid Sub-geometric pottery (known as colonial ware), with similarities to pottery from Siris, was produced in the settlement.\textsuperscript{396} It is quite possible that Incoronata functioned as a trade settlement, from which pottery was spread across the chora of Metaponto. This is because we have found pottery, produced in Incoronata, in Metaponto and in Siris. As a trade settlement, Incoronata could have had an important connection with the more important settlement of Metaponto. This contact was based on more than just trade, because we have found Mycenaean pottery in these

\textsuperscript{394} Adamesteanu 1986, 75-76.
\textsuperscript{395} Carter 2006, 60.
\textsuperscript{396} Carter 2006, 61.
settlements. This pottery was made locally according to Greek ceramic traditions, which proves that the Greeks had a large and permanent impact on the indigenous society.\textsuperscript{397}

Yntema believed that Orlandini was too much focused on the destruction of the indigenous site in 680 and later on again in 630. Orlandini dated the first indigenous habitation in the eight century, although there is evidence for habitation in the ninth century. Yntema even doubts whether there has been habitation in an earlier century.\textsuperscript{398} This indigenous settlement developed and came into contact with the Greeks in the seventh century. In this century the settlement moved from the southern part of the plateau to the northern part, known as ‘Incoronata Greca’. Incoronata contained multiple pits, of which possible function Orlandini did not provide any interpretation. Carter and Yntema\textsuperscript{399} believe that these pits could have functioned as basements of a hut with multiple floors. These basements may have been used as storage rooms, which is useful in a trade settlement. Still, this interpretation remains doubtful while there has not been found any evidence of post holes or multiple floors, although Carter believes that these may have gone missing after the top of the hill changed its form.\textsuperscript{400}

Besides the remains of the settlement we have also found remains of a necropolis, which contained indigenous graves of which one was extraordinary because of its architecture. It was a tomb with an exceptional depth which was closed off with a stone.\textsuperscript{401} De Siena, one of the later researchers, presumed that this grave was the evidence of a rising indigenous elite which was increased by the relationships with the Greeks.\textsuperscript{402} After the abandonment of the indigenous settlement in the eight century, this small necropolis was kept in use. To the northwest of the settlement was a small necropolis with indigenous graves which contained Greek grave goods.\textsuperscript{403} Parallels of these graves have been found at Siris and Pithekoussai and they are important, as they show that an indigenous population continued to exist in the seventh century. Still, there have not been found any graves of the very first Greek settlers, which can be partly explained by the fact that the early settlers were few and left little evidence.

\textsuperscript{397} Carter 2006; De Siena 1996, 165.
\textsuperscript{398} Yntema 2000, 11.
\textsuperscript{399} Carter 2006, 60; Yntema 2000, 11; De Siena 1996, 181.
\textsuperscript{400} Carter 2006, 60.
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\textsuperscript{403} Carter 2006, 63.
After the habitation period, Incoronata was abruptly abandoned. Researchers like Orlandini thought this was because of the Greeks who assumed power and destroyed the indigenous settlement. Later researchers started to believe in another theory which could be applied onto multiple settlements. During the pre-colonial phase indigenous settlements were situated inland. According to Guzzo\textsuperscript{404} these settlements were replaced after the indigenous came in contact with the Greeks, which also happened in Incoronata. In the first period after the arrival of the Greeks the indigenous communities stayed in their settlements that were situated inland. After a while, trade became important and in reaction to this a location at the coast is preferred. Incoronata was abandoned and the community moved to a settlement near the coast. Carter and De Siena believe that this could have been the site known as Andrisani. After Incoronata was abandoned around 600, a settlement which was a mixture of the settlement Andrisani and a beginning urban centre arose at the coast.\textsuperscript{405} These arguments are still questionable and more research should be done to be sure that there is a connection between Incoronata and the site Andrisani.

\textsuperscript{404} Carter 1993, 350.
\textsuperscript{405} Carter 1993, 350- 352; De Siena 1996.