

LOCAL RESPONSES TO COLONIZATION IN THE IRON AGE MEDITERRANEAN

Tamar Hodos

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group

LOCAL RESPONSES TO
COLONIZATION IN THE
IRON AGE MEDITERRANEAN

LOCAL RESPONSES TO
COLONIZATION IN THE
IRON AGE
MEDITERRANEAN

Tamar Hodos

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2006
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016
Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2006 Tamar Hodos

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2006.
“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge’s
collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.”

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders for their
permission to reprint material in this book. The publishers would be
grateful to hear from any copyright holder who is not here
acknowledged and will undertake to rectify any errors or omissions in
future editions of this book.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or
reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic,
mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter
invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any
information storage or retrieval system, without permission in
writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Hodos, Tamar.
Local responses to colonization in the Iron Age Mediterranean /
Tamar Hodos.

p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Mediterranean Region—Colonization. 2. Mediterranean
Region—Antiquities. 3. Iron age—Mediterranean Region.
I. Title.

DE60.H6 2006
930.1'6—dc22
2006004392

ISBN10: 0-415-37836-2 (hbk)

ISBN13: 978-0-415-37836-9 (hbk)

CONTENTS

<i>List of illustrations</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	x
1 Introduction	1
<i>When is the Iron Age?</i>	3
<i>Early exchanges</i>	4
<i>Colonization in the ancient world</i>	9
<i>Colonialism in the ancient world</i>	13
<i>What is a colony and when is it not?</i>	19
<i>What comes next</i>	23
2 North Syria	25
<i>The North Syrian populations</i>	28
<i>Chronologies in the Near East</i>	33
<i>North Syrian coastal communities</i>	37
<i>Burial customs</i>	51
<i>Religious practices</i>	55
<i>Consumption patterns</i>	59
<i>Artistic styles</i>	74
<i>Written voices</i>	78
<i>Conclusions</i>	85
3 Sicily	89
<i>The Sicilian populations</i>	92
<i>Chronologies in Sicily</i>	94
<i>Sicilian communities</i>	99
<i>Burial customs</i>	113
<i>Religious practices</i>	121

<i>Consumption patterns</i>	129
<i>Artistic styles</i>	133
<i>Written voices</i>	137
<i>Conclusions</i>	152
4 North Africa	158
<i>The North African populations</i>	161
<i>Chronologies in North Africa</i>	164
<i>Libyan communities</i>	169
<i>Burial customs</i>	173
<i>Religious practices</i>	180
<i>Consumption patterns</i>	184
<i>Artistic styles</i>	186
<i>Written voices</i>	196
<i>Conclusions</i>	198
5 Conclusions	200
<i>Notes</i>	205
<i>Bibliography</i>	217
<i>Index</i>	257

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

2.1 North Syrian littoral	26
2.2 North Syrian territories	30
2.3 The Levant	34
2.4 Jewellery mould from Kinet Höyük	41
2.5 Inscriptions from Ras el Bassit	43
2.6 Plans of Ras el Bassit	44
2.7 Houses at Tell Sukas	46
2.8 Lamps from Tell Sukas	47
2.9 Plan of Early Iron Age Tarsus	48
2.10 Graves at Carchemish	52
2.11 Graves at Ras el Bassit	53
2.12 Graves at Tell Sukas	54
2.13 Temple at Tell Sukas	56
2.14 Rebuilt tripartite temple at Tell Sukas	57
2.15 Inscription from Tell Sukas	57
2.16 Model boats or baths	60
2.17 Distribution of pendent semi-circled bowls and plates	62
2.18 Carved ivory	65
2.19 Carved tridacna shell	66
2.20 Lyre player seal from Kinet Höyük	67
2.21 Lyre player seal with lyre	68
2.22 Cast lyre player from Tyre	69
2.23 Distribution of lyre player seals	69
2.24 Horse harness from Samos	71
2.25 Phoenician bronze bowl from Crete	72
2.26 Tekke bronze bowl	73
2.27 Al Mina ware	75
2.28 KW aryballos	76
2.29 Inscription from the North Gate at Karatepe	80
2.30 Çineköy inscription	81
2.31 Inscription from Kinet Höyük	82
2.32 Greek inscription from Al Mina	83

2.33	Greek inscription cast from Tell Sukas	83
3.1	Sicily	90
3.2	Villasmundo tomb plan	95
3.3	Greek vessels from Villasmundo	96
3.4	Alleged Middle Geometric sherds	97
3.5	Circular houses at Montagnoli	100
3.6	Square houses of the Greek colonies	102
3.7	<i>Pastas</i> house plans	103
3.8	Monte Saraceno di Ravanusa sixth-century town planning	106
3.9	<i>Oikos</i> plan of Monte Saraceno di Ravanusa temple	107
3.10	Building N, Ramacca	109
3.11	Vassallaggi seventh-century town plan	110
3.12	Vassallaggi sixth-century sacred area plan	111
3.13	Monte Maranfusa sixth-century house plan	113
3.14	Licodia Eubea tomb plan	114
3.15	Greek forms of burial	116
3.16	Clay models of bulls from Polizzello	122
3.17	Necropolis area A of Polizzello	123
3.18	Circular shrine models from Polizzello	124
3.19	Impressed bull horn motif	124
3.20	Sabucina cult building	125
3.21	Rectangular temple model from Sabucina	126
3.22	Plan of rectangular temple B at Sabucina	127
3.23	Pitched temple model from Sabucina	128
3.24	Later Iron Age vessel forms	134
3.25	Oinochoai motifs	135
3.26	Painted motifs of central and western Sicily	137
3.27	Painted motifs of eastern Sicily	138
3.28	Incised and impressed motifs of western Sicily	138
3.29	Krater from Sabucina	139
3.30	Middle Corinthian heraldic animal motif	140
3.31	Geloan amphora	140
3.32	Stylized birds from Marianopoli	141
3.33	Corinthian bird	141
3.34	Late Corinthian canon of proportions	142
3.35	Sabucina plaque	143
3.36	Bronze figurine pair	144
3.37	Terracotta statuette from Caltabellotta	145
3.38	Limestone sculpture from Castiglione	146
3.39	Mendolito script	148
4.1	North Africa	159
4.2	Lakonian cup by the Arkesilas painter showing King Arkesilas II	161
4.3	Bronze Age/Iron Age Cyrenaican pottery	165

4.4	Terracotta Late Bronze Age vessels from Bates' Libyan cemetery	166
4.5	Pottery from Marsa Matruh	167
4.6	Pre-Greek sherds from Cyrene	167
4.7	Drystone houses from Zinhecra	171
4.8	Garamantian settlement pattern	172
4.9	Messa burial mound	174
4.10	Anthropomorphic funerary stela from the Cyrenean hinterland	175
4.11	Non-freestanding stelae from the Cyrenean hinterland	176
4.12	Stelae from Garama	177
4.13	Punic baetyl sitting on a throne cippus	178
4.14	Agrarian scene from Sanctuary of the Ploughs	182
4.15	Libyan-dressed women in pastoral scenes	183
4.16	Incised prehistoric ceramics	187
4.17	Garamantian pottery	188
4.18	Imitation of a Roman shape	189
4.19	Horse-drawn chariots from Fezzan	190
4.20	Graeco-Roman architectural features in a Libyan funerary context	190
4.21	Slonta heads	191
4.22	Freestanding funerary sculpture from Cyrenaica	192
4.23	Slonta figures	193
4.24	Libyan portraits	194
4.25	Inscriptions on Garamantian funerary stelae	197

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful for the library assistance and financial support from various institutions, particularly the British Institute at Ankara and the British School in Rome, and the Universities of Oxford, Leicester and Bristol.

The following individuals have my deep gratitude for their encouragement, guidance, assistance, constructive criticisms and, in some cases, manuscripts: Carla Antonaccio, John Boardman, Neil Christie, Lin Foxhall, Marie-Henriette Gates, Matt Gibbs, Sue Grice, Linda Hulin, Thomas Keller, Bernard Knapp, Gunnar Lehmann, Kathryn Lomas, Roger Lonsdale, Jonathan Lucas, David Mattingly, Nicoletta Momigliano, Margaret Morrison, Josh Pollard, Joe Shaw, Anthony Snodgrass and Peter van Dommelen.

This book would never have even been conceived if it had not been for my parents, Bill and Nira Hodos, who have always encouraged me to wear my travelling hat, and I happily dedicate this work to them.

INTRODUCTION

The Iron Age remains one of the most dynamic periods of Mediterranean history. Individuals travelled further than ever before, with various peoples settling along foreign shores throughout the Sea, not just the central or eastern regions as during the Bronze Age. Greeks and Phoenicians, in particular, established themselves on all coasts, from North Syria and Cilicia to France and Spain, from North Africa to the coasts of the Adriatic. This is the age of the dissemination of the alphabet from Phoenicians to Greeks, and the subsequent development of alphabetic scripts based upon the Phoenico-Greek model by populations throughout the Mediterranean. This is also the period that generated the so-called Orientalizing Movement, in which other aspects of Near Eastern cultures, particularly material goods and religious ideas, inspired and motivated the Greeks and others in their own products and practices. The volume and variety of items traded throughout the Mediterranean, via long distance and more localized routes, expanded to unprecedented levels.

This book explores one major aspect within this vibrant setting: the responses by local populations to the permanent establishment of nearby foreign communities. Virtually every element of this statement demands explanation, justification and parameter-setting, although an even greater question that deserves an answer first is *why*. The Iron Age Mediterranean as a place during a particular time falls between spheres of scholarship, particularly those traditionally defined as Classical Archaeology and Near Eastern Archaeology. Study of the Greeks, as one significant culture active throughout the Mediterranean, represents a major component of the former, while study of the Phoenicians, as another significant, active culture across the Mediterranean, is usually addressed by scholars in the latter (but not exclusively). Both disciplines, however, have a reputation for working in isolation from other archaeological fields and are perceived to have been slow to adopt innovations in scholarship, particularly the integration of archaeological theory. While this is not the forum for a debate about the merits or deficiencies of the application of theoretical models to a body of data, developments in theoretical interpretations do provide an impetus for reflection upon previous

views. Inspired by postcolonial perspectives in particular, this volume aims to reinterpret data from across the Mediterranean as a means of shedding new light on ancient interactions.

To do so, it will be necessary to reassess patterns in and distributions of material evidence and social practices, and interpretations surrounding them, as a means of exploring the impact that the Iron Age colonial movements had on various populations. This book is not about the development of colonial identities, however, but rather will examine material culture associated with and from the perspective of those populations already settled in the areas where foreign colonies were then established, with explicit interest in comparing and contrasting the influences of colonies on such populations. The foreign communities in question are those settlements that are commonly identified as Greek and Phoenician colonies. The nearby aspect mentioned above reflects a dual meaning: as a geographical territory in which both Greeks and Phoenicians established settlements, and as the notion that the Greeks and Phoenicians were competing for the attention of a particular population or populations. It is especially with this point that the scope of the present study becomes bounded to three areas: the north-eastern corner of the Mediterranean, in particular North Syria; the island of Sicily; and ancient North Africa. In all three regions, Greeks and Phoenicians settled and were therefore forced to interact with the same existing populations as well as one another. Although colonies were founded elsewhere in the Mediterranean, the prospect of competing influence over a territory and its population(s) exists nowhere else than in these three regions, and this is the defining feature of such a comparative study. Phoenicians did not found colonies in the Black Sea, although the Greeks did so abundantly. On the island of Sardinia, only the Phoenicians established colonies, and the dynamics of their activities, especially interactions with the Etruscans, Greeks and Sardinians, remain a separate and distinctive sphere of analysis (van Dommelen 1998); while a regional study of Sicily, Sardinia and Italy would be illuminating, this would be situated amid very different cultural, economic and political circumstances and thus would address diverse questions and issues. Similarly, the nature of foreign settlement on Cyprus is distinct. Greek migrations to Cyprus occurred at the end of the second millennium BC, while the Phoenician settlements of the first millennium were ruled from Tyre. As such, Cyprus represents a unique situation worthy of its own study. The far west Mediterranean is excluded for temporal reasons, since by the time the Greeks established their own settlements in France and Spain, the Punic phase of Phoenician history can be considered to have begun. The Phoenician homeland had been incorporated comprehensively into the Neo-Assyrian empire by the end of the seventh century, and Tyre itself was finally destroyed by the Neo-Babylonians in the middle of the sixth century, eliminating any practical political motherland. Thus Phoenician overseas settlements turned to Carthage as their cultural focal point, giving rise to the Punic era. The

development and role of Carthage as a political power player on the Mediterranean stage, in archaeological as well as historical terms, are significantly beyond the scope, and even aim, of the present study. Therefore focus within the Iron Age in this study lies between the eighth and sixth centuries BC, which encapsulates the main thrust of overseas foundations prior to the Punic period of Mediterranean history.

Much within even this brief explanation requires further discussion at the theoretical level and with regard to background scholarship. The Iron Age as a period needs temporal definition, since its dates are geographically contextual. The identification of foreign settlements as colonies, trading sites or other has been contentious in recent literature, and the utilization of the term 'colony' in this study must be situated. Previous methods for reinterpreting the archaeological evidence for early Iron Age cultural contact and colonial influences also need to be presented to contextualize the present study and its conclusions. The rest of this chapter therefore explains these points, and others, as a means of providing the necessary frameworks for the subsequent examinations of the case-study regions.

When is the Iron Age?

To Near Eastern and Greek archaeologists, the Iron Age begins during the twelfth century BC, after the migration of the Sea Peoples and the general collapse of the Mycenaean palace system. In Sicily, however, the Iron Age is perceived as beginning only during the ninth century BC, when long-standing Bronze Age chiefdoms gave way to more egalitarian communities, and with associated material developments. The presence of iron, itself, is not always a necessary factor for the beginning of an Iron Age anywhere in the Mediterranean; in Sicily, for instance, iron was in use by the end of the second millennium BC. Along coastal North Africa, an Iron Age may be considered to commence with the foundation of Carthage, historically dated to the twelfth century yet archaeologically supported only from the eighth century; for the interior, however, traditional scholarship considered all periods prior to Roman contact, which dates to the fourth century, as merely Prehistoric.

One of the defining features of the Iron Age as broadly applied to the Mediterranean is the perception of renewed cultural links after the widespread destructions and subsequent community withdrawals from regular long-distance communication during the twelfth and eleventh centuries BC. This period used to be described as the Dark Age of Mediterranean history, but research increasingly demonstrates that this period was not so dark, nor so isolated, although it remains seemingly so in comparison to what was before and what came after. It is particularly evidence for trade, in its most general sense, that characterizes the beginning of a new impetus in the Mediterranean in the early first millennium, initially conducted by individuals

working in an independent rather than state capacity. This in turn gave rise to broader, more regular trading activities, and ultimately the movement of peoples through the establishment of overseas settlements, often viewed as to capitalize upon commercial opportunities.

The end of the Iron Age is rarely defined, as the period segues into the Archaic phase of Classical civilization, which coincides with the advent of the Punic era of Mediterranean history, the full development of the city-state in the Greek world, and the very beginning of Rome's Republican period. Often literary references to major historical events, however the events in question might be portrayed, have prompted scholars to define new phases with regard to these events. Thus in the Near East, Iron Age terminology is replaced in the sixth century BC with Persian periodization (Lehmann 1998: 1 and 30 for the use of such ethno-political tags), while in North Africa, it is Roman occupation at the end of the first century BC that heralds this change, despite continuity in the material culture on which the previous periodizations had been based. By contrast, in Sicily, the Iron Age as a chronological term ceases to have relevance after the fifth century, for by the end of this time the local pottery forms on which the periodization had been based were no longer broadly produced; this change in terminology has been materially-led.

Early exchanges

Our evidence for international contact comes from foreign objects found across the Mediterranean, items that arrived in various places only because someone brought them there and offered them to an individual. In particular, these are Near Eastern and Greek goods. The nature of these earlier Iron Age exchanges is difficult to view as widespread and regular trade. Rather, Greek and Near Eastern finds are sporadic in the other's contexts largely until the eighth century. Many have therefore viewed these nascent links as evidence of gift exchange between elites, rather than regular contact through established mercantile networks (recently: Crielaard 1998; Coldstream 2000; Lemos 2001, 2005). Such gifts often may be interpreted as representations of the obligations men assume in relation to one another as the symbols of friendship, solidarity, peace, indebtedness and obligation, and reflect an understanding of social context, custom, classification and hierarchy.¹ Some scholars have emphasized the reciprocal nature of gift-exchange and its ability to socialize aggressive behaviour, while others lend primacy to the motivation to retain possessions in the context of a non-destructive mechanism of social competition.² The gifts in question tend to be lasting works of craftsmanship that circulated, such as bronze and silver vessels, items of jewellery, or even classes of ceramics. Thus, the high prestige value of the Near Eastern objects and their Greek contexts – deliberately disposed in burials – articulate to some the status relationship, political obligation and

social ranking aspects of gift exchange (Finley 1979; Coldstream 1983, 2000; Morris 1986; Crielaard 1998; Lemos 2001, 2005). Jones rightly points out, however, that the different interpretations regarding gift exchange rest on assumptions; there are no characteristics of the goods themselves or their contexts that could be used to reject or accept any hypothesis regarding gift exchange, since the motivations are unobservable (Jones 2000: 63). Nevertheless, gift exchange remains a valuable hypothesis to explain the seeming discrepancies between the metal vessels and faience jewellery offered by Near Easterners – objects we view as of high value – and the pottery vessels circulated by the Greeks, which we do not consider to be of similarly high value given the more ubiquitous nature of such clay goods. The somewhat occasional nature of these finds, with regard to type of object, context and date, still strongly imply an exchange between individuals – likely to be elite – and must reflect some sort of cross-cultural understanding for the pattern to be repeated during the tenth and ninth centuries in particular.³

By the end of the eighth century BC, there is a clear increase in the volume of Near Eastern and Greek goods in foreign contexts, with a wider variety of types, particularly pottery forms, including those that carried organic products (oil, wine, foodstuffs). Such items appear with sufficient regularity in urban, domestic contexts (as opposed to funerary or religious ones) that these exchanges are more easily marked as evidence of broader trading activities. Such activity developed as merchant enterprise rather than state-controlled exchange (Sherratt and Sherratt 1993), and various trade routes emerged as individuals forged links between specific regions and settlements. During the tenth and ninth centuries, Cyprus to Crete emerged as one route, and Rhodes to the Aegean as another. Links extended subsequently to the Near Eastern mainland, uniting Phoenicia into the Cyprus–Crete route; expanded to the western Mediterranean; and integrated North Syria more directly with the Aegean. These particular routes are implied by the quantities and origins of eastern goods found in various contexts and locales throughout the Mediterranean (such as at various coastal sanctuaries). By the eighth century, such goods appear regularly, suggesting steady trade, and during the seventh century, Egypt and North Africa entered into the Mediterranean network.

Early studies of the ancient economy viewed much of this exchange specifically as trade in prestige goods, since the economy itself revolved primarily around subsistence practices, and the main basis of wealth was found in agriculture and land ownership. As a result, inter-regional trade was small in scale and expensive, with only luxury goods, used for high-status competition and ostentatious display in state, community and individual contexts, being transported. Thus, in this model, advocated initially by Hasebroek and Finley, the traders and craftsmen were of more lowly status than their elite, gift-exchanging predecessors (Hasebroek 1933; Finley 1973; for discussions of the development of interpretations of the ancient economy, see Hopkins 1983; Cartledge 1983, 1998; Davies 1998; Andraeu 2002;

Reed 2003). The impetus to colonize has often been viewed as a direct result of the need to broaden mercantile and hence financial opportunities within such an economic sphere for these less upwardly mobile traders,⁴ at least for the Greeks. There is little evidence regarding the social status of their Phoenician counterparts from a Phoenician perspective, since such records do not exist. This relationship between trade and colonization, therefore, requires further discussion here, especially with regard to models that address issues of production and distribution.

Discussions surrounding the ancient economy that rely upon archaeology have often been posited in terms of the discourse of World-Systems Theory – such as Sherratt and Sherratt 1993, expressly for the Mediterranean – which suggests a model to understand the relationships between various societal divisions of labour, from the acquisition of raw materials to the markets. Developed by Wallerstein as a means of studying the rise of capitalism, it incorporated the raw materials, labour and markets into the industrial process that began in the sixteenth century AD in Europe, culminating in the imperial forms of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries across the world. This truly global approach was the fundamental distinction between Wallerstein's model and those proposed by Marx and his followers, who focused on Europe exclusively. A world-system may be defined as a unit with a single division of labour and multiple cultural systems. In other words, it is an inter-societal system marked by a self-contained division of labour. It depends upon the identification of a core with advanced production and distribution, and a periphery that provides the raw materials, as well as a semi-periphery, which both exploits and is exploited (Wallerstein 1974; Hall 2000; for core-periphery theory explicitly, see Rowlands *et al.* 1987; Champion 1989; Rowlands 1998a). The model has been explicitly linked to the study of colonial movements, since colonial foundations are often regarded as a result of the expansion of trade (see, for instance, Dyson 1985).

Yet the applicability of this model to non-capitalist societies has been widely challenged on the grounds that there is little evidence for trade that supports systemic regional relations of dependency in such societies. The model dictates that the same set of economic forces be applied, which may not necessarily be appropriate. With particular regard to the Iron Age Mediterranean, dependency or exploitation may not have been a characteristic of the economies of the ancient world. It has been argued that Greece could not have served as a core, for instance, since there was no concept of a state, but rather in the Greek world a variety of state models were utilized, and there is no indication of the kind of cooperation necessary between them for the successful functioning of a stable economic core. Furthermore, social meanings behind the acquisition of certain objects and reinterpretations in other cultures are neglected in the model (with specific regard to the Mediterranean: Arafat and Morgan 1994; Woolf 1990; for general applications and criticisms, see Peregrine 1996; Dietler 1999; Gosden 2004; various

essays in Kardulias 1999; Denmark *et al.* 2000). These criticisms also set it up in direct contrast with the Finley view of the ancient economy, which denies any kind of systemic regional relationship, since in the Finley model trade was only in luxury products, and thus there can be no notion of exploitation through production for trade.

The dialogue has developed in both spheres recently. From the view of the ancient historian, one new model presents an almost three-dimensional image of ancient exchanges. It discusses flows, rather than exchanges, in three stages of complexity. The first stage is between cells from the smallest individual household to those between a city agora and 'out of region'. The second stage incorporates a wider range of transactions not apparent in the size-related increments of the previous stage, such as those involving private employment or cultic entities. The third stage addresses state-related flows, such as state wages and taxation (Davies 1998). The strength of such a model is that it allows for the mapping of all the economic flows within a society, describing structures and networks within a single model. It does not, however, shed light on the motivations of individuals, for instance, nor necessarily will it map relationships between two regions.

From the archaeological perspective, a recent development has been to view the core and periphery (and semi-periphery) not as opposite, exclusive spaces (Rowlands 1998a: 225), but rather to explore them as spheres for interaction, viewed by some as the 'middle ground' (White 1991; Malkin 2002, 2004; Gosden 2004). The middle ground, which acts as core and periphery, in both geographic and social contexts, serves as a means of interpreting the physical, material and social interactions of cultures, interactions in which everyone had agency and mutual need. It emphasizes mutual accommodation and requires an inability of both sides to gain their ends through force, which is why new conventions for cooperation must develop (White 1991: 52). As a process, therefore, it unites value systems to create a working relationship between them, often resulting in new sets of meanings and interactions over time. One might see a middle ground in North Syria, for instance, a region where Phoenicians and Greeks lived and interacted with the local cultures and one another, creating new meanings in material usages and cultural ideologies. One of the most obvious results deriving from this particular middle ground was what we discuss as the orientalization of Hellenic culture, which in reality was the Greek reinterpretation of selective eastern practices and traditions from the fostering of cross-cultural interactions. Dominance and exploitation are not features of this particular model and, indeed, this is borne out in the evidence from North Syria, as will become apparent in the next chapter. Middle grounds may be also found in Sicily and North Africa.

The various paradigms for examining spheres of multi-cultural interaction come together in the ideas of connectivity across frontiers and between microregions of the Mediterranean through the redistribution of commodities,

as expounded recently by Horden and Purcell (2000). The metaphor of a slope of connectivity is used explicitly to draw us away from notions of centrality and peripherality in our interpretations of interregional interactions (Purcell 2003: 22) and to refine notions of the frontier from physical (e.g. land/sea) or political boundaries to gateways of human mobility through which the relocation of producers and consumers in different microregions took place (Purcell 2005a: 121–4). Despite an emphasis on production and labour regimes, and movement, in the connectivity model (see Purcell 2005a and 2005b for the ancient world in particular), our understanding of connective distributive patterns still revolve around the idea that consumption is a stage in a process of cultural communication in which social and/or cultural value is embodied in commodities exchanged. Desire, demand, exchange of one thing for another and power all interact to create economic value in specific social situations of the moment, and drive production. The social readings are reflected in the desire, demand for and economic value of an item, since desire creates demand, leading us to consume (Bourdieu 1984; Appadurai 1986; Douglas and Isherwood 1996). This consumptive angle requires us to focus upon the perspective of the experiences and interests of the consumer, rather than the producer, since objects were produced in response to demand. This is especially in the case of luxury and desired items, which are the primary commodities exchanged between different cultural communities across the Mediterranean during the Iron Age. The limited circulation of luxury goods and the need for centres of production and reception return us to the broader views of ancient economic practice, where while consumption must be recognized as an important factor on a more globalized scale (Purcell 2003, 2005a, 2005b), its importance to the local extraction of value must not be overlooked (Miller 1995). This is essential for our interpretations surrounding early colonial exchanges with local populations.

Luxuries play a particularly important role in the communication of cultural values and can be viewed as a special register of consumption, as part of a large-scale consumption pattern, in which their principal use is rhetorical and social, as goods that are incarnated signs. The deliberately limited circulation of an object and its social significance promotes exclusivity in knowledge of the cultural code, and this is often manipulated to promote power and status.⁵ Luxuries, therefore, may be characterized by restriction in price or law to elites; complexity of acquisition; capacity to signal fairly complex social messages; specialist knowledge as a prerequisite for their ‘appropriate’ consumption; and/or a high degree of linkage of their consumption with body, person and personality (Appadurai 1986: 38). In other words, knowledge of the cultural code is important to the value of luxuries. New commodities may begin as luxuries but develop into perceived necessities, or at least become culturally standardized. Luxuries can therefore lose their exclusive nature, as knowledge of the cultural code spreads (Douglas and Isherwood

1996: 68–9, 106) or develops as it is reinterpreted within the recipient culture (Howes 1996). This aspect is particularly significant for colonial situations, where it is important to understand the cultural codes of the recipient cultures if an understanding of the impact and influences of colonizing cultures is to be better gained. Thus notions of agency and resistance must be examined, as one scholar has recently phrased it, to ‘identify the local social and cultural logic of consumption of foreign goods and practices and to understand the unintended consequences of such consumption in the entanglement of the colonial situation’ (Dietler 1999: 483). This entails an emphasis upon how and why goods were selected for use and foreign customs modified, why other cultural aspects were not adopted, and the resulting cultural developments.

The developing consumptive role of luxuries can be identified easily in the patterns of imported goods exchanged between the Near East and Greece before and after the eighth century BC. Prior to the eighth century, the exclusive nature of the types of goods and their findspots suggest selective consumption identified with elite individuals in both communities, while their more widespread presence and provenances during the eighth and seventh centuries imply a broader understanding of the code that is no longer restricted to the elite (e.g. Lemos 2005). As a more detailed case study, in Sicily, initially only Greek drinking vessels associated with the symposium were of interest to the non-foreign populations, despite the range of materials otherwise available from the Greeks. Used in accordance with local traditions and customs, the sympotic wares initially had a restricted circulation before becoming more widely used, and finally imitated in local production (Hodos 2000c; for other specifically Mediterranean examples of consumption, see also Snodgrass 1983; Osborne 1996; Crielaard 1999a, 1999b).

These two examples, one general, one specific, contribute to the notion of Mediterraneanization, the dynamic process of connectedness in the Mediterranean (Morris 2003: 33). As a concept, it derives much from recent theories of globalization, particularly its emphasis on the *process* of connection. It stands as an embellishment to the theory of connectivity in that it emphasizes states of flux, takes into account sociological elements, and addresses the winners and losers in the process. The active elements of the processes of connection are the focus of the present volume, in which the specific case studies developed in the following chapters examine the conditions of connectivity and highlight the varied processes and outcomes across the Mediterranean in a snapshot of the Iron Age.

Colonization in the ancient world

Those engaged in the transport and exchange of goods, whether as gifts, commodities or other, gained detailed knowledge of other regions of the Mediterranean as prospects for viable, sustainable settlement, opportunities

for expanding commercial opportunities, and ways and means of doing things. One of the direct results of the earlier Iron Age exchanges was the foundation of colonies. The reasons are varied and contentious, and it is not my intention to engage in a discussion of why the Greek and Phoenician colonies were founded, although overpopulation, land shortage and commercial ambition are generally cited as reasons that the Greeks, in particular, established colonies; the Phoenician settlements are often characterized as expressly interested in trade opportunities, particularly for raw resources. Means of legitimization were often tied in with perspectives of cultural superiority or dominance in our ancient sources. Foundation myths, first recorded centuries after settlement, may subsequently have been used as a method of establishing rights to the territory, and sometimes were based upon mythic occupation tales. Religious sanction was another tool to justify aggressive action on the part of the new settlers. Lands often described as 'empty' were empty only in the eye of the beholder, or authors legitimizing the Greeks' claim, in particular, to territory on foreign shores (Malkin 1987, 1997; Dougherty 1993).

For the ancient world, the movement of groups of individuals to settlements in foreign territories has traditionally been discussed through the active voice of colonization, rather than through the politically-laden overtones of colonialism. Scholarship in the field of Greek colonization movements has been dominated by two Oxford University archaeologists in particular: T.J. Dunbabin, Reader in Classical Archaeology, and his successor, John Boardman. Dunbabin was an Australian by birth and grew up in the 1910s and 1920s, during the time that his nation, itself a colonial frontier, was striving to define itself against an indigenous substratum. He moved to Britain in the 1930s, the final era of the British Empire, when notions of colonialism were still held in high regard (de Angelis 1998). His research focused on Greek activities in the central Mediterranean, and Greek interactions with the civilizations of the eastern Mediterranean. His first book, *The Western Greeks* (1998), explored Greek activity particularly in Italy and Sicily. Only limited attention was given to the non-Greek populations in terms of discussion and significance. Rather, they are generalized as primitive and in need of the benefits of Hellenic civilization with nothing to offer the Greeks in return.

Strong in Dunbabin's background was the cultural primacy assigned to Classical Greek civilization by the modern West, as rooted in the classical tradition (Morris 1994; Shanks 1996), and this theme is perhaps more pervasive in scholarship on Greek colonization than any perceived colonialist ideologies. Even when Dunbabin turned his attention to the supposedly more enlightened eastern Mediterranean civilizations, who bestowed their artistic styles and techniques, as well as religious ideas and practices, upon the Greeks, he still found supremacy in Greek actions, since 'the Greeks learnt more, and made more use of these [Syrian] works, than Syrians or

Phoenicians did of the Greeks' works at this time [ninth to eighth centuries]' (Dunbabin 1957: 37). Even though the Greeks took much and gave little in return in this instance, in Dunbabin's eyes they still managed to make more of the situation than anyone else involved, reinforcing the notion of the time of Greek cultural superiority.

Emphasis on the importance of Greek civilization in the Mediterranean world perhaps culminates in the works of John Boardman. Boardman became Reader in Classical Archaeology after Dunbabin's death. Although he may be more widely recognized for his extensive contributions to the study of Greek art (e.g. Shanks 1996), he has maintained a substantial publication record in the archaeology of Greek colonization. In 1964, Boardman published his seminal work on the subject, *The Greeks Overseas*, which appeared in its fourth edition in 1999. Boardman's focus, like Dunbabin's, has been on the spread of Greek civilization throughout the Mediterranean. Unlike Dunbabin, Boardman was explicit in his examination of the material evidence for relations between Greeks and non-Greek speakers by examining the influences the Greeks had upon these non-Greek cultures. To Boardman, however, Greek culture (itself viewed as somewhat static) overwhelmed others with its sophistication of objects and artefacts, and enlightened customs and traditions. In his essentialist view, there is little consideration of acts of agency on the part of the non-Greeks, nor of any reciprocity. This is best summed up in his description of Greek interaction with the non-foreign populations of Sicily and Italy, when he states, 'In the west the Greeks had nothing to learn, much to teach' (Boardman 1999c: 190).

These scholars worked within a framework dominated by the notion of Hellenization, a concept broadly applied to the adoption of Greek cultural elements by non-Greek populations, usually as a result of direct contact with Hellenes through trade and/or, more often, colonization. It thus incorporates both colonialist and philhellenic ideologies. As a term, however, it lacks analytical power, since not all aspects of Greek culture were adopted by those with whom the Greeks came into contact through prolonged settlement, and different aspects were preferred by some and not others. Its usage, most frequently in colonialism contexts, implies a passive acceptance of Greek material goods and ideologies on the part of the non-Greeks, with no consideration of agency, nor of reciprocity. Furthermore, it obscures the fact that any adoption that did occur was not at a uniform rate. Hellenization, as a result of colonization, remains a form of colonialism.

While Hellenization has been criticized, it is only most recently that scholars are beginning to modify their interpretations and actively apply more encompassing frameworks from other disciplines of archaeology, particularly ideas and models drawn from postcolonialism. The result is a much more nuanced view of Greek activities abroad, and especially the responses of other cultures to the Greeks as a result of direct contact. The ideologies of postcolonial scholarship strive to articulate the active histories of the

colonized and to deconstruct the binary models of colonized and colonizers. Boardman's recent criticisms of postcolonial scholarship as a replacement of old prejudices with modern ones⁶ ignores the fact that postcolonial scholarship does not deny the impact of the foreign, colonizing cultures; it continues to assess their influences, but now takes into account notions of agency, reciprocity and hybrid developments in the process.

Study of the Phoenician colonial movement in the Mediterranean can be similarly criticized. This sphere of research as an archaeological discipline was initiated by Sabatino Moscati, who published the first archaeological synthesis in 1966 (*Il Mondo dei Fenici*), at roughly the same time Boardman produced *The Greeks Overseas*. In many respects, Moscati's work presented a similar monocultural understanding of the Phoenicians in their overseas settlements, and focused exclusively on Phoenician characteristics within the colonies, using Carthage as the archetype rather than an unusual exception. Orientalists have a tendency to downplay Phoenician feats or conflate them with Greek achievements, and Phoenician activities in the Mediterranean are often still assessed from evolutionist and dualist frameworks (see the discussion in van Dommelen 1998: 17–24). More recent scholarship, such as the works of H.G. Niemeyer and M.E. Aubet's recent synthesis (Aubet 2001), continues to set the study of Phoenician colonization within a framework of opposition to and competition with Greek colonies, often paying little interest to Phoenician interactions with and influences upon local populations, and even less to any reciprocity or the development of hybrid cultures as a result of such contacts (e.g. Niemeyer 1990, 1993, 1999, 2002; Aubet 2001). It is only very recently that this trend is altering (the work of van Dommelen, in particular).⁷

Until the rise of Carthage as a major Mediterranean power base and focus for the other scattered settlements after the destruction of the Phoenician homeland, the Phoenician settlements abroad were assumed to be not as land-hungry as their Greek counterparts. Tales of hostile and aggressive territorial conquest on the part of the Phoenicians are not mentioned in any literary record. Distinction must be made, however, between those areas where the Phoenicians were in competition with Greek settlements, and those where they were not. In the former (which include the case-study regions of this book), the material impact of the Phoenicians on other cultures is less dramatic during the earlier colonial period; Sicily, for instance, has been broadly interpreted as Hellenized, not Phoenicianized. The fact that few areas are considered to have been Phoenicianized is intriguing, as the impetus for Phoenician expansion overseas is generally held to have been for the acquisition of raw materials, and thus implies commercial exchanges, so it may be surprising that lasting cultural influences as a result of such exchange are not readily apparent. In fact, the very basic forms of exchange, themselves, may be masked by the intrusion of Greek cultural artefacts, contributing to the debate regarding who transported what.

Where Phoenicians maintained a geographical monopoly on colonial settlements, there is strong evidence that they did adopt strategies of territorial control. Sardinia is one such example. The Phoenicians initially founded the coastal settlements of Nora and Tharros along the south and western coasts respectively, and Sulcis on the south-western offshore island of Sant'Antioco, in the middle of the eighth century BC. During the later seventh century, new sites were established, presumably to facilitate contacts with the interior. Their situations reflect a strategic awareness of routes between the coast and the mineral-rich interior, and thus avenues of control, and include hilltop strongholds. Some were pitched to secure easy and direct access to inland fertile plains. The location of these sites and the subsequent distribution of Phoenician pottery throughout the island, in comparison with previous distribution patterns of Etruscan wares, in particular, reveal an increased Phoenician involvement in the internal affairs of Sardinia (van Dommelen 1998).

Nevertheless, parallels in Greek and Phoenician colonial scholarship can still be drawn. On the one hand, Greek and Phoenician activities abroad are no longer viewed as replications of life in the mother-cities. The colonial experience is acknowledged as a modification into something new, framed within ideologies of hybridity (Malkin 2003; Antonaccio 2005). It has been demonstrated that the Greek colonists in Sicily, for instance, made active decisions about the burial forms they utilized more in competition with neighbouring Greek settlements rather than in replication of homeland practices. A sense of distinct identity, developed and nurtured in foreign shores and explicit from the mother-city, was extended to the pan-Hellenic religious sphere, observable in the architecture of Sicilian Greek sanctuaries and the dedications that Sicilian Greeks made in the international sanctuaries of Greece (Shepherd 1995, 2000, 2005b). Approaches to Phoenician colonization have undergone a similar renaissance, with the recognition that Phoenician colonies highlighted certain features not common in the homeland, such as the *tophet*, and created distinctly colonial cultures, including more localized cultural spheres (Aubert 2001; van Dommelen 1998, 2002, in press a). In addition, there is an emphasis on the articulation of voices of the so-called native populations from the material remains, and a focus upon why elements of foreign culture were only selectively adopted, and adapted, with regard and in response to active local social mechanisms rather than mere emulation, and why other aspects were rejected (Dietler 1989, 1999; Hodos 2000c; Albanese Procelli 2003; Antonaccio 2004). All these avenues of study underline the local significance of any colonial-sphere interaction.

Colonialism in the ancient world

Scholarly interpretations of colonial movements have been related frequently to our experiences of more recent colonial activities, especially those influenced

sample content of Local Responses to Colonization in the Iron Age Mediterranean

- [Dragons Of Summer Flame \(Dragonlance: The Second Generation, Book 2\) pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub](#)
- [download The Innocent Moon \(A Chronicle of Ancient Sunlight, Book 9\)](#)
- [click Dancing With Einstein: A Novel](#)
- [**The Lady and the Monk: Four Seasons in Kyoto pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi**](#)
- [click Malign Velocities: Accelerationism and Capitalism pdf](#)
- [read Super You: Release Your Inner Superhero pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub](#)

- <http://bestarthritiscare.com/library/Dragons-Of-Summer-Flame--Dragonlance--The-Second-Generation--Book-2-.pdf>
- <http://betsy.wesleychapelcomputerrepair.com/library/Five-Spice-Street--The-Margellos-World-Republic-of-Letters-.pdf>
- <http://www.celebritychat.in/?ebooks/Catherine--Called-Birdy.pdf>
- <http://korplast.gr/lib/The-Blazing-Star--Warriors--Dawn-of-the-Clans--Book-5-.pdf>
- <http://berttrotman.com/library/Creative-Mythology--The-Masks-of-God--Volume-4-.pdf>
- <http://aseasonedman.com/ebooks/Super-You--Release-Your-Inner-Superhero.pdf>