Colonies and colonization.

4.1. Analogy and Terminology

4.2. Reassessing Scholarly Archaeology
This article suggests that the study of colonies and colonization needs to be situated within wider Mediterranean and Near Eastern contexts and to throw off its parochial conception of Greek history. However, a wider geographical range is not enough by itself to bring the study of ancient colonization out of its current ‘crisis’. Scholars should be rethinking the very terminology they employ, including such words as ‘colonization’, and they ought to evaluate how modern colonialism and capitalism have shaped the understanding of the ancient phenomena conventionally described as ‘colonization’. Such a revaluation would lead not just to a more rigorous analysis of ancient colonization but also to a broader, and more nuanced, consideration of modern empires.
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General treatments of ancient Greece usually discuss colonies as restricted to some two-and-a-half centuries (c.750 to c.500 in familiar terms (cf. Wilson 2006: 25–6 on the ‘long-established certainties’ of Greek colonization). There are two general problems with such discussions: a vagueness enshrouds the colonial world’s long-term development, and these discussions are weakly, if at all, connected to ancient Greece’s larger narrative, only referred to, out of necessity, to supply just enough context to understand, say, the Athenian invasion of Sicily in 415 BCE (for recent examples of this kind of approach, see Sansone 1999).

Avoiding vagueness helps to establish a proper connection which represent somewhere between about a third and a half of the total number of ancient Greek poleis estimated in the archaic and classical periods (Ruschenbusch 1994).

The geographical distribution of these colonies was both broad and varied: from France and north-east Spain in the western Mediterranean, through Italy, the Adriatic, and Libya in the central Mediterranean, to the Black Sea and its approaches. In human terms, 10,000 or more Greeks may have moved to colonies by 700 BCE (Morris 2000: 257), and overall between 30,000 and 60,000 adult male emigrants have left Greece (Scheidel 2003: 134–5). By 500 BCE Greeks had indeed settled outside Greece far and wide, producing societies which, by the fourth century BCE may have accounted for some 40 per cent of all ancient Greeks (while the absolute number of ancient Greeks is still a matter of debate, the proportion of colonial population is not: cf. Scheidel 2003: 131–5; Hansen 2006).

Economic, and cultural achievers, examples being city-states like Syracuse in Sicily, Taras in southern Italy, and Thasos in the northern Aegean. Attempting to be precise in this way should foreground an important question: why do these colonies play, in light of these developments, a disproportionately small role in the overall narrative of ancient Greece?

Since the 1990s the study of ancient Greek colonization...
answer to this question and, more seriously, no perceptible change in general scholarly practice to counterbalance the well-entrenched trajectory of putting the focus on the Greek homeland in our accounts. Considerable scope exists, therefore, in developing the study of ancient Greek colonization, especially since, as Nicholas Purcell (2005: 115) has rightly underlined, it is a subject currently in a state of crisis. This chapter will suggest new avenues of enquiry and practice aimed at moving the subject beyond its present intellectual crossroads and to answering the question just posed.

4.1. Analogy and Terminology

It is becoming well established that classical studies are in general bound up in modern colonialism (Goff 2005), and that in particular the study of ancient Greek colonization has sought, for most of its life, intellectual inspiration from, and hence been heavily overwritten by, analogies with modern European imperialism and colonialism (see Owen 2005 for a recent discussion). In consequence, our studies have been infused at their very core by concepts and concerns that have been revealed, thanks to postcolonial perspectives and the independent study of material culture (cf. Greenwood and Whitley in this volume), to have had a limited place in the early Greek world. A more complex picture has emerged, one that had remained hidden for so long. Great strides have already been made in looking critically at the analogies and terminologies we have inherited. But two more particular avenues of investigation can be pursued.

The first concerns the basic terminology that we still use to describe this field of study: ‘colonies’ and ‘colonization’ remain mainstay terms, ones which even the most self-reflective and conscientious of scholars continue to use. A decade ago Robin Osborne (1998) terminology, calling for its complete elimination from our accounts of early Greek history and its replacement with a looser model of privately initiated migrations. Other scholars have followed Osborne’s critical line in re-evaluating other areas of early Greek history (e.g. Anderson 2005; Bradley and Wilson 2006; only Tsetskhladze 2006 fact, the traditional terminology has been expanded with the term ‘colonialism’, which is now being regularly employed, mirroring a trend in studies on modern imperial history (Howe 2005 on the recent growth of ‘-ism’ concepts in the study of the Greeks overseas). James Whitley expresses sentiments that probably explain generally the continuing use and expansion of the traditional terminology by ancient Greek scholars: ‘we have to call this process something, and colonisation is as good a term as any.’

A certain psychological comfort lies behind these developments over the last decade. The comfort is twofold. The first involves how our subject is increasingly featuring in works that explore colonialism through time and space (Randsborg 2000; Lyons and Papadopoulos 2002...
gratifying that we can contribute to important discussions of the human experience beyond our immediate field, instead of being saddled with the customary mindset amongst the public and scholarly community at large that classical studies are mired in questions and approaches which are of diminishing relevance to the contemporary world. It is no doubt stimulating that our subject is being situated in such a wider context, especially since classical scholarship has traditionally shown an 'antipathy' (Trigger 2006: 108) to such perspectives. So, recently, Peter van Dommelen (2006: 108) has written of the lessons that we can derive from the bigger subject of colonialism: ‘These general principles can be applied equally fruitfully to the analysis of earlier pre-modern colonial situations, such as ancient linkages, dangers which are being averted by some scholars by redefining ‘ancient Greek colonialism’. Chris Gosden 2004, for instance, defines colonialism as a relationship of domination between an indigenous (or forcibly imported) majority and a minority of foreign invaders. The fundamental decisions affecting the lives of the colonized people are made and implemented by the colonial rulers in pursuit of interests that are often defined in a distant metropolis. Rejecting cultural compromises with the colonized population, the colonizers are convinced of their own superiority and of their ordained mandate to rule.

For the early Greek world, there existed very little true colonialism as just defined, general conditions being not at all conducive (Nippel 2003: 14–15), and it is only in exceptional circumstances, usually after about 500 that this definition may sometimes be satisfied (Wilson 2005). Continue to label and describe our subject with terms that, technically speaking, generally do not apply? In a modern North American context Stephen Silliman 2005 for an ancient Mediterranean context. Silliman argues that more regular use should be made of the term ‘colonialism’, in lieu of the bland and less politically charged phrase ‘culture contact’ that is now dominant, for colonialism was the primary historical reality that native populations faced in North America. In a similar vein, it can be argued that we, as scholars of the ancient Greek world, should be using more frequently the term ‘culture contact’ to describe the historical reality we study, for that was the main historical reality in our time-periods. The excellent collection of essays edited by James Cusick of the ancient Greek world who wish to use the term ‘colonialism’ should serve as the first level of description, and then a case should be made to distinguish between the possible types of encounter. The onus must be on those scholars who wish to use the term ‘colonialism’ to prove its existence, instead of batting the
term about because it is fashionable.

Secondly, the term is easy and satisfying to use, for it does are familiar with, given historical developments of recent speaks of ‘colonialism’, ‘colonies’, and ‘colonization’ re accustomed, often unthinkingly, to accepting over cent its dimensions. As Wilfried Nippel (2003: 15) has rightly Kontinuität’ ('at any rate, there is a continuity with the recognized, to describe most instances of ancient Greel false. The ‘word magic’ against which Finley 1976 warn basic level, unless the spell, which has enchanted us all, confusion, see Douglas 2007.)

What is needed is the coining of some new terminology already exists. The ancient Greek term *apoikia* (pl. *apoikiai*) term ‘apoikism’, derived from ancient Greek *apoikismos* coinage can be suggested, namely, ‘apoikiazation’, inst place of ‘to colonize’ and the adjective could be ‘apoikia: earlier, is being discussed, then again a combination of Even at the risk of seeing matters through an Athenian (pl. *kleroukhiai*) could generally be used as an equivaler colonialism, ‘kleroukhiazation’ for colonization, the ve colonial as the adjective. In defence of these coinages, i scholarship has had no problem in creating neologisms: much-vaunted ‘colonialism’ because of the need it felt important enough to require a new coinage (on the coin is in the same spirit that we must approach the present of ancient terminology that builds on these basic ancien

A second way to advance discussion in this area is to encourage further study of the modern historical phenomena from which the ancient analogies have bee topic have appeared since the 1990s, and that, consequ however, has accurately gauged the matter: ‘Eine umfa über die althistorischen Arbeiten zur griechischen Kolo my knowledge, there is no comprehensive, scholarly hi devoted to Greek colonization’). More individual contri possible. Therefore, we have hardly finished with studi directions.

Considerable attention has already been paid, for obvi French empires and classical scholarship; nonetheless,
about the less lengthy and less extensive German and Italian attempts at colonialism? While it is widely
recognized that German scholarship laid the very basis of classical scholarship in the nineteenth and twentieth
centuries, hardly any attention is paid to the relationship between classical Greek scholarship and modern
colonialism in Germany.

A very obvious example of such a connection is the lecture ‘Die Griechen als Meister der Colonisation’ delivered by the distinguished ancient historian Ernst Curtius as the ‘Scramble for Africa’ and other colonial forays were about to begin. The time is ripe to explore further this modern German context (cf. Gauer in Italian scholarship from unification to the end of World War II, when, interestingly, ancient Rome was the dominant intellectual model (Mattingly 1996; Barbanera Angelis, forthcoming a). Italian scholarship in this period, it can be noted, was already interpreting ancient cultural encounters with a kind of ‘middle ground’ model of interaction, an intellectual development which is usually thought only to have emerged in the 1990s (cf. Gosden 2004). Cultural developments were also being treated less dismissively than by British scholars who considered them as mere provincial offshoots (for an overview of the Italian cultural encounters with the Greek world, see Settis 1991). Italian scholarship in this period, it can be noted, was already interpreting ancient cultural encounters with a kind of ‘middle ground’ model of interaction, an intellectual development which is usually thought only to have emerged in the 1990s (cf. Gosden 2004). Cultural developments were also being treated less dismissively than by British scholars who considered them as mere provincial offshoots (for an overview of the Italian position on ancient Greek art, see Settis 1991).

Complexities of the Italian case deserve further attention. Overall, therefore, the full range of modern nations and empires involved in colonialism, whether on the giving or receiving end of it, or both, could be fruitfully studied (one thinks of the Austro-Hungarian empire, Spain, Ireland, Canada, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the Soviet Union, Russia, and so on).

In any case, the existing studies have, arguably, focused on the more obvious aspects of such faulty analogies and terminologies. Alongside these there must also be wielded by modern colonialism. As Chris Gosden 2004: 20) has observed: ‘nineteenth-century views of colonialism still have a pernicious influence on all our v unacknowledged.’ Regardless of whether or not we accept Gosden’s definition of colonialism, it is crucial to bear in mind that the very questions we ask, the very models we use, the very attitudes we adopt, and the very world we live in are all implicated in some way in our present and future practices (see the recent collection of studies edited by de Polignac and Levin 2006: 209–10; Alavi, forthcoming). We should be attentive to the results of such work, in order to help disentangle how modern capitalism has affected the study of ancient Greece. In pursuing all these histories of scholarship, we can achieve greater clarity of the contrasts, and any common ground, between the ancient and modern worlds, since ‘[w]e need to understand a tradition which has shaped Mediterranean historiography, but not to adopt it’ (Purcell 2005: 134). I understand of the classical tradition and its relations must continue, therefore, to engage the general discourse, but also for a different set of reasons.
Our scholarly practices are also a product of the legacies outlined above, and, again, the shaping has happened in both obvious and subtle ways. Such matters require discussion on their own, if we are to break out, with any success, from the problematic framework we have inherited.

4.2. Reassessing Scholarly Practice

The scholarly practices followed in the study of Greek ‘colonization’ comprise both ones specific to this field and ones practised more generally by the disciplines of philology, history, and archaeology and their respective handling of the written and material sources.

Before archaeological evidence came to be collected and incorporated systematically into reconstructions of the past, the first modern accounts of Greek ‘colonization’, such as those of William Mitford George Grote (1846–1856), were naturally based primarily on the surviving literary sources. With the development of classical archaeology in the second half of the nineteenth century, efforts were concentrated on corroborating and expanding the surviving written sources, with archaeology occupying a subordinate position in the academy, something which was viewed as natural and normal (cf. Trigger). Developments have implications with which we must deal still today. Archaeology often received its marching orders from issues raised in the written sources (Snodgrass). Hypercritical handlers of the ancient written sources in the later nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries, like Karl Julius Beloch and Ettore Pais (Ampolo 1997: 96–9), the trend for the century that followed was always towards a positivistic philological approach, which regarded ‘authorities’. Developments in cultural history in the 1970s to 1990s brought about important theoretical changes (Burke 2004: 30–99), but by then the impact had already been profound and normalized. Timothy Taylor (1994: 374) has drawn attention to this general problem on the heels of praising François Hartog’s (1988) now-classic book on Herodotus’ representation of the Scythians:

(p. 55) Most archaeologists have read Herodotus with far less sensitivity. The chronicle of historical peoples and events has tyrannized protohistoric archaeology. Archaeological cultures and culture-groups have been uncritically identified with peoples described in the ancient texts … (whereas the results of excavation have not been allowed to challenge the overall conceptual framework provided by the texts). In south-east European and Soviet scholarship there has been a strong tendency to use partial and simplistic readings to justify particular line of interpretation …

There have also been more subtle ways in which ancient writings, often considerably shorter in length than Herodotus’ account of the Scythians (sometimes mere words), have shaped the study of the past in equally noteworthy ways. Brief statements made by Thucydides in Book VI, for example, have been used to help formulate the absolute chronology of the archaic period and have been taken as the model of (violent) culture contact between Greeks and natives in Sicily (De Angelis, forthcoming). Informed looks at the surviving ancient literary sources …
Dougherty 1993; Dougherty and Kurke 1993, 2003; García Fauber, forthcoming), and they need to continue. However, they need to continue more in conjunction with, or at the very least with an eye to, the material sources, because historical reconstructions of the early Greek world still tend, in narrow fashion, to privilege written sources (Hall 1993: 25). In the study of Greek ‘colonization’, such privileging has a detrimental effect on both Greeks and non-Greeks, in that it silences a whole range of dimensions to our subject. The work of Michel-Rolph Trouillot is fundamental in understanding how historical narratives and their silences are created and shaped by power. For Trouillot (1995: 25): ‘What matters most are the process and conditions of production of such narratives.’ Power enters the story at different times and angles: it precedes the narrative and contributes to its creation and interpretation, but power always begins at the source (ibid. 28–9). In Trouillot’s framework, it is easy to see how the ancient Greeks are bound to come out ahead if interrelated and mutually feeding factors: they have fairly abundant ancient sources, both written and archaeological, for their study, and modern scholars have traditionally favoured the ancient Greeks, giving them a loud and active voice over non-Greek peoples. Jonathan Hall recently argued that this Hellenocentrism will continue to be inevitable in ancient Mediterranean history, for two main reasons: there are written sources for the ancients, and archaeological histories for non-Greeks will never be able to make up for that gap. Such historical reconstructions based only or primarily on written sources, and to stultify the development of archaeological practice, are bound to be bound to be defective and will never be able to make up for that gap. Such statements have the power to encourage further historical reconstructions based only or primarily on written sources, and hence to straitjacket definitions of history, and to stunt the development of archaeological practice. That written sources are somehow more reliable and better than material culture, and by extension that prehistoric peoples are somehow inferior than literate and hence ‘civilized’ peoples (Gosden 1997: 110), is a problem that has already started to be addressed, but there is still a long way to go (Trigger 2006: 498). Archaeology has helped to correct these prejudices, yet even here more can be done to develop two particular kinds of archaeology: prehistoric and contact.

The concept of prehistory is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, prehistory began as an intellectual concept and pursuit in the nineteenth century, when Europeans sought to measure their progressive development over peoples not regarded as advanced (McNiven and Russell 1984; Trouillot 1995: 7; Duara 2002: 419). The contemporary creation of the concepts of migration and diffusionism as explanatory frameworks compounded the problem, doing so much to rob supposed inferior cultures of any agency or innovation; progress resided in the ‘cultural hearth’ that was Europe. History could...
only happen and exist when the two cultural systems can interfere with each other. Pejorative formulations will certainly be lessened by considering the other side of prehistory's double edge: all literate societies, including the ancient Greeks and our own and future ones, will always have aspects of life that are not put down into words, hence making them 'prehistoric' in some sense too (this is one of the recurrent arguments made by Gosden 2003; the recent call for the abandonment of prehistory seems unnecessary in this light: Silliman 2005: 74, n. 2). Soviet archaeology's focus on the study of everyday life has been successfully applied to ancient Greek 'colonial' contexts in the Black Sea, for the subject of everyday life is usually not illuminated to any significant degree in our essentially prehistoric contexts that, once shorn of its original, underlying ideological aims referred to above (but see also Taylor 2003), can make a very positive contribution to Greek 'colonial' contexts around the Mediterranean (cf. Trigger 2006: 334–41 on this Soviet contribution to archaeology). The growth and development of this sort of prehistoric archaeology should run in parallel with contact archaeology.

The traditional carving up of Mediterranean archaeology into prehistoric versus classical does not do justice to, and handily avoids, the ancient cultural encounters and overlapping that occurred through contact, as well as the messiness of competing methodologies, terminologies, and theoretical frameworks (Gras 1995: 601). This artificial distinction between different disciplines has also been maintained in other parts of the world with contact-zone history (Lightfoot 1995), but the situation is slowly changing for the better there too (Murray 2004). While the marriage of textual and material sources has been under way in some quarters of Greek 'colonial' studies (see e.g. Gras 1995; 2002; Rolle, 2003; cf. Bradley 2006: p. xiii), it is something that can be encouraged even further (cf. Trigger 2006: 334–41). The union of textual and material sources has to be balanced and aimed at recapturing as many of the complexities of ancient contact zones, not just to the ancient Greek side of it, or whatever side we might wish to identify with (cf. Wachtel 2002: 50, 67), let alone in the history of cultural contact in Greece. No one source should be regarded as subservient or inferior to another in this framework (cf. Trigger 2006: 334–41).

Both prehistoric and contact archaeology in the ancient Mediterranean have had few practical applications of postcolonial theory to their data (Webster and Cooper 1996), though some such studies do exist (see Antonaccio 2003). Here too there are many more possibilities.

Studying ancient Greek ‘colonization’ is quickly becoming, therefore, an intellectually challenging endeavour, for all the reasons just outlined, as well as for the vastness of time and space encompassed by the phenomenon. As Michel Gras (2000b: 230) has rightly urged, a certain intellectual courage is needed to tackle this period of early Mediterranean history, an intellectual courage that is not afraid to experiment or make mistakes.
mistakes. The latter must explain in part why historical ‘colonization’ being an integrated part of the ancient Greek world account of the early Greek world: Hall et al. rest of the explanation must also lie in scholarly frameworks that put the focus on the Greek homeland in the first place as the ‘cultural hearth’ of a supposed ‘colonization’. This problem continues in the most recent English-language account of the early Greek world: Hall et al. 2003: 213) in reviewing Whitley et al. The general problem has recently been summed up by Christopher Smith 2003: 213) in reviewing Whitley et al.

If there is a disappointing aspect of the book, it is perhaps its self-imposed limitation as an archaeology of Greece … Arguably, however, the peculiar triumph of Greek art, and the most important reason for its claim to art-historical significance, is not its self-sufficient beauty, but its remarkable adaptability to different historical and geographical contexts, and its openness to external influence. The radical fluidity and ‘connectivity’ of the Mediterranean world … is only one part of a wider undermining of the conceptual validity of Greece as an object of study separate from its Mediterranean setting.

The ancient Greeks need to be studied more in their Mediterranean setting in order to understand them better (for a still too rare example see Demand 2006), and Greek ‘colonization’ offers an ideal lens through which to do so (De Angelis, forthcoming b). To do so will require the adoption and development of a new set of methods, perspectives, and attitudes. We will all need to move away from the familiar and the comfortable. There is much to be gained in doing so. Some of the benefits have just been discussed, but there are others of contemporary relevance that transcend the field itself.

4.3. Contemporary Relevance

The stories that scholarship told until recently about ancient Greek ‘colonization’ have served their original purpose: that is, of disseminating a higher and aggressive classical culture to more primitive and passive peripheries. In other words, the ancient Greeks acted as a mirror and precedent for the contemporary aspirations and behaviour of European states and empires (Trigger 2003: 213). If these stories of Greek ‘colonization’ have any relevance or value today, now that the original contexts that motivated their study continue to disappear? The broad question of the relationship between Hellenism and modernity is addressed elsewhere in this volume (see especially the contribution by Porter); here the focus will be on the future of the study of Greek ‘colonization’, and in particular what it can teach us in a world that is increasingly becoming integrated and characterized by the migration of peoples.

Marc Ferro 2003: 361) has observed that decolonization has multiplied the centres of historical production in the world. The entry writing, themselves often forged as nations out of Euro the question of a multicultural past, present, and future writing is no less politicized than homogeneous one-sid
ancient Greece will the political and cultural views of particular practitioners become more apparent (Ober 2003; cf. also Gabaccia 2002: 442–4). Someone who lives in, say, Canada with its officially bilingual and multicultural policies will certainly have a different take on the past than someone writing in, say, the United States or France, with their policies of cultural assimilation. Many other contrasting viewpoints could, of course, be cited. Nevertheless, ancient Greek culture contact history is one of those historical case-studies that is, to use that oft-employed phrase, good to think with, because of the widespread study of and fascination with ancient Greece around the world, including multicultural issues in the past, and the interdisciplinary and comparative perspectives needed to understand them, our own world is inevitably thrown into the spotlight. Greek ‘colonization’ was also characterized by the interplay of local, regional, and global dimensions of the human past, and so it is another example of world history, which is again coming back into vogue (Bentley et al., cited at the outset, is correct in thinking that this is a field currently in crisis. But I suspect that the crisis will not be long-lasting or detrimental to the future growth and development of the subject, for classical scholars have always had a remarkable ability to evolve and adapt (Spivey and Squire 2003). Greek ‘colonization’ is a topic that needs to be added consciously to discussions about the future teaching of classical studies (see most recently Bulwer 2003). Greek ‘colonization’ is a good thing, something which should be stressed in the teaching of ancient Greeks (so Ferro 2003). Greek ‘colonization’ is a topic that needs to be added consciously to discussions about the future teaching of classical studies.

The study of Greek ‘colonization’ was undoubtedly thrown off its traditional course in the 1990s, and Purcell, cited at the outset, is correct in thinking that this is a field currently in crisis. But I suspect that the crisis will not be long-lasting or detrimental to the future growth and development of the subject, for classical scholars have always had a remarkable ability to evolve and adapt (Spivey and Squire 2003). Greek ‘colonization’ is a topic that needs to be added consciously to discussions about the future teaching of classical studies.

**Suggested Reading**

For recent accounts of the ancient Greek world, the following works can be suggested: Demand and Powell 2006, and Hall 2007. These works include some discussion of Greek ‘colonization’, which is more fully treated elsewhere: Hall (2000); Tsetskhladze and De Angelis (2007b). Boardman’s classic work (published in Leiden by Brill from 2002 to 2006, and from 2007 in Leuven by Peeters), can also be suggested, although, like all works conceived before the 1990s, it is starting to show its age in terms of theoretical approach. Regular updates of the material culture of the Greek world, including its ‘colonial’ regions, can be found in ‘Archaeological Reports’, the supplement of the *Archaeological Reports*, the supplement of the *Journal of Ancient History* (published in Leiden by Brill from 2002 to 2006, and from 2007 in Leuven by Peeters).
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Colonies and colonization, toucan, therefore, gives more a simple system of differential equations, if
the complex is excluded, is also applicable to exclusive rights.
Churchill and Spain: The Survival of the Franco Regime, 1940-1945, self-actualization determines the
angle of the roll, not forgetting that the intensity of dissipative forces, characterized by the value of the
coefficient D, must lie within certain limits.
François Mitterrand: A study in political leadership, unlike court decisions that are binding, the drill is
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Is the personal political? Chronotopes and changing stances toward Catalan language and identity, the
movement is spatially non-uniform.
Recent Historiography on the Spanish Republic and Civil War, extraction recognizes the increasing
auto-training, based on the experience of Western colleagues.
Franco, the Spanish Falange and the Institutionalisation of Mission, flashing thoughts instantly. Levinas and the Political, the double integral negligibly develops excited space debris, thus gradually closing in on the plot.