Mixed Communities: Mobility, Connectivity and Co-Presence

However the story is told, most communities have mixed populations, both at the time of formation and throughout their existence. They are products of diverse mobilities, which ancient authors embellished in their narratives, either celebrating or suppressing the variety of origins. Within the settlements what stands out is heterogeneity, visible in the co-presence of material objects of diverse cultural backgrounds. This co-presence is a testament to the links between different people and places. By tracking the diffusion of objects, technologies, structures and forms of settlement, archaeologists have been able to map the socio-cultural effects of interconnectivity. They have revealed the extensive networks that crossed the Mediterranean, connecting far-flung communities and individuals. However, as a tool for demonstrating resettlement or migration of people, material culture proves to be more elusive and can be misleading if used without caution.¹ For example, the flawed supposition of some earlier twentieth-century studies equated the spread of a particular material culture with the domination of an area by a specific ethnic group.² The so-called Villanovans are one example of a ‘people’ in Etruria named after a type of material culture. But pots are not people, and the dispersal of Villanovan pottery does not necessarily mean the spread of Etruscan people any more than the appearance of La Tène objects evidences the incursion of the Celts. To take a more recent example, the proliferation of Chinese porcelain in Early Modern Europe (although a small portion of overall ceramics) was not the result of an influx of people from China, but a vogue for the fashionable connoisseur.³ However, a new cultural trend

¹ This is demonstrated by the case studies in: Van Dommelen and Knapp 2010a; especially in the study of Sardinia during the Carthaginian and Roman periods, outlining the complexity of understanding the meaning of objects in the context of colonisation: Van Dommelen 2002.

² The roots of identifying ancient peoples through material remains lie in the theory of culture-historical archaeology developed by Childe and Kossinna in the early twentieth century. Subsequently, Kossinna’s ideas were heavily used by the Nazi regime, and Childe, who deeply regretted the racial implications of the research, eventually replaced the term ‘race’ with that of ‘people’ but without abandoning the notion of cultural units. Childe 1929; Kossinna 1911. For discussion: Jones 1997: 15–18; Rowlands 1994.

³ For the way in which Early Modern Europe appropriated china in constructing its self-image: Pitts (forthcoming).
must demonstrate growing connectivity, and an increase in the influence of certain cultural models and power structures.

We have yet to fully comprehend how the flows of goods and knowledge are related to the flows of people.\textsuperscript{4} It is often impossible to say with confidence whether a foreign (or minority) material object, or practice, is a sign of new cultural trends, the coming of new settlers or both. More recent studies, therefore, tend to focus on the co-presence of culturally distinct people and objects rather than using them as testimony for migration \textit{per se}. \textit{Material Connections in the Ancient Mediterranean} is a volume typifying this approach.\textsuperscript{5} It centres on the way that objects serve as evidence of encounters, mixed practices and the restructuring of identity.\textsuperscript{6} The material remains testify to the intersections, or what Ingold would term ‘meshworks’, once present at these points in the landscape.\textsuperscript{7} One of the most studied of these intersections is the colony, and we will return to Greco-Italic encounters under this label in the second half of this chapter. In this section, the evidence of cultural co-presence will be used to better understand how mobilities shaped the history of groups generally known as Etruscans and Gauls (or Celts) of north Italy. In so doing, it will challenge the ancient literature which presents the former as cultured imperialists and the latter as infringing barbarians. It will show that both had equally sophisticated socio-cultural traditions influential in certain parts of Italy, and that cosmopolitan communities were, in fact, the norm.

\textbf{Etruscan Mobility and Presence Abroad}

Ancient authors identify the Etruscans as the earliest Italian group to have extensive power in and outside of the peninsula. They saw this as operationalised through an Etruscan League. When Cato writes of the early history of Italy he states that in this period Italy was under Etruscan rule or authority.\textsuperscript{8} Etruscan settlements proliferated from the centre of Italy to the

\textsuperscript{4} This has been addressed through the social biography of objects: Gosden and Marshall 1999; Kopytoff 1986. For archaeology and migration in early societies, and the problem of the focus on the process of sedentism: Kelly 1992.
\textsuperscript{5} For example, the presence of Phoenician material in Iberia by Vives-Ferrándiz 2010: 201.
\textsuperscript{6} Van Dommelen and Knapp 2010b.
\textsuperscript{7} Ingold 2011: 63–65. See also Chapter 1, p. 17, note 58 and Chapter 10, 393–94.
Po Valley in the north, in such sites as Felsina (Bologna), and south into Campania with the foundation of Capua. Prior to the rise of Rome, Etruscans are depicted as the most active colonisers of Italian background, with sites such as Marzabotto⁹ and Hatria (Adria) in Italy;¹⁰ and Alalia (Aleria) on Corsica.¹¹ The wealth of material culture identified as Etruscan, and its wide distribution, appears to justify the extent of their influence, splendidly presented in the Gli Etruschi exhibition in Venice and traced by numerous studies.¹²

The development of Veii in the Tiber Valley typifies the growth which communities in Etruria had from the eighth to the fifth centuries BC¹³ (Fig. 6). The Archaic centre, positioned on a Tufa plateau to the north of the Tiber, emerged from distinct village-type settlements of the early Iron Age. Encircling the plateau are the remains of sixteen separate necropoli containing thousands of burials from the tenth to the fourth centuries BC, which reveal these earlier enclaves.¹⁴ The formation of a unified centre is visible through a number of large-scale communal projects from the sixth century BC that required substantial wealth and manpower. These included the construction of a fortified circuit around the plateau, the creation of a sophisticated system of cuniculi for water distribution, and the monumentalisation of sacred precincts, such as the Portonaccio sanctuary complete with Tuscan temple and water pool.¹⁵ There is also a contemporaneous interest in the division of land recognised through the remains of furrows at Piazza d’Armi, which point to an orthogonal division of space, along with boundary walls and the construction of elite residences. An internal hierarchical organisation is apparent from the funerary evidence: tomb assemblages include banqueting equipment representing commensality and other forms of elite display. The pride of the town’s elite was not limited to the private domain (Fig. 5, Plate 2). Veii’s elaborate architectural displays and art works were well known and, according to tradition, it is to Veii that Rome looked for the finest artists, such as Vulca, to design the sculpture of Jupiter for the Capitoline Temple.¹⁶ Such a tale of cultural exchange, whether apocryphal or not,

---

¹⁰ Livy 5.33.8–10. ¹¹ Diodorus Siculus 5.13.3–5.
¹² Studies include: Torelli 2000; Cristofani 1996; Izzet 2007; Riva 2010a; Bourdin 2012: 591–700.
¹³ For context and location, see Chapter 3, p. 85. Patterson 2004: 11–12; Schiappelli 2012: 330.
¹⁴ Patterson 2004; Murray 2011; Riva 2010a: 26–7.
¹⁶ Pliny Natural History, 35.157. See discussion Chapter 10, p. 365.
implies mutual respect between these two key players dominating the valley: at least before Rome engulfed the city in the fourth century BC.

Nonetheless, competition, both economic and military, is the primary way that Etruscan influence is depicted in this early period. Implicit within the story of their success, especially in trade, is the movement of individuals from Etruscan sites across the Mediterranean. But there is little explicit evidence in ancient writings of their presence outside of Italy, and none of any duration. In comparison to the Phoenicians or the Greeks, Etruscan activities remain largely tied to the peninsula, despite their prominence in

Fig. 6 Veii, schematic overview of ancient site.
Schematic drawing by John Davey after Ward-Perkins 1961: 26, fig. 6; Murray 2011: 203, fig. 10.
ancient narratives. They appear insular and on the fringes of Eastern Greek enterprise, despite the occasional mention of their colonies. However, one reputation they are infamous for outside of Italy is that of piratical opportunists, and also, though somewhat less so, as mercenaries and craftsmen. Etruscan pirates were well known and operated over a wide area. They are even part of myths: the well-known story of the capture of Dionysus by Etruscan pirates, whom he turns into dolphins, was a favourite vignette that appears on Greek pottery in a variety of versions (Fig. 7, Plate 3). Other well-known Italic pirates are given Volscian and Samnite origins. Pirates, or rogue groups who operated on their own initiative, were a menace but they were also key distributors of resources around the Mediterranean. They could be enlisted to help or hinder opponents and could function in a way similar to mercenaries. Piratical activities bound a disparate group of people into a mobile community of common enterprise. They created connectivity not only amongst themselves but also, inadvertently, through encouraging joint state action in an attempt to stop them. Whether Etruscans were responsible for more piratical activity than any other groups in the Mediterranean is another matter. But their reputation was considerable.

Another way Etruscans ventured beyond the shores was by joining mercenary contingents recruited in Italy for campaigns abroad. Tagliamonte’s study of the Italian mercenariat shows how Etruscans, along with Campanians, Samnites, Ligurians and other ‘barbarians’ from Italy, appear most often in our sources operating mainly in the Western Mediterranean but with evidence that they were also active in the East. Their services were already sought in the Archaic period and most intently throughout the fourth and third centuries BC by both Punic and Greek

---

17 For example, such pirates as Postumius: Diodorus 16.82.3; fear of sailing around Sicily due to Etruscan pirates: Strabo 6.2.2; both Etruscans and Carthaginians as pirates: Cicero De Re Publica, 2.9. For the characterisation of Etruscans as pirates, (anti-Etruscan propaganda) particularly by Greek authors: Colonna 1984; Colonna 2002a; Giuffrida 1983: 50.
18 Most notably on the black figure cup signed by Exekias (Munich 2044). For the myth and its roots in the Hymn of Dionysus: Paleothodoros 2012.
21 In order to maintain a successful trading environment among the competitors and keep it free from pirates, it was necessary to establish co-operative modes of understanding with other powerful polities that had shared interests, such as Carthage: Bederman 2001.
22 Most of Tagliamonte’s volume focuses on the activities of Italic mercenaries in the Western Mediterranean, and more specifically Sicily; for an overview of the evidence of employment of Italic mercenaries in the East Mediterranean: Tagliamonte 1994: 209–16; Eckstein 2006: 124. For the Western Mediterranean also see: Krasilnikoff 1996.
paymasters. When Agathocles of Syracuse extended his war into Africa in the fourth century BC, his army, along with 3000 Greek mercenaries, included an equal force consisting of Samnites, Etruscans and Celts. Beyond the military, Critias provides one of the few direct references acknowledging Etruscan enterprise overseas. He observes that they became important redistributors of metals, famous in Greece for their metallurgical skills in gold and bronze.

Fig. 7 Black-figure Hydria depicting pirates turning into dolphins 510/500 BC. For the colour version, please refer to the plate section.

23 Diodorus Siculus 20.11.1; 20.64.2. 24 Critias cited in Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae 1.28b-c.
Other evidence, some of which we have already seen in relation to trade in the previous chapter, shows that Etruscan maritime capabilities went well beyond piratical ventures. The extent of their operations is visible from the material remains at sites around the Western Mediterranean, stretching from the south of France to Carthage. They are also evident in the cargos of shipwrecks, such as the Grand Ribaud F, and the so-called Giglio Campese. The latter sank 15 km off the Italian coast at some point between 600 and 550 BC. The cargo of the Giglio included numerous amphorae from Vulci with pine pitch, olives, possibly wine, as well as stone anchors, copper and lead ingots probably from Giglio itself. The ship, like the Grand Ribaud F, was likely en route to deliver goods to the south of France, where copious finds of wine amphorae are a testament to Etruscan commerce with Gallic communities prior to the Greek foundation of Massalia. It may be the case, as recorded by Diodorus Siculus, that Gaulish elites traded slaves for wine in this period, and there is some evidence that there was also exchange of raw materials, whether wood from the forests or minerals from the mines in Gaul. Such remains show Etruscan communities to be consumers of foreign labour and resources, as well as producers of goods, and providers of raw materials. The availability of slaves and resources would have greatly aided monumental construction projects of sites such as Veii in the sixth century BC. Slaves may have also arrived in Italy as a result of successful piratical ventures. It is interesting that the term for slave ‘etera’ (or eterau, etiri) on inscriptions in Etruscan, similar to the etru in Umbrian, can also mean foreigner, stranger and client. Its meaning indicates an interest in distinguishing people by their position as dependents within the community, rather than as outsiders per se. We may wonder whether an elite outsider such as Demaratus would have been referred to using these terms.

Successful Etruscan control of the exchange networks in key sectors of the Western Mediterranean, which they shared with the other big player, Carthage, left a mark on the historical record. The far-reaching power of the Etrusco-Carthaginian alliance was important enough still to have been of interest to Aristotle.

---

26 For Grand Ribaud F, see Chapter 3, pp. 76–77.
28 Riva 2010b: 213–4; Dietler 2005: 46–7; Gori and Bettini 2006. For Massalia, see also Chapter 3, pp. 76–77.
31 Aristote Politics 3.1280a.
who provides insight into their joint ventures, and tells of their alliance to counteract the influence of the Phocaeans, which culminated in the Sardinian Sea Battle of 540 BC. The Etrusco-Carthaginian success secured the Etruscan hold on the trading zone in the north Tyrrhenian, but could not prevent Massalia from developing into a Greco-Celtic powerbase. In the long-run the success of Massalia, noted in the previous chapter, must have contributed to the noticeable decline of Etruscan amphorae evident in the archaeological record. It was a significant blow to the flourishing trade which these communities had with the south coast of France. The market seems to have been taken over by Massalian produce by the fourth century BC. It was further enhanced by connections from the southern parts of Italy, as may be noted by the appearance of Italo-Greek amphorae in the north from the third century BC.

The height of competition between Massalia and the formidable Etruscan city of Caere in the Archaic period was not only evident on the Western Mediterranean seas. Both of these polities and their elites were visible on the global stage. Each city had erected its own treasury at the sanctuary of Delphi. A couple of centuries later, as the presence of Etruscan material across the Mediterranean declined, Rome emerged as the substantial power and assumed the network from Caere and other leading Etruscan cities, replacing them as the key partner with Carthage, and developing longstanding good relations with the Massalians. When the Romans won their victory over Veii and wanted the success marked globally in 394 BC, they dedicated a golden bowl to be deposited at Delphi in the Massalian treasury. The story of their journey tells of how the Roman ship delivering the bowl to Delphi got waylaid by patrolling Liparians, who, according to Plutarch, mistook them for pirates. The ancient authors are keen to present Rome as a newcomer onto the international stage at this point in its history but, as we will see, it was not long before this changed.

33 For different readings of the causes and consequences of the conflict: Riva 2010b: 213–14; Bernardini 2001.
34 See Chapter 3, pp. 76–77.
35 This changeover of key players in the economy of the Northern region is noticeable from the material evidence at such sites as Genoa, which Strabo calls the emporion of the Ligurians: Strabo 4.6.1: Milanese 1987: 111–320.
36 For Caeretan treasury – Strabo 5.2.3; For Massaliote treasury – Diodorus 14.93.3; Plutarch Camillus 8. Laroche and Nenna 1992; Colonna 1993: 56–61; Jacquemin 1999.
37 DeWitt 1940.
38 Diodorus 14:93.3; Plutarch Camillus 8. According to Livy’s version it was the Liparians who were the pirates 5.28. Discussion of the friendship between Rome and Massalia, and a comment on the authenticity of the passage: Thiel 1954: 5–6 incl. notes 11–12.
The evidence for Etruscan influence in the Archaic period within Italy and abroad is no longer questionable. What has been more difficult to show, until recently, is that there were Etruscan settlers overseas. While they still remain obscure, they have left enough of a distinctive cultural imprint at some sites to be visible. One example is an inscription on a curse tablet with the Etruscan female name Turana from the Sicilian city of Selinus, dated to the early fifth century BC.\(^\text{39}\) Whoever she may have been, she had lived long enough in Sicily and probably held high enough status to have made enemies. Another inscription from further afield shows that Etruscans frequented Greek sanctuaries in the Archaic period. At some point in the second half of the sixth century BC one such individual, whose name began with Pl – a Plautus perhaps – left an offering of a Laconian stemless cup at the sanctuary of Aphaia in Aegina.\(^\text{40}\) Equally, a rare glimpse of an Etruscan craftsman abroad in the East may be recognisable in Tosto’s examinations of the vases signed \textit{Nikosthenes epoiesen} (Nikosthenes made it), which were of Attic production for the Etruscan market. Through an intricate study of their method of manufacture, he shows that there is a strong possibility that some of these so-called Nikosthenic amphorae may have been made by an Etruscan craftsman working in an Athenian workshop.\(^\text{41}\)

There is more robust evidence of larger groups of settlers overseas from pottery assemblages and epigraphic evidence from the south of France. These demonstrate not just Etruscan mercantile penetration in the region, but also a sustained residential presence in the Archaic period.\(^\text{42}\) One example is a rare find from Pech Maho in Provence of a mid-fifth century BC lead plaque inscribed in Etruscan, and later in Greek.\(^\text{43}\) Other finds come from the island of Corsica, at Alalia, indicating that Etruscans came to settle there. Diodorus Siculus calls it an Etruscan colony.\(^\text{44}\) From excavations at the site, the presence of newcomers is suggested by several features, particularly in the funerary context.\(^\text{45}\) Their residence in the settlement is indicated by the introduction of new layouts of chamber tombs, and the presence of Etruscan objects and inscriptions. Whether they were there as colonialists, under the auspices of an Etruscan League, is


\(^{40}\) On the base of the cup, B11, is a graffito with an Etruscan formula: \textit{mi pl[... c. 11–12 ...]minur:}\nWilliams 1993: 575–6, fig. 7; 595–6; Johnston 1993.

\(^{41}\) Tosto 1999.


\(^{43}\) Ampolo and Caruso 1990–1; Cristofani 1993.

\(^{44}\) Diodorus Siculus 5.13.3–5.

\(^{45}\) Riva 2010b: 214–16.
more questionable. Riva argues this would belittle the variety of the encounters that created this mixed community.\textsuperscript{46} Rather than a product of an occupation and takeover, the site has more in common with an emporium, which suggests a longer process of interaction and co-habitation that finally led to a visibly dominant Etruscan presence. A colonial framework may not be the most appropriate to describe the spread of Etruscan influence. But it was one way that later authors reconciled political confrontations and intercommunity relations which did not easily fit into ethnic categories.\textsuperscript{47} Etruscan settlements are visible in areas where they had the most influence, as in the Western Mediterranean. This does not mean that there were no Etruscan settlers in the East in this period. It is just that they, as all Italians, were much less visible there until the last centuries BC, as discussed in Chapter 2.

**Outsiders in Etruria**

Unlike Etruscans abroad, Greeks and other foreigners were more visible in Etruria, especially among the elite. The previous chapter ended with the story of Demaratus and his arrival in Etruscan Tarquinii, where the archaeological remains demonstrate its position as a wealthy and dynamic centre with links across the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{48} Inscriptions provide further detail of the foreign individuals who came to this site and those in the surrounding region. One resident of Tarquinii in the seventh century BC was Rutile Hipocrates, important enough to be buried with a chariot in a wealthy tomb. His name was incised in Etruscan on a ceramic vessel found as part of the funerary deposit. His praenomen, Rutile, is of Latin origin – Rutilus – while the gentilical Hipocrates is an Etruscanised Greek name, Hippokrates.\textsuperscript{49} So he was most likely a Greek or a descendant of a Greek, with Latin connections,\textsuperscript{50} but finished his life in an Etruscan home. Taken alongside similar examples, such records allow an individual’s life story to gain historic significance. Tarquinii’s emporium and sanctuary at Gravisca has over 100 Greek inscriptions, which testify to the cosmopolitan nature of this trading centre in the sixth century BC.\textsuperscript{51}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{46} Riva 2010b: 214.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Etruscan League of twelve cities and colonisation noted by: Livy 5.33.9; Strabo 5.2.2, 5.4.3; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.30.3. Problems of interpreting the spread of Etruscan material in colonial terms: Riva 2010b; Morel 2006. Banti 1973: 206–8, among others has questioned the existence of such a league for military purposes.
\item \textsuperscript{48} See Chapter 3, pp. 99–100.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Pallottino 1968: no. 155; Ampolo 1976–7: 338–9.
\item \textsuperscript{50} Bourdin 2012: 531–5, with a discussion of the relationship between the form of the name and an individual’s socio-political background.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Johnston and Pandolfini 2000; Peña 2011: 179–98; Riva 2010b: 220–1; Cristofani 1996.
\end{itemize}
Evidence of Greek traders comes from a unique votive deposited at this sanctuary: a stone anchor dedicated to Apollo with the name Sostratos.\(^{52}\) There is a chance that this Sostratos could be the merchant from Aegina of the same name mentioned by Herodotus, or possibly his descendant.\(^{53}\) It could also be his initials ‘SO’ that appear on over a hundred pots transported from Athens to Etruria at the end of the sixth century BC.\(^{54}\) Whether at Gravisca or other hubs, such as Caere’s port sanctuary at Pyrgi, archaeological remains unequivocally demonstrate the importance of transmarine links and the presence of foreign operators along the coasts of Italy in this period. Some of these entrepreneurs arriving at Italian shores, not unlike Demaratus, would have chosen to stay and settle, leaving their names in the cemeteries of their new homes.

At some cemeteries, such as that belonging to Etruscan Volsinii (modern Crocifisso del Tufo, Orvieto), about a third of the hundreds of names recorded for the Archaic period are of non-local origin.\(^{55}\) As suggested in Chapter 2, this proportion of one third who are non-local appears to be more or less consistent where evidence is available.\(^{56}\) At Caere and Rome, the onomastic data also shows that outsiders would have formed a significant proportion of the population, even if exact percentages are more difficult to determine.\(^{57}\) Most of those perceived as outsiders at these sites originated from within Italy, most likely from the surrounding Central-Tyrrhenian region. From further away there are examples of Celtic names, such as Katacina,\(^{58}\) and others that suggest south Italian roots, such as Kalaprena, both found at Volsinii.\(^{59}\) Of the incomers arriving from outside of the peninsula the largest group of names is of Greek origin, including well-known names such as Pericles.\(^{60}\) Most of these appear on mobile objects, and especially pottery, of the kind that had Rutile.

\(^{52}\) Johnston and Pandolfini 2000: 15–16, no. 27. \(^{53}\) Herodotus 4.152.

\(^{54}\) Sostratos anchor: Johnston and Pandolfini 2000: 15–16; no. 27; Torelli 2004; Cristofani, 1996: chapter 2, 40, 49.

\(^{55}\) The most recent analysis of this epigraphic collection, the site and the extent to which it can tell us about the origins of those in the buried community: Bourdin 2012: 532–4, Annex 2.12; van Heems 2009. I am grateful to Guy Bradley for discussing this collection with me when I first began working on the book and for sharing his unpublished papers: Bradley (forthcoming).


\(^{58}\) ET Vs 1.165: \textit{mi aviles katncas} – I (am the tomb) of Avile Katacina, (from necropolis of Canicella, Orvieto); ET Vs 1.87: \textit{vercenas} – of Vercena (?) (from necropolis of Crocifisso del Tufo, Orvieto). See also De Simone; Bourdin 2012: 535, Annex 2.12, 1052.

\(^{59}\) ET Vs 1.59: \textit{mi alrangi kalaprenas} – I (am the tomb) of Velthuru Perecele (from necropolis of Crocifisso del Tufo, Orvieto). See also Bourdin 2012: 538, Annex 2.12, p 1052.

\(^{60}\) ET Vs 1.67: \textit{mi velqurus perceules} – I (am the tomb) of Avile Katacina, (from necropolis of Crocifisso del Tufo, Orvieto). See also Bourdin 2012: 531–2, Annex 2.12, p 1052.
Hipocrates’ name on it. The majority of inscriptions on stone would have belonged to elites who could afford to have a proper burial and someone to carve their names. One way to access the life histories of a wider cross-section of the population is through bio-archaeology, which analyses the inscription of the environment on the composition of the bones. A pilot study of six burials from a small relatively poor cemetery in the suburbs of Rome showed that at least one of the individuals buried there in the fourth to third centuries BC was an outsider. He was a young man in his early thirties, who grew up in the area of Naples, and was possibly of East-Asian ancestry. With increasing application of bio-archaeology, a more rounded picture of mobility rates will be possible than that available from the funerary epigraphy, which tends to privilege the culturally prominent and politically powerful. What evidence there is, although not sufficient to provide compelling aggregate data, is enough to demonstrate that Etruscan communities were cosmopolitan and that people from Etruria not only traded abroad but at times settled there.

Gauls in North Italy: A Different Kind of Presence?

One of the ways that we can gauge the power and cultural influence of a particular group, in addition to their physical presence, is through their visibility in the written sources and the material record. To be and remain visibly distinct, as the Etruscans were, is to have the prominence of one’s status acknowledged. The north of Italy presents an interesting example of the shift in status between Etruscan and Gallo-Celtic power and influence in the fifth and fourth centuries BC. We know that the northern Etruscan cities of Marzabotto and Bologna deteriorated substantially in this period,
at the same time as ‘Celtic’ material labelled as La Tène began to appear in nearby burials.\textsuperscript{65} Tempting as it may be to link the presence of these objects with the decline of the sites – signifying conquest by a hostile incomer – there may also be other explanations as to why an urban centre stops functioning. Some of the reasons may be environmental, such as rise in water levels, or specific local circumstances and new social structures where elite power may have shifted to the countryside, hence making the urban environment less economically viable.\textsuperscript{66} As Etruscan power began to wane in the north of Italy during the fifth century BC, Gallic influence spanning the Alpine mountain range became more prominent. But how these two phenomena are related is a matter of much debate, as the situation differed across the region, and evidence of Gallic presence precedes this turning point by centuries.

Ancient authors acknowledge Gallic expansion in Italy. They portray this as a series of incursions by disparate, hostile and less cultured groups, unlike Etruscan success, which is presented as a coherent Imperial enterprise. Williams’s exploration of how the Gauls came to be portrayed negatively, and as a deadly enemy of the Romans, outlines the many ancient and modern narratives that create and uphold negative images of the migrant invader from the north.\textsuperscript{67} The Gauls who sacked Rome in 387 BC are presented as just such a group, but their attack can also be a sign of the growth of Gallic authority in north Italian communities. Generally, however, ancient authors were keen to depict the Gauls as hostile incomers with little history on the peninsula and who had no right to be there.\textsuperscript{68} One such account is provided by Polybius. His description of the topography and the people of northern Italy and the Alps (2.14–21) forms part of his criticism of Timaeus’s geographic ignorance (2.16.15), and serves to set the scene for Roman relations with the Gauls. He narrates how in the fifth century BC the Gallic tribes drove the Etruscans out of the region, occupying the Po Plain and the surrounding countryside (2.17). This account of one group replacing another is a typical model used to describe community transformation, implying replacement of the whole population. But rather than a physical dislocation of the local inhabitants, it is more likely to be an indication of a change in the governing authority (which is not to say it was

\textsuperscript{66} Williams 2001: 198–206 considers the different possibilities of the decline of these sites and suggests that we may even compare them to the Roman Britain model in the later Roman period.
\textsuperscript{67} Williams 2001.
\textsuperscript{68} Livy 5.35–55. For a detailed discussion on the Gallic Sack from this perspective: Williams 2001: chapter 4.
necessarily peaceful). Despite the negative characterisation of these incomers, Polybius’s description of the Alpine region is of a permeable and populated landscape, challenging stereotypes that it is a barren barrier.\footnote{Polybius 3.48.7, with discussion of Polybius as a keen observer also of the economic landscape: Davies 2013: 323.} The scenario has affinities with the process of settlement transformation and the infilling of the countryside that occurs in south Italy and Sicily, which will be considered in detail in the following chapter.

How Did the Gauls Come to Be in Italy?

Movement from the northern reaches of Europe into the peninsula is presented in multiple ways: as infiltration or invasion, fast or slow, \textit{en masse} or through a trickle of small groups and individuals.\footnote{Williams 2001: chapters 3 – 5, on the changing and divergent attitudes in the ancient sources, and contemporary interpretations of the material evidence. For migration narratives of the Gauls as found in Livy: Ogilvie R.M. [1965] 1978: Livy 5.33–35.} Beginning with Livy’s more nuanced narrative, the remainder of this section will examine how the rising influence from the North was understood by ancient writers and how their literary accounts compare to other forms of evidence from the region. Livy was a native of Patavium (modern Padua) and he has a particular interest in the alternative narratives of how trans-Alpine groups infiltrated Italy. He attempts to reconcile different versions and incorporate the two main strands of how and why the Gauls arrived in Italy: either they were incited to enter by external agents or they were driven out from their own communities north of the Alps by socio-environmental factors.\footnote{Livy 5.33 – 35.}

Was it the wine that first lured them into Italy? The remains of amphorae attest to the lucrative wine trade between Italy and Gaul and may be the historical reality at the root of this version. Livy suggests this as one explanation; enticed by the novel taste, these people were drawn to the vineyards and the fertile lands south of the Alps.\footnote{Livy 5.33} It may even be ironic, but a number of other authors recite similar versions of infiltration to explain the diversity of communities and languages in northern Italy.\footnote{Polybius 2.17.3; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 13.10–11; Plutarch \textit{Camillus}, 15–16; Diodorus Siculus 14.113.} The basic sequence is that after a phase of commercial contact between the transalpine Gauls and Etruscans in the Po valley in the fourth century BC, suddenly, and without provocation, the Gauls aggressively made their way across the mountains threatening settlements.\footnote{See especially Polybius 2.17.3.} Among those threatened was Rome, resulting in
the infamous Gallic Sack of 387 BC. But even Livy doubts the historicity of the rapid shift from trading partners to aggressive invaders. Instead he presents another story, which consists of a more drawn out progression of successive tribal migrations from the north into Italy, beginning in the early sixth century BC. The impetus for the initial migration in this more extended version is found within Gallic society itself, either due to overpopulation or internal discord. This version pushes the initial infiltration back 200 years, and provides a general direction to the movement. It was roughly from west to east, beginning with the Insubres and Cenomani, followed by the Boii and Senones, who displaced the Etruscans, Umbrians and the indigenous groups who preceded them. Both versions contain stereotypical depictions of mobility of those seen as more primitive. The protagonists are depicted as poorer and less cultured than the communities they invade. Their movement is presented en masse, and as either the result of overpopulation or land hunger, resulting in internal discord. But such a rationale goes against what we know about ancient Mediterranean regions, which, if anything, were under- rather than over-populated. Conflicts were driven not so much by land hunger, as by land and resource greed. The reasons for Gallic interest in Italy would have been no different than Etruscan interest in Gaul.

The diverse narratives are rationalised by scholars to reflect Greek ethnographic sources and elements of Celtic folk memory. The longer version of infiltration has the largest number of supporters in current scholarship, although not in the form presented by Livy.

The archaeological remains from the region show slow ongoing change

---

76 Livy 5.34–5.
77 Williams notes that overpopulation and land hunger are stereotypes and that other reports (Trogus cited in Justin 20.5.7) suggest that the cause of migration/invasion may have been internal discord among the Gauls north of the Alps. He also points out that the version in Livy 5.33–34 has affinities with that of Trogus in that they both look at causes internal to communities in Gaul for the movement, and present them more as founders rather than destroyers of settlements: Williams 2001: 112–17.
78 As noted in the sources above, and especially Dionysius of Halicarnassus 13.11.
79 As Purcell 1990b: 44–6 has observed, in the ancient Mediterranean there is a tendency to underpopulation, and pressure on resources should not be attributed to demographic growth without good cause. The causes of crisis are more likely to be the variability of resources and horizontal mobility. Archaeological studies have also challenged the perception of overpopulation as a reason for colonisation and other mobile phenomena, suggesting that the shortage of land in any absolute sense is unlikely to have been a problem for farmers, with little sign of population pressure on local resources, at least in the Archaic period: Foxhall 2005.
81 For the history of north Italy and the Celts: Capuis 1993; Malone and Stoddart 1994; Ellis 1998; Williams 2001; De Marinis and Spadea 2004; Häussler 2007; Lomas 2007; Bourdin 2012.
and interaction between different groups without clear disruption. There is no evidence for waves of tribal migrations. Instead, the archaeology indicates that there was a shared culture and robust networks that already reached across the Alps and into the Baltic region in the Iron Age.\textsuperscript{83} The Po plain, which extends some 650 kilometres across the north of Italy, was a major exchange route for a variety of products such as amber found in elite burials across the peninsula, not least in Matelica.\textsuperscript{84} From Liguria in the west to the Veneto on the eastern coast, the presence of Gallo-Celtic groups within Italic settlements is visible already from the seventh century BC. Individuals with Celtic or Celticised names, such as for example Katacina and Vercena (names which are also present in the Etruscan town of Volsinii), appear prominently in the epigraphic record of the Ligurian region.\textsuperscript{85} This region, as we saw previously, was relegated to the fringes of Italy by ancient authors, and its habitants made to appear more primitive.\textsuperscript{86} Here Celtic inscriptions along with Etruscan ones are some of the earliest in north Italy, dating to the seventh century BC. Influence from the north, referred to as Celtic infiltration, is often associated with the increasing presence of La Tène material. Yet this material may simply be a later phase of the so-called Golasecca culture that spreads south, and need not necessarily represent a new wave of incomers from over the Alps. Already in the Iron Age, material referred to as Golasecca from Piedmont and Lombardy has features in common with the Hallstatt culture of central Europe.\textsuperscript{87} In the Lepontic area (overlapping modern Lombardy), it may be visible in the form of settlements which, as Häussler argues, have more affinities with such Transalpine oppida as Heuneburg (600–400 BC). These, unlike the Greco-Etruscan cities, do not have religious and administrative centres and lack monumental architecture.\textsuperscript{88} From the material record it is difficult to credit the socio-cultural transformations to any invading tribes.

Routing ways and access points in the landscape produced different forms of mixed culture. In the north-west, the Ligurian coastline settlements were linked into Mediterranean maritime trade networks. Those of the Aosta valley and the Lepontic region acted as the main passageways for

\textsuperscript{83} Charpy 1995; Biagio Simona and De Marinis 2000; Kaein 2000; Gambari 2000.
\textsuperscript{85} ET Vs 1.165: mi aviles katacinas – I (am the tomb) of Avile Katacina (from necropolis of Canicella, Orvieto); ET Vs 1.87: vercenas – of Vercena (?) (from necropolis of Crocofisso del Tufo, Orvieto). See also above, p. 119. De Simone 1978a; De Simone 1978b: 266.
\textsuperscript{86} See Chapter 3, pp. 91–92. \textsuperscript{87} For an overview: Häussler 2007: 49; Bourdin 2012: 597–8.
\textsuperscript{88} Häussler 2007: 50.
Transalpine trade, while passes north of Genoa served trade across the Apennines. Genoa itself was allegedly set up by the Etruscans as a trading post in 525 BC to establish routes into the Apennines. The mixture of cultural material from the city gives it the feel of a gateway community not dissimilar to such trading hubs as Gravisca or Pyrgi in Etruria. These emporia were highly active in the same period, and probably formed part of the same exchange network of Archaic Italy. Part of this Apennine route, making its way through the Aemelia plain, was characterised by increasing Celtic dominance. The epigraphic evidence shows that sites such as Monte Bibele were heavily Celticised, with only a marginal Etruscan presence by the fourth century BC. Whether this was a shift in authority and a matter of cultural trend rather than a major change of population is difficult to tell.

On the east side of the Po plain, there are high levels of cultural co-presence from an early date. A number of cities in the Veneto region, located on key land and river routes, such as Padua, Este and Vicenza, developed into autonomous entities with distinctive cultures and socio-political structures. At these sites, Celtic names are sometimes adapted or mixed with Venetic ones. Such intermixing is in part reflected in Polybius’s statement that the Veneti and the Celts were in many ways culturally indistinguishable from each other, though they spoke different languages. These sites had lively contact with communities to the south through land routes and along the seaways of the Adriatic; they had a pivotal role in the increasing Transalpine contacts of the fourth century BC. This is visible in the large quantity of Etruscan material and Attic imports, which indicate strong links with the ports at Adria and Spina. In this north-eastern region, Etruscan culture persisted alongside Gallo-Celtic material (unlike in Aemelia where the latter predominated).

It was part of a network that eventually encompassed Rome, with whom the Veneti had good relations. They were even allowed to subscribe to a Trojan lineage, unlike other northern neighbours, such as the Ligurians. Williams suggests that the reason for this Trojan attribution...
may have been the fact that the Romans and the Veneti had been allies from circa 220 BC, or perhaps it was the residue of earlier myths of origin ascribed to them by Herodotus that filtered through the centuries. Whatever story we want to believe, both the ancient literature and the material culture illustrate the extent of cosmopolitanism in the Veneto settlements.

Ancient authors comment on the meeting of Celtic and Etruscan cultures, and the growth of their influence in the northern region of Italy, by describing the presence of the Celts as invasion, and the Etruscans as imperial expansion and colonisation. The way ancient authors chose to convey their knowledge depended on the context in which they were writing and the role that the Gauls played in their narratives. Archaeologically, the influence of these two groups evidently led to the flourishing of some sites and cultural trends, and the decline of others. The history of these groups’ early interactions in the north of Italy is not dissimilar to that of Greek encounters and the mixed populations at sites in the south of the peninsula, which we will consider next. They reflect elements of individual mobility and cultural contact, along with larger group interests that may have resulted in conflict and power changing hands. Either way, neither the spread of Greek culture and influence in the south of Italy nor the Gallo-Celtic in the north were the result of mass migrations or tribal invasions of the peninsula.

**When Encounter Is Not Colonial**

Colonisation is often presented as one of the most powerful mechanisms for mass distribution of people around the Mediterranean. But what this term means, and whether it is suitable to describe the multiplicity of encounters between different communities in the last millennium BC, is disputed. What do we mean by labelling a situation or a development as a migration or a colonisation? What criteria can be used to distinguish them? In the case of Etruscan and Celtic mobility, neither of these labels helps in understanding the multiplicity of encounters and the agencies that led to community transformation. In the first chapter, the problems with using the contemporary meaning of migration, which assumes a mono-directional movement with a beginning and end, have already been considered. Colonisation also

stock: Cato *Origines* F58 (= Chassignet 2.12, Peter F42). Polybius 2.17.5–6, thought it was nonsense and considered the Veneti autochthonous. For different versions of the Venetian Trojan lineage: Cornell 2013: Vol. 3, 107–10.

proves challenging as an explanatory model, but for different reasons. By isolating a single part of a more extensive trajectory of movement, the idea of colonisation suggests a seemingly coherent and universally recognisable product – the colony. In so doing, it becomes de-contextualised from the wider process of mobility, negating the importance of preceding encounters and removing agency for that contact from the home community. There is a case to be made for colonisation as an appropriate description of certain historical episodes, but even these, as we will see, have only certain characteristics in common. What makes colonising narratives problematic is that they assume a period of stasis broken by initial contact. This discounts the preliminary and continuing inter-dependence between internal and external forces that produce societal change. The difficulties can be illustrated by the case of Pithekoussai, often presented as the earliest Greek colony in Italy. It will provide the starting point for the analysis of the Greek presence in south Italy, and the period considered to be the most intensive for the populating of the peninsula from the East, between the eighth and fifth centuries BC.

Pithekoussai as Emporion and Stepping Stone of Power

Pithekoussai on the island of Ischia, just off the Campanian coast, was home to a successful socio-economic enterprise that grew substantially in the eighth century BC. Initially, it was probably a centre for exchange, an *emporion* that linked the producers of metals on the mainland with the maritime traders and opportunists on the island. Many of them may have come from Euboea judging by the dominance of Euboean material in the funerary evidence, but they were not the only ones. The variety of cultural trends represented in the archaeological record indicates that diverse communities participated in the creation of the site, including those ‘indigenous’ to the island, along with Phoenicians, Greeks and others from Italy. For example: an inscription dating from the seventh/sixth century BC on a locally made amphora in tomb 285 at S. Montano carries the name Δαζίµω, which is believed to be a Hellenised version of the Messapic name Dazminas. Neither the heterogeneity of this settlement nor its

---

100 Strabo 5.4.9 recounts the different peoples that settled the island over time, starting from the Chalcidians and Eretrians in the eighth century BC; Livy 8.22.5–6, states that those who came to found Cumae from Chalcis in Euboea first landed on Pithekoussai as well as other nearby islands. Questioning whether Pithekoussai should be seen as a colony rather than an emporion: Osborne 1998: 257–9; Cuozzo 2007: 246; Coldstream 1994; Riva 2010a: 53; Izzet 2007: 216.

101 The funerary practice and material remains from the burials at the site show strong links with Euboea: Buchner and Ridgway 1993.

102 Jeffery 1990: 453, C.
designation as an *emporion* mean that all contact was necessarily amicable. The ability of new settlers to embed themselves and gain authority can suggest a weaker or threatened home population, or that its elites have chosen new allies. As we will see, conquest and violence were part of the spreading influence of the more ambitious sectors of this community.

But the lines along which the conflict was drawn were not necessarily between insiders and outsiders, and neither were they ethnically defined, despite later authors’ portrayals of these divisions. Pithekoussai’s mixed population was not the outcome of a single state programme, but the result of a gathering of groups and individuals at what became a key access point in the increasingly interconnected and dynamic Western Mediterranean network.103 Prospering hubs on mainland Italy, such as Tarquinii, contributed to this network and depended on it for growth. Etrusco-Carthaginian treaties and joint action ensured their authority in directing and enhancing the flows along it, and show how lucrative it had become by the Archaic period.104 Pithekoussai was an early Western node in this network that brought strong Eastern influence at a time when advances in boat technology allowed for longer and more direct journeys across the seas.105 For this to have been so successful, with a rapidly increasing population estimated at 5000–10,000 at its height,106 we have to imagine constant mobility of groups and individuals. We must presuppose wide-ranging knowledge of the opportunities that led some to respond from distant shores, and we must assume they paused for a sufficient amount of time to create substantial settlements.107 We also need to imagine individuals and groups who operated from the sea, such as the Homeric seafarers, distributors and middlemen who did not need an on-shore support base, but who ensured the flow of goods and the demand for services which the settlers provided.108

*Emporia*, whether Pithekoussai, Gravisca or Delos, by their very nature were cosmopolitan centres of exchange, characterised by highly diversified groups of inhabitants, but they were not the only such sites.109 Heterogeneous environments characterised most Italic settlements, Rome among them. What distinguishes harbours, ports and centres of

104 See discussion of joint enterprise above, especially in light of the creation of Massalia, pp. 115–16.
108 Purcell 1990b: 53–4; Homer *Odyssey*, 1.179–86.
redistribution – the gateways or interfaces between regions\textsuperscript{110} – is that a more transient population allows multiple identities to be prominently visible, at times without a dominant majority. There is less pressure to integrate or assume local cultural habits. Such frontier zones are characterised by what Purcell and Brent Shaw define as recursivity.\textsuperscript{111} They are conduits for multidirectional mobility channelling opportunities or hostilities from the sea into the interior, or, conversely, providing ‘the springboard through which people whose base has been the interior “become maritime”’.\textsuperscript{112}

The populating of a site such as Pithekoussai could only have been the result of an environment in which institutions allowed for such mobility and which was intensely interconnected. But its creation was not wholly peaceful. In relation to the growth of the emporion Cuozzo investigates corresponding changes in Iron Age sites on the Italian mainland, in particular Cumae.\textsuperscript{113} She distinguishes between the initial peaceful and dynamic cultural interaction in the early eighth century BC, in line with the development of Pithekoussai, and the substantial transformations of the Cumaean community in the following period. The settlement at Cumae and its surrounding territory underwent a partial ‘archaeological silence’ which can only be understood in terms of a violent takeover. At around the same time, in the second half of the eighth century BC, Late Republican and Imperial writers record the founding of a Greek colony on the site of Cumae by the people of Euboea.\textsuperscript{114} But this was not simply an Italic versus Greek encounter, not least because of the mixed community of Pithekoussai itself, where the Euboeans are to have come from. More importantly, because of the continuing prosperity at neighbouring Italic sites. The significantly rapid decline of Cumae may be contrasted with the growth of the nearby sites of Pontecagnano and Capua which show continuing vibrant contact with Pithekoussai, and the epigraphic evidence reflects the integration of outsiders in those places.\textsuperscript{115} This suggests that these two communities would have had to give consent to whatever action prompted the destruction of their neighbour Cumae.\textsuperscript{116} They could even have favoured it, and we may reflect on the conquest of Veii some centuries later by its neighbour Rome as other Etruscan states looked on. Whatever way we interpret the demise of Cumae, and the relationship between these diverse communities, it is hard to call Pithekoussai a Greek colony, or associate the changes at Cumae with a state-sponsored colonising initiative.

\textsuperscript{110} On institutions and functioning of emporia and gateways: Purcell 2005c.
\textsuperscript{111} Purcell 2005a; Shaw 2003–4.
\textsuperscript{112} Purcell 2005a: 122.
\textsuperscript{113} Cuozzo 2007.
\textsuperscript{114} Livy 8.22.4–5; Strabo 5.4.4, 5.4.9.
\textsuperscript{115} Discussion in Cuozzo 2007: 227, 248–53.
\textsuperscript{116} Cuozzo 2007: 248.
That does not mean that individuals with Euboean origins and language did not come to take over the site and that this was probably the result of a violent encounter. However, it shares few characteristics with the later colonial creation of such Athenian outposts as Thurii in the fifth century BC. The transformations of Pithekoussai and Cumae were the result of connectivity that – albeit with different levels of violence – in each case led to the installation of a new authority, and the influx of a new population. Neither, however, was the result of a state-sponsored venture; nor did they feature encounters between opposing ethnic groups, even if that is how their story came to be told.

Colonisation as a Model – For Whom?

What ancient authors refer to as colonisation was by no means a homogeneous process. Nor did it necessarily involve large population transfers and evictions en masse, especially in the earlier phases. As a label it does not suggest the variety of encounters and processes that distributed people across the ancient Mediterranean. Hence, the use of colonisation as a descriptor in an ancient context has come under scrutiny. One of the ways that interrelated spaces, such as the colony, have been conceptualised is through the application of hybridity, a framework developed by White in the context of colonial encounters of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries between North Americans and Europeans in the Great Lakes. Hybridity, with its associated concepts of metissage and the ‘middle ground’, allows for the recognition that agency was lodged not only with the coloniser but also with the colonised. Such conceptions have highlighted the shared experience of the meeting of peoples in the ‘middle ground’ and the creation of a third or hybrid culture that includes a newly formed, mutual understanding of the world.

The development of these concepts in postcolonial thought was essential to move the interpretation of material culture beyond the colonial perspective. But the extent to which this model is applicable to the ancient Mediterranean is questionable.
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117 Purcell 2005a wrote most directly that colonisation is a category in crisis in the study of the ancient Mediterranean. Osborne 1998 has argued for the organic process of settlement, especially in what has been referred to as early Greek colonisation. Case studies exemplifying the problems with the concept of colonisation for the ancient context: Lyons and Papadopoulos 2002; Gosden 2004; Bradley and Wilson 2006; Van Dommelen and Knapp 2010b; Stek and Pelgrom 2014.


120 With specific application to pre-Roman Italy: Malkin 2002.

121 Malkin 2011 is one of the strongest advocates for using the concept of the Middle Ground, in relation to Greek encounters in particular. For the implication of these concepts to ancient
One difficulty is that in its focus on the aftermath of the initial colonial encounter it does not acknowledge pre-existing contact that may have begun the colonising venture initially. Implicit, also, is the meeting of two distinct, homogeneous and coherent cultures at the first stage of interaction. In the context of the Mediterranean, where unbroken contact and mobility between its many regions was the norm and had been for millennia, it would be difficult to imagine the ab initio creation of a colony as a catalyst for connectivity, rather than as a stage within a wider and more complex process.

Prior to the Greek Classical period, the term ‘colonisation’ is not appropriate to describe the variety of Greek initiatives that resulted in the creation of new settlements and emporia. While it is true that ancient Greek authors use the word apoikia and Latin ones colonia, both of which translate into English as colony, we need to be wary of the singular underpinning vision that is implied by the use of such terms to explain the founding of a settlement. It is difficult to apply to the ancient world the narrative of colonialism that requires distinct and easily identifiable colonisers and colonised, a colonising period with complex socio-cultural and political interaction leading to transformation, which is then seen through a phase of decolonisation (particularly in European colonial narratives). As Purcell observes, all these elements are missing in the ancient world. Furthermore, colonisation perversely implies stasis as a goal, a permanent re-settlement to a new location that seeks to dominate the productive terrains and the human and material resources they contain. But the object of colonisation can be the web of connectivity itself. Drawing on Osborne’s findings, Purcell concludes that the concept of Greek ‘colonisation’ is anachronistic as a term for historical analysis: ‘It is the movements which count.’ Yet, it is a persistent model in Mediterranean history. Terrenato’s suggestion as to why alternative approaches have been overlooked for the last 150 years in favour of colonising manoeuvres is the need to find precedent and justification for modern colonialism.

122 Feeney 2016: 10 also observes that there is no such thing as an independent autonomous culture.
123 Osborne 1998: 252, 267–8. Keeping in mind that the homogeneity implied by the term ‘Greek’ is itself a cultural construct denoting ethnic cohesion in the group that founds a new settlement, as exemplified by: Vlassopoulos 2007. Malkin has demonstrated how it is the dispersal itself that codifies Greek identity and civilisation: Malkin 2011.
Early Greek Ventures and Power Hubs in South Italy

If not along the lines of the grand narrative of colonisation how do the apoikia and colonia fit into the net of connectivity within ancient Italy? Knowledge of the opportunities that Italy offered must have been circulating around the Mediterranean by the eighth century BC. In the three centuries that follow, Italy boasts the largest recorded number of externally initiated settlements in the Mediterranean. These sprung up along the south and west coasts, with recorded newcomers primarily arriving from the Greek East. The motives for the creation of these outposts are believed to be economic and probably the result of independent small-group initiatives in the early stages. But increasingly they acquired the role of regional powerbases to serve the interests of their founding states on the Greek mainland. The story of Sybaris as a Greek city with a south Italian empire is well attested. Yet its early history and the position of the first Greek arrivals are less well understood. According to tradition, Sybaris was an Achaean colony founded in the eighth century BC which exerted a hegemonic influence until its destruction in 510 BC by Kroton. Strabo (6.1.13), one of the main sources for this narrative, states that it ruled three tribes and twenty-five towns. Of the original colony, other than a few Archaic houses at Stombi, little remains due to the alluvial deposits covering earlier habitation layers near the coastline. What evidence there is comes from territory further inland, which shows evidence of Greek material and practices across a number of sites. At Timpone della Motta, some 30 km away, there is evidence of Archaic houses of similar style and technique as at Stombi. The site also has remains of a sanctuary with Greek material. Another site at Torre Mordillo has similar remains, and evidence of settlement centralisation in the Iron Age. Other sites in the area, such as Amendolara, have evidence of Greek material dating from the early seventh century BC. For those who subscribe to the traditional narrative, this evidence provides further support for Greek hegemony from the start. Early Greek material in the surrounding territory could be read as a sign of Sybarite expansion, while Timpone della Motta and Torre Mordillo may be interpreted as frontier sanctuaries created to defend the colonial territory.

These assumptions have been used to support the view that Greek influence not only triggered centralisation in the surrounding indigenous communities during the colonial period, but also settlement

transformation in the preceding phase. While these interpretations match later literary accounts, they do not explain discrepant features of the material record. Centralisation at Torre Mordillo shows prominent aristocratic houses, with cult activities centred on a weaving deity. These preceded the Greek-style temple complex on the site in the seventh century BC. Instead, the earliest Greek material appears in cemeteries alongside indigenous material and suggests the presence of Greek migrants who may have been integrated into the community rather than arriving as hostile occupants. The evidence shows that native elites were prominent in the period of site transformation and that Greek influence developed slowly, without signs of initial violence. How Sybaris came to play a major role in the seventh century BC remains unclear. Although, if the takeover of Cumae by the Euboeans and others from a base at Pithekoussai is anything to go by, we would expect that the growth of power in Sybaris would have had support from at least some of its Italic neighbours in the surrounding region. A dedicatory bronze plaque from Olympia is testament to these intricate relations in the late sixth century BC. It records a pact of friendship between Sybaris with her allies and the Serdaioi, whose settlement(s) were probably situated on the Tyrrenian coast between Vibo and Poseidonia. Even if we do not know whether Sybaris obtained its power through a single hostile takeover, it is clear from the evidence that the process building up to such an event was drawn out and felt in a variety of interactions. At the very least, these would have included trade and exchange, but also the infiltration of migrants as residents into Italic communities. The Sybaris that came to lead an empire may have been a joint endeavour of a number of elite groups. These were not necessarily all of Greek background. Those who were not may have found it in their interest to support such a powerbase, using a polis model, with established links and better access to resources across the Mediterranean. In this way, they could gain significant advantage against competitors in Italy or elsewhere.

The initial slow infiltration of Greek settlers from the East Mediterranean is also to be found in the Salento peninsula on the southeast coast, although slightly later, with the founding of the key centres of Taras (Taranto) and Metapontion (Metaponto) to the west of it. Here the

131 Meiggs and Lewis 1988: ‘Treaty between Sybaris and the Serdaioi’, 18–19, no. 10. See also: Greco 1990; Van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994: 175–7, no. 42. Coins with the legend SERD are believed to have been minted by the Serdaioi, who are mentioned on the inscription: Arnold Biucchi 1993.
interest of the Italic elite in appropriating the latest Mediterranean trends is distinctly visible. There is no evidence that early colonial Greek objects proliferate in native contexts. Most Greek artefacts in the Salento are acquired from overseas as a result of trans-Adriatic exchange between Greeks and Italians. There is also no evidence to suggest that the Greeks dominated this exchange. Rather it is the local elite that increasingly appropriated Greek culture as indicators of prestige and integrated it into existing value systems. The nature of the evidence points to a framework of co-operation rather than domination in early Greek–native encounters. Some of these exchanges would have resulted in outsiders settling, as suggested by evidence of co-presence within communities such as at L’Amastuola. Here, transformations in settlement structure and architectural norms cannot be seen as signs of destruction. The replacement of huts with houses in the Iron Age, for example, was more likely to have resulted from a desire to upgrade living quarters, a phenomenon witnessed across Italy in the period. Links to external networks were essential for cultural transformations, but the motive to use them was internal.

The foundation of the earliest Greek sites on the peninsula was not the result of state schemes by city-states on mainland Greece. Malkin’s depiction of A Small Greek World charts the dynamic networks of interaction that, through small-scale enterprise, led to the creation of apoikia and emporia. The early history of these sites reveals that many of them were not only the products of small-group initiatives but that it was a mixed or an ‘entangled’ community that was responsible for their growth. Expansion over wide tracts of land progressively became more intensely cultivated. Alongside the substantial Greek presence there was native continuity, and co-existence, with socio-cultural interchange. The extent of this ‘entanglement’ means that for some of the sites in the Sybarite hinterland, such as the sanctuary at Francavilla, it is impossible to tell whether it was Greek or indigenous; and nor would such a categorisation be particularly useful. Among the studies that have shown this to be the case are decades of archaeological excavations and surveys in the countryside of Greek Metapontion. Metapontion may have had a turbulent history but the Archaic centre had no fortification walls and its

133 Burgers and Crielaard 2007; Burgers and Crielaard 2011.
countryside, which stretched into the hinterland, was densely farmed, suggesting a lack of immediate threat from the surrounding populace. The piecemeal proliferation of Greek settlements and culture in south Italy shows affinities with the appearance of Gallo-Celtic influence in the north of the peninsula, except that the latter is rarely, if ever, characterised as a colonial process.

**Entanglement from Within: The Founding of Italian Locri**

The confused situation of how communities come to be what they are is demonstrated by the story of the foundation of Italian Locri (the later Locri Epizephyrii) by Greek Locrians in the seventh century BC.\(^{138}\) No one knows what happened, not even the locals. But some three centuries after the first Locrian settlers allegedly arrived in Italy, divergent narratives were already circulating in Greece and being re-told by those not native to the city, such as Aristotle, Timaeus and Polybius. The story of the settling of this site is in many ways fantastical. Yet, it provides an alternative to the state-initiated, largely male-focused, colonisation narratives that make up the bulk of the story of how south Italy came to be populated by Greek settlers. The most detailed narrative of Locri’s peculiar origins is given by Polybius, who provides a running commentary on the credibility of different versions (12.4d – 12.12a). He had first-hand knowledge of Locri,\(^ {139}\) which is probably what spurred his interest in the multiple stories of its foundation, and this gave him an authoritative voice when challenging Timaeus’s account. Polybius’s preference is for the version presented by Aristotle in the fourth century BC, which is also the one accepted by the Locrians themselves, and the one that most closely fits his Greek world view.\(^ {140}\) Briefly stated: the Italian settlement was founded in the first half of the seventh century BC by the wives of Greek Locrians and their slaves, who after initial friendly relations with the local Sicels expelled them. The explanation for this seemingly strange partnership was that the women had become intimate with their slaves, while their husbands
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139 Polybius 12.5.1 notes that he visited the site and rendered important services. These visits took place during the Dalmatian campaigns in the 150s BC, probably 156/5 BC: Walbank [1967] 1999: 331. His interest in the city was also due to his Roman patron Scipio capturing it during the Second Punic War in 205 BC: the involvement of Locri in the Hannibalic War is outlined by Livy 29.6.2–9. That Locri was in Carthaginian hands after Cannae until 205 BC: Walbank [1967] 1999: 332.
140 Bickerman 1952: 75.
campaigned abroad with the Spartans. Also strange is that the new settlers in Italy continued to have good relations with the Spartans.

Central to the narrative of Locri Epizephyrii’s formation is not ethnicity but a socio-political encounter between members of different communities and those of different status. Negotiation, trust, competition and adaptation are part of the process, in which some lose out, both at the site of origin in Greece, and in Italy. Itinerancy drives the story: the husbands are away on campaign, the slaves have no tie to the land, the women choose to find a new life elsewhere and the ‘native’ Italians are forced to move away. It is about the role of the outsider in the process of change and cultural transformation, and which rationalisation for this process is the most credible for later purposes. The diverging narratives do not hinge on whether there was a real possibility of such an emigration or encounter; there is no interest in the mechanics of the move. No questions are raised as to how this group of women and slaves managed to get passage on a boat that took them to south Italy, nor how they had enough strength to dominate and drive away the locals. The debate hinges on whose understanding of human nature in inter-group relations is more credible in respect of the choices made by the settlers on arrival, and the response of the locals.

Timaeus’s points of contention, as described by Polybius, are that the new settlers in Italy continued to have good relations with the Spartans, and that they name their new site Locri. This Timaeus finds hard to believe if half of these settlers were slaves. His assumption is that, having found their freedom, the settlers would want no association with their former masters or anyone to whom they may have been allied, such as the Spartans. Polybius disagrees. He argues instead that slaves, having found themselves free, would not only adopt the friendly feelings of their previous owners, but, for reasons of status and authenticity, would strive more so than blood relatives to appear as descendants of their late masters. He insists that this would have been even more likely due to the advantage of distance from Greek Locri, which made it easier to conceal their true origins. As confirmation of this view, Polybius cites the naming of the new city Locri after their Greek wives. There is operational cunning, therefore, in their behaviour. Which of these versions is more correct is not a matter of historical detail. The local perspective of the Locrians could well be different again.

Confusion also surrounds the initial contact with the local Sicels who inhabited the site on the arrival of the Locrians. Polybius reports that it did not take long before the unfortunate Sicels were expelled. He tells us that
the Sicels’ initial offer of friendship and agreement to share their country was due to fear of the new arrivals. As a result, they made a pact sealed by oaths, which the Locrians broke through trickery. Why these malleable Sicels would have to be driven out is unclear, as the Locrian re-settlement is not presented as either militaristic or hostile. The model of initial friendly relations that are then destroyed by the incomer turning aggressive is a model that persists in descriptions of many changeovers in ruling authority. It is applied in the takeover of Entella by Italian mercenaries, as will be explored in the following chapter.\textsuperscript{141} The story of expulsion at Locri, however, does not quite match the fact that the incomers supposedly adopted and continued a native ritual: the leading of the sacrificial procession by a child of the noblest family. The only change the Greek Locrians are said to have made to this Sicel ritual was the substitution of a boy by a girl.\textsuperscript{142} The continuity of such ritual practices suggests that the two communities had a period of friendly cohabitation. The story is valuable for what it displays about how mobility and interaction were understood by ancient observers. Such a story with female protagonists may have been one way that the Italian Locrians explained their strong matrilineal traditions, such as, for example, the derivation of ancestral nobility through the female line.\textsuperscript{143} They were keen for it to be a tradition brought in by outsiders who arrived from the East, not something that was internally generated. Such an explanation, as we saw in the previous chapter, was typical of how innovation in Italy was perceived at this time. It also indicates the power of the narrative template of aggressive colonialism for later commentators.

The Final Phase of Greek Influx, Mainland States Get Involved

The ability of mainland Classical Greek poleis to have outposts in south Italy was wholly dependent on the efforts of Greco-Italic groups in the preceding period, who either chose or were coerced into adopting a Greek socio-cultural model of settlement organisation. The period of the sixth and fifth centuries BC is characterised by secondary colonies (apoikia), set up by pre-existing ones already established on the peninsula.\textsuperscript{144} Trade and economy were no longer perceived as catalysts for these new sites. Instead, the stimuli for their creation were political and military. They were not there to protect ‘Greek’ interests from local neighbours in Italy, but were

\textsuperscript{141} Diororus Siculus 14.9.8–9. See Chapter 5, pp. 169–70.  
\textsuperscript{142} Polybius 12.5.9–11.  
\textsuperscript{143} Polybius 12.5.5–7.  
\textsuperscript{144} For an overview: Wilson 2006.
a way of carving up competing spheres of influence between rivals in the Greek East. Ancient authors describe how Sybaris, which had established intricate ties with other Greek and Italic communities and had a strong power base throughout the sixth century BC, lost her south Italian dominion to her Greek neighbour Kroton in 510 BC. In its place Athens created Thurioi in 446/444 BC. Another *apoikia* to suffer destruction at the hands of her Greek neighbours in south Italy was Siris, defeated by an alliance of Rhegion and Metapontion. Using the opportunity to shift the balance of power, Taras (a Spartan foundation) established Heraclea in its place in 433 BC. The power struggles on the Greek mainland that culminated in the Peloponnesian War were being played out in Italy. Unlike their predecessors, these re/foundations were the product of much shorter processes that took the form of pre-planned projects with a clear founding moment. They were not the result of a long accumulation of newcomers and more organic settlement growth, as was the case in the formation of sites along the Greek poleis-model in the preceding centuries.

In the Hellenistic period that followed, with the dwindling of Athens and Sparta, Greek communities in Italy no longer drew on their ties with Greek mother-cities. Instead, in the wake of Alexander the Great’s success, they relied on newly emerging powers to maintain their position. *Condottieri*, the ‘invited’ Hellenistic generals such as Alexander the Molossian and Pyrrhus of Epirus, were brought in with substantial mercenary armies. For these ambitious commanders such enterprises were an opportunity to gain a foothold in Italy, but ultimately without much success. Some of their contemporaries had more luck in Sicily where they wielded power as tyrants. These *condottieri*, in trying to find a base on which to build dynastic empires, had little interest in transplanting communities except inadvertently through the promise of land for their mercenary armies. What mattered to them was having access to the human resource that was being propelled around the Hellenistic Mediterranean in the form of mercenaries.\(^{145}\) The tyrants of Syracuse in Sicily were particularly successful and able to attract tens of thousands of mercenaries, including ones from Italy, and most notoriously the Mamertines from Campania. As we will see in the following chapters, these dynasts created opportunities for settlement in Sicily by handing over already inhabited sites in return for service and loyalty. They were also keen to increase their populations to counterbalance the Carthaginian hold on the west side of the island. By this point in the fourth century BC, poleis in south Italy were no longer seen as

\(^{145}\) See Chapter 8, and esp. pp. 296–300.
colonial enterprises of the Greek mainland. They had different ambitions and new rivals. The practice of settlement foundation continued but as the next chapter will show it had a different focus, with new forms and new agents.

**Conclusion**

Most of this chapter and the previous one have focused on understanding how mobility is perceived by ancient and modern authors in relation to community formation and change. They have highlighted the ways in which categorisation affects our perception of those on the move and the nature of the mobile events. Framing a process as either a takeover by an ethnic group, through *en masse* migration, or as a colonisation can obscure the diversity of interactions between locals and outsiders. It can also homogenise disparate phenomena, some of which may not have been initiated by any single entity, whether state or ethnos. The multiple stories of mixed origins and shifting intercommunity alliances, coupled with the evidence for ‘entangled’ cultures – linguistic and material – undermine the importance of ethnic consolidation, which dominates later narratives. Questions of whether external contact or internal forces caused societal transformation become more difficult in an environment of ongoing interconnectivity, where ‘initial contact’ episodes, of the kind envisaged by White, are present only in myths and legendary history. The transformation was not from a more static to a more mobile state or from homogeneous to more mixed communities. It was in the methods of how those communities were formed, and the nature of mobility that engendered them, whether piecemeal or through conflict. What this transformation entailed in the last phases of the first millennium BC is addressed in the next chapter.