# 10. Greeks, Romans, and Others: problems of colonialism and ethnicity in southern Italy

*Kathryn Lomas*

## Introduction

In terms of the study of Roman imperialism, southern Italy poses a peculiar set of problems for the archaeologist or historian, in that several superimposed layers of colonial settlement and ethnic interaction must be unravelled in order to reconstruct patterns of social and ethnic contacts. Conquered by Rome in the early-third century BC and subject to an increasingly high level of colonial settlement from the second century onwards, the Greek communities of the Mezzogiorno were themselves colonies which had displaced the indigenous populations of the region. Given that these indigenous cultures, although literate, did not produce any surviving written history or literature, their existence as perceived by modern scholars is refracted entirely through the eyes of the colonising Greeks, and later, the Romans. The vast majority of the literary sources post-date the Roman conquest, and even when produced by Greek authors, writing in Greek, inevitably reflect the viewpoint of the pro-Roman ruling elites of the empire. Of the indigenous literature of the western Greeks, only small fragments remain, together with the indirect traces of the Timaean source tradition. This school of historiography, derived from the histories of the Sicilian Timaeus of Tauromenion and his imitators, stressed the cyclical nature of history and linked the rise and fall of states to their moral status, and also appears to have reflected the highly conservative political beliefs of Timaeus himself (Momigliano 1959). It was deeply influential in the third and second centuries BC, notably on Cato, who may have relied heavily on Timaeus as a source for the origins of Italic peoples (Cornell 1995, 36-7). Although this approach remained an important strand in later Roman historiography, it was not uncritically accepted. Polybius (*Histories* 12.3-28) broadly accepts the idea of cyclical developments in history, but is vehemently opposed to Timaeus, whom he castigates for inaccuracy and unwillingness to check facts.

The end result is a very strong bias towards the Roman point of view in our understanding of the history of Hellenistic and Roman southern Italy. Literary source material reflects the uneasy imperial relationship between Rome and the Greek world. It cannot simply be jettisoned or ignored - a counsel of despair advocated by some works on pre-Roman Italy (Spivey and Stoddart 1990) - but it needs to be modified by archaeology if a balanced history of the region is to be written. The double layer of colonialist discourse - Roman *versus* Greek, and Greek *versus* Italic - has also had the effect of obscuring the history of the indigenous populations of southern

Italy. This source problem has been exacerbated by the Graeco-Roman bias of much modern scholarship, which filters our view of other groups (Messapians, Oscans etc) in the region, and can potentially exclude them from the history of the area, except as an adjunct of colonialist cultures. A strong tendency has been to examine these ethnic groups solely from the perspective of study of the Greek colonies and to prioritize aspects such as Hellenization or Romanization - the points at which they relate to the imperialist culture. The wider project of producing a balanced history of southern Italy from archaeological, epigraphic, and literary material is well beyond the scope of this paper. The aim here is to explore narrower question of the interaction between the various strands of colonialist discourse in the literary source material.

**Different world views: Greek views of Italians, and Roman views of outsiders**

The Greek world view has long been perceived as simplistic and inward-looking, dividing ethnic groups into two categories of people - Greeks and barbarians - although recent scholarship has begun to examine the roots of this dichotomy in fifth-century Athens, and to suggest ways in which it may be refined (Hall 1989). Later, the need to cope with the rise of the Hellenistic kingdoms and subsequently, of the Roman Empire, meant that this world view had to be modified to take account of changed circumstances. A number of strategies came into play here. One was simply to accept the Romans as honorary Greeks, or as Dionysus of Halicarnassus tried to do, to construct a detailed but entirely spurious history for early Rome as a Greek colony (Dionysius Halicarnassus *Antiquitates Romanae* 1.31.34; Cornell 1991, 61-2).

A related tactic, much favoured by writers and intellectuals of the Antonine era, was the reconstruction of one's own past as a Greek city. Considerable resources were put into producing local histories, complete with Greek foundation myths, often involving heroic or divine founders. This was particularly pronounced in the former kingdoms of the Hellenistic east, where the *onus* was on Hellenized cities of ultimately non-Greek origin to prove their Greek credentials, and the movement had a specific political background. The Antonine emperors were particularly philhellenic in their sympathies, and the foundation of the Panhellenion by Hadrian in 131/2 BC gave this trend formal expression. The Panhellenion was a league of Greek cities and was largely ceremonial in function, but membership conferred immense prestige as well as imperial goodwill. The principal condition for entry was proven Greek origin, and candidates for membership were strictly vetted by Hadrian himself (Spawforth and Walker 1985, 79-84).

In Italy, however, interest in Greek foundation myths appears earlier, and can be traced from the Augustan period onwards, if not earlier. Apart from Dionysius' personal obsession with proving that Rome was really a Greek city, there are numerous Greek foundation myths recorded in Strabo, mostly relating to the coastal cities of Italy, which would, historically, have had the closest contact with the Greek world. For instance, Petelia, a Bruttian city on the coast of Calabria, is said to have been founded by the Homeric hero

Philoctetes (Vergil *Aeneid* 3.401-2), Cretan refugees from Minos are linked with cities in the Sallentine peninsula (Strabo *Geographia* 6.3.6), and many of the Messapic settlements of Apulia are attributed to Diomedes (Strabo *Geographia* 5.1.9-10, 6.3.9; Pliny *Historia Naturalis* 3.103-4; Coppola 1990). Further north, a number of settlements were said to be founded by Antenor (Strabo *Geographia* 5.1.4), and Rome itself, of course, had the myth of Aeneas (Gruen 1992, 6-51). These (mainly Greek) sources are all explaining and validating the existence of selected Italic communities in the hinterland of areas of Greek influence by attributing mythical Greek founders to them. Arguments still rage amongst historians of the Greek colonies as to whether this Hellenization of mythology and cult was an attempt to assimilate Italic myths and deities into a more familiar structure of Greek tradition and ritual - a representation of genuine survival of traces of pre-colonial (possibly even Mycenaean) settlement - or something which should be considered as an imposition of a purely Greek mythology and belief system (Giannelli 1960, *contra* De Polignac 1995, 92-118).[1] Whichever of these interpretations is accepted, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that later source material is adopting an explicitly colonialist stance. Non-Greeks were assimilable mainly by having their indigenous history rewritten in Hellenized form. Nor was this empty mythologising. The Panhellenion was the most overt and complex attempt to politicize Hellenism, but there are earlier examples of the use of Hellenizing mythologies for political ends. Gruen (1992, 44-5) has suggested that in 280-79 BC, Pyrrhus of Epirus mounted a propaganda offensive portraying himself, mainly through coinage, as the defender of Greek interests against the evil designs of the 'Trojans' - ie the Romans.

Although most of these myths come to us from authors of the Augustan age or later, many may have an earlier provenance. Surviving fragments of Cato's *Origines* demonstrate a Roman concern with foundation myths and ethnic origins in the second century BC. Some of the material used not just by Cato, but also by Strabo and others, can be traced to Greek historians of the fourth and third centuries such as Timaeus and Theopompus, although it is difficult to support the argument that the entire pejorative source tradition concerning the western Greeks can be blamed on the influence of Timaeus. Inevitably, some element of active selection by later authors plays a part in determining which line is taken and which facts and attributes are recorded on any subject. As Polybius' highly critical comments show, Timaeus was by no means unquestioningly accepted as a source even in antiquity (12.3-28).

Greek views of Italians are most strikingly stated by Strabo, although he draws a distinction between Italians and Romans, placing the latter only slightly below the Greeks in the natural order of things. In describing the Greek colonies, he makes the ethnic distinctions and hierarchy clear, saying that:

> apart from the Tarentines, Rhegines and Neapolitans, the Greeks have become barbarians; some have been captured and held by the Lucanians and Bruttians, and by the Campanians - in name, that is, but in reality by the Romans. For these have themselves become Romans.
>
> (Strabo *Geographia* 6.1.2)

Non-Roman Italians are, *ipso facto*, barbarians. Other Greek sources specifically characterize them as barbarians with unsavoury habits. Athenaeus (*Deipnosophistae* 4.153d, 7.517e) includes some lurid descriptions of Etruscan social life, which included sexual promiscuity, hot baths, excessive consumption of drink, and the presence of respectable ladies at dinner parties. Curiously, he also attributes some of the bad habits of the Tarentines, a notoriously degenerate people according to ancient literature, to the corrupting influence of the Samnites and Messapians, who apparently introduced the Greek colonists to the delights of hot baths and professional barbers (*Deipnosophistae* 12.518b). This seems a curious role reversal on two counts; in general, authors writing in the Late Republic and Principate are deeply hostile to the Tarentines and take any opportunity to stress that they were a source of corrupting influence, not the recipients of it, and our other sources for the Samnites characterize them as tough, warlike and uncultivated peoples as befits inhabitants of an inhospitable region and fierce enemies of Rome (Livy *Ab Urbe Condita* 9.13.8; Pliny *Historia Naturalis* 29.14; Aulus Gellius *Noctes Atticae* 13.9; Strabo *Geographia* 5.4.2). Here again, we see a construction of the ethnography of the region from the point of view of the colonialist Greeks.

The level of polarization between Greeks and Italians suggested by the sources is very unlikely to have been historically true. From the foundation of the earliest colonies, there are signs that there was much greater willingness to absorb non-Greek populations in the western Mediterranean than was true in Greece itself. The disappearance of indigenous populations from the hinterland of the colonies can partly be accounted for by migration further inland, but much of the displaced population may have been absorbed into the new cities (Morel 1983, 134-5; de la Genière 1990, 176-81). Studies of burial customs at pre-colonial settlements and early colonies (Shepherd 1993) point to Italic influence on Greek customs and assemblages of Italic grave goods which suggest cultural influence on the part of non-Greeks, and possibly their physical presence within the colonies. One of the earliest Greek inscriptions from the west is a graffito on a seventh-century Greek aryballos from Cumae, identifying the owner by the Italic name Tataia (IG 14.865), and Messapic names occur on inscriptions from Heraklea, notably in the fourth-century Table of Heraklea (*IG* 14.645). Strabo (*Geographia* 5.4.7) states that after the Oscan conquest of Campania, Naples admitted a substantial number of Oscans to citizenship. These incomers took a full part in civic government, to the point where the office of *demarchos*, the chief magistracy of the city, was held by a substantial number of Oscans as well as Greeks.

This situation may have been to some extent inherent in the location of these cities on the fringes of the Greek world and in close contact with non-Greek populations, but it may also owe something to an apparently more flexible concept of ethnicity and citizenship in Italian communities. Intermarriage and migration was common amongst the elite families of Etruria and Latium, as demonstrated by the tale of Demaratos of Corinth, who became one of the leading citizens of Tarquinii, and also of his descendent Tarquinius Priscus, who migrated to Rome and eventually

became king, after intermarrying with the Latin Tullii (Dionysius Halicarnassus *Antiquitates Romanae* 3.46-8, 72; Cicero *De Republica* 2.34-8; Livy *Ab Urbe Condita* 1.33-6, 39; Polybius *Histories* 6.11a.7; Cornell 1995, 122-6, 130-33). The Italic tradition of a less exclusive attitude to ethnicity and alterity is best documented and most fully defined in the context of Rome, but there is no reason to think that Rome was unique in this. At Rome, the vital criterion for inclusion is not ethnic origin, but a willingness to accept a Romanized world view. Romans based their views of identity on legal status rather than simply ethnicity. Individuals or communities who were not Roman could attain Roman citizenship (or by the same token, Latin status) by senatorial or imperial grant, usually as a reward for notable loyalty or services rendered to Rome. The main requirements were willingness to adopt a Roman world view and live in an appropriately Romanized manner. This presupposed a command of the Latin language and for communities, an urbanized existence with adoption of Roman laws and a Romanized constitution. Even slaves freed by Roman citizens were granted a form of circumscribed citizenship, and their descendants became full Roman citizens, a process which deeply offended Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Antiquitates Romanae* 4.22.3-4, 26).

This accessibility was, however, stringently controlled by the senate, and it did not by any means imply that Romans were any less pejorative about outsiders. The Other could be admitted to citizenship but cultural stereotypes in literature still reveal that identities were constructed to emphasize Roman superiority. Orientals, for instance, were insincere, untrustworthy and effeminate, Phoenicians were cruel, Gauls were brave but headstrong and undisciplined (see Webster, this volume), to cite only three examples. In terms of attitudes to other Italians, there is a problem. By the time most extant Latin literature was written, all Italians were Roman citizens. Italy was in practice still a very regionalized country, but in theory, it was all Roman. Most of the available material either comes directly from Greek sources or is, like Cato's *Origines*, based on fourth century Greek originals. Overall, therefore, it is not easy to work out what Romans thought of other Italian peoples, with a small number of exceptions. These tended to be the groups which had proved most resistant to Rome's influence and most troublesome during the wars of conquest - the Samnites, the Capuans and, most importantly for our purposes, the Greek and Hellenized peoples of the south.

## Romans and Greeks

The Romans had a deeply schizophrenic attitude to the Greeks. On the one hand, the high culture of the Greeks was deeply admired, particularly that of the fifth and fourth centuries, and provided an important part of the intellectual furniture of the Roman aristocrat. Fluency in Greek and familiarity with Greek literature was *de rigueur* for members of the elite, and Hellenism was a prominent feature of the art, architecture and literature of the Late Republic and Principate (Rawson 1985; Wardman 1976; Gruen 1992). On the other hand, contemporary Greeks were decried as, at best, frivolous, light-minded windbags - good at theorising but not at practicalities. At worst, they were characterized in much the same way as

oriental peoples - as corrupt, decadent, effeminate, and untrustworthy (Petrochilos 1974; Wardman 1976, 1-13).

This dichotomy is a particular problem when it comes to southern Italy. It reflects Roman imperialist constructions of Greek identity which deeply distort our understanding of the history of the region, and by focusing principally on the Greeks, it virtually abolishes the history of the native peoples of the south except in as far as they touch on Roman relations with the Greeks. As already noted, Greek historians are of limited value as independent sources for these native peoples because of their own construction of Greekness and alterity, and because many of them were writing during the period of Roman domination and thus reflect, to some extent, a generalized Graeco-Roman elite viewpoint.

The process is also one in which modern scholars have very largely colluded. Although there has always been a strong tradition of local antiquarian knowledge in Italy, often due to the lifetime efforts of interested amateurs, and an intense pride in local history and traditions, the indigenous peoples of the peninsular (with the exceptions of the Greeks and the Etruscans) have received relatively little attention. This situation has changed radically in recent years, and the regional histories of Italy have been the subject of much research, but there is still a residual tendency to write histories of the indigenous populations from the point of view of their contacts with the main imperial powers - Rome and Greece.

Unlike the Greeks of the Aegean, the Greeks of Italy receive virtually a uniformly bad press in ancient literature. The Tarentines, in particular, who were persistent and powerful opponents of Rome in the third century, come in for much derogatory comment. They (and other Italiotes) were said to be drunken and degenerate in their behaviour (Plato *Laws* 1.637; Plutarch *Life of Pyrrhus* 13.2-5; Dio 9.39.2-10; Dionysius Halicarnasus *Antiquitates Romanae* 19.5.1-7.3; Appian *Samnite History*.7.1-3; Zon. 8.2; Theopomp *ap* Athen 4.166e-f; Dio Chrysostom *Orations* 2.48, 68.2), light-minded and frivolous (Livy *Ab Urbe Condita* 8.22.8, 9.14.1-9, 24.1.7), and prone to political instability (Polybius Histories 8.24.1; Livy *Ab Urbe Condita* 9.14.1-9, 24.2.8). They were people who were unwarlike and cowardly (Appian *Samnite History*. 8; Plutarch *Life of Pyrrhus* 16; Zonaras 8.2, 8.6, Horace *Epistles* 1.7.45, *Satires* 2.4.34; Seneca *Epistles* 68.5) in the face of Roman military might, and untrustworthy allies once peace was made (Livy *Ab Urbe Condita* 24.1.7). The implication is that they were not fit to rule themselves and fully deserved to be subordinate to Rome. Another strand in the source tradition stresses the desolation and impoverishment of the Greek cities under Roman rule, and contrasts this with their past greatness (Cicero *De Amicitia* 13; Dio Chrysostom *Orations* 33.25). This *topos* of *oliganthropia,* or lack of population, is one which has a long history in Greek literature, and makes a moral equation in which lots of people are good and scarcity of people is bad (Alcock 1993, 24-32; Gallo 1980, 1233-70), but it also reflects a belittling and neutralization of the Italian Greeks.

What the sources do not do is give an accurate representation of the history of the Greeks from the third century onwards. Shorn of the pejorative language, it is clear from historical accounts that Tarentum managed to build

up a powerful anti-Roman coalition in 281-80 BC, including the other Italiote Greeks, numerous other Italians and Pyrrhus, King of Epirus (Livy *Periochae* 12, 31.7.11; Plutarch *Life of Pyrrhus* 13.5-6; Dio Cassius 9.39; Justin 18.1.1; Florus 1.13.18), which almost forced Rome to make terms and recognize Tarentine domination in the south (Plutarch *Life of Pyrrhus* 28.6-29.4; *Inscr Ital* 13.3.79). It is also clear from epigraphic and archaeological evidence that many of these supposedly deserted and impoverished locations continued to be flourishing cities until well into the empire (Lomas 1993b; Desy 1993). The physical shrinkage of the habitation areas of some sites, for instance Metapontum and Herdonia, is likely to have been occasioned by a change of topography in order to conform to a more Roman urban plan than by demographic collapse (D'Andria 1975; Lomas 1993a). Pre-Roman cities in south-east Italy were characterized by a large fortified enclosure and a dispersed pattern of land use within it, while Roman ones were much more compact and highly structured, occupying much less territory and with a higher population density. This clearly corresponds to a change in cultural preconceptions of what cities were and how they should work, encouraged, if not actually imposed, by Rome. As D'Andria (1975) points out, Roman Metapontum is not much different in size and population from many other Roman cities which are considered to be flourishing settlements.

**Imperialist history and approaches to southern Italy**
The literary constructs which dismiss the Greeks of Italy as corrupt and degenerate and the non-Roman Italians as barbarians are clearly precisely that - literary topoi which have limited contact with reality. They construct an imperialist discourse in which the non-Roman populations are presented as being unfit to rule themselves, or later, with reference to the post-conquest period, as passive and in need of Roman support and assistance. In this, there is a striking similarity with the colonialist discourses of more recent times. Edward Said (1978) has demonstrated in detail the extent to which a single identity was constructed for oriental peoples by the British and French colonizers of the nineteenth century in order to validate their seizure of control. Many of the attributes of nineteenth-century orientalism are very similar to those of the Greeks, as defined by the Graeco-Roman elite of the principate, but unlike Said's model, which is of a single monolithic identity constructed by imperialist powers to obliterate variations between different oriental cultures as well as silence and disempower them, the elite of the Roman Empire allowed for a number of gradations.

The native Italic peoples fare worst. Their cultures were largely, although not entirely, non-literate, a fact which places them at a disadvantage as most of the surviving evidence other than the purely archaeological is filtered through Greek or Roman perspectives, frequently hostile in nature. The only first-hand documents available are a relatively small number of inscriptions.[2] Greeks pose a problem. As well as having a long and prolific literary culture of their own, and therefore the capacity to make their side of the story heard, they were not a universally bad thing in the eyes of the Roman elite. Elite Greeks and their culture, particularly those who espoused the Atticizing movement which harked back to the Classical culture of the fifth century

BC, were entirely admirable, so long as they were prepared to accept the guiding hand of Rome in the practical matters of administration (Bowie 1974, 203-8; Zanker 1984, 239-63; Gruen 1992). By the end of the second century AD, many of the elite families of the provinces were beginning to be accepted into the ranks of the senatorial order, and a broadly Graeco-Roman elite culture was forming. The contemporary Asiatic strands in Greek culture and ethnicity, and also the lower social levels of the Greeks, were, however, to be deplored (Petrochilos 1974). The Italian Greeks, who had become Roman citizens after the Social War of 90-89 BC, were written out of the picture, except in certain well-defined and largely ceremonial circumstances. Their failure to submit to Rome gracefully meant that in the eyes of later, pro-Roman, authors they fully deserved their fate of eventual absorption into the Roman state.

To a large extent, modern scholars studying southern Italy have been guilty of being too willing to accept later, pro-Roman, accounts at face value, and to impose assumptions weighted in favour of the 'advanced' cultures of Greece and Rome. There has been a tendency to write large and sophisticated Messapic settlements of south-east Italy out of the history of urbanization on the grounds that they are only proto-urban, and to only allow the possibility of city status in contexts where there is enough Greek material to suggest that the Greeks had somehow Hellenized these cities into existence (Whitehouse and Wilkins 1984; Herring 1990; Lomas 1993a). In fact, urban features such as growth in size of a single dominant settlement, evidence for complex social and economic hierarchies and the political mechanisms and economic resources to construct monumental building programmes, were all appearing from the sixth century and reached fruition in the early-fourth century BC, whereas the high point of Hellenization is the later-fourth and third centuries (Lomas 1993a). The problem seems to be that they do not look like planned Graeco-Roman cities until the late-fourth century. Paradoxically, the shrinkage into typically compact, regularly structured, Roman cities was for a long time interpreted, when it did occur in the early second century, in the light of the *oliganthropia topos* of Cicero and others. The process, which is surely one of Romanization of both political/social structures and physical surroundings, was interpreted as a sign of demographic collapse (D'Andria 1975). In point of fact, the supposed economic decline and desolation of Magna Graecia is being increasingly revealed as a fiction, as the intense level of archaeological survey and excavation fills in the gaps in the literary record, demonstrating a high degree of exploitation of the countryside, and as the balance in favour of macro-economic models of the regional economy is redressed (Desy 1993).

On a similar but more historical note, there has been a tendency to accept at face value the source tradition which says that fourth-century Tarentum brought disaster on itself because it was riven with political stasis and was entering a period of political and social instability and degeneration.[3] This, however, is based on the cyclical theory of history popular in the Hellenistic period, in which a period of achievement was inevitably followed by *hubris*, degeneration and decline, and does not necessarily have much relevance to the actual history of the region. It is clear that Tarentum was having to fight

hard against various groups of Italians, Romans included, as well as suppressing discontent within other Italiote Greek states and resisting the imperialist behaviour of Syracuse, during the fourth century BC. Nevertheless, military power and political influence remained such that Tarentum was able to construct and sustain a complex anti-Roman alliance in 280 BC, and brought Rome to the edge of defeat. The tall stories of Tarentine bad behaviour are clearly just that - stories designed to undermine the Tarentine justifications for war and obscure the fact that Rome was the aggressor (Lomas 1993b, 50-51; Lomas, *forthcoming*).

By reading carefully between the lines and stripping away imperialist rhetoric, it is indeed possible to reconstruct at least a partial history for the Greeks of Italy during the period of Roman conquest and Roman rule, although an attempt to do so lies outside the scope of this paper. The real problem lies in constructing an independent history for the non-Greeks in the same region, who are the subject of two sets of different, but related, colonialist discourse - Greek and Roman. In a recent book on the Etruscans, Spivey and Stoddart (1990) suggested that all literary evidence was hopelessly contaminated and should be jettisoned in favour of writing Italian history from a solely archaeological perspective. This is not, however, a realistic option. Literary sources can be combined fruitfully with other kinds of evidence if their limitations are recognized, and they can also be valuable in revealing the views of Romans and Greeks on ethnic identity and alterity. The best solutions so far are those which attempt to make use of both a critical approach to ancient sources and of a theoretical approach to archaeological data, interpreting material culture not just in terms of diffusion of a dominant culture but in terms of interchange between cultures and in terms of two-way processes.

## Footnotes

[1] For discussion of Mycenaean contacts, see Frederiksen 1984, 64-70; Graham 1990; Kilian 1990.

[2] Oscan material is collected in Vetter 1959 and Poccetti 1977, Messapic inscriptions in Parlangeli 1960 and Santoro 1982.

[3] For discussion of this *topos*, see de Senti Sestito 1983.

## References

Alcock, SE 1993  *Graecia Capta. The landscapes of Roman Greece*. Cambridge.

Bowie, EL 1974  'The Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic' in Finley, MI (ed) *Studies in Ancient Society*, 166-209. London.

Coppola, A 1990  'Diomede in età Augustea. Appunti su Iullo Antonio', in Braccesi, L (ed) *Hesperia I. Studi sulla grecità di occidente*, Rome, 125-38.

Cornell, TJ 1991  'Rome: The history of an anachronism', in Molho, A, Raaflaub, K and Emlen, J (eds)  *City States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy*, 53-70. Ann Arbor.

Cornell, TJ 1995  *The Beginnings of Rome. Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c.1000-264 B.C.)*. London.

D'Andria, F. 1975  'Metaponto Romana'  *Atti di 15⁰ convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia*, 539-44.

De Polignac, F  1995   *Cults, Territory and the Origins of the Greek City-State*. Chicago and London.

De Sensi Sestito, G  1987 'Taranto post-Architea nel giudizio di Timeo. Nota a Strabo 6.3.4 C280' *11º Miscellenea greca e romana*, 84-113.

Desy, P, 1993  *Recherches sur l'economie apulienne au IIe et au Ier siècle avant notre ère*. Collection Latomus 221. Brussels.

Frederiksen, MW (ed N Purcell), 1984  *Campania*. London.

Gallo, L 1980 'Popolosità è scarcità: contributo allo studio di un topos', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* ser. III, **10**, 1233-70.

de la Genière, J 1990  'Contribution to the Typology of Ancient Settlements in Southern Italy (Ixth to Ivth century B.C.)', in Descoeudres, J-P (ed) *Greek Colonists and Native Populations. Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology*, 163-89. Canberra and Oxford.

Giannelli, G 1963  *Culti e Miti della Magna Grecia*. Florence.

Graham, AJ 1990  'Pre-Colonial Contacts: Questions and Problems' in Descoeudres, J-P (ed) *Greek Colonists and Native Populations. Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology*, 45-60. Canberra and Oxford.

Gruen, ES, 1992  *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. London

Hall, EM 1989  *Inventing the Barbarian*. Oxford.

Herring, E 1991  'Socio-political change in the South Italian Iron Age and Classical Periods: An Application of the Peer Polity Interaction Model', *Accordia Research Papers*, **2**, 33-54.

Kilian, K 1990  'Mycenaean Colonisation: Norm and Variety' in Descoeudres, J-P (ed) *Greek Colonists and Native Populations. Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology*, 445-67. Canberra and Oxford.

Lomas, K  1993a  'The City in South-East Italy. Ancient Topography and the Evolution of Urban Settlement, 600-300 BC', *Accordia Research Papers*, **4**, 63-77.

Lomas, K., 1993b  *Rome and the Western Greeks, 350 BC - AD 200. Conquest and Acculturation in Southern Italy*. London

Lomas, K (forthcoming, 1996)  'Constructing "the Greek". Ethnic identity in Magna Graecia' in Cornell, TJ and Lomas, K (eds)  *Gender and Ethnicity in Roman Italy*. (Accordia Specialist Studies in Ancient Italy, No. 2)

Momigliano, A 1959 'Atene nel III secolo a.C. e la scoperta di Roma nella storie di Timeo di Tauromenio', *Rivista Storica Italiana*, **71**, 529-56.

Morel, JP 1983 'Greek Colonisation in Italy and the West', in Hackens, T, Holloway, N and Holloway, RR (eds) *The Crossroads of the Mediterranean*, 123-62. Louvain and Providence.

Parlangeli, O 1960  *Studi Messapici*. Milan.

Petrochilos, N 1974  *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks*. Athens.

Poccetti, P, 1977  *Nuove documenti Italici*. Pisa.

Rawson, ED 1985  *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. London.

Said, E 1978  *Orientalism*. London.

Santoro, C 1982  *Nuovi studi Messapici*. Galantina.

Shepherd, G 1993  *Death and Religion in Archaic Greek Sicily: A study in Colonial Relationships* (Diss. Cambridge).

Spawforth, AJS and Walker, S 1985  'The World of the Panhellenion I. Athens and Eleusis', *Journal of Roman Studies*, **75**, 78-104.

Spivey, N and Stoddart, S 1990  *Etruscan Italy. An archaeological essay*. London.

Vetter, E 1953 *Handbuch der Italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg.

Wardman, A 1976 *Rome's Debt to Greece*. London.

Whitehouse, RD and Wilkins, JB 1989 'Greeks and Natives in South-East Italy: Approaches to the Archaeological Evidence', in Champion, TC (ed) *Centre and Periphery, Comparative Studies in Archaeology*, 102-126. London.

Zanker, P 1988 *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor.

The paper discusses how postcolonial approaches might be applied to the archaeology of the Ionian Coast in southern Italy during the Classical and Hellenistic periods. Until now, postcolonial approaches here have been limited largely to so-called « mixed settlements » of the 7th century BC and, to a lesser degree, to the Imperial period. In a second step, I would like to consider if and how marginality and subalternity were codified in terms of ethnicity and hybridity. As a case study I would like to look at Herakleia (modern Policoro) and its hinterland, where the Scuola di Specializzazione in Beni Archaeologici of Matera (SSBA) has been carrying out an archaeological field survey since 201211. The Mediterranean shores stretching between Sicily, Southern Italy and the Southern Balkans witnessed a long series of migration processes and cultural exchanges. Accordingly, present-day population diversity is composed by multiple genetic layers, which make the deciphering of different ancestral and historical contributes particularly challenging.

Abstract. The Mediterranean shores stretching between Sicily, Southern Italy and the Southern Balkans witnessed a long series of migration processes and cultural exchanges. Accordingly, present-day population diversity is composed by multiple genetic layers, which make the deciphering of different ancestral and historical contributes particularly challenging. Original Title. Paestum: Greek and Romans in Southern Italy (New Aspects of Antiquity). ISBN. 0500390274 (ISBN13: 9780500390276). Reader Q&A. To ask other readers questions about Paestum, Greeks and Romans in Southern Italy, please sign up. Be the first to ask a question about Paestum, Greeks and Romans in Southern Italy. Lists with This Book. This book is not yet featured on Listopia. 10 Greeks, Romans and Others: problems of colonialism and ethnicity in southern Italy. Kathryn Lomas 135. Contributors. Politicians and others continued to draw on the Roman. parallel in the following centuries. Associations were established (or. claimed), for example, between the Roman Republican system and the. British political constitution, between their respective architectural. traditions, and in models of landscape gardening (Turner 1989, 65–70). During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, the parallel. drawn between the empires of Britain and Rome was reinvented and. Keywords: Colonialism, Nigeria, Ethnic Conflicts, Rentier State, Federal Character Principle 1. Introduction The geographical entity now known as Nigeria, like many other countries the world over, tasted the bitter pills of colonialism administered by the imperial muscles of Great Britain. The Nigerian entity, an artificial creation made up of people of diverse ethnicity, cultures, languages, norms and expectations was established in 1914 by the amalgamation of the Northern and Southern Protectorates (Lalude & Omitola, 2001). Fundamental problems in the Nigerian polity are attributed to colonialism and the forced amalgamation which created the Nigerian entity (Abdulrahman, 2004; Adefulu, 2001).