CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-71842-4 — Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean
Alex Mullen
Excerpt
More Information

PART I

Multilingualism and multiple identities: interdisciplinary methodologies

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-71842-4 — Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean
Alex Mullen
Excerpt
More Information

1 Multiple voices

1.1 Multiple voices[1]

Across the globe multilingualism is more prevalent than monolingualism and, over the last decades, has become a research focus in the study of the past. Inspired particularly by the work of Adams, who applied contemporary bilingualism theory systematically to a huge *corpus*, linguists are interrogating language contact in the ancient and medieval worlds. But that is not all. The spark of interest has also begun to catch in other disciplines, not least in archaeology, anthropology and (art-) history, as their adherents turn again to studies of language contact for terms and models to apply to the processes and outcomes of cultural contact (§1.3).[2]

This book has three major aims. One is to set out the highlights of modern bi-/multilingualism studies and to demonstrate the scope and limitations of the application of their theories, methodologies and findings to the evidence from antiquity. Picking a sensible path through minefields of terminology and setting out an up-to-date, clear manifesto for how we might proceed should allow both linguists and non-linguists to appreciate the potentialities of this rapidly developing new field. The second is to propose an interdisciplinary approach integrating archaeology and the study of multilingualism. The disciplines of linguistics and archaeology are much more closely allied than our scholarly world often implies. The third is to employ this theory and methodology to interpret the evidence from Southern Gaul from the foundation of Massalia in the sixth century BC to the end of Roman rule. This region remains relatively poorly known beyond its borders and has thus far escaped large-scale, linguistic treatment.[3] A comprehensive history of Southern Gaul is not attempted, instead an integrated interdisciplinary analysis will offer insights particularly into transition phases and

[1] *Multiple voices* is the title of a useful, general introduction to contemporary bilingualism, Myers-Scotton 2006.
[2] See, most recently, Mullen and James 2012, especially chapters by Mullen, Osborne and Wilson.
[3] Dietler's recent monograph (2010) will no doubt open the area to a much wider scholarly audience.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-71842-4 — Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean
Alex Mullen
Excerpt
More Information

will demonstrate the benefits and drawbacks of the approach and suggest directions for future research.

1.2 Identities and cultural contacts

To attempt to appreciate the entanglements of cultural contacts over a millennium in Southern Gaul, we must clarify at the outset what we mean by identity and ethnicity, and how material culture and language can be used in their (re-)construction. The concepts of identity and ethnicity are often employed as all-purpose explanatory tools, perhaps sometimes in a misguided attempt to legitimize research. Let us consider the multiple voices attempting to understand identity, ethnicity and cultural contacts.

There has been considerable progress, at least from our perspective, since the 'bad old days' of the culture-historical approach of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Material culture was directly assigned to ethnic groups without question (the now often ridiculed 'pots = people' equation) and Greek and Roman civilizations were idealized and characterized as monolithic. Cultural contacts between the classical world and 'Others' were essentially reduced to a process of civilizing backward peoples, who, when they did behave themselves and took on Greek and Roman culture, did so with gusto and gratitude. The process of taking on Greek culture was labelled 'Hellenization' and that of adopting Roman culture, the main agent of which was military might, 'Romanization'.

Social scientists, particularly in the climate of post-colonialism and deconstruction, questioned these traditional views of the nature of culture and ethnicity.[4] For them, identity is the multidimensional overarching concept, encompassing several sub-categories, not only ethnic identity, but also cultural, regional, local, personal, religious, occupational and national identities. Manifestations of identity entail the choosing of a set of features, or markers, of which some are prioritized depending on circumstances. So well accepted are these stances that it now seems almost clichéd to recite the standard story that identity is negotiated, multilayered and context-specific. Classicists absorbed these ideas from outside their field and had to reconsider their own views of identity and the processes of cultural change.

[4] I am aware that this characterization of 'bad old days' to 'modern sophistication' is a vast oversimplification. But it is unnecessary to rehearse here the well-known developments along the way (acculturation theory, world-systems theory, etc.), for a useful summary see Dietler 2010 45–53.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-71842-4 — Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean
Alex Mullen
Excerpt
More Information

Ethnic identity, or ethnicity, has received particularly intense attention from Classicists and others.[5] Ethnic identity can perhaps most successfully be described as the self-conscious identification of a group with a series of cultural traits which differentiate it from other groups, plus notions of shared history, shared territory, kinship and common descent. Just like identity, ethnicity is constructed, dynamic and situational. Ethnicity is, of course, not just a scholarly interest; contested ethnicities and ethnic conflicts have blighted human history and continue to do so. Often wrapped up in contemporary ethnic conflict is the contentious issue of reconstructing 'ethnicity' in the past. One problem in reconstructing ancient ethnicity is that some modern scholarship, in appreciating the complexity of identities and the fuzziness of the boundaries between them, has extended the term 'ethnic' allowing it to be synonymous with other socio-cultural constructs, such as cultural identity. But for many Classicists ethnic identity and cultural identity are not simply interchangeable. For example, a set of distinctive features can be said to characterize both Roman and Greek cultural identity, but these identities were assumed by numerous 'non-Greek' and 'non-Roman' communities without *necessarily* including any ethnic component; plenty of communities in the Roman Empire took on ways of 'being Roman' but remained ethnically 'local'. Pinpointing specifically 'ethnic', as opposed to other forms of identity, poses problems however, especially in the absence of textual information. Scholars tend to be divided between those who require textual sources since they consider fictive kinship, descent and association with a shared territory of paramount importance in defining ethnic identity, and others, particularly archaeologists, who adopt broader definitions and argue that ethnicity can be reconstructed in the absence of texts.[6]

Hall champions the more text-centric approach in his investigation of Greek ethnicity in antiquity. He argues that Hellenic identity emerged in the sixth century, later than traditionally thought, and shifted from an ethnic identity to a broader cultural identity in the fifth century.[7] Intrahellenic groups, present from an earlier period, such as the Dorians and the Ionians

[5] Studies evoking identity and ethnicity have been a feature of Classics for decades and, if anything, are proliferating. For important studies, see, for instance, Bickermann 1952, Braund 1980, Cartledge 1993, Cornell and Lomas 1997, Dench 1995, 2005, Finley 1954, Gera 2003, Gruen 1993, Hall 1989, Hall 1997, 2002, Jones 1997, Lomas 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, Malkin 1998, 2001, 2011, Mattingly 1997, McInerney 1999, Metzler *et al.* 1995, Millett 1990, Rives 1999, Roymans 2004, Saïd 1991, Walbank 1951, Wallace-Hadrill 2008, Williams 2001a, Woolf 1998.

[6] Hall 1997 17–33, 2002 9–19, Hall *et al.* 1998. Jones 1997 demonstrates this confusion as her definitions refer to 'and/or common descent' (xiii) but later 'and common descent' (84), though she seems to support a broad definition (87).

[7] Hall 2002.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-71842-4 — Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean
Alex Mullen
Excerpt
More Information

are shown by Hall to have been ethnic groups.[8] Hall has faced opposition, perhaps most vigorously from Malkin (2011), who argues that Hellenic identity was a product of colonization in the archaic period. The debate over archaic Greek identities is perhaps not central to our purpose, but another conclusion of Hall's studies certainly is. Following his definition, ethnic identity cannot be established through archaeology and linguistics alone; literary evidence is necessary, thus rendering many ethnic groups of the past unidentifiable.[9] Even if we reject this rigid definition and accept a polythetic definition of ethnicity, where fictive kinship, descent and association with a shared territory are not essential, it is still not certain that archaeology and linguistics alone can offer access to the psychological constructions which may, or may not, have been associated with zones of similar material or linguistic remains.

In the same year that Hall's *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity* appeared, Jones published an influential treatise, *The archaeology of ethnicity* (1997). Jones presents an excellent introduction to the scholarship and issues in assigning ethnicity to past communities, but, in my opinion, ultimately does not provide a theory of practice for the 'archaeology of ethnicity'. There is no doubt that 'material culture is frequently implicated in both the recognition and expression of ethnicity; it both contributes to the formulation of ethnicity and is structured by it'[10] and we can identify objects with apparently 'emblematic style';[11] however, we are not in a position using material culture alone to identify which precise modes of identity were being transmitted. What may seem significant and 'emblematic' to us within the archaeological record may have had no particular importance to the communities we are studying.

The vexed question of the meaning of 'Celtic' is perhaps one of the best-known examples of the complex relationship between types of identity, and the tension between constructions of these in the past and present. The subject is deeply entwined with modern ideologies and identities and quickly becomes a sensitive issue.[12] Williams (2001a) discusses three forms of modern 'Celticity'.[13] The first, 'federal Celticity', has been used to

[8] See Hall 1997, also 2002, especially 56–89.
[9] See, for instance, Hall 1997 111–142, 2002 19–29.
[10] Jones 1997 120.
[11] For the archaeology of cultural identity, see Wallace-Hadrill 2008 7–9.
[12] Battlelines have, rather unhelpfully, been drawn between 'Celtosceptics' and 'Celtomaniacs'; for a flavour of the debate, see Carr 2004, Chapman 1992, Collis 1997, 2003, Dietler 1994, 2006, Goudineau, Guichard and Kaenel 2010, Hikida 2004, James 1998, 1999, Koch 2009, McCone 2008, Megaw and Megaw 1996, 1998, Merriman 1987, Renfrew 1987, Sims-Williams 1998a, 1998b, Williams 1997, 2001a.
[13] Williams 2001a 6–14.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-71842-4 — Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean
Alex Mullen
Excerpt
More Information

provide unifying pre-historic origins for the European Union, replacing the Roman origins which were tainted by the Fascists and which had too large a geographical scope.[14] The second, 'separatist Celticity', again based on pre-historic origins, was created in the nineteenth century to promote new identities in areas such as Ireland, Wales, Scotland and Brittany in the face of perceived external threats from England and France, and much more recently has been pressed into service in Northern Italy. The third, 'post-Celticity', argues that the popular acceptance of 'Celtic' as a modern ethnic designation should not be incautiously retrojected into antiquity. For the ancient world, we are reminded that we should not confuse emic (the insider's) and etic (the outsider's) constructions, and that Greek, Roman and modern discourses fit into the latter. Williams reserves the terminology 'Celtic', 'Celt', 'Gallic', 'Gaul' to refer to externally imposed ethnic categories.

The debate is clearly of relevance for this study. Though I follow the tenets of what Williams labels the 'post-Celticity' school, my primary use of the term 'Celtic' will be linguistic, with references to contemporary, externally imposed labels made explicit. A sub-group of Indo-European, the Celtic linguistic branch is distinguished by a series of diagnostic features, for instance loss of inherited */p/, */g^{w}/ > /b/, */ṛ/ > ri, */ḷ/ > /li/.[15] We can therefore establish, when enough inscriptional evidence is available, whether the epigraphy is likely to have been the product of what we term Celtic speakers. Problems arise, of course, when the evidence does not yield the relevant diagnostic features or when uncertainty exists over the analysis of the forms.[16] However, if numerous Celtic inscriptions can be identified in an area, we might assume the presence of Celtic speakers. To assign to these speakers a Celtic ethnicity or to associate the material culture of these areas with the language group, and then to classify similar material culture elsewhere as 'Celtic', exceeds the evidence. We have seen that a key lesson of twentieth-century archaeology was that material culture cannot be unquestioningly assigned to peoples, ethnic or otherwise, and we will see that language, ethnicity and culture are linked in an intricate dialectic (§1.3). Since the label 'Celtic' in the ancient world is an etic construction, it is misleading to assume that the fragmented, disparate Celtic-speaking populations of the Iron Age had any sense of Celtic ethnicity. Even in the Roman period, the designation 'Celt' used by local people to refer to themselves

[14] This stance was perhaps most strikingly expressed in the exhibition on the Celts in the Palazzo Grassi in Venice, 1991.
[15] See Mullen 2007b 56. [16] See Mullen 2012a.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-71842-4 — Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean
Alex Mullen
Excerpt
More Information

never appears on dedicatory tombstones in Gaul, and 'Gaul' hardly ever.[17] Indeed, even the designations used in this study, 'indigenous' (to refer to the heterogeneous mass of Celtic-speaking peoples of Southern Gaul), 'Roman' and 'Greek', should be seen as convenient shorthand: ethnicity can rarely be viewed in such black-and-white terms and identities can be multiple.[18]

This more sophisticated way of approaching communities of the ancient world has also forced us to rethink views of cultural contacts. If identities are multiple, dynamic and situational, and pots no longer equal people, our simplistic vision of cultural contacts as the civilizing by Greeks and Romans of barbarians must change too. But an appreciation of the complexity has complicated matters. Debate over which models and terminology we should use for cultural contacts never seems to cease, especially in archaeological circles, with different terminologies sometimes masking very similar models[19] and few clear signs of consensus.[20] We seem to have a choice between rehabilitation of old chestnuts: 'acculturation',[21] 'Hellenization', 'Romanization', or replacement by new, more fashionable, models, such as 'creolization',[22] 'hybridization',[23] 'discrepant experience',[24] 'globalization',[25] 'middle ground'[26] and 'bilingualism' (§1.3), whose longevity has not yet been tested. Or can we mix-and-match? Perhaps, as with identities, it is not a case of 'either/or'; 'discrepant experience', for example, might allow

[17] Collis 2003 105. 'Gauls never represented themselves, in all the honorific and funerary inscriptions they set up, either as Gauls or as members of a given province, but rather as belonging to the *ciuitas* of the Remi, the Pictones, the Redones or the Aedui' (Goudineau 1996 468). I surveyed the instances of the *Kelt-* root in published local, Greek and Latin epigraphy from the Western provinces, and found that, in 'emic' contexts, it seems to appear as a personal name or place-name (once, *Celti*, Southern Spain), never as an ethnic designation, unless one or two of the names can be analysed as ethnics. Intriguingly, the vast majority of these name forms appear in *Hispania*, which poses the question of whether there may have been a local (ethnic?) identity named using this *Kelt-* root, which was then taken on by Greeks in the archaic period and extended to the 'barbarians' of a much wider area. But the relevant evidence from *Hispania* is much later in date and the suggestion highly speculative. The term in an ethnic and 'etic' sense does appear, for example, we find Κελτοί in a third-century AD Greek inscription from Lyon (*IGF* 143) and possibly on the tin ingots found in the Bagaud 2 wreck (§6.4.2).

[18] Dietler 1999a 494 note 2.

[19] Millett underlines the similarity between concepts and suggests that difference is overinflated by rhetoric, by publishing part of his introduction to the *Romanization of Britain* (1990) with the term *Romanization* replaced with *creolization*, with apparently little or no effect (2003–4 171).

[20] For some of the debates, see the proceedings of the Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conferences.

[21] For acculturation, see Dietler 2010 47.

[22] For creolization, see §2.2.2.

[23] For hybridity, see Antonaccio 2005, van Dommelen 1997.

[24] For discrepant experience, see Mattingly 1997.

[25] For globalization, see Hingley 2005.

[26] For middle ground, see Gosden 2004, Malkin 2002, 2004, 2011. This concept is taken from White's work on contacts in the Great Lakes region 1650–1815 (White 1991).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-71842-4 — Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean
Alex Mullen
Excerpt
More Information

us to explain the modalities and dynamics of 'Romanization'. Indeed, we should always be aware of the different scales of our analysis, whether it be Empire-wide, community-based or individual-focused. As Woolf reminds us, the different perspectives, local and global, are not mutually exclusive, and we must look to both.[27]

One indefatigable sticking-point in the debate has been the use of certain well-established '-izations', especially Hellenization and Romanization. These descriptors seem trapped in analytical spins, still attracting the ever-tempting scare quotes, and many archaeologists would be happy to see them eliminated.[28] However, Hellenization and Romanization seem to have held on, in some disciplines at least, with relative tenacity. Whilst fully accepting the criticisms of the traditional use of the terms, I am not sure that they have completely lost their utility, particularly as the alternatives do not specify in themselves the contact culture in question and it is only with large-scale concepts such as Romanization that we can 'compare one local sequence to another and observe variations'.[29] Since no replacements have been universally accepted, Hellenization and Romanization can still be applied, but with an understanding that they now describe a much more complex process than that to which they traditionally referred. As Wallace-Hadrill remarks: 'terms like "hellenisation" and "romanisation" are fraught with difficulties, though this is no reason for avoiding them completely, but rather for unpacking them carefully and not using them unreflectingly'.[30]

The concepts of Hellenization and Romanization can continue to be useful if they encompass the major developments of recent decades. First, a sophisticated view of the transmission of the cultural phenomena must be adopted, though the details of the exact route may remain obscure. Second, the agency of the indigenous peoples and the individual must be in focus. Third, culture cannot be regarded as monolithic and static; objects adopted can no longer be linked in simplistic equations to the donor culture and donor communities can also undergo transformation.[31] Fourth, the nature of so-called Greek/Roman elements must be examined, and their importance and the extent to which they retain their value of 'Greekness'/'Romanness' as they move between settlements and individuals should be assessed.[32] Indeed scholars must reconsider how far what we term key indicators of 'Greekness' or 'Romanness' actually functioned as such in

[27] Woolf 2003–4 159.
[28] See Millett 2003–4 for different responses to the term.
[29] Woolf 2003–4 159.
[30] Wallace-Hadrill 2008 28. See also Harris 2005b 33.
[31] See Dietler 2007 242, 276.
[32] See Bats 2007 for some thoughts on material culture (specifically ceramic) and ethnicity.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-71842-4 — Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean
Alex Mullen
Excerpt
More Information

the ancient world.[33] Finally, rejection and resistance must be analysed in research which should aim to integrate the spectrum of responses.

The term 'Hellenization',[34] if retained in our terminological arsenal, should be used to describe the processes and results of contact with 'Greek' culture, as 'Romanization'[35] should be for 'Roman' culture, though clearly the two are profoundly intertwined. Wallace-Hadrill (2008) provides an elegant discussion of the nature of the interaction. He notes that through the traditional compartmentalization of disciplines and periodization, Hellenization and Romanization have tended to remain distinct, but that '"hellenisation" and "romanisation" are not sequential, but two closely interrelated aspects of the same phenomenon'.[36] 'While the "Greek" is defined precisely by its Hellenic culture, the "Roman" is defined by political structures. Everything under Roman control may be taken as "Roman" whereas within that control, the "Greek" may remain culturally distinctive.'[37] Further to this, Wallace-Hadrill is keen that we keep 'the local' in focus, which renders the picture still more intricate. In pre-Social War Italy, for example, Hellenism should not simply be seen as 'the cultural arm of Roman conquest'.[38] He shows that Romans were protective of their identity and that the Italian cities were often Hellenistic trend-setters where Rome 'lagged significantly behind'.[39] This trend-setting is better explained 'in terms of desire to assert local pride in a context of multiple identities than as an aspiration to Roman identity'.[40] Under Augustus, once a sort of consensus about the nature of Romanness, and the role of Hellenic culture within that, was established, along with the desire to share it, the provinces interacted with this cultural package. But the result, even then, was not homogeneity, but rather a wide range of variants on the same theme, in each case motivated by the specificities of the local cultural background,[41] analogous, indeed, to the creation of regional varieties of Latin across the same areas.

It might seem inopportune in a climate of proliferating terms and lack of accord to attempt to define and support a new term, especially one which has a whiff of a 'Grand Theory'. Nevertheless, 'Mediterraneanization' does

[33] See Wallace-Hadrill 2008 102–103.
[34] Key discussions of Hellenization include: Gallini 1973, Wallace-Hadrill 2008 17–28, Zanker 1976.
[35] Key discussions of Romanization include: Blagg and Millett 1990, Derks 1998, Keay and Terrenato 2001 (who support the use of the term in its 'weak' sense, namely 'as a convenient label that refers loosely to events involved in the creation of a new and unified political entity' (ix)), Metzler *et al.* 1995, Millett 1990, Revell 2009, Wallace-Hadrill 2008 9–14, Webster and Cooper 1996, Woolf 1997, 1998.
[36] Wallace-Hadrill 2008 26. See also Woolf 1994a.
[37] Wallace-Hadrill 2008 27.
[38] Wallace-Hadrill 2008 447.
[39] Wallace-Hadrill 2008 447.
[40] Wallace-Hadrill 2008 448.
[41] See Wallace-Hadrill 2008 453–454.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-71842-4 — Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean
Alex Mullen
Excerpt
More Information

seem to have a different remit from that of 'Hellenization' and 'Romanization' and may prove to be useful. It is essentially a way of signifying that our investigatory framework is one which deals with the complex series of cultures constituting the Mediterranean '*koine*',[42] in which 'Greek' and 'Roman' culture systems, amongst others, play a part.

The inspiration behind the term, for me at least,[43] is the monumental work of Horden and Purcell which provides an all-embracing discussion of the history *of* the Mediterranean.[44] It is worth briefly discussing their *magnum opus* here as they have brought the Mediterranean to centre-stage again in a way that has not happened since Braudel.[45] They argue that the Mediterranean world is 'made distinctive not only by its fragmentation but by its connectivity'[46] and that we might visualize the Mediterranean as a peninsula in reverse,[47] regarding the sea not as an isolating factor but a mass of networks: it 'has an inside-out geography in which the world of the sea is "normal" (the interior), and the land is the fringe, its marginality increasing with its distance from the water'.[48] Their comments on connectivity, and the closely related topic of mobility, both of people and goods,[49] remind us of the fluidity and flexibility of the ancient Mediterranean. They discuss the 'bewildering ethnic variety', noting that, in such an environment, it must have been impossible in many areas to assign true indigenous status to any one group.[50] Also salient for this study are their remarks on trade. Underwater archaeology, which has been well supported in France,[51] has demonstrated that mixed cargoes were common and that *cabotage*, which was able to avoid the seasonal restrictions of bigger vessels, would have represented a significant proportion of trade.[52] The mixed nature of the crews and *caboteurs* resulted in a heterogeneous maritime *koine* involving

[42] The term 'Koine' refers to the common Greek language of post-classical antiquity. The term 'Mediterranean *koine*' refers to the heterogeneous inhabitants of the Mediterranean basin, who share in a series of 'Mediterranean' cultural features (p. 13).
[43] In searching the literature, the earliest use of the term I found is in Kimmig 1988 ('méditerranéisation'); it does not seem to have gained much currency until relatively recently.
[44] Horden and Purcell 2000 (see also Purcell 2003, Horden and Purcell 2005). See Gras 1995a for a view of the Mediterranean in the archaic period, Abulafia 2011 for the Mediterranean across time and Broodbank forthcoming for the archaeology of the Mediterranean until the formation of the classical world.
[45] Braudel 1966.
[46] Horden and Purcell 2000 343. For recent work on networks, see Malkin 2011, Malkin, Constantapoulou and Panagopoulou 2009.
[47] Horden and Purcell 2000 24. Gras views the Mediterranean as a 'ciment liquide' (1995a 4).
[48] Horden and Purcell 2000 133.
[49] Horden and Purcell 2000, especially 123–172, 342–400.
[50] Horden and Purcell 2000 377–400.
[51] See Dietler 1997 294–296, 2007 267–270, 2010 133–138, Hesnard 1992, Long, Miro and Volpe 1992, Pomey and Long 1992 for shipwrecks in southern French coastal waters.
[52] Horden and Purcell 2000 137–143, 368–372.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org