MINISTERO PER I BENI
E LE ATTIVITÀ CULTURALI

BOLLETTINO DI ARCHEOLOGIA ON LINE

DIREZIONE GENERALE PER LE ANTICHITÀ

VOLUME SPECIALE

ROMA 2008 - INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY
MEETINGS BETWEEN CULTURES IN THE ANCIENT MEDITERRANEAN

In collaborazione con AIAC Associazione Internazionale di Archeologia Classica

Alicia Jiménez

Introduction: Colonising a Colonised Territory. Settlements with Punic Roots in Roman Times

Traditional approaches to the process known as 'Romanization' have usually taken into account the interaction between Roman colonists and the native populations around the Mediterranean[1]. Roman colonisation, however, took place in vast regions in a territory previously colonised by Carthage. How did the settlement of peoples of Punic origin in certain cities affect the redefinition of identities in Republican and early Imperial times? Was there a distinctive way of 'becoming Roman' in these areas? Can certain trends in rituals, town planning or settlement of the landscape be perceived in these contexts?

Despite a long scholarly tradition of the study of colonies in the ancient Mediterranean and the widespread use of the word "colonisation" when analysing Phoenician settlements, the Carthaginian domination of wide regions of the western Mediterranean basin and the subsequent Roman conquest of many of these territories, the use of the terms 'colonisation' and 'colonialism' is not problem-free[2]. Colonialism has been defined as the "presence of one or more groups of foreign people in a region at some distance of their place of origin" in the context of the "existence of asymmetrical socio-economic relationships of political domination or economic exploitation"[3].

In this collection of papers, the terms "colonialism" and "colonisation" are used in this broad sense and therefore do not comply with the narrow meaning attached to the Roman legal concept of *colonia*, which would not be appropriate for most towns under Roman control during the late Republic and the early Empire. Perceived in this way, colonisation has wider implications for subjects such as the construction of local identities under Roman hegemony or the meaning of the concept "Punic" after the fall of Carthage. Colonialism is also linked to issues of conquest, migration, connectivity and changes in the power structures due to Roman political control. Questions directly relevant to a postcolonial analysis of cities, rural settlements and ritual places with Punic roots in Roman times, including issues such as hybridisation,

[1] I am very grateful to Peter van Dommelen for his encouragement and advice during the process of organising this session. I would also like to thank him and Elizabeth Fentress, discussants in Rome. Their comments were most helpful in improving and refining the content of the papers presented in the proceedings. I am indebted to all the participants in the session, especially to Jaime Vives-Ferrándiz and Carlos Cañete, for organizing the session at the AIAC conference with me, and to Josephine Quinn, for checking the English of most of the texts and her insightful comments. Many thanks to Jeremy Hayne and Paul Turner as well for helping with the revision of the English of the rest of the sections.

[2] See Colombi and Quinn, who discuss the appropriateness of using the term 'Carthaginian colonisation' in the North of Sardinia and certain areas of North Africa.

[3] P. van Dommelen. 1998. *On colonial grounds. A comparative study of colonialism and rural settlement in first millennium BC west central Sardinia*, Leiden, p. 16.

mimicry and coexistence of several "imagined communities" in a given town, as well as the discourses that have been constructed around them in modern times, are also stressed by different contributors.

In the first paper, Cañete deals with the ambiguous legacy of Rome in modern colonial thought. The discursive appropriation of the Roman model in European imperialist programmes has been at the forefront of many historiographical analyses, presenting the knowledge-power discourse of European nations almost as a monolithic representation of the links between ancient and modern colonialism. The French intervention in the Maghreb studied by Cañete shows the fictional nature of the alleged narrative unity of these kind of dominant discourses, taking as an example the re-evaluation of pre-Roman ancestors (the Berber culture) by Saint-Simonian thinkers. The natural consequence of this approach is, of course, a detailed study of the nuances of various counter-discourses, which pay special attention to a variety of pasts selected for revival by nativist movements. In this sense, Rome can be seen as an invented tradition as much as the nativist revivals, which were, for their part, recreated in opposition to dominant discourses that linked the colonial mission of the European powers with the Roman legacy.

The myriad of ways in which the past can be appropriated, both in the present and in ancient times, is directly related to the consumption of old-looking objects and the reinvention of "traditional" rituals. This could be the case of the characteristic funerary *cippi* found in the necropoleis of Baelo Claudia (Jiménez) or the stelae and ritual practices associated with Temple B at Volubilis, seen by Aranegui and Vives-Ferrándiz as important elements in the construction of Volubitan identities during the process of 'becoming Roman'. The idea that objects with a traditional appearance are only relevant in the sphere of private rituals is rightly contested by Quinn in her study of the public buildings and epigraphy in Lepcis. According to the author, the very fact that writing on stone is a relatively novel practice in the region at that time makes the resort to both Punic and Latin epigraphy on the same monuments part of a new language of self-representation attached to the process of "Romanization".

Public discourses may also have been the medium chosen to portray 'hidden' local transcripts, as seen in the inclusion of Punic inscriptions in monumental buildings and coins, as much as private spaces like cemeteries would have been the perfect stage for public displays, including Latin inscriptions and banquets where Roman tableware was consumed outside the tomb, while local pottery and Neo-Punic script were favoured inside (Quinn, Jiménez). The variety of discourses preserved in the archaeological record are traces of the multiplicity of coetaneous strategies of 'Romaness' and specific ways of being a member of the town (Aranegui and Vives-Ferrándiz, Jiménez) that would, in turn, produce different readings of the symbols offered to the civic spectator (Quinn).

Quinn argues in her paper that this is not a simple case of 'cultural bilingualism', as individuals needed to rewrite the very language they used in order to speak it, creating new formulas that juxtaposed Punic, Roman, native, Hellenistic, Italic, Oriental or, at the very least, different Mediterranean ways of doing things. And even if we are able to perceive as historians and archaeologists the musicality of a given language, the sound can be deceiving. As Quinn puts it, "even when Latin is the medium, a portion of the message can be local". Hybridity –the creation of a third space- is particularly common in colonial situations, although of course every single culture is a hybrid in itself. These hybrid elements and individuals that continually destabilize ancient and modern fixed categories - the cultural grid that allows us to differentiate civilization/*humanitas* from barbarism- have a subversive quality, because they question the very distinction between coloniser and colonised that sustains the colonial order (Cañete).

In order to fragment these binary sets of modern and ancient categories it is especially important to study ancient material culture at the level of the town, a point made convincingly by Aranegui and Vives-Ferrándiz in their analysis of different ways of being Volubilitan in relation to other Mauritanian cities, to better understand regional and 'global' Mediterranean connections. The local and the regional can also be tools to go beyond the Roman *vs.* Punic opposition. Colombi points in this direction when she carefully describes the variability of Punic culture in Sardinia and the relevant contacts of the NW region of the island with central Italy at least from the middle of the 4th century BC, hinted at by the distribution pattern of black-glaze pottery, while connections with some 'Punicized' areas, such as Sicily or even SW Sardinia, seem to

be less important. Punic, of course, is to be conceived as a reification as much as Rome. A greater awareness of local and regional connections inside the territories under Roman hegemony might be a good way of changing blunt models of centre-periphery, in which all explanations redirect the argument in the end to Rome, as well as exploring the possibility that, for example, the spread of provincial items (e.g. funerary monuments like *cupae*, Jiménez), the stimulus of traditional activities (such as fishing in the Straits of Gibraltar area, Aranegui and Vives-Ferrándiz) and the use of Neo-Punic in monumental inscriptions and coins (Quinn, Jiménez) might be read as some of the consequences of the process known as 'Romanization'. In this respect, Cañete suggests paying more attention to the fact that power structures and interests in the 'periphery' inevitably had an influence on the agenda of the metropolis, while Quinn and Jiménez critique the assumption that provincial material culture can only be fully understood as a more or less imperfect copy of that produced in Rome or Carthage. However the main thread of all case studies is the analysis of the question of how multiple local identities may have been constructed in regions that passed from Carthaginian to Roman hegemony, questioning the role of material culture in the way they were negotiated and expressed in the new context of Roman colonisation and the varied trajectory of several representations of this phenomenon in modern and contemporary times.

Acknowledgements
I am very grateful to Peter van Dommelen for his encouragement and advice during the process of organising this session. I would also like to thank him for acting with Elizabeth Fentress as discussants in Rome. Their comments were most helpful in improving and refining the content of the papers presented in the proceedings. I am indebted to all the participants in the session, especially to Jaime Vives-Ferrándiz and Carlos Cañete, for organizing the session at the AIAC conference with me, and to Josephine Quinn, for checking the English of most of the texts and her insightful comments. Many thanks to Jeremy Hayne and Paul Turner as well for helping with the revision of the English of the rest of the sections.

Alicia Jiménez
Consejo Superior de Investigaciones
Científicas (CCHS, CSIC)
Spain
E-mail: alicia.jimenez@cchs.csic.es