



www.otium.unipg.it

OTIVM.  
Archeologia e Cultura del Mondo Antico  
ISSN 2532-0335 DOI 10.5281/zenodo.5516193



No. 9, Anno 2020 – Article 2

## Romanization, *Romanizzazione*: a rhizomatic account of an apparent dualism\*

Mauro Puddu<sup>✉</sup>

*Dipartimento di Scienze Umanistiche, Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia.*

---

**Abstract:** This paper accounts for the divisive picture of Romanization that characterizes different national scholarly contexts. Romanization is still a valid interpretive tool in many countries; though, it is harshly criticised – and allegedly abandoned – in others. The aim of this paper is to provide an historical understanding of such divide, by investigating the roots of Romanization within the late 19th-late 20th century period, when historian Theodor Mommsen moulded it. Romanization, both when freely applied to archaeological data and when critiqued, is treated as a uniform model, valid at all times. This attitude is part of the problem: its original outline expressed different views of the world than the ones around today, after the development – and following criticism – of postcolonial and critical theories. These pages will retrieve Romanization a set of dynamic, historically-shaped paradigms that adapt to specific regional and academic environments.

**Keywords:** Romanization, Mommsen, Realism, Literature, Rhizome

---

✉ Address: Università Ca' Foscari, Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici, Stanza A110, Malcantone Marcorà, Dorsoduro 3484/D, Calle Contarini, 30123 Venezia, Italia. Email: [mauro.puddu@unive.it](mailto:mauro.puddu@unive.it)

\* This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 893017. My gratitude goes to Valentina Serra (reader in German Literature at Università di Cagliari), who kindly dedicated her time and advice to my questions on German realism: the potential drawbacks of the connections that I make between German literature and Romanization are of course entirely mine; and to Edoardo Vanni (reader in Methodology of archaeological research at Università di Siena) for his feedback on the paper's first rough draft.

---

## 1. A 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: THE DECOLONISATION OF EUROPEAN EMPIRES

Romanization is often dealt with as a concept that indicates 'one of the principal consequences of Roman imperialism' (Freeman, 1997:28). However, the nature of such consequences varies depending on what is looked at. This range of variation has been thoroughly discussed in some countries, and mostly neglected in others. When discussed, the value that historians and archaeologists have assigned to the consequences of imperialism and Romanization divides between two opposite positions: on one hand, a positive account of Romanization as a phenomenon that brought about economic, social, and cultural advantages to the provinces annexed by Rome to its dominion; on the other hand, a critical account that questions its ability to match events that are historically and archaeologically supported by evidence.

But when did such dualism arise? A perfect picture of the precise historical moment, the mid-1990s, is given by Freeman's<sup>1</sup> (1997: 30) article on Mommsen, Haverfield and the origins of Romanization studies in the UK: the re-opening of the debate on Romanization was likely 'a reflection of our times and current postcolonial perspectives.' With this remark, Freeman underlines the relevance of 'current political and social backgrounds' in the interpretation of the past. It is true that the original postcolonial ideas disseminated by some of the greatest thinkers of the 20<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> FREEMAN 1997, p. 30.

century such as Edward Said<sup>2</sup>, Homi Bhabha<sup>3</sup>, and Gaytri Spivak<sup>4</sup> reflected on – and to some extent anticipated – the political decolonizing events that had happened before and after the second World War: the breakup of the Spanish, British, German, French and Russian empires. Postcolonial ideas also inspired further decolonising debates and political events like Britain handing sovereignty of Hong Kong and Portugal of Macau to China in 1999, and the declaration of independence of numerous republics from former USSR. Here comes a first fork that need full consideration when analysing the different national attitudes towards the Romanization: some countries have lived the decolonising experience in first person, whether seeking independence or giving up on colonial territories, whereas others have been at the margins of such movements.

A postcolonial awareness is not shared by all countries with the same intensity. Some countries deal with the interpretation of the world through – or rejecting a – postcolonial lens enriched by a direct experience on the matter, whereas others do without this direct involvement. In order to appreciate this difference, we need, first, to sum up what postcolonial studies do: they apply a critical theory analysis to the – generally uniform and monolithic – historical, cultural, and literary discourses that European Imperial powers imposed onto human groups and lands that they controlled, focusing on the social and cultural legacy of this experience on them. Second, although this framework was originally meant to deconstruct – springing from ideas brought forward by Jacques Derrida – the dominant colonial narrative pertinent specifically to the post 1492 colonies (India,

---

<sup>2</sup> SAID 1978.

<sup>3</sup> BHABHA 1993.

<sup>4</sup> SPIVAK 1999.

Americas, Africa), numerous scholars and entire academic systems foresaw the high potential of the postcolonial tool not only, as noticed by Van Oyen (2015), as a tool for critical discourse analysis, but also as an approach to past cultural contact. The cultural contact within the Roman Empire, and the Romanization paradigm mostly used to interpret it, is one of those pasts to have undergone postcolonial theories most frequently and intensely over the last four decades.

## 2. MEETING ROMANIZATION TWICE

Providing an historical definition of this tool, and demonstrating to which Romanization tradition one refers to when using it, can be fundamental to avoid generating the misunderstandings created by a quick mentions of the term in publications and conferences, without further definition. The aim of this paper is to look at the concept's dynamism within its multiple chronological and regional contexts, making explicit the numerous hidden qualities that it has embodied through longer than a century's existence.

To start with, a personal account of the two ways I met Romanization will help to exemplify the divide it experienced relatively to post colonialism. Having received my education in both Italy – Cagliari – and the UK – UCL and Cambridge – I feel having 'met' Romanization twice.

The first time I met Romanization was in 2007, at the University of Cagliari. There, I had decided to study the grave goods of a west-central Sardinia Roman-period necropolis for my BA dissertation, which I was suggested to put in relation to the model of *Romanizzazione*. It all seemed quite straightforward at first. However, I soon realised – and discussed it

with my supervisor, Classical Archaeology Professor Simonetta Angiolillo – that I had come to a fork with at least two possible paths to deal with the concept: either I accepted an intuitive idea of Romanization or, whenever I tried to go beyond the simplistic definition of 'progressively becoming Roman' of people in the provinces, the concept blasted in numerous research windows, hard to keep track of in the short term: what did 'becoming Roman' imply? To adopt the same material culture used in Rome? In Italy? To hold common practices as in Rome? Does using the same material culture as in Rome really mean 'becoming Roman'? Were only the elites becoming Roman or was the broader population involved in the transformation? Was our concept of 'Roman' influenced by the 19<sup>th</sup> century movements of nations-formation?

One functional way to deal with *Romanizzazione* as an archaeological paradigm by most Italian scholarship is by looking at the adoption, in the Roman provinces, of assemblages of material culture sharing common components: the consistent presence of vessels painted by red glaze and imitating the shape of *sigillata italica* – Samian ware – would make us lean towards the interpretation of a site as a Romanized one. Now, the positive side to that, is that it allows to look on site for signs that flag similarities in a wide area such as an empire, providing a background of material culture diffusion. This tends to give scholars a chance to see uniformity in the object of their research, perceiving – and at the same time contributing to build – the size and greatness of the empire. Certainly, such an approach was most useful at a time, during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, when there was a need to understand the regional depth of influence reached by the empire. However, its downside is that, if such phase is not investigated to a further

level of complexity, one risks stopping at this superficial uniformity and overlooking other aspects of material culture that can help disclose the unique ways in which specific communities articulated their lives embodying those same objects within their local and regional dimensions. The hazard laying behind a straightforward use of such framework is the tendency to classify the world in binary systems: either that community/site/province under study is Romanised, or it is not. In Cagliari, I had the opportunity to discuss this issue with several scholars, such as former directors of the archaeological museum of Cagliari, Carlo Tronchetti and Donatella Mureddu, who provided me, on one hand, with the idea that *Romanizzazione* – as an historical process – was very limited in Sardinia and on the other, that in all fairness it had not been thoroughly defined yet, and it was often used as a generic yes/no interpretive system.

The second time I came across Romanization was when I joined UCL for my MA studies in Archaeology, in 2010. There, I was exposed to archaeological theory as a whole independent and growing field<sup>5</sup>, being introduced to the idea that Romanization had been harshly criticised for a few decades, being judged unfit for understanding the complex Roman world. Many publications on Roman archaeology were – and still are – framed by postcolonial ideas<sup>6</sup>. Despite the Romanization paradigm was not rejected by all scholars – the debate is still heated – ideas of hybridization, identity, creolization (see next sections), and colonial discourse entered the Roman-archaeology vocabulary. This forced the whole scholarship – both the supporters and the detractors of Romanization – to confront their

---

<sup>5</sup> i.e. TRIGGER 1989, JOHNSON 2010.

<sup>6</sup> i.e. GOSDEN 2004.

reasons on a common ground, through explicitly led debates, dealing with a complex set of concepts.

The criticism of Romanization reflects and represents an encompassing turn within general archaeological thought: that between processualism and post-processualism, that occurred in the 1970s'. Post-Processualism is an umbrella-term that covers diverse approaches to archaeology and agendas springing from a common growing dissatisfaction with the then dominant Processual framework: the latter, known as New Archaeology, looks for general, unconditional laws to explain human behavior by applying mathematics and statistical methods to archaeological data<sup>7</sup>. In the long term, one reaction to such approach was a call for a return to an interest in people, that processual approaches gave the feeling to have sacrificed in the name of an exclusively methodological development. The most evident characteristic of Post-Processual Archaeologies is the plurality of approaches. While Processual archaeology sought – and still seeks – a normative attitude, Post-Processual archaeologies act towards “an *understanding* of past actions (...) [while attempting to] provide *self-understanding* of the archaeologist conducting an analysis” as well<sup>8</sup>. Archaeologists working within a Post-Processual agenda are conscious of – and make explicit – their presence in the process of the interpretation of data, valuing the contextualization of knowledge by “*critically* examining the social setting in which knowledge is produced, the disciplinary academic context or class background of particular scholars or schools to

---

<sup>7</sup> CLARKE 1968.

<sup>8</sup> PREUCEL 1991, p. 28.

which they belong”<sup>9</sup>. This paragraph on my personal – double – encounter with Romanization aims to align with these principles.

If one considers the development of postprocessual archaeologies, the criticism addressed to Romanization was inevitable in the moment a postcolonial perspective was adopted, as this aims at providing a narrative for those people unaccounted for by the dominant, official history. However sensible, sound, and necessary postcolonialism immediately appeared to me back then, I was also struck by the fact that it was often used to describe Romanization as a unidimensional, monolithic concept. I noticed that such approach did not liaise much with the different usages that of the same paradigm were made within different regions, scholarships, and periods. I continued having the impression that somehow such a strict approach by some researchers and lecturers – that ended up apologetically referring to Romanization at TRAC Oxford in 2010 with «expressions as ‘the R-word’ or ‘Romanization between inverted commas’» as ironically notes Versluys<sup>10</sup>– denied at some point a few foundational principles of both postcolonial and post-processual mind-sets. This contrast has inspired me in writing this paper.

The rest of this paper will explore the Romanization concept extensively, broadening up both the geographical and the temporal perspectives: first, the evolution of Romanization in Britain will be analysed; second will come the analysis of Romanization in Italy; third, and finally, will be the scrutiny of the political, literary, and historical context in which Romanization

---

<sup>9</sup> KOHL 1993, p. 13.

<sup>10</sup> VERSLUYS 2014, p. 5.

originated: 19<sup>th</sup> century Germany, where Theodor Mommsen lived and worked.

### 3. ROMANIZATION

If Roman archaeology theory were an archaeological site to dig up, it would be hard to doubt that the criticism to Romanization would be the most superficial layer to remove, under the turf; before that, we would likely find a fine and thin, but with a distinct texture, unmistakable, postcolonial layer, situated on top of a thick, compacted, and extended layer represented by Romanization, one of those layers visible in all sections around the site from far away. Nevertheless, this apparent uniformity needs further work to spot the different phases in which it formed.

Having worked under Theodor Mommsen to the curation of the CIL VII volume on the inscriptions from Britain, British historian and archaeologist Francis Haverfield was, as far as we know, the first scholar to bring the Romanization paradigm in Britain. Introduced to Mommsen by Pelham, Haverfield, Camden Professor of Ancient History at the University of Oxford between 1907 and 1919, was fond of the work of the German scholar and his methodology to access the Roman history through a profound understanding of inscriptions diffused in the empire. Haverfield stated that «from the letters on stone or coin he [Mommsen] could extract abundant meaning' although flagging that 'he did not often advance into the regions of the uninscribed»<sup>11</sup>, implying that it will have been the British scholar's

---

<sup>11</sup> PELHAM 1911, p. XV.

mission to fill the gap left by the illustrious German colleague. Indeed, for Haverfield, it was archaeology's turn to contribute to the history of the Roman Empire, by going beyond the knowledge of Roman official institutions expressions left in form of inscriptions. Seeking knowledge of 'the life of the governed'<sup>12</sup> (Stuart Jones, 1920: 4), rather than of that of the governors, better known by then, became Haverfield's more or less explicit aim.

Despite his intent to collect different data though, Haverfield kept Mommsen's interpretive framework of the Roman world intact, yielding the picture of the Roman provinces as gifted, in different times, of an injection of progress due to their inclusion within the Imperial system: he explicitly referred to the abduction of the provinces by Rome as a set of 'gifts of civilization, citizenship and language to almost all its subjects' (*ibid*). Not only has Haverfield kept Mommsen's vision of the past together, but he also projected – as we will also see below here with Mommsen – a thread bridging that past to the present, figuring 'a stable and coherent order out of which arose the western Europe of today' (*Ibid*). This is a pivotal point in the history of archaeological thought in general, and of the Roman world in particular. In his most recent work where he reflects on the current situation of British scholarship in Roman archaeology and the increasing amount of data gathered, Millett<sup>13</sup> states that it is today largely acknowledged 'that knowledge is the product of addressing questions, not simply data-gathering, and that the questions we ask and the research we produce are

---

<sup>12</sup> STUART JONES 1920, p. 4.

<sup>13</sup> MILLETT 2016, p. 50.

themselves a product of contemporary perspectives'. This applies certainly in Haverfield's case.

In general, as Mommsen, Haverfield gave most relevance to the presence of inscriptions roughly everywhere in the empire. This state of the art made Haverfield structure a Roman world that was quite homogeneously shaped by authorities, solidifying Mommsen's agenda based on the primacy of texts, and on acknowledging cultural change when coming from the Roman perspective.

Haverfield created a framework of the Roman world where the central Roman rule and culture, meeting with a pre-existing one in the province, was the only one able to modify – if not substituting – it. This vision, which we would call colonialist in its full sense, emerges clear in his *The Romanization of Britain*<sup>14</sup>, a work founded on a binary relationship between the mutually exclusive Roman and indigenous material cultures from which he derived a neat separation between Roman and Celtic civilizations. Such binary framework was at the centre of the debate by several scholars in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Collingwood was amongst the firsts to discuss such binary structure on the basis of archaeological evidence<sup>15</sup>. He reinterpreted Roman Britain's material culture as a vast body of objects, introducing the idea that each of them embodying within themselves **a mixture of both Roman and indigenous features**. Collingwood contributed to a change of perspective by falsifying the dearest idea to a culture-historical approach to archaeology: that objects embodied cultures in a mutually exclusive way

---

<sup>14</sup> HAVERFIELD 1905.

<sup>15</sup> COLLINGWOOD 1932, p. 111.

(i.e. either Roman or indigenous). One of the main representatives of a culture historical approach to archaeology and one of main authorities in the field, Gordon Childe for instance defined culture as a complex of «certain types of remains – pots, implements, ornaments, burial rites, house forms – constantly recurring together»<sup>16</sup> that should have been left by «what today would be called a 'people'»<sup>17</sup>. Such equation, labelled indeed as culture-historical and considered by many outdated, is indeed, it is maintained here, at the origin of much of the struggles of contemporary archaeology too. Collingwood's attempt to address it anticipated, to some extent, key concepts adopted later within postcolonial models, such as hybridization and creolization.

After Collingwood, Romanization stayed focused on a Roman – coloniser's – perspective at least until the 1990s', when it underwent a consistent review, particularly due to Martin Millett's work. His *The Romanization of Britain* «did significantly shift attention to the 'Native' side of the Romanization equation, and – as an implicitly 'processual' work – focused more on socioeconomic aspects of the period than had many previous 'standard' accounts»<sup>18</sup>. Compared to the past, Millett's Romanization stresses the active role of natives – its elites<sup>19</sup> - in the building of Roman-period society, finding that «by the time Britain was invaded, the Roman army and administration were increasingly peopled by natives from

---

<sup>16</sup> CHILDE 1929, p. v.

<sup>17</sup> CHILDE 1929, p. VI.

<sup>18</sup> GARDNER 2007, p. 27.

<sup>19</sup> For a more complete account on Romanization as the diffusion of a Romanised lifestyle through local elites' mediation see ALCOCK 1994; BRANDT AND SLOFSTRA 1983; TERRENATO 2005; WOOLF 1998; WHITTAKER 1997.

other provinces»<sup>20</sup> and that natives «had adopted Roman cultural values and trappings [so that] personal advancement was obtained through service in the Roman army or civil life»<sup>21</sup> The theorization of this two-ways interaction between Roman and local elites created a fertile ground for Andrew Wallace Hadrill (1998) to introduce a further interpretive tool, the metaphor of bilingualism and *codeswitching*, to comprehend the course of hellenization in Rome: the way this worked, for Wallace-Hadrill, was with the elites capable of switching to the most appropriate cultural code (and language) depending on the cultural context in which they had to operate. These approaches certainly got closer to a change of paradigm in British archaeology of the Roman world, as what was depicted until the early 90s' as a cultural change brought about by one solid and impermeable culture – the Roman one – became for the first time a two-ways process to which both natives in the provinces and Romans contributed.

### **3.1 Romanization in Britain today: from postcolonialism to Romanization 2.0**

The last 30 years since Millett's *The Romanization of Britain* have been very fruitful for Roman archaeology in terms of theoretical debate, and Romanization has often been at the core of it in explicit terms. Not always, almost never, in an unproblematic way.

In the early 2000s, the most accepted idea on Romanization was that people in the provinces took part in a 'process that was carried out through

---

<sup>20</sup> MILLETT 1990, p. 53.

<sup>21</sup> MILLETT 1990, p. 53.

imitation, 'by osmosis' (MacMullen, 2000: 128, 137). Although this concept implies that the elements of the two cultures – the native one and the Roman one – could have moved from one another equally, the feeling is that were mainly the natives to import in their culture the elements of the dominant one. Either way, archaeologists of the early 2000s' highlighted the necessity to contrast Romanization by breaking «free from the tendency to see the colonial world as one of rulers and ruled (Romans and natives)»<sup>22</sup>. From this perspective, Gardner has a point in underlining that **only the adoption of a post-colonial critique** by many scholars at the turn of the century<sup>23</sup> produced a change of perspective smoothing those essentialist ethnic categories<sup>24</sup>. Promoting a vision of the Roman world as a complex entity encapsulating different groups capable of holding their inherited identities even if embedded in a heterogeneous society<sup>25</sup> became the more forward-looking vision.

Accordingly to such vision, some scholars saw Romanization as fully founded on the colonial framework, deeming «essential that the colonial discourse is more thoroughly deconstructed and repudiated by European scholars»<sup>26</sup>, and inviting archaeologists to focus on the «subjected people, their behaviour and material culture»<sup>27</sup>. The central idea of postcolonial theories is that the ruled people tended to be made «“invisible” and “voiceless”, only becoming part of history when their rulers decide to write

---

<sup>22</sup> MATTINGLY 2011, p. 29.

<sup>23</sup> BARRETT 1997; JIMENEZ 2007; FREEMAN 1993; HINGLEY 1999; WEBSTER 2001; WEBSTER COOPER 1996.

<sup>24</sup> GARDNER 2007, pp. 27, 28.

<sup>25</sup> HINGLEY 2008.

<sup>26</sup> MATTINGLY 2011, p. 68.

<sup>27</sup> MATTINGLY 2011, p. 14.

about them»<sup>28</sup>. But has postcolonial archaeology succeeded in its aim to give voice to the majority, to the voiceless people of the past?

At this stage, postcolonial archaeology of the Roman world is still undergoing a dynamic process and has not exhausted its cognitive potential at all yet. It has certainly succeeded in switching the focus from Rome to the periphery of the Empire. However, it has struggled, so far, to overcome the duality – Roman *versus* local, rulers *versus* ruled – introduced in the archaeological discourse by Romanization. One example of this struggle is given by the terminological tools introduced in the discourse, such as *creolisation* and *hybridity*. Webster argues in one of the key-works to a postcolonial interpretation of the Roman world that creolisation is «a process of resistant adaptations»<sup>29</sup>, a principle that underscores «the possibility for this bottom-up cultural development to take place»<sup>30</sup>. Terminologically, the attempt allows to shift attention from Rome to the cultural entanglements that took place in the broader empire. However, the three principles on which creolisation theory is based – the negotiations within the Roman world, their material expression with new meanings in new contexts, and the influence on this of asymmetric power relations – are also part of the Romanization paradigm, as intended by Millett, that Webster meant to supplant<sup>31</sup>.

Postcolonial critique is a necessary step in the advancement of Roman archaeology. Though, it needs to find a valid alternative to the strict application of concepts that were created for specific historical contexts

---

<sup>28</sup> GIVEN 2004, p. 3.

<sup>29</sup> WEBSTER 2011, p. 118.

<sup>30</sup> WEBSTER 2001, p. 220.

<sup>31</sup> PEARCE 2013, p. 3.

such as the **modern colonisation of Americas and Asia**. The main issues with these models originate from their founding theoretical assumptions. For example, the term hybrid is necessarily rooted «in its even more problematic counterpart: purity»<sup>32</sup> (Stockhammer, 2012: 2). If we accept the existence of something hybrid and creole, then we must accept the encounter between two pure entities. By doing so, we incur in the paradox of getting rid of essentialist views on Roman culture by introducing at the same time essentialist models of native culture, as put by Jimenez<sup>33</sup>. The more recently proposed «métissages»<sup>34</sup> helps to go beyond the linguistic sphere to which the word “creolization” belongs to.

On the one hand, models of creolisation, hybridisation, and metissage have impacted positively Roman studies by shedding some light on the unpredictable solutions that adaptations to colonial encounters could generate. On the other hand, they refer to processes of linguistic (creole) and cultural (metisse, hybrid) mixing that originate from the encounter of entities that were unknown to one another until the 16<sup>th</sup> century life conditions of slavery, plantation and colonization brought them together<sup>35</sup>: to neglect this while dealing with the Mediterranean and European contexts of Roman archaeology would create more problems than it solves. In fact, today, most scholars acknowledge that «ancient ethnic groups did not exist in isolation and cannot be defined only by their own cultures»<sup>36</sup>.

Postcolonial approaches to archaeology still have a vast unexpressed potential: one route that is relatively unexplored is going at the roots of

---

<sup>32</sup> STOCKHAMMER 2012, p. 2.

<sup>33</sup> JIMENEZ 2008, p. 24.

<sup>34</sup> LE ROUX 2004.

<sup>35</sup> BENITEZ-ROJO 1996, p. 12.

<sup>36</sup> GARDNER, HARRING, LOMAS 2013, p. 2.

postcolonialism, critically approaching the authors that originally influenced the first postcolonial writers, as suggested by Traina<sup>37</sup>, such as Edward Said's<sup>38</sup> interest for Gramsci's theory of subalterns and for Foucault. Gardner and others see the future of Roman archaeology within this context, enforcing the group identities debate by exploring the concept of **human agency**, with the aim of restoring people's capacity «to exercise active cultural choices in appropriating, adapting or, rejecting aspects of Roman culture»<sup>39</sup>.

Recently, after being almost banned from conferences and talked about between inverted commas (i.e. TRAC 2000), Romanization has regained the centre of discussion in the attempt, led by Versluys among others, to rehabilitate it<sup>40</sup> – «to resuscitate it»<sup>41</sup> – through the filter of globalization<sup>42</sup> theory. The form taken by the debate through the vivid pages of the journal *Archaeological Dialogues* has been particularly fruitful. Although admitting both that the terminological impasse that hides behind the 'Romanization' / Romanization quarrel, and that at time postcolonial approaches transformed in anti-colonial ones, Woolf<sup>43</sup> rejects the idea of signing up to a Romanization 2.0 model; whether one signs up to it or not, Versluys' suggestion to look at Romanization as «to creatively discuss what we mean when we say "Rome"», across boundaries set by disciplines or scholarly

---

<sup>37</sup> TRAINA 2006, p. 152.

<sup>38</sup> SAID 1993.

<sup>39</sup> GARDNER, HERRING, LOMAS 2013, p. 6.

<sup>40</sup> SLOFSTRA 2002.

<sup>41</sup> VAN DOMMELEN 2014.

<sup>42</sup> PITT, VERSLUYS 2014; See GARDNER 2013, and VERSLUYS 2014 *contra* Gardner for opposite visions on globalization.

<sup>43</sup> WOOLF 2014.

traditions»<sup>44</sup> is certainly a productive one, if one holds a proper archaeological – or philological – attitude towards the word. Moreover, it is crucial to embody in the discussion, on one hand, different scholarly traditions of other countries and, on the other, the literary and political contexts that inspired the ideas of the first user of Romanization, Theodor Mommsen. The next two sections will deal with these two aims, starting from showing how *Romanizzazione* developed elsewhere in Europe, with main focus on Italy.

#### 4. ROMANIZZAZIONE

##### 4.1. *Romanizzazione, romanização, romanization: the multiple forms of one European paradigm*

The debate on Romanization in the Mediterranean countries of Southern Europe developed differently than in Britain. It was meant essentially to cover one scope: accounting for the widely observed increasing homogeneity of Roman-period material culture<sup>45</sup>.

*Romanização*, in Portugal, was until recently still used to define a very unidirectional process of Roman acculturation over indigenous peoples<sup>46</sup>, whose violent and coercive side was often underlined by scholars as a basic and granted component of the process<sup>47</sup> (; Portugal's trend today leaves more room for the interpretation of *romanização* outside a military imposition and is increasingly seen against the background of the globalization theoretical framework<sup>48</sup>.

---

<sup>44</sup> VERSLUYS 2014, p. 6.

<sup>45</sup> LE ROUX 2004, p. 93.

<sup>46</sup> SORIA 2013, p. 713.

<sup>47</sup> FABIÃO 2001, p. 110.

<sup>48</sup> SORIA 2013, p. 713.

*Romanization* is generally used in French scholarship in both historiographical and archaeological research, alternatively either as an analytical tool or as an historical process: often, it is dealt with consciously as an interpretative tool with its pitfalls and specific research questions, whereas some others it is considered as an historically documented fact. Its use, though, always occurs with full consciousness of its partiality and awareness of the conceptual problems that it implies<sup>49</sup>. Today, Romanization is being tested against the archaeological evidence filtered through the magnifying lens of the postcolonial perspective in France too<sup>50</sup>. Particularly interesting is **Yvon Thébert's** 1970s' work on Romanisation and colonialism, recently recovered by Dumasy<sup>51</sup>, who underlined how Thébert's questions stayed unanswered. Dumasy refers particularly to Thébert's statement that Romanization – of Africa, in the specific case – cannot be considered a phenomenon that follows the military conquest<sup>52</sup>, in contrast with what sustained Bénabou, who instead framed Romanization as a consequence of the coercion of the people of a region – of Africa – from a dominant one – Rome - looking for the mechanisms that determined the passage from one another<sup>53</sup>. In a period of growing interest of ancient historians and archaeologists in the methods used by historians of modern colonialism, Thébert opposed that the cultural distance – *fossé* – separating the peoples that were put in contact during the modern colonialism – i.e. British Empire and Indians, or French Empire and North Africans – did not at all characterise the relationships between ancient Rome and Africa,

---

<sup>49</sup> JANNIARD, TRAINA 2006.

<sup>50</sup> i.e. LAMOINE 2009.

<sup>51</sup> DUMASY 2005.

<sup>52</sup> THEBERT 1978, p. 76.

<sup>53</sup> BENABOU 1976, p. 31.

based on the firm idea that ancient societies did not possess the physical means to control and manage a vast empire in a simply authoritarian fashion<sup>54</sup>. Instead, he based his investigation of the Roman-period cultural encounter in the provinces on what he believed to be the most original aspect of the roman Empire: the class agreement, which is the association of the roman *nobilitas* with the local elites<sup>56</sup>. So he suggested that to progress with a decolonization of African history, scholarship needs go beyond the mechanical application of the concept of resistance, that created an automatically monolithic opposition between Romans and locals, to return to a more fluid idea of the Mediterranean world where cultural and power-related contacts pre-existed Roman conquest. Applying a Marxist framework to Romanization, Thébert stated that if there was a resistance in Africa during the roman times, it was not directed against an imported culture, but rather its essential character was the attitude of Africans hostile to a political and social mutation whose essential agents were African as well and that, at cultural level, took the shape of an intensification of relationships with the Mediterranean world: this was, for Thébert, the shape of Romanization. As seen above with Millett, Dumasy remarks that the historiography debate on antiquity does not ignore at all what happens in the present, but rather it is used to investigate it further<sup>57</sup>. This attention for the intertwining of past and present agendas is used as an invite to

---

<sup>54</sup> THEBERT 1978, p. 76.

<sup>55</sup> My translation of the original « *Ce fossé ne caractérise pas les rapports entre Rome et Afrique et est au sein même de la ou des sociétés africaines il faut chercher essentiel des explications sur les formes prises par la romanisation Les sociétés antiques ne possèdent pas les moyens de contrôler et gérer un vaste empire de façon purement autoritaire* ».

<sup>56</sup> THEBERT 1978, p. 77.

<sup>57</sup> DUMASY 2005, p. 57.

investigate the Roman-period past with critical awareness<sup>58</sup>: methodologically, this is done through different research paths, such as focusing on micro-stories and on a smaller regional level than usual<sup>59</sup>.

Similar changes have occurred in other European countries too, especially within German<sup>60</sup> and Spanish scholarships<sup>61</sup>. In the 1990s' *Diccionario del Mundo Antiguo*, Fernandez and Vazquez defined Romanization as a social and cultural phenomenon that, far from existing in the shape of cultural uniformity, was adapted to the local environments, resulting in remarkable differences<sup>62</sup>. This definition is structured as a statement able to oppose monolithic trends to define a homogenous Spain in the Roman times, for political purposes in the present. The historically more influential definition of Romanization related to the Spanish provinces, is Vigil's one, who intended it not as a simple imitation of the more aesthetic shapes of culture, but as a deep change in the social and economic structures of the region<sup>63</sup>. The scholars part of the debate had to make explicit reference to the political discourse, as some political ideologists appropriated the term Romanization to claim a historical uniformity of Spain as part of its destiny to a united modern country<sup>64</sup>. Alicia Jimenez has recently discussed the interactions between the original debate on Romanization of Spain and postcolonial theories. Not far from what explored above concerning France and Africa, Jimenez warned

---

<sup>58</sup> LE ROUX 2004.

<sup>59</sup> VAN OSSELL 2009.

<sup>60</sup> SCHÖRNER 2005.

<sup>61</sup> VIGIL 1986.

<sup>62</sup> FERNANDEZ, VAZQUEZ 1994, p. 498.

<sup>63</sup> VIGIL 1963, p. 136.

<sup>64</sup> BARBERO, VIGIL 1978, p. 20.

against possible drawbacks of a postcolonial interpretation of Spanish provinces if essentialist models to native culture are applied, highlighting that «the use of binary terms such as conqueror:conquered, Roman:native or domination:resistance in our analysis of the local culture of the *Baetica* province – at the time a territory under Roman control for two hundred years – are fundamentally flawed»<sup>65</sup>. The interesting side of postcolonialism that Jimenez underline is that such a binary use of cultural encounter that has developed in historical and archaeological scholarship has never been endorsed by the early postcolonial scholars from which the subaltern studies originated, such as Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhabha. Jimenez reminds that even Spivak herself pointed out that essentialist ideas on natives as untouched entities reproduce a sheer European fantasy about European origins through a nostalgic image of an uncontaminated culture, individuated in the creation of the culture of the Other<sup>66</sup>. The pattern seen for English and French scholarships is represented in Spain too: Romanization is at first widely applied, secondly harshly criticised and reacted against, and then redefined together with an attempt to re-set – or re-understand – postcolonial tools.

*Romanizzazione* was – and still is – used in Italy to describe the change which the Provinces underwent during and after the abduction of their territories by Rome. Most archaeologists agree that the «Romanization of Italy is the very unequal level of development found in the territories inhabited by peoples speaking Italic languages»<sup>67</sup>. Being so widely applied

---

<sup>65</sup> JIMENEZ 2008, p. 24.

<sup>66</sup> SPIVAK 1988.

<sup>67</sup> TORELLI 1995, p. 2.

by Italian scholarship, it is relevant to notice if Romanization is declined in different ways or if it is used consistently. Some examples from Italian scholarship can illustrate this.

The cycle of lectures in Roman archaeology (2008-2009) held by Lo Cascio at *Università La Sapienza*, Rome, discussed 'the characteristics of the Imperial Roman model, the key points of the modern debate on Romanization, integration and homogenisation, Romanization as self-Romanization, persistence of different cultures within the Empire.'<sup>68</sup> The lectures deal with *Romanizzazione* as an acculturation process, either imposed from top down (homogenisation) or spontaneously adopted (self-Romanization), from which phenomena of resistance arose.

Rinaldi Tufi (2000) employs the word *romanizzazione* at the outset of his influential *Archeologia delle Province Romane*, mainly to account for the transformation of cities: the monumental changes of material culture in architecture and urban planning are taken as unmistakable traces of *Romanizzazione*.<sup>69</sup> This type of *Romanizzazione* is aesthetically oriented, and focuses on those social classes who had the power to manage the urban structure as a whole or to contribute greatly to it.

Desideri, for a change, deals with *Romanizzazione* not as much aesthetically, but as a phenomenon that changed the social values of civil society as a whole. He states with emphasis that it was «perhaps the greatest phenomenon in the history of human civilization, of reduction of a set of peoples submitted with the power, to a political unity and cultural

---

<sup>68</sup>[http://scienzeumanistiche.uniroma1.it/guide/vs\\_moduli\\_orario\\_2007\\_8b.aspID\\_modulo=272](http://scienzeumanistiche.uniroma1.it/guide/vs_moduli_orario_2007_8b.aspID_modulo=272).

<sup>69</sup> RINALDI TUFİ 2000.

homogeneity»<sup>70</sup>. Such framework does not leave much room for a discussion on *Romanizzazione* as a paradigm: it supports it ideologically as a phenomenon to which values of human progress are attached, flattening the contribution to human choice and creativity to social change that archaeology and history are meant to look for. These examples show how different agendas involving *Romanizzazione* within Italian scholarship are.

#### **4.2 *Romanizzazione* and Romanization between Risorgimento and postcolonialism: a top-down model.**

Compared to the lengthy and detailed debate faced by British scholarship over the concept of Romanization, the one that involved Italian academia has been less fired. Nevertheless, some important reflections come from Torelli, whose focus on Romanization is twofold: on one hand it is centred on material culture and, on the other, on an assessment of the history of Italian scholarship. For Torelli (1995: 1), «the study of material culture (...) provides a detailed picture of the main transformations which occurred in the production process.»<sup>71</sup> He qualifies *Romanization* as a process of acculturation, calling for attributing to archaeological evidence the capacity to reflect historical reality, structures and ideologies. This view is, so far, not very different from the views of Vigil, Millett, Gardner, Mattingly, who, despite having different attitudes towards it, all agree on Romanization being an acculturation paradigm. On top of this, Torelli adds a detail that has not been accounted for enough so far and brings his vision closer to Thébert's social complexity seen above: he argues that the mid-90s state-of-the-art of material culture studies «provide[ed] an overall view of

---

<sup>70</sup> DESIDERI 1991, p. 577.

<sup>71</sup> TORELLI 1995, p. 1.

the ruling classes»<sup>72</sup> . While many archaeologists stopped at the Romans-locals divide when dealing with identity<sup>73</sup>, Torelli set up the early Romanization of Italy around a scenario of class-struggle, where the economic development and agricultural production acquire a central role, going beyond the ethnic dualism overemphasised by some uses of postcolonial theories in Britain and France (see above). Of course, the Roman/Local divide in Britain was fed by the vast geographical distance of the island from Rome. However, early contrasts between the emergent city of Rome and the peoples of the Italian peninsular that fought against subjugation concerned Italy too (i.e. the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC Samnite wars).

Torelli holds that the Romans/Locals contrast of much historiography reflects also a matter of a political and academic divide between two parties and relative priorities. These are, on the one hand, the scholars of the indigenous world, mainly archaeologists – ‘*Italicists*’ – who concentrate on local cultures before the impact of Rome on them; on the other are the scholars of the Roman world, usually historians, who focus on the political and military dominion of Rome over other peoples. As a consequence, the *Essays on the Cultural Formation of Italy*, the Romanization of Italy is described systematically as the problem of denied history:

«The young Italian liberal middle class tended to identify itself with the pre-Roman peoples (...). They deliberately put the Greek presence and contribution into the shade and pointed to the Romans, frequently guilty of outright genocide, as being responsible for the tragic decline of their regions, of their peoples, and of the civil life of Italy itself. The Risorgimento,

---

<sup>72</sup> TORELLI 1995, p. 1.

<sup>73</sup> GARDNER 2005, p. 27.

for patriots such as Andrea Lombardi, meant the rescue from a decadence begun with the Roman conquest.»<sup>74</sup>.

This passage shows that the judgment around the ethical values held by the Roman Empire that has characterised the debate in Britain over the last 40 years, has somehow regarded Italy, though with less theoretical awareness, during the Risorgimento that led to the unification of the country. Of course, the Italian<sup>75</sup> debate between the first and the third quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century did not – and could not – have the shape of a structured academic debate as the postcolonial-driven in Britain; nonetheless, it is noteworthy that such a critical discourse developed in Italy at around the same time – mid to end of 19<sup>th</sup> century – of its first formulation in Germany by Theodor Mommsen.

Despite brought about in different historical periods, both Italian and British scholarships reflected on the concept of Empire looking at the past, showing that there is a common ground on which the debates can join. Despite not many, there have been also some explicit efforts to liaise explicitly British and Italian academia on the matter. One example is quite paradigmatic: commenting on Woolf's critique of Romanization as too wide a concept, unable to cover the cultural and ethnic variety it deals with<sup>76</sup>, Lo Cascio <sup>77</sup> invites us to investigate the causes for such variety. He questions whether this unfinished cultural standardisation is either a sign of respect for – and acceptance of – diversity met in the provinces by Roman authorities, of their inability to promote approval uniformly in the

---

<sup>74</sup> TORELLI 1999, p. 1.

<sup>75</sup> TORELLI 2010, p. 168.

<sup>76</sup> WOOLF 1998.

<sup>77</sup> LO CASCIO 1999.

provincial territories, or rather of the lack of interest by the Empire in achieving a wide homogenisation of cultures<sup>78</sup> (Lo Cascio, 1999: 163). These points are worth investigating in depth when it comes to the organizational strategies adopted by Roman imperialism. However, Woolf's and Lo Cascio's arguments seem to address two different levels of the debate. Where Woolf engages critically with the definition of Romanization as a problematic – and sometimes frustrating – cognitive tool, Lo Cascio assesses Romanization as a potentially faulty imperial strategy. The British scholar refers to a paradigm developed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century that he finds to have become with time a fallacious tool to explain the Roman world he investigates, whereas Lo Cascio, picking up from Woolf, refers to it as an historical phenomenon and as the result of the inefficacy – or lack of will – of Rome in subduing all populations it conquered.

Despite this theoretical discrepancy, there are points of contact between Romanization and Romanizzazione. The most evident, recognised by both Millett's and Torelli's discourses, is that the framework through which Romanization is understood sees Rome imposing its cultural values in a top-down scheme, for which local elites were the fundamental agent (if not the only party with agency and power).

From these accounts results that one piece of archaeological evidence is agreed by both British and Italian scholarships as the foundation of Romanization: «the adoption of Roman material culture»<sup>79</sup>, which highlights a common tangible ground on which to base interpretations of the past.

---

<sup>78</sup> LO CASCIO 1999, p. 163.

<sup>79</sup> VAN DOMMELEN 2001, p. 71.

Whether one looks at it from Britain, from Italy, or from other scholarships of the Roman world around the globe, from a traditional perspective or a postcolonial one, with a revival attitude or with a hyper-critical one, the Romanization paradigm tends to highlight uniformity while leaving most scholars feelings that some other relevant elements has been left one. For this reason, this paper adopts a rhizomatic analysis of the subject, introducing further data in the picture, not linked to each other in a hierarchical fashion. Such data are seemingly far from Romanization as a historical/archaeological tool, both geographically, chronologically, and thematically. However, they are deemed here to have been potentially very influential in the its formations- After getting back to the roots of Romanization in Britain, with Haverfield as the archetype, and in Italy, with the Risorgimento values as the prime, we need now to reach the third, and oldest root – to dig the potential bottom layer of our excavation – represented by 19<sup>th</sup> century literary and political backgrounds of Europe and, particularly, of Germany, where Romanization was forged by renown historian Theodor Mommsen. This will help, at the end, to perceive what elements are generally neglected in dealing with Romanization, and will help noticing if this oversight is intrinsic to the nature of the paradigm itself, or if it was generated through time and use. This is what the next sections are going to deal with.

## **5. ROMANIZATION AND ITS ORIGINAL CONTEXT.**

### **5.1 Romanization's origins 1/2: 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe between realism and nationalisms.**

German scholar and politician Theodor Mommsen is generally regarded as the first scholar ever to have worked on Romanization.

The second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Mommsen worked, is a period of important social, artistic, and political changes in Europe. All European nations acquired different shapes than before; economic growth went to the highest rate; consequently, the criticism of Industrial revolution and capitalism became central to many scholars. At that time, Karl Marx wrote *The Capital*, published in 1867, and the *Theses on Feuerbach*, in 1888: from their pages, the German philosopher did not only interpret the world in relation to the means of production, but also aimed to change it in the attempt to see the rights of the exploited proletariat preserved. The category of **the humble ones**, those with no other power beyond their manual job, the tool to make a living, stood at the centre of much of 19<sup>th</sup> century literature and arts that go under the name of **Realism**. Triggered by philosophical ideas from Enlightenment, realism in literature was declined in different ways by authors experiencing diverse European national realities<sup>80</sup>. Being Romanization a product of that same contemporary society, it is worth to expose this cultural stream a bit further by exploring any potential links between the two.

In terms of style, realism aimed at depicting society as it was, in an **unadorned prose** and almost in an impersonal manner, ideally making the author disappear from the matter described. In terms of object of interest, despite all focusing on the details for everyday life, lauding «the honest portrayal of ordinary life»<sup>81</sup>, realist writers focused on different groups of people and exposed different aims whether we look at them in England,

---

<sup>80</sup> WHITE 2014.

<sup>81</sup> BYERLY 1997, p. 2.

Russia, Italy, France, or Germany. This depended on what segments of ordinary life and what social connections were at the centre of their focus.

The Russians, especially Dostoyevsky, focused on the poor people, their economic problems, their power relationships with the members of the upper class that made their life conditions restrictive. The murderous thoughts about his landlady, the greedy usurer Alëna Ivànovna, that agitate Rodja, the protagonist of *Crime and Punishment* (1866), represent a fitting example.

In France, the movement – later named *Naturalism* – focused on the same social issues, by highlighting the poor proletariat in the urban centres of production and commerce. Emile Zola, who worked himself in the customs office of the Docks in Paris, witnessing what poet and journalist Edmond Texier called the real misery of the suffering working class<sup>82</sup>, described with plenty of details the hard life and repulsive conditions that workers had to endure. French realism had faith in overcoming such injustice – i.e. in *Germinal*<sup>83</sup>, set-up to a brighter social spring from the title onwards – promoting the study of these social phenomena with the aim to master and change them<sup>84</sup> (Zola, 1880: 75). Describing that reality was for Naturalists one step towards change: allowing humble people to gain better health and economic conditions.

Italian *Verismo* focused on the humble classes too, though showing much less faith in future progress and in overcoming that economic structure: failure, and not success, was for most Italian realist writers the only possible outcome of poor people's attempts to overcome struggle. The loss of the

---

<sup>82</sup> TEXIER 1859.

<sup>83</sup> ZOLA 1855.

<sup>84</sup> ZOLA 1880, p. 75.

load of 'lupini' that Padron Toni wanted to sell in Verga's *I Malavoglia*, following the drowning of the ship named *Providenza* (Destiny), is symbolic of such attitude. Despite the lack of faith in change, it is clear the programmatic intent to focus on the struggle for the material needs of the poor classes as a mission<sup>85</sup>.

These national interpretations of realism have in common the interest for the working class and for the idea that people are the products of their historical, social, and family background: "I am still a Karamazov", "he will always be a Karamazov", is repeatedly said throughout Dostoyevsky's book by its protagonist Alyosha about himself and his family. Meaning that his destiny was in his name and his family.

English writers focused more on the struggle of bourgeoisie against the old aristocracy of the Victorian age, with the illustrious exception of Charles Dickens, who described the social inequalities and poor conditions in which the workers of London sunk, though whether he did it for a real interest in critiquing society or for a descriptive literary purpose is debated (as will be highlighted below).

German realism seems closer to English Realism and distant from the rest of Europe, as it switched its realist eye on a soft representation of bourgeoisie's daily experience, neglecting its relationships with the rest of society, especially workers. Its main realist threads are a metropolitan one, representing the various social classes, putting at the core the aristocracy and bourgeoisie with their contradictions and problems; and a poetic realism – or countryside realism – where the members of small bourgeoisie are resigned and disillusioned people (feeling known as *Biedermeier*),

---

<sup>85</sup> VERGA 2006 [1881], p. 15.

pleased with the small achievements of their daily lives, who move against the background of idyllic countryside landscapes, isolated in small villas surrounded by gardens, far from the cities and their social issues<sup>86</sup>. An example of these embellished realities are Stifter's analysis of the laws of nature in his *Stones of Many Colours*<sup>87</sup> and the disillusion for a reality that never matches the ideal expectations of men, in *Indian Summers*<sup>88</sup>. In these streams, there seems to be no intention of convinced social criticism as registered in France, Russia, Italy.

Realist literature, must also be noted, developed everywhere in Europe alongside national identity models. The latter were often based on an interpretation of the past used to feed political ideas that could reinforce and legitimate the then consolidating national structures<sup>89</sup>. Romanization originated within such national political and social contexts of Europe<sup>90</sup>. The analysis of the political debates held in Germany in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, presented in the next section, follows the reminder that the study of the past cannot be isolated from the context of the present<sup>91</sup>.

Everywhere in late 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe, the Roman Empire was looked at, as a model for understanding the interaction of people from different places, associating «a sense of subjectivity and cultural integration»<sup>92</sup>. For this reason, it is key to be as specific as possible when approaching its origin: Romanization was the product of the intellectual environment of mid-19<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> WELLBERY 2005; KINDL 2001.

<sup>87</sup> STIFTER 1853.

<sup>88</sup> STIFTER 1857.

<sup>89</sup> DIAZ ANDREU 2007.

<sup>90</sup> MILLETT 2012, p. 31.

<sup>91</sup> HINGLEY 2005, p. 5.

<sup>92</sup> BENTON, FEAR 2003, p. 268.

century Germany, with its poetic realism that looked with interest at the bourgeoisie against aristocrats, and where, in the aftermath of the Congress of Vienna, nationalist ideas were gaining popularity. But there is a further aspect that needs entering this rhizomatic account of Romanization: its creator was himself a reference for politics, history, and literature in Germany and Europe, and as such he was influenced back by those intertwining fields.

### **5.2 Romanization's origins 1/2: 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe between realism and nationalisms.**

Theodor Mommsen was an historian of international fame. His work was deemed so influential for Europe that he was bestowed the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1902 for his *A History of Rome*, published first in 1854. After defending a doctoral thesis in Roman Law at the University of Kiel, Mommsen produced a vast number of books and papers whose focus is primarily, but not exclusively, Roman History. These include volumes of the famous *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, and a *History of Rome* in five volumes (the first three published in 1854, the fourth never published, and the fifth published in 1885): in its last volume, dedicated to the Roman Provinces, the Romanization paradigm is sketched for the first time.

There is another activity that, although prominent in Mommsen's life, is rarely taken into account when his historical models are looked at with an historiographical perspective: politics. Mommsen held several relevant political roles at national level. First, he was chosen as a delegate of the Prussian *Landtag* – parliament – twice: the first time between 1863 and 1869, and the second between 1873 and 1879; subsequently, he acted as a delegate of the *Reichstag* – the German parliament – between 1881 and 1884 (right

before his *History of Rome's* 5<sup>th</sup> volume was published). This results in a 21-years long period of intense political activity during which Mommsen had been asked to manage a severe social issue afflicting 19<sup>th</sup> century multicultural Germany: the insurgence of anti-Semitic feelings.

Many historians and politicians were, back then, expressing their opinion regarding anti-Semitism. Mommsen, who was officially given the task to handle this turmoil, had to express himself on the matter several times by both articulating his thought in German press to influence the public opinion and suggesting potential solutions to the government. In 1879, the Prussian Yearbooks had published an article by his fellow historian and politician Heinrich von Treitschke containing numerous anti-Semitic remarks that invited to discrimination. Treitschke – embodying a diffused and growing feeling all over Germany – saw Jewish culture and people as a threat to Germany's unity and hence expected them to 'become Germans (...) for we do not want to see millennia of Germanic morality followed by an era of German-Jewish hybrid culture'.

Mommsen replied back publically and took the chance to pin down an official position of the government through the pamphlet *Another Word About Our Jews*<sup>93</sup>, where he calls for tolerance towards the Jews and, in strong opposition to Treitschke, underlines their great contribution to the development of the German Empire, as that of other minorities. However, Mommsen also conceded to the accusatory that Jewish communities were perceived at the time, with some reason, as a people living in segregation. For that reason, Mommsen invited the Jews who lived in Germany at the

---

<sup>93</sup> MOMMSEN 1881.

time «to abandon their separateness»<sup>94</sup> . By doing so, while inviting the public to tolerance and acceptance at all costs, somehow Mommsen argued that the route towards the solution of anti-Semitism had to involve also a voluntary cultural assimilation of Jewish communities to the rest of Germany: they had to «make up their minds and tear down all barriers between themselves and their German compatriots»<sup>95</sup>. For this to happen, Jews could make an effort to give up at least some of their special customs, being their «duty to do away with their particularities»<sup>96</sup>, only that way being able to better integrate within the rest of Europe.<sup>97</sup>

The solution proposed by Mommsen consists in, first, inviting to tolerance the whole Germany, and second hinting at the idea that some cultural specificities of the Jewish minority were in the way of a united Germany. From the way Mommsen handled this issue emerges an idea of cultural integration based on the acceptance of diversity but only to some extent, and at one condition: the surrender of the most diverse and peculiar aspects of one's culture, for the sake of a larger, culturally-uniform, majority. The model that Mommsen proposed for 19<sup>th</sup> century Germany pursued homogenization through subtraction of diversity.

The political background of 19<sup>th</sup> century Germany and Mommsen's political model of cultural integration are significant for the archaeological interpretation of the Roman Empire that he supported. His *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*<sup>98</sup> are fundamentally based on the concept that Rome never applied a consistently aggressive policy of expansion, an attitude that, for

---

<sup>94</sup> GRAETZ 2013.

<sup>95</sup> GRAETZ 2013, p. 'Mommsen, Theodor'.

<sup>96</sup> GRAETZ 2013, p. 'Mommsen, Theodor'.

<sup>97</sup> 'Prof. Mommsen and the Jews', *The New York Times* 8 January 1881.

<sup>98</sup> MOMMSEN 1885.

Mommsen, led the people in the provinces towards «a largely acquiescent acceptance of Roman rule»<sup>99</sup>. The main effect of this acceptance is enclosed by Mommsen in the concept of Romanization, which is the degree to which people in the provinces integrated within the Roman cultural and political framework. The material signs of such integration were individuated by Mommsen particularly in the inscriptions, disseminated throughout the Empire, that he used to understand and quantify the degree of penetration of Roman civilization in the western provinces. Having in mind the political model of 19<sup>th</sup> century Germany can help us adding a further element to our understanding of Romanization as a paradigm of tolerance – acceptance of minorities – and cultural integration. Mommsen’s focus being on institutions and their communication through inscriptions, it would be hard to see anything else beyond the way the elites structured the provinces.

## **6. ROMANIZATION, AGENCY, AND IDENTITY BEYOND MORAL JUDGEMENT: WHAT FUTURE?**

This paper analysed the main threads of Romanization in Italian and British scholarships, finally exploring the background of 19<sup>th</sup> century Germany, where the paradigm originated. These research threads, at a first glance very far from each other, hold some common turning points that, if explored in depth, promise a high research potential.

The multiple elements exposed in a rhizomatic way in the previous paragraphs, should now be looked at in relation with one another. These are the postcolonial critique of Romanization, the heterogeneous uses of

---

<sup>99</sup> FREEMAN 1997, p. 32.

Romanization, the numerous trends of literary Realism in Europe, the political backgrounds.

Section 5a flagged that, although realism was one of the most followed streams within the European literary context, not all national academic approaches articulated it the same way: while writers in France, Italy, USSR, Britain (partially) focused on workers' hard reality of exploitation and bad working conditions in the fields, mines and cities, writers in Germany looked at the idyllic retreats of the bourgeoisie in the countryside, at their expectations of growth and mundane reality, far from the effects of industrial revolution on the working class troubling in the cities. This literary context has particular relevance in the analysis of Romanization when one takes into account two crucial elements: first, that most post-colonial critiques were addressed to Romanization due to its tendency to focus «on the elite of the empire, and conceiving of identity in terms that are both too crude and too concrete»<sup>100</sup>; second, that the Romanization paradigm formulated by Mommsen generated a narrative based explicitly on textual evidence<sup>101</sup>, where the main objects looked at mostly «belonged to a **restricted elite-group in antiquity**»<sup>102</sup>, by which the German scholar (and many others after him) assessed the penetration of Roman culture in the provinces. Seeing Romanization against the background of European literary realism shows not only what views Mommsen decided to include in his study of the Roman Empire, the elites, but also, more importantly, what he did not take into account: those people who elites were not. Clearly,

---

<sup>100</sup> HINGLEY 2005, p. 14.

<sup>101</sup> LAURENCE 2001.

<sup>102</sup> TORELLI 1999, p. 3.

Mommsen was a man of his time, and the last observation is not used here to uselessly critique his approach to the past as wrong and biased. Rather, it is meant to wrap up some conclusions related to the aim of the paper, which is critically comparing the different upshots that the paradigm had in different national academic contexts, flagging potential reasons for it. As written above, Germany's literary context is relevant in this matter as the German historian was fully inside the literature world, from which he was awarded the maximum accolade, the 1903 Nobel Prize. From this perspective, Mommsen's Romanization is certainly closer to the Magic realism of Germany than to the realism of Zola, Verga, Dostoevskji. But this is not enough: a man of his time, a man of literature of his time, who was bestowed such an internationally recognised tribute, was 100% knowledgeable of the realist movements in Italy, France, and elsewhere, and we must then consider that he did not find their social enquiry useful for his interpretation of the world, both in the past and in the present.

Moreover, section 5b yielded another relevant component that likely had a role in shaping Romanization: Mommsen's involvement in the anti-Semitic debate functional to the development of Germany's national unity. Section 5b flagged the conceptual proximity between Mommsen's Romanization model of cultural integration and the 19<sup>th</sup> century model he proposed for an integration of Germany's Jews: both models are based on the acceptance of minorities within a centralized state that expands its territories into wider regions, and both models spin around one condition that was deemed essential by Mommsen: that the most evident cultural diversities were abdicated for the sake of a widely accepted 'institutionalised' identity. This aspect is not disconnected to Mommsen's

inclination towards the elites of the Roman empire: if Hingley has drawn attention to the fact that Romanization conceives of identity in too crude terms <sup>103</sup> the reason is the search for homogenizing characters to lay the paradigm's foundations. The justification is of course that there was no trace of such paradigm before Mommsen, and that all that was taken into account during the 19<sup>th</sup> century was still Winckelmann's model of the supremacy of Greek art and civilization compared to the decadence of the Roman empire. Hence, Mommsen found a way to create a more homogeneous knowledge of what was back then an admired model for the political dominion of the Empire, but also a neglected period of the history from the point of view of the material culture. To do so he had to leave something behind, and what he left behind is that large majority of the population that did not leave specifically willing signs – mostly written – to the future generations.

This considered, it shall not surprise that most archaeologists who approached the Roman world through postcolonial theories find Romanization to be a limiting paradigm to answer the questions that have more recently arisen: Romanization was an inevitable beginning in order to give a shape, for the first time, to a big amount of the then available historical and archaeological data – that had been collected until the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century with an antiquarian approach – through the interpretation of the written sources. Such approach has been necessary to the progress of our understanding of the roman world and was, from the outset, meant to do so through the interpretation of the materiality left by the ruling classes that built the institutional framework that supported the empire.

---

<sup>103</sup> HINGLEY 2005, p. 14.

For these reasons, it is not of much use to hold today a moral judgement towards a framework created to answer the questions of 150 years ago about a portion of the past of what not much was known beyond what reported by the works of ancient literature. Mommsen's effort was so monumental that can still be of use today, provided – though – that researchers today make an aware use of it. As flagged in the section 3a, Romanization results originally in a top-down model, of which British scholars who placed themselves along the lines of Mommsen's tradition were perfectly aware. Haverfield, despite his original intent – that later on faded away – to focus on the life of the governed rather than that of the rulers, was aware of its elites-oriented nature at the start of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; Millett kept the awareness at the end of the same century when, although successfully shifting attention to the natives – presented now as active agents rather than passive recipients of gifts of civilization as described by Haverfield – kept focus on the ruling class; so did Wallace-Hadrill at the turn of the century, by focusing on the ability of the elites from elsewhere to communicate their cultural values. The postcolonial turn, dealt with in section 3b, certainly brought to Roman archaeology study a change of approach that has not exhausted its potential yet, provided that it undergoes further theorization: in fact, the straight application of postcolonial concepts – theorized for modern colonialism – made several theoretical issues emerge, amongst which the seemingly indestructible native-colonizer dichotomy. Certainly, some extreme ideas might need reviewing, such as the total ban of the word Romanization, accused to be carrier of indiscriminate and uniform violent coercion of people in the provinces, or the idea of substituting it with concepts like creolization:

certainly reflecting on those alternative concepts has paid off and will pay off further in the future if thoroughly theorized on the background of Roman-period material remains. But simply substituting one word, Romanization, with another, creolization, though having the latter keeping the main features of the former – as underlined by Pearce<sup>104</sup> quoted above, will not move the debate forward.

The debate on postcolonialism held especially in Britain would have benefitted greatly from an earlier explicit dialogue with the work of French scholars quoted in section 4a. Particularly to the point are Thébert's questions – provided already in the 1970s' – on the application of classical postcolonial frameworks – to which he prefers the class agreement of elites and class struggle – to the antique Mediterranean, seen the absence of the cultural distance that characterised instead peoples and lands in modern times. Those questions, still unanswered, need to be revitalised – as suggested by Dumasy<sup>105</sup> – and seen against the background of the British Romanization debate.

Section 4b highlighted the continuity of the paradigm of *Romanizzazione*, an example of which is Torelli's work, with the Romanization paradigm provided by Millett, though showing to be less problematically accepted and applied that it proved to be overseas.

This paper provided the evidence that, on one side, current interpretations of Romanization held by British and Italian scholarships share several ideas, although the distance resulting from their different historical paths; on the other hand, it provided a cultural and political

---

<sup>104</sup> PEARCE 2013, p. 3.

<sup>105</sup> DUMASY 2005.

context to bear in mind in order to accept the idea that Romanization as a paradigm with recurring interpretive limits. Those limits, result of the socio-political context in which Mommsen worked, need to be dealt with, and integrated by alternative and complementary paradigms that do not necessarily need to contrast the interpretive results offered by Romanization. Romanization and other paradigms, indeed, are not mutually exclusive. They can help to provide complementary interpretations of the Roman antiquity simply adopting different perspectives: the elites, the subalterns, the native elites, the roman elites, the roman subalterns, and so on.

The other aspect that appeared everywhere throughout the paper is the impossibility to separate the interpretation of the past from the concepts characterizing the present. It did appear in Mommsen's interpretation of the Roman empire throughout the lens of his political activity; in the sentiments of condemnation of recent colonialist attitude in postcolonial interpretation of the past; in the contrast between the preferences on past populations of the scholar of Risorgimento and of those represented by the young Italian liberal middle class. The present context is undividable between the interpretation of the past, and as such it is rather more prolific to expose it at the outset rather than hiding it. Questions that we ask to the past are often indirectly influenced – if not directly inspired – by the social issues of the present. For this reason, holding back moral judgement helps in building a constructive critique of the history of thought.

Despite Mommsen is universally acknowledged as a prominent figure in the creation of Roman History, Epigraphy, and Archaeology as modern disciplines, his methods of historical analysis were largely criticised,

especially for not discussing systematically the substance of imperialism, allowing numerous free interpretations and schools of thoughts that tried to make his original position explicit<sup>106</sup>. This earned him moral accusations by some fellow scholars not to have a clear notion of right or wrong<sup>107</sup>, as his models were seen often as a praise of the wrongdoing of the Roman Empire towards people in the provinces. At this point, it has to be remembered that much condemnation to Mommsen arrived particularly from Britain – together with praises, of course – which often manifested its concerns for Germany's international aspirations due not to a heartfelt defence of human rights and condemnation of imperial structure, but rather to the concern that it would have affected Britain's own imperialism. This second aspect intertwines with the criticisms Mommsen received for his direct involvement in political questions. Hence, judging the ethical and moral apparatus of a man that, whether we like it or not, embodied the values of 19th century Germany's upper class can lead us to a dead end if we are after useful historical information. On the contrary, leaving the moral question aside allows us to consider Mommsen's search for a solution to the Jewish question as a crucial component of his vision of humanity around multi-cultural communities and of the role of minorities within them.

Not only highlighting Mommsen's political involvement creates a visible link between the academic and political thoughts of a man who lived both spheres in continuity; it also makes explicit the fact that cultural diversity – social identity – was considered a potential problem in the view of a

---

<sup>106</sup> FREEMAN 1997, p. 30.

<sup>107</sup> FREEMAN 1873, pp. 269, 270.

unifying country that had imperial aspirations. This finding, rather than bringing further criticism to a vision of the world held 150 years ago, can instead be positively transformed in a warning sign for our present, as we also live in a European continent in which diversity is often considered an issue to future political stability and unity, and in which identity has been erroneously left in the hands of political groups that transformed it into a monolithic entity inherited from the past and used to exacerbate divisions.

For similar historical reasons, it is also understandable that, looking from close-up at the Italian and British contexts, Romanization had different fortunes after leaving Germany, as it interacted locally with specific cultural and political conditions. This made emerge surely important differences of attitude between British and Italian scholars. However, some research strings of postcolonial Roman archaeologies match some critical formulations of Romanization paradigm in Italy provided by Torelli. The latter aims to overcome the ethnic divide by shading some light on the elites-subaltern power relationships: for reaching such major aim, it is crucial to explore deeply the concepts at the roots of postcolonialism, such as those provided by Gramsci in his Notebooks and by Edward Said (referring to Gramsci) in his *Orientalism*. This theoretical effort can help us set up a new agenda and break the Romans/locals impasse often flagged both in UK and in the rest of Europe. In fact, the model proposed by Said is not simply, as has been written, that of the migrant intellectual that crosses boundaries<sup>108</sup> seeing multiculturalism everywhere: rather, it is a framework that goes explicitly against the comfort provided by single stories. Said exposed the «internal consistency of Orientalism and its ideas about the

---

<sup>108</sup> TRAINA 2006, p. 153.

Orient (the east as career) despite or beyond any correspondence, or lack thereof, with a “real” Orient.»<sup>109</sup> His aim is to make the veil of objectivity in the representation of the Orient fall down, exposing an oversimplified world, easy to dominate, and to demonstrate that the creation of a single story responds to needs of – and facilitates the – political dominion and exercise of power over the object of study. If Said’s lesson is to be learnt, eventually, the postcolonial interpretive attitude and Romanization can be used jointly to analyse the Roman provinces in relation to power, as they operate at different – complementary and necessary – levels. What power is dealt with here? It is the power of communities to reconstruct their own history, to find space in history for the fluid social identities born from their unique choices (theoretically investigated with a postcolonial approach) to deal creatively with the materiality imposed onto them by the past and flowing in their physically and culturally felt social structures that can be brought to light by an aware use of Romanization.

## REFERENCES

ARCINIEGA 1998: A. P. Arciniega, *La Aportaciòn de Marcelo Vigil al Concepto de Romanizaciòn*, in “*Romanizaciòn” y “reconquista” en la Península Ibérica: nuevas perspectivas*, Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, Salamanca 1998, pp. 141-154.

BARBERO 1978: A. Barbero, *La formaciòn del feudalismo en la Península Ibérica*, Editorial Crítica, Barcelona, 1978.

BARRETT 1997: J.C. Barrett, *Fields of discourse: reconstituting a social archaeology*, in C.G.A. Bryand and D. Jary (Eds.) *Anthony Giddens: Critical Assessments*, 4(3), Routledge, London 1997, pp. 249-261.

---

<sup>109</sup> SAID 1970, p. 5.

BENABOU 1976: M. Bénabou, *La résistance africaine à la Romanisation*, Maspero, Paris 1976.

BENITEZ-ROJO 1996: A. Benítez-Rojo, *La isla que se repite: el Caribe y la perspectiva postmoderna*, Ediciones del Norte, Paris 1996.

BENTON, FEAR 2003: C. Benton, T. Fear, *Introduction: From Rome to Buffalo*, in M. Malamud (Ed.) *Center and Periphery in the Roman World*, John Hopkins University Press, Arethusa 2003.

BHABHA 1994: H.K. Bhabha, *The Location of culture*, Routledge, London 1994.

BYERLY 1997: A. Byerly, *Realism, Representation, and the Arts in Nineteenth-Century Literature* (Vol. 12), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1887.

CHILDE 1929: V.G. Childe, *The Danube in Prehistory*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1929.

COLLINGWOOD 1932: R.G. Collingwood, *Roman Britain*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1932.

DESIDERI 1991: P. Desideri, *La romanizzazione dell'Impero*, in *Storia di Roma*, Vol. 2 (2) pp. 577-626, Einaudi, Torino 1991.

DIAZ-ANDREU 2007: M. Diaz-Andreu, *A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology: Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Past*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007.

DMITRIEV 2009: S. Dmitriev, *(Re-)constructing the Roman empire: From 'imperialism' to 'post-colonialism'. An historical approach to history and historiography*, in «Annali Della Scuola Normale Superiore Di Pisa. Classe Di Lettere E Filosofia» n.s. 5, vol. 1.1, 2009, pp. 123-164.

DUMASY 2005: F. Dumasy, *L'impérialisme, un débat manqué de l'histoire contemporaine française: Pour une relecture des travaux d'Yvon Thébert dans la perspective de la colonisation*, in «Afrique & histoire» 1.1, 2005, pp. 57-69, 2005.

FABIÃO 2001: C. Fabião, *Mundo indígena, romanos, e sociedade provincial romana: sobre a pecepção arqueológica de mudança*, in *ERA-arqueologia* 3, Julho de 2001, pp. 108-131.

FERNANDEZ, VAZQUEZ 1994: P. Fernàndez, A. Vázquez, *Diccionario del mundo antiguo*, Alianza, Madrid 1994.

FREEMAN 1873: E.A. Freeman, *Historical Essays*, Macmillan, London 1873.

FREEMAN 1993: P. Freeman, *Romanisation and Roman material culture*, in «JRA» 6, 1993, pp. 438-445.

FREEMAN 1997: P.W.M. Freeman, *Mommsen to Haverfield: the origins of studies of Romanization in late 19th-c. Britain*, in Mattingly (Ed.), *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism*, «JRA» Suppl. 1997, pp. 27-50.

FREEMAN 2014: P.W.M. Freeman, *Mommsen, Hubner, Haverfield and Watkin and CIL VII*, in «Journal of the History of Collections» 26.3, 2014, pp. 423-437.

GARDNER 2007: A. Gardner, *An archaeology of identity: soldiers and society in late Roman Britain*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek 2007.

GARDNER, HERRING, LOMAS 2013: A. Gardner, E. Herring, K. Lomas, *Creating Ethnicities and Identities in the Roman World*, Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, London 2013.

GIVEN 2004: M. Given, *The Archaeology of the Colonized*, Routledge, London 2004.

GOSDEN 2004: C. Gosden, *Archaeology and Colonialism: Cultural Contact from 5000 BC to the Present*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2004.

GRAETZ 2013: M.J. Graetz, *Mommsen, Theodor*, entry in «Jewish Virtual Library» 2013.

HINGLEY 1999: R. Hingley, *The imperial context of Romano-British studies and proposals for a new understanding of social change*, in P.P.A. Funari, R Hingley, S. Jones (Eds.), *Historical Archaeology: Back from the Edge*, *One World Achaeology*, 31, pp. 137-150.

HINGLEY 2005: R. Hingley, *Globalizing Roman culture: unity, diversity and Empire*, Routledge, London 2005.

HINGLEY 2008: R. Hingley, *The recovery of Roman Britain 1586-1906: a colony so fertile*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2008.

JANNIARD, TRAINA 2006: S. Janniard, G. Traina, *Sous le concept de «romanisation»: paradigmes historiographiques et perspectives de recherche*, in «MEFRA» 118, 2006, pp. 71–166.

JIMENEZ 2007: A. Jimenez, *A Critical Approach to the Concept of Resistance: New 'Traditional' Rituals and Objects in Funerary Contexts of Roman Baetica*, in C. Fenwick, M. Wiggins, D. Wythe (Eds.), *TRAC 2007: Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference, University College, London and Birkbeck College, University of London, 29 March-1 April 2007*, Oxbow Books, Oxford 2007, pp. 15-30.

JIMENEZ 2008: A. Jimenez, *Imagines Hibridae. Una aproximación postcolonialista al estudio de las necrópolis de la Bética*, *Anejos de AEspA*, 43, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid 2008.

JONSON 2010: M. Johnson, *Archaeological theory: an introduction*, John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey 2010.

KINDL 2001: U. Kindl, *Storia della letteratura tedesca*, Laterza, Milano 2001.

LAMOINE 2009: J. Lamoine, *Le pouvoir local en Gaule romaine*, Presses Universitaires Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand 2009.

LAURENCE 2001: R. Laurence, *Roman narratives: The writing of archaeological discourse – a view from Britain?*, in «Archaeological Dialogues» 8.2, 2001, pp. 90-101. doi:10.1017/S1380203800001902, 2001.

LE ROUX 2004 : P. Roux, *La Romanisation en question*, in «Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales» 59.2, 2004, pp. 287–311.

LO CASCIO 1999: E. Lo Cascio, *Population of Roman Italy in Town and Country*, in J. Bintliff, K. Sbonias (Eds.), *Reconstructing past population trends in Mediterranean Europe (3000 BC - AD 1800)*, Oxbow Books, Oxford 1999, pp. 161-171.

MACDONALD 1927: G. Macdonald, *Haverfield Francis John*, in H.W.C. Davies, J.R.H Weaver (Eds.), *Dictionary of National Biography. 1912-1921*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1927, pp. 244-245.

MACMULLEN 2000: R. MacMullen, *Romanization in the Time of Augustus*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2000.

MARX 2013 [1867]: K. Marx, *Capital. Volumes One and Two*. T. Griffith (Ed.), Wordsworth Editions, London 2013.

MARX 1998 [1888]: K. MARX, *Theses on Feuerbach. In The German Ideology*, Prometheus Books, New York 1998.

MATTINGLY 2011: D.J. Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity: Experiencing the Roman Empire*, Princeton University Press, Woodstock 2011.

MILLETT 1990: M. Millett, *The Romanization of Britain: an Essay in Archaeological Interpretation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990.

MILLETT 2012: M. Millett, *What is classical archaeology? Roman archaeology*, in S.E. Alcock, R. Osborne (Eds.) *Classical Archaeology*, Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, 2012, pp. 30-50.

MILLETT 2016: M. Millett, *Roman Britain since Haverfield*, in M. Millett, L. Revell, A. Moore (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Roman Britain*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2016, pp. 42-62.

MOMMSEN 2010 [1862]: T. Mommsen, *A History of Rome*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2010.

MOMMSEN 2010 [1886]: T. Mommsen, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian*, Richard Bentley, London 2010.

PELHAM 1911: H.F. Pelham, *Essays by Henry Francis Pelham*, F. Haverfield (ed.), Clarendon Press, Oxford 1911.

PITTS, VERSLUYS 2014: M. Pitts, M.J. Versluys, *Globalisation and the Roman world. World history, connectivity and material culture*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781107338920.

PREUCEL 1991: R. W Preucel, *The philosophy of archaeology*, in R. W. Preucel (ed.), *Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies: Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past*, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale 1991, pp. 17-29.

PUDDU 2020: M. Puddu, *An Archaeology of the Subalterns' Disaggregated History: Interpreting Burial Manipulations of Roman-Period Sardinia through Gramsci's Theory*, in «Theoretical Roman Archaeology Journal» 2.1, 2020, pp. 1–22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.16995/traj.373>

- SAID 2003 [1978]: E.W. SAID, *Orientalism*, Penguin Books, London 2003.
- SLOFSTRA 2002: J. Slofstra, *Batavians and Romans on the Lower Rhine: the Romanisation of a frontier area*, in «Archaeological Dialogues» 9.1, 2002, pp. 16-38. DOI: 10.1017/S1380203800002014, 2002.
- SEBAÏ 2005 : M. Sebaï, *La romanisation en Afrique, retour sur un débat: La résistance africaine : une approche libératrice ?* in «Afrique & histoire» 1.1,2005, pp. 39-56.
- SORIA 2013: V. Soria, *O conceito de " romanização" e o panorama académico português*, in J. Arnaud; A. Martins; C. Neves (eds.), *Arqueologia em Portugal-150 Anos*, Associação dos Arqueólogos Portugueses, Lisboa, pp. 711-716.
- SPIVAK 1999: G.C. Spivak, *A critique of postcolonial reason*, Harvard University Press, Harvard 1999.
- STIFTER 1853: A. Stifter, *Motley Stones (Bunte Stein)*, NYRB Books, New York 2021.
- STIFTER 1999 [1857]: A. Stifter, *Indian Summers. A Tale*, Peter Lang Publishing, New York 1999.
- STOCKHAMMER 2012: P.W. Stockhammer, *Conceptualizing cultural hybridization in archaeology*, in P.W. Stockhammer (ed.), *Conceptualizing Cultural Hybridization*, Springer, Berlin 2012, pp. 43-58.
- STUART JONES 1920: H. Stuart-Jones, *Fresh Light on Roman Bureaucracy, An Inaugural Lecture*, Oxford 1920.
- TEXIER 1859: E. Texier, *Le Siecle. Revue Hebdomadaire*, Lundi 14 Février 1859, 1859.
- THEBERT 1978 : Y. Thébert, « Romanisation et déromanisation en Afrique : histoire décolonisée ou histoire inversée ? », *Annales ESC*, 33, p. 64-82, 1978.
- TORELLI 1995: M. Torelli, *Studies in the romanization of Italy*, The University of Alberta Press, Edmonton 1995.
- TORELLI 1999: M. Torelli, *Tota Italia: essays in the cultural formation of Roman Italy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1999.

TRAINA 2006: A. Traina, *Romanizzazione, "Métissages", ibridità: alcune riflessioni*, in «MEFRA» 118,1, 2006, pp. 151-158.

TREITSCHKE 1958 [1879]: H. von Treitschke, *A Word About our Jewry* The University of Michigan, Michigan 1958.

TRIGGER 1989: B. Trigger, *A history of archaeological thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1989.

VAN DOMMELEN 2001: P. van Dommelen, *Beyond domination and resistance. Colonial culture and local identities in classical Sardinia*. *American Journal of Archaeology*. 105(2), p. 253, 2001.

VAN DOMMELEN 2014: P. Van Dommelen, *Fetishizing the Romans*. «Archaeological Dialogues» 21.1, 2014, pp. 41-45. DOI:10.1017/S1380203814000075

VAN OYEN 2015: A. Van Oyen, *Deconstructing and reassembling the Romanization debate through the lens of postcolonial theory: from global to local and back?*, in «Terra Incognita» 5, 2015, pp. 205-226.

VERGA 1881: G. Verga. *I Malavoglia*, Treves, Milano 1881.

VERSLUYS 2014: M.J. Versluys, *Globalisation and the Roman world: perspectives and opportunities*, in M. Pitts, M.J. Versluys (eds.) *Globalisation and the Roman world. World history, connectivity and material culture*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2014. DOI:10.1017/S1380203814000038.

VIGIL 1963: M. Vigil, *Romanización y permanencia de estructuras sociales indígenas en la España septentrional*, in A. Prieto (ed.), *Conflictos y estructuras sociales en la Hispania Antigua*, Akal, Madrid 1963.

WALLACE HADRILL 1998: A. Wallace Hadrill, *To be Roman, go Greek. Thoughts on hellenization at Rome*, in M. Austin et al. (eds.), *Modus Operandi. Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Rickman*, Institute of Classical Studies, London 1998, pp. 79-91.

WEBSTER 2001: J. Webster, *Creolizing the Roman provinces*, in «AJA» 105.2, 2001, pp. 209-225.

WEBSTER AND COOPER 1996: J. Webster, N.J Cooper, *Roman Imperialism: Postcolonial Perspectives. Proceedings of a Symposium held at the University of*

Leicester, School of Archaeological Studies, University of Leicester, Leicester 1996.

WELLBERY 2005: D. Wellbery, *A New History of German Literature*, Harvard University Press, Harvard 2005.

WHITE 2014: H. White, *Metahistory: The historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 2014.

WOOLF 2014: G. Woolf, *Romanization 2.0 and its alternatives*, in«*Archaeological Dialogues*» 21.1, 2014, pp. 45-50. DOI:10.1017/S1380203814000087.

WOOLF 1998: G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman. The origins of provincial civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1998.

ZOLA 1880: E. Zola, *Roman Experimental*, Ligaran 1880.