[Work in progress for Getty Seminar, not for publication.]

Response to Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, 'Pompeii, Between Oscan, Samnite, Greek, Roman, and Punic', and Ann Kuttner, 'Shouting at the World and One Another: Punes, Latins, and Hellenism as an International (Visual) Language'

Emma Dench

Traditionally, classical philology, ancient history and art history, with their different but to some extent overlapping disciplinary histories, have revolved around particular (and often mutually exclusive) linguistic and cultural poles ('Greek', 'Latin', 'Etruscan'), or political agents (Athens, or the city of Rome), with only the debased muddle of 'Hellenistic' history and culture to complicate things at all. Outside the grand, classical centres, other peoples featured only to be conquered, to be the victims or beneficiaries of Greek culture or Roman power. Fossils of this past remain, particularly in some of the ways in which we still organize our field and our curricula. But these two papers are eloquent examples of how much life has changed, and of the opportunities at the interfaces of disciplines and cultures, not least when we give material culture the attention it deserves.

If 'Hellenistic' history always admitted less monolithic cultural entities, the term itself and the assumptions that lay behind it suggested a very particular fusion of 'Greek' and 'Oriental' elements that are particularly unhelpful when we consider the western Mediterranean world of our two papers, as Andrew Wallace-Hadrill [AW-H] points out. Studies of ethnic and cultural identity in the ancient world have done much to destabilize the notion that 'Greek' culture (for example) is something that is self-evident and fixed in time or by geography or descent. They have also done much to make us hesitate before colluding in (certain) ancient value systems and cultural hierarchies, to speak of the

'barbarization' of artistic production at the interface between Greek *poleis* and local communities in south Italy, for example.

For a whole number of reasons, which include the informed questioning of disciplinary divisions, we are welcoming the opportunity to be thrown off-centre, as it were, and to view antiquity and its interactions from alternative perspectives, as do the two rich papers of AW-H and Ann Kuttner [AK]. AW-H's absorbing snapshots of two ages of Pompeii, once profoundly misunderstood, show just how much we lose in conventional impulses to make the 'coming of Rome' (narrowly understood in time) the sole pivot. We are encouraged to appreciate not only the complex cultural texture of a Pompeii that engages with numerous interfaces that include 'Etruscan', 'Oscan' and 'Punic' as well as 'Greek' and 'Roman', with different emphases at different times, but also the multiple actors and agents who made 'Roman' cultures. Thus, the Pompeiians are no longer idle recipients of Roman culture, suffering the 'cultural provincialism' of which Paul Zanker once accused them, but, as active participants in and material beneficiaries of Roman campaigns in the eastern Greek world, agents of their own updated cultural plan.

AK's 'Punes' of the late fourth to second centuries BCE step out from the shadows, their traditional status as inevitably a 'loser culture', overlooked perhaps partly because of our persistent Hellenomania (one indication of the traditionally literary bias of our field), and claim centre-stage, as imperial agents appropriating with confidence and in distinctive modes the cultural motifs of power and success, a more than fair competitor of Rome, and not just her evil twin, bound to die. For 'Punes' appear also as influential intellectuals and cultural models, perhaps even for the monument that is the epitome of

Roman imperial self-advertisement for the mastery of the world, the *Res Gestae* of the Emperor Augustus.

I'm struck by both the practical obstacles that can present themselves, and the will to get around them. AW-H evokes the combination of elements that have encouraged and allowed him and others to dig deeper (literally): the openness in recent years of the archaeological authorities at Pompeii to national and international teams and/but constrictions of space, with the result that the only place to go is down. The happy result is that Pompeii is quickly becoming much more than a Roman Everytown with a fuzzy 'preRoman' past. AK's 'Punes' of the 'Hellenistic' age are as yet much less visible in the material record, overlooked by Punic specialists seeking something more 'genuinely' Punic, their towns rejuvenated, built up and built over in subsequent eras. This issue of peoples who have fallen between the cracks of scholarly attention because their culture very obviously cannot be labeled <u>either</u> one thing <u>or</u> another (and, for that matter, which people's culture can? But I am getting ahead of myself…) is an interesting one. I am reminded to some extent of Jonathan Williams' peoples of Republican northern Italy, no longer prehistoric enough for the prehistorians and not yet Roman enough for the Romanists ('Roman Intentions and Romanization: Republican Northern Italy', in S. Keay and N. Terrenato (eds.), Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization (2001), 91-101). Such monoliths remain deeply entrenched in our training and expertise, but I find it exciting to see the multiplication of perspectives in the study of the west as in the study of the east, where the boundaries and certainties of 'Greek history' are also gradually being eroded.

The obstacles facing AK once again turn into opportunities in her hands, and her 'excavation' of literary texts recreates monuments from textual descriptions (the statue of Alexander at the sanctuary of Melkart/Hercules at Cadiz; the altar of Hannibal and his *res gestae* at the temple of Hera Lakinia/Juno Lacinia at Croton on the coast of south Italy, a city that revolted against Roman rule in the Hannibalic War), as any art historian worth his or her salt has long been doing for 'Greek' or 'Roman' statues or monuments described by Pliny the Elder (as she points out). She presses through the comments of modern commentators, dismissive of 'Hellenized Punic' culture (as alternatively too Punic or not Punic enough), reads what is actually there, and builds a Punic perspective.

I'm curious to juxtapose the different ways in which our two speakers' subjects characterize themselves, and indeed how far they do this at all. AW-H's Pompeiians don't seem to dwell on questions of who they are in 'ethnic' terms, to put it simplistically. The evidence is eloquent on engagement with multiple cultures at any one time, on multiple fronts, but once we have (quite rightly, it seems to me) stopped insisting that Pompeii is <u>either</u> an Etruscan <u>or</u> a Greek town, as if we were doing a multiple-choice exam, the cultural (and ethnic?) entities all remain outside, and we struggle to find either an 'ethnic' term to describe the Pompeiians themselves. Are we to describe them as 'Oscan', the generic ancient term used by ancient authors to describe many of the peoples of the hinterland of central and southern Italy, who, according to Strabo, 'used to possess' Pompeii? Are we to call them 'local', our studiedly neutral term that often stands for 'non-Greek'? Or 'Samnite'? It depends how one interprets the intriguing address label Pape Sa(vfi): are 'Samnites' in here or out there, are some of us/them Samnites, or are we/they all Samnites? Or is it best to stick with 'Pompeiian', and to see a sort of

characteristically Pompeiian stamp on the cultural appropriations? And is there a sort of sliding scale between smaller entities of this kind and larger ones, such as 'Etruscan': does the 'Etruscan' monolith break down once we take the perspective of an individual town in the 'Etruscan' heartland? Or is quite a large swathe of central Italy peculiar in the intensity of its engagement with numerous different cultures?

AK's 'Punes' seem much more sure of themselves as an international people with distinctive cultural traits. When engaging with other cultural models, they put their stamp on them, whether that means Elissa aka Dido in suitably (modern) 'Phoenician' headgear, 'ethnic' hairstyle and perhaps even 'ethnic' physiognomy in a statue famous enough to be referenced on Punic/Sicilian coinage of the late fourth century, or Tanit marked out in the mosaic floors of otherwise generic 'Greek' houses on Delos and in Sicily, or the unmistakable show of Punic in bilingual inscriptions. These 'Punes' draw in and command other cultures and their artists, an indication of their metropolitan centrality.

I'm wondering about the distance between Pompeiians and 'Punes' in this respect. Should we think about it partly in terms of scale and projected audience, harder to see the micro-region of Pompeii making a statement about being (or rather doing) Pompeiian in anything like the same way as the international network of 'Punes', or more precisely the imperializing Carthaginians? Doing Pompeiian is a subtle process that is apparent at each cultural appropriation and adaptation and especially in the juxtapositions of these, whether considered synchronically or diachronically. It is tempting to imagine local versions of the sort of history that Strabo tells, rationalized and sequential ethnic

narratives that tell of the particularity and peculiarity of the Pompeiians (and of course subject to variation and shifts of emphasis).

One often wonders about the degree to which people and culture correspond. AK's 'Punes' seem quite aloof in this respect: they hire in Greek craftsmen for their finest statues and monuments, and turn only at the last moment (in the Second Punic War) to portraiture, and then only in restricted contexts. AW-H's Pompeiians are in this respect much more elusive, more truly assimilative, making their own version of a 'Greek' grid layout for their archaic city, writing and/or receiving Oscan in an Etruscan script on a scrap of an Attic pot. How confident are we, and how confident can we be, about who is making and/or commissioning/making decisions about material culture? This still seems to me to be one of the most delicate sets of questions that we face.

I'm also wondering whether the appropriation of cultural motifs always has an 'ethnic' label on it, or whether an 'ethnic' label is always uppermost. AK sees a divide between Greek preoccupations with the boundaries of Greekness and everyone else's perceptions of the Greek language (cultural as well as spoken and written) as a fundamentally inclusive means of self-expression that has little or nothing to do with going or playing (let alone wanting to be) Greek. The prestige of Greekness is assuredly present, but has become a luxury brand rather than a label with 'ethnic' associations, on the analogy of a Gucci bag or a Mercedes car.

I find this a fascinating and provocative argument, particularly for those of us who have been interested in Roman or Jewish varieties of (and sometimes anxieties about) 'going Greek', in (say) the third to first centuries BCE. There is of course a Latin and

Greek vocabulary of 'going Greek', and a few very interesting but very different contexts within which this terminology is used with different associations in each case. And I think that many of us are persuaded that 'going Greek' is with rare exceptions not at all the same as 'wanting to be Greek', and that it certainly doesn't necessarily entail Hellenophilia. But do we sometimes go too far in reading a strong 'ethnic' charge into all appropriations? I'm thinking, for example, of the intriguing 'Punic' *cocciopesto* flooring of AW-H's second snapshot of Pompeii, and its association with bathing. Does the familiarity of the adopted form take over at some point, and its 'ethnic' associations diminish, as in the case of verandahs or pyjamas/pajamas? Alternatively, thinking more about Gucci bags and Mercedes-Benz cars, I'm wondering also if they are devoid of 'ethnic' charge (interpreted according to context), and whether the very names carry somewhere within them the power of different 'ethnic' associations (in e.g. Anglo-American culture, of Italian fashion-sense and German engineering?), which might be more or less dominant in different contexts?