On colonial grounds: a comparative study of colonialism and rural settlement in first millennium BC west central Sardinia

Dommelen, P.A.R. van

Citation

Dommelen, P. A. R. van. (1998, April 23). *On colonial grounds:: a comparative study of colonialism and rural settlement in first millennium BC west central Sardinia*. *Archaeological Studies Leiden University*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13156

Version: Corrected Publisher’s Version

License: Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden

Downloaded from: https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13156

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

2 Conceptualizing colonialism.
Mediterranean archaeology and the study of colonialism

> *For the enterprise of empire depends upon the idea of having an empire, as Conrad so powerfully seems to have realized, and all kinds of preparations are made for it within a culture; then in turn imperialism acquires a kind of coherence, a set of experiences, and a presence of ruler and ruled alike within the culture.*
>
> Edward W. Said, Imperialism and Culture (1993), 11

2.1 Studying Colonialism

Colonialism is a theme with a long-standing tradition in Mediterranean archaeology. Since the earliest days of Classical archaeology, the Greek settlements in southern Italy and Sicily which were already labelled as colonies (ἀποικίαι) by (near-)contemporary Classical authors have been at the heart of it. Archaeologically, these often very large sites clearly stand out in these regions as fundamentally different from neighbouring Italic settlements. As a consequence, they represent the best known and most widely studied instance of colonialism in the Mediterranean (cf. Snodgrass 1988, 57). The name *Magna Graecia* for the southern part of the Italian mainland was even derived from this colonial presence. Other colonial movements, both earlier and later, include the Phoenician colonization of the entire Mediterranean Sea, Carthaginian domination in the western Mediterranean basin, the Hellenistic conquest of western Asia and the Roman occupation of North Africa.

Notwithstanding the attention accorded to colonial phenomena in Classical and Mediterranean archaeology, the notion of colonialism as such has hardly received any attention; significantly, the term ‘colonialism’ itself is generally avoided and preference is given to its active counterpart ‘colonization’, which suggests a stronger interest in the actual movement of people and goods than in the ways in which the resulting colonial situations were maintained.[1] The habitual specification of the term as ‘Greek colonization’, ‘Phoenician colonization’ etc. furthermore denotes a particularist point of view which avoids the political overtones of the word ‘colonialism’. Since archaeologists in general have shown little interest in colonial issues, there is a marked contrast with anthropology, where a more or less coherent body of studies has been developed which can be referred to as an ‘anthropology of colonialism’ (Stoler 1989, 134).

At the basis of this work in anthropology lies an increased awareness of the sometimes close involvement of anthropologists and their discipline in colonial as well as neo-colonial situations (Asad 1973; Stocking 1991; cf. Pels 1997). Apparently, such an understanding is virtually absent in (Mediterranean) archaeology.

A lack of attention for the notion of colonialism and a general disregard of the relationships between archaeological representations of and modern attitudes towards colonialism do not mean, of course, that the Western colonial experience is irrelevant for an understanding of colonial settlement in Antiquity. Classical archaeology in particular developed as a product of 19th century Western society and was given shape and substance as a discipline in close accordance with then prevailing concepts and ideas of Western origins and superiority; the crucial role attributed to the Mediterranean and Classical Antiquity in the formation of Western and Christian society in these views was particularly important (Morris 1994, 14; Shanks 1996, 53). Considering the prominent place of colonialism in Western society during precisely the 19th and 20th centuries and its influence on contemporary literature and ethnography (e.g. Said 1993), the impact of these ideas on the study of ancient colonialism is likely to have been considerable -and may to some extent still be; it certainly needs to be assessed (Trigger 1989, 110).

Before turning to Mediterranean archaeology proper, however, I shall first review the definitions and terms in which colonialism is commonly discussed in anthropology and history. In the second part of this section I shall then sketch the lines along which this chapter has been organized in order to construct the perspectives from which I intend to examine the entanglements of archaeology and colonialism in the Mediterranean.

2.1.1 THE NOTION OF COLONIALISM

Colonialism is a notion that has seldom been defined in any precise sense. A closely related term is ‘imperialism’ which is often used in discussions of modern Western presence in Africa and Asia and which regularly appears in studies of the Roman occupation of the Mediterranean and north-western Europe. Both terms are frequently used interchangeably and are assumed to be more or less self-evident as if referring to an unproblematic historical phenomenon. From the usages made of the term 'colonialism' a number of recurrent and presumably crucial features can nevertheless be distinguished (e.g. Horvath 1972; cf. Prochaska 1990, 6; Webster 1996a, 5). Basically, two aspects are regarded as fundamental of colonial situations: the first one regards the presence of one or more groups of foreign people in a region at some distance of their place of origin (the 'colonizers'). The second aspect is the existence of asymmetrical socio-economic relationships of political domination or economic exploitation between the colonizing groups and the inhabitants of the colonized region. The establishment of one or more clearly distinct and often separate settlements in which (the majority of) the colonizers live, is a recurring feature of colonial situations but not an indispensable or fundamental one.

In those cases where no new and separate colonial settlements are established, existing settlements in the region may instead be transformed to house the colonizing groups (cf. Abu-Lughod 1980, 95). Many studies of (early) modern colonialism therefore tend to attribute less importance to the foundation of colonies (Prochaska 1990, 11).

Although these two aspects of colonialism are invariably assumed to be present in colonial situations and to represent the most essential features of colonialism, they hardly add up to a clear-cut representation of colonial situations. The term 'colonial situation' can actually be used for contexts as divergent as those where large numbers of migrants settle in the colonized region and take possession of the land, transforming it after the example of their country of origin, and those situations where colonial presence is limited to a small trading post and relationships with the colonized region are almost exclusively economic, and not necessarily exploitative. These two extremes are referred to as 'settler colonialism' and 'commercial colonialism' respectively (cf. Prochaska 1990, 7). In either case, however, colonialism can broadly be defined as the process of establishing and maintaining a colonizing group and their dominant or exploitative relationships with the colonized region and its inhabitants. Needless to say, divergent underlying colonial intentions as well as different local responses all contribute to the variability of colonial situations.

Imperialism can best be considered a specific case of colonialism. In most studies, it is simply described as a colonial situation 'without significant numbers of permanent settlers in the colony from the colonizing power' (Horvath 1972, 47). A similar definition of imperialism appears to have been intended by stressing aspects of domination and exploitation without any mention of colonial settlements (Garnsey/Whittaker 1978, 1). Generally, imperialism refers to sustaining an empire, which has been defined as 'a relationship, formal or informal, in which one state controls the effective political sovereignty of another political society' (Doyle 1986, 45). This view does not, however, imply any fundamental discrepancy between colonialism and imperialism; the resemblance between the two notions is nicely demonstrated by the interchangeable use of the terms with regard to e.g. the British presence in India, which is referred to in both terms (cf. Cohn 1983). Yet, the use of the term imperialism appears to be far from haphazard, as it is largely restricted to late nineteenth and early twentieth century colonial situations (such as British India). Imperialism can therefore be characterized as a particular manifestation of colonialism defined by the specific historical circumstances of 19th century capitalism in the age of industrialization and Victorian political ideology (Ferro 1994, 13; Thomas 1994, 9; cf. Wolf 1982, 299). The contrast with previous pre- and early modern versions of colonialism is consequently a considerable one, which means that in order to avoid confusion the term imperialism should not be used with regard to pre-19th century situations (Doyle 1986, 141). In this study of the ancient Mediterranean, I shall therefore consistently use the term 'colonialism' in the broad sense outlined above and specify it whenever necessary with reference to particular colonial situations.

Such a generic use of the term, however, should not be taken as a suggestion that colonialism was monolithic or unchanging through history. Whilst the term 'colonialism' applies to numerous moments of world history that share the characteristics described above, it should not imply any direct or simple parallelism between colonial situations in e.g. Archaic Greece and Dutch Indonesia. As has been pointed out elsewhere and as I shall also attempt to show in this study, colonialism is fundamentally historical: it is therefore

> tempting but wrong to ascribe either intentionality or systematicity to a congeries of activities and a conjunction of outcomes that, though related and at times coordinated, were usually diffuse, disorganized and even contradictory.
>
> Dirks 1992, 7

Not only can important discrepancies be discerned between Renaissance colonialism and modern paradigms of power, a fundamental discontinuity can also be observed between colonial situations in Antiquity and in the early modern period (Thomas 1994, 3; cf. Wolf 1982, 101). While the inherent historicity of colonial situations may preclude attempts to define colonialism in any strict sense, it does not, however, detract from the validity of comparative approaches to particular colonial situations. Such an approach does not imply the search for simple or direct parallelisms between ancient and modern colonial situations but rather aims at a close and detailed survey of both similarities and discrepancies of such situations. It is for these reasons that I want to use the term 'colonialism' in the loosely defined sense recounted above:

it represents a means of bringing together three moments in Sardinian history which rooted in very different historical circumstances but which yet shared a number of characteristics that provide a basis for comparison. Confronting these colonial situations with each other as well as with other instances of colonialism which were more remote in place and time can offer useful insights into specific problems.

2.1.2. PARTIAL TEXTS

Turning to archaeology and the Mediterranean in the first millennium BC, the implicit assumptions underlying the notion of colonialism must similarly be laid bare through a survey and analysis of the particular uses of the concept, as explicit definitions are absent. The absence of a comprehensive concept of colonialism in Mediterranean archaeology has nevertheless not prevented archaeologists from discussing and comparing various instances of 'colonization'. Generally speaking, colonialism is most readily associated with the Archaic Greek colonization of southern Italy and Sicily. To a lesser but increasing degree, Phoenician colonization has also come to be understood as part of ancient Mediterranean colonialism. Greek and Phoenician colonization are also often compared as related -presumably because of their proximity in time and place- but yet distinct processes (see e.g. Niemeyer 1990). This debate is characterized by a strong particularizing approach, that is probably best illustrated by the abundant use of supposedly 'original' or 'emic' terms such as ἀποικία and ἐμπόριον for referring to settler colonies and trading settlements respectively. Roman colonialism is on the contrary usually dealt with as a distinct phenomenon under the conventional heading of 'imperialism'. The use of this term in Roman contexts is primarily motivated by the association with the Latin term *imperium* and does not *per se* imply an historical relationship with 19th century and modern imperialism (see however below, pp. 18-19). In line with the above discussion of the concepts of imperialism and colonialism, however, I shall refrain from using this term with reference to Roman expansion and consistently speak of Roman colonialism (cf. Webster 1996a, 2). This is all the more appropriate because the Roman Empire falls outside the period under consideration in this study.

Anthropological and historical work on more recent forms of colonialism has unequivocally demonstrated the intricate entanglements between Western colonial experiences since the 15th century AD and Western academic as well as popular representations of colonial situations (e.g. Said 1993). Because Bruce Trigger has convincingly argued that the same holds true for archaeology in general (Trigger 1984), the next section of this chapter is entirely dedicated to a detailed scrutiny of the partial nature of archaeological texts on ancient colonialism in the Mediterranean (cf. Van Dommelen 1997a, 306). Since ancient colonialism played a primary part in the dissemination of Classical culture, I shall not only examine the interconnections between archaeological representations of ancient colonialism and Western colonial undertakings in the Mediterranean and elsewhere but I shall also look into the consequences of Western notions of origin and superiority for the ways and terms in which interactions between colonial Classical culture and the indigenous peoples of the western Mediterranean have been represented in Classical and Mediterranean archaeology. I have borrowed the designation of 'partial texts' for these accounts from Nicholas Thomas's discussion of Pacific colonial historiography and conventional Western academic representations, which he contrasts with the Pacific islanders' points of view (Thomas 1990; cf. Thomas 1991, 83). Although explicit indigenous participants' views are beyond the reach of (Mediterranean) archaeologists and historians alike, the Pacific 'partial texts' not only serve as a useful eye-opener but may also help evaluating and understanding non-Western or even anti-Western historical representations (see e.g. Mattingly 1996, 57).

In the third section of this chapter I shall proceed to examine colonial situations from an anthropological point of view in order to find a nuanced and theoretically grounded perspective for studying colonialism without falling back into the biases of colonialist and related ethno-centrist perspectives. Drawing on recent insights and arguments developed in anthropology and cultural studies in particular, I shall discuss various alternative approaches to colonial situations and issues of domination and resistance in general. These may be grouped together under the general heading of 'postcolonial' perspectives on colonial situations (cf. Van Dommelen 1997a, 308). In the final section of this chapter I shall draw these two strands together and propose the outlines of an alternative approach to ancient colonialism in Mediterranean archaeology which I shall adopt in this study. In line with the arguments of the third section this point of view might therefore be termed a postcolonial archaeology.

2.2 Colonialism and Archaeology in the Mediterranean

Despite the abundant documentary evidence on numerous aspects of the ancient Mediterranean, which mentions the establishment of Greek and Phoenician settlements across the entire region, ancient colonialism has primarily been studied by archaeologists. The rich archaeological record of many of these colonial foundations offered eminent opportunities for doing so. Because of the heavy reliance on Greek and Latin historical accounts of Classical archaeology in general (cf. Snodgrass 1988, 36), archaeological representations have nevertheless strongly been influenced by the available written evidence. In the absence of indigenous documentary sources, ancient colonial situations have practically exclusively been described from the Greek or Roman, i.e. colonial point of view. A traditionally strong focus on Classical architecture and ceramic fine wares and a concomitant unfamiliarity with indigenous pottery have at the same time long prevented Mediterranean archaeology to redress the uneven literary balance. As a consequence, most archaeological and historical work on Greek and Roman colonialism can in many ways be characterized as 'partial texts'. The colonial preference of Mediterranean archaeology cannot entirely be ascribed to a lack of written sources, however, as show the cases of Phoenician and Carthaginian colonialism: having for a long time entirely been disregarded, possibly due to the absence of substantial written evidence, recent archaeological research of Phoenician colonialism is characterized by an equally strong colonial point of view (see below, p. 23). The extant literary evidence must moreover not necessarily be understood in colonialist terms, as recent alternative readings suggest (e.g. Dougherty 1993).

In this section I explore the background of these preferences and the related implicit assumptions underlying archaeological representations of ancient colonialism in the Mediterranean. By and large, two fundamental tenets can be pointed out in archaeological studies of ancient Mediterranean colonialism which have been dominant in (Mediterranean) archaeological discourse for some time and which to a varying extent can still be detected in recent work. These may be characterized as 'colonialist representations' and 'dualist conceptions' of colonialism. They are discussed in the first two parts of this section. Since an exhaustive analysis would exceed the scope of this study, I have limited discussion to the major publications. In the final part of this section I shall subsequently relate these points of view of Mediterranean archaeology to wider assumptions about the role of colonialism and the dissemination of Classical culture in the ancient Mediterranean.

2.2.1 COLONIALIST REPRESENTATIONS OF ANCIENT COLONIALISM

The first feature apparent in much archaeological work on ancient colonialism is a more or less explicit *colonialist* representation of it: this was most explicit during the heydays of Western colonialism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century when ancient colonialism was explicitly compared with contemporary imperialism. The aim of these archaeological and historical studies was both to learn from history how colonial empires could be maintained and to celebrate contemporary imperialism. British and French archaeologists in particular were quick to point out similarities between the colonial possessions of their own countries and the Roman world: for the historian Lord Cromer, studying the history of imperial Rome yielded 'facts or commentaries gleaned from ancient times which might be of service to the modern empire of which we are so justly proud' (cited in Brunt 1965, 267). For French archaeologists and historians, the parallel between Roman imperial rule and their own colonial possessions was still more obvious in North Africa, where the French regarded themselves as successors to Roman authority (cf. Mattingly 1996, 50):

> We can therefore without fear and despite the numerous shortcomings, which we should not ignore, compare our occupation of Algeria and Tunisia to that of the same African provinces by the Romans: as they, we have gloriously conquered the land, as they, we have assured the occupation, as they, we try to transform it to our own image and to win it for civilization.[2]
>
> Cagnat 1913, 776

No doubt encouraged by the shared christianity of the 4th century Roman and 20th century French rulers in North Africa, more than a millennium of Islamic history has been glossed over in much (French) archaeological and historical work (Thébert 1978, 65): in colonial Bône (modern Annaba in eastern Algeria) for instance, the nearby ancient city of *Hippo Regius*, Saint Augustine's episcopal seat, was frequently referred to by the local colonial authorities in an attempt to suggest a historically continuous relationship between the two cities and the Roman and French colonial authorities (Prochaska 1990, 212). The impact and widespread acceptance of the equation is tellingly demonstrated by the explicit comparisons of the French colonial army in Algeria and Tunisia with the Roman *exercitus Africae* and of the similarities between the tactics (*ense et aratro*, 'with sword and plough') employed by both as well as by the active role played by army officials in the recording of inscriptions and the restauration of monuments. As a consequence of this involvement, military interpretations have long dominated Roman North Africa, such as the representation of the southern *limes* being guarded by Roman soldier-farmers and the general characterization of rural sites as *fortins* (Mattingly 1996, 53, 60). The only difference emphasized was the greater success of the French who succeeded where the Romans had failed, as with the 'pacification' of Kabylia (Dondin-Payre 1991, 146).

As a result, colonial situations in Antiquity were one-sidedly represented from a colonialist point of view and the ancient colonized were regarded in much the same way as the contemporary 'natives' in North Africa and India were treated. It was a widely accepted point of view that the latter were

> ... unoriginal and appear to have had little capacity for self-development. It is doubtful even if they had remained untouched by foreign influence if they would have evolved any advanced political or social organization.
>
> Broughton 1929, 6

Although only Roman colonialism was appreciated as a direct example for modern imperialism (hence the confusion of terms), similar explicit identifications can also be found with regard to the Greek colonization of South Italy and Siciliy: in the foreword to his influential study *The western Greeks* Dunbabin clearly had his own contemporary British (upper-class) society in mind, when he described the Greeks as 'a pleasure-loving people, sportsmen and athletes, and fond of good cheer' and explicitly compared the situation of the Sicilian Greeks to that of 20th century whites in Australia and New Zealand (Dunbabin 1948, vi).

While the direct comparison of contemporary and ancient colonialism disappeared with the demise of the French and British empires after Word War II, colonialist-inspired representations of colonial situations persisted much longer, albeit in a somewhat more mitigated form. In the revised 1980 edition of his often-cited *The Greeks overseas*, for instance, Boardman wrote about the relationships between colonizing Greeks and colonized Italic peoples that '... in most places the Greeks and Sicles got on well enough, even if only in the relationships of master and slave' (Boardman 1980, 190). He expressed his colonialist perspective still more clearly by concluding that 'the natives weighted their new prosperity, brought by the Greeks, against the sites and land they had lost to them, and were generally satisfied' (Boardman 1980, 198). Such explicit and over-simplified remarks have become rare over the last decades. Yet, it is not surprising to still find numerous reminiscences of a colonial perspective after a century of colonialist-inspired studies. While each of these can individually still frequently be encountered today, Boardman's judgement is exceptional because it combines a number of these assumptions.

The most important feature of the colonial legacy in Western society probably is a one-sided preoccupation with the colonizers' part: even important recent publications on both Greek and Phoenician colonialism (e.g. Aubet 1993; Ridgway 1992) focus exclusively on Greeks and Phoenicians and their fortunes abroad. The regions where they settled and the inhabitants of those regions with whom they dealt are conspicuously absent in these studies. This has for instance resulted in studies of Phoenician and Punic colonial settlement in Sardinia which virtually ignore the indigenous 'Nuragic' inhabitants in the interior of the island; another case in point is Greek (Mycenaean) presence in coastal Syria which is only related to other Greek settlements in the Levant and the Aegean and not to its Syrian hinterland.

Another conspicuous inheritance of colonialist thinking in the West is the association of colonization, whether Greek, Phoenician or Roman, with 'civilization': this assumption clearly underlies Boardman's observation (above) about the 'Italic natives' who were 'generally satisfied' with the loss of their lands because of the 'new prosperity' received in return. The kernel is the apparently unsurpassable value and desirable nature ascribed to the 'new prosperity', which is the newly acquired colonial Greek culture. The equation of 'civilization' and 'colonization' has even more explicitly been made by Morel, who defined 'the two meanings of the word colonization ... [as] the subjection and the "civilizing" of the natives as well as the act of founding colonies' (Morel 1984, 124). Such notions of colonialism as a 'civilizing mission' are quite close to the views of a *mission civilisatrice* upheld by Western 19th and 20th century colonizers, and which their contemporary archaeologists and historians had already attributed to Greeks and Romans (Sheldon 1982, 103; cf. Corbey 1989, 81). There is, however, no unambiguous evidence of such attitudes in ancient colonialism, which was inspired by and represented in entirely different terms. Greek colonialism in southern Italy for instance is primarily represented by the literary sources in terms of the relationships of the colonizers with their mother city (Dougherty 1993, 15). Their dealings with the indigenous inhabitants of Sicily and southern Italy are never directly reported but instead represented in mythical and metaphorical terms and in these accounts notions of nature and culture only played an indirect role to conceptualize the differences between the Greeks, who were part of the οἰκουμένη ('inhabited world') and the Italians who obviously belonged to another world (Malkin 1987, 1). Yet, the marriage metaphor which was frequently used to depict the first contacts with the Italic inhabitants of southern Italy and Sicily powerfully demonstrates that there are no indications that these representations should be understood as including an urge to civilize the colonized indigenous inhabitants of these regions (Dougherty 1993, 61). The Roman ideology of *humanitas* and the ideal of *romanitas* which were constructed in the early Principate under Augustus perhaps came closest to 19th and 20th century notions of civilization and the need to help the indigenous inhabitants of the non-Western world (Webster 1996b; Woolf 1995, 15; cf. Bazelmans 1996, 35; Corbey 1989, 81). Yet, the urge to disseminate these ideals among the uncivilized barbarians was much less prominent and these ideals only became a dominant ideology *after* Roman expansion had been achieved.

These colonialist ideas have moreover been nourished by evolutionist assumptions about culture. Usually cast in terms of civilization versus barbarism, they evidently hark back to 19th century concepts which presumably entered archaeological thinking as part of the colonialist legacy. Evolutionist overtones can be discerned in most, if not all, colonialist representations as discussed above. Emblematic in this respect is Beazly's explicit reminder that

> In the West the peoples with whom the Greeks came into contact were at a more primitive stage of development than they themselves; in the East, for a long time and in many respects, the position was the reverse.
>
> Beazley, foreword to Dunbabin 1957

The so often asserted ‘Greek superiority’ (e.g. Boardman 1980, 7) has usually provided the starting point for studying a colonial situation, assuming that the colonized peoples, whether Italic or others, were uncivilized, or at least culturally inferior, and that they could only benefit from participating in the superior Greek civilization — which would eventually result in Western culture. As a consequence, the nature of the relationships between colonizing groups and the regions and peoples colonized are rarely examined and virtually never questioned, resulting in an unbalanced conception of colonial situations.

2.2.2 DUALIST CONCEPTIONS OF ANCIENT COLONIALISM

Although this outline of archaeological approaches to colonial situations applies to most studies, including recent work, reactions have never been entirely absent. A first critical reaction developed in the wake of the French decolonization of North Africa and focused on what probably is the principal ‘blind spot’ of archaeological studies of colonialism, viz. the failure to consider the colonized region and its inhabitants. A landmark in this critique is constituted by the work of two Algerian scholars: Abdallah Laroui’s *L’histoire du Maghreb, un essai de synthèse* (1970) transformed the colonialist representation of North African history into one of a continuous indigenous struggle against foreign oppression and consistently played down the Roman contribution. Marcel Bénabou has taken the issue further in *La résistance africaine à la romanisation* (1976) by elaborating the notion of resistance in other than purely military terms. He has motivated the strong emphasis on the role of the local or indigenous North African population in the colonial situation of Roman Africa by stating that the Roman domination of North Africa

> ... is not simply an episode, among many others, of the history of Roman imperialism; it is also first and foremost a moment of particular importance in the history of the indigenous population of North Africa.[3]
>
> Bénabou 1976, 15

Both Laroui and Bénabou (as well as various others: see Mattingly/Hitchner 1995, 170) have firmly sided themselves with the local population by taking ‘resistance’ as a central feature of the study of Roman North Africa. The notion of ‘resistance’ is of importance to set this perspective apart from studies of ‘native revolts’ in the Roman empire (e.g. Dyson 1975): as argued by Bénabou in particular, ‘resistance’ is not restricted to armed struggle; nor should it be seen negatively as the incapacity or reluctance to accept Roman authority and culture. Instead, resistance is defined as a threefold concept

> firstly, in the military domain, as a combat reaction against foreign occupation; then in the political domain, as a conservative movement opposing innovation and change; finally, in the psychological domain, as an attempt to protect part of one’s personality against the influence of others.[4]
>
> Bénabou 1976, 17

Resistance can thus be used as a means to adopt ‘a twofold view of the single reality of North Africa’ (Bénabou 1976, 18), which means that the indigenous part in the colonial situation is stressed and juxtaposed to the colonialist (Roman) one. Effectively, Bénabou presents ‘resistance’ as an attitude which may be as competitive and pervasive as colonial domination. It is therefore central to the fundamental ‘opening up’ of the colonial situation beyond the colonial sphere. The impact of this critique on studies of Roman colonialism has remained extremely limited, however, and the few reactions of Western archaeologists and historians have been excessively harsh. Not surprisingly, perhaps, the indigenous population is still largely ignored in the archaeology and history of the Maghreb, and resistance is still often merely regarded as the absence of a positive response to Roman culture (cf. Mattingly/Hitchner 1995, 169).

A similar widening of perspective in studies of Greek and Phoenician colonization is either from a much later date in the case of the former or still lacking with the latter. For the archaeology of Greek colonization, it was stated in an important review of studies of Greek colonization in Italy that ‘today we are witnessing a change in the longlived and excessive tendency to consider the natives only as passive and receptive elements’ (Morel 1984, 132). In 1985 the World Congress of Classical Archaeology was devoted to the theme of *Greek colonists and native populations* under which title it was published in 1990 (Descoeudres 1990a).[5] Although many papers still focus one-sidedly on Greek colonies with neglect of the local (indigenous) context (e.g. Bencivenga Trillmich 1990), a change in attitude and perspective is nevertheless present. The remark that ‘... “primitive” is not an adjective that I would willingly apply today to the Italian Iron Age’ (Ridgway 1990, 62, referring to Beazley’s foreword to Dunbabin 1957) is a clear case in point. The explicit aim of the conference to discuss ‘the relations between colonizers and colonized’ (Descoeudres 1990b, 3) instead of taking these for granted represents an indisputable change of perspective. The state of Phoenician colonial studies is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that the one paper included in the same conference proceedings (Niemeyer 1990) exclusively deals with Phoenician colonial matters and hardly mentions any ‘native populations’.

The reaction to colonialist and evolutionist perspectives by foregrounding the indigenous inhabitants of colonized regions has created the second fundamental characteristic of archaeological approaches to colonialism: underlying most, if not all, archaeological studies of colonialism is a *dualist conception* of colonial situations as essentially being made up of two opposed sides -colonizers and colonized- and as being fundamentally determined by the divide between these two. As a consequence, colonial situations tend to be reduced to a relatively simple binary opposition between colonizers and colonized. Colonial dualism can accordingly be defined as 'the tendency to portray the making of colonial society in terms of two distinct cultural and social entities standing in a relationship of opposition and conflict' (Pels 1993, 10). An important presupposition is that both colonizers and colonized make up homogeneous and autonomous communities without contradictions or internal conflicts of interest and that they remain relatively stable over time (Stoler 1989). It thus sustains the use of indistinctive terms such as 'the Roman army', 'the Greeks' or 'the Phoenicians' which sweep over differences between e.g. the various Greek and Phoenician city-states in a similar way as British and Dutch colonizers in India and Indonesia have been conflated as 'white dominance' (Stoler 1989, 135). Such a static and narrow view effectively reduces colonialism to a mere confrontation between two independent and separate cultures, in which the colonizing one often inevitably, in an almost 'natural' way, prevails over the colonized 'native' one. As a consequence, it is usually an accepted *assumption* that colonizers impose their culture on the colonized. It also means that the nature and intensity of the relationships between the colonizers and the colonized generally provide the point of departure for studying a colonial society rather than that these relationships themselves are the object of study (cf. Cooper/Stoler 1989).[6]

The dualist conception was in some sense already present in the one-sided colonialist representation of colonialism but it has been reinforced and in fact foregrounded by the emphasis on the indigenous role in colonial situations. With regard to the particular situation of Roman North Africa, it has been pointed out that counterpositioning the indigenous contribution as resistance to Roman colonial rule implies a relatively straightforward relationship between colonizers and colonized which eventually reconfirms their mutual relationships of domination and dependency. This means that the colonizers continue to be *a priori* conceived as dominating the relationships with the indigenous population, and that these relationships as such are again not the object of study (Thébert 1978, 76). The homogeneous and unified nature of both the colonized indigenous population and the colonizing Romans has also been called into question in the North African case: static representations of the indigenous population in terms of continuous resistance against foreign oppressors over many centuries actually contribute to stereotypical reifications and are therefore just as questionable as the colonialist thesis of the *permanence Berbère*[7] (Fentress 1983, 161; Thébert 1978, 64). The unity of the Roman side is similarly difficult to maintain, as even the Roman army has been argued to have been structured and divided in such a way that it can hardly have been the 'homogeneous repressive body' it is usually claimed to have been (Fentress 1983, 169).

On the whole, however, Bénabou's work has largely remained unnoticed in Mediterranean archaeology and his anti-colonialist attitude has virtually remained without following. Only on nearby Sardinia Bénabou's views on resistance in ancient colonial situations have been taken up (Mastino 1995, 35). As in North Africa, persisting local Punic traditions had conventionally been interpreted negatively in terms of an incapacity of the indigenous population to adopt Roman colonial culture. Following Bénabou, Punic culture in Roman Sardinia has alternatively been represented as a cultural form of resistance (Mastino 1985, 48).[8] Subsequently, the vitality and creative character of Punic traditions under Roman authority have been stressed (Bondì 1990; cf. Van Dommelen 1998; see chapter 6). Outside the Maghreb and Sardinia, the debate around the issue of resistance appears to have been ignored altogether. The only development worth noting is that of an increased attention for the indigenous side of colonial situations. Even this, however, has not gained much ground in Mediterranean archaeology.

In all cases, moreover, including Bénabou's later writings (e.g. 1981), colonial dualism has remained a basic feature which virtually pervades all archaeological work on ancient colonialism in the Mediterranean (van Dommelen 1998; cf. Mattingly/Hitchner 1995, 170).

Colonial dualism ultimately roots in a holistic notion of culture, which treats culture as a well-defined and clear-cut entity. By reducing colonial situations to an often violent clash between two such cultures, it not only reifies both sides of the colonial divide but also reconfirms the notion of culture as an autonomous 'system' which may independently interact with other cultures (Barth 1992, 17; Friedman 1990, 14). Closely related and perhaps inherent in such dualist conceptions of colonial situations is a poorly developed notion of acculturation, which regards culture contact as a straightforward and mechanistic process of the spread of specific cultural forms, supposedly by learning (Friedman 1990, 24; Gallini 1973). In combination with an evolutionist perspective, this has resulted in terms such as 'hellinization' as shorthand for the adoption of the superior Greek culture by non-Greeks (Friedman 1990; Gallini 1973) or expressions such as 'the reception' of Greek culture (Sheldon 1982, 103). In such representations of culture contact, any developed notion of acculturation appears to be absent and culture seems to have been conceived as something that simply spreads by itself 'like measles (but nicer)!' (Whitehouse/Wilkins 1989, 102). Generally, these points of view amount to a heavily biased conception of colonial situations in which colonizers actively spread civilization, whether

Greek, Phoenician or Roman, and the colonized are only passively present as 'receivers' of civilization or at best as actively resisting it.

2.2.3 EUROPEAN IDENTITY AND COLONIALISM IN MEDITERRANEAN ARCHAEOLOGY

The foregoing survey of colonial trends and traditions in Mediterranean archaeology has exposed a number of important relationships between archaeological representations of colonial situations in the ancient Mediterranean and modern attitudes towards colonialism, both in the same region and elsewhere. It is evident that outspoken colonialist and evolutionist perspectives are now increasingly questioned and that they can no longer be said to be characteristic of archaeological approaches to colonial situations. Colonialist views have largely been replaced by dualist ones although much recent work still shows significant reminiscences of evolutionist thought. Early criticisms on these points (especially Gallini 1973) have hardly received any attention in (Mediterranean) archaeology and their implications have likewise been disregarded. Similar criticisms (e.g. Friedman 1990; Whitehouse/Wilkins 1989) are now once more raised, however, in the wake of recent developments in (Anglo-American) archaeology in general, where notions of culture and society such as the ones discussed above are increasingly being replaced by concepts of society and culture as current in the social sciences (in particular anthropology: see e.g. Hodder 1982).

In order to appreciate the persistent and pervasive nature of the dualist and evolutionist points of view and to gain insight in their origins, it is necessary to draw the whole of colonial studies and Classical archaeology into a wider perspective. The key issue involved is that of *identity* — more particularly that of European identity. The influence of a European sense of identity and of a related quest for unique origins have already been shown to have played a major role in the constitution of archaeology north of the Alps (Rowlands 1984). Since the Mediterranean occupies a crucial place in the classical and generally Western definition of European identity as the 'cradle of civilization' and the birthplace of a European spirit, it is obvious that concerns about Europe and Europeanness must have profoundly influenced and shaped the study of the ancestral Greek and Roman civilizations.

The impact of nationalist, colonialist and imperialist world views on archaeology in general is undeniable (Trigger 1984, 1989, 110; cf. above). Because Mediterranean archaeology is only to a limited degree a national matter (perhaps mostly so in Italy, France and Spain) and is instead dominated by a large international academic community which has established a substantial number of foreign Archaeological Schools across the Mediterranean, nationalist concerns can only play a limited part in it and European, or more generally Western, interests lie at the heart of it. This does not mean, however, that nationalism does not count but rather that it is entangled in a wider context, which creates a series of particular problems. In Greece, for instance, the relationships between the Greek national identity and the anthropology and archaeology of Greece are tortuously ambiguous because of the paradoxical situation of Greece as both ancestral and contemporary to Europe (Herzfeld 1987; Morris 1994, 27). In the independent post-colonial states of the Maghreb, the situation is still more complicated, as the association of Roman archaeology with the colonial government has now turned back on it (Mattingly/Hitchner 1995, 169). The work of Laroui and Bénabou already mentioned has explicitly been claimed as *histoire décolonisée*. The Sardinian situation presents a number of similarities with the latter, because of the strong sense of self-awareness and distinct cultural identity, which have resulted in a somewhat strained relationship with the Italian state (cf. Odermatt 1996).

Ancient Rome has long occupied a central place in the European identity, in combination with a Christian background. From the 18th century onwards, attention gradually shifted towards Classical Greece and by the 19th century 'a bundle of new ideas about Europeanness' which glorified ancient Greece and insisted on its unique and superb qualities became the dominant paradigm in Europe (Morris 1994, 11, 15). Despite the instrumental role of Winckelmann in the development of philhellenism, Classical archaeology constituted only a subsidiary discipline within the framework of a wider *Altertumswissenschaft* and was entirely shaped according to prevailing philhellenic norms (Morris 1994, 23). As a consequence of the focus on ancient Greece, the combination of Greek and Roman culture has become an ambiguous one, in which either the superiority of Greek culture may be emphasized or the two can be conflated into 'Graeco-Roman' civilization: the reluctance to address the Roman occupation of Greece is a telling case in point (Alcock 1993, 1). The label of 'euro-centrism' can thus be seen to represent a more encompassing alternative for the term 'Classical tradition' (Friedman 1992a, 838). They are both moreover closely related to a second prominent Western attitude which evolved around the same crucial questions of European identity and quest for origins, and which is usually referred to as 'Orientalism'. This 'style of thought' which 'has less to do with the Orient than it does with "our" world' (Said 1978, 12) and which basically concerns 'an ontological and epistemological distinction made between "the Orient" and (most of the time) "the Occident"' (Said 1978, 2) has briefly but poignantly been defined as 'a "discourse" that dichotomizes and essentializes in its portrayal of others and that functions in a complex but systematic way as an element of colonial domination' (Clifford 1980, 268).

Whilst Orientalism strived to demarcate Europeanness by consistently stereotyping the East as subordinated to Europe and the West, Classical archaeology contributed actively by asserting the uniqueness and superiority of Graeco-Roman civilization to the eastern civilizations: even literacy, undeniably an eastern achievement, was only valorized by Greek initiative. In short, 'the East was practically written out of history — the history that mattered — altogether' (Morris 1994, 21).

The study of ancient colonialism has particularly been affected by the Classical tradition, as the spreading of Greek or Graeco-Roman culture across the Mediterranean and beyond is a crucial issue from a euro-centrist point of view: it represents after all nothing less than the first stage of a process which would culminate in the global Western culture. It is this concern which has motivated the anachronistic association of colonial Greek — or Graeco-Roman — culture with the Western *mission civilisatrice*, perhaps in an attempt to account for the successful expansion of Graeco-Roman culture (Friedman 1992a, 855; cf. Shanks 1996, 81). At least in modern times, colonialism has been the principal vehicle of the European *mission civilisatrice*. It should moreover be noted that the concept of a culture urged to spread by itself is based on the same holistic notion of culture which underlies dualist representations of colonialism (above, p. 21).

The stereotypical dualist categorizations of colonial situations are also closely related to Orientalist representations, which precisely rest on a 'tendency to *dichotomize* the human continuum into we-they contrasts and to *essentialize* the resultant "other"' (Clifford 1980, 258 [original emphasis]; cf. Said 1978, 31). Evolutionist assumptions about the inferiority of colonized indigenous 'barbaric' populations (above, pp. 18-19) were finally also fostered by Orientalist attitudes (Clifford 1980, 273).

The combination of Classical and Orientalist tenets created an extraordinarily ambiguous situation for Phoenician and Punic archaeology. The role of the Phoenicians in the ancient Mediterranean has on the one hand in an Orientalist vein usually been played down and subordinated to Greek achievements; on the other hand, whenever admitted or even appreciated positively, the Phoenician contribution has consistently been conflated with Greek feats. As a consequence, the Phoenician presence in the Mediterranean has remained underrated. Nor is it a coincidence that the first coherent statement on the goals and research themes of Phoenician archaeology was formulated only thirty years ago (Moscati 1963) and that a distinct subdiscipline has surfaced only in the last two decades (Niemeyer 1995, 425).

Phoenician archaeology has undoubtedly suffered most from the Orientalist denial of Phoenician achievements and involvement in the interregional networks across the entire Mediterranean. Symptomatic of this is the systematic lack of attention for Phoenician presence in the alleged heartlands of ancient civilization, Greece and Etruria, where a strong emphasis on the autochthonous development of an autonomous Classical culture entailed a general disregard of external involvements and an isolation of Phoenician finds: undeniably Phoenician objects encountered in Etruscan tombs were thus regarded as having been imported by Greeks (see Rathje 1990). The Orientalist dislike of Phoenician presence in the ancient Mediterranean was reinforced by a Classical tradition which took its lead from the Homeric portrayal of Phoenicians as unreliable merchants and thiefs and the hostile representation of Punic Carthage in Roman mythology and historiography. Phoenician involvement in the earliest Greek colonial activities in Italy, which represent the very first stage of the spread of Greek culture, has only very recently been acknowledged (Ridgway 1992, 111).

Outside the Classical heartlands as for instance in Spain and North Africa, Phoenician presence was appreciated much more positively. It was, however, appropriated by Classical archaeology and represented in exclusively philhellenic or Classical terms: Phoenician colonialism was simply assumed to fit in the model proposed for Greek colonialism in southern Italy without taking into account the different circumstances and underlying reasons for the two colonial enterprises (Niemeyer 1990). It is this inconceivability of Phoenician culture in other than Greek terms which has been described as the 'Classical rock' which Phoenician archaeology strikes time and again (Sznycer 1976, 41).

Just as 'manifest Orientalism' has become rare over the last decades while 'latent Orientalism' keeps lurking (Said 1978, 201), explicit Classical and Orientalist perspectives have been abandoned in Mediterranean archaeology while related assumptions regarding Greek and Roman civilization or eastern influences are still upheld by many Mediterranean archaeologists. The fierce debates following the provocative 'Black Athena' thesis of strong Afro-Asiatic and Semitic roots in Graeco-Roman culture have clearly exposed implicit Classical and Orientalist concepts (see Shanks 1996, 86; cf. Liverani 1996). With regard to ancient colonialism, stereotypical and evolutionist dualisms have already been pointed out as features that remain common in recent work. It is now also clear that they are not typical of colonial studies, perhaps as isolated remnants of a colonialist attitude, but that they rather fit in with the current state of the wider field of Mediterranean archaeology.

Although Phoenician archaeology has now become a recognized subdiscipline which is no longer as 'partial, fragmented and disorganic ... [as] the state of Phoenician studies both in the past and today [i.e. in the early 1970s]' (Moscati 1974, 15),[9] Greek and Roman stereotypes still abound. Perhaps because the Phoenician presence across the entire Mediterranean is readily associated with the spread of a colonial culture, it can easily be regarded as matching and complementing similar Greek activities. As a result, it is not uncommon to represent the Phoenicians implicitly as 'Greeks in disguise' who were equally good at spreading civilization -of which incidentally the Greek aspects are usually emphasized. Descriptions of colonial situations in terms of 'the encounter with the marvellous treasures of the eastern Civilizations' and references to 'the catalytic and decisive function [of the Phoenicians] for the rise of early Etruscan culture' (Niemeyer 1984, 79)[10] are both telling and typical illustrations of an enduring latent Classical orientation of Phoenician archaeology, which habitually includes evolutionist and dualist suppositions.

2.3 Matters of Domination, Hegemony and Resistance

As colonial situations have increasingly been regarded in dualist terms, the common association of colonialism with domination, violence, struggle, repression and exploitation of indigenous peoples has frequently been recast in dichotomies grouped around the twin notions of 'domination' and 'resistance'. Domination is usually equated with colonial power and regarded as a coercive and usually exploitative instrument of control of the colonizers, while resistance is normally related to repression and struggle by the colonized to evade it or at best to cope with it.

Having reviewed the prominent trends in archaeological representations of colonial situations in the ancient Mediterranean, I now turn to the social sciences for alternative and less biased perspectives on colonialism. One reason for doing so is that the colonial involvement of anthropology and history has explicitly been acknowledged and examined (e.g. Stoler 1989). Another one regards the above-mentioned matters of domination, hegemony and resistance, which have already surfaced frequently in the previous section and which in many ways represent the very essence of colonial situations: while general notions of power and domination developed in the social sciences have repeatedly been adopted in archaeology, other equally relevant but perhaps more specific approaches to the study of resistance have largely remained unnoticed. Although not all are directly concerned with colonialism, I intend to explore several of these approaches with an eye to their relevance for studying and representing colonial situations.

In the past three decades or so, colonial situations have mostly been examined from a (structuralist) Marxist point of view, following insights of Marx and Weber regarding power and domination. Such analyses have typically focused on relationships of domination and have identified these as a major structural principle of colonial societies in particular (Miller/Rowlands/Tilley 1989, 3). Structurally opposing colonizers and colonized in this and other ways, however, has reinforced dualist representations of colonial societies in which colonial domination and its power structures were imposed (or often even seemed to impose themselves) as an abstract force on a 'native' society. While Marxist analyses of domination and exploitation of colonized peripheries by colonizing centres have no doubt contributed to an increased understanding of supra-regional relationships — Mediterranean-wide in Classical Antiquity and at a global scale more recently —, the substitution of a Marxist terminology of 'modes of production' for the cultural-historical one of tribes and civilizations has tended to obfuscate the specific *local* contexts of colonial societies (Pels 1993, 10; cf. Friedman 1992b). The shift in attention to the local 'articulations' of different modes of production in colonial situations (e.g. Wolf 1982) marks an attempt to overcome uniform representations of 'the peasantry' and denotes similar concerns with specifically local situations (Kearney 1996, 81; cf. Marcus/Fischer 1986, 77).

The issue that is at stake here, then, is that of human and historically situated agency: if in a dualist conception of colonial society, structural relationships of power — i.e. domination and resistance — are considered to represent the essence of both colonialism in a general sense and of particular colonial situations, the historical and cultural contexts of the concrete colonial situation risk being overlooked — and with it the ordinary people, both colonizers and colonized, who experienced and reproduced the colonial structures on a daily basis (cf. Comaroff/Comaroff 1991, 9). It therefore seems useful to review attempts to bring the cultural dimension of colonialism into focus and to discuss how these relate to structural relationships of power and domination and to see where and how the inhabitants of colonized regions fit in these perspectives (cf. Pels 1997, 165).

In this section, I therefore discuss four distinct approaches to the study of domination and resistance which are deployed in as many different fields of the social sciences. The first perspective is also the most recent one, which has gradually come to the fore from the field of literary and cultural studies over the past two decades. Best known by the label of 'postcolonialism', the significance of this approach primarily lies in its focus on the question of how to represent colonial situations (Thomas 1994, 18; cf. Webster 1996a, 6). The second part of this section concentrates on attempts in East Asian history and anthropology to shed light on the 'people without history' and the ways in which peasants coped with their subordinated social and economic position. While this strand is not specifically concerned with colonial situations, its contribution to this section regards the conceptualization of resistance in situations of strong social and economic inequality. In the third part, I shall briefly discuss Antonio Gramsci's insights in the intertwinements between domination and resistance, which already figured prominently in the

East Asian study of resistance. More general anthropological notions about society and human agency constitute the subject matter of the fourth part of this section: following several anthropological case studies which share an emphasis on diverse social groups and local practice in colonial situations, I highlight some particularly relevant notions of current social theory. By bringing to bear these more general anthropological concepts on the Gramscian notion of hegemony as discussed in the third part, in the last part of this section I shall finally attempt to show in which ways and to what extent these ideas are relevant to the anthropological study of colonial situations.

2.3.1 POSTCOLONIAL PERSPECTIVES

The term 'postcolonial' — as distinguished from its exclusively chronological counterpart 'post-colonial' — acts as a common denominator for an otherwise heterogeneous collection of approaches for studying colonialism. It groups together attempts to write histories 'after colonialism', not so much in the sense that they have originated in a decolonized, i.e. post-colonial situation but rather that they aim at exploring and exposing colonialist representations (Prakash 1995, 3). While the expression may originally be related to attempts to write decolonized histories, it is now more or less recognized that

> the postcolonial perspective — as it is being developed by historians and literary theorists — departs from the traditions of the sociology of underdevelopment or 'dependency' theory. As a mode of analysis, it attempts to revise those nationalist or 'nativist' pedagogies that set up the relation of Third World and First World in a binary structure of opposition. The postcolonial perspective resists the attempt at holistic forms of social explanation. It forces a recognition of the more complex cultural and political boundaries that exist on the cusp of these often opposed political spheres.
>
> Bhabha 1992a, 173

The awareness that political and military decolonization do not mean that the cultural and historical heritage of colonialism has been overcome has particularly broadened the scope of 'postcolonialism'. Claims to 'decolonized' histories and perspectives have played an important role in this respect, such as the writings of Aimée Césaire and in particular the work of Franz Fanon and Albert Memmi, who were both actively involved in the decolonization of Algeria and Tunisia.[11] While it might be far-fetched to claim the decolonization of the Maghreb and more specifically the Algerian War of Independence in 1968 as a starting point of 'so-called post-structuralism' (Young 1990, 1),[12] it was undoubtedly a critical moment for the development of postcolonialism because the colonial relationships were explicitly spelled out and representing colonial situations in dualist terms constituted the first attempt to overcome one-sided colonialist views.[13]

Tracing back its roots to Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), postcolonialism is a primarily literary development. This critical analysis of representations of the Middle East in Western literature and culture, including Classical archaeology (see pp. 22-23) has in fact widely been followed in analyses of colonial representations throughout the Third World (Barker/Hulme/Iversen 1994, 1). It essentially focuses on the ways in which colonizers represented both themselves and the colonized 'Other'. Giving particular attention to the legitimizing and naturalizing nature of colonial discourse which is argued to be a crucial feature of colonialism in order to establish and maintain itself, postcolonial literary theory has highlighted a number of important aspects of colonial discourse and representation. In a series of seminal papers, Homi Bhabha in particular has drawn attention to the stereotypical character of colonial discourse, pointing out what he has paradoxically termed the *ambivalent* nature of these stereotypes. He has argued that

> it is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency ... [and] produces that effect of probabilistic truth and predictability which, for the stereotype, must always be in *excess* of what can be empirically proved or logically construed.
>
> Bhabha 1992b, 66; original emphasis

In this view, the effect of stereotypical representations derives from implicit expectations — perhaps rather prejudices, such as the 'lazy native' — which are widely shared but which cannot be proved and therefore need constant reassertion. Bhabha has elaborated these ideas further with the notion of *mimicry*, which indicates the ambition to transform the colonized population after the colonial example, that is to 'civilize' them. The ambivalence of this process is that such an *évolué*, to use the North African term, will never become entirely 'colonial': 'colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same but not quite'* (Bhabha 1987, 86; original emphasis). The increasing similarity between colonizer and colonized, however, will in the end become a serious cause of disturbance for the colonizers (Young 1990, 141).[14] As a corollary, Bhabha has introduced the key concept of 'hybridity', which is 'the effect of an ambivalence produced within the rules of recognition of dominating discourses as they articulate the signs of cultural difference [between colonizer and colonized]' (Bhabha 1985, 110). Hybridization may well undermine colonial authority, as the latter is distorted in the process of repeating. Hybridization may thus play a subversive role and become an important factor of resistance (Young 1990, 148). A major problem of Bhabha's work, however, is his reliance on Western pscyho-analysis, either directly or through Fanon's writings (Young 1990, 151). While this may seriously hamper any easy or wholesale application of these insights outside modern colonialism, the basic concepts nevertheless seem to offer useful tools for probing the ambiguous dimensions of colonial situations and to break through the dualist cleavage between colonizers and colonized.

What is problematic with colonial discourse theory in general, is its lack of historical and local specificity: most discourse analyses focus on late 19th and early 20th century British colonialism and appear to assume that other (Western) colonial activities in the Americas or Asia or before the Victorian period were not very different. Following the broadened scope of postcolonial analysis to include all Western discourse on non-Western populations in general, the term 'colonial discourse' has come to imply a uniform global Western representation of the non-Western Other as well as the concomitant (post-)colonial imposition of a more or less coherent Western symbolic order on the Third World. In the end, colonial discourse theory thus risks to reify Western colonialism and to reinforce a dualist conception of colonialism (Turner 1995, 203).[15] While discourse and representations undeniably *are* critical features of colonialism, they are also part and parcel of specific colonial situations and therefore need to be considered in terms of their local and historical contexts. An important consequence and major drawback of many discourse analyses is that because of their 'weak contextualizations' (Turner 1995, 204) they often ignore the context and intended audience of the writings: much of the discourse analyses are effectively only relevant for the colonizers and their home country — and often only its upper classes. As a consequence, the colonized are entirely overlooked (Thomas 1994, 57).

The significance of postcolonial literary analysis therefore resides most of all in its insistence that colonialism cannot be understood as a primarily military or economic undertaking; it has a critical cultural dimension as well and even the 'purest moments of profit and violence' have often been mediated and shaped by structures of meaning (Thomas 1994, 2). It is nevertheless important to bear in mind that colonialism does not *constitute* a cultural system, with colonial discourse as a singular and definable entity. It should rather be seen as a 'cultural process' and colonial cultures not simply as 'ideologies that mask, mystify or rationalize forms of oppression that are external to them; they are also expressive and constitutive of colonial relationships in themselves' (Thomas 1994, 2). Since colonial representations are the outcome of practices within such a cultural process (Pels 1993, 6; cf. Fabian 1983, 1990), they cannot be understood without reference to the actual historical and regional context of colonial interactions. In the following parts of this section, I shall consequently focus attention first of all on the so-called 'practical' dimensions of colonial situations, among which human agency and social practice with regard to matters of domination and resistance take a first place.

2.3.2 SUBALTERN RESISTANCE AND EVERYDAY SOCIAL LIFE

As indicated by the name of the publication series from which they have taken their name, the primary concern of the historians of the *Subaltern Studies* group lies with the dominated social groups in their study region of South-East Asia, which are the peasants, the class of 'people without history' in Wolf's words (1982, 385). The use of the technical term 'subaltern' for subordinated at the same time denotes their primarily Marxist inspiration. Although only marginally involved in studies of colonialism, the *Subaltern Studies* group is generally labelled as postcolonialist because of their 'emancipatory' goal to 'attack elite historiography on its treatment of the subordinated peoples of South Asian society as if they had no consciousness of their own and hence no ability to make their own history' (O'Hanlon 1988, 192). Since 'elite historiography' in the South-East Asian (mainly Indian) context means the colonialist and nationalist post-colonial representations which have systematically ignored peasants, this corresponds closely to the postcolonial aims to break through historical and social stereotypes (see Arnold 1984).

A fundamental research theme of the *Subaltern Studies* group is that of rebellion and resistance as part of their endeavour to redress the cliché of the allegedly passive and irrational South-East Asian peasants: they have in particular explored a wide range of collective actions such as grain riots, small-scale peasant insurgencies and communal disturbances, which had previously not been recognized as forms of protest. Arguing that these represented alternative forms of social action, some of which at least can be regarded as ways of consciously resisting domination and exploitation (Adas 1991), the South-East Asian peasants have often been credited with a basic cultural autonomy and class consciousness which inspired their resistance. The tone for this theme was set at an early stage by Ranajit Guha in his opening essay of the first *Subaltern Studies* volume when he insisted on the existence of a 'subaltern politics' as

> an *autonomous* domain ... It neither originated in elite politics nor did its existence depend upon the latter. It was traditional in so far as its roots could be traced back to precolonial times, but it was by no means archaic ... Far from being destroyed or rendered virtually ineffective, as was elite politics of the traditional type by the intrusion of colonialism, it continued to operate vigorously in spite of the latter, adjusting itself to the conditions prevailing under the Raj and in many respects developing entirely new strains in both form and content.
>
> Guha 1982, 4; original emphasis

This emphasis on peasant autonomy has entailed two major consequences which have to a considerable extent determined the *Subaltern Studies*: the first one is a focus on the rare but exceptionally explicit and overt events of violent uprisings; the other one is a kind of reification of the peasant 'underclass' in contrast with the dominant elite, resulting in a dualist representation of society (O'Hanlon 1988, 195). As a corollary, at the level of the individual peasant the emphasis on autonomy has been expressed in terms of people acting 'in possession of a sovereign consciousness whose defining characteristic is reason [and] power of freedom' (O'Hanlon 1988, 191). Direct challenges of elite power make up only a limited part of peasant social life, however, and the focus of the *Subaltern Studies* on what actually are exceptional episodes of open protest has resulted in a biased representation of peasant attitudes and actions in South-East Asian society, since they leave aside large parts of 'ordinary' daily life (Haynes/Prakash 1991, 7).

A slightly different approach to resistance has been undertaken by two South-East Asian ethno-historians, who have drawn attention to the so-called 'non-confrontational', 'silent' or 'everyday' forms of resistance. A specific kind of non-violent and alternative form of resistance has been highlighted by Michael Adas as *avoidance protest*, which he has claimed as a means of dissatisfied groups to

> attenuate their hardships and express their discontent through flight, sectarian withdrawal or other activities that minimize challenges to or clashes with those whom they view as their oppressors.
>
> Adas 1981, 217

Arguing that avoidance was just one of many ways for protesting, a much greater variety of alternative forms of resistance has been grouped together under the heading of *everyday resistance* by James Scott. Supported by careful and richly detailed accounts of his ethnographic fieldwork in Malaysia, he claims that this 'prosaic but constant struggle between the peasantry and those who seek to extract labor, food, taxes, rents and interests from them' is essential for understanding peasant resistance (Scott 1985, 29). In this category of alternative forms of resistance Scott includes numerous modest actions such as foot-dragging, dissimulation, false-compliance, pilfering, poaching, tax evasion, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, sabotage, and so forth. Together, these make up what he regards as the 'ordinary weapons of the relatively powerless groups' (Scott 1985, 29). The advantages for the peasants of these kinds of resistance are threefold: in the first place, it may contribute directly to their welfare; secondly, in the longer run it can erode away impopular customs or laws; and third, it prepares the ground for more overt political activity or even direct rebellion.

It is in the last point that resides the significance of this approach to resistance, as it may cover most, if not all, aspects of ordinary daily life instead of condensing resistance into a limited number of critical moments of overt and armed revolt. Even more so, relating these exceptional events to the wider daily context and considering what peasants do 'between revolts', contributes to a better understanding of these violent outbursts of resistance. Inserting the latter into a larger context of mundane resistance by exploring which attitudes peasants and other subordinated groups adopt towards the dominant social stratum not only explains the occurrence of these events but also relates seemingly isolated episodes of peasant rebellion to each other. Because of the far-reaching consequences that everyday resistance thus may have, it is not exaggerated to identify it as 'a Brechtian form of class struggle' (Scott 1985, 29). In combination with the work of the *Subaltern Studies* group, resistance is now generally accepted as as a *continuum* of contestatory behaviour which may range from modest individual and non-violent actions to large-scale armed rebellions.

The broad range of subtly varied forms of resistance, however, does not bridge the gap between the subordinated peasants and the dominant elite. Since Scott and Adas subscribe to the concept of autonomous and rationally acting peasants, the resulting dualist representation of society is only reinforced by the alternative but equally one-sided emphasis on peasant resistance. It is in fact precisely at this point that the combined *Subaltern Studies* and 'everyday resistance' approaches have reached a deadlock, because they have no answer to the question of how the lower end of the proposed continuous scale of 'modes of resistance' should be defined: is the term 'resistance' applicable to *all* evasive forms of behaviour? And when can an act be labelled as one of resistance? It is evident from the detailed ethnographic South-East Asian evidence of 'everyday resistance' that evasive conduct is usually motivated by short-term and local considerations and cannot be viewed as a form of organized 'underground resistance' which is based on an explicit revolutionary ideology. The kernel of the problem therefore is whether consciousness is a prerequisite condition for resistance. In some of these cases, a certain measure of coherence and consciousness can be discerned in the variety of ordinary acts of resistance: these then take place with a sense of self-awareness and struggle against domination which is often extensively shared among the dominated people. In other cases, however, the situation is less easy to define: subalterns may display a similar conduct of everyday resistance but do not themselves perceive these acts in terms of resistance or struggle.

This dilemma stems from the *Subaltern Studies* preoccupation with peasant autonomy and consciousness. This is claimed to be preserved intact by individual persons even when apparently accomodating to domination. The underlying distinction is that between physical and mental domination or between coercion and persuasion. It suggests that the coercive capabilities and material control of the elite in non-Western societies can and do constrain peasant behaviour but cannot persuade their minds: the subordinated peasants therefore can retain full mastery over their consciousness and may escape the dominant elite ideology. They may even 'demystify' and counter it (Mitchel 1990, 548). The contrast between on the one hand autonomous peasant consciousness and on the other hand dominated peasant behaviour has given rise to the concept of 'hidden transcipts' which denote peasant behaviour outside formal and public contexts where the dominant norms prevail. Such 'hidden transcripts' typically do not include political activities but instead comprise what people say and do in private (Scott 1990, 14). It evidently goes too far to label this as resistance, but private, i.e. 'hidden' behaviour and statements can offer fertile ground for more outspoken forms of resistance. In this way, hidden transcipts can be regarded as offering a '*condition* of practical resistance rather than a substitute for it' (Scott 1990, 191; emphasis added).

The distinction between hidden and public transcripts is explicitly based on the assumption that individual peasant consciousness cannot be influenced by elite violence and coercion. The essential question therefore is how pervasive power can be. The limits imposed on domination by Scott sharply contrast with the views of in particular Gramsci —who is critically discussed by Scott (1985, 304) — and Foucault. By insisting on the contradiction that public demonstrations of accomodation by peasant conceal their spirit of resistance, however, Scott actually ignores the extent to which peasants are imbued in and conditioned by elite or state dominance and ideology. At the very least, peasants have in fact accepted the structures of the exploitative society they live in and are related to the elite and the state in various ways. Even for expressing their own modest claims, peasants usually fall back on the vocabulary of the dominant discourse which implies a certain mental or ideological dependency (Mitchel 1990, 564).

While the *Subaltern Studies* foregrounding of modest forms of protest and resistance no doubt signalled a significant shift in attention, the implied reinforcement of dualist representations as well as the conceptual contradictions inherent in the emphasis on peasant consciousness necessitate a further exploration of anthropological notions of society and human agency in order to resolve the problems observed in this part.

2.3.3 IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF ANTONIO GRAMSCI

Blurring the colonial divide and simultaneously focusing on the local situation imply an increased attention for the notion of resistance and effectively call into question any simple binary opposition between domination and resistance. As has been pointed out by some *Subaltern Studies* contributors (see Arnold 1984) as well as by anthropologists studying colonial situations (Comaroff/Comaroff 1991, 19; Keesing 1994), the political writings of the Italian reporter and communist activist Antonio Gramsci have much to offer at precisely these points. Although Gramsci focused exclusively on early 20th century Italy without paying particular attention to colonialism, the relevance of his insights regarding hegemony and resistance for colonial situations is undeniable (see Kurtz 1996).[16]

A key concept in Gramsci's work is that of *hegemony*. Nowhere does he give a precise definition of this or other concepts, yet it is clear that the distinction between hegemony or 'intellectual and moral leadership' and domination or political rule was a fundamental one for Gramsci (Jackson Lears 1985, 568). It is furthermore important to note that Gramsci did not so much have the leadership of any particular individual in mind but rather referred to it as a property of groups of people, who could be organized on a social or institutional basis. His examples of the hegemony exerted by the city of Venice over its hinterland and of that of the ruling class over the working class are explicit statements in this respect (Kurtz 1996, 105). Hegemony in a Gramscian sense can thus be described as 'a conception of the world that is implicitly manifest in art, in law, in economic activity and in all manifestations of individual and collective life' (Comaroff/Comaroff 1991, 23). It is the dominant conception of the world that has established itself as an 'historically true' and 'universal' orthodoxy. In contrast with domination which is based on control of the coercive means of the state, hegemony has gained its predominance not by force but through the 'consent' of the subordinate people (Femia 1975, 30; Gruppi 1972). As such, hegemony and domination represent two distinct but yet closely related aspects of elite power. Hegemony furthermore differs from ideology in that the latter is more explicit, while the former can be described as 'that part of a dominant worldview which has been naturalized and, having "hidden" itself in orthodoxy, no more appears as ideology at all' (Comaroff/Comaroff 1991, 25). The distinction between hegemony and ideology is thus located in consciousness: the former is only evident in people's actual practice and is for them a matter of fact that goes without words, while the latter is a perfectly conscious framework for deliberate action (Comaroff/Comaroff 1991, 27).

As is already apparent in this brief outline, consciousness occupies a crucial place in Gramsci's thoughts about domination and resistance. Wondering whether 'is it not frequently the case that there is a contradiction between one's intellectual choice and one's mode of conduct?' (*Quaderni* 11, §12),[17] Gramsci made a distinction between conscious thoughts and unconscious values as expressed in actions, i.e. practice:

> The active man-in-the-mass has a practical activity, but has no clear theoretical consciousness of his practical activity, which nonetheless involves understanding the world in so far as it transforms it. His theoretical consciousness can indeed be historically in opposition to his activity. One might almost say that he has two theoretical consciousnesses (or one contradictory consciousness): one which is implicit in his activity and which in reality unites him with all his fellow-workers in the practical transformation of the real world; and one, superficially explicit or verbal, which he has inherited from the past and uncritically absorbed. But this verbal conception is not without consequences. It holds together a specific social group, it influences moral conduct and the direction of will, with varying efficacity but often powerfully enough to produce a situation in which the contradictory state of consciousness does not permit of any action, any decision or any choice, and produces a condition of moral and political passivity.[18]
>
> Gramsci, *Quaderni* 11, §12

Conspicuously absent in Gramsci's views is any reference to autonomy or selfconsciousness of the subordinated peasants: he saw the peasants of southern Italy and the factory workers in the industrializing cities of northern Italy as being dominated both politically and mentally. Under the sway of the pervasive hegemony of the Italian state and bourgeoisie they were entirely blocked by their contradictory consciousness: because their 'consent' or resignation to state hegemony prevented them from taking action against their exploitation by the state, they found it difficult, if not impossible, to translate the outlook implicit in their experience as exploited peasants or factory workers into a conception of the world that challenged the 'official', i.e. hegemonic, culture. This does *not* mean, however, that subordinated groups cannot have any consciousness of their own at all: as every peasant or worker experiences the world (s)he lives in, (s)he gradually develops an attitude of his (her) own towards it, which Gramsci termed 'common sense' *(senso comune)*. Gramsci in fact explicitly affirmed that 'the relevant social group [the working classes] has its own conception of the world, even if only embryonic' *(Quaderni* 11, §12).[19]

The relevance of these notions for the conceptual problems pointed out in the *Subaltern Studies* approach to domination and resistance largely stems from the shared Marxist outlook. Of particular importance in this respect is the Gramscian distinction between physical domination and cultural hegemony, because it explicitly counters the claim of the *Subaltern Studies* group, including Scott, that subordinated groups retain an autonomous consciousness which is impermeable to elite power. According to Gramsci, elite hegemony is on the contrary responsible for a 'contradictory consciousness' which causes these people to subscribe openly to the state ideology while the experiences of their subordinated condition at the same time give rise to a widely shared but usually incoherent 'common sense' *(senso comune)*. If they commit acts of silent resistance, it is their *senso comune* which guides these activities (cf. Cirese 1969, 67).

Although Gramsci's work represents a clear departure from classical Marxist thought because he explicitly counters the reduction of ideology to a superstructural realm (cf. Williams 1977, 111), his terminology and somewhat mechanistic descriptions denote his profound Marxist roots. It is nevertheless precisely this Marxist concern with matters of domination and subordination which relate Gramsci's work to the study of colonialism, even if he did not consider it explicitly, since colonial situations can be understood as historically specific but particularly revealing instances of the processes examined by Gramsci (Keesing 1994, 41). Typical in this respect is the Marxist notion of *praxis* which features prominently in both Gramsci's thoughts as unconscious action and in the *Subaltern Studies* approach as acts of silent resistance. While Marxist thinking in general and Gramsci's ideas in particular have not remained unnoticed in the social sciences at large, they have of course not remained unaffected by more recent developments in social theory. A first influential attempt to 'update' Gramsci's thoughts can for instance be found in the work of Raymond Williams (see especially Williams 1977, 108), who reformulated the notions of hegemony and culture along the structuralist lines of neo-Marxism (Kurtz 1996, 115). As a next step, it is therefore necessary to consider the substantial reconceptualizations of Marxist thinking in this respect.

2.3.4 CONCEPTUALIZING COLONIAL SOCIETY

In order to dismantle the twin notions of domination and resistance and to tune them more closely to their local setting across the dualist cleave, the social contexts of colonial society must first of all be reconsidered. Since the inhabitants of colonized regions did not face abstract entities such as 'colonialism' but had to deal with concrete and individual persons, each of whom combined personal interests with 'colonial duties' (Keesing 1992, 6-7; cf. Stoler 1989), it is clear that a nuanced conceptualization of human agency and society is needed (cf. Thomas 1994, 59). Following recent debates in social theory (see especially Kuper 1992), I therefore highlight some aspects which I regard as particularly pertinent to colonial societies. In this regard, I draw in particular on a number of ethnographic studies in which such a point of view has been elaborated and to a varying degree explicitly expounded. The principal ones are the Comaroffs' studies of British and South-African colonialism among the Tshidi in northern South Africa (Comaroff 1985; Comaroff/Comaroff 1991), Thomas's work in the southern Pacific in general and on Fiji in particular (1991, 1994), Fabian's explorations of religion and language in the Belgian Congo (1986, 1990) and Pels's analysis of colonial Tanganyika (1993). A closely related position can be found in a number of Keesing's studies of the Kwaio on colonial and post-colonial Malaita in the Solomon Islands (1992, 1994).

The theoretical foundations of a concept of human agency within a wider context of structural conditions are primarily those set out by Bourdieu's *Theory of Practice* (1977, 1990). The concepts of practice and *habitus* in particular provide an obvious framework for examining and reflecting on colonialism in terms of *local practice* (Thomas 1994, 58). They constitute an eminently suited starting point for examining co-presence and contacts of people, whether colonizing or colonized, in one specific local context, since '... *co-presence* and its material mediations are the point from which an understanding of colonial situations should start' (Pels 1993, 6). Central in this view is the *habitus* of groups of people who live in the colonial situation and act in terms of these 'systems of durable, transposable dispositions, ... principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes' (Bourdieu 1990, 53). These adaptations are not normally or explicitly aimed at, although strategic calculations always occur. The *habitus* is reproduced and simultaneously transformed as 'embodied' structures through the daily practice of social actors, including their discourse and representations, but it is also produced by the specific conditions of existence, which are set by the political, economic or military dimensions of the colonial situation (Bourdieu 1990, 52). Practice plays a crucial role in this process as it is, in close interplay with the material context, responsible for the reproduction of the *habitus*. At the same time practice is directed by the *habitus* in the guise of experience and tradition and provides the opportunity for transforming the *habitus* and, consequentially, future practice. Together, these notions are eminently suited for the task of examining

> the reciprocal interplay of human practice, social structure, and symbolic mediation, an interplay contained within the process of articulation between a peripheral community and a set of encompassing socio-cultural forces.
>
> Comaroff 1985, 3

The significance for studies of colonial situations is that the theory of practice does not ignore relationships of power and exploitation, which usually are an all too evident feature of colonial society, but incorporates these in the *habitus* and relates them indirectly to practice in everyday situations.

It is precisely because of this emphasis on the materiality and the day-to-day basis of social contacts and practice that the 'practical' approach represents a constructive one in the socio-cultural study of colonialism (Pels 1993, 11; cf. Thomas 1994, 60).

Gramsci's emphasis on unconscious activities bears a strong resemblance to Bourdieu's formulation of *habitus* and practice, which is of course not accidental but goes back to the shared Marxist attention for 'praxis'. Bourdieu has moreover elaborated the pervasiveness and effects of hegemony on subaltern consciousness with the notions of 'symbolic violence' and *doxa*. While the latter term captures the generally accepted and naturalized representations of the social world, the former refers to

> the gentle, invisible violence, unrecognized as such, chosen as much as undergone, that of trust, obligation, personal loyalty, hospitality, gift, debts, piety, in a word, of all the virtues honoured by the ethic honour.
>
> Bourdieu 1990, 127

According to Bourdieu, symbolic violence occurs in particular in pre-capitalist economies where social relations are direct and physical violence is likely to cause rebellion or large-scale evasion which renders it ineffective as a mode of domination. In those cases relations of dominance must be 'euphemized' as 'the gentle hidden form which violence takes when overt violence is impossible' (Bourdieu 1977, 196; see Bourdieu/Wacquant 1992, 93). Symbolic violence can thus be related to hegemony in much the same way as physical violence accompanies domination. These situations, in which people experience a contradiction between their own conditions and public representations of it, are captured by Bourdieu's term 'heterodox belief', which is clearly akin to Gramsci's notion of 'contradictory consciousness' (cf. Bourdieu 1977, 78, 159).

A markedly different conceptualization of society is Dumont's reworking of structuralism: although Bourdieu's notion of *habitus* retains strong structuralist elements, his Marxist focus on practice and agency is virtually absent in the work of Dumont and his school (Bazelmans 1996, 83). Instead, 'ideology' in the broad sense of 'ideas and values' is foregrounded as the body of meaningful constituents of societies through which people establish themselves as competent social actors. In any society these elements are ordered differently with respect to each other and thus constitute specific 'hierarchies of values' (De Coppet 1992). Since these so-called 'social levels' define the most significant contexts of a particular society, it is argued that the relations between ideas and values offer the best opportunities for ethnographic study and cross-cultural comparison (Barraud/Platenkamp 1990, 103). It is this focus on the cultural and 'ideological' dimension of society which appears promising in a postcolonial perspective on colonialism, which precisely attempts to draw attention to this aspect of colonial situations.

While none of these social theories has any particular relevance for colonial situations, all have been applied to societies in (post-)colonial situations: most ethnographic fieldwork in the tradition of Dumont has for instance been conducted in Indonesia and Melanesia (cf. Bazelmans 1996, 94), Bourdieu's early ethnographic work took place in colonial Algeria and the *Subaltern Studies* group mostly deals with India and Malaysia after independence. In most cases, however, the specific colonial dimension of the situations under consideration was either ignored or barely acknowledged. A few exceptions to this 'rule of thumb' nevertheless show that both approaches can and do shed light on the role of colonialism in those societies. It is for instance telling that Bourdieu referred to French colonial domination and hegemony in Algeria in a discussion of symbolic violence (Bourdieu/Wacquant 1992, 95). Another case in point is Platenkamp's analysis of the Christian transformation of indigenous Tobelo ritual (1992), which on the one hand hardly addresses the impact of colonialism but on the other hand provides a striking example of the local reworking of indigenous features along ostensibly colonial lines (i.e. those of the Christian church).

2.3.5 LOCAL PRACTICE AND COLONIAL HEGEMONY

With regard to resistance, and everyday or silent resistance in particular, Gramsci offers a coherent theoretical foundation with his notion of 'contradictory consciousness', since it describes the paradoxical situation of people who on the one hand openly accept hegemonic culture but yet on the other hand implicitly defy it through acts of silent resistance. They may for instance uphold dualist representations of their colonial situation while at the same time refuting it by their actual behaviour. Capturing such paradoxical behaviour with Bourdieu's notion of *habitus*, it can be understood how such modest acts of protest and refusal do not stem from strictly individual decisions but rather root in more widely shared experiences of the daily world. This paradox has perhaps somewhat more straightforwardly been labelled as the distinction between 'discursive consciousness' and 'practical consciousness' (Giddens 1984, 7, 290).

While acknowledging that this practical consciousness *(senso comune* in Gramscian terms) was often an incoherent collection of assumptions and beliefs, Gramsci also pointed out that it can lay the basis for the development of broader and more coherent subcultures, which he referred to as 'popular culture' or even more generically as 'folklore' (Cirese 1969, 113). While these are not normally conceived of in terms of resistance, and may even remain entirely within the limits set by the hegemonic culture, they do provide common ground for counter-hegemonic activities (Lombardi Satriani 1974; cf. Keesing 1994). Occasionally, these subcultures can acquire an explicit counter-hegemonic character and effectively grow into political movements. Although the means of their struggle may be modest, such counter-hegemonic subcultures clearly merit the label of 'resistance' (Keesing 1992, 213). More often, however, subcultures take the shape of other than political movements, notably religious or in particular millenarian ones: the Zionist cults among the South-African Tswana present a convincing case in point, showing how non-political activities effectively express a sense of resistance, without explicit acknowledgement or awareness of the people involved (Comaroff 1985; Comaroff/Comaroff 1989). Popular culture in general, characterized by subversions and original recreations of the hegemonic culture can also have a considerable contestatory impact (Lombardi Satriani 1974, 220). In the face of such ambiguous situations, it is clear that, if one can speak of resistance, it differs from the more explicit versions; recognizing such behaviour as manifestations of unrest, however, contributes significantly to an understanding of how feelings of resistance can be nurtured and at some point expressed more consciously (Keesing 1992, 215). A refusal to recognize hegemonic authority, even without recurrence to open revolt, may therefore be regarded as a first stage of resistance and, as Gramsci claimed, a necessary step towards more explicit revolutionary action (Comaroff/Comaroff 1991, 29).

A further important aspect of local practice in colonial situations regards its relationships to both the local contexts, no matter of a more colonial or indigenous nature, and the wider, primarily colonial situation. Building on Marxist analyses of interlocking and articulating modes of production in a World System (e.g. Friedman 1992b; Wolf 1982), the impact of wider (global) culture on local contexts has more recently been examined as a process of 'creolization' (Hannerz 1987). If merely taken as descriptive of a process in which 'different clusters of meanings and symbolic forms, historically of varying provenance' meet and mingle (Hannerz 1994, 189), this concept hardly contributes to a more profound understanding of colonial situations, because it conceives cultures as independently existing entities which constitute an 'organization of meanings and meaningful forms' (Hannerz 1994, 183). It is only when this essentialized view of culture is abandoned and attention shifted to what people do and how they conceive of the world and themselves, that the dynamics of colonial situations can be grasped, for 'cultural mixture is the effect of the *practice* of mixed origins' (Friedman 1995, 84; emphasis added). Such essentializing culture concepts are particularly widespread in studies of globalization and centre-periphery relationships where attention is focused on the macro or supraregional relationships (Kearney 1996, 59). The so-called 'networks analysis' conversely regards society as being made up of individual global networks (Hannerz 1992): yet, because of the emphasis on the individual nature and global expanse of the networks, the communal and social foundations of local practice are lost in this approach, too (cf. Friedman 1995, 82). In order to retain the postcolonial emphasis on both the local context and socially based practice, I alternatively suggest the closely related notion of ‘hybridization’. In the postcolonial sense as introduced by Bhabha (1985, 110; cf. above p. 25), it offers a powerful tool for probing the ambiguous dimensions of colonial situations, because it refers to the ways in which social, economic or ethnic groups of people construct a distinct identity within the colonial context and situate themselves with respect to the dominant, i.e. colonial culture. Bhabha’s reference to the ambivalence of hybridization processes furthermore brings out the connection with silent resistance of local inhabitants, as relatively simple distortions in the process of imitating hegemonic culture can easily undermine colonial authority: in this way hybridity often assumes a more or less explicit counter-hegemonic character in the form of subcultures or popular, often religious, movements (cf. Keesing 1994). The already mentioned Zionist cults in northern South Africa are an evident case in point: while the form of the cults apparently adhered to the ritual norms of the Christian church, they incorporated at the same time various aspects of indigenous origin. The incorporation of traditional Tshidi kinship-based leadership as a model for Zionist organization is but one example (Comaroff 1985, 194). Yet, because the transformation occurred along colonial lines, it is in the end difficult to decide whether the outcome must be labelled indigenous or colonial -which is of course precisely the point made by Bhabha through his notions of hybridization and ambivalence. The same ambivalence regards the meanings of this process: does it comprise an element of resistance or must it rather be seen as an affirmation of the local identity within the new and wider colonial context?

In combination with Bourdieu’s elaboration of the modes of domination, both domination and resistance can be firmly founded in daily practice and in the *habitus* of social groups. The significance of this combined perspective is that it looks into the ‘realm of partial recognition, of inchoate awareness, of ambiguous perception, and, sometimes, of creative tension’ which lies between the elusive expression of protest and malcontention and overt rebellion (Comaroff/Comaroff 1991, 29). It thus solidly grounds hybridization in concrete ethnographic situations (cf. Thomas 1996). It also takes matters of domination and resistance beyond the narrow limits of political oppression and economic exploitation into the fields of ideology and culture without abandoning the former altogether (Comaroff/Comaroff 1991, 19). Only in this way it is possible to take seriously the statement that ‘... the power structure of colonialism is everywhere clearly laid down, [but] the colonizing process itself is rarely a simple dialectic of domination and resistance’ (Comaroff/Comaroff 1989, 291).

In this study, I shall therefore take daily practice and the *habitus* of social groups living in the colonial situation as a starting point. Given the importance of domination and hegemony I shall on the one hand draw on Marxist-inspired insights about colonial structures of power and exploitation and supra-regional networks. On the other hand, since discourse and representation are equally part and parcel of daily life and grounded in social practice, I shall also repeatedly take recourse to culturally defined ideas and values. By asserting that the local inhabitants who act out the local structures, whether colonial or indigenous, are competent actors, I thus intend to give a firm place to everyday social interaction of the local people in the construction of colonialism. In this way I hope to take seriously the claim that

> colonial projects are construed, misconstrued, adapted and enacted by actors whose subjectivities are fractured — half here, half there, sometimes disloyal, sometimes “on the side” of the people they patronize and dominate, and against the interests of some metropolitan office.
>
> Thomas 1994, 60

2.4 Towards a Postcolonial Archaeology of Ancient Colonialism

From the survey of perspectives and trends in the study of ancient Mediterranean colonialism an image of a somewhat incongruous field of study has emerged which has strongly been affected by the modern Western colonial experience.

It has also become evident that decolonization and (reactions to) Western neo-imperialism similarly influence literary, historical and anthropological studies of colonial situations today. They ultimately underlie the rise of a distinctly ‘postcolonial’ perspective in the academic world. In archaeology in general and in the Mediterranean case in particular, however, the latter development is much less clear and it might seem as if Mediterranean archaeology has altogether ignored it. Several trends can nevertheless be pointed out which show that not all parts of the discipline have entirely remained out of tune with recent developments. There can be little doubt, for instance, that outright colonialist and evolutionist attitudes have largely been overcome. The boundaries between the various colonized regions in the Mediterranean have moreover occasionally been crossed in recent years and different colonial processes are now fruitfully compared (e.g. Acquaro et al. 1988; Descoeudres 1990a). A likely explanation of this somewhat incoherent state of affairs can probably be found in the divided character of colonial studies in Mediterranean archaeology, where attention is dispersed over various instances of colonialism.

Whether these few trends amount to a perspective in Mediterranean archaeology which might be labelled postcolonial remains to be seen, however. In archaeology in general, postcolonial insights have occasionally surfaced, in particular in the context of North-West European Roman archaeology, where ongoing debate about the ‘romanization’ of the Iron Age peoples North of the Alps has induced serious rethinking of the concepts involved (see Webster 1996a; cf.

pp. 167-168, 206-209). Although similar considerations are virtually absent in Mediterranean archaeology (cf. Mattingly 1996, 57; Van Dommelen 1997a, 308), it does not follow that contemporary developments in the region and postcolonial academic debate have passed entirely unnoticed in Mediterranean archaeology.

In the final section of this chapter, I therefore start by briefly examining the extent to which Mediterranean archaeology has been influenced by decolonization and postcolonial thinking as discussed in the previous section of this chapter. In the second part of this section these insights again provide a starting point for setting out the lines along which I intend to study ancient colonialism in the Mediterranean in the remainder of this book.

2.4.1 DECOLONIZING MEDITERRANEAN ARCHAEOLOGY

Just as the decolonization of North Africa has been claimed as a starting point for a post-colonial and perhaps even post-structuralist outlook in the social sciences, it has certainly not passed unnoticed in Mediterranean archaeology. The explicit identification of a new orientation towards Roman colonialism in North Africa as *histoire décolonisée* (cf. p. 22) does not leave any doubt that Mediterranean archaeology has seen the rise of a post-colonial approach. But to what extent can it be rated among the various instances of postcolonialism as defined by Bhabha (cf. p. 25)?

The first and most explicitly political characteristic of the approach headed by Laroui and Bénabou is their strong and often one-sided emphasis on the indigenous colonized population (pp. 20-21). In this respect, their work shows a striking and presumably not coincidental resemblance to Fanon's and Memmi's writings; with these it also shares an outspoken dualist nature. The intention to reinterpret North African history from an indigenous point of view is clearly akin to the 'emancipatory goal' of the *Subaltern Studies* group.

A second outstanding feature of the approach is Bénabou's study of resistance (1976). He has drawn attention to other aspects of resistance than the traditional military one, claiming it as a threefold concept, made up of a military, political and psychological dimension. This obviously corresponds closely with one of the principal features of postcolonialism, which is the insistence on understanding colonialism in other than exclusively military or economic terms. It is also one of the few elements which can be found in both literary studies and the social sciences. Bénabou's recognition of a 'psychological domain' of resistance in which people's individual personality is threatened by colonial power (1976, 17) corresponds with Gramsci's views on the pervasiveness of hegemony and with Bourdieu's notion of symbolic violence. Bénabou's suggestion that the persistence of indigenous culture in Roman Africa which can be traced for several centuries after the Roman conquest of North Africa can be regarded as a form of cultural protest (Bénabou 1981) moreover relates to Gramsci's thoughts on popular culture and similar ideas about subcultures. Outside the Maghreb, these insightful ideas have only been taken up on nearby Sardinia (cf. p. 21) and they have generally remained without much following. Despite several outspoken postcolonial features, the explicit dualist character of Laroui's and Bénabou's approach detracts from its coherence as a postcolonial perspective in the sense discussed in the third section of this chapter; nor can it easily be reconciled with postcolonial attempts to overcome 'nativist' tendencies (Bhabha 1992a, 173; cf. Parry 1994). Not unlike — again — Fanon's and Memmi's work, however, this cannot undermine the fundamental and instrumental importance of their shift in perspective.

The unique occurrence of postcolonial trends in Mediterranean archaeology in the Maghreb brings the impact of the violent decolonization of Algeria once more back into focus: as the initial impetus for the anomalous development unequivocally roots in the historical situation of that time, it may serve as a healthy reminder of the intimate interconnections between postcolonialism and postwar decolonization and the denouncement of neo-imperialism in the 1960s. In this light it is perhaps no surprise that Sardinia, of all places, has showed a comparable inclination to a postcolonial perspective: for many islanders, who retain a remarkably strong sense of self-awareness, the Italian government of today is only the last in a long series of foreign oppressors, who have now merely supplanted brutal oppression with more subtle means of (cultural) hegemony. The widespread influence of this attitude in Sardinian archaeology is well illustrated by the comment in a discussion of the indigenous armed struggle against Carthage that 'despite repeated announcements and expectations of liberation, the Sardinians have not entirely overcome dependence' (Lilliu 1992, 35).[20]

2.4.2 CONTOURS OF A POSTCOLONIAL ARCHAEOLOGY

As may be evident from the foregoing, an archaeological approach to ancient colonialism along postcolonial lines can hardly be built on earlier work in the discipline. Drawing therefore on the insights and approaches developed in the social sciences at large as discussed in the third section of this chapter, I shall attempt to sketch the contours of a postcolonial archaeology of ancient colonialism in this final part. It is explicitly not my intention to try and build an all-encompassing model, which in one way or another both describes and explains how colonialism 'works'. I shall refrain from such generalizing statements about colonialism in general or, for that matter, Phoenician or Roman colonialism more specifically. It is on the contrary my contention that colonialism cannot be regarded as some abstract entity which has set foot ashore in several places and which might somehow be captured by one single 'model' which has left archaeologically traceable remains at each port of call *(pace* Aubet 1993, 278; Niemeyer 1990). I rather suggest that colonialism should first and foremost be conceived in terms of a number of specific colonial situations which share a set of interrelationships. These are furthermore not static as they are maintained by these very same colonized areas which may thus interfere in the colonial network.

The approach which I advocate is grounded in basic assumptions and guiding principles adapted from postcolonial work in the social sciences and literary studies. A first starting point is provided by the focus on the local context of colonialism. This does not imply that the colonial network of interregional relationships can be ignored but means instead that these interconnections must be taken into account in as far as they define the structural conditions of the local context by providing relatively easy access to international networks for some people, by rearranging the local infrastructure, by imposing specific demands on economic production etc. Each local context thus needs to be examined in its own terms rather than fitted in with an overarching, supposedly uniform colonial network. The phrase 'structural conditions' refers in the first instance to the so-called 'hard reality' of colonial situations, that is the military-political and economic context created by dominant colonizers. In the second place it includes a cultural dimension in the widest sense of the term, which consists of elements shared with colonized areas elsewhere: these play a role in reproducing the *habitus* of at least some (groups of) people living in the colonized region and are likely to contribute to the colonial hegemony.

A second entry is that of practice which can be examined in various social domains. In the first place, I shall focus on that of daily life in the colonial situation which is abundantly documented in the archaeological record by the remains of rural settlement (farms) and evidence of other routine economic activities. The landscape in which these settlements were located and people experienced the colonial conditions represents a prominent domain to be explored, assuming that 'landscapes are created by people — through their experiences and engagement with the world around them' (Bender 1993, 1). If the ways in which people have organized their 'ordinary landscapes' (Meinig 1979) and if the objects used by them represented means for shaping daily practice in conjunction with the aforementioned structural conditions (*habitus*), then there can be little doubt that examining these aspects sheds light on important dimensions of the colonial situation. A further much less 'mundane' but no less promising domain for studying practice is that of ritual, which can be traced archaeologically in specific ritual places such as shrines but also in cemeteries. In contrast to the field of daily routine activities, where practical knowledge or consciousness rooting in Gramsci's *senso comune* can be expected to play a major part, ritual activities generally constitute a critical feature of society where the prevalent 'ideas and values' are eminently discernable (Platenkamp 1992, 74). As a corollary, it has been claimed that 'the power of ritual may come to be used, under certain conditions, to objectify conflict in the everyday world, and to attempt to transcend it' (Comaroff 1985, 119), which means in Gramscian terms that a 'contradictory consciousness' is likely to be revealed most sharply in ritual contexts (cf. Keesing 1992, 213). Comparing the various social domains or 'levels' thus offers the opportunity to look into the principal constituents of (colonial) society and to consider their indebtedness to colonial, indigenous or other 'local' ideas and values (cf. Barraud et al. 1984, 509).

A third and final point of departure is that colonial situations represent contexts which are reproduced by various social groups, some of which can be defined as colonized and others as colonizing while still others appear to occupy positions in-between (Stoler 1989, 139). Because ostensibly deviant attitudes of people may take the shape of archaeologically traceable subcultures and given the prominent role of material culture in the construction of identity in general and of subcultures in particular, it is certainly worthwhile probing various domains of the colonial situation in order to identify groups within colonial society and their mutual relationships.

Because of the close succession and entanglement of the colonial situations which are the object of this comparative study of three subsequent instances of colonialism in first millennium BC Sardinia, I shall use the term 'local' in the specific sense of referring to the colonial context; the phrase 'local people' therefore comprises *all* inhabitants of the area under discussion, regardless of their colonial or indigenous origins. The reason for this is that it is often difficult to decide who is to be regarded 'native' in a colonial situation. Since people of 'colonial descent' but born in the colony are native of the colonized region in a literal sense, they can either be regarded as colonial or as colonized, depending on the criteria adopted. People of indigenous descent but absorbed by the colonial community — the *évolués* in French colonial terminology — are similarly difficult to label. This clearly shows why the terms 'colonial' and 'indigenous' (or 'native') may often obfuscate the aforementioned ambivalent or 'murky' dimensions of the colonial situation which are precisely the ones focused upon from a postcolonial perspective. The terms 'colonial' and 'colonized' stand of course for a foreign and indigenous background respectively, if this distinction is deemed relevant.

Setting out from these starting points for an examination of the three successive colonial episodes in first millennium BC west central Sardinia as announced in the introduction, I shall further illustrate and elaborate these arguments in detail in the following chapters of this book. Having sketched the relevant contexts of the physical environment and of the available archaeological evidence in the next chapter, I shall discuss the Phoenician, Carthaginian and Roman colonial presence in west central Sardinia in the subsequent chapters four, five and six. In each of these, I shall first outline the locally relevant structural characteristics of the colonial network in the (western) Mediterranean in general and then proceed to explore matters of everyday practice and interaction of various social groups. Through detailed comparison of the material culture used in different contexts, I shall attempt to situate some of these groups in the local colonial situation. By zooming in on these aspects, it may be possible to shed some light on the murky dimensions of ancient colonialism and to cut across conventional categories such as the colonial divide which usually structure representations of ancient colonialism in the Mediterranean.

notes

1 A fundamentally different usage of this term denotes first-time human occupation of a given area. This sense of the word derives from biology and carries strong ecological connotations (see Patton 1996).

2 'Nous pouvons donc sans craindre, et malgré les fautes nombreuses qu'il ne sert à rien de cacher, comparer notre occupation de l'Algérie et de la Tunesie à celle des mêmes provinces africaines par les Romains: comme eux, nous avons glorieusement conquis le pays, comme eux, nous avons assuré l'occupation, comme eux, nous essayons de le transformer à notre image et de le gagner à la civilisation.'

3 '...n'est pas simplement un épisode, parmi d'autres, de l'histoire de l'impérialisme romain; elle est aussi, et surtout, un moment particulièrement important dans l'histoire de la population indigène de l'Afrique du Nord.'

4 'Résistance, d'abord, dans le domaine militaire, comme réaction de lutte dirigée contre une occupation étrangère: puis dans le domaine politique, comme force de conservation s'opposant à l'innovation et au mouvement; enfin, dans le domaine psychologique, comme tentative de protéger une part de sa personnalité contre l'influence d'autrui.'

5 A similarly crucial conference was held in the Netherlands in 1980 and subsequently published under the heading of *Roman and native in the Low Countries Spheres of interaction* (Brandt/Slofstra 1983). See in particular Slofstra's observations on the notion of 'romanization' (Slofstra 1983). Cf. pp. 167-168 and 206-209.

6 This applies to academic (analytical) representations and should not be confused with participants' views which are part and parcel of colonial situations and may be more or less dualist (p. 31; cf. p. 216).

7 The allegedly permanent and unchanged, often fiercely resisting presence of the so-called 'Berber element' was frequently emphasized by both Roman and French colonizers of Algeria and Morocco (cf. Mattingly 1996, 50).

8 This suggestion was first made in the context of a wider comparison of North Africa and Sardinia under Roman rule.

9 'Parziali, frammentari, disorganici: tali appaiano dunque ancor oggi, come in passato, gli studi fenici.'

10 'die Begegnung mit den phantastischen Schätzen der östlichen Hochkulturen'; 'die katalysatorische, entscheidende Funktion [der Phönizier] für die Entstehung der frühen etruskischen Kultur.'

11 See Gates 1991 and Parry 1994 for an overview of and comments on interpretations of Fanon's work.

12 Derrida, Lyotard and Cixous were all either born in Algeria or in some other way involved in the Algerian War of Independence. Yet, as pointed out by Said (1993, 240), an anti-colonial stance had occasionally already been voiced in the 18th and 19th centuries: the writings of Multatuli against the Dutch exploitation of Indonesia are a case in point.

13 Similarly, distinguishing between one-self or one's group and 'the Other' necessarily precedes any further differentiation of the latter (cf. Rouse 1995, 356). Local (participants') views of the colonial situation may therefore often be dualist ones in order to cope with the situation.

14 The close connections between imitation and projection of stereotypes of Self and Other have been explored by Michael Taussig in his analysis of western representations of indigenous 'savagery' and healing in Colombia (Taussig 1987).

15 A typical example is the persistent emphasis on race in many postcolonial analyses, which no doubt lay at the heart of Victorian colonial discourse but which represents a Western construct which cannot unproblematically be regarded as a universal characteristic of colonialism: racial concerns do not seem to have been a major concern of Renaissance colonialism in the Americas and likewise appear to have been virtually absent in ancient representations of colonized others (Ferro 1994, 38; Thomas 1994, 37; cf. Dougherty 1993; Silverblatt 1995).

16 Gramsci's focus on the specific situation of southern Italy and its relationships with the industrializing North in the context of fascist Italy have no doubt contributed much to this. His personal experiences as a Sardinian in Turin may also have played a role. Gramsci was native of the village of Ales in the Marmilla region of west central Sardinia and wrote much of his work with the Sardinian situation in mind while staying in a fascist prison cell (Angioni 1990, 41). The notebooks in which he recorded his thoughts have later been collected and edited under the title of *Quaderni del carcere* ('prison notebooks'). A detailed biography has been written by Giuseppe Fiori (1966).

17 'E non avviene spesso che tra il fatto intellettuale e la norma di condotta ci sia contraddizione?' (Gerratana 1975, 1378; English translation after the abridged English edition by Hoare/Nowell Smith 1971, 326). The reference in the text gives the location of the fragment in the original *Quaderni*.

18 'L'uomo attivo di massa opera praticamente ma non ha una chiara coscienza teorica di questo suo operare che pure è un

conoscere il mondo in quanto lo trasforma. La sua coscienza teorica anzi può essere storicamente in contrasto col suo operare. Si può quasi dire che egli ha due coscienze teoriche (o una coscienza contradittoria), una implicita nel suo operare e che lo unisce a tutti i suoi collaboratori nella trasformazione pratica della realtà e una superficialmente esplicita o verbale che ha eriditato dal passato e ha accolto senza critica. Tuttavia questa concezione “verbale” non è senza conseguenze: essa riannoda a un gruppo sociale determinato, influisce nella condotta morale, nell’indirizzo della volontà, in modo più o meno energico, che può giungere a un punto in cui la contradittorietà della conscienza non permette nessuna azione, nessuna decisione, nessuna scelta e produce uno stato di passività morale e politica.’(Gerratana 1975, 1385; English translation by Hoare/Nowell Smith 1971, 333).

19 ‘Significa che un gruppo sociale, che ha una sua propria concezione del mondo, sia pure embrionale’ (Gerratana 1975, 1379; English translation by Femia 1975, 33: the English translation by Hoare/Nowel Smith [1971, 327] is unnecessarily ambiguous).

20 ‘Infatti dalla dipendenza, per quanto si vadano cogliendo annunzi e attese liberatorie, i Sardi non ne sono ancora usciti, interamente.’