Images of Rome

Richard Hingley

Introduction

The articles in this volume explore the uses of images derived from classical Rome in a number of countries in Europe and in the United States of America. Individual papers focus upon different periods, but the emphasis is on the 16th c. to the present day. The collection originated at the Roman Archaeology Conference held at Durham in April 1999, in the session *Images of Rome*. A number of archaeologists were invited to talk about the ways in which popular and academic images of Rome have been developed during the past five centuries, and the session included papers by many of the authors represented in this volume — N. Terrenato (Italy), M. Struck (Germany), W. Hessing (Netherlands), and R. Hingley (England). R. Laurence presented a paper about American images of Rome but was unable to contribute to the publication, and S. Dyson kindly produced a paper in his stead. In addition, it has been possible to include papers by A. King on France, G. Mora on Spain and S. Babić on Serbia, and these have considerably extended the range of topics covered. The papers concentrate on the western part of Europe but include individual contributions on the Balkans and the United States. A selection of national traditions is explored, but no attempt is made to cover countries outside the boundaries of these areas.[1] Individual articles consider literary traditions, popular writing, education, art, architecture, and antiquities. Many of the papers also discuss traditions of archaeological research in the various countries and how these have related, and continue to relate, to popular images.

This introduction is an overview of the contribution to the topic of images of Rome made by the eight papers presented here. It also develops an argument for the need for archaeologists to consider the context of their work with regard to recent critiques of Western scholarship.

Rome and the past

The past has been deployed by Europeans, and peoples of the Western world in general, to carve out opposing identities, to construct the West and the non-West, and to create a cultural ancestry.[2] In this context the construction of the past has never been an unbiased activi-

---

[1] For a discussion of N Africa see Mattingly 1996, and for Romania see Deletant 1998 (I owe this reference to D. Breeze).

[2] Meskell 1999a, 3.

ty.[3] Rome has a special place in the definition of European history and thought.[4] It has an almost boundless capacity for providing multiple, mutable and conflicting images; this has made it a rich source for making sense of — and for destabilising — history, politics, identity, memory and desire.[5] For instance, Rome has been made to stand for literary authority, republican government, political unification, imperial power and its decline, military prowess, administrative efficiency, an imperial golden age, the Catholic Church, and the pleasure of ruins. This volume forms part of an expanding body of work on the varying historiographical associations provided by classical Rome.[6] Several of the stimulating recent volumes on this topic do not fully engage with the ideas and materials produced by the archaeologists who have studied the Roman empire.[7] The present collection aims in part to help to develop an archaeological perspective with regard to the use of images derived from classical Rome in the modern world.

The authors in this collection have different perspectives on the meaning of the phrase 'Images of Rome', but the main emphasis rests on how materials derived from the Roman past have been drawn upon to provide inspiration for modern peoples in various parts of the world. These materials include architecture, archaeological remains and the available historical sources; they have been utilised to help create and transform images of cultural origin and national purpose in a variety of countries.

Roman and native images

A dichotomy is drawn by N. Terrenato in chapt. 4 between Roman policies and the reaction of the native (i.e., non-Roman) peoples of Italy; he defines this as a 'touchstone issue' for his paper. In fact, this

---

3   Smith 1986, 180-81.
4   Edwards 1999a, 2-3; Wyke and Biddiss 1999a; Farrell 2001.
5   Edwards 1999a, 2-3. The complex variety of images provided by Rome was also evident to classical authors (Hardie 1992).
6   For instance, the following works are relevant. Pagden (1995) summarises the use of the image of Rome during the 16th to 18th c. in France, Spain and Britain; Moatti (1993) considers a variety of ways in which the image has been used in several countries. The volume edited by Jenkyns (1992) contains a range of relevant papers. Vance (1997) examines the ways in which the Victorians interpreted classical Rome. Wyke (1997) studies cinematic images of Rome in 20th-c. Italy and America, and the volumes edited by Edwards (1999b) and Wyke and Biddiss (1999b) provide a variety of perspectives on the modern uses to which classical Rome has been put. Galinsky (1992) gives an account of classical and modern interactions in America, and Deletant (1998) discusses the use of the image of Rome in Romania.
7   Hingley 2000b, 828.

dichotomy between the Roman image and native identity also proves a significant issue for a number of the other papers.

The image of the Roman empire has provided an origin myth for many of the peoples of Europe and, in particular, the West throughout history. Communities in the present-day Italian peninsula drew upon the Roman imperial past as a 'golden age of prosperity and centrality' from the early Middle Ages onward (Terrenato, below pp. 74-75). From the 9th c. the Germanic empire, which included a large part of modern Italy, was regarded as the successor to imperial Rome (Struck, below p. 94). In Spain during the 15th c. the image of classical Rome provided a useful political model for the new monarchy after the conquest of the territories under Islamic control (Mora, below p. 34). The Catholic monarchs were thought to represent the inheritors of the Roman empire and to have a direct lineage to the Roman emperors, through their successors, the Visigothic kings (ibid). The élite of various Western nations during the 16th to 20th c. used the image of Rome in a range of ways in the development of education, art, architecture, literature and politics. Relevant points are developed in a number of the papers (for instance, those by Struck and Hingley), but Mora provides a particularly detailed and lucid account.

With regard to the contrasting idea of native identity, the Roman literary sources served to provide an idea of 'otherness' that has been used to help define and unite peoples within individual nations in Western Europe. By defining their own civilisation in opposition to barbarian 'others',[8] classical authors provided a powerful interpretative tool for those who helped to create modern nations and empires. Roman authors writing during the period of Roman expansion in the 1st c. B.C. and 1st-2nd c. A.D. recorded the names and deeds of various significant 'ethnic' groups in the Western Empire and elsewhere (including Gauls, Batavians, Germans, Britons, Dacians). Some significant Roman texts became available to the educated élite in Western Europe from the 16th c. onward. They contained information about these earlier peoples, about their ways of life and acts of resistance to Roman imperialism. The texts occasionally indicated the approximate location in which these peoples had lived.

With the rise of antiquarianism from the 16th c. onward, physical evidence (artefacts and structures) derived from the past could be employed to locate these peoples in the contemporary landscape of Western Europe. In this context, archaeology has translated an idealised

---

8   For the classical definition of the barbarian 'other' see, for instance, Habinek 1998, 157; Hall 1989; Jones 1971; Patterson 1997, 30-32; Romm 1992; Shaw 1983; Webster 1996 and 1999.

image of the ethnic past into tactile realities using the modern "canons" of knowledge.[9] By the late 19th and early 20th c., archaeologists were using techniques to locate, date, describe and classify material remains, but they also provided 'stories' about the origin of monuments and artefacts which assisted in the development of national self-identity.[10] In these stories the physical elements of inherited culture — the artefacts, buildings and landscapes — provided a particularly tangible connection with an imaged ethnic past. Sense of place is vital in national self-definition, and the tying of ethnic identities to certain forms of physical archaeological evidence has provided a powerful tool for regional and state nationalism in several European countries. The identification and description of prehistoric peoples has often formed the basis for nationalistic enterprise,[11] and the classical sources have provided the material on which nationalistic projections have operated by naming and providing descriptions of these peoples.

Roman texts also included an inter-related source of information because they named certain native leaders who led these pre-Roman groups in armed opposition to the Roman imperialists. They included Arminius/Hermann in Germany, Vercingetorix in Gaul, Boadicea/ Boudica in Britain, Civilis in the Netherlands, Viriathus in Iberia, and Decebalus in Dacia. These individuals played an important rôle in defining national self-identity by providing national figureheads in a variety of contexts. This theme is explored in the papers by Struck, Hessing, King and Hingley.

Roman historians provided accounts of the ways in which the supposedly 'civilising' power represented by Rome came into conflict with the 'barbarians', and tales of various native peoples' resistance to Roman imperial expansion were often developed in a strongly anti-Roman fashion. Nationalists found it useful in some situations, however, to imagine that native groups being incorporated into the empire were also deeply influenced by the 'civilisation' of the Romans. It is significant in this context that imperial Rome was often viewed to have performed a special rôle — the passing on of Mediterranean 'civilisation' to various Western European peoples, which effectively enabled the distinct Roman and native images to be combined. The classical sources attest to a range of prehistoric peoples in Gaul, Germany,

---

9   Smith 1986, 180; see also Trigger 1989, 174.
10 For recent volumes on archaeology and nationalism, see Atkinson *et al.* 1996; Díaz-Andreu and Champion 1996; Kohl and Fawcett 1995; and Meskell 1999b.
11 See individual case studies in the four collections of papers mentioned n.10.

Iberia, Britain and even Italy — peoples who in some ways seemed more akin to the native populations of the New World than to the contemporary populations of Western Europe. Rome, it was argued, had civilised these peoples. For instance, Hessing observes that during the 16th c. the comments of Tacitus on the Batavians permitted the recasting of Holland and the Dutch Republic in the context of the history of the Roman Empire. It could be argued that the Batavians learned and profited from the Roman example, enabling the prevailing image of a barbarian primaeval age to be rewritten.[12]

The Romans had introduced the culture of civilisation — roads, towns, bath-houses, taxes and the Latin language — a civilisation modern Western Europe was thought to have inherited. Christian Europe was also felt to have inherited its religious tradition from classical Rome. Roman writers spoke to the educated élite classes of 19th and 20th c. Europe and the USA in Latin, a language that helped to define their identity and one that they could understand. As a result, many members of these classes felt an association with the ancient Romans through an inheritance of a common classical tradition, religion and civilisation — an association that was all the more influential because of the dominance of the Latin language in the education of the contemporary élite.[13]

The Roman and native images of origin therefore have not always been developed in opposition to each other, as they were argued in certain situations to be complementary.

The papers in this volume

The individual papers develop a variety of perspectives that relate to images of Roman and native and to the rôle of archaeology with regard to these. In chapt. 2, G. Mora surveys the rôle of scholars, architects and artists in the introduction and transformation of images of Rome within Spain in the 16th to 18th c. She focusses upon art and architecture and explores the vital rôle of images derived from classical Rome in these fields and the political contexts of the ways that they were used in the service of rich patrons. She also considers how early archaeological endeavours, both in Italy and in Spain, operated within the context of the development of classically-derived concepts.

---

12 See Mikalachki 1998 for a comparable development in Britain at around the same time.

13 Stray 1998, 11; Wyke and Biddiss 1999a; Farrell 2001. The relevance of these observations is not restricted to what is usually defined as Western Europe. An image of a Roman origin has been influential in Romania in modern times (see Babić, below p. 170). See also Deletant 1998 for the Roman image and the complexity of ideas of national origin in modern Romania.

Rome has also been seen as a source of civilisation in some parts of the world that have been colonised by Europeans. For some in the contemporary world, the word 'civilisation' evokes an image of an inheritance from the Egyptians, Greeks and Romans which has its highest development within the United States.[14] In chapt. 3, S. Dyson considers the ways that images provided by classical Rome have been utilised in American neo-classicism from the 17th c. onward. As he shows, classical Rome presented a grand and powerful image to people in the United States that has been drawn upon in their constitution, in art and architecture. His emphasis, however, is on art, and he explores those areas that are more likely to leave a trace in some future archaeological record. He stresses that this archaeological record could be made to support the continuity of classical models that link Athens with Alexandria, Alexandria with Rome, and Rome with a range of small towns and great urban centres on the western shores of the Atlantic.

N. Terrenato in chapt. 4 reviews the perceptions of ancient Rome in modern Italian culture from the 18th c. onward, identifying some of the essential elements that are common to both scholarly and popular views in that country. A dichotomy is drawn between Roman policies and the reaction of the native (i.e., non-Roman) peoples of Italy, which Terrenato defines as a 'touchstone issue' (see above). The native perspective within Italy stressed the mosaic of small independent states that existed prior to the Roman expansion, while ideas of Rome as an icon emphasised its military and cultural dominance and its rôle in spreading civilisation to the native peoples. Terrenato also draws a number of lessons for modern archaeological endeavour from his study, arguing that archaeologists have a duty to contribute to new perceptions of Rome that overturn obsolete concepts and assumptions. The idea that archaeologists need to engage with outmoded popular images of Rome is one that is shared by several of the authors in this volume.

In chapt. 5, M. Struck explores the development of the image of Rome in Germany from the Middle Ages onward. Struck provides a detailed study of the 19th- and 20th-c. developments, but she also emphasises the value of the contrasting idea provided by a Germanic image of origin. The classical sources that described the culture and actions of the ancient Germanic peoples provided a powerful idea of identity that was developed in the 19th c. as part of what Struck describes as 'political Germanism'. In the 19th c. the victory of Hermann the German — Arminius of the classical sources — over three Roman legions in A.D. 9 was glorified as part of this native image. In addition to the useful discussion of the earlier material, Struck's chapter provides a particularly valuable perspective on an under-researched topic

---

14   Patterson 1997, 9.

— the archaeology of the Nazi period in Germany and the post-war reaction.

In chapt. 6, A. King develops another native image — that of Vercingetorix — the French equivalent of Hermann. King looks at the development of the cult of Vercingetorix during the 19th and 20th c. and considers the complex relationship between the image of native heroism and that of Rome within French society. He argues that Vercingetorix's rôle within French society has now been inherited by the cartoon character Asterix and the stories provided by his brave, if entirely fictitious, opposition to the Roman invaders. Of particular significance is the origin myth, dating back to the 18th c., which suggests that the peasant Gauls and Gallo-Romans were the ancestors of the contemporary French population. The papers by Struck and King show the complexity of the process by which the Germans and French drew upon an identification with ancient figures of the resistance. Hermann provided a symbol of German resistance against France in the 19th c., while Vercingetorix was, in turn, drawn upon by the French against the Germans.[15] In this context, it is significant that the statue of Hermann that was erected near Detmould in 1841 was positioned facing to the west as a counter to potential French aggression (Struck, below p. 99).[16] In Britain, Boadicea provided a figure of resistance against all comers,[17] and her contrasting rôle is considered briefly in the paper by Hingley. Her statue placed on the Embankment in London in front of the House of Commons during 1902 symbolised a defence of Parliament from an attack over the Thames from the south.[18] The rendition of ancient heroes in physical form could help to focus national identity in the face of international pressures.[19] By contrast, the Dacian leader Decebalus fulfils a rather less grand rôle in Romania today — he is commemorated in the name of a department store in Turnu Severin (Babić, below p. 169).

In chapt. 7, W. Hessing explores images of Roman and native in Dutch historiography and archaeology from the 16th c. onward. His narrative develops around the topic of the 'Batavian myth', the idea that the identity of people within this part of Europe drew upon a pre-Roman people mentioned by the Roman writer Tacitus. Interestingly,

---

15   For Vercingetorix see also Dietler 1998 and *Vercingétorix et Alésia* 1994.
16   See also Smiles 1994, 34-36.
17   Hingley 2000a.
18   Webster 1978, 2.
19   Historical figures drawn from Rome itself were also used to bolster the political power of individual leaders, as King (below p. 115) describes in his account of Napoleon III's use of Julius Caesar; see also Dietler 1998. Wyke (1999) provides an account of the ways in which Mussolini drew upon Julius Caesar.

he argues that it was sometimes useful to combine the idea of Batavian origins with an input of classical civilisation derived from the Roman intervention — that native barbarity was excised by the input of classical civilisation.

In chapt. 8, I consider the significance of the image of Rome with regard to the development of the idea of Englishness during the late 19th and early 20th c. In the 18th and 19th c. the English often defined their own civilisation in opposition to the 'Celtic' identity of others in the north and west of the British Isles. The classical historical sources were used in this context to help to define a barbaric Celtic 'other'.[20] The English also drew upon an image of the Roman origin of their civilisation. This idea of Roman origins became particularly significant during the heyday of British imperialism because of the argument that the English had inherited the imperial torch of Rome. The idea of Englishness enabled them to draw upon an image of origins that included the bravery of the ancient Britons in addition to the civilisation of the Romans and the supposed political freedom of the Anglo-Saxons. This image of Englishness was based upon the idea of racial mixing. I argue that the development of the theory of 'Romanisation' within Roman archaeology during the 20th c. has helped to support and supplement this image of Englishness, as it provided the means by which Roman civilisation was passed through to the native Britons and therefore to the contemporary English. This has connotations for the archaeology of Roman Britain, which needs to re-establish close contacts with ancient history if it is to avoid a nationalistic emphasis.

It is relevant to this discussion that, from the mid-19th c. to World War II, European powers controlled or influenced most parts of the world. At this time, a Eurocentric perspective focussed attention upon the importance of Europe in world history.[21] Civilisation was considered by many to have been successively displaced in time and space, from the ancient Near East through Greece and Rome to the Christian Middle Ages, the Western European Renaissance, and to the modern

---

20   Hingley 2000a, 40.
21   Bernal 1985. Bernal's book *Black Athena: the Afroasiatic roots of classical civilisation* was first published in 1985. It has had a major impact on classical studies (cf. Lefkowitz and MacLean Rogers 1996) and is, perhaps, the most discussed book on the ancient history of the eastern Mediterranean since the Bible (Liverani 1996, 421). The book raises important scholarly questions about the methods of ancient history which focus upon the topic of Eurocentrism (Habinek 1998, 15, 173-74). Bernal's efforts have resulted in a lively debate over the imperial context of past studies of ancient Greece, yet it is of interest to note that the study of classical Rome has seen no such thorough re-examination of its basic tenets.

European industrial nations.[22] This Eurocentric perspective included the passing of classical Greek culture to the modern West through the medium of the Roman empire. The Eurocentric discourse gave primacy to the development of Western civilisation and can be argued to have involved the Western appropriation of ancient cultures for the sake of its own development.[23] I argue that this idea of Western dominance was a vital part of imperialism (below pp. 153-54).

In contrast to these Western images, the perception in Eastern Europe has often focussed upon an idea of cultural origins that stems more directly from classical Greece.[24] In chapt. 9, S. Babić explores the image of Rome in Serbia. Babić shows that Rome has not fulfilled such a core rôle as a myth of origin in this part of the Balkans as it has over much of the West. Instead, Serbia and the Balkans are often placed on a crossroads between East and West — an image which she develops using the analogy of Trajan's bridge over the Danube. The idea of Greek identity with regard to the peoples of Eastern Europe emerges in this paper, but Babić also shows that Serbian myths of origin are complex and contrasts these with the more direct Roman origin myth that pertains in the neighbouring country of Romania. The attention that has been paid to classical Rome in Serbia is part of a desire to draw upon a common European tradition that is shared by Western nations.

In fact, as M. Struck stresses (below pp. 100-1), the Greek image of origin has also been significant in Western European nations, where it has been drawn upon as a contrasting image to that of Rome.[25] S. Dyson also considers the value of the image of ancient Greece in America and its complex relationship to ideas derived from Rome. This Greek myth is not studied below in detail, but it does provide additional evidence for the complex character of images of origin in all times and places.

The rôle of archaeology

Various papers in this volume demonstrate that archaeology has

---

22 Bernal 1985 and Patterson 1997, 22. Bahrani (1999) discusses the ways that the 'Mesopotamian' past was made to fit with a colonialist agenda concerned with the passing of the 'torch of civilisation', while Hingley (2000a) provides a comparable perspective for the Roman period in Britain.

23 Bernal 1994; Bahrani 1999; Hingley 2000a.

24 Alcock 1997; Millett 1997. Gourgouris (1996, 73) considers the impact of the discourse on philhellenism in the formation of the nation of Greece and on the 'entire epistemic space' of 19th-c. Europe. See Janik and Zawadzka 1996, 118; Jones and Graves-Brown 1996, 10; and Hupchick 1994, 74-76 and 123, for additional discussion on the relationship between Eastern and Western Europe.

25 See also Jenkyns 1980 and Habinek 1998, 15-20.

served a rôle in nationalist and imperialist agendas. I wish to explore this topic further before concluding by considering the lessons that the volume holds for Roman archaeology in the 21st c. Spanish architects received support to draw Roman buildings because of the useful images they provided for the Spanish Crown (Mora, below p. 24). The excavations at Tivoli, Pompeii and Herculaneum during the 18th c. received royal assistance because they helped in the assessment of valuable ideas and images that were derived from the classical historical sources (ibid). In Europe, in the mid to late 19th c., under the influence of German and Italian scholars, including B. G. Niebuhr and T. Mommsen, an image of Roman Italy arose that formed a suitable rôle model for the new states of Germany and Italy (see Terrenato, below p. 77).[26] The city-state of Rome was perceived at this time to have had a rôle in creating a centralised Italy, a classical lesson that had significance for the Germans and Italians in the creation and definition of their own unified countries. The German image of an inheritance from ancient Rome was strong because of the geographical and historical links between imperial Rome and the Holy Roman Empire. In the context of the political value of the Roman example, Wilhelm II directly encouraged archaeological work on Roman military sites in Germany (Struck, below p. 105; King, below p. 119). During the early 20th c. the Italian state used the classical past for self-definition. Mussolini utilised a variety of Roman monuments in the creation of his new Roman capital (see Terrenato, below p. 80).[27] Roman architectural fragments and artefacts were vitally important to the creation of political power in a number of countries in the West during the 18th, 19th and early 20th c.

Countries that were involved in acquiring and administering imperial possessions could also derive lessons from imperial Rome.[28] Rome presented an image of an extensive, powerful, and well-organised world empire — a parallel that could be drawn upon in a variety of ways. The French uncovered and restored classical Roman buildings during their occupation of Rome (1809-14).[29] Classically-educated English administrators and politicians derived guidance about the topics of decline and fall, contemporary frontier issues, and matters of 'race relations' within the British Empire, and Roman archaeology had a part to play in this.[30] Germany and the United States also had

---

26   See also Terrenato 1998, 21. Freeman (1997, 30) discusses the context of Mommsen's work in the light of events in Europe during 1848.

27   See also Manacorda and Tamassia 1985; Quartermaine 1995; Stone 1999; Wyke 1999.

28   For a comparable use of the image of classical Greece see Dougherty 1993, 3-4.

29   Ridley 1992.

30   For 'race relations', see Betts 1971; for decline and fall and frontier issues, see Hingley 2000a.

periods of imperial ambition in the late 19th c., and these led to the articulation of Roman images in both countries (Struck, below p. 94; Dyson, below p. 65).[31] In N Africa during the 19th and early 20th c., French colonial administrators and military men saw themselves as direct descendants of the Romans.[32] They adopted concepts from Roman historical sources and used Roman monuments in the creation of their colonial present. The expansion of Italian territory to include parts of N Africa from the 1910s to 1940s was projected as an attempt to regain lands that had formerly been part of the Roman empire and properly belonged to Italy.[33] Imperial Rome was drawn upon by a variety of nations to assist in the creation and maintenance of imperial possessions, and archaeology often had a rôle.[34]

A post-colonial reaction to this use of the image of classical Rome by Britain, France and Italy has taken place. For the post-colonial nations which now form parts of N Africa, the Roman empire appears to be associated with colonial French and Italians; classical archaeology is not popular in these countries.[35] A similar state of affairs appears to exist with regard to former English domination in parts of Highland Scotland. A lecture on the reasons for the failure of the Romans to conquer the Highlands of Scotland in Inverness was received in an unfavourable manner when the lecturer tried to suggest that strategic problems prevented conquest (D. Breeze, pers. com.). Some of the present-day population of Highland Scotland apparently believe that it was the valour of their ancestors that prevented the conquest[36] and do not wish to be told otherwise. Part of the reason for this appears to be that many Scots believe that the aims of the Roman and the 18th-c. Hanoverian invaders were similar. This assumption projects the beliefs of the 18th-c. invaders of Scotland back onto their modern-day successors.[37] In England, Italy and France modern nations have claimed a direct historical association with the imperial Romans. In N Africa and perhaps in Scotland this claim has been rejected by subsequent generations, to the disadvantage of Roman archaeological studies.

---

31   For the American use of the image of decline and fall in the 19th and 20th c., see Galinsky 1992.
32   Mattingly 1996.
33   Stone 1999; Terrenato, below chapt. 4. Roman lessons were also used by the Nazis in Germany in their attempt to create a new European order (Struck, below chapt. 5).
34   See Gilkes and Miraj 2000 and Hingley 2000a. The use of Roman imperial parallels to bolster the British Empire is a process that I have described as 'imperial discourse' (Hingley 2000a, 6-9).
35   Mattingly 1996.
36   See Breeze 1988, 3, for the background to this suggestion.
37   See Hingley 2000a.

In Western Europe the political use of ancient peoples as ancestor figures in some national archaeological traditions led to strident critiques of nationalistic agendas from the 1930s onward (see Terrenato, below p. 81; Struck p. 108; Hessing, pp. 138-39). Yet, as a number of the papers in this volume argue, a variety of inherited popular images are resistant to change and retain influence in the modern world; these continue to influence archaeological work. Terrenato points out that unquestioned assumptions relating to progress remain common in modern Italian society, as does the image of 'the Romans' as strong military figures. Hessing explores the survival of the 'Batavian myth' in the Netherlands, while King suggests that the modern cartoon character Asterix reflects aspects of the Gauls as presented in 19th-c. school books. Hingley considers the survival to the present day of a myth of mixed racial origins for the English that includes the inheritance of aspects of Roman imperial civilisation.

Several papers suggest that stories of origin continue to influence archaeological research. Yet it is not only the ideas that archaeologists use to interpret the archaeological evidence that are influenced by myths of origin. The evidence itself, as collected by archaeologists, also has a direct relationship to popular traditions, since the available archaeological data has been created by research interests that are often unconscious. The split between traditions of research in the Eastern and the Western Empire is one clear example of the influence of modern ideas upon archaeological research.[38] In this context, Babić (below p. 171) argues that archaeologists rarely pay attention to the Roman archaeology of the Balkans, as the area falls effectively into a conceptual gap between the East and the West.

On a more local level, with regard to Trajan's monumental bridge over the Danube, the remains survive on both banks of the river. In Romania they are well conserved and displayed, while in Serbia they are located in an open field. Babić suggests that the differing attitudes to the monument in these two countries relate to images of origin — Roman in Romania and Greek in Serbia. Carroll has argued that the terms used by archaeologists, such as 'Romano-British', 'Gallo-Romain' and 'Belgo-Romain', imply some kind of national particularism and contrast with the use of the concept 'Roman' in Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland.[39] France focusses far more resources upon the excavation of late Iron Age sites than on those of Roman date; whereas in Germany and the Netherlands the reverse is the case. This relates to French utilisation of the Gauls as ancestor figures, while German and Dutch scholarship until a decade ago

---

38   See note 24.
39   Carroll 2001, 12.

concentrated upon the Roman imperial endeavour.[40] In Britain a connection was perceived between the élite and the Roman upper classes — an association between Roman officers and English gentlemen — which has caused archaeologists to focus upon the works of the military, major towns, and the dwellings of the élite.[41] The homes of the less wealthy and powerful have been neglected until recently.

The character of programmes of the excavation and conservation of archaeological monuments appears to a degree to reflect the national myths of origin for each country, with Celts, Germans Batavians, Etruscans, Dacians, Greeks, Serbs, Romans, Islamic peoples and others providing differing origin myths for various groups. Archaeologists, by serving the public and the state, have sometimes helped to support these popular myths of origin, sometimes with disastrous results.

Summary

The value to archaeology and history of a study of images derived from classical Rome is perhaps the main theme to emerge from these papers. The historiographical study of Rome in the recent past has been dominated by ancient historians and art-historians; archaeologists now need to become more fully involved in the discussion.

This topic is of importance in itself, but it also has a rôle with regard to the discussion of the current state of Roman archaeology. Several chapters suggest that archaeological narratives continue to draw upon a range of popular images. These observations indicate that the relationship between academic works and images derived from the Roman past requires further attention (see Terrenato, below p. 83; Hessing p. 141; Hingley p. 162; and Babić p. 179). Knowledge of the past has been used to define modern nations in the West, and the theory of 'Romanisation' has served to map the course by which intelligent native peoples were able to adopt civilisation under the influence of Rome.[42] Images of Roman and native have been derived from the classical literature and from archaeological research and used to provide morals and lessons for nationalist and imperialist enterprises. Yet, despite the wealth of evidence for the exploitation of antiquity, explorations of the ways that Roman archaeologists have developed their studies are rare. Investigations of the link between images and the details of the practice of archaeology are rare.[43] Critical inquiries into the dominant traditions of research should form part of the future

study of the archaeology of both the eastern and the western parts of the Roman empire and also the area of interface between the two.

The eight contributions to this volume add to the debate from the perspective of the images of Rome in Western European countries, in the Balkans, and in the United States. Future work should attempt to extend the discussion to the countries of Eastern Europe, India, North Africa, and South America, as well as other areas in which classical Rome has been utilised to provide guidance for imperial and political agendas and to formulate archaeological theory.

University of Durham

Acknowledgements

References

Alcock, S. 1997. "East is east," in ead. (ed.), *The Early Roman Empire in the East* (Oxford) v-viii.

Atkinson, J. A., I. Banks and J. O'Sullivan (edd.) 1996. *Nationalism and archaeology: Scottish Archaeological Forum* (Glasgow).

Bahrani, Z. 1999. "Conjuring Mesopotamia: imaginative geography and a world past," in Meskell 1999b, 159-74.

Bernal, M. 1985. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic roots of classical civilisation,* vol. 1. *The fabrication of ancient Greece 1785-1985* (London).

Bernal, M. 1994. "The image of ancient Greece as a tool for colonialism and European hegemony," in G. C. Bond and A. Gilliam (edd.), *Social constructions of the past: representations as power* (London) 119-28.

Betts, R. F. 1971. "The allusions to Rome in British imperial thought of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries," *Victorian Studies* 15, 149-59.

Breeze, D. 1988. "Why did the Romans fail to conquer Scotland?" *ProcSocAntScot* 118, 3-22.

Carroll, M. 2001. *Romans, Celts and Germans: the German provinces of Rome* (Stroud).

Deletant, D. 1998. "Rewriting the past: trends in contemporary Romanian historiography," in D. Deletant and M. Pearton (edd.), *Romania observed: studies in contemporary Romanian history* (Bucharest) 276-303.

Derks, T. 1998. *Gods, temples and ritual practices: the transformation of religious ideas and values in Roman Gaul* (Amsterdam).

Diaz-Andreu, M. and T. Champion (edd.) 1996. *Nationalism and archaeology in Europe* (London).

Dietler, M. 1998. "A tale of three sites: the monumentalization of Celtic oppida and the politics of collective memory and identity," *World Archaeology* 30, 72-89.

Dougherty, C. 1993. *The poetics of colonisation: from city to text in archaic Greece* (Oxford).

Edwards, C. 1999a. "Introduction: shadows and fragments," in Edwards 1999b, 1-18.

Edwards, C. (ed.) 1999b. *Roman presences: receptions of Rome in European culture, 1789-1945* (Cambridge).

Farrell, J. 2001. *Latin language and Latin culture: from ancient to modern times* (Cambridge).

Freeman, P. W. M. 1997. "Mommsen through to Haverfield: the origins of Romanization studies in late 19th-c. Britain," in D. J. Mattingly (ed.), *Dialogues in Roman imperialism* (JRA Suppl. 23) 27-50.

Galinsky, K. 1992. *Classical and modern interactions: postmodern architecture, multiculturalism, decline and other issues* (Austin, TX).

Gilkes, O. and L. Miraj 2000. "The Italian Archaeological Mission in Albania," *Public Archaeology* 1, 109-24.

Gourgouris, S. 1996. *Dream nation: Enlightenment, colonization and the institutions of modern Greece* (Stanford).

Graves-Brown, P., S. Jones and C. Gamble (edd.) 1996. *Cultural identity and archaeology: the construction of European communities* (London).

Habinek, T. N. 1998. *The politics of Latin literature: writing, identity, and empire in ancient Rome* (Princeton).

Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the barbarian: Greek self-identification* (Oxford).

Hardie, P. 1992. "Augustan poets and the mutability of Rome," in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman poetry and propaganda in the age of Augustus* (Bristol) 59-82.

Hingley, R. 1991. "Past, present and future — the study of the Roman period in Britain," *Scottish Archaeological Review* 8, 90–101.

Hingley, R. 2000a. *Roman officers and English gentlemen: imperialism and the origin of archaeology* (London).

Hingley, R. 2000b. "Ancient Rome in modern Europe," *JRA* 13, 827-28.

Hupchick, D. P. 1994. *Culture and history in Eastern Europe* (New York).

Janik, L. and H. Zawadzka 1996. "One Europe — one past?" in Graves-Brown, Jones and Gamble 1996, 116-24.

Jenkyns, R. 1980. *The Victorians and ancient Greece* (Oxford).

Jenkyns, R. (ed.) 1992. *The legacy of Rome: a new appraisal* (Oxford).

Jones, S. and P. Graves-Brown 1996. "Introduction: archaeology and cultural identity in Europe," in Graves-Brown, Jones and Gamble 1996, 1-24.

Jones, W. R. 1971. "The image of the barbarian in medieval Europe," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 13, 376-407.

Kohl, P. C. and C. Fawcett (edd.) 1995. *Nationalism, politics and the practice of archaeology* (Cambridge).

Lefkowitz, M. R. and G. MacLean Rogers 1996. *Black Athena revisited* (London).

Liverani, M. 1996. "The bathwater and the baby," in Lefkowitz and MacLean Rogers 1996, 421-27.

Manacorda, D. and R. Tamassia 1985. *Il piccone del regime* (Rome).

Mattingly, D. 1996. "From one colonialism to another: imperialism and the Maghreb," in Webster and Cooper 1996, 49-70.

Meskell, L. 1999a. "Introduction: archaeology matters," in Meskell 1999b, 1-12.

Meskell, L. (ed.) 1999b. *Archaeology under fire: nationalism, politics and heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East* (London).

Mikalachki, J. 1998. *The legacy of Boadicea: gender and nation in early modern England* (London).

Millett, M. 1997. "A view from the West," in S. E. Alcock (ed.), *The Early Roman Empire in the East* (Oxford) 200-2.

Moatti, C. 1993. *The search for ancient Rome* (London).

Pagden, A. 1995. *Lords of all the world: ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800* (London).

Patterson, T. C. 1997. *Inventing Western civilization* (New York).

Quartermaine, L. 1995. "'Slouching towards Rome': Mussolini's imperial vision," in T. J. Cornell and K. Lomas (edd.), *Urban society in Roman Italy* (London) 203-16.

Ridley, R. T. 1992. *The eagle and the spade: archaeology in Rome during the Napoleonic era* (Cambridge).

Romm, J. S. 1992. *The edges of the earth in ancient thought: geography, exploration, and fiction* (Princeton).

Shaw, B. D. 1983. "'Eaters of flesh, drinkers of milk': the ancient Mediterranean ideology of the pastoral nomad," *AncSoc* 13/14, 5-31.

Smiles, S. 1994. *The image of antiquity: ancient Britain and the romantic imagination* (London).

Smith, A. D. 1986. *The ethnic origins of nations* (Oxford).

Stone, M. 1999. "A flexible Rome: Fascism and the cult of romanità," in Edwards 1999b, 205-20.

Stray, C. 1998. *Classics transformed: schools, universities, and society in England, 1830-1960* (Oxford).

Terrenato, N. 1998. "The Romanization of Italy: global acculturation or cultural bricolage?," in C. Forcey, J. Hawthorne and R. Witcher (edd.), *TRAC 97: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference, Nottingham 1997* (Oxford) 20-27.

Trigger, B. G. 1989. *A history of archaeological thought* (Cambridge).

Vance, N. 1997. *The Victorians and ancient Rome* (Oxford).

Vercingétorix et Alésia 1994. Exh. cat., Musée des Antiquités nationales, St.-Germain-en-Laye.

Webster, G. 1978. *Boudica: the British revolt against Rome A.D. 60* (London).

Webster, J. 1996. "Ethnographic barbarity: colonial discourse and 'Celtic warrior societies'," in Webster and Cooper 1996, 111-24.

Webster, J. 1999. "Here be dragons! The continuing influence of Roman attitudes to northern Britain," in B. Bevan (ed.), *Northern exposure: interpretative devolution and the Iron Ages in Britain* (Leicester) 21-32.

Webster, J. and N. Cooper (edd.) 1996. *Roman imperialism: post-colonial perspectives* (Leicester).

Wyke, M. 1997. *Projecting the past: ancient Rome, cinema and history* (London).

Wyke, M. 1999. "Sawdust Caesar: Mussolini, Julius Caesar, and the drama of dictatorship," in Wyke and Biddiss 1999a, 167-86.

Wyke, M. and M. Biddiss 1999a. "Introduction: using and abusing antiquity," in Wyke and Biddiss 1999a, 13-18.

Wyke, M. and M. Biddiss (edd.) 1999b. *The uses and abuses of antiquity* (Bern).