



(ATINER)

The Athens Journal of History



(ATINER)

Volume 5, Issue 3, July 2019

Articles

Front Pages

THOMAS BROBJER

[Classical Philology and Racism: A Historiographical Critique of Bernal's Black Athena and the Assumption That the Nineteenth-century Classical Philology Was Strongly Governed by Racism](#)

ANGEL PANIAGUA

[Space, Rurality and Power in Spain: The Agrarian Ideology of Vizconde Eza \(1873-1945\)](#)

ELEFThERIA PAPPa

[Recent Discoveries in Iberia and the Application of Post-Colonial Concepts: The Modern Making of a State, Tartessos](#)

IRINA FRASIN

[Greeks, Barbarians and Alexander the Great: The Formula for an Empire](#)



**ATHENS INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION AND
RESEARCH**

*A World Association of Academics and Researchers
8 Valaoritou Str., Kolonaki, 10671 Athens, Greece.*

Tel.: 210-36.34.210 Fax: 210-36.34.209

Email: info@atiner.gr URL: www.atiner.gr

Established in 1995

(ATINER)



(ATINER)

Mission

ATINER is a *World Non-Profit Association* of Academics and Researchers based in Athens. ATINER is an independent **Association** with a **Mission** to become a forum where Academics and Researchers from all over the world can meet in Athens, exchange ideas on their research and discuss future developments in their disciplines, **as well as engage with professionals from other fields**. Athens was chosen because of its long history of academic gatherings, which go back thousands of years to *Plato's Academy* and *Aristotle's Lyceum*. Both these historic places are within walking distance from ATINER's downtown offices. Since antiquity, Athens was an open city. In the words of Pericles, *"Athens" ... is open to the world, we never expel a foreigner from learning or seeing*". ("Pericles' Funeral Oration", in Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War*). It is ATINER's **mission** to revive the glory of Ancient Athens by inviting the World Academic Community to the city, to learn from each other in an environment of freedom and respect for other people's opinions and beliefs. After all, the free expression of one's opinion formed the basis for the development of democracy, and Athens was its cradle. As it turned out, the Golden Age of Athens was in fact, the Golden Age of the Western Civilization. *Education* and *(Re)searching* for the 'truth' are the pillars of any free (democratic) society. This is the reason why *Education* and *Research* are the two core words in ATINER's name.

The Athens Journal of History

ISSN NUMBER: 2407-9677 - DOI: 10.30958/ajhis

Volume 5, Issue 3, July 2019

Download the entire issue ([PDF](#))

Front Pages

i-
viii

Classical Philology and Racism: A Historiographical Critique of Bernal's Black Athena and the Assumption That the Nineteenth-century Classical Philology Was Strongly Governed by Racism

157

Thomas Brobjer

Space, Rurality and Power in Spain: The Agrarian Ideology of Vizconde Eza (1873-1945)

169

Angel Paniagua

Recent Discoveries in Iberia and the Application of Post-Colonial Concepts: The Modern Making of a State, Tartessos

189

Eleftheria Pappa

Greeks, Barbarians and Alexander the Great: The Formula for an Empire

209

Irina Frasin

Athens Journal of History

Editorial and Reviewers' Board

Editors

- **Dr. Steven Oberhelman**, Vice President of International Programs, ATINER & Professor of Classics, Holder of the George Sumey Jr Endowed Professorship of Liberal Arts, and Associate Dean, Texas A&M University.

Editorial Board

- Dr. Nicholas Pappas, Vice President of Academic Membership, ATINER & Professor of History, Sam Houston University, USA.
- Dr. David Philip Wick, Director, Humanities & Education Division, ATINER & Professor of History, Gordon College, USA.
- Dr. Jayoung Che, Head, History Unit, ATINER & Deputy Director of Research, Korean Academy of Greek Studies, South Korea.
- Dr. Edward Anson, Academic Member, ATINER & Professor, University of Arkansas, USA.
- Dr. Romeo-Victor Ionescu, Academic Member, ATINER & Professor, Dunarea de Jos University, Romania.
- Dr. George Kaloudis, Academic Member, ATINER & Professor, Rivier College, USA.
- Dr. Sara Estrella Gil-Ramos, Academic Member, ATINER & Adjunct Professor, Art & History Department, New Jersey City University, USA.
- Dr. Michael Eisman, Academic Member, ATINER & Associate Professor, Temple University, USA.
- Dr. Margit Linder, Academic Member, ATINER & Assistant Professor, Department of Ancient History and Archaeology, University of Graz, Austria.
- Dr. Moshe Gat, Professor Emeritus, Bar Ilan University, Israel.

- **General Managing Editor of all ATINER's Publications:** Ms. Afrodete Papanikou
- **ICT Managing Editor of all ATINER's Publications:** Mr. Kostas Spyropoulos
- **Managing Editor of this Journal:** Ms. Despina Katzoli ([bio](#))

Reviewers' Board

[Click Here](#)

President's Message

All ATINER's publications including the e-journals are open access without any costs (submission, processing, publishing, open access paid by authors, open access paid by readers etc) and are independent of the presentations made at any of the many small events (conferences, symposiums, forums, colloquiums, courses, roundtable discussions) organized by ATINER throughout the year. The intellectual property rights of the submitted papers remain with the author.

Before you submit, please make sure your paper meets some [basic academic standards](#), which include proper English. Some articles will be selected from the numerous papers that have been presented at the various annual international academic conferences organized by the different [divisions and units](#) of the Athens Institute for Education and Research.

The plethora of papers presented every year will enable the editorial board of each journal to select the best ones, and in so doing, to produce a quality academic journal. In addition to papers presented, ATINER encourages the independent submission of papers to be evaluated for publication.

The current issue of the Athens Journal of History (AJHIS) is the third issue of the fifth volume (2019). The reader will notice some changes compared with the previous issues, which I hope is an improvement.

Gregory T. Papanikos, President
Athens Institute for Education and Research



Athens Institute for Education and Research

A World Association of Academics and Researchers 17th Annual International Conference on History & Archaeology: From Ancient to Modern, 3-6 June 2019, Athens, Greece

The [History Unit](#) of ATINER, will hold its **17th Annual International Conference on History & Archaeology: From Ancient to Modern, 3-6 June 2019, Athens, Greece** sponsored by the [Athens Journal of History](#). The aim of the conference is to bring together scholars and students of all areas of history, archaeology and other related disciplines. You may participate as a stream leader, presenter of one paper, chair of a session or observer. Please submit a proposal using the form available (<https://www.atiner.gr/2019/FORM-HIS.doc>).

Important Dates

- Abstract Submission: **22 April 2019**
- Acceptance of Abstract: 4 Weeks after Submission
- Submission of Paper: **6 May 2019**

Academic Members Responsible for the Conference

- Dr. Steven Oberhelman, Professor of Classics, Holder of the George Sumey Jr Endowed Professorship of Liberal Arts, and Associate Dean, Texas A&M University, USA, USA, Vice President of International Programs, ATINER and Editor of the Athens Journal of History.
- Dr. Nicholas Pappas, Vice President of Academic Membership, ATINER & Professor of History, Sam Houston University, USA.
- Dr. David Philip Wick, Director, Arts and Humanities Division & Professor of History, Gordon College, USA.
- Dr. Jayoung Che, Head, History Unit, ATINER & Deputy Director of Research, Korean Academy of Greek Studies, South Korea.
- Dr. Tatiana Tsakiropoulou-Summers, Director, Athens Center for Classical & Byzantine Studies (ACCBS) & Associate Professor, The University of Alabama, USA.

Social and Educational Program

The Social Program Emphasizes the Educational Aspect of the Academic Meetings of Atiner.

- Greek Night Entertainment (This is the official dinner of the conference)
- Athens Sightseeing: Old and New-An Educational Urban Walk
- Social Dinner
- Mycenae Visit
- Exploration of the Aegean Islands
- Delphi Visit
- Ancient Corinth and Cape Sounion

Conference Fees

Conference fees vary from 400€ to 2000€
Details can be found at: <https://www.atiner.gr/2019fees>



Athens Institute for Education and Research

*A World Association of Academics and
Researchers*

12th Annual International Conference on Literature 3-6 June 2019, Athens, Greece

The [Literature Unit](#) of ATINER is organizing its **12th Annual International Conference on Literature, 3-6 June 2019, Athens, Greece** sponsored by the [Athens Journal of Philology](#). The aim of the conference is to bring together academics and researchers from all areas of literature and other related disciplines. You may participate as stream leader, presenter of one paper, chair of a session or observer. Please submit a proposal using the form available (<https://www.atiner.gr/2019/FORM-LIT.doc>).

Important Dates

- Abstract Submission: **22 April 2019**
- Acceptance of Abstract: 4 Weeks after Submission
- Submission of Paper: **6 May 2019**

Academic Member Responsible for the Conference

- **Dr. Stamos Metzidakis**, Head, [Literature Research Unit](#), ATINER & Emeritus Professor of French and Comparative Literature, Washington University in Saint Louis, USA.

Social and Educational Program

The Social Program Emphasizes the Educational Aspect of the Academic Meetings of Atiner.

- Greek Night Entertainment (This is the official dinner of the conference)
- Athens Sightseeing: Old and New-An Educational Urban Walk
- Social Dinner
- Mycenae Visit
- Exploration of the Aegean Islands
- Delphi Visit
- Ancient Corinth and Cape Sounion

More information can be found here: <https://www.atiner.gr/social-program>

Conference Fees

Conference fees vary from 400€ to 2000€

Details can be found at: <https://www.atiner.gr/2019fees>

Classical Philology and Racism: A Historiographical Critique of Bernal's *Black Athena* and the Assumption That the Nineteenth-century Classical Philology Was Strongly Governed by Racism

By Thomas Brobjer*

*In this paper I show that the nineteenth century classical philology was much less governed by racist values than Martin Bernal argued in his *Black Athena* (1987) and which many thereafter assume to have been the case. I criticize Bernal's lack of evidence and examine a number of thinkers and texts from the period c. 1850 to 1920, essentially randomly selected, who and which show few signs of being governed by racism when discussing Greek culture and civilization in comparison with Egyptian and other early civilizations.*

There are two main themes in Martin Bernal's three volume *Black Athena* project (1987, 1991, 2006). Firstly, to show that Egyptian and other southern and eastern Mediterranean influences on ancient Greece have been wrongly denied or strongly underemphasized by scholars since about 1800. The reasons for this are claimed to be external to scholarship, and as the primary cause he points at nineteenth century racism. This view is still echoed today. Secondly, Bernal attempts to show the existence and importance of especially Egyptian influence and colonisation on prehistoric and ancient Greece.

As an intellectual historian I will be concerned only with the first theme. This is the main theme discussed by Bernal in the first volume of *Black Athena* (1987) called *The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1885*. In essence, Bernal's argument is simple and based on Kuhn's scheme of paradigms. From the classical period until approximately 1800 there was a general consensus in regard to the origin of Greek civilization. This consensus consisted in a belief that the Greeks had been civilized by Egyptian and Phoenician colonization and of the importance of later Egyptian influence on Greek philosophy and thinking. Bernal calls it the Ancient Model. Up to the eighteenth century there was no doubt, says Bernal in his conclusion to volume 1, that "Egypt was seen as the fount of all 'Gentile' philosophy and learning, including that of the Greeks; and that the Greeks had managed to preserve only some part of these."¹ During the first half of the nineteenth century this model was rejected and a new one took its place. This supposedly new view Bernal calls the Aryan Model and he characterizes it by stressing that the "notion that Greece was a

*Professor, Uppsala University, Sweden.

1. Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*. Volume 1: *The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985* (London, 1987), 440.

mixed culture that had been civilized by Africans and Semites became not only abominable but unscientific."²

The scholarly and learned interest in antiquity, and especially Greek antiquity, increased immensely during the nineteenth century, during the time of the birth of modern classical philology, particularly among German scholars. With a great revival of interest and knowledge about Greek antiquity changes in the views about the Greeks are of course to be expected. However, Bernal states that the critique and decline of the Ancient Model is to be explained by external factors alone, i.e. that new knowledge and new methods were of no consequence.³ For the rise of the Aryan Model one important 'internal' development was fundamental: Greek was an Indo-European language. Bernal accepts this and his own view is not that of the Ancient Model but one which he calls the Revised Ancient Model which "accepts a number of features from the Aryan one, including the central belief that at some time a significant number of Indo-European speakers came into Greece from the north." (p. 439).

The Aryan Model, according to Bernal, ruled supreme until the Second World War, continued thereafter but increasingly without its "ideological underpinnings of racism and anti-Semitism". Since the data do not fit his claim that the Aryan Model was hegemonic, Bernal occasionally uses more careful language. For example, he states:

"In fact, for much of the nineteenth century the two [i.e. the Ancient and the Aryan Models] coexisted in what I call the Broad Aryan Model. [...] the supporters of the Aryan Model have been concerned with racial hierarchy and racial purity, and the idea of Egyptian and Phoenician colonization always seems to have been distasteful to them."⁴

On the whole, Bernal's claims seem not implausible. That values, in this case racist and related values, can and often do play a role in the interpretation of history is clear. The plausibility of his case - together with a general 'humility' and the dislike to defend something that could be associated with racism - are important reasons for the lack of resistance to, and rejection of, Bernal's claims in regard to historiography, and the assumption that nineteenth century classical philology was governed by racism is common today.⁵ This is

2. Ibid, 441. Compare p. 292: "As first the Egyptians and then the Phoenicians were increasingly perceived as 'racially' inferior, the Greek legends of their having not only colonized but civilized 'sacred Hellas' became not merely distasteful but paradigmatically impossible."

3. Ibid, 441: "I see this destruction of the Ancient Model as entirely the result of social forces such as these, and the requirements put upon the Ancient Greeks by 19th-century Northern Europeans. My belief is that no internalist force - or advance in the knowledge of Ancient Greece - can explain the change." See also p. 330.

4. Bernal, 330-331. Bernal shifts between using the Aryan Model and the Broad Aryan Model without specifying reasons. Mostly, and almost always when making general statements, he refers to the Aryan Model. Unfortunately, he also does not define the Broad Aryan Model clearly, in particular, it needs to be distinguished from his own Revised Ancient Model. The difference between them is not clear.

5. See, for example, Ali A. Mazrui, "The Re-Invention of Africa: Edward Said, V. Y. Mudimbe, and beyond", *Research in African Literature* 36 (2005): 68-82.

so in spite of the many flaws of the book. Bernal's thesis has received important critique, but, nonetheless, continues to be frequently perceived as true. Examples of earlier historiographical critiques are: Frank M. Turner's "Martin Bernal's *Black Athena: A Dissent*" in *Arethusa* 22 Special Issue (1989), 97-109, P. O. Kristeller's "Comment on *Black Athena*", *J. Hist. of Ideas* 56 (1995), 125-27, R. Palter's "*Black Athena*, Afrocentrism, and the History of Science", *History of Science*, 31 (1993), 227-87, Josine H. Blok's "Proof and Persuasion in *Black Athena: The Case of K. O. Müller*", *J. Hist. of Ideas* 57 (1996), 705-724 and David Gange's "Religion and Science in Late Nineteenth-Century British Egyptology", *The Historical Journal* 49 (2006), 1083-1103, as well as two books from 1996 associated with Mary Lefkowitz.⁶

Two persons with the same values, for example racist values, can nonetheless write studies of a very different quality. One can conscientiously examine the evidence, give reasons for her or his argumentation, conclusions and values and treat seriously also arguments that go counter to her or his own values. The other can select facts and build his case on preconceived notions. Bernal, who makes no secret that he is deeply engaged in 'politically correct' end-of-the-20th-century values, unfortunately uses for the historiographical part of his book procedures which are more akin to the second than the first manner.⁷ To this should be added that Bernal uses almost exclusively externalistic and circumstantial evidence and he refers to very few primary sources.

In this paper I will question Bernal's historiography. I will do so by examining the references to the origin of Greece and the discussion of the influence on the Greeks, especially the Egyptian influence, by a number of thinkers and classical scholars during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the 20th.

6. In his sharp but friendly review Turner explicitly criticizes Bernal on two of the major points of concern in the present article, i.e. the lack of specific analysis of what classical scholars actually has said and the need to show that there is a direct connection between racism and the writing of ancient history. In regard to the first point Turner writes: "it is this consistent absence of particularistic analysis that mars and from the standpoint of intellectual history almost fatally flaws the credibility of Professor Bernal's argument as it is presented." (p. 104). Turner, however, does not perform any such analysis or give any counter-examples. To a large extent the purpose of this paper is to do so. Kristeller, in his much more hostile review, explicitly claims that most of the scholars during the early part of the twentieth century did not support the Aryan Model and did not deny the importance of non-Western cultures for the ancient Greeks.

7. During lectures held at Uppsala University during the spring of 1994 Bernal stated: "My main motive was to attack racism among 19 and 20th century classicists". There is, however, a risk that these sorts of motives and values simply are the result of a different set of prejudices based on the idea of progress - a special form of Whig history - the nineteenth century was racist, bigoted and unscientific, we know better. Bernal even ends his book with the predication that "a revised form of the Ancient Model will be generally accepted early in the next century". To me, that seems not unlikely, but the reason is that I am not convinced that this has not, more or less, always been the accepted view. Bernal seems to have fabricated, or at least exaggerated, the racism and the effect of this racism in nineteenth century classical philology. It is thus an example of what is called a straw man argument.

The authors and texts discussed are not the result of a systematic investigation of the views of classical scholars, but mostly reflect classical philologists and thinkers I have encountered in my research. While examining the views of, say, thirty scholars and philosophers, I have not come across a single one who explicitly denies Egyptian influences on the Greeks. However, for a fairly large number of cases I have not found any opinion expressed at all on the questions discussed here - which is not all that surprising since, at least in the nineteenth century, there seems to have been a very limited interest in the origin of Greek culture and civilization.

One of Bernal's major points is that the nineteenth century classicists were over-critical and dismissed written records and myths even when there were no real ground for doing so.⁸ Bernal's critique may in many cases be justified, though the nineteenth century over-critical approach is understandable as the result of historicism, new information and methods, the fact that classical history and philology became more and more established academic disciplines and departments, and as a reaction to the rather gullible attitude towards the Greeks in previous centuries. However, Bernal suggests that this over-critical approach was used for racist reasons and in fields relevant for the denying of external influences on the Greeks. But, in fact, this over-critical approach was used in all fields of classical philology - whether relevant for racism or not. For example, during the second half of the nineteenth century the genuineness of almost every Platonic dialogue was called into question.

All this means that what he does is to substantiate (or suggest) that his case is plausible - he gives, for example, a large number of 'externalist' reasons why it should be so, such as the Greek War of Independence in the 1820s, a general political reaction to the French Revolution, nationalism, increasing racism, the idealization of Greece, etc. - but he does *not* actually substantiate that racist values *did* in fact influence classical philology. In his summary Bernal claims: "The main point I have been trying to make throughout this book is that the Ancient Model was destroyed and replaced by the Aryan Model" (p. 442) and that the main cause for this was systematic racism. However, only three names are mentioned to substantiate this: Abbé Petit-Radel, K. O. Müller and William Smith, and only one of them, Müller, is discussed in any detail. Müller was an important German classicist, but Petit-Radel and Smith were neither important nor influential. If they were typical, this has not been shown, nor does Bernal claim this specifically. A few other 'classicists' are mentioned: Hegel, Marx, Heeren and Niebuhr as transitional figures and Thirlwall, Grote and Curtius, but none of them fit Bernal's description of the Aryan Model, with the possible exception of Ernst Curtius.

In fact, Bernal's case is almost exclusively based on his interpretation of Müller and his studies: "The Aryan Model - which followed his success - was

8. For example, in the case of George Grote, Bernal writes: "Momigliano claims that because of his 'neutrality', Grote's views on mythology have in no way been invalidated by later archaeological discoveries that would seem to confirm legendary accounts. This excuse does not apply if, as I maintain, his views were sceptical. [...] Nevertheless, Grote's contempt for tradition's failure to satisfy the requirements of 'proof' has been immensely influential", Bernal, 328-329.

constructed within the new paradigms" (p. 32).⁹ Even one of Bernal's quotations from Müller indicate that Müller was far from denying all or substantial influences from the East and thus should probably not be regarded as supporting the Aryan Model: "What Müller outlawed was any special relationship between Greek and Eastern myth. Indeed, as he put it, 'the entire book is opposed to the theory which would make the majority of myths importations from the East.'" (p. 313).¹⁰ Blok has examined the case for racism concerning Müller in much greater detail and shown that Bernal's account "cannot be regarded as acceptable history".¹¹

My investigation concentrates on the question of the existence and hegemony of the Aryan Model 1850-1920, especially in regard to Egyptian influences. This is mainly discussed in chapter VI (Hellenomania, I: The fall of the Ancient Model, 1790-1830) and VII (Hellenomania, 2: Transmission of the new scholarship to England and the rise of the Aryan Model, 1830-60) in Bernal's book. Bernal does not continue the investigation and argument about the denial of Egyptian influences after 1860, but clearly implies that the reason for this was that the Aryan Model ruled supreme. I will show, by example, a number of individuals, and more general texts (encyclopaedias), who and which in no way seem to support or fit the Aryan Model. Of course, a number of examples do not disprove Bernal's claims - only make them questionable - but, in fact, the number of examples given here for which the hypothesis of a general denial of Egyptian influences on the Greeks does not fit, is larger than the ones cited by Bernal in support of his argument.

John Stuart Mill, like most thinkers in the nineteenth century, was much more concerned with ancient Greece than with ancient Egypt. In fact, Mill was one of the great proponents of the classical tradition. He learnt Greek early and wrote extensively about Greece and Greek culture, philosophy and politics. A notable example of this attitude is seen in his claim that "the battle of Marathon, even as an event in English history, is more important than the battle of Hastings".¹² The almost only reference to ancient Egypt that Mill makes, written in 1850, far from confirming the Aryan Model which according to Bernal was hegemonic at that time, in fact claims the opposite and could almost have been said by Bernal himself: "The original Egyptians are inferred, from the evidence of their sculptures, to have been a negro race: it was from negroes, therefore that the Greeks learnt their first lessons in civilization; and to the

9. Compare: "Thus, after Müller, all 'reputable' scholars have worked in what I call the 'Broad Aryan Model'", 313).

10. Bernal is not clear as to whether Müller belongs to the Aryan Model, as implied by his central place in the book, by the subtitle of the book and the summary, or if he belongs to the 'Broad Aryan Model' as indicated in the text (p. 308-316). The problem is that if he is not classified as one of those who belong to the Aryan Model, then Bernal does not name a single person who is (with the possible exception of Curtius, but this is never clearly stated), while repeatedly referring to this as the main view in the second half of the nineteenth century.

11. Josine H. Blok, "Proof and Persuasion in *Black Athena*: The Case of K. O. Müller," *J. Hist. of Ideas* 57 (1996): 708.

12. *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Vol. XI (Toronto & London, 1978), 273, that is, in the first page of Mill's review of Grote's *History of Greece*.

records and traditions of these negroes did the Greek philosophers to the very end of their careers resort (I do not say with much fruit) as a treasury of mysterious wisdom."¹³

Twenty and thirty years later Jacob Burckhardt held his famous lectures on the history of Greek culture.¹⁴ These lectures reflect Burckhardt's attempt to understand the Greek spirit and are as such almost hagiographic. Even so, Burckhardt in no way denies Greek indebtedness to other older cultures: "We shall not deny that the Greeks, directly or indirectly, learned many things from these other peoples" (p. 323), "unknowingly they derived so many things from these [Babylonian and Assyrian] cultures" (p. 116) and "the plastic representation [...] Here too the Orient paved the way" (p. 142) and he claims that Doric and Ionic art were derived from Egypt and the Orient (p. 151 and 153). He, of course, did not exclude religion, in respect to which he claims that Herodotus derived the names of the Hellenic gods and the Greek cult ceremonies "from the Egyptians, perhaps in the main correctly, for they were of great antiquity in Egypt and introduced into Greece much later" (p. 333).

Nor does Burckhardt in any way deny Phoenician influences: "Before the Greeks, the Phoenicians had already founded *poleis*, i.e., city communities, city states, with bodies of laws. [...] In many other respects the early impact of Phoenician culture on Greek life is recognized; we may assume that Thebes was originally a Phoenician city on what later became Boeotian territory. At all events, the Greeks must have had early knowledge of the cities along the Phoenician coast and of the colonies they planted." (p. 5). Later on he claims that the Phoenicians can be regarded as predecessors of the Greeks (p. 326, compare also similar statements on page 277).¹⁵

One of the most attentive listeners to, at least, some of Burckhardt's lectures was his colleague, the classical philologist Friedrich Nietzsche. He became the philosopher who perhaps more than any other proclaimed the importance of Greek culture and values in modern times. His philosophy, and in particular his revaluation of all values, can to a large extent be regarded as an attempt to return to the ancient Greek values. For example, he claims that the Greek man of antiquity "alone has hitherto been 'the man that has turned out well'"¹⁶ and he refers to Greek culture as a standard: "When the Greek body and the Greek soul 'bloomed' [...] there arose that mysterious symbol of the highest world-affirmation and transfiguration of existence that has yet been attained on earth. Here we have a *standard* by which everything that has grown up since is

13. *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Vol. XXI (Toronto & London, 1978), 93.

14. These lectures, *Griechische Kulturgeschichte*, were held for the first time in 1872 and for the sixth and last time in 1885/6. They were posthumously published in four volumes 1898-1902. The quotations below are from the English translation of the abridged version of Burckhardt's lectures, *History of Greek Culture* (London, 1963).

15. Burckhardt refers to, and quotes from, K. O. Müller several times during the lectures but never in regard to the origin of Greek culture or on the question of influences from other cultures.

16. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe*, vol. 11 (KSA 11), 37[8]. Also published as *The Will to Power*, trans. W. Kaufmann (London, 1967): section 957.

found too short, too poor, too narrow."¹⁷ However, this romantic immense emphasis on the Greek culture as an example [*Vorbild*] does not mean - in spite of his praise of the value and importance of creativity - that he denied that the Greeks has built on, and borrowed much from, other cultures. "Not to create forms but to borrow them from abroad and to transform them into the fairest appearance of beauty - that is Greek".¹⁸ In fact, he does the opposite and is thus as far removed from the Aryan Model as one can be. "They [the Greeks] never lived in proud isolation; on the contrary, their 'culture' was for a long time a chaos of foreign ideas and concepts - Semitic, Babylonian, Lydian and Egyptian; and their religion a general conflict among the gods of the whole Orient".¹⁹

In *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks*, written in 1872 but never completed for publication, he repeated that "nothing would be sillier than to claim an autochthonous development for the Greeks. On the contrary, they invariably absorbed other living cultures. The very reason that they got so far is that they knew how to pick up the spear and throw it onward from the point where others had left it" (p. 30). Several of Nietzsche's comments refer, not only to his own views, but also explicitly to views common in the nineteenth century: "It has been pointed out assiduously [...] how much the Greeks were able to find and learn abroad in the Orient, and it is doubtless true that they picked up much there" (p. 29). Similar statements are found in Nietzsche's lectures at Basel University. Here not only does he mention Greek borrowing from other cultures, but also briefly summarizes different hypotheses about the origin of Greek mythology.²⁰

These are not merely general comments in Nietzsche's case. In fact, he seems to emphasize Egyptian and Phoenician influences as much as Bernal does: "The constitution of the *polis* is a Phoenician invention; even this was copied by the Greeks. For a long time, like happy dilettantes, they studied everything around them; even Aphrodite is Phoenician. And they refuse to disown their importations, the nonindigenous."²¹ He emphasizes the Egyptians

17. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe*, vol. 11, KSA 11, 41[7], written in August-September 1885. Also published as *The Will to Power*, WM, section 1051. This whole section is pertinent. In it Nietzsche, for example, claims that "Dionysos is a judge" in the sense that antiquity is the judge of modernity.

18. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Human, All Too Human*, Vol. II.1, trans. R. J. Hollingdale (Cambridge, 1986), section 221.

19. Friedrich Nietzsche, *History in the Service and Disservice of Life*, trans. Gary Brown (New Haven, London, 1990), section 10.

20. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (KGW), II.3 (Berlin, New York, 1993). The series of lectures entitled 'Encyclopaedie der klass. Philologie', held in 1871 and possibly also in 1873/74. The review of different hypotheses of the origin of Greek mythology is on page 410, in the section 'Über Religion und Mythologie der Alten'. Hermann's and K. O. Müller's hypothesis that it was an internal Greek development is mentioned as one hypothesis among others. Attempts to derive it from Egypt and Phoenicia are also mentioned. See also, for example, 428.

21. Friedrich Nietzsche, "We Classicists," trans. W. Arrowsmith in *Unmodern Observations*, ed. W. Arrowsmith (New Haven & London, 1990), 360. (This is equivalent to KSA 8, 5[65] in the German standard edition.) In the same fragment Nietzsche has no problem to also assert: "The Greeks are the only people of *genius* in world history".

and the Egyptian heritage with even more strength: "The Egyptians are a *much more literary* people than the Greeks. Here I disagree with Wolf."²² A little later he continues on this theme: "The really *scholarly* [*wissenschaftliche*] people, the people of literature, are the Egyptians, not the Greeks. What looks like learning [*Wissenschaft*] among the Greeks derived from the Egyptians and later returned home to blend its waters with the old current. Alexandrian culture is a blend of Hellenic and Egyptian."²³

In spite of these similarities with Bernal, Nietzsche draws completely opposite conclusions from Bernal: the Greeks have been undervalued, we must strive harder to make Greek culture not merely decorative but to let it shape our culture. Nietzsche's argument is not one of chronology but one of quality:

"The quest for philosophy's beginnings is idle, for everywhere in all beginnings we find only the crude, the unformed, the empty and the ugly. What matters in all things is the higher levels. People who prefer to spend their time on Egyptian or Persian philosophy rather than on Greek, on the grounds that the former are more 'original' and in any event older, are just as ill-advised as those who cannot deal with the magnificent, profound mythology of the Greeks until they have reduced it to the physical trivialities of sun, lightning, storm and mist which originally presumably gave rise to it. [...] Everywhere, the way to the beginnings leads to barbarism."²⁴

The expert on the religion in ancient Greece, Martin P. Nilsson, writes in his *A History of Greek Religion* (1925):

"Some students of the question have sought to connect it with the ancient religions of the East - of the Semitic world and of Egypt. Traces of Semitic and Babylonian influences upon Minoan-Mycenaean cultures are vague and difficult to detect. Not so with influences of Egypt. It can be shown that an active relationship existed between Crete and Egypt; the first efflorescence of Minoan culture in the Early Minoan Age seems to have been due to Egyptian impetus."²⁵

In a more general work, a world history in which Nilsson wrote the second volume, dealing with Greece and the Hellenistic kingdoms, he even less denies the influence of other cultures on the Greeks:

"The revival of the Greek art is probably due to impulses which in part had remained from the Minoan time and in part came from Egypt, but already from the beginning it [Greek art] betrays its future distinctive character

22. Ibid, 360. This is equivalent to KSA 8, 5[66] in the German standard edition.

23. Ibid, 370. This is equivalent to KSA 8, 5[122] in the German standard edition. *Wissenschaft* is the normal German word for science (natural and humanistic science).

24. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks* (written in 1872), trans. M. Cowan (Chicago, 1962), 30. Compare also page 29.

25. Martin P. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion* (1925), 10f.

[...]. The first closer acquaintance with the old culture of the Orient seems to have overwhelmed the Greeks. This resulted in the orientalising fashion during the seventh century B.C. It would be rather strange if this current only had brought with it a decorative fashion and not also influenced the spiritual life."²⁶

A paradigmatic view is often more pronounced in general introductions, encyclopaedias, etc. than it is in the works of individual scholars and thinkers. An examination of such general works does not sustain Bernal's claim that the common view was that Greece had not significantly borrowed culturally or linguistically from Egypt and Phoenicia.

For example, the famous eleventh edition of *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Cambridge, 1910) states in a section of the article on ancient Greek history called 'Oriental Influence':

"To the question, 'What is the origin of this civilization? Is it of foreign derivation or of native growth?' it is not possible to give a direct answer. It is clear, on the one hand that it was developed, by a gradual process of differentiation, from a culture which was common to the whole Aegean basin and extended as far to the west as Sicily. It is equally clear, on the other hand, that foreign influences contributed largely to the process of development. Egyptian influences, in particular, can be traced throughout the 'Minoan' and 'Mycenaean' periods."²⁷

In *A Companion to Greek Studies*, edited by L. Whibley (Cambridge, 1905), in the chapter on "Mythology and Religion", written by E. A. Gardner, it is stated that there has been much controversy and many opinions as to what part of the religion of Greece was brought by the Greeks as their version of the common Aryan inheritance, and what part they adopted from earlier inhabitants of the land or borrowed from foreign neighbours. The book leaves the question unanswered.²⁸

Another problem with Bernal's thesis in *Black Athena* is that he has a far too simplistic view of racism and how this affects one's view of the world. For

26 Martin P. Nilsson, "Hellas och de hellenistiska rikena," in *Världshistorien*. Part 2 (Stockholm, 1928), 180 and 182. Translations into English made by me. There are, of course, many other scholars and thinkers who do not fit the Aryan Model. Joseph Wiesner in *Grab und Jenseits: Untersuchungen im ägäischen Raum zur Bronzezeit und Früher Eisenzeit* (Berlin, 1938) contains twenty references to Egypt and lists a large number of similarities between details of Egyptian graves and Greek ones. G. F. Schoemann in *Greichische Alterthümer* (1902), for example, refers on page 387 to a thesis by Th. Bergk in which he claims: "The mystery-cults in Greece were originally, without exception, alien cults" and to a study by Foucart *Recherches sur l'origin et la nature des mystères d'Eleusis* (1896) in which he argues that the Eleusian mysteries came from Egypt and that Demeter was identical to Isis.

27. Edward Mewburn Walker, "Greece, History, Ancient" in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Cambridge, 1910), 441. The same text was used, at least, until and including the edition printed in 1945. Similar statements were used in several Swedish encyclopaedias written during this period.

28. E. A. Gardner, "Mythology and Religion" in *A Companion to Greek Studies*, ed. L. Whibley (Cambridge, 1905), 295.

example, he claims that "Philhellenism has always had Aryanist and racist connotations"²⁹ which is patently wrong. Not only did philhellenism (love of and admiration for ancient Greek culture) exist long before the 18th century and the time the Aryan Model came into existence, but philhellenism was also held by many individuals who were in no sense racist.

A denial of Egyptian and Phoenician influence does not necessarily imply racism, nor does an emphasis on race, even of racism, necessarily lead to a rejection of Egyptian and Phoenician influence. One example of the latter is Gustav Bang's *Europeisk Kulturhistoria* (1897) which, like so many books from this period, strongly emphasizes the Indo-European race of the Greeks but, at the same time, does not deny Egyptian and Phoenician influences: "The root of the Hellenic culture came from Asia and Egypt. Phoenician traders taught the Greeks measure, weight, coins and the alphabet, trade and sea-travel. The Greek gods were influenced from the east, and on travels to Persia and Egypt the Greeks fetched results that had been acknowledged in these ancient cultural lands and transferred what they learnt back to their homeland".³⁰

Another example of the fact that there is no simple correlation between racism and the emphasis on the influence of other cultures on the Greeks is the work *The Legacy of Greece* (1921), edited by R. Livingstone. In the chapter on the topic of religion, written by W. R. Inge, the author strongly denies racist assumptions and values. He claims that the Greeks were not a homogeneous race, not even a race, but a culture. However, he begins his discussion of Greek religion with Homer and makes no references to external influences, in spite of the fact that religion and mythology was one of the areas where foreign influence had been most stressed. In the essay dealing with biology, it is emphasized that the Greeks inherited much from other "peoples".³¹

Bernal claims that up to the 18th century not only was Egypt generally regarded as the source "of all 'Gentile' philosophy and learning, including that of the Greeks," but also "that the Greeks had managed to preserve only some part of these," which implies that the Egyptians were held in higher esteem than the Greeks. He goes on to claim that "the sense of loss that this created, and the quest to recover the lost wisdom, were major motives in the development of science in the 17th century" and that it was "in opposition to the 18th century notion of 'reason' on part of the Egyptophiles that the Greek ideal of sentiment and artistic perfection was developed".³² These claims are untenable.

The number of references in European scholarly and philosophical works to ancient Egypt and the Egyptians, sometimes friendly, sometimes hostile, are minuscule as compared to the references to ancient Greece and the Greeks. The influence of ancient Egypt on European thought between the Middle Ages and the Enlightenment seems to be confined mostly to two fields: art and mysticism. In the arts there was an Egyptian revival during the middle of the

29. Bernal, 387.

30. Gustav Bang, *Europeisk Kulturhistoria i korta drag* [A Short History of European Culture] (Stockholm, 1897), 14.

31. Charles Singer, "Biology" in *The Legacy of Greece*, ed. R. Livingstone (Oxford, 1921), 163.

32. All the quotations come from the conclusion of Bernal's book, 439-443.

18th century (mostly affecting wall decorations) and a second one after Napoleon's Egyptian campaign, 1798-99, (affecting mainly architecture, furniture and other aspects of the applied arts). However, even during the peaks of these revivals, classical themes were generally of greater importance than Egyptian ones.³³

Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516) is more typical of the attitude to Egypt and Greece than Bernal's claims. More tells there how some Romans and Egyptians were shipwrecked on the island a long time ago (this is the only reference to the Egyptians), while there are numerous references to the Greeks and their learning, science and philosophy. At the end the story-teller says that he believes that this happy island was a Greek colony.

Many thinkers, such as Locke and Shaftesbury, held highly critical views of the ancient Egyptians. Others, like Montesquieu, whom Bernal quotes and takes to exemplify the deep respect for ancient Egypt, praise Egypt but are much more concerned with classical Greece and the Greeks. This, of course, reflects the very different nature of the material available from ancient Egypt and ancient Greece - from Egypt no or little written material was available, while the Greek literature and philosophy was widely available and read. The ancient Egyptians could be mentioned, while the Greeks were read, discussed and studied.

Thus, Bernal has greatly exaggerated the status and importance of Egypt in European intellectual history in the period before 1800, and hence the demise of the status of Egypt in the nineteenth century (if there was one) is much smaller than claimed by Bernal.

In conclusion, it is difficult to falsify claims such as those made by Bernal in this book. He describes his own approach as "looking at flowers from horseback," i.e. his case rests on general statements with very few specific and detailed investigations. What I have attempted to do is to climb down from the horse and examine a few flowers in more detail.

In this article I have not shown that racist values played no part in classical philology and ancient history during the nineteenth century. What I have tried to show is that Bernal has not substantiated his claims that they were of utmost and primary importance. On the contrary, I have brought forth a number of thinkers and scholars who highly praised the Greeks but who seem not to have been motivated by racist values nor have they denied important Egyptian and Phoenician influences on the Greeks. Thus, if there is any truth at all in Bernal's historiographical claims - "the fabrication of ancient Greece 1785-1985" (the subtitle of Bernal's book) - this remains to be shown, and if it does exist, it was much weaker and much less dominant than he has suggested, and than many still take for granted today.

33. David Irwin, "Neo-Classicism in Art," in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, ed. P. P. Wiener (New York, 1973), vol III, 363.

Bibliography

- Bang, Gustav. *Europeisk Kulturhistoria i korta drag*. Stockholm, 1897.
- Bernal, Martin. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*. volume 1: *The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985*. London, 1987.
- Blok, Josine H. "Proof and Persuasion in *Black Athena*: The Case of K. O. Müller." *J. Hist. of Ideas* 57 (1996): 705-724.
- Burckhardt, Jacob. *Griechische Kulturgeschichte*, four volumes (1898-1902). The quotations are from the English translation of the abridged version of Burckhardt's lectures, *History of Greek Culture*. London, 1963.
- Gange, David. "Religion and Science in Late Nineteenth-Century British Egyptology." *The Historical Journal* 49 (2006): 1083-1103.
- Gardner, E. A. "Mythology and Religion." In *A Companion to Greek Studies*, edited by L. Whibley, 295-345, Cambridge, 1905.
- Irwin, David. "Neo-Classicism in Art." In *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, edited by P. P. Wiener. Vol III, 362-372. New York, 1973.
- Kristeller, P. O. "Comment on *Black Athena*." *J. Hist. of Ideas* 56 (1995): 125-27.
- Mazrui, Ali A. "The Re-Invention of Africa: Edward Said, V. Y. Mudimbe, and beyond." *Research in African Literature* 36 (2005): 68-82.
- Mill, J. S. *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Vol. XI. Toronto & London, 1978.
- Mill, J. S. *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Vol. XXI. Toronto & London, 1978.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe*, vol. 11 (KSA 11).
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (KGW), II.3. Berlin, New York, 1993.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Will to Power*. Translated by W. Kaufmann. London, 1967.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Human, All Too Human*. Translated by R. J. Hollingdale. Cambridge, 1986.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *History in the Service and Disservice of Life*. Translated by Gary Brown. New Haven, London, 1990.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "We Classicists". Translated by W. Arrowsmith. In *Unmodern Observations*, edited by W. Arrowsmith. New Haven & London, 1990.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks*. Translated by M. Cowan, Chicago, 1962.
- Nilsson, Martin P. *A History of Greek Religion*. Oxford, 1925.
- Nilsson, Martin P. *Hellas och de hellenistiska rikena*. In *Världshistorien*, Part 2: Stockholm, 1928.
- Palter, R. "*Black Athena*, Afrocentrism, and the History of Science." *History of Science*, 31 (1993): 227-87.
- Schoemann, G. F. *Greichische Alterthümer*. Berlin, 1902.
- Singer, Charles. "Biology." In *The Legacy of Greece*, edited by R. Livingstone, 163-200. Oxford, 1921.
- Turner, Frank M. "Martin Bernal's *Black Athena*: A Dissent." *Arethusa* 22 Special Issue (1989): 97-109.
- Walker, Edward Mewburn. "Greece, History, Ancient." In *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Cambridge, 1910.
- Wiesner, Joseph. *Grab und Jenseits: Untersuchungen im ägäischen Raum zur Bronzezeit und Früher Eisenzeit*. Berlin, 1938.

Space, Rurality and Power in Spain: The Agrarian Ideology of Vizconde Eza (1873-1945)

By Angel Paniagua*

Eza's agrarian ideology presents multiple dimensions that have not been analyzed systematically until the present day. The approach to Eza has been more punctual or episodic, from a partial or sectarian point of view, without a global consideration of this personage with notable human and social values, recognized for his own labors and employees. Eza provides for posteriori an academic work that offers the opportunity to study a historical period of change in Spanish agriculture, with little attraction among academics for the traditional interest in the study of the II Republic. The agrarian ideology of Eza suggests some relevant elements of interest for the agrarian historiography in the post Franco period, like the regional adaptation of agrarian structures, particularly the latifundios, the relationship between the (rural) individual and the State or the relevance of the micro social agrarian research.

Introduction

The Viscount of Eza is a polyhedral figure like many agrarian ideologists of the time. However, his agrarian ideology is only part of his intellectual legacy¹, which also includes aspects of an economic, social and legal nature. His agrarian work has a remarkable temporal trajectory and is, consequently, influenced by the successive historical, national and international avatars. In a historical stage, the Restoration, agrarian social policy had an important rhetoric and little truly practical action², in contrast to the action of agrarian reform in the Second Republic.

Eza identified with the farmer: 'when I am older, I will be a farmer, for everyone's good, starting with myself, I will return to my agricultural school and I will continue to be exactly the same as I am today'³. The agrarian Eza, combined the facets of theorist and peasant, to present personal rustic properties in both Cordoba and Soria⁴. This enabled him to be both a man of the country and the city at the same time, which reverberated in many of his judgments and analyses. He conducted studies of agrarian economy, when experimenting on

*Senior Scientific Research, Spanish Council for Scientific Research. CSIC, Spain.

1. F. Campo, "El vizconde de Eza y la cooperación," *Estudios Cooperativos*, 16 (1968): 27-40.

2. E. Malefakis, *Reforma agraria y revolución campesina en la España del siglo XX* (Barcelona: Ariel, 1982).

3. E. de Vizconde, *La tahona reguladora* (Madrid: Sucesora de M. Minuesa de los Rios, 1914), 24.

4. L. Martín Granizo, "Prologo", *Antología de las obras del Excmo. Señor Vizconde de Eza* (Madrid: Escuela Social de Madrid, 1948).

forms of colonization and transport on his own properties, and even on geographical units and complete towns⁵. In this facet of agrarian ideology, its social preoccupations had remarkable repercussions. This is the main feature that distinguishes Eza from the social Catholics of the time⁶. He held important posts throughout his intense life, he was Director General of Agriculture (1907), coinciding with the start of the policy of agricultural colonies and internal repopulation. He was also a member of the Internal Colonization Board and president of the Social Reforms Institute. Later, he was mayor of Madrid between 1913 and 1914⁷, Minister of Development in 1917 and the Minister of War between 1920 and 1921, and, finally, deputy to Congress for the constituency of Soria between 1899 and 1923, for the Conservative Party⁸. He was also founding president of the National Association of Farmers and presided the Spanish Association for the Progress of Sciences until his death.

Eza is an interesting figure in catholic-social agrarian thinking of the first third of the 20th century. Of a religious-ideological orientation, which had its origins in the encyclical *Renun Novarum* of 1891 of Papa Leon XIII, a text that on the one hand preserved the right to individual property⁹, located in a social context¹⁰ and on the other, aimed at promoting an understanding between the classes. Its content was not only social but also territorial, based on the essence of traditional (rural) life. These two characteristics are both present in the work of Eza, although with clear nuances. Social Catholicism was a heterogeneous movement, in its social and territorial principles. However, its main guidelines also show certain uniformity, which is more or less maintained during the first third of the twentieth century. Eza himself, who could be considered to be of heterodox views within social Catholicism for his attention to and concern for social problems, throughout his life also defended the basic principles of individual property, the capacity of the individual, the moral idealization of rural life and the agrarian family.

Despite the continuity of Eza's agrarian ideology in the first third of the 20th century and its theoretical relevance to the development of agrarian policies, there is no systematic interpretation of this author, who is obscured and overshadowed by the greater attention paid to the reforming thinkers of this historical stage¹¹. With this paper, we aim to provide a more global

5. P. Sangro, *El Vizconde de Eza, gran señor social* (Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo, 1947), 14.

6. J.M. Cuenca Toribio, *Catolicismo social y político en la España contemporánea (1870-2000)* (Madrid: Unión Editorial, 2003).

7. A. Calama, "El Vizconde de Eza Don Luis Marichalar y Monreal (1873-1945). Político e intelectual, diputado a Cortes por Soria de 1899 a 1923, Alcalde de Madrid (1913-1914)," *Torre de los Lujanes. Boletín de la Real Sociedad Económica Matritense de Amigos del País*, 61 (2007): 71-115.

8. Cuenca Toribio, *Catolicismo social y político en la España contemporánea*, 2003.

9. A. Salcedo Ruiz, *El socialismo del campo* (Madrid: Imp. de los Huérfanos, 1894); E., Majuelo, and A. Pascual, *Del catolicismo agrario al cooperativismo empresarial. Setenta y cinco años de la Federación de Cooperativas navarras, 1910-1985* (Madrid: MAPA, 1991).

10. S. Martínez González, *La crisis de la agricultura. Sus causas y sus remedios* (Salamanca: Imprenta Católica Salmanticense, 1893).

11. E. Sevilla Guzmán, "Sobre el pensamiento social agrario en España," In *Introducción a la sociología rural*, ed. H. Newby, and E. Sevilla Guzmán (Madrid: Alianza Ed., 1983).

interpretation of Eza's agrarian ideology, and also to review the interpretation of some established geographical and historiographical tendencies relating to the historical period in which he lived.

The Spatial Dimension of the Agrarian Question

The central aspect of Eza's ideology is the regionalization of agrarian policy and the spatial dimension of the agrarian question. To pursue his ideas, it was necessary to steadily develop a body of knowledge about the physical and socio-economic conditions of each of the regions of the national territory, which could form the basis of a global synthesis¹². The agronomic physiography that characterizes each region is based on the property and a convenient cultivation system, associated with physical and edaphic factors.

The agricultural structure of Spain was conditioned by the poverty of the land and the inadequate proportions of uncultivated and cultivated land. In the first third of the century, uncultivated land exceeded 60% of the entire national agricultural area and this constituted an important problem with multiple vertices for agrarian policies of the time. Agriculture was also affected by the remarkable subdivision and small size of the ownership structure, the lack of capital and power and the social isolation of the farmer¹³. The transformation of rural Spain was aimed at achieving a spatial balance between land dedicated to irrigation, mountains and dry land¹⁴. An adequate balance could be achieved by increasing the cultivated area by 3 million hectares, through the constitution of colonization societies, to reach a total of 28 million hectares. This would entail a small increase in reforestation and dedication of 17 million hectares to crops of dry land, leaving poorer land uncultivated.

Determination of the most favorable cultivation regime for each region will affect the most appropriate type of property that this supports (large, small and medium). The social function of property has a double meaning in Eza's thinking: (1) to obtain from each land the maximum profitability by adapting it to the kind of exploitation or cultivation that is appropriate, -the agricultural operation is that which produces material that the land needs for its growth in order to obtain benefits from the capital and labor invested¹⁵-; (2) to enable as many families as possible to settle on these lands. Eza's agrarian program aimed to double agricultural production and also the Spanish population. These opinions were shared by other agrarian ideologists of social Catholicism and reformist inspiration of the period, like Molins¹⁶. It suggests that in order for

12. E. de Vizconde, *Conservación y creación de las pequeñas explotaciones agrícolas* (Madrid: Bernardo Rodríguez, 1911), 22.

13. E. de Vizconde, *El riesgo profesional en la agricultura* (Madrid: Suc. M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1906).

14. E. de Vizconde, *El solar español: su fuerza social, económica y tributaria* (Madrid: Ruiz hermanos, 1926).

15. E. de Vizconde, *El riesgo profesional en la agricultura* (Madrid: Suc. M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1906).

16. J.E. Molins, *La crisis en España* (Barcelona: Imp. Barcelonesa, 1904).

agriculture to develop, an agricultural population constituted by agrarian families is required.

Complementary to the agro-physical study, in Eza's ideology it is also essential to carry out a social study, based on the conditions of the population and individual initiatives¹⁷, the land they develop and their regional social function. In some cases, small farmers in the countryside or workers in the city must become small landowners; in others, however, it is necessary to expand or to introduce suitable conditions to cultivate plots or lots disintegrated today¹⁸. This concern for management of the agricultural area, an adequate distribution of the arable land, together with the need to repopulate the countryside, all had a notable influence on the first political regime of Franco¹⁹.

The problem of 'latifundismo' is linked mainly to two regions: Andalusia and Extremadura, due to the historical process of the reconquest²⁰. Eza participates in the southern vision of the agrarian question in Spain, as recognized by an orientation of agrarian history²¹. However, the large size of the property would not be a problem in itself for Eza but rather the poor exploitation of large farms. Their subdivision into lots is not viable in economic terms and does not permit management beyond 10% of the farm area. This is the main point of divergence from the agrarian reformists of the time. In other areas of Spain the problem lay in the dispersion of the property. The politics of the State in some areas entailed subdivision and in others areas concentration, through a policy of incentives to individual initiative. The State can only intervene in the organization of property -say the social Catholics- when it does not respond to social purposes and harms public welfare²².

The problem was not the size of the property but achieving a management appropriate to the conditions of the physical environment. Here, Eza participates in a debate that was to some extent common among the agrarian ideologists of his time (of different ideologies): the limits of the physical environment and the great agrarian property²³. In any case, the social problem in rural areas is real, as Eza suggests, as the complaints of the rural workers show. This social vision of the rural problem is a characteristic of Eza's ideology, and accompanies him throughout his life, distinguishing him from conservative and catholic social agrarian thinking of the time.

The social facet of the agrarian question is shown in the direction of the report on the agrarian problem of the province of Cordoba of 1919²⁴. Eza makes a direct contribution to this in the form of the 'Questionnaire drafted to

17. Eza, *Conservación y creación de las pequeñas explotaciones agrícolas*, 1911, 25.

18. Ibid., 36.

19. O. Elorrieta, *Ordenación económica de la producción agraria* (Madrid: Inst. Forestal de Investigaciones y Experiencias, 1941).

20. Vizconde de Eza, *La exhumación de los señoríos* (Madrid: Imp. y Enc. Suc. M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1932).

21. Malefakis, *Reforma agraria y revolución campesina en la España del siglo XX*.

22. G. Amor, "La propiedad y la cuestión agraria," *La Paz Social*, 9(1907): 453-457.

23. J. Maurice, *La reforma agraria en España en el siglo XX (1900-1936)* (Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1975).

24. Información *Información sobre el problema agrario en la provincia de Córdoba*. (Madrid: Sobrinos de la Sucesora de M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1919).

obtain employer and worker information by the Hon. Mr. Vizconde de Eza, President of the Institute of Social Reforms and of the Commission sent to the province of Cordoba by the Royal Decree of January 14, 1911'. It includes 22 questions related to the origin of the conflict, the conditions of cultivation, the agrarian property, the days of work, the dismemberment of large properties, the subdivision of the property and the transformation into irrigation, the collective leases or agricultural credits²⁵. The solution to this social-agrarian problem of the province of Cordoba is found in the expropriation and parceling of uncultivated lands and in the improvement of crops. Thus, the problem of the Cordovan field is a problem of colonization, by means of the constitution of family lots with an extension between 2 and 10 hectares, located in the ring of the population nuclei to facilitate access to the new agricultural exploitations²⁶. The Central Board of Colonization and Internal Repopulation²⁷ assume these recommendations. It is interesting to highlight the insistence to consider nuances in the agrarian problem, associated with the specific characteristics of the different municipalities or agrarian districts. This point of view can also be found in other recognized catholic-social contributions, such as that of Aznar²⁸, who also stated that the social-agrarian problem is different between regions, and even within each region. Three major regions can be distinguished in this regard: (1) Galicia, where the cause of the crisis is in the 'foros', the 'caciquismo', and the loss of income and remarkable fragmentation of property; (2) in the two Castiles, the main problems would be: the agrarian agitators, the excessive parceling of the land for an intensive and technical cultivation and, finally, the forced unemployment of 'nomad workers' not attached to the land; (3) finally, in Andalusia and Extremadura the main problems would be: lack of education and agricultural capital, poor communication channels, absenteeism, concentration of land, indolence at work, the subsistence of the rural cacique.

After his visit to the province of Cordoba, Eza suggests two types of solutions²⁹: (1) immediate and transitory, based on changes in the contracting system and agreements between employers and workers; (2) fundamental and deferred, linked to the modification of the current property regime, covering as many families as possible: through the conversion of day laborers into small landowners by colonization by the State or by private individuals with the help of the State. In the year 1919, coinciding with the report on the situation in Cordoba, the Agricultural and Livestock Progress³⁰, published an editorial entitled 'The Land Question', in which it remarked upon the regional and even provincial character of the agrarian question in Spain, suggesting the

25. Ibid., 71-72.

26. Ibid.

27. Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior, *Nota informativa de la colonización interior en España, que presenta al Congreso de la Asociación para el Progreso de las Ciencias (Coimbra, 1925)* (Madrid: Imp. Helénica, 1925).

28. S. Aznar, *El catolicismo social en España. Nuestro primer curso social* (Zaragoza: Mariano Escar Tip., 1907), 7.

29. Vizconde de Eza, *El problema agrario andaluz* (Madrid: Imp. Bernardo Rodríguez, 1919).

30. Cuestión "La cuestión de la tierra," *El Progreso Agrícola y Pecuario*, 30 de junio, 1113 (1919): 333-334.

inadvisability of 'destroying, through general laws, an excellent agrarian regime of the almost totality of Spain because this does not exist in a few provinces ...'³¹. In the same way that sustains that the reform should be inspired in an eminently practical sense.

Eza's position anticipates some more recent historiographical trends, by not participating in the traditional view of the 'latifundio' as an inefficient exploitation³². For Eza, as for some agrarian historians, many 'latifundistas' carried out an adequate form of exploitation in relation to the physical environment, climatology and soils. The large property was well adapted to the environment. Social conflict was linked to political changes and changes in labor relations and in the organization of work due to changes in the product market. According to Carmona and Simpson³³, concentration and dispersion were the two sides of the agrarian problem, with a regional dimension, as Eza had already pointed out, throughout the first third of the 20th century. For Eza, as others suggested later, large estates were not a problem in themselves. The problem is not the size of the property but an appropriate management of the conditions of the physical environment. Here, according to Eza the geographical environment imposes conditions on the individual, who through the business management of resources can improve the environmental conditions for their activity and way of life. In fact, Eza uses and develops the work of the geographer Dantín Cereceda who established a regional physical dimension of Spain³⁴, in which he stated that the agriculture of a country depends on the climate and soil or that 'agriculture is but the most faithful geographical expression'³⁵.

The Debate about the Value of the Individual

There are three dimensions to the debate about the individual, based on the catholic-social ideology of the time: the union of the individual with the right to individual property; the moral difference between the rural individual and the urban individual; and, the limitation of the intervention of the State to favor the social and economic capacity of each individual. Property, for Eza, has an eminently individual, but also a collective character when inserted in a certain social environment³⁶. One of the tasks of agricultural cooperation is the

31. Ibid., 334.

32. J. Carmona, and J. Simpson, *El laberinto de la agricultura española: instituciones, contratos y organización entre 1850 y 1936* (Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, 2003).

33. Ibid.

34. J. Dantín Cereceda, *Ensayo acerca de las regiones naturales de España* (Madrid: J. Cosano, 1922); J. Dantín Cereceda, *Concepto presente de la región natural en geografía* (Madrid: Hernando, 1925).

35. Dantín Cereceda, *Ensayo acerca de las regiones naturales de España*, 1922, 41.

36. Vizconde de Eza, *La reforma agraria en España* (Madrid: Imp. Suc. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1931).

harmonization of collective life and individual initiative³⁷. For Eza, the agrarian problem has three vertices: the State, the society and the individual³⁸. State intervention should be reduced to hydraulic works, land consolidation and internal colonization. An intrinsic characteristic of field workers is absolute freedom of action and initiative, in contrast to the highly regimented factory population³⁹. The institutions should only improve agricultural production by affecting the economic condition of the farmer, which will cause a moral elevation⁴⁰. The State must contribute to the full development of the rural individual. Eza considered it necessary to take advantage of the good qualities of the peasant spirit and place them at the service of agricultural progress⁴¹, even by encouraging them to return to the agrarian field: 'the rural exodus taking place today must be replaced by an urban exodus'⁴¹. This point of view was also taken by other social Catholics who talked about reintegration into the countryside⁴², by dignifying the profession of the farmer and valuing the individual (rural)⁴³, once the negative effects of the migration from the countryside to the city had begun to be observed⁴⁴.

He despised the division between farmer (field) and worker (city), and during his period as Mayor of Madrid announced that 'the world is big enough for everyone to fit in it'⁴⁵. This differentiation between the agrarian and rural individual frequently appears in Eza's trajectory. In his agrarian program, he indicates: 'the agrarian community (...) has much greater social and economic stability than the urban-industrial and commercial community ...'⁴⁶. Agrarian life is linked to a set of unique moral virtues. The peasant observes that the other social classes do not have the least feeling of gratitude towards him, and even less empathy for the sacrifices that rural life represents; a life of self-denial and suffering ...⁴⁷. In any case, this idealization of the rural life and family (as opposed to the city) is common among social Catholics during the first third of the twentieth century. Pedro Ricaldone in 1903 indicates: 'in the countryside on the contrary (to the city) marriages are proportionally more numerous and births more abundant: diseases are scarce and mortality is lower. All the

37. Vizconde de Eza, *La cooperación agrícola: su exención fiscal. Informe presentado a la Agrupación Parlamentaria Agrícola* (Madrid: Imp. Asilo de huérfanos, 1904).

38. Vizconde de Eza, *El problema agrario en España* (Madrid: Imp. Bernardo Rodríguez, 1915).

39. Eza, *El riesgo profesional en la agricultura*, 1906.

40. Vizconde de Eza, "Prologue -July 1905-". *La cooperación agrícola en el extranjero*, edited by Rivas Moreno, F. (Madrid: Ambrosio Pérez y Cía., 1907): 7-23.

41. Eza, "Prologo -Julio de 1905," in *La cooperación agrícola en el extranjero*, ed. F. Rivas Moreno (Madrid: Ambrosio Pérez y Cía., 1907), 6.

42. J. Mallart, *La elevación moral y material del campesino* (Madrid: Gráfica Mundial, 1933).

43. L. Leal, "Factores jurídicos y sociales del problema agrario en España," in *Discursos y artículos de León Leal Ramos. Temas sociales, jurídicos y religiosos* (Cáceres, Anaya, 1959, original 1934), 195-208.

44. J. Rodríguez Labandeira, *El trabajo rural en España, 1876-1936* (Madrid, Anthropos, Ministry of Agriculture, fishing and food, 1991).

45. Eza, *La tahona reguladora*, 1914, 18.

46. Eza, *Agrarismo* (Madrid: C. Bermejo Imp, 1936), 34.

47. Ibid., 40-41.

elements offered by our physiological and moral lives have a sweet attraction and poetic charm in the rural area. There, unforgettable patriarchal traditions of respect reign and each home is an idyll of pure and Christian love. Living is more hygienic, the body is strengthened, and the soul rises to sweet expansions. The needs are more limited and humble; the spirit of saving becomes a habit and almost derives in sweet need, the bonds of family are narrowed and confirmed, and the spirit of religiosity is always deeply rooted in those peaceful masses, whose calloused hands and bronzed complexions give us a great idea of the nobility of the work of Christian resignation'⁴⁸.

In general, Eza is in favor of free commercial contracting and opposes the system of fees⁴⁹. He criticizes excessive regulation in agriculture and praises a certain economic freedom of the farmer⁵⁰, where he can show his individual capabilities. In any case, this criticism of the system of rates and competition through technical progress is conditioned by the characteristics of agriculture, especially in areas of central Spain: 'but agriculture must be the basis of any tariff policy in Spain, and these agricultural products must continue to maintain our exports and constitute the strongest support of our foreign trade. Hence, it can be affirmed that, although Spain must be to some extent protectionist, for the good of this same agriculture in its internal branches of insurance in wheat and cattle for national consumption, it must harmonize that protection with prudence, the only way that we do not kill our export reducing Spanish life to the rickets of favoring some manufacturing branch'⁵¹.

The Family and Small Farm

For Eza 'agriculture plays a key role in the international organization of work'⁵². At the same time, he suggests that 'the tendency at present to increase and consolidate the rural class composed of small landowners and cultivators, is universal'⁵³. The Viscount is favorable to the establishment of a large rural class that relies on the possession and enjoyment of enough rustic property to feed a peasant family⁵⁴. He refers to 'the social force that in itself contains the individual property, directing all efforts towards achievement of the ideal, which consists in making owners of all men'⁵⁵. Rural life rests on the basis of the peasant family⁵⁶. From all perspectives, these opinions reveal that the ideal

48. P. Ricaldone, *Los labradores, la agricultura y la cuestión social* (Sevilla: Biblioteca agraria solariana, 1903), 89.

49. Vizconde de Eza, *El problema de los trigos: informe de la Asociación de Agricultores de España* (Madrid: M. Minuesa, 1916).

50. Vizconde de Eza, *Agrarismo* (Madrid: C. Bermejo Imp.: 1936).

51. Vizconde de Eza, *El problema económico en España* (Madrid: Sobrinos de la Suc. De M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1919), 18.

52. Vizconde de Eza, *La agricultura en la organización internacional del trabajo* (Madrid: Sobrinos de la Suc. De M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1920), 6.

53. Eza, *Conservación y creación de las pequeñas explotaciones agrícolas*, 1911, 5.

54. Ibid., 8.

55. Ibid., 8.

56. Ibid., 40.

worker is the small owner; owner of his own means of production, his house, his garden and his animals⁵⁷. In addition, the installation of families in small properties limited emigration to the cities⁵⁸. At this point, Eza coincides with the program of social Catholicism of the time: the idealization of the small agricultural owner⁵⁹. As Aznar observed⁶⁰, the effectiveness of work is different when you work for yourself than when you work to get a salary.

According to Gongora Echenique⁶⁰, Eza distinguished three types of rural improvements: better farming, better business, better living. The first consisted in teaching the farmer modern methods of cultivation, the second in facilitating the association and transportation for his business and, finally, the third corresponded to educational, social and intellectual improvements of the (farmer) citizen. These improvements were aimed not only at increasing the rural population but also improving their location in the space and their living conditions⁶¹.

In his later writings, from during the Second Republic, he insists on basing agrarian reform on a small property and the development of a rural petty bourgeoisie: 'Where there is a rural petty bourgeoisie, this is shown as an element of strength and stability. The multiplication of these peasant proprietors can contribute to containing the depopulation of the countryside, which is one of the most glaring facts of contemporary evolution⁶². Thus, cultivation of smaller areas must be encouraged, because they employ more labor than large ones thus stopping rural depopulation. The agrarian economy must be based on family farming. Deep agrarian reform should consist in establish small individual owners⁶³. The development of small farms must be based mainly on credit. Encouragement of entrepreneurial responsibility of the small farmer and the prevention of activities of agrarian reform and colonization, imposed especially from 1926⁶⁴ with paralysis of the colonies policy of 1907, was excessively burdensome for the State. In Eza's thinking there were three parameters in the profitability of the company (agrarian)⁶⁵: (a) qualitative, based on the productive elements (nature, capital and work), which concur in the productive process; (b) the quantitative proportion of these elements in the agrarian enterprise; (c) the absolute magnitude of these elements.

57. Eza, *El riesgo profesional en la agricultura*, 1906; Eza, "Requisitos indispensables para la difusión de la propiedad privada," *Boletín de la Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior*, 20, 4 trimestre (1923): 3-27.

58. M. Góngora, *El problema de la tierra: opiniones e iniciativas de los señores Alba, Argente, Aznar, Bernaldo de Quirós...* (Madrid: Góngora, 1922).

59. Malefakis, *Reforma agraria y revolución campesina en la España del siglo XX*.

60. Góngora, *El problema de la tierra: opiniones e iniciativas de los señores Alba, Argente, Aznar, Bernaldo de Quirós...*, 33.

61. F. Soler Pérez, *Población rural* (Madrid: V. Rico Imp., 1919).

62. Eza, *De mis carpetas II. La reforma agraria y el crédito* (Madrid: Imp. Sobrinos M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1933), 49.

63. *Ibid.*, 98.

64. Malefakis, *Reforma agraria y revolución campesina en la España del siglo XX*; Rodríguez Labandeira, *El trabajo rural en España, 1876-1936*, 1991.

65. Eza, *La reforma agraria en España*.

Land reform must be implemented according to a plan that sets the goals and the most propitious means to achieve them, and establishes the precise human type to carry out transformation of the countryside. It should always remain within the framework of the law⁶⁶ and should be governed by respect for individual assets. However, the notion of family agricultural heritage was changed by many other agrarists of the period⁶⁷, based on the agrarian modernization process⁶⁸ with different regional and international nuances⁶⁹.

Eza and the Agrarian Colonization

Coinciding with the promulgation of the law of agricultural colonies of 1907, the Vizconde of Eza was the General Director of Agriculture. As indicated in 1911 the colonies would be the real 'agro-social laboratories'⁷⁰. He often set an example of some colonies generated by the Board of Colonization and Internal Repopulation in his more general writings on agrarian policy. His problem was to obtain land for colonization, respecting individual and private property, in addition to problems of the agrarian technique linked to colonization based on family lots⁷¹. In this sense, Eza suggests that "The working class of the field, in all the countries of the world, (is) superior in number and more in need of shelter, in terms of their economic and social situation"⁷². Interior colonization founded on the 'family property' was intended to be an intermediate step between the smallholding and the large estate⁷³. This social foundation of colonization had already been recognized in the IX International Congress of Agriculture⁷⁴, in which considerable importance was given to the creation of small farms and to the means to attract the owners to the countryside and prevent the emigration of agricultural workers⁷⁵. In this way, we should not criticize Eza because of the limited scope of the colonization policy⁷⁶, given that perhaps this was not a clear purpose of the

66. Eza, *De mis carpetas II. La reforma agraria y el crédito*.

67. J. Algarra, *Colonización de España. Exposición de Economía Social. Barcelona, 1911* (Barcelona: Imprenta y librería de Monserrat, 1911).

68. R. Moreno, "El paro forzoso en la agricultura," *La Paz Social*, 51(1911): 230-248.

69. P. Caziot, *La terre à la familia paysanne: une solution du probleme agraire* (Paris: Payot, 1919).

70. Eza, *Conservación y creación de las pequeñas explotaciones agrícolas*, 22.

71. Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior, *Estudios e informes relativos a la colonización agrícola de la zona de protectorado de España en Marruecos* (Madrid, Imp. Helénica, 1923).

72. Eza, *La agricultura en la organización internacional del trabajo*, 7.

73. C. De Castro, *La revolución desde arriba. Ensayo sobre la reforma agraria y la colonización interior* (Madrid: Sociedad General Española de Librerías, 1921).

74. Congreso IX Congreso internacional de Agricultura: celebrado en Madrid del 1 al 7 de mayo de 1911 (Madrid: Tip. J.R. Martín, 1912).

75. S. Aznar, *Despoblación y colonización* (Barcelona: Labor, 1930).

76. F.J. Monclus, and J.L. Oyon, "De la colonización interior a la colonización integral (1900-1936). Génesis y destino de una reforma agraria técnica," in *Historia agraria de la España contemporánea. 3. El fin de la agricultura tradicional (1900-1960)*, ed. R., Garrabou, C. Barciela and J.I. Jiménez (Barcelona: Crítica, 1986); R. Robledo, "Política y reforma agraria: de la Restauración a la II República (1868/74-1939)," in *Reformas y políticas agrarias en la*

ideologists of the agrarian colonization of 1907⁷⁷. Instead, we can regard it as the development of singular colonies that served as an example of how to establish lots or agrarian family patrimonies in different parts of the Spanish geography, with a differentiated natural and socioeconomic environment. These would constitute regional examples of agrarian colonization⁷⁸. This qualitative interpretation of the colonization of 1907 seems more appropriate to the ends, even personal ones, of Eza himself. He claimed that it was better to have few settlers, provided these were successful⁷⁹. But, it is Eza himself, recognizing the depth of the social problem in Andalusia, who states in 1919 that not even significantly extending the colonized area would end the social conflict⁸⁰. Here, also, Eza recognizes a specific social dimension to the agrarian problem, which differentiates it from other catholic-social ones. The formula, in any case, was too 'expensive' for a public budget deficit.

Eza's position in relation to colonization was critical, based on the high costs of internal colonization for the State, arising from its intervention in depopulated and uncultivated areas⁸¹. The State should only give the land of labor and the settler must do everything else⁸². Internal migration had to be fought in a way that was compatible with the freedom of the individual, not only by colonization, which was too onerous for the State⁸³. Some agrarists, like Cascon (Agronomist, director of the Agricultural Farm of Palencia and since 1916 member of the Agronomic Advisory Board)⁸⁴, denounced Eza as a 'trumpeter', for his involvement in the model of colonization. The only interest of the large landowners, according to reformist critics of Eza, was to extract the highest income and preserve their rights. The property must be founded on work. The number of land owners had to be increased, but without an increase in the deficit of the public treasury⁸⁵. Implicitly, the welfare state was criticized -even within the social Catholics-⁸⁶. This point of view was finally imposed in 1926, as previously indicated, and in certain aspects would culminate in the technical arguments of republican agrarian reform. In Eza's own thinking, the

historia de España, ed. A. García Sanz and J. Sanz Fernández, (Madrid: MAPA, 1996): 247-350.

77. Maurice, *La reforma agraria en España en el siglo XX (1900-1936)*, 1975.

78. A. Paniagua, *Repercusiones sociodemográficas de la policía de colonización durante el siglo XIX y primer tercio del XX* (Madrid: MAPA, 1992)

79. Eza, "La política social en España," *Boletín de la Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior*, 24, 4 trimestre(1924): 6-14.

80. Eza, "Importancia de la colonización en España," *Boletín de la Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior*, primer trimestre (1919): 6-23.

81. Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior. *Las colonias agrícolas. Folleto divulgador del proyecto, organización, desarrollo y estado actual de la colonia agrícola de 'Els Plans' (Alcoy) al quinto año de su instalación* (Madrid: Imp. Alemana, 1916)

82. J. Cascon, *La cuestión agraria: España puede colonizarse. Una réplica a los Sres. Zulueta y Vizconde de Eza* (Madrid: Mario Auguiano, 1916).

83. F. Soler Pérez, *La crisis rural* (Madrid: Fco. Beltrán, 1918).

84. Cascón, *La cuestión agraria: España puede colonizarse. Una réplica a los Sres. Zulueta y Vizconde de Eza*, 1916.

85. F. Soler Pérez, *Función social de la propiedad del suelo* (Madrid: Est. Tip. Jaime Rates, 1919).

86. F. Rivas, *Los progresos del campo y la cooperación* (Madrid: Hernando, 1926).

solution to agrarian credit can be regarded progressively, so that each farmer could develop his individual qualities in the management of his family property.

Eza's critics, who supported a technical reform, may have been right, but the technical foundations in the subsequent intervention, for example, of the Institute of Agrarian Reform when establishing communities of peasants in the Second Republic are also true. The prosecution of Eza arises from the social limitations of the state action for the solution of an agrarian problem, that in a regionalized way, Eza recognized. The qualitative vision of the colonization of the first quarter of the twentieth century intended to be an effective way to: '(1) find out the most conducive means to obtain the highest yield of profits, and, consequently, an increase in the national wealth, of each part of the territory of which a given town is in possession (...) (2), to discover the most feasible way for each nation to have the largest possible population nucleus fed by their work, educated in their profession and trained every day to aspire to rise to the sphere of progress and civilization'⁸⁷. The colonies, under this previously described qualitative vision, did not want to be more than a living expression that contributed to the national synthesis that Eza proclaimed in the regional studies. In any case, Eza became aware of the limitations of respect for individual property adapted to the environment and the depth of the social problem in some areas analyzed. Eza saw this contradiction more implicitly than explicitly. But, it will always be in favor of an orderly and measured intervention of the State in the agrarian structure. Maintaining the rural population and raising its material standard of living and moral condition, together with a situation of seasonal unemployment and a structure of property, which in physical-agronomic terms would be appropriate, is another of the contradictions and problems with facing Eza and, in general, the catholic-social ideology⁸⁸.

The Agrarian Program

In general terms, Eza recognizes that agricultural progress is 'palmary' in Spain⁸⁹. An opinion that reflects wise judgments about the agriculture of the time, as was revealed later⁹⁰. The agrarian problem in Spain is not unique and has different modalities and nuances, even at municipal or regional scales⁹¹. As Eza pointed out in 1931: 'The diversity of the countryside is such, not only in counties and provinces, but even in each municipal area, which cannot be

87. Eza, *Conservación y creación de las pequeñas explotaciones agrícolas*, 23.

88. Aznar, *¿Decadencia, senectud o crisis de crecimiento?* (Madrid: Ruiz, 1930), 73 and sucesive.

89. Eza, *La tahona reguladora*, 18.

90. J.I. Jiménez Blanco, "Introducción," in *Historia agraria de la España contemporánea. 3. El fin de la agricultura tradicional (1900-1960)*, ed. R. Garrabou, C. Barciela, and J.I. Jiménez (Barcelona: Crítica, 1986): 9-141.

91. Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior, *Nota informativa de la colonización interior en España, que presenta al Congreso de la Asociación para el Progreso de las Ciencias* (Coimbra, 1925).

generalized when it comes to social structure and economic organization ...⁹². The main problems are economic, based on: profit and social returns and feeding the largest possible number of people by their own labor⁹³. Eza leaves profitable large estates outside all reform⁹⁴, faced with the social fact that some farms do not yield what they should in agronomical terms. Society is empowered by the natural law to reintegrate into its domain so that it can provide greater wealth. Gongora's⁹⁵ interpretation of Eza's ideology includes recognition of 'latifundio' or large property, provided that its use is consistent with its agronomic characteristics and the settlement system concentrated in distant settlements between them. This point of view was questioned decades later by Martínez Alier in his study on the *Stability of latifundio*.

The convenience or not of the small or large farm will depend on various factors, especially the availability of land. There will be areas where the large property is better and areas where the small property will be more suitable⁹⁶. For Eza, one of the objects of the agrarian reform was its geographic delimitation. The 'latifundio' is only favorable in Andalusia, La Mancha and Extremadura. But, the reform strategy in the 'latifundios' should consist of the improvement of dry-land crops that are deficiently exploited in a 'convenient parceling'⁹⁷, of around 10% of the surface of each 'latifundio'. For these conclusions, he combines the social laboratory -even on parcels on his own land - and a remarkable knowledge of international literature. The large estate is not necessarily deplorable and accepts a regional adaptation in the extension of the smallholding and the 'latifundio'. Consequently, the task of colonization and reform must follow regional guidelines. This position has been interpreted later as shoring up the stability of the 'latifundio' in a stage of rural change, with a modification in the wage labor system by another employee with incentives without real economic independence, which would constitute sharecropping. Also, in this sense Martínez Alier – by contrast to Eza's claims decades before - pointed out that ecology is irrelevant in the stability of the 'latifundio' as the very type of settlement⁹⁸.

For Eza, agrarian reform 'must consist in establishing on the farms (...), a farmer endowed with strong production elements and intense social collaborations in order to achieve their economic improvement and the citizens' elevation'⁹⁹. In his later work *Agrarismo*¹⁰⁰, it defines its agrarian program based on the need for field reforms, associated with the following bases: (1) the prosperity of agriculture; (2) the broader distribution of capital among small

92. Eza, *La reforma agraria en España*, 18.

93. Eza, *Conservación y creación de las pequeñas explotaciones agrícolas*, 23.

94. Eza, "Importancia de la colonización en España," *Boletín de la Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior* (1919): 6-23.

95. J. Martínez Alier, *Labourers and landowners in southern Spain* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1971).

96. Eza, *La reforma agraria en España*.

97. J.J. Castillo, *Propietarios muy pobres. Sobre la subordinación política del pequeño campesino* (Madrid: MAPA., 1979)

98. Martínez Alier, *Labourers and landowners in southern Spain*, 27.

99. Eza, *La reforma agraria en España*, 5.

100. Eza, *Agrarismo*.

and medium-sized farms; (3) the collaboration of all types of citizens. Agrarianism is identified with individualism and is opposed to collectivism. Eza himself defines agrarianism as: 'the determination of the agronomic circumstances that concur in our territory, as well as of the indispensable elements for the convenient production use of those by coordinating the latter in three orders of technical improvement, social interdependence and legal norms that submit and adopt them to the organic structure that responds to the maximum performance of the economic and educative energies ... '. The solution to the agrarian problem lay in political stability -one of the characteristics of agrarian colonization programs- and a social, economic and legal organization adapted to obtain the highest yield on the land -a regionalization of the reform policies associated with the agronomic characteristics-. Agrarianism 'is a method to carve out a life' which privileges enough property for the existence of a family. These judgments of Eza are a constant in his work. Already, *The agrarian problem of Spain*¹⁰¹ published in another national and international sociopolitical context, in similar terms, stated that the agrarian problem is the determination of the agronomic circumstances that occur in our territory, as well as of the indispensable elements for the convenient production utilization of these through the coordination of three dimensions: technical improvement, social interdependence and legal changes¹⁰².

One of the characteristics of Eza was the combination of the micro social laboratory, taking as an example the parceling and colonization activities -and even his private plots on his farms- and the international examples. This led him to write some works on the comparative results of agrarian reform in Europe¹⁰³, from which it can be concluded that agricultural property has typical aspects in each country. For this reason, in some countries measures of concentration or division of land had been put in place, with the intervention of the State, while in others the land was disintegrated, distributed and concentrated by the set of economic laws. The socio-economic context surrounding agriculture in each country is also different and has a significant impact on the analysis of rural life and State policies.

Conclusion

As indicated above, Eza is a figure of multiple profiles and interests, among which those of social-agrarian are particularly noteworthy. His agrarian concern reflects, to a certain extent, his status as a great social owner, as his own workers saw him. Not only was he a theoretician, he also carried out social-agrarian experiments, even with parceling on his own farms. The

101. Eza, *El problema agrario en España*.

102. Eza, *El problema agrario en España*, 11.

103. Eza, *Resultados de la reforma agraria en Europa* (Madrid: Asociación Española para el Progreso de las Ciencias, 1929); Eza, *La tierra y la política en Inglaterra* (Madrid: Imp. y Enc. Suc. M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1932).

distribution of his properties between Soria and Córdoba undoubtedly influenced many of his agrarian judgments.

The analysis of Eza's work allows us to review some points of view relating to a period, the first third of the 20th century, which has been characterized by social-agrarian history as a time of little movement in the agrarian structure that nourished the emergence of the agrarian reform during the Second Republic¹⁰⁴. It is even known as a period of transition stage where actions or inactions have as a final result the agrarian reform of the Second Republic¹⁰⁵. The southern perspective of the agrarian question has traditionally obscured facts accepted today such as the increase in agricultural productivity and capitalization, the increase in cultivated area or the decrease (in absolute and relative terms) in the rural and agrarian population¹⁰⁶. All these facts and tendencies were already incorporated by Eza in his thoughts and writings of social-agrarian policy. It could even be suggested that, because of his social tendency, Eza was one of the social Catholics most prone to the intervention (direct) of the State. He recognized a remarkable southern social dimension of the agrarian problem, whose solution was not exclusively subject to technical and credit improvements.

Eza's ideology was novel in some historiographical aspects. In his analysis of the 'latifundio' he proposed that the great property was not negative in itself, provided that it was adapted to the physical environment and properly managed. The large properties in Extremadura and Andalusia responded, to a large extent, to the restrictions of the physical environment and, secondarily, to the historical process of repopulation. Parceling and colonization would only be beneficial in a limited part of the latifundio, the part closest to the population.

For Eza, the problem lies in the structure of the property. Small and large properties are two aspects of the same problem. The solution in one case is concentration and in the other parceling, through agrarian colonization based on the family patrimony. Consequently, the agrarian policy must be regionalized. This is another feature of Eza's agrarian ideology: recognition of the diversity of problems and agrarian issues in Spain and the multiplicity of solutions. Eza proposed the region as an appropriate geographical unit in which to approach rural problems and agrarian solutions. Here, Eza refers to expositions developed by some historians: the regional specialization of agriculture and the existence of diverse agrarian questions and solutions, to problems with different roots¹⁰⁷.

Above all, Eza has a dual vision of space and society that characterized rural life in the twentieth century¹⁰⁸. This dual agrarian ideology of the Viscount is embodied in diverse relationships: (1) field-city, (2) locality-globality, (3) small-great property, (4) individual-State, which correspond to

104. Malefekis, *Reforma agraria y revolución campesina en la España del siglo XX*. Rodríguez Labandeira, *El trabajo rural en España, 1876-1936*, 199.

105. Maurice, *La reforma agraria en España en el siglo XX (1900-1936)*.

106. Jiménez Blanco, "Introducción".

107. Ibid.

108. J. Sánchez Jiménez, *La vida rural en la España del Siglo XX* Barcelona: Planeta, 1975.

some of the fundamental and permanent binary associations in his agrarian ideology. (1) The countryside and the city appear as two differentiated social entities: there were moral values and a type of life typical of the countryside and others characteristic of the city. This duality has a moral-social rather than a spatial foundation and overshadows a more territorial duality: the rural-urban one, which hardly appears in his ideology. (2) The second duality is associated with analysis of the agrarian question that is often based on social-agrarian laboratories in farms or localities and the study of agrarian issues at an international level, which Eza combines masterfully in his analyses. This shows how the local agrarian social processes had an international explanatory context. (3) The binary difference between small and large properties encloses the regional complexity of the agrarian question in Eza's agrarian ideology. In both cases, the solution was an adequate management in relation to environmental conditions and internal colonization through the constitution of family agrarian patrimonies. In any case, gradually Eza opts for a concentration of the properties and a certain consideration for the 'latifundio'. (4) The fourth duality that characterizes Eza's ideology connects with the differentiated role of the individual (creator) and the State (regulator). Allowing for the agrarian individual to develop capacities in the management of his exploitation, in a certain social framework, is a characteristic of Eza's ideology. In this way, inequality between individuals is not necessarily regarded as negative -one of the characteristics of social Catholicism in Spain¹⁰⁹, but rather as being the result of the unequal natural conditions of man and the generation of dependency relationships. The State must configure a regulatory framework that guarantees the development of individual capacities, especially the individual right to property (agrarian). The State, above all, must have a subsidiary nature.

All these binary axes of Eza's ideology remain constant throughout his work despite the remarkable historical ups and downs that occur during the first 40 years of the twentieth century. They also grant a remarkable social and geographical character to their thinking: regional differentiation, the field-city relationship, the geographical value of the individual (rural) -with a somewhat relational view of the rural space-, the influence of transport and the disposition of the settlements. These are some of the topics of notorious geographic content. Eza's own way of carrying out agrarian research today would have a lot of geo-ethnography.

Bibliography

- Algarra, J. *Colonización de España. Exposición de Economía Social. Barcelona, 1911.* Barcelona: Imprenta y librería de Monserrat, 1911.
 Amor, G. "La propiedad y la cuestión agraria." *La Paz Social*, 9(1907): 453-457.
 Aznar, S. *Despoblación y colonización.* Barcelona: Labor, 1930.
 Aznar, S. *El catolicismo social en España. Nuestro primer curso social.* Zaragoza: Mariano Escar Tip., 1907.

109. Aznar, *Despoblación y colonización.*

- Calama, A. "El Vizconde de Eza Don Luis Marichalar y Monreal (1873-1945). Político e intelectual, diputado a Cortes por Soria de 1899 a 1923, Alcalde de Madrid (1913-1914)". *Torre de los Lujanes. Boletín de la Real Sociedad Económica Matritense de Amigos del País*, 61(2007): 71-115.
- Campo, F. "El vizconde de Eza y la cooperación." *Estudios Cooperativos*, 16(1968): 27-40.
- Cascon, J. *La cuestión agraria: España puede colonizarse. Una réplica a los Sres. Zulueta y Vizconde de Eza*. Madrid: Mario Auguiano, 1916.
- Carmona, J., and Simpson, J. *El laberinto de la agricultura española: instituciones, contratos y organización entre 1850 y 1936*. Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, 2003.
- Castillo, J.J. *Propietarios muy pobres. Sobre la subordinación política del pequeño campesino*. Madrid: MAPA, 1979.
- Caziot, P. *La terre à la familia paysanne: une solution du probleme agraire*. Paris: Payot, 1919.
- Congreso IX Congreso internacional de Agricultura: celebrado en Madrid del 1 al 7 de mayo de 1911. Madrid: Tip. J.R. Martín, 1912.
- Cuenca Toribio, J.M. *Catolicismo social y político en la España contemporánea (1870-2000)*. Madrid: Unión Editorial, 2003.
- Dantín Cereceda, J. *Ensayo acerca de las regiones naturales de España*. Madrid: J. Cosano, 1922.
- Dantín Cereceda, J. *Concepto presente de la región natural en geografía*. Madrid: Hernando, 1925.
- De Castro, C. *La revolución desde arriba. Ensayo sobre la reforma agraria y la colonización interior*. Madrid: Sociedad General Española de Librerías, 1921.
- Elorrieta, O. *Ordenación económica de la producción agraria*. Madrid: Inst. Forestal de Investigaciones y Experiencias, 1941.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *La cooperación agrícola: su exención fiscal. Informe presentado a la Agrupación Parlamentaria Agrícola*. Madrid: Imp. Asilo de huérfanos, 1904.
- Eza, Vizconde de. "Prólogo -Julio de 1905." In *La cooperación agrícola en el extranjero*, edited by F. Rivas Moreno, 7-23. Madrid: Ambrosio Pérez y Cía., 1907.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *El riesgo profesional en la agricultura*. Madrid: Suc. M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1906.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *Conservación y creación de las pequeñas explotaciones agrícolas*. Madrid: Bernardo Rodríguez, 1911.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *La tahona reguladora*. Madrid: Sucesora de M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1914.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *El problema agrario en España*. Madrid: Imp. Bernardo Rodríguez, 1915.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *El problema de los trigos: informe de la Asociación de Agricultores de España*. Madrid: M. Minuesa, 1916.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *El problema agrario andaluz*. Madrid: Imp. Bernardo Rodríguez, 1919.
- Eza, Vizconde de. "Importancia de la colonización en España." *Boletín de la Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior*, primer trimestre (1919): 6-23.
- Eza, Vizconde de. "Requisitos indispensables para la difusión de la propiedad privada." *Boletín de la Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior*, 20, 4 trimestre (1923): 3-27.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *La agricultura en la organización internacional del trabajo*. Madrid: Sobrinos de la Suc. De M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1920.

- Eza, Vizconde de. "La política social en España." *Boletín de la Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior*, 24, 4 trimestre(1924): 6-14.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *El solar español: su fuerza social, económica y tributaria*. Madrid: Ruiz hermanos, 1926.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *Resultados de la reforma agraria en Europa*. Madrid: Asociación Española para el Progreso de las Ciencias, 1929.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *¿Decadencia, senectud o crisis de crecimiento?* Madrid: Ruiz, 1930.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *La reforma agraria en España*. Madrid: Imp. Suc. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1931.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *La exhumación de los señoríos*. Madrid: Imp. y Enc. Suc. M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1932.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *La tierra y la política en Inglaterra*. Madrid: Imp. y Enc. Suc. M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1932.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *De mis carpetas II. La reforma agraria y el crédito*. Madrid: Imp. Sobrinos M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1933.
- Eza, Vizconde de. *Agrarismo*. Madrid: C. Bermejo Imp., 1936.
- Vizconde de Eza, *El problema económico en España*. Madrid: Sobrinos de la Suc. De M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1919.
- Góngora, M. *El problema de la tierra: opiniones e iniciativas de los señores Alba, Argente, Aznar, Bernaldo de Quirós...* Madrid: Góngora, 1922.
- Información. *Información sobre el problema agrario en la provincia de Córdoba*. Madrid: Sobrinos de la Suc. de M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1919.
- Jiménez Blanco, J.I. "Introducción." In *Historia agraria de la España contemporánea. 3. El fin de la agricultura tradicional (1900-1960)*, edited by R. Garrabou, C. Barciela, and J.I. Jiménez, 9-141. Barcelona: Crítica, 1986.
- Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior. *Las colonias agrícolas. Folleto divulgador del proyecto, organización, desarrollo y estado actual de la colonia agrícola de 'Els Plans' (Alcoy) al quinto año de su instalación*. Madrid: Imp. Alemana, 1916.
- Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior. *Estudios e informes relativos a la colonización agrícola de la zona de protectorado de España en Marruecos*. Madrid: Imp. Helénica, 1923.
- Junta Central de Colonización y Repoblación Interior. *Nota informativa de la colonización interior en España, que presenta al Congreso de la Asociación para el Progreso de las Ciencias (Coimbra, 1925)*. Madrid: Imp. Helénica, 1925.
- Leal, L. "Factores jurídicos y sociales del problema agrario en España." In *Discursos y artículos de León Leal Ramos. Temas sociales, jurídicos y religiosos*, 195-208. Cáceres: Anaya, 1959, original of 1934.
- Majuelo, E., and Pascual, A. *Del catolicismo agrario al cooperativismo empresarial. Setenta y cinco años de la Federación de Cooperativas navarras, 1910-1985*. Madrid: MAPA, 1991.
- Malefakis, E. *Reforma agraria y revolución campesina en la España del siglo XX*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1982, original of 1970.
- Mallart, J. *La elevación moral y material del campesino*. Madrid: Gráfica Mundial, 1933.
- Martínez Alier, J. *Labourers and landowners in southern Spain*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1971.
- Martínez González, S. *La crisis de la agricultura. Sus causas y sus remedios*. Salamanca: Imprenta Católica Salmanticense, 1893.
- Martín Granizo, L. "Prologo." *Antología de las obras del Excmo. Señor Vizconde de Eza*, XI-XXXIX. Madrid: Escuela Social de Madrid, 1948.

- Maurice, J. *La reforma agraria en España en el siglo XX (1900-1936)*. Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1975.
- Molins, J.E. *La crisis en España*. Barcelona: Imp. Barcelonesa, 1904.
- Monclus, F.J., and Oyon, J.L. "De la colonización interior a la colonización integral (1900-1936). Génesis y destino de una reforma agraria técnica." In *Historia agraria de la España contemporánea. 3. El fin de la agricultura tradicional (1900-1960)*, edited by R., Garrabou, C. Barciela, J.I. Jiménez, 347-382. Barcelona, Crítica, 1986.
- Moreno, R. "El paro forzoso en la agricultura." *La Paz Social*, 51(1911): 230-248.
- Paniagua, A. *Repercusiones sociodemográficas de la policía de colonización durante el siglo XIX y primer tercio del XX*. Madrid: MAPA, 1992.
- Ricaldone, P. *Los labradores, la agricultura y la cuestión social*. Sevilla: Biblioteca agraria solariana, 1903.
- Rivas, F. *Los progresos del campo y la cooperación*. Madrid: Hernando, 1926.
- Robledo, R. "Política y reforma agraria: de la Restauración a la II República (1868/74-1939)." *Reformas y políticas agrarias en la historia de España*, edited by A. García Sanz and J. Sanz Fernández, 247-350. Madrid: MAPA, 1996.
- Rodríguez Labandeira, J. *El trabajo rural en España, 1876-1936*. Madrid: Anthropos, Ministry of Agriculture, fishing and Food, 1991.
- Salcedo Ruiz, A. *El socialismo del campo*. Madrid: Imp. de los Huérfanos, 1894.
- Sánchez Jiménez, J. *La vida rural en la España del Siglo XX*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1975.
- Sangro, P. *El Vizconde de Eza, gran señor social*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo, 1947.
- Sevilla Guzmán, E. "Sobre el pensamiento social agrario en España." In *Introducción a la sociología rural*, edited by H. Newby, and E. Sevilla Guzmán. Madrid: Alianza Ed., 1983.
- Soler Pérez, F. *Población rural*. Madrid: V. Rico Imp., 1919.
- Soler Pérez, F. *La crisis rural*. Madrid: Fco. Beltrán, 1918.
- Soler Pérez, F. *Función social de la propiedad del suelo*. Madrid: Est. Tip. Jaime Rates, 1919.

Recent Discoveries in Iberia and the Application of Post-Colonial Concepts: The Modern Making of a State, *Tartessos*¹

By Eleftheria Pappa^{*}

The present paper offers a review of the current state of research on the proto-history of the southern Iberian peninsula, dealing specifically with the period of colonization in the first half of the 1st millennium BCE. It takes as a point of departure a synthetic picture presented in a recent publication that aims to diffuse knowledge on the subject to readerships outside this specific field. In doing so, however, it creates the precedent for the diffusion of a rather partial review of the evidence that presents contemporary interpretations that have not been met with a consensus, which fact remains unacknowledged. Here, the aim is to present a critical discussion of trends in the state of the art in this field of studies, highlighting problematic areas and giving some suggestions as to future lines of research. It concerns a major episode in the proto-history of the Mediterranean, in a period when writing spreads in Europe and local cultures across the Mediterranean are profoundly transformed through colonization.

Introduction

Spectacular archaeological discoveries in southern Iberia have continued apace in recent years, expanding our knowledge of the prehistoric and proto-historic periods associated with the so-called Tartessic culture. Given that this region was colonized by the Phoenicians (an umbrella term that includes other Near Easterners), the Iberian peninsula became embedded in cross-cultural developments taking place elsewhere in the Mediterranean, from Cyprus to Morocco. The recent scholarly interest in the Phoenicians has furthered research in Iberia itself, with the fine-tuning of typologies and the better understanding of cross-Mediterranean chronologies from excavations in Lebanon, Sardinia, Sicily, Tunisia, Morocco and elsewhere. New methods, such as radiocarbon dating, have entered the scene, complementing traditional archaeological approaches to dating. This is significant, as for modern historical reasons, Iberian archaeology followed a different trajectory than the eastern Mediterranean regions of the "classical world". The peninsula remained cut-off from the 18th century "Grand Tour explorations" and its archaeological record less known outside the country, a trend that continued in subsequent centuries.

This is where a new publication comes in, intended to diffuse a summary of the latest discoveries. It does so with the intention of applying new post-colonial concepts developed mainly within anthropology, albeit without avoiding methodological problems. Entitled *Tartessos and the Phoenicians in*

^{*}Post-doctoral researcher, University of Sao Paulo, Brazil.

1. Review Article on *Tartessos and the Phoenicians in Iberia*, by S. Celestino Pérez & C. López Ruiz, 2016, Oxford University Press.

Iberia, the volume aims to present to a non-Spanish speaking readership recent archaeological discoveries in a "synthetic nature", avoiding "the technical details of the specialized archaeological publications aiming for a thorough but quicker overview of the material evidence" (iv).² It focuses on *Tartessos*, a term known from archaic Greek sources, which in current archaeological terminology is associated with the early 1st millennium BCE southern Iberia, centred in Andalusia and neighbouring regions. Authored by Sebastian Celestino Pérez, active in fieldwork in Spain and with a prodigious research output,³ and Carolina López Ruiz, a classicist with an interest in the cultures of the ancient Near East, it combines archaeological and historical/philological evidence. Reading the monograph implicitly raises questions on the extent to which concepts from post-colonial theory can be applied to prehistoric archaeological evidence, and the risks of reifying ancient historiographical terms in a historical reality through the recruitment of archaeological finds.

Reviewing the Synthesis of Current Knowledge Presented

The monograph is composed of eight chapters, and an epilogue. The first four, written by López Ruiz, deal with the (mostly Spanish) history of research into Tartessos and the Greco-Roman literary sources. The last four, written by Celestino Pérez, address the archaeological evidence.

The Preface on why Tartessos matters, thus necessitating this monograph, emphasizes the dearth of related publications in English (iv). Some may view this as a rather damning evaluation of research done on the proto-history of southern Iberia in other languages, as it ignores older works,⁴ or more recent scholarship⁵ whose topics overlap with those of this book. This evaluation is partly explained conceptually by the consideration implicit in the authors' treatment of Tartessos as a discrete entity, a "unit" detachable from the Iberian proto-history, which thus would explain the supposed dearth of publications on it outside Spain. This is discussed further below.

Chapter 1 begins with a historiographical account of the philological/historical and archaeological research on Tartessos in Spain. There is a section on the problems of defining and identifying ethnicity in the colonial worlds of ancient Iberia based on the archaeological evidence (22-23).

2. S. Celestino Pérez and C. López Ruiz, *Tartessos and the Phoenicians in Iberia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

3. Most recently: S. Celestino Pérez and E. Rodríguez González, (eds), *Territorios Comparados: Los valles del Guadalquivir, el Guadiana y el Tajo en Época Tartésica*, Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología LXXX (Mérida: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2017).

4. R. Harrison, *R. Spain at the Dawn of History: Iberians, Phoenicians and Greeks* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988).

5. E. Nikolopoulos, *Σχέσεις της Ιβηρικής Χερσονήσου με την Ανατολική Μεσόγειο κατά τη 2η και στις Αρχές της 1ης Χιλιετίας Π.Χ.: Μύθος Και Πραγματικότητα* [*Relations between the Iberian Peninsula and the Eastern Mediterranean in the 2nd and the beginning of 1st millennium BC: Myth and Reality*], Ph.D. Dissertation, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2009.

Chapter 2 deals with the Greek sources on Tartessos, beginning with 7th c. BCE Ionian lyric poets, such as the earliest reference to Tartessos by the lyric poet Anacreon of Teos. The chapter offers a detailed account that is missing from other available publications on the topic, where Greek literary texts referring to Tartessos or to the western Mediterranean are mentioned *en passant*, without receiving a proper treatment of their own. Nonetheless, the problematic literary account of the famed journey of a certain Pytheas, from the Greek colony of Massalia (France) to an icy *Thoule* (modernly identified with places ranging from Scotland to Iceland) is curiously hailed as the "first notice we have of a renewed Greek activity in the Atlantic after a fifth century apparent gap" (49). The fragment on Pytheas, even if it was indeed based on some journey to northern Europe, cannot sustain the claim of Greek activity. Knowledge of the farthest regions of the Atlantic must have remained occasional and fragmented well into Roman times.

Chapter 3 discusses Roman-period Greek and Latin texts on Tartessos and its semantic heirs (e.g. Turdetania) through to the Augustan period. Tartessos in these texts emerges as the projection of an ancient prestigious culture. A critical discussion on semantics concludes that some of the terminological confusion derives from historiographers transliterating ethnonyms in Greek to Latin and the opposite without translating them. This resulted in multiple variations for the same ethnonym (e.g. *Tourdetanoi/Turdetani*). Dual toponyms (Tartessos/Baetis, Hispania/Iberia) are explained in the context of introduced Roman administrative terminology (58).

Chapter 4 deals with the cosmological conception of the "Far West" in Greek mythology (the Herakles' related myths of the Geryon's monsters and Gardens of Hesperidai) and eschatology (Isles of the Blessed). Various afterlife cosmologies from the Near East and Egypt to Greece are associated with the West, as the place where the sun sets. Early Greek mythological narratives situate the Hesperidai by the *Ocean* in the western end of the world, without clearly referencing Iberia or Tartessos. The earliest documented association of Tartessos with the myth of Geryon is a 7th/6th c. BCE lyric fragment by the Siceliot Greek Stecchorus (known through 3rd c. BCE Strabo's writings). It is unclear from the analysis if the association between the Ocean in the "Far West" and Herakles/Melqart proceeded from 850-600 BCE Phoenician and Greek travellers' stories or whether they were a later "euphemeristic-style" development of the classical period. Potentially, the setting of some Greek myths (vaguely) in the West, understood as a cardinal point and afterlife abode at least from the classical period onwards – when geographical knowledge had improved – could have led to these mythical narratives being geographically associated with Iberia. Thus the Pillars of Herakles were identified with the Straits of Gibraltar (e.g. in Euripides' *The Madness of Herakles*). Continuing, the chapter offers a convincing case for identifying Tartessos with biblical Tarshish on the basis of historical, archaeological and importantly, linguistic grounds, furnishing the most persuasive treatment of this long-standing debate (113-114). While Chapter 4 is well-argued overall, its section on "final thoughts" is entirely out of kilter with the analysis previously presented, ending with a stunning conclusion: despite the extremely fragmented corpus of data it

is asserted that "we can glimpse a realm with fairly well defined geographical and cultural contours, even if its precise ethnic and political composition and evolution remains a mystery" (124).

With *Chapter 5* begins the archaeological, second part of the book. It introduces the application of post-colonial concepts as used in Mediterranean archaeology, defines terms used in the book ("Orientalizing", "Phoenicians"), and summarizes the evidence for Phoenician and Greek Mediterranean networks, as well as for pre-colonial contacts in Iberia. The first section on the theoretical approaches to colonization (125-129) raises questions. The authors talk of Phoenician colonization in several regions (from Cyprus to Portugal) (142), claiming that in the early 1st millennium BCE Iberia "very little of that world resembles modern colonialism, which is premised on the systematic exploitation, domination and expansion of the colonial power" (127). In fact, one could claim that southern Iberia at this time presents a textbook-case of ancient colonialism. By juxtaposition with colonization, it is the weaker term regarding (hegemonic) power asymmetries.

Additionally, avoiding to use the words *culture* and *ethnicity*, as if they embodied a concept that is an inherently bad thing that needs to be avoided at all costs (lest it lend itself to nefarious purposes) results in confused statements, e.g. "We need to understand these Phoenicians and Greeks (at this stage at least) not as ethnically or culturally homogeneous, let alone politically unified, but rather as linked through common language (with dialectal variants) and a set of shared traditions, and practices, especially religious, that set them apart from others" (131). Here the authors are hopelessly trying to speak of cultural identities while at the same time claiming that they are precisely not doing that, as if so as to appease the most superficial of post-colonial narratives where words *per se* are demonized. This troubled understanding of the essence of post-colonial theory culminates with calling the settlement of Pithekoussai "a nice example of Greek and Phoenician early colonization" (142), although the only cogent attestation for Phoenicians on this trading post amounts to graffiti at a time during a period in which we have several lines of evidence documenting that Greeks and Phoenicians avoided settling one near the other in their colonial forays in the Mediterranean, as in Sicily and Libya. We should be careful not to construct pasts that did not exist in our efforts to modernize our interpretations through a misconstrued sense of post-colonial theory that demands symmetry of power relations among all parties involved in colonial situations by considering the attested intercultural mobility of individuals as mirrors of large-scale intercultural alliances in establishing new foundations overseas.

Some other remarks should be made. Punic-period populations were self-identified as *Ponnim*,⁶ which is omitted from the discussion on the supposedly only etic, extant ethnonyms of Phoenician/Punic groups (132, footnote 23). Dates of ca. 700 BC for the emergence of states in Anatolia and the Greek world (p. 135) are too late. The settlement of the Phoenicians did not reach "from the Atlantic North-African coast to Algeria" (138) but to Libya (Lepcis).

6. C.R. Krahmalkov, *A Phoenician-Punic Grammar* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001).

Several of the radiocarbon dates that appear in the discussion, most notably those of Carthage (141), were obtained from problematic samples and their use requires more caution.⁷

Importantly, in discussing pre-colonization, understood as a period where maritime connections paved the way to colonization, the authors refer to Tartessos as if it had been pre-existing. But in what sense? What was Tartessos that pre-existed the Phoenicians and what is the evidence for it? In the next section, the Late Bronze Age monumental "warrior stelae" of south-western Iberia are considered evidence for the "Tartessic society before the colonial wave" (159). By the end of this section, Tartessos turns up spatially in western Spain and southern Portugal at each place or region that eastern Mediterranean elements turn up as imports or influences in the material record of Iberia. But that is a methodologically problematic way of identifying a culture, society or civilization that anticipates the problems of Chapter 6.

Objects considered Mediterranean that are depicted in the "warrior stelae" of south-western Iberia have been for decades interpreted as the products of pre-colonial contacts. The problem is that these stelae pretty much lack contextual material, and as a result, their dating cannot be placed with certainty prior to the Phoenician colonization. The iconography of the stelae is reasonably related to finds from Ireland (V-notched shields, Atlantic swords), to the Aegean (Late Geometric vases from Greece) and to the Near East. Combs depicted on the warrior stelae are "unattested materially" (155) in pre-colonial Iberia. Yet ivory specimens are known from Phoenician/Orientalizing settlements (e.g. Carmona). So, does the depiction of Mediterranean objects on Iberian stelae predate the Mediterranean objects found in excavations? Depictions of V-notched shields on these stelae are compared to the wooden and leather V-notched shields found in Irish bogs and to the metal and clay miniature copies deposited in Greek sanctuaries in the Aegean in the 7th c. BCE. Iberia is certainly the connecting link between the Irish and Greek artefacts, but the evidence here is used to consider "Tartessos part of the pan-Hellenic cultic landscape" citing Pausanias' remark (2nd c. CE) that one of the treasuries at Olympia was made of Tartessic bronze (167). Does "multicultural" reflect the identities of people who visited Aegean sanctuaries or the origins of the votives consecrated to the temple? The horned, anthropomorphic figure depicted on the Magacela stela (Badajoz, Spain) is compared to a stela presenting a bull-headed bipedal in Beth Saida (Israel), implying cross-Mediterranean influences (p. 169). The suggested dates are close enough for iconographic influences as the authors imply. Another suggestion would be that emphasizing virility through the use of horns in a pre-historic, society where cattle played a vital role in sustenance is nothing uncommon. For example, schematic anthropomorphic sculpted figures bearing bull-horns are known in 2nd millennium BCE Cyprus.

Wheeled, bronze stands with attached cauldrons from the settlement of Nossa Senhora da Guia - Baiões (Portugal) do not necessarily constitute pre-

7 E. Pappa, "Framing some aspects of the Early Iron Age 'chronological mess': Aegean synchronisms with the West and their significance for the Greek Geometric series," *Kubaba* 3 (2012): 2-38.

colonial local imitations of Cypriot designs as is suggested; rather, they could be later hybrid forms of bronze tripods known from the Near East and Cyprus, and the Halstatt wheeled cauldrons known as *Kesselwagen*.⁸ Atlantic objects found in the eastern Mediterranean are few. On the Atlantic imports of Cyprus, referred to as "metallic grills and fibulae" (155), there is some confusion. The reference to "metallic grills" in particular is perplexing. If it refers to an Atlantic Iberian rotary spit (not grill) found in tomb 523 in Amathus (Cyprus), dated to ca. 1000 BCE,⁹ then there is only one such other find in all of central and eastern Mediterranean, coming from the Monte Sa Idda hoard in Decimoputzu, Sardinia.

As to Cypriots importing Atlantic fibulae that later evolved into the known Phoenician types, the hypothesis is thoroughly unconvincing. These so-called Atlantic fibulae appear fully developed in Atlantic contexts of the early 1st millennium BCE, yet their antecedents are known in the Near East.¹⁰ The roles of Cyprus and Sardinia in pre-colonial networks are rightly emphasized but here the postulation is that Mediterranean imports reached southern Spain through an overland, inland route southern from the Pyrennes (155). Maritime contacts between nuraghic Sardinia and Iberia ca. 1,000 BCE, independently of any eastern Mediterranean actors, are plausible, but do not necessitate inland routes.

Discussing the Ría de Huelva deposit, traditionally dated to the pre-colonial period, it is stated that the Phoenicians "did not establish a colonial enclave in Huelva" (171). In actuality, there is little information to suggest either way. The deposit from Huelva does not support the idea of Phoenician commerce in a native town. Rather, the recent finds of ca. 9th BCE Phoenician workshops suggest otherwise. Despite the Phoenician-built ashlar wall in Huelva (San Pedro) and later sanctuaries known from the modern city, the authors claim that Phoenician activities betray a "mutual interest in exchanging raw material for novelty products and technologies" (171), but without a Phoenician residential establishment, in contrast to the Phoenician colonies located in the bays of Guadalquivir and Cadiz. In Malaga (La Rebanadilla), Middle Geometric Attic imports from Phoenician colonies belong to the same types as some of the earliest in Huelva¹¹ that are considered pre-colonial. The archaeological record of Huelva is known from rescue excavations. Thus, its designation as an indigenous town *a priori* reifies the settlement as the heart of Tartessos, without adequate evidence.

Chapter 6 discusses settlement patterns and economic activities during the colonial period, with a valuable section on the sanctuary of Cancho Roano that has escaped attention outside Iberia. Here "changes in the territorial organization of Tartessos" are linked to Phoenician colonization *and* to

8. E. Nikolopoulos, *Σχέσεις της Ιβηρικής Χερσονήσου*, see pp. 159-164.

9. C. Vonhoff, "The Phenomenon of feasting in early Iron Age Cyprus. Bronze and Iron Obeloi from Cypriot Tombs as Evidence for Elite Self-Conception. Social Networks and Trans-Mediterranean Cultural Exchange", in *Cahiers du Centre d'études Chypriotes* 41 (2011): 133-152.

10. Nikolopoulos, *Σχέσεις της Ιβηρικής*, 19.

11. Pappa, "Framing some aspects".

"internal colonization of the hinterland" (175). There was little mention of territorial patterns in the previous chapter where Tartessos was traced to Huelva and to the warrior stelae (e.g. Extremadura). The palaeogeomorphological transformations of the coastline of the provinces of Seville and Huelva resulted in several coastal regions now being inland (176-178), which raises questions as to this "internal colonization". A Tartessic colonization of Portuguese Atlantic regions has been previously postulated,¹² but most Portuguese archaeologists would object to the idea of a Tartessic-style material culture on the Sado or the Tagus deltas deriving from a colonization wave. Castro Marim (Algarve) is referred to here as a colony when its excavator considers it an indigenous Orientalizing settlement,¹³ while even Alcácer do Sal (Alentejo), a settlement with pre-Bronze Age beginnings, is considered Tartessic in this chapter (180). The nomenclature derives from considering as Tartessic non-Phoenician material culture (and at times, Phoenician too), even when we know that there was ethnic, cultural and linguistic complexity of indigenous Iberian populations through to the Roman period. Without explanation, sites such as the sanctuaries of Carambolo (Seville), where the Near Eastern element is glaring, are called Tartessic too (178). This is not an argued identity but one that is simply ascribed to the sites by the authors. Although the authors admitted to limited knowledge on the political organization of the region (124), they bizarrely include Gadir, the Phoenician colony *par excellence*, into the "Tartessic territory" (175-176). So, in what way was Gadir Tartessic if it had been occupied by Phoenicians – a colony known to have maintained a strong Phoenician cultural identity until the Roman period? Is Tartessos conceptualized as a confederation of small states? The loose terminology results in methodological errors leading to an interpretational paradox.

Subsequently, economic activities, mining, agriculture and pastoralism are discussed, along with marine resources exploitation. It is unlikely that the mining industry was controlled by the local elites as claimed here (187). New mining techniques in Huelva correspond to the contexts of mixed indigenous-Phoenician presence, but the onset of the Phoenician colonization furnished new mining techniques, as documented by archaeometallurgical research.¹⁴

The cultivation of domesticated species (vine, olive) in Iberia is overstated as to cultural interactions (193). For example, grafting trees is not the complex procedure it is made out to be. In the discussion of putative indigenous participation in the salted fish production of coastal Iberia, the argument is that it was Tartessic because the Phoenicians allegedly had no similar industries elsewhere (196). By contrast, a few pages later, the "salted fish" activities are considered a new, post-6th c. BCE Phoenician activity that affects Tartessos (204). In reality, across the southern Iberian coasts marine source cropping is

12. M. Torres Ortiz, "¿Una colonización tartésica en el interfluvio Tajo-Sado durante la Primera Edad?", *Revista Portuguesa de Arqueología* 8 (2005): 193-213.

13. M. Arruda, "A Idade do Ferro do Sul de Portugal. Estado da Investigação", *Madri der Mitteilungen* 48 (2007): 114-139.

14. M.A. Hunt Ortiz, *Prehistoric mining and metallurgy in Southern West Iberian Peninsula* (British Archaeological Reports International Series 1188) (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2003).

well attested in the earliest levels of Phoenician colonies (e.g. Cerro del Villar, Toscanos in Malaga). However, there is limited archaeological evidence for fish-preservation activities in Iberia prior to the 6th c. BCE. Sáez Romero considers fishing to have been a specialized activity already in 800-600 BCE, tied to ship-building and pottery production, with exports to the indigenous hinterland.¹⁵ Exports of preserved fish in large storage vessels are documented at the indigenous settlement of Depreción de Ronda (Malaga), dated to the 7th c. BCE.¹⁶ The site may have had already Phoenician connections not limited to commercial exchanges.¹⁷ This evidence does not demonstrate that such activities were in the hands of Tartessians. Rather, it is the Phoenician colonies that seem active in the production of fish-related products. The later Greek sources referring to fish by-products, such as *tarichos* (derived from tuna and later sturgeon) mirror late archaic-classical export.¹⁸ All in all, there is simply no reason to argue for a Tartessic root in these activities, which start with the earliest occupation of Phoenician colonies. Fish-processing activities are archaeologically documented in the Punic period, from Portugal to Morocco, mainly after the declining of Tartessos, making the statement "it is difficult to calibrate the importance of salting during the *floruit* of Tartessos" (196) redundant.

The section entitled "the economy of an emerging state" (198-202) is perplexing, since there is no evidence for a Tartessic *state*, and the authors condemned in the introductory chapters the historiographical reification of Tartessos as a clear historical entity. Having dismissed past archaeological and historical research in the chase for a mythical Tartessos in the opening book chapters, here the authors create another historical construct, by referring to Tartessos as a "state" no less. This is not borne by any archaeological reality whatsoever. This ensuing discussion exhausts itself to describing exchange in luxury goods, issues of conflict, Phoenician cults (with no reference to temple economy whatsoever), and urban infrastructure but leaves out any reconstructions of commercial patterns in bulk, of which there is ample information, commercial structures, trade networks, the possible currencies used and questions on power relations.

The following section (202-213) discusses the causes of the 6th c. BCE crisis of Tartessos. The subjugation of Tyre in the early 6th c. BCE is discounted, but the Battle of Alalia in Corsica between Greeks and an alliance

15. A.M. Sáez Romero, "Fish processing and salted-fish trade in the Punic West: new archaeological data and historical evolution", in *Fish and Ships: Production et Commerce des Salsamenta durant l'Antiquité, Actes de l'atelier doctoral* (Rome 18-22 juin 2012), ed. E. Botte and V. Leitch, Bibliothèque d'Archéologie Méditerranéenne et Africaine 17 (Paris: Centre Camille Jullian, 2014), 159-174.

16. Sáez Romero, "Fish processing", see p. 163.

17. P. Aguayo, M. Carrilero and G. Martínez, "La presencia fenicia y el proceso de aculturación de las comunidades del Bronce Final de la Depresión de Ronda (Málaga)", in *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Studi Fenici e Punici*, (Roma, 9-14 novembre 1987), vol. 2, ed. E. Acquaro, P. Bartoloni, M. T. Francisi, L. I. Mazza, G. Montalto, G. Petruccioli, S. Ribichini, S. Scandone and P. Xella, Collezione di Studi Finici 30, (Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Istituto per la civiltà fenicia e punica, 1991), 559-571.

18. E.g. Sáez Romero, "Fish processing", see p. 160.

of Etruscans and Carthaginians (540 BCE), as reported by Herodotus, is considered a "turning point" (203) that led to a reconfiguration of Greek and Carthaginian commercial circuits. Another possibility is a natural cataclysmic disaster, supposedly seen in geological cores from the Guadalquivir palaeoestuary (Huelva) dated to "some time in the 6th century" (206). The geological study¹⁹ referenced by the authors, however, cites a potential tsunami or storm event whose calibrated dates at the latest dates to the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 1300 BCE) and cannot explain a crisis 700 years later.

While exogenous factors should not be the only point of reference, the authors could have taken into account the wider historical circumstances. The widespread abandonment of coastal Phoenician settlements in southern Iberia coincides with loss of independence for Phoenician cities in Lebanon. Tyre remained in siege for 13 years at the end of the 6th c. BCE and was subsequently annexed by Babylonia. Recent translations of Babylonian clay tablet texts show that Tyre was occupied by Babylonian troops that build their garrison on the island, while the Tyrian royal house was forced to exile in Babylonia. By the time Tyrian monarchy was reinstated, each monarch was sent to Tyre from Babylonia when the throne was vacated.²⁰ The political and economic collapse of Tyre as an autonomous power had conceivably repercussions in its Mediterranean foundations, generating a cascade of economic effects that must have disrupted pre-existing economic synergies and contributed to the abandonment of commercially-oriented Tyrian foundations in southern Spain.

Chapter 7 concerns religion and cult life. After a discussion of Phoenician religion, sanctuaries and other evidence pertaining to "Tartessic cult life" are discussed. The sanctuaries of Carambolo and Cancho Roano are described in more detail. Even the earliest of the two, Carambolo, is considered "indigenized", despite acknowledging that little is known of pre-Phoenician ritual customs (232). One wonders reading this chapter if the indigenous "oval huts of the Bronze Age" at Cancho Roano (245) will turn out to be the *bothros* of a Near Eastern-style sanctuary, as happened recently with the famous indigenous hut of the Carambolo sanctuary. The Phoenician temple of Melqart in Gadir is presented as the "most famous" temple to Melqart in the western Mediterranean (233), yet all the while Gadir appears as located in Tartessic territory. The sanctuaries discussed are interpreted with recourse to Phoenician and Egyptian religion, but they are called Tartessic sanctuaries. If this is to show a new local religion or cult, this remains unexplored. Further, comparisons of the oxhide-shaped altar of Cancho Roano B with cultic features in Cyprus are chronologically muddled. There is a reference to the "horn of consecration" in Kition (modern Larnaca). The latter, however, pertains to Temple 1 (Area II) that yielded LH IIIC pottery prior to the destruction level,

19. A. Rodríguez-Ramírez et al. "Atlantic Extreme Wave events during the last four millennia in the Guadalquivir estuary", *Quaternary Research* 83, no. 1 (2015): 24-4.

20. C. van der Brugge, C. and K. Kleber, "The empire of Trade and the empires of force. Tyre in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian periods", in *Dynamics of Production in the Ancient Near East, 1300-500 BC*, ed. J. Moreno Garcia, *Dynamics of Production in the Ancient Near East, 1300-500 BC* (Oxford: Oxbow Books), 187-222.

thus predating any Phoenician involvement in Kition. The oxhide form is known from Late Bronze Age Enkomi as a weight or miniature votive. An alternative possibility is that its form spread from the Hittite world, where the shape denoted the hieroglyph for "earth", and was associated iconographically with gods standing on them.²¹

Subsequently, the heterogeneity of funerary customs at necropoleis in southern Iberia is discussed. Funerary rites are not passed on with the easiness of acquiring exotic goods, as religious beliefs come into play; thus the designation of them as Tartessic needs explanation. The adoption of Phoenician funerary customs (cremation) needs scrutiny if we are not dealing with communities of Phoenician descent. After all, many of the funerary customs of necropoleis such as the Cruz del Negro (Carmona, Seville) have close affinities with Phoenician necropoleis in Lebanon, as confirmed by the excavations directed by M. E. Aubet in the contemporary Tyrian necropolis of Al-Bass.²² *Cruz del Negro* urns, named after an inadequately published necropolis in Carmona (261) are not some locally imaginative creation as it is implied ("an emblematic signpost of Tartessic culture"), but derive from the Near Eastern - Cypriot Bichrome Ware, consisting in a wide variety of ceramic types decorated with parallel red bands and black lines. While the decoration is known as "polychrome" or "painted" in Iberian archaeology and the urns of this style as Cruz del Negro in the attempt to "indigenize" their origins, this distinctive decoration appears as early as the Middle Bronze Age II in Palestine. In the Iron Age, it is found in Phoenician colonies in north Africa and elsewhere.²³

Chapter 8 discusses art and the technology: ceramics, metalwork, ivories and peculiarly, script and writing. The authors postulate a "Mediterranean inflection" on the Carambolo ware (271). The influence of Greek Geometric pottery on the decoration of these ceramics is not unanimously accepted in Iberia. Its decoration may have been influenced by Greek Geometric pottery, as such imported vases are known from Malaga and in Huelva, which makes the transmission of influences conceivable. The Orientalizing ware of the "Carmona style" features naturalistic griffins and lotus flower motifs. The lotus flowers are a recurrent motif on pottery from 2nd millenium BCE Cyprus, and

21. E. Pappa, "Oriental gods but domestic elites? Religious symbolism and economic functions of Phoenician-period cult loci in southern Iberia", in *Sanctuaries and the Power of Consumption. Networking and the formation of Elites in the Archaic Western Mediterranean World*, Proceedings of the International Conference in Innsbruck, 20th–23rd March 2012, ed. E. Kistler, B. Öhlinger, M. Mohr and M. Hoernes, *Philippika-Alturtumswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen/ Contributions to the Study of Ancient World Cultures* 92 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag), 43-62, see p. 49-50.

22. From the publication output of the excavations, see indicatively e.g. M. E. Aubet, "Cremation and social memory in Iron Age Phoenicia", in *Ritual, Religion and Reason. Studies in the Ancient World in Honour of Paolo Xella*, ed. O. Loretz, S. Ribichini, W.G.E. Watson, J.Á., Zamora, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 404 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 77-87.

23. R. Docter, "Bichrome Ware Amphorae from Al Mina, Kition and Carthage", in *Ritual, Religion and Reason. Studies in the Ancient World in Honour of Paolo Xella*, ed. O. Loretz, S. Ribichini, W.G.E. Watson, J.Á., Zamora, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 404, (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 89-102.

from Phoenicia, originating in Egypt where the flower was associated with a safe transition to afterlife. Questions such as whether the Carmona finds show the transmission of iconographic motifs or that of religious ideas are not addressed.

It is baffling why a section on language and writing, curcial indicators of identity, are buried in the last section of the last chapter. Epigraphic and linguistic evidence can furnish invaluable information on cultural identity, as well as political formation, which the authors try to address in this volume. Yet here, this evidence remains unexploited. Had this discussion on language and script be included earlier in the book, it would have demonstrated the methodological futility of reading a "Tartessic" identity everywhere in the archaeological record of a region that stretches from Cádiz (Huelva) to Badajoz (Extremadura) to Lisbon (Portugal). Instead, the disparity of linguistic groups would have to be acknowledged and correlated with other insignia of identity and social organization. Later, coinage could have been used too, seeing as the disparate metrical systems and scripts represented in the early minted coins at the time of Roman conquest belie cultural and political groups of centuries earlier. All these sets of evidence undercut the suggestions of Tartessos as an "emerging state". Indigenous and Phoenician populations in south-western Iberia were not homogeneous groups, the former much more than the latter.

The book's *Epilogue* ends with some open questions, further stretching the loose semantics of the monograph, concluding that "we can talk about 'Tartessians' as the communities who inhabited this territory independently of their ethnicity, culture and status" (302) and later on, "so we might extend the Tartessic label to the indigenous culture with which later Mediterranean peoples made contact in the tenth-ninth centuries" (302). Reduced to a catch-all phrase, Tartessos is then empty of meaning, redundant as an archaeological term (for Tartessic can refer to pre-colonial as well as to colonial-period material culture) and certainly also redundant as a historical designation of a culture (for the authors claim it was not a culture). These two paragraphs encapsulate the conceptual confusion of what in reality forms the archaeological remains of a socially, politically, culturally and ethnically diverse proto-historical period in Iberia. The main question of whether Tartessos existed as a self-recognized entity in the proto-historical period of Iberia remains answered, at the same time as Tartessos has been construed with no corroborating evidence as a *state*.

So, What is Tartessic and Who Was a Tartessian?

The book is permeated by conceptual pitfalls that are castigated in the opening sections of the book itself: reifying past historical realities through repetition of factoids in the literature that turns into a historiographical tradition. Though hedging from place to place, the authors view Tartessos in a muddled way, as an indigenous culture, a hybrid culture (but we are told throughout, it was not a culture) and as an indigenous state with some Orientals (including famous Phoenician colonies, such as Gadir). Cultural contact fluidity cannot

account for the semantic mix-up of this sort. The wisdom of the words found in Chapter 1 on deconstructing the historiographical creation of Tartessos did not affect the analysis in the rest of the book, where Tartessos shifts from appearing as a staunchly indigenous, pre-colonial entity to being a "state" to emerging in the book's conclusion as a catch-all term linked to a vague territory in south-western Iberia with no reference to a specific culture, ethnicity or social formation from ca. 1,100 to 500 BCE. By the *Epilogue* of the monograph, Tartessos is no longer an archaeological culture in the sense of a material record of finds sharing common characteristics, neither a past social culture, a state or a region, but its study has become "a discipline in itself" (308). Despite reflecting on Mediterranean networks in the book, Tartessos here is not really seen as part of the proto-history of southern Iberia, transformed by Phoenician colonization and intimately linked to the eastern Mediterranean. Rather, it has transcended pesky philological, historical and archaeological dichotomies to the point of becoming a discipline to itself.

This forms a main conceptual error of how to approach Tartessos, which reflects the errors of past decades of research (despite the opening theoretical excursus on post-colonial theory). Such errors also explain why Tartessos is not well-known outside Iberia (as stated in the Preface), since in effect it is approached as an entity of its own, even as no logically consistent definition exists for it. Once the literary and archaeological evidence comes into the discussion, Tartessos is treated as a territory, albeit one whose geographical borders are shifting each time some spectacular site is unearthed. From Huelva and Seville, to Algarve and Extremadura, Tartessos' territory shifts to encompass "warrior stelae" or other monumental finds. This conceptual error results in semantic and historical paradoxa, as when Gadir, the famous Phoenician colony *par excellence* is considered to be in Tartessian territory (and state) – yet the Phoenician foundations on the Mediterranean coast of Spain, much smaller, are left out. Is the implication here that these small Phoenician settlements, such as Morro de Mezquitilla were independent, but Gadir was not? The Near Eastern-style sanctuary at Carambolo is treated as founded in Tartessian sanctuary, without being Phoenician. Yet all the interpretations of it are based on Phoenician culture and civilization. What makes it a Tartessian sanctuary then? The religious rites, the architecture, the finds? The pilgrims that frequented it? Its physical location in Iberia, pure and simple? Does Tartessos include all sites in southern-central Portugal or only those with "Tartessian" pottery? Can sites in Extremadura with no evidence for an Orientalizing horizon be considered Tartessian? Did the people living in south-western Iberia self-identify as Tartessians (whether by a cognate ethnonym or not)? Is Tartessos a valid category by which to analyze social identity and socio-political formation (the authors' "emerging state" of Tartessos?).

It seems to me that the answer is no. To keep the term Tartessos as archaeologically valid so as to denote the Orientalizing style of southern Iberia or the period corresponding to it is a persuasive suggestion, to turn it into a culture, a state or a disciplinary field, not so. The semantics in flux permeating the monograph begs the question of why a book on something as loosely defined as *Tartessos* is needed in the first place. Why not study the early 1st

millennium BCE across southern Iberia for example, if no ethnic, cultural, social or chronological cohesion can be said to permeate Tartessos, as it appears in the book's conclusions? While the authors acknowledge the pluralism of languages spoken in Iberia, they completely ignore this fact of linguistic fragmentation in their demarcation of the boundaries of ethnic-cultural identities of Tartessos that shrinks and expands opportunistically according to spectacular archaeological finds, charting its territory where monumental finds and Mediterranean material culture have come to light. What if the archaeological evidence were to be correlated with linguistic patterns? What would the emerging picture be then? The fact that neither of the authors is a specialist in this area of research (epigraphy or linguistics) would not prevent them from accessing recent bibliography. Latest research points to the fact that a non-Indo-European language was spoken in the southern-east of the Peninsula (the core of Phoenician ports of trade in Malaga and Granada), while an Indo-European language was spoken in the area where the South-West inscriptions are found (western Andalusia and southern-central Portugal). The South-West script was adapted from the Phoenician one. There is no consensus on the language that belies this new script, but the distribution patterns of inscribed stelae cluster more densely in Portuguese territory, forming the western periphery of the Phoenician/Orientalizing (archaeological) horizon of the Guadalquivir valley. Thus, the South-West script and the underlying language was spoken west of the Tartessic culture, and perhaps formed a territory that was geographically and culturally peripheral to it – if such a culture ever existed as a socio-cultural formation and not merely as an archaeologically visible commonality in material culture spreading with the diffusion of Phoenician culture in the region. The contested readings of the South-West corpus of inscriptions include the model of a Celtic-speaking society with a low socio-political organization.²⁴

Thus, how can we talk of Tartessic identity when this putative identity follows the trajectory of spectacular archaeological finds, and recognizable artefacts, but ignores differential settlement patterns and the linguistic fragmentation of the populations that made it up? Settlements patterns and the consumption of goods, as well as production, burial customs and other indicators of identity could tell us something in terms of identity, but not selectively. The conglomerate of finds discussed does not pinpoint to a singular society turned state, and if one takes into account the linguistic evidence, it precludes linguistic uniformity and supports the model of a culturally, ethnically and politically fragmented landscape of low-level social organization. It is precisely this low hierarchical formation that would have permitted the Phoenician expansion. Military conflict instigated by armies hailing from the other end of the Mediterranean is a highly unrealistic scenario. At most, what we see is a conglomerate of tribal-level indigenous societies, some influenced materially more than others from the Phoenician colonies in Iberia. The former would have been economically depended, to some degree,

24. J.T. Koch, *Tartessian. Celtic in the South-West at the Dawn of History*, Celtic Studies Publications XIII (Aberystwyth: The David Brown Book Co, 2009).

on Tyrian colonies founded on the shores of a sparsely inhabited southern Iberia. The degree of political interdependence of the colonies must remain open to discussion. The most valid hypothesis of a polity pre-existing Phoenician colonization would rely on the identification of Tarshish with Tartessos, as suggested by the authors. However, such identification does not confirm the presence of a local polity, much less a "proto-state". It could have referred to a toponym, known from maritime connections. Herodotus' historical understanding of Tartessos as a kingdom may have reached the Greeks through sailors' hearsay of Iberian societies, inflated by cultural suppositions based on Greek understanding of state formation and separated by some centuries.

In this monograph, the historical/archaeological reification of Tartessos is married to a "post-colonial" fetishistic approach to deconstructing historically documented cultures. While boldly assuming the existence of a Tartessic identity and drawing associations between ancient baalic - bull symbols in Iberia with *matadores* in modern Spain ("who can resist alluding to the importance of bull culture in Spanish culture to this day, with other connotations and expressions?", on p. 240), the authors eradicate documented historical Mediterranean cultures and ethnicities *tout court* on the altar of a misconstrued sense of post-colonialism. Post-colonialism was meant to provide a voice to cultures and nations eliminated by a western sense of superiority, but it has now moved to eradicating past cultures too – in an equally misguided sense of an intellectually superior or vantage point. Presumably so as to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past in the history of archaeology (on notions of civilizing barbarians that were used to legitimize European empires), the word *Greeks* in the monograph is put, for example, into scare quotes: "Let us not lose sight of the fact that *all* cultural and ethnic categories are constructed by a process, external and internal, that involves abstraction, reification, and generalization; take 'the Greeks', themselves, 'the West', 'Europe', and so many others" (124). The Greeks, who have a *continuous* linguistic (at least, but also cultural) presence of over 3000 years in the same territory and plenty of emic sources spanning thousands of years to document their existence, have to be referred to with scare quotes as their identity allegedly "involves abstraction, reification, and generalization" (124). Yet Tartessic identity, which the authors explicitly acknowledged as difficult to pin down for lack of any emic sources, emerges in this book first as staunchly indigenous and then a *historically real*, local identity in southern Iberia, whose insignia appear in modern bull-fighting in Spain.

Trite platitudes with a wink to the (abused) post-colonial concepts are referenced to demarcate a (not ethnic and not cultural, as we are told...) Tartessic identity based on few external, fragmentary sources dating to centuries later. This conceptual flattening of the evidence may be the sort of thing that superficially satisfies trends within the liberal arts academy in its effort to align with post-colonialism, but as previously noted,²⁵ any such account becomes extremely tedious and uninformative in the end when

25. A. Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium. The Transformations Of Greeks, Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

stretched to this extent. The surprising take in this post-colonial version is that the flattening of historically documented identities happens in the effort to define a brand new, specifically southern Iberian ancient identity – Tartessic – which on the basis of completely absent emic sources must remain extremely tentative at best.

To sum up, the greatest value of this book lies in the discussion of etic literary texts of the Greco-Roman period connected to Tartessos and related ethnonyms, as well as the presentation of newly excavated sites (e.g. Carambolo, Cancho Roano, La Angorilla). Its interpretations and general framework of understanding the evidence should be read with caution, however.

Methodological and Conceptual Problems in Studying Iberian Proto-History: A Way Forward

The volume reviewed here illustrates the methodological and interpretational pitfalls that have pervaded the archaeology of this period in southern Iberia that affects the understanding of Tartessos.²⁶ Several derive from conceptual rigidity. This is seen, for example, in the use of pottery for dating sites. Once a pottery style known from the eastern Mediterranean is considered Tartessic, the potential it has to illuminate the cultural aspects of a site or aid towards its dating is greatly diminished because *a priori* it is seen as a local, Iberian development.

Chronology in Iberia in the period dealing from the 12th century to the 5th c. BCE is a major issue. Ceramic styles attributed to the Final Bronze Age period of Iberia (e.g. *reticula bruñida*, pottery with finger impressions on the shoulders) continue more or less unchanged for centuries in large territories. Their production must have been widespread but decentralized, in dispersed, small workshops or perhaps in domestic contexts. At any rate, the non-standardized nature of these pottery styles makes it difficult to devise precise typologies, since the same decoration appearing in different types of bowls, jugs and storage vessels (made from coils or on the slow wheel) shows little variation. A typological system that would use this style from across Iberia to chart chronological differences has not been attempted, but it is unlikely that such variation would be useful in dating sites even to a specific century.

These pottery styles, attributed by convention to the Final Bronze Age traditions of Iberia, overlap chronologically with the Early Iron Age in the Mediterranean, and thus with imports arriving from Phoenicia, Greece and elsewhere, as well as the local imitations the latter spurned. Since the production of these indigenous styles continues for centuries, they cannot lend themselves to dating accurately sites the way contemporary Phoenician or

26. See a thorough treatment of these problems in: E. Ferrer Albelda, "La colonización en la Tartésida estrategias e fases", in *Territorios Comparados: Los valles del Guadalquivir, el Guadiana y el Tajo en Época Tartésica*, ed. Celestino Pérez, S. and E. Rodríguez González, *Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología LXXX* (Mérida: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2017), 11-46.

Greek pottery permits with the accuracy of often a decade's margin. In that sense, taking a style of pottery as significant, and forgetting the relative stylistic chronology (Bronze Age for indigenous styles, Iron Age for imports), we construct an artificial historical reality, where every handmade pot denotes some kind of pre-existing native horizon of the Bronze Age (i.e. of the 2nd millennium BCE down to the 8th c. BCE) unless found in association with imports. In reality, such handmade pottery may pertain to an archaeological context of ca. 650 or 550 BCE known from rescue excavations, which if extended spatially to larger surfaces could show a settlement with Phoenician or Orientalizing pottery of different dates. A need for context would require us to update our information on chronology every time a site published in earlier decades as Bronze Age or Iron Age is cited presently. In parallel, radiocarbon dating needs to be used with more prudence, discussing the *quality* of each sample used, and citing returned dates at both 1 and 2 sigma.²⁷

Another problem is that sites get excavated often in the course of rescue excavations, remain unpublished as scientific reports submitted to authorities, or they lend themselves to becoming the subject of student dissertations (the latter in Portugal). Thus, the excavations themselves are often inaccessible to the broader scholarly community for cross-referencing data and chronological comparanda from elsewhere in the Mediterranean.

Scientific contributions to Iberian archaeology (both in Spain and Portugal) have enjoyed an exceptional surge in the past twenty years (archaeometallurgy, palaeomagnetic dating, radiocarbon, isotopic and other chemical analyses). The results of these studies, however perfect the actual scientific method followed, have *per force* diminished potential when the samples are selected out of unpublished excavation contexts whose description is not available, cannot be accessed, or cross-referenced. Their value, other than having a nebulous general view of an unknown ceramic repertoire sample's chemical composition, from an unpublished site and thus unknowable context, lies either in testing the capabilities and limits of the scientific method *per se*, or in accumulating data that might come of use in the future, if and when these sites do get published or for broad comparisons with future studies on same classes of material. This is not the most fruitful avenue of investigation, if results are to be useful in the present. Since such scientific programmes do take place, the best avenue would be for samples to come from sites with detailed published contexts, rather than selecting specimens from unpublished contexts so that something is "done about them" in the sense of having a publication appearing from X rescue excavation. The results of a perfect archaeometric analysis, for example, cannot be used in a meaningful way archaeologically unless they come from published contexts with *published contextual assemblages*. Tables upon tables of data measurements do not furnish the value they could provide unless the questions asked about them can be answered on the basis of context.

To avoid also an inward look that does not lend itself to self-referential understandings of colonial grounds, where some elements were indeed external, a pan-Mediterranean view has to be adopted. That Phoenician

27. Pappa, "Framing some aspects".

settlements in southern Spain show widespread abandonment in the early 6th century BCE, when in the eastern Mediterranean Tyre falls into the Babylonians, demonstrates the vital, political and economic links of Phoenician colonies with Tyre. Beginning with what evidence does exist and then moving on to hypotheses is more productive than favouring speculations on environmental catastrophes, which untie the proto-history of a colonized region from its historical, political, economic and social context in the Mediterranean.

A symptom of a wider problem of *a priori* interpretations selectively using archaeological data in order to materially document pre-conceived notions is reflected in designations of sites as "indigenous" or not on scarce evidence. This reiteration over the years and decades in the scholarly output creates factoids, in the sense that they have become an over-repeated storyline. On present knowledge, there existed maritime connections between Huelva and north Atlantic regions, as well as with the Mediterranean by the turn of the 2nd millennium BCE, after which point architectural and other evidence shows an intense settlement of people from the eastern Mediterranean, including workshops and sanctuaries. The exact nature of the settlement, its demographic make-up and its political organization will have to await future research. Finally, an issue of proto-historical archaeology that needs to be taken seriously is the diffused, *faux* gendered archaeological interpretations, which result in direct equations of hand-made Iberian-typology pots with "indigenous (Iberian) wives". For by that kind of logic, given the presence of Final Bronze Age pottery types in northern Africa, indigenous Iberian wives should be seen in Lixus, in Carthage and elsewhere where this pottery turns up with Phoenician-style imports. *Is this the best we can do?*

Acknowledgment

The research for this article was carried out during two linked post-doctoral research projects (2015/26909-0; 2018/01268) funded by the São Paulo Research Foundation (Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo – FAPESP) and hosted by the Laboratory for the Studies of the Ancient City (Laboratório de Estudos sobre a Cidade Antiga – LABECA) at the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology (Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia) of the University of São Paulo and by the Department of Prehistory and Archaeology (Departamento de Prehistória y Arqueología) of the University of Seville, respectively.

Bibliography

- Aguayo, P., Carrilero, M., and G. Martínez. "La Presencia Fenicia y el proceso de Aculturación de las Comunidades del Bronce Final de la Depresión de Ronda (Málaga)." In *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Studi Fenici e Punici*, (Roma, 9-14 novembre 1987), vol. 2, edited by E. Acquaro, P. Bartoloni, M. T. Francisi, L. I. Mazza, G. Montalto, G. Petruccioli, S. Ribichini, S.

- Scandone and P. Xella, Collezione di Studi Finici 30. Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Istituto per la civiltà fenicia e punica, 1991.
- Arruda, M. "A Idade do Ferro do Sul de Portugal. Estado da Investigação". *Madri der Mitteilungen*, no. 48 (2007): 114-139.
- Aubert, M.E. "Cremation and Social Memory in Iron Age Phoenicia." In *Ritual, Religion and Reason. Studies in the Ancient World in Honour of Paolo Xella*, edited by O. Loretz, S. Ribichini, W.G.E. Watson, J.Á., Zamora, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 404, 77-87. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Celestino Pérez, S. and E. Rodríguez González. (eds.) *Territorios Comparados: Los valles del Guadalquivir, el Guadiana y el Tajo en Época Tartésica*. Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología LXXX. Mérida: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2017.
- Docter, R. "Bichrome Ware Amphorae from Al Mina, Kition and Carthage". In *Ritual, Religion and Reason. Studies in the Ancient World in Honour of Paolo Xella*, edited by O. Loretz, S. Ribichini, W.G.E. Watson, J.Á., Zamora, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 404, 89-102. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Ferrer Albelda, E. "La colonización en la Tartésida estrategias e fases". In *Territorios Comparados: Los valles del Guadalquivir, el Guadiana y el Tajo en Época Tartésica*, edited by Celestino Pérez, S. and E. Rodríguez González, Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología LXXX. Mérida: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2017.
- Harrison, R. *Spain at the Dawn of History: Iberians, Phoenicians and Greeks*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1988.
- Hunt Ortiz, M.A. *Prehistoric mining and metallurgy in Southern West Iberian Peninsula*, British Archaeological Reports International Series 1188. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2003.
- Kaldellis, A. *Hellenism in Byzantium. The Transformations Of Greeks, Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Nikolopoulos, E. *Σχέσεις της Ιβηρικής Χερσονήσου με την Ανατολική Μεσόγειο κατά τη 2η και στις Αρχές της 1ης Χιλιετίας Π.Χ: Μύθος Και Πραγματικότητα* [Relations between the Iberian Peninsula and the Eastern Mediterranean in the 2nd and the beginning of 1st millennium BC: Myth and Reality], Ph.D. Diss., National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2009.
- Krahmalkov, C.R. *A Phoenician-Punic Grammar*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001.
- Koch, J.T. *Tartessian. Celtic in the South-West at the Dawn of History*, Celtic Studies Publications XIII. Aberystwyth: The David Brown Book Co, 2009.
- Pappa, E. "Framing some aspects of the Early Iron Age 'chronological mess': Aegean synchronisms with the West and their significance for the Greek Geometric series". *Kubaba* 3 (2012): 2-38.
- Pappa, E. "Oriental gods but domestic elites? Religious symbolism and economic functions of Phoenician-period cult loci in southern Iberia". In *Sanctuaries and the Power of Consumption. Networking and the formation of Elites in the Archaic Western Mediterranean World*, Proceedings of the International Conference in Innsbruck, 20th–23rd March 2012, edited by E. Kistler, B. Öhlinger, M. Mohr and M. Hoernes, *Philippika-Alttertumswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen/ Contributions to the Study of Ancient World Cultures* 92. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

- Rodríguez-Ramírez, A. et al. "Atlantic Extreme Wave events during the last four millennia in the Guadalquivir estuary". *Quaternary Research* 83,1 (2015): 24-4.
- Sáez Romero, A.M. "Fish Processing and Salted-Fish trade in the Punic West: New Archaeological Data and Historical Evolution". In *Fish and Ships: Production et Commerce des Salsamenta durant l'Antiquité, Actes de l'atelier doctoral* (Rome 18-22 juin 2012), edited by E. Botte and V. Leitch, Bibliothèque d'Archéologie Méditerranéenne et Africaine 17. Paris: Centre Camille Jullian, 2014, 159-174.
- Torres Ortiz, M. "¿Una colonización tartésica en el interfluvio Tajo-Sado durante la Primera Edad?" *Revista Portuguesa de Arqueología* 8 (2005): 193-213.
- van der Brugge, C. and Kleber, K. "The empire of Trade and the empires of force. Tyre in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian periods". In *Dynamics of Production in the Ancient Near East, 1300-500 BC*, edited by J. Moreno Garcia, *Dynamics of Production in the Ancient Near East, 1300-500 BC.*, 187-222 Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Vonhoff, C. "The Phenomenon of feasting in early Iron Age Cyprus. Bronze and Iron Obeloi from Cypriot Tombs as Evidence for Elite Self-Conception. Social Networks and Trans-Mediterranean Cultural Exchange". *Cahiers du Centre d'études Chypriotes* 41 (2011): 133-152.

Greeks, Barbarians and Alexander the Great: The Formula for an Empire

By Irina Frasin*

Under the leadership of Alexander the Great the Greeks reached far into Asia. This extraordinary enterprise was made possible not only by his well-equipped and trained army but also by his revolutionary way of thinking. What facilitated the creation of such a vast empire, apart from his military genius, was his attitude towards the Others, his incredible openness and curiosity towards the difference and the different. This made his relatively short reign have colossal influence in both eastern and western worlds. My paper analyses this moment of meeting between cultures, focusing on the construction of the image of the Other, the different, the barbarian, the enemy and the impact of this ideology upon shaping the empire that Alexander the Great built.

Introduction

Under the leadership of Alexander the Great, the Macedonians and their Greek allies from the League of Corinth, conquered the East. This extraordinary adventure, that took them far into the heart of Asia and close to the allegedly believed end of the Earth, was made possible by both the strategic and military genius of Alexander (together with the well-equipped and trained army he inherited from his father, King Phillip II) and the Greek thought and philosophy. The Greeks were firm believers in their superiority over barbarians¹. They imagined that their freedom, their reason and their sense of measure could and should transform them into the leaders of the barbarians, who, in the eyes of Aristotle, were "slaves by nature"². Thus the conquest of the East was pictured as a mission to civilize the barbarians, to bring light and law into the dark and irrational world³.

It is quite engaging to understand how the empire could be born in the midst of democracy and how the mission to civilize the barbarians could change the ways of seeing, meeting and understanding *the Other*, the different, the enemy, the barbarian. Furthermore, the ways and manners used by the

*Senior Researcher, "Gh. Zane" Institute of Social and Economic Research, Romanian Academy.

1. As seen by Plato, in *Laws*, III, 693c – 698a or *Republic*, Aristotle, in *Politics*, 1253b, 25-35; 1255b 10-12 or Aeschylus in *The Persians*; to name but a few of the most famous examples (all references to Plato, Aristotle and Aeschylus are from the Romanian version of their work as found in the bibliography).

2. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1252b 5-10.

3. This may be a reflection of Plato's ideas from *Republic* or Aristotle's from *Politics*. See also Claude Mosse, *Alexandre. Le destin d'un mythe* (Paris: Editions Payot & Rivages, 2001), 126-167.

ancient Greeks to define and understand themselves and the others were later embraced by the Western culture and political thinking throughout the centuries to justify their supremacy and dominance over *the Others*.

Alexander's adventure in Asia was an extraordinary opportunity for meeting and knowing *the Other*, the barbarian. Step by step, one day at a time the great king discovered that the world was much wider and richer than it was originally thought in Athens and that the barbarians were not so uncivilized and unreasonable as Aristotle believed. The legendary king astonished his contemporaries and fascinated generations to come. Alexander the Great was the one who took Greek culture deep into Asia, opening new ways for trade and communications of all sorts. Moreover, even if the idea of political unity that he dreamed about was crushed along with his death, the real legacy he left us proved far more durable. Even if he started the war against the Persians to avenge the Greeks for the losses and humiliations suffered in the Persian Wars⁴, the Macedonian king was not content with simply becoming the master of the Persian Empire. He always wanted to go further, to continue, to conquer more, to know deeper – and this seems to be the origin of the legend that brought him to the end of the Earth and beyond. Far from the image of the burning palace of Persepolis, the mass weddings at Susa seem to announce the dawn of a totally different future; a universal monarchy bringing under a common scepter Greeks, Macedonians and barbarians, all respecting one another. Thus, the young conqueror ignored Greek vanity and showed excellent political sense. Viewed as a tyrant by some, for his new way of thinking and acting, Alexander wanted to build an empire where all different people of different languages, traditions, religious beliefs and heritages could stand and work together in mutual respect for the common good. He did not want to repeat, in the name of Greek imperialism, what Xerxes failed to do in the name of Persian imperialism. It was time for a new way of thinking.

The profound meaning of Alexander's great and daring adventure is remarkably well expressed in his own legend. The king, passionate about adventure, hungry for new discoveries and knowledge and curious for meeting and understanding *the Other*, is the hero who meets and fights the Absolute Other: the foreigner, the barbarian, the monster. And all his actions show us that this one can be recognized, respected and even loved. We are fully aware that there are many ways of understanding the "first European Great King of the Persian Empire"⁵ and his amazing achievements. Nevertheless, the ancient literary sources and the relics are merely the foundation of the image we have created about Alexander. For our purpose the image constructed around the conqueror throughout the ages is as relevant as the historical truth⁶. As his

4. This was his claim as the leader of the Greek Alliance.

5. David Grant, *In the Search of the Lost Testament of Alexander the Great* (Leicester, Matador, Troubador Publishing Ltd. 2017), 47.

6. The main issue is that no one can prove what determined Alexander to act in the way he did or to understand how he felt. First, the main literary sources available to us are dated from the Roman period, thus they may not be completely accurate. But even if we had literary evidence from Alexander's time, from his official historians, we still could not be sure of their objectiveness. As history is always written by the victors it remains inherently biased.

spectacular campaigns changed the political map of the world, his image and goals kept being reflected by many traditions, making of the historical Alexander "the most elusive of figures"⁷.

The Other as Enemy, as Opponent: Greeks and Barbarians

The meeting, the communication, the discovery of *the Other* as well as the conflict, war and domination of *the Different* are problems as long as time. Since the beginning of mankind and continuing with the establishment of stable communities and the emergence of the first cities, there were attempts to meet, to face, to understand and to confront those who were different – belonging to a different tribe, to a different city, speaking perhaps a strange and different language, worshiping different gods and so on. We can find in history examples both for the attempts to confront and conquer the others as well as for communication and tolerance.

Communities in general, and even individuals perceive and define their identity partly by differentiating themselves from what they are not, from an external world that is regarded as alien, different - even if it can be either menacing and dangerous or friendly and admirable. The core idea is that in order to reconsider what we represent we have to detach ourselves from the rest of the world; we have to distinguish between us and the others. Thus the only thing that the others, the rest of the world have in common is the thing that they are different from us; there is no other common trait to make the outside world seem homogenous than the fact that is different from what we are. Considering this we can easily understand how *the Other*, most of the times, is conceived and described as an antithesis of us; *the other* looking more like an inverted mirror image than an entity from the real world. Briefly, we need *the Other* in order to define and determine who we are. We would not question who we are and what we represent if we did not try to see ourselves from the standpoint of *the Other*.

The other and his/her different group or community is, as we can easily observe, closer or further from us culturally, morally, linguistically or historically. As we have seen before, in extreme cases we are dealing with a total strangeness, with a radical difference. The ancient Egyptians viewed the others so different from them that they even hesitated, in exceptional cases, to see them as humans. They considered their kingdom as the only oasis of peace and order surrounded by an external world dominated by chaos⁸. But there are also groups who have come to admire and befriend the alien and different wide world.

For the ancient Greeks, due to their extended contact with other foreign populations in the time of colonization, we discover very complex ways and manners of understanding the outside world and relating to the others. On one hand they regarded those whose language they did not understand as

7. A. B. Bosworth and E. J. Baynham, eds., *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction* (Oxford University Press, 2002), 22.

8. For details see Lewis Spence, *Egypt* (London: Senate, 1996).

"barbarians" and, on rare occasions, they doubted if they were rational beings or mere objects endowed with soul⁹. On the other hand we have also examples¹⁰ of foreigners regarded with admiration and respect. Thus the Greeks created for European culture and thinking models for analyzing and understanding the foreign cultures both objective and open-minded, but also some generalities, common places whose use overshadow the spirit of inquiry and discovery.

From the beginning of their history, the Greeks were involved in multiple cultural and commercial relations with their non-Greek neighbors. These contacts left their mark on the cultural changes and developments. But a special importance for both the way of understanding the others as well as their common Greek identity happens during the time of the great colonization. It is the era when hundreds of *poleis* were born, and Greeks from different origin cities came to live together in the new colonies. Thus the spirit of a new discovered community was born and a new solidarity was encouraged possibly by the conflicts with indigenous populations from Sicily and the Black Sea to Asia Minor and further. There is a feeling of belonging, of kinship – as we understand from Herodotus¹¹ – regarding common origin, gods, language and traditions. In this time, due to traveling, commerce and cultural exchange the knowledge about the others increases, but it is nonetheless additionally accompanied by elements of fiction – as the edges of the world are inhabited by miraculous and fantastic beings.

The Persian Wars, when the Greeks confronted and defeated the greatest empire of the time, was a decisive moment for changing and shaping the image of *the Other*; the barbarian, who was merely the one who did not speak Greek, or spoke it with an accent, became the enemy, the opponent, the representative of an irrationally large empire. The image of the others, the foreigners changed both due to the increase of empirical knowledge about new populations but also due to a new discovered feeling of superiority that animated the Greeks after the defeat of Great Kings, Darius I and Xerxes. If the fragile alliance between tiny *poleis* could defeat the colossal structure that united countless strange populations it must certainly mean that the Greek *poleis* possessed something that set them apart from the rest and made them stand out, made them unique, special and unbreakable.

The Persian Wars have been analyzed countless times by different authors, from different perspectives, but what stands out almost every time is the contrast between the freedom of the Greeks and the tyranny of the barbarians. The *hybris* of Xerxes, who wanted to build a bridge over the Hellespont, is regarded as an irrational attempt to surpass this essential difference and extinguish it by bringing the Greeks in his overwhelmingly large empire. The rule of law, the responsibility of the leaders, the liberty and political equality between the Greek citizens were on that occasion contrasted with the tyranny of the Persian rule, the representation of the power and willing of one single man. The lack of liberty of the Persians was used to explain the defeat of the great

9. Aristotle, *Politics*, II, 152b.

10. The most famous of them is the 'Atlantis' of Plato.

11. Herodotus, *Histories* (Wordsworth Editions, 1996), 669.

empire – as the Persian soldiers were led into battle under the whip¹² – and the famous, celebrated and amazing victory of the Greeks.

The luxury, weakness, promiscuity, savagery, lack of courage, cruelty and the incapacity to organize themselves become attributes of barbarians. And gradually the differences between Persians, Thracians, Egyptians, Scythians, Indians and other foreign nations become blurred as they were seen all as barbarians, first and foremost – a general population with general and common traits¹³. It is very important to keep in mind one thing: most certainly the Greeks did not forget or ignore what they admired and learned from the others across the centuries. However, what they cannot accept, or ignore is the lack of freedom. The most criticized attribute of the barbarians is their lack of liberty, their servitude, their obedience, their "natural slavery". This can be easily traced if we focus on the ideal political model – the democracy invented by the Greeks. This society supposes the existence of free and equal citizens who obey willingly to the law that they themselves created. This becomes the model for all that is civilized and rational in contrast with the barbarian society that embodies different stages of irrationality. The freemen obey only the law whereas the barbarians are the slaves of an absolute monarch. This becomes the fundamental distinction between the law – that is Greek – and the slavery – that is barbarian. The courage and the respect of the law become qualities of all beings endowed with reason and it is opposed to the lack of measure and self-control that lead to weakness and cruelty. Therefore, regarding these irreconcilable differences, there can only be enmity and opposition between the Greeks and the barbarians.

By contrast the war between the Greeks (as we discover in the Peloponnesian War) was played by different rules. Unlike the radical opposition between the Greeks and barbarians, between Greeks of different *poleis* there was no natural enmity; the "natural enemy" of the Greeks was the Barbarian, between each other the war must be played in moderation¹⁴.

The differences between Greeks and barbarians and the discovery of *the Other*, have a long and complex history but, by simplifying we can reduce it to a question of values. It is obvious that the speeches of generals and politicians of the time abound in praise to the Greek virtue. It is perfectly understandable if we take into account that those speeches were made to motivate, to inspire, but what is really impressive is their attachment to these values. The Greeks loved the virtue, wished that it was something that every citizen could achieve and criticized its absence – in themselves or in others. Thus, if we follow how the Greeks viewed the barbarians we can also understand how they pictured their own virtues, what they valued and what they despised. The most common distinction between Greek and barbarian is the dependence of the latter on impulse and desire; these made it impossible for barbarians to understand and value balance and measure (marks of men guided by reason), the true

12. Herodotus, *Histories*, (Wordsworth Editions, 1996), VII, 34-35, p.527.

13. For details see Thomas Harrison ed., *Greeks and barbarians* (Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 193-210.

14. For details see Michel Debidour, *Les Grecs et la Guerre. Ve – Ixe siècles* (Editions de Rocher, 2002), 67, 113-115.

guidelines on the road to freedom. Aeschylus in *The Persians* makes a messenger say the following words to queen Atossa, the daughter of Cyrus the Great referring to the Athenians "they are the slaves of nobody, they are not the servants of any man"¹⁵.

Even if it may be tempting, we must avoid understanding this opposition Greek – barbarian as ethnocentrism. Most of the texts refer not to innate traits, but to obtained virtues. We can become barbarian living among the barbarians, but we can also learn the Greek way of life. Most of the time¹⁶, we are not dealing with a difference of nature, but a difference of culture – the Greek culture is superior, but is also open to everybody. Isocrates is the most famous messenger of these ideas "our city, in what concerns philosophy and rhetoric, is much above the other cities, thus making its disciples become the teachers of others and Athens has made the name Greek to be more a symbol of civilization than represent a people. Therefore the name Greek should refer to those who had the privilege of sharing the Greek culture, more than to those who are Greek by birth"¹⁷.

We are reading a beautiful declaration about universal values, when the laws of the Greeks become the laws of all others. This kind of declaration may sound very concerning for us today – regarding that now, after all the traumatic experiences recorded by history, we see that all the people, ethnic groups, big or small, similar or strangely diverse carry their own values and have the right of respect.

City-States, Alliances, Empire

The ancient Greeks were living in city-states – the political regime of these states varied between democracy, aristocracy and even tyranny. The *polis* was based on the cohesion and common interest of its citizens.

In its Golden Age, Athens, the model for the Greek democracy, had become a great cultural center for the entire Hellenic world that it began to dominate both by its power and wealth. It is very interesting to observe and understand how this cradle of freedom, democracy and equality between citizens led to the emergence of a very original political system, different from both the neighboring kingdoms and the oriental empires. The explanation for this phenomenon seems to reside primarily in the mentalities about the role of the individual in the affairs of the city-state and the special dignity of the citizen. This makes the empire of Alexander the Great, the Hellenistic states that followed and even the Roman Empire, in spite of all oriental influences that they got, never resemble the eastern empires too much.

15. Aeschylus, *The Persians*, v242.

16. Aristotle and his theory about the slaves by nature was an isolated example.

17. Isocrates in *Pagini alee din oratori greci* (Bucuresti: Editura pentru literatură, 1969), 138.

At the pinnacle of its glory, Athens was both a model for democracy, liberty and philosophy, but also a strong and feared city-state for its allies¹⁸. When we look at the Athenian democracy today we are fascinated by its extraordinary achievements, but also amazed by its less glorious sides. The democratic ideal, as conceived by the ancient Greeks supposed a society formed by free and equal individuals – citizens who obey only the laws that they make for themselves. In this way they get to govern an independent and autonomous state. This ideal combined with the feeling and ideas of superiority achieved after the victories of the Persian Wars led to the beautiful declaration of Isocrates – that the Greek' laws, rules and way of life could become the way of life for everybody else.

To understand those changes that led to that astonishing transformation – from *polis* and democracy to *symachia* and empire – we should start by observing the main characteristics of the city-state. Each *polis*, regardless of its size, had to be free, independent and autonomous, having its own political and religious institutions, sometimes even its special coinage. As we have understood from Herodotus, all the city-states had a clear consciousness of belonging to a larger Hellenic community, sharing common ancestors, gods and rituals, traditions and rules, and, naturally, the Greek language. This is why the alliance with the barbarian against other fellow Greeks was regarded as the highest act of treason. The *polis* could not admit any form of subordination to another state. This made the union of the Greek city-states in federations and alliances to be always short-lived and often problematic.

The power of the city-state over its citizens (and, of course, over all its other inhabitants) was absolute; its authority being the source of all the rights and obligations for the people, but also reaching all other activities and aspects of life¹⁹. Inside the *polis* we shouldn't confuse freedom for anarchy and it is somehow obvious that only by obeying the laws could all the citizens be free. This is the very basic place where the special dignity of freemen resides: their community was the source of the laws and the respect of these was the source of liberty.

In democracy "being a citizen was a duty, regarding the cultivation of virtue; it was a duty excluding any other work beside"²⁰. In democracy the power was gained and maintained by the skilled usage of the public discourses²¹. The fate of the community was decided in the Assembly; the one who controlled or seduced the people was guaranteed to have his will and ideas triumph. This permanent confrontation, this permanent struggle for public recognition, for success, for surpassing all opponents can be understood as a permanent effort for glory. Thus the values of the aristocratic society of fair

18. Allies transform gradually into subjects because they cannot abandon the alliance as they please and as the tribute they pay is used by Athens not only for reinforcing the fleet but also for embellishing its temples.

19. In this context it is very interesting to analyze the meaning that the ancient Greeks gave to freedom itself, but this is not the subject of the current investigation.

20. Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Vanatorul negru. Forme de gandire si forme de societate in lumea greaca* (Bucuresti: Eminescu, 1985), 389.

21. See Plato's dialogue *Gorgias* and also Marcel Detienne, *Stapanitorii de adevar in Grecia arhaica* (Bucuresti: Meridiane, 1996).

competition and constant effort for glory seem to be maintained; the main difference being that the rivalry in democracy was supposed to be among free and equal men / citizens.

It is quite obvious that all these rights and liberties concerning such a large number of people were not easy to maintain. Considering the fact that plentiful of poor citizens were struggling to survive it is not difficult to imagine that, even if the resources available were shared reasonably and equitably (things possible only in utopia) the resources available in just one city-state would have ended by not being enough for all the population. So inevitably in one point in time the city-state had to rely on resources from abroad – that it could get by plunder and war, or by forging an empire that would receive its tribute from its subjects. We shall look at both possibilities: first the forming of an alliance that nobody could escape from, ruled by a powerful *polis* – the case of the Delian League, and second by war and conquest, replacing the city-state with larger territorial units – the case of the empire of Alexander the Great, and later the Hellenistic states and the Roman Empire.

The time between the Persian Wars and the Peloponnesian War is highly important for understanding this transition from city-state and democracy to empire. We know this period mainly due to Thucydides. The Delian League, the famous alliance formed to protect the Greek *poleis* from outside menace, was gradually transformed into an Athenian maritime empire. Increasing its power and influence after the victory of Salamis, Athens ended up consolidating its privileged position by founding the League of Delos – an alliance²² constituted theoretically for mutual protection and support. The center of the alliance was – formally at least – the sanctuary of Delos, the place where the treasury was kept and the meetings of the allies took place. Athens had the *hegemony*, it had the military command, but all the other members were autonomous²³. Although the council of the allies had the power of decision and this was by vote, and Athens had but one vote, nobody could in fact measure up with the famous city.

The disproportion between the power of Athens and the other city-states continued to grow until the League, initially an association between partners, was turned into an empire dominated by a super-power. Thus the *symachy* - a free consented alliance, was turned into an *arche* – an imposed domination. Founded to protect the Greek against a Persian attack, the League fulfilled its mission; but it also allowed Athens to increase the life quality of its citizens, fortify its famous fleet²⁴, build and embellish its famous temples.

To be able to be a democracy at home, Athens had to become an empire outside. The existence of this empire, that the Athenians themselves viewed as

22. A *symachia* was a military alliance created for mutual defense in front of a common threat, a common enemy – in this case the Persian Empire. See Thomas Harrison, (ed.), *Greeks and barbarians* (Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 244.

23. Only in theory, as in fact they could not get out from the alliance in case they chose to.

24. The fleet was formed from the poor citizens, who after their success – as the fleet was both the pride of Athens and the guarantee of its power – started to ask for more than just survival; thus, needing more money Athens started to think about domination outside the Greek world – see the expedition in Egypt in 459 B.C.

a tyranny was growing due to the mirage of power, prestige, prosperity and security which were all so hard to resist. The concern for democracy and its values and the efforts to try and understand how these values were co-existing with the imperialistic rule were a constant preoccupation for the rulers and their opponents. Pericles, the great symbol of Athenian democracy was telling his citizens "Your empire is now a tyranny: maybe it was a mistake to have formed it, but certainly now it is dangerous to give it up"²⁵.

The Empire of Alexander the Great: *The Other* as Ally, as Co-citizen, as Friend

The reign of Alexander the Great had an incredible and long lasting effect on both conquerors and conquered, on both western and eastern worlds that he tried to bring together in his short-lived empire.

Alexander was, most probably, the greatest military leader the world has ever known; and in his brief reign he changed the known world. He became king of Macedonia when he was twenty and when he was thirty he had already reached the edges of the known world, had defeated the most powerful empire of his time and had been regarded as a living god. The tremendous success that he enjoyed in his short life overshadowed countless generations of glorious generals from Caesar to Charlemagne, from Napoleon to Eisenhower. Both admired and despised, Alexander has always been a character to inspire high passion and debate. This made numerous historians along the centuries view in Alexander a man of their own ideals; and this is why the deeds and personality of the Macedonian king never cease to fascinate us, as he seems to come out of time and by his example still serves as model for us today.

Everything about Alexander is fascinating; thousands of books and articles have been dedicated to solving the mysteries of his life²⁶. For some historians, Alexander was the creator of a global empire, the author of the ideal of a united world, paving the way for the religions of love and peace. For others, he was the one who murdered thousands of people – apart from the battle field – seeming incapable of quenching this thirst for blood. He was the one who embodied the most noble of virtues, but also the most terrible of vices; he was wise and temperate, but also abusive and tyrannical; a sensitive and devoted young man, but also a man capable of murdering his closest friend in fits of insecurity. His numerous portraits are both contradictory and controversial.

But this mystery surrounding his life has not been invented by modern historians; it has been passed along the generations going back to the main historical sources we have on Alexander. His amazing and incredible career both fascinated and puzzled his contemporaries, who seem not to have known

25. Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War* (London: Wordsworth Editions, 1997), II, 63.

26. For further details on Alexander's life and campaigns see Carol G. Thomas, *Alexander the Great in his World* (Blackwell Publishing 2007), Ian Worthington (ed.), *Alexander the Great. A reader* (Routledge, 2007), or A.B. Bothworth and E.J. Baynham (eds.), *Alexander the Great in fact and Fiction* (Oxford University Press, 1999).

how to understand him; and the generations to come inherited this ambiguity. He was the model leader for both his generals and generations of generals to come. He literally led from the front, and his quest of glory blended gracefully with his brilliant tactics and strategies. He encouraged everybody, he motivated his men like no other, he raised them to excellence and made them the best versions of themselves. And for that he had their love and devotion. We know that he never lost a battle and he treated his defeated enemies with magnanimity that dazzled his contemporaries²⁷. But also he never forgave betrayal or stubborn opposition and those enemies were treated with cruelty hard to imagine²⁸.

His brilliance as a general²⁹ is seen both in his magnificent battle plans but also in his extraordinary ability to adapt to new and puzzling situations. His strength was his capacity to realistically evaluate new, unexpected circumstances and to decide both quickly and correctly the best way to go. He had the qualities of a great general, perhaps the greatest in history, but also those of a great leader of men.

Alexander was the one to break the barriers of the city-state and to bring the Greek culture and philosophy deep into the heart of Asia, thus opening trade routes and political ties even if the unity of his empire proved less durable. The Greeks – bothered by overpopulation and poverty, as we have seen before – found a solution for their problems, as the massive colonization created fruitful combination capable of both absorbing a large quantity of population and also supplying resources to the mainland.

The deeds and decisions of Alexander of Macedonia are the kind to fascinate, disturb and baffle – as he was not satisfied to become the conqueror of the Great King – the traditional enemy of the Greeks – and the richest man alive in that time, but he wanted to continue the march till the edges of the world, till he reached the Outside Ocean. He wanted to bring all the world under his rule. But his need to conquer more and go further didn't come out of greed or hunger for riches and power; it came from a great curiosity – a special ability to keep being amazed and mesmerized by the world around. His *pothos* for more conquest, for going ever further was fueled by his never quenched

27. As in the case of the family of Darius III, after the battle of Issos (Arrianus II, 12, 7, Diodorus XVII, 37, 5-6, Curtius Rufus III, 12, Plutarch, 21) or the treatment of the Indian king Poros after his defeat (Plutarch, 60). All references to Alexander's ancient sources Arrianus, Diodorus, Curtius Rufus and Plutarch are from the Romanian version of their works as found in the bibliography.

28. As the case of Batis of Gaza, whom Alexander dragged behind his chariot around the city – killing him in this way (Rufus IV, 6); also the case of Bessos the murderer of Darius III (Curtius Rufus VII, Arrianus IV, 7,3).

29. For further details see Lance Kurke, *The Wisdom of Alexander the Great* (New York: Ibooks, 2004) and David J. Lonsdale, *Alexander the Great. Lessons in Strategy* (Routledge, 2009), Frank L. Holt, *Into the Land of Bones, Alexander the Great in Afghanistan* (University of California Press, 2006); and also for Alexander's generalship see J.F.C. Fuller, *The Generaship of Alexander the Great* (Wordsworth Military Library, 1998), Donald W. Engels, *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army* (University of California Press, 1997) and Stephen English, *The Field Campaigns of Alexander the Great* (Pen & Sward Military, 2011) and *The Sieges of Alexander the Great* (Pen&Sward Military, 2009).

thirst to explore. It is not difficult to imagine that the only possible connection of such a vast territory populated by such different people could be only the authority of the sovereign. Alexander clearly understood this³⁰ and the premature collapse of his empire does not show us that such a construction was not viable, but that it needed an Alexander to keep it going.

The most spectacular thing about the young king and his great empire is that, even becoming the master of all these different populations, he disregarded the Greek pride³¹, proving to be a very skillful politician. Herodotus told us in his *Histories* about the permanent conflict between Greeks and barbarians – as we have seen between civilization, liberty, democracy and savagery, slavery, tyranny. This conflict was transformed into a fight between two different types of existence, two different kinds of humanity, two different models; it became more than the conflict between two peoples. The Macedonian king disregarded this way of understanding and brought under his rule Greeks, Macedonians, Persians, Egyptians, Scythians, Bactrians, Indians and others, all subjects under the same sovereign, living peacefully together³² – like in the time of the great banquet of Opis. Instead of treating the others as inferior barbarians, Alexander was curious and open. He considered the barbarians worthy of sharing his table and the riches he acquired and possessed. He tried to know the others, their way of life, their religious beliefs, to understand them. And even if he did this only for the sake of understanding better his opponents, this already brings him in a special category of leader of men.

The conquest and empire of Alexander the Great represent a turning point concerning the relations between victors and vanquished. He tried to promote the idea of a peaceful, united world, where understanding and mutual communication and respect should rule. Thus the famous distinction Greek – barbarian started to fade³³. Alexander's contemporaries, and the historians and philosophers of the centuries to come, wrote about the deep meaning of Alexander's exploits. Plutarch, due to his role as a conqueror and peacemaker, considered him a philosopher and compared him to Plato. Even if his attempts to bring together victors and vanquished brought him hatred and misunderstanding from his generals and contemporaries, it also brought him the admiration of the future centuries. He seems to have understood the value of

30. As he ruled in a different way, different populations: he was simultaneously Macedonian king, hegemon of the League of Corinth, pharaoh and son of Amon, Great King of all Asia. This may have been indeed dictated by practical reasons, as it would have been simply impossible to dominate such a huge territory only with soldiers brought from Macedonia and the allies without the cooperation of the locals. Nevertheless this should not make us neglect the extraordinary vision of Alexander.

31. Theoretically, at least, as the *hegemon* of the League of Greek allies, he must have been aware of what was expected of him. But "if Alexander was misunderstood, he himself may have failed to grasp the subtleties of those around him when journeying of the road Aristotle would have bade him follow", David Grant, *In Search of the Lost Testament of Alexander the Great* (Leicester, Matador, Troubador Publishing Ltd., 2017), 66.

32. See Jean Sirinelli, *Urmasii lui Alexandru cel Mare* (Bucuresti: Teora, 2000), 21.

33. As we can see tracing the evolution of the Greek – barbarian opposition. For details see Thomas Harrison ed., *Greeks and Barbarians* (Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 257-277.

opening up to other cultures, the need of tolerance and modesty and the fact that the acceptance of *the Others* is accompanied by challenges of our own preconceptions.

Alexander the Great is so much more than the founder of an empire with an uncertain geography; he is the one who practically "extended" the *polis* to contain the whole world³⁴. This way, he saw all the populations that he conquered as citizens of his newly founded empire. To keep such diverse populations united under a common idea and goal he, as a brilliant politician that he was, understood the importance of learning from *the Other*, of trying to see the world through the eyes of *the Others*. To keep the empire glued together everybody needs to have a place, all the subjects / citizens must work together for a common good. And achieving this could only be the work of a very firm and strong leader. Thus even if after his death his colossal empire fell apart, this lesson proved far more durable – the idea of a fusion between the two divided halves of the world, East and West brought together by one single rule. This idea lived on – admired by Julius Caesar and his successor Augustus – and thus we can even see the Roman Empire as a fulfillment of Alexander's dream³⁵.

The life and deeds of Alexander have been told and retold countless times in both Europe and Asia, getting the spices, details and interpretations specific to the time and space where they were unfolding. Thus the image of the conqueror has been reflected in countless mirrors and embellished and enriched with time till it got the shape of the myth³⁶ we know today. But the heart of this idea was the aura that Alexander cast around himself in the time of his life as a model leader, a perfect and fearless warrior, a general that lead his army from the front, a king that understood and cared for his people. His extraordinary authority came from the love and respect that he had from his subjects. He had taken all the responsibility for his position with his courage, intelligence and devotion and for that he had the total loyalty of his people. He had a natural charisma, the authority of an inborn leader. Thus his main concern was to keep his subjects in harmony, to keep them happy and content together, to unite them and avoid any possible tendencies to division. And he did all these by the power of his own example.

Very early, the idea of world domination was associated with Alexander the Great. No matter the previous attempts³⁷, this idea shows primarily the Greek intent to emphasize the universal civilizing mission of the conqueror. The image of the *cosmocrator* became more and more popular in the Hellenistic and Roman times. In this resides the universality and eternity of Alexander's conquests; and this is the way in which any type of despotic ambition and lack of measure is denounced. The tradition made that his

34. In David Grant's terms "Alexander may indeed have been an original *kosmopolites*, a self-declared *citizen of the world*" D. Grant, *In Search of the Lost Testament of Alexander the Great* (Leicester, Matador, Troubador Publishing Ltd., 2017), 9.

35. See Alexandru Suceveanu, *Alexandru cel Mare* (Bucuresti: Editura Academiei Romane, 1993), 161.

36. For more details about the legend see Claude Mosse, *Alexandre. Le destine d'un mythe* (Paris: Editions Payot & Rivages, 2001) and A.B. Bothworth and E.J. Baynham, *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction* (Oxford University Press, 2002).

37. By the Pharaoh or the Great King, for instance.

personality, or more than that, the idea of "Alexander the Great", be a carrier of special significance and meaning. These ended up by leaving behind the historical figure.

Analyzing the history of the Macedonian king and questioning the specificities of his empire in comparison with others, writers and historians brought ever new meaning for the well-known facts. Thus, Alexander's life became more than a succession of events and he himself became a symbol. He got to represent the sign or symbol of a special kind of presence that brings universal concord and unity.

Even from the beginning, there have been fiery debates among Alexander's historians to understand if the Macedonian king was just a tyrant, favored by luck and fate, who wanted world domination, or a wise ruler who dreamed of universal peace; if he was an ill intended genius of Evil, or a true philosopher and a precursor of modern cosmopolitanism. Then and now the consensus is missing. If we begin by analyzing the facts we can clearly see at least the following: he enrolled in the army Persians, but kept in the key points Macedonians³⁸; he organized the mass marriage of Susa and the reconciliation festivities at Opis where "a common government and the establishment of a good understanding"³⁹ was celebrated; he respected all the religions and the gods in his empire; he himself venerated foreign gods and even asked his subjects to acknowledge him as the son of Zeus-Amon; he was ruling simultaneously as Macedonian king, *hegemon* of the League of Corinth, pharaoh and son of a god, and Great King of all Asia; before his untimely death he was preparing an expedition around the Arabian peninsula and probably to Carthage. Summing up and analyzing these facts can we conclude that Alexander was a symbol of the policy of annexations, assimilation, a symbol of imperialism or maybe something different, altogether new?

In time, the image of the heroic and divine king from the classical and medieval legends was replaced by Johan-Gustav Droysen⁴⁰ by that of the founder of a new era; thus making Alexander the symbol of a new beginning, the creator of the western-eastern fusion, the founder of a mixed, hybrid civilization. Alexander became the unifier *par excellence* and the British historian William Woosthorpe Tarn⁴¹ made him the man of universal concord, peace and understanding. After the Second World War, Ernst Badian⁴² considered Alexander a ruthless totalitarian tyrant. Finally, Alexander became a realistic politician, a symbol of political lucidity. From this perspective his policy was not intended to merge different cultures or to Hellenize the barbarians, but to rule effectively an ever larger territory keeping in use the

38. With very rare exceptions – like Oxyarthe; and the Persians in the army were trained following the Macedonian program

39. Arrianus, VII, 11.

40. J.G. Droysen, *Histoire de l'Hellenisme* (Paris : Errest le Roux, 1883).

41. W.W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (Cambridge University Press, 1951).

42. Ernst Badian, "Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind," *Historia* VII (1958), 425-444.

structures and administration that he found. Pierre Briant⁴³ considers that the so-called "fraternization" of all the peoples dreamed by Alexander was no more than the merger of two aristocracies. Even if he changed the people, he kept the structures.

Today we can only smile when we read what Droysen was writing when he thought there was no difference between victors and vanquished. Even if Alexander, along his campaigns, had been trying to realize collaboration and closeness in spirit, he realized, upon his return from India, that just a few years had been enough for hatred, misunderstanding, conflict and opposition to prevail. Thus we can clearly notice that even after the mass marriages of Susa, the reorganizing of the army and the reconciliation of Opis the hierarchy continues to persist⁴⁴. But we must also accept that, even if there was not a homogeneous world, where differences disappear, this does not necessarily mean that we cannot recognize a unified world.

Tzvetan Todorov has a very interesting gallery of portraits of travellers. At a first glance we might be tempted to see Alexander the Great fitting in the first type, that of the assimilator: he "is the one who wants to change the others to look more like him; in principle he is a universalist (he believes in the unity of mankind), but he usually interprets the differences with the others in terms of lacking compared to his ideal"⁴⁵. It is true that Alexander was the one who took the Greek culture deep into Asia, but he believed in the possibility of a universal empire. It is obvious that without his burning curiosity to explore the foreign cultures that he encountered and discovered along with the admiration and respect for the different populations that he conquered and brought under his rule, his empire would have probably looked very different. The young Macedonian who conquered the world also wanted (equally maybe) to know it and understand its mysteries⁴⁶. So, as Plutarch had already noticed long ago, what still remains Alexander's particularity is that he chose to act as a true philosopher: "The philosopher is universalist – as was the assimilator, with the special difference that, due to his careful observation of the differences, his universalism is no longer an ethnocentrism"⁴⁷.

43. Pierre Briant, *Alexander the Great. The Heroic Ideal* (New York, 1996a), *Histoire de l'empire Perse. De Cyrus a Alexandre* (Paris: Fayard, 1996b), *Alexandru cel Mare* (Bucuresti: Corint, 2001).

44. Macedonians and Greeks continued to hold the key positions, followed by the Persians; the other populations are their subordinates. We know that Alexander accepted in his army members of all different populations, but these always had subordinate places.

45. Tzvetan Todorov, *Noi si ceilalti. Despre diversitate* (Bucuresti: Humanitas, 1999), 464.

46. And here we can recognize the student of Aristotle. In his desire to know the world and understand its mysteries, Alexander surrounded himself with philosophers, artists, scientists, geographers, doctors and astronomers.

47. Tzvetan Todorov, *Noi si ceilalti. Despre diversitate* (Bucuresti: Humanitas, 1999), 475.

A Few Closing Lines

The world of today is offering us a great variety of ideas and perspectives, a vast diversity of cultures and ever closer connections to those different from us. We may sometimes imagine that we have a more united and homogeneous world due to globalization; however, at the same time we cannot fail to notice the constant challenges and unrest this unity and closeness bring. The dream of Alexander the Great of a united world seems today so close to be achieved – and yet it seems so far away. Our greatest challenge seems to be the crossing of cultural divisions, but without neglecting, or denying any cultural identity. As we live closer together, and we are more dependent on each other than in any other period in history, we have to learn the true meaning of respect and responsibility. We have to understand tolerance and the meaning of living together in diversity which can be both a great challenge but also an opportunity for growth, as in growing and becoming together, reaching togetherness – in respect and mutual understanding.

"Either in this century we will learn how to build a common civilization with which each one can identify, united by universal values, led by the firm belief in the human adventure, and enriched by all our individual cultures; or we shall fall together into a common barbarity"⁴⁸. These words seem to describe perfectly the dream of Alexander the Great and also the extraordinary challenges he faced and affirm the need to get to a common civilization of living together, reach a shared culture for different people of different traditions and backgrounds and diverse beliefs and languages. If we are to live together (and at this point in history it looks like the choice had been already made for us) we have to learn that we cannot rely on a single magic solution for this. The more we realize we are all different, hard to unify, the more we find each other already united by invisible ties of economy and politics, of culture or geography. We have to build new ways of interaction, of living and becoming together. Even if in our interpretation of the history of Alexander the Great we are influenced by our own history, still we have a great example to follow and to guide us in the stormy times we are experiencing.

The greatest enemy of our time seems to be the fear; the fear of *the Other*, the enemy, the foreigner, the terrorist, the migrant, the neighbor, and even ourselves. And the only antidote to this, as the myth of Alexander so spectacularly shows us, is love; love of *the Other*, of the barbarian, the stranger, the different. We protect only what we love and we love only what we know. In order to know and understand *the Others* we need an emotional connection. We need to surpass the indifference and open wide our curious eyes to the new realities and people that challenge our comfortable preconceptions. We need to see the world with ever renewed curiosity and fascination and never stop questioning and exploring

48. Amin Maalouf, *De dereglement du monde. Quand les civilisations s'épuisent* (Le livre de Poche, Grasset, 2009), 32.

Bibliography

- Aristotel. *Politica*. Bucuresti: Iri, 2001.
- Arrianus, Flavius. *Expeditia lui Alexandru in Asia*. Bucuresti: Minerva, 1996.
- Badian, Ernst. "Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind." *Historia*, VII, (1958), 425-444.
- Bothworth, A.B., & E.J. Baynham, (eds.) *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*. Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Briant, Pierre. *Alexander the Great. The Heroic Ideal*. New York, 1996a.
- Briant, Pierre. *Histoire de l'empire Perse. De Cyrus a Alexandre*. Paris: Fayard, 1996b.
- Briant, Pierre. *Alexandru cel Mare*. Bucuresti : Corint, 2001.
- Debidour, Michel. *Les Grecs et la Guerre. Ve – Ixe siecles*. Editions de Rocher, 2002.
- Demostene. Eschine, Licurg, Isocrate. *Pagini alese din oratori greci*. Bucuresti: Editura pentru literatura, 1969.
- Detienne, Marcel. *Stapanitorii de adevar in Grecia arhaica*. Bucuresti: Meridiane, 1996.
- Diodor din Sicilia, *Biblioteca istorica*. Bucuresti: Sport-Turism, 1981.
- Droysen, J.G. *Histoire de l'Hellenisme*. Paris : Ernest le Roux, 1883.
- Engels, Donald W. *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army*. University of California Press, 1997.
- English, Stephen. *The Field campaigns of Alexander the Great*. England: Pen & Sward Military, 2011.
- English, Stephen. *The Sieges of Alexander the Great*. England: Pen & Sward Military, 2009.
- Eschil. *Tragedii*. Bucuresti: Univers, 2002.
- Fuller, J.F.C. *The Generalship of Alexander the Great*. Wordsworth Military Library, 1998.
- Grant, David. *In Search of the Lost Testament of Alexander the Great*. Leicester. Matador, Troubador Publishing Ltd., 2017.
- Harrison, Thomas (ed.). *Greeks and Barbarians*. Edinburgh University Press, 2002.
- Herodotus. *Histories*. London: Wordsworth Editions, 1996.
- Holt, Frank L. *Into the Land of Bones, Alexander the Great in Afghanistan*. University of California Press, 2006.
- Kurke, Lance. *The Wisdom of Alexander the Great*. New York: Ibooks, 2004.
- Lonsdale, David J. *Alexander the Great. Lessons in Strategy*. Routledge, 2009.
- Maalouf, Amin. *De dereglement du monde. Quand nos civilisations s'epuisent*. Le livre de Poche. Grasset, 2009.
- Mosse, Claude. *Alexandre. La destine d'un mythe*. Paris: Editions Payot & Rivages, 2001.
- Platon. *Opere*. Bucuresti: Editura Stiintifica si Enciclopedica, 1986.
- Platon. *Dialoguri*. Bucuresti: Iri, 1996.
- Platon. *Legile*. Bucuresti: Iri, 1995.
- Plutarch. *Vieti paralele*. Bucuresti : Editura stiintifica, 1996.
- Quintus Curtius Rufus. *Viata si faptele lui Alexandru cel Mare, regale Macedonienilor*. Minerva. Bucuresti, 1970.
- Sirinelli, Jean. *Urmasii lui Alexandru cel Mare*. Bucuresti : Teora, 2000.
- Spence, Lewis. *Egypt*. London: Senate, 1996.

- Suceveanu, Alexandru. *Alexandru cel Mare*. Bucuresti: Editura Academiei Romane, 1993.
- Tarn, W.W. *Alexander the Great*. Cambridge University Press, 1951.
- Thomas, Carol G. *Alexander the Great in his World*. Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. *Noi si ceilalti. Despre diversitate*. Bucuresti: Humanitas, 1999.
- Thucydides. *The History of the Peloponesian War*. London: Wordsworth Editions, 1997.
- Vidal-Naquet, Pierre. *Vanatorul negru. Forme de gandire si forme de societate in lumea greaca*. Bucuresti: Eminescu, 1985.
- Worthington, Ian (ed.). *Alexander the Great. A Reader*. New York: Routhledge, 2007.