

Alex Mullen, *Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean: multilingualism and multiple identities in the Iron Age and Roman periods*. Cambridge classical studies. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013. xix, 455 p. \$115.00. ISBN 9781107020597.

The publication of this beautifully printed book is no doubt an event in the history of Gaulish and, in a wider context, Western Mediterranean studies. The brief summary which is placed on its dust jacket gives in fact a perfect resumé of its contents. Indeed, “this book combines sociolinguistics and archaeology to bring to life the multilingualism and multiple identities of the region from the foundation of the Greek colony of Massalia in 600 BC to the final phases of Roman Imperial power. It builds on the interest generated by the application of modern bilingualism theory to ancient evidence by modelling language contact and community dynamics and adopting an innovative interdisciplinary approach”. The modern academic community is now heavily indebted to Dr Alex Mullen for tackling within the new frameworks of analysis all these questions which have been in the centre of attention for decades. As the author acknowledges (p. xiii), her discussion of the data was much inspired by the works of Professor Jim Adams, *Corrupting sea* by Horden and Purcell, and *Rome’s cultural revolution* by Wallace-Hadrill. Dietler’s important *Archaeologies of Colonialism* (2010) was published after the text of *Southern Gaul* was essentially finished, and the author admits that though the chronological and geographical spread of the two works may overlap, the volumes remain complementary. What is really remarkable about this book is its interdisciplinary nature which is not simply proclaimed by its author, but is carefully adhered to.

The volume is divided into two parts, and contains three extremely valuable appendices (pp. 309–383), a comprehensive bibliography (pp. 384–442) and indices. The first part is entitled “Multilingualism and multiple identities: interdisciplinary methodologies” (p. 3–143) and includes five chapters. The titles of the chapters, apart from the introductory “Multiple voices”, are highly indicative of their contents: “Language contact and community dynamics”, “Bilingual texts and community dynamics”, “Scripts as indicators of contact” and “Names as indicators of contact”. Southern Gaul is known, of course, for a number of languages which are attested although on a different scale before the Roman conquest, such as Greek, Iberian and Gaulish. Greek in this area is firmly associated with Phokaeian colonies, while the date (but not the mode — it seems that nowadays no-one believes in a massive invasion) of appearance of the-Gaulish speaking peoples in the area is disputable. Mullen (p. 36, n.181) sees “no reason why we should not follow Py in considering that Celtic-speaking communities are present in Southern Gaul well before 600”. The question remains, though, whether they were in fact speaking Gaulish, and there are quite different views expressed on the subject. As J. de Hoz notes, “it is not possible to consider the Celts who reached the Mediterranean shore of France at the end of the seventh century to be Gauls because of historical and chronological difficulties”¹, and, moreover, a number of

¹ J. de Hoz, “The Mediterranean frontier of the Celts and the advent of Celtic writing,” in *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 53/54 (2007), 1–22, at p. 10. This important work is missing from the otherwise very

scholars nowadays believes that the Ligurian language is in fact an early form of Gaulish rather than a separate language, although other views on this problem are also known. The author does not discuss the data traditionally labelled as Ligurian and focuses on the Gallo-Greek record which she thinks “has traditionally been misinterpreted due to outdated views of cultural contacts” (p. 47) in conjunction with archaeological data.

Mullen surveys modern sociolinguistic theories and their implications for the study of the area labelled as *Gallia Graeca* by Pompeius Trogus, which, as the author correctly insists, is certainly a misnomer. She refers both to the fruits of recent observations on pidgins, creoles, etc., and (socio)linguistic situations in the ancient, predominantly Western, world². The author, expectedly, concentrates on Gallo-Greek, that is, the corpus of Gaulish inscriptions written in Greek, and her discussion of the data is an immense contribution to the study of this continental Celtic language and the linguistic situation in the Western Mediterranean, as it contains new approaches to old questions, and offers new solutions. Several of Dr Mullen’s original suggestions may briefly be noted here. First, this is her assessment of the theory accepted so far, perhaps even unanimously, that the adoption of the Greek script by the local Gaulish-speaking communities comes from Massalia. Mullen argues (p. 99) that “no diagnostic feature specifically links the script to Marseille” and makes a claim for “the importance of Mediterranean-wide influences motivating the creation of Gallo-Greek”³. She also argues — in contrast with earlier scholarship — that “the initial borrowing may have been from handwritten, as opposed to incised lapidary, form of Greek script”, and thus “the likely initial model for Gallo-Greek was handwritten Greek” (p. 105).

The second part of the book, “Multilingualism and multiple identities in Southern Gaul” starts with the investigation of Gaulish-Greek linguistic contacts. Her research leads Mullen to the conclusion that there was “a relatively poor penetration of Greek outside the colonies, with the important exception of trading contexts and perhaps, to an extent, the south western zone” (p. 177). The Italian connection, which is explored on the basis of a few Gallo-Greek inscriptions⁴, and particularly those with the so-called

rich bibliography; on the reasonable skepticism regarding Bronze and Iron Age Celtic speakers see P. Sims-Williams, “Bronze and iron age Celtic speakers: what don’t we know, what can’t we know, and what could we know? Language, genetics and archaeology in the twenty first century,” in *The Antiquaries Journal* 92 (2012), 1–23.

² The sociolinguistic discussion of the ancient (Indo-European) world is a growing discipline, and Mullen makes use of a wide range of publications on the subject. Parallels from the eastern parts of it may be revealing for the present discussion, such as, e.g., I. S. Yakubovich, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language* (Leiden 2009), and particularly a series of works on Greek-Indian bilingualism by N. Kazanskij and Y. Kryuchkova, e.g., “Grecheskaya uchenost v indiyskom prelomlenii,” in *Vostok i zapad v balkanskoj kartine mira* (Moscow 2007), 159–169.

³ The argument for the distribution of the monuments to the east of Massalia (useful map on p. 100) *mutatis mutandis* still may be considered for the presence of the “unepigraphic” Ligurians to the west of it. The only written language west of the Hérault river, as J. de Hoz (*The Mediterranean frontier*, p. 15) admits, was Iberian and the inscriptions contain Celtic personal names.

⁴ I discuss elsewhere the recently found Gallo-Greek inscription from Velleron (analysed by Mullen on pp. 182–187) in view of newly discovered data.

dedebratoudekantem formula, and which is discussed on pp. 179–219, is certainly revealing. At least for the creation of the formula, which is not known in other varieties of Gaulish or other Celtic languages, the explanation with reference to the Mediterranean *koine* is significant. The essence of this *koine* remains quite enigmatic, and the mechanisms of its interaction with the Celtic-speaking communities in Southern Gaul is unknowable. In fact this concept has been used by other scholars, and of course (possible) Sabellic and Latin influences on the Gaulish pre-Roman texts in Southern Gaul have been acknowledged. Therefore, the ‘Hellenization’ of Southern Gaul is, following the author, rather ‘Mediterraneanization’. To support this claim Mullen devotes the next forty pages of the book to the case study of two settlements, Glanum and Aristaion, as key *loci* for contact-induced change in the second and first centuries BC. Generally, it is impossible to deny influences from the Italian peninsula, the term used by the author herself (e.g., p. 302), and a closer focus on certain areas of ancient Italy may be rewarding in future research.

The book contains a great amount of discussion of purely linguistic matters. Celtic linguists will be interested in the treatment of the place of the Gallo-Greek inscriptions in the history of Gaulish and a somewhat negative discussion of the notion of a ‘Dialect of Narbonensis’ offered by the author (e.g., pp. 117–119, 174f.)⁵, scholars of Greek will enjoy Mullen’s vigorous stance against considering the Ionic character of the local Greek in the Hellenistic period (pp. 137–143) and the consequences of such an approach⁶, while students of Latin will not miss her discussion of the fem. dative plurals in *-abus* in epigraphy (pp. 279–280). The list of Greek inscriptions of France not included in *IGF* which is published as the appendix 2 of the book will be certainly welcomed by epigraphists, while the list of personal names from Glanum (Appendix 3) is definitely of great importance for onomastics. Historians of the ancient Western Mediterranean now benefit from a comprehensive discussion of the linguistic/ethnic situation in the areas of the “Gallo-Greek” inscriptions. As the focus of the book is Gallo-Greek, *desiderata* for future research, as I see it, include the search for identities of the Celtic-speakers slightly westwards from the area of this study and those of the Celtic-speakers in the area itself who used the Iberian and Etruscan scripts⁷ in contrast with the population groups of

⁵ On this see now D. Stifter, “Lenition of *s* in Gaulish?,” in *The Sound of Indo-European* (Copenhagen 2012), 523–544, and J. Eska, “A salvage grammar of Galatian,” in *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 60 (2013), 51–63. Relevant problems of Gaulish accentuation are discussed by P. Schrijver, *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology* (Amsterdam, Atlanta 1995), 20–21.

⁶ The suggestion that the Greek alphabet adopted by the Gauls “had typical *koinē* values of the time” (K. McCone, *Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change* [Maynooth 1996], p. 6) is known to Celtic scholars. Readers of this journal may be interested in recent research by S. Tohtasev, “Grecheskiy yazyk na Bospore: obscheje i osobennoye,” in *Bosporskij fenomen* 2011, 673–682, where 5 periods (!) in the history of the Greek language in the Bosphoran kingdom are recognized on the basis of epigraphic data.

⁷ See most recently on that, T. L. Markey, M. Egetmeyer, J.-C. Muller, “The boar’s tusk of Istres (Bouches-du-Rhône): a Lepontic talismanic inscription,” in *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 60 (2013), 117–140.

discussed in the book. Although further afield, it is also interesting to note that there is at least some evidence that the Celtic-speaking Galatians of Asia Minor, whose language is known to us only through onomastics recorded in Greek epigraphy and reports of ancient authors, kept some contacts with the “Gallo-Greeks” of the Western Mediterranean in the Hellenistic epoch⁸.

ALEXANDER FALILEYEV
GOGINAN
ABERYSTWYTH

⁸ A. D. Macro, “Galatian connections with the Celtic west in the Hellenistic era,” in *Regionalism in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor* (Bordeaux 2007), 169–177.