The current view of the scholarship is that 'Celtic' migration in the fourth and third centuries BC significantly impacted on the formation of identities in central and southeastern Europe. This work questions the notion of 'Celtic' identity and patterns of 'roaming tribal migrations' in light of recent criticisms, using post-modernistic notions of culture and ethnicity as a fluent and socially constructed phenomena, as well as contextual criticism of the Greco-Roman discourse on barbarians that is presented in written sources from antiquity. The 'Celtic' arrival in southeastern Europe and the formation of identities with a 'Celtic ethnic element', such as Scordiscan, are seen here in regional settings and explained as a consequence of the process of hybridization and restructuring of existing identities through a selective acceptance of global cultural templates from the Mediterranean and temperate Europe.
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Introduction: Wild Hordes and Post-Modernism

The question of population movements across southeastern Europe in the fourth and third centuries has significantly occupied the attention of modern scholarship, and is generally accepted as fact. According to this interpretation sometime during the fifth and fourth centuries masses of Celts moved from their homeland in central Europe towards Italy and southeastern Europe. “Wild hordes of Gallic warriors led by Brennus swept down like an avalanche from the Danube basin over the Balkan peninsula to Central Greece.” (Papazoglu 1978: 271). The current consensus of scholars is that the Celtic migrations caused wide turbulence inside the Illyrian world and reshaped the previously existing social, ethnic and political networks in what will later
be known as eastern-northeastern Illyricum and Moesia. This view is backed by three separate lines of evidence: the archaeological confirmation of the spread of La Tène culture, the onomastic evidence for the spread of Celtic language(s), and the written evidence of ancient sources that mention the invasion of Macedonia and Greece by the Celts/Gauls, in particular Justin's Epitomes of Pompeius Trogus, Pausanias and Diodorus Siculus. They are taken together with the supposed Celtic character of the Scordisci who were said by the written sources to be the remains of the Celts who invaded Greece in the early third century (Strabo, 7.3.11; 7.5.12; Just. Epit. 24.4.8; 32.3.6–8; Posidonius ap. Athen. 6.234a-b; Todorović 1970; Nachtergaeel 1977; Papazoglou 1978: 52–57, 271–278; Rankin 1987: 83–102; Szabó 1991; 1999; Cunliffe 1997: 78 ff; Birkhan 1997: 130–150; Šašel Kos 2005: 133 ff. and Schmidt 1992 for linguistics).

This paper shall re-examine this broad historical explanation in light of new post-structuralist developments in views on identity-formation in antiquity and contextual source-criticism of the available written sources. Its main purpose is to examine and critique the discursive interpretation of written sources from antiquity, which suggest massive ‘Celtic’ migrations in southeastern Europe in the fourth/third centuries BC and to discuss the mechanisms behind the development of, what our ancient sources recognized as, ‘Scordiscan’ identity.

The recent debates in the field of archaeology of ethnicity and the development of a post-modernistic discourse on identities and culture in the ancient world have shaken previously firm views on the nature of ancient identities and culture. Modern scholarship for too long followed the Greco-Roman view on the identity and ethnicity of non-Mediterranean peoples as perpetually conserved and their history as timeless and static. The implementation of post-modernistic socio-anthropological views on identity as a fluctuating, hybridizing social phenomenon defined and constantly re-negotiated in the present, replaced earlier views of ancient culture and identity as well-bounded, pre-determined and static features. Social anthropology shows that identity is formed and re-negotiated only in the interaction with the ‘Other’, rather than through pre-determined cultural templates, seeing identity as flexible and situational, changeable and differently constructed in different social contexts (Wells 1995; Graves-Brown et al. 1996; Hall 1997; Jones 1997; Brather 2004). A post-modernistic and post-structuralist perspective on culture corresponds with this notion of identity. Culture is taken from its modernistic spatial-bounded definitive context and redefined as the intersection, or even a process where local communities constantly redefine wider global cultural templates and project them back to the societies that originally developed them (Bauer 1999; Hingley 2005: 49 ff. esp. 51–54).

Large groups known from antiquity such as the Germans, Celts, Slavs or Illyrians were in recent decades revealed by the scholarship in many aspects as artificial pseudo-ethnic constructions, ‘Germans’, ‘Celts’, ‘Slavs’ or ‘Illyrians’, perceived as such by Greco-Roman-Byzantine sources and constructed in a modern interpretation for various reasons (Chapman 1992; James 1999; Collis 2003 – the Celts; Curta 2001; Brather 2004a – the Slavs; Džino forthcoming – the Illyrians; Brather 2004 - general). Material evidence of ethnic identity interpreted through the Kossina-Childe ‘archaeology of cultures’ that assumed inseparable links of defined cultural and ethnic identity was shown as an unreliable method for establishing the identity of ancient peoples. The assemblage of artifacts might show the taste and reflect the cultural habitus of those who used them, it might show social identities within the society but the artifacts can not be seen as the key parameters of ethnicity, and that is one of the reasons this paper does not necessarily rely on archaeological evidence when discussing ethnicity.1 Ethnicity is a complex social, political and cultural construction that might be constructed in many different ways, but is most frequently a social construction that reflects the power relationships inside society and its social and political mobilization (Jones 1996; 1997: 68 ff.; Brather 2002: 169–175; Curta 2007). Therefore, the expansion of certain cultural traits such as La Tène is not necessarily a sign of conquest or migration of the social group that used them, but can be explained as a spread of fashion, utilitarianism, taste, exchange or change of identity-construction for various political, economic or cultural reasons.

1 Ancient sources equally used collective terms Celtae/Kēlōn and Galli/Γαλάται and there is no clear indication that they depicted different identities (Birkhan 1997: 32–51), especially not in the period discussed here. Dobesch (1995: 26 ff.; 1996: 29 ff.) speculates that the term ‘Celts’ depicts earlier aristocratic Hallstatt and La Tène A and ‘Gauls’ more egalitarian La Tène B society. For the reason of clarity this paper uses the term ‘Celts’ for Iron Age population of Europe and ‘Gauls’ for the Roman-constructed identity.

2 Habitus is a subliminal disposition towards certain perceptions and social practices (morality, tastes, role of sexes in the division of labour, communication etc.) that are implanted into an individual’s sense of self (Bourdieu 1977: 72 ff.; Bentley 1987). In some instances the politisation of cultural habitus might indeed become the basis for the construction of ethnicity as Curta 2007 recently pointed out.
“... we must allow that some of the changes recognizable in the archaeological record need be nothing more than the adoption of new styles and new behaviour patterns by indigenous communities.” (Cunliffe 1997: 79; cf. Wells 1980; 1984; 1995a — trade and exchange in Iron Age Europe as the engine of cultural change).

The peoples who participated in the making of the La Tène culture are revealed as a quantity of heterogeneous communities that followed a similar lifestyle but in no way shared a common identity, or a sense of ‘Celtness.’ “What has been so confusing and thus damaging to good archaeological research has been the tendency to treat the inhabitants of northwestern Europe as if they were in some sense a single ‘people’, a ‘Celtic nation’, and thus in some real sense an ethnic unit.” (Renfrew 1996: 132).4 The term ‘Celts’ perhaps makes some sense if it is applied in the context of la longue durée to the macro-cultural habitus of an Iron Age population of continental Europe and the British isles (Diepeveen-Jansen 2001: 24 linking Bourdieu and Braudel), their similar language(s) and shared cultural templates that archaeology detects existing in certain periods, known today as Hallstat or La Tène (Renfrew 1987: 245–250; Harding 1990). The development and expansion of these shared cultural templates could be explained through the concept of long-term “cumulative Celticity” (Hawkes 1973) that is applied successfully by Almagro-Gorbea (1993; 1995, cf. Ruiz-Zapatero 1997) to the problem of appearance of the Celtoiberians in Spain.

‘Celtness’ was, in fact, imposed on these peoples by outside observers who wrote the sources we have today. The ‘Celts’ were all those foreigners from the west and north whom the Greeks and Romans initially called the Celts, not those who perceived themselves as such, at first. The only people that we know of who initially perceived themselves as the Celts were, according to Caesar (Caes. B Gall. 1.1), the inhabitants of central and southern Gaul – called Gauls by the Romans. However, during the late Republic and the Empire, a self-perceived Gaulness indeed occurred, but should be placed in its historical context of the Gaulish provincial elite ‘becoming Roman’ and accepting and further re-negotiating the Roman-constructed perception of themselves as Gauls or Gallo-Romans (Woolf 1996; 1998: 242). Thus, it is possible to regard the ‘Celts’ today in many ways as a constructed group-identity perceived as timeless and static by ancient sources and in more recent times interpreted through the discourse of race, language and culture, that was frequently used for modern political purposes ( Fitzpatrick 1991; Chapman 1992; Dietler 1994; Collis 1996). Iron Age Europe might have seemed a geocultural-ethnic unity to Roman and Greek observers, with shared technological, cultural and agricultural practices as well as similar languages. However, it is undeniable that it was significantly diverse, lacking any centripetal power, either political, economical or ideological to unite it, as the Mediterranean was united by Rome, firstly through power, and later tied with ideology through the invention of elite imperial discourse (Woolf 1993; 1997).5 The La Tène world was uniform only at the surface, beyond it were visible regional modifications and adaptations of new cultural forms to the indigenous forms (Cunliffe 1997: 111 ff. esp.123–125). “Europe was like a series of rockpools over which waves crashed from different directions, but left tiny local micro-environments, the same in broad features, but each unique in detail.” (Woolf 1997: 341–345 quote from 343).

The existing view that explains the spread of La Tène cultural templates in Europe through the ‘Celtic mass-migrations’ therefore remains wide open to thorough re-assessment. This especially relates to southeastern Europe, as the evidence for mass-migration is even scarcer than that from northern Italy, where we can see a pattern of long-term ‘Celtization’ and very gradual and sporadic population movements across the Alps (Wells 1980: 130–138; Cunliffe 1997: 70–72; Prosdocimi 1999: 54–55, questioned by Diepeveen-Jansen 2001: 201 ff.), or sporadic long-term movements across the Pyrenees (Almagro-Gorbea 1995; Ruiz Zapatero 1997). Historians and archaeologists constructed an explanatory framework of ‘Celtic migrations’ that stands upon the fragile equilibrium between the literary reading of written sources and the assumption that La Tène artifacts were spread and used by the ‘Celts.’ The written sources scholars rely on are not trustworthy mostly for the cultural bias of their approach. They were observing the events and perceived Iron Age population of temperate Europe exclusively through Greco-Roman discourse on

3 The bibliography on this subject is growing and criticism of the ‘Celtness’ as the identity of Iron Age Europeans has a significant presence in contemporary scholarship (Chapman 1992; Fitzpatrick 1996; Collis 1997; 2003; James 1999; Diepeveen-Jansen 2001; Brather 2004: 117 ff., 206–209, 240–248). The debate is still ongoing. The new view is not accepted by all scholars, especially paleolinguists (Sims-Williams 1998) but also archaeologists (Megaw & Megaw 1996; Raimund 2004), see the most recent overview of the debate by Megaw (2005).

4 The ideological legitimation of power in early Iron age societies is possible to speculate Dietler (1995a) esp. 71, but is still unclear and undefined. A warrior ‘nature’ of ‘Celtic society’ was also questioned as a mere construct of the sources (Webster 1994).

The sources imply a Greco–Roman interpretation for the causes of the migrations as overpopulation or a barbarian longing for the riches of the Mediterranean (Livy, 5.34; Just. Epit. 24.4.3; App. Celt. 2.1 – overpopulation; Just. Epit. 20.5.7 – quarrelling; Livy, 5.33; Plin. HN 12.2.5 – longing for the riches; Memnon, FGrH 434 F8 – famine and population increase as the reasons behind Brennus’ expedition to Delphi). Neither overpopulation nor depletion of the La Tène ‘homeland’ in central Europe are confirmed by the archaeology (Wells 1984: 131–132; Diepeveen-Jansen 2001). In fact, archaeology shows a political fragmentation that excludes the existence of unified political force(s) in eastern or central Europe in the fourth century (Collis 1995) that might exist behind these movements, as suggested by, say, Livy’s ‘Biturigan kingdom’. The spread of La Tène cultural templates, population increases in central Europe (Motyková 1991; Čižmář 1999: 300–301) and the Transdanubia-Carpathian basin (Bújna & Szabó 1999), considerable economic stability, wealth and trade are all attested by the archaeology, but they are not evidence of ‘mass-migrations’, but rather the expanding ‘cultural continuum’ of Cunliffe (1997: 78–80), or ‘kulturelle Koine’ of Jerem (1996), where the ideas and population circulated without obstacles. The examination of human remains from the La Tène graves in Hungary shows no distinctive physical features of a ‘Celtic’ population, but rather a very heterogeneous mixture of the existing physical types from central Europe (Kiszeli 1979).8

The spread of La Tène artifacts in Europe and the decline of imports from the Mediterranean in the middle La Tène period shows the shift in the ways that elites expressed their identities as elites, new attitudes towards self and the other, but not the expansion of ethnically homogeneous ‘Celts’, especially not as the consequence of their ‘lure for wine and fruits of Italy’ (Fitzpatrick 1996; Wells 1999: 42–47; 2001: 60–67; Diepeveen-Jansen 2001 esp. 206–213). Decrease of burial data in the middle La Tène period in the Marne-Moselle zone and elsewhere in central Europe can be explained by new, less visible burial patterns rather than with the migrations – ‘The explanation of the decrease in burial data by migration theories does not account for the burial rite and practices changing at the same time and for the lesser emphasis on wealth in personal equipment in this context.’ (Diepeveen-Jansen 2001: 116).

It is also worth noting the anti-migrationism that resonates through archaeological theory and the tendency in more recent scholarship to limit the large population movements in prehistory and history to a more believable level (Chapman & Hamrow 1997a). The migrations are seen as a social strategy rather than an automatic response to overpopulation. These cannot be explained as roaming ‘tribal migrations’ but rather as rule-governed group-behavior of a circular or chain type that required a significant level of social organization and planning (Anthony 1990; 1997: 22 ff.). Völkerwanderung in some other historical periods, such as the Dark Ages in Greece (Hall 1997: 113–128, 184–185), the Cimbri and Teutones episode in the late second century BC (Burns 2003: 42–87), or the end of antiquity (e.g. Curta 2001; Gillett 2002) are re-assessed and explained in different historical and social contexts. Even the ‘celtization’ of some other parts of Europe such as the Iberian peninsula, is not necessarily seen as the consequence of mass-migrations (Almagro-Gorbea 1995; Ruiz Zapatero 1997).

The appearance of La Tène in southeastern Europe is thus possible to be seen as an expansion of cultural forms and artifacts, a complex process of continental globalization in temperate Europe characterized by movement of goods and people. In all that we know this was an interactive process. La Tène objects appear in southeastern Europe in the third century, but in the same period Macedonian coinage (Nachtergaele 1977: 8, n. 7; Allen 1980: 46 ff.) or south (i.e. ethnic) Illyrian finds such as necklaces or fibulae make its way into central Europe (Čižmář 1999: 301) and the objects of Danubian origin emerge in Italy (Szabó 1991: 19–20 with refs.) In this context we should take seriously the notice of itinerant populations in Diodorus (Diod. Sic. 22.9.1) as camp followers and traders in Brennus’ army. Colonizing activities, such as the search for new farmlands by the population of Iron Age central Europe are the consequence, not the cause of this process of spatial widening of La Tène world (Wells 1999: 45; Bintliff 1984: 170, 186). The size of an itinerant population such as traders and especially settlers should not be overestimated, even...
less deducted from written sources, as it is not believable to assume that the search for land pushed the Iron age peoples of Europe as far as landless and sourceless Greece through successive generations. The population moved, not as wild, roaming hordes, but rather as small groups that followed particular goals. A significant way of interaction that sources reveal was the need of Hellenistic states for mercenaries and the willingness of continental Europeans to supply them – no different from the time when Greece supplied mercenaries for the Persian empire. The number of ‘Celts’ served as mercenaries in the Hellenistic armies (Griffith 1935; Szabó 1999a) and our sources quite often do not distinguish between those wandering bands of mercenaries and what they perceived as migrations. It is possible that demand for mercenaries indeed functioned through the elite-centered networks, so minor groups from the temperate European elite joined the mercenary armies of the Mediterranean world and were perceived as the ‘Celts’ by the Mediterraneans (Diepeveen-Jansen 2001: 205–206).

The wider acceptance of La Tène in temperate Europe is, in a limited way, comparable to the dispersion of ‘Greek’ cultural templates from the seventh century (so-called ‘Hellenization’) that did not imply large-scale migrations from Greece, or the Greek conquest of the Mediterranean, but rather the continuous expansion of cultural forms we recognize as ‘Greek’, their selective acceptance and hybridization with the existing indigenous cultural forms through expanded networks of contact, interchange and settlement either individual or through colonization of certain points (Dietler 1995; Domínguez 1999; Lomas 2005). *Mutatis mutandis*, the process of ‘becoming Roman’ does not imply flooding of Europe with the Romans, but the selective acceptance of Roman identity and cultural templates, this time accompanied with the ideology of newly-created elite discourse on the Roman empire and an Augustan reinvention of Romanness open to provincials willing to assume and negotiate that identity in local contexts, creating hybrid provincial ‘Roman’ identities (Woolf 1998; Webster 2001; Hingley 2005: 49–90).

The ‘Celtic tsunami’ and slippery evidence

The arrival of the ‘Celtic tsunami’ in southeastern Europe is also assumed through a combination of archaeology, onomastics and ancient written sources. However, taken individually neither of these show decisively that ‘Celtic tsunami.’ Archaeology does not show clear evidence of a replacement of the indigenous population with immigrants and an establishment of ‘Celtic’ ethnic pockets in the Central Balkans. All available evidence points to cohabitation of the new and old traditions such as funeral rites and the appearance of, usually locally produced, La Tène-style artifacts with the pre-La Tène-style artifacts, such as coarse hand-made pottery, in the area of northern Serbia – Pećine near Kostolac (Jovanović 1984), and Karaburma (Todorović 1972),
6 central and eastern Slavonia (Dizdar 2001: 66–69, 78–96; Dizdar 2004: 78–89; Dizdar & Potrebica 2002), and northwestern Thrace (Theodossiev 2000: 98–100; 2005). La Tène-style artifacts later also appear in central Thrace – the valley of Kazanlák (Emilov 2005), western Serbia – Krajičinovići near Priboj (Zotović 1987) and southern Serbia (Jovanović 1995; Popović 2005). The appearance of La Tène artifacts, mostly weapons and jewellery, in the north of the Balkan peninsula (Popović 1991: 341, fig. 1) is not the only evidence that points to population movements, or conquest, as they can be interpreted in various ways that imply cultural exchange and globalization of cultural forms as this paper suggests.

Onomastics cannot be taken too decisively as evidence for mass-migrations either. Language does not reflect ethnicity, as the assumption that those who spoke, what linguists call Celtic language(s), must identify themselves as ‘Celts’, or be a compact group that shares the same identity makes no sense (Collis 1997: 198–199), as a linguistic group cannot be equated with ethnic group by default (Hall 1997: 143–180). In addition to this, there are only a few place-names in southeastern Europe that could be safely identified linguistically as Celtic, and it seems that these toponyms and names were concentrated in isolated enclaves (Falileyev 2005; 2005a). This might correspond with the above-mentioned views of sporadic population movement, and the concept of ‘cumulative Celticity’. The names of the ‘Celtic’ Scordisci are mainly non-Celtic with only occasional names that might be interpreted as ‘Celtic’ (Katičić 1965: 63–69). Similar to ‘Celtic’ graves in Hungary, human remains from the La Tène necropolis in Pećine show a heterogeneity of physical

---

7 The chronology of Todorović was updated and partially corrected by Božić, cf. Božić 1981 and 1987. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for this information.
8 It is worth mentioning so-called ‘dialectic continua’ that cut across the linguistic boundaries and form common linguistic forms between different languages (Hall 1997: 171–172).
features, including some that might imply migrant population, but with an overwhelming presence of features that are common to an indigenous population (Mikić 1987: 42–45, see n. 5 above).

The most significant parts of the existing explanatory framework are, therefore, written sources. These were not criticized properly and assessed inside their contextual meaning and genre by earlier scholarship, but rather analyzed through Quellenforschung and accepted more or less literally as accurate descriptions of the events. What do we know about those supposed migrations over the Transdanubia and Balkan peninsula in the fourth century? Justin (i.e. Pompeius Trogus) stated that, forced by overpopulation, the ‘Celts’ moved from behind the Alps, and some penetrated the Illyrian gulf (Illyricus sinus) and some went to Italy (Just. Epit. 24.4.3). However, he earlier (Just. Epit. 20.5.7) provides a completely different reason for the migrations – discord and contentions amongst the ‘Celts’. Justin further states that the invaders settled in Pannonia and slaughtered numerous barbarians, fighting their way through hostile areas. After that they are said to have conquered the Pannonii and carried out further wars with their neighbours. This story derives from the same source as Livy’s (Livy, 5.34) statement that the king of the Bituriges sent two sons, one to Italy and the other towards the East (Hercunian forest). Livy is however limiting migrations in Italy only to the Gaules from central and southern Gaul (Livy, 5.34.1, cf. Caes. B Gall. 1.1) and depicts these migrations as a long-term process.

Both Livy and Trogus should be observed in the context their works were made. Trogus is a Gaul of the Voscontii people, a third generation of Roman citizens (Just. Epit. 43.5.11 – Gaulish ancestry; Epit. 43.1.1 – Roman identity; Alonso-Núñez 1987: 57), and Livy was a willing propagandist of the Augustan regime, therefore it is no wonder both of them had a hidden agenda influencing their accounts. Livy was helping in the creation of a new imperial ideology and reinvention of Roman identity. His lack of interest in foreign cultures and stereotyping of barbarians is apparent and notorious, so the episode of the sack of Rome by barbarian Gauls should be seen in this context (Galinsky 1996: 280–287; Kraus & Woodman 1997: 51–81, esp. 70–74). Dobesch (1999: 37) also notes the strong contemporary influence of Caesar’s depiction of the Gallic wars in Livy’s account of the Gallic invasions. Trogus’ Gaulish identity was created by the Romans, largely by Caesar himself in de Bello Gallico, in order to make easier management of the local population against the ‘Germans’ that are in the same way constructed as an artificial ethnic category (Woolf 1998: 242; Lund 1998; Riggsby 2006: 28–32, 46 ff.; Krebs 2006).

Trogus identified himself with civilized Gauls as his ancestors but also regarded Rome as his patria, and positive bias towards his (imagined) Gallic ancestors is clearly visible in their depictions (Urban 1982: 1424–1433; Malaspina 1976; Alonso-Núñez 1987: 69). The sources for book 24 of Trogus are not clearly identified, the excursus on migrations was possibly taken from Timagenes (Forni & Angeli Bertinelli 1982: 1343–1344, 1357). There is also an emphasis in his universal history on simultaneous events occurring throughout the Mediterranean. Trogus subordinates space to time in order to make significant historical events simultaneous (Clarke 1999a: 267 ff.). There is a convenience of approach for the author of universal history (Seel 1982 – universal history genre in Trogus) to ascribe common roots to the origin of the sack of Rome 390 and the invasion of Greece a century later.

Pausanias is another source that implies the arrival of the ‘Celts’ in Greece from a faraway land. He has a rather odd depiction of the ‘Celtic homeland’ (Paus. 3.4.1, cf. 1.4.1). Pausanias locates his ‘Celts’ in the most remote portion of Europe near the river Eridanus in semi-mythical surroundings, in the generic north of Greek imagination. Pausanias is not interested in the facts, so he details legends rather than providing the accurate description, for example, stating in 5.12.7 that amber is found in the sand of the Eridanus, something that could not relate to the river Po (cf. Plin. HN 37.31). It is also important to note the symbolism in this story. The Delphic oracle is significantly connected with the Hyperboreans who are said to be its mythical founders in Greek mythological tradition (Hdt. 4.33; Paus. 10.5.9; Plut. De Pyth. or. 402d; Katić 1995: 41–42; Romm 1992: 61 ff.), and the ‘Celts’ in Pausanias’ story arrived from the river Eridanus in a Hyperborean domain.

Most certainly Pausanias relied in this instance on Hieronymus of Cardia who lived in the time of the attack on Delphi and who reveals grossly distorted geographical misconceptions of his times (Hornblower 1981: 72–74; Habicht 1986: 85, n. 72, 97; Bosworth 2002: 169–209). Pausanias’ work, 9 The note of Polybius (Polyb. 2.20) that the ‘Celts’ suffered had luck in war in this period should be seen in the same context of general history, and the role of Tyche as a capricious deity in his writings (Wallbank 1957: 190–191).
10 Eridanus is in older Greek tradition linked with Hyperborean north and amber, and later with the river Po. However it was considered to be a mythical river even in antiquity (Strabo, 5.1.9; Plin. HN 37.31–32 cf. Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopaedie 6: 446–448).
11 However, Pausanias’ frequent reliance on local informants and oral tradition (Pretzler 2006) might also contribute to some distortions of Hieronymus, or he could draw his information from Timaeus and Phylarchus (Strootman 2005: n. 3).
as a whole, frequently escapes its Roman imperial present and lingers in nostalgia for past Greek greatness and glory, constructing Greece as a discourse of Greek identity rather than providing an accurate description (Elsner 1992; 2001: 18–21; Bowie 1996, esp. 208; Swain 1996: 330–356 esp. 333–335). No wonder Pausanias made the sack of Delphi such an extraordinary episode by constructing the invaders as a ‘hyper-Other’, and presented this event as a pan-Hellenic struggle for Greek survival, surpassing even the Persian wars in importance (Sidebottom 2002: 498). In reality the ‘Celtic wars’ were not even a shadow of danger the Persian invasion had been for Greece. They were used as a useful propaganda tool by Hellenistic royal ideology (including the Aeolian league), which constructed these events as an attack on the civilization itself, similar to the mythical Gigantomachia. This time, instead of Heracles and the gods the disaster was prevented only by the Hellenistic kings, who delivered the Greeks from the barbarian onslaught and in turn were entitled to receive divine honors (Strootman 2005).

All the other evidence from Diodorus, Pausanias and Justin-Trogus relates only to the raids of the ‘Celts’ on Thrace, Macedonia, Greece, ethnic Illyrians, and the establishment of identity perceived as Celtic-Illyrian-Thracian Scordisci in the later period. No other authority states that the ‘Celts’ arrived from a faraway homeland, or that they were recently settled in southeastern Europe, so by discrediting Trogus, Livy and Pausanias we are left without a credible source that those who attacked Macedonia and Greece arrived or descended from a faraway land. In fact, all the sources that mention their homeland locate it not too far from the Mediterranean world. Pausanias implies that the invaders returned home after each of their raids (Paus. 10.19.5 ff.), Diodorus implies that they tried to return home after their failed invasion of Greece (Diod. Sic. 22.9.3), and Justin (Just. Épit. 25.1.2–3), and Polybius (Polyb. 4.46.1) both knew of the detachment that had remained in their homeland and from there attacked the Thracians, Getae and Triballi, later fighting the Macedonian king Antigonus Gonatas, while Livy (Livy. 38.16) only knows that the ‘Celts’ somehow came to Dardania.

So, it is reasonable to conclude that there are two traditions in regards to the arrival of the ‘Celts’ to southeastern Europe, which the sources have transmitted, both are untrustworthy when analyzed in more detail. The whole legend of Grossvölkerwanderung of 200,000 Celts crossing Illyricum, fighting their way through the nameless barbarians for a century, settling in Pannonia and conquering the Pannonii, seems impossible to believe as it has been constructed by the sources. Pausanias, on the other hand, shows nothing but misconceptions of the space from earlier times, and reflects Greek mythology and Hellenistic political propaganda discourse. Thus, it looks more accurate if the explanation is looked at in more regional settings.

‘Celts’ and ’natives’: fragmenting the fragmentary fragments of the evidence

The next piece of written evidence is the block of reports of interaction between the ‘Celts’ and the indigenous population in the central Balkans. The sources Theopompus and Polyaenus evidently depict the same event, although it is not clear whether conflict occurred between the ‘Celts’ and the Autariatae (Polyaenus, Strat. 7.43 A11) or the ‘Celts’ and ethnic Illyrians (Theopomp. FGrH 115 F39–40 [=Athen. 10.443 b–c]). Some scholars (Mócsy 1972; Bearzot 2004) try to reconcile these accounts, while others (Papazoglou 1978: 104–105; Wilkes 1992: 138) dispute its authenticity. The event is usually dated in 359–358 as book II of Theopompus’ Philippics that deals with this period, but it might also be dated to 344–343, or even later (Flower 1994: 120–121). However, it must be clear that the fragmentary nature of Theopompus’ work does not allow us to be precise as to whether this event happened before, during this period or was incorporated by Theopompus as after-knowledge that would allow it to be dated until his death c. 305 as the latest date.

Strabo claims that the Scordisci broke the hegemony of the Autariatae, who broke the earlier hegemony of the Triballi over the area (Strabo, 7.5.11). In composition of his Geography Strabo was frequently trying to establish the sequence of regional hegemons in order to show how temporal change affected a particular space, juggling in that way space and time. He was not necessarily interested in providing an accurate historical account, but rather combined his sources into a stylistic construction, in this case...
constructing an imaginary Illyricum, a space civilized by the Romans (Clarke 1999: 252–260, 299 ff., – Strabo’s composition; Džino forthcoming a – Strabo’s imaginary Illyricum).

Appian gives a very historically sloppy story of the Autariatae joining the ‘Celts’ in their raid on Greece. Although different historical periods are mixed in his account it seems reasonable to believe that the Autariatae joined in the Delphic expedition with the new overlords or even equal partners (App. Ill. 5; Dobesch 2001: 950 ff.; Šašel Kos 2005: 188–190).

In the 310s Cassander was in conflict with the Autariatae (Diod. Sic. 20.19.1; Just. Epit. 15.2) but also fought with undisclosed ‘Celts’ (Plin. HN 31.5; Theophr. In Seneca Quaest. Nat. 3.11.2). It does seem as though the Autariatae was a group name only, rather than a political or even an ethnic identity, given by outside observers to the population of eastern Bosnia, northern Montenegro and western Serbia who shared a common regional cultural habitus of what is known in archaeology as a Glasinac cultural group (Papazoglu 1978: 87 ff. esp. 106–109).

The ‘Adriatic Celts’ who met Alexander in 335 during his expedition against the Triballi, mentioned by Strabo (Strabo, 7.3.8) and Arrian (Arr. Anab. 1.4.6) are significant evidence but only if explained in the context. Some scholars assume that those are the ‘Celts’ from the Italian Adriatic coast (Zanimović 2001) and some see them as the ‘Celts’ from the Pannonian hinterland or Transdanubia (Vulić 1926; Todorović 1970; Szabó 1999: 315), but in fact they can be whomever the original source Ptolemy (Ptolemy, FGrH 138 F2) perceived as the ‘Celts,’ either for their armor, clothes, appearance or language. They are not evidence of ‘Celtic’ migration through the Pannonian basin, but rather evidence of ongoing contact and exchange between Macedonia and central/eastern Europe, like the dispersion of Phillip II’s coinage in central Europe (Allen 1980: 46 ff.). Archaeology confirms the significant negotiation of La Tène cultural forms amongst the population north of the river Sava (later known as the Pannonii), but it does not make them Celts, it only creates a perception that they are more-less ‘celticized,’ i.e. that they accepted and rejected La Tène templates in different degrees in the construction of their identities in this period and later (Zanimović 2001: 61–62; Dizdar 2004: 552–554; Dizdar & Potrebica 2002; 2005; Đomić-Kunić 2006: 74–81).

The attack of the ‘Celts’ on Macedonia and Greece is difficult to reconstruct for semi-mythical and contradictory evidence of the sources (Polyb. 4.46.1, 9.30.3, 9.35.4; Diod. Sic. 22.9; Paus. 10.19.5 ff.; Just. Epit. 24.4 ff.; Nachtergael 1977: 1–205; Rankin 1987: 83–102). There was a chaotic situation in the whole region, and a significant political instability in Macedonia (Hammond & Walbank 1988: 239–258). It is very possible that our sources comprised the events that were going on for a long time into a much shorter sequence of events, and that relates especially to Pausanias. His account mentions two expeditions, first by Camballus towards Thrace and second by three army groups attacking simultaneously the Thracians and Triballi, the Paeonians, Macedonians and ethnic Illyrians and third by Brennus and Achicorius against Greece. It was no doubt a very significant event in Greek history, “the second finest hour of Hellas”, as Rankin called it. It made an impact on developing the discourse wherein Hellenic identity was additionally constructed towards the “Other,” this time from the north, not from the east (Polyb. 2.35.7; Rankin 1987: 83–102; Strootman 2005). Brennus is almost certainly a mythical, or generic name, and the numbers given by Justin (Just. Epit. 24.6.1) of 150,000 infantry and 15,000 cavalry are nothing but a clear exaggeration. After the ‘Celtic’ defeat in Greece a new identity appears in southeastern Europe – the Scordisci. They are said to be of ‘mixed Celtic and Illyrian identity’ (Strabo, 7.5.12, cf. 7.3.11), but are also perceived as Thracians by Roman sources (Flor. 1.39; Livy, Per. 56, 58). The sources also claim that they are formed from the remainders of the ‘Celts’ who attacked Delphi (Posidonius ap. Athen. 6.234 a-b; Just. Epit. 32.3.6–12) and remain a dominant political force in this area until the Romans conquered them in the first century.

THE END OF THE ‘BRENNUS MODEL’

The ‘Brennus model’ implying ‘Celtic tsunami’ washing off southeastern Europe is difficult to hold in light of recent developments of post-processual ‘archaeology of ethnicity,’ a post-modernistic assessment of ethnicity and culture and contextual source-criticism. This model stands on the outdated Kossina-Childe ‘archaeology of cultures’ assuming that artefacts show ethnicity of those who used them by default. It also employs migration as the explanation of the process and accepts unreliable Greco-Roman sources at more-less face value.

---

15 Livy’s Gallic chieflain who sacked Rome is also called Brennus (Livy, 5.37.3).

16 Cf. Diodorus (Diod. Sic. 22.9.1) 150,000 and 10,000 cavalry; and Pausanias (Paus. 10.19.9) 152,000 and 20,000. The other army that invaded Macedonia and was defeated by Antigonus numbered a realistic 15,000 infantry and 3,000 cavalry (Just. Epit. 25.1.2). Only 4,000 Greeks defended Delphi with success against an alleged 65,000 enemy soldiers (Just. Epit. 24.7.8).
A new model, open for further upgrades and corrections, should be proposed here in order to explain the ‘Celtic migrations’ in southeastern Europe through the available evidence briefly overviewed above. The archaeological evidence shows a spread of cultural forms that is not necessarily achieved by the mass-migrations of ethnically homogeneous ‘Celts’ in central and southern Europe. "Cultures do not migrate. It is often only a very narrowly defined, goal-oriented subgroup that migrate." (Anthony 1990: 908). This process is in a degree comparable to the ‘Hellenization’ occurring through the copying and local production of Greek artifacts in the non-Greek contexts of Italy, Sicily, or Spain that show a significant presence of cultural hybridization (contributions of Jones & Buxeda y Garrigos, Antonacchio, Kerschner and Boardman in Lomas 2005: 55–162). Linguistic evidence reveals a bleak presence of Celtic toponyms and names in this area. The written sources depicting ‘Celtic migrations’ betray their literary genre, subjective and cultural-discursive perception, disinformation and the agenda of the sources not a scholarly approach towards history or ethnology.

We should examine these events in regional settings rather than continue to use Diodorus–Trogus’ universalistic approach to history after 2,000 years. Szabó integrates fragmentary sources and material evidence and assumes two phases of the ‘migrations’. First, in the fourth century when the ‘Celts’ consolidated their power in Pannonia, and the second their ‘thrust’ into southeastern Europe caused by a ‘global demographic explosion in the Celtic world’ (Szabó 1999: 315–316; Birkhan 1997: 130–132; not a new idea cf. Vulic 1926; Todorović 1970). Theodossiev advances this view and postulates a much more acceptable process of ‘ethnical intermingling’ and development of, what he calls, a Celto-Illyro-Thracian interaction zone of different cultural habitats. Strabo’s mention of a ‘Celt-Illyrian mixture’ of the Iapodes (Strabo, 6.4.10, 7.5.4) and ‘Celt-Thracian’ mixture of the Scordisci (Strabo, 7.3.11, 7.5.12) shows Strabo’s way of perceiving, rather than accurately describing, ‘barbarian’ identity. The ‘Celticity’ of the lapodes in Strabo 7.5.4 is seen through their use of ‘Celtic’ armor and their ‘Illyrianness’ through their custom of tattooing. There is no reason not to assume the similar process going on amongst the Scordisci, where the existing stereotypes of ‘Celts’ ‘Thracians’ and ‘Illyrians’ Strabo and his sources previously had, do not work, so their identity can be explained only through this picture of pseudo-ethnic intermingling.

Archaeology suggests that La Tène is selectively accepted and modified in southeastern Europe, it is not used as a tool for re-emphasising the identity of foreigners in the north and north-east Italy (Wells 1999: 46). It seems as though the indigenous population constructs their identity by recasting existing categories perceived by outsiders as ‘Thracian’ ‘Illyrian’ or ‘Celtic’ so that they can be perceived as belonging to all of those categories in the same time. In other words, they construct a hybrid or in fact a brand new39 Scordiscan identity as a product of constant negotiation between the existing regional cultural habitus and the La Tène and Mediterranean cultural templates.

If the ‘Celts’ were recent arrivals who established themselves in the northern parts of southeastern Europe a generation or two before Brennus, we must assume that they either came in large numbers and annihilated the indigenous population – that is not likely from the archaeological evidence that suggests a continuance of indigenous cultural forms and settlement patterns – or superimposed themselves as the elite over the ‘natives’ (Papazoglu 1978: 345 ff.; Tasić 1992), which is difficult to believe. The second view does not explain why a majority of indigenous population would accept the rule of the foreign elite, if not forced by overwhelming numbers, advanced technology, or a well-established social state structure/religion/ideology that could support colonial interaction, none of these are matter of fact in this case. What is especially difficult is to accept the view that the foreign elite remained in power over an indigenous majority withdrawing after their spectacular defeat in the Greek expedition, which is what the current view on Scordiscan ‘ethnegogenesis’ suggests.

The return to a regional context also helps to assess the political interaction of the ‘Celts’ and the indigenous population. The wars of the Autariatae/
Ardiaei and the ‘Celts’ from Theophompus and the Autariatae and Scordisci from Strabo seem to be a reflection of the same event. The Autariatae, who must be understood as a heterogeneous regional group neither ethnic nor political, are incorporated into a political alliance with the Celts/Scordisci whether by force, diplomacy or even active and willing participation. Together, they are involved in conflict with Macedonia and the invasion of Greece. The evidence of Cassander fighting the Autariatae and ‘Celts’ in 312 should thus be explained as part of the same event, the regional conflict between the Macedonian kingdom and a new political force in southeastern Europe, fighting for the succession of Phillip’s and Alexander’s European empire. Written evidence points out that the ‘Celts’ who attacked Macedonia and Delphi were a large political alliance bound by political power, not ethnic bonds, and it was dominated by the ‘Celts’ whose stronghold was in the area where classical sources located the Scordisci (Todorović 1980; Bearzot 2004: 77–78; Šašel Kos 2005: 138–139).

There is no reason not to see the leaders of this alliance of later-to-be-Scordisci essentially as indigenous population of the south-southeastern Pannonian plains whose elite underwent a strong influence from La Tène culture, and thus became ‘Celts’ in the eyes of outside observers who wrote our sources. This process can also be seen through the ‘cumulative celticity’ framework that implies long-time process of acquiring ‘Indo-European’ or ‘proto-Celtic’ cultural habitus that developed its base in Western Europe in the Bronze Age (Almagro-Gorbea 1993; 1995; 2001). The acceptance of La Tène cultural templates appears as a gradual and interactive process and does not imply the conquest of eastern or southeastern Europe by disorganized, wild ‘Celtic hordes’, but rather appears as a complex process of cultural interaction between different cultural templates through the circulation of goods and people. Therefore, some population movements are not to be ruled out completely, as this would result in the other extreme, wherein the “baby would be thrown out with the bathwater” (Anthony 1990; cf. Härke 2004 for early medieval Britain), but the scale of such movements must be significantly reduced in future interpretations.

The formation of common cultural templates in antiquity is well-known through the comparable examples of ‘Hellenization’ and ‘Romanization’ that represent different mechanisms of dispersion and the negotiation of cultural templates on different points in the space. The spread of La Tène could not be achieved without the movement of populations occurring in this time, possibly through small bands of settlers from central Europe searching for farmland, the establishment of trade links, warfare and answering the demand for mercenaries from the Hellenistic world. This itinerant population was spread throughout indigenous communities where they were not able to maintain original identities for a long time, such as the Greeks who settled outside of Greek colonies in the western Mediterranean (De Hoz 2005; Barron 2005). It must be clear that this population movement in no way resembled a population tide of ethnic or cultural ‘Other’ but initiated the formation of new, hybrid identities, comparable in a lesser degree to the role Greek colonies played in the western Mediterranean.

‘Becoming Celt’ is obviously artificial, but a very insightful depiction of the wider process that occurred with the dissemination of La Tène cultural templates through temperate Europe. Lack of relevant sources does not allow more insight into what the attraction was in participating in this continental globalization process, beyond what material evidence suggests. The artifacts of La Tène should be analyzed in this context, what they represented to those who used them. For comparison, the aristocrats belonging to the Thracian or Dacian cultural habitus were represented with La Tène weapons (Theodossiev 2000: 99) not only because they were aesthetically pleasing or because the weapons enabled them superiority in combat, but also for the message that this image sent to their community or the neighbours. Foreign symbols were given local meaning, the imports were adopted and presented as ‘native’ symbols, like in the later example of ‘Slavic’ migrations (Curta 2001: 307–310 esp. 309). They showed identity, not only status. The rise of the new, warrior-based ethos of La Tène B carried by the new, more egalitarian elites and a new military organization seems a valid explanatory framework at this moment (Dobesch 1996, esp. 34–35). Alternatively, we can assume that social transformations, such as institutionalization of hierarchical relationships in social groups (like clientele) and their implementation in the organizational structure of the society took place in this period in the La Tène world (Dipeveen-Jansen 2001: 209–213, T. 5.3).

The people of the La Tène world ‘became Celts’ only in our sources, as their socio-cultural appearance fit into the preconceptions of the Mediterranean observers who wrote the sources. ‘Becoming Celt’ is at first sight more comparable to the process of ‘Hellenization’ that was characterized by a selective acceptance of Greco-Mediterranean cultural templates than to ‘becoming Roman’, which was based on ideological self-determination for the benefits that this identity offered inside the Roman
empire. However, significant differences between the geographical circumstances of the Mediterranean (good communications and poor resources) and temperate Europe (poor communications and plentiful resources) makes this similarity artificial (Woolf 1993: 232–233). The Hellenocentric view of continental Europe as a periphery of the Mediterranean core is historically inaccurate for assuming a priori superiority of the Mediterranean (Dietler 1995: 91 ff), and space must be allowed for an explanatory framework that incorporates a ‘peer-polarity interaction’ model between different cultural templates in the ancient world (Renfrew & Cherry 1986; Babić 2002 – peer-polarity interaction in central Balkan peninsula in the early Iron age). To ‘become Celt’ was obviously equally attractive if not a more attractive choice of Mediterranean globalization for the communities that were ‘peripheral’ to the Mediterranean in this period. The degree of acceptance of the La Tène macro-cultural *habitus* also varies significantly in southern Pannonia and the middle Danube, showing a different level of acculturation amongst individual communities.

**THE CONCLUSION**

Therefore historical interpretation should take into account the rise of new identities and political force(s) in the confluence of the Danube and Sava and northwestern Thrace but also in modern-day central and eastern Slavonia. We can only assume that this political grouping of local communities was established c. 350, but its real expansion followed the death of Alexander the Great in 323. From what we know from the fragmentary sources, the Macedonians diminished the power of the Triballi in the 330s and left a political vacuum in southeastern Europe. Cassander checked the designs of the new political forces in Thrace in 312, but the unexpected defeat of Ptolemaeus Ceraunos and Macedonian army in 279 opened the way for expanding influence towards the south. The situation in 279 in fact seems like a large-scale regional conflict, which besides the ‘Celts’ and Macedonians, also involved ethnic Illyrians led by king Monunius and Ptolemaus – a son of Lysimachus and a pretender to the Macedonian throne.20 The expedition to Greece was apparently crushed, according to the very biased Greek sources, but the Scordisci, to call them by the later group name, remained a significant regional political factor until their defeat by the Romans. It is not implied here that there was a continuity of political institutions amongst the Scordisci, but rather a loose alliance of regional communities that were ruled by the strongest one, such as the ethnic Illyrians (Carlier 1987; Cabanes 1988). The disappearance of the Autariae is easily explained by the assumption of Scordiscan identity in the eyes of our sources. However, the framework of ‘becoming Celt’ is not limited to the Scordisci only but can be used in some other regional settings, which are different from Scordiscan. It can explain the discrepancy between the lack of Celtic onomastics and the significant presence of La Tène in central and eastern Thrace, associated with the ‘Celtic’ kingdom of Tylis (Polyb. 4.46; Falileyev 2005a – linguistics; Megaw 2004; Emilov 2005 – material culture; Lazarov 1993; 1996 – numismatics). It appears as another example of hybrid identity that was influenced by the warrior ethos and cultural aesthetics that symbolized the ethos of temperate Europe, negotiated with the existing indigenous cultural *habitus*. The ‘Celts’ in southeastern Europe were not necessarily an entirely different and foreign ‘ethnic element’ or ‘stratum,’ but the same people with a different way of expressing identity.

‘The arrival of Celts’ in southeastern Europe seems rather a consequence of the interaction of two different global culture-restructuring processes affecting indigenous communities, moving from south to north – ‘Hellenization,’ and from the north to south – ‘Lakenization’21 The north/northeast of southeastern Europe (southern Pannonian plains, northwestern Thrace and what would become Roman Moesia) thus became a zone of interaction and acculturation after the fourth century, the interface where hybrid identities are formed. They are not explained adequately only by the migratory movements of populations, or the creation of ‘mixed ethnicities’ but rather in the appeal of La Tène cultural templates and the appeal of ‘becoming Celt’ that influenced the construction of hybrid identities amongst an autochthon population. Hybridity obviously existed amongst those communities between the Sava and Drava rivers, that will become known as the Pannonii in Roman times, in an even more significant degree as they were placed between two distinct La Tène regional *habitus* represented by political alliances and perceived by the sources as the Scordisci and Taurisci (Dizdar 2004: 534 ff.; Dizdar & Potrebica 2005). This period brings significant changes in the formation of ethnic identities in fu-

---

19 Pyrrhus’ departure for Italy in 280 is also difficult to place in the context of wild barbarian hordes sweeping his neighbourhood.

ture Illyricum, already a dynamic and lively process. La Tène did not affect the area of the Dinaric Alps and Adriatic coast directly, but still had a limited impact on the areas south of the Sava river (Marić 1963; Paškvalin 2002; Perić 2002: 187-193).

The end of the ‘Brennus model’, as postulated and argued here, finally enables scholarship to assess the construction of identities in future Illyricum outside of the earlier ‘ethnogenesis framework’ (Benac 1987a) that assumes an evolution of ethnic identity through the sequence of historical, cultural and ethnic ‘layers’. The construction of group identities in future Illyricum should be seen for what it really was – a dynamic social process of perpetual negotiation between the autochthonous, regional cultural habitus and two different global cultural templates of equal importance – one from the Mediterranean and the other from temperate Europe.
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