

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Hodges, Matt (2002) Time and Modernity in the Mediterranean: A Case Study from Languedoc. *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*, 12 (1). pp. 191-221.

DOI

Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/27779/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

TIME AND MODERNITY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN: A CASE STUDY FROM LANGUEDOC

MATT HODGES

POSTPRINT

Published in Journal of Mediterranean Studies 12(1): 191-221, 2002

Contact Details:

School of Anthropology and Conservation, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent,
CT2 7NZ, UK ; email: m.hodges@kent.ac.uk; tel: + 44 (0)1227 823835.

ABSTRACT

This article develops a critical perspective on 'modernity', derived from an interest in the anthropology of time. Drawing on social scientific and philosophical work on time and temporality, I seek to unravel the temporal dimension of this term, both through an initial theoretical analysis and subsequent ethnographic interrogation. The ethnographic component of the article draws on a year's fieldwork in Monadières, a village near Narbonne, in Languedoc, France. Through a number of studies highlighting the changing temporalities of people's lives, the concept's utility is examined, and its relevance for discussion of the wider Mediterranean basin, and elsewhere, is brought out. The article concludes that for the notion of 'modernity' to retain critical utility, it must encompass a more precise appreciation of the temporal and contingent ethnographic features of social life.

PREAMBLE

For an anthropologist, it is indubitably clear that the interest of a concept should relate to its utility in interpreting specific instances of social life, and their relationship to a wider historical continuum. Anthropologically speaking, such is the way in which theoretical models, for all their attraction in the abstract, must in the last instance be judged. From this point of view, perhaps the attraction of a volume such as the current one is precisely its attempt to wed the generalising concept of modernity, renowned for its extensive, and it should be said, often highly decontextualised literature, to the concrete, if contentious historical context of the Mediterranean. In this article I will be taking this process of fleshing out one stage further by locating the notion of modernity in a still more precise historical reality: that of the confines of the village in Southern France where I recently carried out ethnographic fieldwork on the anthropology of time. In doing so, however, my goal is not merely an interpretative, but also a reflective one. In an approach characteristic of much recent critical anthropological writing, it is through the application of this perspective on time and temporality, I argue below, to an ethnographic discussion of Southern French ‘modernity’, that certain fresh insights can be obtained into this complex and contested theoretical tool.

From 1996-7 I lived and worked in Monadières, which lies on a large brackish lagoon bordering the Mediterranean Sea, some 10 kilometres from the city of Narbonne in the Aude *département* of the Languedoc *région* of Southern France.¹ A village of some 500 permanent inhabitants, and the administrative centre of the *commune* that bears its name, it is clustered on and around an outcrop of rock that juts out into the lake’s southern half. This lake supported one of the two local economic activities for which the village was renowned: during my stay it was still fished by the

12 remaining fishermen from the village for the eels that swim in its briny waters. As for the other, much of Monadières' arid, stony earth, crossed by the motorway that led to Montpellier and Toulouse in the north and Barcelona in the south, was covered with stubby vines whose grapes were used to produce the local variety of Corbières wine.

The village population, however, was far from comprising an integrated, indigenous community living off fishing and agriculture. While a third of permanent residents did claim an indigenous heritage, the other two-thirds were either second or third generation, or more recent immigrants, and 30% of the houses in the village belonged to second-home owners, of predominantly urban, north European origin. Any sense of local community was thus significantly fragmented.² Agriculture and fishing were also no longer the predominant local sources of employment: in 1990, only 15% of the village lived exclusively off viticulture and fishing, as opposed to 75% in 1946, and the many other people who grew grapes did so to supplement an income derived principally from other jobs, 50% of the active population working in the shops, service industries, and factories of nearby Narbonne, only ten minutes away by car.³ The decreasing importance of Monadières as a site of economic activity, however, has recently been countered. Historical change in France in the last 40 years, as in many other parts of the world, has been substantially influenced by the growth of an internal, and international tourist industry. In Languedoc, this initially took the form of a series of state-inspired coastal developments during the 1960s and 1970s, which resulted in the building of extensive tourist accommodation and other related infrastructure along all parts of the region's coastline. Monadières, and two other villages on the lake's borders, for various reasons remain the only coastal settlements in proximity to water throughout the whole of Languedoc which have escaped

substantial restructuring. However, during the 1980s and 1990s some local inhabitants began to cash in on the growing numbers of tourists that wandered from the beaches in the summer months to frequent the villages of the hinterland, instigating a moderately successful form of heritage tourism (c.f. Hodges 2001). In sum, Monadières has been subject to rapid, and extensive social change in the last thirty years, compounded by wider developments in French society associated with consumer capitalism, and has also experienced a more gradual but significant and consistent rate of change since the advent of viticultural capitalism in the early 19th century.

Such a history should render Monadières' characterisation in terms of philosophical and sociological notions of modernity a viable possibility, if not entirely unproblematic. But coming from the perspective of the anthropology of time, of potential critical relevance given the intrinsic temporal claims of modernity as a concept (Habermas 1990:1-22, Koselleck 1985, Osborne 1991), the central question that concerns me in this article is the extent to which this notion compares with an anthropological sense of the historically continuous and discontinuous, the incessant structuring and re-structuring of social life, which has characterised 'modern times' in Monadières. How useful is 'modernity' for the discussion of the minutiae of how we experience historical time? To what extent does it permit us to articulate the complex ways in which we experience and appropriate pasts, presents and futures in our everyday lives? Is it limiting, or enabling in an analysis of the power relationships that structure, and are structured by such temporal experiences? And by consequence, how do such insights illuminate and refashion our conceptions of modernity? In addressing these questions I base my analysis on a practice-based theory of the human experience

of time as ‘temporality’, itself predicated on a wider understanding of time based on Deleuze’s work on Bergsonian duration.

The perspective on temporality adopted here draws in part on the work of Nancy Munn (1992). In a key passage from her seminal paper, Munn sets out a view of the human experience of time:

‘[Human temporality is] a symbolic process continually being produced in everyday practices. People are “in” a sociocultural time of multiple dimensions (sequencing, timing, past-present-future relations, etc.) that they are forming in their “projects”. In any given instance, particular temporal dimensions may be foci of attention or only tacitly known. Either way, these dimensions are lived or apprehended concretely via the various meaningful connectivities among persons, objects, and space continually being made in and through the everyday world’ (1992:116).

Encompassing, therefore, human temporality firmly within the sphere of contemporary ‘practice theory’, for Munn the conscious and tacit, embodied experience of time occurs through discrete *temporalising practices*, and her theoretical apparatus makes for the detailed analysis of them. It should be added that, in keeping with recent trends in anthropological theory (e.g. Wolf 1982, Mintz 1985, Roseberry 1989), analysis should also involve situating any contingent temporalising practice in its historical context, something that Munn downplays and I am concerned to address here.

Well-equipped as Munn’s practice approach is to the discussion of the day-to-day generation of temporal reality, however, it fails to establish the relationship between cultural and objective time, the clarification of which enables further theoretical elaboration. My own perspective relies on Deleuze’s critical development of the work of Henri Bergson (Bergson 1988, Deleuze 1991, 1994), where human temporality is situated ‘within’ the concrete, continuous, but self-differentiating flux

of *la durée*, or ‘durational time’.⁴ By contrast with Munn, therefore, and in keeping with Deleuze’s materialist perspective, human temporality lies in a complex relationship with durational time, which encloses and encompasses it while remaining inaccessible to direct human representation. In brief, this reveals the partially determined, but inherently cultural nature of human temporality, as durational time underpins the implicitly temporal nature of human existence, and the physical laws which govern it, while the experience, appropriation and representation of time reside largely in the domain of cultural practice. And in this respect it should also be noted that to conceptualise these processes in language is a task that can complement and quantify, but not represent the complex qualitative experience of duration that constitutes our lives – as Bergson and Deleuze have made clear, conceptual thought can only constitute a spatialisation of lived duration.

Elaborating on Munn’s approach, therefore, every social practice entails a *temporal modality*, an implicit orientation towards past, future, habit and innovation, which is related to social reproduction. This is because human sociality is situated in durational time and consequently is inherently temporal in nature. However, such temporal modalities do not necessarily tally with cultural perceptions of significant pasts and futures and their roles in perpetuating, or disrupting social reproduction. They are, moreover, quasi-objective features of social life, which are perhaps more directly accessible to the analyst than to the practitioner (c.f. Bourdieu 1977), and as will become clear, through their significant role in social reproduction are of key importance to a discussion of modernity. As for the conscious and tacit, embodied experience of time and continuity by subjects, or their *temporal outlook*, this is shaped, but not determined by the temporal modality of their actions; exists in a complex relationship with the ‘natural’ temporalities of the human body and physical

world; and is mediated by contingent cultural devices used for the organisation and evocation of temporal phenomena (for example, calendars, clocks, and so on) – these I term the *temporal fabric* of everyday life. While this image of human temporality as a partly-determined, historically-situated social practice is necessarily abbreviated, it provides a workable foundation for the analysis that follows, as we shall now see.⁵

RETHINKING ‘MODERNITY’

To what extent does the current literature on ‘modernity’ correlate with an anthropological analysis of human temporality? To address this question it is first necessary to undertake a critical review of such literature, and in keeping with my temporal emphasis I focus henceforth on the insights offered by an analysis of the temporalities of modernity itself, both as a conceptual apparatus, and a proposed historical epoch. One possible starting-point is the work of Anthony Giddens, a key contributor to this literature, who has defined this problematic term as ‘modes of organisation of social life which emerged in Europe from about the 17th century onwards and which subsequently became more or less worldwide in their influence’ (Giddens 1990:1). The objectives of writers such as Giddens have been to illustrate at a very general level the sociological characteristics of modernity as a contemporary, and predominantly capitalist period of human history. However, their assumptions regarding the temporality of modernity, while featuring prominently in their arguments, have often remained untheorised, rather than being problematised and brought to the fore. In this respect, the pre-modern period has been unreflexively characterised as consisting of ‘traditional’ societies, where the future is produced and conceived of in the past’s image; whereas the modern period that has succeeded it is comprised of ‘post-traditional’ societies, where the future is an all-encompassing

concern and the past pales into insignificance. The ethnographic detail of these historical periods, for the main part, remains implicitly Northern European/North American in origin, and lacking in specificities, and actual temporalities of everyday practice are not usually addressed.⁶

It is clear that for many of these writers, the characterisation of an era of 'gesellschaft' relies implicitly on its opposition to a vanished past of 'gemeinschaft' (Tonnie 1955, c.f. Habermas 1990:11-16). In the past few years, however, the broad generalisations that are the hallmark of this distinction, and of much writing on modernity as a whole, have become increasingly problematic. Heelas, in the introduction to a recent volume addressing the traditional/post-traditional distinction that is a principal feature of such periodisations, notes how 'although it cannot be denied that detraditionalisation has taken place, it is nevertheless possible to argue that claims that we have lurched – or are lurching – into a post-traditional age are highly contestable' (1996:1).⁷ He goes on to outline what he terms the 'radical thesis', typified by the work of Giddens and other writers proposing widespread 'detraditionalisation', a decline in the significance of the past, and a growth in the importance of the future. He contrasts this to a 'coexistence thesis', which emphasises the constructed nature of 'traditions', and while acknowledging the importance of widespread social change in recent European, and world history, proposes that this is an uneven and contingent set of transformations and must be examined as such.⁸

From the perspective on temporality adopted in this article, the distinction between the implicit temporal modalities of social practices, and the qualities of continuity or discontinuity with the past such practices are perceived to possess by those involved in them, clearly problematises any straightforward labelling of 'pre-modern' sociality as 'traditional'. First, any approach to 'tradition' that inserts its

analysis into a historical context must acknowledge that no social practices have *ever* existed beyond the reach of social transformations of one form or another (Wolf 1982). Secondly, an emphasis on social life as existing in durational time stresses that no repetition in the reproduction of social life is *ever* ‘the same’. As I clarify below, a ‘traditional’ society is therefore only ever an interval of apparent stability between two periods of social transformation – such ‘stability’ indicates that social reproduction is dominated by past-oriented temporal modalities, while in periods of social transformation such modalities are of necessity future-oriented (although to complicate matters the *habit* of anticipation could itself be considered as past-oriented in nature). This discursive labelling of the ‘traditional’ or ‘non-traditional’ by the analyst is therefore based on the recognition of such modal predominance rather than the identification of a transcendent element within social life itself, the conditions of durational time pointing to the ‘never-the-same’ of a world continuously in flux. And although political in consequence, such a perspective should be analytically distinguished from those political claims on the traditional perpetuated by local subjects. It is clear, for example, that a short-term, past-oriented, or ‘traditional’ temporal modality can be endowed with a ‘factually incorrect’ long-term temporal continuity by those involved in it (c.f. Hobsbawn & Ranger 1985), an anomaly, incidentally, which would be overlooked by an approach concerned solely to identify the ‘pre-modern’ as ‘traditional’.

By contrast with the advocates of the ‘radical’ thesis, in considering the temporal distinctiveness of modern times in Monadières what is required is a tripartite examination of temporal modalities, indigenous temporal outlooks, and relevant wider historical contexts, permitting an analysis that explicitly considers some or all of these categories depending on specific objectives. An approach, it could

be argued, that with its emphasis on ethnographic contingency constitutes an anthropological correlative to Heelas's 'coexistence thesis'. In addition, application of this anthropological 'coexistence thesis' also offers some interesting possibilities regarding the literature on modernity, in particular for the consideration of the Mediterranean region. For rather than accepting, or rejecting wholeheartedly the temporal generalisations of the 'radical' modernity theorists, one may instead begin to contextualise their work in the examination of ethnographic specifics. Let us begin by considering the past's role in social practice.

THE PAST IN THE PRESENT

With respect to the temporality of 'pre-modern', or 'traditional' sociality, Giddens notes: '[w]here traditional modes of practice are dominant, the past inserts a wide band of "authenticated practice" into the future. Time is not empty, and a consistent "mode of being" relates future to past' (1991:48). Giddens's comments may be elaborated with reference to Osborne's examination of 'tradition': 'As a form of temporalisation,' he writes, 'tradition is distinguished by its apparent prioritisation of the past over the present and future. The future is envisaged in the image of the past, and the present appears solely in its mediating function as a link in the chain of generations' (Osborne 1995:127). In circumstances where 'tradition' is the dominant mode of social reproduction, however, the performance of such social practice does not go without saying. As Osborne continues: '[i]nsofar as the continuity of this chain [of tradition] must be secured anew in each generation, the process of handing down is fraught with the risk of failure in the present... As a result the continuity of tradition requires a constant exercise of authority to combat the threat of betrayal inherent in its temporal structure' (1995:127). In 'traditional' societies, therefore, the

past is the dominant index of temporal modality, the future enacted in its image, and its authority must be continually reinforced to ensure the fabric of social life does not disintegrate. And for a society to remain ‘traditional’ social change must be minimal, indeed its inherent disposition is to resist such change, given the reproductive symmetry imposed on past and future.

From a long-term historical perspective it is clear that even before the 17th century, which Giddens marks as the beginning of the historical period of modernity, the region of Languedoc regularly underwent social crises and transformations that render the suggestion of a pre-modern era of ‘traditional’ stability unfeasible.⁹ This is of course in keeping with the perspective of the ‘coexistence thesis’, and does not exclude the possibility that there were periods of comparative social stability both before, and since the 17th century when aspects of the temporal modality of social life were predominantly past-oriented, or ‘traditional’ in nature. However, I shall show that in general the presence of past-oriented, ‘traditional’ temporal modalities in social life has decreased in favour of future-oriented ones, in particular since the 1960s when the residents of Monadières have experienced a period of rapid social transformation, acknowledged in their own recollections of that time (this does not discount the importance of the past in other ways, as we shall see). I shall focus in this section on the predominant economic activities over this period, viticulture and fishing (which are therefore most likely to have produced ‘traditions’ that could subsequently have disappeared), before moving on to discuss more general aspects of economic and social life during my time in the village in the next section.

Let us consider first a brief history of viticulture in the *commune* since the early 19th century. As the most important economic activity from the mid-19th century to the 1950s, and the subject of a veritable economic boom during the 1870s and 1880s,

its periods of change and transformation registered throughout all aspects of life in Monadières during this time. The transition from a predominantly polycultural, subsistence economy to a predominantly capitalist, monocultural one by the 1870s required substantial modifications of existing social customs, as the workforce adopted the new organisational arrangements and ethos of petty commodity production (particularly among the hundreds of economic migrants who flooded the area, their lives characterised by the disruption of routines that comes with fresh starts). The temporal modalities of social life must therefore have shifted accordingly, allowing the abandonment of the historic cultivation of olives and arable crops for the possibilities of an alternative future of viticulture. Yet even after this initial transition to the monoculture of the vine, which was complete by the 1880s, subsequent transformations were in store. The crisis of *phylloxera*, a highly destructive insect infestation, occasioned a further reorganisation of the workforce, as smaller producers went out of business. Then, 30 years later, market crises and the advent of the wine co-operative swung production once more around in their favour. Mechanisation followed in the 1950s, which saw the workforce decrease dramatically in size and the introduction of new techniques of production, effects vividly described to me by older wine growers who suddenly found themselves working alone with machines for much of the time, rather than in the company of others. And throughout this time there was the need to consider what the future course of markets and innovation might bring, such as a drop in prices, or new techniques that had to be mastered, concomitant with the emphasis of capitalist economic practice on the securing of profits.

While from a long-term historical perspective viticulture is marked by change and transition, and a consequent remodelling of its implicit temporal modalities, it must, however, be recalled that these changes took place over many years, and,

importantly, in terms of the lived experience of individuals many aspects of everyday temporal modalities may have remained consistent for much of their lives. Indeed, in conversation it was those periods of intensive, substantial change such as the mechanisation that took place during the 1950s that were often singled out as worthy of comment, rather than the intermediate periods when new techniques had been mastered, and daily practices once again oriented themselves towards the routine reproduction of the past. ‘Traditional’ practices, in the sense of predominantly past-oriented temporal modalities, are therefore likely to have been present in periods of short-term social stability that, apparently insignificant from a long-term perspective, nevertheless stretched over significant periods of a life being lived. The interplay between stability and social transformation is illustrated by an example dating from my own stay in Monadières during 1996-7.

INNOVATIONS ON A VITICULTURAL ESTATE IN THE 1990S

Next door to my flat in Monadières, and located on one of the main streets, was the *cave*¹⁰ of an estate that had once been one of the largest in the village. Originally owned by Gabriel Cros-Mayrevieille, long-time mayor of the village during the first half of the century, it was now owned by Eliane Mercadier, a female descendant of his who, like Cros-Mayrevieille before her, lived for a large part of the time outside Monadières. The estate was run by a manager, a stocky wiry-haired man in his fifties called Jacques Durand, who had come to Monadières as a child when his father was himself appointed manager of the estate in the 1950s, and was helped on and off by his son André. When I arrived in Monadières it was one of the two left in the village that still produced and sold their own wine: all the other producers tracted their grapes across a causeway over the lake to the local wine co-operative in nearby

Peyriac-de-Mer. Since their heyday at the turn of the century viticultural estates in the *commune* had been in progressive decline, a trend playing out its end-game during my stay in the village, as we shall shortly see.

Unlike the co-operative in Peyriac, these estates did not have the capital to adopt all the latest techniques in vinification that have brought recent financial stability to the co-operative over the last decade. But if Jacques Durand differed from the *cave* with respect to the capital at his disposal, he also differed regarding his attitude to the wine-making process. He preferred to make wine the way his father had, rather than looking to the new technologies of wine production, or experimenting with different varieties and blends of grape, as the co-operative did. And when change was forced upon him, through the adoption of new fertilisers or machinery, he accepted it begrudgingly. Ironically, even if he had been interested in adopting wholeheartedly the new techniques, he probably could not have afforded the necessary equipment. But at the same time, for Jacques Durand the way of making wine that he had learned when he was younger stubbornly coloured the way he approached his work. And inherent to this approach was the attitude that to change was foolish, and innovation was to be distrusted.

Jacques Durand's approach to viticulture is engaging. For his attitude demonstrates that past-oriented temporalities could survive in the changing world of viticulture, and that continuous transformation in the long-term could still permit short-term pockets of 'traditional' practice from one generation to the next. Indeed, although he never explicitly referred to his attitude as part of a 'tradition', he certainly saw continuity between his approach and that of his father, and said as much.¹¹ In the world of viticulture, such attitudes are increasingly uncommon, however, and during 1997 the estate reached a point where it could no longer operate independently. Due

to the decreasing demand for the poor quality wine that Durand produced, and the changes in markets and production that were, for financial reasons, also rendering the ‘tradition’ of the small independent estate obsolete, the business finally became financially unviable and Eliane Mercadier took the only option open to her: she decided to join the wine co-operative. The responsibility for responding to the demands of innovation was handed over to the management of the co-operative, which provided this service for other producers in the village, and Jacques Durand was left in charge of the growing of grapes.

* * *

A close comparison of Durand’s identification of continuity between his own and his father’s activities, with the conditions of gradual but consistent social change that separated them, illustrates the necessity of distinguishing between historically changing temporal modalities and the temporal outlook of subjects. His story therefore provides a neat example of the sort of contingency that Heelas’s ‘radical theorists’ might overlook. At a more general level, it also points to the need for those involved in viticulture today to remain open to future possibilities, and to draw on past experience only to the extent that it is productive in the present context. This is a shift in the temporal modality of viticulture that has become increasingly pervasive as the industry has developed. Whereas in earlier periods change was experienced at times of crisis, which although intensive, were sporadic in nature, when I lived in Monadières viticultural production required continual openness to innovation, and the capital to finance it, to compete in a dynamic, and volatile market.

But can these observations not be made more specific concerning different sections of the viticultural workforce?¹² Of the 20 or so people employed full-time in viticulture in Monadières, by September 1997 all were wine growers (if one includes Durand) except for two: the non-resident employer of Jacques Durand, and a wealthy Monadiéroise who still managed her own, independent estate. The managers of the nearby co-operative, already implicated in our discussion, lived outside the village, were born outside the immediate locality, and had usually benefited from higher education and institutionally-based vocational training. While the status of managers is self-evident (if slightly differing), wine growers maintained the appearance of an artisanal class while effectively constituting a viticultural proletariat. As Lem (1999:216) has pointed out for nearby Broussan, despite the economic security offered by co-operatives, ‘growers have increasingly become alienated from the products of their labour and their work has become transformed from an artisan-like undertaking to a kind of work that resembles factory work, in which workers produce one component of a product that is sold on the market’. Needless to say, such distinctions were mirrored financially: managers enjoyed a salary equivalent to other well-paid professionals (except for the two owners of estates who also enjoyed private incomes); wine growers frequently expressed how on their income it was ‘hard to make ends meet’. Let us move to consider the dominant temporalities at work within this social hierarchy.

At an everyday level, the growing seasons of the viticultural year were marked by a cyclical continuity perceived as such by the wine growers themselves, which also established the nature of routine work tasks, even if they were gradually changing with the development of new technologies. This past-oriented modality provided a counterpoint to other aspects of economic change in the profession, and coloured the

temporal outlook of the wine growers as a social group. It was consolidated by the fact that those delegated to attend to the uncertainties of changing markets and other factors were the managers at the co-operative, uncertainties which the wine growers experienced primarily as anxiety about their annual income. In terms of the temporalities of these two groups, therefore, it is clear that management acted as agents of future-oriented temporal modalities, and by consequence the socio-economic hierarchies associated with them, while the temporal modalities of wine growers was predominantly past-oriented in nature. And this was also the case for the temporal outlooks of these two groups: with respect to viticulture, at least, managers were predominantly forward-thinking, in keeping with their active involvement with the future-oriented market economy, while wine growers tended to value continuity and were more resistant to change. But despite these differences, which clearly show the association of social hierarchies with distinctive temporalities, one must nevertheless conclude that the overall relevance of past practices during the fieldwork period, as demonstrated by the fate of Jacques Durand, was judged on their relevance to a changing future. As the rate of social transformation, resulting from volatile markets, was rapid, the possibility of the development of 'traditions' was thus overshadowed by a growing, and necessary future orientation.

In historical terms, the other most significant economic activity in the locality is fishing. The numbers of those fishing in fact grew during the viticultural boom and immediately thereafter, from 42 in 1861 to 54 in 1911, before trailing off substantially in the post-war period to 10 in 1968. All the same, during this time the actual practice of fishing remained consistent, and a predominantly past-oriented modality was the dominant motor of social reproduction. By the 1990s, however, numbers of fishermen had approximately doubled, due to changes experienced during the late 1960s and

1970s. This brief history at once illustrates how different economic activities in Monadières have experienced different timescales of social transformation, illustrating the need for a nuanced, ethnographic assessment of the so-called ‘entry’ into modernity. A further vignette will extend our discussion of changing temporalities during this time.

INNOVATIONS IN FISHING IN THE 1960S

During the 1960s fishermen adopted nylon netting and outboard motors, which enabled them to increase their catches, while improvements in transport networks and expanding markets permitted them to sell the catches and increase profits. This signalled the transition to a capitalist mode of production. But older fishermen, when asked about these changes, commonly claimed that before the technical innovations of the 1960s fishermen were not just limited in their productive levels by their technical abilities, they were also not interested in producing more. Apart from late December to late January, the low season when fish were wintering out at sea, fishing catches were usually consistent, and provided a reliable source of food, and a small income from the sale of surplus produce. Fishing’s benefits were therefore clear in relation to viticulture, the other main source of employment, which lurched from one crisis to another. The techniques of fishing were the guarantee of good catches, and reinforced the wisdom of applying methods that had been tested and proven. The authority of the past in shaping social practice was therefore upheld by a strong consensus among the fishermen working in the village who, in my acquaintances’ recollections of the 1960s, maintained a firm opposition to change and experimentation. In this sense the temporalities of fishing were predominantly past-oriented, its reproduction, although subject to variations due to the contingencies of subtle innovation or the hazards of

natural disaster, envisaged predominantly in the form of replicating past experience (also seen to be for the long-term benefit of future generations). When transformations occurred they took place gradually, being incorporated into a body of practices in which the past appeared as ‘the way things had always been done.’ And such past-oriented temporalities remained the dominant feature of fishing on Lake Monadières until the mid-1960s.

Many people credited one man with provoking the changes that occurred in fishing, and which heralded the transition to capitalist practices: Pierre Cadassus. Pierre Cadassus came from an unconventional background, which was often cited by other people when they mentioned his achievements. His father originated from outside Monadières, leaving his mother and the village when Pierre Cadassus was still young, and he grew up feeling both an insider and outsider in the Monadiérois community. When I talked to him in 1996, he criticised the fishermen’s, and especially the older fishermen’s, unwillingness to change in the 1960s. ‘They had a set way of doing things, and they didn’t want to try anything else,’ he told me. This resistance to change had in his view been a drawback for them. Without his willingness to innovate, he claimed, they would never have profited from the opportunities offered by such technical inventions as the new netting and motors he had helped to introduce. ‘But when they saw the size of my catches increase, and the money I started to earn, they quickly changed their tune.’

Pierre Cadassus’s status as a partial outsider in the village, and the hardship he is consequently said to have suffered, was popularly credited with endowing him with the strength to go against prevailing opposition to innovation when he was a young man, and with his other subsequent achievements in the restaurant business. At the same time he was characterised as forward-thinking: as one villager succinctly put it

to me, ‘He was a guy from the year 2000 for this place, and still is.’ Pierre Cadassus had a lack of respect for how things had been done, and some people described him as angry. He looked continually to a future which for him was pregnant with new possibilities, rather than reproductive of what had already been deemed possible. What was of use to him from the past he would take; what was not he would discard until perhaps one day it became useful in another context. He was therefore active in orienting social practice towards a future that differed from how things had been, a future he saw as better and, of course, more profitable as well. And catalysed by his improvisatory temporal outlook, for a time the temporal modalities of fishing shifted from being primarily past-oriented, to predominantly future-oriented, as one individual grasped the opportunity presented by the combination of technical innovation, and changes in access to, and size of markets.¹³

As with the case of viticulture, it is clear from the story of Pierre Cadassus that a disposition towards future-oriented temporalising practices is both financially and politically advantageous, and also serves to integrate local socio-economic practices within a wider market economy. Indeed, the motivation for Cadassus’s actions seems to tie in with the stereotypical image of the small-scale entrepreneur and agent of historical change: his anomalous place in village society is credited with inspiring his openness to social change. And in a similar way to viticulture, local fishermen have also become something of a proletariat: from purveyors of their own produce to local markets, their principal buyers, since the early 1980s, have been large commercial organisations in the lagoons around Venice, in Northern Italy, who then fatten the fish up and sell them on the lucrative markets of Northern Europe. While this initially made local fishermen wealthy, it has become a problem for them, as the stocks of the lake appear to be diminishing due to overfishing. Cadassus attributes this set of

problems to an inability, on the fishermen's part, to work together and realise dynamic new projects among themselves, and a deep suspicion of change, both of which are the result of their adherence to habits of the past: and to a certain extent, his criticisms are valid. While fishermen experimented with change in the 1970s, since a new socio-economic consensus was established they have been reluctant to contemplate alternative futures, although they remain buffeted by the caprice of the EU. Once again, it is evident that agency within the dynamic and encompassing world of the market economy is dependent upon future-oriented temporalities.

* * *

In sum, if the contingency of ethnography illustrates the detail of shifts in temporal modalities (and hence, one might venture, the complexity of 'modernity' at a local level), it is nonetheless clear that a general trend in viticulture and fishing has emerged, mirrored in the changing temporal outlooks of wine growers and fishermen alike. The persistence of past-oriented temporalities that only broke with habit during sporadic periods of social transformation have been challenged by individual and historical demands for active engagement with alternative futures, and a more reflexive approach to the past to ensure economic success. At the same time, those disposed to such future-oriented temporalities were those who exercised power and influence, at a local level at least; while the story of Jacques Durand, who acted with indifference towards such developments, illustrates the probable fate of following such a course of action. This is not to say, of course, that future orientations absent from pre-1960s temporalities: in the most simple sense, day-to-day practice would always incorporate some form of future-oriented activity, whether it was mending

nets for the next day's work, or planting a new vine. But the activity of calculating unpredictable future possibilities and attempting to cater for them was usually confined to a consideration of the possible effects of natural disasters, such as frost or a drop in fish stocks in the lake. By the 1990s this situation had changed, and I now discuss the extent to which future-orientation is characteristic of those new professions, centred mainly in Narbonne, which dominated economic life during my own stay in the village, before considering other aspects of social life that are less directly reducible to economic influence.

TOWARDS A FUTURE-ORIENTED WORLD?

Giddens points out how in the 'modern period' the future has taken on an 'open' character: '[t]he "openness of things to come expresses the malleability of the social world and the capability of human beings to shape the physical settings of our existence' (1991:111). The concern of agents, institutions and business to influence the future with respect to their specific interests has therefore given rise to what he terms 'the colonisation of the future': '[w]hile the future is recognised to be intrinsically unknowable, and as it is increasingly severed from the past, that future becomes a new terrain – a terrain of counterfactual possibility. Once thus established, that terrain lends itself to colonial invasion through counterfactual thought and risk calculation' (1991:111). While for companies and institutions colonising the future usually takes the form of calculated economic strategies, for individuals its 'open' character, intrinsically related to 'life chances' predicated on one's position in society, is the subject of 'life planning', the necessary correlate for individual activity in a world where future action is the result of a choice among options, rather than visible in the actions of one's predecessors and therefore constrained within limited horizons

(1991:82).¹⁴ This also introduces risk and insecurity into everyday life on a fundamental level, as the necessity of choosing among possible courses of action has increasingly profound repercussions (Giddens 1991:109-143, Beck 1992). One main motor for this transition, Giddens (1991:15) notes, has been the historical development of industrial capitalism, future oriented *par excellence* with its objective of revolutionising techniques of production.

The world thus becomes increasingly future-oriented, entering from a temporal point of view the era of ‘modernity’, and with the redundancy of ‘tradition’ the past’s significance apparently diminishes. Was this the case in Monadières? With respect to the temporalities of extra-village employment, which accounted for the majority of the working population, past and future orientation actually varied depending on the job involved. In 1990 employment in business accounted for roughly 15 % of the *commune*’s active population, and this motor of economic production required regular consideration of possible futures. By contrast, those working in transport and telecommunications (8 %), building, civil and agricultural engineering (8 %), industry (3 %), and retail (21 %) saw past and future orientations vary dependent on the status of their employment.¹⁵ Generally, higher-ranking jobs involving greater responsibility for decision-making displayed a greater degree of future orientation than lower status jobs involving repetitive tasks, mirroring the situation in viticulture and fishing. Although I have no precise figures available for the employment status of those I knew, the majority of long-term residents worked in lower status jobs, reflecting predominantly past-oriented, repetitive tasks, while recent immigrants tended to have higher status jobs, dealing with possible futures. However, some measure of past experience informed even the most future-oriented professions, although the manner in which such experience was drawn upon, in an improvisatory or repetitive way,

depended on the nature of the task involved; while, as with viticulture, lower-status jobs were still open to the possibility of innovation due to their relationship to the capitalist market economy.

A closer consideration of some of the different occupations among people in the village will flesh out the preceding statements. For those working in insurance, such as the mayor of the *commune*, Antoine Canovas, the calculation of future possibilities was central to their work, itself subject to regular bouts of social change. While the premiums he set were partly based on the projection of future possibilities derived from past experience, they were also calculated according to the profit targets of the company he worked for, *les Mutuelles du Mans*. Although his profession was particularly concerned with future possibilities, however, the importance of his own experience in calculating premiums and arranging policies also testifies to the significance of the past for his job. The daily routine of Marie Virenque, on the other hand, the secretary at the mayor-house in Monadières, involved the performance of repetitive tasks, with little consideration for the future beyond daily planning. However, the on-going revision of bureaucracy meant that she had to be willing to adapt, thus periodically drawing on her previous experience in different ways, and this was especially the case for her superior, Philippe Aube, the clerk of the mayor house, who spoke to me on several occasions of the difficulties he encountered in assimilating and implementing bureaucratic innovations.

Moving on to other areas of life in Monadières, the need to consider diverse possible futures was also present. For example, the temporal outlook of those reaching school-leaving age was predominantly future-oriented, as they considered their direction at this crossroads in life, and furnishes an example of the life planning noted by Giddens. In contrast to their parents who had a more limited range of options, in

particular if they were Monadiérois, young people had to make a variety of important decisions, regarding the path of education they chose, the employment choices they made, where to live, and so on. Such forward thinking was forced upon them by the temporal modality of this time in their lives, itself related to the structural position of their age group in wider French society, and although such decision-making was a feature of every young person's life, the range of options (and hence complexity of the decision-making process) increased as one ascended the social hierarchy, linked to the financial status of one's parents.¹⁶

The insecurity of the job market meant that those in middle age were confronted with dilemmas, particularly if they lost their job, but also in catering for the future possibility of unemployment at an older age and how they would respond. Differences between the generations were also accentuated by these changes. Young people did not look to their parents for indications as to the clothes they should wear, or even, in many cases, for help in decisions regarding life planning. The experience of older people was seen by many young people as irrelevant to the conditions they faced in their own lives, and this was also visible in the way younger Monadiérois were more oriented towards a national youth culture than towards the cultural outlook of their families. There were exceptions to this general trend: I sometimes saw older fishermen, for example, giving tips to their young relatives as to where certain fish might be found in particular weather conditions, and the techniques of making nets and reading the lake for signs of fish were learnt by the young from the old. But there was a distinctive move away from valuing the past as a model for action in such domains of social life, a feature of a temporal outlook that clearly, if indirectly mirrored the shifting temporal modalities of economic life – self-conscious adherence

to the ‘traditions’ of the older generation, for complex reasons, had not become a feature of youthful activity.¹⁷

* * *

To claim that the past was irrelevant to the social practices described would be wrong. For even the most future-oriented temporalities must be predicated on past experience, even if they ultimately transcend it through adaptation or improvisation. Yet it would seem that, in many respects, explicit past-orientation was being relinquished for a necessary consideration of future possibilities, a development related to recent, rapid social transformation. This was acknowledged in the periodisation of recent history among those I knew into a pre-1960s era of stability, as against a subsequent epoch of on-going uncertainty, which reflects precisely this timescale of accelerated change. So if to deem this an acknowledgement by local people of Giddens’ and others’ ‘post-traditional’ era would be erroneous, given the co-existence of sporadic perceptions of continuity, it is clear that this turbulent epoch has registered in local consciousness. Where past-oriented temporalities remained influential tended to be among lower status occupations or among those enclaves in viticulture and fishing that, although attributed status by those involved in them – the pride of wine growers in their profession, for example, was legendary – nevertheless occupied a disadvantaged position in socio-economic hierarchies. But that is not to say that such past-oriented practices were without social value. It is evident that an adherence to ‘tradition’ is a way of resisting the encroachment of the global market economy, which clearly benefits the few and was widely acknowledged as such, and has led to the politicisation of certain ‘traditional’ practices by wine growers and

fishermen who were particularly critical of the workings of the state and market. As Berger's (1979, 1991) recent work on Haute Savoie has shown, looking to the past when the wider economic system is looking to the future, while often seen as politically conservative, can sometimes provide a measure of resistance and dignity in an unequal world.

Returning to the literature on modernity, therefore, although I have not explicitly adopted Giddens', and others' dichotomy of 'traditional' versus 'post-traditional' societies as a way of defining recent events in Monadières, I agree with the basic proposition of their argument. The preceding analysis, however, through qualifying their generalisations with a close attention to ethnographic detail, reveals the complexity of 'modernity' and its variegated temporalities at a local level. While this reveals the Popperian flaw to any general statement – there may always be exceptions to the rule – it also reveals some further complications. For the belated, complex and uneven development of future-oriented temporalities in Monadières, despite suggestive evidence of relevant long-term social changes such as an established and cumbersome bureaucracy (c.f. Weber 1964), indicates that the historical timescale of modernity, from an ethnographic viewpoint, may be a much more multifarious form of social life that any one generalisation can encompass.

This problem appears inherent in Heelas's 'radical theorists' as a whole. Taking Habermas's (1990) influential work, for example, his notion that the modern entails a transition from being subjects to active, forward-looking agents of history; a 'new experience of an advancing and accelerating of historical events [...] where a purely transitory present sees itself brought to account before the future for its interventions and omissions...' (1990:6,15): such notions, among others in his comprehensive overview, clearly mirror aspects of life in Monadières. But as

generalisations, it is equally clear that to permit them to stand, as the author would probably concede, obscures the detail of specific ethnographic realities. If the concept of modernity is to achieve contingent applicability, it would therefore seem that Heelas's co-existence thesis is indeed the way forward. Instead of positing one, uniformly developing modernity we are then confronted with the prospect of multiple, unevenly developed modernities with certain possibly common features. Could such an 'ethnographic' concept of modernity be adapted for different regions, such that we could write of a specific 'Mediterranean modernity', as opposed to a Northern European or North American one? Only to the extent that such generalisations illuminate, rather than obscure ethnographic contingency. At the same time, it is also evident that any local instance of modernity must be seen as related to significant wider historical realities: modernity as a concept must correlate with recent changes to the anthropological concepts of 'culture' and 'locality', for example, which have been adapted to accommodate the workings of a global cultural and economic ecumene (c.f. Gupta & Ferguson 1997, Piot 1999, Van Der Veer 1998).

Returning to the ethnography of Monadières, finally, and to add a further layer of contingency, while in one respect – as a model for social action – the past was clearly diminishing in importance, in another sense it clearly was not. Indeed, in many ways the very redundancy of the past as a social model, and the pressing demands of the future with its associated risks and insecurity, had rendered the past significant in other, innovatory fashions. Before I conclude this article I shall briefly articulate the nature of these interests, questioning whether these developments could indeed constitute an example of a possible 'Mediterranean' modernity.

THE CHANGING RELEVANCE OF THE PAST

Many recent authors have noted an increasing interest in the past during the last 30 years in Western Europe and North America, although the reasons suggested for this interest have been widely conflicting. Such debates have often centred on ‘heritage’ (in English), or *patrimoine*¹⁸ (in French), both ‘nomadic terms’, as Samuel observes, ‘which travel easily and put down roots ... in seemingly quite unpromising terrain’ (1994:205). Hewison (1987) and Wright (1985) have argued that such interest has been whipped up by states and capitalists, as part of a ‘heritage industry’ designed to dull the masses’s senses to their low rung on the exploitative social ladder. Samuel (1994) has argued the contrary point of view, describing instead a celebratory appropriation of the past, as local people in local contexts have challenged the hitherto regulated use of history by those in power. Urry (1990) has taken the middle way, suggesting that while state interest has a role to play in such developments, so too do contingent localised socialities, as different people in different places put the past to use for various, different reasons. Others have drawn attention to the changing temporalities of social life, increasingly embracing risk, and the social transformations of which they are a part, provoking economic migration and the breakdown of community (Graburn 1995, MacCannell 1976). They point to the search for ‘authenticity’ and a respite from modern alienation in such interests, although this is once again problematic, as Williams (1993) illustrates how city dwellers have idealised country life in similar ways for many hundreds of years.

It is clear from this brief review that an answer to such questions can only come from the specificities of local contexts themselves, as Urry suggests. What were the factors shaping local temporalisations of the past in Monadières? What sorts of past were being temporalised? Here I must narrow down my focus, as many different

kinds of past were important to those I knew, from the national and regional pasts associated with residence in a modern nation state, to local pasts from other areas of France and Europe in the case of migrants, to biographical histories, to name some of the most significant. However, of all pasts temporalised, it was the past of the locality that was most prominent and visible in the village, and which has a bearing on this discussion. For long-term inhabitants, this was partly due to the desire for group identity through the temporalisation of a shared history. In this respect, the village, as the site of dwelling for the group, was naturally a focus for the temporalisation of the past, although through such practices it was also constructed as a historical locality. For recent immigrants and second home owners, interest in the local past was of a different nature. For some, it comprised a substitute for the lived experience of place afforded by long-term residence, and was temporalised through information available about the locality, such as narratives of local history, or the ownership of old postcards of the village.¹⁹ For others, it was part of a recreational interest in history, or valued for the intellectual pleasure it afforded. For others still, including some Monadiérois, it was of economic value in attracting heritage tourists. And for some, its idealisation provided a secure refuge from the insecurities provoked by future orientation and social change. Certain patterns therefore emerge, the Monadiérois, for example, primarily accessing the historical past through narratives of lived experiences, while others drew on printed media such as books or photos. And although such interests resemble uses of the past from other eras of human history,²⁰ they may also be seen as recent developments, emergent from the complexity of recent social transformations.

And here lies the crux of the matter. While current interest in the local past can be linked both to wider interests in heritage tourism, and to contingencies of localised

sociality, from a historical perspective they are predicated on specific local developments in cultural media for the temporalisation of the past. On one level this is also part of a wider set of developments. Anderson (1991) has demonstrated how advances in the technology of 'print capitalism' from the Middle Ages onwards influenced the growth of nation states, and eventually led to the birth of that great medium of national simultaneity, the daily newspaper. Along with other technological breakthroughs, it also laid similar groundwork for changes in the temporalisation of the past. The invention of the photograph in the early 19th century, technological developments in archival techniques, new means of commemoration associated with nation states (postage stamps, monuments, street signs etc.), and the growth of technologies for the mass production and reproduction of commodities in the 19th and 20th centuries, all constituted important innovations in this respect. Combined with the increasingly rapid rate of social transformation, and the endless proliferation of disposable objects provoked by post-war consumerism, such innovations have provoked an explosion in the volume and visibility of the different 'ways we were', and our ability to temporalise them (c.f. Lowenthal 1985).

But it is precisely the contingent nature of such social transformation in Monadières, and one could argue, villages like it both within France and certain other Mediterranean countries, that points to a regional commonality here. The point of this 'expanding past',²¹ as I have termed it, is not that consciousness is overwhelmed by the volume of material that passes through our lives. Forgetting has always been the principal tool of immunisation against the quantity of lived experience that makes up any one life (Benjamin 1992:156-159, Freud 1955). Nor does it overlook how aspects of the past have always been re-temporalised in human sociality. Benjamin notes how the surrealists were among the first to self-consciously temporalise the 'expanding

past', or what he terms the 'outmoded' (Benjamin 1998:229), although they cannot be credited with the subsequent pervasiveness of this temporalising practice. The appearance of this aspect of surrealist practice was historically related to the increasing prominence of the 'outmoded' in social life.²² The notion of the 'expanding past' draws attention to how, under such historical conditions, the present becomes littered with the detritus and memory of former existences, 'outmoded' ways of life that in various ways may then be re-temporalised into alternative projects. Briefly, it is the specific nature of this 'expanding past' in rural villages such as Monadières, particularly where it testifies to the disappearance of a community and workforce focused on the immediate locality, local artisanal practices, and the mechanisation of agriculture, that appears characteristic. A development that, although contextualised in the temporalising practices of local and wider historical forces, simultaneously underwrote them as a whole.

TIME AND MODERNITY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

The importance of such innovations in local relationships to the past to a temporal perspective on Mediterranean modernity derives from their potential role in the production, conceptualisation and experience of tradition and change. For alongside those rapid social changes that could provoke the problematic construction of continuity and tradition at a local level, we now also have the notion of a shift in the very structure of the local past. Such a shift, altering as it does our concrete media for access to it, clearly has the potential to affect the way in which the past is temporalised as an index of continuity or discontinuity. From the point of view of the anthropology of time, therefore, it is perhaps here that an argument could be made for a contingent French, and possibly wider Mediterranean sense of 'modernity'. A

‘modernity’ that, in keeping with our earlier observations, must be seen as integrated with wider historical forces (of which tourism is an obvious example), as well as existing in contingent local contexts that have their own distinctive histories and should be analysed as such.

Turning to the ethnographic literature on the Mediterranean, one can see in greater detail how the off-shoots of such developments are being registered in the region (c.f. Abram *et al.* 1997, Boissevain 1996), although in this respect the enabling role of an expanding past is often overlooked. Above all, such developments, in league with specific historical conditions, have led to increasing local conflicts over local pasts: a growing politicisation of local traditions and customs, and a marked increase in commercial representation and exploitation of local pasts in relation to the tourist industry. Such conflicts differ from the political conflict that has always been associated with the temporalisation of the past, with respect to their scale and extent, and the variety and diversity of interested groups implicated in them. And these factors, once again, are directly facilitated by the increased and widespread availability of the past for temporalisation, and its particular ethnographic nature.

In Monadières, for example, conflict over the temporalisation of the local past, and its role in shaping narratives of continuity and discontinuity in relationship to differing local identities and economic activities, was a keen point of contention during my stay in the village. This expressly took the form of differences between incomers seeking to mould local pasts into narratives for tourist consumption, and long-term inhabitants temporalising perceived inalienable local pasts as markers of continuity in community and family identity. A dichotomy between future-oriented, economically advantageous temporalities and past-oriented, politically resistant ones is again recognisable here, with similar correlations to advantaged and disadvantaged

socio-economic groupings as was visible in viticulture, fishing and other professions. Such conflicts often focused on the projected use of material artefacts such as photographs, important historical agents in the 'expanding past' which have been used in the village since the 1920s, but which have taken on an increased significance since the social changes of the 1960s rendered their subject matter a curiosity to outsiders (and not merely a record of intimate family relationships). Other notable conflicts focused on 'outmoded' social practices associated with the former diet of the area – namely the packaging of 'local specialities' (to practitioners of heritage tourism; the inalienable 'food of our grandmothers' for many long-term residents) for tourists. While such interest in the past has been documented as offering the opportunity elsewhere in France for the renewal of 'traditions' and the refiguring of continuity, and in some cases has done so in Monadières, it has also intensified tension between sections of the local population (c.f. Abram 1997, Hodges 2000). Indeed such differences in development once again illustrate the need for an attention to local detail.

Is this one influential trajectory of a regional modernity? It is certainly indicative of a regional set of social developments, with tributaries in France and other countries bordering the Mediterranean, and is indeed closely-related to developments in the 'heritage industry' world-wide. Whether to label such developments as symptomatic of the 'modern', however, is perhaps a question that should remain open. For in conclusion it is apparent from the preceding discussion that, from a temporal viewpoint, the concept of 'modernity' may be circumspectly employed in social analysis, both in the Mediterranean region and beyond. And the extent to which any such analysis can be deemed effective, I have argued, is quantifiable by the extent to which a dimension of this concept is grasped as

shorthand for the complex and complicated practice of human temporality; and the scope of its remit modified to allow for greater ethnographic precision. In this sense I concur with recent writers on modernity, who argue for its more subtle deployment, and my emphasis on time and temporality provides a complementary perspective. But despite the apparent adaptability of ‘modernity’ to a conception of social life as intrinsically temporal, and infused with local and global contingencies, it seems unclear, to this writer at least, whether this concept really serves to enlighten our understanding of contemporary social realities. For having lost its license to generalise, ‘modernity’ may now be no more than an ambiguous, political marker of historical periodisation, indeed the proper subject of ethnographic enquiry, rather than a tool in its execution. And in this respect, whether the notion of the ‘modern’ will retain critical purchase over more precise terms for contingencies and generalities remains to be seen.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

I would like to thank Olivia Harris for her astute comments and editorial suggestions regarding an earlier draft of the material presented here, and for being so generous with her own thoughts about time and modernity; Jon Mitchell for some very useful insights at the stage of redrafting; and the residents of Monadières. Fieldwork and

research on which this paper is based was carried out with the aid of an ESRC Postgraduate Studentship.

¹ PhD Fieldwork was carried out in Monadières from October 1996–September 1997.

Pseudonyms replace the names of the village and its inhabitants.

² Briefly, inhabitants of Monadières were divided into ‘long-term residents’, or ‘Monadiérois’ (those of indigenous heritage or claiming parental or more distant relatives in the village); ‘recent immigrants’; ‘tourists’ and ‘second-home owners’. Monadiérois constituted about two-thirds of the permanent village inhabitants. For more detail on the social groupings in Monadières see Hodges 1999:86-98.

³ Censuses of 1946 & 1990.

⁴ In an article such as this it is impossible to do justice to Deleuze’s materialist notion of *la durée* as the ‘world in the process of becoming’. Grosz (1999:17, 28) provides a useful, if abstract summary: ‘Time, or more precisely duration [...] is braided, intertwined, a unity of strands layered over each other; unique singular and individual, it nevertheless partakes of a more generic and overarching time, which makes possible relations of earlier and later... [It] proceeds not by continuous growth, smooth unfolding, or accretion, but through division, bifurcation, dissociation – by difference – through sudden and unexpected chance or eruption. Duration is a mode of infecting self-differentiation: difference is internal to its function, its modes of elaboration and production, and is also its ramifying effect on those objects located “within” its milieu... our very concept of objects, matter, being...needs to be open to the differentiations that constitute and continually transform it’.

⁵ The model outlined here resembles that proposed by Alfred Gell in his authoritative overview *The Anthropology of Time* (1992). Gell similarly relates the cultural perception of time to a notion of an extra-cultural ‘real time’ – I am indebted to his conviction concerning the necessity of such an approach, but take issue with his reliance on the work of the analytic philosopher D.H.Mellor, and Husserlian phenomenology, whose theoretical models contrast in many important respects with the notion of *la durée*. He also argues for a similar distinction to my own between the temporal modality and temporal outlook of social life:

‘The anthropology of time ought... to pursue a dual strategy of “allocationalist” investigations of the inherent choreographical possibilities of social actions in their space-time frame [and] other investigations leading towards the reconstruction, in model form, of the schemes of temporal interpretation, or internalised time-maps, of the ethnographic subjects [...] and must include analysis of language and cognition as well’ (Gell 1992, 325, 327). I present my own model of human temporality, its relationship to the work of Gell and other writers in the limited specialist anthropological literature on this subject, and to Deleuze’s notion of duration, at greater length elsewhere (Hodges 1999: 34-58, Hodges n.d.).

⁶ See Benjamin 1983, 1992, Berger, Berger & Kellner 1973, Giddens 1990, 1991, Hall, Held & McGrew 1992, Nora 1989, Terdiman 1993, Thompson 1996, Tonnies 1955, & Weber 1964, some of the most prominent writers to draw on this model of historical periodisation. Osborne (1991, 1995) provides a concise philosophical analysis of the temporality of this trend.

⁷ Heelas 1996:1. Adam, writing in the same volume, provides a related critique of this use of tradition that is equally applicable to Tonnies’s distinction, mentioned above:

‘Detraditionalisation is constituted with reference to tradition, which is the source of its being, a source with which it is no longer identified and which is conceived as its “other”. This means that the conceptual tool with which we are to grasp and explain reflexively organised authority in an age of uncertainty, disorder, flux and contingency is *fixed* with reference to a postulated past condition and narrowly defined in terms of what it is *not*’ (Adam 1996:136, her emphasis).

⁸ C.f. Piot 1999, Van der Veer 1998. ‘The best way to emphasise detraditionalisation,’ Heelas writes, ‘is to posit a comprehensively tradition-dominated past, a comprehensively post-traditional present/future, and to attend solely to those processes which serve to detraditionalise. In contrast, the best way to criticise the (radical) loss-of-tradition thesis is to argue that “the traditional” (serving to gauge what has been lost) is not as tradition-dominated as might be supposed, that “the modern/post-modern” is not as detraditionalised as might be

claimed, and that detraditionalising processes do not occur in isolation from other processes, namely those to do with tradition-maintenance and the construction – or reconstruction – of traditional forms of life’ (Heelas 1996:7). For a full account of these two theses see Heelas 1996:3-11.

⁹ See Le Roy Ladurie’s *The Peasants of Languedoc* (1976) for details of social transformations in the region during the Middle Ages, although other examples abound, such as the extensive changes that occurred with the arrival of the Roman Empire.

¹⁰ A *cave* is literally a ‘cellar’ in English, although in viticultural areas it also refers to the workshop which contains the vats, presses, and other paraphernalia of wine production, a predominantly masculine domain. I have therefore retained the original French.

¹¹ In fact, Durand’s resistance to change is symptomatic of earlier attitudes among wine growers in Monadières, although by the 1990s their involvement in the wine co-operative had ensured some form of adaptability to change. In the 1930s, however, when the co-operative had opened, wine growers in Monadières had been very reluctant to participate, despite the advantages it provided. This, older people told me, was because ‘change was to be distrusted’, and it may be assumed that, in an insecure world, what had been proven to produce results was the wiser option over the risk of the new. However, once one or two people had tried the co-operative, and found it to be beneficial, the remainder of the wine growers joined *en masse*.

¹² For brevity, this schema does not include other full-time and occasional employees and associates of the co-operative who lived outside Monadières, but only those members of the viticultural workforce resident in the village or of direct relevance to the discussion. It also does not breakdown full-time wine growers into those with larger and smaller holdings, or address the large number of part-time wine growers with smaller vineyards.

¹³ See Hodges 2001 for discussion of Pierre Cadassus’s influence on heritage tourism in the village.

¹⁴ Giddens 1991:82. C.f. Koselleck (1985:276) for a comparable exegesis: ‘My thesis is that in modern times the difference between experience and expectation has increasingly expanded; more precisely, that modernity is first understood as a new age from the time that expectations have distanced themselves evermore from all previous experience.’ Koselleck locates this difference in the increased distance between what he calls the ‘space of experience’ and the ‘horizon of expectation’: the temporality inherent in the capitalist mode of production therefore orients the agent towards an ever-expanding range of future possibilities, and renders past experience more or less redundant due to rapid social transformation.

¹⁵ Census of 1992.

¹⁶ Given the fact that those jobs underpinning the upper end of the social hierarchy required greater engagement with alternative futures, it is probable that a resulting tendency towards more sophisticated future-oriented temporal outlooks disposed the children of those higher-up the social hierarchy towards similar employment as their parents. This market economy ‘ethic’ would then be a factor (among many) in consolidating this hierarchy and the wider economic system of which it is a part, while limiting social mobility within it.

¹⁷ The disappearance of the ‘fishermen’s fête’ in the early 1960s may be seen as indicative of this general shift in social life. Before this period religious practice was more pervasive in the village, and the fête, which involved the blessing of the waters of the lake by the local priest to induce the return of fish for the following year, can be seen as an acknowledgement of the limits of human agency over the future and an invocation of divine providence. By the 1990s, religious invocations of this sort were no longer deemed necessary, and problems with the size of catches were put down firmly to secular factors, such as the skill of the fisherman involved, or the effects of pollution. It is worth noting, however, that a small number of young people in their 20s and 30s were interested in the *patrimoine*, or ‘heritage’ of the village, which they saw in some ways as a source of pride and resistance against such social trends. I raise this issue towards the end of this article, and at greater length in Hodges 1999, 2001.

¹⁸ See Chastel (1997) for a discussion of *patrimoine*.

¹⁹ Urry has written of an increasing self-consciousness in the recent construction of place, noting (1995:30) how today ‘[t]aking place seriously means taking writing, architectural designs, paintings, guide books, literary texts, films, postcards, advertisements, music, travel patterns, photographs and so on seriously.’ His comments clearly apply to Monadières, and in particular to recent immigrants and second home owners.

²⁰ Idealisation of the past in times of social insecurity, for example, has been a feature of human sociality since time began, and is particularly entrenched in Western mythology through the Christian religion, with its celebration of the ‘Garden of Eden’. Re-temporalisation of vanished ways of life is similarly commonplace: one need only think of the Renaissance, with its re-appropriation of classical styles.

²¹ Leroi-Gourhan (1964) has put forward a similar notion in his idea of ‘memory in expansion’, taken up by Le Goff (1992:84-97), although both limit their focus to explicit innovations in techniques for remembering.

²² Foster writes: ‘The process of outmoding is continual in capitalism: why does it come into focus [in the 1920s and 1930s]? ... [A]fter World War I modernisation intensified greatly. The period centred in the 1920s and 1930s is now seen as the long wave of the second technological revolution, defined technically by new uses of electricity and combustion and stamped culturally by new forms of transportation and reproduction. As these techniques penetrated everyday practices, the outmoded was brought to consciousness as a category’ (Foster 1997:165; c.f. Jameson 1974:103-105 for a similar argument).

references:

Abram, S. A. 1997. Performing for Tourists in Rural France. In *Tourists and Tourism. Identifying with People and Places* (eds.) S. Abram, J. Waldren & D.V.L. Macleod, Oxford & New York: Berg.

Abram, S., Waldren, J. & Macleod, D.V.L. (eds.). 1997. *Tourists and Tourism. Identifying with People and Places*. Oxford & New York: Berg.

Adam, B. 1996. Detraditionalization and the Certainty of Uncertain Futures. In *Detraditionalization. Critical Reflections on Authority and Identity* (eds.) P. Heelas, S. Lash & P. Morris, Oxford: Blackwell.

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London & New York: Verso.

Beck, U. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.

Benjamin, W. 1992. *Illuminations*. London: Fontana.

Benjamin, W. 1998. *One-Way Street*. London: Verso.

Berger, J. 1979. *Pig Earth*. London: Writers & Readers.

Berger, J. 1991. *Once in Europa*. London: Granta.

Berger, P. L., Berger, B. & Kellner, H. 1974. *The Homeless Mind. Modernization and Consciousness*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bergson, H. 1988. *Matter and Memory*. New York: Zone Books.

Boissevain, J. 1996. *Coping With Tourists. European Reactions to Mass Tourism*. Providence & Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: a Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Chastel, A. 1997. La notion de patrimoine. In *Les lieux de mémoire 1* (ed.) P.Nora, Paris: Gallimard.

Deleuze, G. 1991. *Bergsonism*. New York: Zone Books.

Deleuze, G. 1994. *Difference and Repetition*. London: Athlone.

Foster, H. 1997. *Compulsive Beauty*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Freud, S. 1955. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. London: Standard Ed.

Gell, A. 1992. *The Anthropology of Time. Cultural Constructions of Temporal Maps and Images*. Oxford & Providence: Berg.

Giddens, A. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Graburn, N.H.H. 1995. Tourism, Modernity and Nostalgia. In *The Future of Anthropology: Its Relevance to the Contemporary World* (eds.) A. Ahmed & C. Shore, London: Athlone.

Grosz, E. 1999. Thinking the New: Of Futures Yet Unthought. In *Becomings. Explorations in Time, Memory, and Futures* (ed.) E. Grosz, New York: Cornell University Press.

Habermas, J. 1990. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hall S., D. Held & T. McGrew (eds.). 1992. *Modernity and its Futures*. Cambridge: Polity.

Heelas, P. 1996. Introduction: Detraditionalization and its Rivals. In *Detraditionalization. Critical Reflections on Authority and Identity* (eds.) P. Heelas, S. Lash & P. Morris, Oxford: Blackwell.

Hewison, R. 1987. *The Heritage Industry*. London: Methuen.

Hobsbawn, E. & Ranger, T. (eds.). 1985. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hodges, M. 1999. What the Past Holds in Store. An Anthropological Study of Temporality in a Southern French Village. Unpublished PhD thesis. Goldsmiths College, University of London.

Hodges, M. 2000. The sheep from the goats. *Anthropology Today* 16(5): 19-22.

Hodges, M. 2001. Food, Time and Heritage Tourism in Languedoc, France. *History and Anthropology* 12 (2):179-212.

Hodges, M. n.d. Bergson, Deleuze and the Anthropology of Time. Unpublished Paper presented to the Postgraduate Research Seminar, Dept. of Anthropology, Goldsmiths College, University of London.

Jameson, F. 1974. *Marxism and Form. Twentieth-Century Dialectical Theories of Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Koselleck, R. 1985. *Futures Past. On the Semantics of Historical Time*. Cambridge, Mass. & London: The MIT Press.

Le Goff, J. 1992. *History and Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lem, W. 1999. *Cultivating Dissent: Work, Identity, and Praxis in Rural Languedoc*. New York: SUNY Press.

Leroi-Gourhan, R. 1964. *La geste et la parole. Vol.2: La mémoire et les rythmes*. Paris: Gallimard.

Le Roy Ladurie, E. 1976. *The Peasants of Languedoc*. Urbana, Chicago & London: University of Illinois Press.

Lowenthal, D. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacCannell, D. 1976. *The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken Books.

Mintz, S. 1985. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Viking.

Munn, N. D. 1992. The cultural anthropology of time: a critical essay. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 93-123.

Nora, P. 1989. Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*. In Memory and Counter-Memory (eds.) N. Zemon Davis & R. Starn, Special Issue of *Representations*, No. 26: 7-25.

Osborne, P. 1991. Modernity is a Qualitative, Not a Chronological, Category. *New Left Review* 192: 65-84.

Osborne, P. 1995. *The Politics of Time. Modernity and Avant-Garde*. London & New York: Verso.

Piot, C. 1999. *Remotely Global: Village Modernity in West Africa*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Roseberry, W. 1989. *Anthropologies and Histories. Essays in Culture, History, and Political Economy*. New Brunswick & London: Rutgers University Press.

Samuel, R. 1994. *Theatres of Memory. Volume 1: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*. London & New York: Verso.

Terdiman, R. 1993. *Present Past. Modernity and the Memory Crisis*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

Thompson, J. B. 1996. Tradition and Self in a Mediated World. In *Detraditionalization. Critical Reflections on Authority and Identity* (eds.) P. Heelas, S. Lash & P. Morris, Oxford: Blackwell.

Tonnies, F. 1955. *Community and Association*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Turetzky, P. 1998. *Time*. London & New York: Routledge.

Urry, J. 1990. *The Tourist Gaze. Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.

Urry, J. 1995. *Consuming Places*. London & New York: Routledge.

Van der Veer. 1998. The Global History of 'Modernity'. *Journal of the Social and Economic History of the Orient* 43 (3): 285-294.

Weber, M. 1964. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation*. London: Macmillan.

Williams, R. 1993. *The Country and the City*. London: Hogarth.

Wolf, E. 1982. *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.

Wright, P. 1985. *On Living in an Old Country*. London: Verso.