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PART I – BEGINNINGS

1. Introduction

In modern text books the term 'Romanization' is put to frequent employment. It is vulgar and ugly, worse than that, anachronistic and misleading. 'Romanization' implies the execution of a deliberate policy. That is to misconceive the behaviour of Rome.

- Sir Ronald Syme on the term Romanization (Mattingly 2002:337)

For the archaeologist, provincial and classical alike, the very term Romanization\(^1\) evokes a multitude of connotations – Roman imperialism, the role of native elites in relation to Rome, the spread of Roman material culture, the merging of Roman and native cultural expressions as well as the emergence of new categories of material artefacts. The term originally fathomed all these aspects and more as archaeologists and ancient historians aspired to say something about the complex processes taking place under the aegis of Roman imperial expansion and its effects in the provinces and beyond. To what extent was Roman material culture adopted and emulated by the native provincial populations? What were the driving stimuli behind such a development? What characterizes provincial Roman material culture, and what does the material expression tell us about cultural identity under Roman rule? How do so called native expressions fit into this scheme? Questions abound, and in more recent years problems relating to the gap between historical and archaeological sources and the validity of ethnic classifications have arisen to complicate and contrast the picture further. These questions taken into account, the term and its discourse also offer a good opportunity to review and further contrast the classical dichotomy Roman-Barbarian.

With the advent of the post-processual paradigm in archaeology several archaeological theoretical works have firmly established the discipline within the social sciences, i.e. as an interpretative science and hence as a cultural producer (cf. e.g. Shanks and Tilley (1996) and Pluciennik (2002)). In light of this view this paper sets out to review the Romanization debate and aims to clarify and discuss in what ways the discourse mirrors the academic, intellectual and political climate it was born within – from momentous imperialistic beginnings to modern particularistic approaches. In reviewing the discourse of the term the paper aspires at least to bring some clarity to the evolving of theories and differing views concerning the cultural changes involved in the more provincial parts of the Empire as ultimately witnessed in archaeology through the material remains. The author’s aim, however, is twofold. In reviewing the discourse of Romanization the author also wants to bring to light the changing
views of cultural interaction as a result of Roman provincial rule. In this respect the changing stands regarding the participants and dynamics of these encounters will be stressed. In regard to material, the amount of books written on Romanization is today too vast to review in its entirety. The author in no way purports to cover this broad span, but that is neither the intention. As the initial intention is to focus on the discourse of the term, this is possible to deal with through a selection of key works representing the main currents of thought. This paper will also restrict itself as it will deal only with works published in English and focus on the Northern provinces – i.e. Northern Europe. This choice was made out of consideration for the scope of the paper, but also in regard to the schism that usually is agreed to exist within the more historically based Southern European archaeological studies (mainly Spain and Italy). In these areas were there are far richer textual sources the debate has thus, for good or bad, been less theoretically aware than in Britain, The Netherlands and to some extent France (Keay and Terrenato 2001:x). Germany has also until recently shown reluctance towards theoretical approaches in the wake of the war, but will not be excluded from mention (Härke 1989).

The selected works are *The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian* by Theodor Mommsen (originally published 1885), *The Romanization of Roman Britain* by Francis Haverfield (originally published 1904), *The Romanization of Britain* by Martin Millett (originally published 1990), *The Archaeology of Ethnicity* by Sîan Jones (1997) and *Globalizing Roman Culture* by Richard Hingely (2005). The first two works were selected as they directly relate to the origin of the term and constructed the fundament for further studies. The Mommsen edition used in the following is *The Provinces of the Roman Empire. The European Provinces. Selections from The History of Rome Vol. 5, Book 8* (1968). The Haverfield edition used is the enlarged and revised edition of *The Romanization of Roman Britain* from 1912. The remaining three works were selected out of the now towering literature on the subject. These were chosen as they constitute important shifts and/or theoretical implications that have had a broad impact on the study of Romanization. The paper deals with the mentioned works in chronological succession through three parts respectively entitled *Beginnings, Complexity* and *An end to the discourse?* The first part focuses on the origin and elaboration of the concept of Romanization through the works of Mommsen and Haverfield. The second part first introduces a broad line of new theoretical perspectives arising in the time between these older works and the more recent ones. This is done to bridge the historical gap and further contextualize the thereafter presented works by
Millett, Jones and Hingely. Part three consists of a concluding discussion where we question
the validity and continued use of the term Romanization informed by the reading of the
selected works.

The quote in the beginning of this section was uttered by the eminent classical scholar Sir
Ronald Syme. As the author of the pinnacle work *The Roman Revolution* (1939) he was a
harsh critic of past historical interpretations of the Late Roman Republic and the Early
Empire. In this book he redefined the historical image of the Roman Republic and disrobed
the emperor Augustus as a ruthless power monger much in the light of the political climate of
contemporary pre-2\textsuperscript{nd} world war European politics (Ginsburg 1940). Does the description
offered by him as late as 1988 herald the end to the application of the term Romanization?
However in the recent book titled *Italy and The West. Current Issues in Romanization* the
compiling authors wonder if the term can be redefined, stripped of its baggage and take on a
new lease of life (Keay and Terrenato 2001.ix). Despite several attempts to dismantle the
concept and the use of the term (cf. e. g. Woolf 1997; Barrett 1997a; Forcey 1997; Hingley
2005), it continues to be used by both ancient historians and archaeologists to this day. The
question of the validity of the term, as well as the academic inquiries and debates leading up
to such a stand will be reviewed in the following pages.

2. Empire – Historical considerations

His ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono: imperium sine fine dedi
To these [Romans] I place neither boundaries of things nor time: I have given empire without end
- Vergil (Aen 2.278-9)\textsuperscript{2}

During its height in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century the Roman Empire was vast; spanning from the Iberian
Peninsula bordered by the Atlantic Ocean in the west to the Persian Gulf in the east. In the
north its limits was marked by the Hadrianic, and later, the Antonine Wall. In the South the
*Fossatum Africace* traced the limits of the Empire. In many ways the Roman conquests have
been seen as a direct result of the close ties between domestic Roman politics and an
expressively martial ideology. The Roman concept of *imperium,* today a synonym for
absolute power or dominion, was originally strictly a military term for an official who had the
right to call an army. Opportunistic generals and field marshals were rewarded with important
governmental offices and triumphal honours as a direct result of military conquest. This trend
saw its height during the Late Republic (1\textsuperscript{st} century BC) when the Roman aristocracy
increasingly used the martial arena as a way of strengthening their power base among the
voters through extravagant triumphs and propagandistic monumental building - it was the time of Caesar and Pompey, Octavian and Antony. This steady race to outdo each other eventually ended in several civil wars and the transition to imperial reign under Caesar Augustus (Zanker 1992; Favro 1996).

In the centuries before Julius Caesar North Western Europe was populated by a patchwork of Iron Age peoples conveniently categorized by Greek and Roman writers respectively as Gauls or Celts and Germans. According to Caesar the Celts inhabited the lands on the west bank of the Rhine while the Germans stuck to the lands on the eastern side (Wells 2001:99-104). Native-Roman conflict was a reality during the Republic (c. 450 – 27 BC) with recurring Celtic and later German invasions, but trade also flourished especially after the conquest of Gallia Transalpina in 121 BC (i.e. the Languedoc area) (Cunliffe 1988:53-58). As a part of Caesars rise to power he launched an ambitious campaign from the year 58 through 50 BC which resulted in the inclusion of the Gallic region as far as the English Channel. Under his successor, Augustus, the conquest was pushed beyond the Rhine where it was brought to a grinding halt with the disastrous Varian defeat at Teutoburg in year 9 AD. Here, three whole legions fell victim to a German tribal conspiracy led by the rebel Arminius – a native nobleman who was trained by the Romans and led the Varian auxilia. Augustus died leaving behind an express wish that the German border, Limes Germanicus, was to be consolidated along the Rhine. The grand invasion of Britain, long delayed, was brought about by Emperor Claudius in 43 AD. When General Agricola defeated the Caledonians at Mons Grapius in 84 AD the Roman Empire saw the height of its northern expansion. For both Britain and Gaul these invasions marked the beginning of a Roman provincial rule that was to last a span of about 400 years. In the Late Republic and Early Empire the European cultural landscape was thus transformed into one of Roman provincial and frontier character – a landscape in which many participants contributed towards the formation of new and diverse material expressions and the forging of new cultural identities (Wells 2001:64-98).

3. The glory that was Rome – Theodor Mommsen

It is not sin in a historian to introduce a personal bias that can be recognized and discounted. The sin in historical composition is the organization of the story in such a way that bias cannot be recognized...
- Herbert Butterfield in The Whig Interpretation of History [1931] (James 2000:141)

In hindsight the instigator of the Romanization debate was the eminent classical historian Christian Matthias Theodor Mommsen (1818-1903). It does not serve this paper’s purpose to
give a thorough biographical presentation of Mommsen, neither should it be necessary as he is frequently placed alongside Leopold von Ranke as the two greatest historical minds of their century (Krieger 1968:vi). It suffices to say that after graduating as a doctor in Roman law he travelled to Italy where he studied and collected inscriptions for the future *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (*C.I.L.*) as well as studying Roman numismatics. His most widely read work is without doubt *History of Rome* published in three volumes in the years 1854-56, for which he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature as late as in 1902 making him the senior laureate in literature to this day. Other important works include *Roman Public Law* (1870-88) and his continuous work on the *C.I.L.* a work of great referential value to classical archaeologists today. In 1885 he published a fifth and final volume of his *History of Rome* where he focused on the provinces of the Empire from Caesar to Diocletian. It is in this volume that Mommsen recounts the history of Roman expansion in Gaul, Britain and Germany and its subsequent cultural results (Broughton 1968).

In 19\textsuperscript{th} century Germany classical archaeology with its focus on the Mediterranean, historical sources, epigraphic material, art and architecture held pre-eminence over the budding prehistoric research. In Turkey Heinrich Schliemann excavated Troy, in Greece German archaeologists such as Ernst Curtius, Richard Bohn, Friedrich Adler and Wilhelm Dörpfeld raced to secure the best sites for future excavations. Classical archaeology thrived. This was in part due to the fact that Germany was considered the ancestral seat of the discipline since its methodological founder, Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768), hailed from Prussia. During the 19\textsuperscript{th} century classical archaeology became firmly established within the academic context of the universities and the German Archaeological Institute. Prehistoric archaeology gained stronger foothold in the process of the German unification, but was to a large extent left to the domains of a variety of museums as well as local, regional and general societies (Bittel 1980:275; Trigger 1996:115). Even though Mommsen was not an archaeologist himself, but a historian of jurisprudence, it should be stressed that his studies was conducted and published in an age where many great academics acted as jack of all trades. To name a few; Dörpfeld was originally an architect, Schliemann was a self-made man in every sense of the word and Curtius, among others, acted as both historian and archaeologist. Mommsen’s studies brought him close to the material remains through his studies of inscriptions, coinage and monuments. He also initiated the organization of the *Limeskommission* (1894) and gave the stimulus to the creation of the *Römisch-Germanische Kommission* (1903) where prehistoric archaeology was put to the fore in the 1930s (Bittel 1980:275; Broughton
1968:xviii). In the words of his British successor of sorts, Francis Haverfield: *Mommsen did more than any scholar living or dead to extend the field of historical inquiry to archaeological evidence* (Haverfield 1904:86).

In his *History of Rome Vol. 5, Book 8 (The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian)* Mommsen recounts from his diverse material, though with heavy basis on inscription, life in the Roman provinces and their borderlands. He summarily works his way through the provincial areas and tries to vividly lay bare all the facets of ancient life expressed through the customs of the various peoples and tribes Rome encountered during her expansions. Of importance here is Northern Europe as stated above, though Mommsen included chapters on Northern Italy, Spain, Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, Judea, Egypt the Danubian lands and the Euphrat borderlands as well. Already in the introduction, where the scene is set by more generally describing the Imperial Age, a main clue to Mommsen’s narrative is revealed. Mommsen writes:

*The carrying out of the Latin-Greek civilising process in the form of perfecting the constitution of the urban community, and the gradual bringing of the barbarian, or at any rate alien elements into this circle, were tasks, which, from their very nature, required centuries of steady activity and calm self-development; and it constitutes the very grandeur of these centuries that the work once planned and initiated found this long period of time, and this prevalence of peace by land and sea, to facilitate its progress* (Mommsen 1968:4).

Here Mommsen offers a gleam of his towering respect for the Roman provincial apparatus; praising the civilizing aspect of Roman rule while hinting at planned imperial direction behind the process of Romanization. Of further notice is his mention of the *barbarian*, which he then rectifies to *alien elements*. At the first glance this might perhaps seem as a rather modern statement, but we should consider the possibility that Mommsen only rectifies himself to distinguish between more easily Romanized peoples and peoples less apt to accept Roman ways – hence barbarians. And thus he proves himself ever the classicist and obviously accepts and adopts the Greco-Roman term *barbarian* - meaning those who do not speak Latin or Greek, subscribe to strange manners and who are generally deemed less civil in life and conduct than their Roman counterparts. There seems to be good reason for this argument as such perspectives is shown explicitly in other paragraphs.³ His mention of a time of peace and tranquillity also evokes an echo of a definite Roman reading of the sources; the
Pax Romana (27 BC–180 AD) was in no way a period of peace, but a Roman construct crafted in the spirit of Augustus. In the sense that no major civil wars occurred, peace in some ways prevailed, but that it was a time of peace is a fact hard pressed. We need only point to the fact that under the emperor Trajan (98–117) the Roman Empire saw its greatest extent due to the Emperor’s ambitious and successful military campaigning. The modern equivalent to such a concept would be to say that the United States has enjoyed a period of peace and tranquillity since 1865.

Though Mommsen never expressly defines the term Romanization the theme colours the work throughout. After briefly setting the historical context he goes on to show how Gaul was pacified and included into the Roman fold mainly through communal organization based on pre-existing cantons, the obligatory use of the Latin language in official spheres, the stamping out of rebellion, restrictions on trade and the eventual granting of Roman franchise and citizenship. He describes the process as one of amalgamation, which means the merging of two or more elements into a single one, and points to the fact that the cantonal organization covered rather than obliterated the existing tribal patterns and that Celtic religion, at least at the outset, was allowed to flourish (Mommsen 1968:86-87, 108-111). He also describes certain geographical differences in relation to the success of Romanization and distinguishes between the easily Romanized south where Rome had held control since the Republican times, the northeast and the west. Of the latter two the northeast, described as largely Germanic, was left more open to Roman habits as this area held the large standing Rhenish army with all this entailed; civilian settlements, extensive trade, craft merchants and native recruitment (Mommsen 1968:90-91, 107, 126). Of the process itself Mommsen writes: The Romanising was not taken in any abrupt way, but was cautiously and patiently pursued, the Roman foreign rule in the Celtic land ceased to be as such because the Celts themselves became and desired to be Romans (Mommsen 1968:86).

In the chapter concerning Roman Germany Mommsen focuses on the northeastern areas where Roman influence was most keenly felt, and sums up that An interpretation of the two nationalities, and a mixed culture thence resulting, such as the Romanised land of the Celts presented, Roman Germany has none to show (Mommsen 1968:176). He follows up by stating that these areas bore Romano-Gallic cultural traits as they had originally been Celtic. The Germans had been resettled here; furthermore Celts had been resettled to the frontier zones across the Rhine thus strengthening the Romano-Gallic elements. He also claims that
beside the Romanizing effects of the heavy Roman military presence this area more easily adapted to Roman ways as it lacked communal centres such as encountered in Gaul proper (Mommsen 1968:176). Today, in the light of archaeological investigations, the discarding of local German elements proves a rash judgment. Material from sites in both Germania Inferior and Germania Superior show that besides the existence of several Gallic traits in for instance agricultural practice (Bloemers 1983:169; Kreusz 1999:90) and ceramic production (Okun 1989:104). Local traditions continued or were adapted to the new provincial lifestyle. Local variations in burial, such as is the case of the busta graves at Asciburgium (Bechert 1980:508-513), in German villa layout (King 1990:153-154) and new religious expressions such as the Jupiter columns goes to show that the cultural picture was complex and included traits both “Roman”, “Gallic and “German”. Mommsen comments shortly on the Germanising of the Roman state in its later phases as ultimately witnessed by Theodric’s rule in Italy, but concludes that concerning the German origins the sources are obscure; Tacitus is coloured by ideas of a declining antiquity and later sources are too saturated by Roman elements to discern anything clearly (Mommsen 1968:175-178). In another blatantly revealing paragraph Mommsen shows his stand on the alien German element: To depict the Germans in their national development is not the task of the historian of the Romans; for him they appear only as hindering or destroying (Mommsen 1968:175).

The chapter on Britain is short, but proved influential. Here he recounts the motives and course of the invasion as well as resistance and revolt in the almost 400 year long occupation. Then he continues to, in the words of Philip Freeman (1997:10), to estimate the degrees, forms and effects of Roman culture on the Province. His regard of the conqueror again slips through: The occupation of the land was not attended by any special difficulty. The natives stood, in a political as in a military point of view, at the same low stage of development which Caesar had previously found in the Island (Mommsen 1968:184). Though the course of its attainment differs from that of Gaul, for instance in Britain pre-Roman tribal cantons seemingly disappear, Mommsen describes the Romanization as similar. Though Roman language and manners proved a more exotic growth than on the Continent urban centres such as Camulodunum, Verulamium, Sulis and Londonium sprang up. Trade, farming and road implementations in South East Britain continued to bless the colony with prosperity while native religion flourished in the guise of Latin (Mommsen 1968:186, 202-204). In his description of Britain, as in Gaul and the two Germanies, it is the Roman element that takes pre-eminence. His view on the cultural change is that though some mixing in of native
elements occur the driving force behind the Romanization process is the Roman initiative, its fruits Roman civilizing and the result is eventually that of becoming Roman.

When we read Mommsen’s work it deserves to be read in context with its times and the socio-political climate it was created within. Mommsen was a classicist scholar and described himself as an *animal politicum*. As previously mentioned the classical studies in the 19th century owed, and to some extent still owe, a great deal to the rediscovery of classical ideals during the Renaissance and their formulation in the context of art history. From the times of Winckelmann scholars have tried to catalogue and appraise Greek and Roman material remains based on these ideals resulting in the measurement of civilization according to classical standards (Freeman 1997:10). As we have seen Mommsen conforms to this view already at the outset of the work. The socio-political climate when Mommsen wrote was one of nationalist and imperialist currents. Only two decades prior to Mommsen’s publishing of his last volume of *Roman History* the French emperor Napoleon III had initiated large scale excavations at Alesia, called on national unity by evoking the Celtic past and even fashioned a statue of Vercingetorix resembling himself (Cunliffe 1997:13). Mommsen did not partake in a similar revival in his homeland. Though he regretted the war with France he had high hopes for the future of the German Empire. His constant mention of *national concerns* in Iron Age provincial Europe, such as that of the Celtic nation in opposition to the Roman nation6, however marks the work throughout, and bears the stamp of 19th century political thought. During his time as deputy in the Prussian Parliament and later in the Reichstag he promoted individual and intellectual freedom, but firmly believed that these were best secured by a strong head of state (Broughton 1968:xxiv). Mommsen was an ardent believer in liberalist thought and it has been noticed that in his evaluation of key political figures in his *History of Rome* he tends to judge them according to whether they adhere to his liberalistic standards for an ideal state or not (Askew 2005:87). He idealized Caesar as the strong man needed to unite and save the state, but regretted that when Germany’s strong man came he came in the shape of Bismarck (Haverfield 1904:84). However, even if Mommsen is read as a critic of modern autocracy, as he himself indeed claimed in the second edition, his respect of the grandeur that was Rome is ever present. If an ideal was to be sought anywhere in the past, Mommsen seemed to argue that it was to be found in the Roman, rather than in the Germanic past. As we shall see he was not the last figure of archaeological importance to tend a view along these lines.
4. Continued imperial romanticism and spurring nativist tendencies in early 20th century archaeological thought – Francis Haverfield

*It has been said that Greece taught men to be human and Rome made mankind civilized. That was the work of the Empire; the form it took was Romanization*

- Francis Haverfield (1912:11)

Even though Mommsen’s chapter on Britain was short it was to have a tremendous impact. His heir to the theme and in many ways its longstanding propagator was the British historian and archaeologist Francis John Haverfield (1860-1919). To Haverfield, who had gotten his degree in classics at Oxford and was specialized in the works of Tacitus, the publishing of Mommsen’s *Roman Provinces* became an eye-opener. *It became easy to appreciate the true character of the Roman Empire* he wrote after reading Mommsen and also showed Mommsen’s provincial synthesis credit by saying that *It is no use to know about Roman Britain in particular, unless you also know about the Roman empire in general* (Craster 1920:63, 64). At Mommsen’s personal request Haverfield took up the study of Roman inscriptions in Britain for the *C.I.L.* and thus, adding forgotten inscriptions as well as newly surfaced ones through excavation, made himself a specialist on Roman material remains in Britain. An interesting fact from an archaeological view is that even though Haverfield gained his reputation as an epigraphist he always stressed the need for excavation and personal involvement in the gathering of evidence. Through his involvement in excavation he was responsible for more careful registration and classification of ordinary objects that had previously been neglected among his peers. He also saw the importance of publishing and giving annual readings on Roman finds, both home and abroad, as the British excavations at this time were all private enterprises in which public information was scant or nonexistent (Craster 1920:66-65). His large area of interest spanned from Roman military aspects to town planning, his methods from art historical appreciations to the typological dating of *fibulae*. A long bibliography boasts titles beside *The Romanization of Roman Britain* (1906) such as the revision of Mommsen’s *Provinces* (1909), *Ancient Town Planning* (1913) and the posthumously published *The Roman Occupation of Britain* (1924). His broad overview combined with deep knowledge of all things Romano-British was finally awarded with the Camden Chair at Oxford in 1907. He was also the first President of *The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies* (1910) and was instrumental in preparing its *Journal of Roman Studies* (MacDonald 1918; Miller 1925).
Needless to say the book of most interest to us here is *The Romanization of Roman Britain*. In this essay sized book Haverfield effectively and eloquently presents Roman Britain through different aspects - language, material civilization, art, local government and landholding. The choice to confront the material in this fashion rather than presenting the Romanization in chronological form, displays Haverfield’s successful hand at popularization, not in the derogatory meaning of the term, but as a merit. His effective use of pictures and illustrations further credit him as a successful mediator aimed not solely at the academic elite. Haverfield also includes an introduction where he places Romanization in a broader imperial context – already here, as was the case with Mommsen, core issues in the narrative are revealed. He picks up where Mommsen left off and states that *The greatest work of the imperial age must be sought in its provincial administration* (Haverfield 1912:9). The fruits of this administration, indeed of Romanization itself, were those of civilization. Haverfield’s choice of words reveals an unmistakable imperialist stance: *In the lands that he (i. e. the Roman) had sheltered, Roman civilization had taken a strong root...Outside was the wild chaos of barbarism* (Haverfield 1912:10). Imperial conquest and the Roman intruders, acting as emissaries of civilization are ultimately hailed as benevolent cultural reformers who, though not completely without flaws, bring order to a barbaric world of discord and strife. The parallel to the early 20th century British Empire is strikingly evident. If we for a moment turn to Haverfield’s inaugural address to the aforementioned *Roman Society* (1911) he further elaborates on this theme. Here he makes but little attempts to hide both his immense respect for Roman civilizing force and a possible historic imperial analogy:

*It [the Roman Empire] provides few direct parallels or precise precedents...But it offers stimulating contrasts and comparisons and those glimpses of the might-have-been which provide so much for the intelligent reader. Its republican constitution offers the one true analogy to the seeming waywardness of our own English constitution. Its Imperial system, alike in its differences and similarities, lights up our own Empire, for example in India, at every turn. The methods by which Rome incorporated and denationalized and assimilated more than one a third of Europe and a part of Africa , concern in many ways our own age and Empire* (Haverfield 1911:xviii).

In his introduction to *The Romanization of Roman Britain* Haverfield explains the varying degrees of success Romanization achieved in the Roman Empire at large. He advocates the view that racial and cultural characteristics leading to the crystallization of thoughts,
On the general advancement of Romanization in material culture Haverfield describes the process as one of uniformity - Graeco-Roman material fashion soon spread from the Mediterranean to Central and Western Europe. Emulations of classical styles soon came to exist in the provinces, such as Samian pottery in Gaul, but these where classical in everything but their place of production (Haverfield 1912:15-16). Roman material culture hence supplants pre-existing native material through the process of Romanization. He does however, in his review of the archaeological material, point to the existence of local variations within this scheme and even to the emergence of new material expressions. In housing he point to the variations not only with Mediterranean floor plans, but with other provincial types in Gaul and Germany. English *corridor houses* are frontal displayed towards the landscape, whereas southern Roman houses are generally focused inwards toward open *impluvia*. The same goes for the *courtyard houses* in England, although arranged around an open courtyard, the ground covered is far too big to offer a fitting analogy to Mediterranean houses. These houses, Haverfield concludes, are likely to be Roman modifications of Celtic originals. As for the existing interiors, these reflect Roman tastes throughout - from opulent rural villas complete with Roman baths, frescoes and mosaics to poorer houses with crude hypocausts (Haverfield 1912:31-32, 36-37). For the most definite inheritance of Celtic traits Haverfield points to the field of applied arts. Here we can witness obvious La Tène affections and traditions into a definite coherent form hindered Romanization. Such was the case in the Greek East where Hellenic culture had manifested in such a way that, though eventually calling themselves Romans, the inhabitants never adopted Roman language and culture fully. While in North Western Europe, where no broad racial or ancient culture marked the native from the Roman, Romanization was easy (Haverfield 1912:11-12).

Haverfield then draws our attention to the chief instruments of the Romanization being both official and unofficial; the establishment of veteran colonies in the newly conquered territories, the previously mentioned effects of the installation of legionary fortresses as well as the rewarding of opportunistic native aristocrats with Roman honours (Haverfield 1912:13-14). Here Haverfield echoes a well known passage from Tacitus where the Roman historian writes that General Agricola encouraged Roman behaviour among the conquered aristocrats and consciously played on their conspicuous attempts to outdo each other. This in no way seems an unlikely story. Tacitus adds: *Being inexperienced as they were, they [the natives] called this civilization, even as it was in reality a proof of their enslavement* (Tac. Agr. 21).
decorative influences - spirals, curls and animal representations abound. In pottery there is Castor ware, taking its name from a location in Cambridgeshire, one of several places where the pottery was produced. At this settlement the houses were furnished in Roman style, yet the pottery in many ways reflects pre-Roman features. Both in ware and decoration Castor reflects a merging of native and Roman elements. Classical elements, such as foliated scrolls, hunting- and mythological scenes, are brought to life in a way very reminiscent of Celtic art. Haverfield also shows these trends occurring in statuary and metalwork. In Bath (Sulis) there is the so called Gorgon Head adorning Minerva/Sul’s shield on a classical group. The Gorgon, in the classical Graeco-Roman sphere was traditionally represented as a wrathful woman, but here it is wrought as a fierce man with flaming leaf-like hair and moustache. In metalwork Haverfield points to the bronze fibulae of the Roman period, especially the dragon brooches, where an obvious Celtic spirit is evident through their coloured enamel and figurative animal swirls (Haverfield 1912:39-47).

Following Haverfield’s assessment of the material, let us turn to his stand toward the native. As Haverfield’s field of study is the Roman period, he never explicitly defines native Britain as a cultural scene before the arrival of the Romans. From his statements the following is clear – based on language and archaeological material broadly categorized as La Tène-styled he follows Mommsen and the major pre-historians of his time in perceiving the British Isles before the Roman invasion as a Celtic tribal community. The Celtic label is also applied to pre-Roman floor plans in houses. In other words pre-Roman seems to equal Celtic. Even though Haverfield takes a definite Roman stand he in no direct way presents the pre-Roman Celtic material in any derogative way. He adopts a pragmatic approach and argues that native arts in general tend to lose out when in competition with the neater and more evenly produced products of town manufactures (Haverfield 1912:39). His essential point is that new and mass produced items, previously unavailable, supplant traditional goods however beautiful. Haverfield’s views on cultural change reflected in the material and what this entails in regard to cultural identity however are clearly stated. He sees the Roman period not essentially as an episode of occupation, but as one of transformation. The merging of Roman and native elements creates a new material expression that is Romano-British. He stresses the need to see the changed cultural landscape as a Roman Province, rather than opposing Roman and native expressions (Haverfield 1912:18). To lend an expression from his mentor Mommsen – the material culture to him represents an amalgamation of expression. He stresses that provincial variations in the Roman sphere does not contradict its Roman character and that
elements in material culture do not reveal nationalist or revivalist ideas, but the birth of new Roman fashions (Haverfield 1912:16).\(^\text{10}\) Haverfield reacts, as he explicitly states, against the common conception among historians of his day that saw the Roman period as an episode of occupation; the Romans came and left - leaving the Britons almost as Celtic as they had been before the Romans arrived. He is also critical of the emergence of recent Welsh national sentiment supporting such a view of history as it lends credibility to the belief that Celticism was only interrupted in the Roman period (Haverfield 1912:17).

According to archaeologist Colin Forcey Haverfield took the stand of the Romanist in opposition to his contemporary Paul Vinogradoff, who by publishing his *The Growth of the Manor* (1905) assumed a Nativist stance (Forcey 1997:16).\(^\text{11}\) Paul Vinogradoff (1854-1925) was a Russian born historian who had studied under Mommsen and eventually rose to a professorship of jurisprudence at Oxford. His preferred field of study was medieval England and particularly the origin of feudalism (Powicke 1926). In the first part of *The Growth of the Manor* Vinogradoff tries to trace the origins of landholding and serfdom in the pre-Anglo-Saxon era and his sources are primarily historical. His point is essentially that Roman organization of occupied agricultural land was based on compromises and hybrid forms of tribute collecting - resulting in native traditions of organization and landholding being disguised and hidden by Roman legal forms (Vinogradoff 1905:56-57). On Romanization itself he states that there was *comparatively slight impression produced by Roman domination on the Celtic population of the British Isles* and further that *...only by admitting for a strong under-current of Celtic life may we account for the powerful Celtic revival of the 5th and 6th centuries* (Vinogradoff 1905:37, 42). Forcey poses a continued meta-narrative of Romanization originating in Haverfield where Romanists battle Nativists about the extent and depth of the Romanization process, a debate leading to the process itself left little discussed. To fit his meta-narrative scheme for the Romanization debate he poses the *town and country controversy* as example of the opposing views in the discussion. In short this debate focuses on whether lack of successful Romanization led to a second wave of Romanization represented by Roman elite Villas in the rural areas and to what extent the Romanization had penetrated. In continuance the debate surfaced in the early 1980s as to the (Roman vs. native) origins of these villas (Forcey 1997:16-17). Forcey rightly points to a rather sterile polarized debate where the phenomenological and epistemological aspects of Romanization seem sadly to have suffered only to make way for questions relating to whether traits of rural organization as well as villa structures are simply Roman or native in both origin and
continuance. However his point somewhat obscures Haverfield’s original view of Roman Britain as a conglomerate of native and Roman forms making up the Romano-British character. Haverfield’s student Robin Collingwood (1889-1943), although representative of the so-called Romanist current in the Villa-debate also argues against a simplification into a scheme of simple Roman/British dichotomy and adds that the make-up of Roman Britain was *A compound of elements which can be separated by analysis but not by fact* (Collingwood 1923:67). Collingwood’s view on the process of Romanization changed after the publication cited however. He became a spokesman for a more clear division between Roman and native rural forms and also disputed the importance of native use of Roman material (Hingley 2000:131-136). In doing this *he*, and not Haverfield, becomes the point of departure for the continued native/Roman discourse in the town and country debate.

As has been pointed to by others (cf. Hingley 2000:125-126), there is however an inherent problem with Haverfield’s theory and this might in part be the reason for Collingwood redefining his theories on Romanization during the 1930s. Because if, as Haverfield had claimed, the Roman period transformed the province and pre-Roman traits melded into the Romano-British character supplanting native material culture and *national claims*, there is a breach of logic concerning the *Celtic revival* that ends Haverfield’s book (Haverfield 1912:60-68). Here he turns his attention to the immediate post-Roman period and the resurgence of Celtic elements after the British province had been cut off from Rome in 407. According to Haverfield this revival was given opportunity due to the less Romanized Britons in Cornwall and the North as well as the settling of migrating Celts from Ireland in the 4th and 5th centuries in Wales and Caledonia. These migrations coupled with the Saxon invasion directly hitting the Romanized areas of the south-east led to the destruction of Roman Britain and the revival of *...Celtic national feeling and spirit* (Haverfield 1912:62). Although Haverfield restricts his Romanized zone to the south-eastern civilized districts and accounts for less Romanization in the military districts in the north and south (Haverfield 1912:58-59), the concept of a Celtic revival seems hard at odds with his initial attempt to eradicate the native-Roman opposition at the opening of the work. In conclusion to this issue, when reading Haverfield’s *The Romanization of Roman Britain* we should be wary of simplifying his work by placing him within a structuralist framework and simply label him as a *Romanist*. True, he was a Romanist in that he revelled in the benefits of the Roman period, but the fact that he acknowledged the existence of pre-Roman contributions in many aspects of the Romano-British character should not be overlooked or played down. The Celtic revival
issue certainly reflects a flaw, or at least a weak point, in his theory, but his contribution to
the polarized debate concerning the Roman-native dichotomy could be seen as indirect.
Though his views may today be read as biased, such a debate could constitute the very
opposite of what he was aiming to do.

Turning to Haverfield’s work in light of the early Edwardian times in which they were
shaped, this has recently been the issue of some controversy. Archaeologists Philip Freeman
and Richard Hingley are at odds when it comes to Haverfield’s attitudes toward Roman
archaeology in the light of the imperial currents of the British Empire. Whereas Hingley
(1996; 2000; 2005) sees Haverfield as an active participant in formulating ideas alleviating
British imperial identity, Freeman (1996b; 1997) sees him as a scholar with little interest in
contemporary imperial politics and seeks to place his works in a more particular academic
and non-imperial context. Hingley, as we shall return to, is influenced by post-colonial
readings of the past and makes strong arguments for placing Haverfield within the late
Victorian and early Edwardian imperial currents of thought. In the late Victorian era the
value of the Roman imperial image changed - from being seen as providing a historical
lesson in despotic corruption until the 1870s, tendencies arose that drew upon the Roman
element for military, organizational and civilizing aspects (Hingley 2000:22, 56-60). In the
work and opinions of writers such as C.P Lucas, J. A. Cramb and the Earl of Cromer it
became increasingly popular to draw moral lessons for the British from the Roman past
(Hingley 2000:34-35, 87). Hingley sees Haverfield and his theory of Romanization within
this context and specifically points to Haverfield’s hailing of the benefits of the Roman
civilizing mission, and thus supplying an analogy for the Edwardian theory of progress
entailing that …the British had a moral right and duty to lead others to the benefits of
civilisation (Hingley 2000:128). He also stresses the importance of frontiers in Haverfield’s
works; the structures that created a boundary between the civilized and the barbarian and
were military instructive comparisons for the British in India. Hingley draws on a large body
of material from Haverfield’s bibliography and draws particular notice to the address quoted
above and three others delivered in the period 1910-1913 - a period when works of imperial
comparison was particularly evident in England. It is in these addresses he identifies the most
overt imperial analogies (Hingley 1996:38; 2000:25-26). Freeman on the other hand counters
Hingley by trying to view Haverfield in the stricter context of his academic era and peers
(Freeman 1996b:32; Freeman 1997:37-45). As for Haverfield’s quote on comparative
imperialism in the 1911 address he argues that we should be careful not to read too much into
what he dubs an innocent public address. He draws attention to the fact that this is Haverfield’s only substantial statement on comparative imperialism and that he made as many references to the lessons of more recent European history. Another statement on imperial analogy is discarded as it was given before a (semi-)lay audience (Freeman 1996b:30, 33). In Haverfield’s published academic work he says next to nothing on the nature and form of imperialism, and Freeman argues that this could be a trait inherited from his mentor Henry Pelham as well as from Mommsen, who seemed little interested in the issue (Freeman 1997:37). He also points to the fact that Haverfield seemed sceptical to the dominance the study of classical languages had taken in relation to ancient history, and places him almost as an outsider in relation to university politics in a period when the Classics were instrumental in the training of potential colonial administrators (Freeman 1996b:29, 32).

Freeman calls for distinction between popularizing imperial historians (such as Lucas and Cromer14) and historians in the real academic sense and tries to show that at closer inspection few ancient historians actually drew imperial comparisons (Freeman 1996b:22, 27). Hence Freeman puts Haverfield down as a rather apolitical actor who’s main motivational undercurrent was to improve the position of Roman archaeology in Britain with hopes of eventually ushering it in as a part of the university curriculum (Freeman 1996b:31). Freeman contributes to narrow the socio-historical context for Haverfield’s work, but the fact that there are few references to comparative imperialism in his work mandates that those existent must be given due attention. Hingley neither attempts to hide the fact that much of the works on imperial comparison was of mixed origin and credits both administrators, politicians, educationalists, children’s writers, poets as well as academics with the joint effort of forging a new Roman image for Britain (Hingley 2000:25). Freeman’s strongest point, however, is the question of whether we are simply projecting our own understanding of the present post-colonial world back on the past, and thus placing Haverfield’s possibly non-political work in a school of mentality simply because this existed at the time. It is, perhaps, somewhere in between these opposing views of Haverfield that we should place him historically; as an ardent academic who remained an apolitical actor at Oxford and at the same time a successful popular mediator not solely aimed at the academic circles. However, it cannot be disregarded that in both these roles he supplied the discourse of Romanization, and though perhaps inadvertently the Edwardian rule, with a theory promoting a linear historical process progressing from native to civilized (Hingley 1996:39; 2000:121-123; 2005:37-40). And in this process the wielder of the civilizing force was ultimately seen as benefiting native society.
After having reviewed the roots, so to speak, of the concept Romanization we will now move on to a selection of later evaluations of the process. First we will comment on some theoretical advances and see how they have influenced archaeology on a more general plan with focus on social dynamics and cultural change. The following examples will then be treated in adherence with these theoretical developments and the central issues they raise.

PART II – COMPLEXITY

5. Rethinking the past – Theoretical advances

*If the voice of the other, the dispossessed and silent is now to be heard through the material record then it is we who will hear it and it is we who will give it life; it is through us that they will speak again. This seems to bequeath a considerable responsibility, akin to the obligations of a translator or a representative and as fundamental as the responsibilities of the anthropologist*

- J. C. Barrett (1997b:2)

Since the days of Mommsen and Haverfield archaeology has seen several theoretical shifts and the material unearthed and amassed is vast. The world has changed, and with advances in sociology, anthropology, historiography and archaeology, so have our ways of looking at the past. The close of the western imperial epoch, the events of the Second World War and the post-modern paradigm have ushered in new perspectives. In wake of the war and the Nazi preoccupation with the Germanic heritage the romantic Tacitean view of the noble savagery of Iron Age Germans had to be redefined, or at least tackled anew. Racial theories, which had flourished before the war within both axis and allied camps, ceased to be seen as fruitful. With the abolition of the colonies in the post-war period new trends surfaced in the social sciences resulting in changes in the understanding of indigenous peoples, social make-up and cultural dynamics. In the 1980s it became increasingly popular to try to see the dynamics of change between Romans and natives within structuralist frameworks. Core and periphery relationships were explored (cf. e.g. Rowlands, Larsen and Kristiansen 1987) and archaeologists, such as Barry Cunliffe tried to apply variations on Immanuel Wallenstein’s world system theory to explain Roman motivations for the imperial provincial enterprise (Cunliffe 1988). However one of the most important contributions toward the explanation of Roman-native dynamics is far more centred on the immediate than on the grand system scale; it has its roots in anthropology, has found firm foothold in the continually evolving post-processual archaeology and it concerns the construction and manifestations of ethnicity.

In 1969 Fredrik Barth edited and wrote the introduction to *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Here Barth drew critical attention to static interpretations and ratified the dynamics of ethnic
groups as categories. Of utmost importance in his theoretical approach is the notion that ethnic groups are categories of ascription and identification by the actors themselves. Barth further states that *We can assume no simple one-to-one relationship between ethnic units and cultural similarities and difference. The features that are taken into account are not the sum of objective differences, but only those which the actors themselves regard as significant* (Barth 1969:14). He concludes that it is the social/territorial boundaries that define these groups, and not the cultural stuff that they enclose. These boundaries are in turn maintained through a continual process of expression and validation (Barth 1969:10, 14-16). The views of Barth (and others) thus enabled archaeologists to tackle social processes in a new way – breaking away from closed models of human behaviour and reviewing frontiers as contexts of dynamic change (Green and Perlman 1985:xv). Boundary studies such as that of Ian Hodder on Calabash decoration in the Baringo district in Kenya has also shown that the same material decoration may offer different significance to different groups within society and that it is actively used in social strategies between conflicting parties (Hodder 1985). Such studies help to see materiality as a means of operating on multiple levels of interpretation and plead for more complex readings in archaeology’s attempts to perceive the social processes behind its objects of study.

During the 1990s efforts trying to overcome the bias of historical readings of the past informed by post-colonial works, such as Edward Said’s hugely influential *Orientalism* (1978), crystallized into what can loosely be labelled post-colonial archaeology. Common for these interpretations of the past are the ambitions to de-centre Western categories of knowledge, articulate active histories of colonized people, deconstruct binary models of categorization and question imperial representations of the colonial Other (Webster 1997:7). The reformulation of ethnic groups in anthropology as well as recent critiques of the traditional use of historical texts has alleviated the process of peeking behind the historical images shaped by the conquerors. Archaeologists in recent years have become increasingly interested in alternative representations of identity. In extension of these arguments some call for critical awareness toward use of age-old categories such as Celt and German arguing that these are historical constructs originating in classical sources, the perceived differences fit badly with the archaeological evidence and the categories do not necessarily express the voices of the indigenous Other (Wells 2004a:111-113). In the case of the Celts, a debate has originated in Britain whether the insular Celts ever existed as a historical people. Archaeologist Simon James, among others, has argued convincingly toward the idea that a
race, nation or ethnic group called the Celts in Ancient Britain and Ireland is a historical construction serving diverse political and cultural agendas in the 18th and 19th centuries. His arguments are based on the facts that the labelling of an ancient people as Celtic on the Isles is fairly new (18th century). The great diversity in archaeological evidence points toward continuity with contact, not mass invasion, and undermines the perception of a similar culture emanating from a homogenous Celtic origin (James 2000:37-42). Based on this evidence he summons up an alternative picture of the insular pre-Roman Iron Age as one of multiple traditions undergoing constant change and reformulation. James stresses the lack of need for the development of an island wide identity as there was no significant cultural Other in the early stages of the period and points to evidence for continuity between the late Bronze Age and the early pre-Roman Iron Age. The evidence in totality neither point toward the stratification usually attested to Celtic societies. When Celtic elements begin to surface in the 4th and 3rd centuries, such as the square-ditched burial mounds in East Yorkshire, chariot graves and La Tène artefacts, these are set in a context implying continuity of settlement and James suggests that what actually migrated, were not people on a large scale, but ideas and ideologies. This argument is backed by the fact that the La Tène material displays considerable local variation. In short James sees the pre-Roman Celtic period as one of societal change; we are witnessing the generating and rise of local nobles – and thus Celtic artefacts are indicators of status and not of ethnicity (James 2000:87-100). Needless to say James is not entirely unopposed in his views, but this is not the place to review the authenticity of the Celtic label in depth. However, the healthy debate is illustrative of current views on cultural change, social processes and alternate formulations of identity. In light of this short summary of important theoretical advances in the recent decades we will now move on to three select works tackling the increasingly difficult questions of Romanization.

6. Indigenous initiatives – Martin Millett

…”Roman” culture was by definition a cosmopolitan fusion of elements from diverse origins rather than purely the native culture of Rome itself. We must thus see Romanization as a process of dialectical change, rather than the influence of one “pure” culture upon others. Roman culture interacted with native cultures to produce the synthesis that we call Romanized

- Martin Millett (1990a:1)

In 1990 Martin Millett published The Romanization of Britain which was to become one of the seminal modern works on the subject. Initial positive reviewers saw the book as counteracting trends which placed classical inferences in the front rank (Keppie 1991:415)
and believed that it heralded a more mature phase of publications on Roman Britain (Scott 1993:602). One reviewer even called it *superior to anything that has gone before* due to Millett’s use of archaeological evidence in producing a coherent story for the province (Reece 1993:993). Millett has two goals at the outset, namely to assess the abundance of recent archaeological data and to supply the already towering literature on military and political aspects with a synthesis based on the social and economical development of the province. This approach was further to look to the other social sciences in its implementation (Millett 1990a:xv). When defining Romanization he explicitly states that he intends to build on the foundations of Haverfield with the advantage of the increased archaeological material of recent decades. He points to Haverfield’s essential point that Romanization in general extinguished the distinction between Roman and provincial, though not everywhere and at once. As reflected in the above quote, he approaches Romanization as a process of dialectical change and nods to the pioneering theoretical headway made in the Netherlands during the early 1980s. Here Roel Brandt and Jan Slofstra et al. approached Romanization in the light of anthropological perspectives, such as examining acculturation as a two-way process (Millett 1990a:1-2; Brandt and Slofstra 1983).

Mommsen and Haverfield never scrutinized the nature of Roman imperialism; in the *History* Mommsen does not *explain* Roman expansion and gives no definition of imperialism *per se*, and Haverfield finds little place for imperial or expansionist explanations (Freeman 1997:30-31). Both of them, however, see Romanization as ultimately imposed on the provinces, although they do not dwell long on the subject; probably as they both see the process in the expressed context of progress. Not so with Millett, who, after having placed himself within the post-imperial generation and stressed the need for new explanations for cultural change, tackles the nature of Roman imperialism head on. He sees the Roman expansion as neither steady nor planned, but identifies three stages of differing imperial exploitation fuelling it. He follows Badian’s arguments for disincentive social conventions at the height of the Republic limiting expansion. While in the Late Republic he identifies a period of less restrained provincial exploitation with room for individual opportunism, yet does not see this as systematically organized. In the Augustan period reorganization of tax revenues and local collection follows, hence stimulating local developments at the provincial rather than at the imperial level. Millett criticizes analyses that utilize World System analysis, as these approach core-periphery relations as benefiting the centre, while he sees the Augustan restructuring as one moving money and bullion (esp. through the army) to the peripheries. In
conclusion he states that the Roman government, due to the distribution of power on relatively few hands and the vastness of the Empire’s territory, was far less centrally based than often supposed. In reality the early imperial system was one of loosely decentralized administration, a federation of different peoples under Rome, which allowed overall control and left the low level administration to the local aristocracy (Millett 1990a:3-7). Thus Millett effectively refutes the critique levied against the concept of Romanization by Syme and at the same time supplies the overarching framework for his hypothesis which is ...that Rome incorporated existing systems, and transformations occurred accidentally as a result of interaction between Rome and the civitates\textsuperscript{19}, not as a consequence of any deliberate policy (Millett 1990a:85). This process is further seen as largely indigenous in its motivation (Millett 1990a:212).\textsuperscript{20}

In the remainder of the book he tries to show how the social, economical and organizational aspects of this dynamic were initiated and maintained. Characteristics pertaining to agricultural economy, evidence for regional groupings and so called proto-urban centres within Late pre-Roman Iron Age [LPRIA] society are scrutinized as a backdrop to the changes occurring later on. Millett’s take on the LPRIA is in accord with that of James; he sketches an image of emerging localized elite-driven patterns and he steers clear of the Celtic label due to its ambiguities. Millett points to agricultural intensification in the period after 500 BC as a backdrop for the regional patterns and discards Britain as a cultural unity. The most informative archaeological material, here evaluated as pottery, early coinage and settlement type, is then taken to give indication of existing social units as they are reasonably coherently grouped spatially (Millett 1990a:10-17). As for social organization Millett argues for a period between the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} century and the Claudian invasion where increased wealth and social differentiation is reflected in the wider spectrum of material goods, including Roman imports, emergence of the oppida and power maintenance through military symbolism (Millett 1990a:20-35). Based mainly on structural evidence Millett argues for pragmatic invasion tactics and again calls for a caveat concerning grand imperial schemes before he turns to the emergence and maturity of the civitates. In a very stimulating analysis he shows that it is very likely that the civitates organization is in direct continuance of LPRIA tribal organization as was the case in Gaul. By allowing tribes to transform into decuriones the hereditary system was retained. Millett argues that LPRIA wealth display implies the existence of a taxation system which Rome could utilize, while the native aristocracy could reinforce their power by leaning on Rome. At the same time knowledge of Romanitas gave
the existing elites new symbols of power, as the old martial ones were quelled by new Roman laws (Millett 1990a:65-69). It is impossible to here review all the specific themes in Millett’s synthesis, but it will suffice to say that that the Romanization, whether reflected in urban development and munificence, the growth of villas, rural settlements or trade, the process is largely seen as one maintaining and manipulating the strands of social fabric developed in the LPRIA. He concludes that though the power structures mutated during the course of the Empire; from one of rurally based elites with important nodal economical (urban) centres to one of peripheral economical activity later on, the net changes need not have altered the structure of society at all. Eventually, as a result of the indigenous elites’ use of Roman material culture, its further permeation into lower strata of society and its overall importance for understanding of contemporary social organization, Millett sees Britain as being utterly Roman by the third quarter of the 4th century. This process, and hence the Romanization itself is seen as largely indigenous in its motivation (Millett 1990a:151, 212).

While Millett’s post-colonial revisionist synthesis is successful in that it decentres the context for Romanization and formulates an active history for the indigenous population, it has drawn criticism from several quarters. As argued by Jane Webster (2001:216), Millett’s model is elitist as it accounts for only a tiny proportion of the total population while the non-elites... become passive receptors of those random elements of Roman culture that trickle down to them. Freeman (1993) who, besides asking for a more concrete definition of Romanization, questions Millett’s take on Roman material culture. To appreciate the changes brought about by acculturation one must study the autonomous cultural systems in contact. While the indigenous system is frequently elaborated on, Millett fails to scrutinize the Roman system adequately – this again results in a lack of understanding as to what actually constituted Roman material culture. Freeman argues that Millett contributes to the lasting legacy of Mommsen and Haverfield by fuelling a continued tradition seeing Roman culture as something homogenous. Though Millett, as mentioned above, recognizes the problem he does not elaborate on the issue in his analysis, but continues to use traditional categories, such as the role of the villas, in stereotypical ways. Freeman argues that natives may adopt material and cultural traits from the Roman sphere, but this does not imply a wish to become Roman. Further, if we subscribe to Haverfield’s thought about Roman and native categories merging into something new, we must accept that this happened in other provinces as well, and the resulting plethora of categories makes comparison and categorization difficult (Freeman 1993:443-444). By doing this Freeman to some degree anticipates the arguments of
Greg Woolf who takes into account both internal and external provincial differences while stressing that the social processes entailed in imperial expansion should be seen against the background of changes in the Empire in the Late Republic and Early Empire. Woolf does not see the adoption of Roman material culture so much as a process of becoming Roman, but as a process going from a LPRIA unity-in-diversity to another kind of unity-in-diversity after the conquest. In this process the peoples of Gaul, in Woolf’s example, were given the opportunity to participate through hegemonic relations of a new imperial order — and in the process become different. Against this background both centre and periphery is changed (Woolf 1997). While Woolf’s model supplies a valuable consideration of what actually constitutes Roman culture and allows for more complex readings than the model supplied by Millett, it is still elite-driven. And, as pointed out by Webster (2001:217), none of the two really allow for ambiguous use of material culture. In relation to Millett, Webster rightly highlights the fact that he eventually operates with a polarized provincial world of Romans (or Romanized natives) and natives with no grey areas in between. Roman material is only seen in the context of emulation, while resistance through alternative or creolized applications are not explored (Webster 2001:215-216). Hence Millett is shown to be entrenched in binary models of categorization and continues to reflect cultural historical categories and envisage alternative ways of cultural change. In the following we will turn to Siân Jones who in exploring the relationship between material culture, identity and ethnicity has used the discourse of Romanization as a case-in-point.

7. Ethnic implications — Siân Jones

*Expectations of boundedness, homogeneity and continuity, which have been built into ideas concerning culture since the nineteenth century, are related to nationalism and the emergence of the nation-state*

- Siân Jones (1997:136)

*The Archaeology of Ethnicity* (1997) is a work that sets out to scrutinize the relationship between material culture and formulations of ethnicity. Jones applies the theories of the late sociologist Pierre Bourdieu in an ambitious attempt to create an archaeologically applicable theoretical framework introducing ethnicity as a vantage point for investigation. In this context ethnicity is seen as based on the shared subliminal dispositions of social agents which shape, and are shaped by, objective commonalities of practice (Jones 1997:128). Thus Jones paves the way for readings where the peoples of the past are allowed a more active role in their respective formulations of ethnicity through ambiguous use of material ultimately connected with the contexts they appear in. Jones’ book is by no means a treatise on
Romanization - rather it is a theoretical work trying to break free from vestiges of lingering cultural historical elements within archaeological analysis. In the following we will not delve into the more general themes of the work as it falls out of the scope of this paper. Of importance here is that she uses Romanization as a case study to highlight the flaws in using such cultural historical elements without scepticism, and in doing this she questions the validity of the continued use of the concept. In Jones’ short summarization of the discourse of Romanization Haverfield is criticized as seeing the cultural processes in the guise of Romanization as ultimately that of becoming Roman. Millett, on the other hand, is congratulated in his attempts to bring to light the socio-cultural processes before and in the wake of the conquest. However, she highlights the all-encompassing focus on the socio-economic and political aspects and calls out for a discussion on materiality (Jones 1997:34-39).

One of Jones’ primary concerns is the relationship between material remains and the formulation of cultural categories resulting in a view where past peoples fit into what she dubs monolithic ethnic groups. She also points to the fact that such categorizations, in the explicit example of Romanization, are essentially historically informed. In most cases the LPRIA cultural landscape is forced into bounded monolithic cultural entities to the result that variation and possible alternate negotiations of identity are obscured. Instead of scrutinizing the basic premises for these categorizations, such as historical sources, style and typology, these are more or less taken for granted. As a result the LPRIA in Britain emerges as a period of temporal and spatial boundedness – as a historically informed tribal reality where, as Freeman pointed out, alternative and ambiguous uses of material is left unexplored. In such a perspective ethnicity is linked to historically attested tribes through specific material such as pottery and coinage and according to style and typology. Jones argues that such a reasoning, as reflected in the pioneering work of Cunliffe and later Millett, is essentially cultural historical in its assumptions, and does not question neither the nature nor the mechanics of ethnicity (Jones 1997:30-31, 39). Among these assumptions, uncritical use of style and typology are highlighted. Within studies of style she points to the tendency to fit complex heterogeneous sets of artefacts within spatial and temporal frameworks rather than focusing on possible variation within these. While within typology the inherent assumptions that like goes with like, that change is gradual and that dissimilarity equals social and/or physical distance potentially leads to circular arguments concerning past cultural and ethnic entities (Jones 1997:38). In this way Jones not only questions the uniformity and general
advancement of Roman culture that is usually criticized in newer accounts of Romanization, but tackles the cultural processes in a way that questions categorization on both sides of the Roman-Native divide. In other words Jones attacks the very foundation that Romanization studies was built upon – the clash of two or more distinct cultures with the adherent changes brought about. As a result there appears an aptness to simplify material variety into categories such as Roman, native and Romano-British alleviating simplistic conclusions about complex cultural processes (Jones 1997:36-37). Jones illustrates her point by looking at four LPRIA sites in Essex and Hertfordshire that takes on Roman features in the post-invasion centuries. Between all sites she points to variation in pottery assemblages – imports, locally produced copies and consumption of these all vary from site to site. In architecture she points to the fact that at one of the sites sill-beamed houses appear - typifying the Roman category while another takes to masonry, again Roman, yet seemingly placed on the premises of pre-existing houses indicating continuity. This negation of a linear transition to Roman trends is also evident in the fact that in some rural localities Roman construction is never applied (Jones 1997:132-135).

How then is one to abstract any wisdom from the cultural clash that in no doubt did occur between the different peoples during and after the Roman invasion? The answer, argues Jones, is besides questioning the underlying premises for material categorization and dating, to turn to more context based analyses. There is a need to scrutinize variety between any particular site within and through time, and to view this variability in the light of context and the sites’ entire assemblages (Jones 1997:132, 134). Only then will it be possible to glean that material culture was probably used in negotiations of identity not only between socio-cultural groups, but also within them. And though Roman material was most likely tied up with social reproduction through status and negotiations of power, as Millett and others have tried to show, the same material may have been used in different ways in different social contexts further rendering the categories of Roman and native too simplistic (Jones 1997:134-135).
8. Unity, diversity and Empire – Richard Hingley

...having rejected outdated outmoded models of Roman imperialism that drew upon the culture of the nineteenth and earlier century, we should instead, look to contemporary theory, as expressed by works on globalization, to develop rather more decentralized and dynamic images of the Roman world

- Richard Hingley (2005:109)

Whereas Jones’ work is not a treatise on Romanization, Hingley’s Globalizing Roman Culture (2005) is. The aforementioned Hingley is a prominent scholar on various themes mainly dealing with Roman imperialism, the use of Rome as an image in the modern world, LPRIA/Roman rural settlement archaeology and the material culture of the same periods (Hingley 2006). He is also the author of the much appraised Roman Officers and English Gentlemen (2000) which deals with mirroring the imperialist discourses of the Roman and British Empires. In Globalizing Roman Culture he expands on the themes introduced here, suggests that the term Romanization is obsolete and that new perspectives, informed by emerging theories on globalization, take its place. To arrive at this stance Hingley guides us through a challenging theory laden examination of problems relating to moderns receptions of the classical past, Roman identity, readings of past cultural processes and the material evidence. Hingley, influenced by post-modernism, negates idealist approaches claiming to render objective readings of the past. While he grants authors on Roman culture credit, notably Karl Galinsky, for trying to see Roman culture in the view of contextual historical analysis, he effectively shows that the reading of the past is intricately woven together with both the context in which it was rendered as well as the one in which it is read. Past contexts, previous readings and uses of the past filter together with the present paradigm, hovering over any attempt to recapture history, resulting in biased subjective views (Hingley 2005:6, 12-13). The solution, in Hingley’s words, is to develop approaches that directly investigate the relationship between the ancient and the modern (Hingley 2005:12).

Enter the Romanization debate. Hingley sees the discourse as one reusing the past to serve political purposes initially aided by textual evidence. Mommsen and Haverfield are seen as propagators of Romano-centric values that suit the context of their times. As we have seen above both downplay heterogeneity and view the movement toward the civilization offered by Rome as progress. Hingley reads Mommsen’s picture of a unified Italy during the Republic and the culture this was taken to produce as a model for German unification. Haverfield is not only given credit for having supplied the British with a model for imperialistic ambition, but also for creating a badly needed link between conflicting
narratives within a felt ancestral history. By launching his reformulation of Mommsen’s thoughts he supplied the British with an image that blended the valour of the native Britons with the orderliness and civilized aspect that was seen as Roman (Hingley 2005:32-35). And as Hingley (2000) convincingly argues elsewhere this image became central to British Imperial thought. Both Haverfield and Mommsen are seen as typical of the modernist paradigm they operated within; both see the cultural change as progress from barbarian to civilized, past peoples are grouped in monolithic cultural units while Romanization is used as a teleological explanation and the West takes a central place in regard to human history (Hingley 2005:31). Hingley then moves on to review the post-1960s approaches to Romanization, where these modernist characteristics tend to be reversed; individual agency is reinstated in cultural processes, fractured identities are explored alongside ideas of cultural relativity while the centrality of the West is questioned (Hingley 2000:37). While the nativist attacks of the 1970s and 80s are seen as problematic as they reinforce the dualism between opposing monolithic categories (Roman-native), Millett is seen as a less extreme heir to this movement and is again criticized for his elite focus and an uncritical attitude towards what really constitutes Roman culture. He is, however, credited for moving the debate into the post-modern sphere by allowing for individual agency and degrees of cultural relativity (Hingley 2000:41). In hindsight Hingley sees the discourse of Romanization as a cultural construct and not a self-evident entity that has been reshaped and reformulated to fit passing contemporary needs (Hingley 2005:15).

Hingley then attempts to reassess the material and sketch new perspectives in addressing cultural change in the provincial Roman sphere. His ideas concerning globalization obviously owe theoretical inspiration to Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s Empire (2000). In this inter-disciplinary informed work of political science the current world system is explored against the background of Roman republicanism. Within a global system, it is argued, local contexts are developed through both indigenous as well as global factors; global interests are reproduced, while not necessarily in opposition, at the local level (Hingley 2005:1; 2003:117-119). Hingley then tries to offer perspectives on Roman culture in a global context. It is perceived not as a bounded and territorial entity, but more like a constantly developing field of common structuring principles where people negotiate meaning through symbolic representation. Trying to break free from earlier accounts he redefines culture as the identity of people as a whole and the ways in which they live their lives (Hingley 2005:51). This approach enables Hingley to review common denominators within the Roman sphere while
also paying heed to alternative local solutions and fractured identities. Hingley traces concepts within the Late Republican era and the formative reign of Augustus in literature, material goods, monumentality, classical education and citizenship. He arrives at the conclusion that there existed a malleable Roman cultural package initially centred on elite negotiation that allowed flexible identities in that it incorporated and manipulated other cultures at local levels. This again, led to repercussions on the global level (Hingley 2005:54-71). However, as Hingley himself observes, this location of common traits based in elite culture tells us little of the life of the less well-off in the Empire. And to remedy this he turns to several case studies where alternate uses of Roman material is explored. Two of these relate to literacy. In a Batavian settlement in the Netherlands that lacks much in the way of urbanization several military seal-boxes have been found, indicating returned Roman auxilia units. These are taken to imply that Latin was adopted through auxilia recruitment and possibly employed at the settlement while the inhabitants continued to draw on traditional local customs, such as cattle-raising, indicating only gradual and selective adoption of Roman traits. Similarly in Gaul, the production of terra sigillata is seen, not merely as reflecting emerging new Roman sensibilities, but as a conscious use of Roman innovations in production and marketing of local products (Hingley 2005:95-102). Roman material is hence not seen as solely communicating Roman values, but is seen against a utilitarian local background. Further examples are drawn upon to account for discrepant experiences that help to move the focus away from standardized and centralized images of how local communities grew and operated within the Roman sphere. Hingley points, among others, to Millett’s studies of non-villa landscapes in North Western Iberia where traditional LPRIA hilltop settlements continued to prosper under Roman hegemony. These patterns are then taken to imply Roman ways of incorporation, such as alternative mechanics of auxilia recruitment and elite inclusion in the management of the rich ores of precious metal in the area, that allowed local tradition to persist (Hingley 2005:102-104). Finally, in regards to Roman portable material Hingley poses the extremely important question of whether the occurrence of a broad range of cultural items in the last centuries BC and the first century AD indicates a trickling of Roman traits down the social hierarchy as claimed by Millet. And to what degree can these items be taken as indicators of Roman identity? Striving to see the cultural changes in a less centralized manner, Hingley examines recent economic analyses of the Roman Empire that sees it as a conglomeration of dependent markets; a system wherein even the smallest of local markets are progressively interconnected leading to a period of economic growth. Against this background the spread of Roman material is explored in the context of a
pragmatic consumer culture. New material options where offered to a larger area through the small markets and towns connected by the very symbol of Roman power – the roads. Within the evolving network new possibilities opened up for opportunists such as craftsmen, merchants and the manumitted (Hingley 2005:105-109). Although Hingley does not purport to go in depth on the complex processes of local incorporation of Roman styled material objects, he makes interesting observation on the subject and concludes that Roman objects may have been acquired for their symbolic value rather than on account of any imbued Roman quality. This argument is backed up by convincing evidence from Fairy Knowe, Scotland, where terra sigillata was used and possibly reused in creative new ways in a local context (Hingely 2005:110-115). Again, as in Jones, the importance of micro studies that help to contrast the picture of broad changes from one cultural stage to another is underlined, while a move from purely typological studies, of for instance pottery, to more pragmatic studies of use and wear is stressed (Hingley 2005:105, 113, 116).

In extension of Hingley’s own arguments; both Jones’ and Hingley’s works are, ultimately, like those of Haverfield, Mommsen and Millett, tightly interwoven with the socio-political climate they were written within. While the effects of the present paradigm, in this case post-modernism, can be much harder to pry apart from the scholarly discourse than those viewed in hindsight. Hingley, however, in opposition to these earlier writers addresses this issue and draws on a virtual cornucopia of theoretical knowledge in trying to extrapolate perspectives on the past that can help inform the present and vice versa. He places himself within a paradigm – defines its strengths and limits while actively scrutinizing the dialectical relationship between past and present. While this recurrent credo constitutes one of the main strengths of Hingley’s approach, the theoretical vastness sometimes obscures the processes studied. One such example is when Hingley after having reviewed the changing meanings of culture and discarded modernistic thoughts about monolithic bounded entities comments that Rome lacked the means to impose a new culture; as a result, provincial elites were encouraged to adopt Roman identity (Hingley 2005:70). While in a paragraph relating to Roman elite culture Hingley states, informed by global concepts, that Culture represents the ways in which people make their lives meaningful for themselves, both individually and collectively, by communicating with each other a way of life (Hingley 2005:53). In trying to break free from old categories issues become blurred. Hingley’s use of culture in the second quote is more akin to Barth’s ethnic group, which obviously relates to identity. What then separates culture and identity in the first quote? And does it even make sense? What it in any
case does is to highlight the trouble Hingley has with the amount of deconstruction when trying to fit the pieces back together. In this regard it is also interesting to note that in a popular book elaborating on the mythical image of Boudica, also published in 2005, Hingley reveals similar problems. Though he comments that LPRIA tribes may have been less centralized than previously thought and that the networks of power may have been flexible, the account is still steeped in past interpretation. The maps of Cunliffe, whose historically informed analysis is criticized by Jones, adorn the pages while a rather traditional account of the LPRIA tribal community unfolds (Hingley and Unwin 2005:1-39). It should be noted that this book is aimed at a more general public and that its main focus is the construction of British identity alleviated by ancient sources. Yet the fact remains that it showcases the difficulty in applying such advanced theoretically informed perspectives practically in coherent narratives.

**PART III – AN END TO THE DISCOURSE?**

9. **Discussion**

...the writing of history is in one way like the writing of translations. Each age must make its own, if it is worthy of one.

- Francis Haverfield (Haverfield 1904:84)

In the above review key works concerning the origins and new approaches to the concept and understanding of Romanization have been discussed through the review of five key works relating to the subject. We have focused on how the different authors define and approach the term. While Mommsen never offers an explicit definition, Haverfield explicitly sees Romanization as a progressive movement towards the benefits of civilization; a process where the distinction between Roman and provincial gradually becomes extinguished. Though he accounts for native models for deviating material trends, these are seen as birth of new Roman trends - the emergence of a Romano-British synthesis, rather than as elements signalling opposition. On the main however he argues that Roman material commended itself to the conquered and progressively supplanted pre-existing elements. Both Mommsen and Haverfield are seen as clearly Romano-centric in their approaches though Roman imperialism itself is left little discussed. In the light of the theoretical advances, expressively decentralizing post-colonial perspectives, Millett’s synthesis based on Haverfield argues that native initiative was instrumental in the process of Romanization. Informed by anthropological studies he tries to view the cultural processes as dialectical relationships, but
is criticized, by among others Jones and Hingley, for not including discussions on materiality and what really constitutes Roman culture. It should be noted that what Millett sets out to do is to counter the trends where the focus has been aimed at mainly military and political aspects. His expressed focus is the socio-economical sphere. However, this does not exempt his synthesis from criticism and the fact that such elements are not taken into consideration makes for the weakest point in his analysis. Though he stresses the need to see Roman culture as a cosmopolitan fusion of elements from diverse origins, Romanitas is often employed without really being explored. Romanization essentially becomes the mechanism through which elites adopt Roman ways in local contexts to reassert existing power relations in Roman contexts, while opposing and alternative use of material is left little explored. Jones and Hingley elaborate on this issue. Jones sees the process of Romanization as one informed by out-dated cultural historical assumptions effectively hiding diversity. Traditional historically informed concepts concerning LPRIA society are taken for granted while the concept of Romanization clouds potentially informative material variety by the application of simple labelling brackets such as Roman, Romano-British and native. Hingley offers a much needed review of the concept of Romanization, argues for the abolition of the term and offers creative new ways of looking at provincial scenarios. A further strength is that he reads the evolving theories concerning Romanization against their contemporary backgrounds. Mommsen is seen as supplying a model for German unification, while Haverfield supplies the British Empire with an instructive example – thus the torch of civilization is passed on. Hingley also criticize Millett on this account and correctly pins him down as a less extreme heir to the nativist stances of the 1970s and 80s.

However, there are inherent shortcomings in Hingley’s approach that concern key aspects of this paper. As has been argued above we should be wary of simply labelling Haverfield as a Romanist because of his pro-Roman stance. Such a view was the norm in his times when archaeology was mainly engaged in large scale excavation of prestigious sites. Haverfield, in hindsight, was an archaeologist that worked to broaden the scope of Roman studies and though the obvious inclination to formulate his stand on Romanization was spurred by nativist currents, this somewhat obscures the fact that in reality Haverfield supplied the first systematic approach to Roman provincial cultural studies. We must obviously grant that his view was largely biased by Roman values and romanticism concerning civilization, but he still created a synthesis in which both Roman and native elements where given room to flourish. There is a danger that this combining element, Haverfield’s most important
contribution to the discourse, is downplayed when focusing on Haverfield in opposition to nativist reactions in continually evolving polarized debates. As pointed to by others (Adler 2006:2), Hingley has similar problems when he turns to the discourse of Romanization in the light of contemporary thought. In Haverfield and Mommsen we are presented with what he dubs progressive accounts. To Hingley these are seen as classically derived outdated modernist concepts entailing simple and directional changes from one state to another in an orderly fashion (Hingley 2005:38-39). However, in sum, Hingley’s review of Romanization studies becomes just the same – a steady progress from simple binary beginnings to more informed and nuanced views. Also, one of Hingley’s strongest points, namely the scepticism toward scholarly objectivity and the need to see the past-present relationship in ways scrutinizing our own intentions, make some trouble for him. This concerns the continued application of the term Romanization and is hence of central importance to us here.

In Hingley’s words Romanization has been reinvented in each age to reflect upon the contemporary situation. It is a cultural construct and not a self evident entity (Hingley 2005:15). In the above we have agreed on the first objection that the early writers reflect contemporary views and supplies, possibly wilfully, instructive past scenarios through the discourse of Romanization. Later writers such as Millett, focused on here, expressively coloured by the perspectives introduced in the so called post-colonial period, build on the same theoretical fundament while formulating native possibilities in accordance with pressing contemporary needs. The way forward, Hingley concludes, is to abandon Romanization and look to contemporary theory, as expressed by works on globalization, to develop rather more decentralized and dynamic images of the Roman world (Hingley 2005:109). After first having rejected the concept of Romanization on the terms that it is a subjective construct informed by its past contemporary contexts, he suggests that we replace it with Globalization, which is another non-self evident entity, and repeat the same contemporary informed flaw. This is an obvious breach of logic and may account for Hingley’s vendetta against imperial elements within the discourse. It may also be added that the possibilities of the Globalization approach is left largely unexplored due to the massive focus on deconstructing flaws in past approaches. However, the strengths in Hingley’s approach should not be overlooked when discussing the way forward for Romanization studies. Its openness in scrutinizing current and past perspectives through the inescapability of overarching paradigms, contemporary subjectivity as well as the possibly valuable perspective of Globalization are all merits. That Romanization is a cultural construct hardly needs arguing against, and in the above we have
seen how it originated. It is a concept of modern and not of ancient history. But does that render it useless? It goes without saying that the Romano-centric dynamic of Haverfield and Mommsen of course are long since outdated. There is also the question of whether just criticism levied against a concept warrants the demolition of the entire field of study.

Archaeology is, as Hingley obviously agrees with, mainly an interpretative science, firmly rooted within the humanities. This author, in opposition to Hingley, does not necessarily see the reinventing or reformulating within Romanization studies as extremely problematic. It is possible that by reinventing Romanization; continuously questioning the term’s underlying assumptions and confronting these, new knowledge will be produced. In extension of this argument it should be possible to see Romanization, not so much as a continually progressing discourse, but as a dynamic field of study wherein different stances and perspectives are explored in the light of past, present and future possibilities. In this way it should also be possible to steer clear of any logical breaches concerning past and present subjectivity.

Summing up, if Romanization is to be stripped of its baggage and given a new lease of life several factors need to be taken into account:

- Abandonment of the study of Romanization as if it was a specific and evident Roman tool of incorporation. While some of the cultural changes brought about in the processes explored may have been, and most likely were the result of force, others were most certainly not.
- Less Romano-centric focus on the changes brought about, yet an overt exploration of Roman actions by scrutinizing Roman imperialism.
- Awareness of past-present interconnectivity. Awareness of the changing use and history of terms applied, such as Romanization.
- Severe questioning of traditional labels of cultural identity such as Roman and native through:
  - More context based studies of material. Supply traditional methods of ascription, such as typology, with studies of use and wear to account for variety within and between sites.
  - (and) More micro- and regional studies to show deviance from expected norms within the broader framework of the Roman provinces.
10. Concluding remarks

...we are moving in a dim land of doubts and shadows. He who wanders here, wanders at his peril, for certainties are few, and that which at one moment seems a fact, is only too likely as the quest advances, to prove a phantom. It is too a borderland, and its explorers needs to know something of the regions on both sides of the frontier.

- Francis Haverfield (1912:68)

In this paper the discourse of Romanization has been scrutinized through the critical assessment of five key works. The danger of oversimplifying issues is always present when addressing a broad school of studies through a narrow selection of works, but the author, as initially stated, had no intention on covering the whole array of Romanization studies. The focus has been on the discourse, its interconnectivity with past and current modes of thought and the resulting views of cultural processes reflected through varying approaches to Romanization. It has been showed that though Romanization originated as a centralizing and idealized Romano-centric concept that held dubious links to contemporary ideals and politics, we should be cautious of trying to fit the actors into too rigid brackets. However, Mommsen and especially Haverfield’s contributions to contemporary national and imperialistic currents should not be downplayed. Millett’s contribution is seen as countering these trends by approaching Romanization as a largely indigenous endeavour. The more recent criticisms of Jones and Hingley offer severe challenges to both Millett’s and future approaches to Romanization. They stress the need to re-evaluate material categories and offer alternative readings further aiding the deconstruction of polarized images of Romans and natives. Hingley argues that Romanization is obsolete mainly on the grounds of past subjectivity. Despite an intriguing approach and the introduction of extremely valid perspectives, he fails in his attempt to replace the term Romanization with Globalization due to a circular argument concerning past and present subjectivity. Whether the school of Romanization is to continue or not, is not for us to say here. Several points, informed by problematic issues raised in the course of the discourse, have however been identified. Perhaps an evolving discourse with a continuous discussion around these themes is preferable to a discarding of the term. Thus a link to past misgivings will be kept close at bay while new approaches may continue to supply new knowledge without archaeologists having to continuously discard labels every time a current perspective is rectified or deemed outdated.
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The spelling of the term differs; Romanization and Romanisation are spelling differences, spellings with a lower case “r” often implies differing attitudes to the value of the concept (Hingley 2000: 111). For convenience the spelling Romanization is applied consistently throughout. The spelling is not meant to imply any theoretical leaning on behalf of the author. Translation by Robin N. Mitchell-Boyask (1996:292).

Cf. Mommsen on Southern Gaul (Mommsen 1968:115) and contrast with his description of the Picts (Mommsen 1968:202).

In Mommsen (1968) Romanising is used throughout. Here, except in direct quotes, Mommsen’s term is abandoned for the conventional spelling.

Conventional spelling preferred to Mommsen’s Camalodunum.

See the publications of Barry Cunliffe for a modern comparison of successful popularization of archaeology.

My bold characters.

For a parallel in Mommsen who stated that the Roman foreign rule ceased to be as such see quote on p. 9.


Cf. e.g. Webster 1996; Wells 2001; 2004a; 2004b, Jones 1997; Hingley 2005

I.e. the considerable effort involved in the conqueror having to act as patron of the conquered.

The civitates were city states within the province with a capital and degrees of local autonomy through a curia council (cura) of landowning aristocrats (decuriones). They are often seen as imposed by Rome as vehicles alleviating civil administration (Millett 1990a:65).

This process is further elaborated in Millett 1990b.

I.e. The Roman cultural revolution cf. Zanker (1992)

Hegemonic themes in relation to Romanization is also discussed by Forcey (1997)

For instance sand-tempered kiln-fired pottery and rectilinear timber sill-beam constructed houses.

For instance grog-tempered wheel-turned pottery

I.e. historiographical analysis (Hingley 2005:7, 12).

This is also evident in Hingley 2003.

My emphasis and bold characters.