Britons abroad : the mobility of Britons and the circulation of British-made objects in the Roman Empire
Ivleva, T.A.

Citation
Ivleva, T. A. (2012, November 20). *Britons abroad : the mobility of Britons and the circulation of British-made objects in the Roman Empire*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20136

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

Leiden University Repository

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20136 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Ivleva, Tatiana Alexandrovna
Title: Britons abroad : the mobility of Britons and the circulation of British-made objects in the Roman Empire
Issue Date: 2012-11-20

6 – *E pluribus unum*: Britons abroad through the textual and artefactual evidence

6.1. <u>Epigraphic analysis</u>

Epigraphic sources, although they exist only in small numbers, also allow us to determine how Britons living on the Continent perceived the land they left: was there a sense of lingering attachment, or was their ancestral land forgotten once they had emigrated?

A total of 43 persons of British descent were identified through the epigraphic record; yet only 26 mention his or her origin directly[359]. The number of surviving texts on which Britons directly mention their origin is low in comparison with other ethnic groups: 150 cases of Dacians abroad (Oltean 2009, 96) and 174 cases of German emigration from both Germanic provinces are known (Kakoschke 2004, 198). Such low numbers do not indicate the real level of mobility, since epigraphic evidence is known to be biased towards higher status individuals, its distribution is uneven and the extent of the epigraphic habit varied between provinces (Eckardt 2010c, 104). For British individuals who had moved abroad two factors could explain the low number. The first has to do with commemorative customs, whereby "only few people were remembered by stone funerary monuments, […] their memories were promoted by other means, invisible to us" (Hope 2003, 132). In the British case, a lack of the custom of funerary commemoration in stone or a total lack of 'epigraphic habit' can be suggested, with other forms of display being preferred, to inscriptions[360]. A second factor might be the irrelevance of naming individual origins for soldiers serving among their own countrymen. Oltean notes in her study of Dacian soldiers serving abroad that it becomes "particularly significant for a Dacian individual to indicate his Dacian origin in a unit of different or mixed ethnic background" (Oltean 2009, 97)[361]. It would have been unnecessary for a 'Briton' in a British auxiliary unit to specifically name his origin, whereas if he served in another ethnic unit he would most likely have wanted to emphasise his ethnic background. Nevertheless, the data available for the analysis provide different scenarios and choices made for recording origin on stones and in military diplomas[362].

---

[359] A total of 13 British-born soldiers serving in British auxiliary units (cf. chapter 3, section 3.2.16.4.2) and a total of 30 people of British descend (cf. chapter 4, section 4.10) were identified.

[360] The majority of inscriptions in Britain itself comes from military areas, while "the number of civilian district inscriptions remains scanty" (Birley, A. 1980, 13).

[361] Cf. van Driel-Murray 2009, 814: "men serving in their own ethnic unit did not need to mention their tribal affiliation, as their origin was perfectly obvious to all".

[362] The preliminary results of the analysis have been published in Ivleva 2011a, 142-144. Here a more detailed and in-depth study is presented.

Figure 6.1 Naming of origin on inscriptions and military diplomas by century: light grey stands for the late first, dark grey for the second, white for the third centuries, black means there is no record of origin[363]

These inscriptions and military diplomas were divided by century in order to determine any changes in the naming of origin (fig. 6.1). Four inscriptions can be dated to the late first century. On three, the heirs indicated the tribal origin of the deceased and in two cases relatives of the deceased expressed their origin (*cives Britto* and *cives Dumnonius*) through a combination of tribal and national origin, and Roman citizenship. Notably, a soldier, commemorated as *cives Dumnonius*, i.e. citizen of the Dumnonii, and who served in the Roman navy, where Roman citizenship was granted after 26 years of service, was still serving at the time of his death but seems to have already possessed citizenship. Either this is a case of wishful thinking on the part of those who commemorated him or he had indeed been granted citizenship for some exceptional deed while serving. The exhibition of tribal and provincial *origo* together with an indication of the possession of citizenship, suggests that these two people – or their heirs – emphasised both their connection with the province of Britain and their status as Roman citizens. The other two British individuals or their heirs explicitly chose to indicate their origin, because these two served in units consisting of recruits from various ethnic backgrounds, a significant 'push' factor for exhibiting one's ancestry.

From inscriptions and diplomas dated to the second century, another pattern can be determined. While nine people still continued to name as their place of origin either a British city or a tribe, ten preferred to identify themselves as a community by naming their origin as *natione Britto/Britannicianus* or by indicating their provincial descent and simply stating their origin on military diplomas as *Britto*. Two inscriptions dated to the

---

[363] In this figure the naming of the origin of 42 (sic!) people has been calculated. The missing person is Claudia Rufina, a British woman in Rome. She was excluded from the calculations, since it is unknown how she wished (or whether she wished) to show her origin. She was called "British-born" by her friend, poet Martial.

third and fourth centuries indicate a refusal to provide a tribal or city origin, and the (conscious?) choice to record provincial origin.

By trying to access the thinking and practice behind these choices, it may indeed be possible to examine aspects of emigrant identity. It must be noted that only tentative conclusions can be drawn from this evidence. It would be a mistake to generalise on the basis of information from this limited amount of sources and to suggest that a set of commemorative customs, such as how one should name one's origin, was utilised by 'Britons' and their family members throughout the Roman Empire. Yet, the material available to us does show a considerable degree of variation in naming origin and various choices being made in expressing descent (fig. 6.2).


Figure 6.2 Choices in expressions when naming origin, by century: light grey stands for the late first, dark grey for the second, white for the third centuries

Four migrants who arrived overseas after the invasion in AD 43 emphasised their specific affiliation with a British tribe or with a city and their status as citizens. In other words, for these moved individuals, the combination of being both Roman and belonging to a specific British tribe, with its deep roots stretching back into the past, may have been an (important) symbol of identity.

On the second-century inscriptions, a slow shift can be detected. While some people still preferred to be identified with a specific British tribe or a city, others seemed to emphasise their national origin, as *natione Britto*. Notably, there is a visible difference here between Britons and other individuals in the Roman Empire, who usually indicated their home region, as *domo* or *civitas* together with an indication of their *natio*[364]. Those

---

[364] Cf.: *AE* 1990, 990 – *natione Pannono domo Sirmus; AE* 1961, 331 – *natione Graeca, civis Tarsus Cilicia;* Denkm 233 – *natione Norico civis Ovilavis; CIL* XVI 152 – *natione Italico domo Miseno* and many others.

who identified their origin as *natione Britto* never indicated the region where they came from. That some moved Britons were able to provide details regarding their origin (i.e. recalling the tribal or town name), while others made a conscious choice to call themselves *Britonnes*, require further discussion. At the outset, I would like to remind the reader, that as has been pointed out here in chapter 3, section 3.2.16.1 the term *Britannus/Britto* and its usage, may have been imposed by the Roman government in order to speed up the process of inclusion of the natives in the Roman orbit as well as to prevent further inter-tribal warfare, because there were "no such social groups as 'Britons', the peoples were an assortment of tribes" (Mattingly 2004, 10). Therefore, by choosing the Roman-imposed label the mobile Britons may have been expressing their new form of Roman-imposed identity and constructed ethnicity. Two possible explanations for such choice can be suggested.

The first is that those who called themselves 'Britons' were born in Britain but did not belong to any specific tribe. To be able to indicate on the tombstone that one was, for instance, *Belgus* or *Dobunnus*, an individual needed to have both or at least one parent who was a member of a particular British tribal entity. It can be suggested that these *Brittones* were the children of immigrants who came to Britain with the Roman army, or were the children of traders living in Britain. In that case, *natione Britto* could have been used as a form of ethnic identification by individuals who were born in the province of Britain but were not members of British indigenous tribes. Yet, as we have seen in the cases of Titus Statius Vitalis or Marcus Ulpius Quintus, who were themselves the children of such immigrants, this scenario does not hold: both these individuals indicated their descent from families who settled in Romano-British *coloniae*.

The second option is that *natione Britto* was used by second-generation emigrants, those who were not born in Britain but whose parents belonged to one of the British tribes. In other words, one might consider that those who named a British tribe or city belonged to the indigenous population and had emigrated directly from Britain overseas. This leads to the further consideration that having parents who were members of a certain tribe did not necessarily make you a member of the same tribe if you yourself were born overseas. However, it could perhaps ensure membership of a group whose ancestors originated from Britain. Derks (2009, 256) notes that ethnic origin in the Roman Empire was hereditary and illustrates this by means of an epitaph erected by a Batavian to his son, who was most likely born at Cnidus in Asia Minor but had *natione Batav(u)s* (*CIL* III 14403). While Derks (2009, 257) suggests that *natio* "denotes a tribal affiliation adopted through birth", extending this to the notion that children not born on Batavian soil were still Batavians by descent (2009, 249, note 43), in the British case this does not seem to be entirely true. As mentioned above, *Britto* does not designate a tribe; the term "*Britonnes*" was a Roman construct denoting all the inhabitants of the Roman province of Britain. This can be clearly seen on the inscriptions erected in Britain itself, where Britons gave the preference to tribal affiliation on the epitaphs[365].

Within Roman Britain itself a total of 12 inscriptions[366] have been recorded, that mention an origin of an individual from a particular British tribe or town: seven are funerary, three are votive, one is a building inscription and one is a bronze votive plate. These twelve individuals were interprovincial migrants and belonged to various British tribes: five were citizens of the *Canti* (RIB 192), *Cornovi* (RIB 639, female), *Dobunni* (RIB 621, female), *Dumnonii* (RIB 188) and *Catuvellauni* (RIB 1065, female), and the city of *Lindum* (RIB 250, female); three indicated their origin (*natio*) as belonging to the *Belgi* (RIB 156), *Briganti* (RIB 2142) and *Catuvellauni* (RIB 1962) tribes, while two

---

[365] Thus, other nationalities settling in Britain, where the choices in the ways of naming the origin varied greatly (see Noy 2010, 20). For the levels of immigration to Britain, see Rowland 1976, Noy 2010 and Eckardt 2010c, 104-17, esp. fig. 7.3 on the analysis of the data collected by Rowland.
[366] Rowland (1976, 13) records seven inscriptions, Noy (2010, 18-20) nine.

simply named their origin as (*colonia*) *Victrix* (RIB 3005), *Caledonus*[367] (RIB 191) and *Brittonus*[368] (RIB 2152) (fig. 6.3).


Figure 6.3 Naming of origin on inscriptions found in Britain

These stones with inscriptions were erected by the relatives of individuals who had died far away from their home tribe inside Britain and by individuals who were fulfilling vows in a foreign region of their home province. For instance, an individual from the *Canti/Cantiaci* tribe erected a votive monument at Colchester, a city that lay within the boundaries of the Trinovantian tribe; an individual from the *Cornovi* tribe died in Ilkley and a woman from the *Dobunni* in Templeborough, both Ilkley and Templeborough situated in the territory covered by the Brigantian tribe, a Dumnonian tribesman was commemorated in Dorchester, a town of the *Durotriges*. Notably, the territories of these tribes, the *Cantiaci* and *Trinovantes*, or *Cornovi* and *Briganti*, or *Dumnonii* and *Durotriges*, are adjacent, yet these individuals or their relatives found it important to emphasise their origin in the neighbouring tribal territory; a deed that indicates the significance of the tribal ethnicity above the provincial one and the persistence of tribal divisions and differences in Britain under the Roman rule.

Indeed even inside tribal territory, relatives of the deceased could emphasise his/her origin: a woman, a citizen from *Lindum* (Lincoln), died in the very same town; a member of the *Belgi* died at Bath, a town of this very tribe. In the case of the woman, her origin seems to have been of less importance than her status. She was a citizen of the city where she died; hence, she was a Roman citizen of *Lindum*[369]. In the case of the soldier who died in his own tribal territory, his origin, on the contrary, had played a role. He must already have had Roman citizenship, since he served in the legion. There was

---

[367] It has been suggested that this individual was actually a Syrian or Libyan; yet, the evidence points to his origin as Caledonian, i.e. a Pict (Noy 2010, 19, also note 34 for further literature and discussion).
[368] This votive inscription has survived partly. The name of the dedicant is absent.
[369] It has been suggested that she or her relatives preferred to indicate her difference from the non-Roman native population, because she was a descendant of a family of a Roman army veteran (Noy 2010, 19), thus, an immigrant herself.

no need to emphasise it; yet his relatives did so, but chose the term *natio* instead of *civis*. However, since he served in a legion which also had soldiers from other ethnic backgrounds, on his tombstone his relatives most likely preferred to mention that he was native of the region his legion was stationed in, in contrast to his comrades from the Continent[370]. It is also possible that he was mentioned as *Belgus* because of the mixed ethnic environment in Bath: its popular hot springs had seen many visitors from elsewhere[371].

The votive monuments of individuals who indicated their origin as *Caledonus* and *Brittonus* deserve special attention. The first one was found at Colchester, the territory of the *Trinovantes*, and another one in Castlecary on the Antonine Wall in Scotland. The ethnic name *Caledonia* was also a Roman construct, given to the confederacy of the tribes of Scotland which later became distinguished in the literature as Picts. *Caledones* and *Brittones* are the classic ethnonyms, primarily used by Romans to indicate the confederacies of tribes in northern and southern Britain respectively. Assuming therefore that 'Briton' was a clear expression of supra-regional origin, there is no reason to assume that the label 'Caledonian' did not fulfill the same function. Both were Roman constructs used to indicate supra-regional identities in lands that were inhabited by a different supra-regional group. 'Caledonian' indicated an individual's supra-regional 'ethnicity' in the heart of the territory where 'Britons' were living, while 'Briton' was used to indicate an individual's supra-regional 'ethnicity' in the territory inhabited by the northern confederacy of tribes called 'Caledonians'.

All the cases discussed here suggest that, within Britain itself, supra-regional and local ethnic identifications were used by individuals to emphasise their belonging to a particular group. In the case of 'Caledonian' and 'Briton', supra-regional and imposed ethnic identification may have been used to stress the differences between artificial confederacies of those who lived in the north and the south of Britain. However, rather than recording the uniformity within the confederacies in overall diversity of ethnic identifications, these two categories may have been simply used to emphasise different regional backgrounds, i.e. southern and northern. In the case of those who mentioned their city or tribe, the regional identity was used to underline the profound differences between neighbouring tribal entities.

This brings us to the conclusion that within Britain itself individuals were prompted to denote their tribal affiliation, even when moving to the neighbouring tribal territory. One may ask therefore what made Britons, who moved to the Continent, choose between the affiliation given them by the Romans, i.e. *natione Britto*, and the name of their tribe or town? It is unlikely that *natione Britto* and the term *Brittonus* were used in the same manner, i.e. that both designated a person from the southern tribal confederacy as opposed to the northern, Caledonian, since the whole meaning of the distinction would be lost in the Continental setting. Possibly both constructs were used in different ways but still to distinguish oneself from another, i.e. within Britain, an individual from the south as opposed from the one from the north; outside Britannia, an individual from Roman Britain, as opposed to an individual from Roman Gaul or Germany. Yet, the question who could use the *ethnikon natione Britto* remains. Was it used by people who were born in Britain but did not belong to any British tribes? Or was it used by second-generation emigrants to emphasise the origin of their ancestors?

It is likely that the label *natione Britto* was "applied to [and by] diverse individuals who lacked a clear sense of group identity" (Mattingly 2004, 10). By using the Roman-imposed identification, the term *Brittones* became the ethnic label for the migrants, in

---

[370] The legion had soldiers from *Nicaea in Bythynia* (RIB 203); *domo Samosata* (RIB 450); *natione Syrus, Osroenus* (RIB 490)*;* from various towns on the Continent: *Lugdunum* (RIB 493); *Celeia* (RIB 498) and *Arelate* (RIB 500) *etc*.
[371] I. Oltean, pers. comment

the absence of one. Most likely, migrants emphasised their connection with the land of their ancestors by using the Roman term. In other words, by choosing to refer to one's origin as British, one distinguished oneself from other groups of migrants or from the dominant group in the territory where migrants and their families settled down.

The situation can be compared with that of modern-day emigrants[372]. First-generation emigrants often refer to the city or village or region where they were born, while second-generation emigrants name the country of origin of their parents. In other words, to the question regarding their origin they would answer, for example: 'I am Russian from Moscow, but I live in Holland', while their children would say: 'We were born in Amsterdam in Holland, but my parents are Russians'. Probably the same situation can be observed on one inscription from Rome, where someone mentions *'natione Dacisca regione Serdica nato'*: he is Dacian by origin, born in the region of Serdica, the modern-day capital of Bulgaria, Sofia (*CIL* VI 2605)[373].

Having discussed the second century inscriptions in much detail, let us turn to the epigraphic record left by migrants in the third and later centuries. Now the tendency for designating origins shifted the other way: emigrants preferred to name their province instead of their tribe or city – the national emigrant identity suppressed the more regional one. Although we have only two examples of this, the total disappearance of the tribal affiliation in favour of a provincial one is striking. This situation may have resulted from being incorporated into a new identity group in the third century as a result of everybody being given Roman citizenship; this broke tribal ties, a situation noted by Derks (2009, 269) on inscriptions set up by Ubians and Baetasians. In the later periods, therefore, the provincial label and term 'Briton' would seem to imply those who were born in the province of Britain, irrespective of precisely where within that province. The supra-regional identity suppressed the regional one, which may have resulted in the ultimate '*e pluribus unum*', when, from a variety of tribes, one 'province' of emigrants emerged.

The British individuals who had moved elsewhere can be divided into three categories in terms of how they refer to their origin: those who gave the tribal identification, those who gave their city's name, and those who called themselves *Britonnes*. While the third category has been discussed here already, the first two categories also deserve some attention. While Britons made a distinction between regional and supra-regional identities, they also made distinctions in terms of regional identities. Six persons named their urban origin, of which four served in legionary forces, one served in an auxiliary unit, and one was a civilian; five indicated their tribal origin, of which four served in auxiliary units and one in a fleet.

The Romano-British cities, named as places of origin by six individuals, were all former legionary fortresses[374] that had grown into veteran settlements, except *Ratae Coritanorum* (modern-day Leicester). This town probably never had military installations in its vicinity[375] but instead grew from a native settlement into a local urban center. Those four individuals born in the former legionary camps were most likely the

---

[372] This observation is based on the personal experience of the author, who is herself an immigrant from Russia living in the Netherlands, and during her studies in Holland has met many migrants.

[373] This inscription can be interpreted differently, however, and its interpretation depends on the dating: a pre-AD 270s date may also indicate a person who was a member of a Dacian tribe which moved to south of the Danube early in the first century; a post-AD 270s date would suggest that this person lived in Dacia Mediterranea, whose capital was Sardica (I. Oltean, pers. comment). The latter suggestion is favoured by most interpreters.

[374] *Lindum*, *Deva*, *Glevum*, but *Camulodunum* was in fact an Iron Age oppidum which was turned into a Roman legionary fortress after the invasion of AD 43 and later turned into a city with the status of colonia and was populated with veterans.

[375] There is an ongoing discussion as to whether this town ever had a fort and, if so, which unit or legion was located there. Suggestions range from a legionary vexillation fortress to an auxiliary temporary fort. See Todd 1973, Clay and Pollard 1994, and Wacher 1995 for further discussions.

children of legionary veterans and had Roman citizenship by birth; the individual who originated from *Ratae* was free-born without Roman citizenship. For this reason the former four were conscripted to serve in the legions, the latter one to the auxiliary forces. For the same reason, all five individuals who indicated their tribal origin were members of the auxiliary forces, to whom citizenship would be given upon completing their years of service. Therefore, giving a town name as origin suggests a particular status, i.e Roman citizen status, and in our case indicates a second-generation immigrant to Britain, while recording tribal descent may have stood for regional, non-Roman and genuine 'British'. It would be useful to test this suggestion by comparing similar groups elsewhere in the Roman Empire, to see whether having urban roots did indeed automatically secure Roman status, and whether by contrast rural or tribal origins made one appear 'native'. Unfortunately, such research is beyond the scope of the present thesis.

Instead, let us have a look at the status of those who give *natione Britto* as their origin. Five out of ten served in the auxiliary units or a fleet; three were members of the Imperial horse guard; one served as a soldier in a detachment; one was civilian. The majority of those with *natione Britto* origins, then, were free-born, non-Roman citizens. What this tells us is that the preference was to display not only origin but also to indicate status. Whenever it was impossible to indicate that one had Roman citizenship by stating that one hailed from a town, the 'status word' *civis* was deliberately chosen, emphasising Roman citizenship through membership of a particular tribe (as was the case the individuals from *civis Dumnonius* and *civis Brittonus*, who had to serve in the army to acquire citizenship).

6.1.1. *Female migration*

All the evidence so far discussed here has to do with male migrants, while women were also on the move both within the province and crossing the English Channel. There is enough evidence for intra-provincial migration of women: four out of twelve; yet, the evidence fails for Continental migration: three women have been identified (Catonia Baudia and Lollia Bodicca on the basis of their names and 'British' husbands; Claudia Rufina was called 'British' by her friend, the poet Martial).

In the case of the intra-provincial female migrants, their origin was recorded on funerary inscriptions. Therefore, the choice of how to record their origin was made by their relatives rather than by the women themselves. These four women came from various social circles: a Cornovian was possibly a partner of a soldier (Noy 2010, 19); a citizen of Lincoln may have hailed from a veteran family and have enjoyed the status of Roman citizen (Noy 2010, 19); a Catuvellaunian was a freedwoman of Palmyrian merchant; a Dobunnian was probably a freeborn Roman citizen.

The two British women living abroad are recorded on the funerary inscriptions that they themselves erected to commemorate their husbands, a hint as to their status and wealth. Both Catonia Baudia and Lollia Bodicca were wives of legionary centurions and followed them, literally, until death. Claudia Rufina also enjoyed a privileged status: she was the wife of a legionary centurion and also his follower. Claudia Rufina is praised by Martial on numerous occasions as an educated woman as well as adoptee of a Roman way of life.

The contrast between British female émigrés living abroad and intra-provincial migrants is visible: although all of them were their husbands' followers, in the former case they were confined to the role of (loving) wives and care-givers, in the latter they showed signs of independence, education and of adopting the 'being Roman' package.

Based on the evidence discussed it was suggested that 26 mobile British individuals still felt themselves to be connected with the province of their birth[376]. Even in the second century there may have been cases of children of first-generation emigrants who emphasised their British ancestry, by choosing the label *natione Britto*. Yet, ethnic identification was not only confined to this label. There were many ways of identification through reference to a tribe, a town or province. The variety of display of ethnic identities both within and outside of Britain may have been "a result of specific mechanisms of identity definition" (Oltean 2009, 99) between individuals, such as by mentioning a supra-regional or local identity in- and outside the province, or by the establishment of links with ancestors by naming a provincial origin, in the absence of a regional connection with the homeland.

Considering this, the context in which the decision to be identified with a particular ethnic entity (tribe, urban community or province) should also be taken into account. If we are dealing with a text on a tombstone, we should not forget that it was chosen by the relatives and inheritors, and rarely by the deceased. What this means is that we have here a social group intending to emphasise someone's origin; it can therefore be argued that on the tombstones we are dealing not with individual memory, as is the case with votives, but with collective memory. A group of people chose an ethnic definition which they felt suited them, and with which they most likely identified themselves and would have used for their own funerary or votive inscriptions. Military diplomas present a different situation: the receiver probably was able to recall his origin; therefore he chose his own way of defining his identity and we are presented with an individual rather than a communal choice.

The overall conclusion drawn from the scant epigraphic evidence gives us a dynamic picture of adaptation, reconstruction and reinvention of ethnic identities by mobile Britons. Early on, especially in the first century, individuals living within and outside Britain emphasised their tribal and local differences whenever possible. In spite of the fact that it was a Roman construct, the ethnic marker *Brittones* started to be used by the late first and early second century AD, especially when other ethnic identifications seem to have failed. The label *natione Britto* was "applied to [and by] diverse individuals who lacked a clear sense of group identity" (Mattingly 2004, 10) and was used by the second generation of emigrant groups in order to distinguish themselves from other communities. Later on, the usage of the Roman word increased, especially in the second century, probably because of pressure from the Roman administration or Roman army to unify diverse peoples within provinces. Mobile individuals seem to have adopted the Roman ethnonym in order to distinguish themselves from other communities, while the Romans appear to have encouraged the use of this ethnic name in order to construct a supra-regional identity[377]. Unfortunately, due to the small number of surviving inscriptions and diplomas, it is unknown how widespread this phenomenon was. At any rate, for at least ten people this name became a symbol of their shared ancestry.

6.2. Artefactual analysis

The occurrence of 242 British-made brooches on the Continental sites can be explained through the presence of people who had some connection with Britain (cf.

---

[376] These 26 people are those who mentioned their origin directly. There is no way of determing whether the same feelings had been felt by the other 17 people who did not indicate their ancestry.

[377] Cf. Oltean's (2009, 99) conclusion regarding Dacian emigrant identity: "the Roman army reinvented rather than destroyed Dacian ethnic identity and provided the environment for the formation of a new Dacian military identity".

chapter 5, section 5.7). Since British brooches are not evidence of the ethnicity of their users and wearers, one may ask what kind of identities, if any, were projected through their use. Because brooches were brought overseas by various groups, emigrants from and immigrants to Britain alike, this poses another question - whether it is possible to distinguish between the groups represented on sites who travelled from Britain and those who most likely originated from this province.

Usually, British-made brooches were spread across the Roman Empire as a result of their function as clothes' fasteners: for the people, whatever their origin, who travelled from Britain to the Continent they were objects of daily life, brought for the sake of necessity; they needed after all to hold their clothes together, which made the brooches essential. Yet, through analysis of the archaeological context the brooches were found in, it became obvious that these objects must have played various roles rather than being simply functional devices. The objects may have changed meaning depending on their usage, context they were worn in or discarded, and depending on their viewers or admirers. In this sense, brooches can be identified as helpers in the code switching process, whereby a particular meaning or identity can be switched on or off depending on when, where and how they were used, and especially by whom[378]. Owners may also have had particular associations with the objects (e.g. the evocative aspect of material culture), which too could have been switched on or off, i.e. the associations one has with an object is dependant on both the user and the viewer, as well as the context it appears in. The variety of contexts in which British brooches appear reflects the diversity of their meanings and associations emanated through their usage. What sorts of statements of identities do these contexts constitute?

6.2.1. *Burials*

In total 34 British-made brooches have been found in a cemetery context, though not necessarily as grave goods (three were surface finds; three are of unknown provenance but within a cemetery's boundaries)[379]. All were found in or associated with cremation burials. Determining geographic origin by the presence of a British-made brooch is impossible, because wearing or dying with a British brooch would not have made someone British[380]; yet, the placement of an object of a foreign provenance among grave goods is significant. The relatives of a dead individual may have chosen objects that circulated widely among the living, but they instead chose to deposit an object with foreign associations and possibly one that was unique[381].

Burial rituals influenced the way brooches entered archaeological record: if brooches were placed with the body of the deceased on a funerary pyre, they would have been completely burned, thus leaving us with no record of their existence; while if brooches were positioned during the physical burial of cremated remains, or during the feast, they

---

[378] The clearest example of code switching can be seen in the case of the zoomorphic brooches, linked to specific Roman or Romano-Celtic deities (cf. Crummy 2007 for further discussion): being objects that were worn daily, they presumably reflected the particular devotion of the owner, who, through their use, might have wished to emphasise his or her religious piety or associations with a specific god or gods. The switching of meaning occurred on a daily basis, depending on the wearer's daily activities: when the owner visited a shrine, a brooch might have had religious connotations, when travelling associations with a god's patronage (i.e as a token of the god's omnipresence), when eating it may simply have been a clothes' fastener.

[379] Sites: Diersheim, Mainz-Weisenau, Mayen, Worms, Rheinzabern, Frankfurt-Praunheim, Loxstedt, Vrbice, Weissenfels, Kobern/Martinsberg, Nijmegen, road between Plasmolen and Middelaar, Destelbegen, Tiel-Passewaaij, Pont, Thuin, Blicquy, Flavion, Trier, Fallais, Wederath, Schaerbeek, Regensburg, Rusovce and Ečka.

[380] Cf. Pearce 2010, 84, who argues that "the presence of a single item of distant provenance [in a burial] seems much less secure as a marker of origin".

[381] The British brooches formed 1 or at most 3 percent of the total number of brooches found on any given site, which can be seen as an indication of their uniqueness in comparison to other objects on a site.

would have survived complete, with some signs of wear (S. Heeren, pers. comment). One should take into account that the decoration of a body of the deceased as well as the placement of a grave goods was done by the living, the relatives, and represents not the deceased 'self', but the norms regulating burial rites that existed within the community, as well as the wishes, desires and practices of family members[382]. It is not the representation of an individual, but of those who remain in the land of living. The conduct of funerary ceremonies by professionals and according to special laws and traditions is another significant factor problematising the discussions of individuality and identities of the deceased (Pearce 2010, 87).

The performance of burial rituals and the placement of particular goods in different stages of funerary rites articulates the ways identities of the deceased were (un)consciously recreated by the living, and highlights perceived associations and/or connections between the deceased and burial objects. While the deceased were buried with a variety of objects and provision of grave goods was sometimes very generous, giving us possibility to explore multi-identities and multi-connections, the focus here will be on brooches, limiting us to one type of connection and association, that of their original provenance and the objects' biographies, specifically their 'British-ness' and the British past of the things, because these objects after all were British-made. Yet, I am not discussing here the origin of the deceased or ethnic connotations of the brooches, rather the social associations with and interactions between the object and deceased, and evocations of the past through the deposition of British-made brooches[383].

The duality of brooches gives us the possibility to explore these associations, interactions and evocations (cf. chapter 2, section 2.6). The physical aspect of brooches is a significant element here. The placement of brooches with the body of a deceased individual on a fire and their complete physical destruction differentiates and opposes them to the brooches deposited intact as grave goods. The latter case suggests an unwillingness for their destruction and a wish to preserve them in a complete state, while the former stands for the loss of a brooch's identity as well as part of the identity of the deceased it represented and this dead person's past. In the other words, the former destroys the objects' biographies, their embodiment of values and associations, places them in a realm of immateriality and un-identification. The latter on the contrary practices a manifestation of some kind (discussed below) that is performed within the burial setting. That some deceased were burned with brooches suggests that they may have been part of their personal dress accessories (S. Heeren, pers. comment), therefore, important every day objects and objects with a direct association with the deceased's personhood. The provision of brooches as grave goods or in the ditches around graves may indicate the wishes of the living. Therefore, they may have stood for the perceived or invented identities of the deceased as communicated by the descendants (S. Heeren, pers. comment).

---

[382] The practice described by Pearce 2010, 91 as 'invention' of a funerary tradition.
[383] Cf. Pearce 2010, 90: "the reference to external origins is not by direct replication of ancestral origins but by evocation of a heritage […]. This may have also been achieved by the history associated with the buried individuals, as embodied in the artefacts placed with them".

The total of 34 British brooches has appeared on 25 Continental sites. Majority of the brooches found in burials were most likely brought by the veterans returning from Britain to their own homelands (cf. chapter 5, section 5.7.1., table 5.11): 18 as opposed to 6 found in burial next to a fort, which were brought by soldiers and their partners coming from Britain, but not necessarily of British descent[384]. The distribution of these burials shows the preference for sites in North-Western provinces situated behind the Roman river frontier, the Rhine, rather than the sites near or before the limes (16 as opposed to 9), although this can be attributed to the lack of data from the sites on and around the Danube frontier (fig. 6.4). All brooches found were in good state and unburnt (except one in Worms), suggesting their deposition after the burning of a body of a deceased.

Figure 6.4 Distribution of the brooches found in burials

The situation in Britain provides a contrast to the numbers of British-made brooches in graves on the Continental sites. Considering that each province, tribal entity or settlement community had their own burial rituals, where both the process of mourning and cremation as well as the actual burial were performed differently, the personal identities projected at death may have been sharply different. The intention here is not to study such personalities but to understand *why* British-made brooches were deposited and formed part of the grave ritual both in Britain and on the Continent. The evidence from Roman Britain shows that the number of cremation burials with personal ornaments forms a small proportion of the total number of burials; yet, brooches prevail as the most common items put into graves in mid and late first century cremations (Philpott 1991, 128-129). Notably, brooches are usually the only personal ornaments in such burials, found in single numbers, although three or more are also common in pre and early post-AD 43 graves (Philpott 1991, 129). For the period of the mid and late first

---

[384] The persons who brought the other ten brooches were determined to be traders and craftsmen.

century it has been observed that burials with depositions of a variety of types of ornaments, such as bracelets, figurines, amulets, coins, *etc.*, are typical for Roman and Continental practices rather than those of the Iron-Age (Philpott 1991, 129). By the later period, i.e. second century, brooches continue to occur in burials as the only personal ornaments, although they are usually found in pairs or in larger groups; by the mid second century bracelets and rings started to be appear alongside brooches (Philpott 1991, 129). The positioning of brooches in graves suggest that some of them were used to fasten "a bag or cloth containing the bones" because they were found on top of the cremated remains, some were placed in a box, or "were concentrated in a pile, as if originally deposited in a cloth or leather bag" (Philpott 1991, 130). In general, the analysis of burial rituals in Roman Britain in the first to second centuries had shown that "the deposition of personal ornaments with cremation did not constitute a consistent burial rite […] but was the spontaneous deposition of treasured items of sentimental value with the deceased" (Philpott 1991, 135). For the third and later centuries, however, there seems to be a development "of new practices or beliefs about the appropriateness of certain ornaments as grave offerings" (Philpott 1991, 136). Regarding inhumations, brooches appeared in all periods: they seem to be found near the shoulders of the deceased and to have served a functional purpose – to fasten a piece of clothing at the time of burial (Philpott 1991, 137-141).

The British example shows that brooches, both in inhumation and cremation burials, performed a double role: they were placed for their functionality, i.e. to fasten a piece of clothing containing the remains of deceased or to fasten a piece of clothing covering the deceased body, and for their associations with dead person, i.e. their placement in a box or bag. In the latter case, brooches were indeed regarded as personal ornaments, the ones the deceased had used during their lifetime and could cotniue to use in the afterlife. As for the Continental examples, where all burials were cremations, the position of the brooches has been recorded for a) the trumpet 2A brooch with a chain from a grave in Worms, which was found in a pot together with beads and a key, on top of the cremated remains; the second trumpet 2A brooch was found as part of the grave goods, burned, in one grave next to an earlier one; b) the headstud brooch from a grave in Frankfurt-Praunheim, as part of the secondary grave goods, unburnt, under a pot; c) the headstud derivative and the trumpet-head derivative T166A found in a cemetery of Tiel-Passewaaij were top soil finds; one was found in the grave ditch and was probably a later grave deposit; another was not associated with any grave; d) Polden Hill, T100 type, with two other brooches, unburnt, next to cremated remains in a grave in Wederath; e) the gilded brooch, T271 type, found on top of cremated remains in a pot in a grave in Regensburg; f) a pair of headstuds was found in a glass vessel on top of cremated remains in a grave in Trier. The deposition of some brooches discussed here on top of the remains suggests that they were used as cloth fasteners, while some appear to have been placed as votive offerings. Notably, most of the brooches had their pins intact (slightly corroded but still with the spiral attached) suggesting that they were deposited not as broken objects with no further use, but as functional items, intended to secure pieces of clothing.

The significance of the placement of brooches in graves has been shown: their functionality was an important factor; yet, one may ask why *these* particular brooches were put into graves, i.e. why the relatives of the deceased chose particular brooches to follow their beloved ones into the afterlife[385]. Deliberateness in the inclusion of brooches suggests that they had important connotations for the deceased whose remains they were

---

[385] E.g. why a brooch of a type A, and not one of a type B. What made the brooch of type A important enough to be placed in a grave? Why did the living not wish to use it anymore, even though it was still in perfect shape to function as a proper clothes fastener?

supposed to secure as well as for the relatives, whose choice of a particular brooch may have been a defined act. Philpott (1991) notes that personal ornaments, including brooches, were rare as grave goods in Roman Britain (though he fails to provide the exact number of how many brooches entered the archaeological record in this way) while indicating that personal ornaments are found in ca 5 percent of the total number of cremation burials. The paucity of brooches in burials in Roman Britain does not indicate that brooches were not placed with the bodies of the deceased. Rather their absence as intact objects may indicate that they were placed in the first phase of burial ritual and consequently were completely burned with the body, in this way not surviving to enter the archaeological record. Their complete destruction stresses their nature as objects of daily-ness, as things used in daily life as well as things that would be used in the afterlife. Because British-made brooches were abundant in Britain, their users may have had different associations with them, expressing through their deliberate completeness individuality and personhood (cf. Pudney 2011, 126-128) and the destruction of individuality at the time of burial (as pointed out to me by Stijn Heeren with respect to the Batavian evidence).

The users of brooches on the Continent may, however, have had other associations. Here, the brooches' biographies play a significant role: made in Britain, brought over the Channel to the Continent because of their functionality; not destroyed, kept intact, they could have been used by other members of a family or community because of their limited availability, exoticness and uniqueness. Yet they officially ended their lives being buried and being a protector of the deceased's remains. Therefore, not their precious looks (enamel patterns, decoration motives, *etc.*) or their functional value for the living, but particular associations with the deceased were important. As noted above, the brooches in burials are confined to areas where there is evidence for the presence of veterans having returned from Britain. Brooches, therefore, could have been valued by their owners and, later, by the relatives of the deceased for their associations with the past, indicating the (dead) owner's experience in Britain. Thinking firstly about British-made brooch as an embodiment of a 'British' past, and secondly about the unwillingness for them to be destroyed and the deliberateness in choice in the case of Continental burials, it could follow that their inclusion in graves was a manifestation of memory relating to the deceased's past as having lived in Britain. The destruction of the brooches destroyed memory and associations, while the holding on to them would have preserved it and have served to mediate between the past and the present.

6.2.2. *Votive offerings*

In total nine British-made brooches were located at six sites associated with religious activity[386]. Only one brooch, that from Fesques, was found in a pit of a sanctuary, whilst three brooches, those from Vermand, were surface finds discovered within the boundaries of a Gallo-Roman sanctuary. Five brooches were recorded as having been found near or at Gallo-Roman sanctuaries (Velzeke, Hofstade, Trier and Möhn), although their exact location is unknown. The appearance of British-made brooches as votive deposits on sites in the province of Gallia Belgica ties into an older tradition there of making offerings at large centralised sites and in burials: brooches have frequently been found on the sites of Gallo-Roman temples and open sanctuaries as well as in graves, especially in the French regions of Picardy and Upper Normandy (Wellington 2005, 235-236).

Figure 6.5 Distribution of the brooches found on sites of Gallo-Roman temples

Depositing various objects in sanctuaries could have various kinds of religious significant: an act of oath fulfillment, payment for received or future favours, giving a gift during festivals and celebrations, offers for divine intervention or after an oracular consultation, or giving personalised gifts for the hope of good luck (Puttock 2002, 72). In pre- and post-conquest Britain brooches were also deposited and played a role as votive offerings on a number of sites, although they appear to be less common than other objects placed in sanctuaries (Puttock 2002, 71-72; Pudney 2011, 123-126, also for further literature). The inclusion of British-made brooches in votive deposits on the Continent and in Britain is therefore not unusual. That the choice fell on objects of personal adornment suggests that people offered them for "more personal reason", as an act of offering "something *of themselves*", i.e. "people may have offered the brooches to the gods as a surrogate for their identity or as a part of themselves as a sacrifice of their personhood" (Pudney 2011, 126). This idea is strengthened by evidence that the most of the personal ornaments found in sanctuaries in Roman Britain were not made of precious metals and, probably, did not have a high monetary value (Puttock 2002, 73), an

---

[386] Sites: Velzeke, Hofstade, Trier, Möhn, Fesques and Vermand.

indication that it was the act itself that was of particular importance rather than *what* was deposited. The act of deposition also included the special treatment of the items: some artefacts were found to be broken or bent, an act that is sometimes referred to as ritual 'killing' (Puttock 2002, 75-76). For brooches, pins and spirals were removed, which signified the death of functionality and the birth of spiritual symbolism. However not all brooches were treated in the same manner in Roman Britain, some were deposited in their complete state (Puttock 2002, 75). The importance of brooches as votive offerings was enhanced by their various shapes and forms: shoe-sole shaped brooches may have symbolised the act of travelling and their inclusion in ritual depositions may have signified the wish for a safe journey (Puttock 2002, 83)[387].

The analysis has shown that all nine British-made brooches found on the Continent within a sanctuary context were brought by families of returning veterans or by veterans themselves (cf. chapter 5, section 5.7.1). Upon completion of their service, veterans may have wished to make a sacrifice of things they had used during their military life, as an expression of gratitude for surviving the harsh realities of their military and warring lives. The action of placing the objects in sanctuaries upon completion of military service has been recorded for returning Batavian veterans (Roymans and Aarts 2005), who dedicated their military equipment to the gods for their protection during their years of service. Those who brought British-made brooches with them to the Continent took the trouble of transferring them overseas, but chose not to use them appropriately, i.e. as cloth fasteners, and gave them away as offerings. The deliberateness of the act of deposition stresses the brooches sacrificial value, yet it does not explain what was at stake when the decision was taken to include these British-made objects[388] in the rituals performed on various sites in Gallia Belgica. Considering that the objects arrived with (families of) returning veterans, their inclusion as votive offerings suggests a possible act of a vow fulfillment or an act of thanksgiving for protection. That the choice of gift fell on British-made brooches, might indicate their symbolic value as an embodiment of 'British' military past. By positioning a British-made brooch in a ceremonial pit of a sacred site, veterans or their family members may have wished not only to fulfill a vow or thank the gods for their help but also to say goodbye to their service and to thank the gods for protecting them in Britain. Objects, as symbols of the past and (unpleasant) service, were no longer needed in daily life, probably because of their associations. There is no possibility of knowing how long the brooches were in the state of in-betweeness, i.e. how long they fulfilled the role of clothes fasteners before playing a role in ritual activity[389]. This chapter of the objects biographies is closed to us; yet, the 'life' on the Continent was subject to the reality of discourse, by which the objects' functionality and symbolism of the past might have existed side by side and mediated the relationship between the objects and their owners. In other words, while wearing British-made brooches in the setting of foreign cultures, the past of the owners was projected as people who lived in or were from Britain. By deliberately refusing to use the brooches anymore as clothes fasteners, the projection of a foreign past and the experience in a foreign land was brought to an end. In this sense, brooches were subject to twofold actions: as personal offerings to gods and as closures of past activities; by

---

[387] Other brooches of similar symbolic quality are horse and rider shaped brooches, dragonesque, dog, *etc.* (cf. Puttock 2002, 83-88 for a discussion and full list).

[388] In Gallia Belgica not only British-made brooches, but also coins, British-made enameled and non-enameled metalwork has been found on the sites of Gallo-Roman temples and sanctuaries (chapter 5, section 5.3).

[389] The brooch from Fesques is complete, with the spiral still attached but the pin missing; the Möhn brooch's spiral and pin are missing but it is otherwise complete; the Colchester brooch found in Vermand is complete, with pin and spiral still attached; the Dolphin type brooch found in Vermand is broken at the foot - the spiral and pin missing; the T168 brooch from Vermand is in bad shape - the pin and spiral are missing and the catch plate is broken.

giving such personal items away to the gods, the past was symbolically buried and vows were fulfilled. Here the duality of brooches as physical embodiments of the past and physical items for securing items of clothing is most clearly expressed.

6.2.3. *Brooches as rubbish deposits and accidental losses*

In total 45 British-made brooches, located on 22 Continental sites, have been recorded as having been found in cities, forts, vici of a fort and rural settlements; some have no affiliation to any particular context and were recorded as 'accidental finds' (fig. 6.6).


Figure 6.6 British-made brooches in urban, military and civilian contexts[390]

Within these 22 sites, the location of most brooches has been recorded: nine were found in rubbish pits (including one in a well), 17 in roads, gateways and earthen ramps, and 12 in buildings (though for some precise location within the building has not been recorded); the location of seven brooches is unknown. Pudney (2011) analyses the evidence from Severn Estuary sites, where brooches were found in similar contexts, and suggests that some objects were intentionally deposited within the boundaries of a building, as part of the foundation ritual, while others, found in a pit of an abandoned legionary fortress, represented an act of abandonment of a place and abandonment of military identity. While Pudney to some extent deals with the data recorded precisely, for our purposes there is no possibility to know, whether the brooches found in buildings were located in foundation trenches or on either side of a doorway; although for some items their findspot can be explained following simple logic. For instance, brooches recorded as having been found in a bath house of the Weissenburg fort and from Lillebonne found in the context of the Roman theater, most likely entered the

---

[390] The brooches counted here are the ones whose location within the site was recorded, cf. brooches found in Saalburg, the location of which has been recorded precisely, and brooches from Zugmantel, the findspot of which is unknown. Sites: Saalburg, Bickenbach, Heldenbergen, Frankfurt-Heddernheim, Xanten, Nijmegen (Lage Veld), Ahrweiler, Étaples, Lillebonne, Augst, Martigny, Oberwinterthur, Aime, Straubing, Weissenburg, Morlupo, Căşeiu, Bumbesti, Drösing, Schützen am Gebirge, Mautern and *Thamusida*.

archaeological record as a result of someone's carelessness: it might have been lost when someone undressed to take a bath and it may have fallen off the clothes of a spectator watching a performance or gladiator fight in the theatre respectively.

The location of brooches in the fort of Saalburg deserves some attention here: seven were located in an earthen ramp, constructed behind the defensive walls to allow defenders access to the top[391]; one was found in a well, another next to the same well; one was located in a ditch next to the *porta praetoria*. It has been proposed that these brooches ended their lives as rubbish deposits, probably upon the relocation of a British unit to the Odenwald-Neckar frontier ca AD 100 (chapter 5, section 5.1.1). Notably, the brooches found in the ramp were still in a good state, some even had their pins and spirals attached. Such deliberate 'throwing away' of the objects, which their owners no longer want, yet could have continued to use, is a considerable act, and warns against thinking that this was just military rubbish. While the ramp is not contemporary with the period of the abandonment of the fort by a British unit (ca AD 135 against ca AD 100), the items might have been deposited in one place a decade earlier by the leaving members of the British unit and later dug up during the demolition of the previous constructions by a new unit and have ended up as 'demolition waste' in the ramp. Not all brooches were thrown away: there is evidence that some were brought to the Odenwald-Neckar frontier – the Hesselbach and Obernburg forts count such brooches. It seems that it was part of a deliberate deposition of some items (that could have been further used) rather than a general rubbish damp. Pudney (2011, 122 with further literature) notes the existence of "specific practices related to the abandonment of a place, including the explicit and structured deposition of objects" in Britain. Considering that the soldiers in this British unit may have been British-born (cf. chapters 3 and 4) and familiar with the rituals performed at home, this ties in with the intentional deposition of "meaningful objects" conducted at some sites in Britain (Pudney 2011). The movement to another fort or region can be related to the end of practices that were performed daily, the end of the routine; by placing items of personal importance in a pit, a group of soldiers might have ritually signified the end of a particular phase in their lives (Pudney 2011, 122) and bid a personal farewell to a place that their home for some time.

For the brooches found within one of the insula of Oberwinterthur and within the city boundaries of Augst a different explanation can, however, be proposed. The objects found in Oberwinterthur were found in the town's occupation area, in buildings located across the street from each other. Three brooches entered the archaeological record in a broken state: one is missing its upper part (only the foot survives), second one has a broken left side, missing its catch plate and pin and the third one is missing a spiral and a pin. Two brooches found in Augst represents also nothing more than rubbish: one was broken into two parts, and the foot, spiral and pin were missing; another one was found together with 'third century' pottery and a crossbow brooch. Their deposition was clearly intentional: they could no longer perform their role as clothes fasteners and were thrown away into rubbish pits. The fourth brooch, (trumpet brooch type 2A), however, unlikely was part of the rubbish, because it was found in a complete state, with its pin and spiral attached. In total 351 brooches were found on this site, generally well-preserved and in perfect condition (Rey-Vodoz 1998, 62), which counts against the idea that our British-made brooch was a special and intentional deposit. Notably, the group of brooches found on this site is homogenous and are of local origin, with a small number of brooches of non-local types; all this indicates that the British trumpet brooch would have stood out and have appeared unusual to the inhabitants of the region, yet, it was

---

[391] Böhme (1970, 9, note 15) notes that the findspot of the brooches recorded as "earthen ramp" might not be totally correct: the previous excavators did not record the findspots of brooches at all; only in 1912 three brooches were noted as having been found in "earthen ramp", two in the earliest levels of the ramp.

discarded. Possibly this brooch found in Oberwinterthur was unintentionally deposited, i.e. it entered the archaeological record through accidentally being lost, as appears to be the case with other brooches from Augst, whose location has been noted by excavators, such as the umbonate from the theatre in *insula* 2A, and one at Colchester from *insula* 15. Notably, the umbonate brooch is in a perfect state, except the pin is missing, which might have been the cause of the brooch's loss: the pin broke and the object fell from the clothes, as in the case of the Lillebonne brooch, discussed above (i.e. both brooches were found in the context of a theatre).

Another example of the brooch being an accidental loss includes the British-made brooch from Bickenbach found on a site where a Roman road joins a swamp bridge. The Bickenbach brooch is also in a good state; the pin and spiral are still attached and only the small loop on the top is missing. This object may have been lost when a group of soldiers, heading towards their post on the Odenwald-Neckar frontier in the mid second century, was crossing the bridge. Another example that can be proposed here is a brooch (type T173A) found on the route of the Roman penetration during the Marcomannic Wars: a surface find, it may have fallen off the clothes of a soldier moving with his unit. All items were most likely worn at the time of loss, an indication for us that British-made brooches were part of daily routine, habitually and continuously worn, in spite of changes in living place, of daily habits (military vs civilian (rural or urban) daily practices) and the people surrounding the brooches' wearers.

In comparison, three British-made brooches have been reported as being found in rubbish pits (Mautern, Heddernheim and Étaples) can be addressed. Two brooches from the area of civilian settlement in front of the fort at Heldenbergen may have been rubbish deposits: one was completely broken -, only a foot has survived, another bent to the left side, while pin, spiral and headloop were still attached[392]. All sites, except Étaples, are military vici that developed in the vicinity of forts where British auxiliary units were stationed; the time of deposition is also contemporary with the presence of the British troops. Étaples is a civilian settlement that developed in the vicinity of the British fleet station, Boulogne-sur-Mer, and might have been a place where people coming from Britain, as well as mariners serving in the fleet, stayed for some time. These brooches may have been deliberately thrown away, maybe even without any attempt to repair them: a brooch from Heddernheim is missing its pin, when it could have easily been repaired. Such deliberateness and refusal of further use suggest that these objects were no longer important or special; their "daily-ness" and un-exoticness may have been the cause of their becoming rubbish. Inclusion of the items in rubbish pits symbolises the fact that the objects were non-essential, of little value, probably because of their ordinaryness. Considering that all the sites mentioned had a direct connection to British auxiliary units and the British fleet, it is possible that there was an abundance of British-made objects on these sites. In other words, there were too many British-made brooches to consider them as special or of any importance for ritual activity. This contrasts with brooches from Saalburg, which may have been deliberately deposited for their past value and embodiment of British-ness in order to bid farewell to the activity performed in the fort.

Does the difference lie in the fact that the deposition action in Saalburg was performed within a military milieu (mostly men?), while the inclusion of the brooches in rubbish was possibly done by civilians (mainly women?)? In other words, the relationship between owners, i.e. soldiers, and objects in Saalburg had much deeper connotations, while for communities living in the vicinity of forts, brooches did not have a particular meaning other than being clothes fasteners. This invites further discussion of how brooches' meanings were dependant on the complex intervening associations and

---

[392] A failure to straighten the brooch might have resulted in its rejection and throwing away.

social domains existing within particular groups. Not every British auxiliary unit was the same in its composition in terms of social background (educated vs non-educated, urban vs rural recruits), tribal background (Dobunnian, Icenian or Continental majority within a troop) and age (more 20's or 30's year old). Status-related relations between their members, openness to the new environment, problems and co-operation due to stress of relocation and transfer also varied between units. Brooches worn by one group therefore may have been an embodiment of sacrificial values, while in another have had a more practical, mundane value; yet the difference in their exploitation has its roots in routinisation: one (former) group saw in a brooch more than it had to offer as a clothes fastener; another (the latter) was so overwhelmed by brooches' "every day-ness" that for them there was no other option than to throw the unneeded objects away.

By placing the brooches in rubbish or having them accidentally lost meant the functional death of the object. Such an action had consequences for the projection of any form of identities, be they gender, ethnic, cultural *etc.*; the intentional death of an object stands for the death of meaning this item is associated with, following up on the 'death' of identities desired or wished for or (un)intentionally projected. In our case, the label 'Britishness' that brooches held in them, i.e. as products of Britain, together with all other identities the owners had and projected through wearing them, was 'thrown' away. Such a denial to transmit the 'British' aspect of a brooch, as well as whatever connections the owner had with Britain (the object after all had been brought from there to the Continent), suggests one of two directly opposite intentions: a) a refusal to acknowledge the 'British' past by the owner, i.e. an intention to forget a period of service or life in Britain and bury the past; b) acceptance of the brooch's "daily-ness", because of the object's abundance and availability. In the former case, owners did not have any emotional connections with the land that served them as home for some period of time; life in Britain was regarded as temporary and of no value. In the latter, the availability of brooches allowed owners to continue to transmit whatever identities they wished to; brooches were not regarded as important or special; rather the routine of wearing them continuously and on a daily basis reinvented the associations.

Groups of British-made brooches discussed here provide a range of scenarios for their use and for being discarded, which in some context depended on the groups of people using them (i.e. soldiers in British auxiliary units and probably British-born individuals) and in another – dependant on their physical presence (excessiveness) and physicality (i.e. perishable pin and spiral). The value of all these brooches varied from emotional to practical to sacrificial; yet, we will never know whether the objects considered here as accidental losses were of particular importance, i.e. whether their loss meant something to their owners. Moreover, we cannot assume that all British-born individuals serving in British auxiliary units performed the act of the symbolic funeral of their British-made brooches upon abandoning a place. However, British brooches acted in the variety of ways, had many associations and were being valued and non-valued; precisely such practices help us to outline 'the shape' of people who brought these brooches with them.

6.3. Objects of value, objects of desire, objects of fashion: brooches in context

British-made brooches took on and played a variety of roles both within and outside Britain. While the context is a cornerstone in determining the ways they were used and what they expressed on individual, group and communal levels, the three aspects of routinisation, discourse and evocation dominate all contexts. The responses of agents towards the objects and objects' 'unintentional' influence towards the agents (as in a dialectical relationship between objects and humans) give a texture to our understanding of the usage of personal accessories and provide us with the possibility to look beyond

the notion of them as simple decorations. In our case, British-made brooches were surely "more than meets the eye" (Jundi and Hill 1998).

The normative, rational and emotional actions of person are embedded within the shared aspect of *habitus*: a brooch therefore was primarily a clothes fastener in <u>any</u> contexts. Its physicality, i.e. presence of a pin, spiral and sometimes headloop, was its *habitus*. When a person, an agent, enters the stage, its usage starts to be dependant on the *responses* the brooch evokes. By putting the brooch in a variety of contexts, social surroundings and landscapes, the item starts to change its meaning, whether intentionally or unintentionally as can be determined only by and through the agents' usage. The normative person would continue to use the brooch for its primary function: to fasten the clothes. The positioning of a brooch at shoulder level and wearing it so that everyone could see it provides an entrance for the rational person, who gives it a meaning depending on the responses from the viewers, his own desires and wishes, and evaluates the potential value of it. The emotional person sees the value of the item as an embodiment of particular meanings, associations and feelings. Each aspect in the man intervenes and collaborates, and finalises the end result of a brooch's use, i.e. whether it is thrown away, buried, given away, *etc.* When a brooch enters the archaeological record, it is a sum of all responses, aspects and (un)intentional values. The significance of each action, i.e. *why* (it was thrown away, buried, *etc.*) rather than *how*, indicates the levels of associations and relationships between objects and agents.

In the case of British-made brooches, the past is an important matter. The desire to forget, re-invent, evoke or project the past attests to the importance and value of memory when British-made brooches were put in specific contexts abroad. The aspect of remembrance and evocation also existed in the inscriptions erected by mobile Britons, though here it was confined to the idea of a homeland and place of birth. Here, 'ethnicities' were overlooked and had no particular meanings, though the aspects of 'physicality' and 'place of manufacture' connected the agents with their British past (discussed below). However, the presence of objects made in Britain on sites with homogenous material culture allowed them to stand out in the material record of that site: the realisation that a brooch was outstanding and exotic might provide the grounds for the growing of a new meaning, possibly not existing in Britain itself, one relating to the expression of ethnicity, especially when the owner was British-born[393]. Ethnicity here becomes a by-product of the relationship between the owner and the object: the uniqueness and particularity of the artefact might enhance the expressions of the ethnic identity.

6.4. <u>Brooches as identities' markers: 'Britishness' and Britons</u>[394]

The distribution of brooches has shown that the objects occurred on sites where people were attested who had some connection with Britain, which raised the question whether it is possible to distinguish groups represented on those site who had travelled from Britain from those who most likely originated from this province. The analysis conducted here regarding the contexts and possible meanings behind including brooches in burials, sacred and rubbish pits, indicates that it is in some ways possible to correlate the context in which the brooches were found with the groups of people who may have brought these objects to the sites. It seems that British recruits serving in British units were prone to accidentally lose their brooches or to discard them as unneeded rubbish, while there are indications that returning veterans included foreign material in their own social practices, such as putting an exotic object in a grave or in a sanctuary. Some of the

---

[393] Cf. Jones S. 2007, 73: "Any distinctive, non-random distributions of particular styles and forms of material culture in different contexts […] plausibly relate to the expression of ethnicity".
[394] The shorter version of the discussion in this section has appeared in Ivleva 2011a.

brooches could, of course, have been, exchange or trade goods, although as foreign and probably exotic objects, they were imbued with particular social meanings which would have varied between the groups using them and were still specifically chosen to be part of a particular action or religious performance. As such, the contexts allow a relatively clear distinction to be made between sites with high and low potential for evidence for a British presence, i.e. military as opposed to civilian, although a British presence on civilian sites should not be ruled out.

Analysis of the epigraphic record has suggested that British ethnic self-awareness survived as far down the line as second-generation emigrants. The presence of late first-century brooch types in a late second-century context, by which time the type had ceased to be produced, may indicate a second-generation emigrant for whom a brooch was a valuable heirloom, an ancestral reminder[395].

The notion that people arriving from Britain, whether male or female, continued to wear their British-made brooches overseas has received support here, although whether by practical necessity or as a result of ethnic consciousness is a point of discussion. One of the limitations of using brooches to understand ethnic consciousness is that wearing a British brooch does not make one British. Brooches could have been valued by migrants not so much for their ethnic associations as for their association with luxury and exoticness, with the past (for veterans who served in Britain) or with gender. However, British brooches were common dress accessories in Britain. Therefore the inhabitants regarded them as ordinary, everyday objects and may have considered them as such overseas, although not necessarily, as has been discussed above. Moreover, a Briton living overseas, probably, would know that a brooch was made in Britain and by wearing British brooches, members of British emigrant community could easily recognise each other overseas.

The assumption that brooches in general were used as symbols to deliberately emphasise ethnic origin can be contested. However, it must be stressed that here we are dealing with a community, dispersed over diverse groups. Any communities formed across diverse groups can be "seen as being created, understood and reinforced by means of symbolism" (Crowley 2009, 118). In some migrant communities the usage of symbolism is even stronger and more articulated (Brettel 2003; Sheffer 2005). Rothe (2009, 79) noted that the move to a new territory, in her case the transfer of Ubians, "appears to have engendered a desire for some degree of cultural continuity among part of the population". The movement and transfer overseas could have triggered in some Britons a desire to dress in the same way as their ancestors, reinforcing a desire to express the differences between them and the host population – differences in origin, way of dressing or wearing brooches. It became clear from the epigraphic material that the sense of 'being British' persisted as far as the second generation among some Britons.

It can be suggested that, since they were British products, brooches were symbols that stood for *Britannia*. Through wearing a brooch, different messages could have been sent by the owner, while the 'British-ness' of the brooches could 'resonate' together with all the other meanings. Messages could range from 'I served as a soldier in Britannia' or 'I travelled to Britannia and returned safely' to 'I came from Britannia and I am a Briton'. Different meanings are emphasised in each case, but a connection with Britain is present in all of them. This is where the theory of 'material resonance', discussed in chapter 1 and outlined in Antonaccio (2009), provides the possibility for seeing how various forms of ethnicity[396] may have been projected through material culture - in our case, specifically through the wearing of British-made brooches. Material ethnicity

---

[395] Brooches found in Mautern, Bumbeşti, Munz(en)berg and Pont.
[396] I.e. desired, achieved and received through citizenship status or given at birth.

theory, therefore, suggests that British brooches could have been used by mobile Britons as indicators of their shared ancestry or by immigrants to indicate their shared experience as soldiers in Britain. Access to British-made objects by people not native to the province may or may not have triggered the desire 'to do like the British do'; yet, objects were still being associated with British-ness, i.e. foreignness and the past, and acted as agents for evoking particular associations and feelings. If an individual wore a brooch in the same manner as in Britain, although this would not have made this person British, the value of brooch as symbol and embodiment of "British" aspects and pasts was at the front, literally and metaphorically, for everyone to see.

6.4.1. *Were Britons emigrants or a diaspora?*

Enough evidence, albeit in small numbers, is available to pinpoint the location of mobile Britons on the Continent. It became clear that the past and memory of their land of birth was important to them, although it should be emphasised that for any individuals settling elsewhere the past and homeland is important: an increase in the demonstration of one's origin is particularly noticeable in mobile communities (Oltean 2009, 94-95). Britons are no different from any other migrants in their choices regarding the projection of their origin through epigraphy and material culture. Some Britons living abroad were keen to make their ethnic origin explicit through written language, whether the decision lay in naming their tribe or in employing the adopted Roman construct *Britonnes*. The epigraphic record indicates that ethnic consciousness existed for Britons, although there is no conclusive evidence that this was a widespread phenomenon. For most mobile Britons, wearing a British-made brooch would be a necessary and obvious thing to do, since it would have been brought among their personal possessions. This makes it possible to use British brooches as tools in the search for Britons living abroad. While wearing a British brooch for some mobile Britons would reinforce their 'Britishness', other identities and messages could have been projected as well.

The question central to the discussion here is: whether Britons living abroad can be termed emigrants or diaspora, taking into account the dual nature of both words and brooches (cf. chapter 2, section 2.6), as well as the multiple ethnic identities of any mobile individual. We have seen that diaspora communities differ from migrants in their relation to the idea of a home (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3.3), where the former resides in three-angled view of home, host and new land, the latter approaches the host land as if it was their new land, refusing any connections with the homeland. Therefore, the reasonable question to ask is where 'sense of home' was embedded for Britons and how it might be studied. It has been proposed (cf. chapter 1, section 1.4) that 'shared ways of doing things' constitutes 'a home', the notion based on a shared *habitus* between people who stay put and who moved[397]. Through wearing a British brooch, naming their tribal or national origin on inscriptions and military diplomas and erecting votive monuments to their ancestor goddesses, some Britons did indeed do things in a way that was similar to that of their communities back home. Another step is to determine whether these actions were deliberate, reinforced by living in a different society as in diaspora communities, or not, as migrants would do, considering that *habitus* / habits forced both groups to act in the same way as back home.

I would like here to suggest as a parallel with the African-Caribbean diaspora, peoples of which form the so called 'Black Triangle' consisting of Africa, the Caribbean and the USA or the UK (Hall S. 2003, 235). This triangle is centered in Africa, "the name of the missing term, the great aporia, which lies at the center of our [African-Caribbean] cultural identity and gives it a meaning" (Hall S. 2003, 235). The past in this

---

[397] As opposed to 'the home', a changeable and conditional aspect, flexible and creative, meaning that 'the home' can be recreated at any location using symbolism of distinctiveness.

diaspora appears to be broken, and in some ways, un-restorable, it is essentialised and idealised; the community acknowledges its uniqueness, although it goes through constant transformation, looking to the future, constrained by narratives of the past and forming the narratives of the future (Hall S. 2003, 235). The community itself is not bounded, rather "the boundaries of difference are continually repositioned in relation to different points of reference" (Hall S. 2003, 238): 'Others' see them as all 'the same'; while they (i.e. African-Caribbeans) see themselves as different in cultural terms, i.e. difference between Jamaicans, Cubans and Martiniquains.

In our case, such a triangle also exists, consisting of Britain, the provinces and the Roman Empire. Britain, as birth land and home for some time, shaped the essentialised identities and formed the *habitus* and narratives of the past. The provinces, as places where mobile Britons settled, hosted them and gave them a new home and formed their narratives of the future; they were places where newcomers and hosts entered into a discourse, while the Roman Empire unified these peoples across their differences and embedded them within cultural norms and practices. Britons were seen in the provinces and within the Roman Empire as very much 'the same'; they are even named after an adopted and artificially constructed unity. Yet, there were profound differences between Britons themselves, which were recognised and contrasted, as inscriptions made in Britain show. Those Britons who had Roman citizenship, were both Romans and non-Romans: their new ethnicity was confined to a legal term, standardised according to Roman laws and payment of taxes; it added a new meaning to their core ethnicity - i.e. 'a' tribal, urban, parental, rural identity or whatever, "without erasing the trace of its other meanings" (Hall S. 2003, 239 on the idea of difference in Derrida sense).

By looking at the community of Britons living abroad through the notion of a 'triangle', the discussion moves onto another level: from discussing the solid entity that (emigrants or diaspora) mobile Britons on the Continent might have been, we arrive at 'an imagined' community living across and trespassing any 'semantic' boundaries (Isaev 2009, 224). Rather than labeling them with concepts such as emigrants or diaspora, which in semantic terms they were both and none, I would like to suggest that the social contexts and the flexibility of 'the home' and essentiality of 'a home' formed the responses these mobile individuals projected and used in any given situational contexts. Depending on circumstances, availability of the scenarios and choices, the restricted boundaries of the *habitus* adapted to the new environment. This 'imagined' community consisted of a variety of patches of individuals and personhoods, employing a variety of symbols and scenarios in a variety of contexts, making them sometimes appear as 'emigrants', in other contexts and circumstances as a 'diaspora'. While deconstructing the labeling of particular communities, we should avoid deconstructing them to the point of non-existence (Isaev 2009, 224). The notions 'migrant' and 'diaspora' outline for us the variety of scenarios a person might have wished to choose from when being transferred or moved to a new territory. The idea of 'a home' and the construction of 'the (artificial) home' as described by migrant and diaspora theories give a texture to understand the realities of the past.