3. The ‘legacy’ of Rome: the rise, decline, and fall of the theory of Romanization

Richard Hingley

They who have no taste to relish [classical publications] would, if they loved their country, patronise them from political principles ... The nation that out-rivals its neighbours, will become the mart of commerce: the ingenious and industrious will procure a comfortable subsistence: the inhabitants will multiply: and the kingdom will increase in riches, and consequently, in power.

(Ruffhead 1757; quoted in Wilson 1989, 23–4)

Introduction

In this paper three interrelated topics will be discussed. First, I will explore how some British academics, administrators and politicians actively used the Roman Empire to help identify and define their own aspirations, and in so doing drew a parallel between Britain and Rome. In discussing this topic, I will provide a brief consideration of the work of Francis Haverfield, a pioneer of Romano-British archaeological studies. Second, I will show how some contemporary scholars retain a positive conception of the Roman experience, and identify some of the ways in which this affects present-day Roman archaeology. Third, I will consider some ideas that are currently promoted by post-colonial studies – ideas that can be taken to suggest an urgent need for a change in Roman studies. I shall also consider what this change might involve.

In discussing these three topics I will adopt an approach which is polemical in character. Such a study must aim to respect historical accuracy but, in propounding a strong line of argument, does not seek historiographical completeness (Fabian 1983, 38).

Drawing parallels between Britain and Rome

A number of authors have discussed the ways in which people and nations have drawn on the past to help them to identify their own place within the present (eg Hobsbawm and Ranger (eds) 1983; Lowenthal 1985; Hewison 1987; Hodder (ed) 1991). In this paper I intend to examine some of the ways in which the British used the image of Classical Rome to identify and support their own nationhood and expansion (see also Hingley 1995). This process of drawing on the past to inform the present can be considered to be circular in nature as, in drawing on the past, individuals selectively appropriate and re-invent it.

The image of Rome in medieval and modern times was partly a product of the historical context in which Rome was studied. Yates has discussed how emperors and kings throughout medieval Europe viewed the Roman Empire as symbolic of power, unity and peace. Many political leaders, from Charlemagne and Charles V of the Holy Roman Empire to Elizabeth I of
England, drew on the image of Rome in this way (Yates 1975). In the English context, Camden’s *Britannia* (first published in 1586) provided a detailed account of the Roman monuments and history of Britain. Piggott has argued that part of Camden’s motivation was to help to establish England as a member of the fellowship of nations who derived their strength and identity from the Roman Empire (1975, 57–9). Camden’s work appeared at the time both of England’s involvement in the Renaissance movement, and of attempts by English scholars to associate Elizabeth with Classical imagery, thereby strengthening her image as a British and imperial ruler (Yates 1975). Politicians and others continued to draw on the Roman parallel in the following centuries. Associations were established (or claimed), for example, between the Roman Republican system and the British political constitution, between their respective architectural traditions, and in models of landscape gardening (Turner 1989, 65–70).

During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, the parallel drawn between the empires of Britain and Rome was reinvented and redefined. Classical models comprised one important element in the complex network of Victorian and Edwardian thought (Harris 1993). During the nineteenth century, Hellenistic concepts continued to be used to help define a range of political concepts, social activities, and building styles (Turner 1981, 1989). A rival image also existed, identifying the rise and fall of Rome as a recurring reference point for British virtue, the British Empire and future British decline (Hynes 1968, 24–7; Harris 1993, 247–8). This Roman image was important not only to the Old Etonians who dominated Parliament but also to imperial administrators and school teachers (Betts 1971, 158; Harris 1993, 247–8); it became increasingly significant in the early-twentieth century (Turner 1989, 75).

I have argued elsewhere that some Edwardians came to draw upon Rome as a means of identifying Britain’s imperial purpose (Hingley 1995); however, some qualifications are required here. First, only certain aspects of the Roman imperial model were felt to be relevant, and most British authors who envisaged a parallel between the British and Roman imperial systems were highly critical of the despotic nature of the rule of the Roman emperors. The British Empire was felt to be highly superior in political terms (Haverfield 1905, 183; Betts 1971), and it was generally agreed that there was a closer political association between Britain and the Roman Republic than between Britain and the Empire (Haverfield 1911, xviii; Turner 1989, 63; and Jenkyns 1992, 4).

Secondly, it is evident that the British did not suppose themselves to be descended from the Romans in a genealogical sense. Some authors did, however, consider that Britain shared a moral purpose with Rome. Rome was fundamental in the dissemination of Classical civilization over a wide area of present-day Europe and parts of North Africa. In parallel, the British assumed that they were carrying the most evolved form of European civilization to their ever-expanding Empire (Turner 1989, 61).1

A number of writers drew a particular association between Britain and Rome in the period between 1899 and 1914.2 These Victorians and Edwardians range from administrators and politicians such as Lord Cromer,
to educationalists such as JC Stobart, and academics like Haverfield. Some published works argued that the history of Rome provided ‘morals’ for the British at a time of particular international pressure. For instance, the Earl of Cromer hoped to seek

in the history of imperial Rome for any facts or commentaries ... which might be of service to the modern empire of which we are so justly proud.

(quoted in Brunt 1964–5, 267)

The reason for the supposed parallel which these authors drew are complex, and I shall only discuss two points here. First, the Classical nature of the educational system clearly had a deep impact on the ways in which the British viewed the world (Cross 1968, 35; Betts 1971; Bowler 1989, 44; Turner 1989, 63). The men of the ruling upper and upper-middle classes were educated in a public school system where Classical language and literature formed basic elements of the curriculum. Greek and Roman concepts, in particular the significant Roman concept of gravitas, played a fundamental role in the formation of the character of the English gentleman (Mason 1982, 22). By the Edwardian period the role of Classical education was beginning to be challenged from some unexpected quarters (eg Haverfield 1911, xii–xiv), but it has remained fundamental in some public schools up to the present day.

Second, it is of interest that the Roman parallel was drawn upon just at the time when the British faced a serious military and political challenge from Germany (Hynes 1968; Reynolds 1991). One English origin myth, established in the sixteenth century, stressed Teutonic - or Anglo-Saxon - descent. This myth emphasized the inherent superiority of Germanic peoples and the freedom of the political and religious institutions which supposedly grew from this Germanic source (MacDougal 1982, 1–3; Keynes and Lapidge 1983, 48). Throughout the nineteenth century Britain had held a fairly secure and unchallenged international position of dominance in industry, at sea, and in its colonial acquisitions (Reynolds 1991, 9), and at the height of Victorian imperialism it was considered by some that England’s triumph grew from an unquestioned Anglo-Saxon inheritance. The decline of the Anglo-Saxon myth in the early-twentieth century mirrors the political rise of Germany (Bowler 1989, 117). The idea that the source of supposed British political independence lay in primitive Germanic culture became untenable in view of the growing awareness of Kaiser Wilhelm’s expansionist aspirations (MacDougal 1982, 128–9).

This international pressure also forced the British to look seriously at the efficiency of their empire, and is one of the reasons why the Roman parallel became attractive during the early years of this century. The Roman parallel was felt to provide morals and lessons for Britain’s own empire through a philosophical consideration of concepts such as empire, efficiency and administration (Betts 1971; Turner 1989, 75; Hingley 1995). In addition, however, the Roman parallel was employed to define a line of continuity in European cultural development from the Classical past to the present (Turner 1989, 61). In so doing it may have provided Edwardians with a welcome sense of security and stability in an increasingly troubled world.
I am not suggesting that a uniform and dramatic transformation, from a mid- to late-Victorian predominantly Germanic origin myth to an Edwardian conception of a Roman–British parallel, occurred in public and intellectual thought. There was evidently no such thing as a universal Victorian or Edwardian attitude (Hynes 1968; Harris 1993), and conflicting concepts of national origin existed. In the world of political and social thought, however, the Roman image did begin to reassert itself over both Germany and Greece during the first fifteen years of this century. The developing political interest in the Roman parallel suggests that Romano-British studies originated as a modern discipline at a particularly appropriate time in the history of modern Britain.

Several recent works have identified Francis Haverfield as the founder of modern studies (eg Potter 1986; R Jones 1987, 87; Hingley 1989, 2). The nature and context of Haverfield’s work has recently become a topic of research for a number of authors (eg Hingley 1991, 1995; Freeman 1991, 1993, this volume; Lawrence 1994). Rick Jones has stated that Haverfield’s *The Romanization of Roman Britain*, first published as a lecture to the British Academy in 1905 but expanded and republished as a book in 1912, contained a basic structure for future work and set the agenda for Romano-British studies for the next sixty years (1987, 87). *The Romanization of Roman Britain* constituted Haverfield’s most important work, but to identify something of his possible motivation we need to turn to an earlier lecture, namely *An inaugural address delivered before the first annual general meeting of the [Roman] Society* (Haverfield 1911). This lecture of 1911 places Haverfield among those scholars who argued that Roman studies had particular moral value for the British. He stated that

> The methods by which Roman incorporated and denationalised and assimilated more than half its wide dominions, and the success of Rome, unintended perhaps but complete, in spreading its Graeco-Roman culture over more than a third of Europe and a part of Africa, concerns in many ways our own age and Empire... Even the forces which laid the Roman Empire low concern the modern world very nearly...

(Haverfield 1911, xviii)

Haverfield’s framework of analysis, as outlined in his 1911 lecture and in *The Romanization of Roman Britain*, included two aspects which I have argued elsewhere have conditioned the history of twentieth-century research (Hingley 1991, 92): the study of incorporation, and of assimilation/denationalization. In his 1911 paper, and also in the 1915 republication of *The Romanization of Roman Britain*, Haverfield clearly identified these two aspects in arguing that the efforts of the Romans took two forms – the defending of the frontier and the development of the civilization of the provinces during the resulting peace (1911, xviii–xix; 1915, 10).

Haverfield possessed a real interest in frontier defence, as his archaeological work in northern Britain early this century illustrates. He organized excavations in northern Britain, and in 1915 became President of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Archaeological Society. His published works contain accounts of Roman frontier policy; for instance

In Roman times the region (around Ambleside fort) was a tangled chaos of
hills in which wild hill-men defied Roman ways. Rome could not leave them alone ... Borrans [the field in which the fort stands] then was a strategic point on a distant frontier, a Chitral or a Gilgit... The lessons to be learnt ... are first and most, military matters. They concern problems such as we have still to face in guarding our own Indian North-west frontier, and even in making safe our own coast in Britain.

(Haverfield 1913–4, 433–5)

Haverfield’s main work, however, considered the assimilation of the province. He established a model for the process of progressive change - ‘Romanization’ - which has much in common with nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century concepts of ‘progress’ and ‘development’ (Hingley 1995). This positive moral content of the Roman imperial mission is inherent in the view that some Roman literary sources take, but it is also very much in keeping with the patronizing attitudes of Haverfield’s contemporaries towards the domination and control of the natives within their own empire.

Haverfield visualized Romanization as directional and progressive, the process by which native social groups in Roman Britain became increasingly ‘Roman’. The conquest and Romanization of the Roman Empire also had a positive moral content:

The men of the Empire wrought for the betterment and the happiness of the world.

(Haverfield 1915, 10)

The assumption that natives wished to become Roman, or more Roman, is argued to be the motivation behind the gradual transformation of material culture in the province from native to Roman throughout the three-and-a-half centuries of Roman rule (see Hingley 1995).

It is of interest for the broader topic of British imperial studies that Haverfield was not the only scholar who was interested in the progressive spread of Roman civilization throughout the British Empire. Betts has suggested that a number of late Victorian and Edwardian authors felt that Rome had excelled in what would possibly today be titled ‘race relations’ (Betts 1971, 156–7), including the Earl of Cromer and CB Lucas (Cromer 1910, 77; Lucas 1912, 99). That Haverfield felt that this topic provided a lesson for his contemporaries presumably provides one explanation for his interest.

The Rise of Romanization

New approaches to Roman Britain have been developed over the last seventy years, and particularly under the recent influence of a new generation of scholars who have been educated during and since the decline of Britain’s own empire. Romanization is no longer seen as a form of moral and social progress, but more in the light of the development, or acculturation, by which native society readily adopted ‘Roman’ culture (Millett 1990a, 1990b; R Jones 1991; Wolf 1992; Hanson 1994). In many of these recent studies it is accepted that native society adopted new ideas and made use of them under changing circumstances.

Millett has argued that the elite of the western provinces adopted Roman
material symbols to reinforce their social position by identifying themselves with Rome (1990b, 38). This model for change appears to be very useful in the context of contemporary theory for the political structure of the Roman Empire. We believe that the provincial administration took over the pre-existing native ‘tribal’ organization wherever possible to form the building blocks of the new provinces; it utilized the native elite to operate the new civitates, to collect taxes and to run the tribal council (eg Garnsey 1978; Garnsey and Saller 1987). According to Millett, new ideas passed down the social hierarchy through a process of emulation:

Progressive emulation of this symbolism further down the social hierarchy was self-generating[,] encouraging others within society to aspire to things Roman, thereby spreading the culture.

(Millett 1990b, 38)

According to this theory Roman material culture - from towns and country houses to coinage, pottery, and brooches - spread by this process through society, as did new beliefs, language and attitudes (Millett 1990a). This basic theory forms the background to the concept which Hanson has described as the ‘new orthodoxy’ in Romano-British studies (1994, 149).

The decline and fall of Romanization?
What is wrong with this approach? If we assume that the nature of the study of Roman Britain in the past has been partly determined by its context within the society in which it developed, the potential of post-colonial analysis becomes apparent (see Hingley 1995). This is not to say that we need to redesign our interpretative models for the Roman Empire to fit post-colonial critiques of the nature and influence of any particular Western empire. Moreover, as a range of post-colonial scholars have argued, there is no single and consistent colonial culture (eg Spurr 1993, 1; Slement 1994, 31; Thomas 1994). Works of post-colonial analysis may nevertheless enable us to view and to consider the perspectives which created past studies and also to suggest broad frameworks for new understandings.

Which elements of post-colonial study might be of use to us in reconstituting Romano-British archaeology? I have noted three interrelated aspects: (a) the attempts of post-colonial scholars to de-centre studies; (b) recent accounts which show a complex and varied range of responses to colonial contact; and (c) work that suggests overt and covert opposition to domination by colonial powers.

De-centring
Works of post-colonial theory illustrate the variety of differing views of the colonial or imperial situation on the part of both native peoples and members of the colonizing powers. They have also illustrated the primacy granted in colonial discourse to the views of the dominant imperial powers (see, for instance, Fanon 1961; Fabian 1983; Spivak 1993 [1988]; Said 1978, 1993). The agenda of much post-colonial literature appears to be to establish alternative images of the colonial situation; images which differ from those produced by the imperial societies.

In studies of the Roman Empire the dominant perspective on
Romanization derives from the work of Haverfield, but includes that of Millett. This work suggests an enlightened process by which well-meaning individuals in the imperial, tribal, and local elite gently demonstrated the advantages of the new ways to their interested kin, clients, and slaves, and permitted - even encouraged - voluntary change in their way of life. It also suggests a context in which everyone in society - from the humble peasant to the mighty lord - had an equal interest in actively maintaining the empire. Changes in material culture were then considered to be directional, and to have resulted from a wish on the part of the provincials to become Roman.

Is this approach likely to be correct in the context of the Roman Empire? If it is true that Millett’s account of the Romanization of Britain shares a common analytical framework with Haverfield’s earlier study (Freeman 1993; see also Hingley 1995), this means, in turn, that the dominant explanation for change - Romanization - is a development of ideas that derived from moral concepts of progress in the world of Britain’s own empire (Hingley 1995).

There is some evidence that the Roman administration actively encouraged the tribal elite to adopt Roman education (Garnsey 1978; Hanson 1994), as the British were later to do with native elites within their own empire. Ideas might have percolated down from the tribal elite to the other members of the tribe. Regarding the non-elite, however, Roman studies are encumbered with concepts of progress which contemporary post-colonial writers consider spurious (eg Fabian 1983; Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (eds) 1989; Said 1993; Thomas 1994). Many late-Victorian and Edwardian administrators argued that the moral purpose of the British was to bring progress and liberty to the natives in the colonies. This civilizing mission, or moral crusade, was also thought likely to improve the outlook of whole peoples, and it was felt that Rome had fulfilled a similar moral purpose. Owing to the deeply-held parallel between the British and the Roman Empires, our own imperial history has compelled many authors to see the Roman imperial presence (or ‘mission’) in a positive light.

Most British academic writers would now appear to consider the views of many late-Victorian and Edwardian commentators to be ridiculously one-sided in relation to our own Empire. Although certain passages within Haverfield’s own works may appear ‘unpalatable’ to a modern audience (Freeman 1991, 102), I would argue that our theories have been recycled with only certain aspects of the terminology redefined; we have not yet conducted the required radical re-think for Roman studies.5

Recent scholars have viewed native society as constraining or modifying ‘Roman’ material culture (Hanson 1994). Thus natives had something of a part to play in the process of change within the Roman Empire. Concepts were adopted or adapted to fit native needs, particularly the needs of the tribal elites. The dominant model still suggests, however, that during the process of change Romano-British native society was largely passive: that Roman ideas and goods were purchased, attained or imitated because they were vital to individuals in the creation or maintenance of their imagined or real status through the emulation of the great and the good. The natives adopted a largely ‘Roman’ way of making statements about personal power and social identity.
Existing approaches attribute a distinct practical value to new (so-called ‘Roman’) items of material culture and denigrate native culture. For instance, Freeman’s suggestion that new wheel-made pottery types were adopted by natives because of their technological superiority to native wares (1993, 444) ignores both the fact that many so-called ‘Roman’ pot types were derived at least partly from native prototypes, and also the active role of native society in defining the function, value and role of its own possessions (see Rubertone 1989, 37 for a comparable situation). Individuals within society negotiate and resist certain representations of superiority/inferiority and set up counter-arguments (e.g. Jones 1994). Thus, within a limited set of ideas and experiences, they partly define their own concepts of superiority, as they relate to items such as the form and function of a particular pot, or the image of a particular building type.

The dominant approaches also create a reification of the concept ‘Roman’. They suggest that the idea of ‘Rome’ (and those of Roman material culture and Romanization) have some actual objective existence in relation to the conquest and control of Roman Britain. As Freeman has remarked (1993), these approaches suggest that there is such a phenomenon as ‘Roman’ material culture. In fact many material items which are taken to indicate ‘Romanization’ are not items derived from Rome but from other areas of the Empire. This is true for example in the case of pottery produced in Roman Gaul (including samian) and fine wares from Roman Britain. In addition, elements that are titled ‘Roman’ can be seen to differ in nature, context and meaning across the Roman Empire, as in the case of the villa and public buildings such as the forum or amphitheatre.

A de-centred study of the Roman Empire should consider the differing ways in which ideas and concepts were utilized within civitates, provinces and across the empire. We should not assume that one standard ‘Roman’ image developed. There was no unified Roman material culture package (Freeman 1993) and the concept ‘Roman’ is not a secure category upon which to base analysis of change.

**Complexity of response and opposition**

Certain recent works of sociological, anthropological, and archaeological theory suggest that the process of change in many societies is far more complex than existing models for Romanization would suggest. For instance, we should actively consider opposition to new methods of control (see, for instance, articles in McGuire and Paynter (eds) 1991, and Layton (ed) 1989). Scholars who study the Roman Empire usually argue that once new provinces had been conquered and pacified, opposition to Roman control was rare and usually small-scale. This certainly is, on the whole, the impression that Classical literary sources leave in our minds. Apart from certain revolts, usually early in their history, provinces are considered to settle down into peaceful pro-Roman territories.

The difficulty in believing this view is that the Roman literary sources are written from a particular viewpoint (or range of associated views) and that we do not have the opinions of those subjected to Roman imperialism. Pre-Roman society in Britain, as over most of the rest of the western empire, was not literate. Those within Roman Britain who were able to produce written
texts that survive to the present day (by commissioning inscriptions or writing on tablets) are also likely to be people who benefited directly from the empire.

In a review of studies of colonial contact in America, Paynter and McGuire (1991) have argued that not all forms of opposition need to be overt. These authors have outlined a programme of research, involving the analysis of domination and resistance, which appears particularly attractive in the context of Roman Britain. The basis of their argument is that in the relationship between indigenous American Indians, imported African slaves, and Westerners, resistance, though not expressed in literature, may sometimes have been created or reflected through the media of behaviour and material culture.

Where is the evidence to indicate that there was active resistance to the process of change through the creation of material culture? As Siân Jones has shown in her PhD study (1994), the ways in which we have collected our data are predicated upon certain beliefs and assumptions which have distorted the available information and make reinterpretation very difficult. For example, the methods by which artefacts are collected and analysed are based on the assumption that similar styles are of the same date while dissimilar styles differ in date. This approach stresses homogeneity and ignores variability (Jones 1994, 106–8).

In addition, as I have argued elsewhere, the archaeological community has concentrated on the excavation of the houses and settlements of the elite and almost totally ignored those of the apparently less wealthy. This makes it difficult to study non-elite groups (1991). It is possible that subtle acts of resistance to the Roman administration and the tribal elite drew on concepts of past identity. How can we challenge the progressive model of Romanization outlined by Haverfield, Millett and others if we do not excavate the homes of the poor and powerless and if we ignore Roman-period structures and finds that appear ‘archaic’ (Hingley forthcoming)?

Here we encounter another problem, as our very definitions of wealth and poverty are based on the deterministic, progressive approach to Romanization, which is in turn based on assumptions about our own society. As I have attempted to show in Rural Settlement in Roman Britain (Hingley 1989) not all wealthy households chose the villa to symbolize control of surplus wealth. There may be other less overt, or less archaeologically obvious, ways in which power was manifest—such as control of feasting, or control of ritual. Some of these options will not have been examined because of the conscious and unconscious ways in which the existing academic power-structure has policed research, driving people’s ideas in certain directions.

We also need to think about other concepts that we use freely. Although local folk memory can be long-lived, the concept of what was Roman and what was native will have varied throughout society at the time of the conquest - concepts of folk identity will not have been homogeneous or standardized. In addition, such ideas will have changed dramatically over much of the province between AD 43 and AD 410. It is not necessary to assume that resistance to attempts by the elite to extend control always
involved the use of native (ie pre-Roman) material symbols (Hingley forthcoming). In fact the concepts ‘Roman’ and ‘Native’ require a broad critical evaluation (Jones 1994; Hingley forthcoming).

Most individuals within society are able to dominate someone else, and all individuals are themselves dominated. Therefore, the native tribal elite would not only have adopted new concepts in order to symbolize their relations with those who they dominated or wished to dominate; they may also have reacted in opposition to others by whom they were dominated. Likewise, even the poor may wish to demonstrate their power over others by adopting new ideas and materials. We should not replace a simple model by which material culture spread throughout society through emulation with one in which the creation and adoption of material culture by the non-elite was simply the result of opposition to the pro-Roman rulers. We may actually expect the situation to have been far more complex, with emulation and opposition working in a variable manner.

A realistic archaeology of Roman Britain might, therefore, accept the theory that individuals and communities actively adopted new symbols and ideas to create or maintain control of power relations; but at the same time might counter it with a second theory: that dominated individuals and communities reacted to attempts to dominate them through acts of opposition which had material correlates.

**Conclusion**

On the basis of the above, the following points may be offered.

We require less deterministic models for change in Romano-British material culture and society. Evidently, individuals had varying choices available to them in responding to the imperial situation. Conquest offered new opportunities to some members of the elite for domination and social control, but may have provided a threat to the liberty and security of some agricultural producers. Conversely, some members of the elite may at times have felt threatened by changes in society, and the Roman army certainly provided an escape from agricultural drudgery for some native males.

In particular, we cannot expect the entire native population to have reacted in the same ways to the Roman conquest of Britain. The processes of change will have involved the complex and continuous interaction of varying influences. We need to consider change and continuity against a background of differences in power, wealth, age, gender, identity, and geography.

We need to rid ourselves of the assumption that ‘Roman’ material culture was technologically superior to the material culture in use before the Conquest. New concepts and objects may have been in certain situations more convenient, more powerful, or more accessible, but individuals within society will have had an ability to resist certain representations of superiority by establishing counter-measures. Change will not have been simple and directional.

A more subtle understanding of what old and new ideas meant within Roman provincial society is required. Current discussions of the process termed ‘Romanization’ do not address these issues. They remain predicated on the assumptions of linear progress from simple to complex. Rome and Rome’s influence are assumed to have been both more advanced and more
progressive, and consequently the more advanced and progressive natives adopted more of it. Recent works on contemporary communities indicate that this viewpoint is derived from the assumption that there is only one correct way to behave, that there is a linear progress from primitive society to the modern world (Fabian 1983), and that in the procession of differing societies through time, Rome was close to the ultimate ideal. In my opinion this viewpoint is based on an incorrect premise, and it is time that it is effectively challenged and replaced.
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Footnotes
1 Francis Haverfield was actually rather more cosmopolitan than some of his contemporaries, probably as a result of his close association with Continental scholars, including Mommsen (see Freeman, this volume). He attributed a distinct value to European civilization as a whole, feeling it to be a direct descendent of Roman civilization. Haverfield’s view is expressed in several works. For instance:

   The man who studies the Roman frontier system, studies not only a great work but one which has given us all modern western Europe.

   (Haverfield 1911, xix)

   and:

   As the importance of the city of Rome declined, as the world became Romeless, a large part of the world became Roman.

   (Haverfield 1905, 186)

2 Relevant works which draw a parallel between the British and the Roman Empires include Churchill 1899; Mills 1905; Baden-Powell 1908; Cromer 1910; Haverfield 1911; Lucas 1912; Stobart 1912; and Bryce 1914. A number of modern authors have provided a variety of differing views on these late Victorian and Edwardian writers; see for instance Brunt 1964–5; Hynes 1968, 15-53; Betts 1971; Wells 1972, ix-x; Hingley 1991; Jenkyns 1992; Lawrence 1994; Majeed forthcoming; Freeman, this volume. Contemporary scholars have made similar observations about the value of studies of Roman Britain to an understanding of modern times. For instance, G Webster in a study of Boudica’s revolt has suggested that:

   If we could understand more fully the factors behind the Revolt, and especially the attitude of the Roman government, we would be in a much better position to evaluate present politics. ... archaeologists and historians can offer their contributions to the understanding of our present troubles by showing how historical sequences at different times, and in different places, run in such close parallel.

   (Webster 1978, 132)

3 It is clear that the Greek and the Roman parallels were used in a range of very
different ways during the nineteenth and twentieth century, and can be viewed to an extent as rival images (Turner 1989; Freeman, this volume). This theme will not, however, be discussed in this paper.

4 An alternative Celtic myth of origin was evidently drawn upon by other factions in Britain during the period under discussion (Chapman 1982).

5 As Fabian has argued in relation to the study of social anthropology, the academic discipline is ideologically connected with the political economy of Western imperialism. This connection cannot be merely disavowed by repenting of the ways of our colonialist predecessors: we are required to rethink the very nature of our discipline (Fabian 1983, 96).
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