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Introduction
This paper has two aims, the first providing a foundation for the second. The first is to argue, from the evidence of pottery, for the importance of availability and convenience as factors promoting the transference of ‘Roman’ material into the indigenous material culture of people living in Britain. These factors, it is argued, were more important for the adoption of Roman-style goods than any allegiance to the (assumed) social symbolism of ‘Roman’ material culture. It is believed that the ubiquity of Roman-style pottery during this period has helped to provide a false impression of the range and depth of ‘Romanization’ across all sectors of society, and has fostered the belief that possession of it signalled an acceptance of all things Roman.

The second aim, is to give credence to the existence of a substantial post-Roman population in the period c AD 410-450, who might be termed the ‘blank generation’ because the limitations of artefactual and historical dating continue to make them invisible to us. It is argued that the invisibility of this generation is a result of its almost total dependence on workshop-produced pottery during the Roman period, through which they lost the skills to produce pottery themselves. The progressive centralization of Romano-British pottery production, typified by the development of large rural nucleated industries (Fulford 1977; Peacock 1982) in the later-third and fourth centuries, dictated that pottery-making skills were held in fewer hands. When centralized production broke down in the opening decade(s) of the fifth century (Fulford 1979), few alternatives emerged until the arrival of Anglo-Saxon pottery styles.

Pottery represents the most visible, most easily transferable, and least status-oriented aspect of any material culture of which it is a part. Taking examples from two surveys in the East Midlands, it is argued that the widening occurrence of Early Anglo-Saxon pottery on late Romano-British rural sites might represent the adoption of a new material culture by a static post-Roman population, rather than the replacement of this population by incomers. This argument might be seen to provide support for Reece’s suggested model of continuity based on ‘minimal population movement but total change in fashions’ (1989, 231). However, Scull (1995, 72) has convincingly argued that models based on acculturation and endogenous change can still accommodate the idea of migration, and his argument is followed here.

The central section of this paper seeks to provide a deliberately schematic overview of the changing nature of pottery supply and use from the Late
Pre-Roman Iron Age to the post-Roman period. It attempts to examine the validity of the concept of Romanization in relation to this aspect of material culture. It will be argued that the accelerated transition to the workshop mode of production after the Roman Conquest created a climate of convenience and availability that is the key to understanding the successful transference of this aspect of ‘Roman’ material culture. In the final section it will be suggested that the acknowledgement of convenience and availability is also the key to understanding why the apparent vacuum created by the abrupt end to workshop production in the opening decade of the fifth century, envisaged by Fulford (1979, 129), was so readily filled (though on a much reduced scale) by Anglo-Saxon pottery styles in the eastern part of the province. The intention is to show that the leap from Romano-British material culture to Anglo-Saxon (in terms of pottery at least) need not have been perceived as that great by the post-Roman population.

Whose material culture?
A traditional mistake made by archaeologists is to label material cultures as ‘Roman’, or ‘Anglo-Saxon’ when they really mean the material culture of Britain ‘during the time it was part of the Roman Empire’ or ‘following the Anglo-Saxon Conquest’. This tendency denies the existence of a continuously evolving indigenous material culture, which simply came under different influences at different times, and within which there may have been many variations based on status and geographical location. This material culture may have been similar in many ways to geographically adjacent areas which came under similar influences, but it was uniquely British (if that is the specific unit of area being considered), and underwent its own process of adaptation and development, which may or may not have involved some movement of people. As Hingley (this volume) has similarly argued, the material culture of conquered populations must therefore be seen to have remained their own even when it adopted external elements and styles.

Pottery and Romanization: a question of availability?
The increasing occurrence - particularly of Gallo-Belgic finewares, but also of wine amphorae and other finewares - on Late Pre-Roman Iron Age sites, has often been taken to indicate that these items were being adopted as new symbols which either maintained, or on some readings destabilized, existing power structures (Jones 1994; Willis 1994, 144). The argument that there is no such thing as ‘Roman’ material culture in Roman Britain, only the adoption and adaptation of ‘Roman’ goods into an evolving indigenous material culture, does not deny the possible social significance of these objects. The argument here is that it was the restricted availability of these objects in the pre-Conquest period that made them attractive for those who wished to be seen as different, and not necessarily their ‘Roman-ness’. 

Equally, it was their wide availability in the post-Conquest period that made them attractive as an everyday commodity.

With reference to the pre-Conquest period, acknowledgement of the importance of restricted availability over ‘Roman-ness’ is echoed in Willis’s
recognition of the problem that, with the benefit of hindsight, archaeologists have tended to study such imports as part of a process of ‘Romanization before the Conquest’, rather than as an aid to studying the Late Iron Age itself (1994, 141-2). By acknowledging that such a process was in operation and so introducing the possibility of the ‘hidden hand’ we are denying the likelihood that items were adopted into the material culture for reasons that were not necessarily to do with identification with the Roman Empire, but simply because the latest consumer goods happened to be coming from that direction.

In the post-Conquest period, the situation becomes rather different. Pottery assemblages become much larger and the range of vessel types represented becomes much wider, indicating that workshop-produced pottery had rapidly changed in status from a sought-after item to an everyday commodity available to all sectors of society. Two aspects will be considered here: first, the production and supply of pottery, and second, its use.

The major factor responsible for the large size of these assemblages is the increased scale of production and supply since in the death assemblage (rather than the life assemblage) we are measuring the rate of breakage and discard of pottery and thus access to replacement vessels. Both Going (1992) (building on Marsh’s foundation of 1981) and Millett (1991) have demonstrated that it is levels of production and supply which dictate the amount of Roman pottery in the archaeological record. Demand, it might be argued, remains relatively constant, since people always need pots if they are used to using them and have forgotten how to make them themselves.

Going (1992) offers an example of the way in which striking variations in supply can be reflected in the archaeological record at the fringes of the Roman world. The small native farmstead of Cefn Graeanog on the edge of Snowdonia was occupied continuously through the Roman period, and yet due to fluctuations in supply (which appear to be cyclic and detectable at all sites) only had access to pottery in the Flavian and Antonine periods, in the later-third century, and the mid-fourth century (Going 1992, 94). If the supply pattern had not been recognized as cyclic, and if palaeobotanical evidence had not been available, then the only interpretations open would have been periodic abandonment of the site or periodic active rejection of the forces of Romanization.

The need to acknowledge the prevalence of mundane factors such as convenience and availability in assessing the distribution of ‘Roman’ goods has also been recognized by Freeman (1993, 441). This recognition is vitally important because of the bearing it has on the relationship between the transference of material culture and the assumed Romanization of the indigenous people of Britain.

The argument here is that the Roman Conquest witnessed an accelerated transition to workshop production amongst indigenous potters, which was initially sparked by the opportunity to supply the Roman Army. The Army was happy to adopt indigenous traditions when suitable or, in the case of aceramic areas, to set up its own legionary workshops (Peacock 1982, 11). In some cases, the latter subsequently passed into the hands of civilian
potters, as at York (Swan, 1988, 8). During prehistory most pottery was handmade and produced at the household level and the skills to make it were passed down within families, possibly through the female line (Peacock 1982, 8). The Late Pre-Roman Iron Age and post-Conquest period, however, saw the increasing adoption of wheel-thrown pottery. This is by definition a workshop product requiring specialised facilities such as wheels, kilns, and clay preparation; and skills which gradually became held in the hands of professional artisans. Production in Britain therefore moved to a mosaic of production modes, some of which might be termed 'household industry', but for the most part comprised individual or nucleated workshops, within Peacock's categories 2, 3, and 4 respectively (1982, 8-9).

In the later Roman period it could be argued that the development of large rural nucleated industries in the Lower Nene Valley (Howe et al 1980), Oxfordshire (Young 1977), and the New Forest (Fulford 1975, 1977), which could produce a large proportion of the forms and fabrics required, represents the logical extension of a process of centralization. The production of pottery shifted from being a largely subsistence activity to a viable economic activity where individuals invested in equipment and perhaps less tangible things such as time, and clay-digging rights, and depended for their livelihood on making a profit.

Without wishing to transpose 'modern' concepts of production-led fashion (of which we are all passive victims) on to a supposedly 'ancient' economy and society, it is true to say that during the Roman period, and perhaps earlier (J Evans pers comm), people lost the choice either to produce pottery themselves or go to the local market place and buy it. Wheel-thrown pottery was being used and produced in Britain before the Roman conquest and so the idea of 'choice' was already being eroded, but the onset of large scale indigenous production of Roman style pottery in Britain in the second half of the first century AD, must represent the point at which there was no turning back. Why should anyone have worried about this apparent loss of choice, when there were plenty of positive reasons for producers to turn their backs on household production and embrace the new technological breakthrough? For the potters the most obvious of these reasons was that wheel-throwing allowed the production of the new range of imported forms. The process of replication by local producers may itself also have helped to make these 'alien' objects more acceptable (Willis 1994, 146). It certainly made them more easily available, and the kilns allowed the production of pottery in fine fabrics. The second good reason for producers was that these wheel-thrown workshop products might have been perceived by the consumers as technologically better than their handmade household counterparts. For the consumer, the most significant good reason was that when a pot broke it was now much more convenient to buy a replacement at the local market, rather than collecting clay from the nearest river bank, hand-making one's own, and firing it on the hearth. Workshops therefore led to the large-scale production of a standard product which, due to low unit cost, was rapidly accessed by all sectors of society. The downside, of course, was that these new pots did not bounce so readily as the old ones as they were in finer fabrics. But who cared when they were so cheap?
Pottery and Romanization: what’s the use?

The rise of workshop production led not only to the increased generation of domestic rubbish but also to the appearance of a far wider range of vessel types within an increasing number of Romano-British households (for example see Going 1987,109 Table 10). Within Mediterranean contexts vessels such as mortaria, samian tableware, colourcoated beakers, and flagons had very specific functions, and an analogy might be drawn with the growing fashion for tea drinking in the eighteenth century, whereby the need to have the right equipment was socially contingent with the concept of ‘polite society’.

Within Roman Britain such vessels augmented the existing, but progressively wheel-thrown, Late Pre-Roman Iron Age repertoire comprising closed forms such as cooking pots, although tablewares of Gallo-Belgic origin had been growing in popularity for over fifty years. It cannot be ignored that a desire to emulate (Millett 1990b, 38) must have been a factor in the adoption of the new vessel types since something surely had to make it ‘right’ to want to possess them. However, were these ‘right’ reasons the same for all those who purchased these vessels? Consumers could have exerted choice by not buying them, but it appears that by and large they did. All site assemblages will contain (to varying degrees) examples of the full range of forms available. Their presence could be related to wealth, status or geographical location, as much as to a genuine desire to emulate Roman ways. Can it be assumed that these vessel types were being used in exactly the same way across all site types? It is patronizing to believe that this Romanized repertoire of forms necessarily bewildered the bulk of the indigenous population along with the other ‘demoralizing temptations’ listed by Tacitus (Agricola 21). For some the purchase of ‘Roman’ forms might certainly have been linked with a desire to emulate Roman eating and drinking habits (Dannell, 1979), but for others, as Meadows has argued (1994, 137), the equation may not have been that simple, and we should consider that ‘Roman’ objects may have been used in ‘non-Roman’ ways.

Career opportunities

Reece has portrayed the late Roman pottery industries as desperately peddling a narrow range of wares to an increasingly uninterested population (1988, 131), and cites Chris Going’s view that the lack of back-street potteries springing up following the collapse of centralized production indicates a failure of demand rather than a failure of supply. However, although the range of vessel types did clearly narrow there is no real reason why demand for pottery, as such, should fail, since use of pottery was not something peculiar to the ‘Romanization’ process (apart from in previously aceramic areas). It should not, therefore, be linked to the ‘de-Romanization’ of the later Roman period (Reece 1980), exemplified by the disuse of public buildings (Millett 1990a, Table 6.1). Such a view confuses the use of pottery with the use of ‘Roman’ pottery, and forgets that this aspect of material culture was dynamic and had been quietly ‘de-Romanizing’ itself (ie evolving) over a four hundred year period. It is therefore important to acknowledge that there is no such thing as a ‘Roman’ material culture (Freeman 1993; Hingley this volume) only each province’s expression of the
adoption and adaptation of Roman styles. *Romano-British* pottery was following its own career trajectory. After all, many of the ‘Roman’ forms introduced to Britain by military potters had already undergone a process of adaptation that had blended Hellenistic and Italian traditions with those of Gaul and the Rhine and Danube frontier regions (Greene 1993, 3).

Therefore, although the opportunity to supply the Army had an important impact on shaping the repertoire that subsequently became available to the civilian population, the range of vessel types was gradually modified over time in a continuing process of evolution to accommodate uses peculiar to Britain. For example, colourcoated ware beakers produced by the Lower Nene Valley industry become unusually large (Howe et al 1980; unpublished kiln assemblage from Water Newton Kiln 10), their volume suggesting use for communal drinking, perhaps of beer rather than wine. A similar tendency towards communal serving vessels has also been recognized in Okun’s study of diet and dining practices in the Upper Rhine (Meadows 1994, 137). The function of mortaria also appears to change, or at least the function originally intended for them could no longer be performed effectively, since they became more fragile in appearance and the once snout-like spout became no more than a decorative thumb mark on the rim.

However, the original ‘Roman’ forms, particularly those of samian, did continue to influence the repertoire of Romano-British potters right up until the end of production, long after large-scale importation had ceased in the early-third century (Marsh 1981). Their comparatively thick-bodied descendants were incorporated into changes that saw the gradual blurring of the distinction between ‘fine’ tablewares (samian, colourcoated ware beakers, flagons) and ‘coarse’ kitchen and specialist wares (cooking pots, jars, bowls, and mortaria) and gave rise to what might be termed an ‘oven-to-table’ ware. This trend was particularly apparent in the Lower Nene Valley industry during the later-third and fourth centuries, when the range of bowls, dishes, and jars previously produced only in greyware fabrics was subsequently produced only in colourcoated ware, becoming the backbone of the repertoire until the end of production (Howe et al 1980; Perrin 1981). The coincident decline in the production and demand for colourcoated ware beakers (which had been the mainstay of production through the later-second and third century) is also apparent, and has been recognized generally in the later-fourth century (Evans 1990, 92).

By the later-fourth century a further narrowing of the repertoire down to three basic forms - the jar, the conical flanged bowl, and the plain rimmed dish - is apparent in a number of industries. These include Black Burnished Ware 1 (by this period contracting its market), and the late shell-tempered products of Harrold, Bedfordshire (Brown, 1994), which appear to be replacing BB1. These also appear to be the most common products for the Lower Nene Valley (Howe et al 1980 nos 75-77, 79, and 87, respectively) although the range as a whole appears to have widened during the fourth century. In apparent contrast to the picture of falling demand painted by Reece, these forms are very common and widespread. Indeed, Going sees the period AD 360-430 and after as the final phase of a series of cycles of pottery supply, with AD 360 as the beginning of a period of rapid expansion.
for those industries which survived the early-fourth century (1992, 101).

The repertoire of pottery forms available to consumers in the late Roman period had therefore narrowed considerably from the major ‘blip’ in the profile experienced in the first century AD. Indeed it was beginning to resemble both the Iron Age repertoire from which it had partly sprung (J. Evans pers comm), and the very narrow range of closed Anglo-Saxon forms that were about to replace it. Despite this ability to evolve, the production of this repertoire ceased very abruptly, and possibly, like coinage, within the first decade of the fifth century (Fulford 1979, 129). As has been suggested above, the end must be linked to the mode of production rather than falling demand for pottery itself. The fact that much of the pottery was produced by large workshop industries for regional distribution meant that they were inextricably linked to the Roman economic system, and so any, perhaps minor, change in circumstance might make them unviable. It is difficult to assess how much of a shock the end of workshop production was to the population, since on Going’s model (1992) they had experienced periods of shortage before which had thrown up many relatively localized industries imitating the major wares on a small scale.12 Interestingly there appear to have been relatively few of these small industries in the eastern part of the country, and Going has argued that the area may have already been adapting to a relatively low level of pottery use during the shortages of the early-fourth century (1992, 102). This might provide an important pointer to what happens subsequently.

From one transition to another

We should view the indigenous population of post-Roman Britain as many archaeologists would now view the Late Pre-Roman Iron Age population. That is, as having their own needs and aspirations and as being ready to consume and adapt a new (incoming) material culture if so desired and, most importantly, if and when available. This contrasts with the traditional view (still detectable in general works on Roman Britain and Anglo-Saxon England)1 of a post-Roman population shell-shocked, decimated by plague, and sheltering under tarpaulins, before becoming the invisible underlings of Anglo-Saxon society, or disappearing into the Irish Sea.

A number of barriers stand between archaeologists and the concept of the post-Roman consumer. The first of these barriers is that the material culture change appears so drastic, without a trace of Romanitas surviving beyond perhaps AD 420 (Millett 1990, 227). The second is that the incoming Anglo-Saxon society appears so socially embedded that it is difficult to see how the two populations integrated and how, therefore, these artefacts were transferred between them. The third concerns the contentious ‘gap’ in the chronology of the first half of the fifth century, which sees the post-Roman population standing in the cultural supermarket waiting for the next set of materials to adopt. The fourth, and most deeply rooted in the British imperialist viewpoint rapidly adopted in the early-twentieth century,2 is the sense that the transition from Iron Age to Roman sees the British population climbing the ladders while the Roman to Saxon transition sees them sliding down the snakes. There are plenty of positive reasons for adopting Roman
customs but not so many, it appears, for living in ‘grub’ huts

It’s the end of the world as we know it … and I feel fine

The remainder of the paper works from the basis developed in the central part, that pottery was a highly transferable aspect of material culture and that its sudden disappearance should not necessarily signal the disappearance of the people who used it. Reece (1989, 235) and Scull (1995, 77) have outlined the way in which a transition to the Anglo-Saxon period based on, or including (respectively) the transference of a new material culture to a static post-Roman population might have occurred. The intention is to relate this idea to the evidence of recent fieldwork.

Evidence is drawn from two programmes of excavation and fieldwalking survey undertaken in the East Midlands; the Medbourne Area Survey in the Welland Valley of south-east Leicestershire (Liddle 1994) and the Rutland Water Project in the Gwash Valley, a tributary of the Welland in Rutland (Cooper forthcoming b and c). Both surveys have produced evidence for continuity into the Early Anglo-Saxon period on a substantial proportion of sites known to have been occupied in the late Roman period, and the phenomenon is being increasingly recognized elsewhere in Leicestershire (P.Liddle pers comm).

In the Medbourne Area survey, six of the seven sites known to have been important in the late Roman period (including the small town of Medbourne itself and a series of villas) have produced (in three cases) appreciable amounts of Early Anglo-Saxon pottery (Liddle 1994, 35 and Figs 9.1 and 9.2). Five new sites are also established during the Early Anglo-Saxon period, so that there are actually more settlements of this date than during the late Roman period.

In the Rutland Water Survey the two excavated major late Roman sites both yielded coin sequences ending in the early-fifth century, the latest issues of which were very worn (Ponting forthcoming). One of the sites (Cooper forthcoming b, Site 2), comprising an aised villa building which was purely residential, does not appear to have been a site of Early Anglo-Saxon occupation, although evidence of burial suggests that it was reused as a church in the Middle Saxon period. On the opposite side of the valley, Site 1, which appears to be the productive half of the establishment, sees the development of an Anglo-Saxon settlement and cemetery 150m to the east (Site 3), dated on the basis of pottery and grave finds to the later-fifth century (Blinkhorn forthcoming). A field walking programme has revealed two other late-Roman scatters, one of which also included Early Anglo-Saxon pottery.

The interpretation of such scatters and excavated evidence is fraught with difficulties arising predominantly from the problems of dating during the fifth century, but also from the conceptual framework surrounding the transition, which has been influenced by the historical evidence, as well as by the British imperialist viewpoint alluded to earlier. It is not the intention to discuss the problems of chronology in detail since they do not alter the evidence of the fieldwork; that scatters of two chronologically different types of material are occurring together in the same place.
Allowing for the small degree of settlement shift that is often apparent in the precise focus of these scatters of Roman and Anglo-Saxon material, their association cannot be put down to geographical coincidence and this in itself confirms the presence of a post-Roman population on these sites at the time of contact with Anglo-Saxons, and the material culture they brought with them. The subsequent presence of items of that material culture on those sites indicates either that an Anglo-Saxon population took over a working farm or that the post-Roman population took on the material culture of the Anglo-Saxon population who were now taking control of the region. If we were discussing an Iron Age to Roman transition, not many would argue with the latter case, as they would accept the transference of Roman material for many of the reasons already discussed in this paper. However, the problems of chronology and the conceptual framework make it more difficult to accept the latter case when looking at the Roman to Anglo-Saxon transition. While those wishing to see continuity scuffle around for evidence which is always confounded by the lack of dating, those who spurn the idea find it very easy to point to this apparent lack of evidence and remain unconvinced, quietly forgetting that their dating framework is inadequate, and that they still have not come up with a feasible way of removing the post-Roman population (cf Reece 1989). Time and again those interested in discussing continuity are forced to dredge up their two trump cards, Orton Hall Farm, Cambridgeshire, and Barton Court Farm, Oxfordshire, where structural evidence for settlement of Anglo-Saxon date is present (Mackreth 1978; Miles 1984). Yet having played them, they might receive the reply that the evidence suggests migrants taking over a working or recently abandoned farm. However, if the evidence outlined for Leicestershire and Rutland is echoed elsewhere, and the idea of migrant take-over is applied to all sites where Anglo-Saxon material is found, then the scale of migration would have to have been enormous, even without taking into account the sites which appear to be newly-founded during the Early Anglo-Saxon period. We would have to return to the ‘plague theory’ (Wacher 1974, 415) in order to thin the post-Roman population out and make room!

Room for the blank generation?
If the coincident location of these settlements goes some way to convincing doubters (if only indirectly) of the reality of the post-Roman population, then the likelihood of a ‘gap’ still represents a threat to the certainty that the post-Roman population remained to become receptive to the incoming Anglo-Saxon material. While most workers agree that there is no reason why the subsistence economy of post-Roman Britain should fail (Reece 1988, 1989; Scull 1995), the population have so far failed to produce a distinctive alternative to Romano-British material culture visible to archaeologists. It is therefore necessary to briefly examine the chronological possibilities in order to see if there is room for the blank generation.

Current thinking maintains that there is a distinct break between the end of Roman Britain and the arrival of Anglo-Saxon invaders, and Millett’s model for decline and fall (1990a, 227) seems to explain the mechanism
behind the collapse of Roman administration. However, much less certainty
surrounds the nature and dating of the Anglo-Saxon invasion, due to the
difficulties of interpreting the historical sources (Chadwick-Hawkes 1989).
Scull has stated that migrants from north Germany and southern
Scandinavia were present in Britain from the second quarter of the fifth
century, and that the archaeological evidence would tend to indicate a
complex picture of movement over several generations rather than a single
event in the mid-fifth century (1995, 73). The gap between the ‘minimalist’
end of Romano-British material culture c AD 410 (Fulford 1979) and the
potential availability of the Anglo-Saxon material which replaces it could be
around 30-40 years; just a generation’s length. Reece has demonstrated how
the uncertainty of the two opposed dating schemes might either close the
gap or widen it further (1989, 232).

While closing the gap from the Anglo-Saxon end appears more difficult (cf
Chadwick-Hawkes 1989), it might be possible to close it from the Roman
end. Going’s model presents the possibility that the final phase of Romano-
British sites could be open ended, that assemblages containing later-fourth-
century pottery could in fact be of later-fifth or even sixth-century date
(1992, 112), and this might open up possibilities for sites with the latest types
of pottery and worn final issues of coinage. It may be possible to extend the
lives of the major pottery industries beyond Fulford’s minimalist limit, but
not for more than a decade or so (Evans 1990, 92; Going 1992), and there
is the additional possibility of stock-piling from the ‘boom’ years after AD
360. However, if the gap remains open then the population either became
acermic or adopted a very stringent ‘make do and mend’ mentality, having
been unable to find one among them whose forebears had taken an evening
class in pottery making under Agricola’s liberal education initiative (Tacitus
Agricola 21).

Turning to the people themselves, two factors promote the reasonableness
of the case for a high degree of acculturation between the post-Roman and
Anglo-Saxon populations. Both Evans (1990, 101) and Millett (1990a, 228)
have discussed the fragmentation of post-Roman society into local
aristocracies and the observation has been made that its close resemblance
to the incoming society of the Anglo-Saxons provides a context for the
integration of the two. The ascendancy of the latter possibly benefitted from
the short time the former had to develop a coherent political identity, and
with it any identifiable material culture (Scull 1995, 73). Secondly, Scull has
observed that the major rise in the number of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in the
period after AD 475 in East Anglia and central England could be the result
of an acculturation process which made parts of the post-Roman population
archaeologically visible again.

**Conclusion**
The main aim of this paper has been to stress the transferability of material
culture, for reasons which are not necessarily to do with the emulation of the
customs of an incoming elite. The acknowledgement of convenience and
availability as vehicles promoting this transference (‘pottery as shopping’) has too often been overlooked in the attempt to see all transference as
socially contingent.
In common with other contributions to this volume (see Hingley, and Clarke), this paper has highlighted the inadequacy of the term ‘Romanization’ as an explanation for a complex process whereby individual consumers of Roman-style material culture did not necessarily adopt an entire Roman ‘package’. Pottery, as the most easily transferred and archaeologically visible aspect of that ‘package’ has dictated that the archaeological label ‘Roman’ has been sprinkled too liberally. Consequently, acceptance of the idea of the ephemeral nature of Romanitas and its gradual devolution within the Roman period has been relatively slow. The pace of acceptance can be quickened if it is acknowledged that many of the people who used Roman-style pottery had no particular desire to emulate Roman ways but were simply taking what was available to them and busily adapting it as part of the material expression of their own culture. No convenient term will easily replace ‘Romanization’ as it still tells part of the story, but as with the term ‘Celtic’, for many it will only live on in inverted commas.

Although acknowledgement of the role of the post-Roman population in Anglo-Saxon England seems to be dictated by common sense, it still requires a metaphorical (if not a genuine) leap of faith while there is a lack of distinctive cultural markers by which this population might be identified. However, further fieldwork and artefact study will surely begin to tip the balance in their favour.
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Footnotes
1 For example Wacher's revised edition of *Towns of Roman Britain* (1995) still clings firmly to the theory of a plague in post-Roman Britain.

2 Hingley (this volume) has demonstrated how belief in the Anglo-Saxon origin myth during the Victorian period was rapidly abandoned with the rise of Germany in the early-twentieth century.

3 Willis *forthcoming* and Fitzpatrick 1989 have both discussed the influence of rarity.

4 Eg Severn Valley Ware, (Timby 1990), or Black Burnished Ware 1 (Holbrook and Bidwell 1991).

5 Willis *forthcoming* and Pollard 1988 have demonstrated the progressive disappearance of Iron Age and Transitional wares in East and Northeast England and Kent respectively, and the emergence of a fully Romanized repertoire by the turn of the second century.
Hingley (this volume) has criticised Freeman (1993, 441) for entertaining this possibility. He is partly right; the durability of the indigenous Durotrigan handmade tradition of Dorset Black Burnished Ware, stands as a notable example of indigenous excellence, which the Army was not slow to spot, but it is as well to acknowledge that ancient consumers could have been as gullible as modern ones.

Cooper forthcoming a and Willis forthcoming have distinguished the initial gulf between military and civilian assemblages in terms of proportions of 'Roman' forms. Going's data makes clear that 'Romanized' forms of familiar vessel types, particularly jars, still make up the bulk of the assemblage.

Cooper's forthcoming a and Willis forthcoming have distinguished the initial gulf between military and civilian assemblages in terms of proportions of 'Roman' forms. Going's data makes clear that 'Romanized' forms of familiar vessel types, particularly jars, still make up the bulk of the assemblage.

Cooper forthcoming a and Willis forthcoming have distinguished the initial gulf between military and civilian assemblages in terms of proportions of 'Roman' forms. Going's data makes clear that 'Romanized' forms of familiar vessel types, particularly jars, still make up the bulk of the assemblage.

Eg Keegan's survey of Leicestershire sites, and Booth 1991.

See Reece 1988, 29 for suggested use of mortaria.

Notably the longevity of samian forms 31, 36, 37, and 38 in the range of Lower Nene Valley and Oxfordshire industries: see Perrin 1981, and Young 1977.

Evans (1990, 93) points to the Oxfordshire industry as a vehicle for the spread of Shell-tempered products from Harrold.

See Cooper forthcoming a on fourth century imitations of BB1 at Cirencester, and Cooper forthcoming d on native production of wares at Piercebridge probably during a period of shortage in the early-second century AD.

The inclusion of plans of both sites is almost obligatory in general works on Roman Britain eg Jones and Mattingly 1990, 249 and 253.

The similar longevity of samian ware into the third century remains unresolved: see King 1981.

As a student fifteen years ago, Reece (1980) was regarded as ‘forbidden fruit’.
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