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Abstract

This thesis critically analyses the ways in which The Netherlands, both as a nation and as an academic community, has understood and represented its origins in the Roman era (50 BC - AD 250) since the advent of its statehood in the 16th century. This involves the contextual analysis of a rich but understudied set of Dutch archaeological discourses developed in the post-WWII era (1945-2014) regarding early episodes of Roman: ‘barbarian’ interaction around the lower Rhine limes (roughly corresponding with modern-day The Netherlands). Key research questions comprise: What are the origin and nature of Dutch archaeological discourses on this topic? How does archaeological discourse influence and is influenced by the development and formulation of historical myths and national identities? In what way do multiple contextual factors inform the formulation of such discourse?

This study focuses on the works of two major Dutch archaeologists — Willem Willems and Nico Roymans — who have shaped the discipline in the last four decades. It is supported by a series of interviews conducted with native scholars, which provide invaluable insights into the role of personal context in the development of academic discourses and the sociology of Dutch academia, and gives them their own voice. These developments are then compared with wider theoretical approaches and, more specifically, with British post-colonial discourses on the topic of Roman: ‘barbarian’ interactions and Roman imperialism.

My conclusions are that archaeological discourse in The Netherlands is not derivative of those imported from other major European academic traditions (notably Germany and the UK), or exclusively the result of inherited historical discourse; rather, the evolution of the Dutch academic community itself and the different discourses created within is deeply influenced by a web of interconnected contextual factors at different levels — personal, local, regional, national, international — and spheres, whether cultural, social, political, or intellectual. These multiple contextual factors informing both the choice of theoretical frameworks and the formulation of discourse explain the nuances in discourse between scholars and the unique evolution of Roman archaeology in The Netherlands.
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Preface

As is fairly common with doctoral projects, this thesis has undergone a dramatic and substantial process of transformation from its initial scheme of research towards a better defined and more relevant piece of work, entirely out of constant re-assessment of its parameters and by actively letting research outcomes affect its form and content — as expected in good academic practice. However, I regret not having spent the full extent of my PhD researching the aspects finally presented here — namely the contextualisation of current Dutch archaeological discourses and the extended use of the accumulated interview data. However, problems arose early on.

![Figure 0.1. Location of the national case-studies as per original thesis proposal (Source: Author).](image)

When I started this project six years ago, my aim was to assess the existence in the archaeological record of patterns of interaction between Romans and ‘barbarians’ at and beyond the northern frontiers of the empire in an area around the North Sea, involving several Northern European academic communities — Britain, Scotland, Germany, Denmark and The Netherlands (Figure 0.1). However, early in my doctoral studies I realised that such a project could only be achieved after a critical evaluation of the different modern national approaches to the topic. As Collinwood (1939, 132; cited in Trigger 2006, 1) wrote in the early stages of WWII: “No historical problem should be studied without studying… the history of historical
thought about it”. Such would be essential to both understand and filter the current scholarly perceptions and reconstructions of those interactions in the academic traditions of those nations geographically involved. This recognition conjured up a different set of questions and thus a different type of thesis — one in fact better fitting my own background as a historian. It was then decided that the analysis of national traditions on the archaeological interpretation of episodes of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction would be my principal focus, initially retaining the geographical span noted above (Figure 0.2).

![Figure 0.2. Flow of ideas as initially projected (left) and as finally applied (right) (Source: Author).](image)

The very size of some of the academic communities I was originally seeking to exploit and compare — Germany and the UK being the largest of these — and their well-established traditions of archaeological interpretations made that task unachievable for a PhD project, and so, soon after, it was decided that comparison of two relatively smaller, more manageable, yet still core academic communities, Denmark and The Netherlands, would be more advisable, as representative of very different situations both in terms of their ancient interactions with the Roman empire and their modern approaches to the study of such issues.

My initial research then concentrated on the Dutch academic community. This generated fascinating, but very extensive material related to their traditions of archaeological interpretation on Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction. As a result, a final decision was made to redefine the thesis to focus exclusively on the origin and formulation of modern Dutch discourses on the topic.
Chapter 1. Project Outline and Theoretical Context

1.1. Introduction

According undue importance to particular ideas and not paying enough attention to their changing context will lead archaeologists to underestimate the amount of change that has characterised the development of archaeological interpretation. (Trigger 2006, 12)

Archaeological thinking is closely related and very much affected by changes in social and cultural behaviour. (Lars Joergensen, interview 2011)

We are not ‘discovering’ the past but are always ‘constructing’ it. (Willems 1999, 2)

This thesis is an historiographical study of a single community of academics in the context of post-modern theoretical fragmentation and post-colonial approaches. Its focus is Dutch archaeological discourses concerning Roman imperialism and Roman:`barbarian’ interaction.¹ These discourses, and the context in which they are produced, are examined with a set of meta-data collected over the course of the last four years, including personal interviews with the Dutch scholars themselves. This thesis aims to identify the nature and development of these discourses and theoretical frameworks in The Netherlands — an academic community yet to undergo a deconstruction process of its own archaeological tradition — by focusing on smaller units (individual scholars) and the factors that condition their formulation.

This first chapter will present the wider theoretical context and justification of this project, together with a brief introduction to the specific frameworks within Roman archaeology that will be used throughout — which will be further developed in Chapter 3. It will then outline the aims, research questions, and structure of the thesis, followed by a

¹ Roman:`barbarian’ interaction: The choice to use this term throughout the thesis is justified by an effort to balance the approach to the relationship between the Romans and native/local populations. Interaction is a term that denotes the bi-directional nature of such a relationship. ‘Roman’ represents the Roman empire and its delegates in the area of study; ‘barbarian’, as used here, is not intended as a pejorative qualification of the groups it refers to — it is only used as a replication of the Roman construct defining the non-Roman populations. Although it needs to be acknowledged that such a label has accumulated a heavy ideological load throughout history, the use of this term in this work is not intended to replicate this ideology. Hence, in the title and elsewhere in this thesis, ‘barbarian’ will appear in inverted commas and in lower case. Such choices respond respectively to the aforementioned attempt to avoid the ideological charge of the label and to the author’s belief that barbarians cannot be qualified as a people.
justification for the case-study choice and the chronological framework. Additionally, it will describe the approaches and methodologies chosen, and the resources that have been used in order to complete it. The chapter will close by acknowledging the potential problems to be encountered here by applying these methodologies.

1.2. Theoretical Context and Justification

Archaeological approaches, methodologies and theories have always reflected the socio-cultural, intellectual and political context in which they were produced. At the same time, theoretical innovation *per se* is not always in the minds of those who lead it and instead it normally occurs in response to that changing context (Hodder and Hutson 2003, 207). It is only in retrospect that changes in the philosophical structures of the discipline are noticed and classified, as the words of Spivak collected by Hedge and Shome (2002, 272) illustrate:

> When I did this work [Spivak 1988] I did not know I was establishing postcolonial theory. It has been my good fortune for people to have said that these were perhaps the early texts of that way of doing.

As a result of the few decades of technological, socio-cultural, and intellectual revolution that followed the end of WWII, archaeology entered a stage of maturity defined by a state of ‘critical self-consciousness’ (Clarke 1973, 6). In this state archaeological theory played — and still plays — an important role in redefining the nature of the discipline: archaeologists now lay as much importance on the results of their research as on the disciplinary context and theoretical frameworks in which they were produced.

While the history of archaeology has been matter of enquiry since the mid-19th century (Trigger 2001, 361), the issue of the origins, nature, evolution and movement/transfer of theoretical frameworks in archaeology has only been at the heart of the discipline for the last four decades. Many surveys of the history and evolution of the discipline (e.g. Murray and Evans 2008; Schlanger and Nordbladh 2008; Trigger 2006) and compendia of archaeological thought (e.g. Johnson 2010; Hodder and Hutson 2003; Hodder 2012) have been produced across this period at an increasing pace, and with different focus: biographical, national, ideological, theoretical, etc.
However, the ways in which histories of archaeology have been written has not changed much despite this new phase of self-awareness. While most historiographers recognise the importance of an externalist approach capable of assessing the influence of the subjective social context in which archaeologists evaluate archaeological data (Trigger 2001, 374), most histories of archaeology follow an internalist approach focused on generic categories of archaeological interpretation — nations; schools of thoughts; wider theoretical frameworks; debates (Trigger 2006, 25). New times call for new ways of doing historiography, and despite increasing connectivity and collaboration, the archaeological thought process is undertaken more and more individually in accordance with personal parameters, preferences, experiences, pressures and choices. While historiography can play a vital role in deciphering such epistemological and theoretical concerns, the focus needs to change towards the individual. That is one of the proposals of this thesis.

The character of traditional pre- and early post-WWII archaeology are very much linked to the origins and development of nation-states due to the political use made of the former by the latter to justify their territorial rights by claiming ownership over the past (e.g. national museums, heritage protection policies, public monuments). Thus, trends in the development and spread of archaeological approaches have always been identified through the analysis of change in intellectual trajectories and academic discourses (content, focus, concepts and models used) of large analytical units, chiefly national (e.g. US, UK, Germany) and supranational (e.g. ‘Western Archaeology’, ‘Scandinavian archaeology’), and thus describing different regional traditions and distinct national/international dynamics (e.g. Kristiansen 2012; Trigger and Glover 1981; 1982). These geographical categories have expanded to now include other social and thematic groupings, such as proto-national (regional) archaeology (e.g. Diaz-Andreu 2012), nationalist archaeology (e.g. Diaz-Andreu and Champion 1996), colonial and post-colonial archaeologies (Hingley 2000; 2014), and indigenous archaeologies and archaeologies of resistance (Trigger 2006, 13).

However, this stage of reflective self-consciousness, initiated in the 1970s and 1980s, brought a deep change to the philosophical structures of archaeology, which produced an increasing fragmentation and a multiplication of theoretical approaches (Trigger 1984, 355), with a high turnover of theories and paradigms — paradoxically sharing many features with each other — in a fast-paced version of Kuhn’s (1970) ‘scientific revolution’. This fragmentation of archaeological approaches, discourses and methodologies — the origins of which can be found in Anglo-American Post-Processual archaeologies and their emphasis on
theoretical reflection — has accelerated since the 1990s, and it has become one of the most iconic consequences of Globalisation, both the socio-cultural phenomena we currently experience and the theoretical framework in which we produce our interpretations of the past (Mizoguchi 2015, 12).

Paradoxically, the other major consequence of Globalisation for Archaeology is the homogenization of such discourses. These opposing processes result from the spread of theoretical and methodological frameworks formulated and developed in major western academic clusters (USA/UK) under specific historical, cultural, sociological and intellectual circumstances; such a spread is further promoted by the adoption of English as a global academic language (Kristiansen 2012; Mizoguchi 2015, 16; Willems 2008b). While Globalisation and the increasing connectivity derived from the world-wide IT and communications revolution would easily explain the trend towards homogenization, it can also produce the contrary effect, as some scholars turn towards a reactionary radicalization of positions when feeling more exposed to the scrutiny of the public eye and peers (Mizoguchi 2015, 15).

Fragmentation is also a reflection of the socio-cultural, economic and political realities experienced in those major Western clusters (Gardner 2013), i.e. “hyper-capitalists and neo-liberal economics embodied by the increasingly shortened production and discard cycle” (Mizoguchi 2015, 16). It can also be explained as the reaction or local interpretation of those imported frameworks by different (and normally smaller) academic communities with their own background, whose own circumstances and background do not always fit the premises upon which those frameworks were created in those major western clusters, in what I call ‘post-colonial discrepant experiences’ (to be discussed in Chapter 3). This can generate reactionary behaviours in certain areas of the world as these Post-Processual archaeologies are often seen as a signature of neo-colonial expansion. Alternatively, it can result in the stagnation of old paradigms, as a sign of resistance to imported models and a claim to uniqueness by the non-ruling Western blocks, e.g. the Dutch ‘middle way’ (see Section 7.4) in archaeology or their ‘unique Romanization’ (Roymans and Heeren 2004). On the other hand, applying uncritically those major pre-existing sets of theories or methodologies to ‘developing’ academic communities might make the identification of ‘indigenous’, locally unique theories and methodologies increasingly difficult.
While I personally advocate the fragmentation of archaeological discourse as a way of representing the variety of current approaches to the discipline, I cannot ignore the perils of the high-speed turnover of models and approaches (Kristiansen 2011), as it can produce negative, nihilistic reactions in some sectors of the academic community, who may start questioning the usefulness of theoretical debate in and of itself — e.g. The Death of Archaeological Theory (Bintliff and Pearce 2011).

To fight those negative views and the loss of ontological security we must acknowledge the existence of different trajectories in different parts of the world, beyond the boundaries of traditional categories and labels, and national archaeological traditions. Comparing theoretical and methodological packages, explicitly describing their historical, epistemological and ontological origins, and the context and factors involved in their evolution, looking for similarities (meeting points) and differences (arenas for discussion) is one important way forward.

The aforementioned analysis of intellectual trajectories and the focus on broad regional traditions (distinct national approaches to archaeology) was created to give a response to the metaphysical enquiries about the theoretical nature and evolution of the discipline in the later part of the 20th century. Despite the current changing intellectual and ontological/epistemological landscape described above, the widely encompassing and generalizing categories traditionally used to analyse theoretical approaches are still fully operational (e.g. four paradigmatic and geographical blocks described by Mizoguchi 2015, 14-15).

Both fragmentation (the diversification of conceptual and theoretical frameworks) and global connectivity (as the discipline evolves and grows in size and conceptualizing capacity) suggest, in my opinion, that those pre-established national/regional traditions may no longer be appropriate units to explain the nature and development of discourses and theoretical choices, and that general classifications are no longer effective, except for comparative purposes. In words of Spivak (quoted by Hegde and Shome 2002, 272), ‘the nationalist understanding of academy’ does not fit post-colonial positions in the era of Globalisation, culturally founded on multiculturalism and transnational principles.
Below those national academic communities (and their traditions of archaeological practice and theory) are other possible units of analysis (Figure 1.1). Ultimately, those national academic communities are made up of individual scholars, and they are subject to smaller spheres of influence (smaller regional or institutional clusters) than the national academic community. Furthermore, due to the advent of Globalisation and its ever-increasing connectivity, scholars now have access to many other sources of inspiration to formulate their discourses about specific topics, thereby diluting the boundaries of the traditional national archaeological traditions and trajectories in which they work. The proliferation of international conferences and collaborative projects (e.g. TRAC, RAC, CRAC, *Edges of the Roman Empire* conference; see Hingley 2014) are very good examples of how these venues have grown exponentially in the last few decades, increasing the exchange of ideas.

Clearly, if we are to understand all aspects of what archaeologists do, we have to study them as individuals. (Trigger 2006, 16)

Those individuals are the ones producing discourses and choosing theoretical frameworks and as such they should become the focus. Of course I am neither denying the validity of traditional socio-political approaches to the history of archaeological thought with a focus on national trajectories, nor am I reducing them to the sum of different individual discourses.
ignoring certain level of synchronization within national academic communities. However, I do believe that new perspectives need to be explored to respond to the new socio-cultural landscape in which we currently produce our discourses.

Instead of focusing exclusively on the social factors that affect the development of frameworks within national traditions, I defend the need for reassessing the evolution of those theoretical frameworks with a focus on smaller units (individuals) and the factors that condition them (both personal and wider social ones), in order to accurately map the very diverse theoretical landscape in which we currently operate. Under such considerations, those national traditions become just another factor influencing individual discourse production, and no longer are the unit of measurement.

This proposed focus, although not new (O’Brien et al. 2005), has not been fully explored. It can still produce accurate information about the underlying structures and dynamics that shape broader academic trends, thus allowing regional comparisons:

It might be interesting to confront people with the question whether, and in how far, the fact they are studying their own ancestors affects the course of their research! (van Driel-Murray, pers. comm., e-mail 28/04/2011)

In sum, the recognition that archaeological thought is currently produced in a landscape of intellectual fragmentation as a consequence of the new socio-cultural landscape inherent to Globalisation is inevitable. Mobility, transnationalism and connectivity have transformed the individual scholar into their own nations, with their own ‘national’ tradition responding to both specific and wider contextual factors. In order to overturn the potential negative consequences of such a fragmentation we need to produce contextual historiographies and biographies of the scholars producing discourses and the context in which these are produced, in the same way that they have analysed the context in which their inherited discourses were produced (Versluys 2014, 6).

1.3. Aims, Research Question and Structure

The development of new socio-cultural and intellectual landscapes world-wide has changed the ways we practise and think about archaeology. Therefore, the ways in which we approach the analysis and classification of the nature and evolution of its theoretical frameworks and
derived discourses needs to be adapted to these new conditions. I propose a much closer engagement with the producer of discourses, namely the scholar, making him/her the focus of my analysis, putting emphasis on the identification and description of the factors that bias/underpin the formulation of their discourses.

Roman Archaeology, and more specifically the topic of Roman imperialism, has become the object of intensive debate and the arena where most new theoretical approaches to the issue of Roman:‘barbarian’ cultural interaction have been developed and tested. While extensive analysis has been undertaken already into the origins and development of British archaeological discourses on Roman imperialism (especially around the Romanization paradigm — see Section 3.4), that does not seem to be the case in other European academic communities. Thus, I will use the British post-colonial deconstruction process as a comparative background for the analysis of the processes of formulation and development of archaeological discourses on the topic of Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions, Roman imperialism, and cultural change in The Netherlands, identifying parallels and divergences, thus situating it within a wider European academic context, and possibly identifying regional peculiarities not yet traced.

This thesis will zoom in and focus on the individual analysis of a small, yet important and representative, sample of Dutch scholars and their work, trying to extract trends that define (and have defined) the evolution of their theoretical approaches and discourses on those topics. The analysis of individual discourses will, I believe, produce an accurate picture of current trends (or discrepancies) in Dutch archaeology. Describing and qualifying the resulting framework and discourses, and identifying the factors that play a role in their development, are the main goals of this thesis. Discerning whether the resulting framework is a post-colonial one, in the same terms as in Britain, is another expected outcome of this work. The results of this research should be seen as an important filter to be applied to current views of the ancient Roman:‘barbarian’ past of The Netherlands and its methodology could be transferred to other academic communities. As the Dutch archaeologist Miguel John Versluys proposed:

It would be good to have intellectual contextualisation of PCRA (post-colonial Roman archaeologies) in the same manner as PCRA have produced them regarding their predecessors; your PhD should be able to provide that [for The Netherlands]. (Versluys pers. comm., e-mail 03/06/2014; see also Versluys 2014, 6;)
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Therefore, the main aim of this thesis is to produce a modern historiographical, anthropological and anthropocentric\(^2\) approach to analysing and contextualising current archaeological approaches to Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in The Netherlands. By ‘looking over the shoulders’ of the modern Dutch scholars, this work tries to identify and deconstruct the inherited frameworks and biases that inform their current archaeological discourse, identifying the multiple factors involved in the development of new discourses, and describing these.

Based on the project outline and aims described earlier, the overarching research questions this study intends to answer are:

- What are the nature and defining features of current Dutch archaeological discourses regarding ancient episodes of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in the area around the lower Rhine *limes*?

- What are the factors that defined its development since WWII? How do discourses and developments relate to wider theoretical frameworks and academic trajectories?

In order to answer these, this thesis necessarily addresses secondary themes. Thus, the focus will first be on analysing the wider contextual frameworks in which discourses are produced (Chapters 3-5), before it progressively focuses on the detail of the individual scholars and the personal contextual factors that inform the formulation of discourses (Chapter 6). This will facilitate identifying trends within Dutch archaeology (Chapter 7) before reaching conclusions about the wider implications (Chapter 8).

In more detail, I will use Chapter 3 to describe the main features of both the generic categories used to structure the analysis of the evolution of archaeology and the post-colonial theoretical frameworks within Roman archaeology in Britain. This contextual knowledge will allow their use as a comparative element for the analysis of Dutch discourses. I will describe in detail the application of post-colonial theory to archaeological perspectives in Britain and outline the results of the deconstruction process carried out by British Roman archaeologists.

---

\(^2\) I use this term not in the classical sense of considering the human being as the centre or most significant entity of the universe (*Merriam-Webster Dictionary*), but in a more simplified sense of individuals being the central focus of the analysis. My choice of this word is also related to the relatively recent appearance of ideas of ‘Anthropocene Age’ (Crutzen and Stoermer 2000), where human agency plays a major role in ecological development, the same way I will analyse the agency of individual scholars on the theoretical development of discourses.
in terms of new approaches and debates: the identification of a colonial ideological bias, the revision of the Romanisation paradigm as a valid element to describe the nature and consequences of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction, and the resulting new frameworks. I will argue that the conclusions reached by British archaeologists regarding their own inherited discourses that gave way to post-colonial approaches to these topics, though an integral part of the mainstream theoretical debate, should not be applied naively by other national academic communities without initiating their own process of self-reflection, as such approaches are based on pre-conditions and historical baggage very specific to Britain that might not fit other national academic communities and their own backgrounds. It has recently been argued (Gramsch 2011; Mladenović 2012, unpublished) that, while British academics are operating under the assumption that other Western academics are engaging with their post-colonial views and the dismissal of the Romanisation paradigm, in fact Anglo-American theory has so far had a limited impact in a number of European academic communities — including France, Germany, Spain, and Serbia. Partially in agreement with such a statement, I will defend the need for, and possibly the existence of, discrepant post-colonial experiences. This justifies, from a theoretical point of view, the need for a revision of the context in which Dutch archaeologists produce discourses about their past in the Roman era.

Another issue to be addressed in Chapter 3 is the relationship between ancient and modern identities, and more specifically the influence of archaeology on the formulation and development of national identities in Europe, and the role of the latter on the formulation of academic discourses about the past. I will explore the Roman:‘barbarian’ dichotomy that can be found in the essence of many European national identities. As such, the political use made of episodes of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction and the analogies made between ancient barbarian characters and modern national heroes will be one particular focus. The role external military threats could have played in the formulation of both ancient and modern identities, together with other ideas such as the proposal of earlier dates for the initial formulation of national identities in Europe or the idea of ‘heritage landscape’ as a defining factor of national and archaeological identities, will complete the chapter and frame the following analysis of such ideas in the Dutch case.

Chapter 4 will address some of these questions by referring specifically to the Dutch case. Firstly, it is important to clarify which historical episodes of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in The Netherlands I will be looking at: which ancient peoples inhabited what is now Dutch territory during the period under review? What was the nature of their interaction
with the Roman Empire according to literary and material evidence? In the case of The Netherlands I will be looking at three ancient peoples that match the geographical, chronological and thematic scope of the thesis: the Cananefates, Frisians, and Batavians — with a stronger emphasis on the third (see Section 4.2.1). Secondly, it will be necessary to evaluate how the classical accounts of historical episodes of interaction and visible archaeological remains of these peoples were received during the 16th century humanist revival and the following centuries. To what degree and through what processes did they ‘populate’ historical and archaeological discourses over the 16th-20th centuries? This will lead into the analysis of the creation and evolution of myths around those episodes and the process by which these were converted into proto-national myths of common origin. Finally, this chapter questions the influence that these myths had (and may still have) on national archaeological academic discourses regarding Roman: ‘barbarian’ interaction in The Netherlands, hopefully resulting in a de-construction of the discourses inherited by current Dutch archaeologists and a contextualization of their theoretical perspectives, described in the following chapter.

Chapter 5 will focus on presenting the non-academic context in which archaeological discourses have evolved in The Netherlands. These would include geo-political, socio-economic and organisational factors that affect the development of the discipline and, partially, the researchers’ choices. This contextual framework will serve as background to be applied to the analysis in Chapter 6.

Chapter 6 analyses of modern archaeological discourses in The Netherlands with a special focus on the post-WWII period. Through the analysis of interview data and critical reading of published works of individual Dutch Roman archaeologists I will describe and map the current structure, development and theoretical perspectives that inform Dutch academic discourse on the aforementioned topics. Some of the questions I tackle here are: Has there been a coherent theoretical self-reflection process in The Netherlands? If so, how did it start and what are its consequences/effects on Roman: ‘barbarian’ interaction discourses? Are the resulting discourses post-colonial, similar to the British case? If not, how can these be described? How much influence do imported discourses have? What is the weight of inherited historical discourses and national identity in the formulation of academic discourses? And what other factors influence (and influenced) the development of discourse in the scholars analysed?
In Chapter 7, I will present an attempt to answer the core research question, and therefore will describe the nature, trends and features of Dutch Roman archaeology generated by of the previous analysis, providing a panoramic view of current discourses on Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in Dutch academia. This will be followed by a discussion of the wider implications of the outcome of my analysis, and concluding remarks for the whole thesis, in Chapter 8.

The nature of the topics, themes and questions discussed in this thesis calls for a multidisciplinary approach. Therefore, I will be drawing upon the fields of Archaeology, Historiography, Anthropology, History, Reception Studies, Theory of ideas, Art History, and Social Sciences.

1.4. Geographical Focus and Case-Study Choice

The Netherlands is an important case-study because of a few unique features, mainly related to its geographical location and what this meant both in ancient and modern times. The Dutch live at a modern crossroads between major European intellectual trends and academic traditions, just as the peoples who inhabited their territory in Roman times lived at an ancient crossroads between the Roman and the ‘barbarian’ world. The modern territory of The Netherlands straddles the ancient lower Rhine *limes*, and comprises part of a former Roman province (*Germania inferior* = modern Dutch southern provinces, south and west of the Rhine), the frontier system itself and areas of south-western *Barbaricum* (modern Dutch northern provinces), including a ‘buffer zone’ or *Vorlimes* (Soproni 1978, 119; Carrié 1993, 505) (Figure 1.2). Thus, as a case-study for the study of ancient identities in the area, it should provide us with insights into three very different realities in Roman times: integrated ‘barbarian’ peoples within the Roman provincial system, frontier area interactions, and groups established well into the ‘barbarian’ hinterland (van Es 1983, 5).

---

3 Not so much in the classical sense of the term, because it is not referring to the traditional Greek or Roman past, but it is reception studies of the more obscure episodes of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction processes and how this have been absorbed and used in the formulation of national identities (see Vasunia 2010a; 2010b).

4 The Netherlands or Dutch territory: Unless specified otherwise these terms refer to the modern territory of The Netherlands in continental Europe. The reader will find definitions throughout this thesis for other names used throughout the centuries to define the very changing nature of political and territorial organization to which The Netherlands have been subject (e.g. northern and southern Netherlands, Republic of the Seven United Provinces, Kingdom of The Netherlands, Batavian Republic).
The topographical division generated by the Rhine fluvial system also has an impact on regional variations within the modern Netherlands, and traces of such features will be searched for in their academic and institutional organization, as well as in the formulation and evolution of scholarly discourses about the different ancient peoples that inhabited the modern territory of The Netherlands in Roman times; I will refer to this feature/effect as the ‘limes effect’. The huge influence of the fluvial system was already noticed by Waterbolk (1981) when he defined Dutch archaeology as ‘Delta Archaeology’ (see Section 5.2).
The relationship between ancient and modern identities, one of the themes underlying this thesis, is easily traceable in the Dutch case as we can follow a thread starting with ancient historical peoples whose interactions with the Roman Empire were recorded by a few contemporary sources. I will argue that once received by Dutch 16th century humanists, those textual sources were soon used to forge myths of origin around those ‘native’ peoples and informed the formulation of Dutch national and regional identities, which eventually would leave their mark in the academic archaeological discourses.

The case of the Batavians (Section 4.3) in that sense is paradigmatic within Dutch scholarly tradition, and has attracted much attention since the 16th century, becoming one of the main topics within Dutch Roman archaeology; indeed, it is currently a sub-discipline in its own right (see Roymans (2014, 232) for a brief account of the most important works on the topic). As Carol van Driel-Murray stated at TRAC (Newcastle) in 2011:

I must say it was a distinctly odd experience to find that the Dutch obsession with archaeological Batavians has become a branch of research in its own right… the subject is actively growing. (pers. comm., 28/04/2011)

As such, this thesis will chiefly focus on the discourses created around these people. However, the Batavians were not the only group settled in today’s Dutch territory during the Roman era. The presence of other ancient tribal groups such as Cananefates and Frisians, who also developed their identities in close interaction with the Roman Empire, will be considered, providing grounds for comparison, both in antiquity and in modern reception and archaeological perspectives, at a regional and national level. The complexities of political and historical developments in The Netherlands at a regional and a national level are interesting and challenging at the same time, and I believe have an impact on the modern reception, myths and interpretations of these ‘native’ peoples.

The label ‘native’ is used throughout this thesis to refer the non-Roman groups (Batavians, Frisians and Cananefates) that inhabited The Netherlands at the time that Roman expansion reached these territories. Whether these groups can be considered autochthonous or the result of political and ethnic Roman manoeuvrings in the area has been the object of discussions (Willems 1984, 206), but following the Roman sources these groups occupied these territories and interacted with the Romans. Additionally, the consideration of these groups as forefathers of the Dutch nation or some of its regions since the 16th century will be
described and also justifies the use of this term. ‘Local populations/groups’ is used on occasion, as it does not imply these were native or autochthonous groups, but simply groups settled or present in the area during the period under study.

Unlike other countries in north-western Europe, the geographical location of The Netherlands at the edge of the Roman World provides both literary and archaeological sources about the peoples that inhabited this territory in Roman times. Furthermore, it constitutes a strong example of the Roman:‘barbarian’ dichotomy in the formulation of national identities, a feature common to many European nations and another one of the underlying topics and themes addresses by this thesis.

Nonetheless, there are some undeniable logistical considerations. The Netherlands feature a relatively smaller academic community than the ones ascribed to bigger national entities (e.g. Germany or UK), and is therefore a more manageable case study for a thesis. However, as The Netherlands occupies a central place in the axis of major European scholarly traditions of archaeological interpretation, i.e. Germany-England, the development of their own archaeological interpretative tradition — possibly informed by those two poles — makes its scrutiny appealing. That said, The Netherlands has managed to stay at the epicentre of the academic arena by sustaining a strong publication output, which means a huge corpus of secondary data are available for the researcher.

Noticeably, The Netherlands, being a nation with a distinct and minority academic language, has engaged with a larger international academic audience and has a long-standing Anglophonic tradition — especially in the last four decades, which are a particular focus of this thesis — when it comes to spreading their ideas through academic publications, reducing considerably the impact that the language gap could have on my research (see Figures 6.15 and 6.29 on the language publications trends for the two main scholars analysed in this thesis and the BROB). This is not the case with other potential case-studies (e.g. Germany and France).

In sum, despite being a distinct nation and academic community, shaped by unique historical roots and developments, The Netherlands operates within a common set of political, cultural and intellectual European traditions. Additionally, it shares theoretical

---

5 For example, Denmark, which, despite having a huge amount of Roman finds, lies far beyond the former Roman *limes* and has no historical or archaeological records of Roman presence in their territories and therefore tends to link its modern identity to post-Roman/Viking roots.
frameworks and approaches to the topics under discussion. These will offer an effective contextual framework in which a variety of Dutch archaeological agendas and discourses can be analysed in a European framework, making this study operational and The Netherlands such a distinctively interesting case-study. Indeed, as De Regt (1994, 46) noted:

Dutch archaeology nicely illustrates most of the themes which are uncovered by the many detailed historical studies of European archaeology.

1.5. Chronological Framework

The chronological framework of the thesis is two-fold: ancient and modern. Within the ancient one the focus will be on provincial, frontier and trans-frontier Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions in the area around the lower Rhine *limes*, roughly corresponding with the modern territory of The Netherlands, in the period ranging from the reign of Julius Caesar to the mid-3rd century AD (58 BC - AD 250), and focusing on the native groups identified earlier, chiefly the Batavians.

Julius Caesar portrayed himself as the opener of the North Atlantic world for the Romans, in a propagandistic emulation of Alexander the Great’s deeds in the Far East for the Greeks (Plutarch, *Caesar*, 23; Virgil, *Aeneid* I, 286-8; Gozalbes Cravioto 2003, 76). His are the first recorded Roman interactions with peoples in Northern Gaul and the lower Rhine area in classical literature (*De Bello Gallico*), and so it only makes sense to start with his campaigns in the area in 58 BC, as the role of classical sources and their modern reception are key in the development of most of the issues to be discussed throughout this thesis. My study will not consider material derived from the period after the mid-3rd century AD because of the ethnographic complexity of the late antique period in the area, when some of the major ‘barbarian’ groups formed and migrated South and East, encouraged by the institutional weaknesses of the Roman imperial structures in the West (Aillagon 2008; Christie 2011; Heather 2009). This period will be referred to when discussing the development of some European national identities, but will not be considered on its own right as it will make the project unmanageable in size.

This ancient study period witnessed the peak of recorded activity by Batavians, Frisians and Cananefates, whereas the mid-3rd century has been marked by scholars as a period of
drastic decrease in population in the area and eventually of disappearance of these groups. Additionally, most of the research carried out by Dutch archaeologists regarding the interactions of these peoples and the Roman Empire in the area is focused on a very similar chronological span, with an emphasis on the Late Iron Age and Roman periods, 1st century BC to 4th century AD (Van Es 1972c, 120-127).

The modern chronological framework goes from the late 15th century reception of ancient sources to contemporary archaeological discourses. It is in the period between the early 16th century and the mid-20th century when the necessary intellectual-cultural changes and the appropriate socio-political contexts culminated in the formulation and development of historical myths and national identities around the ancient peoples of The Netherlands. As this is a contextual factor of notable importance in the development of discourses about the interaction of these groups and the Roman Empire, the whole of Chapter 4 will be devoted to its analysis. However, the main focus of this study is post-war or current Dutch archaeology; these terms will be used to refer generally to the ongoing period since the end of WWII (1945-2014). The analysis of archaeological discourses and trends will centre around the last five decades (1960s-2010s) in which Dutch provincial Roman Archaeology and trans-frontier studies have developed their current theoretical frameworks, as most of the approaches to the topic of Roman: ‘barbarian’ interactions in the Dutch area have.

This emphasis is justified by the massive changes in economics, politics and ideology observable during the post-WWII era. These changes not only brought about a new social mentality (Hobsbawn 1995; Judt 2005), but transformed the ways in which Dutch people and scholars approached their recent and not so recent past, directly breaking the traditional inherited narratives. The current institutional structures and organization of Dutch archaeology (described in Chapter 5) have their origins in post-war changes, and most of current well-established archaeologists responsible for the methodological and theoretical development of the discipline from the 1970s onwards were post-war children. Additionally, the number of archaeology students grew exponentially from the 1970s onwards, once this post-war generation reached graduate school age, and the number of institutions dedicated to the archaeological enquiry multiplied as well. As such, from a pre-war scenario in which we can clearly identify only a small handful of individuals to describe the evolution of the discipline, we move on to one in which key figures and works multiply significantly and

6 Such was the focus of the 2012-2015 NWO-FWO funded research programme "Decline and fall? Social and cultural dynamics in the Low Countries in the Late Roman period (AD 270-450)" run by Prof. Nico Roymans and Dr Stijn Heeren from Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, in collaboration with the Gent University.
exponentially, allowing us to describe the post-war evolution of Dutch archaeology as a succession of generations of individual scholars. The technological revolution, partially derived from WWII itself, opened an era of new methodological and theoretical approaches to field work and research. The appearance of new intellectual currents and frameworks of archaeological interpretation (Section 1.1; Chapter 3) had an increasingly strong impact in the development of archaeological discipline world-wide, including in The Netherlands.
Chapter 2. Methodology, Data, and Resources

2.1. Introduction

This thesis is not simply an extended literature review. While analysis of secondary and primary sources is still core, my approach seeks to be more direct — talking to, not just of, the scholars. Testing the validity of the innovative methodology I propose in this thesis is as valuable an outcome as the results produced by its application to data. As such, this chapter will describe the ways by which I will try to answer the research questions proposed in Section 1.3, which tools are thought to be most effective, and which sets of data will I be using.

Due to the historiographical nature of this project, the most effective and, arguably, the most logical way to achieve the aim of describing the nature and evolution of Dutch scholarly discourses around the topic of early imperial Roman: ‘barbarian’ interaction in the lower Rhine limes is to critically analyse the works of prominent Dutch scholars working on the topic. Following a thorough review of the available literature a list of names was compiled. While analysing the works of all the individuals on that list was recognised as a titanic task beyond the limitations of a PhD, by focusing on the leading and most visible/challenging figures among them will provide sufficient analytical depth to represent trends and discrepancies within the Dutch academic community accurately.

The textual analysis of written accounts (scholarly works) as a way to characterize those academic archaeological discourses is not an innovative approach in a historiographical sense. The identification of the factors/spheres that influence their formulation (Figures 1.1; 2.1; 2.2) is of essential importance in this sense, as they provide an additional level of analysis that is not commonly appreciated.

However, as the main focus of this study is the ideas and themes underlying those discourses, the scholars who generate them and the context in which they do it must be considered too. Thus, I decide to undertake research also on the personalities themselves, and to conduct open and structured interviews with an array of scholars face-to-face (for more details see Section 2.5; Table 2.1; Appendix 1 for a full list of interviewees). This personal
interviews allowed me to gain insights into the production process that otherwise might not be available. These interviews serve the purposes of contextualization of these processes.

During all the interviews I carried out, Willem Willems and Nico Roymans came across as the most influential figures of the last few generations of Dutch scholars in the field of Roman archaeology. They have shaped the discipline and led innovative developments in the way Dutch scholars approach and represent their own past in the Roman era. As such their discourses became the focus of this research. Beside textual analysis and interviews transcripts, other analytical tools — such as bibliometrical/statistical analysis of the bibliographies of these two scholars (see Section 2.4) —, will be used to enrich this analysis. I will now describe the methodological choices and the dataset to which these will be applied.

2.2. Text: Willem’s and Roymans’ Relevant Works

This methodological choice obviously facilitates the use of publications as secondary data in the analysis of archaeological discourse. Furthermore, it informs and contextualizes the collection of primary interview data by outlining certain trends or themes already visible in the written record; it also provides some background for the answers obtained from the interviews.

The gathering of works by Willems and Roymans was challenging given their respective high academic output, and long and distinguished careers (see Section 2.4.1; Appendices 7 and 8). However, not all the works they have produced are relevant to the topic under scrutiny here. A selection was made based on thematic focus around the processes of cultural interaction in the lower Rhine in Roman times. Language of publication, generally English and Dutch, was not a defining factor on such a selection. The works that were not selected due to thematic affinity with the aims of this thesis were not dismissed completely since many of them provide valuable insights into the development of the discipline and topic (e.g. Willems 1997g; 1998c; 2007c; Roymans and Heeren 2004).

Once gathered, these works were analysed in detail, looking for trends, themes and common features in the characterisation that each of these scholars make of the processes of cultural interaction in the study area. This analysis constitutes one of the two keystones of
This doctoral project, the other one being the multiscalar approach to the analysis of contextual factors.

Multiscalar is a widely used approach in anthropology that refers to possible multiple levels of analysis (e.g. ‘micro’-‘macro’) when studying human behaviour, especially in complex social systems (e.g. Palumbo et al. 2013). In archaeology, the availability of abundant spatial data has raised concerns about the applicability of datasets of different nature (e.g. Lawrence 2010), and some attempts to test multiscalar approaches on the material record have taken place, especially in studies of landscape and settlement patterns (e.g. Bevan and Conolly 2006). However, its historiographical application to the study of social organization of academic communities within the discipline and development of discourses has yet to be tested. Such is the intention of this thesis.

2.3. Context: Multi-scalar Analysis

The space between pen and paper or, in modern terms, between keyboard and screen, is not a void; it is in fact filled with the intellectual tribulations of the scholar. It is an intangible realm of thoughts under the tyranny of the scholar’s own biases and external conditioning factors, all of which pass unnoticed in most occasions; yet it is the realm where discourses are produced before they are ‘carved’ in paper.

This abstract space is restrained by different spheres of influence and contextual factors that dictate academic discourses. These spheres and the factors within them need to be identified and described in order to understand the origin and development of scholarly discourses in any given topic about the past.

These five spheres of influence in the development and formulation of individual discourses outlined here (Figure 2.1) correspond with the five structural levels defined earlier (Figure 1.1). These spheres of influence do not refer exclusively to the geographical scope of the factors contained in each one of them, but most importantly to the proximity to and/or distance from the scholar. While the plural nature of the four most external spheres can be, and in fact are, common to more than one scholar, it is the closest, most intimate sphere where, in my opinion, the differences in discourse arise.
Figure 2.1. Multiscalar representation of contextual spheres of influence (individual, local, regional, national and international-supra-national) and the contextual factors within each one of them. These factors are in operation during the formulation of thoughts that produce archaeological discourses (Source: Author. Design: Giacomo Savani).

While most approaches to the analysis of discourse development in various national scholarships are focused on nation-wide political, ideological and intellectual trends, and the
common factors that affect their development, little attention has been paid to the fact that individual scholars bring in their own specific and personal experiences and biases that can deeply affect the development of discourse in a given academic community. Thus, the aforementioned political and intellectual trends should be seen as generalisations — useful for cross-regional analysis — and factors of influence themselves, but not as providing a fully accurate picture of current discourses. Hence the importance of studying discourses individually and paying special attention to the first sphere of factors (S1) during my analysis of each scholar.

This inner sphere of influence, the closest to the scholar’s mind and precisely because of that probably both the most influential and least noticed, corresponds with ‘personal’ factors that affect archaeological thinking, many of which are not related to archaeology as such, but to the life experiences that shape the researcher’s mind in a unique way. In this category, factors such as memories, interests and academic background should be included. These personal factors do not stand alone and need to be considered within the political and social history in which these individuals developed — e.g. living through war, border changes, the introduction of the Eurozone, the rise and fall of fascism, democracy and socialism, level of parents’ education or generational availability of higher education.

Some examples of works highlighting the importance of personal background and psychology as factors of influence on both the questions and answers that archaeologists formulate were provided by Trigger (2006, 16), and include Sartre’s (1971–72) biographical approach to Flaubert’s works. More recently, Simon James (1993) explored the influence of psychological backgrounds on archaeological interpretation. While it is certainly difficult to obtain information related to the psychological backgrounds of most scholars, it is nonetheless possible to draw on personal, biographical experiences, and to gain better insights by talking to the scholars themselves (see Section 2.5 for more details on personal interviews as a method used in this thesis to access this level of information).

James also explored the potential relationship between the academic disciplines of archaeology and psychology, and pointed out an area of application very relevant to this project: “The role of group psychology (and indeed sociology) in the [archaeological] profession” (James 1993, 98). Group dynamics within a given academic community constitute a contextual factor of the utmost importance in the development of discourses, yet these are barely acknowledged in the existing literature. Proximity, intellectual affinity,
collaborations, contacts, location, academic genealogy and hierarchical structure, are all elements of these group dynamics that need to be explored, being responsible for the synchronization or polarization of individual approaches.

Those who commit themselves to a particular arena of discussion come to identify themselves with others in that grouping in an increasingly specific, formalised manner. (Mizoguchi 2015, 17)

The process of synchronization, as described by Koji Mizoguchi — a Japanese archaeologist with a special interest in the evolution of archaeology as a discipline —, could be described as a top-down one, guided by the existing (and often unspoken) hierarchical structures and group dynamic within a given institution, nation or school of thought, where the approach and discourse of the ‘leader’ are embraced by the rest of the community, as he (and unfortunately it is still normally a ‘he’) is seen as the most authoritative or charismatic voice on the topic. That is normally the case in academic communities of relative small size, such as in The Netherlands. The size of bigger academic communities — e.g. UK — propitiates discrepancies, and limits intellectual dominion by prominent figures, diluted under the sheer weight of alternatives. Thus, the analysis of the unspoken sociological structures and group dynamics in play within a given institution or academic community gains relevance.

Whether the addition of individual approaches results in a synchronization of discourses within Dutch scholarship remains to be seen. Nevertheless, such a conclusion needs to be a result of individual analyses, and not a premise upon which to analyse the individual discourses. This process of synchronization or polarization of individual discourses will be traced along the four remaining spheres.

Furthermore, the importance of the “formative years” — i.e. the period of time in which these scholars undergo academic training as archaeologists and have their first contact and experiences with academic environment, debates, and trends; I would define that as the period generally comprising their Higher Education training up to doctoral level, if not well into their early lectureship — as an influential factor on the scholars’ development of discourses and theoretical approaches to the past has been discussed by Eickhoff (2013, 155). He links this formative period to the choice of research tradition with which scholars most

7 Androcentrism, lack of debate, and concentration of ‘power’ around a ‘leader’ are aspects of Dutch archaeology mentioned by some of the scholars interviewed that will be discussed later (Section 7.5.2); this is also true of other academic communities.
associate, and this choice to that of their teachers/supervisors. Such relationships, pertaining to the personal and local spheres (Spheres 1 and 2), will be explored during the analysis of current discourses in Chapter 6.

The second sphere of influence sees contextual factors related to the immediate professional environment of the scholar come into play: the ‘local’ or ‘institutional’ sphere. This environment can be linked to the institution where one develops one’s research activity: the size, ranking, funding, agenda, preferences, colleagues and internal group dynamics in the institution can tremendously affect the focus and choices of the scholar. The location or municipal adscription of the institution has to be considered too, as local policies, agendas and identities may play a role in scholars’ choices. Academic genealogies, as the scholar’s immediate intellectual references, can play an important role in defining discourses: supervisors, mentors, and often even students can shape the way scholars develop their approaches. Finally, the group of close collaborators, those colleagues (not necessarily within the same institution) with whom scholars tend to prefer to collaborate also need to be taken into account as a contextual factor. All these factors will be explored in the analysis of Willems and Roymans (Chapter 6).

So far the two spheres of factors closest to the discourse-producing scholar have been described. Traditionally, focus has been put on the spheres above these, which are certainly important since they are responsible for the production of political and ideological agendas that affect the development of archaeology at a practical and interpretational level (Figure 2.2). However, the third sphere (S3) takes us to the regional level, where the influence of new contextual factors on the formulation of discourses should be assessed. The regional institutional structure, i.e. the array of universities and academic institutions, regional museums or archaeological depots, is one of them. This is normally conditioned by another contextual factor, namely socio-economic regional imbalances, which in the case of The Netherlands account for most of the institutional differences. A major factor in play in Sphere 3 are the different regional cultural identities and political agendas linked to them. These are especially notorious in regions with a strong sense of historical identity and/or driven by independent aspirations, such as Catalonia in Spain or Friesland in The Netherlands.
Figure 2.2. Cumulative hierarchies of national, regional, European, and international attitudes, recognise the coexistence of these four levels from a psychological perspective. It could be adapted to the agendas operating within discourse formulation, normally in an opposing fashion (Source: Dekker et al. 2003, 348).

Sphere 4, the national sphere, is probably the most prominent in the existing historiographical literature due to the noted focus on national academic communities as units to explore the evolution of archaeological thought and discourses. Several contextual factors can be identified upon a critical survey of any national academic community, most of which are present in the Dutch case and will be analysed later (Chapters 3-5): the institutional and structural organization of archaeology (e.g. dependency on ministries, number and type of universities and funding bodies); heritage management policies and ‘heritage landscapes’; socio-economic development (periods of crisis and its effects on academia); political agendas established by governments and their effects in funding priorities; ideological and cultural identity (e.g. monarchic and Protestant nations, such as The Netherlands will interpret certain episodes of the past with an inherited bias and historical discourse); national identity (forged by episodes of shared national stress due to external threats); and socio-cultural and ideological heritage (e.g. colonialist/imperialist bias in the UK and France, or Marxist influences in Eastern Europe).

The evolution of discourses within an academic community is not only subject to internal factors (Spheres 1-4), but to external factors too. The fifth sphere of influence (S5) is

---

8 The notion of ‘heritage landscape’ refers to the idea that the aspects, periods, groups, identities, approaches, and images of antiquity that communities/nations decide to highlight or favour, and the way we chose to approach them in academic and ideological terms, might depend to some extent on the archaeology available in the landscape and with which we become familiar, even unconsciously (e.g. Roman ruins in Italy, or Viking Denmark).
the furthest from the scholar but, as the most encompassing one, it affects all other spheres below. It contains contextual factors at the ‘international’ or ‘supranational’ level. Among these we could recognise global socio-cultural developments (e.g. the advent of globalisation), supranational processes (e.g. EU heritage management policies, EU funding, and international economic trends) and political agendas (e.g. common European roots), as well as more directly related factors such as pan-disciplinary development in archaeology (e.g. academic trends, theoretical developments, ‘fashions’, buzzwords, paradigms, technological developments), academic traditions in their immediate surroundings (nations or supra-national regions), connectivity and dialogue between universities and departments, visiting lecturers and professors (see Section 6.3.2), collaboration in fieldwork, or conferencing (e.g. Section 6.5.1).

Finally, there are some factors that cannot be directly linked to any of these five spheres but that are important. Among these, the availability of archaeological data and literature about the topic of choice in certain areas, the preservation quality of those data (see Section 5.2 for details on the Dutch case) —, or the dominant academic language in any given academic community, can crucially affect both the thematic focus chosen by the scholar and the discourse produced.

Some of the factors mentioned and described so far might be present in multiple spheres at the same time, as is the case with funding, agendas, cultural identities or heritage management policies. However, none of these factors in isolation can explain the development of discourses, nor are they direct components of it, but rather as a context within which they are formulated and developed. Hence, my proposal is to take into consideration all the possible biases that might condition the formulation of scholarly discourses by applying a multiscalar analysis to these multiple contextual factors on each scholar. The identification of these factors in the career and academic output of the selected Dutch scholars will occupy the core chapters of this thesis.

While common features and factors at international, national, regional and local level will be identified and described drawing information from existing secondary data, the individual sphere and its contextual factors will be approached mainly through the statistical analysis of their bibliographies (bibliometrics) and the use of interview data, both of which use original datasets gathered for this thesis (Appendices 7 and 8).
2.4. Context: Bibliometrics/Statistical Analysis of Bibliographies

Using databases or citation indexes such as Web of Knowledge (Web of Science), Scopus and Google Scholar, bibliometrics provide a set of methods to quantitatively analyse academic literature. Most commonly used in the academic world to estimate the impact of scholarly publications, citation and co-citation analysis can be used to illustrate — even graphically with the right software and enough data — how influential authors and publications are related to each other, what is the intellectual structure of a field, and which are the most common topics, themes, research methods within a specific field, and how these may have changed over time (Pilkington, n.d.).

However, there is an obvious lack of an open access up-to-date database for humanities in general and Dutch archaeology in particular, both of which are clearly underrepresented (van Leeuwen, pers. comm., e-mail 4/11/2014). As an example, a search in the Web of Knowledge for publications authored by Nico Roymans threw back just two results, whereas I have gathered 70 of his titles (see Appendix 8).

Faced with such a problem I contacted Dr Thed van Leeuwen at the CWTS (Centre for Science & Technology Studies), a working group on evaluation of the Social Sciences, Humanities and Law at the University of Leiden, which is developing research techniques based on bibliometrics; he explains this phenomenon as follows:

The problem is the ‘deviant’ publication culture in the humanities, with their books, chapters, and journal publications outside of the Web of Science realm. I use the term deviant here, as it differs so strongly from the natural, life and biomedical sciences, without any negative connotation. (van Leeuwen, pers. comm., e-mail 4/11/2014)

Thus, while citation analysis might not be possible due to the lack of data, other statistical analyses can be carried out on the bibliographies of specific authors within Dutch archaeology in order to obtain crucial information on trends, relationship, and the intellectual structure of the field.
2.4.1. Primary Data: Bibliographical Datasets

The issue of incomplete and outdated databases has been tackled by painstakingly gathering an original dataset with all the existing bibliographical references of the works of these two scholars (Appendices 7 and 8). Complete — previously inexistent — bibliographies have been gathered for this thesis, adding information from the indexes mentioned above, from databases such as ‘Worldcat’ and ‘The Library of Congress’ Virtual International Authority File’ (VIAF) and via references found in other works.

In combining these bibliographical data in Excel tables according to different parameters, some initial trends can be derived, and these are outlined and visualised in graphs throughout Chapters 6 and 7. As a final methodological note related to this dataset, papers which have been published within a volume have been considered as independent works, even if the volume was edited by the authors themselves; these edited volumes have also been counted as independent pieces of work.

2.5. Context: Personal Interviews

Considering the formulation of the research question and the methodological focus on the context in which academic discourses are formulated, the variety of sources and disciplines within the Humanities upon which this study stands, and the qualitative nature of the data I will be managing (primary interview data and secondary literary sources), a qualitative approach within the Hermeneutic tradition has been deemed necessary.

While quantitative analysis in European archaeological research benefits from a long-standing tradition of culture-historical research especially in Germanic and Nordic methodological traditions, there seems to be a lack of works within Archaeology based on qualitative analysis of interview data.9

Furthermore, while the analysis of modern written and oral accounts as part of the archaeological dataset available to this researcher is not a widely employed technique in the history of archaeology, it is fairly common in American anthropology and historical

---

9 Some examples of approaches based on interviews see: Hegde and Shome (2002); Rathje, Shanks and Witmore (2013); ‘Oral History of British Science’ research project, run by the British Library; Society for California Archaeology ‘Interviews with Archaeologists’ (1997-2006); ‘Personal Histories Project’ by P. M. Smith.
archaeology, normally linked to the study of the impact of colonialism in native populations during the 18th-19th centuries, and oral memories of it (Cipolla 2012).

There is, however, an example from the Dutch academic community itself. In 2003, Martijn Eickhoff published his doctoral thesis, entitled De oorsprong van het ‘eigen’. Nederlands vroegste verleden, archeologie en national-socialisme. This work, analysing the effects of the German occupation of The Netherlands during WWII and national-socialism on Dutch archaeology, was partially based on interviews with the surviving figures of that period. However, it was only in a recent paper (2013) that he explicitly discussed his use of interviews as a methodology for the study of the history of archaeology and its benefits — sadly rather too late for me to apply his methodological approach to this project.

Fortunately, there is a field much more used to dealing with this kind of data: Psychology. Attempts have been made lately to see the potential of the application of its methods and theories to the field of Classics and Reception Studies. In a recent call for papers for an interdisciplinary conference to be held in March 2015 one could read:

Psychology can also play a prominent role within the modern paradigm of ‘Classical Reception Studies’. To what extent can adaptations and psychological modifications serve as a heuristic tool for the reconstruction of shifting mentalities? And, on a more theoretical level, since a scholar inevitably brings her own assumptions to the interpretation of classical culture, what can the field of psychology offer with regard to her own self-understanding? (J. Lauwers, CFP ‘Psychology and the Classics’, by e-mail, 14/02/2014)

The potential of interview data for the history of archaeology is enormous, as pointed out by J. Bintliff in his review of a recent publication (Rathje et al. 2013) in which the development of current archaeology was synthesised through 21 interviews with leading archaeologists:

…as is also true of the interviews, one can find a common set of ideas that one might realistically see as the developing core of a mature method and theory for contemporary archaeology. (Bintliff 2014, 172)

Additionally, Eickhoff (2013, 159) suggested that interviews give researchers access to collective memories and myths that act as common bonds within any given academic community. Moreover, the scholars interviewed recognise an interview as a way of situating themselves within those collective memories and of shaping the ways in which they will be
remembered by future generations (2013, 154). Thus, personal interviews with relevant Dutch scholars, as the main corpus of original primary data, are an essential part of this thesis and, arguably, form one of its biggest strengths for several reasons:

- These reduce the possible critique of my position as an external observer (anthropological ‘etic’) and help bridge the language gap — two of the potential problems foreseen (Section 2.6).
- These give me the opportunity of questioning these professionals directly, offering me primary insights into what they think regarding this topic and why (anthropological ‘emic’), rather than trying to infer it from what they say in print.
- These could help me locating and exploring doxa, i.e. themes or ideas avoided silently or taken for granted as obvious part of the common Dutch discourse.
- These allow plenty of space for the interviewees to elaborate what they want to say, producing data that throw some light on the intellectual context from where their discourse emerges, and providing information rich in meaningful insights and detail. To favour this, my questionnaires were based on open questions, and the flow and structure of the interview were flexible.
- These complement and contextualize my reading of their publications.

Taking all these factors into consideration, importing methods from the fields of Psychology, Social Sciences, Anthropology and Historical Archaeology, and adapting them to the study of intellectual trajectories of modern scholars in this research project can be regarded as a potentially fruitful research method.

2.5.1. Primary Data: Interview Transcripts and Notes

In an earlier phase of this project interviews were conducted also with scholars from Denmark, as that academic community was intended a case-study in the initial thesis outline. While these will not be included as data in this thesis, some quotes from those interviews will be used to reinforce or contextualize points made throughout, especially when attempting a wider European contextualisation of Dutch trends — chiefly Chapters 7-8.

For the purposes of this thesis I contacted 37 individuals by e-mail to inform them about the topic of my thesis and exchange some initial ideas; I then invited them to meet in
person for an interview. I was fortunate that of these, 20 accepted the invitation (see Table 2.1 and Appendix 1 for a full list). The sample is to be seen as representative enough: it incorporates individuals from different regions and institutions (see Figure 2.3), at different stages in their careers, with different ‘Dutch’ ancient peoples and regions as their research focus, and working within the different disciplines or fields involved in the development and transmission of academic discourses on these topics.

![Figure 2.3. Geographical distribution of museum and universities visited for conducting interviews. Those marked in black are the cities with a University but with no archaeology department (Base map: D. Dalet. Design: Author).](image)

To conduct these interviews in person I visited The Netherlands for research twice during the duration of my PhD, first in May 2011 and second in November 2013. These interviews
included 15 archaeologists and two historians within Dutch HE institutions (at various career stages, from one emeritus retired professors to PhD candidates, including post-doctoral researchers, well-established lecturers, chair-holders and Deans), two commercial archaeologists; and three museum curators.

Table 2.1. Overview of individuals interviewed, showing field, institution, and region where they pursue their scholarly activity. Numbers presented in this table add up to more than 20 people. This is due to the fact that some of these individuals hold positions at different institutions at the same time, including Ruurd Halbertsma, who holds a chair in Archaeology at the University of Leiden and is also principal curator at the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden (Source: Author).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeologists and Historians within Dutch HE universities</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Leiden</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Amsterdam</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free University Amsterdam</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radboud University, Nijmegen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus University, Rotterdam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Groningen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeologists within commercial units</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxilia, Nijmegen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vos Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum curators</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Valkhof, Nijmegen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Museum of Antiquities, Leiden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fries Museum, Leeuwarden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings with scholars took place at universities, museums or public places agreed in advance. The first round of interviews (2011) was not recorded; it was subsequently realized that notes were not enough, and the second round of interviews (2013) was recorded with permission from the interviewees. Audio recordings are ethically preferable, being less intrusive and provide a higher degree of detail. Additionally, recording these interviews allowed me to focus on an exchange of ideas with these scholars. After the interviews were carried out I processed the notes and recordings (when applicable), transcribing them and adding some preliminary ideas of my own if applicable, getting the data ready for analysis.

As defined by Pike and Miell (2007, 261) the kind of interview that I conducted was semi-structured. As opposed to structured interviews — normally planned around a predetermined set of questions that will be strictly followed to explore the area of interest and a variety of themes around the research question — my semi-structured interviews, although planned around a questionnaire, posed varied questions adapted to each interviewee; the interview structure depended on the responses given by them, as I followed up topics and probed responses to elicit meaning. In this case, space was made for participants to elaborate and expand on their meanings and experiences, propitiating an exchange of ideas, in which both individuals can move from topic to topic without many constrains. Thus, the questionnaire’s structure was necessarily flexible.

Obviously, the questionnaire was created with the research question in mind and based on my reading of the topic-specific literature available in order to identify a number of topics and themes within the on-going debates, unanswered questions, and strengths and weaknesses within the authors’ discourse. Additionally, its main purpose is to “get the participant to provide insights into their own reality and viewpoint” (Hollway and Jefferson 2000, 35). In this case, I prepared a generic questionnaire applicable to all individuals and added some specific questions for each one of them related to their area of specialization, published works or professional circumstances.10

Once interviews were conducted, and data were recorded (either as notes or audio recordings), it had to be made operational. Therefore, interview notes were organized and annotated, while audio recordings were transcribed. Converting interview data into a manageable textual format allowed me to balance my approach to both data sources

---

10 Advanced guidance on structuring questionnaires, and the collection and treatment of qualitative data from interviews was sought from Dr Marc Scully and Prof. Colin Hyde at the University of Leicester.
(interviews and readings of existing literature), treating both of them as literary sources in which to identify discourse themes and trends.

The scope and limitations of this thesis means that most of the interview data collected will not be used profusely, with the exception of the interviews conducted with Willems and Roymans. However, by including all of them as appendices (3-5 and CD) a valuable corpus of primary data are made available for further research by myself or other interested researchers.

2.5.2. Types of Analysis: Discourse and Thematic

The two types of analysis which best suited the qualitative nature of the data (both written accounts and interview transcripts/notes), the methodological choices made, and the purposes of this thesis are discourse analysis and thematic analysis. It is logical to turn to discourse analysis as this focuses on the private and collective discourse and narratives people engage with to form their identities — intellectual identities in this case — and talk about themselves and others (in the past). Using the concept of ‘interpretative repertoire’, discourse analysis refers to the analysis of a sample of material around a theme, e.g. the ways in which a group (in this case the Dutch academic community and wider society) represents and talks about certain issues and topics. The use of additional concepts related to discourse analysis, such as ‘voices’ and ‘subject positioning’, will throw some light to other aspects, such as the structure and organization of social interaction within Dutch scholarly communities. The concept of ‘voices’ refers to the inherited voices of others in which one’s discourse are based on. Transferred to Dutch academic and intellectual sphere, we could apply this concept to look for academic genealogy or influence; the transfer and evolution of archaeological discourses from generation to generation of scholars. ‘Subject positioning’ is a concept extracted from sociological theory — Lovis Althusser and Jacques Lacan (Pike and Miell 2007, 272) — and refers to the fact that every time a person tells a narrative and usually each time they use an interpretative repertoire from the stock available in their culture they position themselves and often others; these positioning construct identity. Thus, we could use this to see how identity (national, regional or academic) is formulated by the repetition of certain interpretative traditions and myths regarding Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction. The focus in this thesis is on

11 “These are a way of picking out familiar/common arguments and ways of making sense of a society or a community […]” (Potter and Wetherell 1987; Pike and Miell 2007, 271-2).
the meaning-making processes of a whole community and the implications of the patterns identified in their discourse about Roman:’barbarian’ interactions.

On the other hand, thematic analysis is a generic technique to categorize and sort qualitative data into a series of themes that allows interpretations to be made. Applied to a qualitative dataset, such as the one collected for this thesis, it can be used to “draw out meaning in the form of themes (recurrent topics, ideas, statements) by seeing the patterns in experiences and statements… across several people” (Pike and Miell 2007, 286). An effective thematic analysis starts with the familiarization of the researcher with the transcripts by reading them while keeping the research question in mind, and is followed by a stage in which data are organized in themes and indexed (Langbridge 2004; Pike and Miell 2007, 291). Thus, thematic analysis allowed me to confirm expected themes (the ones on which I based my questionnaire) and identifying unexpected ones, while relating the information collected to the research question.

Once primary interview data were processed and themes identified, a holistic analysis was undertaken by contrasting its results with those obtained from the analysis of secondary data (existing publications). I could then identify trends and conventions within Dutch archaeological discourse, linking themes together and exemplifying these with quotes from the interviews in order to create a narrative. Contextualization of the results obtained for the Dutch case-study against its own historical development, theoretical perspectives, and parallel situations in other national academic communities in north-western Europe would, it was hoped, explain the development of Dutch academic discourse regarding Roman:’barbarian’ interactions in the area, and therefore provide answers to the research question.

2.5.3. Methodological Justification: Qualitative Research and Hermeneutics

This project overall intends to explore academics’ experiences and understanding of social-intellectual conventions, and the construction of academic discourses; as such, it is centrally concerned with the interpretation of meaning. Hermeneutics, the philosophical theory concerned with the exploration of meaning and the subjectivity in text interpretation (Ramberg and Gjesdal 2013), certainly provides an interesting theoretical and methodological framework to achieve the aims of this project. Thus, qualitative research methods have been
chosen within the hermeneutic tradition to critically explore the meaning of modern archaeological academic discourses, both written and oral, along with the subjective and broader social meanings attached them.

According to Pike and Miell (2007: 275), a research project based on qualitative analysis and data (e.g. interview transcripts) needs to explicitly describe the researcher’s theoretical stance (ontological, epistemological and academic, i.e. specific to the topic researched) as this informs the research question and affects the researcher’s choice in terms of methods, data collection and type of analysis. This theoretical stance provides an effective framework in which to collect data and identify themes within them. Thus, adapting the process proposed by Pike and Miell (Figure 2.4) we can produce a simplified version to be applied to this research project (Figure 2.5).

![Figure 2.4](image_url)

*Figure 2.4. Graphical description of the iterative process of knowledge creation within a qualitative research project (Pike and Miell 2007, 275).*
The researcher’s particular view of their object of enquiry, i.e. how they conceptualize the nature of what they are looking at (ontology) and what constitutes knowledge in that context (epistemology), will necessarily and explicitly inform the means by which they should approach this knowledge (methodology) (Pike and Miell 2007: 266). Following such principles and the stages outlined above (Figure 1.7), the first step must be to define the theoretical perspectives and assumptions that underpin my methodological choice. As I see it, these theoretical principles can be divided in two types: ‘Theory behind the method’ — notions of ontology and epistemology — and ‘Theory behind the topic’ — existing theoretical framework in which discussions about the topic of this thesis currently develop. While the latter, pertaining to post-colonial theory and the role of Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions in European national traditions and identities, will be addressed separately in Chapter 3, the former will be scrutinized now.

Notions of ontology and epistemology need to be adapted in accordance with the discipline for which they are being used. For instance, in Computer Science, and more specifically in the context of knowledge sharing, ontology is “the description of the concepts and relationships that can exist for an individual or a given community of agents” (Gruber
In that sense, “we chose to write an ontology or a set of definitions of concepts; an ontological commitment is an agreement to use a vocabulary in a way that is consistent with respect to the theory specified by the ontology” (Gruber 1995, 910). Reflecting on these definitions, what is an academic community, such as the one I am studying here, but a given community of agents? And what are discourses and archaeological ‘-isms’ and conventions but a consistent vocabulary formed by a set of formal definitions and tools for knowledge sharing?

Building upon this example and the critique expressed by Yannis Hamilakis (2012, 14), that “critical archaeology today should reopen the big question of Ontology — what is archaeology? — and temporality — what kind of times do we reproduce in our work and what are their political implications? — even if that means dislodging the foundational stones of our cosy modernist ‘home’”, I am able to define my ontological and epistemological views for this project.

This project rests on the ontological assumption that scholars are able to convey in their writings and oral discourses their position concerning certain archaeological topics/issues/ideas. Thus, inherited archaeological traditions and discourse, as well as personal perspectives and experiences, are elements that can be identified by analysing verbal or written accounts of individuals belonging to a specific collective, in this case, the Dutch academic community.

Following Matthias Steup’s (2013) definition of Epistemology as “… issues having to do with the creation and dissemination of knowledge in particular areas of enquiry”, the Epistemology I espouse, i.e. what constitutes knowledge on the framework of this study and within the field of archaeology, is a two-sided coin: Epistemology as my subjective perspective and epistemology as the very object of study itself — the formulation, development and transfer of archaeological knowledge and discourses in The Netherlands.

In sum, this project is underpinned by these ontological and epistemological notions that make me assume that Dutch scholars are reflective, meaning making and interpreting their own experiences of their ancient past through their academic writings and verbal opinions on the topic.
2.6. Potential Problems and Solutions

2.6.1. Bridging the Language Gap

As a non-native speaker of Dutch there is an inevitable gap between me and some of the literature available for my research topic. But my case-study choice is not arbitrary; the Dutch academic community has increasingly published in English on most of the topics related to my research project. Priority was given to works published in English. However, translations of key texts in Dutch have been carried out too when necessary. Despite fitting the qualitative nature of the project, the decision to conduct interviews with relevant scholars and use these as primary data are partially motivated as a safety net against this issue; interviews not only provided me with deeper insights into those works but allowed me to approach the authors of some works published in Dutch.

It could also be argued that asking these scholars to speak in their non-native language necessarily changes some of the thought and discourses patterns because of the way language and cognitive processes are linked. However, this issue does not only affect the scholars interviewed but myself as a Spanish researcher. As such, English becomes a common ground and it allowed us to converse in a common language.

2.6.2. Criticism and Reception of this Research

It is often possible for an ‘outsider’ to discern preconceptions and national assumptions more clearly than those who have been brought up in the existing tradition of research. (van Driel-Murray, pers. comm., 05/12/2010).

Everyone has their own biases but no one recognises them; as an outsider you can critically look for the motifs behind people’s interpretations. (Van Driel-Murray, interview, 31/05/2011)

Despite the fact that most Dutch scholars always welcome constructive criticism and that this thesis has raised much interest among them, my status as an outsider and the nature of the project and its research question, might mean that the plausible conclusions will not be well received by the object of study — i.e. the Dutch academic community itself. Although I am bringing my Spanish academic biases and I am aware I am approaching this study from an Anglo-American theoretical perspective (and this could be a source of criticism in itself), I
would argue that I am preventing this eventuality by talking to Dutch academics directly, and simply articulating their answers in a coherent way. The fact that I am reading both English and Dutch texts, and that I am contextualizing my results within a wider northern European frame should help me avoid any strong critique in this sense.

2.6.3. Validation of Analytical Process and Conclusions

As both the researcher and the subjects inevitably bring in their own interpretations, experiences, theoretical assumptions and choices there must be mechanisms in place to make sure that qualitative data are analysed rigorously and systematically, and that these are open to scrutiny. The following mechanisms, imported from psychological research methods (Pike and Miells 2007, 303-5), were implemented across this thesis:

- **Reflexivity**: the researcher needs to reflect on how they have affected the research while choosing the questions asked, the issues focused on, and the interpretations given. Therefore, I must be clear about the theoretical framework that informs my positions, as I have done in the past few pages and will explicitly do in Chapter 3.

- **Variability of data**: The fact that different people were interviewed must be noted and coded (by creating an index), together with their different points of view (theme-coded); the latter should include not only trends encountered but also contradictions and changing views (evolution of discourse).

- **Transferability of findings**: The characteristics of the interview participants must be described. D. Silverman (2000) noted that the representativeness of a small sample (problem) needs to be established by comparing them with others and defining their relevance for the research we are undertaking. Thus, details will be given throughout the thesis as for why each participant’s opinion is relevant (e.g. publication record, research interest, position within academic community).

- **Credibility, confirmability and dependability of the analysis (or ‘audit trail’)**: by presenting enough information and quotations from data collected and by contextualizing findings with other research on the field, we can prove that themes described here are justified by the theoretical framework, the data collected and the existing literature, and that the sample used, the data collected and the analysis done are appropriate to answer the research question. Additionally, full notes and transcripts of the interviews carried out will
be provided as appendices of this thesis and thus made openly available (see Appendices 3-5 for examples, and CD for all audio recordings and transcripts).
Chapter 3. Archaeological Theory: Roman Imperialism and Cultural Change

3.1. Introduction

A history of archaeological thought requires knowledge not only of the social settings in which archaeological research is carried out but also of the ongoing development of archaeological practice. (Trigger 2006, 25)

Following Trigger’s statement, it is paramount to observe both the social context and factors that influence the development of discourses, and the theoretical frameworks in which Dutch scholars produce them. While the analysis of contextual factors (e.g. social, personal, historical) is present throughout this thesis, the description of those intellectual frameworks will be the focus of this chapter. Furthermore, these wider, pan-disciplinary theoretical trends and approaches to Archaeology are an integral part of my fifth sphere of influence (see Section 2.3), mostly related to factors of international/trans-national nature. As such this chapter will start by presenting briefly the post-war evolution of theoretical approaches to archaeology (Section 3.2).

However, distinct national approaches to these wider frameworks also need to be acknowledged (cf. Hodder 1991; Härke 2000, 15), and the influence of national academic traditions on each other is important in this. As part of those ideas, the concept of ‘discrepant post-colonial experiences’ will be presented and discussed (Section 3.3), and the relationships between The Netherlands and other academic communities, chiefly Britain, explored.

More specifically, within the realm of Roman provincial archaeology, I will discuss the theoretical paradigms and models developed in the last few decades to explain the nature of Roman imperialism, Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction and cultural change: from Mommsen’s (1885) use of the term Romanisierung at the eve of Roman archaeology as a discipline in 19th-century Germany, to the various post-colonial positions developed in the last few decades (discrepant identities, hybridity, creolization, etc.), chiefly by English archaeologists (Section 3.4). The focus will be on the heavily scrutinized British debate, which I believe constitutes both an ideal comparative element and a contextual factor of influence on the development of Dutch discourses on the topic.
This will enable a wider comparative framework upon which we can situate the results of the analysis of Dutch scholars’ works. If similarities between the wider theoretical framework and their discourses are identified, then these could be labelled with recognisable trends and paradigms. While the focus still is the individual discourses of Dutch scholars (see Chapter 6), these need to be articulated in wider theoretical frameworks such as the one described here. As such the issues critically analysed in this chapter constitute a valuable comparative framework.

Finally, I will explore relationships between ancient and modern identities, historical myths, national identities and historical discourses as essential elements of archaeological interpretations and discourses about the past (Section 3.5). Several characteristic features of the processes by which these elements interact with each other can be identified in most European nations and will be addressed here too: notably, evidence for proto-national identities since the 16th century (Section 3.6) and the role that external threat had in their formulation (Section 3.7.3); Roman:‘barbarian’ dichotomy in European national identities and the role of ‘barbarian’ leaders as national heroes (Section 3.7; 3.7.2); and the development of discourses about ancient and modern identities. Concepts such as ‘historical myth’ and ‘national identity’ will be described, and the ideological implications that they carry in the context of the nation-state political system that has characterized Europe since the late 18th century will be assessed. Specific examples of these features in the Dutch case will then be provided in Chapter 4, where the analysis of factors at a national scale (Sphere 4) is undertaken.

3.2. Post-war Evolution of Pan-disciplinary Theoretical Approaches

Culture-history, Processual Archaeology, New Archaeology, Marxist Archaeology, Post-Processual Archaeology, critical theory, interpretative archaeology, post-colonial approaches, are all lines of enquiry, grand conventions that allow us to define and classify different interpretative approaches to the past and its material evidence, and to trace changes in the theoretical structures of the discipline, in a way that creates a common framework of understanding for archaeological practice and discourses.
As social scientists we work with conventions, we reduce all those different perspectives and discourses to conventions; conventions are the bottom line, and categories (or trends) are the embodiment of conventions. The complexity of the context in which these discourses are produced must be acknowledged. (Diaz-Andreu, per. comm., April 2013)

Table 3.1. Overview of the evolution of archaeological thought and frameworks. All these approaches outlive their peak period and remain active and evolving while new ones appear. They evolve at different speeds (or not at all) in different academic traditions/regions (Source: Author).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Approaches</th>
<th>Early 20th century Early post-War</th>
<th>1960s 1970s</th>
<th>1980s 1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary State</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>Self-Consciousness</td>
<td>Critical Self-Consciousness</td>
<td>Self-critical Self-Consciousness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Revolution</td>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>Scientific Methodological</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Paradigmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Bias</td>
<td>Colonial/Imperial</td>
<td>Colonial/Imperial National</td>
<td>Post-Colonial</td>
<td>Multicultural Transnational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Cultural Evolutionism</td>
<td>Positivism Objectivism</td>
<td>Idealism Subjectivism Conceptualism</td>
<td>Fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Data/Theory</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Meta-Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Virvhow Kossinna Childe</td>
<td>Binford Flannery</td>
<td>Hodder</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many histories of archaeology have investigated the development of intellectual frameworks in archaeology (Trigger 2006; Dyson 2006). Here, I will present a simplified overview of the evolution of archaeological thought during the second half of the 20th century and into the present one (Table 3.1). The main theoretical approaches will be described, defining their distinctive features. Processual and Post-Processual archaeologies will be given more attention as these are the main frameworks in which the discourses that I am analysing in this thesis are formed. Presenting this information briefly here allows me to later identify these features in the Dutch discourses.

But this overview must start first with culture-history, the dominant paradigm from the 19th century up to the 1960s. This theory posits that historical groups can be identified ethnically and defined through their individual material cultures; thus it grew alongside the
rise of nationalism and racism in the 19th century (Trigger 2006, 211). This has also been called ‘classificatory-historical’ by Gordon Willey and Jeremy Sabloff (1974, 88) because of culture-history’s emphasis on chronology and the inductive reasoning of historical explanations that mirror our textual sources. As such, it has been used by many groups, including the Nazi party before and during the Second World War, as a convention that allowed for ‘special’ connections between modern and ancient peoples as a way to solidify or justify their deep heritage. This concept was revolutionised in Britain by Gordon Childe (1893-1957) who was one of the few culture-history archaeologists to begin questioning why and how processes in the past happened rather than establishing simple chronologies. Childe and American archaeologist Julian Stuard (1902-1972), who pioneered cultural ecology, are considered two of the most important progenitors of this thought paradigm. Even in the post-war period, culture-history remained a prominent archaeological paradigm and although new approaches have appeared, culture-history has continued alongside them (Johnson 2010, 68).

The New Archaeology, or Processual Archaeology, first brought forward by Gordon Willey and Phillip Phillips (1958), and led by American scholars Lewis Binford and David Clarke in the 1960s, is thought of as the turning-point in modern archaeological theory and as a revolt against the culture-history practice (Johnson 2010, 11). Processual Archaeology challenged the idea that the goal of all archaeology was solely to catalogue artefacts and create historical timelines with them. Instead this ‘New Archaeology’ focused on process: explanation over description, deductive reasoning over the inductive of culture-history, explicit conclusions, quantitative data, and the use of scientific methods to understand and explain human behaviour. Processual Archaeology broadened the field enough that this school of thought itself broke into two separate parts: ‘Functional-Processualism’ in the 1960s and 1970s and, more recently (1990s), ‘Cognitive-Processualism’ which developed in the United States alongside the Post-Processual movement, though the two remain separate and sometimes opposing views in Britain (see Trigger 2006 for an overview of each).

Post-Processualism has been in some ways more of a reaction than a movement with a single focus. Also called ‘Interpretive Archaeologies’, Post-Processualism includes a broad scheme of theoretical frameworks that mixes Marxist, structuralist, and culture concepts and includes behaviourist, evolutionist, ecological and positivist tenets (Trigger 2006, 386). It rejects the objective nature of Processual Archaeology and instead argues that all archaeology is necessarily subjective. In the late 1970s and early 1980s this movement was most vocally led by British scholar Ian Hodder, who wanted to reinstate the intrinsic value of material
culture in Archaeology through the idea that material culture is and was an active element in
social interaction (Johnson 2010, 102). Post-Processual Archaeology has also been described
as the ‘rediscovery’ of the culture concept by archaeologists, borrowing from its parent
discipline oA anthropology (Trigger 2006, 444). Post-Processualism has added to the
theoretical fragmentation of the discipline through its assertion that there is no ‘one’ single
interpretation of any archaeology: rather, there are multiple interpretations of everything
based on individual perception.

3.3. National Traditions and ‘Post-colonial Discrepant Identities’

… it seems unwise to overestimate the historical independence or theoretical
distinctiveness of these regional archaeologies. One important task for historians
of archaeology is to determine to what extent developments in one region did or
did not influence developments elsewhere. (Trigger 2006, 14-5)

Within those wider pan-disciplinary frameworks, national traditions are trends, general
enough to represent the nuanced ways of doing and thinking archaeology within them.
Although distinct from each other, these academic traditions have not evolved in isolation.
Archaeology has always promoted the trans-national exchange of ideas, from interactions
based on personal connections between established scholars in the early days of the discipline
— traceable for instance through the exchange of personal correspondence — to modern
world-wide exchange of ideas brought by the globalisation of academia (evidenced by the
abundance of journals, conferences, or multi-authored volumes) and intensified connectivity,
producing buzzwords and micro-paradigms that spread quickly — although not evenly —
among national academic communities.

This characteristic has promoted the circulation of theories and approaches world-wide,
but with clearly identifiable flows and trends, e.g. from Anthropology and Social Sciences to
Archaeology, from big academic communities to small ones, and from America to Europe.
As beneficial as this exchange of ideas for the development of the discipline in the landscape
of Post-Processual fragmentation can be, it could also be problematic if these ideas are
uncritically applied without scrutiny of their origins (Trigger 2006, 24). The validity of
imported frameworks should not be taken for granted, as these may not be fully applicable in
communities other than the one where these originated.
The distinctive and often complementary findings of different research traditions cannot be successfully synthesized without an understanding of the specific circumstances in which these findings were produced. (Trigger 2006, 13)

The conditions (social context, inherited ideological biases, etc.) in which certain theoretical frameworks have been produced and developed in one specific national academic community may differ substantially from the existing conditions of the receiving community. This is closely related to the idea of ‘post-colonial discrepant experiences’ that I present here and will develop in Section 3.4 when analysing the alleged spread of British post-colonial positions in European approaches to Roman archaeology.

The character and features of major national academic archaeologies have been described in stereotypical broader trends defined in terms of their adherence to any of the main approaches to archaeology, theoretical school of thought, methodological conventions, and paradigms explored earlier. Hingley’s (2001) volume, Images of Rome was an initial attempt to start a discussion on different national academic communities; unfortunately, only lately similar attempts have occurred (Gonzalez Sanchez and Guglielmi, forthcoming). While more detailed and comparative analysis of these communities is necessary to break unjustified stereotypes, those broader categorizations remain useful for comparative and classificatory purposes.

Germany and the United Kingdom are very good examples of two well-studied archaeological communities. Works by Bloemers (2000) and Härke (2000), for instance, provide us with guidelines to understand the differences between these two opposing national traditions. These will be identified and analysed in detail later (Chapter 7) in relation to Dutch developments, but these are representative of most dichotomies present in archaeological thought and practice in Europe: Hermeneutic (UK) vs Scientific (G); Qualitative (UK) vs Quantitative (G); Theory-driven (UK) vs Data-driven (G); Post-Processual (UK) vs Processual (G).

It is widely believed that the development of smaller national academic communities reflects influences from these two major intellectual trajectories. Such is the case, for instance, of Denmark and our case study, The Netherlands. While the former is stereotypically associated with northern continental archaeological traditions and a strong
German influence, the latter is described as highly receptive to developments in American, British and Scandinavian [and German] archaeology (Bazelmans 2006, 64).

The question is, to what extent does archaeology in The Netherlands actually conform to these classificatory conventions? If the answer is that it does not conform, how do we describe the theoretical development of Dutch archaeology? My analysis of post-war discourses will hopefully provide an answer to that question (Chapters 6 and 7), but many surveys have already explored the nature and characteristics of the Dutch approach to archaeology (Van Es 1972b; Hodder 1994; Härke 1994; 2000; Kooijmans 1994; Slofstra 1994; Waterbolk 1981), these often reaching different conclusions.

Bloemers and van Derp (1991) arguments imply that explaining the development of Dutch archaeology in terms of those wider paradigm changes described in Section 3.2 could be accurate. On the other hand, some other authors have concluded that Dutch archaeology cannot be described according to Anglo-American categories of Culture-History, Processual and Post-Processual Archaeology (Hodder 1991b, 22). Processual Archaeology (and the New Archaeology) was judged to be an a-historical social science, making it incompatible with the long-standing European and Dutch traditions of historical perspectives and culture-historical methods (cf. Hodder 1991b, 11-12; Slofstra 1994, 16). Hence, in absolute terms, if there was no Processual Archaeology, nor could there be Post-Processual Archaeology in The Netherlands (Hodder 1991, 16; Slofstra 1994, 24).

Despite the lack of recognisable frameworks such as Processual and Post-Processual Archaeology, it is commonly recognised that American and British traditions have played an important role on the theoretical development of Dutch archaeology (Slofstra 1994, 33), while the German origins of archaeological approaches in The Netherlands, especially in terms of methodologies, have been widely acknowledged too (Roymans and Heeren 2004).

To reconcile all these ambiguous conclusions, many Dutch archaeologists (or at least certainly every single one of the scholars I interviewed) tend to define the theoretical system in which they operate as an intellectual hybrid of British and German influences, getting the best of each tradition and adapting it to the specific characteristics of Dutch archaeology — what I call the ‘Dutch Middle Way’. I will explore this concept in Chapter 7, when I illustrate with examples from my analysis the validity of such a claim. Whether this correctly defines
the nature of the Dutch approach to archaeology is one of the points discussed later, to see if they critically import (and from where), or create independently.

3.4. Romanization, Post-colonialism and Beyond: The British Debate as a Framework

…our external picture of the Romans always stays our picture, determined by our own time and culture. (Van Es 1983, 9)

Accounts arose in particular historical circumstances relating to the character of contemporary societies and the meanings for which the past was felt to be useful. (Hingley 2008, 439)

We run a more serious risk if we fail to explore the underlying assumptions and biases of our own conventional wisdom about the Roman World. (Mattingly 1997a, 15)

Coming from Spain myself — a national academic community where theoretical discussions have had very little impact on the development of archaeological interpretations until very recently — landing in the middle of a very lively British post-colonial and post-Romanisation debate was quite a shock and made me realize what a huge impact national archaeological traditions can have on the way scholars characterize their discourses. Thus, British Roman archaeology and its post-colonial deconstruction process should serve as a good comparative model to see how discourses elsewhere have evolved in other academic communities. Academic/intellectual discourses can perpetuate such unspoken biases if a process of self-analysis and critique is not carried out by their respective academic communities in order to uncover and surpass inherited biases that currently burden our views of the role of our ‘ancestors’ during the Roman past.

The past and the present respond to each other in an infinite dialogue. The use — or misuse — of the past has inspired the development of discourses about the present, while at the same time the present informs our views of the past. Due to the inherent nature of the discipline, this truism is especially evident within Archaeology, as it reflects aspects of modern identities when scrutinizing ancient ones; archaeologists’ reaction to this ‘loaded’ reality can go from unconscious replication to acknowledgement and active use in the formulation of new discourses.
Perhaps the most appropriate example of how changes in the socio-cultural landscape see direct reflection in the ways archaeologists approach the study of the past is the paradigmatic embracement of post-colonial theories by British archaeologists from the late 1980s, the ‘critical self-conscious’ deconstruction of their inherited theoretical discourses around a monolithic paradigm of Romanisation, and the radical changes that these two processes brought to the study and conceptualisation of Roman imperialism.

3.4.1. From Romanisierung to ‘Romanisation’: Origins and Character of an Archaeological Paradigm

The first notion of Roman imperialism and Romanisation to look at, if we want to understand the theoretical evolution of those concepts within Roman archaeology, is the one adopted by the Roman elites themselves. The classicist Richardson (2008, vii) asked the question “what did the Romans think they were doing when they created the Roman empire?” and proceeded to look at diachronic instances of the use of the words ‘empire’ and ‘provinces’ — or of the Latin and Greek terms used by the Romans, to be more precise, which may not necessarily match with English derivatives — in the works of classical authors; his conclusion is that we cannot speak of one Roman imperialism, but several (2008, 192). That imperial scheme was guided by a set of Roman cultural values summarized in the Greek concept of humanitas (civilization), bestowing a civilizing mission to their territorial expansion (Webster 2001, 209; Woolf 1994, 339; 1998, 54-60).

...chosen by the power of the gods... to gather the scattered realms and to soften their customs and unite the discordant wild tongues of so many people into a common speech so that they might understand each other, and to give civilization to mankind. (Pliny N.H. III.39)

The presence of this theme or implicit idea of Roman imperial expansion as a civilising task can be traced once again during the Renaissance (Freeman 1997, 45). The revival of those classical (Greek and Roman) values and concepts during this period explains the first English notions of ‘cultural transformation’ in the first decades of the 17th century, associated with a phase of English colonial expansion (Hingley 2008; Mattingly 2010, 40). Camden’s Britannia (first published in Latin in 1586, and later translated into English in 1610), William Burton’s topography of Britannia (1658), and the works of other late Elizabethan and Jacobean authors, used the idea of ‘civility’ to explore the way in which Romans transferred
civilized culture to pre-Roman settlers in Britain (Hingley 2008, 428). This has been interpreted as an expression of moral superiority of Englishmen over their ‘savage’ or ‘barbarian’ neighbours in Ireland, Highland Scotland or North America (Armitage 2000, 49-59; Hingley 2008, 429). In the following centuries (17th-18th) some examples of the use of the terms ‘romanise’ or ‘romanised’ to describe the effects that Roman presence had on the native populations can be found among English authors (see Hingley 2008 for a detailed review of these).

While these instances all account for an intellectual use of those terms since the Renaissance, it would not be until the late 19th century when the use of the concept of Romanisation as a model to explain cultural and social change in an expanding Roman empire became widespread among historians and archaeologists, and would remain largely unchallenged (in England and elsewhere) for over a century (Freeman 1997; Hingley 1991, 91-2; Webster 2008).

The academic origin of the concept of Romanisation used to describe that idea of Rome being in the driving seat of cultural change in the conquered territories can be pinpointed in the German scholar Theodor Mommsen’s (1817-1903) use of the concept Romanisierung in the fifth volume of his Römische Geschichte (1885), focused on The provinces of the Roman Empire (Figure 3.1). In this work Mommsen broke with the traditional Rome-centred approach and challenged Gibbon’s theories by introducing a more analytical and objective interpretation of the imperial periphery based on methods of empirical science. His contribution is not just theoretical but methodological; as there was no coherent political narrative for the provinces, he focused his attention on material evidence of the Roman presence, chiefly epigraphic and numismatic (Dyson 2006, 91-2). Although, in his works “there is no substantial statement or analytical perception of imperialism as a process” or defence of political philosophy of expansion by Rome (Freeman 1997, 30), he proposed the concept of ‘defensive imperialism’ to explain Rome’s expansionist policies. As it has been suggested Mommsen interpreted the process of cultural Romanisation of the provinces as a direct consequence of the acceptance of Roman rule by the conquered peoples and the establishment of the Pax Romana, the latter being consistent with the lack of an aggressive policy of expansion (Freeman 1997, 32).
Mommsen’s work was strongly influenced by a nationalistic view of the past linked to the late German Romantic movement. Despite the fact that he had actively supported the unification of Germany and the growth of German imperialism (Freeman 1997: 32-35), he was disappointed with the politics of the German Empire and he was quite pessimistic about its future. This ideological baggage can be seen reflected in his ideas about Roman imperialism. He found in the provinces all the good things that he could not found in the core of the empire. The good romans were in the provinces, conquered, and is there where one could find a good example to follow for German imperialism and a justification for colonial expansion (Wulff Alonso 1991). This nationalistic view comprised a Roman: ‘barbarian’ dichotomy that we will explore in Section 3.7, and that was present in all Western European nations in this period. As Dyson (2006, 91) put it, at the end of the 19th century German elites were “culturally and archaeologically schizophrenic”; they stressed examples of German resistance to Rome while they focused on the study and honouring of classical remains found in German soil. Furthermore, his ideas on cultural change in the Romanised provinces could be seen as a reflection of his political and ideological agenda: Mommsen favoured
assimilation of ethnic minorities into German society, not exclusion, and saw a solution to antisemitism in ‘voluntary cultural assimilation’, i.e. ‘Germanisation’, peoples integrated into the empire to give up some of their special customs (Prof. Mommsen and the Jews, The New York Times, 8th January 1881).

Theodor Mommsen played a pivotal role in the evolution of Roman studies across Western Europe since the late 19th century. Some factors — common to most western European nations — can be identified to explain the rapid spread and longevity of a monolithic concept of Romanisation shaped after his work. Firstly, the transformation of antiquarianism into archaeology; this process allowed the systematic excavation of sites and a whole new comprehension of Roman material culture, favouring the adoption of the new methodological approach used by Mommsen. Secondly, the growing internationalization of knowledge favoured the spread of ideas; this can be evidenced by the growing close intellectual and personal relationship between scholars, with its origin in the ‘Republic of Letters’ in the late 17th and 18th centuries, and clearly evident in the case of Mommsen and Haverfield’s Anglo-German collaboration. Thirdly, the growth of ideas of social evolution, race, and progress in a historical context determined by European nationalisms, modern imperialism, and colonialism (Hingley 2008, 437). That civilizing task, both as a right and a moral obligation, was still very much present in the minds and cultural baggage of scholars who inherited notions of Romanisation in the late 19th and early 20th centuries’.

Nationalistic views and use of the Roman empire was mainstream during the first half of the 20th century, not only in Mommsen’s Germany: The role of notions of a common Roman past during the Italian unification and the use of archaeology to promote the Italian fascist regime’s identification with ancient Rome (Mouritsen 1998; Dyson 2012); similar trends observed in Spain as a result of a strong Germanisation of Spanish archaeology (e.g. influence of Adolf Schulten and the foundation of the DAI – Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in Madrid), and promoted by the needs of Franco’s fascist regime (Payne 2008, 65).

How (and in which historical and cultural context) Romanisation became an archaeological paradigm among English archaeologists, and how it developed largely unchallenged until the 1980s, are questions that have been object of numerous and exhaustive studies in the last few decades (e.g. Hingley 1996, 2000, 2008; Freeman 1996, 1997, 2007). Despite Mommsen’s accounts being criticized by British scholars during the second half of the 19th century — mainly by E. A. Freeman (see summary of his critique in P. W. M.
The scarcity of literary evidence for the province of Britannia (a feature shared with the German territories) favoured the adoption of Mommsen’s new methodological proposals (Freeman 1997, 46). The replication of Mommsen’s ideological perception of Romanisation is evident in Francis Haverfield’s seminal work *The Romanization of Roman Britain* (1905, 11): “Romanization defines the process by which the Roman provinces were given a civilization”. In this model — based on passive acceptance of Roman cultural influence by the native provincial populations — a positive view of Roman imperialism prevails and its civilizing effect over native populations is stressed. The context of English imperialism, colonialism, and nationalism were the perfect ground for those conceptual ideas to grow. The representation of Haverfield as a catalyst for the adoption Mommsen’s ideas by Romano-British archaeology is largely accepted (Freeman 1996b; Hingley 1996), although there are discrepancies on whether Haverfield himself was influenced by British imperialism or he was simply replicating Mommsen’s loaded concepts (Webster 1996, 1; Hanson 1999, 421; for a fuller discussion on Haverfield’s life and work see Freeman 1997; 2007; Hingley 2007).

The concept of Romanisation rooted quickly among English archaeologists and changed the theoretical landscape in which approaches to the topic of cultural change and Roman imperialism were based in Roman archaeology in Britain (Hingley 2000, 130-155) and Europe (Wulff Alonso 1991; Hingley 2005, 31-37) for most of the 20th century. Despite the introduction of certain nuances into the model in the 1930s by R. G. Collinwood — one of the pioneers of archaeological theory with his use of concepts such as ‘Fusion’ to described the idea of a Romano-British culture, although still ignoring the conqueror/conquered relationship — uniformity of archaeological discourse around the Romanisation paradigm remained largely unchallenged through an overtly theorised processual phase and until the late 1980s.

3.4.2. Post-colonial Roman Archaeology in England: A theoretical revolution

Something was clearly changing in English archaeology when Martin Millett (1990b, 35) wrote these words:
Over the past few years there has been an increased interest amongst both ancient historians and archaeologists in the perennial issues of Roman imperialism and Romanization. This interest coincides with a questioning of our own imperial past, particularly amongst those of the first generation to have grown up in the post imperial age.

Two very important ideas can be extracted from Millett’s statement. Firstly, there were traces of a more critical agenda emerging in England — and Anglophone archaeology — already in the 1980s (e.g. Dyson 1985a; 1985b; Hingley 1989; Woolf 1990). Secondly, the post-imperial and post-colonial nature and origin of these new agenda.

Post-Processual archaeology, introduce to English archaeology by Ian Hodder (see Section 3.2), brought an increasing theorisation to the archaeological discourses. Roman archaeologists in Britain (Webster and Cooper 1996; Mattingly et al. 1996; Woolf 1997; Webster 2001; Hingley 2005; 2014; Gardner 2013) started to look outside the boundaries of their discipline for valid alternatives to the established paradigm that had dominated the discourse on Roman imperialism and cultural change until then, i.e. Romanisation. As a result of the influence of post-colonial approaches to the past initiated by literary and cultural studies scholars (Said 1979; Spivak 1988; Bhabha 1994), a process of deconstruction (and critique) of the model of Romanisation was initiated and a better understanding of the origin and ideological nature of such inherited discourse was achieved (Figure 3.2).

The result was the identification of clear traces of strong ideological biases left in the conceptual interpretation of ‘Romanisation’, firstly in terms of the import into British archaeology of German notions — Romanisierung — by Francis Haverfield (1912), and secondly by Britain’s own imperial experience (see Section 3.4.1). The result of that process is the critique of inherited views of Romanisation, its rejection as a valid paradigm to explain Roman imperialism and cultural change (Merryweather and Prag 2002), and the testing of new theoretical approaches. However, this — ongoing — process has not resulted in the appearance of another overarching paradigm but instead in fragmentation of British archaeological discourse into different approaches to those topics, in line with wider trends in the discipline described earlier (see Sections 3.2; Table 3.1).
The first alternatives to the established Romanisation model came in the 1970s-1980s with Richard Reece’s ‘Nativist backlash’ (Webster 2001), which was a 180º turn and depicted Rome simply as a veneer and explored native resistance to cultural change. Reece’s work (1988) was a milestone and opened the door to fundamental changes still to come, but his model lacked essential parameters to unveil the complexities of this relationship between conquerors and conquered and perpetuated some of the pitfalls of the prevalent Romanisation paradigm, e.g. dichotomous opposition of ‘Roman’ and ‘native’.

In England the critique of established models of Romanisation indeed commenced in the 1980s but on the margins of the discipline, initially with no widespread engagement from the institutions (e.g. universities, Roman Society) or the academic community. Some authors though, were already proposing alternative approaches. Stephen Dyson (1985a; 1985b) was one of the earliest critical voices against standard interpretative models of Roman imperialism by means of using analogies from modern colonial situations. It could be argued that his focus on the revolts (1971) sparked some ideas about a not so homogenous and pacific cultural change. Syme (1988, 64) directly criticised the term Romanisation and
characterised it as ‘vulgar and ugly’, ‘anachronistic’ and ‘misleading’ when studying the behaviour of Rome. Barry Cunliffe (1988) challenged the prevailing theoretical uniformity in Roman archaeology by adapting concepts and frameworks such as ‘core/periphery’ and ‘world-systems’ (see also Woolf 1990), which were already used in Prehistorical archaeology (Kristiansen 1987), somehow becoming a precursor of current globalisation debates (Gardner 2013, 6). Greg Woolf also engaged with some of those theoretical frameworks and soon proposed alternative approaches to Roman imperial topics (1985) in those early stages.

However, it was not until the 1990s that new approaches to Roman imperialism and cultural change in the Roman territories and its fringes can be detected. The decade opened with Martin Millett’s works (1990a; 1990b), proposing a new socio-economic approach to Romano-British archaeology. He put the Britons in the driving seat but still culturally emulating Rome, with those at the bottom still waiting for the ‘trickle-down’ effect. While there were already some scholar questioning the validity of the paradigm, the critical reaction triggered by his work opened the door to the review process that would result in the appearance of many new approaches in the following two decades (Gardner 2013).

This was followed by a first wave of initiatives and publications (e.g. first edition of TRAC in 1991, Leicester symposium on post-colonial approaches to Roman imperialism in 1994, and subsequent edited volumes — Webster and Cooper 1996; Mattingly 1997) which were proposing radically new theoretical approaches to the topic. The critical importance of TRAC (the Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference) and its theory-driven agenda for the development of new approaches in British archaeology has already been pointed out (Hingley 2014; Totten and Lafrenze Samuels 2012; Gardner 2013); among the negative aspects of it we could account the side-lining of some early works critical with Romanisation (e.g. Dyson) due to a lack of implicit engagement with post-colonial theory, which was the driving force behind TRAC.

While the earlier challengers of the Romanisation paradigm where broadly post-colonial — i.e. they were conscious of the change of historical and cultural context of their generation — the post-colonial movement in English Roman archaeology of the 1990s draws explicitly upon ‘post-colonial theory’ developed by literary and cultural studies scholars, e.g. Said, Spivak, Bhabha (see Webster 1995 and Hingley 1995; Mattingly 1997). American anthropology and the theoretical alternatives presented within it (e.g. acculturation) had only a limited influence on this movement.
The result was the critique and collapse of the dominant narrative around the model of Romanisation. The main flaw pointed out by post-colonial authors was its inability to capture the diversity and complexity of the process of cultural change (Hingley 2014). The Romanisation paradigm presented cultural exchange as a one-way process in which local peoples were passive recipients of a more advanced (Roman) culture, or as Webster (2001, 210) put it, “Romanization is simply another word for acculturation”. This vision is the result of a modern colonial discourse on the positive nature of the Empire. It also presented a model showing top-down cultural emulation (Millet 1990, 1), with elites on the driving sit of the process (Syme 1979, 476; Mattingly 2010, 18), preventing archaeologists to get a clear picture of power and social inequalities, and to different reactions to that process of change.

The increasing recognition of these handicaps pushed archaeologists in England to create ‘devaluated’ or ‘more precise’ versions of the paradigm, with concepts such as ‘Vulgar Romanization’ or ‘Weak Romanization’ (Keay and Terrenato 2001, ix; 228-230; Mattingly 2002). A paradigm so nuanced is no longer a paradigm (Mattingly 2010, 41), and the resulting fragmentation of theoretical approaches and ongoing debate is celebrated by a majority of the academic community (e.g. Gardner 2013; Hingley 2014). Different theoretical frameworks were then progressively imported and applied, chiefly postcolonial theory, and more recently, globalisation theory. Post-colonialism is a good framework to tackle the fundamental issue of power inequalities built into colonial approaches, while the application of globalisation theory favours approaches that take into consideration the different social scales and groups that underwent these processes of cultural change (Gardner 2013, 19).

As a result of the application of these theoretical frameworks imported from other fields a series of new approaches to the topic have been presented and discussed in the last two decades, and have shaken off the “imposed tyranny of a single theoretical paradigm” (Bintliff 2011, 6); Romanisation is now increasingly seen as an “obstacle to move the debate forward” (Mattingly 2011, 208). Some of the most important innovations are Jane Webster’s (2001) model of creolization, David Mattingly’s (1997; 2011) plead to focus on power struggles and to admit the existence of discrepant colonial experiences and identities, and Richard Hingley’s (2003; 2005) sizing up of Globalisation theory as a framework (see also Pitts and Versluys 2015).

Jane Webster, who was among those who in the early 1990s introduced an alternative approach to cultural change in the Roman provinces based on a concept imported from
American colonial studies: Creolisation. The creation of a unique, hybridised culture from two or more sources — with ‘blended’ language, customs, and material culture — gives room to identify a much wider range of responses to Rome, including those from sectors of society, which have hitherto been invisible, such as the enslaved or servile communities. It provides a far more nuanced appreciation of the diversity of material culture expression within the Roman Empire, it allows us to move beyond simplistic dichotomies of ‘Roman’ and ‘indigenous’, and it contrasts radically with the elite-driven emulation Romanisation model. Furthermore, it has helped us to consider the indigenous contribution to material culture and the complexities of ‘creolised’ or ‘hybrid’ entities such as Romano-Celtic religion, approach which has been well received beyond English archaeology (e.g. Gallo-Roman temples in The Netherlands; Roymans and Derks 1994; Roynans 2004).

David Mattingly (1997) introduced the concept ‘discrepant identities’, developed form Edward Said’s (1992: 35-50) post-colonial analysis of imperial discourse as a ‘discrepant experience’. This model of interpretation combines elements from Webster’s approach to identity with J. Scott’s (1990: 1-16; 26) post-colonial ideas of ‘hidden transcripts’. It searches for difference in the use of material culture and then assesses whether they are attributed to different expressions of identity within society. Accepting ‘discrepant experience’ as a model of cultural experience means accepting the existence of a variety of reactions, positive or negative, to Rome, from resistance or non-conformity to compliance or participation without privileging one over the other.

Richard Hingley’s opposition to Romanisation as a valid model to explain the complexities of cultural change under Roman imperialism started in the late 1980s and early 1990s. His works in that early period of the post-colonial revolution (Hingley 1996; 2000; 2001; 2008) were focused on the study of the effects that the cultural and historical context had in the origin and development of prevalent discourses of imperialism. His more recent works (Hingley 2003; 2005) draw upon Globalisation theory, a theoretical framework that is growing rapidly (Witcher 2000; Narebout 2007; 2008; Hitchner 2008; Pitts and Versluys 2015), to analyse jointly an empire-wide elite-driven ‘Roman’ culture and a diversity of localised cultural experiences at lower social scales (Garner 2013, 8). The aim of this framework is to address issues of scale not solved by post-colonial theory, make the study of Roman imperialism more relevant to the current context in which we are producing new discourses (Hingley 2005, 117–20), and to reconcile both global and local identities have been produced recently (Pitts 2008; Hodos 2010; Gardner 2013, 6-9). Hingley (2015) has
recently explored and combined both avenues of post-colonial theory and globalisation theory.

Identity, while not a new theoretical approach in itself, is a general theme around which to structure and test many of these new theories and models in which the discipline is fragmented nowadays, a conceptual tool common to most contemporary studies on the topic (Gardner 2007; Pitts 2007; van Dommelen and Terrenato 2007; Revell 2009; Mattingly 2011). However, as Gardner (2013, 5) recently pointed out, none of the new theoretical frameworks allows us to fully explain the diversity of Roman imperialism, and issues such as agency and self-identity still need to be explored. New frameworks and approaches keep bringing new tools and conceptual buzzwords, e.g. ‘communities’, ‘networks’, ‘glocalisation’.

There are now voices who are requesting a similar process of self-deconstruction a scrutiny for what Miguel John Versluys (2014) denominated ‘PCRA’ — Post-colonial Roman Archaeologists. Precisely at the second TRAC ever held beyond English frontiers (Amsterdam 2009; Frankfurt 2012), Versluys and Michael Sommer organised a session with this aim in mind. I myself presented a paper at that session with the intention to look beyond post-colonial archaeologies and English-driven debates, and to draw attention to the fact that different national academic communities could experience and apply post-colonial frameworks in different ways, what I referred to as ‘post-colonial discrepant experiences’ (see Section 3.3). These suggestions, far from being novelties, are in line with the ‘de-colonisation’ of discourses already proposed by Greg Woolf (1997, 341) more than a decade earlier. The reaction against Romanisation as a model for cultural change has now softened among English archaeologists; while the focus has shifted towards different theoretical approaches leaving the old paradigm in the dark, some scholars are still willing to discuss with those who claim Romanisation may be a valid model for particular places and periods (Gardner 2013; Hingley 2014, 2; Versluys 2014).

While the above is an accurate account of the process that British archaeology underwent in the last two decades, it is probably safe to say that not all national academic communities have reacted equally. The dismissal of the concept of Romanisation is not shared by authors beyond British archaeology (e.g. de la Bédoyère 2007), and has continued to be used on a nuanced version in The Netherlands — ‘unique Romanisation’ (Roymans and Heeren 2004; see Section 6.5).
In The Netherlands, while much emphasis has been put on the research of the ancient peoples who inhabited the lower Rhine *limes* and their interaction with the Roman Empire, less attention has been paid to the theoretical frameworks that inform modern academic discourses on such topics. Yet Dutch archaeologists have engaged fully with the British post-colonial frameworks and debates. Examples of such an involvement could be seen in an increasingly strong presence of Dutch scholars at TRAC, early use of post-colonial and anthropological frameworks by Dutch scholars already in the early 1980s (Brandt and Slofstra 1983; Willems 1980), or full involvement of some of them in international debates regarding the nature of such post-colonial frameworks (e.g. Versluys 2014). However, there seems to be no reflection as to whether this framework fits the nature of their evidence, or the socio-cultural context in which their analysis is taking place, or at least there is no noticeable debate about it. This is not denying Dutch theoretical originality, or accusing them of theoretical emulation of imported post-colonial frameworks, but simply supports the need for the analysis and contextualization of current archaeological approaches to the topic of Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions in The Netherlands (Section 1.3), an academic community yet to undergo a deconstruction process on its own archaeological tradition. The analysis of their recent discourses (Chapters 6 and 7) may actually conclude that Dutch archaeologists have created their own path towards post-colonial frameworks, or even that they have not embraced it despite their engagement in international debates.

### 3.5. Historical Myths, National Identity and Archaeological Interpretations

*L'oubli et je dirai même l'erreur historique, sont un facteur essentiel de la formation d'une nation et c'est ainsi que le progrès des études historiques est souvent pour la nationalité un danger.* (Ernest Renan 1882)

Forgetfulness, and say the very historical mistake, is a major factor in the formation of a nation and thus the progress of historical studies is often a danger to nationality. (Ernest Renan 1882)

It is imperative to discuss first my understanding of some pivotal terms that will shape part of my analysis of the Dutch case (Chapter 4), namely ‘national identity’ and ‘historical myth’, as their relationship informs, and in many ways conditions, archaeological discourses produced about the past (Figure 3.3), not only in The Netherlands but in most western European nations and academic traditions.
According to Finan (2004) a nation is defined by a population sharing an ethnic history, cultural tradition, and language, and this population’s connection with a particular, definable geographic region. However, some of the classical features that define a nation are suffering a process of de-territorialisation as a consequence of transnational migration, i.e. Diasporas (Anthias 1998; Howard 2000, 376; 386). The traditional equation of nation with nation-state is endangered too. While some supranational processes such as the formation of the European Union try to move the emphasis away from the nation-states as the main identity marker, some other regions, politically and territorially part of nation-states, claim their right for self-determination, arguing that they do possess unique versions of the features that define a nation (history, culture and language); such are the cases of Catalonia, Basque Country, and, to a lesser extent, Galicia in Spain, or political efforts by the *Lega Nord* and *Lega Lombarda* in Northern Italy (Ruzza 1996; Howard 2000, 384).

Nations can also be described as ‘imagined communities’ — a social construction based on the illusion of a shared group identity by member of the community that will never really interact with each other (Anderson 1983, 6-7). Identity can be formally defined as the characteristics determining who a person is. This identity can be defined by two elements: Self-image and External image, i.e. how we see ourselves and how others see us. Personal
identities often depict both individuality and group affiliations, such as national identity (Howard 2000, 385-7).

Formally, if we combine these two elements (nation and identity), then ‘national identity’ should be defined as the characteristic features of a nation (e.g. language, traditions, culture, history and, within history, myth), accepted and shared by the majority of its people — defining the nation’s self-image — and formulated in opposition to other nations and their identities — defining the external or international image of the nation. Other aspects such as biological descent — i.e. genetic commonality — might also be included but are highly complex issues, with too many implications to be discussed here. While the features listed above are directly related to the evolution of national cultural identity, biological descent or racial commonness, despite having been used in the past for cultural exclusivity and nationalistic claims of racial uniqueness — e.g. Nazi Germany — are not, in the author’s opinion, of high relevance for the current discussion (Arnold 2006).

3.5.1. ‘Fatal Attraction’ in a Changing Context

Claims about a common past are more intensely used as political justification precisely on the eve of nationalism, as a conflict emanating from that oppositional element of national identity. Many surveys have been produced exploring the political role of archaeology as an intellectual bridge to the past in the context of nationalism (e.g. Kohl and Fawcet 1995; Diaz-Andreu and Champion 1996; Atkinson et al. 1996). The analysis of the effects of such a use (and misuse) is a consequence of the intellectual development of historical disciplines towards a more self-reflecting ethos. Deconstruction and critique of inherited frameworks have been common ground in history, and critique of nationalistic views of the past has become common ground in Europe (and worldwide) after the traumatic experience of the first half of the 20th century — reflected, of course, in numerous reviews of Kossinna and Nazi archaeology (Eickhoff 2003).

Together with nationalist approaches to the past, Trigger (1984) identified other ideological biases in Archaeology, i.e. colonialist and imperialist glorification of the past by European nations trying to find analogies in antiquity to justify and legitimise their political and ideological agendas. Perhaps one clear example of such a trend is the British imperial bias (Diaz-Andreu 2004) acknowledged and tackled by British archaeologists during the
Post-Processual deconstruction process undergone in the late 1980s and 1990s (see Section 3.4).

‘Historical myths’ that are already a key element of national identity are reinforced, twisted and consumed more intensely in this nationalistic context, entering a whole new dimension fuelled by their political use as justification. Historical myths,\textsuperscript{12} understood as being those founded (or unfounded) past deeds perceived by the collective memory as real history (Cruz and Frijhoff 2009, 1),\textsuperscript{13} are one of those features which relate to a common ancient ancestry of the greatest importance for the formulation and reaffirmation of national identity. These are closely related to Halbwachs’ (1980; 1992; 2004) concept of ‘memoire collective’.

However, this collective memory is not a natural process but in fact a very selective one, in which nations have an important input in formulating historical myths that reinforce cohesion and serve their political claims and agendas. Therefore, the relationship between myth and history is based on a complex dichotomy, in which we strive towards exposing the truth of the historical fact behind the artful fabrications of the myth.

Tracing the foundations and makings of a myth is a highly complicated process. Firstly, because myths thrive on the society that created them and thus, society finds recognisable features of itself in the myth, making it more familiar, attractive, and powerful. Powerful myths can convey multiple meanings and this flexible nature allows them to adapt and mutate as the needs of their audiences change (Cruz and Frijhoff 2009, 3, 6-7). Secondly, because myths, as well as identities, are not created, but built upon other myths, largely breaking free of their original historical anchors (Simon James, pers. comm.) and evolving dynamically with a changing historical, intellectual, and political context. Thus, deconstructing those myths in their changing historical context is the only thing that could reconcile myth and history, and the only way to understand all their meanings (Cloutier-Blazzard 2009, 88).

\textsuperscript{12} Understanding myth as a “traditional tale with secondary, partial reference to something of collective importance” (Burkert’s 1979: 23).

\textsuperscript{13} See also Frijhoff’s (2009: 117) definition: “Historical myth may be defined as a narrative, fictional by intention or by standards of historical scholarship, but expressing the perception of the past as meaningful history, meant to affirms one’s, […] the group’s or community’s sense of identity. […] Myths … are appropriated as real history”.

65
Lindsey Allason-Jones’s opening lecture at TRAC 2011 in Newcastle University provided a very appropriate example to illustrate the effects of a changing historical context on myths. She reflected on different artistic expressions of Queen Boudica’s myth, from very classical representations to modern fanciful reinterpretations, including the statue in central London (Figure 3.4). These varying and often contradictory representations of Boudica throughout time (see Hingley and Unwin 2005) respond to specific historical circumstances and context. Among the conclusions that Allason-Jones drew that day, she stated:

> Each generation had their own idea of what these women looked like, depending on what was happening politically and socially at the time… each generation brings its own attitudes to its studies. (Allason-Jones 2011)

For the purposes of this thesis I would sum up these ideas by saying that each generation produces its own interpretation of the past depending on their given political and social context, bringing their own attitudes to their reading of the collective past. That collective past — in the form of shared historical myths often based on ancient deeds difficult to prove (legends and stories) — affects the formulation of national identities. Inversely, national identities condition the way we describe historical myths and create new historical discourses. This bi-directional influence is also observable in the relationship between these two elements and academic discourses (Figure 3.5).

---

14 Note this is not from the published version in the TRAC 2012 proceedings; instead it is from the original version delivered at the conference — a paper to which she kindly gave me access.
Figure 3.5. “History became legend. Legend became myth” (J. R. R. Tolkien, *The Lord of the Rings*). Inspired by Tolkien’s words, and in relation to the interconnectedness already explored (Figure 3.3), this is a graphical representation of a linear and bidirectional process explaining the way in which these elements that are present in the formation of historical and archaeological discourses inform the formulation of each other. Historical episodes in the distant past became the source legends which feed myths. In later historical context, those myths become part of group identities, and those identities feed the historical and archaeological discourses (Source: Author).

3.6. Proto-national Identities (16th-18th Centuries)

National identity is necessarily linked to the idea of nation. Thus, we could generally situate its origins along those of the nation-states since the late 18th century, as is the most common convention among scholars (see Anderson 1983; Hobsbawm 1990; Geary 2003). However, the antiquity of the concept of the nation, and subsequently of national identity, has been the subject of much debate. While pre-World War movements of Perennialism and Primordialism argued for the antiquity of the nation, on occasion citing it as far back as antiquity or the Middle Ages, Modernism has argued for the nation as a modern construct, i.e. 19th century onwards. Post-war ethnosymbolists have argued for the modernity of nations but evolving from strong ethnical units from the earlier periods of history and stressing the importance of symbols, myths, values and traditions in the formation (Conversi 2006, 15-30).
While I agree that, semantically speaking, national identity could not predate the creation of nation-state, I would argue that the genesis of national identity or ‘proto-national’ identity can be traced at least from the 16th century in most European nations. Identities are not created, but formed and constructed. Therefore, there is no such thing as a moment of creation of national identity. Modernity creates such distinctions.

Furthermore, a common identity seems to be a logical pre-requisite for the creation or birth of a nation. In most cases, inhabitants of newly formed nations share some kind of common consciousness that binds them together culturally, historically, and linguistically. Exceptions would be territories ‘forced’ into a nation form by territorial reorganisation following large-scale conflicts in order to maintain political stability in the area — e.g. Belgium post-WWII. The political use of the figure of Ambiorix would be iconic in the process of creating a common historical ground. Ambiorix, leader of the Belgian tribe of the Eburones who revolted against the Romans in 54 BC and first mentioned in the classical sources by Caesar in his *Gallic Wars* (V.26-51; VI.29-43; VIII.24), was viewed as an ideal figure of resistance and pride in a newly founded nation (1830) requiring urgent historical legitimization. The use of literary genres, such as the historical novel, helped the myth created around this character to quickly root in the historical narrative (Bemong 2006a; 2006b; 2008). Furthermore, a statue of Ambiorix was erected in 1866 in the market square of Tongeren — the oldest city in Belgium, and home to a Gallo-Roman antiquities collection in display since 1854 —, and public spaces were named after him in the capital city (e.g. Ambiorixsquare, just between Rue des Patriotes and Rue des Eburons in central Brussels). These are yet another statement of public use of barbarian figures for public display of national identity (Figure 3.7; Section 3.7.2). Beyond this exceptional case, and following this principle, identity must then precede that birth-moment of the nation.

Literary, monumental, and artistic evidence suggests the presence of evolving forms of collective identity within large-scale political-territorial organisations that corresponds to what we would today term nationalism or patriotism since the 16th century. These predate 19th century nationhood. Poems and ‘Historiae’ such as *Anglica Historia* (1534) by Polidore Vergil, *The Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* (1577) by Ralph Holinshed or *Richard III* (1597) by Shakespeare, fall within a history genre devised to promote English national identity. Examples can be found not only in Britain, but also in The Netherlands. Thus Cornelis Aurelius (1509) explicitly recognized the Batavians as ancestors of the people of Holland in his *Defensorium Gloriae Batavae*, while Erasmus of Rotterdam published
Auris Batava (1508), in which he defended Batavian virtues. Lotte Jensen’s latest research project — Proud to be Dutch: The Role of War and Peace Propaganda Literature in the Shaping of an Early Modern Dutch National Identity (1648-1815) — and her interview, offer some very interesting remarks on literary representation of the Dutch nation already since the mid-17th century. All these examples of patriotic texts justify exploration of the idea of common proto-national sentiments predating the formation of nation-states in the 18th century. The common identity/consciousness or proto-national identity of a given territory with cultural coherence is the genesis of what will eventually be called national identity after the 19th century. As such, the argument could be reduced to a semantic issue.

3.7. Roman:‘Barbarian’ Dichotomy in European National Identities

While Western European culture has claimed, since the Renaissance, a common Roman heritage, the emergence of a significant number of national identities in this region are, at least partially, often linked to historical myths inspired by ‘barbarian’ characters and conflicting interactions with Rome (Figure 3.6). The importance of this Roman: ‘barbarian’ dichotomy in the creation of both ancient and modern identities is an aspect of great potential for discussion since its controversial nature is still to be satisfactorily explored.

Figure 3.6. Left, German stamp commemorating the 2000 anniversary of the Clades Variana, containing images of Arminius. Top right, a French imperial coin with Napoleon represented as Caesar, and bottom right the famous painting ‘Vercingetorix surrenders to Caesar’ by Lionel Noel Royer (1899), two very different approaches and iconographies of the French-Roman past (Source: Creative commons).
Within the context of such a dichotomy, I will outline here two elements of the greatest importance for the formulation of national identities in Europe, namely the presence of barbarian ancestors in national myths of origin, and the mutation of local ‘barbarian’ leaders into national heroes.

3.7.1. ‘Barbarian’ Ancestry in European Nations

In contrast with a wider European heritage based on Roman culture, many nation-states looked for historical myths to legitimize their ancestry and uniqueness, focusing on the figure of ‘barbarian’ peoples who inhabited their territories in the Roman era. “Nos ancêtres les Gaulois” (Dietler 1994) — a French nationalistic claim linking modern Frenchmen and women with the Gauls — is a very good example, as would be the noted early 20th century construct of Ambiorix in Belgium. I will argue in Chapter 4 that the Batavians play a similar role in The Netherlands as the keystone of the Dutch ancestry myths.

The ‘Batavian myth’, and origin myth based on the interaction between this native Dutch tribe and the Roman empire, is necessarily connected with its Roman counterpart. ‘Batavians’, like many other ethnic labels of Germanic cultural or tribal groups, could in fact be considered a Roman construct. The only surviving descriptions of the Batavians are Roman, and therefore it is a Roman projection that has been inherited and developed in our scholarly and literary tradition. Thus, the Batavian myth comprises not only Batavian but also Roman elements, evidencing the Roman:‘barbarian’ dichotomy on which it is based (Hessing 2001).

An interesting fact in this case is that Batavians are part of an ancestry myth that began in the 16th century, not just since the nationalistic movements came into operation in the 19th century; this can find parallels in Britain and Germany. The question that arises is whether the 16th century Netherlanders thought that the Batavians were literally their ancestors or just fore-runners, i.e. previous inhabitants of the same lands facing similar external threats. The same question could be applied to other nations and their ancestry myths, e.g. Celts in Ireland, Britons in England, Germanic tribes in Germany. It is unclear in my opinion, but it could definitely be argued that there was a conscious use of their name to label early modern Netherlanders (e.g. Erasmus’ use of the label in his writings or the use of the term Batavian to
name people from the province of Holland). Have the Dutch referred to the Batavians as forefathers (like the French have said “Nos ancêtres les Gaulois”) or simply pointed out that they were people living in the area before them? This question will be examined further in Chapter 4.

3.7.2. *From Barbarian Leaders to National Heroes*

The promotion of these ‘barbarian’ characters as forefathers and icons of nations can certainly be traced in historical works. Furthermore, artistic and monumental public displays mark the commemoration of mythical ‘barbarian’ heroes in very prominent locations (town/city squares, commemorative spaces, museums, and heritage related locations) and with a marked romanticized look all throughout Europe. These reflect nations’ attempts to appropriate figures from the past to justify their political legitimization with ancestry, in a period of growing nationalism, i.e. second half of the 19th century (see Figures 3.7 and 3.8).

Thus we can observe a double sphere of interaction between these myths and society: abstract, in the collective memory, and physical, in public spaces. Such are the cases of Vercingetorix in France (Amalvi 1988), Ambiorix in Belgium, Boudica in Britain (Hingley and Unwin 2005; Allason-Jones 2011), Arminius in Germany (van Londen 2012, 204), Viriatus in Spain/Portugal, Civilis in The Netherlands and Decebalus in Romania (Popa 2014).

It is the interaction with and antagonism to Rome — which was idealistically depicted in the 16th century as a powerful Empire — which makes them valuable tools for the formation of national identity, as it increases the positive impact of their deeds on the psyche of the nation. (González Sánchez 2012, 88)
Figure 3.7. Statues of barbarian leaders erected in public spaces in commemoration of their resistance to the Roman Empire. From top left to bottom right: Ambiorix in Tongeren, Civilis in Toegevoegd, Viriatus in Zamora (note the inscription ‘terror romanorum’), Vercingetorix in Alesia, Arminius near Teutoburg forest. Other examples would be Decebalus carved on a cliff face by the river Danube in Romania and the cited statue of Boudica in central London. It is interesting to note that, in the case of Viriatus, the leader of Iberian resistance, his figure is celebrated with statues in both Spain and Portugal (Photo sources: Wikimedia commons).
3.7.3. The Role of Common External Threats in National Identity Formation

In the exhibition catalogue *Mythen der Nationen*, Flacke (2001) argues that the formulation of national identities is directly linked to moments of victory and defeat, moments of crisis in opposition to foreign ‘others’. In her view, most Western European nations have origin myths based on ancient historical episodes of confrontation with the Romans — Arminius’ victory over the Romans in the Teutoburg forest in AD 9, Vercingetorix in Alesia in 52 BC, the Batavian revolt in AD 69, and the Numantian resistance in AD 133 —, and moments of peace as a result of military victory — e.g. the Peace of Munster (1648) or the Treaty of Versailles (1919) — as modern historical references (Figure 3.9).
This idea points towards foreign aggression as a factor of influence in the formulation of both ancient identities (the very idea of ‘barbarism’ is a Roman construct of otherness) and modern national identities. In the case of the Dutch territories, we can already appreciate in these very initial stages some kind of common identity or sense of belonging, triggered and promoted — just like in many other instances in other nations — by common opposition to an external enemy or threat (vs. Spain in the 16th century; vs. France in the early 19th century;
vs. Germany during WWII). On all those occasions they turn towards the values and features of their ancestry — almost exclusively the Batavians.

3.8. Conclusions

This chapter has outlined the wider pan-disciplinary theoretical frameworks in which Dutch archaeology (and that of other national communities) operates as a way of producing a comparative framework in which to analyse it. In that way, features identified in the Dutch case study can be related to wider trends, strengthening this thesis’ approach.

Furthermore, the evolution of theoretical approaches to Roman imperialism throughout the 20th century (and especially since the 1980s) reflects a two-fold influence: on the one hand, the influence of socio-political and intellectual context, and on the other hand, the influence of pan-disciplinary theoretical developments. The former is represented by the character of discourses about the nature of Roman imperialism and Roman:‘barbarian’ cultural interaction in terms of colonial/post-colonial approaches: from a concept and model of Romanisation originated in Mommsen’s historical works and characterised by a very nationalistic conception of the past and a positivist approach to the study of imperialism and colonialism in the Roman past, to late 20th century application of post-colonial theories, the rejection of Romanisation as a biased concept, and the generation of multiple new approaches (cultural identity, discrepant experiences, hybridity, creolisation, etc.) well into the 21st century. The processes of adaptation of imported models used to study the local pasts need to be explored too in order to avoid uncritical acceptance of models based on foreign backgrounds that often have very little in common with local conditions. Thus, original models are expected to be found in The Netherlands.

Finally, most of the ideas discussed in the final section of this chapter in relation to the formulation of national identities and historical myths will be explored in detail for the Dutch context in Chapter 4: the evidence for proto-national identities and the role of external threats in such processes; the importance of historical myths in the formulation of national identities; their dual Roman:‘barbarian’ nature; and how these evolve to meet the needs of different audiences in different historical contexts. This fulfils the analysis of a very important aspect at the national sphere of influence: namely inherited frameworks and discourses.
Chapter 4. Deconstructing Dutch ‘Myths’ and National ‘Memories’ on Roman:‘Barbarian’ Interaction

4.1. Introduction

Drawing on the already explored relationship between historical myths and the formulation of national identities, this chapter assesses the degree to which inherited historical discourses and national/regional concepts of ancestry and identity are important intellectual factors for the development of modern post-war academic discourses around episodes of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in The Netherlands.

The chapter will look at the Dutch context and its specific historical background, following a thread from Roman literary sources regarding the interaction between ‘native’ or ‘barbarian’ groups and the Romans in the lower Rhine area, their early-modern reception and the myths of ancestry created around these ‘native’ groups and their central figures as forefathers of the Dutch nation. An analysis of the impact of these myths in the creation of both national identity and long-lasting archaeological discourse will follow (Figure 4.1).

Although the other tribes that inhabited the area in Roman times (Frisians and Cananefates) will be taken into account, the main analysis will revolve around the Batavians for multiple reasons: among those ancient tribes this is the one for which more classical references have survived; probably as a result of this, it has received the most attention in
modern Dutch archaeology too; they play a central role in Dutch ancestry myths and national identity, but they also have their weight in regional identity issues. Thus, their analysis gives us insights into both the regional and national spheres of influence in the multi-scalar structure already described in Chapter 2.

4.2. Lower Rhine Tribes: Classical Discourse and the Batavian Primacy

Firstly, we need to identify the main actors in these interactions, i.e. who were the groups established here across 50 BC-AD 250? This section will not provide a detailed account of what modern scholars think about these societies and the processes of interaction (see Chapter 6 for that discussion), but rather provides a brief description of what Roman classical sources in our study area — chiefly Tacitus — tell us about these people.

Figure 4.2. Groups inhabiting the modern area of The Netherlands by the 2nd century AD and the theoretical extension of their territory/civitas according to the ‘Thiessen polygons’ system of spatial distribution around a focal point (Source: Willems 1986, 292). The box marks the area around the capital of the Batavian territory — modern Nijmegen.
Following Willems’ (1986, 292) application of ‘Thiessen polygons’ to the map of the lower Rhine in Roman times we can observe that there were three tribes whose full territory is thought to have lain within modern Dutch territory: Frisii, Batavi, and Cananefates (Figure 4.2). A survey of contemporary sources about these three tribes already points towards the primacy of the Batavians in the Roman discourse about their ‘barbarian’ counterparts in the area. Other groups, such as Belgae or Gauls, who also fit those parameters, will not be analysed here because they have been used by other nations to support their national claims of ancestry. Furthermore, groups such as Saxons or Franks, who also left their footprint on these territories in later periods, will not be examined as they fall beyond the chronological boundaries of the project. However, each will be mentioned as they played an important role in the development of national ideas of commonness in The Netherlands.

4.2.1. Batavians

The Batavians are one of the better recorded tribal groups for this region in ancient sources. While Tacitus (AD 56-117) is the main literary source for the Batavians and their deeds, other authors contribute to a picture of these people relating to three main aspects: their physical attributes and skills, their alliance with the Romans, and the Batavian revolt in AD 69-70 (Brunt 1990, 33; Table 4.1). These representations remain basically unaltered, both in ancient sources and modern literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st c. BC</th>
<th>1st c. AD</th>
<th>2nd c. AD</th>
<th>3rd c. AD</th>
<th>4th c. AD</th>
<th>5th c. AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Josephus</td>
<td>Tacitus</td>
<td>Dio</td>
<td>Vegetius</td>
<td>Zosimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacitus</td>
<td>Dio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First mentioned by Caesar (BG IV.10) in 55 BC, the Batavians were a ‘break-out’ group from the German Chatti; their physical description matches those of other Germanic groups: tall and large (Tacitus, Hist. IV.14; V.18), with blonde or red hair (Martial, Epig. 14.176). They emigrated and established themselves in a territory between the rivers Waal, Meuse and Rhine, known as the insula Batavorum by the 1st century AD (Pliny IV.15; 29; 101; Tacitus, Hist. IV.12; V.23; Annals II.6). The actual location of the Batavian homeland is
not very clear from the sources, and this provoked a very lively argument in the 16th century between provinces seeking to claim the Batavians as their own (see Section 4.3.1). This controversy remained unresolved until archaeology provided firmer evidence (Bogaers 1972, 328; Willems 1983, 108; 1986a, 291).

According to Tacitus (*Germania* XXIX.1), the Batavians were allowed to settle in this area after negotiating an agreement with the Romans under which they did not pay taxes in exchange for their allegiance and the provision of men for war. This was a deal seemingly profitable for both parties; the Romans in fact viewed them as the bravest of all nations (*Hist.* II.28) and praised them for their war-like spirit and battling abilities:

Agricola ordered four battalions of Batavi and two of Tungri to bring things to the sword's point and to hand-to-hand fighting; ... when the Batavi began to exchange blows hand to hand, to strike with the bosses of their shields, to stab in the face, and, after cutting down the enemy on the level, to push their line uphill, the other battalions, exerting themselves to emulate their charge, proceeded to slaughter the nearest enemies (Tacitus, *Agricola* XXXVI. 1-2).

Several passages by Tacitus (*Agricola* XVIII.4; *Hist.* IV.12; *Annals* II.8; *Annals* XIV.1) and Cassius Dio (*Hist. Rom.* LX.20; LXIX.9.6) describe specifically their ability to cross rivers while mounted and fully armoured, helping other infantry soldiers to cross:

They had also at home a select body of cavalry, who practised with special devotion the art of swimming, so that they could stem the stream of the Rhine with their arms and horses, without breaking the order of their squadrons (Tacitus, *Hist.* IV.12).

Plautius, however, sent across some Celts who were practised in swimming with ease fully armed across even the fastest of rivers. These fell unexpectedly on the enemy, ... (*Cassius Dio, Hist. Rom.* LX.20).

However, the terms of this agreement or treaty signed at some point in the second half of the first century BC (Swinkels and Roeloffs 2004, 13) were not all observed by the Romans (e.g. excessive levying). This imbalance of power is argued to have been one of the reasons why, along with the general episode of unrest in the AD 60s (especially in Britain and the Rhine *limes*), they eventually rebelled against the Romans in what has been called the Batavian revolt in AD 69-70 (*Historiae* II; IV; V; *Agricola* XVIII.4; *Germania* XXIX.1;
Annals II.6; 8; 11-12). Despite being defeated, the Batavians apparently retained all the privileges derived from their special relationship with Rome through a new treaty signed at the end of the campaign — AD 70 (Tacitus, Germania, XXIX.2). As I will detail later on this chapter (Section 4.3.1), most of these aspects mentioned by Tacitus played a significant role during the 16th century humanist revival of the Batavians.

Other important aspects of what classical sources tell us about the Batavians need to be summarised, especially their movement out of the lower Rhine as Roman auxiliary troops in Britain and the Danube, and as elite guards to the Emperor in Rome. The elite imperial bodyguards, Equites Singularis Augusti, were a mounted unit mostly composed of Batavians, and for this reason they were also referred to as the ‘Batavian cavalry guard’ (Speidel 1984). Because of this, parallels have been drawn between this tribe and ethnic military units in modern imperial armies, such as the Gurkhas fighting for the British army (van Driel-Murray 2002; Simon James, pers. comm.).

These episodes spread the interest on the Batavians beyond the borders of Dutch scholarship. British interest in Batavian links also back to Tacitus:

They had had a long training in the German wars, and they had gained further renown in Britain, to which country their cohorts had been transferred, commanded, according to ancient custom, by the noblest men in the nation (Tacitus, Hist. IV.12).

A. Birley (1979, 90) points out that from AD 43 there were up to eight Batavian cohorts (Cohors I-VIII Batavorum equitata quingenaria) fighting as auxiliaries in Roman Britain up until Nero decided to withdraw them back to the Rhine limes in AD 60, and at least four new Batavian units were fighting for Agricola in Britain (and elsewhere, at Dacia and Raetia) after the Rhineland revolt in AD 69 was subdued (Hassall 1970) — these units were mostly stationed at Carrawburgh and Vindolanda on Hadrian’s Wall, during the first two centuries AD. Since literary evidence is scarce (Tacitus, Agricola XXXVI.1-2; Tacitus, Annals XIV.1; Cassius Dio, Hist. Rom. LX.20), so epigraphic evidence (diplomas, altars, tombstones, and tablets) becomes important testimony:

- Cohors I Batavorum stationed at Carrawburgh: CIL VII.1195; CIL XVI.69; 70 (RIB 2401.6); 82 (RIB 2401.8); RMD 184; RIB 1534 (58); 1535; 1536; 1544; 1545;
Batavian troops were deployed to the Danube region after AD 69 (Zosim. 3.35; Speidel 1991). This could lead to questions of how this lower Rhine tribe affected the formulation of modern identities and discourses in other nations such as Hungary through their military presence (van Lieburg 2004). The presence of Batavians in Roman campaigns in Britain and elsewhere is attested well into the 4th century — e.g. reference to Batavii sent to Britain with Lupicinus in AD 360 (Ammianus XX.1.2); to numerus Batavorum brought to Britain by Theodosius in AD 367 (Ammianus XXVII.8.7); to Batavi seniores and iuniores as auxilia palatina in the Notitia Dignitatum. The heavy levying of troops among Batavian populations in the lower Rhine is also argued as one of the reasons for the Batavian revolt of AD 69. Furthermore, it is also argued that returning veterans to the lower Rhine area from other parts of the empire after 25 years of service brought with them Roman literacy, as evident from seal boxes found in the area (Derks and Roymans 2002). This has been argued as a type of Romanisation of the lower Rhine as these Batavian soldiers underwent a deep process of acculturation while in service. As I will analyse in Section 4.3, this focus on Batavians in the ancient sources will be traceable also in the early modern Dutch literature and that of the subsequent centuries.

4.2.2. Cananefates

Batavians, Cananefates and Frisians are mentioned together by Tacitus on only one occasion (Hist. IV. 16), as the instigators of the AD 69 revolt. Little is specifically known about the Cananefates, since only two ancient sources referred to them. According to Tacitus (Hist. IV.15), they “... inhabit part of the island, and closely resemble the Batavians in their origin, language, and their courageous character, but are inferior in numbers”. Velleius Paterculus tells us in his History that Tiberius subdued the Cananefates in the reign of Augustus (II.105.1). As with the Batavians, this tribe perhaps was part of the Chatti. Since Tacitus locates the Batavians in the eastern part of an island in the Rhine Delta (the ‘Batavian
island’), it has been assumed that the Cananefates occupied the western part, in the fertile soils between the Rhine and the Meuse, in the Dutch province of Zuid-Holland.

An early settlement can be traced archaeologically from the first half of the 1st century AD in the western part of the Rhine basin, near modern Voorburg. After the Batavian revolt this settlement grew and became the capital of the civitas Cananefatum. Around AD 120 the capital’s name was changed to Forum Hadriani, after Hadrian’s visit to the area. Sometime before AD 162 it was made a municipium, probably by Marcus Aurelius. The settlement was abandoned around AD 260-270, probably due to flooding.

As mentioned above, the Cananefates were also an integral part of the Batavian Revolt. Tacitus here relates the story of their leader Brinno and his attack on the Roman camps to the Batavians call for local allies to take joint action:

There was among the Cananefates a man of brute courage named Brinno, who was of illustrious descent; his father had dared to commit many hostile acts and had shown his scorn for Gaius’ absurd expeditions without suffering for it. The very name of his rebellious family therefore made Brinno a favorite; and in accordance with their tribal custom the Batavians set him on a shield and, lifting him on their shoulders, chose him as their leader. He at once called in the Frisians, a tribe living across the Rhine, and assailed by sea the winter camp of two cohorts which were nearest to attack. (Hist. IV.15)

Before and after the revolt the Cananefates served as mounted auxiliary units in the Roman army, along the Danube (Carnuntum) and in Numidia. Because modern national discourse and scholarship is more heavily focused on the Batavians, the historical discourse around the Cananefates reinforces their secondary role in the Batavian revolt of AD 69. Nevertheless, the Cananefates have received attention as a group in their own right at least since the 19th century. While excavations of the capital started in the 1830s (by Reuvens), Holwerda (1923) and Byvanck (1935) produced the main works on these people until Bogaers published Civitas en stad van de Bataven en Canninefaten in 1961. More recent works include Toorians (2006), de Jonge et al. (2006), and van Londen’s doctoral thesis (2006). These give greater context to these marginal ‘barbarian’ groups in the lower Rhine region.
4.2.3. Frisians

While the Cananefates receive limited attention in the classical sources (strangely, since their role in the Batavian revolt is important and sources describe them sharing origin and ethnic features with the Batavians), the Frisians are also well attested to by Tacitus for their own revolt in AD 28. Much like the Batavian one, the Frisian revolt grew out of dissatisfaction with Roman treatment of their people and abuse of Frisian lands and high taxes:

That same year [AD 28] the Frisians, a nation beyond the Rhine, cast off peace, more because of our rapacity than from their impatience of subjection. [...] First it was their herds, next their lands, last, the persons of their wives and children, which they gave up to bondage. Then came angry remonstrances, and when they received no relief, they sought a remedy in war. The soldiers appointed to collect the tribute were seized and gibbeted. (Tacitus, Annals 4.72)

Tacitus’ Annals chronicle nearly as much, if not more, of this revolt as the Batavian revolt. And unlike the Batavian revolt, the Frisians were successful in their war against the Romans and there is no reason to think they were subject to the same oppressive terms that brought them up in arms: “The Frisian name thus became famous in Germany, and [the emperor] Tiberius kept our losses a secret…” (Tacitus, Annals 4.74). It is interesting to note that although this revolt is earlier than the one led by the Batavians in AD 69, the Frisians were not chosen as exemplary basis of Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions for Dutch national myths in later historical periods.

The situation seems to have normalised at least for a short period. The Tolsum writing tablet (see Section 4.3.6), dates to the winter of AD 29 and is likely a receipt or a loan note given to a local farmer by two Roman centurions after buying an ox (Hugh 2013, 69). But within two decades of this peace a second revolt took place in AD 47 which included the Chauci people, this time led by a Cananefate named Gannascus. This revolt was put down within months by the Roman military commander Corbulo, who established a garrison in their territory:

So, the Frisian clan, hostile or disaffected since the rebellion inaugurated by the defeat of Lucius Apolonius, gave hostages and settled in the reservation marked out by Corbulo: who also imposed on them a senate, a magistracy, and laws. To guard against neglect of his orders, he built a fortified post in the district, while despatching agents to persuade the Greater Chauci to surrender, and to attempt the life of Gannascus by ruse. (Tacitus, Annals, IX.19)
Later in the *Annals* (XIII.54), Tacitus describes an episode in which the Frisians are asked to leave the new areas which they had settled along the bank of the Rhine by the local Roman garrison and upon their refusal were killed under the orders of Emperor Nero. It should be clear by now that the lower Rhine region was unstable at least up to the time of the Batavian Revolt. The fluctuations in the Roman relationship with these barbarian groups (from peace to revolt and back again) described by these classical sources would feature heavily as a source of political justification in the new national myths created by 16th century elites in the lower countries who reinterpreted different versions of their ancestry during their struggle as a rising nation (Section 4.3).

These ancient Frisians would later disappear, in line with the general processes of de-population in the area of the lower Rhine (Heeren 2015). However, another group under the name Frisians is attested to in the Early Middle Ages, long after the Batavians had disappeared from our records. Despite the fact that the ethnical and cultural continuity between the ancient and early medieval Frisians is heavily debated (Bazelmans 2009), the use of this same name by these groups across centuries reinforces the regional identity in this area of northern Netherlands, which persists even today in the name of the Frisian province. Because of this medieval connection most of our surviving sources about the Frisians come from the Middle Ages rather than the Classical era, and the modern identity is largely based on this second, medieval group.

### 4.3. The Tribal Ancestry Myths: Reception, Historical Myth and National Identity

A discussion of some of the past historical concepts concerning the Batavians in The Netherlands might therefore help to clarify the present position of Dutch archaeologist in the academic debate... (Hessing 2001, 127).

As I will demonstrate in Sections 4.4 and 7.2, Dutch archaeological discourses about Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in the lower Rhine are strongly articulated around the Batavians. Because of this primacy, the historical analysis that follows will focus on the reception of tribal ancestry myths and the formulation of national myths around this tribe.

The Batavian revolt (AD 69-70) was an episode of violent Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction at the northern borders of the Empire, in which the tribes of the *Batavii* and the
Cananefates challenged Roman rule in the area. In 1568, the rebellion of the Dutch Provinces against Spain began the Eighty Years’ War, which would eventually put an end to Habsburg rule over their territory. These two events, exactly fifteen centuries apart, have much more in common than their geographical location: the birth of the ‘Batavian myth’.

The link between those two episodes is the ‘Batavian myth’, a 16th century appropriation of the events accounted by Tacitus (Section 4.2.1). The term ‘Batavian myth’, coined by Schöffer (1975), refers to the Batavian tribe being depicted since the 16th century, and throughout the following centuries, as forefathers of the Dutch nation and its people, playing a central role in the formulation of Dutch national identity.

This section does not intend to be yet another descriptive history of the ‘Batavian myth’ (van Groesen 2007; Swinkels and Roeloff 2004). Instead, the aim is to critically analyse the social and political background of its origins, the cultural mechanisms which embedded it in Dutch national identity, and how its uses and discourses were adapted over the course of five centuries of changing historical circumstances in The Netherlands. Thus, I will deconstruct the Batavian myth and construct an historical narrative of national identity formation around it, observing how it pervades not just intellectual circles and scholarship but also Dutch society as a whole.

In Chapter 3 we saw the importance of historical myths and how they are flexible and adaptable. We have also seen how the connection between myth and national identity materializes through different channels aimed at different audiences. Identity, just as myths, only becomes national when it is accepted and assumed by a vast majority of the population. Only then does it become part of the collective memory. Archaeology and history play a central role in the formulation of myths, but these took root in Dutch society before archaeology existed as an academic discipline.

Therefore, the rise, evolution and adaptation of the Batavian myth as a national myth of ancestry need a multilayered analytical approach in which the role of other diverse factors (such as poetry, drama, paintings, music, education, socio-political evolution), as channels that spread historical myths from intellectual elites to all layers of society, are also acknowledged. Against the conceptual background outlined above and analysed in Chapter 3, the following analysis will address the many lives of the Batavian myth throughout five centuries of changing historical context.
4.3.1. Tacitus’ Batavians and the Humanist Exegesis (16th century)

As a result of the rediscovery of Roman texts during the Renaissance, some European territories — ones that would eventually become nations — started to seek their primal forefathers among the ‘tribes’ that, to a greater or lesser degree, had interacted with Rome. Tacitus’ narrative would play a huge role on this process of appropriation of the past during the 16th century. The patriotic readings of his works, especially the Germania, fueled these claims all over Northern Europe (see Leira 2008, 673; Renes 2007, 9).

Within this context, the genesis of the Dutch ‘Batavian myth’ is to be found in the rediscovery of Tacitus’ work by Dutch humanists in the late 15th and early 16th century. The first edition of Tacitus’s text was printed in Italy in 1470. By the end of the 15th century the text began to circulate in Northern Europe. Dutch humanists came to access it during the first decade of the 16th century in Italy (Hessing 2001, 131).

As seen above, Tacitus’ account of the Batavians, collected mostly in his Histories and Germania, provides a twofold description of them and their interaction with the Romans: on the one hand, he praises their unique features — brave, warlike people, lovers of liberty (Tacitus, Annals II, 6; 8;11; Agricola XVIII, 4) — and highlights their special relationship with the Roman Empire — allies and friends, exempt from taxes and reserved for war as auxiliary troops (Tacitus, Historiae IV, 12; Germania XXIX, 1).

Of all these people, the most famed for valour are the Batavi; [...] removed to their present settlements, in order to become a part of the Roman Empire. They still retain this honour, together with a memorial of their ancient alliance; for they are neither insulted by taxes, nor oppressed by farmers of the revenue. Exempt from fiscal burdens and extraordinary contributions, and kept apart for military use alone, they are reserved, like a magazine of arms, for the purposes of war (Tacitus, Germania XXIX.1).

Not weakened by the power of Rome or by alliance with a people stronger than themselves, they furnished to the empire nothing but men and arms (Tacitus, Historiae IV.12).

We are being depraved of the help of the bravest men, those troops victorious in so many campaigns (Tacitus, Historiae II.27).

On the other hand, Tacitus pays much attention to a more confrontational side of their
interaction, the Batavian revolt of AD 69 under Julius Civilis’ leadership, against an oppressive Roman Empire that did not respect the terms of their ancient treaty and heavily levied troops among their population (Roymans 2004; Nicolay 2007, 247;Tacitus, *Historiae* IV.14; 17; V.17)

... ‘we are no longer treated’ he [Civilis] said, ‘as we used to be, like allies, but like menials and slaves’. (Tacitus, *Historiae* IV.14)

...the Roman power had been expelled from the island of the Batavian. (Tacitus, *Historiae* IV.17)

He [Civilis] told the Germans and Batavians that they were standing on the monuments of their glory, that they were treading under foot the ashes and bones of legions. (Tacitus, *Historiae* V.17)

Both sides of Tacitus’ accounts are identifiable in the formulation of the early modern myth concerning the Batavian ‘forefathers’ of the Dutch in the 16th century. The mainstream interpretation of the myth is based on these first stages. However, the myth has traditionally been regarded by Dutch scholars (and society) as unique and unchanging. Interestingly, as will be discussed below, a closer analysis and deconstruction of this myth reveals the many different faces it had.

It is clear, as expressed by many authors (Beyen 2000b, 494; Hessing 2001, 132; Blanc 2009, 244; Leira 2008, 674; Renes 2007, 9; de Vos 2009, 121), that the Batavian myth is mostly based on the parallels drawn by 16th century Dutch humanists between their historical context — the Dutch revolt against the Spanish Habsburg rule in the second half of the 16th century — and the one Tacitus described for the Batavians in their struggle against the Roman Empire. As mentioned earlier, the question that arises is whether the 16th century Netherlanders thought that the Batavians were literally their ancestors or just predecessors. What caused such parallels to be seen by these Dutchmen in the 16th century?

However, its emergence cannot be explained exclusively on that basis and other factors need to be acknowledged. Firstly, the conditions before the rediscovery of Tacitus could explain its impact (Hessing 2001, 128), i.e. no perception of a Roman past of the area, no visible remains, oral traditions or accurate historical account bridging the gap between Roman times and subsequent periods. The publishing of his rediscovered texts was virtually the first mention of the Batavians in centuries. Secondly, Dutch humanists were eager to find their own link with an idealised and admired Roman civilization (Hessing 2001, 131). This is
actually not a process exclusive to modern societies, but one that can be seen also in antiquity — the Romans of course looked for an illustrious legendary past, claiming a Trojan origin (Virgil, *Aeneid* I, 1-7). Finally, the role of the *Iter Italicum* (Shackelford 2005), a diaspora of Dutch students in Italian universities looking for an education that would inevitably impact upon the humanist development of Dutch culture, needs to be considered. Those students were among the first Dutch people to become familiar with Roman classical sources about Batavians and on their return they laid the foundations for the Batavian myth, and for the proto-national identity of their homeland.

For example, Cornelis Aurelius (1509) recognized the Batavians as ancestors of the people of Holland in his *Defensorium Gloriarum Batavinae*; he also asserted that the island of the Batavians (Tacitus’ Batavian capital) was in Holland — a claim opening a huge regional controversy around this issue during the early 16th century (see Wesseling 1993, 75-77).

Almost simultaneously, Erasmus of Rotterdam (1508) published *Auris Batava*, in which he defends Batavian virtues in response to Martial’s negative view of ‘his’ people (Wesseling 1993, 68). Martial’s (*Epigram*, VI, 82, 6) implicit association between Batavians and cultural barbarism was extended among Italians and Spaniards in the early modern era as a mean of abuse and reflected on pejorative uses of their name: *O Crassum ingenium! Suspicor fuisse Batauum* — “Blockhead! Batavian, I presume?” — (*The Colloquies of Erasmus: the Shipwreck*). Furthermore, it informs about the already common practice of labelling Dutch students as ‘Batavians’, irrespective of their province of origin, which implies an incipient common external image. Tacitus’ more positive description of the Batavian attributes was used by Erasmus to defend their name (Wesseling 1993: 68). This has more to do with the connection between the Batavians, depicted as brave, war-like and Roman allies — the first aspect of Tacitus’ account emphasized at this early stage of the creation of the Batavian myth —, and the peoples of Holland, an aspect stressed by Erasmus.

However, his positive view of the Batavians and his own homeland (Holland) is not a constant. In fact, it can be considered an exception and a ‘marketing tool’ (Wesseling 1993, 73). Despite calling himself *Homo Batavus* he associates the tribe and its modern counterpart with cultural barbarism, especially when put in contrast with the cultural merits of the Italians, both ancient and modern. Paradoxically, the most universal of Dutch humanists reflects a lack of clear ancestry in his letters to Petrius Manus, and not even seeming to put much value on his homeland in the Dutch provinces at this stage: “whether I am a Batavian is
not yet clear to me; that I am a Hollander I cannot deny, born in a district which… is on the boundary between the two [France and Germany]” (Erasmus 1520, 45-50; quoted in Bietenholz 1988, 1146; Wesseling 1993, 75).

4.3.2. The Birth of the Batavian Myth and Proto-National Identity

Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor (1519-1556), had, among his many territorial possessions, seventeen provinces in the early modern Dutch territory. In the summer of 1549, as part of a very well calculated operation, Charles V introduced his Dutch subjects to his heir, Prince Philip, through a trip to the main towns of their Dutch possessions that would soon have to swear obedience to him as Philip II of Spain. Jac Geurts (2009, 55) states that the Dutch provinces considered Philip nothing like his father, as he was seen as a foreign ruler, brought up in Spain, in opposition to his father’s ‘local’ origin and education. Curiously, Charles V had the same problem when he arrived in his Hispanic territories and was considered nothing but a ‘Dutch’ foreigner (Colmeiro 1884, XXIV).

Figure 4.3. Roma and Batavia, by Antonio Tempesta (1612), in the series The War of the Romans against the Batavians (Source: Los Angeles County Museum of Art).
Each major city or town prepared welcome festivities (*Blijde Inkomste* or *Joyeuse Entree*) and decorated their main streets and buildings deliberately using images and myths extracted from classical antiquity and the history of the Low Countries in an attempt to establish a dialogue full of symbolism between the Spanish/Habsburg rulers — depicted as Roman Emperors — and their subjects (Geurts 2009, 63). This could be interpreted as a use of the aspects of Tacitus’ accounts related to the ‘old treaty’ honoured by Romans and Batavians (Figure 4.3).

Overall, he was welcomed, although the provinces of Groningen and Friesland, and the city of Maastricht, showed little sympathy for the future ruler. In this respect, it is important to note that the north-eastern provinces of Groningen, Friesland, Overijssel and Gelderland were the last territories to be annexed by Charles V to his Dutch possessions (1536-1543). Thus, their feeling of belonging to a common structure was not that strong, rendering them less prepared for Philip’s ‘intrusion’.

However, a spread of this negative attitude towards the foreign interference represented by Philip could be observed in Antwerp at Charles V’s death in 1556. Heroes of the Roman Republic and not Roman emperors were used as decorations for his memorials and the inscription SPQA (*Senatus Populusque Antuerpiae*) decorated the newly built town hall. This city, which during Philip’s first visit had emphasized his role as the “restorer of the Roman Empire” (Geurts 2009, 70; 84), was at this point expressing a very different discourse. This is a very convenient frame for the later evolution of the Batavian myth, based on analogies between the uprising of the Batavians against the Romans and the uprising of the Dutch provinces against the Hispanic ruler.

It is worth observing that Antwerp was then one of the most important cities in northern Europe where business and banking flourished during the first half of the 16th century, earning the Spanish crown a huge amount of income from taxes. In a territory with strong regional identities, the rule of Philip II initiated a process of centralization over the 17 Dutch provinces under the Hispanic crown. Philip was often described as a ruler who did not respect the ancient ideals of independence of these territories (Hessing 2001, 132). This was seed of discontent among the elites and a major political cause for Dutch rebellion, triggering the first manifestations of a ‘proto-national identity’ against a foreign oppressor (Cruz 2009, 160; Cruz and Frijhoff 2009, 12) — what Kossmann (1978, 155) called ‘national culture’. Thus, it was once again a change in the historical scenario/context that brought a new development in
the myth, towards an emphasis of a second feature of the Batavians, their rebellious attitude.

Once more, Tacitus served as a reference, although this time a new aspect of his account on the Batavians was emphasized: The Batavian Revolt against an oppressing Roman Empire that did not respect the terms of their ancient treaty. Parallels and analogies were conveniently and rapidly drawn between Tacitus’ idealized description of the Batavians fighting the Romans and their modern counterparts: The Dutch and the Spaniards; Civilis and the Roman emperor; William de Orange and Philip (Hessing 2001, 155). The 16th-century historical context witnessed and also influenced the birth of the “Orangist myth”, according to which the Nassau-Orange family were the heirs of the Batavian tradition and therefore entitled to manage the destiny of the Dutch people (Levillain 2005; Stern 2009; Geevers 2011). It was based on the political use of Tacitus and the Batavian myth by the Nassau-Orange family and their supporters to reinforce their position as Stadtholders. Its central figure would be William I of Orange, Stadtholder during the revolt against the Hispanic Empire, and considered at the time the true descendant of Julius Civilis, leader of the Batavian revolt (Hessing 2001, 135).

A striking, underlying fact arises: Tacitus reported on 200 years of positive and peaceful Batavian interaction with the Romans, and so did reflect the early phases of the myth. So, why did an 18-month conflict between Batavians and Romans receive so much emphasis in later developments of the myth? The answer lies once more in the historical context.

Regionalism was the main feature of this historical period in the Dutch territories and did not encourage the formation of a national sentiment. Households and cities were the main features defining identity at a much localized level (e.g. Erasmus “of Rotterdam”). Thus, the Dutch aristocratic elite needed, on the one hand, a unifying myth against the Spanish enemy that allowed them to transform that deep regionalism of their territories into a unified separatist effort and, on the other hand, historical legitimization of their struggle against Philip II. This struggle was then considered the perfect example of their supposed Batavian forefathers’ attitude to foreign occupation, ostensibly highlighting the most venerable aspects of Dutch character and the worst of Roman attitude, drawing clear parallels with their contemporary struggle against the Spaniards (Figure 4.4), and aiding the development of the already mentioned proto-national sentiment, based on the union of efforts against a common enemy, the Spanish oppressor (Dunkelgrün 2009, 230).
In sum, in its initial stages, the ‘Batavian myth’ was influenced and informed by Tacitus’ account of the Batavian tribe. However, once Tacitus’ account is interpreted within the specific 16\textsuperscript{th} century historical context of the Dutch revolt against the Spaniards, and once the myth had taken form around an idealized image of the Batavians as forefathers characterized by their rebellious spirit, every further modification or adaptation relied on that 16\textsuperscript{th} century form of the myth, not on Tacitus’ original accounts. It is the early-modern myth that inspires further interpretations, not the classical source. It is actually the Dutch revolt that became the original myth of the newly founded republic, not the classical accounts of Batavians.

In this context of multiple interpretations Cruz and Frijhoff’s (2009, 14) words — “…myths built upon myths upon myths” — gain a new dimension. Different interpretations of the myth were linked to different historical contexts, affecting many fields of Dutch life (Hessing 2001, 131). However, I would question whether the process was not the reverse, where it was actually the context that influenced the development of the myth. As seen, the context, and not the facts as told by Tacitus, led to the birth of the myth and all of its
variations. From that point onwards, the myth largely breaks free of historical anchors and develops independently.

4.3.3. **Golden Age and ‘Regional Nationalism’ (17th-18th centuries)**

The Dutch nation represents essentially an expansion of the province of Holland (Kossmann 1978, 156).

For centuries to come Humanism, as developed in Holland and at the University of Leiden, was to be the tissue of Dutch national existence (Kossmann 1978, 165-167).

Following the collapse of Habsburg rule in the northern Dutch territories, seven provinces (Holland, Zeeland, Groningen, Friesland, Utrecht, Overijssel and Gelderland) won independence from the Spanish crown in 1581 and founded a new polity: the Republic of the Dutch United Provinces — also named the ‘Republic of the Seven United Netherlands’ or ‘Northern Provinces’, in opposition to the ‘Southern Provinces’ or ‘Spanish Netherlands’ (present-day Belgium and France) which remained under Hispanic rule.

The lack of historic precedents for this polity and the uncertainty caused by the new political developments were the conditions that favoured the search of political exempla from the past (Dunkelgrün 2009, 230). Upon that context we can understand the dynamic intellectual and artistic activity during the ‘Dutch Golden Age’ (Bennassar et al. 2000; Cruz 2009; Schama 1988; Schöffer 1975; de Vos 2009, 117). Leeuwen’s work (1685) *Batavia Illustrata ofte Holandsche Chronyck*, for example, contains an epic initial statement, illustrating the survival of the intellectual contemporary vision on the tribe’s myth and its main features by the end of the century (here translated into English): “War is often necessary for the support of liberty, and the ancient Batavii were lovers of one and the other”. This kind of reference reinforced the myth of the 16th century revolt against Spain and, by analogy, the Batavian myth in which it was rooted. These myths served as promoters of a sentiment of commonality across the new Dutch territories.

---

15 A term used to celebrate that period of Dutch history, roughly pertaining to the 17th century and closely linked with Dutch colonial expansion, in which culture and economy boosted hand in hand and paradigmatic names in the arts and sciences reached international recognition. The adjective ‘golden’ is also used to characterize parallel periods of similar cultural, political and economic growth in other territories — e.g. the *Edad de oro española* (Spanish Golden Age) or *Siglo de Oro* (the ‘Golden Century’) during the imperial Hispanic expansion in the 16th century.
However, we should not talk about national identity, or if we do, we have to acknowledge its regional focus on the Northern territories and especially around the province of Holland in a clear case of ‘regional nationalism’, by which the regional cultural history of this province became the culture of the Dutch nation: “The history of Dutch national myths is largely the history of its regionalities” (Kossmann 1978, 155-6). The Batavian myth grew upon the economic leadership of Holland over the other provinces that formed The Netherlands. Note how the nation is still called nowadays in many instances after the name of the province of Holland, and how similar cases of ‘regional nationalism’ can be found in Europe — such as the identification of England with Britain or the case of Castille and Spain.

Intellectual works praising Amsterdam or Holland as fatherlands, with no mention of the broader Republic as a whole, became common. Thus, Baeto or The Origin of the Hollanders (Hooft 1617; see Kossmann 1978: 158) contains the following quote:

> For you, the gods have reserved an empty space between the rivers Maas and Rhine and the ocean where you will find a people capable of lasting forever. Their name will be Batauwers (Batavians), and later Hollanders; and together with their neighbours they will excel in peace, in war, in everything.

This passage illustrates the reliance of these authors on classical sources and their strong influence on the development of mechanisms for the formation of a common identity. In this instance, links with the Batavians are stressed and the aim is clearly the creation of a ‘supra-regional’ myth around the province of Holland.

P.C. Hooft (1613) did so in his poem Geeraerdt van Velzen, and foresaw a bright future for Holland in his dramas too. However, his analysis of the Dutch revolt against Spain, Neederlandsche Histoorien (1642), ignores such positive thoughts and simply justifies the uprising through Philip II’s destruction of his father’s legacy of respect for his Dutch subjects’ independence, which is illustrative of how different discourses were produced for different audiences. Vondel’s (1638) play Gysbreght van Aemstel and Huygens’ (1650) poem Hofwyck also show a clear Hollandish ‘patriotism’, used here as per Duke’s (2004, 34-5) definition as a ‘common feeling of belonging’.

Other academic and popular works reinforced the idea of a province of Holland linked with the ancient Batavians: Petrus Scriverius (1609): Batavica Illustrata. Johannes Gijsius (1616): Oorsprong en voortgang der Neder-landscher beroerten en ellendicheden; Theodore Rodenburgh: De trouwen Batavier (1609) and Batavierse vrijagie-spel (1616). Jan Sywertsen
Kolm (1615): *Battaefsche vrienden-spieghel.* Their use of the 16th century features of the Batavian myth could be seen as a way of reinforcing the Dutch Republic. One of the best examples is Hugo Grotius’ (1610) *De antiquitate reipublicae Batavicae,* a history of the Dutch Republic, commissioned by the Staten-Generaal, which explains its origins in Roman times through the connection of modern Holland with its ancestors the Batavians, thus justifying the rebellious spirit against an oppressive Spanish government in defence of the ancient freedom of the Dutch people (Kossmann 1978, 161).

However, the most interesting 17th century literary depiction of the Batavian myth may be van Leeuwen’s (1685) *Batavia Illustrata ofte Holandsche Chronyck.* The first chapter of Onslow Burrish’s (1728, 1) English translation of this work, devoted to the Batavian origins of the Province of Holland, contains an epic statement illustrating the survival of the intellectual contemporary vision of the tribe’s mythology and its main features by the end of the century: “War is often necessary for the support of liberty, and the ancient Batavii were lovers of one and the other”.

The arts also provided ample ground for the diffusion of the symbolism of the Batavian myth during this period. Interesting examples are the series of engravings and paintings illustrating Tacitus’ accounts of the Batavian revolt. The first series was created by Antonio Tempesta (1611) and consisted of 36 engravings under the name *Batavorum cum Romanis bellum,* published by Otto van Veen (1612) under the Dutch title *Batavische ofte oude Hollandtsche oorloghe teghen de Romeynen.* These works inspired van Veen (1613) to create a subsequent series of 12 colour paintings, commissioned to him by the Dutch Staten-Generaal to decorate its meeting room, which was located at the Biennenhof, in The Hague, until 1808. These paintings depicted Civilis’ rebellion against the Romans — a true statement of intent by the Staten-Generaal. Their content and location can be taken as indicative of the clear propagandistic/informative function assigned to these works and their themes.

Both series were taken as thematic and stylistic models for the paintings commissioned for the ‘Batavian Gallery’ at the newly built *Stadhuis* in Amsterdam in 1660: “The iconographic program [...] is also political and institutional and it is nourished by many historical myths [...] for the “glorification of Amsterdam” (Blanc 2009, 243-4). Some of the most important Dutch masters of this cultural ‘Golden Century’ (Blanc 2009, 237) took part in the project — e.g. Rembrandt, Flinck, Ovens, Lievens, Jordaens, de Groot, Bol. However, the artistic piece that has attracted most interest in modern historiography due both to the
genius of its author and to his especial symbolic interpretation of the Batavian myth was Rembrandt’s (1661) *De Samenzwering van Civilis — The Conspiracy of Civilis* (Figure 4.5). His very personal interpretation of a well-established common myth was highly Romanized and quasi-monarchical, not matching the expectations of its commissioners, who finally decided to reject the painting, thus proving the intentionality of these commissions and the deliberate use of the myth by the ruling elites as a message barer (Blanc 2009, 253).

![The Conspiracy of the Batavians under Civilis, Rembrandt, 1661. The current piece on display at the Swedish national museum in Stockholm is just a portion of a much larger painting that Rembrandt probably cut into pieces himself after its rejection; he sold it and through inheritance and donations it ended up in Sweden (Source: Nationalmuseum of Stockholm).](image)

It is perhaps worth considering to which extent all these examples are really illustrative of the acquisition of national consciousness by Dutch people or just political propaganda used by the ruling elite for their benefit or perhaps to indoctrinate more sceptical groups in Dutch society and beyond, such as Frisians in the North or enemies throughout Europe.

It is worth noting that the features found in the Batavians through Tacitus’ descriptions are very much present in his accounts of these other two tribes. In the case of the Cananefates they shared the AD 69 struggle, and in the case of the Frisians, they even rose against Roman abusive practices four decades earlier. Therefore, the choice of Batavians, instead of Frisians
or Cananefates, as forefathers and focus of the ancestry myth for the young nation must be linked to the primacy of the province of Holland in the political and economic context of the 16th and 17th centuries. In this context, discussion about the location of the *insula Batavorum* acquires a renewed interest with clear political nuances.

4.3.4. *Batavians and the Colonial Myth (17th-20th centuries)*

In 1619, the capital of the Dutch Eastern colonial-commercial empire was newly founded under the name Batavia in the territory of today’s Jakarta, Indonesia (Figure 4.6). The name choice, part of an orchestrated claim to legitimize their expansion through links with antiquity and prestige, can only be explained if we assume that the myth had evolved into a new variation or that different elements of the myth were then being stressed for a different purpose.

![Figure 4.6. Vue de l’isle et de la ville de Batavia appartenant aux Hollandois, pour la Compagnie des Indes (Daumont, c. 1780). View of Batavia, capital of the Dutch Eastern colonial-commercial Empire (Source: Universiteitsbibliotheek Vrije Universiteit).](image)

It is striking from a modern perspective though that the name of the tribe that Tacitus described as liberty lovers and rebels against Roman imperial oppression was used to name the headquarters of the East Indies Dutch imperial enterprise. Expansionist and colonial
ideals now overshadowed the core theme of the myth: independence and liberty. Alternatively, it is entirely possible that these qualities might not have been as important for them as they are for us nowadays or, simply, they would not necessarily have found the two interpretations/uses of the myth incompatible, such as the American founding fathers asserting the natural right to liberty and independence of the British colonies in North America, while allowing the slave trade.

It was the strength and bravery of the Batavians that was now stressed and it was Dutch pride that was in play — probably a first hint of how the myth had taken root in their common consciousness. Simon Schama (1988, 24-25) suggested that the struggle to control the sea was an important aspect of emerging Dutch identity. Additionally, this could be interpreted as a powerful message to send to both colonial/imperial competitors and settlers of the new colonies: the once-dominated Dutch territories had built up an impressive fleet and empire of their own shortly after the Northern provinces gained their independence. In my opinion, this message was expressed by the export of national symbols, such as through the naming of the first colonial capital or some of the ships of regular and merchant fleets after the Batavians, thereby linking colony and homeland through common and easily recognizable historical myths. This variation of the myth would run in parallel with others analysed above until the Indonesian colonies achieved independence by the end of the Second World War.

Closely related to Dutch colonial establishments were both the commercial fleet, ruled by the colonial commercial company, and the military fleet, commanded by the federal government. Ships were the driving force of the republican trading empire and one of its most visible emblems: they were a message in themselves. Thus, it is not surprising to find ‘Batavians’ also among them. One of the most famous ships of the fleet, the Batavia, was wrecked off the Australian coast on its way to the East Indies colonies (1629), and it is usually mentioned among the elements that carry on the myth. However, it is not the only example of ‘Batavia’ or its derivatives (e.g. Batavier; Kasteel Batavia; Wapen van Batavia) being used as a label for a ship or colonial harbours (for a full list of names of commercial and regular line ships, see the VOC — United Dutch East India Company — website: http://www.vocsite.nl/schepen/lijst.html?sn=B). Traditionally, many of the ships of the military fleet were named after Dutch cities, provinces, or famous admirals and personalities, e.g. Prins Frederik Willem (later changed for Gelijkheid — Equality), Admiraal Tjerk Hiddes de Vries, Noordholland, Drenthe. However, an interesting shift can be observed during the Batavian republic, when Dutch warships carried names of Roman gods or classical myths,
such as *Hercules, Jupiter, Minerva, Ajax*. Therefore, it might not be wrong to think that the *Batavia* was named after the colonial capital and not the mythical tribe, in line with the regular fleet naming scheme, although the line between these two is very fine. In any case, the importance of the *Batavia* ship (Figure 4.7) derives from the fact that it was archaeologically traced and reconstructed in recent times, expressing once more the on-going interest in the myth, and the link of the latter to national identity.

![Figure 4.7.](http://www.flevolandsgeheugen.nl/7088/nl/beatrix-bij-batavia-en-nieuw-land). The royal interest for the reconstruction of this historical symbol of the Dutch Golden Age is also reflected on the fact that Queen Beatrix also led the Christening and launch of the replica ship in 1995 on its maiden voyage following the route of the original Batavia. Since then the shipyard has become a historical touristic attraction and usual visiting place for dignitaries in official visits to The Netherlands.

It would be interesting to investigate whether other main terms/elements of the myth, such as Civilis, were also used in this colonial context (for instance use as a vessel’s name or trading port). Additionally, a comparative approach to similar uses of the label ‘Batavia’ in the Dutch Western colonial enterprise in North America, analysing the toponomy of their settlements there, might be informative.

### 4.3.5. ‘Batavian Revolution’, ‘Batavian Republic’ (1795-1814)

The 16\textsuperscript{th} century witnessed the birth of the ‘Orangist myth’, consisting of the Nassau-Orange family being considered heirs of the Batavian tradition. This was based on the political use of
Tacitus and the Batavians myth by the Nassau-Orange family and its supporters to reinforce their position as Stadtholders (Geevers 2011; Levillain 2005; Stern 2009).\(^\text{16}\) Its primary figure was William I of Orange, Stadtholder during the revolt against the Hispanic Empire. The conflict between Republicans and Orangists, which crystallized in the late 17th century, was still active throughout the 18th century.

At this point, the historical and political context suffered enough changes as to produce new uses of the Batavian myth. It was a time of enlightenment and revolution in Europe. The House of Orange, and the Dutch aristocracy who supported its monarchical pretensions, were increasing their political power. The Patriots, burgers from the main economic centres in Holland with very marked republican ideals, feared for their liberties. Both sides used the Batavian myth to justify their political positions regarding the nature of power. For the Patriots, the Batavians represented liberty and independence from a despotic establishment. For the Orangists, Prince William was regarded by Dutch people as a “true descendant of Civilis” (Hessing 2001: 135) and therefore as a natural leader in unsettled times, referring to the French Revolution.

This internal struggle between Patriots and Orangists would result first in a failed Patriot revolt in 1787 (Beyen 2000b, 494; Hake 2004, 12), and then in their final victory, leading to the establishment of the Batavian Republic in 1795, maximum expression of the political use of the Batavians. This marks the transition between the former federal republic (1581-1795) and the later unitary and centralized nation-state modeled after the French republic (1795-1806), opening the most intense period of Dutch nationalism (1806-1940). The Batavians emerged out of this episode as a strong national symbol (Hessing 2001, 135).

However, just a decade after the establishment of the Batavian Republic, the Napoleonic imperialist programme favored the installation of a Dutch monarchy, initially under a French puppet king, Louis Bonaparte — Napoleon’s brother. His brief reign would come to an end in 1810 when Napoleon decided to invade and dissolve the Kingdom of Holland, integrating its territories into the French Empire under his own imperial rule. Note Napoleon’s decision to name the Kingdom after its most prominent province, following the principles of ‘regional nationalism’ outlined earlier.

\(^\text{16}\) The term Staatsholder is used to refer to the governors of the provinces under the Dutch Republic. They were appointed by the Staten of each province. In many provinces and for more than two centuries this office was closely linked with the Nassau-Orange family, becoming hereditary de facto.
This situation provoked the popular uprising against the French ruler and ultimately put the crown in the hands of the House of Orange. The same kind of Napoleonic interference and popular uprising is observable in other European countries — notably the Spanish uprising of 1808, which ultimately would give birth to Spanish national consciousness (Elorza 2005, 20-29).

Yet, while the foundations for a widespread national identity were reinforced by historical events such as the Napoleonic defeat and the proclamation of the Kingdom of The Netherlands in 1815, the Batavian myth was paradoxically pushed into the background. The appropriation of this by the Patriots, and their support of the French cause, are probably among the most important factors in the fall of the Batavian myth (Joor 2009, 191-198).

4.3.6. The Fall of the Batavian Myth (c. 1815-1950)

The current conception in most historical textbooks is that after the confusion of the migrations, one can distinguish in The Netherlands three tribes - the Frisians along the coast, the Franks south of the Rhine, and the Saxons east of the Ijssel in the present provinces of Drente, Overijssel, and part of Gelderland. (Slicher van Bath 1949, 319)

These words by van Bath make no mention at all to the Batavians as an ancient tribe in Dutch territory, not even when referring to Gelderland, a region traditionally associated with them. Below we discuss how they disappear from the Dutch historical discourse over the course of a century.

Although other Dutch ancient tribes were mentioned by Tacitus, it was not until the mid-19th century that the Batavians were displaced as the main tribal ancestry myth. Marnix Beyen (2000a) explains this period of Batavian decline and the rise of a new ‘tribal trinity’ as a consequence of the growing geographical integration of The Netherlands. This process initiated a gradual shift from Hollando-centric approaches, which favored the centrality of Batavians, to a new and broader explanation of the common ancestry of the nation, encompassing three distinct tribes associated with the Late Roman-period Germanic invasions — Frisians, Franks and Saxons — each of them linked to specific regions within the Dutch Kingdom other than Holland, and each of them providing distinct qualities to the typical character of the Dutch nation (Beyen 2000a, 495). This new myth of common
ancestry began to take root in Dutch historical consciousness at this stage. Thus, the role of
the Batavians diminished in a period in which Dutch national identity was taking shape.

Once more, the historico-political context helps to explain this new development in
Dutch tribal mythology. When the Batavian Republic became the Kingdom of The
Netherlands in 1815 and the republican essence of the nation was lost, its most prominent
symbols, including the Batavian myth, were progressively replaced. According to Beyen
(2000a, 494) “doubts about the Batavian ancestry had been constantly growing during the
eighteenth century” and there was no space for further adaptations of the Batavian myth. The
general context of European Romanticism strongly emphasized local/regional histories,
resulting in the introduction of other formerly ignored tribes into Dutch origin myths. This
was also favored by a more generalized critical and scientific approach, derived from the
application of emerging sciences of ethnology and anthropology to the study of the past, and
by growing ideas of racial roots shared with Germanic peoples, an idea that would be
radicalized under the strong influence of German Romanticism, the Germanenforschung or
German intellectual movement and the later Pan-Germanic ideals of National Socialism
(Beyen 2000a, 507-510).

The displacement of the Batavians as the forefathers of the nation during the second
half of the 19th century is clearly detectable in the works of Dutch intellectuals and historians
— e.g. Van den Bergh (1852), Lubach (1863), Winkler (1880), Blink (1892) and Block
(1892) — who reinforced the role of the tribal trinity over the Batavian myth in the creation
of an identity based on common ancestry (Joor 2009).

Many of the names behind this change were of Frisian or non-Hollandic origin,
stressing the dismantling of the Hollandocentric perception of the Dutch past around the
Batavians, the integration of other regions into the national spectrum, and the influence of the
‘Frisian movement’ (Friese Beweging), which was responsible for the introduction of the
middle-class myths (around the ‘tribal trinity’) typical of the rise of nation-states (Joor 2009,
196-199).

More specifically, the works of the Frisian authors Blink (1892) and Block (1892)
opened the door to a scientifically-based thesis for this substitution followed in intellectual
and academic circles up until the Second World War. Despite the fact that the ‘tribal trinity’
also found its way into school text-books by the early 20th century, it never completely
displaced the Batavian myth. This, in my opinion, makes its dismissal during this period
more of an academic issue than a question of widely accepted change in Dutch national consciousness.

![Tolsum writing tablet, AD 29](image)

**Figure 4.8.** Tolsum writing tablet, AD 29 The oldest written document in the Netherlands, and the northernmost handwritten Latin text in Europe (Source: Fries Museum)

An illustrative archaeological highlight of this period is the Tolsum Tablet (Figure 4.8), a writing tablet recovered in 1914 during leveling works of the Groot Tolsum terp (an artificial dwelling mound), in the modern Dutch region of Frisia. First analysed by C.W. Vollgraff in 1917 (Blanc 2009, 253), the contents of the tablet were originally interpreted within the context of the early 2nd century AD and a normalised relationship between Romans and Frisians. The first transcription made of the tablet read:

I, Gargilius Secundus, duly and in lawful manner purchased a cow for 115 pieces [of silver?] from Stelus, son of Reperius, Beosian, of the estate of Lopetius, with Cesdius, first centurion of Legio V, and Mutus Admentus, first centurion of Legio I, as witnesses. Right to cancel and formalities of civil law are waived. Bought in the consulship of Caius Fufius and Cnaeus Minicius, September 9. Proper delivery vouched for by Lilus Duerretus, veteran. (*Fontes Iuris Romani Anteiustiniani* 3.137; Hugh 2013, 68-9)
This first interpretation depicts ancient Frisians trading an ox (so typically Frisian!) with Roman officials. This reading was probably highly attractive for those modern Frisian authors developing the intellectual basis of their regional/national Frisian identity. Just as Holland did make use of the textual accounts about the prestigious alliance between Romans and Batavians, Frisia now had proof of its own tribal myth of interaction with the Roman Empire in the form of a tablet.

However, in view of technological advancements, the tablet was recently ‘revisited’ by the Vindolanda team (Bowman et al. 2009) and a new reading of the text emerged, situating the origins of this tablet much earlier, namely in the months following the Frisian revolt AD 28:

' [...] Carus(?) slave of Iulia Secunda which I am obliged to repay to her(?) or to whomever this matter pertains on the day on which s/he(?) shall ask for them. Trans- acted on 23(?) February at ... in the consulship of C. Fufius Geminus. Quadratus acted as interpreter (or intermediary?).' (2nd hand) Titus Cassius, tribune of the fifth legion. (3rd hand) Miunnio(?) soldier of the unit of Batavians, of the century (or decury?) of Bonumotus(?). (4th hand?) Caturix, slave of the said Secunda(?). (Bowman et al. 2009, 162)

This would imply that commercial exchanges and interactions between Romans and Frisians resumed with normality soon after the revolt ended. According to Bowman et al. (2009, 168), this would imply that the Romans maintained a presence in the area after the revolt. Furthermore, their interpretation, surely unbiased in terms of nationalistic affiliation with the Frisian identity, actually relates the document to a Batavian unit as part of the operation.

It could be argued that such changes in interpretation are common in scholarship and that this one only responded to the use of more advanced techniques and the natural progress of the discipline. However, I cannot help wondering whether the Tolsum tablet was subjected to the historical and intellectual context in which it was originally interpreted and thus used as a tool to override the very solid myth of the Batavian revolt in a context of rising Frisian regional identity.

In any case, it is certainly surprising that during the period of rising nationalisms the Batavians apparently lost their role as primordial forefathers of the nation and their historical myths are substituted by those based on other ancient tribes. Among the reasons that one
could argue to explain this phenomenon the most plausible one in my opinion is the post-traumatic effects of the ‘Batavian Republic’ episode in the 19th century: the political use made of Batavians by the occupying French to name their imposed republic quite possibly burdened their popularity among the Dutch.

4.3.7. The Rebirth of the Batavian Myth (1950-2014)

As a result of a scientific approach to the study of the past during the 19th century, the Batavian myth based so far on national symbolisms, lost part of its attractive power (Hessing 2001, 139). The first half of the 20th century, with the two World Wars, established some of the new modern Dutch national ‘myths’ — neutrality and internationality (Van Tuyll 2009) — and saw the debilitation of the national tribal symbolism inherited from the late 19th century — ‘tribal trinity’.

The Batavian myth, which never disappeared completely from archaeo-historical discourse, was still deeply rooted in Dutch consciousness; this could partially explain how it came to be revived over the last six decades. In line with what occurred four centuries earlier, interest in the Roman classical and archaeological past would revive interest in the Batavians. Schools created favourable conditions for the Batavian return to national consciousness. Schools and arts maintained alive the Batavian myth during the period of the rise of the ‘tribal trinity’ making its revival possible (Beyen 2000a, 494). Textbooks revived the Roman world as well as traditional stories about Batavians for Dutch schoolboys and -girls of the 1950s and 1960s (Willems, pers. comm). Some of these individuals became the core of the archaeological academic community of the last third of the 20th century, bringing with them a renewed scientific and academic interest in Batavians, but still very much influenced by the Batavian myth (Hessing 2001, 140). The role of schools in the spread of ideas on a common national consciousness and as a channeler of ideas about a common origin, going from the academic and intellectual elites to the majority of the population, cannot be dismissed and needs further study.

Provincial Roman Archaeology quickly became one of the most important branches of Dutch archaeology during the 1960s and early 1970s, mainly focused on the Romans and their interaction with local peoples along the Rhine limes (Bogaers 1960; van Es 1972a; de Weerd 1977). In the 1970s, studies of the interactions between Romans and Barbarians in
Dutch territory were primarily centred on Batavians. This led to a renewed examination of the historical testimony and its modern uses, and the creation of the concept ‘Batavian myth’ itself, making the academic community aware of the intellectual baggage they were carrying. Hessing (2001, 127; 141) asked whether Dutch archaeologists would ever dispose of “those four-centuries-old idealized images of the Batavians”.

By the 1980s, the door was definitively opened for a new wave of Batavian-centred studies very much influenced by new Anglo-American theoretical frameworks such as the New Archaeology, and characterized by the introduction of interdisciplinary approaches, concepts of social anthropology and a major stress on the indigenous element and local/regional perspectives. Willems’ works on Romans and Batavians (e.g. 1981; 1983; 1984; 1986) were a major expression of this new trend and a whole new generation of scholars with Roymans at its head carried it on, situating the Batavian topic at the core of archaeological debate in The Netherlands and internationally.

Whether this is due to academics following national traditions or to exceptionally good archaeology made available is yet unclear. Brandt and Slofstra’s (1983) Roman and Native in the Low Countries: Spheres of Interaction, introduced the debate around traditional approaches to Romanisation into Dutch academia, leaning the balance from Roman perspectives to indigenous ones and opening the door for anthropological approaches to influence research on the Batavians. Specialists on the topic (e.g. Roymans 2004; van Driel-Murray 2008; Derks 2004) and younger researchers (e.g. Heeren 2009; Stoffels 2008; Groot 2008; Nicolay 2007) have kept the topic academically active through lively debate and an intensification of specialization. This evolution will be the focus of the next chapter.

Beyond archaeology, the academic community has tried to contextualise and explain the Batavian myth to the general public through education, exhibitions and other means of social transmission.
The successful exhibition *De Bataven: Verhalen van een verdwenen volk* at the Museum Het Valkhof in Nijmegen (2004) and its resulting catalogue (Roelofs and Swinkels 2004; Figure 4.9) illustrates this popular interest and contains references to other popular modern events (e.g. *Batavierenrace*; Figure 4.10), iconic commercial use (such as the *Batavus* bicycle company, *Batavier* line, *Batavier* cigarettes; Figures 4.11 and 4.12), activities and publications (including cartoons, comics; Figure 4.13) linked to the Batavians. The tribe keeps its aura of popularity in The Netherlands and so does the Roman Empire. Batavians remain an integral part of Dutch national identity.
Figure 4.10. The Batavian race (batavierenrace) is an annual relay race over 175 km from Nijmegen to Enschede. The organisers state in their webpage that the name of the race is “Inspired by the Batavians, who sailed down the Rhine in 50 B.C.” (Source: Swinkels and Roeloffs 2004, 79; https://www.batavierenrace.nl/english/general/).
Figure 4.11. Left: Advert for the sea route Rotterdam-London. Right: Dutch cigarette box. Both images show the ‘presence’ of the Batavians in everyday objects and commercial identities recognisable by the general public (Source: Creative Commons).

Figure 4.12. Promotional advert of the Batavus bicycle company; in a country where cycling is the main means of urban transport due to the levelled topography of the country, this company is one of the oldest and largest producer of bicycles in The Netherlands (Source: Swinkels and Roeloffs 2004, 78).
Figure 4.13. Dutch cartoons for children from the early 1970s (top) and comic strips from the 1960s (bottom), showing a very traditional view on the Batavians, full of popular clichés — gamblers, beer drinkers. Eli Asser’s text that accompanied the first image (by Joop Geesink) explicitly states that History in The Netherlands started when the Batavians came down the Rhine with their belongings on hollowed-out trees and established themselves there. The story behind the second image (by Annie Schmidt and Fiep Westendorp), praises the Batavian lifestyle far from the yoke of civilization (Sources: Swinkels and Roeloffs 2004, 77).
4.4. Conclusions: From National Myth to Academic Discourse

The exploration of a Batavian myth that experienced multiple variations as a result of its close relationship with the changing socio-political and cultural context during five centuries is the only way to gain an insight into the wide variety of ideas and constructs contained within the historical discourses inherited by post-war archaeologists about the processes of cultural interaction in the lower Rhine area. Key to understanding the longevity of this myth is the variety and flexibility of its interpretation. Variety comes hand in hand with the fact that the Batavian myth is interactional, necessarily connected with its Roman counterpart. Thus, the Batavian myth comprises not only Batavians but also Romans, completing the Roman:‘barbarian’ dichotomy within which it is based. A significant proportion of Western European national identities are partly based on myths triggered by Roman:‘barbarian’ clashes propitiating the elevation of ‘local’ Barbarian leaders to national heroes (Section 3.7). It is the interaction with, and dichotomic antagonism to, Rome — idealistically depicted in the 16th century as a powerful Empire — that makes them valuable tools for the formation of national identity as this perception increases the positive impact of their deeds on the nations psyche — i.e. the Roman element in the origin of ‘barbarian’ ancestry myths. Batavians, as many other ethnic labels applied to cultural or tribal groups in the limits or periphery of Roman territories, could in fact be considered a Roman construct, since the only surviving descriptions of the Batavians are Roman; therefore, it is a Roman projection that has been inherited and developed.

The key to understanding the complexity and longevity of this myth lies in its flexibility and adaptability to multiple historical contexts. As a result of this flexibility we can identify not just a unique interpretation of the myth as traditional scholarship on the topic tends to argue, but many layers of it, some of them running parallel for centuries; in other words, these are the many lives of the Batavian myth. Furthermore, its connection to other national historical myths made the Batavian myth central to the Dutch myths of origin, over other tribal contestants such as the Frisians or Cananefates.

As noted, the analysis of the ancient past has commonly informed and influenced the formation of modern national identities in Europe and elsewhere. As soon as classical sources became available during the Renaissance, Western European powers launched themselves into a regional quest for ancestry linked with the Roman classical past. Dutch territories found in the Batavians an ideal vehicle to exploit due to both their special relationship with
the powerful Roman Empire, and the Batavian revolt against the Roman oppressor, which became the main element of the myth during the struggle against the Spaniards in the late 16th century. If we can assert that the 16th century creation of the Batavian myth was a direct consequence of both the historical context and the interpretation of Tacitus’ newly available account of an ancient ‘Dutch’ tribe, we must also acknowledge that all the later variations of the myth depend on that 16th century interpretation. Dutch national identity has no specific moment of creation and is rather the result of a long process of formation, based not only on variations of common ancestry myths such as the one built around the Batavians, but also on the conjunction of many others that have shaped the Dutch self- and international image.

I have examined here many crucial episodes for these myths to materialize, mostly connected to the formulation and reification of common identity against external threats. What we can certainly agree on is that more than half a millennium after the first publications of Tacitus’ texts which brought the Batavians back to life, this ‘Dutch tribe’ remains very much alive in national consciousness. The Batavian myth is just one more among the historical myths that took root in the Dutch national identity, but it is probably “the most persistent of them all” (Cruz and Frijhoff 2009: 14).

The different lives of the myth reflect not only the different Dutch historical episodes of political and social development, which are crucial to the understanding of subsequent variations of the myth, but also the intellectual and academic trends that framed such an evolution, both in The Netherlands and in a wider European context.
Chapter 5. Contextualising Dutch Modern Academic Discourses on Roman: ‘barbarian’ Interaction

5.1. Introduction

The primacy of the Batavians in classical accounts and historical discourse sees its extension into post-war academic archaeological discourses, partially through its role in the formulation of Dutch national identity (Chapter 4) and partially through other contextual factors as will be analysed here.

Following the multi-scalar progression proposed earlier, this chapter will describe the wider structural context in which Dutch archaeology has evolved since the end of WWII, focusing on contemporary non-academic factors — geo-political, socio-economic and institutional. Furthermore, the origins and early developments of modern Dutch archaeology as a scholarly discipline up to the mid-20th century will be examined to understand how the current structural framework in which discourses are formulated in The Netherlands was not created ex növo after WWII, but was the result of historical developments. All these are factors that had an effect on the formulation of academic discourses at regional, national and European level in the post-war period.

Finally, I will explain why and how thinking about Dutch archaeology in terms of scholarly genealogies is helpful and illuminating. These is not just an analytical approach but a factor of the upmost importance to understand the development of archaeological discourses in the last few decades in The Netherlands. A periodization of Dutch post-war archaeology will emerge and this will be used to structure the analysis to come in Chapter 6.

5.2. Geo-political Factors and Regional Imbalances

A series of structural factors, external to Dutch archaeology as an academic discipline, have also helped to define its nature, development, and functioning, as well as its thematic choices and geographical focus, namely: geo-political, economic and intellectual trends, both national and international, that affect the way archaeology is practised (focus and topic-wise). Examples of these factors would include EU heritage management and protection policies,
development planning, regional imbalances, or the NOaA (National Research Agenda). Needless to say this is one side of a two-way process. The Netherlands are not just passive receivers of influence but play an important role in the development of those wider processes.

According to Parker (1979, 117), The Netherlands witnessed a rapid development from a basically agricultural to an industrial country during the second half of the 20th century, due mainly to geopolitical factors: its geographical centrality in relation to the EEC (and subsequent pan-European organizations) and its situation at the mouth of the Rhine. However, it is necessary to acknowledge that this region was extremely precocious in its development of a capital economy from the early 17th century. Many of the developments within Dutch archaeology discussed later in this chapter (Section 5.3) can only really be explained by this trajectory.

However, that development was not evenly distributed across all regions in the country. Regional imbalance in The Netherlands arises from the existence of two physically distinct regions that have developed historically along quite different lines. The existence of these ‘two Netherlands’ is attested since the beginning of the Dutch state. This historical division is between the West and the East, and in particular between the core maritime urban and industrial areas in the West — province of Holland (North and South) and Utrecht — and the peripheral agrarian areas in the East and the northern regions — provinces of Friesland, Groningen, Drenthe, part of Overijssel and the northern tip of Nord Holland (Parker 1979, 122-132; Figure 5.1).

In order to deal with the pressures on space due to limited territory and an increasing population, physical planning controls and mechanisms have become much stricter and accordingly only essential urban and industrial developments are given permission. Developmental planning is an important aspect and it is directly related to the preservation of landscape and heritage. While the regional imbalances just mentioned are reflected in this matter, it is also an issue influenced by national and European. We say “Regional” because the pressures and effects of increasing development are more noticeable in specific regions; municipalities have been taking an increasing interest in the question from an ecological and archaeological point of view, but there is not much they can do due to the scale of the problem and the pressure of privatising lobbies (van der Laarse, interview 2013). “National” because those plans are nationally discussed and agreed according to nation-wide situations and needs. Finally, “European” because of the Valletta Convention (1992; see Willems
2007), a European policy on heritage management that requires archaeological assessment and excavations to be undertaken prior to any construction development.

That means that areas with a higher economic development, such as the Randstad — an area in West-Central Netherlands with huge industrial and urban development, including the four biggest cities of the country, i.e. Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht — will receive more attention in terms of excavations than areas under lesser development. However, that does not necessarily mean that research in those areas is more intensive at an academic level, it only means that there is more material potentially available, as often those materials surfacing at commercial rescue excavations are recorded but not interpreted. On the
other hand, there are some underdeveloped areas in the North — e.g. Groningen and Drenthe — and the South — e.g. Limburg — where growth has been receiving stimuli as part of national policies to address that regional imbalance (Figure 5.1), thus increasing the potential for development-driven archaeological research and funding.

Dutch regionalism has a further implication in the academic sphere. The separation of Northern and Southern Netherlands by the Rhine is not only visible in the distinct character and economic development of those regions on both banks of the river, but is also clearly identifiable in academic research in what I have labelled as a ‘research limes’. The institutional structure, the way archaeology is practised (methodology, topics choice, chronologies, etc.) and the ways in which the past is perceived north and south of the Rhine vary considerably according to regional/institutional academic traditions within The Netherlands.

Geologically, the extensive delta of the rivers Rhine, Meuse, Scheldt, Ems and Demer which embraces the western part of The Netherlands — the most populated area of the country where most urban centres are located —, plays a very important role, not only in economic terms as the biggest European port (Rotterdam’s Europort), but also in terms of regional imbalance and the development of archaeological activity in different areas. The influence that the riverine system has on different aspects of the discipline is so huge that H. T. Waterbolck (1981) described and characterised Dutch archaeology as ‘Delta archaeology’. One can note that a huge proportion of the country’s subsoil is of Holocene age and was shaped by fluvial processes and, because of that geology, the general quality of preservation, time-depth, and visibility of archaeological remains found in the Dutch wetlands is widely recognised (Arnoldussen 2013, 733; Groenewoudt and Bloemers 1997, 144; 153-4). However, the different types of soils present regional variation too, which affects very clearly the choice and outcome of archaeological research. While the river areas of the rural interior are more prone to keep archaeological evidence in relatively good condition due to its clayish soil, the coastal industrial areas are dominated by sandy soils, less prone to produce well-preserved materials. This might explain somehow the regional focus on the Eastern river area and southern Netherlands where the quality of the data attracts archaeologist and researchers.

Another factor that may explain this trend is the government’s choice of strategies and priorities for archaeological heritage management in The Netherlands. These are decided based on certain criteria — preservation threat, public interest, cost versus benefits, special
national and international significance (Groenewoudt and Bloemers 1997, 150). Three major themes are favoured, one of them being precisely the *limes* as a border and zone of interaction. The *limes* is a unique international archaeological feature — a World Heritage Site (http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/430/); the Dutch section of the *limes* (Figure 5.2) is important because of its unique environmental conditions — on the river delta — and what that entails in terms of preservation of exceptional archaeological remains (Bloemers and Groenewoudt 1997, 153–4). These, together with the intense development activity occurring in the urban centres on the delta — which endangers the preservation of archaeological remains — explain geologically and politically the regional variation in focus.

*Figure 5.2. Orientation of the river Rhine through various countries. It runs E-W in The Netherlands and N-S as soon as it leaves its territory. While the traditional trend in most of Europe is to talk about the Rhine in terms of E-W banks, a N-S division fits better the fluvial reality of The Netherlands. Curiously, Dutch archaeologists do talk about E-W banks, which could be seen, perhaps, as a reflection of the influence of external discourses on Dutch archaeology (Base map: David Diel. Modified by: Author).*
5.2.1. *When Size does Matter*

The size of The Netherlands — relatively small in comparison with most of its European neighbours — is an important contextual factor and one with serious implications for the structural development and intellectual choices of its relatively small academic community, and more generally for the Dutch nation as a whole. Being one of the smaller countries in the EU by territory — 41000 km², representing 2% of Economic European Community (CEE), and an even smaller percentage of the later European Union (EU) — and population — 5% of CEE, and again a smaller percentage of the EU’s population — (Parker 1979, 117), The Netherlands has played (and still does) a very important role within EU economics — a relatively rich nation accounting for a 6% of EU’s total GDP — and politics, in which it was involved since 1949 as a founding member (Parker 1981). This could be explained through its geographical position at one of Europe’s most important natural nodes of communication facing the North Sea, the mouth of the Rhine.

*Figure 5.3.* Location of the five main universities with archaeology departments in relation to the Rhine and Roymans’ research in the DMS area (Source: Author).
Some of the features that characterise The Netherlands and its supra-national economic role are recognisable in the position of its academic community among other national academic communities in Europe. Being relatively small in territorial terms, The Netherlands is home to 15 universities. In other words, The Netherlands has as many universities in total as the region of Madrid in Spain alone. Of these 15 universities only five have departments or faculties of Archaeology or pre- and proto-history — Radboud University Nijmegen, Leiden University, University of Groningen, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, and University of Amsterdam (Table 5.1; Figure 5.3).

Table 5.1. Dutch and European universities with Archaeology departments (Source: Author, after Lutins and Clist 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of public (or subsidized) universities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities that offer archaeology research degrees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4. Total numbers of universities and Archaeology departments in different EU nations (Source: Author).
However, while the total number of universities is small in comparison with other European nations (Figure 5.4), the density and proportion of universities with archaeology-related departments are similar, with a ratio of 1:3 (Figure 5.5). The smaller number of Dutch universities with Archaeology departments may have an effect on the diversity of theoretical approaches as the number of scholars is also more reduced. Another supporting piece of evidence is Heinrick Härke’s (2000, 15) comment regarding the differences in size of the German and Dutch archaeological community pre-1985: while The Netherlands had 80 archaeologists in permanent positions, Germany counted 550. This greatly affects the diversity and number of discourses.

Despite its relative size, Dutch archaeology and its academic production have attained a strong weight and prestige within European academia. The age of its universities, with several of them founded well before the 20th century — e.g. Leiden (1575), University of Amsterdam (1634), University of Groningen (1614), The Free University (1880) —, might partially account for such a phenomenon. More specifically, this prestige is reflected within diverse brands of Roman Archaeology — e.g. frontier and trans-frontier studies, Roman provincial archaeology, Roman military studies — and it can be explained by its very convenient position in the former frontiers of the Roman empire and the subsequent ‘local’ availability of material evidence, as well as the technical quality of their research and
publications. This could also be explained in terms of their geographical position among some of the major players in European academic arena (France, Britain, and Germany), and also in terms of their engagement with both the main Anglo-American theoretical debates and their traditional methodological affiliation to Germany since the early 20th century — the so-called ‘Dutch middle-way’ that will be analysed in detail later (Section 7.4); archaeological practice in the Netherlands has always been informed by intellectual currents from elsewhere.

While bigger communities are less prone to develop under the influence of one sole leading scholar, in such a relatively small academic community it is not difficult to identify the main academic figures. In fact, it seems that just a few universities are involved in the study of interactions in The Netherlands during Roman times; as such, it is feasible to look for and describe affiliation and academic genealogies, as well as the structure and social dynamics of the current scholarly community. However, there are other institutional players beyond academia in The Netherlands that need to be taken into account in order to understand better the development of the discipline: research institutes, research funding bodies, commercial archaeology units, museums, all of them intertwined in a complex network.

5.3. The Structural Context of Modern Dutch Archaeology

Several surveys on Western national academic traditions have been produced in the last few decades (e.g. Trigger and Glover 1981; Bazelmans et al. 1994; Härke 2000a). There have also been various attempts to characterize Dutch archaeology from within (e.g. Van Es 1972b; Waterbolk 1981; Kooijmans 1994; Slofstra 1994) and from outside (e.g. Hodder 1994; Härke 1994; 2000). In his very lucid analysis of the development of Dutch archaeology, Slofstra (1994) stresses the importance of external non-academic factors and their role in the development of the discipline. He identifies a few structural factors that affected the institutional development of Dutch archaeology in the post-war period, and as a consequence the development of its methodologies, interpretative frameworks and discourses, and even, quite possibly, its research choices (Slofstra 1994, 8-9). Among those factors, the increasingly complex network of research centres, universities, research institutes, commercial archaeological units, and museums, plays a central role.
Despite its relatively small size, Dutch archaeology has a very complex institutional structure which directly and indirectly affects the direction in which it develops. This complex organisation is indebted primarily to the Valletta European Convention in Cultural Heritage Protection signed in Malta in 1992, and the subsequent modifications of Dutch heritage protection laws (Monuments and Historic Building Act 1961; 1985; 1988; 2001) in accordance to the principles established in Malta (Bazelmans 2006).

5.3.1. Current Organisation of Dutch Archaeology

Apart from the five universities already mentioned with departments or faculties of Archaeology or pre- and proto-history (Section 5.2.1), there are many other institutional players currently participating in the development of Dutch archaeology, and many of them are obviously inter-dependent:

- Six research institutes, one national and one for each of the universities with archaeology departments mentioned above. While variability applies, generally speaking the function of these ‘university’ institutes is to manage the archaeological activity of these departments and process materials and data according to the established policies for archaeological heritage management. The ROB is a nationwide, centralised institute of archaeological investigation:

  - ROB (Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkun Bodemonderzoek — Dutch State Service for Archaeological Investigations, in Amersfoort), the central archaeological service. Since 2006 it was put under the administration of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science with the new name of ‘State Cultural Heritage Agency’ (Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed).

  - IPP (Instituut voor Pre- en Protohistorische Archeologie — Institute for Pre- and Protohistorical Archaeology, University of Amsterdam), which recently changed its name to AAC (Amsterdam Archaeological Centre).

  - BAI (Biologisch Archeologisch Instituut — Biological Archaeological Institute, Groningen).

  - AIVU (Archeologisch Instituut van de Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam - Archaeological Institute of Vrije Universitet Amsterdam).
- Nijmegen - Institute for Roman Provincial Archaeology.

- Several other research centres: CLUE (Research Centre for the Heritage and History of Cultural Landscapes and Urban Environment); ACASA (Amsterdam Centre for Ancient Studies and Archaeology — a joint research centre for University of Amsterdam and Free University Amsterdam).

- National and regional archaeological museums, such as the RMO (Dutch National Museum of Antiquities) in Leiden and the Fries Museum in Leeuwarden (Friesland).

- Provincial and municipal archaeological depots where all the data available from a field project need to be stored since the ‘Monuments Act’ of 1961 (Willems and Brandt 2004, 25). While the NAD (Archaeological Depot of the Northern Netherlands), at Nuis, is shared by the provinces of Groningen, Drenthe and Friesland, each of the other nine provinces has its own archaeological depot. In addition, there are 30 municipal depots (Keers et al. 2011, 7), and a National Depot for Ship Archaeology at Lelystad, exclusively dedicated to the storage of maritime archaeology finds (Keers et al. 2011, 14).

- Numerous private commercial archaeology units. At present, the SIKB (Stichting Infrastructuur Kwaliteitsborging Bodembeheer – Quality Assurance Infrastructure Foundation Soil Management) has 68 registered companies with permits for archaeological excavations, 26 of which are associated with or part of municipalities. Five of them are private units linked to universities, such as Auxilia (Nijmegen) and VU-HBS (Free University); and five others have licences issued directly to universities for scientific research (source: SIKB website). These are in charge of most of the rescue excavations linked to urban or industrial development projects since the 1992 Valletta Convention, and as such they have an impact on the research agendas followed.

- Foundations: SNA (Foundation for Dutch Archaeology), ARCHON (Dutch National Research School for Advanced Studies in Archaeology), RAAP (Reginaal Archaeologisch Archiverings Project, University of Amsterdam).

- Two major National Research funding institutions: The NWO (Netherlands Organization of Scientific Research), which replaced the ZWO (Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research) and KNAW (Royal Society of Sciences and Arts).
The complex organisation under which Dutch archaeology currently operates is the consequence of adapting the already existing institutional structure — many of these institutions have a long history of their own — to the new policy framework coming out of the Valletta Convention (Malta, 1992). This European treaty on the protection of the archaeological heritage was already in preparation by a committee of experts between 1988 and 1991 in response to the new challenges that the booming economy and urban/industrial development was presenting to archaeological heritage preservation since the 1960s, and dramatically so since the early 1980s (Willems 2008, 136; 2007, 58). Willem Willems, who in 1989 had just been put at the front of the ROB and named State Archaeologists, was one of the experts involved in this European policy-making process as the Dutch representative.

In basic terms, the treaty imposes on the Member States the need to develop spatial planning based on archaeological assessments prior to the commencement of any project. As a result, commercial archaeology units suddenly gained huge importance because Universities and Institutes could not compete with market prices/budgets; this brought the decentralisation and commercialisation of the sector, and it is perceived as damaging for the scientific quality of the research and for the regional research projects pursued by Universities (Roymans and Heeren 2004/5, 31).

A quality control system — with technical and scientific specification of aims and methods — has been imposed by the Dutch government (at the insistence of the archaeological and academic community) to oversee that all the archaeological interventions in its own territory respond to the European conventions stated at Valletta (Willems and van der Dries 2007b; Willems and Brandt 2004; Bazelmans 2006).

The effects that these European policies had nation-wide were explained to me by Dr Heleen van Londen (assistant professor at the Amsterdam Archaeological Centre) during her interview:

The Dutch ‘Monuments Act’ of 1961 was modified because of the Valletta Treaty. A lot of money and decision making about the content of research shifted from universities to consultants in the market or to the people in government positions, and there is still a lot of tension and criticism from both parties, which has a lot to do with power shift. […] EU conventions, the Valletta Convention, the European landscape convention and the Faro convention, are very explicit that
all member states that do sign up promote European identity. (Van Londen, interview 20/11/2013)

This complex institutional structure generates multiple and diverse — and often conflicting — interest groups. Thus, when it comes to deciding on a research focus, multiple agendas are currently in operation at different levels: European, national, regional, municipal, private sector (development and construction companies and lobbies). Funding is available depending on the agenda/s followed and hence scholarly focus and archaeological practice regarding Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in the Netherlands varies accordingly (e.g. VU’s native Batavian focus — mostly funded by the NWO —, or Nijmegen’s Roman provincial interests — most probably favoured by regional and municipal interest, funding, and local availability of archaeological evidence). As Heleen van Londen put it:

There is a lot of money now available for research on regional landscapes and the creating of regional identities, and if you look at politicians at their municipalities, they are all interested in their own cultural DNA. These are the words they use. (van Londen, interview 20/11/2013)

Paradigmatic of the influence of these local/regional agendas on research development is the use that Nijmegen’s municipality makes of its ‘Batavian heritage’. Examples of this are: the use of the title of ‘oldest city of The Netherlands’ — formulated upon Nijmegen’s location in the area of the Batavian capital; a very successful archaeological museum that exploits the interest that the city’s Roman and native past generates — e.g. through thematic exhibitions (De Bataven: Verhalen van een Verdwenen Volk, 2004); or public displays of the role of the city in the ancient past of the region, in recognition of the public and touristic interest that these attracts — e.g. a replica of a Roman imperial column (Figure 5.6) and a lookout over the Rhine with a quote in remembrance of the Batavian leader Civilis (Figure 5.7), both in the Valkhof, the highest area of the city where the old Oppidum Batavorum was located.
Figure 5.6. The ‘Column of Gods’, a modern commemorative column in the Valkhof square (Nijmegen), in front of the local archaeology museum. It was unveiled in 2005 by the then Prime Minister and Mayor among great public interest. The base is a bronze replica of stone fragments, excavated in 1980, of the original Roman column, preserved inside the museum. The remainder of the column is built with black marble slabs in a modern style (Source: Fer de Vries).

Figure 5.7. Verse on a balustrade in the Valkhof Park looking at the river Waal, after the poet Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687): *HIC STETIT HIC FRENDENS AQUILAS HIC LUMINE TORVO CLAUDIUS ULTRICES VIDIT ADESSE MANUS* — “Here he stood, here he saw, reluctantly, the eagles, here Claudius saw, with a grim look on his face, the avenging troops approach” (Source: Han Dekker).
At a European level, agendas are clearly established in the Valletta document too: archaeological heritage is “a source of the European collective memory” (Bazelmans 2006, 55). While there is no hint of a nationally driven agenda (at least not in nationalistic terms), the establishment of the National Archaeological Research Agenda (NOaA) defines much of the archaeology done in the entire territory of The Netherlands (Bazelmans 2006, 60).

The NOaA provides guidelines to ensure the quality of archaeological research and the preservation of cultural heritage. Furthermore, it is meant to provide methodological and thematic guidelines to ensure coherence in the practice of archaeology and a common set of aims for all parties interested, and it is updated regularly (Bazelmans 2006); the next update is due in 2016.

The NOaA describes previous research and presents new questions to be followed in 25 chapters organised by periods, regions and themes (Nationale Onderzoeksagenda Archeologie 1.0). Set up under the auspices of the central government through its Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, it claims to be “produced jointly by all parties in the field of Archaeology (universities, heritage management organisations, local authority and provincial archaeologists, consultancies)” (Cultural Heritage Agency, 23/06/2015); it is “an initiative involving the whole discipline. The project group includes representatives of universities, central government, local and provincial authorities and archaeological agencies” (Bazelmans 2006, 59).

5.3.2. Origins and Institutional Development of Dutch Archaeology

The multiple overlapping interests and institutions just outlined had their foundations laid in the 19th century. That long history of Archaeology in The Netherlands needs to be described and acknowledged as a factor influencing its modern development. The historical narrative of Dutch archaeology that follows has a wider significance: the earlier history of many of these institutions shows that archaeology has always existed outside universities too in The Netherlands — whether through institutes, museums, amateur groups, etc. — and that it has always had an international dimension.
Dutch interest in the recovery and preservation of ancient remains can be traced back further. There are some early recordings of archaeological monuments being unearthed in quite destructive non-scholarly excavations during the 16th century — for example the coastal castle at Brittenburg near Katwijk, revealed after seasonal inundations (1520; 1552; 1562; 1581; 1627) (Figure 5.8); Voorburg near The Hague; and Roomburg near Leiden (Halbertsma 2003, 112).

Additional examples are the appearance in the 17th century of literary compilations of archaeological remains seeking to illustrate the Dutch ancient past, such as Antiquiteten (1660) and Annales Drenthiae (1660) by the clergyman J. Picardt (Figure 5.9).
Furthermore, the involvement of the Dutch state in the conservation and management of cultural heritage through the creation of a ‘Monuments Protection Act’ can be traced back as early as 1734 (Willems 1997, 4). Such an Act was created as a response to the threat posed by floods on the Hunebeden (Stone Age graves), and it was combined with and followed by a system of national inventories, legal protection schemes and other measures.

These were common currency in early modern Europe, linked to patriotic or nationalistic ideologies of the ruling establishment looking to the ancient past for legitimization and prestige (Kristiansen 2000, 25), but The Netherlands witnessed this quite early for various political, economic and religious reasons. This is one of the earliest examples of the passing of such laws in Europe, following some earlier Scandinavian instances — e.g. the ‘Royal Decree’ in Denmark (1626) issued to all clergy requiring them to report all historical remains in their parishes, and the ‘Antiquities Ordinance’ in Sweden (1666), the first archaeological heritage protection law in the world, which decreed that all monuments in the Kingdom were the property of the Crown, who was responsible for protecting and preserving them as part of the Swedish heritage (Cleere 2008, 3-4).

The 19th century is the period of the creation and development of public institutions and societies devoted to the study of the ancient past. The year 1818 witnessed the birth under royal decree of the first Dutch institution linked with the preservation of cultural heritage: the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden (RMO – National Museum of Antiquities) in Leiden. That same
year Caspar Reuvens (Figure 5.10) was appointed both as its first director and the first holder of a Chair in Archaeology at the University of Leiden — the first of its kind in Europe. As such, Reuvens played a very important role in the origin of Dutch modern archaeology (Grane 2007, 15). His double role at the RMO and the university reveals that the overlapping nature of modern and current Dutch archaeological practice — as pointed out in Section 5.3.1 — has historical precedents.

![Figure 5.10. Portrait of C. J. C. Reuvens (1793-1835) (Source: Creative Commons).](image)

At first sight Reuvens’ activities seem more in line with the antiquarianism that characterised the 17th and 18th centuries than with the modern scientific conception of the discipline. He drew on multiple international contacts at foreign museums to rapidly expand the collection that he curated at the RMO (Halbertsma 2003; 2008) and he worked on an archaeological atlas of The Netherlands that was only published after his death — *Kaart van de in Nederland, Belgïë en gedeelte der aangrenzende landen gevonden Romeinsche, Germaansche of Gallische oudheden: benevens de Romeinsche en andere oude wegen* (1845).

However, Reuvens was also a pioneer and promoter of fieldwork as a source of knowledge of the past. His excavations (1827-33) of the capital of the civitas of the Cananefates — *Forum Hadriani* — were very sophisticated for the time, with meticulous
collection and recording of archaeological material and ‘professional’ excavation techniques, as was his desire to carry investigations in the field (Halbertsma 2008). When the King and his Ministry of Culture viewed excavations as a bad investment of funds that otherwise could be used for the acquisition of more antiquities for the collections, Reuvens appealed repeatedly to national pride and foreign glory to explain the importance of archaeological excavations and to push his project through (Halbertsma 2008, 32-33).

Understanding the context of his actions is important: the United Kingdom of The Netherlands was proclaimed in 1815 shortly after the end of the tumultuous period of the short-lived ‘Batavian Republic’ and subsequent French occupation. As such, the creation of the RMO and the Chair of Archaeology at Leiden can be seen as a legitimization of the new political regime — a process largely repeated throughout Europe.

This historical context also explains a broader thematic shift in terms of scholarly focus on Dutch ancient populations: while the previous centuries were characterised by a virtual monopoly of the Batavians as forefathers of the Dutch nation and as topic of choice, the aftermath of the ‘Batavian republic’ imposed by the French Napoleonic regime would see their fall and the rise of the ‘tribal trinity’: Frisians, Franks and Saxons (Beyen 2009). The negative effect that the use of the label Batavian by a short-lived occupying regime had on their perception as a national reference was not overcome until the mid-20th century (Section 4.3.6).

Reuvens’ role in establishing what would be the embryonic form and structure of Dutch archaeology was crucial (Brongers 2002). Unfortunately, his early death in 1835 put a halt to such developments, and professional approaches to archaeology were not to be seen on Dutch soil until the very early 20th century (Verhart 2008, 222).

The RMO held an official monopoly of excavations from its creation (1818) until the mid-20th century. However, this control was not total, as numerous local and regional amateur archaeological societies were founded in that period. Important examples were De Nederlandse Oudheidkundige Bond (1899), which followed the guidelines and focus of the RMO in terms of archaeological heritage, and De vereeniging voor Terpenonderzoek (1899), which was devoted to the study of the mounds (Terpen) typical of the northern provinces of Groningen and Friesland. Both groups carried out excavations with minimal scientific input and relevance (Grane 2007, 16).
The early 20th century saw the definitive take-off of Archaeology as a professional discipline in The Netherlands. Foreign academic interaction, especially with Germany in the form of fieldwork training and education of rising key Dutch scholarly figures, added great scientific value to Dutch archaeological research (Bloemers 2000, 381). Development was then halted, like everywhere in Europe, by the World Wars and a shift on state priorities. However, the 1900s-1940s is a period of central importance for the development of Dutch archaeology and deserves careful examination.

In 1904, and under the RMO’s directorship of his father A. E. J. Holwerda, a young Jan Hendrik Holwerda (Figure 5.11) became the first curator of the newly created Dutch department at the RMO, in charge of overseeing the collections and archaeological activities related to the early Netherlands (prehistoric, Roman and medieval). The Holwerdas wanted the RMO to play a central, nation-wide role in Dutch archaeology, and it did so until 1945 when, once again, the aftermath of a historical episode — the Nazi occupation and its political effects on the RMO as a central heritage bureau — had a notable impact on the institution, which progressively lost such a role afterwards (Eickhoff 2005; 2008; Van Es 1972b; Sarfatij 1972; Brongers and Mank 1977).

A very heavy influence from German archaeology can be detected in the first half of the 20th century, mainly in terms of methodology, but to a lesser degree in terms of interpretative frameworks. Methods such as the recognition of postholes and of different soil traces were imported by Holwerda after his study visit in 1905 to the Roman site at Haltern in

Figure 5.11. A. E. J Holwerda (1845-1922) (Source: Nationaal Archief Fotocollectie) and J. H. Holwerda (1873-1951) (Source: Verhart 2008a, 8).
Germany (Grane 2007, 16; Verhart 2008, 222). A culture-historical approach to the past, developed in Germany through the works of Virchow and Kossinna, was widely influential across other western European academic communities, including The Netherlands. Van Giffen’s (1930) dedication of his work to Kossinna — noted by Slofstra (1994, 12) — is a good example of these connections.

Although the approach did remain popular beyond 1945, it was progressively substituted by other currents during the post-war period due to its association to racial research of the Third Reich (Eickhoff 2003). However, as Verhart (2008, 222) has pointed out, the scientific development of Dutch archaeology in the pre-war period responded more to personal endeavours and not so much to European trends.

Holwerda’s commitment to making the RMO a central institution for Archaeology in The Netherlands, added to his personal style, soon created friction with some regional museums and institutions, prominently northern ones, and more specifically with certain individuals, most certainly with Boeles, curator of prehistory at the Fries Museum (Leeuwarden), and Albert E. van Giffen (Figure 5.12). In 1911, the latter entered the RMO as an assistant. As a biologist his views and research techniques imported from botanic research — such as the combination of levels and sections creating a three-dimensional approach to archaeology and his application of the ‘quadrant method’ — would very soon clash with those of Holwerda, clearly oriented towards historical sources and the collection of artefacts. A series of personal and professional conflicts between Holwerda and van Giffen (including an accusation by the latter to the former of academic fraud) ended up with van Giffen accepting the Chair of Prehistory at the University of Groningen in 1917, where shortly after (1922) he founded the BAI (Biologisch-Archaeologisch Instituut) (Verhart 2008a, 9). These rivalries were the genesis of the structural evolution of Dutch archaeology, and it affected its characteristic development in such a manner that Verhart (2008, 223) and Eickhoff (2013, 155) see distinct ‘traditions’ of doing archaeology — centred on the universities of Leiden and Groningen. As we will analyse later (Section 7.5.1) these divergent regional trends remain a feature of today’s Dutch archaeology.
However, this personal conflict did not resolve favourably for Holwerda, whose aspiration to have the RMO as the central institute for archaeological research would come to an end when in 1947 van Giffen’s newly founded ROB (De Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek — State service of archaeological investigation, in Amersfoort) took over that duty. The origins of the institution were described in detail by Van Es (1972b), who saw the development of archaeological heritage protection policies and the organization of archaeological heritage management around this institute as a reaction to German occupation (Van Es 1972b, 17-24).

Since its creation soon after the end of WWII (1947), the ROB (Dutch State Service for Archaeological Investigations) was officially the only national institute in charge of all excavations run in The Netherlands, alongside other duties such as monuments protection (Van Es 1972b, 28; 1972b, 120; Sarfatij 1972, 79). However, in the Monuments Act of 1961 “there is no trace of the special status of the ROB… as the central and sole excavation institute” (Van Es 1972b, 30). While it had been responsible for some excavations, these only represented a fraction of the total number of excavations carried out in The Netherlands (Van Es 1972c, 119), and with the exception of long-term investment on the excavations at Nijmegen, these were mostly rescue excavations or excavations related to the protection of threatened monuments. The reality is that the ROB never functioned as the sole excavation national institute (Van Es 1972b, 29; 30). Its real practical function was more related to the application of heritage policies and the national integration of archaeological research (Van Es 1972b, 32).
Van Giffen’s foundational activity only finished when in 1951 he created the IPP (Instituut voor Pre- en Protohistorie) at the University of Amsterdam. These institutions were created with different aims in mind: while the ROB aimed to excavate and document the Dutch archaeological heritage, the IPP was created at the University of Amsterdam to approach the same thematic contents (the ancient past of The Netherlands) from a more interpretative perspective (Willems 1997: 9-10; T. Grane 2007: 17).

In any case, this was the genesis of the post-war institutional decentralisation process in Dutch archaeology which would see its peak in the late 1980s and early 1990s with the application of European policies (Valletta Convention) and the exponential increase of other institutional elements such as commercial archaeology units (Section 5.3.1). For all these reasons exposed above, Van Giffen would end up being considered the pivotal figure in the post-war expansion of academic archaeological research in The Netherlands, and the father of its institutional development (Eichkoff 2013, 158; Verhart 2008, 222; Safartij 1972; Waterbolk 1976; 1989).

5.4. Periods, Generations, and Genealogies

Intellectual genealogies hold the key for understanding current intellectual trajectories and therefore… we need more historiography. (Versluys 2014, 52)

Verluys’ important reminder is probably inspired by the conceptualisation that Dutch scholars themselves have produced of their own development. In a relatively small academic community hierarchical structures grow in importance, due to the familiarity of its members and the clear presence of one or two leading individuals. Section 5.3.2 gave several examples of how similar patterns of intellectual influence were apparent in earlier periods of the institutional development of Dutch Roman provincial archaeology. Therefore, thinking in terms of scholarly genealogies is a relevant and useful approach to the study of intellectual activity and trajectories in the region.

Roymans and Heeren (2004/5) produced a hundred-year review dedicated entirely to the analysis of the evolution of studies of rural indigenous populations in The Netherlands and their interaction with the Roman empire, providing a valuable chronological narrative around the development of the topic within Dutch archaeology and its wider context during
the period under scrutiny. They identify three periods in the development of post-war Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction studies, a reliable and topic-specific periodization to be used as a guide in this study — Period 1 (1904-1960), in which the focus of early studies of ancient rural habitat was on the identification of native round houses described by the ancient sources; Period 2 (1960-1985), in which the post-WWI innovations allowed archaeological research on Romano-native habitats to take off, again with the discovery of native rectangular settlement patterns and farmsteads; Period 3 (1985-2004), in which the Romanisation of the area and the characterisation of the ancient rural landscape were defined. Three years later, Willems (2007, 554; interview notes, 26/05/2011) produced another paper, identifying four generations of scholars for the post-war period — a generational divide that had been already pointed out by Bloemers (2000, 384).

Bloemers’ and Willems’ chronological structure reinforces my opinion regarding the great importance of academic genealogies. Hence, I have combined this idea of scholarly generations with Roymans’ and Heeren’s periodization. Then, I have assigned relevant scholars to each one of those generations basing my classification on some parameters that in my opinion reflect well some of the underlying structures of Dutch archaeology. Those parameters — defining factors of the development of discourses in these two scholars (Section 6.4 and 6.6) —, are:

- Periods in which scholars started their academic engagement with the topic of Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions (normally coinciding with their formative years).
- Genealogical relationship to their PhD supervisors, where normally supervisor and student will not be in the same generation.
- Period of active involvement with the topic, which, on occasions, goes over the boundaries of pre-established periods and generations.

Using these parameters, a chart (Figure 5.13) has been produced based on the three post-WWII periods described by Roymans and Heeren (2004/5), grouping relevant scholars into five generations, thus identifying one more generation than Willems recognised (Gonzalez Sanchez 2012, 102). In fact, while Willems (2007, 554) places himself in the second generation basing his decision on a purely chronological parameter of academic contemporaneity, the role played by Willems in transforming inherited ways of studying the topic is so important, and his style differs in so many ways from that applied by his predecessors (Generation 2), that he deserves opening a new stage (Generation 3).
This periodization is necessarily flexible, and those parameters cannot be uncritically applied to all scholars. Such is the case of what I might call the ‘Roymans exception’, explained as follows. Although Roymans’ early involvement with the topic, academic background, and genealogical academic relationship to Bloemers, match very closely those of Willems, I have placed them in different periods and generations for several reasons. Roymans’ involvement with the topic outlives by far that of Willems, who stopped seeing it as his central research focus in the early 1990s; Roymans continued being the leading reference on the topic well into the 1990s and 2000s, and still is nowadays. While Willems’ works still influence in intellectual terms the latest generations of archaeologists dedicated to the study of the ‘native’ populations of The Netherlands in Roman times, Roymans’ influence on these younger scholars is somehow more direct, with multiple genealogical ties, supervising doctoral research, and assisting the career development opportunities to many of them, which induces me to position him in a later generation and period than Willems. This inclination to separate Roymans and Willems in different generations was backed up by
Willems himself, whose own generational classification did so as well (2007, 544). This ‘exception’ made to the parameters in which my periodization is based, and the differences between Willems and Roymans that I have just outlined, are of critical importance to understand my choice of these two scholars as representative of the last four decades of developments in Dutch Roman archaeology.

Finally, a more recent and large group of young scholars (e.g. Heeren, Nicolay, Groot, Stoffels, de Bruin) are part of a fifth generation who have developed this field of study greatly by adding new methodologies and theoretical approaches. The importance and innovative character of this latest group were also pointed out by Carol van Driel-Murray (pers. comm., e-mail 28/04/2011) saying that: “…they will be taking the subject forward in their own way”.

5.5. Conclusions

Essentially, this chapter adds two main points to the discussion developed so far in this thesis. Firstly, that archaeological investigation in The Netherlands operates in a variety of different institutional contexts – inside and outside universities. The overlapping nature and the complexity of the institutional structure in modern Dutch archaeology has its origins in the 19th century, but has increased much with the implementation of wider national factors — cultural, political and geo-economic — and European context — mainly its heritage management policies and agendas. Hence, the long history of archaeological institutions in The Netherlands needs to be described and acknowledged as a factor in itself that partially explains the modern development of Dutch archaeology. The historical narrative of Dutch archaeology has a wider significance: the earlier history of many of these institutions shows that archaeology has always existed outside universities too in The Netherlands — whether through institutes, museums, amateur groups, or private enterprise — and that it has always had an international dimension.

Secondly, taking into account this complex institutional nature and the specific geopolitical, economic, and social characteristics and context in which the discipline has developed in The Netherlands, a realisation emerges: thinking about scholarly genealogies is the best way of assessing developments in archaeology in The Netherlands post-WWII. This approach, far from being new, represents the terms in which Dutch scholars have
conceptualized their own development, as proven by many examples provided in Section 5.3.2. However, I am reformulating this approach by introducing the analysis of contextual factors, both at the broader level of the archaeological community (Chapters 3-5) and at an individual level (Chapter 6).

The resulting chronological structure (Figure 5.13) will be applied hereby to the analysis of Dutch post-war evolution of the discipline, its methodological and interpretative trends, and its academic discourses on Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions, with special emphasis on the last four decades, and using Willem Willems and Nico Roymans as guides in this important process.
Chapter 6. Deconstructing Post-war Academic Discourses on Roman:‘barbarian’ Interaction (1945-2015)

6.1. Introduction

In this chapter all the contextual factors described so far (Chapters 3-5) and others that are related to archaeology as a community of scholars — the social dynamics of the discipline; internal power structures and personality dynamics; academic genealogies, groups and trends; centres of ‘power’ and their agendas; changing publication trends; wider intellectual movements in the social sciences and internal development of theoretical frameworks; academics and their individual preferences and personalities — will be both traced and used to produce a contextual analysis of the formulation of Dutch archaeological discourses around the topic of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in the lower Rhine. This analysis will follow a chronological structure, following from the early institutional development of the discipline outlined earlier (see Section 5.3.2) and, using the periodization formulated in Section 5.4 (Figure 5.13), post-war Periods 1-3 (1945-2015) will be examined in search of the methodological and theoretical developments, with special emphasis on the last four decades.

This historiographical analysis needs to centre on relevant Dutch scholars, i.e. those who have set new research trends and influenced the evolution of the discipline. While it is relatively easy to identify those prominent figures in early periods, the number of relevant figures multiplies exponentially as we approach the current day. Firstly, because the post-war structural growth of universities, institutes and agencies dedicated to archaeology or heritage has produced an increase in the number of scholars; secondly, because the longer in time the period analysed is, the easier it becomes to put the work and relative importance of its scholars in context and by being too close — even contemporary — to the period and generation under study I certainly lack the perspective I would have if I were to scrutinise earlier periods and their scholars.

Hence, my initial intention was to cover in detail a variety of scholars (Van Giffen, Holwerda, Waterbolk, Van Es, Bogaers, Bazelmans, Bloemers, Slofstra, Willems, Roymans, van Driel-Murray, Heeren, de Bruijn, Stoeffels) across different generations. However, as noted in the Preface, I finally opted for fine detail instead of quantity, and so I have produced
extensive dossiers on two pivotal figures of Dutch Roman archaeology during the last four decades — Willem Willems and Nico Roymans — as one-person guides to Periods 2 (1960-1985) and 3 (1985-2014) respectively.

Arguably, the analysis of further authors in those two periods and of archaeologists whose works cover other pre-historical and early medieval periods would generate a more complete overview of the discipline. However, my focus is the Dutch study of Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions, and accordingly, only scholars dedicated to the period initially established for this thesis (50 BC – AD 250; see Section 1.5 for a justification) have been selected for scrutiny.

While providing individual dossiers of other scholars in those periods would have provided more material for discussion, I argue that Willems and Roymans are fully representative of the development of Dutch archaeological approaches and discourses on the topic in the last four decades, and their works illustrate perfectly well the internal evolution of the discipline and the effects of contextual factors in the formulation of discourse. As will be described later, they both engaged academically with the topic very early in their academic career, at a time — the late 1970s and early 1980s — crucial for understanding the changes occurred in the discipline in The Netherlands; they both shared academic spaces during their formation years at the IPP (Institute for Pre- and Proto-history) in Amsterdam, and even had the same doctoral supervisor (Tom Bloemers); they both have the Batavian tribe as their main research focus, but with very different approaches; and they both play pivotal roles in the importation, adaptation and development of theoretical frameworks in which Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction discourses have evolved. Yet their trajectories are clearly distinctive and reflect different ways of approaching the Roman past of The Netherlands.

Their works will be scrutinised in order to extract the main themes of their discourses, and to gather general trends in order to characterise the discourses generated in The Netherlands during the last four decades. For that purpose, dossiers on both scholars have been produced, and within them an in-depth analysis of their careers and works has been conducted, feeding my conclusions about discourse development with the contextual factors described so far and with material extracted from the interviews conducted with them and other scholars in The Netherlands, who are also key to understand the development of these two main figures and of the academic community as a whole. This constitutes a
contextualised approach to the more intimate spheres of influence on the formulation of discourse, i.e. personal (S1) and local/institutional (S2).

Finally, while a more extensive use of the interview data collected would be desirable, its limitations and the very nature of this research project makes this a difficult task. In many cases, I conducted only one extended interview per scholar. A second round of interviews after completing the forthcoming analysis, would have allowed me to ask more specific questions, obtain more directly relevant quotes, and support my conclusions more firmly. Furthermore, the lack of audio recordings for some of the interviews means that in those cases I can only count with my own notes, leaving me with a potentially biased record of our conversations, not giving me the confidence to fully use it as reliable testimonies. I will comment more on the methodological limitations and ways forward in Chapter 8.

6.2. Pre-War and Post-War Period 1 (1900-1960)

Van Giffen and Holwerda, central figures of the 1900s-1930s, were very much influenced by German archaeological techniques and traditions of interpretation (Germanische Altertumskunde). This influence favoured a culture-historical approach based on imported techniques from German settlement archaeology, and it was the result of personal relationships of these scholars — and the institutions they oversaw — with German colleagues, and the archaeological training they received during research visits to Germany. In this sense, special attention needs to be given at the end of this period to the situation during the German occupation as it is considered an important factor affecting the institutional development of Dutch archaeology (Eickhoff 2003; 2008; van Es 1972b; Sarfatij 1972).

Through a succession of excavation projects — e.g. de Waele 1931 —, Nijmegen (the Batavian capital Ulpia Noviamagus) and the Roman military structures along the limes area became an epicentre for the study of Roman provincial archaeology in The Netherlands (van Es 1983). This reflects the urban military character of Roman provincial archaeology in this period. Meanwhile, the main aim of early Dutch archaeological research on the native populations was the identification of material evidence and ‘round houses’ of ‘Batavian’ or ‘Germanic’ style. Thus, approaches to that issue during the first half of the 20th century (e.g. Holwerda 1922; Braat 1949) were based on historical analysis, aspirations of an ethnic
explanation (*l’ethnische Deutung*) of material culture, and a normative conception of culture (Roymans and Heeren 2004, 5).

The belief that Batavian native houses were of circular shape was based on Tacitus’ descriptions of the Batavians as Germanic peoples rediscovered in the 16th century, but Roymans and Heeren (2004, 3) think this does not justify entirely the representation of their settlements as round houses, as the only reference to round houses in Northern Gaul is not Tacitus’ but Strabo’s (*Geo.* IV, 4.3). Thus, they concluded these images need to be attributed to the pictorial representations of that period of scholarly ‘rediscovery’ (Figures 6.1-6.4), which later on were interpreted under the influence of the colonial situation of the 18th and 19th centuries and the application of ideas of primitiveness to the Germanic-Batavian context.

![Figure 6.1. Petrus Kaerius, Représentation des cabanes bataves dans l’atlas Germania Inferior (1617) (Source: Roymans and Heeren 2004, 5).](image1)

![Figure 6.2. Jacob Folkema, Aloude Kleedy der Batavische Vrouwen (1734) (Source: Roelofs and Swinkels 2004, 61).](image2)
Figure 6.3. Anonymous, *Landschap met Bataven* (c. 1830-1850) (Source: Roelofs and Swinkels 2004, 61).

Figure 6.4. Reinier Vinkeles, *Landbouw der Batavieren* (1784) (Source: Roelofs and Swinkels 2004, 66).
In this pre-war period most of the research on native settlements on the Roman side of The Netherlands (Southern Netherlands) was generated by the RMO at Leiden, under its head Holwerda (1922), who introduced many innovative German techniques that allowed the identification of wooden buildings. However, technical constraints — small trenches opened by hand — and the clayish soil of the south led archaeologists to believe that these were round houses, believed to be characteristic of native unplanned Batavian settlements (Braat 1949; Roymans and Heeren 2004, 7). The only exception would be the rectangular house discovered by Van der Sanden in Alphen (1938) — a unique find in Southern Netherlands until the second half of the 20th century (Roymans 1977, 111-21).

Meanwhile, in the North, the application by van Giffen (1936) and his colleagues at the BAI of these imported techniques to the investigation of Germanic style settlements produced the first finds of rectangular houses — Ezinge terp in the Frisian Coastal area (Roymans and Heeren 2004, 7). However, these finds would have little influence on the research of native settlements in the southern part of The Netherlands until the end of the early post-war period.

The early post-war period — Period 1 (1945-60) —, however, was characterised by a continuity with the pre-war status quo in most facets of Dutch archaeology. Post-war reconstruction efforts and the decline of the RMO as the leading archaeological institution virtually halted research on rural habitats until the 1960s, once the rise of new archaeological institutes — ROB, and university institutes — was completed. Academically, the main figures are Waterbolk (1954), Glasbergen (1954a/b), both students of van Giffen, with PhD theses produced at the BAI in Groningen. They went on to occupy positions as head of different archaeological institutes, and they would apply very similar styles.

In terms of academic approaches to the study of the native populations, this early post-war discourse brought few innovations with respect to the research produced in the pre-war period. However, an important piece of research on the native populations of The Netherlands in Roman times needs to be mentioned: Modderman’s (1949; 1951) survey of the Batavian area and systematic inventarisation of settlements and material evidence had a huge impact on the research produced in the following period. His ‘diachronic’ approach to archaeological survey was, according to Willems (1980, 277), the first example of a methodological approach that would become a trend in Dutch archaeology in the 1970s; it also provided the first archaeological database specifically focused on the Batavian area.
6.3. Period 2 (1960-1985)

Dutch archaeology experienced a rapid growth after WWII, but especially from the late 1960s onwards; until then, the continuity described in Period 1 still featured prominently. This process can be explained by a growing national economy (Slofstra 1994), the development of new institutions and other institutional developments (see Section 5.3.2), and the arrival of new techniques and interpretative frameworks in the academic community (Verhart 2008, 223-4).

The economic growth provoked a rapid urban expansion into rural land in certain areas of the nation (see Section 5.2; Figure 5.1), promoting archaeological interventions and the accumulation of data, and impacting on research strategies and focus choices. Institutionally this was a period of stability, with the ROB and the university institutes — especially the IAP (Leiden) and the AIVU (Free University, Amsterdam) — as the main promoters of archaeological research on the native populations during Roman times. The IPP would play a central role in the theoretical development of Dutch archaeology (see Section 6.3.2). Technological advancements, derived mainly from WWII scientific developments, allowed the introduction of new methods of excavation. Examples of these are new dating techniques (e.g. C14 and pollen analysis), mainly applied by researchers at the BAI (Groningen), or the use of powerful bulldozers (Figure 6.5) that allowed the archaeological assessment of large areas at speed — a necessary step in order to identify settlement patterns (Roymans and Heeren 2004, 6; Bazelmans 2006, 64; Arnoldussen 2013, 723).

Figure 6.5. Excavations at Geldrop (Photo: IPP; Source: Roymans 1996b, Fig. 3). Note the bulldozer opening a great portion of land and the use of metal detecting techniques.
This new situation shifted the traditional focus on Roman Nijmegen progressively towards an interest in the structure and evolution of native rural habitats. The most important achievement regarding the archaeological research on rural native populations during the Roman era (1st – 4th centuries) was the recognition of rectangular structures as the most common type of native habitational choice in all regions of The Netherlands — and therefore the dismissal of the traditional idea of native unstructured settlement —, and the acknowledgement of regional variation (Figure 6.6; Roymans and Heeren 2004, 12).

Figure 6.6. Distribution of rural habitats with farmhouses in Roman times (Source: Roymans 1996, fig. 18; Roymans and Heeren 2004, Fig. 3). A: non-villa landscapes; B: villa landscapes; C: rural habitats with farmhouses.

In the coastal regions — with notable excavations at the site of Rijswijk ‘De Bult’ in the area of the Cananefates (1967-69) published by Bloemers (1978) — and in the southerly sandy soils — with excavations at Haps (from 1972), Oss (from 1976) and Hoogelon (1980-86) published, among others, by Slofstra (1987) and more recently by Roymans (2014) — progress was made towards the identification of native farmhouses of rectangular shape and the progressive Romanisation of habitat styles towards the 3rd century AD (Figures 6.7 and 6.8).
However, in the river area the clayish nature of the soil made it very difficult for archaeologists to dismantle Braat’s idea of unstructured Batavian settlements. In fact, Van Es
(1972a, 169) and Willems (1984, 64) call these sites without recognisable shape ‘post-hole swarm settlement’ (Roymans and Heeren 2004, 14). It would not be until the late 1970s and 1980s when excavations at Druten (1974-78) and Wijk-bij-Duurstedede ‘De Horden’ (1977-86; Figure 6.9) would provide evidence of structured and planned farmhouses with clear Roman influences — presence of mural paintings, small bath houses, and stone foundations — and periods of long occupation, from Late La Tène to the early 3rd century (Roymans 1996, 75).

This second post-war period also witnessed important developments in the field of interpretative frameworks. The works of Bloemers and Willems are crucial in this sense, and represent the integration of both native and military aspects — this recognised as one of the characteristics of Dutch Roman archaeology. They established the socio-economic nature of the relationship between rural settlements and military bases — i.e. farmhouses of the interior providing food to the military camps in the limes. Based on archaeobotanical and zooarchaeological research, Bloemers (1978) calculated the surplus that a site like Rijswijk (in the territory of the Cananefates) would need to produce to feed the Roman army. Willems (1984, 230-237; 256) calculated that in the pre-Flavian period the Batavians were subject to intensive recruitment (c. 5550 men — approximately 1/6 of their entire population) to serve permanently in the Roman army. They established the very familiar idea of a territory under huge pressure by the Roman military presence in the limes (Figure 6.10).
Figure 6.10. Pre-Flavian military recruitment in the different native territories (Source: Roymans 1996, Fig. 4). Note how the most intensive recruitment was concentrated on the Batavian civitas.

The strong German methodological influence perceived in previous periods (see Section 6.2) was still present, and went a step further in this period with the importation of regional survey and settlement research techniques that would prove essential for the next stage of development of Dutch archaeological research (Bloemers 1999). However, this was also a period of intellectual reorientation in Dutch archaeology. Much credit for this change was given in the early 1980s to the theoretical impetus of Anglophone Processual archaeology — both British (Brandt and Slofstra 1983a) and American (see Section 6.4.1). This is clearly visible in the 1980 conference, Roman and Native in the Low Countries: Spheres of Interaction, and its subsequent proceedings (Brandt and Slofstra 1983) — a bibliographical keystone of Dutch archaeology of the Roman era discussed in detail later (Section 6.5.1), where the most relevant Dutch archaeologists of the 1970s, and a body of new scholars, coincided and discussed new theoretical avenues, notably the use of ‘acculturation’ as a model to describe the situation in the lower Rhine during Roman times (Reece 1985).
6.3.1. *The Character of Dutch Archaeology in the Early 1970s*

As already mentioned (Section 5.3.2) the ROB had a nation-wide responsibility. As such, changes to its policies, aims and decision-making parameters with regards to archaeological projects should be regarded as important contextual factors for the development of trends in thematic focus and discourse in Dutch archaeology.

In 1972, the ROB celebrated its 25th anniversary. To mark the occasion, the annual publication of the institute (BROB) dedicated that year’s volume to a retrospective analysis of its activities. Two papers by Van Es (1972b; 1972c) contained the analysis of the excavation records accumulated in the previous 25 years. Those papers constitute an extremely interesting insight into the way that archaeology was practised and perceived until then in The Netherlands. Through a number of distribution maps and block diagrams, Van Es (1972c) traces and identifies the main characteristics, features and trends of ROB-led excavations in the period 1947-1972, namely:

- “Slight decrease in the number of excavations since 1965” [...] while “the time involved in each settlement excavation has increased” opening the door to long-term projects, for which most example given by Van Es (1972c, 124) are Roman settlements, both civil and military. More available money and increasing independence of ROB are the reasons behind such a change on focus from rescue excavations to thematic projects based on a scientific aim. (ibid. 124-5).
- The lack of multidisciplinary research — “inclusion of subsidiary branches of archaeology… paleobotany, paleozoology, c14, geology, and soil survey” (ibid. 125-6) — is another of the trends identified by Van Es, and one of the suggestions for improvement made.
- Both the number and length of ROB’s excavations focused on the Roman period are bigger than nearly any other period analysed by Van Es, except for medieval monasteries, churches and castles (Van Es 1972c, fig. 2; 122); within the Roman period, an increasing emphasis on civil and military settlements over burial sites can also be detected since the 1950s (ibid. 121; 127). However, “in the period 1966-1971 there was a shift in emphasis from military to civilian Provincial-Roman settlements (ibid. 120-1), with the excavation of civilian sites at Rijswijk, Rimburg, Maastricht, Heteren, and Wijk bij Duurstede, and at the same time the temporary halt in the investigation of the *castra* in Nijmegen in 1967.” (ibid. 120-1).
In terms of ROB’s regional concentration of research on the Roman period, Van Es’ distribution map (Figure 6.11) illustrates very clearly the situation: “there has been a concentration of excavations in the South, which means that provincial Roman objects have received relatively much attention. In comparison there has been little activity in the study of free Germanic objects — mainly settlements…” (Van Es 1972c, 125), and when this happened it was mostly in the north-western coastal areas and the zone directly north of the Betuwe (traditionally considered the home of the Batavians); there is also an “almost complete lack of research in the western river areas and western North-Brabant” (ibid. 125) for any pre-medieval period.

Of course regional and thematic variations might relate to the existence of other regional institutes not considered in Van Es’ study more concerned with prehistoric research in areas neglected by ROB, e.g. Groningen’s BAI, Amsterdam’s IPP (Van Es 1972c, 127). However, he highlights that “certain areas, such as Overijssel, Gelderland, the Western River Area, were neglected by all institutes” (ibid. 125). Additionally, he was indeed analysing the central state service for archaeology (ROB), which might be indicative of state priorities and parameters, and regional socio-economic developments.

In sum, ROB’s emphasis in terms of excavation projects during what we could call the pre-Willems period was imbalanced geographically towards the Eastern River Area and thematically towards proto-historical and Roman periods. Based on those trends Van Es suggested some guidelines for improvement that would be later cited by Willems (Willems 1980, 277) as justification and context for his Eastern River Area project (ERA) — a flagship of the early part of his career dedicated to Roman provincial archaeology and the study of the Batavians. Paradoxically, none of the guidelines suggested by van Es were directed to tackle the geographical and thematic imbalances he had identified. The major lines of his proposal were: to focus on fewer projects; to make these more thematic in focus and integrate different aspects of research in an interdisciplinary fashion (e.g. archaeology, ecology, geography, soil surveys); and to consider sites under excavation in a wider regional context.

The 1970s, a decade of dramatic changes in Dutch archaeology, would bring winds of change mostly in terms of theoretical approaches to archaeological research on the topic. ‘Theory’ and ‘Anthropology’, as concepts from Anglo-American academic traditions, were innovations that a new generation of Dutch archaeologists was ready to embrace after decades of traditional (German) culture-historical approaches to the Roman past of their territory — e.g. Glasbergen, Waterbolk, van Es, Bogaers (Slofstra 1994, 3) —, with a few earlier exceptions, such as Modderman’s works (1949; 1951).

6.3.2. The 1970s Theoretical Revolution at the IPP, Amsterdam

… the atmosphere was congenial: intellectual freedom, unconstrained by monolithic ‘research designs’ or self-perpetuating politico-social ‘agendas’ […]. Successful acculturation, perhaps, and maybe the reason why I began to find Roman archaeology so attractive. (van Driel-Murray 2002, 56)
It was also theoretical models like centre-periphery, and I remember reading all these postcolonial articles when I was a student because that's what we were taught. (van Londen, interview)

Carol van Driel-Murray, a then 21-year-old British student, arrived in Amsterdam in 1971, initially for six months, not knowing it would become a permanent move attracted by the lively character of the institute. The IPP in Amsterdam was the epicentre of changes in Dutch archaeology during the second half of the 1970s and the 1980s. Among the scholars that were formed inside its walls were Willems, Roymans, Slofstra, Brandt, and van Driel-Murray herself — some of the most influential academics in Dutch Roman and Prehistoric archaeology. As such, the description and understanding of the dynamics of the Institute in that crucial moment of changes are important to pursue next.

In 2002 a one-day symposium was celebrated to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the IPP (Instituut voor Prae- en Protohistorie – Institute of Pre- and Protohistory; currently under the acronym AAC, Amsterdam Archeologisch Centrum — Amsterdam Centre for Archaeology). All papers presented, some of them reviewing fondly the history and stories of the Institute, were collected and published by Willy Groenman-van Waateringe and her colleagues (2002). Her opening speech, J. A. Bakker’s presentation and D. van der Waals’ closing remarks all provide valuable personal insights into the internal dynamics and developments that both the Institute and Dutch Archaeology experienced during the second half of the 20th century.

The IPP was founded at the University of Amsterdam by Albert Egges van Giffen in 1952 with the support of the city major (the UvA was not a state university until decades later) but no special sympathy or interest from the Faculty of Humanities (van der Waals 2002, 96-7). The omnipresent figure of van Giffen in early post-WWII Dutch archaeology also touched the IPP, of which he was both founder and first director (1952-1957).

Van Giffen had founded the BAI at Groningen in 1922 with the idea that archaeology could only progress through methodical excavations and interdisciplinary research involving both archaeological and botanical materials, with very little attention to theory: “Die Tatsachen bleiben, die Interpretation schwankt” — ‘the facts remain, the interpretation changes’ (van Giffen 1913, 1; Slofstra 1994, 13). Such a positivistic, empiricist approach to Archaeology was passed on when he founded the ROB in Amersfoort (1947) and the IPP in Amsterdam (1952), and it has been suggested that it also inspired Modderman’s foundation
of the Institute of Archaeology at Leiden’s University in 1963 (Bakker 2002, 13-14) — not to be mistaken with the RMO dependant of the Museum in Leiden. According to Groenman-van Waateringe (2002, 10) the research at the IPP during the 1950s and the 1960s was data-oriented, with a heavy influence from German archaeology, and with Childe’s culture-historical approach still an important interpretative framework; anthropological approaches coming from the American school were not yet highly regarded. Hence the lack of collaboration between the IPP and the Cultural Anthropology department (Bakker 2002, 14), illustrated by the comments made by Prof. André Köben years later in response to Glasbergen’s ideas about Childe and his theories: “the archaeologist’s view of anthropology is 30 years behind” (cited by Groenman-van Waateringe 2002, 10).

Willem Glasbergen, van Giffen’s disciple, replaced him at the front of the Institute (1957-1979); the growth, in size and importance, of the IPP in this period is commendable, as it was the promoter of interdisciplinary approaches to the study of the past, with a big role played by geographical and geological studies, a feature that van Giffen himself introduced and is still very much present in Dutch archaeology nowadays (Hessing 2001, 139). It is difficult to find works without a geological study, geomorphological maps, or ecological reconstructions. In the 1970s Andrew Sherratt said of Dutch Archaeologists: “they are all geographers” (cited by Bakker 2002, 15); and, as mentioned above, Waterbolk (1981) coined the term ‘Delta archaeology’ to define the special relationship between Dutch archaeologists and the riverine landscape of The Netherlands, and to describe how many regional projects in the 1970s were focused on Rhine-Meuse-Schelde-Demer delta and its human occupation in pre-history and antiquity (Bloemers 2000, 382).

After his death in 1979 Glasbergen was replaced in 1982 at the front of the Institute by one of his former doctoral students, Tom Bloemers, who, among many other things, introduced Archaeological Heritage Management, one of his main research interests, to the curriculum (Bakker 2002, 20). This succession of directors (van Giffen — Glasbergen — Bloemers) is another notable example of Dutch academic genealogies in action.

The 1970s and the 1980s, under the directorships of Glasbergen and Bloemers, were times of change and growth at the IPP — this period coincides with a consistent growth in number of students, members of staff, and funding for excavations and research projects. Although empirical research without much theory went on at the IPP (Bakker 2002, 15), this era also witnessed an increasing use of imported new intellectual trends and theoretical
developments, mostly from American ‘New Archaeology’ (Bloemers; 2000, 382; Bakker 2002, 13). The four visiting professors who stayed at the IPP in the two-year interim period between Glasbergen’s death and Bloemer’s appointment as director of the institute (1979-1981) surely had something to do with it: John O’Shea, Klaus Randsborg, Chris Peebles, and Ian Hodder (Groenman-van Waateringe 2002, 11). Renowned names in their own right for their innovative theoretical approaches; and names and approaches that surely left a mark on some of the students who had the opportunity to coincide with them at the IPP, as can be seen in the many references to their works in, for instance, Willems’ and Roymans’ publications.

Two consecutive generations/groups of students changed the nature and direction of the IPP, once some of their members become relevant figures throughout the following decades they also shaped the development of Dutch archaeology. These two groups, the ‘Gideon’s Gang’ (1970s) and the ‘Kempen Band’ (1980s), are part of the mythical discourse on which the shared memories of the academic community are based, and, as such, they were recalled and mentioned by most of the scholars that I interviewed.

Far from being antagonists they developed research in different directions but paying much more attention to theory than ever before at the IPP; and both had Jan Slofstra as a nexus. The ‘Gideon’s gang’, formed by Brandt, Hallewas, van der Leeuw, Slofstra, Voorrips and Willems (Bakker 2002, 19), introduced innovative theoretical approaches in the 1970s, trying to apply Binford’s and Clarke’s ‘New Archaeology’ to the study of ethnological and social aspects of prehistoric native populations in The Netherlands, and more specifically through the Assendelver Polders Project, on Frisian settlements from the Roman period. While Willems would move on to become a pivotal figure in Dutch archaeology, others like Brandt and van Beek continued their activity at the IPP, creating the RAAP foundation in the 1980s, and bringing archaeological field survey to the centre of archaeological practice (Bakker 2002, 20).

The ‘Kempen band’, featuring van der Sanden, Deeben, Bazelmans, Theuws, Roymans and Slofstra, was formed probably at a much earlier stage than the ‘Gideons Gang’ but became important at a later stage. The group’s origins are linked to the ‘Kempen’ research programme that a young Slofstra initiated in the 1970s on behalf of the VU in the Eindhoven area, south of the Meuse river. “Out of the blue, a group of schoolboy-helpers turned up who soon wanted to become archaeologists themselves” (Bakker 2002, 10). As such, Slofstra’s work and approaches would strongly influence the way these scholars would develop their
own discourses and approaches. Among those schoolboys some of the scholars that would spend their formative years at the IPP and were part of the ‘Kempenbende’, including Roymans. The ties that united them back in those days would have structural consequences in the development of archaeology in The Netherlands, with many of them occupying positions at different universities and archaeological institutions during the following decades.

Following Slofstra’s advice, most of them went to study Archaeology at the IPP (UvA), including Roymans, Nico Arts, Jos Deeben and Frans Theuws; Wijnand van der Sanden and Jos Bazelmans ended up at Leiden, but collaborated throughout the years with the IPP group. These eager students opened a strong link between the IPP and the province of Nord-Brabant, encouraged by the then director of the IPP, Tom Bloemers — a link that would influence a thematic focus on that area traceable in the following decades. They also brought new theoretical approaches, beyond the New Archaeology, a socially and anthropologically oriented background, with an emphasis on the importance of the interaction between ancient peoples and landscape.

Roymans was probably the central figure of that group and of subsequent generations of archaeologists. Once he attained his PhD (1987) he focused his attention on the Demer-Meuse-Schelde (DMS) area, i.e. Southern Netherlands. Shortly after (1994) he succeeded van Es in the Chair of North-Western European Archaeology at VU, an institution in expansion at that time. New jobs and research opportunities became available there and Roymans relied on those who collaborated with him in the DMS project at the IPP, including Hiddink, Derks, Fokkens and Gerritsen, who gained their PhDs under the supervision of either Roymans or Bloemers. That period was, in words of Bakker (2002, 11), one of ‘blood-letting’ for the IPP.

Although not exclusively focused on the archaeology of Roman times in The Netherlands, cutting-edge research in this field has consistently come out of the IPP, especially during the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s, when a sizeable concentration of both well-established scholars and eager newcomers made of it the centre of reference in Dutch archaeology. As will be analysed in detail later (Section 6.5.1), the colloquium on Romanisation organised in 1980 at VU (published in 1983 as an edited volume by Brandt and Slofstra) illustrates very clearly this generational confluence.

It was only in the context of financial recession in the 1990s, with reduced funding and resources, and important members of staff leaving the Institute (Groenman-van Waateringe 2002, 11) when the IPP lost its leadership to a rising and more resourceful Centre for
Archaeology at the Free University (ACVU). Roymans duly moved from the IPP to VU when he was offered the Chair of North-Western European Archaeology, and around his figure the rise of a new group of scholars definitely condemned the IPP to a secondary role. A shift of academic powers from one centre to the other was inevitable at this point.

Curiously, from that generation developed throughout the late 1970s and early 1980s at the IPP, three researchers survived the exodus provoked by Roymans and remained at the IPP, all of them women: Carol van Driel-Murray, Helen van Londen and Linda Therkorn. The former stayed at UvA for a couple of decades until she recently moved to Leiden doing magnificent work on the effects of intensive military recruitment on the formulation of ethnic identity among the lower Rhine tribes (especially the Batavians), and being an excellent theoretical counterpoint for Roymans approaches to the question, including the focus on the non-male non-elite segments of Batavian society (2002, 62). Heleen van Londen and Linda Therkorn carried out excavations for the IPP for decades and recently obtained their PhDs under the supervision of Bloemers, the former (2006) focusing on the study of landscapes in the area of Cananefates (following Bloemers’ research interest), and the latter (2004) on sites in the Assendelver polders.

None of these scholars are mentioned as part of any of these groups developed in the 1970s in the IPP, even though they participated in some common projects (e.g. Therkorn in the Assendelver polders project, with the ‘Gideon Gang’). This may sustain van Londen’s and van Driel Murray’s comments collected in their interviews about the androcentric and hermetic character of those groups, whose members currently occupy most chairs of Archaeology at Dutch universities.

**6.4. DOSSIER: Willem Willems**

Prof. Willem Willems (Figure 6.12) — who was the most senior scholar interviewed for this thesis — had a long, prosperous and influential academic career in Archaeology over the last forty years (Figure 6.13), becoming, as noted, a pivotal figure in the development of Dutch archaeology. He held the chairs of Roman Provincial Archaeology (from 1987) and International Archaeological Resource Management (since 2006) at the University of Leiden, until he recently passed away in December 2014. His contribution to Dutch archaeology was by no means limited to the academic community. In fact, the two chairs he held are
representative of two career strands he pursued, as can be traced through close analysis of his publication record.

With a productive first few years in the late 1970s, Willems’ publication career became most intense during the 1980 and 1990s (Figure 6.13). Thematically, during the late 1970s and 1980s he mostly focused on Roman provincial archaeology in The Netherlands. Through various projects — the Eastern River Area project (ERA) being the most important of them — and seminal publications dedicated to the study of indigenous populations in the area — specifically the Batavians —, he became one of the leading scholars dealing with the archaeology of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in the lower Rhine limes. He played a pivotal role in the development of this sub-discipline of Roman provincial archaeology in The Netherlands, integrating, synthesizing and transforming approaches inherited from a previous generation of ‘pioneers’ to produce a whole new corpus of data and theoretical interpretations eventually used by subsequent generations of Dutch archaeologists.

Figure 6.12. Prof. Willem Willems (1950-2014) (Source: Album Academicum, UvA).
Professionally, in this period he became Provincial Archaeologist of Limburg (1981-1988), a fact reflected in the numerous reports he produced on archaeological interventions which he carried out in that province (1981a; 1981c; 1981d; 1982a; 1982b; 1982c; 1982d; 1985c; 1986d; 1986e; 1987a; 1987c; 1987d; 1988i; 1988k; 1988n), especially in the journal *Archeologie in Limburg* and *PSHAL*, and the annual reports on his activity as provincial archaeologist (1981h; 1981i; 1983b; 1983c; 1983d; 1984a; 1985b; 1986f). His publication record shows a very special interest in the Roman villa rustica of Voorendal, also in Limburg about which he published in several occasions well into the 1990s (1986c; 1986d; 1987a; 1987b; 1987c; 1988h; 1988j; 1988k; 1992b; 1995f).

Arguably, his most important contributions to the field revolved around ROB’s ERA Project (1978-1980), a large-scale regional project he co-directed with Bloemers and Hulst. Publications related to this project span several site reports published in the KNOB bulletin before the project finished (1980; 1980a; 1980b; 1980c; 1980d; 1980e; 1980f; 1980g; 1980h), wider-scope papers interpreting on the outcome of the project during the following years (1981j; 1983; 1986a; 1986b; 1988c; 1988d), and two volumes (1981; 1984) published in the BROB (*Berichten van der Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek*) — the annual bulletin of the ROB. Detailed analysis of these will be provided in Section 6.4.2.

![Figure 6.13. Willems’ publications by decade (Source: Author). These figures take into account all his publications, independent of type, length, language, publisher or topic (see Appendix 7).](image-url)
This process would culminate on his doctoral thesis, *Romans and Batavians: A Regional Study in the Dutch Eastern River Area* (1986), and his appointment as Professor of Roman Provincial Archaeology at the University of Leiden soon after (1987). His inaugural lecture, *Oorzaak en gevolg van een opgraving* (‘Cause and Effect of an Excavation’), delivered that same year, was certainly based on his experience on Roman and native sites and topics. However, he decided to centre his presentation on fieldwork management and methodologies. This was perhaps a hint of the turn his career was taking.

Indeed, the 1990s would witness his progressive academic and professional shift toward archaeological heritage management (Figure 6.14). This can be explained by his career development towards this field, with his appointment as Director of the Dutch State Service for Archaeological Investigations (ROB) and State archaeologists in 1989 as a turning point. This had a direct reflection on the numerous prefaces he published as part of the BROB (1992d; 1993e; 1997k) and introductions to ROB’s yearbooks (1989d; 1990c; 1991f; 1992c; 1993; 1994; 1995e; 1996g; 1998b) — these normally reflecting his personal view of developments within Dutch archaeology.

![Figure 6.14. Willems’ thematic focus per decade (Source: Author; see Appendix 7).](image)

As state archaeologist of The Netherlands Willems participated in the Council of Europe committee that drafted the Valletta (Malta) Convention signed in 1992 (Willems 2007f; 2008); as a result, he became the founding President of the EAC (*Europae
Archeologiae Consilium), the association of State Archaeologists of all European countries that was to oversee the application and results of the Malta Convention. From 1998 to 2003 he served as President of the EAA (European Association of Archaeologists), and, once again, there are numerous publications that reflect these professional developments (1998a; 1999c; 2004a; 2009c; 2010; 2010a).

Internationally, as a recognised world expert in archaeological heritage management, he was co-President of the ICAHM (ICOMOS Committee for Archaeological Heritage Management) from 2009, and occasionally served as a specialist in the evaluation of nominations for World Heritage Sites, such as the UNESCO project Frontiers of the Roman Empire (Breeze, Jilek and Thiel 2005).

Nationally, he was involved with the restructuring of Dutch archaeological heritage management at The Netherlands Ministry of Culture since 1999, followed by his appointment in 2001 as Chief Inspector for Archaeology at the State Inspectorate for Cultural Heritage (Erfgoedinspectie), responsible for overseeing all archaeological work in the country. This impressive curriculum vitae would culminate in his appointment as Professor of Archaeological Heritage Resource Management at Leiden University in 2006, coinciding with his most productive period in this field of research.

However, he continued publishing and working in projects related to Roman archaeology. Within these, some thematic variation can also be observed between the 1980s and the 1990s. While the early focus was on the effects that the integration in the Roman empire had on native populations, chiefly Batavians, the 1990s were characterised by broader and more traditional approaches to Roman archaeology, notably in putting his accumulated knowledge into the wider context of the Roman frontiers.

All the aforementioned shows the importance of Willems within Dutch and European archaeology, and the two-fold evolution of his career/research focus (Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in The Netherlands and archaeological heritage management). Thus, his 40-years publication record offers an important insight into both Dutch archaeological discourse around Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in the area and the context in which these were formulated. However, due to the nature of the research question formulated for this thesis, I will only analyse those works reflective of his discourse about the native populations of the lower Rhine in Roman times and their interaction with the Roman empire. As a result of that
choice, his first period (1978-1991) will be my main concern in the following pages; the weight of these works on the development of discourses around this topic is fundamental.

Partially using materials from Willems’ interview (Appendix 3) I will first introduce some factors — e.g. personal background, formative years, influences (Section 6.4.1) — that should help to understand the context in which his archaeological discourse was formulated. This will inform the analysis of his works (Sections 6.4.2 and 6.4.3), and the implicit/explicit trends, themes and discourse that can be extracted from a detailed reading of these (Section 6.4.4).

6.4.1. Personal Background, Formative Years and Early Career

Willems was born shortly after the end of WWII (1950) and raised in a Netherlands that was undergoing reconstruction, a nation trying to break free from the horrors of its most recent past — German occupation and the Dutch role in the Holocaust — mostly by ignoring it and by looking for continuity (Judt 2008).

I was born in 1950 and grew up in a village (Blerick) on the Meuse, close to the German border, in a street still partly in ruins from WW2. (Willems, n.d.)

According to these childhood memories it was at school that he gained his first notions of the ancient peoples that inhabited in Roman times the landscape not far from the section of the river Meuse in which he was born.

I still remember how the myth of the Batavians sailing down the Rhine in their canoes was taught in school in the 1950s. (Willems, interview notes 25/06/2013)

This will be an interest that would grow exponentially and became the focus of the first couple of decades of his academic career in archaeology. An academic career that took off in the 1970s — a decade of huge changes in archaeological research in The Netherlands — as a student at the IPP (Amsterdam), an institution which, much influenced by Anglo-American trends, was already engaging with innovative theoretical approaches to the archaeology of the Roman presence in The Netherlands (Section 6.3.2; van Driel-Murray, interview notes 31/05/2011).
He first undertook a BA in Cultural Anthropology (1974-77), spending his last year at the University of Michigan (USA), and thus experiencing in first person a different way of doing and thinking archaeology — ‘New Archaeology’ (‘the native behind the artefact’, as he put it in his interview) and Cultural Anthropology — that arguably had a huge impact on his approaches to the study of Roman: ‘barbarian’ interaction.

I went to the University of Amsterdam to study anthropology and archaeology. It was the 1970s, and I wanted some first-hand experience of the ‘New Archaeology’ in those days, and that took me to the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA for a graduate year. The experience gave me a different perspective on the Roman occupation of the Low Countries. (Willems, n.d.).

This innovative approach helped him transform the language and approaches established at the time in Dutch archaeology, incorporate innovative ideas and theoretical frameworks to his research, and introduce his work to a wider international arena.

At the age of 27, he published his first academic papers. He had by then finished his degree in Cultural Anthropology at the IPP (Amsterdam), spent a year (1976-77) at the University of Michigan (USA), and was in the process of finishing his Masters in Prehistoric and Roman Archaeology, also at the IPP.

His first couple of papers (1977 unpublished; 1977) were written in collaboration with Roel Brandt, with whom Willems coincided at the IPP in those early years (see earlier reference in Section 6.3.2 to the Gideon’s Gang at IPP) and for whom Willems would develop admiration and friendship, as proven by several collaborations, and by the title and comments in a volume on innovation in Dutch archaeology (2005), dedicated to Brandt after his retirement (Liber amicorum voor Roel W. Brandt). In one of its papers (2005a), entitled Innovatie: waar rook is, is Brandt (‘Innovation: where there is smoke, there is Brandt’), Willems describes Brandt as one of the most innovative characters of the discipline, and comments in the introduction of the volume testify for their mutual respect, and possibly, to the origins of Brandt’s influence on Willems:

I have vivid memories of passionate discussions with Roel Brandt in the years around 1990, about the advent of contract archaeology in The Netherlands. These took place in the evening, over a beer, …
Professionally, they collaborated early (see above; 1983) and late (2004) in their careers, in both Willems’ career developments: earlier papers are related to archaeological methodologies and specific projects, while later collaborations tended more towards Heritage Management and the establishment of quality control policies, with Brandt as founder and director of the RAAP foundation and Willems as director of the ROB.

Their first joint publication (Willems and Brandt 1977) — and in fact Willems first published work — was Het Project Wijster, about the research project conducted by Van Es (1960-65) in the town of Wijster, near Groningen, in the province of Drenthe. It is interesting to notice that Van Es, Willems’ doctoral supervisor at IPP, had that project as the focus of his own doctoral dissertation at Groningen University back in 1967 (Wijster, A Native Village beyond the Imperial Frontier, AD 150-425). Willems would replicate the same process with his own doctoral dissertation (1986), focusing on native populations and the impact of Roman occupation, only this time basing his thesis on his own work as part of the Eastern River Area project (1978-80).

That same year, Willems published two short pieces overviewing the ongoing research projects in The Netherlands (1977a) and outlining the functioning of the NWO, National Organisation for Scientific research (1977b). His last paper of this busy year was a site report for one of the early volumes of Cingula, a series edited by the IPP. This paper (1977c), originally written as a graduate thesis for a course on Provincial Roman Archaeology of The Netherlands and assessed by Prof. Glasbergen (1977c, 127, note 15), reports on a 1973 ROB-led rescue excavation conducted by Bloemers and Bruijn in the town of Halder, near St. Michielsgestel, outside ‘s-Hertogenbosch, in the province of Nord-Brabant. Bloemers, who would later be Willems’ doctoral supervisor, never wrote up the report, and the task was passed on to Willems. On it, Willems describes typologies found at the site, with abundant references to Bogaers’ reports of finds on St. Michielsgestel (1965; 1968) and Halder (1974), Bloemers’ pottery finds in the same area (1967; 1973), typological studies of the materials found at Nijmegen (Holwerda in the 1940s and Stuart in the 1960s), and comparison with similar sites in Germany and Belgium (Willems 1977, 117). Based on the finds described, he then proposes models of interpretation for the use of kiln, relating its existence and development to the Batavian revolt of AD 69, with multiple references to the works by Bryant (1973), Hodder (1974) and Hartley (1973) on Romano-British pottery trade. This could be interpreted as a mixture of influences present in Willems’ work, combining
continental (mostly German and Dutch) typological description with interpretative Anglo-American theoretical frameworks and models.

Within his interpretation of the data Willems points out factors that would influence the development and (re-)location of the kiln, namely the lack of local industry to meet Roman demands at their arrival in the early 1st century AD, the mobility of the troops who would bring their own pots, and the fact that pottery could also function as a container for transporting other materials, both for short and long distance trade. In this discussion we already see one of the very themes that would accompany Willems throughout the following two decades of study of the Batavian region: the effect of Roman military presence on an underdeveloped local population, i.e. the Batavians.

It is interesting to note that Willems published more titles in English than Dutch in this year; the effort to export his work was made earlier than many of his colleagues, and predicts a trend throughout the following decades (Figure 6.15). Carol van Driel-Murray, Willems’ colleague at IPP, produced many of these early translations (e.g. Willems 1977c, 127, note 15).
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**Figure 6.15.** Willems’ language of publication per decade. English and Dutch were his main publishing languages, shortly followed by German, French and to a much lesser degree other languages, including Polish, Czech, Italian, Japanese, Spanish and Chinese, some of which were translations of already published works, some of which were original works. (Source: Author; see Appendix 7).
In his first paper (Willems and Brandt 1977, unpublished), Willems dealt with new methodological and theoretical approaches to Bronze Age burials in the Netherlands, a topic about which he finally published a year later (Willems 1978). This work illustrates the heavy impact that Willems’ visit to the US in 1976 had on his theoretical development, not only because he states the materials for this paper were gathered during his stay at University of Michigan (Willems 1978, 94, note 99), but because the clearly Anglo-American influence detectable in the sources he uses.

Willems indeed stated that Childe’s ‘culture model’ must be replaced by an anthropological approach to the study of burial practices (and settlement analysis) in order to gain insights into social organisation of past societies. He considered burial analysis an effective research tool as it represents the richest source of prehistoric information — a notion repeated by Roymans and Theuws in the introduction to Images of the Past: Power and Elite (1991, 3). That elite focus, implicit in Willems and explicit in Roymans, is one of the notable features of Dutch archaeological research throughout the following decades — and one bitterly criticised by van Driel-Murray on numerous occasions (e.g. 2002) and very different from the British post-colonial tradition.

Willems points out how the adoption of anthropological theories in Archaeology (e.g. Hodder’s ethnography) — an original feature in American archaeology since the 1960s not present in European archaeology at this time — should open the door to a new theoretical approach to the study of prehistorical human remains: ‘burial analysis’. As such, the theoretical base of ‘burial analysis’ can be found in the New Archaeology, especially in Binford, whose works Willems uses extensively, together with those by some other authors — e.g. Flannery, Hill, Peebles, Goodenough, Hodder and Claessen —, in order to introduce some anthropological concepts, such as ‘social evolution’ and ‘social persona’ (Willems 1978, 84).

While most of these scholars are of American origin (except for Hodder), the presence of Henry Claessen is significant. The numerous mentions made to his work here — and by Roymans (1983) — suggest that this cultural anthropologist based at Leiden probably played an important role in bridging the theoretical gap between Dutch archaeologists reassessing their traditional European approaches and the new theoretical frameworks produced by American anthropologists and archaeologists. Furthermore, Claessen was Roymans’ PhD
supervisor, and his touch can be felt in his own earlier works (e.g. Roymans 1991), as I will analyse in detail later on (Section 6.6.1 and 6.6.2).

6.4.2. 1980s-1990s: The ERA Project and the Batavians

The interest and different perspectives on the effects of Roman occupation on native societies in the lower Rhine that Willems acquired as a result of these influences developed in years to come, and is visible in the projects in his Batavian-related projects — ‘Eastern River Area’ project and ‘Nijmegen Kops Plateau: a Roman camp’ — and publications in the years leading up to his doctoral award (1986), with a thesis entitled Romans and Batavians: A Regional Study in the Dutch Eastern River Area.

The origins of his interest on the topic of his doctoral thesis can be sought in his involvement on ROB’s excavations at Nijmegen since 1972, which were directed by Bogaers until 1978 and by Bloemers until 1981. Like many other relevant Dutch archaeologists before and after him, Willems ‘won his spurs’ in Dutch archaeology in the excavations at Nijmegen in the 1970s (van Enckevort 2004, 103). The excavations carried out there expanded beyond the defences of the known forts, which resulted in the discovery of many sites, — e.g. native farming settlements at Ewijk and Druten — revealing aspects of the acculturation of the rural population (Willems 1980, 279).

I had been working for the ROB for some years at the excavations in Nijmegen - Ulpia Noviomagus [capital of the Batavian civitates] and decided to do a PhD on the interaction between Roman colonizers and native Batavians. (Willems, n.d.).

It is presumably in those soils where Willems’ professional collaboration with Bloemers began, and it continued throughout Willems’ career, firstly having Bloemers and van Es — two major figures of Roman archaeology during the early post-war decades — as PhD supervisors, and later on participating in some joint publications, mostly with Bloemers (1980; 1981h; 1981i). The work of Willems’ supervisors certainly influenced the theoretical approaches and thematic focus of his work in this period — Roman:Batavian interaction —, especially around the ERA (Eastern River Area) project (1978-1980) and subsequent publications, including his thesis (1986).
Van Es — part of an earlier generation of Dutch archaeologists — describes his very traditional approach to the effects that Roman occupation had on native societies, with much focus on the Roman military and the *limes*, and a preference for historical approaches (Van Es 1983, 9):

All this is based on the assumption that we are prepared to accept the phenomenon of Romanization as a guiding element in our investigation of the Roman period. [...] May Romanization continue to be active in our time. Long live Romanitas.”

Van Es’ focus on military sites and a Romano-centric perspective (1972) can be seen in Willems’ involvement with urban military sites (e.g. the Roman camps at Nijmegen) and Roman-style villas (e.g. Voerendaal).

Bloemers introduced new, more holistic ways of understanding the evidence on the native population, a focus on the indigenous/native aspects of Roman archaeology, and the relationship between native tribes and the Roman empire in the lower Rhine area. In his own thesis (1978) he provided estimated population figures for the *civitates* of the Cananefates and the Batavians, and introduced for the first time data conducting to the idea of heavy Roman recruitment of troops among these groups (Bloemers 1978, 82; 101-13; 1983, 166-7). Bloemers produced several works on the interaction between natives and Romans in the lower Rhine, using concepts of acculturation (1983; 1989; 1991a; 1991b).

Intellectually, Bloemers’ influence is an important factor to understand Willems’ interest in the ‘Dutch’ native populations in Roman times. A look at some of his publications (1980; 1983) reveals a rapid theoretical evolution parallel to Willems’. While in 1980 he uses the term ‘Romanisatieproces’, by 1983 he was using the very different label of ‘acculturation’ to describe how local populations were affected by the Roman presence. This already suggests a strong influence of imported Anglo-American theoretical schemes that is matched in Willem’s work.

The contrast between the different styles of his supervisors can be explained as a consequence of Willems’ academic rise and intellectual development during the 1970s and the 1980s, a period defined by the academic crossroads that Dutch archaeology was facing as a result of economic development and growth, the crossroads between traditional German-oriented approaches or Anglo-American theoretical influences, and the incorporation of anthropological perspectives to a traditional historical approach. The nature of that process of
change is captured in Brandt and Slofstra’s 1983 volume, containing the proceedings of a symposium on Romanisation held at VU in 1980 (see Section 6.5.1).

The historiographical situation around the topic before and during Willems’ early career surely also affected his approach to his early 1980s projects, especially ERA. When he started his studies in the 1970s, most previous discussions on the relationship between Romans and Batavians had been primarily based on literary evidence (Willems 1983, 105; Van Es 1983), especially Tacitus (Sprey 1953; see Section 4.2.1). Furthermore, Ivo Schoffer (1975) had introduced the conceptualisation of the Batavians as a Dutch ancestry myth. This might be among the factors that attracted Willems’ attention towards these people, among others, e.g. his involvement in the late 1970s on the new ROB-led excavations at Nijmegen and the impact of existing academic works on the topic.

Furthermore, since Reuvens and Leemans had commenced the first excavations there in 1838 at the commission of the RMO (van Enckevort 2004, 103), and until the 1970s, most research concentrated around Nijmegen, especially in the legionary camps, focusing on military aspects of Roman presence. Modderman’s (1949; 1951) efforts to gather a diachronic archaeological database of the Batavian tribal area in the eastern part of the Dutch Rhine delta were characterized by Willems as pioneering (Willems 1980, 277), and was an exception to those historical and Romano-centric studies, and to the focus on Nijmegen. Jules Bogaers also widened the spectrum in those early stages with his study of the Gallo-Roman temple in Elst (Bogaers 1955; Willems 1980, 277) and his approach to the civitates and capitals of Batavians and Cananefates (Bogaers 1960-1); Willems recognises a big influence from Bogaers in his early works in two papers (1996c; 1996d) dedicated to his memory after his passing in 1996.

Contextually, in the 1970s, the booming economy in the river area (Parker 1979) and renewed institutional goals/parameters (Van Es 1972c; Willems 1980, 277) drove the ROB to lead new excavations at Nijmegen, unveiling huge amounts of new ‘Batavian’ material (Bogaers 1979) and driving Roman provincial archaeology forward (Willems, interview notes 26/05/2011). Modderman’s and Bogaers’ work would prove vital to the success of the ERA Project (Willems 1980, 277; Willems, interview notes 26/05/2011), as ‘Batavian’ materials were made available in much larger quantities than ever before.
For 1978-1980 there is a gap in Willems’ publications, but not in research activity. In fact, this is the period in which the bulk of the field research for the ERA (Eastern River Area) Project — run in collaboration with Bloemers and Hulst — occurred.

Following some of the guidelines suggested by Van Es (1972c; Section 6.3.1) “the Eastern River Area (ERA) project was one of the regional research projects selected by the ROB to receive more personal and financial attention” (Willems 1980, 277). This might come as a surprise considering that one of his recommendations was to aim for a more balanced approach to geographical and chronological research choices. Why then did ROB fund and support another project dealing with an overrepresented area and topic? According to Rien Polak (interview 2011), Willems’ ERA project has to be understood as a reflection of ROB’s interest in providing a wider context to the findings coming out of Nijmegen.

This is an example of the importance of the institutional agendas and priorities in promoting certain topics, projects and scholars. As a ROB-funded project, Willems’ ERA was the first substantial archaeological project on the Batavians with national support — to be followed by Roymans’ NWO-funded three successive projects on the same topic in the next decade — opening a sub-discipline within Roman provincial archaeology in The Netherlands.

The ERA project studied all sorts of settlements in an area spanning 25 km around modern Nijmegen, the capital of the Batavians in Roman times (Figure 6.16). The area was divided in parcels and systematically surveyed in search of archaeological evidence of past human activity. According to Willems (1980g, 666), this process was a combination of two German techniques: Landesaufnahme (‘systematic archaeological regional survey’) and Siedlungskammer (‘settlement cell’). This kind of regional archaeological inventories — with parallels to Slofstra’s work in the ‘Kempen’ project — were inspired by Modderman’s (1949/51) ‘diachronic’ inventories (Willems 1980, 277), and considered by Willems (1981g, 671) to represent the way forward in the study of the native populations in Roman times.
Figure 6.16. Research area of the Eastern River Area project. The site of Castra Herculis (near Arnhem) is marked with a star (Willems, 1980g, 665, fig. 1).

Sites reported during 1980 were all dug within the geographical scope covered by this project, along and around the rivers Rhine, the Waal and the Meuse. While most of these reports (1980a; 1980b; 1980c; 1980d; 1980e; 1980f; 1980g; 1980h) were written in Dutch, a majority of the interpretative works were published in English (1980; 1981; 1981j; 1983; 1984; 1986; 1986a; 1986b; 1988c; 1988d). Those interpretative papers would put the findings of the project into the wider context of the Roman Rhine limes. Among these site reports, it is important to pay attention to two papers devoted to the discovery of Castra Herculis, a previously unknown Roman fort near Arnhem, along the limes (1980g; 1980h) (Figure 6.16). This was a notable discovery in accordance with the traditional focus of Roman archaeology in The Netherlands, based mostly on the study of the limes and its Roman military structures. However, Willems (1980g, 665) states that such a discovery “…is part of a ROB project aimed to learn as much as possible about the Roman occupation of the Eastern River Area, home of the Batavians…” In my opinion, this clarifies how Roman military aspects were not central and that the main focus of the project was the indigenous occupation and the nature, intensity and pattern of interaction with the Roman colonisers. Following those principles,
Willems presented the aims of the project as the description of the history of occupation in the area, the development of the Romanisation of the indigenous population, and the ecological and demographical changes in the landscape (1980g, 666).

His first paper in English about the ERA project, *A Short Introduction to the Eastern River Area* (1980), provided an overview and described the involvement of the area with the Roman empire by stating that *Ulpia Noviomagus* acted as epicentre for the zone across the centuries: it was a 1st century AD military temporary headquarters for the lower Rhine frontier; 2nd century AD civil capital for the Batavian tribal area (*Civitas Batavorum*); 4th century AD fortified settlement. Then, he clarifies ERA’s research goal: “…to study the socio-economic development in this territory based on the analysis of the historical, archaeological, geographical, and ecological data” (Willems 1980, 277), and to put it into a wider context.

Willems (1980, 279) describes how the ERA Project used and developed Modderman’s inventarisation of archaeological finds in the riverine area by integrating all aspects of soil survey — botany, palynology, zoology, numismatics, glass, ecology —. This clearly responded to one of Van Es’ noted recommendations (1972c; see Section 6.3.1).

Volume I of his first report on the ERA project was published in the BROB at the end of the project (1981); this volume was very descriptive and showed the impressive amount of materials and sites studied. Volume II (1984) was equally descriptive and provided the contextualisation to the finds described in the previous volume. Both volumes came out under the title *Romans and Batavians: A Regional Study in the Dutch Eastern River Area* — matching that of his doctoral thesis (1986) at the IPP, which was virtually a combination of these two. A year later (1987) Willems became Professor of Roman Provincial Archaeology at the University of Leiden based on his impressive work.

His paper in Brandt and Slofstra (1983) then summarised the outcome of the ERA project. It opened with the following statement: “The Batavians are certainly among the most well-known tribes in the Roman empire, both in antiquity and today” (1983,105). Whether this sentence, used several times by Willems — and later by Roymans in most of his seminars and conference papers (e.g. Roymans 2014, 232) —, was actually true before Willems devoted his attention to them is unclear to me. There were obviously works from the fields of history and archaeology (to a lesser extent) before his arrival; that Willems played a pivotal role on the development of their status is, however, certainly beyond question.
The ERA project’s most successful outcome was to produce “archaeological correlates of the acculturation processes (described by the sources) which operate here from the Late Iron Age to the Early Middle Ages” (Willems 1983, 105). This statement shows a change in conceptual language with respect to more traditional approaches to the topic. ‘Romanization’ is rejected as a valid concept for it being too specific to the Roman case and therefore not allowing cross-cultural analysis, and other terms to describe the interaction between Romans and native populations were introduced, such as acculturation. This reflects the growing theoretical influences received by Willems during his formative years.

Willems quoted Barnett’s (SSRC 1954, 974; Willems 1983, 105) definition of ‘Acculturation’ at the SSRC: “culture change that is initiated by the conjunction of two or more autonomous cultural systems”; in the case of Romans and Batavians, he argues, the imbalance of power and social complexity is evident (1983, 112; Roymans 1983) and results in coercion. This factor drove Willems to the conclusion that the process of acculturation that took place in that area could be considered a case of colonialism. He relates colonialism and imperialism and links them to Luttwak’s differentiation of force and power, based on energy and information respectively (1976, 195-200). Because the energy needed to colonize is finite (while information is not), colonialism relates to ‘frontiers of exclusion’ (when a point is reached where there is no energy surplus), while imperialism relates to ‘frontiers of inclusion’ (Lattimore 1962). Willems reflected then on the perpetuation of a colonialist situation in the area due to the establishment of a permanent frontier system that relates to military force, not to information power.

His 1986 paper presents an overview of innovations in the study of this territory. While in previous works the project included both the German and the Dutch areas, here he focuses on the Dutch ERA exclusively, and puts Nijmegen-Noviomagus at its epicentre.

ROB-led large-scale excavation at Nijmegen (1972) with “modern theoretical perspectives led to a new set of goals”: from a focus on local military manifestations of the Roman Empire, to a focus on the regional context of individual sites, looking for “an intermediate level of analysis between that of the site and the province or empire as a whole”. This shows the influence of theoretical imports on changes in the research choices.

The question of the geological composition of the soil and the ecological conditions for habitation is a recurrent theme in these papers. In total, 542 sites on the Holocene clay deposits of Rhine, Waal, and Meuse, and representing 85%-90% of all former settlements,
were located. These clay deposits are favourable to the discovery of settlements because habitation on river clay has resulted in a distinctive soil type known locally as ‘ancient settlement soil’.

Willems’ paper ‘Role of the periphery’ (1989) — the last on the series derived from his 1980s interpretative approaches to the study of native populations on the lower Rhine — is representative of his innovative edge in theoretical terms. Reflecting on the contemporary theoretical models of core-periphery (e.g. Champion 1989), he integrated the local/regional research within the imperial context, as expressed in his initial aims for ERA (1980). He approached the frontier area and the periphery of the empire based on concepts of Imperialism/Colonialism, Dominance/dependency, coercion, interest, and inequality of the social systems, and refers to Luttewak’s differentiation between ‘power’ and ‘force’ to illustrate ‘imperialism’ and ‘colonialism’ respectively (1989, 33-4) — something he already argued in earlier papers (1983; 1984). Once again, he used Lattimore’s (1962) concepts of ‘frontier of inclusion’ (dynamic) and ‘frontier of exclusion’ (static). However, he recognised that these are only valid when applied to ancient empires — not post-15th century, due to their transcontinental nature —; but accordingly he defended its validity to explain the evolution of the Roman northern frontier area. He discusses frontier developments as acculturation, and even accepts the use of ‘Romanisation’ to describe the situation in the Late Roman Period with the Salii (Franks) established in those territories as allies of Rome. He characterises the acculturation process in that area then as a result of the permanent establishment of frontiers along the Rhine and the effects of a perpetuation of aspects of a colonial situation by the imposition of a large imperial force in the area.

The strong acculturation process derived from the establishment of a stable frontier system was, according to Willems (1984), the cause of the Batavian revolt in AD 69. As Dyson (1971) concluded, “all native revolts occurred in the context of enforced acculturation” (cited by Willems 1984, 40), including the victorious ones such as those of Arminius or the Frisii (Willems 1984, 44). He integrates the Batavian case within wider picture and theoretical discussion about the regional differences on the effects that acculturation and establishment of frontiers had.

Willems discussed supply to the frontier region both from Gaul and Northern territories, specifically the Frisian territory and its supply of soldiers, referring in numerous occasions to Bloemers’ (1983b) work on the topic. He suggested that militarized population
groups with caste-like properties developed in the area in the 2nd century, with a self-perpetuating frontier population considered as a form of integration (acculturation). This would contrast with van Driel-Murray’s (2002, 59) opinion that “ethnic soldiers are by definition at the political and economic peripheries of power structures”.

6.4.3. 1990s-2014: Post-ERA Period and Research Focus Shift

Once the ERA project was finalised Willems became involved in the ‘Kops Plateau’ project (1986-1995) in collaboration with H. van Enckevort. This was focused on three Roman camps excavated near Nijmegen. Sadly, those excavations were not fully published, and only partial aspects were discussed in various subsequent papers (1991g; 1991d; 1994a; 1995h; 1996). Currently, the NWO has made funding available to publish the results; in fact, Eef Stoffels’ PhD thesis — under Willems’ supervision — is based on such materials, with the involvement of Auxilia (commercial archaeology unit attached to Radboud University Nijmegen) and the municipality of Nijmegen. Willems’ other major involvement in terms of fieldwork was the excavation of the Roman villa of Voerendaal. These three projects reflect his interests, geographical focus and approach to Roman archaeology of The Netherlands.

After 1989, no significant additions to his wider interpretative works on Roman:Batavian interaction or the wider lower Rhine limes would appear until 1999, when he published a paper presenting latest advances in the study of the Dutch section of the limes. His volume on Nijmegen: Ulpia Noviomagus (2009) was his last major work in the field of Roman archaeology.

This gap can be explained by a career shift resulting from by his appointment as director of the ROB, his involvement in the committee that drafted the Valletta (Malta) Convention, and further professional developments related to Archaeological Heritage Management (see Section 6.4.4). It can be argued — and indeed I will discuss this possibility later (Section 6.7) — that the rise of Roymans as a new pivotal figure within Dutch provincial Roman archaeology had something to do with this career move.

Following Willems’ work on the topic throughout the 1980s, wider interest in the archaeology of the Batavians increased exponentially, both in the academic and public spheres, first with four NWO-funded research projects on the Batavian area (the first by
Willems in the 1980s and the other three by Roymans in the 1990s and 2000s) and reaching its peak in 2004 with the public exhibition held at Museum Valkhof, Nijmegen (Roelofs and Swinkels 2004). Academic interest has not declined since, with a younger generation coming through with new studies and approaches to the topic, influenced by his publications and his direct involvement in doctoral supervision (e.g. Eef Stoffels, within the Kops Plateau project).

In terms of his contribution to theoretical discourses about the Batavians Willems can be especially highlighted (together with Bloemers) for proving the importance of the intensive military recruitment in the development of native identities in the lower Rhine (Roymans and Heeren 2004), and for producing the first serious archaeological survey on the Batavians (1986) since Modderman’s (1949; 1951).

CAREER AND RESEARCH FOCUS SHIFT

Although his interest in Roman provincial archaeology, the Roman lower Rhine limes, and its native populations never disappeared, Willems (personal interview, 25/06/2011) has described how his career made an unplanned turn towards a different field, that of Archaeological Heritage Management. This started when he was offered a position as provincial archaeologist of the province of Limburg (1981-88) and it escalated years later when he was made director of the ROB and State archaeologist (1989-99). While both roles allowed him to stay in touch with developments in Roman archaeology, his duties were mostly related to the protection and management of archaeological sites, in Limburg and nationally respectively. The academic shift on thematic focus towards heritage management was irreversible by then and was fully recognised when he was appointed Professor of World Archaeological Heritage at the University of Leiden (2006). He combined his two professorships and his administrative duties as Chief Inspector, with appointments at international heritage management institutions and projects. However, his words and a closer analysis of his publication record points towards a much earlier interest in this field, from the early 1990s onwards to be more precise:

From the 80s to the 90s, I gradually developed an academic interest in archaeological heritage management and the social role of archaeology. I was deeply influenced by what I learned from working in a committee of experts from
the Council of Europe that drafted what later became the Malta Convention, and a lecture trip through the USA for the American Institute of Archaeology, where colleagues were working on NAGPRA — ‘Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act’. (Willems n.d.)

The fact that it was a largely unplanned career change is reiterated in the following quote extracted from a 2007 paper in which he reflected, in a very personal tone, about the origins of the Valletta Convention in which he played an important role:

When, on 2 October 1988, I got on the international train to Strasbourg to take part — as Dutch representative — in an expert meeting organized by the Council of Europe, I had no idea what was in store. In any case, I could not have foreseen that I was going to be involved in a process that would dominate nearly 20 years of my professional life. (Willems 2007, 58)

However, it could also be argued that shifting away from Roman provincial archaeology and the study of the Batavians was also a consequence of the pressure exercised by the new generation of scholars who by the late 1980s and early 1990s were coming through in the field of Roman provincial archaeology, and more specifically working on the topic of Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions in the lower Rhine area. Such is the case of Nico Roymans, whose potential was acknowledged by Willems during his interview in 2011:

There is no point in trying to compete with Nico Roymans. I keep it [Roman archaeology and the Batavians] as a ‘hobby’ and I would still like to publish two Roman villas I excavated in the mid-1980s. (Willems, interview notes 25/06/2011).

This statement was produced in the context of Willems praising Roymans’ ability to put together big projects and attract huge amounts of funding. Roymans, who also had Bloemers as his PhD supervisor, who, like Wilems, was trained at the IPP in that period of revolutionary development in the 1970s and early 1980s, and who was already professor at VU and a very active publisher in the field by the early 1990s, was probably both Willems’ major rival and natural successor as the leading scholar in the topic. This is yet another example of the importance of academic genealogies and ‘centres of power’ in Dutch archaeology, and points towards contextual reasons for Willems’ shift of focus in the later part of his career.
Nevertheless, although he stayed connected academically and professionally to the study of Roman provincial archaeology and Dutch native populations in Roman times (Willems, 1999; 2005; 2007; 2009), Willems recognised that peer competition was too strong within a relatively small field for him to attempt a return to his original interest in Roman:Batavian interactions from his heritage focus. As a biographical note in one of his later articles Willems stated in third person: ‘His works in Roman archaeology include numerous articles and several monographs. [But] He has worked mainly in archaeological heritage management.’ (Willems 2007, 70).

6.4.4. Themes, Trends and Discourse Analysis

CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCES AND THEMATIC CHOICES

Willems’ American experience and the influence of American scholarly trends were very important factors in both his career and discourse development. During his formative years at the University of Michigan, Willems came into contact with the New Archaeology, the focus on native aspects of cultural interaction in colonial settings, and theoretical concepts and frameworks from Cultural Anthropology. This American influx also reached him during his time as a student in Amsterdam, at a time (1970s) when the IPP was introducing/importing cutting-edge theoretical anthropological approaches to the study of archaeology, mostly from visiting American scholars (e.g. Peeble) and local ones (e.g. Claessen).

As mentioned, there are many other factors that probably conditioned Willems’ thematic choice (Batavians) and favoured the setup of the ERA project: personal and professional choices; Modderman’s and Bogaers’ early works; theoretical influence from Willem’s doctoral mentors (academic genealogy); institutional changes in ROB and funding policies/priorities; and macro-economic developments.

This focus on the native was praised by Carol van Driel-Murray (2002) as one of most significant contributions of recent Dutch archaeology. After a period of focus on Roman military, mainly around Nijmegen, his application of previous regional surveys (Moddermann 1949; 1951; Slofstra 1978) to a wider area around the Batavian capital produced vital new insights into socio-cultural changes in the populations of the lower Rhine during Roman times.
DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

In his early 1980s papers, Willems (1983, 105) is clear about his rejection of Romanisation as a valid model to explain the acculturative processes that, in his opinion, occurred in the lower Rhine basin in Roman times. He preferred to describe these situations in terms of ‘acculturation’, ‘imbalance of powers’ and ‘social complexity’.

These positions were coming from the heavy American influence just mentioned. In the theoretical aspect he actively used Luttwak’s *Grand Strategy of the Roman Empire* (1976) to discuss the appropriateness of qualifying the situation in the lower Rhine *limes* as imperialism or colonialism, and Owen Lattimore’s works to describe the Late Roman period in terms of transition to a defensive imperial system and how this affected the native population in this area of the imperial frontiers. This American influence on his theoretical positioning was confirmed during his interview:

I studied in Amsterdam and also in America during the times of the New Archaeology, when post-colonial views and native perspective (“the Indian behind the artefact”) were developing. I decided I wanted to do that, to apply that method, to say things about the people through data and de-colonize the archaeological discourse. (Willems, interview notes 25/06/2013)

At that point in the interview I asked him for his opinion about the risks of unbalancing discourses towards the native perspective. He admitted the risk but said that it was avoidable by confronting sources and material culture — an assertion also inherited by Roymans, and the base of their shared ethno-historical approach to the past.

The power difference between societies in antiquity was not so big technologically. But the power difference in the modern colonial world was much bigger. And this conception was applied to views on the Roman Empire. Thus, the resulting power-unbalanced view, colonial-imperial discourses (Willems, interview notes 25/06/2013).

However, after careful consideration of the language he used in the early 1980s to describe the situation, his choice of terms seems to point towards a different direction:

At that time this region must have been the ‘heart’ of the famous tribe of the Batavi. During the whole Roman period it belonged to the frontier zone of the north-western part of the Empire, defended by a chain of forts, where the *native*
population with its prehistoric background was confronted with the highly developed culture of the Roman immigrants (Willem 1980, 227; Bloemers 1983, fig. 2).

Was he not reproducing the civilising language that modern empires used in their rhetoric to justify the colonial oppression over ‘less developed’ peoples? And furthermore, were the Batavi a long established population in the area? It is widely accepted that the migration of the Batavians from the territory of the Chatii responded to political manoeuvres orchestrated by Rome (Willems 1984, 206). If we accept that was the case, what implications do this assertion by Willems have? Was he perhaps reproducing the old mythical discourse of Batavi as forefathers?

However, Willems (1983, 105) openly rejected the use of ‘Romanisation’ as a label for the processes of cultural change ongoing in the area in the first two centuries AD. His use of other concepts and models instead is probably one of the earliest examples of rupture with inherited models of Roman imperialism (Van Es 1983).

In the USA, Stephen Dyson (1985a; 1985b) was examining many comparable concepts already in the 1980s. In England, the Post-colonial movement that broke through in the 1990s as a result of — and as a critical reaction to — Millett’s (1990b) vital reassessment of the character of ‘Romanisation’, has also a pre-existence in the late 1980s. Hingley’s (1989) book Rural Settlement in Roman Britain summarises a number of articles by David Miles, Martin Jones, Barry Cunliffe and Richard Reece who had started to attack the progressive perspective of Roman imperialism and turned their attention to studying the non-elite. Some of these points became incorporated into the Post-colonial movement in Roman archaeology of the following decades (see Section 3.4). This later English mainstream development of critical approaches to Romanisation is, in Hingley’s opinion, a consequence of the rigid academic structures and hierarchies:

In my opinion, where we had more of a difficulty in the UK is that the hierarchs in Roman Archaeology would not accept these more critical ideas about the Roman past. This is why the Brandt and Slofstra (1983) volume [in which Willems’ paper was included] was so useful, because in the Netherlands the Roman academic system was not nearly so dictatorial in terms of challenging approaches. The critical focus in English PCRA is to me, partly a result of the extent to which the academic system tried to silence dissenters in the 1980s and early 1990s, until TRAC broke through. (Hingley, pers.comm)
Taking that into account it is interesting to see how Dutch scholars still think that the development of their theoretical frameworks is a heritage of British scholarship.

On the other hand, from the analysis of the vocabulary and ideas presented in his 1980s writings, Willems operated on an assumption of acculturation, and power imbalance (in line with general trends in that period in Dutch Roman archaeology and elsewhere in Europe), but not under the label of Romanisation. However, the fact that he is talking about acculturation does not mean that he was not consistent with his desire to give voice to the native through the objects; he was actually looking at acculturation processes through native material culture, instead of through classical Romano-centric perspectives. Still, the processes he described find some parallels in those described for a process of Romanisation.

6.5. Period 3 (1985-2014)

This third period of Dutch Roman archaeology is characterised by an increase of the number of large-scale excavation projects — managed by ROB, university institutes, municipal archaeological services, and commercial archaeology units — as a result of the industrial and urban developments in overpopulated areas of central and southern Netherlands (see Section 5.2). Thus, rescue excavations looked like well planned projects due to systematic development planning and to the fact that the ROB and university institutes organised their research around regional projects with specific scientific focus (Bloemers 1999). In southern Netherlands, Leiden continued with their research at Oss (‘Ussen Project’) as representative of the situation in the DMS (Demer-Meuse-Scheldt) area in Roman times (Fokkens 1998). In the central river area, the Free University led a project at Tiel-Passewaaj (1992-2004; Figure 6.17) as part of the ‘Southern Netherlands’ project (Roymans 1992), and Nijmegen’s Municipal Archaeological Service excavated at Oosterhout (1996-2004).
This increase brought improved knowledge of rural occupation patterns during Roman times, which would be at the centre of the discussion around the Romanisation and characterisation of the rural landscape (Roymans and Heeren 2004, 20-22). Northern Netherlands, as an area with less economic and urban development, did not see these effects in archaeology to the same degree, which could explain why research on the native populations in that area has not been as productive as in the south due to diverse factors — e.g. less funding, reduced number of projects, weaker material evidence, specialisation of the northern institutes. However, Groningen intensified its specialism on archaeobotanical and zooarchaeological, mostly oriented towards the question of rural economy and surplus of production for military and urban markets. In the mid-1990s the interpretation of an ever increasing body of evidence (Roymans 1996a, 79-82) contradicted Bloemers’ positions (see Section 6.2) and implies that there was an increase in agrarian production for the markets but no indication of a serious role played in the provisioning of military camps. However, this thesis has been challenged lately and the important role attributed to military demands has been put in the context of a growing municipal and monetary organisation of the area (Aarts 2003; Groot et al. 2009).
In this period, we can also observe a profound reorientation of interpretative frameworks in Dutch archaeology around four points:

- The use of landscape archaeology to contextualise and complete the eco-functional study of these regions, firstly by not considering sites in isolation but as part of a landscape that now also has a mental dimension — e.g. “mythical landscapes” (Derks 1996; Roymans 1995) —, and secondly by having a diachronic approach through the study of the landscape’s cultural biography (e.g. Roymans 1992, 238; Roymans and Gerritsen 2002; and the project *The Biography of a Sandy Landscape: Cultural History, Heritage Management and Spatial Planning in the Southern Netherlands*).

- Dutch contribution to the international discussion on Romanisation, with Slofstra presenting a social model based on patron/client relationships to explain the occupation patterns in southern Netherlands and the process of integration of rural populations in the Roman empire (Figure 6.18), and with Roymans (e.g. 1995; and project *Rural Communities in the civitas Batavorum and their Integration into the Roman Empire*), focusing on the native perspective and highlighting the weight of native ideas and values in a process of appropriation of Roman cultural traits.

![Figure 6.18. Different dimensions of the Romanisation process (Source: Slofstra 2002, Fig. 1).](image-url)
- Vossen’s studies on the Batavian area, confirming that Roman Netherlands was mostly a non-villa landscape, unlike territories further south (see Figure 6.6). What characterised this landscape in terms of settlement patterns was a considerable number of non-villa native farmhouses with Roman elements (‘protovillas’). The absence of villas can be explained by the economy of local populations being based on cattle (Roymans 1996, 58-103) and not so much on agrarian production for surplus supply to the Roman army (Slofstra 2002), while the presence of certain Roman elements could prove the interest of some native peoples in adopting Roman-style housing and other cultural traits.

- Focus on material culture, chiefly bronze objects located using amateur metal detectors, to explain and assess the relationship of native populations with the Roman army, the mixture of civil and military life-styles, and the development of a native ethnic identity in the context of a Roman militarised frontier space (e.g. the project The Batavians: Ethnic Identity in a Frontier Situation).

  The result is, as the Chicago-based archaeologist Karim Mata (2012, 33-4) put it, a ‘familiar narrative’ of the native populations of the river area in Roman times. This narrative describes a process of cultural change in this area as a ‘unique Romanisation’ of native populations, and according to Dutch archaeologists, is mainly the result of the impact of intensive recruitment for the Roman army among local groups (Roymans and Heeren 2004, 1; 29-36). The traditional focus on settlement patterns and the new focus on metal objects allowed Dutch archaeologists in the 2000s to identify three processes that explain such cultural change in rural populations, mostly in the river area — i.e. Batavian territory.

- Firstly, the process of militarisation of the rural population evident from the recovery of abundant Roman militaria and horse gear in rural habitats of the Batavian area (Nicolay 2005; Figure 6.19).
While one would expect such finds in military-urban contexts — e.g. the Roman military face mask found in the Kops Plateau, Nijmegen (Figure 6.21; Willems 1992) —, the amount of objects recovered in rural areas (Figure 6.20) indicates intensive recruitment (see Figure 6.10), and an important role of the Roman military on the forging of local rural identities with a marked hybrid character. Their impact reaches even religious aspects, as suggested by the presence of militaria in the Gallo-Roman temple of Empel (Roymans and Derks 1994; Derks 1998) or the common cult of Romanised local deities such as Hercules Magusanus (Figure 6.22; Roymans and Derks 1994; Nicolay 2001, 63; Roymans 2004).
Figure 6.20. Number of military equipment and horse gear found in the Batavian area in different finds contexts (Source: Nicolay 2001, 54, Fig. 2).

Figure 6.21. Processional Roman military face mask recovered at the Kops Plateau, Nijmegen. Currently displayed at the Museum Valkhof, Nijmegen (Source: Robert Clark, National Geographic).
- Secondly, the process of monetarisation of native economy from Augustan times, and especially with the incorporation of the Rhineland into the Empire as the province of *Germania Inferior* c. A.D. 83–84. An increasing municipalisation, a growing administrative system, and an expanding local production and trade network, explain this process (Aarts 2003). However, the military factor resurfaces again, with Roymans and Heeren (2004, 32) pointing out the role that payments to Batavian auxiliary troops, and the supply of goods to cover the needs of the Roman army (Aarts 2003; Groot et al. 2009), may have played in this process.

- Finally, the process of Latinisation — i.e. the acquisition of Latin literacy and the epigraphic habit. This process, once again, has been linked to the militarisation of the area and identity of the Batavians (Derks and Roymans 2002). This is supported by the presence of seal boxes (Figure 6.23), as evidence of the exchange of letters, and of writing tablets (Figure 6.24), both elements linked to the presence of Batavians among the Roman troops — e.g. the 9th cohort in Vindolanda; Vindolanda tablets — and to returning veterans who helped spread knowledge in the rural area (Figure 6.25). The abundant funerary inscriptions in Latin following traditional Roman formulations, including *tria nomina* with native names, imply that Roman citizenship was fairly well extended in the area by the 2nd century AD (Derks 2004). It also relates to veterans returning as Roman citizens after years of service in the army, and to the existence of ‘military families’ that would be the base of the demanding supply of troops to the Roman army.
Figure 6.23. Bronze seal boxes found in the Betuwe area (Source: Roelofs and Swinkels 2004, 63).

Figure 6.24. Writing tablet found in Neerijnen (Source: Roelofs and Swinkels 2004, 64).
According to Derks and Roymans (2006), all these point towards the great impact of the relationship with the army and the *limes* on this process of ‘unique Romanisation’, and towards military veterans as the main ‘transcultural mediators’ of Roman culture in the area. The male, military focus detectable in the foundations of this narrative has been criticised by van Driel-Murray (1995; 2003), and results in a homogenised view of the native populations of the river area that reproduces some aspects of the much-battered Romanisation narratives (see Section 3.4.2). More importantly, such narratives were produced “in a field shaped by national heritage interests and the institutionalized division of archaeological activity” (Mata 2012, 33-4).

6.5.1. *The 1980s and the Transition Period*

As seen in Sections 6.3-6.5, the late 1970s and early 1980s were crucial for the interpretative development of Dutch archaeology: several regional research projects (e.g. ‘Kempen’, ‘ERA’, ‘Southern Netherlands’) produced new materials and interpretations; the number of
students of Archaeology grew considerably; and a clear awareness of the need for self-reflection and change to move the discipline onwards (van Es 1972c). Heinrich Härke (1989; 2000) has pointed out on many occasions the urgent need for self-reflection and change detected in German archaeology in order to avoid isolation. It could be argued that Dutch scholars saw this need much earlier and acted accordingly by opening their discipline to new theoretical approaches — the conjunction of two pivotal generations of archaeologists, with different approaches to the Roman past of The Netherlands but ready to find common ground.

Roymans and Willems rarely coincided in publications, and certainly never included each other in any volume edited by the other. One of the rare occasions in which they shared the pages of a volume was in the seminal work *Roman and Native in the Low Countries: Spheres of Interaction* (edited by Brandt and Slofstra 1983). They shared this volume with a cast of important Dutch researchers representative of different generations and a range of approaches to the topic of Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions in the lower Rhine area. The composition of this volume reflects a generational transition in the Dutch academic community of the 1970s and 1980s, including well-established authors — e.g. Van Es, Van der Leeuw, Groenman-van Waateringe, and Bloemers —, some already prominent early-career archaeologists — e.g. Willems, Slofstra, Brandt — and anthropologists — e.g. Claessen — and some who were very promising students — e.g. Roymans. As such, its analysis can shed much light over the different discourses and approaches that were operative in the period under study.

The editors, Roel Brandt and Jan Slofstra, are very important figures in their own right: Brandt was considered by Willems to be the pivotal character in Dutch archaeological innovation (2005a); and as described earlier (Section 6.3.2), Slofstra had great influence on Roymans’ generation since the 1970s through active presence in the IPP. Methodologically, he applied German research techniques (*Landesaufnahme* and *Siedlungskammer*) to Dutch archaeology in his ‘Kempen’ project, one of the earliest examples of Dutch large-scale regional projects; both Willems and Roymans would base their research projects on Slofstra’s survey methodology and some of his results. In theoretical terms, Slofstra was very much influenced by American Archaeology and Anthropology (cf. Roymans 1996).

The volume presents the results of the Symposium ‘Romanisation in The Netherlands’ that took place in 1980 at the Free University Amsterdam (VU), hosted by Van Es (Bloemers
1983, 204, n. 3; Slofstra 1983, 100, n. 1) — then Professor of Archaeology in that institution — and organised by Brandt, Bloemers, Slostra and Willems (van der Leeuw 1983, 38). ‘Romanisation’ is presented as inherent to the regional, large-scale nature of Dutch archaeological research since the 1970s (Brandt and Slofstra 1983a, vii). Although ‘Romanisation’ is used by some of the authors and vividly defended by Van Es in the Introduction, the editors defended the need to apply anthropological perspectives to the study of the Romanisation process (Brandt and Slofstra 1983a, vii); in fact, Slofstra’s paper is entitled “An anthropological approach to the study of Romanization processes”. Furthermore, five out of the nine papers in this volume have the words ‘acculturation’ and ‘anthropological’ in their title, and all of them discuss acculturation as a theoretical tool. As the British archaeologist R. F. J. Jones (1985, 340) noted in his review of the volume two years later:

The volume offers a variety of different ways of investigating and understanding the problems of cultural change on the Roman frontier, mostly drawn from anthropological work on acculturation.

Whether the editors and participants were questioning the validity of traditional approaches to ‘Romanisation’ as a model to explain the richness of the processes of interaction in the lower Rhine area during Roman times through a process of self-reflective deconstruction of their discourses or simply by reflecting influences from American Anthropology, is debatable. What is certain is that this process was happening at a time when the concept of ‘Romanisation’ was still mainstream among other European academic communities — e.g. UK and Germany — without major consideration to the nature and ideological bias of the concept.

The explicitly anthropological models used here are treated much more fully than in any comparable work on Roman Britain [...] …this book challenges the framework of ideas governing most work on Roman Britain. [...] it is up to Roman provincial specialists to set the pace themselves. It is clear that this is happening in The Netherlands (Jones 1985, 340).

Although the editors insisted on the idea that the development of a more theoretically informed approach to the Roman period in Dutch archaeology was the consequence of “penetrating influence of contemporary British archaeology”, the truth is that such developments predate the key works of the early 1990s in England (e.g. Millet 1990; Hingley
1995; Mattingly 1996). While British embracing of post-colonial theoretical models imported from literary and cultural studies scholars — e.g. Said, Bhabha — brought the subsequent challenging of ‘Romanisation’, the Dutch approach was inspired by developments imported from American anthropology, which were less explicitly post-colonial. This realisation — and Willems’ (1981; 1983) already mentioned explicit use of anthropological concepts — may be good examples to defy the extended idea that Dutch archaeology is a hybrid between British and German traditions, or at least that those influences are not clear cut.

Why such a difference then? The fact that nowadays Dutch archaeologists still use Romanisation as a model does not mean that there have been no attempts at reflection on its validity. The Dutch indeed had their own process of self-critical deconstruction, but the outcomes are entirely different than those observed in the UK. This may have to do with the differences in the contextual framework in which they developed their discourses: the weight of German influences in the Dutch community (historical approaches, regional surveys, etc.), not traceable in British archaeology after the 1980s; the earlier engagement with American archaeology and anthropology; the traditional relationship of Dutch archaeologists with landscape; and the closer proximity of the imperial experience and the ‘colonial guilt’ in the British process of post-colonial deconstruction of inherited theoretical frameworks, an element of lesser impact in The Netherlands.

While Dutch archaeologists were explicitly applying anthropological approaches to the concept of ‘Romanisation’ and to the study of the processes of cultural change in the lower Rhine during the Roman era before other European academic communities, the result was not the rejection of the paradigm, as would happen in Britain. Rather, it seems that what they were doing was not a deconstruction of their discourses on Romanisation in search of biases, but applying to it new theoretical approaches more appropriate to describe the interaction processes in The Netherlands. As I will identify later, ‘Romanisation’ still is a central concept in Roymans’ discourse, which has dominated his and wider Dutch approaches to the topic since the mid-1990s (e.g. Versluys, Heeren, Derks).

In order to delve deeper into the discourses expressed in this period of transition, one needs to analyse some of the contributions in this volume (Brandt and Slofstra 1983) in detail. The opening paper is an introduction by Van Es, probably the most senior scholar in the group. He represents some of the most traditional approaches in Dutch Roman
archaeology, much in contrast with some of the explicit anthropological perspectives adopted by other authors in the volume. He even admitted:

This may be hard to swallow for those among us inclined to consider provincial Roman archaeology as a special kind of archaeology, or even a separate specialty reserved for researchers with a historical and preferably classical education” (Van Es 1983, 2)

While his intervention does not present much new in terms of approaches, he offers an overview of research on the Roman period in The Netherlands, producing notable insights into some research trends in Dutch academia at the time (1983, 8). He stated that research on the Roman period was mainly ‘historical’ until the 1980s, with or without an ecological component, but a conscious interest in theoretical principles (inherited from the British) and an open mind to influences from cultural-anthropology were starting to leave their mark.

He also points out the changes that Dutch archaeology was undergoing in this exciting period: from focus on classifying and dating data to theoretical explanations; from dominance of military aspects (focus on the limes) to new focus on civil aspects and civil settlements — also confirmed by Bloemers (1983, 159); from local individual sites to regional research, with an emphasis on landscape occupation history. Romanisation is still part of the Dutch landscape research, although not the point of departure (Van Es 1983, 2):

Perhaps the key word for everything that occurred in the Roman empire is Romanization. Certainly for the Roman Netherlands it seems to me to be the quintessence, the *summa summarum* of local socio-economic.

Van Es’ traditional approached is followed by Van der Leeuw’s very theoretical paper describing his view on acculturation processes. He describes that process as a transformation of interaction patterns related to cultural changes, and describes its phases, concluding that “conceptual apparatus developed in anthropology to deal with acculturation is not in conflict with the interaction approach (1983, 25). For him, Romanisation in The Netherlands was a specific manifestation of a general process of acculturation in the frontier areas of the empire.

But perhaps the most interesting part of Van der Leeuw’s paper for our purposes is the End note with its acknowledgements. He first thanks non-Dutch scholars as inspirations for the paper, and noticeably they are all American: H. Martin Wobst, R. Whallon Jr., B. Abbott
Segraves, C. S. Peebles, and G. A. Johnson. Then he mentions the team in charge of organising the symposium, and also mentions two students: Roymans and Theuws.

While Brandt and Slofstra (1983) claim a British influence — which could be potentially traced back to Ian Hodder’s presence in the IPP in late 1970s — the list of names provided by van der Leeuw is entirely American. Thus, the influence received, mainly through the adoption of anthropological positions, seems much more American than British.

Despite Roymans being still a student when this conference took place, he presented a paper on late Iron Age Celtic tribes in a wider area beyond Dutch borders, in which he analysed the Romanisation process through the study of coins. He described that process as a hierarchical one, top-down: from the Romans to the elites and then trickling down (Roymans and van der Sanden 1981). Roymans also sees Romanisation as an integration (not interaction) process of less complex tribal society to the complex Roman state system — internal structures were not developed enough to be adapted to the Roman system. He even draws parallels between the Roman empire and 19th century western colonial powers. Basically, his approach to Romanisation contains some traditional aspects criticised by British postcolonial approaches to the topic in the 1990s (see Section 3.4.2; Millett 1990b, 1. Mattingly et al. 1996; Webster 2001, 210; Mattingly 2010, 18).

Another important aspect Roymans commented on was the increasing anthropological orientation within Western European archaeology, and his paper presents the possibility of using a historical-anthropological approach — i.e. use of anthropological models against which historical sources and archaeological data can be tested — in the way the scholars from the French Annals group did: “It is even possible and desirable, … to arrive at developing a specific historical-anthropological approach within archaeology” (Roymans 1983, 43). This implies that such an approach was not common ground in Dutch archaeology when Roymans was a student in the early 1980s. He would develop it throughout his career and establish it as the main method of study for the native populations of the lower Rhine.

The final paper of this volume to discuss here given its contrast with the varied positions already described is that by Jan Slofstra. Like Willems, he follows the SSRC’s definition on acculturation, but Slofstra argues acculturation does not reflect the nuances of the process of Romanisation well enough because is based on unrealistic homogenous perceptions of the groups involved in the interaction process (1983, 71-74). Willems
presented this the other way around, blaming Romanisation for being too specific of a model to explain the processes of acculturation.

A final aspect noting the transition process that this volume reflects is the language choice for the publication. All of its papers are in English, thereby reflecting the Dutch transitioning between German and English as their academic language. The group was very clearly aiming at an international audience.

6.6. DOSSIER: Nico Roymans

6.6.1. Personal Background, Formative Years and Early Career

Born in Bladel in 1954, Nico Roymans’ (Figure 6.26) first steps in archaeology and his earliest publications were connected to his hometown and the wider region of Noord-Brabant (Roymans 1975; 1977; 1977a; 1979; 1982). His first contact with the ancient past was at an early age when he found a Celtic golden Regenbogen coin almost on his doorstep (Bakker 2002, 20). It is no surprise then that his early works in the 1980s focused on silver triquentum (Roymans and van der Sanden 1980) and the study of late Iron Age Celtic populations in northern Gaul (Roymans 1983; 1987), probably inspired by romantic memories of his early childhood discovery.
Together with van der Sanden, Roymans (1980) soon published the analysis of the Celtic coins and weapons recovered from an area between the Meuse and the Waal (a tributary of the Rhine), recognising this site as the central place of the Batavian polity in the Late Iron Age. They presented these as evidence of the Chatto-Germanic origins of the Batavians mentioned by Tacitus, although offering evidence of cultural continuity which pointed to the presence of an important element of Celtic autochthonous population too. They also concluded that this tribe was socially organised around an aristocratic leader backed by a *comitatus*, and probably supported by Rome (Willems 2007, 555).

It is no surprise either that the geographical scope throughout Roymans’ career has been the area between the Demer-Meuse-Schelde (DMS) area, south of the Rhine. Near his home, Slofstra had in fact started an archaeological survey (the ‘Kempen Project’) in the early 1970s and Roymans, still a school boy, volunteered to help, along with some friends, most of whom ended up studying archaeology with him at the IPP and becoming relevant figures in the field at different Dutch institutions — notably van der Sanden and Theuws (see ‘Kempen band’ in Section 6.3.2).

Roymans’ academic career took off in the 1980s. He produced two important publications in English, the already mentioned paper with van der Sanden on the archaeological context of Celtic coins in The Netherlands (1980), and ‘The North Belgic tribes in the 1st century BC: a historical-anthropological perspective’ in Brandt and Slofstra’s BAR publication, *Roman and Native: Spheres of Interaction in the Low Countries* (1983). We can imagine how important it was for Roymans to be part of a transgenerational volume as important for the theoretical development of Dutch archaeology as these one (see Section 6.5.1) but the publication of these — his first papers in English — made his research accessible to an international audience. With the exception of a few papers, his publications were mostly in Dutch until the mid-1990s, when he progressively shifted towards English as his main language of publication, probably due in part to his emergence in the international arena as the leading figure of Dutch Roman archaeology and his participation in an increasing number of international projects and multinational publications.

However, only in 1987 did he obtain his doctorate at the IPP (Amsterdam) under the supervision of Tom Bloemers (also one of Willems’ supervisors) and Henry Claessen (cultural anthropologist and Professor of Social Anthropology in Leiden since the 1970s), with a thesis inspired on the topic of that paper — Celtic and Gallo-Roman societies on the
Brabant plateau (in the DMS area): *Tribale samenlevingen in Noord-Gallië: een antropologisch perspectief*. He would publish an English version of his thesis three years later (Roymans 1990), but still with a Dutch publisher.

The 1980s also saw a growing professional involvement by Roymans in large-scale regional projects south of the Rhine, firstly with Slofstra’s ‘Kempen Project’ in the late 1970s (Roymans 1982; 1985a) and later on with his own ‘South Netherlands’ project (Roymans 1996b), focusing again on the DMS region. These are just two of the many projects that would have that area as their target in the following decades in Dutch archaeology (e.g. ‘Eastern River Area Project’ and ‘Maaskant Project’).

These were important formative years in Roymans’ career. As such, his publications and research offer an early statement of his future intellectual development, in terms of geographical (Southern Netherlands; DMS), chronological (Late Iron Age, Roman period) and thematic (tribal native societies) foci, and, more importantly, in terms of his methods and interpretative frameworks (notably an historical-anthropological perspective).

The influence of Roymans’ supervisors may have also shaped his theoretical and methodological approaches to the topic, chiefly the historical-anthropological approach which he explicitly claims in several works at different stages of his career (1991, 1; 2004, 1). Roymans interest on the Romanisation of native tribes of the lower Rhine (1983; 1987; 1990) and his vision of a militarised Batavian society under the pressure of a heavy Roman military recruitment were certainly based on the figures and conclusions provided by Bloemers (1978, 112). On the other hand, Henry Claessen’s research focus on early-state formation (1978; 1988; 1994; 2008; *et al.* 2008), and in particular his case-study of the early formation of the Frankish Kingdom (1985), quite possibly inspired Roymans’ doctoral interests and later focus on the ethnogenesis and ethnic identity of the lower Rhine tribes, and, more specifically, the Batavians (2004).

Furthermore, Claessen’s definition of power — “capacity to limit the behavioural alternatives of other people, by force, threat, manipulation or authority” (1988, 23) — is influenced by Godelier’s (1978, 767) idea that “in the relationship between dominant and dominated… the stranger component of power [understood as violence and consent] is not the violence of the dominant, but the consent of the dominated”. Claessen (1988, 24) suggests that “such relations presented themselves as an exchange of service”. This strongly recalls the ‘amicable’, yet deceptive, nature of the ancient Romano-Batavian treaty described by Tacitus.
While archaeological evidence of intensive military recruitment in the Batavian area (see Bloemers 1978, 53; Willems 1984, 235; Roymans 2004) indicates that the terms of the treaty represent an imbalance of power and domination, the relationship is presented in classical sources and collected by early modern literature as an amicable balanced agreement. Moreover, Roymans’ conceptual choice to use ‘Romanisation’ as an explanatory model fits with Claessen’s notions of power as an imbalance and exchange of services.

Between 1989 and 1994 Roymans led, together with Frans Theuws, the PIONIER project ‘Power and Elite’ funded by the NWO, the KNAW and the IPP (University of Amsterdam), and co-edited with him a volume titled *Images of the Past: Studies on Ancient Societies in North-western Europe*, which dealt with the analysis of long-term developments in the socio-political organization of tribal and state societies in the late pre- and proto-history in that area (a chronological span that includes the Roman era), with a specific focus on elite groups and changes in their power structures (Roymans and Theuws 1991, 3).

This group of “younger Dutch scholars” (Hedeager 1994, 87), editors and authors of the *Power and Elite* volume (1991), were the core of the ‘Kempenbende’ (see Section 6.3.2) and would collaborate with Roymans in years to come, both in projects and publications, some of them eventually having him as doctoral supervisor, e.g. Derks (1996) and Hiddink (1999) or obtaining a position at VU during Roymans’ professorship, including Derks. The influence of these regional projects on the development of social dynamics within Dutch academia will be analysed in Chapter 7.

When Lotte Hedeager calls this group “younger Dutch scholars” in her review of Roymans and Theuws’s volume, she is probably not referring to age — Roymans was already in his 40s when this review was written as were most of his collaborators. While in academic terms this might still be considered young, I think she is referring to the intellectual youth of this group, to the fact that this group was bringing in a new impulse to the topic/discipline, as opposed to ‘older’ well-established academics, i.e. Willems and pre-Willems scholars. It could be a matter of argument to what extent that new impulse was innovative in relation to theoretical positions of other Dutch scholars (e.g. Willems’ American-inspired used of acculturation and anthropological models) or elsewhere (e.g. British post-colonial archaeology).

A closer analysis at this work provides us with some characteristic features of Roymans’ research that will be present throughout the rest of his academic career. The first
one is his research interest for a longue-durée approach to landscape occupation. The volume itself, edited by Roymans and Theuws, covers nearly two millennia (900 BC – AD 800), with contributions by seven authors covering different periods. Furthermore, Roymans’ substantial paper (1991, 9-90) covers the transition period between the Bronze Age and the Iron Age. His research interest in that period will soon be overshadowed by his later works focused on later periods — the late Iron Age and the Roman period.

Another feature of this volume is the focus on the native elites — justified by Roymans (1991, 3) by arguing that these groups are the most defining element in the structures of pre- and protohistoric societies. This feature is visible on the focus on Batavian male martial- elites in his later works, an aspect bitterly criticised by Carol van Driel-Murray (interview; 1995). This emphasis on elite ideology is observable in his following paper (1992), and linked to the cultural Romanisation and martial ideology as main features of the Batavian ethnic identity (1993; 1995).

These aspects clash with early British post-colonial approaches to Roman imperialism and cultural interaction such as the acknowledgement of discrepant colonial experiences (Mattingly 1996), which calls for a reappraisal of studies of Romanisation (or cultural interaction and change) far from the focus of the elite, as the elite only represent certain responses to the Roman presence (see Section 3.4.2). Thus, we can conclude that Roymans had not then incorporated certain postulates of the British post-colonial discourse or critically examined the theoretical frameworks he has been using. Carol van Driel-Murray (1995; 2002), was very critical of that aspect of Roymans’ work, and argued that more attention should be paid to other social and gender strata within the Batavian society in particular, and in native contexts more generally.

6.6.2. 1990s-2000s: VU, Batavian Focus and Roymans’ Centrality

The Power and Elite project was the opening act of the most productive stage in Roymans’ academic career (1990s and 2000s), coinciding with his transfer to the Free University (VU) in 1994 and his most intensive research activity (Figure 6.27). This activity was structured around several 3/5 years-long research projects, with Roymans as the leading scientific director, starting a trend in Roymans’ research style, in line with the wider Dutch tradition of
regional approach to archaeological research since the 1970s — a phenomenon described by Bloemers (1999).

To date he has managed seven projects dedicated to the study of different aspects of the Batavian tribe: their ethnic identity, their interaction with the Roman empire, and their archaeological presence in rural landscapes. These are: The Batavians: Ethnic Identity in a Frontier Situation (1999-2004); The Biography of a Sandy Landscape: Cultural History, Heritage Management and Spatial Planning in the Southern Netherlands (2002-2006); Rural Communities in the civitas Batavorum and their Integration into the Roman Empire (2003-2007); Coins from a Roman Army Camp in the Frontier Zone in Lower Germany. Distribution, Circulation, Use and Function of Roman and Celtic Coins at the Kops Plateau in Nijmegen (2005-2009); Roman Villa Landscapes in the North: Economy, Culture, Life-styles (2006-2010); Identity, Self-representation and Life-style of Villa Elites. The Burial Evidence (2006-2010); The Villa of Hoogeloorn and the Settlement at Riethoven. Key-sites in the Roman Rural Landscape of the Lower Rhine frontier Zone between limes and löss (2010-2014); and Decline and Fall? Social and Cultural Dynamics in the Low Countries in the Late Roman Empire (AD 270-450) (2012-2015).

Figure 6.27. Roymans’ publications per decade (Source: Author; see Appendix 8). Note that first publication dates from 1975. Likewise, the 2010s figures are relative as the period is not finished yet; but at the rate he is producing works he will be at least in numbers to match the 2000s.
There are some commonalities already to observe. Most of these projects belong to his phase at the VU (from 1994 onwards), with the exception of this first one (1989-1991) which was carried out while he was still at the UvA. As such, most of that fieldwork linked to these projects was carried out by VU-HBS, the commercial archaeology unit linked to the Free University. All of these projects were nationally funded by the Dutch Science Organisation (NWO) and each included several PhD and post-doctoral projects under his supervision. It could be implied that these longer-term interventions in wide areas respond somehow to the guidelines for the improvement of Dutch archaeology suggested by van Es 20 years earlier (Section 6.3.1). All of them had Southern Netherlands as its geographical focus; among the recently investigated sites are Roman-period rural settlements in the Dutch river area (Tiel-Passewaay, Geldermalsen), Roman temples (Kessel, Elst), and multi-period settlement excavations in the sandy landscape of the Southern Netherlands (Weert, Nederweert, Someren, Veldhoven). All of them generated abundant bibliography by Roymans and by numerous collaborators, post-doctoral or doctoral researchers (see Appendix 8).

His ability to manage this large-scale projects and consistently produce several works each year can be explained by one of Roymans’ academic ‘habits’ that the analysis of bibliographical data (Appendix 8) throws, namely his collaboration in projects and publications with a very consistent group of scholars — Derks, Theuws, Scheers, Tol, Hiddink, Fokkens, Aarts, and Gerritsen. As I pointed out earlier (Section 6.3.2), this group shared a long-standing personal friendship with Roymans since the times of the ‘Kempen’ project and their years at the IPP, and most of them would end up collaborating or working with Roymans at the VU once he secured a position there as Assistant Professor (1994-1998), and later on as Chair of Western-European Archaeology (1998-to date).

These are by no means the only scholars he collaborates with in publications, but the most regular ones. This allows him to cover a wide spectrum of topics, approaches, materials, areas, and periods. For instance, his interest for the cultural biography of a landscape (longue-durée approach to human-landscape relationships) justifies his numerous collaborations with Theuws (e.g. 1991), who is an expert in the early medieval period (allowing him to produce multi-period narratives). His geographical focus on the southern Netherlands (DMS area), explains his collaborations with most of these scholars who also developed or shared projects in the same area (Gerritsen 2003; Roymans and Fokkens 1991c; Slofstra et al. 1982). His desire to apply an ethnographical-historical approach to the study of ancient populations in The Netherlands forces him to deal, not only with settlements research (foundation of the
Dutch Roman: ‘barbarian’ interactions research of German influence, as we saw when describing the early post-WWII stages) but with different categories of material culture, which probably explains his collaboration with Derks on epigraphy (2009), literacy (2002b) and religion (1994), with Aarts (2009) on coinage, with Groot (2009) on livestock and army supply, with Nicolay (2007) on Bronze militaria, and with Heeren (2004) on settlement patterns. This collaboration also covers many of his pupils with whom he published in a number of occasions, facilitating the development of their academic career. It is difficult, however, to assess the extent to which Roymans contributed to all these papers and volumes.

These behaviours are quite common in other continental academic traditions, especially in the Sciences, and are probably related to the nucleated and hierarchical structure of Dutch academic archaeological community and the role of academic genealogies in the development of the discipline and discourses — issues that will be discussed later in this thesis (Chapter 7).

Furthermore, statistical analysis of Roymans’ academic bibliography (Appendix 8) offers some interesting conclusions regarding his preference for certain publishers and series (Figure 6.28). Since his arrival at VU his relationship with Amsterdam University Press, and more specifically with the series which editorial board he has chaired since 1996 (Amsterdam Archaeological Studies - AAS), is very close: a full half of the publications (11/21) listed in his Free University online profile are associated with these two. Naturally, Roymans has repeatedly opted for this series to publish a large number of papers and monographs, including the first volume of the series in that same year (1996); the same can be said of the series Zuidnederlandse Archeologische Rapporten (ZAR), with its first volume (1995c) edited by Roymans and many to follow with archaeological reports of projects and excavations in Southern Netherlands normally led by Roymans or some of his collaborators (Roymans and Tol 1996c; Roymans, Tol and Hiddink 1998; Roymans 2011).
Roymans’ preferred publishers/series (Source: Author; see Appendix 8). The biggest slice (‘others’) correspond with 20 works by Roymans that have been published in 20 different publishers/series; as such, this represents the least used publishers, series or journals, and not the most, as the size of the slice would suggest.

It could be implied that through the creation of these new series, Roymans covered existing gaps in the publishing infrastructure of the discipline, but at the same time it certainly created publishing opportunities for him, colleagues and students, many of whom have abundantly published in those series: 8 out of the 13 volumes published AAS are by him or his close group of collaborators or graduate students; and at least 3 out of the first five volumes in the case of ZAR. This has surely contributed to reinforce Roymans’ pivotal role. However, some scholars, especially those not part of that cluster, are highly critical of these ‘endogamic publication practices’ (i.e. the same group of people publishing within the same publications, series, journals); they see them as dangerous behaviours for the development of healthy discussion within the academic community: “they work together, they publish together, using the same concepts in the same ways” (van Londen, interview). A good example of how those practices are real and very current would be the 42nd volume of the VU periodical ‘Lampas’, entitled Romaniserings (Boter and Hemelrijk 2009), in which the concept of Romanisation is discussed through 6 different papers. Among those are very recognisable names from the Roymans ‘school’ (e.g. Derks, Stek), including Roymans himself.
As mentioned, at the end of the PIONIER project (1994) Roymans took a position as Assistant Professor at the IPP (University of Amsterdam) which he occupied until 1998, when he obtained the Chair of Western-European Archaeology. Careful analysis of his intensive publication activity during this period shows some of the main trends of Roymans’ career.

He first published with Ton Derks on the Gallo-Roman temple of Empel (1994; 1994a; 1994b), which they had excavated years before (Bakker 2002, 20); this would be Roymans’ first approach to concepts of religious landscapes and identity. These papers would be followed by three papers published in the newly-founded (1994) Archaeological Dialogues, a journal which, despite its international nature (published by Cambridge University Press), can be considered a reflection of theoretical developments and innovation in Dutch archaeology, given its heavily Dutch-oriented content and close connection to Leiden University; in this respect notice how in its first issue several papers focus on the Dutch national archaeological tradition.

In the first two of Roymans’ papers in Archaeological Dialogues (1995a; 1995b) he applied the concepts of ‘archaeological landscapes’ and ‘cultural biography of landscapes’, introducing the notion of ‘mythical landscapes’. In the third one (1996b) he reports on the progress of the ‘South Netherlands’ project — in which he was involved although not as director — as a reflection of wider trends in Dutch archaeology. Both the concept of landscape biography and the geographical focus on the Southern Netherlands through long-term regional projects would be a constant throughout his career.

The very first volume of the Amsterdam Archaeological Studies was edited and co-authored by Roymans himself (1996; 1996a) and focused on the Romanisation of the Belgic Gaul and the Rhineland. This volume illustrates his use of ‘Romanisation’ as a valid model to explain cultural interaction in the Rhine limes, at a time when Mattingly (1996) and other British archaeologists had commenced questioning its validity. In that respect, it may be relevant to note that, in contrast to some of his Dutch colleagues who were taking part in the awakening of a varied post-colonial critique of Romanisation in England — such as Peter van Dommelen (1993) — Roymans did not attend early editions of TRAC. He would in fact keep using that concept and characterising Dutch ‘Romanisation’ as a process of unique characteristics within the Roman empire (Roymans and Heeren 2004/5).
Some excavation reports (1995c; 1996c) with notable interpretative content complete his production in this period. It is worth noting that this archaeological site (Molenakker) is in a modern neighbourhood in the north east of Weert (Limburg), built between 1985 and 1995. These two reports are the result of the 1994 and 1995 excavation campaigns, and are linked to the urban development of the area and to the heritage management policies that linked development planning with archaeological interventions (see Section 5.3).

Coinciding with his appointment as Professor of Western European Archaeology at the VU (Vrije Universteit – Free University, Amsterdam) in 1998 he delivered an inaugural lecture entitled ‘Romeinse frontierpolitiek en de etnogenese van de Bataven’ (1998b). Whether this was a declaration of intent or not could be arguable. However, there is no doubt that this marked the starting point of a period (1999-2015) in which successive research projects and a great proportion of his publications were dedicated to the study of the Batavians, their territory (military, urban and rural villa landscapes), the formulation of their ethnic identity (ethnogenesis), and their integration in the Roman empire — i.e. Roymans’ Batavian phase. For the first time, he refers directly to the Batavians in the title of a paper. This phase had, and still has, a notable impact on the Dutch archaeological community in terms of students, projects, and funding, and shaped the way the topic of Roman:’barbarian’ interactions in the lower Rhine has developed over the last decade in Dutch archaeology.

When asked about the specific reasons behind such a thematic choice he argued as follows:

Mainly because of the high quality of the evidence available for the group and the area, the availability of historical sources (Tacitus) and epigraphic evidence (due to the intensive recruitment for the Roman army Batavians are a group with one of the largest number of inscriptions), and the high quality of preservation of the rural settlements, cemeteries, ritual sites and military infrastructure in the area. All these factors allowed the development of complex models, more than in any other area or with any other group in the empire. If there was as much data available in Frisia I would have researched the Frisians, not the Batavians; Frisians have a much better ethnographical context than Batavians (interview notes 2011; 2013).

While these reasons are perfectly valid (and brought up in every publication he has produced and conference papers he has delivered on the topic), they just cover the academic justification for an interest on the Batavians. In Chapter 7 I discuss other contextual reasons to explain such a thematic focus. Furthermore, Carol van Driel-Murray (in interview) has her
own opinion on why the reasons argued by Roymans are not enough to explain his preference for a Batavian research focus. She thinks that there is no gap on the material evidence available for the study of the other tribes, and that if there was one, it would be reasonable to blame it precisely on the lack of attention paid to these ‘other’ groups; if anything, that gap should provide a good reason to focus on those other groups. According to her, the work that Jasper de Bruin is preparing at Leiden University for his thesis on Cananefates proves the availability of other tribal datasets. Furthermore, she argues that part of the vast amount of data mentioned by Roymans has been made available during Roymans’ excavation projects thanks in part to the flexible metal-detecting policies in The Netherlands — an attitude bitterly regretted by Willems (2007, 556). Thus, those data cannot be considered both cause and effect of his research choices.

In any case, the nature of the topic (identity, Romanisation, integration, etc.), its geographical (lower Rhine *limes*) and chronological (early Roman empire) foci, and his approach to it in fashionable terms (ethnogenesis, identity, Romanisation), attracted international attention to his works among frontier studies scholars and Roman provincial archaeologists, situating him as one of the most recognisable Dutch figures.

This rise in popularity could also be explained in relation to his decision to shift from German to English as his preferred language of publication, following wider international trends. Once again, statistical analysis of his bibliography (Appendix 8) illustrates this point. He published primarily in Dutch until the mid-1990s and strongly shifted towards English thereafter (Figure 6.29). Such a progression fits with the trend by which German was progressively displaced as the primary scientific language in favour of English during the post-war period; this trend is observable throughout Dutch archaeology in particular and more generally in Western European academia (Härke 2000). Despite this positive progression towards English as his main publishing language, and his collaboration within volumes edited by British authors, such as Colin Haselgrove (2005, 2006), or participation in volumes published in the UK, such as the BAR series (1983; 2007), he has no works with UK publishers in which he is the primary editor himself. He has primarily been published in The Netherlands and Germany, and more marginally in Belgium, France and the USA (Figure 6.30). This trend does not change if we analyse these parameters by decade (Figure 6.31). Although objectively these results could imply a low international impact to Roymans’ work linked to his preference for publishing in Dutch publishers, the high quality and diffusion rate
of some Dutch publishers and periodicals can be viewed as factors to diminish such a negative impact.

Figure 6.29. Roymans’ language of choice by decade (Source: Author; see Appendix 8). To create this chart, the language in which the paper was written has been taken into account. Some of the papers written in English were published in volumes with German or Dutch titles. While the language used expresses Roymans’ preference, the language of the volume could hint at his targeted audience. That said, we could deduce that with such a choice Roymans was looking for maximum impact.

Figure 6.30. Publishers’ nationality for Roymans’ publications (Source: Author; see Appendix 8).
6.6.3. Themes, Trends and Discourse

CENTRALITY AND LEADERSHIP

Roymans is currently the central figure in Late Prehistoric and Roman archaeology in The Netherlands, and his work is highly influential among his contemporary scholars and those of the latest generations (Generations 4 and 5). He has provided (and still provides) doctoral supervision to numerous researchers whose work is now taking these fields to new paths — e.g. Heeren, Nicolay, Groot, Vos. Furthermore, he has surrounded himself with a large group of usual collaborators, scholars specialised in different periods and aspects of the pre- and proto-history of the lower Rhine basin, which has allowed him to deal with a long-term holistic approach to the study of the native populations of this area and their interaction with the landscape.

His very extensive publication record, his involvement in many large-scale regional projects, and his ability to be successful with sizeable funding applications are some other reasons that justify such a centrality. The shift of power from the UvA to the VU that occurred when he moved from the former to the latter in 1994 clearly illustrate Roymans’ weight within the academic community.
His impact reaches beyond the limits of the academic community. In 2010, he received from the Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) the *Huijbregtsenprijs voor Wetenschap en Samenleving* (Huijbregtsen Prize for Science and Society), in recognition for the valuable impact on society of his work on the biography of the southern Dutch landscape (Figure 6.32). Furthermore, he often appears on television as an expert archaeologist (Figures 6.33 and 6.34).

**Figure 6.32.** Nico Roymans receiving the *Huijbregtsenprijs voor Wetenschap en Samenleving* (Source: Frank van Driel; http://www.avondwenm.nl/archief/avond-2010/item/foto-s-2010).

**Figure 6.33.** Nico Roymans interviewed in 2015 by a regional TV channel (Omroep Brabant) regarding the presence archaeological traces of Julius Caesar’s presence in Brabant (Source: Youtube, video caption).
However, this pivotal role within Dutch archaeology does not necessarily translate into overall leadership. Collaboration does not seem to be translating into discussion; in fact, those who are not part of that group of usual collaborators have bitterly criticised the hermetic nature of Roymans’ school, and how this hinders the theoretical development of the discipline (interview comments by Vos, Van Londen and van Driel-Murray).

In any case, Roymans’ work illustrates very well general trends and features of Dutch archaeological research. Hence, I will describe common trends, themes and discourse from his works.

GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS: SOUTHERN NETHERLANDS AND REGIONAL PROJECTS

“Southern Netherlands... a region which ranks among the most intensively studied cultural landscapes of Western Europe” (Roymans 2009c: 337)

Roymans’ work has much to do with such a status. Since very early in his career (late 1970s) one can see hints of this geographical focus, with his first local studies around Bladel (his hometown) in Noord-Brabant. From the 1990s onwards he honoured the long-standing Dutch tradition of large-scale regional projects (Bloemers 1999) by participating or directing several research projects, expanding the geographic scope of his research to the wider
Southern Netherlands — roughly the area between the river banks of the Rhine, Meuse, Demer and Schelde, and more specifically the provinces of Noord-Brabant and Limburg —, an area he explicitly deems as an important case-study (1996; 2002a; 2009c). Some of these regional projects were: Kempen, Southern Netherlands, DMS (Demer-Meuse-Schelde), Pionier ‘Power and Elite’, Maaskant, Civitas Batavorum, Batavian rural landscapes. It is noticeable that Roymans has not produced any work on Northern Netherlands.

These points towards an imbalance on research focus towards the river area and Southern Netherlands that could be associated to the Batavian thematic focus already explored. These aspects — regional research and focus imbalance — will be further explored in the next chapter as defining features of Dutch archaeology.

Chronologically his projects’ focus span from late Bronze Age urnfields (700BC) earlier in his career to his latest/current interest in Late Antique demographics (AD 400-700), with quite a strong emphasis on the Roman period.Thematically, the native occupation and settlement patterns in the rural areas of the lower Rhine limes in Roman times is his main occupation, with projects such as ‘Roman villa landscapes in the North: economy, culture, life-styles’, or ‘The villa of Hoogeloon: Key-sites in the Roman rural landscape of the Lower Rhine frontier zone between limes and löss’, in the municipality of Bladel — Roymans’ birthplace.

He has paid particular attention to the study of the ethnic identity of the Batavians, to which he has dedicated the greatest part of his last 15 years with several NWO-funded projects — e.g. ‘The Batavians: Ethnic identity in a frontier situation’; and ‘Rural communities in the civitas Batavorum and their integration into the Roman empire’. I will now describe those trends in further detail and analyse the wider implications in Chapters 7 and 8.

LONGUE-DURÉE APPROACH TO LANDSCAPE ‘CULTURAL’ BIOGRAPHY

Roymans’ preference for a long-term perspective on the study of landscape and the groups that inhabited it and interacted with it can be illustrated by the thematic evolution in his projects and works. A quick look at the projects he has directed or been involved in clearly shows this interest in large chronological spans; most of these projects are multi-period and multi-authored. His first project, ‘Power and Elite’ (1989-1994), looked at a two millennia
evolution of aristocratic societies in the lower Rhine area. His paper on the volume that came out of that project (1991) focuses on the transition between the Late Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age. This was followed by a phase in his career (1995-2011) with several projects and all associated literature focusing on the Late Iron Age and the Roman period in the river area. Currently he is directing a project in which he is concerned with the lower Rhine population in Late Antiquity.

This shows a progressive transition and that overall interest in understanding the evolution of landscape and societies in that area in interaction with each other, i.e. ‘landscape biography’. While he explicitly dedicates a few papers to the discussion of this concept as a research strategy (1995; 1996; 2009c), he also applies it in many of his publications since the mid-1990s (1995; 2002; 2011).

Furthermore, Roymans recovers the idea of ‘cultural biography of the landscape’ — introduced by Samuels (1979). This concept is used by Roymans to express the cultural, ideological, even mythical, dimension of the interaction of human groups with the landscape (Roymans and Derks 1994). This approach to the study of landscape evolution contrasts with the Processual approach focused on socio-economic aspects through quantitative methodologies (Bloemers 2010; Woudstra 2012).

Thus, Roymans illustrates and leads the renaissance of ‘landscape archaeology’ that characterises current approaches to archaeology in The Netherlands.

ETHNO-HISTORICAL APPROACH

I was trained as an archaeologist, but I am trying to employ an historical-anthropological perspective.

One of Roymans’ most repeated methodological considerations is his ethno-historical approach (1983; 1991; 2004). Giving much importance to the historical sources, and combining them with settlement archaeology and different categories of material culture, Roymans approaches many different aspects of the ethnographic development of the lower Rhine societies, with special emphasis on the Batavians. This has favoured a growing focus on the native perspective of the cultural change processes occurring in the area during Roman times.
THEMATIC FOCUS: RURAL BATAVIAN LANDSCAPE

The Batavians rank among the most well-known native groups along the *limes* (Roymans 2014: 235).

Roymans’ engagement with the topic of rural Batavian landscapes since the mid-1990s produced a whole new impulse to the study of this particular native tribe and of Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions more generally, inspiring a whole new generation of archaeologists dedicated to such topics. His research focuses on different aspects of the relationship between Batavians and the landscape on the one hand (e.g. settlement, rural landscape, burials) and on their interaction with the Roman empire on the other (e.g. elites, ethnogenesis, identity, coinage, literacy, religion, militarization), describing its effects in their cultural evolution as a ‘unique Romanisation’.

The militarisation of the Batavian area during Roman occupation and the nature of the classical sources put the emphasis on the male military elites of the society, as the most likely group to provide insights into cultural developments (Roymans 1991). Roymans’ approach has created a special image for the Batavians in the international academic community. However, there are critiques of this position within Dutch archaeology: Carol van Driel-Murray has pointed out the flaws and origins of this approach, naming that there is an essential asymmetry in the Roman-Batavian relationship; a patronising attitude of the ruler and a colonial discourse (2002, 59); the rest of Batavian population is not taken into account despite its very important role on sustaining a militarised society. She thinks that the stress on male military Batavians may also be a consequence of the demographics of current scholarship in The Netherlands, primarily male-dominated.

Southern Netherlands, and more specifically the Eastern river area, the DMS area, and the Batavians territory, monopolize geographically Dutch academic archaeological research since the 1980s, with two main figures: Willems, and his ERA project (1981; 1984; 1986) and Roymans, with his career entirely devoted to that area and the last two decades devoted to the study of the Batavians, their ethnic identity and their relationship with the Roman Empire. His central position within Dutch archaeology has put Batavians (and the southern Netherlands) at the centre of academic discourses on Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction.

As Heleen van Londen pointed out in her interview, this does not mean there are no scholars focusing on different areas or ancient peoples, as her own works and de Bruin’s on
the Cananefates, Galestin’s and Kramer’s work on interactions beyond the *limes* and Frisians, clearly attest.

It could also be argued that Roymans saw in these and other contextual developments (convergence of institution, fieldwork, funding and a well-established ‘sexy’ topic in the south) a career development opportunity. The appeal of the topic and its relation to funding opportunities and to the demands of political agendas may also be argued as a contextual reason for the focus on Batavians.

**ROYMANS’ DISCOURSE: ‘UNIQUE ROMANISATION’ IN THE LOWER RHINE AREA**

We will argue that the integration of the rural settlement archaeology and the military *limes*-archaeology in The Netherlands has led to the insight that the position of the settlements in a frontier zone of the Roman empire close to the *limes* caused a Romanisation process with its own specific properties (Roymans and Heeren 2004b).

This quote expresses peculiarities in Roymans’ (and many of his followers’) methodological and theoretical approaches to the study of the integration and cultural interaction of local populations in the Roman Empire; peculiarities that have been assimilated and replicated by Generation 5 in my overall chronological classification. This is not surprising considering that many of the researchers belonging to that latest generation were or are his pupils (e.g. Heeren, Nicolay). As such, he has generated a view of the cultural interaction between Rome and the native populations with features that almost exclusively apply to The Netherlands — ‘unique Romanisation’.

They do not dismiss Romanisation but defend a ‘unique’ Romanisation process closely linked to the situation of the Batavian area in a frontier militarised environment and the intensive recruitment of troops among the Batavian population. However, the geology of the territory and the survival of Germanic settlement traditions prevented the cultural transformation of the area into a ‘villa landscape’, as occurred further south.

While in his earlier projects, such as the Pionier project *Power and Elite* (Roymans and Theuws 1991) his focus is on native elites, in later projects on Batavians he looks at the bottom-up processes of Romanisation (Roymans and Heeren 2004/5), especially when talking about the role of returning veterans in the process of integration of lower Rhine native
communities in the Roman imperial system and the resulting cultural interaction. This shift towards a bottom-up, native-centric approach, could be interpreted as an evolution of his interpretative frameworks driven by early British, broadly post-colonial theoretical influences during the 1990s (Millett 1990b; Woolf 1997) or as a hybrid of this with traditional German Romanisierungfaschung. It is also interesting to note that one of van Driel-Murray’s critiques of Roymans’ approach to the study of these groups is precisely an excessive focus on the male military elites; it could be suggested that Roymans’ shift responds also to a process of internal critique within the academic community, although not completely, as the role of women is still ignored and the role of the military aspects is still central to his discourse.

Roymans’ use of the term Romanisation can be attested even in the titles of his works since the early stages of his career (1996) and throughout (e.g. 2009 volume on Romanisation). He has not discussed or dismissed Romanisation as a valid model to explain cultural interaction between lower Rhine local populations and the Roman empire, as it has been the case in British archaeology since the early 1990s; instead, he has characterised it as ‘unique’ (Roymans and Heeren 2004/5), describing its specific features and nuances. We can conclude that, while certain aspects of the British post-colonial theoretical revolution have been assumed by Roymans — such as his focus on the native populations — the resulting image of the processes of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction does not differ much from that inherited from the German tradition, and shows more elements of influence from American anthropology.

Roymans does not make open theoretical statements about his positions or specifically defines terminology he uses to describe the processes of interaction and cultural change in the area, but his methodological approaches and the conclusion he reaches can tell us a lot about the theoretical influences he had. For instance, in the first chapter of his volume Ethnic Identity and Imperial Power (2004) he only discusses his theoretical approaches to the concepts of ethnicity and ethnogenesis, and then describes the processes of administrative (202; 208), social and religious (235-6) change in the Batavian area as ‘Romanisation’.

… the role of origin myths in the construction of new identities… is a vital aspect of the Romanisation of lower Rhine groups. (Roymans 2004, 236)

His only clear statement regarding his understanding of Romanisation is not related to the underlying theoretical considerations of its use but to the specific characteristics of the
process in the lower Rhine area, what he describes as ‘unique Romanisation’ (Roymans and Heeren 2004/5). While he nuances the type of Romanisation he does not consider or examines the appropriateness of such a concept/model to define processes of cultural interaction in the same fashion as British archaeologist. In fact, such an academic behaviour could be consistent with my view of a Roymans influenced by the German archaeological tradition, which uses ‘Romanisation’ without really examining it.

Roymans (1995a) described how he developed his understanding of the biography of the Batavian landscape from previous approaches focused on rational-ecological perceptions of landscapes by peoples in antiquity — typical from the Functional-Processual approach — and moved on to propose a new approach with a focus on the ideological, cultural and mental relationship of the Batavian rural population with the landscape (e.g. ‘mythical landscapes’; Derks 1998). Roymans; approach strongly recalls Renfrew and Bahn’s (2006, 42) description of the Cognitive-Processual movement of the 1980s “… which seeks more actively to include the consideration of symbolic and cognitive aspects of early societies into the program of research”. The lack of Post-Processual focus on theoretical explanations, his focus on data-driven research, and the fact that his formative years coincided with that cognitive-Processual trend, leads me to conclude that his approaches to the study of the Batavians is much framed by such a tradition.

6.7. Conclusions

This chapter has analysed Willems’ and Roymans’ works individually and in context. Although we see no trace of the mythical rivalry between Holwerda and van Giffen in the relationship between these two modern scholars, their development, and the evolution of their discourses and approaches to the issue of Roman-‘barbarian’ interaction, are certainly divergent. Thus, a comparative analysis of their trajectories and approaches is necessary to understand the development of the discipline in the last four decades and illustrate the diversity of discourses that characterises it.

A brief overview of the careers of these two scholars revealed that the peak of their academic production on the topic of native populations in the lower Rhine limes and their interaction with the Roman empire did not coincide in time. While Willems’ focus on the topic was mostly limited to the period 1980-1995 — with a later research focus shift towards
heritage management — Roymans’ main most productive period on the topic starts in the mid-1990s and is ongoing.

Although Willems explained the shift on career focus away from Roman provincial archaeology as a consequence of a change in his professional circumstances (directorship of ROB, and the Malta Convention), it is entirely feasible to suggest a partially conscious decision as an alternative explanation. This new professional opportunities presented to Willems at a time of growing academic pressure exercised by the new generation of scholars who by the late 1980s and early 1990s were coming through in the field of Roman provincial archaeology, and more specifically working on the topic of Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions in the lower Rhine area. Such was the case of Roymans, who, by the early 1990s, became Willems’ natural successor as the leading scholar in the field (see Section 6.4.3).

This suggests that Willems’ career turn toward archaeological heritage management was partially a consequence of contextual reasons, i.e. the rise of Roymans as a leading scholar on the topic. This points, once again, towards the importance of the social dynamics of Dutch archaeology as a defining factor.

Competition or not, there was certainly no rivalry in the fashion established by Van Giffen and Holwerda in the early 20th century. In fact, after comparing the analysis of Willems’ and Roymans’ trajectories and works we can spot some similarities in certain aspects of their research. Both spent their formative years at the IPP in Amsterdam; they both had the Batavians as the focus of some of their most important works; and they both had a predilection for large-scale regional projects over several years (e.g. Willems’ ERA project and Roymans’ various 1990s projects).

Despite having things in common, the two never worked together; they did coincide in some volumes, but they never included papers in volumes edited by the other. This could be explained by the critical differences that one can spot between their works after careful analysis. For instance, while Willems’ focus had much to do with the study of urban military sites and Roman-style villas, such as Nijmegen and Voerendaal, Roymans focused on rural native sites and the non-villa Batavian landscapes. The differences in the theoretical plane are more notorious though:
The evaluation [of legitimacy and power in colonial situations] depends on the views of the scholar concerned, for no objective judgement seems possible. (Claessen 1988, 25)

While Willems opted for the rejection of Romanisation as a valid model to understand the cultural changes and the interaction processes in the lower Rhine area, and used one based on acculturation instead, Roymans’ use of Romanisation shows the disparity of their approaches. Although it is true that Roymans points out the special character of the Romanisation process in the area (‘unique Romanisation’), the nuances he presents are not related to the theoretical paradigm itself, but to the factors affecting the cultural evolution of the native population of the area. As such, there is no trace of critical approach to the Romanisation model — at least not in the way experienced in English archaeology in the 1990s.

There are also differences in terms of theoretical frameworks used: thus, Willems rejects Romanisation as a valid concept for its exclusive link to the Roman empire and therefore not allowing cross-cultural analysis (1983, 105); this contrasts with Roymans’ preference for describing the processes of cultural change in the area with that concept — this trend can be seen also in younger generations, as a reflection of Roymans’ influence (Heeren, interview 2013).

A further difference is in terms of approaches to the Batavian topic itself. While Willems, especially in his more interpretative papers in the second half of the 1980s, tends to stress the interactional process between tribe and Empire and contextualise the development of the native population as part of the empire, Roymans prefers to focus on the ethnographical development of the tribe, making them the main characters of his narrative, and with the Roman empire a factor in such a development.

This could lead towards another conclusion. In Willems’ career and works we see a clear influence of American schools of thought and theoretical frameworks, mostly adopted from cultural anthropology. Roymans describes his approach to the study of the Batavians as ‘historical-anthropological’ (2004, 1); his uncritical use of ‘Romanisation’ as an appropriate label and his focus on historical data suggests his closer position to neighbouring continental — primarily German — archaeological frameworks. Furthermore, the anthropological element of his approach could be interpreted as an influence of his supervisor, the cultural anthropologist Claessen, and not something acquired through direct contact with American branches of Anthropology, as was the case in Willems.
Such a conclusion can also be extracted by exploring the relationship that these two scholars had with non-Dutch institutions and societies. Willems’ personal and academic experiences during his formative years brought him closer to American trends through research visits to the USA, involvement in projects such as NAGPRA, and even membership of the Society for American Archaeology since 1976; this heavy American influence was reinforced in later stages of his career when he received numerous prestigious awards and posts as head of World, European, and American institutions and societies. Based on similar parameters I would suggest a strong German influence in Roymans’ case, both through the traditional link between Dutch and German archaeology that he surely absorbed during his participation on regional projects early in his career, and from personal experiences, such as his 1990 research fellowship ‘Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung’ at the Forschungsinstitut für Vor- und Frühgeschichte (Research Institute for Pre- and Proto-history) of the RGZM (Römisch-Germanische Zentralmuseum) in Mainz. As in Willems’ case, this German connection is clearly evident in his later years: between 2008 and 2010 he became corresponding Dutch member of the DAI (Deutsches Archäologisches Institute) and scientific advisory board member of the exhibition program ‘2000 Jahre Varusschlacht’ and ‘Kalkriese’ in Germany.

Both of these scholars have certainly shaped Dutch archaeological research on the native populations of the lower Rhine limes and their cultural interaction with the Roman empire for the last 40 years. They took different influences and transformed the way the Roman past of The Netherlands and its peoples were approached. As such, their influence in theoretical and methodological terms is massive for the development of the field, with both being teachers and supervisors of many of the members of the latest generation of researchers working on the topic.

Willems’ influence on the archaeological community in fact goes beyond the topic of native populations due to his later involvement with archaeological heritage and the organisation of archaeology in The Netherlands. Roymans, by contrast, can be considered more influential in the field of Roman studies precisely because of his sole focus on the topic and the influence of his approaches in the 1990s and onwards.

However, this new generation (Generation 5) drinks from a much wider pool of influences due to the globalisation and internationalisation of academia. A strong example of this would be Carol van Driel-Murray, who arrived in Amsterdam from Sussex in the 1970s
and brought with her a solid interest in British theoretical postulates — an interest that would later be transferred to her pupils within this latest generation:

The path that led to a TRAC in Amsterdam started in the winter term of 1999, when three out of the five organisers participated in a research seminar on Roman Britain at the University of Amsterdam, led by Carol van Driel-Murray, who had been involved in TRAC since its early years. She quite literally flooded us with TRAC proceedings as a source of inspiration for our seminar papers. Ignited by her enthusiasm, the entire seminar group then decided to attend the London TRAC of 2000. From that point onwards, this group became a regular attendant of TRAC and spread the news to friends at other universities and new students. The Dutch have become a constant factor at TRAC ever since. And again, when the idea arose to organise a continental TRAC it was Carol van Driel-Murray who stimulated us to have a go at it. (Driessen et al. 2009, iv)

It may take further research into the works of this new wave of archaeologists, and some more years of perspective and reflection, to say whether there is now a proper Dutch approach to the processes of cultural change that native populations underwent in The Netherlands in Roman times.
Chapter 7. Characterising Dutch Post-war Archaeology and Discourses on Roman:‘barbarian’ Interaction

7.1. Introduction

So far I have explored all the contextual factors that influence the development of Dutch archaeology and the works of the two most relevant Dutch scholars on the topic, providing an overview of the approaches and discourses formulated during the last four decades.

This chapter discusses the results of that analysis, inferring broader trends that could be used for comparative purposes with other academic communities in North-Western Europe and beyond. This will help me to answer the research question by describing the nature and features of Dutch archaeology and its discourses on the topic of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction and cultural change in the lower Rhine.

However, post-war Dutch archaeology cannot be defined in a monolithic fashion; it needs to be discussed in terms of smaller thematic approaches, and hence the structure of this chapter reflects that reality.

7.2. Batavian Thematic Hegemony and Shifting Focus

The thematic focus on the Batavians is nearly an obsession in Dutch archaeology, one that has its roots in four centuries of inherited historical discourses and myths created around this lower Rhine people (Chapter 4). Those discourses responded to the impulse and needs of patriotic feelings, nationalistic ideologies and national identity formulation, and the relevance of the Tacitean accounts on this tribe — recovered in the Renaissance — to the specific historical context of early-modern Netherlands.

Except for a brief period (mid-19th – mid-20th century) of interest in the Frisians as part of a trinity of ancestral tribes (‘ Saxons, Frisians and Franks’), none of the other tribes that shared modern Dutch territory in Roman times has received much attention. Such a thematic imbalance is clearly visible in modern Dutch archaeology too.
Despite the words of Helen van Londen in her interview defending the existence of past and ongoing research with a focus other than the Batavians, those of Carol van Driel-Murray — “…the Dutch obsession with archaeological Batavians has become a branch of research in its own right… (pers. comm., 28/04/2011)” — reproduced in the introduction of this thesis qualifying studies on this group as a true sub-discipline in Dutch Roman archaeology still resonate solidly. This can be proved by simply perusing the academic ‘production’ on Batavians of the last few decades: numerous publications, research projects, conference papers and contributions to international journals.

The weight of Roman-related themes (e.g. Roman frontier studies, Roman military archaeology, Roman provincial archaeology, archaeology of native populations in Roman times, rural landscapes) in Dutch archaeology in the 1960s and 1970s can be seen in the graphics and maps produced by Van Es (1972c). Within such a trend, and once the focus turned from a Romano-centric approach to a native-centric one in the 1970s-1980s, the primacy of Batavians as a research topic is undeniable. Willems and Roymans have both played a pivotal role in this Batavian thematic hegemony. As Heeren (interview notes) put it: “Willems opened the door and Nico invited people in”.

However, the reasons behind it go beyond personal preferences, and have even been questioned by some other Dutch scholars. Now that most contextual factors that have an effect on the development of Dutch archaeological research and discourses have been identified and described, a multi-scalar analysis can be applied in order to explain this thematic focus.

The influence of Roymans’ work on the Batavians and his engagement with new generations of archaeologists may partially explain this Batavian focus in Dutch archaeology. And the reasons he offers for his own thematic choice remain valid for this wider trend, namely the availability of abundant literary sources and archaeological data (interview 2011; 1983, 105). Van Driel-Murray disagrees with such a statement (interview notes). However, Willems (1980, 279) pointed out some of the many other contextual factors not mentioned by Roymans, which may help clarify this issue:

“Regional inventarisation of archaeological finds from the Iron Age into the Early Medieval period started in 1978 and, since then, has provided a good insight into the size and distribution of habitation through time in that area.”
The economic boom and new heritage management policies in the 1970s-1980s also helped to produce more archaeological materials than ever before, in areas geologically favourable to the preservation of objects. The Valletta (Malta) Convention (1992) changed the way archaeology was practised, from big (but few) long research projects to many smaller, emergency excavations (mostly commercial units involved in urban development), providing archaeologists of that generation with huge amounts of material and favouring extensive research on the Batavian area. Accumulation of unstudied material has been constant since then; some funding was made available in the last few years to be devoted exclusively to the study of such material — e.g. Willems (interview notes 26/05/2011) referred to Eef Stoffels’ PhD thesis, which studied the unpublished materials resultant from Willems’ ‘Kops Plateau’ project (1986-1995).

Inherited discourses prioritising Batavians among other ancient tribes must be considered as an important factor too. The monopoly that Batavians have on historical and archaeological discourse is traceable from the 16th century to our time, with the century-long exception (c. 1850-1950) of the rise and fall of the ‘tribal trinity’ (see Section 4.3.6). More specifically, the 1980s saw the definitive return of the Batavians as a research topic in Dutch academia.

However, the nature of such a prominence in the scholarly discourse in different historical episodes responds to different factors. While the 16th-18th century use of Batavians responds mostly to national identity needs, the post-WWII renewed scholarly attention in these respects to other contextual reasons: (i) Academic, namely broader post-colonial academic trends that argues for a turn from Romano-centric to native-centric research (see also discussion on Roymans’ trajectory earlier); (ii) institutional regionalism with greater presence in southern Netherlands; (iii) methodological and interpretative development influenced by broader post-colonial trends towards native-centric approaches; (iv) economic and political, with regional development more pronounced in the central and southern areas of The Netherlands and new European heritage policies (Valetta treaty) that provoked an increase of excavations and material in those areas; and, as mentioned above, (v) to techno-ecological factors, with an ecology of the soils in the Batavian area are more appropriate for the technological capabilities and preservation of archaeological material.

The ideological element linked to identity and nationalism visible in interpretations of episodes of Roman:native interaction in the periods between the 16th century and the mid-20th
century, is not present (or at least not evident) in discussions by current scholars. Whether it is not visible because such elements are not there anymore or because it is a different ideological landscape is still to be analysed.

Furthermore, it would be interesting to consider to which extent the political use of specific ancient icons during stressful historical episodes might have affected the preferences and perceptions of subsequent generations of scholars (Lotte Jensen, interview). A good example to illustrate this process would be the situation during (and the effects of) the ‘Batavian republic’ in 1795 and the following period of French occupation. As detailed in Section 4.3.5, the name of the Batavians was associated with the much-disliked new French-imposed regime due to its political use, and once this fell, the Batavians too fell into disgrace. Hence focus turned next to other ancient groups — the ‘tribal trinity’ of Frisians, Franks and Saxons (Beyen 2009) — prompted by broader northern-European intellectual trends (folklore, racial and ethnic approach to ancient cultures). For the same reasons, and in a reverse process, after WWII this tribal trinity lost favour, and renewed interest turned to the Batavians once more, possibly due to scholars wanting to break with pre-war trends.

Within this topic there is also a noticeable shift of focus from emphasis on Roman military urban aspects to the civilian rural. This implies also a change of focus from a Romano-centric perspective to a native-centric one, in line with post-colonial precepts and responding to one of the critiques thrown at the traditional Romanisation model. This change might also respond to the phenomenon described by Lawrence Keeley (1996; see also James 2001a) as ‘the pacification of the past’, and the downplaying of the role of conflict in recent historiography. However, this turn has not changed the ‘militarisation of the Batavian ethnic identity’, as pointed out by van Driel-Murray.

So far I have described the multiple reasons why a focus on Batavians is favoured in The Netherlands. However, it would be interesting to look into the reasons why the other two ancient tribes, Cananefates and Frisians, receive less attention in Dutch Roman archaeology. Both tribes settled in areas of the modern Netherlands that are less prone to modern economic development, and as such, conditions are less favourable to their archaeological exploration. The area of the Cananefates is also one of sandy soils, less prone to preserve materials in a good state than its neighbouring Batavian area of clayish soils. Furthermore, the Cananefates have normally been studied in relation to the Batavians, following the Tacitean construct of
the former revolting against the Roman empire under the leadership of the Batavian general Julius Civilis.

Studies of Frisians are much more focused on their medieval phase because of the relatively abundant sources for their study. According to Roymans (interview notes), the lack of material available on Roman-era Frisians in northern Netherlands makes their study less appealing. The very strong regional identity makes the institutions based elsewhere less interested in it, and this is framed by the regional imbalance and institutional separation mentioned earlier.

7.3. Methodological and Theoretical Approaches

The structure of the Nationale Onderzoeksagenda Archeologie (NOaA – National Archaeological Research Agenda) — the document that guides archaeological activity in The Netherlands — reflects the “regional orientation of Dutch archaeology, its focus on the co-evolution of man and the natural landscape, and its emphasis on studying long-term processes” (Bazelmans 2006, 64). It is useful next to describe these and other defining features of Dutch archaeology.

The first aspect to address is: which sub-discipline does the Dutch academic community operate within when approaching episodes of their Roman:‘barbarian’ past? Current research on the native populations of the lower Rhine area in Roman times is more defined by landscape archaeology and an ethnographical-historical approach than with traditional conceptions of Roman archaeology. As the Danish scholar Thomas Grane (2007, 19) stated: “In the case of the archaeology of the Netherlands, it is not possible to sort out provincial Roman archaeology as a discipline in itself”. Late Prehistory (e.g. Gerritsen 2003) and the Late Iron Age (e.g. Roymans and Theuws 1991; Roymans 1996), are quite common alternative terms used to refer to periods well within the chronological span of traditional Roman archaeology. In fact, only one of the five university institutes of archaeology is named after that branch of archaeology — Nijmegen’s Institute for Provincial Roman Archaeology. The remaining are either directly referring to non-Roman periods (IPP – *Institute for Pre- and Proto-history Archaeology*, Amsterdam; IPL – *Institute for Prehistory*, Leiden) or simply not chronologically qualified (AIVU – *Archaeological Institute Free University*, Amsterdam; BAI – *Biological Archaeological Institute*, Groningen). Despite these institutes having a
long-standing tradition of studying the Roman period, the Roman *limes*, and Roman territory south of the Rhine, they opt for a very ‘Germanic’ approach to the study of their ancient past based on prehistorical perspectives — one that can be clearly seen in the German and Danish archaeological tradition. However, in those traditions this trend is justified by the lack of Roman historical sources and the necessary reliance on archaeological data.

Generalisations are not valid for the Dutch case. Methodologies and approaches change, noticeably between regions: while the North is generally German-oriented with focus on material culture, the South focuses on settlement development, regional approaches, and/or landscape biography.

### 7.3.1. Large-Scale Regional Projects

The organisation of archaeological research into large-scale regional projects is one of the most paradigmatic features of post-war Dutch archaeology (Bazelmans 2006, 60; Bloemers 1999). According to Bloemers (2000, 381), Härke (2000), and Willems (1981j), such a tradition is an original Dutch development derived from the combination of two German approaches: *Landesaufnahme* — ‘regional survey’ — and *Siedlungskammer* — ‘settlement chambers’ or ‘settlement cells’, referring to micro-regions or moderately large settlement areas delimited by natural boundaries (Bakker 2009, 13). In fact, Willems uses the term *Landesaufnahme* in one of his early reports on the ERA (1981j).

This trend commenced in the late 1940s with Moddermann’s surveys of archaeological materials in the Batavian area, saw its full application on the field in the 1970s with the introduction of large excavation machinery that allowed stripping of wider areas (Bloemers 2006, 65). Sloftra’s Kempen project (Figure 7.1) is perhaps the earliest survey of these characteristics, starting in 1974, and with wider implications on the social dynamics of the academic community in later years. It is possibly one of the longest projects too: by 1980 the AIVU took over the project and excavated in the area until 1994 (Roymans 2011b), eventually under the name of the ‘South Netherlands’ project (Gerritsen 2003, 26-7; Roymans 1996c); eventually it came under the supervision of Roymans. This succession of projects account for two decades of archaeological research on the Dutch side of the Kempen region, which provided insights into the settlement pattern, and valuable information to select settlements for excavation (Slofstra 1983, 98). Contemporary projects included the
excavations of the Assendelver Polders by the IPP since 1978, and Willems’ Eastern River Area (ERA) since 1978. The latter can be considered the first fully-planned large-scale regional project put in place on the Batavian area, and its structure would be followed by later projects, chiefly those organised by Roymans in the 1990s and 2000s. The Maaskant project, directed by Harry Fokkens and with its main excavations located at Ors (between Nijmegen and s’-Hertogenbosch, in Southern Netherlands), is one last example of regional field projects.

![Figure 7.1. Demer-Meuse-Schelde (DMS) area, with the Kempen region marked. Both these regions encompass territories in The Netherlands and Belgium (Source: Slofstra 1983, 97).](image)

Note that the regional character and the focus on the DMS area are also visible in research projects not involving new fieldwork — e.g. Roymans (1981) and Gerritsen (2006) — whose aim was the study of regional developments over time. A number of other projects not directed by either one of the scholars analysed here completes a panorama of overlapping regional projects that saw its peak between the 1970s and 1990s (Bazelmans 2006, 60).

These projects (see Figure 7.2) have a common geographical focus within Dutch territory: the area limited by the fluvial system formed by the rivers Demer (South), Meuse (East and North), Rhine (North) and Schelde (West). As such, cooperation was also a feature between them, and it can be related to the idea explored in Roymans’ dossier regarding a
regular group of collaborators. The names of the coordinators of these projects correlate with those closely related to Roymans’ career.

With the exception of the project organised by the BAI at Groningen, there are no traces of this trend in the northern Netherlands. It could also be argued that the Dutch Northern school, with Groningen as its visible head, is much more focused on material culture, and typochronologies — e.g. Taayke’s (1990) ceramic typochronologies, Galestin’s (2010) focus on goods exchange. Conversely, the wider regional focus of the Southern school favours the use of a longue-durée approach to archaeological landscape — another feature of Dutch archaeology (see below). Evidence and knowledge accumulated over larger portions of territory allow archaeologists to look at those areas from a multi-period perspective. This is related also to Roymans’ tendency towards collaboration with experts from different periods.

Figure 7.2. Large-scale regional projects in Dutch Roman archaeology (1970s-1980s). 1. Drente (BAI); 2. Assendelver Polders (IPP); 3. Kromme Rijngebied (ROB); 4. Eastern River Area (ROB); 5. Maaskant project (IPL); 6. Kempen project (AIVU) (Source: Bloemers 1983, 160).
Ironically, the application of the Valletta Convention for the protection of cultural and archaeological heritage in The Netherlands, has put this tradition to an end. The introduction of the private sector into archaeological activity and its focus on small-scale and short interventions, combined with reduced central research funding, has partially reduced the ability of Universities and archaeological Institutes to conduct large regional projects.

7.3.2. Cultural Biography of Landscapes — Longue-durée Approach

The relationship between Dutch archaeology and the landscape is a feature in itself: ‘Delta Archaeology’ (Waterbolk 1981) and ‘Drowned landscape’ in Fokkens’ thesis (1998) are good examples. This has been expressed through a methodological engagement with ‘soil sciences’ (e.g. paleobotany, geology). This trend for large-scale regional surveys (Section 7.3.1) favours the study of long-term processes, in search of continuity and/or change across centuries and even millennia.

Some studies have clearly struggled to deal with the classic period-based division of pre- and proto-history. The existing period classifications, even the division between the Iron Age and the Roman period and between the Roman period and the Early Middle Ages, are all fairly artificial. This realisation has prompted contemporary archaeologists not only to focus on long periods of time, but also to adopt a new approach, with the introduction of the concept of ‘cultural biography’ in recent years (Roymans et al. 2009c). This is based on the idea that the structured, built environment – in the broadest sense of the word – is relevant not only to the period in which it is created, but also in many cases for centuries, sometimes millennia, thereafter. No society exists in a landscape that can be regarded as a *tabula rasa*. Every society has to deal with the environment it has inherited in its own way. Some parts of it will be forgotten, others reduced to rubble and destroyed, while others might be accorded a significant place in the new order (Bazelmans 2006, 61).

The focus of Dutch archaeological research has clearly shifted from material evidence to settlements, and from settlements to cultural landscape, in a Dutch revival of landscape archaeology — a concept and framework originated in America (Woudstra 2012). The natural landscape provides the framework but does not determine developments in society; man establishes a relationship with the landscape that goes beyond economical determinisms, into the realm of intellectual, even mythical, interactions (Roymans 1995a). One can better
understand in this context Roymans’ trend to qualify his object of research with the term ‘landscape’ — e.g. ‘Batavian rural landscape’ or ‘Non-villa landscape’.

7.4. The Dutch ‘Middle Way’: Between German and Anglo-American Traditions

A question was posed in Chapter 3 of whether the nature of Dutch archaeological tradition can be defined in terms of overarching — mostly Anglo-American — conventions on archaeological approaches, i.e. Culture-History, Processualism, Post-Processual archaeology, etc. The answer to that question is of the utmost importance here. If, as Hodder stated, there is no recognisable Post-Processual phase in The Netherlands, how then we define the nature of Dutch archaeology? The first port of call would be the opinions of the Dutch archaeologists themselves, expressed in their interviews.

While they do not acknowledge full inheritance of any theoretical or conceptual system — in fact they deny the effects of Processual and Post-Processual archaeologies (see Section 3.2) — they recognise theoretical influences from different academic traditions. As such, Dutch theoretical development moves between an ‘independent’ internal evolution and a dual external academic influence (Continental and Anglo-American). Or so they claim:

Dutch archaeology might act as a mediator between Anglo-American and Continental European perspectives and traditions. (Bloemers 1990; 2000, 392)

Dutch and Scandinavian archaeologists seem to have stood bemusedly on the side line, but rather than taking on an active intermediary role, they have started to go their own ways by combining the best of both traditions. (Härke 2000, 16)

Most Dutch archaeologists, however, feel that their archaeology does not greatly differ from that practised in neighbouring countries. As a characteristic of Dutch archaeology one might expect some form of integration of elements derived from other traditions (Waterbolk 1981, 240).

Besides these quotes and many others, fully all of the Dutch scholars I interviewed and asked about this issue agreed that Dutch archaeology has evolved independently from these other two major traditions, yet taking the best traits of both.

The Netherlands is influenced by German and Anglo-American research, but it carries its own course — a kind of middle ground (Willems, interview notes).
The Netherlands is greatly influenced by German, very traditional, empirical approach (although German style is changing now allowing more theory), and also by British theoretical models, but it has its own middle way — e.g. the BAR Series volume on *Spheres of Interaction* between Romans and natives was criticized both as ‘speculation without material base’ and ‘simple descriptive reports’ (Derks, interview notes).

I think Dutch academia is basically empirical research with conceptual frame on top of it […] which I think is vanity more than anything else. So this is how we would like to perceive ourselves. We are very content that we are sort of in the middle (van Londen, interview).

Assessing whether this analysis represents reality or is just an illusion is the aim of this section.

Despite the German school progressively losing its dominant position since WWII, archaeological approaches in Germany and elsewhere in Europe continued their parallel developments until the 1960s, when the irruption of New Archaeology from the USA confirmed the rupture between the British and German schools of archaeology (Härke 2000). The language barrier did not help either (different languages as well as different concepts and systems of thought); the switch from German to English as the archaeological language in Europe probably also has political undertones, especially clear in The Netherlands and Scandinavia since 1945 (Härke 2000, 15-16), and could explain and/or reflect a shift in Dutch academic preferences.

![Language of BROB papers by year](image-url)

*Figure 7.3. Language of BROB papers by year (1950-2006) (Source: Author).*
An increasing use of English as the scholarly language in The Netherlands can be attested by the evolution, for instance, of the BROB publications (Figures 7.3 and 7.4) or the case of Willems (Figure 6.15) and Roymans (Figure 6.29).

Table 7.1 describes the stereotypical characteristics of German archaeology. Looking for traces of these in Dutch archaeology offer clues to how much German tradition there is in Dutch archaeology; stereotypically, British archaeology would be defined as an opposition to these features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Too empiricist</td>
<td>- Solid and meticulous work with primary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Description over interpretation</td>
<td>- Source criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical excellence but no reflection</td>
<td>- Avoid rash interpretation and precocious publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hierarchical attitudes</td>
<td>- Reliance on proven archaeological methods rather than ill-understood scientific techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Absence of lively debate</td>
<td>- Continuity of method instead of rapidly changing intellectual fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-imposed isolation from intellectual mainstreams of European archaeology</td>
<td>- High scholarly standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, analysis of this issue should not limit itself to such generic features. Rather, methodological and theoretical considerations may throw a clearer and more interesting light regarding the external influences that drive the ‘Dutch middle way’.

Methodologically, one of the arguments made by Dutch scholars is that structuring research around regional projects is an original feature of the Dutch tradition (van Dommelen and Prent 1996; Slofstra 1994; Hodder 1994; Roymans 1996b; Roymans and Heeren 2004). However, as already explained, this feature is associated by Härke (2000) and Roymans (1996b; Roymans and Heeren 2004) with the German Landesaufnahme. Far from assuming that Dutch regional projects are a direct influence from German tradition, contextual reasons must be argued to understand the specific character of this trend in Dutch archaeology. On the other hand, Slofstra (1983, 97-8) states that anthropological approaches have led to large-scale research of native settlements. As such, we are witnessing here another example of the variety of external intellectual influences that shape archaeological practice in The Netherlands: the duality of German and Anglo-American influences is clear. On the one hand, the methodology is an adaptation of German traditions; on the other, the theoretical framework is Anthropology mostly imported from America.

Furthermore, claims are made by Dutch scholars (see throughout interviews) that they are neither as theoretical as the British, nor as typological as the Germans; they claim that they have a balance between the British ‘too-much-focus-on-theory’ and the German ‘material-typologies-are-everything’.

While Processualism (New Archaeology) was ignored by German scholars in the 1960s and 1970s, Dutch scholars, such as Slofstra (1974), Roymans (1996b, 231-2) and Willems, pers.comm., were eager to embrace it from the 1970s, progressively replacing culture-historical approaches — a vestige of German influence — that had dominated interpretative frameworks of early pre- and early post-WWII scholars through the works of van Giffen, Waterbolk and van Es, among others.

The switch from German to English as the academic language of preference after WWII played an important role in that theoretical shift role as well, and had, according to Härke (2000: 31-2), a politico-historical explanation. Roymans and Heeren (2004) mention language change as factor in the 1980s developments too, and these can be detected in Willems’ and Roymans’ own evolutions.
In sum, a swing from a Dutch archaeology traditionally influenced by German scholarship to one using Anglo-American frameworks can be identified in the post-war period and is especially evident later on, around the 1980s. This refers to the extended idea among Dutch scholars that their archaeological tradition is halfway between German and British traditions. The German influence comes from a time in which archaeology as a science was being set up in The Netherlands, when its main State institutions were created and heritage laws formulated in the time of occupation. That influence also came through scholars who studied in Germany and brought scientific methodology to Dutch archaeological excavations (Sarfatij 1972).

However, strong British influence is evident in terms of theoretical frameworks (i.e. post-colonialism). Several reasons for this come to mind: geographical proximity, similar historical context in which they developed their archaeological discourses, and shared imported American theoretical frameworks.

The Dutch academic community tends to think they are promoting the best of both worlds — i.e. the theoretical frameworks from the British and the methodology and data management of the Germans. However, because of that ‘myth’ of their academic identity they tend to ignore what, in my opinion, is a strong American influence in its own right. These are unique influences, especially from the anthropological science, that differ from the British ones, and shape many of the features and scholars of Dutch archaeology (e.g. Willems). Furthermore, if there is no Post-Processual trajectory as Hodder and Bazelmans seem to think, the possibilities of having a British influence are reduced. Heleen van Londen’s words (interview 2013) offer much in this respect:

Then there is a sort of stereotype of what kind of archaeology we do in The Netherlands, so I think the Germans are stereotyped as being very thorough in descriptive terms, not big in interpretation, but very good in documentation, so their books are like bibles with typo-chronologies and stuff. Whereas in the UK the stereotype is that it’s all very conceptual, and that of course The Netherlands is right in the middle, which I think is vanity more than anything else. We are very content that we are sort of in the middle. So this is how we would like to perceive ourselves. I think that, in practice, if you look at commercial archaeology, it is not very theoretical at all. I think that we do have good standards concerning documentation, and if you look at academic archaeology it is getting there conceptually but is not necessarily very good at documentation. […] Dutch academia is basically empirical research with a conceptual frame on top of it.
Carol van Driel-Murray’s circumstances as a British immigrant in the Dutch academic community grants her certain perspective on structural issues and discourses, and it probably helped her to adapt to an academic community that was going through an opening process at that time. Her language skills (as a native English speaker) helped too as translations into English of academic works were often handed to Carol in those early years. When she shares her belief of a “Dutch disdain for their own linguistic identity” (van Driel-Murray 2002, 59), she is referring to the tendency of Dutch scholars to increasingly translate and publish their works in English.

This Dutch tendency is explained by Willems (2008) in a short paper presented at the World Archaeology Congress under the title ‘Language and Archaeology’, as the effects of the smaller size of Dutch academic community in comparison with other mainstream bigger traditions (UK, Spain, Germany, France or Italy) and the subsequent need for these minorities to adapt to majority languages and therefore be opened to external influences.

English as a world academic language is a post-war phenomenon; one of the reasons argued by Härke (2000, 31-2) is the complexities of scholarly dialect of German language — Wissenschaftsdeutsch (different language, different concepts, different system of thought). Perhaps language similarities between Dutch and German might explain purveyance of German ideas, concepts and approaches in Dutch archaeology, as it is easier for Dutch scholars to understand German complex concepts. Knowledge of German by British and American archaeologists has become rare since the 1960s/70s and the shift from German to English as academic language of reference has clear political undertones, especially in Netherlands and Denmark since 1945 (Härke 2000, 32) — the end of Nazi occupation and the advent of American cultural domination.

This ability to go ‘cherry picking’ aspects of different national academic traditions, and to adapt them to respond to the unique nature of Dutch archaeology is, arguably, a consequence of the international character of Dutch academia.
7.5. Structural Character

7.5.1. ‘Research limes’ and Regional Imbalance

Despite unanimity among Dutch scholars on seeing the ‘middle way’ between other major European academic traditions as one of the main and valuable features of Dutch archaeology (Section 7.4), it could be argued that there is no such thing as a single ‘Dutch middle way’. Regional variation has been described already in many other aspects — such as economy, urban development, research focus (see Section 5.2) —, and it is also at the heart of this statement. In the words of Van Es (1983, 8): “The uneven spread of investigation is one of the main problems for the study of Romanisation [in The Netherlands]”.

The rivalry of Holwerda vs. van Giffen in the early 20th century discussed in Section 5.3.2 was the genesis of the structural evolution of Dutch archaeology, and it affected its characteristic development in such a manner that Verhart (2008, 223) sees distinct ‘traditions’ of doing archaeology back then: the Leiden or Groningen way. This regional variation of Dutch archaeology could also be linked to non-academic factors, such as the economic regional imbalance between North and South (see Chapter 5).

The differences North and South of the limes can also be attested in the development and nature of modern academic archaeology either side of the Rhine, on what I call the ‘research limes’. This term describes the differences observed between the development and current nature of archaeological practice, in terms of methodology, focus, theoretical frameworks, and institutional structure. These differences can be explained partly on the basis of different regional economic development, but also in academic terms:

North of the borders research is carried out as pre-history. There is no interest (or means) for a historical approach to the past. They have been working more with C14 (at Groningen’s laboratory) and dendro-chronologies for the last decade (Taayke, interview).

A 4-to-1 ratio in Universities attests the regional imbalance of academic institutions north and south of the Rhine, with Groningen the only University with an institute dedicated to Archaeology (BAI), and the Fries Museum in Leeuwarden the only museum with a collection of northern archaeology (Willems, interview 2011).
There is also imbalance in research focus derived from the focus on the river areas — see earlier discussion about Dutch archaeology as ‘Delta Archaeology’ (Section 5.2). Most of the research related to Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions in The Netherlands is focused on the ancient populations in central and southern Netherlands (Batavians and Cananefates) during the early and high empire; and that focusing on the North tends to be related to later Frisians.

7.5.2. **Hierarchy, Genealogy and Social Organization in Dutch Archaeology**

This brief historiographical analysis provides insights into the importance of academic genealogies as a factor in the development of archaeological discourse and archaeology as a discipline. The importance of the formative years in the formulation of archaeological thought, and therefore the influence of academic mentors/supervisors and teachers is closely related to this. Thus, the study of networks and clusters of scholars seems crucial to understand its operational structure. Another prominent feature of Dutch academic archaeological community is its patriarchal structure, with very few female academics occupying relevant posts (see the interviews with van Driel-Murray and van Londen, CD), and accounting for a bitterly criticised androcentrism in interpretations (Scott 1993; 1995; Allason-Jones 1995; van Driel-Murray 1995; 2008). The genealogy at the front of the RMO, the ROB, or the IPP are good examples.

The hierarchical character of the structure of Dutch academic archaeology produces an interesting phenomenon, namely the reverence of scholars to their teachers:

… one of the central themes in the interviews was the way they expressed their loyalty to their teachers, even after their own retirement. This phenomenon points to why archaeologists in mid-career attach so much importance to [and suggested] interviews with their predecessors: the collective stories of their predecessors should not be forgotten because these stories are about the academic communities they themselves belong to through inter-generational ties (Eickhoff 2013, 157).

The title of that paper — “You should speak with […]” — is something I experienced myself while conducting my interviews. Not a single one of the scholars interviewed let me go without expressing their opinion on who should I talk to, and quite generally it referred to former supervisors, mentors, or the obvious leading figures.
In comparison with a bigger academic community like the UK, they are much nucleated around main figures (with descent from others) who, in the Dutch case, are related to each other through academic genealogy (Roymans, Heeren, etc.) or proximity. That is a very ‘continental way’ to operate (like in Spain or Germany), in contrast with the more varied academic landscape of the UK.

The study of networks and clusters of scholars seems crucial to understand its operational structure. Arguably, the increasing amount of regional projects since the 1970s (Bloemers 1999) that we have just described would have a notable effect on the social structure and dynamics of Dutch archaeology, as this is where the ties between the members of the IPP’s ‘Kempenbende’ originated and developed in the 1970s and 1980s; most of the researchers involved in them ended up being prominent professors or well positioned in relevant archaeological institutions. This fits with the comments made by van Londen (interview) among others:

Interestingly, if you look at the professors that have a seat right now they were a bunch of friends doing excavations together when they were students… and basically all of them became professors, it’s a typical case (laughs).

Her words suggest that academic Chairs in Archaeology at Dutch universities are nowadays monopolised by Roymans, the ‘Kempenbende’ and those who collaborated with him in successive regional projects in the following decades. This may be proven by the fact that when in the early 1990s he obtained the professorship at VU, replacing van Es, he gained access to funds to cover new staff and research projects. Most of his old colleagues and collaborators in the ‘Kempen’, ‘DMS’ an ‘Southern Netherlands’ projects left the IPP, collaborated with him or secured positions at VU, where some of them finished their PhDs under the supervision of Roymans himself: Hiddink, Gerrtisen and Derks (Bakker 2002, 20). Van Londen (interview) also added:

It’s this group that might pose a threat to the debate and discourse, because it’s too closely linked. […]

The effects of such an empowered, reduced and hermetic cluster in a relatively small academic community such as the Dutch one, have very negative consequences and produce a lack of internal debate. This system of power perpetuates itself through genealogical processes (Supervisor-PhD student). The issue is recognised both internally and externally as
one of the scourges of Dutch archaeology. According to an anecdote recollected by Wouter Vos during his interview, years ago, an anonymous British scholar approached Carol van Driel-Murray during a conference in Newcastle and said: ‘You Dutchies need to start speaking to each other’. This encouraged her, Vos, and some others — mainly those who are not within the Roymans school — to meet regularly and discuss under the banner of ‘The Newcastle group’. This does not necessarily mean that the Roymans’ cluster does not have internal debate, but it is a low-risk and low-impact debate.

Another effect of this organization is the shift of ‘centres of power’. The shifting leading role of institutions (both universities and research institutes) is directly linked to the presence of relevant figures at different periods/generations and their networks. Thus we can see how in the pre-war period the RMO (Leiden) held that leading role, which the passed to the ROB (Leiden/Amersfoort) and the BAI (Groningen), which shared that leading role in the early post-WWII decades. In the 1970s and 1980s the University of Amsterdam, especially through the IPP institute, gathered most of the leading scholars and formed the following generation of them, who then transferred that honour to Vrije University Amsterdam in the 1990s, where most of these influential scholars gathered around the figure of Nico Roymans.

7.6. Dutch Discourse: Post-Processual Reflection and ‘Unique Romanisation’

While the application of post-colonial frameworks in Britain led to the eventual challenging of the Romanisation process as a valid model to explain cultural change (see Section 3.4), in The Netherlands such frameworks have been imported — together with other foreign influences — with a completely different result. Despite it being discussed thoroughly (e.g. Brandt and Slofstra 1983), the Romanisation process has not been dismissed as a valid model to describe the situation in the lower Rhine limes; instead, it has been consolidated, albeit in a nuanced fashion.

This diversity of results leads to an initial conclusion that needs to be pursued: the post-colonial interpretative frameworks produced by British archaeologists are not as widely accepted and extended (in fact they are widely rejected/ignored in France, Germany and Italy); the fact that the main international discussion is taking place with British archaeologists in the centre of it does not mean that the terms in which they produced their reflection can be generally applied beyond the British Isles. In this regard, recent criticism of
this British-centric perception by non-British archaeologists (e.g. Méthy 2011; Mladenovic 2012; Versluys 2014) needs to be acknowledged. It is debatable if what in Anglo-Saxon scholarship now clearly has become a ‘paradigm shift’ is also perceived as such in Roman studies at large. Especially in several continental traditions, while the need to overcome diffusionist perspectives has widely been accepted, the plea to ‘do away with Romanisation’ has been critically received — or been ignored altogether (Sommer and Versluys, unpublished; Versluys 2014).

The process by which the same interpretative framework (post-colonial/Post-Processual) produce different results in different academic communities, i.e. ‘discrepant post-colonial experiences’, is one barely explored and yet one with huge potential (see Section 3.3). Firstly, we should look into the origin of the application of these frameworks on each academic community (When did it happen? What was the background? Was it internal evolution or external import?). Secondly, it is critical to understand the reasons for this disparity on the application of post-colonial frameworks.

Slofstra’s and Willems’ work in the early 1980s could prove that some Dutch scholars imported approaches borrowed from American Anthropology — e.g. engagement with a ‘native’ perspective — and started breaking partially with traditional approaches in Roman archaeology, in occasions using some of the core elements present in the British post-colonial revolution of the 1990s — e.g. engagement with specific types of ‘non-elite native’ material culture —, albeit not acknowledging a direct influence from post-colonial theory as British archaeologists did. However, the effects that post-colonial approaches produced in the British academic community are not necessarily the same as those in the Dutch community. For instance, the British developments that resulted in the rejection of Romanisation as an appropriate paradigm to explain interaction processes and intercultural change have not yet been replicated by Dutch scholars. Nevertheless, Dutch scholars are indeed engaging with the British archaeologists on debates regarding the nature of those processes (e.g. Versluys 2014)\(^\text{17}\) and they seem to be applying post-colonial theoretical frameworks in their interpretations, at least partially.

How can we explain then this very particular Dutch approach to Roman imperialism and Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction? The answer is embedded in one of the premises of this

---

\(^\text{17}\) Another example would be Dutch heavy involvement in TRAC, including the first TRAC abroad in Amsterdam in 2008.
thesis: the importance of individual discourses, combined with some of the structural issues that define Dutch archaeology, such as regional imbalance, hierarchy and centres of power.

Can we consider the extensive Dutch use of ‘Romanisation’ as a conceptual model as a sign of stagnation, i.e. keep using it as a reaction to fragmentation and the resulting radicalisation of positions? Or could it be explained as a claim to uniqueness by Dutch archaeologists in opposition to other models explored internationally? I think the answer should be that it is unique due to the fact that imported theoretical packages did not fit their own background, and at the same time they are theoretically developed enough to look for meeting points.
Chapter 8. Conclusions

The core research question to this thesis has been answered in the previous chapter by describing the nature, context, and features of Dutch archaeological discourses around the topic of Roman:'barbarian' interactions. In this final chapter I summarise the main ideas presented and developed across the thesis, as well as presenting some wider implications of the results obtained and some reflective comments regarding this project and future developments.

8.1. Concluding Remarks

The growth and evolving maturity of Archaeology as a discipline, combined with the new socio-cultural and intellectual framework (Globalisation), have brought fragmentation to the theoretical approaches to the past, and an ever growing variety of discourses that are no longer easy to label under the traditional archaeological conventions, neither widely encompassing theoretical/methodological trends, nor broad geographical/national traditions.

In such a fragmented but challenging intellectual and theoretical landscape, the ultimate responsibility for the production of discourses about the past relies no longer on an ideologically loaded and imagined community (national, regional, or academic) but on its indivisible units, the individual scholars. From this perspective, those encompassing constructs are not the epicentre of the analysis of archaeological discourse, but simply factors affecting their formulation at an individual level. As such, attention needs to turn to the scholars and their works, and towards the identification of the many contextual factors biasing and underpinning the individual production of discourses about the past. As the Spanish philosopher Jose Ortega y Gasset (2004, 757) asserted in the middle of a convulsive period in Spanish history (1914), when the nation suffered a deep identity crisis after the loss of its last colonies in 1898: “Yo soy yo y mis circunstancias”. (I am myself and my circumstances).

That said, those circumstances need to be part of the equation when approaching the analysis of individual discourses. The structures within which individual scholars produce their discourses are still deeply influential; these structures are hugely based on peer-review
at so many levels (e.g. obtaining PhDs, having articles published, obtaining posts, or obtaining research grants) that the full atomization of the individual is utopical and, arguably, not entirely desirable. With the approach pursued in this thesis I have aimed not to ignore the sociological forces in operation within (and between) archaeological academic communities, nor to dismiss the reality of academic structures as a limiting factor, nor denying the importance of generalizations as a facilitator of communication and understanding of theoretical trajectories, but simply vindicating the need for a new approach to contextual individual historiographies in a time of fragmentation. In fact, I have integrated them in my analysis: the socio-cultural forces as factors of influence and generalisations in the resulting description of the nature and characteristic features of Dutch archaeology and discourses, in order to allow broader comparison with other theoretical trajectories.

Methodologically, the main innovation offered by this thesis to the study of distinct national archaeological traditions is the application of multi-scalar analysis — i.e. the identification and analysis of diverse factors of influence at diverse scales: international, European, national, regional, local and individual (see Section 2.3) — as a way to explore intellectual trajectories and their defining factors. To that end, I have conducted further analysis of non-academic factors of influence that affect the formulation of post-war Dutch academic discourses (Chapters 4 and 5).

In terms of data collection, the most interesting approach has been the collection and scrutiny of oral accounts through personal interviews with the scholars as part of the academic community that is the object of study. It has proven most enlightening and, although it could probably have been exploited more, it has provided insights into the social dynamics of the Dutch archaeological community impossible to acquire otherwise.

Conceptually (Chapter 3), wider developments in Roman archaeology — especially regarding the topics of Roman imperialism and cultural change, and the Romanisation paradigm — were presented to provide a comparative framework. The British post-colonial deconstruction process was described as a possible guide to understand parallel processes in The Netherlands (Section 3.4).

I also introduced — although perhaps did not fully explore — some ideas in order to understand the formulation and development of historical and academic discourses around Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in The Netherlands, such as the concept of ‘post-colonial discrepant experiences’ — i.e. the existence of different national approaches within a
common post-colonial framework, imported from the USA, and generally applied in its 
British version throughout the different national academic communities without 
considerations of appropriateness or possession of parallel historical backgrounds (see 
Section 3.3) —, the dual Roman:‘barbarian’ nature of European national identities, or the role 
of threat, conflict and crises in the formulation of ancient and modern identities.

This highlights the importance of myths created around episodes of Roman:‘barbarian’ 
interaction, and the role of certain ‘barbarian’ characters as national heroes as a fundamental 
aspect in the formulation of European national identities. Nationalism and the formulation of 
national identities were one of the main factors in the creation of discourses and images about 
the past during the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries, as they were intimately related to the 
Roman presence in their territories and to the identification of ‘barbarian’/native groups and 
individuals as forefather of the nation in opposition to the ruling Roman empire.

This has led me to the analysis of the longer origin and development of historical 
discourses around episodes of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction in The Netherlands since the 
16th century, and to their characterisation as factors of influence in the development of 
modern academic discourses around such topics (Chapter 4). This analysis chiefly focused on 
the case of the Batavians and the so-called ‘Batavian myth’, and I conclude that there is not 
just one Batavian myth, but several formulations and uses of it, with very different (in 
occasions opposing) aspects of the tribe highlighted for different purposes at different 
periods, in accordance with the historical context.

The primacy in ancient sources of Batavians among those ancient peoples that 
inhabited the modern territory of The Netherlands was reflected and perpetuated from the 16th 
century onwards, especially during the phases of formulation of national identity, and this is 
very much still visible in modern archaeological discourse and the structure and dynamics of 
modern Dutch academic community.

In particular, I analysed the works and careers of the two main figures of the last four 
decades in Dutch Roman archaeology: Willem Willems and Nico Roymans (Chapter 6). My 
analysis was conducted upon the contextual frameworks identified and described in previous 
chapters, and the results of these analyses constitute the answer to the principal research 
questions proposed by this thesis, namely:
What are the nature and defining features of current Dutch archaeological discourses regarding ancient episodes of Roman: ‘barbarian’ interaction in the area around the lower Rhine limes?

The answer is, by nature, complex and needs to be presented according to the multi-scalar approach presented by this thesis.

The main features of Dutch Roman archaeology and, more specifically, of Roman: ‘barbarian’ interaction and cultural change in the lower Rhine in Roman times have been outlined in Chapter 7 and comprises: big regional projects; a focus on the Southern Netherlands and a regional imbalance (‘research limes’); a longue-durée approach to cultural landscape biography; hierarchy and genealogy; complex structure; clusters; centres of power; and a prominent Batavian focus.

With regards to that final element, one conclusion reached is that the ideological element, linked to identity and nationalism, and visible between the 16th century and the mid-20th century interpretations of episodes of Roman: native interaction, is not present (or at least not evident) in the interpretations made by current scholars. However, as Hessing (2001) has suggested, the origin myths (i.e. the Batavian myth) promoted by that early modern and modern patriotic/nationalistic ideological impulse still feature strongly in current academic discourses. While this thesis rather avoids this issue to focus on the less explored contextual factors in which Dutch scholars produce their discourses, Hessing’s suggestion has much value to add to this discussion, as my analysis in Chapter 4 demonstrates.

In sum, what my analysis of contextual factors and post-war discourses has demonstrated throughout the thesis is that Dutch archaeology is characterised by a multi-scalar complexity. In other words, Dutch archaeology and their discourses on Roman: ‘barbarian’ interaction in the lower Rhine limes can be defined through the analysis of a series of contextual factors detectable at multiple scales or levels. These contextual factors are framed within a clearly hierarchical academic community that could be grouped in clusters and generations around pivotal figures — e.g. Willems and Roymans —, each of them creating their own academic discourse. However, this characterisation of Dutch archaeology may admittedly be biased by my own choices of the objects of study. In order to avoid said bias, research needs to move beyond these two figures and their discourses/interpretations, by addressing in detail the approaches and generated by those who critique them (e.g. van Driel-Murray) and their context.
The nature of the discourses can be defined by both internal factors — unique developments within Dutch archaeology (e.g. the ‘unique Romanisation’) — and external influences of different origin — mostly German (e.g. methodological choices such as the *Landesaufnahme* and the *Siedlungskammer*, see Section 7.3.1), American (e.g. ethno-historical approaches; landscape biographies) and British (theoretical debates).

### 8.2. Wider Implications of Results

This section will now assess how the Dutch experience as described in this thesis, reflects wider trends in Archaeology as a global discipline.

#### 8.2.1. Reflexivity in Archaeological Research

For more than a decade, since the mid-1980s, the context of archaeology has changed rapidly and profoundly all over Europe. We are still in the middle of this development and numerous recent publications show an increasing awareness of archaeologists about its causes and implications. This is what Gramsch in his paper calls the self-reflexive approach and I join him in his appeal for the development of an archaeological reflexive theory embedded in sociological theory and epistemology. Not only to help us to be better aware of the changing context of our work but also to provide us with the insights and the tools to cope with such change. (Willems 2000, 36-7).

This thesis constitutes a serious attempt to explore the real practical applicability of Willems’, as well as Gramsch’s (2000), abstract propositions.

Methodologically speaking, my research has embedded the analysis of current Dutch scholarship and archaeological academic discourses in their broader social, cultural, and intellectual context. Additionally, ethnographical data and techniques have been used: interviews with the scholars with the object of study alongside reflective observation of the context in which they formulate their discourses. The result is a holistic approach to the study of scholarly traditions in The Netherlands with a clear anthropological flavour. Turning towards an anthropological approach to modern scholarship by focusing the analysis of individual scholars and their discourses in context is, in my opinion, an important and revealing way of reflecting the current socio-political nature of our profession. Perhaps the successful application of this methodology opens the door to similar studies of scholarship in
other academic communities. However, the level of acceptance of a self-critical approach still needs to be evaluated; based on the difficult early days of post-colonial critique in England, resistance could well constitute the first reaction (see Section 3.4.2). I do think, though, that Globalisation as a socio-cultural phenomenon that ‘shrinks’ space and time has provided levels of intellectual awareness and consciousness that have made archaeologists more conscious of the contexts in which we produce our discourses; therefore, we should be better equipped than ever before to, at least, try to incorporate this process of self-critique as an integral element of our practice.

8.2.2. Academic Globalisation and Transnationalism: Intellectual Fashions

In the time of nation-states, the transfer of methodologies, intellectual trends, and theoretical frameworks between national academic communities happened through either personal connection between scholars — e.g. correspondence between the Spanish archaeologist Luis Pericot and some London colleagues such as Thomas Kendrik and Gordon Childe (Díaz-Andreu, 2012a) —, or in accordance with geographical or ideological proximity (e.g. German influences on The Netherlands). Nowadays, when the nation-state is losing its central role as the defining political unit at the hands of supra-national structures (i.e. EU), this transfer happens across the world linked to academic fashions or trends (Pluciennik 2011). This phenomenon is intensified by Globalisation as a social phenomenon — one that increases connectivity beyond political boundaries and the unique academic transnationalism, part of a wider process.

Closer integration between European nations has effects on archaeology, both at organisational (Valletta Convention, Malta) and ideological (looking for common roots: Celts in Venice; Neanderthals; Franks) levels. This integration is challenging and requires: closer cooperation by archaeologists at an organisational level (Kristiansen 1990); enhanced communication between various archaeological traditions; and mutual appreciation of respective historical, social and ideological backgrounds (Härke 2000, 15). This adds an international dimension to the traditional spheres and agendas that use to drive developments in Archaeology (i.e. national and regional). Willems’ opinion on this diversity of spheres (European, National and Regional) and their agendas affecting archaeological thought are to be valued, as he was Dutch representative at the EU Valletta (Malta) Convention.
There are Regional/Local variations because of their slightly different priorities. National research agenda in The Netherlands is not connected to the EU agenda (general and provincial priorities go first, but not very strong provincial ones). The more European identity is imposed, the more regional identities that appear or the stronger they express themselves. The Europe of the Nation-State was a 19th century invention and it’s disappearing. The rise of regional identities is giving place to the Europe of the regions to rise, which is good for the disappearance of the nation state and therefore for the evolution of an integrated Europe. The problem with The Netherlands in this framework is that because it’s too small, it has no multiple regional identities, except for Frisian. An example of a very explicit political use of archaeology was the Bronze Age campaign backed with lots of funds from the Council for Europe. They were looking for the pre-Celtic world to embody European Union values, trying to erase the Roman frontier from the European subconscious. But it failed politically, because it was too far, just like attempts to use the Stone Age. Celtic common identity with the exhibition in Venice. (Willems, interview notes 25/06/2013).

Academic language is another factor that can promote globalisation or isolation of academic discourses in Archaeology. Globalisation has made English a world-wide academic language and hence facilitated the extension of Anglo-American theoretical frameworks:

The English discourse is so dominant at the global level that it may seem to be the only one—especially to native speakers of English that often tend to have rather poorly developed language skills (Willems 2008b, 179).

According to Neusputny (1997-98), because of the global character of English as an academic language, the traditions and interpretations generated by those communities with English as their first language influence all other communities, affecting especially smaller ‘minority’ communities — e.g. Dutch and Danish — which are not big enough to formulate their own full discourse on all topics in the discipline and need to turn outside to look for sources. ‘Minority’ communities often compensate such a status by becoming very outspoken and by developing a strong international orientation (Willems 2008b, 180). This may, however, be an issue that goes beyond the limits of the academic community. Indeed, Tollebeek (2010) goes a step further and links this feature with a paradox of ‘international patriotism’ present in Dutch (and Belgian) national identity.
We tend to ignore this language factor because we live our academic lives in a mostly anglicised (globalised) world, but it is indeed of great importance. Language, size and traditions of archaeological interpretation are intimately related to each other, becoming key factors to take into account when analysing the import-export of theoretical frameworks.

In the Dutch case, this can be traced simply through bibliographical analysis of the scholars under review in this thesis. A language shift towards English can be recognised during the period in which Dutch academic community was undergoing a changing process, and importing foreign interpretational frameworks, chiefly Anglo-American (see Section 7.4; Figures 6.15 and 6.29). The adoption of academic programmes fully taught in English by Dutch universities may similarly be reflective of this issue and aids the continuity of this trend.

Whether the adoption of English language as the primary academic language by the Dutch academic community is to be viewed as active “disdain for their own linguistic identity” (Carol van Driel Murray 2002, 59) or simply a consequence of being a ‘minority’ community shared with others (e.g. Spain, Denmark, and other central European academic communities), is therefore debatable. What is certainly a feature of Dutch archaeology (and its wider academia) is its permeability and internationalism, which might lie beneath the Dutch importation of methodological and theoretical frameworks since the early 1970s.

8.3. Outcome, Applications, Further Research, and Retrospective

I want to close this thesis with an exercise in self-reflection about what questions could and should still be asked, how the approaches and ideas I have used and proposed could be applied elsewhere.

8.3.1. Outcome and Potential Applications

The results of this thesis — the identification of contextual factors affecting the production of past and current perspectives on the Roman past of The Netherlands — will hopefully be received by Dutch archaeologists and Romanists as an effective tool to critically analyse or reflect on their own discourses on the topic of Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction along the lower Rhine limes. Self-awareness and critique are essential elements in the stage of self-reflective
awareness in which Archaeology has operated since the late 20th century. The first step into a more objective archaeological and historical practice rests on the understanding of the origins and development of one’s own discourses. The application of this method of data collection to other scholarly communities in Europe is an innovative development that needs to be explored more deeply. This would facilitate the creation of frameworks shared with other national academic communities in which to hold a productive dialogue regarding these topics.

The relevance of this research beyond the boundaries of the archaeological discipline also needs to be considered. As stated in Chapter 1, theoretical frameworks and archaeological discourses reflect changes in society and culture. While in this thesis I have explored changes in those contexts as a factor influencing the development of discourses, the process could be inverted. In this way, the study of developing archaeological discourse in a given academic community, could throw light on ideological developments in society, and thus become useful for social and political science, for instance.

Once the context in which current Dutch discourses on Roman:‘barbarian’ interaction has been traced and described, the topic itself becomes the focus once again. With the results of this study in mind (i.e. biases and underpinnings of Dutch Roman archaeology) it may be the right time to look directly at the growing archaeological evidence related to this topic, in the hope that a more objective picture could arise, with textual and material evidence back at the heart of archaeological research, as free as possible from contextual constrains, through investigating, acknowledging, questioning, and recognising their very origins.

There are some themes and topics for which the outcomes of this thesis may be useful, notably: representations of the ‘other’ in a world of global interactions — globalisation of archaeological discourses; globalisation of antiquity — and regional discrepancies; parallels between processes of Roman:‘barbarian’ interactions and contemporary conflicting ‘worlds’.

In methodological terms, the use of the British post-colonial self-reflective deconstruction process as a guide for the deconstruction of current Dutch theoretical frameworks has proven successful. Applying such a methodology to some other European national academic communities, or even to other ‘frontier’ communities beyond the European spectrum (e.g. North-American frontier during colonial expansion), would be a natural (and challenging) step forward.
The proposal of a multi-scalar analysis of contextual factors has proven effective in the analysis of archaeological discourses, as was the attempt to characterise these by focusing on individual scholars instead of broader stereotypical national categories. As part of that approach to the individual as ultimate producer of discourses, the interviews conducted with relevant Dutch scholars constitute one of the most precious outcomes of this thesis — invaluable sources of information that will be available for consultation.

When someone studies archaeological discourses produced by scholars in the past, sometimes he/she can reach for archives, private memoires and letters, published works and talks. But often decades (if not centuries) can separate the researcher from his/her object of study, and therefore the pass of time offers a higher ground from which to analyse circumstances and contexts of discourse production. However, when facing the task of analysing the discourses of current or very recent scholars, we rarely have such materials at hand, and depend principally on published works; there is rarely a biographical context to draw upon, and our analysis of the socio-political and ideological context in which those works have been produced is burdened by the lack of perspective produced by us living in that same period. An exercise of imagination is necessary to surpass such a hurdle. However, the collection of direct interview data is a highly valuable substitute and, arguably, is a crucial route to understanding scholarly approaches.

Indeed, the insights into scholars’ personal perspectives gained through this kind of data can be/are infinitely greater than those obtained from reading just academic texts, and speak to us about the people behind the theories and approaches, providing a more accurate explanation of the origins of the archaeological discourses. However, these sources of information are not risk free: firstly, there is the problem of the interviewer’s biases and assumptions, as may be reflected on their choices (e.g. questions asked, selection of interviewees); secondly, the realisation on the part of the interviewee that they are being interviewed about their own academic practice and position within a given academic community, in essence, to describe their place in historiography; thirdly, there is a risk to over-rely on interview data, hence making it into a false friend. The solution to the first problem is to do reiterations of interviews, to repeat cyclically a set of interviews, allowing the responses and findings of previous rounds of interviews to be compared and then to inform the selection of the next set of questions. The solution to the second one, is to not analyse the interview data in isolation, but within the context provided by the published work within its immediate historical context. All in all, as Andrew Merrills (pers. comm.) has
stated: “…historical and archaeological practice is determined by the pen and with the trowel, not by the interview microphone”. There is also a final paradox from which the researcher intending to use interview data for the analysis of archaeological discourse cannot escape: by interviewing the main producers of discourse, we may be inadvertently perpetuating the traditional discourses we are deconstructing and questioning about.

The early and unexpected death of Willems represents not only the loss of an extremely talented scholar, but also highlights the importance of the collection of oral records and interview data for the study of the history of archaeology (and other sciences). In that sense, and to avoid further historiographical tragedies of such a calibre, I would like to explore the possible extension of research programmes such as the ‘Oral History of British Science’ at the British Library (Perks 2010) to other national academic communities in Europe, and specifically to archaeology scholars, or even the professionalization of the volunteer-led project ‘Personal Histories’ (Carpeneti 2012), as a way forward. The creation of a European, or even Global, database of interview data with (relevant, high profile, early career, etc.) scholars, although highly ambitious, would be a possible way forward in this sense.

In this thesis I have analysed the mechanisms that operate the first half of the knowledge transfer cycle ‘Society – Academic Discourse – Society’. However, the inverse application of the methodology proposed here could potentially throw some light over the second half of such a cycle, namely the transfer of academic discourses to society, through education, heritage polices, museums, etc. It would be a potentially very fruitful route by which we can explore the influence of institutional and public agendas on non-academic discourses.

8.3.2. Retrospective: Self-critique, Improvements, and Further Questions

REFINING AND IMPROVING THE METHODOLOGY

While I am aware that a more in-depth analysis needs to be applied to other authors within Dutch academia in order to prove that the conclusions and trends elicited from the analysis of Willems’ and Roymans’ works are accurate, the time available was limited and the circumstances in which this thesis has been produced were limiting. However, I believe that the real value of this project is in the approach to the topic and the methodologies applied,
which can be transferred both internally to those other authors, and externally to other academic communities and (in Europe and elsewhere) their scholars. This would produce valuable comparative data and insights into issues important issues — e.g. the impact of heritage management policies at different levels and in different areas; the importance of language choice; and the transfer of methodological and theoretical frameworks.

Interview data are really valuable, but they lose half of their value when these are collected in the form of notes, and not as full interview transcripts from audio recordings. How accurate and bias-free interview notes can be? Having a set of recorded interviews allows the researcher (and anyone else who wants to trail back the information provided) to go back to the original sources. It also allows appreciation of nuances such as the tone and even the silences of the interviewee. In sum, it makes it real and accurate. Those interviews that were not recorded are less useful in terms of extracting quotes to sustain one’s arguments and analyses.

On a more personal note I regret not having recorded my interview with Willem Willems. There are so many things that a scholar of his stature and in his position can tell one about the evolution of the discipline, the social dynamics of the academic community, their views on the future of the field… insights that are now partially lost. Having had the chance to discuss with him the evolution and current state of Dutch archaeology was an incredibly enriching experience that I will always cherish.

Those interviews that are recorded need to be fully transcribed for the data to be useful and better exploited in terms of analysis of content. I do not think the transcripts should be edited (neither by the researcher or by the interviewees), as this would compromise once again the integrity and objectivity of the data.

If I could have afforded it, I would have done additional rounds of interviews with the same scholars as my research was advancing. This type of research is iterative: you collect interview data, start extracting initial trends, and, immediately, new and more refined questions arise. If a second or third round of interviews is not scheduled, those specific questions will remain unanswered (e.g. What do commercial archaeologists think about the clusters and genealogies in the academic world? Does Willems recall a vocal discussion about ‘Romanisation’ during the 1980 conference ‘Romans and Natives’?) and memories, impressions, and opinions that are not included in publications will be lost. With those extra sessions I would definitely be able to use more widely and decisively the interview data.
In fact, I would make use of qualitative analysis software tools such as Envivo10 to analyse the common occurrences of certain terms, ideas, comments, and extract thematic trends, backing my conclusions much more solidly.

Obviously, the analysis carried out in this thesis has produced a somewhat incomplete picture of Dutch archaeology and its academic community due to the limited number of study subjects (Willems and Roymans) and due to the limited amount of interviews carried out. In order to complete the picture provided by this thesis the analysis (and the collection of interview data) has to extend its scope as much as possible: firstly, to other Roman archaeologists within the academic community who may offer contrasting insights into discourse formulation, and who would offer a better balance between northern and southern respondents; secondly, to archaeologists of other periods (e.g. prehistory or early medieval); thirdly, to members of other disciplines (e.g. historians, art historians, reception studies scholars); and finally, to a further number of individuals involved with the study of the past beyond the boundaries of the academic community (e.g. commercial archaeologists, museum curators, heritage management administrators, primary and secondary school teachers, and why not, even the final audience, Dutch society). In sum, interviews should be held with as many individuals within the Dutch (academic, heritage, and commercial) archaeological community as possible, and should be part of a more systematic record of oral history of archaeology in order to create a framework of real-time awareness of inherited positions and socio-historical context in which the discipline is developing: in a globalised world in which time and space are compressed, immediacy is all.

Furthermore, attention needs to be paid to foreign researchers who work on the topics discussed in this thesis (e.g. Batavians) to see how their approach to the Dutch ancient past differs from that by Dutch archaeology. Answering this question would avoid a Dutch-centric approach to the Batavian question. In this sense, it is interesting to note that there are barely any projects in the Netherlands run by scholars or teams from other countries; they are mostly run by Dutch scholars based there. Exceptions are collaborative projects with scholars from neighbouring academic communities such as Belgium or Germany, or supranational projects related to sites of general interest such as the UNESCO project ‘Frontiers of the Roman Empire’ (Breeze et al. 2005). Unlike Southern European countries, The Netherlands is not an importer in terms of research, but an exporter, running projects and archaeological institutions in those countries (e.g. Dutch School at Rome, Athens, etc.), much like the Germans (e.g. DAI in Spain) or the British (e.g. British School at Rome).
Another group that deserves special attention and that would need to figure prominently in more extended versions of this thesis is the current and emergent generation of Dutch archaeologists. Backed by the liberties offered by world-wide academia and new research techniques, I would venture a progressive disappearance of the hierarchical structures and features of the Dutch academic community and the appearance of new approaches and discourses about their ‘national’ heritage and past.

A final methodological aspect that I would like to explore more fully in the future is the use of interview data and personal observations of academic dynamics as the bases for an anthropological and ethnographical approach to historiography and the history of archaeology in any given academic community (e.g. national, regional, institutional, topic-oriented). To do so, first I would need to liberate the label ‘ethnography’ from the burden of its colonial European ancestry. I would need to present it as a methodological and theoretical approach to the study of academic communities (Da Col and Graeber 2011), not as the study of a remote community in an underdeveloped society. Ethnography literally means the “systematic study of people and cultures”, and what is an academic community but a group of people with its own culture, social dynamics, networks of power, politics, and historical baggage? Most historiographical studies of academic communities or specific scholars or schools of thoughts are based on the direct analysis of publications, and in the occasion when these are put in context it is normally limited to a historical or socio-political context (except when these studies are biographies).

This thesis sought a more holistic approach to the study of a specific academic community, through observation, interaction, textual analysis, and analysis of factors (including, but not exclusively, the historical context; mainly because the historical context is right now, and we do not have much of a perspective on it). While this thesis would have benefited from a more intensive use of the interviews, that would in reality have meant a different methodological and theoretical approach, integrating more anthropological and ethnographical methodologies, focusing on the interview data as main dataset, and apply qualitative analysis to it. This approach would have fit much better in an American academic environment, where Archaeology is actually one of the four fields of Anthropology. I would like to expand on this ethnographical approach to the study of scholarly communities in future papers, and will certainly revisit the interview data that I have compiled here.
ABOUT THE DUTCH NATIONAL AND HISTORICAL DISCOURSES:

Seeking answers to some further questions related to this aspect would be a valuable step forward:

- How were the Dutch myths of national common roots, such as the Batavian myth, received and reacted to by the groups against these were used (Hispanic Hapsburg empire, Napoleonic France, Indian colonized populations, etc.)?
- Further research needs to be undertaken on the role of the other ancient ‘Dutch’ peoples (Frisii, Cananefates, etc.) and their impact on the formation of national identity and the development of regional identities in The Netherlands.
- The use of the Batavian myth in the Western (North-American) colonies (e.g. place names, the use of the Dutch flag for the state of New York (former ‘New Amsterdam’, the use presence of many orange flags in houses’ porches across New York state).

REGARDING THE CONTEXT IN WHICH MODERN ACADEMIC DISCOURSE DEVELOPS:

In this thesis I have addressed the effects that the academic institutional structure has on the development of the discipline and its discourses. However, some other elements and factors could be explored in the future given their importance in the development of research strategies and, ultimately, discourses. One key factor comprises the funding structures and their influence on the choice of research topic, agenda and approach.

How Archaeology has been entrusted on occasions to private corporations in search of funding (e.g. the Austrian company Hilti funding the underwater excavation campaigns at the port of Alexandria) has been the object of critique for a long time. In most cases it means the loss of the researcher’s independence in favour of the underlying interests of such corporations. However, less attention has been paid to the loss of independence to public funding institutions at European, national or regional level — e.g. the European Commission; the CSIC (National Centre for Scientific Investigations) in Spain; or Catalonian regional government research grants. The question is then: is it any different than the influence exerted by corporations? While the intensity of interference may well be comparable, it is the nature and origin of it that varies. Private corporations are normally driven by marketing and financial objectives, while public involvement is driven by the ideological and political agendas of those who govern those spheres.
An example of how politically-oriented funding can dictate archaeological agendas was given by Härke (2000, 13): “[When the Berlin Wall fell] Western European and Scandinavian archaeologists privately expressed concerns about the prospect of an export of the ‘German archaeological tradition’ to the newly opened countries of central and eastern Europe, on the back of generous grants of Deutschmarks to foreign colleagues for archaeological projects which would reflect the preferences of German funding bodies and mirror the approaches of their academic referees in Germany.”

After all, the choice of research topic is intimately related to the topics favoured by funding bodies, whether public or private. If a researcher wants to research a certain area or topic, he/she will have to apply for funding with a project that meets the requirements of the funding body; a project that focuses on the aspects favoured by the funding body (and its agenda) — whether European, national or regional —; and one that uses in the application the language and terms expected by it. Thus, while funding constitutes the researcher’s primary worry, what their application and topic/area choice reflect is the political context and agendas in which this is planned and produced (e.g. Härke 2000, 27; Lotte Jensen, interview).

Rien Polak (interview notes 24/5/2011) gave his insightful opinion about the importance of funding in Dutch archaeology and gave some perspective on the motivation and context for Roymans’ projects:

Funding is an important factor both in commercial and academic archaeology. Nico Roymans’ project focusing on Batavians came 10 years ago when Roman material was not interesting; that Batavian project contained a “sexy” research question and attractive stories.

As Diaz-Andreu and Champion (1996, 27) stated: “Archaeologists’ opportunism is ‘normal’ in democratic states, and indeed inevitable because the humanities are dependent upon state funding”. It is clear that in The Netherlands (as elsewhere), funding is a factor affected by agendas, political, yes, but also research and intellectual agendas, mostly at institutional level (e.g. NOoA). However, this aspect would need to be investigated in more detail.

REGARDING PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:

Further question regarding this important issue would help completing an accurate view on Dutch approaches to their past in the Roman-era from a non-academic perspective:
• What are the mechanisms behind the transfer of archaeological knowledge and discourses from academia to society? How does it affect the way society perceives its own past (i.e. academic discourses feeding society’s perceptions; society and national identity feeding scholarly perception)?

• Education and the ‘Canon of Dutch history’: The systematisation of a processed and filtered past; reductionism to a few moments of history chosen by government, probably on political agendas. Nationally driven views of the past or politically imposed by government in turn.

• The power of exhibitions tools for discourse transfer: how do those responsible adapt to new audiences? How do they deal with the issue of immigration?

8.4. Endnote

While many questions clearly still need to be addressed in order to produce a detailed and neat picture of the Dutch academic community and their discourses about Roman: ‘barbarian’ interaction in the lower Rhine area, the research undertaken for this thesis has certainly provided me with a close academic familiarity with the Dutch ancient tribes and their historical and archaeological discovery. While it would be presumptuous for me to provide guidelines on how to ‘properly’ view the Batavians and the other ancient groups that inhabited the Netherlands, I can offer my opinion on how to avoid an incomplete perception of them.

The way we currently view the Batavians is not the exclusive result of nationalist myths of origin and their diverse uses over the centuries, or the consequence of elusive contextual factors. Current views of the Batavians and the other Dutch tribes are the combination of the two and of consecutive historical contexts that have shaped the understanding of generations of Dutch researchers about their past in the Roman era. In my opinion, that is how Batavians (an any other group in antiquity) should be seen: as a changing construct.

Furthermore, my work with (and survey of) Dutch scholars was in no way an audit of their work or of the efficiency of the structures and dynamics that govern their careers. It was intended as an honest exercise of scholarly curiosity and peer admiration. I had the chance to personally meet with and talk to many of the archaeologists and researchers who have created and shaped Dutch archaeological discourses and our knowledge of the native peoples in the lower Rhine limes, and my gratitude has already been expressed for all those who opened
their offices and enthusiastically shared their views with me. Academic communities have much to offer as objects of study themselves, and in return we may be able to find a more honest approach to the study of the past by means of communication and self-reflection. Just as the unique conditions of the area — both in antiquity and in modern times — make the Batavians an ideal case-study for the study of cultural interactions and Roman imperialism, I firmly believe that the special nature of their scholarship make the Dutch academic community a perfect trial subject for an innovative kind of historiography. A kind of historiography that not only has demonstrated its productivity, but also is essential in order to readjust our approaches to the study of the past in a rapidly changing socio-cultural academic world.
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The primary data gathered for this project is in itself a valuable contribution to the study of Dutch academic discourses on the topic of Roman ‘barbarian’ interaction. The one of the main products of this thesis is the collection of personal interviews conducted with members of the Dutch archaeological community—university scholars, museum professionals, and commercial archaeologists (Appendix 1). The transcription of these interviews made such data analysable. It is my wish for this data to transcend the boundaries of this thesis by making it available for further scrutiny and questioning by myself, or other interested parties, in the future. As such, the original generic questionnaire used in the interviews (Appendix 2) is provided here and a digital version of the full interview dataset with all transcripts and notes, and the original audio files, from all interviews has been added to this thesis in the attached CD.

As explained earlier, interviews conducted during the early stages of the project (2011) where not recorded, and therefore transcripts can only be produced for those interviews conducted at a later stage (2013). In the case of those interviews conducted earlier in the project sets of notes have been produced instead. Such is the case with the two scholars in which this thesis has focused on: Willem Willems and Nico Roymans. The notes produced from their interviews have been used in the analysis of their figures and discourses. For that reason, these two full sets of notes have been attached as appendices here (Appendices 3 and 4).

Furthermore, it has been decided that at least one example of interview transcripts should be added as part of the body of this thesis too (Appendix 5), mainly for purposes of
comparison between the two methods of data collection used: not-recorded interviews and notes vs. recorded interviews and transcripts. The differences in the level of detail obtained are truly revealing.

Additionally, documentation related to the research ethic approval obtained in response to the questions raised around the nature of primary interview data with subjects of study has been also added here (Appendix 6).

Finally, the bibliographical datasets collected for both Willem Willems and Nico Roymans are presented here as two appendices, separate from the Bibliography, as they have been used as quantitative data throughout the thesis (Appendices 7; 8).
Appendix 1. List of Scholars Interviewed

Round 1 (May 2010) – Not recorded interviews. Notes processed and annotated.

PROF. MARTEEN DE WEERD (Emeritus Professor)
DR. MIGUEL JOHN VERSLUYS (University of Leiden)
PROF. RUURD HALBERTSMA (University of Leiden, National Museum of Antiquities)
PROF. WILLEM WILLEMS (University of Leiden)
DR. RIEN POLAK (Nijmegen, Commercial archéologie)
DR. ERNST TAAYKE (Groningen University)
DR. JOHAN NICOLAY (University of Amsterdam)
DR. EVERT KRAMER (Leeuwarden, Fries museum)
PROF. NICO ROYMANS (Free University Amsterdam)
DR. TON DERKS (Free University Amsterdam)
DR. STIJN HEEREN (Free University Amsterdam)
DR. CAROL VAN DRIEL-MURRAY (University of Leiden)
DR. EEF STOEFFELS (University of Leiden)
ROLAN EMAUS (University of Amsterdam)

Round 2 (November 2013) – Recorded interviews. Transcripts

DR. LOTTE JENSEN (Historian, Radboud University, Nijmegen)
PROF. WILLEM FRIJHOFF (Dean Faculty of Arts Free University/University of Rotterdam)
DR. HELEEN VAN LONDEN (University of Amsterdam, Archaeologists)
DR. WOUTER VOS (Vos Archeologie, commercial archaeology unit, expert in Batavians)
DR. ROB VAN DER LAARSE (University of Amsterdam, Historian)
DR. LOUISE SWINKELS (Curator of Roman collection at Museum Valkhof, Nijmegen)
DR. MIGUEL JOHN VERSLUYS (short catch up meeting, recorded)
PROF. NICO ROYMANS (short catch up meeting, not recorded, notes taken)
PROF. RUURD HALBERTSMA (short catch up meeting, not recorded, notes taken)
Appendix 2. Generic Questionnaire

- Question about their particular work and projects
- The ‘research limes’ (i.e. the limes effect on research): differences N-S, Prehistory-Roman provincial archaeology, chronologies and historical discourses
- Batavian monopoly of research:
  - Current debates and positions (including new generations). Is there a regional division?
  - Your views on the nature of interactions between Romans and Batavians.
  - Origins, reasons and evolution (of interpretations and approaches) of the topic.
  - Why not Frisians or Cananefates?
- Role of Batavians/Batavian myth in national identity/discourse both academic and general (reasons and stages since 15th century)?
  - Different (political) uses
  - Why emphasis 1.5 years period?
  - What about the role of Frisians and/or Cananefates?
- German-British influence in Dutch academia
- National and international collaboration
- “Sons of our times” (what defines our times and how does it affects our interpretations?)
- Impact of post-colonial perspectives:
  - Are they valid for Dutch archaeology?
  - Do they have the same kind of British colonial past and guilt? Or is it simply an imported framework.
  - Do you think you are writing within that theoretical context? If not, which one?
- European-National-Regional agendas-perspectives-identities
- How do you think it affects you the fact that you are studying your own past?
- How do current situations of cultural exchange, adaptation, identity creation (immigration) affect your views on ancient one?

Specific Questions for Historians

- Can we talk of a pre18th century Dutch national identity?
- How do you think it affects you the fact that you are studying your own past?
What are the main historical episodes that build Dutch national identity? Are there regional variations? And European identity processes?

What characterizes Dutch national identity?

**Specific Questions for museum curators/exhibition coordinators**

- How is the past presented in this museum?
- Is national identity transferred somehow through the materials exhibited or the displays? Or is it more regional/local?
- What was the aim (motivation, justification, excuse) behind these exhibitions?
- Have you detected an interest in the public or that was what you wanted to wake up?
Appendix 3. Interview Prof. Willem Willems (notes)

25/5/2011 Interview, notes.

Context:

Professor of Roman Provincial Archaeology and Heritage Management, and Dean of the Faculty of Arts at University of Leiden.

Questions:

Evolution of archaeology in The Netherlands and evolution of the interest on Batavians (when does it starts?)

Main debates and positions (is there a regional academic division?). Main schools

Batavians in the national identity

Political and ideological use of the Batavians in the archaeological discourse during the 16\textsuperscript{th} century (why focus on 1.5 years of Batavian history?)

Batavianist monopoly: centrality of Batavians in archaeological discourse (why them and not others like Frisians or Cananefates?)

EU/National/Regional agendas and discourses

Academic influences and interaction with other communities (Germany, UK or own path?)

Classical archaeology vs. Prehistory

“Sons of our times” (what defines our times and how does it affects our interpretations?)

His views on the nature of interactions between Romans and Batavians

Interview notes:

His work on Batavians was one of the First attempts in The Netherlands of de-colonization of the discourses.

He studied in Amsterdam and also in America during the times of the New Archaeology. Post-colonial views - native perspective (“the Indian behind the artifact”). He decided he wanted to do that, to apply that method, to say things about the people through data.
*At this point, asked about the risks of unbalancing discourses towards the native view, he admitted the risk but said it was avoidable by confronting sources and material culture.

The power difference between societies in antiquity was not so big technologically. But the power difference in modern colonial world was much bigger. And this conception was applied to views on the Roman Empire. Thus, the resulting unbalanced power view, colonial-imperial discourses.

**********

The ‘research limes’

How does territorial division of The Netherlands by the *limes* affect interpretations and discourses, both in terms of approaches to the topic and chronologies?

Regional differences/characteristics within The Netherlands:

Most of the institutions dedicated to this topic are located in the area of the former frontier of the Empire, except for Groningen. He thinks there is not so much difference, but just different ways of looking at things. Maybe because of the lack of literary evidence for Northern Netherlands Groningen is more tending to use a prehistorical approach (e.g. Bloemers work) while the rest of institutions apply a more historical-archaeological approach to the Roman period. So in his opinion, that is not so much regionalism or regional differences but more of a discipline-based or methodological difference, imposed by the availability of literary sources.

*About the problem with the different chronologies:*

What for the territories to the north of the frontier is Roman Iron Age, for the territories in the frontier and to the south is simply the Roman period; it is the same time-frame. The northern chronologies are, according to him, based on materials which are not much different in terms of typology from those encountered in the frontier system. The chronologies in the south are fine due to the quality of the material encountered there.

**********
Batavian monopoly of Dutch archaeological-historical discourse:

This is a recent phenomenon. Before the World Wars use to be more Frisians (more evident back in the day due to the existence of a modern people called Frisians). This rise of Frisian back in the day was due to the factor of Dwelling mounds (de Terpen), promoted by the national government, not due to nationalist interests but because they just wanted to know how to protect Netherlands (and its heritage?) from the rising water. Thus, Groningen was asked to research on previous rises of water.

After the war, the evolution of academic research about the ancient people of The Netherlands is:

- Bloemers (Willems’ supervisor) was focused in Cananefates
- Then, more sources became available and more excavations took place in Nijmegen (Boegards was pivotal in this sense to develop provincial archaeology by collecting Batavian materials).
- Willem’s thesis (first contemporary serious work on the relationship of Batavians and Romans) derives from all those collected materials by Boagers, and was his last approach to it.
- Roymans picked up the baton with his studies on Batavian coinage, and then he created a new “school on Batavian studies” with all his projects and PhD students analysing different aspects of these ancient people. Tried to transfer new academic trends (big funds) to public interest.
- Roymans was good in highlighting this and that’s why he secured all those funds and projects.
- While Roymans focuses on the native rural side of things, with no research on military settlements, Carol, Groningen, Willem, Rieen, Bloemers have a military perspective. It’s interesting that Willems says that, because Carol thinks that Roymans focuses on the warrior-military-male aspects, her reaction is to focus on military and gender-focus issues. But according to Willems there is not so much distance between disciplines nowadays.

*The Veletta convention (Malta 1992) responded to changes in the way archaeology was practiced in the late 1980s. It provoked a shift from big long projects to many smaller excavations (mostly commercial units), providing archaeologists of that generation with more materials, resulting on not so hypothetical approaches to Batavians.
*The 16th century is indeed a time for national praise of Batavians and their glorious past (Colony in Indonesia), poems about Batavians. During the 2nd WW, Batavians seen as a Germanic tribe…

But all in all, Batavians are not for The Netherlands what Franks are for France; yes, there is a spread knowledge (national myth of Batavians sailing down the Rhine in their canoes was taught in school in the 1950s), but still not same importance as the Franks for France. Frisians are important for Frisia, and Cananefates are well unknown.

**********

Politics changed his career. He started with an interest in Batavians and Roman provincial archaeology. Then he was offered a position as state archaeologist and then another one in Leiden following the study line of Heritage.

He still wants to publish 2 roman villas from the 1980s. Willems thinks there is no point on trying to compete with Nico in order to go back to his original interest in Roman-Batavian interactions (Roman provincial archaeology, instead of his current heritage focus). He keeps it as a hobby.

**********

*Regional/National/European agendas and discourses:*

Willems is in a perfect position to talk about this as he was Dutch representative at the EU Veletta convention (also called the Malta convention).

Regional/Local variation (slightly different priorities)

National research agenda is not connected to the EU agenda (general and provincial priorities go first, but not very strong provincial ones)

The more European identity imposed, the more regional identities that appear or the stronger they express themselves. The Europe of the Nation-State was a 19th century invention and it’s disappearing. The rise of regional identities is giving place to the Europe of the regions to
rise, which is good for the disappearance of the nation state and therefore for the evolution of an integrated Europe. The problem with The Netherlands in this framework is that because it’s too small, it has no multiple regional identities, except for Frisian.

An example of a very explicit political use of archaeology was the Bronze Age campaign backed with lots of funds from the Council for Europe. They were looking for the pre-Celtic world to embody European union values, trying to erase the Roman frontier from the European subconscious. But it failed politically, because it was too far, just like attempts to use the Stone Age. Celtic common identity with the exhibition in Venice.

*****

The Netherlands in between UK and Germany archaeological trends:

The Netherlands is influenced by German and Anglo-American research, but it carries its own course, a kind of middle ground. He thinks that is the case also in Denmark. He thinks in the Dutch case it’s because it’s too close to them (especially to Germany) to release itself from their influence. But there is an anti-German folklore.

E.g. The editions of “Saxons symposium” are normally dominated by German scholars, but they focus more on late roman-early middle ages themes.

*Roman provincial archaeology in France is dominated by traditional classical archaeology. They are out of the European debates, a kind of spot in the pan-European connection. France is not participating in the limes or European debates, with the exception maybe of Redé.
Appendix 4. Interviews Prof. Nico Roymans (notes)

Interview 1 conducted 30/5/2011.

Interview 2 conducted 22/11/2013

**Interview 1, notes:**

*Why Nico’s attention to Batavians (and not in Frisians):*

Mainly because of the high quality of the evidence available for the group and the area, the availability of historical sources (Tacitus) and epigraphic evidence (due to the intensive recruitment for the Roman army Batavians are a group with one of the largest number of inscriptions), and the high quality of the rural settlements, cemeteries, ritual sites and military infrastructure in the area. All these factors allowed the development of complex models, more than in any other area or with any other group.

If there was as much data available in Frisia I would have researched the Frisians, not the Batavians; Frisians have a much better ethnographical context than Batavians. Chances would have been even better there as there is still a Frisian modern sentiment present in modern times.

There are no political or ideological reasons behind my interest or any intention of boosting the role of Batavians in the national identity.

That was more in the 16th-18th centuries; since the 19th century the presence of Batavians in the national imagery has decreased; nowadays it’s limited to schools. There is no national Batavian pride.

*Why the emphasis in those 2 years?*

In the late 15th century Tacitus’ manuscripts describing the Batavians and some of their historical episodes were rediscovered by humanist scholars. They created a series of analogies (links) with their own historical context. Picking certain elements of Tacitus’ description and modifying the evidence, they tried to back their ideals and political intentions (e.g. the political heart of The Netherlands was in the coastal provinces of Northern and
Southern Holland, but Batavians were located in the eastern interior area of the Dutch territories; they tried to locate Batavian related sites in the coast to back the legitimacy of the main role of Northern and southern Holland).

What role did Batavians play in the colonial context in the 18th century?

The Dutch empire is different to the British empire in the sense that the later has the Roman Empire as a model and reflect their ideals in their colonial enterprise. The use of the name Batavian could be seen as a provocation in that sense. The Dutch present themselves in the colonial context (to other colonial systems) using the Batavian myth, already rooted in national consciousness. It’s an ambivalent structure, in which Dutch proudly make use of the Batavians, who paradoxically are still depicted as barbarians (17th century representations of Batavian settlements still show round houses, native barbarian).

Since 19th century: Batavian issue is not so prominent in national identity, more marginal. It’s more based on Germanic identity.


Now in terms of general public perception: Trying to create broader interest through a local approach based on broader knowledge; schools briefly touch on it.

Evolution of the topic:

Earlier studies, mostly in Dutch language and reproducing historical stereotypes with a very traditional approach.

1980s and Willems: First publication in English (he studied in USA and had an anthropological background) and using all sorts of evidence.

Then the NWO funded two waves of research on Batavians run by Nico Roymans: First one, in which Nicolay was involved, with a focus on the ethnic identity of Batavians, and a second one, in which Stij Heeren and Walter Vos were involved, focusing on the integration of the Batavian rural communities in the Roman World.
The later publication is the Mythos volume of Varusschlacht (2009).

Now he is still marginally working in the topic but from a different perspective. He feels the new evidence available through excavation reports is fascinating. His new focus is the transformation of the rural villa landscape, but it can be compared with the lack of development in the River area, so somehow is still linked to its first research projects.

Current debates and positions:

There is no basic disagreement between Nico and Carol, just nuances separate their positions. Carol critic is that Nico’s research on Batavians and the image he is picturing of Batavian society is too much male focused, because it is mainly focused on the military aspects. Nico focuses on the impact of returning veterans reintegrated in the rural societies, bringing roman identities to the area from the bottom up; it is another perspective on Romanisation, an original model on cultural change. She thinks women role deserves attention as they had to take on traditional male roles when these were recruited by the army.

Then, in the North, we have Nicolay (who obviously agrees with Roymans thesis) and Gallestin. Nijmegen has no professor on Roman Provincial Archaeology anymore, just pottery specialists (Rien Polak).

But there are no big internal debates within Dutch academia around this topic because it is a small academic community (many people producing excavations report, but very little interpretation and therefore opportunity for debate). Their arena for debating is an international one, mainly with the Anglo-Saxon community (e.g. TRAC); there is no possibility to discuss either with the German community because they are too far (have no influence) from British theoretical model and positions.

German-British influence?

There are very few German scholars interested in theory but they still appreciate Nico’s contribution. The idea of the Dutch middle way was criticized by Dirk L. Krausse (2004), from the Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Baden-Württemberg and University of Tuebingen,
stating that models are not closed and complete truth and that they are opened to debate; he also criticized Nico’s idea that there is a cultural component on the economic development.

The research limes, N-S and Prehistory and Roman provincial archaeology and chronologies:

That division is too simplistic; there is heterogeneity…Southern scholars also look at northern materials (and the other way around?). There are many kinds of backgrounds.

He thinks his research bridges Iron Age archaeology with Roman provincial archaeology (from rough to the plough???)

In terms of chronologies, they use the same Roman period chronologies in the S and the N (early, middle and late).

The Netherlands tries to make use of historical sources and have a historical approach, while other communities like Denmark have more problems to find historical sources and therefore apply a more prehistoric approach.

European-National-Regional agendas-perspectives-identities:

Field work projects are mostly carried out by commercial archaeological units in a very regional/local level and following those agendas. In the context of Malta convention (European level) these units cannot synthesize or analyze deeply the results of their excavations, but these are still carried out because they are still interesting to Universities’ research projects as case studies to be applied upon an international perspective. These academic projects at universities are bringing local/regional projects to the international sphere and integrating them into a global perspective.

There are both national and regional agendas in operation.
Post-colonial perspectives:

These are coming mainly from British models (due to their colonial background), but in Nico’s opinion they went too far in their arguments. There is no evidence of cultural resistance, maybe not enthusiasm.

Romanisation debate is not useful anymore as it has gone too far. Mattingly is stereotyping the concept in a way that doesn’t work, but it can be redefined in many other ways. Creolization and other terms are also problematic.

Recommended publications:

Stijn Heeren, Mythos volume, Willems revisiting Nijmegen JRA volume, Exhibition

Interview 2, notes:

There is no special treatment for the Batavian topic in terms of funding and support given.

I then questioned him about the national NWO funding he secured for his two Batavian projects in the past and he answered that NWO project proposals are assessed by external referees who make the final decision (normally UK or Germany).

So the reason why money was given to Batavians is not to be looked for in identity or political reasons, but on mere scientific bases. Simply, the available evidence is enormous and unique: The historical sources combined with a unique data corpus.

- The clay soils of the Batavian area preserve bronze objects very well (coins, statuettes, militaria, etc.)
- There is a huge amount of excavation data as large scale excavations have been carried out during the last 10 decades in the Batavian area, more than for any other areas of any other tribe in Gaul.
- Large quantities of epigraphy used by Batavians and about Batavians.
- Vindolanda tablets and Batavians in Hadrian’s Wall (another epigraphic evidence)
You can conclude that Batavians are unique and therefore interesting because of all the evidence available, which shows that Batavians were not a mere Roman imperial construct but an identity embraced by the peoples living in these areas. They used this label to name themselves in epigraphy, not only here but also in Hadrians wall or in Rome. That makes them a unique and very important case-study for the discussion on native identities in Roman times.
Appendix 5. Interviews Dr. Louise Swinkels (transcript)

Interview conducted 28/11/2013 at Valkjoff Museum (Nijmegen)

Louise Swinkels is the principal curator of the Roman collection at the Valkjoff Museum in Nijmegen. He organized the exhibition on the Batavians (2004) an edited the subsequent catalogue.

Questions:

How is the past presented in this museum?

Is national identity transferred somehow through the materials exhibited or the displays? Or is it more regional/local?

What was the aim behind these exhibition…the motivation…the justification…the excuse?

Have you detected an interest in the public or that was what you wanted to wake up?

If there is no social interest why did you do it? And if there is no social interest why these exhibition was so successful? Was it successful and did it have an impact? At a local/regional level or at a national level

Transfer of knowledge between academia and society and mutual influence. Role of exhibitions and museums on this process?

How do you think it affects you the fact that you are studying and presenting your own past?

Is the post-colonial academic swift towards natives also visible in museums?

Regional-National-European agendas, identities and perspectives. Is there a very heavy regional bias/input (political) in terms of Batavians?

Why the emphasis (not only in academic research but also in your exhibition) on Batavians? Why not Cananefates or Frisians? Title seems to suggest that they are the lost forefathers, which is an idea developed since the 15th century. Is it because the exhibition has a regional focus and audience?

Role of Batavians/Batavian myth in national identity/discourse both academic and general? And what is the role of the other tribes?

“Sons of our times” (what defines our times and how does it affects our interpretations? Post-colonial times? Global times?). How do current situations of cultural exchange, adaptation, identity creation (immigration) affect your views on ancient one?
Interview Transcript:

[irrelevant chat. He asked if I had visited other museum professionals, and I told him I talked to Ruurd Halbertsma and wanted to speak to the organizers of the Batavian commission exhibition in the Royal palace, but they were too busy. Also told him I have been talking to historians, commercial archaeologists and academic archaeologists in different universities because I’m starting to see regional differences in discourses. He agrees. He also agrees with the idea of a pre-19th century common identity in the Dutch territories]

S: One of the aspects that I’m more interested in of your work here is the way in which the academic discourses around Batavians, especially Batavians in this case, but also other ancient peoples in The Netherlands, is transferred to the public sphere and how it is received. The exhibition that you have here, and published, is one of the main examples of that, and the idea is... how do you present your own past to the public and why? There must be a reason, or an interested detected, otherwise...

LS: The exhibition was for us really the first time that we focused on the Batavians; in the Roman exhibition of this museum the Batavians hardly play a role except for a few minor elements. You can find them but they are not a separate topic in the permanent exhibition which is rather general... it’s about prehistory, the roman age, early Middle Ages, and it largely focuses on Roman remains in Nijmegen, and the surroundings. Nonetheless, the academic research from the 1980s onwards, the Batavians play a big role. The dissertation by Willem Willems in the 1980s and then the research by Nico Roymans and his team in Amsterdam are very important. There have been new excavations is the Batavian region, the sanctuary of Empel near ’s-Hertogenbosch in the early 1990s, very important, but also the settlement excavations in the river area here, Tiel is the best example, they have brought a lot of new data, and a new way of looking at the Batavians, and you could say that the Batavians as a topic for presentation to the public became available again for the museums. Before that when i started working in the museum in the late 1980s it would have been very difficult to make an exhibition on Batavians because there was hardly any literature focusing on the topic and that’s part of a tradition in scientific research from the early 1800s. Batavians were very important in the national historiography until the end of the 18th century and then from the beginning of the 19th they seem to disappear from research. They get mentions now and then but the archaeological literature talks about Germans and Celt but not about Batavians or Caninefates or Frisians. So it’s the early populations in The Netherlands are named under the general terms, and that remains until the 1980s with this new research and then Batavians are studied again as such with new scientific methods and excavations methods, new types of settlement research that it becomes possible to discuss them again

S: So there like a pre-19th century important role of Batavians and then they kind of disappear and they don’t come back as such until the last 3 or 4 decades...

LS: Yes, you could say that. From the 16th to the 18th century they are very important in historiography, they are considered to be the national forefathers of the Dutch and
especially the Batavians uprising against Rome is very important in the national self-esteem, and this is written about and you find it in the paintings.

*S: So if pre-19th century was more of a national issue in terms of how Batavians were depicted, described, and how people looked at them, and the last 4 decades is more of an academic issue, it’s not so much of a national...*

LS: No, because when you look at the public perception of Batavians in the 16th to 18th century this also changes in the 16th and 17th century, the Batavians are seen as equals, as people who lived hundreds of years ago but were the same as us, with the same kind of civilizations, living in cities, and that’s how they are represented in the paintings by Rembrandt and others. In the 18th century there is changes, antiquarians are looking at reading Tacitus and they conclude that the Batavians were not civilized as we are, they lived a primitive life as Tacitus describes, in their way of living, their houses, their clothing... and this primitive image of the Batavians then predominates in about the 1800s, that’s the general idea, and they are considered to be a noble people with high moral standards but their material life is primitive. That stays like that until well into the 20th century and basically is still the same for the general public who hasn’t read the scientific discourse and hasn’t seen the exhibition, Batavian is synonymous with primitive, crude, people with animal skins and clubs, and they drink loads of beer, that’s what still is (the public image)... [he opens a book, presumably the exhibition catalogue]... a bit like Asterix, like this... that’s Batavians for the common Dutchman who doesn’t know what has happened in scientific research. That also creates a problem. the first archaeologists who started studying the Batavians had to compete with this public image, and you can read in their publication “what we find as archaeologists is completely different to what the public understands”, and this primitive view of the Batavians also made the Batavians les interesting as the national forebears, so other peoples were moved forward, the Frisians, the Saxons, the Franks... and it was also believed that the present day Dutchman are the heirs of these peoples because in written source the Batavians disappear at the end of the Roman age. It was generally believed that the original Batavians had left The Netherlands, had moved to the south and had amalgamated with the peoples there and there were no Batavians left, so in the 19th century, when people were looking for national identities, these later German Germanic tribes were more interesting.

*S: Frisians have that kind of medieval or early-medieval presence, while Batavians and Caninefates didn’t, so that’s probably one of the reasons.*

LS: That’s why we called the exhibition “The Batavians: stories of the people who have disappeared”. After the Roman age we only have stories about Batavians, some Roman stories, Tacitus in particular. And then from the 16th century onwards there are new stories, and they are continuously told and re-told

*S: Batavians myth...*

LS: Yes.
S: I’m looking at the evolution and effect of the Batavian myth has on modern discourse. It’s striking because the early 16th century myth I think that’s the only one based on the original accounts, on Tacitus, from then onwards all the variations, all the uses of the myth, I think they are used on the 16th century view, not on the original accounts.

LS: That’s not completely true, in the 16th-17th century the focus is different, and the Batavian rebellion is the main point. This story in the Historiae of Tacitus is what people focuses on... and in the 18th century and 19th century also, then the Germania of Tacitus is more important, which describes daily life and the culture of the people living here and the rebellion is less important there, so it a different use of the sources, and the Germania of Tacitus is ignored in the 16th-17th century, and it’s brought forward in the 18th and 19th century and that’s a very important difference. Both times use ancient sources but they chose the source and that is a very important difference. And you can see it not only in the historiography but also in art, this (shows a picture) is a 17th century painting of one of the key moments of the Batavian rebellion, the end and the peace negotiations between romans and Batavians, who are identical practically, and they stand on a stone bridge. And later on there is a big difference, the Romans are depicted as Romans and the Batavians as primitive people and the bridge is also very primitive in The Netherlands, a wooden bridge, so you see that this primitive view of the Batavian civilization here is prevailing in 18th and 19th century, both art and historiography. And this primitive image makes them less interesting for using them in a national identity. You see that Nijmegen city was first proud of both roman and Batavian origins, its identified with the Oppidum Batavorum mentioned in Tacitus, the city of the Batavians, and Nijmegen calls itself until the beginning of the 10th century ‘Stadt Batavieren’, city of Batavians, and then that disappears and the Roman origin of Nijmegen is put into focus much more, and the Batavians disappear, and you can see that Nijmegen celebrates its Roman past, not its Batavians past. In 1955 there was a great jubilee celebrating the fact that approximately in 105 AD Nijmegen may had get city rights, become a municipium, by Emperor Trajan, and the jubilee was again celebrated in 2005, 50 years later, and again the Roman past was celebrated and the Batavian past has disappeared from the public attention. In this exhibition, and the accompanying book, we have tried to put that into the focus, under the attention, how these views of the Batavians changed through the past 5 centuries.

S: One of the other issues that I am curious about is these different uses of the Batavians from the 16th to the 19th century... how they actually chose what they want to use from the Batavian character or the Batavian aspects... because you have the 16th century liberty lovers, fighting against the oppressing Spaniards, and at the same time in the early 17th century you have the use of Batavians as a symbol for the colonial setting, which is a completely different point of view, you are talking about your own imperialism and you are using Batavians to leave your mark in the capital of the East indies... very different uses, the liberty lovers, fighting against oppression Roman imperialism but we use Batavians as a symbol for our own imperial quest.

LS: I’m not a historian, but I don’t know if they were used as a symbol in this colonial enterprise. As far as I know names were used, also for ships, but...
S: Maybe they are not using Batavians as a model, but as a label for Dutch people, in which case it’s like saying this is a second homeland.

LS: Yes.

S: Even if they use it just as a label, that label has some kind of ideological load. Calling yourself Batavian is not just a label, it has something of the idea of being Batavian. In this case, if it’s inherited from this 16th century idea, is all this brave-like people, war-like, very combative, loads of virtues and moral standards... so I guess it might be considered just a label, but with all the loads that brings.

LS: I’m not familiar with the history. As far as I know Batavians... there isn’t really a Dutch people at that time, and the term Batavian is used to create such an identity, an identity that is already very old. I’m not familiar...

But reading these text from the 16th-17th century, as far as I understand it it’s a way of claiming a national history, and in that sense also an identity, which wasn’t there before the rediscovery of Tacitus, there hardly was any national history, so as in Germany these text have a huge influence in defining self-awareness of a history that goes back a long time.

S: That comparison with Germany can also be drawn with many other European countries, because they have these claims of Roman heritage in one hand, and on the other they always used these ‘barbarian’ leaders that fought against the Romans as national heroes. You have Vercingetorix in France, Arminius in Germany, Civilis in The Netherlands... so it’s kind of a double identity.

LS: Yes, that’s true.

S: We are part of the very prestigious Roman Empire but at the same time our identity is based on rebelling against the empire, and we have these heroes which are actually the ones that resisted the Roman Empire.

LS: Yes, yes... you see, here in Nijmegen, from the 12th century onwards there is a tradition which claims that the city was founded by Julius Caesar, you see it in the castle built by Frederik Barbarossa...

S: The one here in this park?

LS: Yes... in 1155 the building starts, and there is an inscription here in the museum that records Barbarossa rebuilds the castle previously built by Julius Caesar, and this tradition remains until the 20th century referring to Julius Caesar, but at the same time, from the 16th century onwards, the Batavians come into view, and there is a tradition that the Batavians have founded this city, and they coexist. There is on one hand the Batavian rebellion, the uprising, and on the other hand there is the tradition, especially here in Nijmegen but in The Netherlands as a whole, the pride in the fact that there was a treaty between Batavians and Romans, the ‘antiqua societas’ mentioned by Tacitus, and we have a painting here in our museum that was made for the city hall here in
Nijmegen in the 17th century, at the same time that the paintings were made for the city hall in Amsterdam, and the painting here in Nijmegen does not focus on the Batavian rebellion but on this treaty, and it shows Roma and Batavia shaking hands and making a treaty and making peace, and this aspect is highlighted, the peace between Batavians and Romans as equals, as here in this painting (shows painting on the book) are shown as equals. But at the same time there are texts about this Batavian rebellion so they really coexist and they can be used at liberty when the occasion occurs.

S: If you look at all the accounts on Batavians in antiquity, the rebellion is literally just one year and a half, while the whole spectrum of the Batavian presence in the sources talk about treaties, ancient treaties with Rome, the treaty they sign after the rebellion again, so it’s more of a peaceful comfortable relationship according to the sources... and is only this one year and a half of rebellion that is actually the one highlighted... I don’t know if there is a reason, I guess the historical context in which Batavians were brought back in the 16th century is precisely that one of a rebellion, so that’s why is highlighted. My other doubt is why Batavians, and not, for instance, Caninefates, who also play an important role on that same rebellion, or Frisians, who were revoltting against the Roman Empire even earlier than the Batavians, and there are sources also for them?

LS: The Caninefates probably because they were ignored as they were on the Western part of The Netherlands, but that part of The Netherlands, the province of Holland, claimed to be the ancient Batavia, so in the 16th and still the 17th century there was a very big discussion about where did these ancient Batavians lived and the western part, which was the most important part of The Netherlands, still is, also claimed to be the territory, the land of the Batavians, not the eastern part of The Netherlands were we are here. They also claimed that the city of the Batavians was not here in Nijmegen but to the West. So there was little room for the Caninefates, but i think, it’s just a guess but very important, Caninefates are not mentioned very many times in the ancient sources while the Batavians are, and this text by Tacitus about the Batavian rebellion is a huge text in terms of the ancient sources available for The Netherlands, otherwise we only have very short remarks by Pliny and others. So I think that must have been a very important factor that you have a very important and extensive text on this topic and in the political circumstances of the age it became very important.

S: When I’m looking at how these discourses are created I’m also looking at different discourses at regional, national, and even European level... and it’s confusing because you have discourses about Batavians and the relationship between Batavians and Romans in the three levels basically. My doubt is whether this exhibition and all the research that has been done on Batavians in the last 20-30 years has to do with any kind of agenda, either regional, national... I wouldn’t say European because probably is not a European issue, but is definitely affected by the European agendas imposed so whether there is a kind of agenda behind it, not in a negative way... (he understands) I mean like an underpinning or motivation, regional or national. Because the projects that for instance Nico Roymans has developed are mostly funded by the National Research Committee (NWO), I’m not sure about this exhibition but I presume is more of a regional/local idea... did it have a national impact?
LS: No, it was... there were no national funds, it was relatively cheap exhibition. For us, we had the idea to make an exhibition on the Batavians probably ten years before, after the excavations in Empel and when new research has started in Amsterdam, the settlement excavations in Tiel were very important, there were new excavations here in Nijmegen where you got new data, real archaeology, not only the Roman stories and the stories written from the 16th century onwards, but you also got the archaeological finds that you could compare with them, and that’s what we did in the exhibition, so we took the stories as a starting point, the different stories... Tacitus reports that they came originally from Germany, that they were a German tribe, their coming to The Netherlands is one story, their treaty with the Romans is another story, the rebellion with all its different sub-stories is another one, the way they live is another story, their houses, their religion, and some of the individuals. Civilis mainly, but other ones... and what we tried to do is present the stories in the way they have been depicted in art and then see what we now at this moment about these topics: what is the archaeological evidence for the coming of Batavians?, for instance,...

S: Is more of a regional push, it’s not national... you are not presenting or looking at this as a symbol of national identity because there is a national interest on it... it’s more regional...

LS: No, you could say, we use these stories to look at the archaeological evidence and as a way of introducing them to the public, as, it’s not the same of course, but we have the Museum in Leiden had for 20 years, I believe, an exhibition on the Romans, a general exhibition, it’s for families, for children, and they used the cartoons on Axtex as an introduction, drawings from Axtex were used to look at archaeological evidence behind these scenes. And these stories about the Batavians are hardly part of the national identity, people hardly know them anymore, they are not taught at schools anymore, it was the case until the 1950s, 1940s, but after that they have disappear from the curriculum, pupils at school don’t know who the Batavians are, and the stories about rebellion are not being told anymore. So, also that was interesting for us to revitalize these stories because they are interesting as they have been important in our national history in the past 5 centuries. It was for us an interesting topic, we are a museum that presents archaeology, we are not a historical museum, we have no historians in our staff, we have archaeologists, art historians, and we present art and archaeology. The history behind the Batavians is for us a very interesting means to present the new evidence from archaeological research; that was for us the main focus.

S: So it came as a consequence of all the new research that has been done.

LS: Yes, that’s been the trigger to make this exhibition, and what for us of course was very interesting is that the topic has been forgotten, there has been no exhibition on Batavians... well, I don’t know if there has ever been an exhibition on the topic, at least not an archaeological exhibition... there has been an exhibition on the excavations at Empel in ‘s-Hertogenbosch, in the North-Brabant museum, but that was focused on this excavation, and not on the Batavians as a people, and all the art work from the past 5 centuries wasn’t used in that exhibition, so the later history of the Batavians wasn’t used in that exhibition. So it was for us a very nice opportunity to present a new topic,
with new evidence. As a museum we have no agenda and we are not funded by national authorities to do so.

**S: So it was more of a private initiative of this museum**

LS: Yes, initiative of this museum. And yes, the first ideas are from shortly after the Empel excavations, and that was for me also the first time that I became acquainted with this later history of the Batavians; I knew about it but I hadn’t studied it before, and together with a colleague here, an Art Historian, we started to develop the programme for this exhibition.

**S: In terms of transfer of knowledge between academia and the general public, what is the role of museums? I know it’s one of the most important tools, apart from publications, but mainly because academic publications are not getting to the general public. What is in your opinion the role of the museum in that sense?**

LS: Well, I see it as a natural role for museums to play. Museums hardly have staff to do the research themselves, I have very little time to do so... so I make exhibitions and the other museum work, but my research time is very limited, and that goes the same for my colleagues, so we are dependents of the research carried out elsewhere, on the universities. We have our relationship here with the University of Nijmegen, it’s very important for us. Also the art historical exhibitions, part of them come forward out of research that has been carried out at university, so that’s very important for us as a museum, to be able to make exhibitions, because we can’t do that stuff all by ourselves, it’s impossible. And also, it’s of course interesting for a museum to present new ideas, new evidence, new material, especially when it brings into focus the collections that you already have, and puts into a new perspective. So academic research is vital for us, and for our function.

**S: So the way Batavians were portrayed in this exhibition was drawn from the new academic perspectives.**

LS: Yes, both the archaeological and also the historical evidence. In the book a lot of historians participated to present the latest views on the Batavian myth and other topics. And also new elements were described for the first time. The Batavian reception in the 18th and 19th century wasn’t discussed before in academic research, and for the first time two historians discuss this material in this book on our invitation, so the focus has always been on this Batavian myth of the 16th century... whereas the Batavians became less interesting from the 1800s onwards but they do not disappear from the public view, in the schools the stories about the Batavians were told until the end of the 1940s as I said,... so older people still know all the facts about the Batavians, and there were still drawings, and books with illustrations and historical novels being written on the Batavians until these days. Just appeared a new historical novel on the Batavian rebellion, so they have not disappeared but it’s interesting to know what happened from then on, that was also part of this exhibition.
S: So in that sense you are mostly drawing from the research that is made at universities, the perspectives and theoretical frameworks that they are use at University are also transferred to the exhibitions and to the public.

LS: Of course, yes

S: I’m thinking about all this post-colonialism that is now been discussed in the archaeological circles in terms of how to present native populations and not to focus so much on the elite and focus on daily life, on how people lived their lives, that is somehow also present and transferred through this kind of interpretations in the exhibitions and also goes all the way to the public.

LS: Yes, of course. For instance, on the Batavians and on Nijmegen as a Batavian city, you have different views on that. You have thee view put forward by Willems and Bloemers in the 1980s, that the city of Nijmegen was called city of the Batavians but wasn’t really of the Batavians but a city in the country of the Batavians, where hardly any Batavians live, but it was mainly Roman settlement in Batavian territory to be a basis for the administration and so on. Nico Roymans and Stijn have changed this view somewhat, putting into view that the Batavian element is important and not so much looking from the Roman viewpoint but taking a Batavian stand, to see how a city here in Nijmegen may have been part of Batavian life in this part of The Netherlands. And this discussion is still going on, how we have to view Roman Nijmegen, was it mainly a roman city, an enclave in native territory or was it also a city that had any importance to the native population. There is no definitive answer yet but these discussions are going on, and are of course important for us to follow and to use in the stories we tell to the public. My part in this book has been to summarize the way archaeologists have studied Batavians from the early 1800s to the research of Roymans, and the different focus that you can see in this research and how that has of course influenced research results. So that is certainly, as I see it, a part of our job, to follow these academic discussions and to look at ways to present it to the public. It is difficult of course to use all the new answers but to make it clear to the public that it is possible to take different stands and see things differently as it’s done in academic discussion.

S: One of the reasons for creating this exhibition is to create awareness of the Roman past for the public in the area. How the new sociological composition of Dutch society, not only Dutch, has loads of immigration, emigration... there is not any more “this is The Netherlands and Dutch people live here”... well, it is Dutch people but Dutch people made of people coming from many other places. Is there a component in this kind of exhibition in which you are trying to make those people aware how the past of the region has been developing?

LS: We haven’t made a specific topic yet. You could say that it’s implicit in this exhibition, also in the fact that we highlighted the fact that the Batavians have disappeared. The word Batavian is still known to every Dutchman, everybody has a notion of primitive club and animal skin, but that is all. The notion that they are our forebears is still common, but actually 100 years ago in schools you were told... education was by year numbers (dates), so for example you learnt that in the year 1500
there was the battle of... and in the school books of a century ago, around 400 the Batavians disappear. And we have tried to bring that back. The idea that there was a people here called Batavians, or who called themselves Batavians, or were called by the Romans Batavians, and that has gone, and nobody has a problem with that. On the other side, the Frisians are very proud of the fact that the Frisians were being named by Roman authors and that they are still being called like that, so they are the oldest people in The Netherlands. Whereas archaeological research has shown that there is an occupation gap in Frisia at the end of the 4th and 5th century, and probably new people settled the area, so there is no continuity of occupation, and that is not a popular message in the North. It’s different here in this part of The Netherlands, we have no problem at all in saying that the Batavians have disappeared and that there are new people. But the fact that there have been so many new identities is of course a very interesting thing to use in our national history; there has been a coming from people from the prehistoric times onwards. And there is at this moment obviously a strong sense of longing for national identity and when our present Queen, Maxima, said in a speech some years ago “I don’t know what the Dutch identity is because it’s so pluriform” she was heavily criticized but of course she is right, you cannot define a Dutch national identity in terms of specific peoples, there are so many characteristic. So it is a theme that is interesting for us as a museum to use in the future... I don’t know, we haven’t got any plans for exhibition on these issues for a near future. We are going to change our permanent exhibition in the coming years and probably will be an element on the new element in the new permanent exhibition.

S: The Batavians you mean?

LS: No, well, this changing of inhabitants in this areas, not only the Batavians. But we are just starting to discuss how to do that (laughs)

S: It’s very interesting. I think we should strive towards that kind of presentation; we need to reflect our own time...

LS: Yes, of course...

S: ...and our own times are the times of heterogenic societies, immigration, emigration, movement of people and globalisation (agrees), so that’s one of the other things I was interested in when asking you about the post-colonial discourse that has been transferred. Because from my point of view, post-colonial discourse is at the end of its life (agrees); we are now talking more about Globalisation now. We defined ourselves for a while as what we were not, we were not colonialists anymore, we were post-colonialists, but we didn’t know exactly what we were, and now we are kind of defining ourselves as globalizing, and hybridity and these ideas.

LS: Yes, you may very well be right. It’s getting to terms with this pluriformity, and you cannot use easy etiquettes and names any more. There are so many new answers and differences.
LS: There is little on the Batavians; it will be more in a few years’ time certainly. We have loads of school visits.

S: Is it normal then to bring school kids to reinforce the history lessons they have at school?

LS: Yes, there are two moments in school life when Romans are a standard topic, when they are about 10 years of age and then again when they are in secondary school, the topic comes again. We try to have programmes for both these ages’ groups and for teachers to use and get them to the museum. The topic of the Romans, Roman history, together with the museum in Leiden, we are the most important museum in The Netherlands, so a lot of school, not only from the region but from the whole Netherlands come and visit us.

S: But is more focus on the Roman aspects than on the Batavian aspects.

LS: Yes, and when this museum opened in 1999 there was still too little archaeological information, new finds from the new excavations where not available yet, and they were presented for the first time in the exhibition at the end of 2004, now we have a lot of new material, both from Nijmegen and surrounding area. So it is much easier now to make a completely different presentation and one of the main ideas is to use the Roman names, they call Nijmegen ‘the city of Batavians’, as a label for a label for presentations, and also the land of the Batavians, the countryside, the native settlements as a different topic. Of course the Roman military sites are important, and their finds, but thanks to the research of the last 10-15 years we can present a completely different picture of the archaeology of the Roman period in this region.

LS: There is this painting round the corner (the one with Batavians and Romans in the peace treaty over the bridge)... as I said, it was made for the city hall (in Nijmegen), made by a pupil of Rembrandt and it shows Rome shaking hands with Batavians, also St. Angelo in Rome, Valkhof castle, river Waal and mass, and river Tiber, so it’s completely focusing on this piece treaty between two equal peoples. There is no sign of rebellion as in Amsterdam city hall. And together with this showcases, the only element we have of the Batavian rebellion, the Batavians settlement here, the Oppidum Batavorum, was destroyed as described by Tacitus. There has been excavations in the past 20 years in this area which brought to light the traces of destruction, several cellars of houses filled with debris, for instance a cellar completely filled with amphorae and this are three of them that got destroyed during this rebellion, and this silver bronze name plate with the name of Caius Aqilius Poculus, centurion of the 8th legion, and in Tacitus account, the centurion Aqilius is mentioned as the last Roman officer to oppose Batavians at the start the rebellion, before he retired to the legionary forts of Xanten, and this may be the person...

LS: Perhaps for the identity of Nijmegen... I told you about the celebrations of 1955 focusing completely on the Roman past of Nijmegen and the Roman city rights and that focus on the Emperor Trajan, and on the same year this bronze ??? (1:08:50) was found, allegedly dragged from a plough here not far from Nijmegen... we now know it
must have been dragged during ploughing activities near Xanten, in the nearest Roman town. In 1955 Trajan was highlighted and celebrated and there was a new statue being placed in the square nearby, which is still called the Trajan square, but 50 years later, in 2005, Trajan almost got forgotten and the emperor Tiberius got now more into focus. This was found in 1980, on the square here in front of the museum, and of course is older, and it shows a Roman emperor here in Nijmegen somewhere at the end of the Germanic wars, in the year 17 or 19, not sure, so the idea was in 2005 that there must have been a kind of city life here in Nijmegen at that time because otherwise there wouldn’t be such a monument here, and that was the reason for making a new monument for this celebrations and that is the monument that you see in front of the museum (the obelisk). These blocks were used for a cast in bronze at the bottom and then a new monument was put on top.

S: so the monument for Trajan disappeared?

LS: No, it’s still there, but this is much more important now. And Nijmegen has always been very proud, since the 12th century onwards, on being the oldest city in The Netherlands. Julius Caesar has already come here and founded Nijmegen, and that’s still part of the city’s identity, still calls itself ‘the oldest city of The Netherlands’. So as a Museum, we have to deal with that, also because it’s very important for the city, but the scientific evidence is not always that conclusive or what the city wants.

S: It’s interesting... local use and local agenda, but on the other hand the academic perspective is contrary to some of those ideas, so you need to deal with both at the same time.

[offers coffee, irrelevant chat]
Appendix 6. Research Ethics and Data Protection

As detailed earlier, in an attempt to be systematic and organized I decided to use a semi-standard set of questions and, when verbal permission was granted by the interviewees at the beginning of each meeting, recorded some of the interviews, rather than just taking notes.

However, this exercise was not designed as a formal questionnaire/interview process at all, in the fashion of medical or psychological research, and it is not a matter of random-sampling potentially vulnerable members of the public as research subjects. I consulted named figures (professional advisers or informants) about their work and opinions regarding ongoing academic debates. The people I have interviewed are obviously not research subjects per se, as they are not the focus of my research; there is no interest in any emotional or psychological aspects of their personas. It is their ideas and intellectual discourses that I am interested in, which are readily available and of public domain through their published works and exposure in conferences, lectures and seminars.

In terms of data protection issues, the interviewees were verbally informed in advance of the purpose and topic of the meetings, the fact that the conversation was recorded (when applicable) or notes were taken, and the ways in which their opinions would be used, if found relevant, within my thesis.

Nevertheless, concern was sensibly raised by my supervisor Prof. Simon James regarding possible data protection and research ethics issues; the fact that collection of data were related to human subjects and the semi-structured nature of the interviews through personalized questionnaires, called for a check on the current research ethics and data protection regulations standing at the University of Leicester (University of Leicester Research Ethics Code of Practice).

Additionally, the decision was made to seek advice from Dr Marc Scully, researcher of the School of Historical Studies at the University of Leicester with wide experience on the management of qualitative and interview data.

To avoid any unforeseen problems, it was then decided that permission should formally be sought for data collection through submission of the project for review through formal channels. A research ethics review document (see below), including details on my data collection methodology, was sent for approval to the Research Ethics Officer in the School of
Archaeology and Ancient History at the University of Leicester, Dr Jo Appleby. The research ethics review was approved and signed off, and permission was then granted to proceed with the collection of qualitative data through interviews (see below).

**RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW**

**Section I: Project Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Project title:</th>
<th>Roman-Barbarian Interaction in North-Western Europe: &quot;Myths&quot; and national traditions in archaeological interpretation (16th-21st centuries)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Research Purpose</td>
<td>This research is centred on the historiography of Roman:‘barbarian’ relations in The Netherlands and it involves the critical comparison of the ways in which various national scholarly traditions in northern European countries have understood and represented their origins in the Roman era since the 16th century. Special emphasis will be placed on the examination of the ‘filtered’ historical and archaeological interpretations given to the historical episodes of Roman-Barbarian interaction in the northern frontiers of the Empire and beyond from the reign of Julius Caesar to the mid-3rd century (50 BC - AD 250). Inevitably, this thesis will touch on parallel topics such as the creation and development of national myths, the formulation of national identities and the close relationship between archaeology and nationalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Aims/ Research questions:</td>
<td>To look over the shoulders of modern scholar communities and assess how they analyse data regarding Roman-Barbarian interaction, trying to deconstruct their inherited frameworks in order to identify national biases or underpinnings on the archaeological discourse. RESEARCH QUESTION: What are the defining features of the Dutch national tradition of archaeological interpretation that have informed their discourses around Roman-Barbarian interaction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed methods:</td>
<td>I will be reading and analysing relevant publications and talking directly to the current generation of active scholars and field researchers -sensibly so as my Dutch is limited, and I have the luxury of asking them what they really think, and why, rather than trying to infer it from what they (do/not) say in print.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of recruiting</td>
<td>I contact them by e-mail. Arrange to meet them in person when possible. Have a chat/discussion/interview with them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
research participants | regarding the topic of my thesis.
Criteria for selecting research participants | Make a critical selection of relevant and leading scholars in this specific field of study within Dutch academia.
Estimated number of Participants | 15-20
Estimated start date | 01/11/2013
Estimated end date | 30/06/2014
Will the study involve recruitment of participants from outside the UK? | If yes, please indicate from which country(s).
Yes. The Netherlands

Section II: Applicant Details

| 2. Name of researchers (applicant): | SERGIO GONZALEZ SANCHEZ |
| 2b. Department: | Archaeology & Ancient History |
| 3. Status: | Postgraduate Research |
| 4. Email addresses: | sg290@le.ac.uk |
| 5a. Contact addresses: | School of Archaeology and Ancient History, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester, LE1 |
| 5b. Telephone numbers | 07952593647 |

Section III: For Students Only

| 6. Module name and number or MA/MPhil/PhD course and department: | Archaeology (Arts) Research |
| 7. Module leader’s/Supervisor’s name: | Prof. Simon T. James |
| 8. Email address: | ja253@le.ac.uk |
| 9. Contact address: | School of Archaeology and Ancient History, University of Leicester |

Section IV: All Research Applicants

Please outline below whether or not your research raises any particular ethical issues and how you plan to address these issues.
I do not think my research raises any particular ethical issues. This exercise is not a formal collection of data per se and these people are not the vulnerable subjects of my research sample, but rather professional informants in whose work I am interested for academic/thesis purpose; I am not interested in any aspect of their personality or psychology but exclusively on their academic works and their views and input on current academic debates. I am simply consulting named figures who voluntarily agreed to meet up, who verbally agreed to be interviewed and quoted, and who know that those conversations are taking place as part of my thesis research, as i inform them by e-mail on my initial contacts. As academics, the people I am consulting are normally exposed to the public scrutiny of their works anyway, via publications, conference papers, lectures at University, media, etc.

Are you using a Participant Information and Informed Consent Form?
If YES, please paste copy form at the end of this application. NO

Have you considered the risks associate with this project? YES

**Section V: Research Ethics Checklist**

Please answer each question by ticking the appropriate box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the study involve participants who are particularly vulnerable or unable to give informed consent? (e.g. children, people with learning disabilities, your own students).</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will the study require the co-operation of a gatekeeper for initial access to the groups or individuals to be recruited? (e.g. students at school, members of self-help group, residents of nursing home).</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Will it be necessary for participants to take part in the study without their knowledge and consent at the time? (e.g. covert observation of people in non-public places).</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Will the study involve discussion of sensitive topics (e.g. sexual activity, drug use)?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are drugs, placebos or other substances (e.g. food substances, vitamins) to be administered to the study participants or will the study involve invasive, intrusive or potentially harmful procedures of any kind?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Will blood or tissue samples be obtained from participants?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is pain or more than mild discomfort likely to result from the study?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Could the study induce psychological stress or anxiety or cause harm or negative consequences beyond the risks encountered in normal life?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Will the study involve prolonged or repetitive testing?  NO
10. Will financial inducements (other than reasonable expenses and compensation for time) be offered to participants? NO
11. Will the study involve recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS? NO
12. Does this research entail beyond minimal risk of disturbance to the environment? If yes, please explain how you will minimize this risk under section IV above). NO
13. Have you gained the appropriate permissions to carry out this research (to obtain data, access to sites etc)? YES
14. Measures have been taken to ensure confidentiality, privacy and data protection where appropriate. YES

**If you have answered 'yes' to any of the questions 1-12 or 'no' to questions 13-14, please return to section IV. All Research Applicants' and ensure that you have described in detail how you plan to deal with the ethical issues raised by your research. This does not mean that you cannot do the research only that your proposal raises significant ethical issues which will need careful consideration and formal approval by the Department's Research Ethics Officer prior to you commencing your research. If you answered 'yes' to question 11, you will also have to submit an application to the appropriate external health authority ethics committee. Any significant change in the question, design or conduct over the course of the research should be notified to the Module Tutor and may require a new application for ethics approval.**

**Declaration**
Please note any significant change in the question, design or conduct over the course of the research should be notified to the Departmental Ethics Officer and may require a new application for ethics approval.
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The information in the form is accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief and I take full responsibility for it. - YES
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Context:

Historian, Radboud University Nijmegen.

She coordinates the project *Proud to be Dutch: The role of war and peace propaganda literature in the shaping of an early modern Dutch national identity (1648-1815)*.

*Project description:* Historical research on Dutch nationalism has mainly been focused on the nineteenth century. However, the growth of national thought - the idea that the Dutch belonged to the same community - can be traced back to earlier stages of Dutch history. This project will do so, by studying the role of war and propaganda literature in the period 1648-1815. The diachronical approach will enable us to investigate developments and changes in the rise of Dutch national thought. By focusing on the pre-modern period, it will also challenge current international scholarly views on the formation of national identities.

1648 and 1815 are considered as landmark years in Dutch history. With the signing of the Peace of Münster in 1648 the Dutch Republic became an independent state; 1815 is considered as the beginning of a new era, because of the installation of William I as the sovereign of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. On these occasions, and at intervening political highlights and times of crisis, writers made much effort to symbolise the unity of the Dutch Republic. Texts written at the occasion of war and peace treaties, therefore present us with unique material to study the growth of national awareness in pre-modern times.

This research consists of three interrelated subprojects. The first project focuses on propaganda literature written during the four Anglo-Dutch wars (1652-1654, 1665-1667, 1672-1674, 1780-1784) and investigates to what extent authors attempted to create a unified imagined community. The second project scrutinizes resistance literature during the French regime (1806-1813). In this period literature was being used as the main resistance tool by explicitly articulating ‘Dutchness’ and the nation’s identity. The third project analyses the shaping of national unifying images at the occasions of peace treaties, starting with the Treaty of Münster (1648), and ending with the Treaty of Paris (1814/1815).

Another very interesting project she is co-managing with Marjet Derks is *Re-Mastering the past.*
Project description: Processes of memorialization and self-historization as reflections of attempts to master the past. Such processes inevitably involve a struggle for meaning and memory: what is remembered by whom and how, and what isn’t. Often this struggle goes back to questions of truth and authenticity that in turn form the basis for formal and informal claims to authority and power.

Projects focus on collective memory in particular and do so from opposite sides. On the one hand the analysis is geared to what commemorative communities have indeed recognized in the past as meaningful sources and berths for their historical, foundational narratives in connection to what they conceived as their particular identity. On the other hand, the scholars recognize that collective memory inevitably harbours controversial elements and episodes. Therefore particular attention is paid to ‘unstable’ or ‘negative’ memory that elucidates what has been left out from collective memory, has been silenced, trivialized, ignored or plainly forgotten. The manner in which communities in past and present dealt and deal with those aspects and episodes that are not considered to be characteristic of their identity also sheds light on the interconnections between memory and identity.)

Questions and additional information to frame these questions:

Can we talk of a pre-19th century Dutch national identity?

From the project description you seem to think so, and I agree with you. I think that national identities are formulated much before the creation of nations themselves.

What are the main historical episodes that build Dutch national identity?

You say it’s the peace of Munster in 1648 (creation of the Dutch Republic) and 1815 (United Kingdom of the Netherlands). Both of them are linked to political changes derived from overcoming external threats. Why not going even further back, to the struggle against the Spanish Empire?

You look for symbols of that national identity through writers… Batavians, archaeology, ancestry, forefathers, etc. Have you come across many instances in which Batavians have shown up as symbols? And others like Frisians or Cananefates?

What about regional identities? How did these episodes affect different regions?

And does this intersect with European identity processes?

What characterizes Dutch national identity?

You are not Dutch, you are Danish? How do you non-Dutch origins affect you approach to another’s national past? Have you received critics? I’m in the same situation (I have been actually praised for bringing a fresh look to Dutch archaeology, an outsider’s look) and I am really interested in your answer because Denmark is my other case study.
My research for Denmark needs to be set up differently. Can you remember any instance in which Roman interaction (positive or negative views, for the lack of it maybe) has been used for nation building in Denmark?

How do you transfer this kind of knowledge to the general public? Have you detected an interest or is simply academic interest that you are doing it for?

What are the reasons behind this kind of research? Is it because in a crisis context (not least of the European common identity) we tend to look for identities, for what makes us special?

**Interview Transcript**

*S:* Can we talk of a pre-19th century Dutch national identity?

*From the project description you seem to think so, and I agree with you. I think that the formulation of national identities precede the creation of nations (nation-states) themselves.***

*LJ:* The difficulty with that question is that there is a discrepancy between regional identities and national identity. When we speak of the United Dutch provinces, which already implicates there is something united within them... but historians have debated whether their identity is only regional (in which each region has its own identity), or whether there is something that is called supra-regional identity, which you can call national identity. And the main aim of our project is to show that there is something like a national identity before the 19th century, and what we do is we look at the way certain stereotypes, myths, tales, the use of the house of Orange as a binding force... how they recur in Dutch history. We start at 1648 (that is the year in which the treaty of Munster is signed), because the Dutch republic is declared sovereign from the Spanish king, and then we go all the way to 1815 because 1815 is usually considered a landmark here, when the new king William the first was installed as the king of Belgium and the Netherlands together, the United Kingdom of Belgium and the Netherlands, so that is a new era one could say. And we look at the way national identity is shaped in this period, especially by looking at how traditions already became manifest in war propaganda texts and also in peace texts. And you are looking for that Batavian myth...

*S:* Well, I’m not looking exclusively for the Batavian myth, but I have realized that it is difficult to find other ancient people of the Netherlands in this kind of national discourse. I know it has been mainly focused on Batavians...

*LJ:* Yes

*S:* So it’s easier to find traces of Batavians throughout these centuries.

*LJ:* Yes, there has been published A LOT about it, because the Batavian myth became really popular during the 16th century, and especially during the 17th century when P. Hooft translated Tacitus’ Germania, and then it becomes some kind of one could say
literary (2:55) game, so many people write about this Batavian myth trying to show that they are superior to other myths and of course that they were superior to the Romans back then…so there is some kind of literary game, the use of these literary stereotypes that goes back to one could say this ‘Character Nationaliteitenschema’ …(schemes 3:05). Joep Leersen has written about it, so there has been published a lot about this Batavian myth. But what we do is a bit different because we look at other types of sources and other types of traditions as well.

S: Yes, I’ve been reading a little bit of your 2011 publication, the one that got the Golden medal…

LJ: Oh yes! About the resistance literature…

S: Yes, and I have actually found a very interesting point there for my own research in terms of…if those iconic images or iconic cultural ideas have a presence already in the early 18th century, is because they already are present in the common identity of the people…

LJ: Yes

S: You can’t not say…”well, people started using them in the 18th century so that is when national identity started”… that’s coming from much earlier roots, so it’s not just the presence (of those ideas in texts) but where those ideas are coming from.

The other thing that I am really curious about is why so much focus on Batavians and not in Frisians for instance, or Cananefates...

LJ: I think that is important, because sometimes you see there is a particular interested in Frisian roots, especially with Frisian authors…so, for example I just studied the text which were written about the peace of Utrecht in 1713 and there is one Frisian author Helmers (4:50) (I just finished an article about it, also in English by the way) and you clearly see he has three types of identities he relates to: the Frisian identity, the National identity and the European identity. And his Frisian identity keeps recurring in his praisal (praise?) to the peace of Utrecht. And he is not the only one, you also see some other Frisian authors earlier in the 17th century that state that Frisians are quite capable of making poetry. There is one article on it called Frisian noncontact??? (she looks for a copy of it)…it’s about how Frisian poets position themselves, and they do refer to this Frisian tribes. And what was the other? The…

S: Cananefates

LJ: Yes. Well,

S: I have found archaeological studies about them but I haven’t found many mentions in historical sources.

LJ: No, but they do…Helmers’ poem, ‘De Hollandsche natie’, was published in 1812, and there is a certain passage (V, 208-213; 2009, 230-1) (or I, 253-258; 2009, 118) where he mentions all these different tribes and he says they are all part of one Dutch national
identity,… but he mentions them all, not only Frisian and Cananefates, also of Gelderland [home land of the House of Orange]…let me see if I can find it, it’s a very nice phrase… he does separate between those, he starts with the ‘Der Batavieren’ completely Tacitus, stating this is the common ground of the fatherland where the Batavians entered the country and made their island, but then later on he also mentioned all these separate tribes, saying they are all part of this one common fatherland… that’s an interesting point.

S: Because that’s the thing, I mean, modern archaeological research has been focus on Batavians…there is some on Cananefates and Frisians, but mostly on Batavians, especially in the last 15 years there are some massive archaeological projects around them, and still ongoing right now. And one of my questions is why so much focus on Batavians now and back then, and not on other tribes when they have similar features… because they tend to say that (the attention to Batavians) is because in the late 15th, early 16th century Tacitus was translated and he makes mention to Batavians and their features (warlike people, brave, lovers of freedom)...but you have also literary passages from antiquity talking about Frisians…

LJ: But also in the 18th century there are several epics written about heroes, and there is also an epic about a Frisian hero, every time when the brothers von Graden?? (8:40) write something (they published between the 1720 and the 1770) they make reference to these Frisian tribes and when they talk about Dutch heroes they also go for search for antiquity in their Frisian tribes the search for their identity on those Frisian tribes…that is the most well-known example.

The other,… perhaps there is this other author in the 19th century, Staren??… he is the only poet that is an icon of the province of Gelderland… I think he makes reference to old Gelders tribes as well…but the Batavian myth has, just as you say, taken over. They’ve become similar… and then they disappear. You should read a very interesting book (small) about this Batavian myth [9:45]...

But that is a very good overview of the way in which the Batavian myth has been used, from all the way back till… yes the “Opstand de Bataviere” by Vorlooren. It’s a very nice overview.

S: So this is a biography or transcription of...

LJ: I think that some kind of an addition...

So it is actually only when they want to put their regional identity in front that they go for these other tribes. But especially in the 19th century is mainly about one united national identity, really national identity…so you see these [different tribes and regional identities] more in the 17th century than in the 19th century when it’s getting one united national identity.

S: That united national identity is about Batavians...
LJ: Yes. Yes. And then this Batavian, sorry, the myth of Bato gets very politicized, also at the end of the 18th century because it becomes more or less a symbol of the patriots vs the Orangists, so later on in the 19th century, when we have a king and we become a monarchy you see that the Batavian myth is forgotten completely, because we do not go back all the way to the Batavians, but we go back to William, the Stadholder, I, II, III, IV, V. And then we tend to forget that ancient history a bit more, and in the 18th century, this Bato figure becomes more a symbol for the republicans, vs the old Stadholder traditions. There is... also we become the Bataafse Republic in 1795 which of course is a reference to that old Batavian myth, so it becomes politicized.

S: I’m looking at different uses of the myth, because from the accounts I have read there is always references to THE Batavian myth as if there was only one myth that has been evolving. But if you start looking at different periods you identify different uses of the Batavian myth in the last 5 centuries...different views or aspects of the myth that have been highlighted, and there are in use at the same time, so they cannot be the same myth, they have to be different myths...same theme, the Batavians, but different myths...is the myth of the Batavians who are resisting the Romans (which is the one they use in the 16th century as an image of resistance vs the Spanish King), you have a kind of opposite view, which is the colonial use of Batavians...

LJ: Yes, also...yes

S: ...they go to Jakarta and Batavia is the name they give to the colonial capital, and in the first instance you are talking about anti-imperialist, anti-oppression point of view, and the colonial point of view is exactly the contrary, they are using the same name to point out that we are a powerful empire.

(smiles, nods, agrees)

LJ: Yes, this, exactly this contradiction is within this poem. Because this is the most famous resistance poem against the French oppression, it’s written in 1812, when the Dutch were annexed by Napoleon. On the one hand you see how he thinks about the Batavians to illustrate their superiority, and there is lot about the colonial power of the Dutch people on this poem. On the other hand, it’s also making more reference to the fight against the Romans, so as a resistance symbol. Or as a resistance symbol against another political power. But there is no reflection whatsoever that the superiority that he shows within the colonial discourse it’s some kind of oppression as well. These two are not put into combination.

S: So that’s what I mean, they are using the same myth (they ancient myth of Batavians) in completely different ways, and that’s what I’m looking at different lives of the myth.

LJ: Different discourses, yes.

(I’ll make a little print for you because i know where to find the nice little quote for you)
So you go all the way up to the 21st century?

*S: Yes, actually the last stage of my research (and my main focus) is talking to archaeologists who are looking at Batavians, Frisians and Cananefates and see how those myths or those discourses that they have inherited are affecting the way they are looking at archaeological evidence and how they are looking at their own past.

*LJ: Ah OK!

*S: So it’s a scope from Antiquity and the Batavian-Roman relationships to Renaissance, there is not much to say in the middle, but then from the 16th century onwards up to modern academia.

*LJ: It’s interesting.

*S: And I’m trying to do the same thing with the Danish case and compare them, but it’s going to be a bit more complicated because in the Danish case you don’t have accounts of interactions between Romans and Danish tribes.

*LJ: Hmmm

*S: They are not within the imperial system, they have contacts but that’s all we can talk about, so the national identity of Denmark is not based on antiquity, but on early Medieval-Viking identity...it’s not Roman related.

*LJ: Yep

*S: That’s why it’s also a good contrast point.

*LJ: Yes it is, absolutely. I was, by the way, trying to download an article by you on the Batavian myth before you came, but I couldn’t. It was in Academia.edu. I thought it was interesting that you wrote that article, I was curious to read it.

*S: I have it here with me in my memory stick if you want it.

*LJ: Oh yes!

*S: What I said in that article is more or less what we were discussing the dichotomy of 16th century use and the colonial use of the myth. And then I tried to present the idea of modern academia discourse development, but I didn’t go much into detail because I didn’t have much time back then, and didn’t have actually the data either. I hadn’t talk to anyone yet.

*LJ: Aaaah! Do you read Dutch?

*S: No, that’s one of the other reasons why I’m talking to people, because...

*LJ: Yes, it’s difficult otherwise...

Anyway, this is a very interesting quote for you, [she reads out for me in english, from a Dutch text] “the [Marshal, the North usurpator, the groningers, the Frisinas...they are
all having this love for freedom...the [Cambrian] people from Gelderland,...they are just as much worth people as the Batavian, like different parts of one plant”...he says this in this poem, originally the poem from 1812 [she makes this remark because the book she is reading from is from 2009], so as a way to show that we are united against the French...it’s one country. This is very interesting because he combines these regional differences with a national identity, and then probably this Batavian, on the one hand he says “we are all Batavians” but he also seems to separate them, as somehow them (Batavians) being Holland.

S: Yes, because the identification of Batavians is mostly with the province of Holland.

LJ: Yes, yes...Holland. It’s interesting how he tries to bring it all together.

Here you can keep it (handed a copy of those pages to me).

And, I printed this one because I suddenly realized that perhaps...this isn’t a very good...this cannot be used...no, I’m sorry.

S: One of the other things you have mentioned that I’m also quite interested in, both in early modern times and modern times, and modern academia, is the interrelation between regional, national and European identities... because it’s a complex ‘game’... as you said there are examples of these identities operating at the same time: that example you used about this poet [Helmers] using his three identities, regional as Frisian, national as Dutch, and then linking it to a European idea through the treaty of Utrecht, so... do you think that those ancient myths have any kind of input on that kind of triple agenda? My point of view is that European identity is a modern creation, since the idea of United Europe started to develop politically in the mid-20th century they started to look for identities, they first looked for Celtic identity as a EU identity, the kind of Roman heritage that we all share...but then if you look at a national level most of those identities are based on non-Roman features, barbarian heroes fighting against the Romans are in the centre of national identities. So that’s completely opposite, a European identity based on Roman culture and a national identity based on Barbarians who actually fought the Roman Empire.

LJ: Yes, Ok, that’s a difficult one. I only know something about 17th, 18th and 19th century sources, and the contrast or paradox that you mentioned is not a thing that this authors seem to be bothered about. They (Dutch authors) use Europeanism a lot in their texts, especially when it’s about the big peace treaties, they speak about: Europe is again in peace, Europe is in harmony, we are happy peace has been restored again in Europe. Then they try to state what was the Dutch country position within that peace process. But there is no reflection at all, and this is strange, when speaking about Europe identity, which on the one end goes back to this barbarian troops and on the other end what they do is only consider religious differences, the catholic in the south, the protestant in the north...that is something that is not to be united within that European thought. But all these different layers of identity they seem to [ignore]... it is tension within our heads... more than it is for them.
S: Yes, my supervisor mentioned once how the founding fathers of the United States were talking about freedom and liberty for the new nation but at the same time they were perfectly OK with slavery, so that kind of paradox is out of our moral values or boundaries, so we consider it a paradox or contradiction but not of the moral values of those people.

LJ: And there is another thing that is that this European union of the 20th century is a political union. When I look at the authors of the 17-18 who speak about Europe is some kind of an imagined community, something of an abstract word they relate to, it doesn’t clearly learn us anything about did they really feel European, is there something like a European consciousness, it’s nearly impossible to answer. But there is something they relate to, this national identity as these two…it’s related to regional identity and the European…something there in between. But this, yes, I don’t see any reflection of the difficulties of these different ancient roots within that. It merely functions as a way of relating their own national identity, not as a reflection point in how do all these other nations belong to this one European thought. This European thought is one but in a very restricted or exclusive way… somehow,… I have difficult to explain,… merely pragmatic I would say, there are peaces being established, no more fighting, something like an international balance of powers, but not united in that really elevated sense (of identity) ….well, perhaps, that’s not completely true when in the Enlightenment you get this cosmopolitanism, the idea that we are all citizens of one world, Europeanhaveasit!, cosmopolitanism, that already starts in a way with Erasmus, and then with Voltaire and other enlightened thinkers and then it becomes a more inclusive nature, so that human beings belong…

S: So it relates more to a more cultural intellectual...

LJ: Yes...

S: Identity more than actually supranational

LJ: Supranational, yes, supranational… but then again within one person you can see all these contrast again because this Helmers, he is also a cosmopolitanist, stating we are all brothers of the same world, claiming that this is the world, the world is there for Jews, Muslims, and for Christians, and at the same time he really hates the catholic French people, so there is this same pattern we were describing before.

It seems to be more a tension or problem of us as researchers than really was for them.

S: It’s a perception issue more than a historical issue.

LJ: But it’s nice for your analysis to see all these tensions.

S: I’m not following this [questionnaire] much…but I have just realized that most of the issues I wanted to discuss we have already talked about them.

I know you are specialised on Dutch history, but in terms of your Danish perspective...you were brought up in Denmark...
LJ: No, no, mostly in the Netherlands but I’m Danish by birth.

S: I was thinking if there is any kind of use or lack of use of antiquity, Roman times antiquity, in Denmark…by use I mean “hey we were not part of the empire but we related” or highlighting the lack of interaction…

LJ: Nowadays you mean? Yes

S: Nowadays or if you know of any previous episode in which Roman times Danish peoples have been used to build up that kind of national discourse/identity.

LJ: It’s a difficult question…I don’t know enough Danish history to answer it… I would imagine they used some kind of an ancient sovereign that was to be admired….but the Vikings of course they play a huge role in their national identity, but they go there before…

S: That’s it….my idea is that what they highlight is the lack of interaction, like “hey, there was this massive empire in the South and they didn’t reach here”.

LJ: My impression is that they don’t relate to it much, not even that way. Well the Vikings yes…

S: I see. That’s one of the other things; I don’t read Danish either, so I still have to talk to people about it.

LJ: But you should ask Danish specialists and Danish people.

S: Oh yes, I have been in Denmark talking to people… I just thought maybe you had some opinion.

LJ: Well, from the point of view of someone who visits Denmark quite a lot it’s all about Vikings….they are selling Danish as Vikings, but not as ancient [pre-Viking] tribes, that’s more of a footnote.

I was thinking about how perhaps is interesting to you if you look at the way we use the Batavian myth nowadays in the Netherlands, there are many regional differences. You are here in Nijmegen, and Nijmegen looks to Medieval and ancient history, a lot, because there are so many traces, also archaeological, they found here, so this city represents itself going back to, not only medieval root, but especially ancient roots. You don’t see that kind of promoting yourself as an [ancient] city when you go to Amsterdam, there it is the Golden Age, 17th century and onwards….so there is something regional in the way the myth still plays a role…it [the Batavian myth] does [play a role] here, in the province of Gelderland and Nijmegen, because there have been so many traces founds of the Batavians, or the roots here. You should visit the museum here…

S: I was there two years ago, and back then I was looking more at the archaeological aspects so I visited the museum, and I talked to a couple of local archaeologist.
LJ: Did you talk to Eric Moorman as well?

S: No, I talked to Rien Polak, who is in the archaeology department (wrong, he is part of the Auxilia Unit).

LJ: It might be interesting for you to contact Eric Moorman, he works here at the department, he is just very wide-read.

S: I have to come back to Nijmegen in two weeks because I’m meeting Wouter Vos, who is an archaeologist also but he is based here in Nijmegen, he has a commercial archaeology company, so I have to come back, and I’ll try to see Eric Moorman. Because that’s the thing, I cannot read Dutch, I cannot read Danish so I have to talk to people.

LJ: Yes, or learn Dutch.

S: Yes but learning Dutch and Danish and do a PhD at the same time is too much in too little time.

LJ: Yes. How did you end up in Leicester then?

S: It’s a long story… [irrelevant]… I cannot approach the text so let’s approach the author…also because I’m interested in the reflections that authors make of their own inherited ideas and discourses. How national identity affects the way you write about your ancestors… I’ve been told by some archaeologists that it is a good point that I’m not Dutch because I can see things from a different point of view.

LJ: One thing about this Batavian myth… what you see in the Dutch reception is, you have the Batavian myth which was popular in the 17th century, Medieval no interest whatsoever, and then 17th century gets celebrated, later on, so lets say the beginning of the 19th century. And from these two episodes we go back to, the Batavian myth, then gets drop of in the 19th century, it gets less attention, and we keep the Golden Age as a reference point for our national identity or the construction of national identity. And this has something to do with the fact that we became a monarchy in the 19th century, so then going back to the Stadtholder line, and not to the ancient tribes, or it gets less attention at least. And this is different in the 16th and 17th century when you get this antiquarian interest and humanism.

S: What are the reasons behind the kind of research you are doing, the project ‘Proud to be Dutch’.

LJ: Well, there are of course personal reasons and a scientific reasons. Personal reason is that I have another nationality, I’m Danish, and I have been living here now for nearly all my life, so I am fascinated by this national identity issue. I’m not Dutch, and neither Danish anymore, I’m somewhere in between, but what are the things that people relate to when they talk about national identity is so important for everybody, still within this new European union and what are the issues we relate to when we talk about this, and in my opinion is more a cultural history, these are cultural things more than political things. We do not feel related to the nation because we have this or that
political government, we feel related to a nation because of all the cultural institutions, and because of the traditions and the history.

LJ: The scientific reason is that I did a lot of study into 19th century Dutch literature, and this is very patriotic literature, saying all the time “we are proud to be Dutch, we are very fond of our nation and this is the history we are proud of”... and it gets to the 17th century and they start jubileeing the sea heroes, the scientific heroes, the economic wealth, the world power Amsterdam was in those times... so I’m interested basically in the literature in that period, but to explain why this literature was so patriotic you need to see the cultural context, you need to see how national identity developed and also you have to look at theories about national identity.

LJ: So there are these two main things about theory: the invented tradition, of Hosbawn and Ranger, and then Anthony Smith (‘The Antiquity of Nations’), who has written loads about national identity, and the third thing is the ‘imagined communities’, by Benedict Anderson. But they are put into this modern perspective of “this all started in the 19th century”. And there is a huge gap between those who study the 19th century and those who study the period before. And I’m also a literary scholar for the periods before, 17th and 18th, and I wanted to break this huge barrier between the modernist and those who work in earlier fields, and I was thinking there is much more continuity between these periods than is admitted in the scholarly publications about the 19th century, it’s not an invention of tradition, is a reinvention of tradition that was already there. So, that’s how I came up with the idea of looking for deeper roots of this 19th century nationalism.

S: So you are bridging the gap between the two kinds of situation.

LJ: And they are very much related to the work of Anthony Smith (‘The Antiquity of Nations’), also pointing out much more continuity between the past and the present, between the traditionalist and the modernists, and he has looked a lot about the ancient roots of nations, so also your period, and I look more at the specific Dutch case. The Dutch case is such a good one because the Dutch Republic became a sovereign state with political ambitions in a very early stage in history. So if you have the German history, it’s not one nation, it’s very complex. But the Dutch republic as seven provinces, of course with regional identities, but the language about unity of these united provinces starts very early, it already starts with the revolt against the Spanish people, lets say 1568-1648. So there really is a united identity, which has a lot to do also with the protestant faith of course, it’s something that bind people together, although there were so many Catholics living in the Republic. So it’s the discourse I look at, which symbols are there, what patterns are there which make up this Dutch national identity. And the recurrent patterns are, for example, the role of the house of Orange; sometimes is there, sometimes is not there, when we don’t have the Stadtholder. But the way they talk about this, the orange house as a binding force of the nation, you see it popping up now and then, and when it pops up, for example in 1748, when we get a new Stadholder, then they start looking at the past, and creating their national history. And that is a national discourse, not a regional discourse. So my point
is to show that this national identity is constructed in the period before, and it’s not invented in 1815, not at all.

S: I really agree with that idea, and I only need to find the aspects of that idea that fit with my research. Because, for instance, you mentioned the house of Orange… the same way that the Dutch people in the 16th century relate to Batavians against the Roman emperor, the house of Orange, and Willem, is related to Civilis which is the leader of the Batavians. So even if the myth for later stages becomes the house of Orange it’s somehow related to Batavians, because one of the reasons why the house of Orange and its head became so important and well seen was because of that analogy with the Batavian leaders. So, even if it’s just the house of Orange myth that survives for a period, that is somehow still related to Batavians.

LJ: Yes. But that is only one line. There is also the line of the imagery of the lion with seven arrows bonded together. There is also a discourse when there are times of war, for example, with England or France. This discourse is about creating a common cause. Sometimes they go all the way back to Bato… Civilis is not mentioned that much in those. But the terminology is Batavians, that is true… “we Batavians are the heroes, we Batavians are brave”… so they relate all the time to them. And that becomes common use.

S: One of the reasons why I was asking you about the reasons behind the research you are doing is because, the same way that it seems that a struggle against a common enemy or crises are the periods when they consistently go back to Batavians or to ancient common roots, the kind of financial crises in which we are right now and how that affects the European politics and identity (mistrust between EU members)… the imposition of a European identity is affecting national identities, if this kind of research in the archaeological field that is taking place right now, the kind of research that you are doing… if it has some kind of implication in terms of “ok, now that national identities are under threat, because of crisis, because of the imposition of European identity, this kind of study about the origins of Dutch national identity or ancient tribes in the case of archaeology, if it has something to do with that or is just simple coincidence of individual interest.

LJ: Noooo, yes, it has to do a lot with that, but it goes a bit further, so it’s not now, I think already popped out in the 1990s. It has been popular to do research about national identity and the roots…and that has something to do with it. I think the questions we ask about our material are completely influenced about current discourses and national identities being “threatened” by European identity. There has been an obsession in Dutch society with national identity in the last 15 years and that is also because of the rising up of the populist movements, the right wing movements, which say the most stupid things about Dutch national identity but they triggered something saying “well, European identity is a threat”, and that makes it more interesting to do this kind of research…and the pragmatic thing is that is easier to get money for this type of research, because people think this is relevant, there is something at stake. That’s probably the reason why you are doing this kind of research as well.
S: Hmmmm... I haven’t actually asked myself that question, and I should probably. I don’t know why I’m doing it. I always thought that it was just a succession of events in my life in the past few years that have taken me to this point and to choose this topic. I actually have never thought about this aspect of my research until last year, when I was already into my PhD. It’s not something that I was planning in advance. That’s why I never thought there was a reason behind it, but maybe the development of the context in which I’m working right now is affecting somehow. But I’ll have to think about it.

S: The only other thing I would like to talk about is the transfer of this academic knowledge to the public sphere and audience. First, if you have actually detected that there is an interest in the public about these topics and secondly how do you transfer this kind of knowledge, apart from publications. Do you organize exhibitions, do you put your research out there for people or is merely an academic issue?

LJ: No, no... it’s not, it’s absolutely not. But as academic scholars we are divided between two things. On the one end we have to do this double, triple, peer review publications, these are the ones that count within the academic community, but on the other end, as historians, we publish a lot of popularizing articles, so I also have published in popular history magazines about this issue or given public lectures. And I wrote a book about the resistance against Napoleon and there was a lot of media attention, because my claim was that national identity really got an impulse because of the resistance against Napoleon, there you see this united national identity put very much in the front, while before it is something regional; well, there is a national discourse but you always have the question of how national was it really? Or is it mainly Hollandocentrist from the Holland perspective? And this quote by Helmers I have showed you shows that it becomes a united discourse. And people are very much interested in this, so talking about it in the radio, there has been a TV programme about Dutch history and national identity, and I got the opportunity to participate in that as well. So the nice thing is that this topic makes it possible to speak to a broader community. But you always have to be very careful that it doesn’t become nationalistic or a discourse where you start generalizing things or when you want to transport it to contemporary feelings about national identity. Because it is mainly about history, it is not about how we behave nowadays, but the thing that we do this research of course it is related to what our preoccupations are nowadays....

...but it is not mainly an academic discourse, and especially not the European issue. The European issue is very much alive now in Dutch newspapers. I also cooperated with ‘Europa Jaarboek’, the yearbook of Europe, with an interview, trying to link this historical issue with what is going on nowadays and my conclusion is that the European union will never become one union if we don’t have a cultural common ground. And that is the main thing we do not have, a cultural common ground, and what we should do is celebrate diversity within this European Union. We can never force people into one union if we don’t share this cultural common ground. Political, economic and financial politics will never bring people together within this European Union, and that is not what the European Union is for. To create one common culture, we should have
the opposite approach; we should celebrate the cultural diversity with all these different roots within this one European community. And if we don’t share one common European history, it will not succeed; it will only bring these national sentiments higher up.

S: If you try to impose a kind of general view on Europe or a general cultural path what probably happens is that national and regional identities will react to that. So it would be a Europe of regions.

LJ: Yes, look what happened in Spain with Catalans, Basques... it was a bit strange to watch actually, that within Spain suddenly you get these revolts of smaller communities wanting to keep their own identity while there is no real threat that they will lose this identity.

S: No, but again, it is time of crises now and that’s when this kind of minority groups feel they are threatened, and if on top of that you try to impose a generic code to cover all of them is when they feel that they are going to be culturally buried and they are fearing to lose their identity and their autonomy. If the EU wants to succeed it needs a common cultural identity and that’s probably why EU research agendas are focused on looking for commonness, and common roots, but that clashes completely with national agendas, because national agendas are looking actually at points of diversion from this EU theme.

LJ: My prognosis that the ARC council where they divide these starting grants and they plans grants, there will be a lot of research about Europe and European identity in the coming years, so we will go from national identity research to European identity research, and it also reflects our own preoccupations.

S: And that is imposed by the European Union or by national...

LJ: No, I think research will react to that, so my next project will be about European identity in the early modern times (laughs)... yes, it will, it’s not a joke, because it’s a logical reaction to what happens now and see what are the historical grounds of this European identity (laughs)

S: I’m looking forward to it... I know of a few projects that are trying to bring together people of different nationalities to study this kind of things. Do you know Margarita Diaz-Andreu? She studies 19th century Spanish use of antiquity, she is being doing things on national identity and nationalism, she is based in the UK, I think in Bristol, and she is planning to do a kind of cooperative project with people from different nationalities to look at more or less the same themes or topics. I also know that Nico Roymans, an archaeologist from Free University Amsterdam, wants to do the same but from an archaeological perspective, kind of trying to look for different national points of view, instead of looking for a European point of view that is bringing together different national points of view, comparative studies. I’m actually going to do something similar, there is an international conference in Roman archaeology in Spring next year and I’m chairing a session in which I have brought people from Scotland Ireland, Denmark, the Netherlands, Germany and England, trying to talk about the same topics, with diversity because you can’t be rigid, but that’s the idea, to see
different national points of view, because you are looking for diverse approaches to the same topic related to different national agendas or ways of looking at the past.

LJ: There has been a very nice exhibition in Germany, 1997, there is also a catalogue, ...

S: Mythen der Nationen ...

LJ: Yes, Mythen der Nationen, is a bit that approach

S: Yes, I find that quite interesting.

LJ: But if you know any colleagues or meet any colleagues who are working on actually these early modern national identity formations, I would be very interested in getting to know them, because here in the Netherlands I work a bit isolated... we have this big group but I haven’t met so many people doing this kind of research in Europe, not yet... and I would expect that there are other people working on this issue.

S: There surely are, I mean, I’m not an expert on that field...

LJ: So nationalism in the 19th century is not a problem, I know everywhere in Europe there are people working on it, but it’s pre-19th century that is (a problem).

S: I’m not quite sure but I think this professor I talked you about, Margarita, she is 19th century but I would have to check, although I’m not so sure she is not more related to antiquity myths.

LJ: Yes, I know.

S: But it would be drawn to early modern times, not only 19th century.

LJ: The thing is that I have been studying 19th century all the time before so this is for me also a new move into pre-modern. But it’s interesting to hear your... I’m very curious to see how you manage to bring together the knowledge without being able to read the primary sources.

S: Me too... (both laugh)... I’m basically doing more of a meta-analysis, so looking at how people are analysing, more than actually analysing things myself...

LJ: Ah! Yeah, ok...

S: So that’s why talking to people is so vital for me, it’s my data basically. The information I get from these interviews and discussions is what I use as my data.

LJ: Then you are nearly more of an anthropologist...

S: Yes, surely,...I’m also using archaeological data to back up what I’m saying with evidence, but it’s becoming more of a historiographical, anthropological study at this point, and it started as a mere archaeological look at interactions in antiquity, but it became this interdisciplinary thing now...
LJ: Interesting…

*S: I hope using this kind of data will be good enough for the PhD because I believe some people will criticize my work because of that, because of not being able to look at the books myself, but as I said earlier I think if you talk to the people who have written the books you are actually getting more insights into the ideas they ad when they wrote it and what are the implications of their work.

LJ: Well, if you need somebody to read something specific of what you have written you can always send me to see if there are corrections to make or suggestions...

*S: I will definitely accept that offer. Thanks!

LJ: Well I hope that it has been useful for you.

*S: It’s been amazingly useful, so thank you very much.

Other notes taken during interview:

The 19th century is the century of nations and nationalism. Pre-19th century nationalism or national identity is not paid much attention.

1648 Treaty of Munster

1713 Peace of Utrecht, Frisians

1720-1770 Frisians epic sagas

De Batavia van Hadrianus Junius: Holland is een eiland

Jan Frederik Helmers (1812), ‘De Hollandsche Natie’, presents same dichotomy between resistance and imperialism. Extracts of this poem I, 253-258 (Helmers 2009, 118) make clear allusion to the idea of unity against the French. Also mentioned and V, 208-213 (Helmers 2009, 230-1)

Prof. Willem Frijhoff

19/11/2004 – Interview, transcript and notes

Context:

Professor of Early Modern History at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Professor of History of Culture and mentalities in pre-industrial societies at Erasmus University Rotterdam. Director and chair of several projects and committees in the NWO (Dutch Organization for Scientific research) and the KNAW (Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences).

Since 2003, he chairs the thematic research program ‘Cultural Heritage and Cultural Dynamics’, of the Dutch National Research Organization (NWO, until 2013, sixteen research projects involving about 50 research positions), for which he drafted the initial program and supervised its elaboration. Does it has a national focus? Regional? EU?


Questions:

The importance of historical myths for the creation of national identities?

Can we talk of a pre19th century Dutch national identity?

Have you detected in History (as a discipline) as much interest on Batavians (and other ancient groups) as in Archaeology?

Symbols of that national identity (you look at that through writers)…Batavians, archaeology, ancestry, forefathers, etc. Have you come across many instances in which Batavians have shown up as symbols? And others like Frisians or Cananefates?

What about regional identities? How did these episodes affect different regions?

And does this intersect with European identity processes?

“Sons of our times” (what defines our times and how does it affects our interpretations?)

Impact of post-colonial perspectives

European-National-Regional agendas-perspectives-identities:

Role of Batavians/Batavian myth in national identity/discourse both academic and general (reasons and stages since 15th century)?
Different (political) uses
Why emphasis 1.5 years period?
What about the role of Frisians and/or Cananefates?

Does studying your own national past affect somehow your views?

Interview Transcript

S: There are a few issues/questions i have in mind...

WF: yes, ask your questions...

S: you are lately looking at memory and identity...

WF: yes, things like that...

S: and I’m very interested in the relationship between that memory that Dutch people have about their own past and the kind of discourses that we produce academically...

WF: well, i would say the memory of the Batavians does not exist anymore in the Netherlands anymore, it’s gone...

S: you mean in a public sense?

WF: the name... well, let me start in another way. Some years ago I was a chair of a committee or a national committee for the commemoration of the Batavian revolution...you know what it is the Batavian revolution, right?

S: Yes

WF: 1795, or some years earlier it started. And then we tried to make it interesting for companies to invest in it...there are some companies who still have the name Batavian company and some Batavian constructors society...but well, I’m not even sure it does refers to Batavian... they don’t know anyway...so it’s something that in the current memory i think has disappear. And there is a reason for that, because the Batavian revolution put an end to the Batavian period in fact, the new kingdom in 1813, 1815, we are commemorating this year, it didn’t want to do anything with the Batavians because the word Batavian was linked to the revolution. I think that is the first discourse that there is, the end of the discourse…and then the first point, although you know that, is that the Batavians came up in the late 15th-early 16th century is that the humanists are thinking about it, including Erasmus, much more his friends... and then it was picked up in fact as the identity factor of the new republic, that’s the fact, because they look for a word, I would say, an ethnic specialty that would differentiate them from the southern Netherlands, this was not Batavia, the Netherlands is north of the Rhine, not south of the Rhine,...so that was when Grotius came with Batavians and thins like that that felt on a field that was already ready to be picked up,...and then another thing happened, this I suppose you know that too... the early Batavians were
situated in Gelderland, in the east of the Netherlands, and then Holland as the first province took it over and picked up the Batavian quality as being the heirs of the ancient peoples within the old republic with the exception that was not the discourse of Frisia. The Frisians always “we are no Batavians”. And then I have another small fact... I’m a historian of the universities and I started in 1984 a Dutch association for Dutch universities history, and our president Prof [???]... he is a law historian, he is dead now but he was a very famous law historian, he gave it the name Batavia Academica, and when he did that, the next day there came quite a lot of messages from Frisians saying: “we are no Batavians”. The general discourse is that there are two countries, the one that is the Dutch Batavian country, the other that is the OLDER Frisian country, and that’s the point, that’s the older Frisian country with its own system because Frisia had a legal system before the old provinces set it, the Lex Frisorum, which is one of the oldest text that exists in these countries, and Frisians have always been very proud of their antiquity, their identity as a particular province with a particular legal system, etc. But there is a discussion about what is Frisia: it is the province of Friesland, which would carry also Groningen. Groningen originally is Frisia, is part of Frisia, but at certain point they didn’t want to be assimilated with Frisia and declared themselves people of Groningen, seceded from the Frisian idea... I’m not sure they became Batavians, but that’s something different.

S: So there is also a kind of regional identity within academia...

WF: Yes, it is a small country, but the Netherlands, it always struck me, I’ve lived long time in France, 6 years in France, so I know the French situation very well... it always struck me that the small provinces of the Netherlands, not very big, 50 kilometres, have very strong identities... it is changing right now, of course, because the kind of globalizing movement, not only internationally but also nationally, but there is still a tendency to conform to the traditional identity of the provinces. I am myself from a small town, Zutphen, which originally is a medieval town, but they have discovered Roman things by now also... not really a city but there was a habitation. I have this (points out a dossier) on my desk because the major of the town started some weeks ago a huge campaign to identify the identity of the town into develop initiatives for immigrant in the town to conform to the traditional image of the town... and things like that... I think that’s very typical for the Netherlands in this moment; they try to maintain a certain regional identity that may be a chiefs of the region? but there is something like that. But the Batavians do not have a strong place on that I’m afraid. What happens is that every now and then they discover something, a ship, a [7:25] and again the Batavian question is on the front... but for example when two years ago we made a historical atlas of this town, it’s a very nice volume, and I put the picture in it of [7:30], a picture on which the town is assimilated to a place called Navalia, which is the Netherlands of Suetonius or something like that, and I put it in it in order to show that there was a link between the medieval town and the ancient town in the spirit of the people of that time... well, nobody reacted. It’s not playing a role in this moment.

S: It’s more of an academic issue...
WF: Yes, it is an academic issue. I think in the 17th century which was the high day of the Batavian identity, and perhaps the Batavian revolution too, that was much more political. But in the 17th century there was quite an idea, you have quite a lot of writings in Latin speaking of the Batavian qualities of the Golden Age... then it was much more an idea that people could relate to, and the whole Batavian pictorial things in the ancient town hall of Amsterdam, have you seen it?

S: I’m going tomorrow; I want to meet the organizers of the exhibition that they organized there. They are busy so they cannot meet me, but I will go anyway.

WF: It will be very interesting for you to take photos, because really, that is the Batavian ideology as the municipal burgomaster said would wanted to expand, particularly because for them the Batavians were the democracy of the time, and they justified a non-imperial government. That’s the point. The idea of Civilis with the people around him, it’s exposing the sovereignty of the people, that is the ID.

S: But that’s kind of curious also, because in that peak of democracy feeling they also use Batavians or the name Batavia for the colonial enterprise...

WF: Yes, yes, yes, yes...

S: ...which is a completely different use...

WF: yes, yes, yes... now that starts with the Dutch imperialism. Now, well, yes... I do not quite know well why it was called Batavia, because it was Jan Peterson [9:55], I think, that gave the name Batavia to that place which was formerly called Jakatra, and when it was founded didn’t have the name Batavia in the first years I think, if I remember well. But the idea was of course that Batavia was the equivalent of the Republic, whereas other places, like in Brazil, which had been conquered in 1625, they called Nova Hollandia, not Batavia, therefore that’s much more confined to the province of Holland, because in that moment Holland was only the province, it was not a country. Batavia was much more the idea that is the old Dutch republic who takes that place, and the East India Company was a company of the Old Republic, it was not a company of the province of Holland, although most of the money came from Holland, but not all, there were participants of companies that came from Drenthe, Nijmegen, etc. I think that’s much more the Batavians seen as the equivalent of the Dutch republic.

S: Because that’s one of the aspects that I’m looking at the different lives of the Batavian myth. You have the 16th century use because of the struggle against the Spaniards...

WF: Yes

S: ... then you have this 17th century colonial use which is completely different...

WF: Yes

S: ...then you have the Batavian revolution which is assimilated to something completely different.
WF: Yes, I think that’s completely different... Batavian revolution, just like the French revolution, went back to Roman models. So for them Batavia is not the 17th century Batavia, but I think is Roman Batavia.

S: It’s the original one...

WF: That’s correct. And they try to install a government in that sense, but well, in the 17th century is more complicated because, I’m not sure anyone makes the whole inventory of all the Batavian occurrences in the Netherlands since [12:09]. There is quite a lot if you look the [12:15]. It was something more frequent than only in the city hall. The city hall is part of it but it was a more general idea. If you want the equivalent the Latin of the ancient equivalent it is Batavian. But is the Republic. It was always the Republic, it was never seen as an imperial thing. And the Batavia of the colonial period... of course it was an imperial city, an imperial structure but it was not seen as such.

S: Yes, it was an example that my supervisor at Leicester told me once, that for them it was not contradictory, it was perfectly normal like for the founding fathers of the United States...

WF: Yes.

S: ...they are all about liberty and independence but they promote slavery

WF: Yes! Exactly, that was not an issue. Anyway the Dutch in the East Indies didn’t really see the people, you know, one striking example is that the Dutch only recently have discovered that Indonesians most of them are Muslims, nobody knew that in the Netherlands! They didn’t see it. It’s the biggest Muslim country in the world.

S: And they just knew because they started coming back?

WF: They thought they were barbarians... [14:00]... they didn’t see it, so it’s really an imperialism. And then I was, not any more, a chair of the Foundation Daendels. I don’t know if you know the name Dundles.

S: mmm...

WF: No, I suppose not. Daendels (Herman Willem Daendels) was the Governor-General of the East Indies after the revolution (1808–1811). And he was really an imperial ruler; he wanted to be the boss of everything. Because he was one of the makers of the Batavian revolution in Gelderland, he incorporated much more that spirit of Batavia as a Roman imperial foundation or something like that, but that’s rather late, and it’s not... and then, like many people in the revolutionary period, he changed his allegiance several times... most of them started as revolutionaries and ended up as conservatives.

S: It’s striking what you are telling me about the... [15:00 someone nocks on the door and conversation between them starts in Dutch; unrelated to interview] ...that there is no public
interest, especially lately, but there is actually a huge research focus on Batavians, especially in archaeology but also through exhibitions in museums. So how is that possible?

WF: I think it’s something really historical for the people, if you see it. For example, at Nijmegen they have the exhibitions well known. We know that there are Batavians, but I’m not sure that people make the link between ancient Nijmegen and present day population. The Batavians are gone as we know. It remains an enigma, I think. As far as I’m informed we don’t really know what came off the Batavians, if they remained there, if they integrated the new people coming there or not. The problem is that also the country, well you know how it is, it’s much water and not and changes all the time (laughs). I’m not sure, I cannot speak for people, but as far as I see it, I hear people speaking about exhibitions and things they see... I have the impression that the Batavians are something from a very distant past, not really linked with their present history. Anyway, Dutch people do not have very much developed historical sense of history in my opinion. Much less than the French or the Germans. The Germans have much better integrated their history into their identity. Here Dutch people live very much in the present, and that’s the force of the Dutch, because they had a thoroughly complicated history for the country, not really difficulties in all senses, but it changes all the time, and it forces to live in the present, and the past... for example, the 17th century, the Golden Age, beautiful, but the link between the Golden Age and the 20th century is very small. There is no sense of it’s going on, and on, and on... it’s something very beautiful but in the distant past. That is more or less the idea.

S: Yeah, maybe

WF: Well, that’s me perhaps, but I think...

S: It strikes me as a contradiction, there is no public interest but there is loads of academic interest. Why is there so much academic interest when there are no people who are actually demanding that?

WF: There is a certain demand of the people for beautiful historical things and the Batavians in certain respect are something spectacular because we don’t have very much of that time. Small things: A ship, a gem... there is no beautiful town [outlight in the dirts? 18:30]...nothing like that, only Nijmegen but that’s not distant. I think for the Dutch it remembers them of something beautiful in the past but I’m not sure that they think of it as something of their own and something of their country, but only something of their own, I’m not sure, I’m not sure... I never saw somebody proclaiming that they decent from the Batavians. But the academic interest is big because that’s the prehistory... I’m very much interested in centuries where no one is interested in (laughs)... the 18th for example... in the Dutch history the 18th century is something that nobody studies, because is after the Golden Age and then is only decline, you know... decline for me is interesting and I’m interested in the Batavian revolution because is a way of going beyond the decline within the ideology of the ancient Romans, but I’m not sure that Dutch people... historians and archaeologist yes... and it’s the only thing you can find in Dutch history... we virtually have nothing before,
because it was water. And there are some archaeologists that work in earlier periods but most of them are for the Roman period or for other countries, but when it’s in the Netherlands is the Batavian period and then you have in Drenthe, in Groningen, you have some older things; the Hunebedden, you heard speak about that? The Hunebedden is of Dolmens, etc. in Drenthe. Because one thing you have to know, we had some years ago a big national discussion about Dutch history and the government commanded a canon, as they called. The first item of the canon are the Dolmens of Drenthe, so that’s the point people have in the head, they are spectacular, big stones,... but that’s rather peculiar because in Holland the dunes change all the time. Where the dunes are now, were not in Roman times. The relics of the roman fortification... the Valkenburg, near Leiden, was the discovery in the 17th century, you know perhaps the picture... near Leiden in the 17th century when the sea withdraw in certain moment rather low they discovered that famous Roman military place...

S: It’s that famous inscription (referring to Fratri Romani inscription)

WF: Yes. Now, that was a discovery and they “Oh! The Batavians!” and “the romans and Batavians, there you have them”. That was a marking point for the exactness of the ideas we have about them. But that’s rather unique.

WF: And then you have the other ones, Domburg, Nehalennia, the cult of Nehalennia, you know that? Domburg, in Zeeland, there is on the island of Walcheren, the main island, a small town called Domburg, and they found there at the start of the 17th century quite a lot of images of statues of deities called Nehalennia, that was earlier before the Batavians but at the same time in fact. And that were the two big discoveries that guided the perception of that time, that’s finished by now. I’m not sure that it has more than a passing place in the historical memories of the country. I think for most people the historical memories don’t start with the Romans, although many places try to take the Romans as starting point, but it starts really with the country falling into the middle ages, the Christianization by the English missionaries and things like that, that I think is for most people the starting point. Because from that point onwards there is continuity. There is no continuity before 700s.

S: So that may be why Frisians have that kind of stronger link with the original Frisians, it’s more of a medieval idea.

WF: Yes, I think that’s it, yes. With Frisians you don’t have Roman relics, or very few anyway, because it was also a province that has been well subject to storms. It were the monasteries which fixed the soil and to make it a stronger province with the dykes, etc. The whole dyke building is something that is from after the Romans and after the Batavians... so no, in the idea of the country dykes are crucial, that’s what Holland makes, dykes, and in reality that’s the point. So history starts when there is something fixed, a fixed occupation of soil, etc. And Batavians didn’t leave the idea of a fixed occupation of the soil, they went somewhere, that’s all...but what did they do? Question
mark? Well, I’m telling you things I can’t always prove but that’s the idea I have when speaking of those things.

S: No, but that’s precisely what I’m looking at, what are people thinking when they are researching their own past, and that kind of idea that you have in your mind, even if you cannot prove them, is the kind of thing that biases your discourse.

WF: Yes, that’s a point, yes, yes. What I didn’t do but it would be possible... for example, we have all our libraries, the older books before 1800s are now digitalized. So you can put the word ‘Batav*’ sequence in the machine and everything that refers to the Batavians would come out immediately. You can try it.

S: Here?

WF: On the internet, you have the site of the Royal library, in The Hague. And, for example, they have digitalized all the pamphlets, and there are 20,000 pamphlets. You can try to ask the words ‘Bata’, it’s enough, and you can see what comes out. You can see the years in which it’s an interesting word for a printer. And then another thing comes to my mind: in the 18th century, perhaps earlier already, Batavia becomes something, I would say,... I’m thinking of the poem ‘Batavische Arcadia’ (1657), Arcadia connected with Batavia, Batavia is something friendly, something natural, that’s 18th century I think (no?). It takes another sense, it’s not the conquering sense of the early 17th century, but more Batavia that’s the old country, the country of our ancestors, the country of... I think it would come out if you look at the title of poems or something like that... you can try to interrogate.

S: I’ll have a look.

WF: I don’t think we can enter here, because we are going to a new system. Are you in a hurry?

S: No, no.

WF: I’ll try then.

S: I have as much time as you want to give me.

(Laughs) (Starts checking the web) (Mumbles words in Dutch)

WF: Don’t know if it works, we’ll see. Aha! 1988 results, now it starts with 1578...Cornelius Aurelius 1586 Batavia Junius and then quite a lot, Verszius, Scriverius, all the people...1624 Batvische ??? voila!...(mentions a list on the computer) [29:00]. Horacio, Atenis Batavorum habita, then it means only Leyden, that’s another name for Leyden.

S: For Leyden?
WF: Yes, they call themselves Atenea Batavorum. Opidus Batavorum is Nijmegen... Smetsius is the famous treaty... Batavis arcadia, it starts in 1657, that’s when the poems???

S: I’ll have a look, because I know most of them but there are, for instance this Arcadia reference...

WF: The Short Title Catalogue Netherlands, STCN... KB.nl, and then STCN, but you cannot do it at home, you need to go into the site of the KB.nl, so in the university it works but at home you need to be a member of the KB, if you are not you have to do it at the university.

S: I am at the Free University Amsterdam, so I hope...

WF: Oh yes, no problem. That gives you an idea of the occurrences of the word Batavia and what it means.

S: I’m quite familiar with most of those words, especially 16th-17th century but...

S: The other thing that strikes me when i look at that kind of material is that there is lots of references to Batavians, which is one of the original tribes, but the other original tribes, such as Cananefates or Frisians they are not so much put into play in terms of use.

WF: No, no... the other problem, and you must know that, is that the Batavians change from the East to the West. There was always a kind of inner competence between the Holland people and the Gelderland people. The Gelderland people saying that they are the true Batavians, from Nijmegen. That’s the real Batavian, Arnhem also is a Roman foundation, Arenacum. There was always a kind of struggle and in the literature of the 17th century that’s very present. Sometimes is subjacent to the literature, but often it is there. Because the Gelderland people thought that the Holland people had taken their history from them.

S: Appropriation of...

WF: Appropriation yes. Appropriation of their own history. And there is something true in all that.

S: And the other thing is... most historians talk about national identities only from the late 18th or early 19th century but I think in that case it could be taken a bit further back, to the 16th century.

WF: Yes, that’s a difficult point. It much depends on what you call national. I think... I’m from the East and I’m very much involved in the history of Gelderland but what I see is that as early as the 2nd part of the 17th century they start to think global, for the old country, so perhaps not yet national as something that is identical everywhere, but the idea that the country is a whole is already there in the 17th century. [33:30] etc, etc. That’s the institutions of the Republic respect the provincial identities but at the
same time all the institutions work in the same way, so it depends on how you want to look at it. I’m not sure it starts only in the 18th century, I think it’s earlier.

*S: I think for the Netherlands is definitely earlier, maybe not for other ones.

WF: The thing is there are other reasons to think it’s earlier because in the middle ages already there was a sense of the lower countries, perhaps with the southern parts together, but not quite at all. It’s the idea of the Bishopric of Utrecht that covers almost the whole region that later was the Netherlands, it was a reality. So there are a lot of factors that favours a sense of community for the whole North. And then, the success of the Batavians in the late 16th-early 17th century has to do with the idea that it was already a common country, there is common interest in the world... and a common origin, perhaps not yet, but a common faith in religious matter and things like that. And then Batavians give a common origin in fact, that’s the point I think.

WF: Now, the Cananefates doesn’t do that... for example ??? [35:02] the original people of the antiquity are remembered among the inteligencia, and you see it, and that’s an interesting point, in the way they matriculate that university. for example, people from Arnhem, Gelderland, one of the four capitals of the Gelderland. [35:29] virtually almost say??? Arenacum Sicamber... out of Sicambrian... so you have that extension that gives that sense of... antiquity... because the Batavus is always someone from the province of Holland. A man from Gelderland never will call himself Batavus if his father or mother is not from Holland, and then he will be a Sicamber or something like that,... my home towm Zutphen, called itself Usi popolis?? [36:00], they thought it was founded by the Greeks (laughs)... so when they put their name in the ‘matricula’ it was either Zutphania Galbus, as the province, or Zutphania Usipetru [36:15]... that was the consciousness of being descendant of a particular tribe.

*S: But that’s current?

WF: Not any more. That’s 17-18th century and it disappears in the Batavian revolution. Then all the Roman references disappear. It’s really a new country that starts in 1830-1850, I think...it’s a monarchy to start with...well the monarchy started with the Napoleonic king but it was short-lived... and it’s much more a unified country in 1830-1850 than before... the revolutionary period has taken away the idea that it was a confederation, and Batavians are the victim of that because they are the embodiment of the idea of confederation, and I think that’s one of the point.

*S: I’ve been also reading, i cannot remember right now the name of the author (Beyen 2009 - Rise of the tribal trinity), but it was an article about things to do with ancient people, and after the, let’s say, mid-19th century onwards is more about, or especially until the mid-20th century, it’s all about Frisians, Saxons and Franks, more than the Batavians.

WF: Yes, yes, yes... but that’s later. Those are the tribes that came after the Batavians. Yes, it’s exactly what i learnt at school, the classical trilogy: the Franks, the Frisians and the Saxons, and I am a Saxon, my father was a Frank, my mother a Saxon, that’s what we though, really (laughs)... that’s not true at all because if you are a historian you
know that there is no country where people move so much times and emigrated, it’s really an immigration country, my own family comes from Germany, but it’s not Frank at all (laughs)... but they thought they were Franks.

*S: It was a good thought to have...

WF: Yes... but that’s I told you that the historical consciousness of the Dutch doesn’t go beyond 1700s, the time of Saints Willibrord and Boniface, the first missionaries, because that’s the time when Frisians, Franks and Saxons were rediscovered finally. They were supposed to have taken possession of the country, that’s the idea. And then the Batavians are something before without a strong link. It may well be that the work of the archaeologists is very important at this point because it has put the Batavians back in the historical agenda, I think that’s the case.

*S: That’s what I think, but the other thing I’m curious about is the motivation for that.

WF: Yeah.

*S: Is there like a national motivation, like a political motivation behind that... I know you have been involved with the National Agenda (NoAA)...

WF: yes

*S: ... and I know it’s divided in themes and regions...

WF: yes, you have 24 chapters there...

*S: so is there any kind of impulse behind that kind of research or is just simple personal interest from people who are running those research projects...?

WF: It’s research interest because we like something well organized, systematically, I don’t know, that’s the Netherlands... so the idea is that there shouldn’t be a period without investigation, that’s the first point...and then Batavians, well... of course it has been a strong item in archaeology ever since Van Giffen and archaeologist from one century ago... that’s not a reason, but a peculiarity of Dutch archaeology, it is a specialty, and I’m not sure there something national behind, no. Well, I never heard. It is the idea that there should be something that goes without interruption from the start until now... so, in that point the Batavians are an element of the chain, and a strong element because of course we have always reminiscences of the Batavians from former... from histories, but also because archaeology really has done a lot of work and still is working more and more in that sense, I would say. They favour that period, for them is a start period. Also because Nijmegen, which has also been one of the star sites, but also the other one, the Temple van Empel, for example, things like that... big, not really big, but important research places.

*S: And then, just a couple more of things that I have in mind... the controversy between regional, national and European identities and how that operates between the academic discourse and the historical discourse in terms of common past. Because, as you were
WF: Well yes, the Dutch when 30-40 years ago we were in the forefront of national identity thinking... (corrects himself) of European identity thinking, and that has diminished a bit by now, it’s back to the Netherlands and sometimes even back to the provinces. Because in the Netherlands, outside the province of Holland, the province of Holland is assimilated to the government, and there is a very strong anti-government sentiment arising in the country, everywhere. I’m not sure that it will affect the identity feeling within the country, but... the Dutch, I think, have always and still think that they are a bit of the centre of Europe, they find themselves very European, and even if they are in this moment a certain sense arising against Brussels, against the community, the idea that we are Europeans is very strong... and that’s not contrary to another movement that is very strong to, that you can call the Americanization of the Dutch country, because the Dutch go very far in the taking of American custom, language, rituals, this University is Americanization very strong-based... but that’s not different because we are in between, the Dutch are a bit the “tred d’Union” between America and Europe, but we are Europe, that’s the point, I think in the Dutch mind there is no opposition between Dutch identity and European identity, I don’t think so.

S: They are kind of linked.

WF: There is a strong link; we are the heart of Europe, that’s the point. So Europe is perhaps more, but it is the Netherlands too, and it is not our sight. I’m sure that the Dutch will never take the initiative to leave the European Union, even if there is no party that it’s against, no, no. They are very critical with the European Union, but that is not contrary to the European sense of identity. But, well, you never know what happens in the future (laughs). Say regional identities in the Netherlands do exists but they are much more identities you adopt when you go to another place in the Netherlands, it’s not... I think Dutch people are still very much general Dutch, and then if you go to Gelderland or to Frisia you adopt your new fatherland (laughs), and you take some of the peculiarities, but it’s not something... you are not losing your Dutch identity in favour of your regional identity, as for example in France happens. In France you have those regions in the East, in the South and the West where they do not feel themselves French at all. They are Languedoc, Britain, etc. And they act in consequence as it never happens in the Netherlands. It’s very much an integrated country, and that has to do with the fact that there is virtually no family in the Netherlands that lives in one province alone, they have always members in the other provinces, they exchange provinces several times, even in the country side, so no.

S: In the conference proceedings you edited with Cruz, about myth and history,...

WF: Yes
S: ...you were talking in the introduction, if I’m not mistaken, about the importance of historical myths for the formation or formulation of national identity.

WF: yes

S: And that’s something that actually has guided me to look for those historical myths...

WF: Yes, for the Netherlands?

S: Yes. Because the main aim of my research is to know what is behind the archaeologists’ minds...

WF: yes, and this is very interesting question, I know, i know, it’s good that you ask the question (laughs). It’s difficult to answer (laughs).

S: I know. So, in terms of historical myths, apart from Batavians, and all this Golden Age themes, do you think there are no historical myths in the later 19th century-20th century?

WF: We have small stories about things that happened, but national myths? Well, you could call the Orange family a national myth, which I think is a national myth, because people are convinced in this country that the royal family reigned during centuries, they all think so. Virtually nobody knows that we were a Republic before, that’s something that is long-forgotten actually, so there is the idea that William of Orange, the father of the fatherland, as he is called, made the country and that ever since, everything that’s good comes from the Orange family. That’s certainly a national myth.

S: There is a link between William and Civilis...

WF: …and the revolt... yes... of course, there is a strong link, I think William of Orange was a very clever man and he managed in a very difficult period to safeguard something of a country that was not really predestined to be a unity but still was on the way of being unified, you know, by Charles V, his employer at first, since 1543 when he had conquered the last province, Gelderland was conquered in 1543, then he founded the ring, the circle of Burgundy and we were taken off from Germany. Now there was a unity being formed and William already had worked with that idea, he was himself a German, or whatever was a German at that time, and he was a very good statesman. We never know what he thought, he had been catholic, protestant, noble, in favour and against the emperor.... well, it doesn’t matter, he was a very good statesman, and he has been recognised virtually immediately as an important founder of the Republic. He has been recognised as such and venerated as such [note to self: like the founding fathers in USA]. And then the other, his sons, his two sons, first Morris and then the other one Frederik Henry, were very clever generals and they worked a lot, and they did a very good work to unify the country, and the other ones after them have benefited from them. But we have long period without Stadtholder, without the Oranges, so there is really no unity from the beginning to the end, and in 1813-15, when the son of the last Stadtholder came back, I think it’s in November, in two or three days we will remember him at the end of November, it’s the bi-centenary this
year,... and he had not put feet in the Netherlands for 20 years, he didn’t even know what he had to expect, because in fact he had forfeited his monarchy by accepting a Dukedom in Germany from Napoleon... that’s very strange, nobody never told it here because the Orange are sacrosanct, you cannot touch them. It can even be dangerous. Yes, you cannot discuss that freely and the Royal family doesn’t give it leeway for free discussion, you cannot in an official meeting put that on the table... for example, I have a very clear example, I was on the board of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Science some years ago, and the Royal Academy has been founded by the King of Holland, Ludwig Louis Napoleon, not by the Oranges, and when in 2008 we had the bicentenary the Queen came, I had the speech to make and it was formally forbidden for me to refer to the foundation by Louis Bonaparte.

S: That’s err... interesting

WF: yes, that’s interesting (smiles). I could remember the foundation but not by the king of Holland. There is no other king of Holland than the Orange. I think that’s the national myth by excellence and that’s a long time, because it already worked in 17th century, you know the Orange’s story is a long story,... other national myth, I don’t know. I think that’s quite a lot (laughs).

WF: In a certain moment you had a Spanish researcher, Yolanda Rodriguez something, she wrote a dissertation some years ago on the ‘Leyenda Negra’ anti-Spain... well, that also points that the Dutch didn’t want to know that they had their own black legend against the Spanish (laughs), and that’s true, that’s true... that is a story that is very interesting from the historical point of view, because in the primary schools the primas?? from which the children learn to learn were small booklets and the most popular booklet was called the Spanish tyranny, and when the French in 1672 conquered the country it was replaced by an all new prima?? [53:14] the ‘French Tyranny’. So you have the two archenemies in the booklet and during almost a century the children learnt something against the Spanish, and that’s the black legend, Spanish massacring Americans and things like that. But it’s part of the old independence myth, was overall arranged on the one side in the Spanish, on the other Black... that’s the same story, but normally the Dutch present they don’t even remember or even think that the Spanish are in the national anthem... you know the first verse is anti-Spanish... nobody knows what it means.

S: There are claims that the national anthem is 16th century.

WF: Yes

S: So, if there is a national anthem coming from the 16th century, there is a nation, and if there is a nation there is a national identity.

WF: Yes, yes, yes. Because the nation has been, and that is the difference with other nations... the nation has been found during a war. That’s not the case of the French, or of the Germans, that their nations have come from occupations, etc. But our nation has taken shape in a war, so there was a whole series of songs sang quite a lot of times
every day about the war, war experiences and things like that. So our national anthem is a war song, it was not yet national in the 16th century, it was made in the 16th century, but I’m sure it was sang by virtually all the country. There is a book on that Louis (Prof. Louis P. Grijp)... what is his name? He works in the Meertens Institute, he is a musicologist, he wrote a book on the national anthem and I contributed something on the French national anthem because it’s very different but there were several national anthems discussed and in it he wrote a part on the Dutch national anthem. You see, it’s something that is a war song, and it worked that way, as something uniting the people against the enemy, but you must know that the war ended only in 1648 and whereas the province of Holland was in peace as early as 1580-5 at last, in the East of the Netherlands the last town taken, was taken in 1636 only, more than 50 years later, so on the eastern fringes the war was permanent, that worked that way. But the national anthem is very national, is one of the things that all Dutch people agree with, the Frisians have their own anthem but they sing the national anthem, too (laughs). But see, they have their own language, you know, not spoken by all the Frisians, but part of the Frisians. That’s the point yes.

S: One of the things that is a current discussion in archaeology, especially in the UK it’s about the theoretical frameworks they have in order to look at evidence, and they are talking a lot about post colonialism and things like that... do you think that’s some kind of framework that Dutch historians or archaeologists are actually using or are they moving on to a more globalized view?

WF: For the post-colonialism and... I’m not quite sure... anyway the Dutch are not ready with their colonies, they still are working on it, and every year a new perspective is opening on the difficulty of the Dutch to master their own history on that sense. I think that the globalizing perspective is much more fruitful. You have quite a long of historians here, for example Jan L. van Sander who is an economic historian; a social-economic historian, Martin Parker, who work very much in that perspective, much in the globalizing history, and then in most universities you have a global studies department. So I think that’s more the idea, yes.

S: So there is no so much interest in looking at a post-colonial way in opposition to the colonial past?

WF: There is perhaps an interest but they don’t realize quite well what it implies for their own historical thinking, that’s the point I think... I think Dutch history is still rather, I wouldn’t say old-fashioned, but it’s traditional history, but then in another setting, the one in a more global setting. Of course Dutch history is perfect for a global setting, because we are everywhere, so you can easily to expand your theme to things like that. The other one that occupies this bureau (office) is the historian, he is specialist of African slavery, and slavery is very popular among Dutch historians because, of course, we have slavery, but that’s the point (laughs). And the discussion these days on slavery is on St. Nicholas, did you hear about that? We have on the 6th of December we have St. Nicholas children feast. Well, there is quite a discussion in the country at this moment because ever since the 19th century, not
before, he has a kind of a minister who is black, pit black. Since this year, there is a discussion because opponents say that is a symbol of slavery. I think that’s not true, but it doesn’t matter, it is the post-colonial point, it’s coming up, but it’s not yet settled.

S: So it’s still on the making...

WF: Yes, it’s still on the making, I think, yes.

S: And Globalization is something that is more established,...

WF: Yes, I think, yes.

S: ...it’s also may be part of the identity, like, you know, as you said, Dutch are everywhere, so it’s easier for people to engage with globalization.

WF: One of the things I have worked on is the early history of New York, because it was Dutch. And that’s a bit of the, we have a bit of the same story there,... in the early decades of the 17th century Dutch had black people at home but not yet as slaves, because slavery came at the Dutch in the 1670, when they conquered part of Africa, before it was more or less ‘free labourers’ coming from another country, but now in new York they want absolutely that they were slaved from the very beginning. And for Dutch people that’s difficult because we never think in those terms, so it’s the post-colonials impose another way of thinking on the historians of early New York who don’t want it, they want other kind of vision, a more globalizing vision, because there were blacks everywhere, black in Brazil, black etc. Sometimes there were children of slaves, but not always there was quite a kind of traffic between the continents. That’s a very difficult question to tackle now. If you do it in the papers immediately you are a racist and things like that. It can be quite dangerous.

S: You got involved in this American-Dutch group of investigation in New York

WF: I know quite a lot yes, and I’m working on the very early, the first Dutch going there, before the West India Company. The West India company mastered that part of America, what they called New Netherlands, that means New York, Connecticut, part of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, that was approximately new Netherlands, and in 1623 the West India Company took over that country, but before, two decades before, after the discovery of the island of Manhattan by Henry Hudson, there were kind of freemen going there. And I’m working on a family like that because one of the members was the very first European to make peace treaties with the Onondaga, which was one of the tribes there, and it was in 1613, exactly four centuries ago, and they remember it. The Indians remember that, there was an oral memory of that. And the oral memory has been written down much later, but it was an oral memory. But that was before the West India Company imposed the system and also the slavery and things like that. But Indians were virtually never slaves.

S: The same way that the East India Company used Batavians or that kind of terminology for their colonial settings... is there something like that in the West?
WF: No, no.

S: I’ve seen that there is a couple of settlements nowadays called Batavia...

WF: Yes, but no, in the West it was New Amsterdam, and New Amstel... no, no, there is nothing like that, there is no single reference... it was much more the names of the Old World put into the New down with the word ‘New’ before, New Amersfoort, New Utrecht... not an ideology of ‘we remake the history in the Batavian’ sense, that doesn’t exist here.

S: So that’s much more for the East?

WF: Yes, that’s more for the Eastern Company, yes. I don’t know who did that exactly in the East India Company, who put the name on that town, I don’t know. For that you should go back to the originals and that’s a lot of work. I’m not even sure you can find it, because that’s something that comes back as a message from Batavia saying ‘we have founded a town called Batavia, stop’. Who gave it the name? Nobody knows. That’s the way it worked, I think.

S: I don’t think I have much more to add, to be honest. If you want to add something...

WF: No, I would be very interested by keeping contact and reading what you are going to do. If you want me to read a chapter that’s always possible, you have my mail address... yes, that would be interesting, yes. Because you never know what... and if you have a lot of questions you can ask them by mail.

S: I came here 2 years ago to talk to a few archaeologists, I was making some interviews, and I realized that the questions I was making two years ago are completely different to the questions I am making now, merely because the evolution of the thesis has made me think about other things, and that’s why I’m trying to talk now to more historians. But yes, I’m definitely happy to send you material and see if you have point to make which you probably will.

WF: Yes, if you give me your text when you have a draft it’s alright,... and another question, who did you see, other historians did you see.

S: Lotte Jensen...

WF: Ah yes, Lotte Jensen, of course.

S: I saw her three days ago... that was quite an interesting point too because she is actually looking at pre-19th century national ideas. So far no one else but I tried to talk to the organizers of this exhibition in the Royal Palace...

WF: Yes...

S: ...but they couldn’t meet. They told me that I could send them questions by e-mail but they wouldn’t have the time. Also, Louise Swinkels, who is the organizer of the Batavian exhibition.
WF: Yes, ‘oui, oui, oui’ he is the Batavian exposition, yes.

S: And then I’m talking to a lot of archaeologists who obviously have a lot of knowledge on the historical Batavians. Carol van Driel-Murray, Nico Roymans,...

WF: Yes, there could be some art historians, perhaps but most of them are living in other countries (laughs), that’s the problem.

S: It’s OK. I think I have a clear idea of the main things... because the main point of the thesis is not about the historical Batavians, it’s more about the archaeology and the...modern academia, and how they are looking at them. But in order to do that I need to go to the historical background, because otherwise it wouldn’t be accurate.

WF: Yes, alright, well, if you send me your draft, in a certain number of months, I suppose, I have a look at what you quote, perhaps there is something easily accessible in English or something that you are missing, it’s always possible.

S: There is so much published that it is difficult to...

WF: Well there is much more in Dutch on national identity, that’s the problem.

S: Yes, my hope is to have the draft of the chapter on the Netherlands by early January (2014)...

WF: Alright. Waiting for it.

S: So I can send you that and then get some ideas.

WF: Ok, I give my comments, don’t worry.

S: That’s great!

WF: Well, good luck.

S: Thank you very much for your help

........ [RECORDING 2] ........

WF: ...the divide between national archaeology and general, or Italian, or Greek or Roman, etc.

Before, i would say 30 years, there was not much more than the Batavians, and nowadays there is much on the Middle Ages, quite a lot of work in medieval towns and things like that... but before it was only that. I would say is quite normal (laughs)... [unrecognisable speech 0:25]

S: But it would be also a good thing to know if that is the only reason why...
WF: yes, yes, yes, I know, but you should... well in their papers... I read some of the chapters on the general statement you referred to in the beginning. I think that was quite good, the survey they did of the archaeological situation of the Netherlands.

Other notes taken during interview:

In the 17th century registration books of Universities show how students were registered in terms of origin making reference to the ancient people of their region. E.g. Leiden students will be put down as “Athenie Batavorum” (link with the Troyans, etc) or from Nijmegen they would be called “Populus Batavorum”.

1657 Batavische Arcadia (poems section of the Royal Library in Den Hague). Check Batav* in the digitalized catalogue of the Royal library in Den Hague (Nationale Bibliotheke - KB). www.kb.nl. Look the STCN catalogue (Short Title Catalogue Netherlands)

Local uses of roman/Batavian past is clear at his home place Zutphen


http://www.ijpelaan.nl/Archief/Kennemerland/Cann-Mythologisch.html
Dr Heleen Van Londen

20/11/2013 – Interview, transcripts and notes

Context:

Director AAC (Amsterdam Archaeological Centre)/Projectenbureau, unit for contract archaeology, University of Amsterdam. Assistant professor at the Amsterdam Archaeological Centre. Director of Van Londen archeologie.

Research on Forum Hadraini (Cananefates): New research suggests it is feasible that in the second and third century AD, the inhabitants of Forum Hadriani, the Civitas capital of the Cananefates, consumed food derived from the direct vicinity of the city. Although little is actually known about the local agrarian economy, we do have the building blocks. First evidence was given by the excavations of the Harnaschpolder that were carried out at the start of this century. However, by far the most promising and complete information was collected between 1991 and 1999 during large scale excavations in Midden-Delfland, a regional study on the Roman landscape.


Research on archaeological heritage both Dutch and European (closely worked with Tom Bloemers on the topic of heritage management): interaction and integration of the results of contract archaeology and the more traditionally funded academic research on the topics of landscape archaeology and heritage; commercial archaeology (she has a private company); She participated on the writing of the National Archaeological Agenda


Interview transcript:

[she hands me a copy of her thesis “The Roman Native Landscape Past and Present”; it’s online but maps aren’t that good]

*S: I’m trying to connect the ancient interactions with the modern use of those...

HL: Yes, so that’s in the heritage debate.
S: I’m not just looking at Batavians; I’m also looking at Caninefates, Frisians, as they were also other peoples interacting with the Romans.

HL: Let me give you another book then (E-learning Archaeology). This is a handbook for e-learning, with a few colleagues professors of archaeology from different universities we developed learning materials for e-learning; this is for teachers, so that they can see what content they would like to put in, so these are lectures more or less, and one of these is a chapter by me which is ‘archaeology and politics’ which goes right into the use of the present in the past, and also into the Batavians and stuff (she point out page 207)... so I’m a bit familiar with the topic (laughs). So it’s about national identity, and of course we are now at this phase of constructing regional identities, so I start with the correlation between nationalism and peaks in archaeology, and there is a nice correlation there. So there are of course 4 peaks of nationalism that we experience, we experience the fourth now,... here there is also a case study of Arminius and Vercingetorix, so... I’m going to give this one to you as well (laughs).

S: So one of the aspects I’m looking at is the relationship between modern archaeology and the way modern archaeologists are looking at their own past and the way national identity has been developing and how is the public in general perceiving that. From what I have heard these days it seems that people are not very interested in their past but when you put it there for them in exhibitions and publications they actually consume that kind of past.

HL: Did you research that interest?

S: No, it’s from what archaeologists have been telling me, I also talked to people who are in charge of exhibitions, like Louise Swinkels in Nijmegen, so I’m trying to support that with some kind of backing evidence. That’s why i need to talk to people. The other reason why I talk to people is because i don’t read academic Dutch, so I need to talk to the people who are writing the books and see what their views on the topics are.

S: Your work is mainly focused on Caninefates, in Forum Hadriani...

HL: Yes, so Roman archaeology and landscape archaeology, this is how I started, and then I became interested in integrating cultural history into planning, and from there on to heritage, and everything about the past and the present... so basically now I’m at the point of critically reviewing the biography of landscape as an instrument, because I think archaeologists mainly operate within the framework of safeguarding and they are not very critical about the narrative that they produce. At the same time if you look
from a societal point of view, from a heritage point of view, it’s kind of scary what happens (laughs)... because there is hardly an awareness of the societal context in which the narratives that are produce is used, so you see all these regional canons, I’m not sure if you have the same developments in the UK or Spain but probably, it’s a European thing and has to do with the formation and promoting of regional identity, and of course the selection of the narrative, or the story elements in the narrative, has more to do with PR and profiling than anything else, so this is scary. I think there are two very different paradigms that archaeologists work within the safeguarding paradigm, and are not very much aware of the constructions and societal, and all the emotions, so I think that a line of communication is very effective and you get a lot of public attention, this is when you have hit the nerve of emotion, and mostly archaeologists are very satisfied with the attention and they think “I did well!”, so now there is “I did well” in the field of getting public support, and now people appreciate it more and support the safeguarding of heritage. What basically happened is that they entered the arena of construction and identity, so this is why they got all the attention.

S: Because that has to do with the emotions of the public?

HL: Yes, that has to do with the emotions... and I find the research of the historian Maria Grever at the Erasmus University Rotterdam, she publish in English,... she focuses on the opposition between history education and heritage education, where heritage education happens around us because there is a lot of heritage in the public sphere. What she thinks is the essence of historical education is that we teach historical distance between ourselves and the past societies, and she thinks that it might be possible in the heritage education that this professionalism can be incorporated as well, so that we don’t drawn ourselves in sensations and emotions.

S: So basically control the emotional part and be able to objectivize a bit more the results.

HL: Yes, yes. I think one of the basics that Universities strive for in humanities is to develop a sense of distance in which you can criticize, not necessarily negatively, but criticize certain developments in society, so you need distance to see what’s happening.

S: Striving for objectivity and not being biased...

HL: Well, is not necessarily objectivity. It’s not getting confused with the whole historical sensation and be tempted to feel that it really has something to do with you... your ancestry and stuff like that.
S: Why in the last 20-30 years this emphasis on looking for the ancient peoples of the Netherlands, Batavians mainly because it’s the main focus of research, but also Caninefates...

HL: Is it? Is it the main basis of research?

S: I don’t mean basis, but if you look at the interactions between romans and ‘barbarians’ in this area one of the heaviest groups of research are focusing on Batavians if I’m not mistaken. I know there is also research done on Caninefates...

HL: And Frisians...

S: ... and Frisians too, but I think one of the main heavy core of research field of interactions is Batavians... if I’m mistaken I would like to know...

HL: There is a bit of a bias because you have been... I think Nico has a strong research tradition on the Batavians and he holds the chair of Roman archaeology of course, so therefore this is a dominant view, but there is a lot more happening...

S: But also in terms of transferring this knowledge to the public, with the Batavian exhibition in 2004, the Batavians paintings in the palace... has it been transferred that well to the public in other fields of study like Caninefates or Frisians.

HL: Well, the Frisians are... if you go to the province of North-Holland you will find a lot of attention has been given to Frisians but it’s more from the politic side, not from the academic side. Academic research on the Frisians, Linda Therkorn who is my colleague, she has done a lot of... I’ll give you that as well... so this is a long term development of part of the landscape in Nord-Holland (Therkorn et al. 2009) and covering also of course Roman period.

S: So you think that the idea I have right now in my head about the main focus on Batavians... (is wrong)?

HL: There is a lot being done but it’s not... if you look at research not instigated by Universities you’ll see that a lot has been done also in other fields other than Batavians. but for now, I think that because of Nico’s position you may say that within the academic tradition Batavians get the best attention.

S: OK, I guess that I have that feeling because when i attend to conferences like RAC/TRAC for instance, you mostly see people coming from the Netherlands and talking about Batavians and not talking about other peoples that probably are why I have that in my head.
HL: Did you speak also to Jasper de Bruin? You will hear some more about Caninefates (laughs)

S: I’m trying to be broad, I’m not focusing exclusively on Batavians because that’s not the aim of my research, I don’t want to repeat the kind of research that other people have done, so i need to include Caninefates and Frisians too... also because it’s interesting this kind of regional division and historical developments in terms of Frisian identity...

HL: Have you seen the national research agenda?

S: Yes, I’m aware of it, i had a look at it, I haven’t gone in detail through it yet, but I talk with Willem Willems 2 years ago about it and I was talking yesterday to Willem Frijhoff, and he also was involved in the national agenda... so yes, I’m aware of its existence and also aware of the Canon. So I’m looking at different things, not just academic archaeology that’s why I’m so interested about what you just said, maybe in academia there is more focus of Batavians because of Nico’s position but then there is much more out there.

HL: Oh yes, there is a lot more.

S: The other thing I am very curious about is the historical developments that led to Batavians becoming part of the national identity, maybe not in the last century and a half, but why that historical focus on Batavians and not on Caninefates or Frisians?

HL: Yes, I can explain that to you. there is an article by Ton Bloemers and he is retired now as a professor, but he wrote down that in the Netherlands we have this tradition of regional research, that this is a good thing, that from the 70s onwards we had big research investments from generation to generations where we focus on what’s happening there. So there are generations of professors that went well into Batavians and Caninefates and so on and so forth. Also the areas where he could excavate depended on where there was building activity, you see... so you need the areas where there is a big building activity because these will give you finance (funds)

[Note to self: this could explain why research is focused on the Batavian area, as Frisian and Caninefates areas are developing at a much lesser rhythm, according to Parker 1979].

S: Yes, because it’s liked to commercial archaeology...

HL: Yes, not of course in the 70s and 80s but still it was link to rescue archaeology, so therefore you find those areas which have a lot of landscape transformation there you’ll see a lot of research going on. It is the tradition doing regional archaeology (Bloemers
1970s) one generation after the other that will then give the focus [on Batavians], in combination with those areas in the Netherlands that are under pressure of dynamic development.

S: So it’s more of a development factor...

HL: It has to do with it as well, yes. Because you need your money to do your excavations (laughs). So Tom Bloemers wrote this down well, it’s in English, about the way archaeological research in the Netherlands has developed, so if you are curious about that it’s available.

S: Absolutely. Yes, I’m looking at those factors that are behind the decision on what research is done, obviously there is always a personal reason, you are interested in a topic and you go for it, but what makes you interested in those topics, if there is any specific reason, maybe regional identities that you have absorbed maybe without realizing... and then there is political biases and agendas.

HL: Absolutely, yes.

S: When I look at how people are looking at their past I’m also looking at the reasons why they look at it that way.

HL: Well, interestingly, if you look at the professors that have a seat (chair) right now they were a bunch of friends during students, so it’s a classical case (laughs)...

S: Yes, in Spain is the same.

HL: ... so they were doing excavations together (for the Kempen project maybe??) and they were sharing concepts, and basically all of them became professors, so it’s this group that might pose a threat to the debate and discourse, because it’s too closely linked. We are getting a new chair here for Western Archaeology, and it’s going to be someone from the UK, and I’m very happy about it because it’s going to give us a new sound. So this is a classic case (laughs).

S: Yes, in Spain is a very similar case, when archaeology started to be an academic discipline in Spain very few people were doing archaeology, so those were actually the people who got those positions and they’ve been there for 30-40 years now, so they have actually set up the agendas, the research focus, their own interests... which is perfectly OK, it’s perfectly valid and probably interesting, but it’s their own point of view.
HL: I think that because it is a small community of archaeologists in academic positions, so it’s basically these people in power positions who define the PhD research as well, because you need as a PhD student get your professors to acknowledge your topic, and of course if you want to have funds is the same bunch of people that judge the papers. So definitely, this is a problem, yes (laugh). And interestingly enough, when we got our new archaeological system because of the monuments act that changed because of the Valetta treaty, a lot of money and decision making about the content off research shifted from universities to consultants in the market or the people in government positions, and this is still a tension in who is determining what has to be researched, so there is a lot of criticism from both parties, and has a lot to do with power shift.

*S: So power in that sense of decision making is shifting from Universities to political spheres.*

HL: Therefore, if you want to look at the research results is not enough to look at Universities only. There are companies that may produce good work also, and in some of the municipalities good researchers have been doing their thing for a number of years and they are really good at their stuff as well.

*S: I’m also interested in the historical and early-modern side of the development in terms of the rise of Batavians as the forefather of the nation in the 16th century all the way through the late 18th, and then how they are actually taking aside because of this political use in the Batavian revolution... one of my questions is why Batavians and not Caninefates, who also played an important role in the Batavian revolt against the Romans.*

HL: I think because of the scriptures, Tacitus,...

*S: Yes, I know there are many more mentions in there to Batavians, but Caninefates are also mentioned, and actually the role of Caninefates within the revolt I would say that is as important or even more than the Batavians. The fact that Batavians are named more times...*  

HL: Of course Noviomagus was a bigger city than Forum Hadriani, a bigger centre, but Maria Grever has written about this case, she analyse the Batavian since 16th century Dutch political situation. I’m not sure if that is in English, but it’s “National identity and Multiple past”, that’s the title, and she analyses... is the Nation State as a pedagogic enterprise (chapter 2), so it’s for education, so it’s King Arthur as a case study it’s about Arminius, so all the heroes of the revolts against the Roman Empire, they were
chosen as symbols for the early nations, and here she analyses all the things about the Batavians and ‘Geuzen’.

[Geuzen: confederacy of Calvinist Dutch nobles and other malcontents, who from 1566 opposed Spanish rule in the Netherlands; check also Geuzen medal].

*S: That issue about ‘barbarian’ leaders as national heroes is an idea that I had in my head... I didn’t know that someone already tried to put together all those, because it’s a constant at least in all the Western European nations (she agrees), also in Rumania... which at the same time are claiming a common Roman past (she agrees) or a cultural heritage at least (she agrees)... so you have this kind of dichotomy, all of them are claiming a relationship to Roman past and culture, but their national heroes when they decide to become independent nations they are all barbarians.

HL: Yes, it’s about the resistance.

*S: That’s the point, it’s a double discourse

HL: Yes, yes.

*S: We are barbarian base, that’s what makes us different, we have ancestors that fought the Romans against imperialism, but we are also Romans (she agrees).

[irrelevant chat]

HL: I’m not sure if you are aware of a big debate on Dutch identity... the wife of our Prince, now she is our Queen, Maxima, she said that Dutch identity does not exists, so the press and everybody went right over her... and she based herself on this. What she said was I think very with a good nuance, but not what people wants to hear (laughs). It’s not the Dutch identity, you know... but this report played a big role in that debate. It questions also the national canon that school are obliged to use by law.

*S: Which also goes back to the political sphere and how do they influence the reading of the past.

HL: It’s very political. Are you aware of the work by Margarita Diaz-Andreu?

*S: Yes. I’ve met her and read a couple of things.

HL: I was really impressed. I met her at EAA and I was aware of the things that she produces, because I teach theory, and then she has this thing all worked out on how people need shared ideas, and if those people who share ideas are at power positions
this then becomes knowledge, so a dominant discourse. So this networks of people meeting and speaking is something that you can analyse, and she just explained how you can follow these leads and then of course finding all kinds of side paths where you have to decide whether to follow that as well or not (laughs)... but that theoretical frame to study this kind of problems is very useful.

S: So it’s also related to a network issue.

HL: Yes, well, it’s related to Actor Network Theory by Bruno Latour. It’s a dominant theoretical frame now from material culture studies, and it’s the postmodern, it’s after contextual archaeology and the phenomenology we are arrived to looking how knowledge has gotten to the status of truth.

S: The theoretical framework is also looking at... this is probably all coming from my background... I’m coming from Spain, where archaeology has not developed as fast as a discipline as in other countries and the theoretical ideas and frameworks have just very recently arrived, so when I came to the UK for the PhD I just suddenly found myself surrounded...

HL: Swamped! (laughs)

S: ... in theory and postcolonialism, because in Leicester we have David Mattingly and a few people who have been very involved in that kind of debate (she agrees)... so I had to get myself immerse on that. And then I realize that what they did was a kind of deconstruction of their own use to see where was the flow, and that’s where the postcolonial views on interactions came from (she agrees). So I’m trying to do the same with other national communities like the Netherlands or Denmark. And I’m not so sure that the embracement of postcolonial views is a natural process within Dutch academia or even if it’s something imported... obviously, it has its own development but the adoption of postcolonial views is more of an imported issue, or that’s how I see it. I’m not sure if I’m right or not.

HL: I think so, yes.

S: You have also people like Versluys in Leiden who are, not dismissing postcolonial views, but introducing other concepts like globalization. And I’m not sure if it might have something to do with the fact that he is younger than other professors and people who have been involved in these debates, so he is more affected by the new setting which is not the postcolonial world, it’s the global world (she agrees). So I’m starting to think that it might be more of a social issue than an academic issue.
HL: Interesting! I like your thesis!

S: Thanks! Again, if you look at the early writings of postcolonial authors in the UK is more of a... they admit they are sons and daughters of their time, which is the postcolonial time, that’s how they actually come up with those sorts of ideas (frameworks), also imported by the way, because those ideas are coming from American social anthropologists, it’s not so much of an original (British) archaeological discourse (she agrees).

HL: Well, Nico has a strong emphasis on local elites, and the emancipation of those indigenous tribes, so this is the main core of his focus...

S: And that’s very postcolonial.

HL: I know, I know (laughs)

S: That’s the other curious thing I have realized... I was talking to Carol (van Driel-Murray), she obviously has different views to what Nico and the people who work with him have (she agrees)... she criticizes that focus on the elites and focus on the male-based society...

HL: Yes, I really enjoy her contributions.

S: I’ve been talking to her twice about my thesis and she always gives me lots of ideas on things to look at, so she is really good (she agrees), especially because it breaks the monotone of the discourse that I was getting (she agrees). I was getting this Batavian male...

HL: Well, and there is a lot of gender bias as well in setting the agenda.

S: Exactly for the same reasons: who is in charge of setting the agenda.

HL: Yes, yes.

S: That makes sense actually (she laughs). These are the kind of things that I am trying to come up with as conclusion in terms of the analysis of these conversations and publications, I need to extract that kind of conclusions because that’s the aim of the thesis I’m doing, to try and get a picture of how Dutch academia operates around these topics, and the reasons why that’s happening.

S: Does the fact that you are studying your own past affect you and how?

HL: Well, I’m not sure if it’s my own past. I’m studying a past and it’s always subjective. I’ve noticed when writing articles or doing research, that it really depend also on the day of writing (laughs) what the content will be, so in that sense I’m really aware of the subjectivity and it’s just not bothering me that much, but you need to be
very explicit and transparent about your sources and your line of argumentation, and that’s OK, and I think it is very clear that we bring our own perspective in what we do, and there is no escaping from that.

S: Yes. Some people have told me that the good thing about my research is that I’m not Dutch (she laughs) because I can look at those issues from an outsider perspective (she agrees), but I also bring my own Spanish and British background, so I’m aware that I’m not objective in that sense.

Everybody is a prisoner of their own value system (she laughs).

S: There is something that I call the ‘research limes’ which is basically the difference in research between Dutch regions North to the Rhine and South to the Rhine, in terms of the way they approach material evidence, south to the Rhine you have Roman provincial archaeology because still is within the provinces, while to the north you are not any more in the provinces so in theory there is no possible room for Roman Provincial Archaeology. You could do it the same way and I don’t see why you wouldn’t because the influence of the provinces I’m sure expands beyond the frontier (she agrees), but it’s more done in terms of prehistory.

HL: I think in the Netherlands we have compared both sides of the Roman border and there is a research tradition on doing that, and I did it also in my thesis. I tried to do comparable landscape in Nord-Holland, the Frisian territory, just to see if there are different patterns in material culture and stuff like that. And of course there is the PhD thesis by Michael Erdrich. I think that with the generation of Tom Bloemers there was this focus on the indigenous Roman archaeology and it never left...

S: Indigenous would also involve both sides of the Limes?

HL: Yes. And looking at the native influences also in the provinces. So that would be also in the 70s and 80s, the introduction of the native perspective.

S: Which is the initial postcolonial input.

HL: Yes, yes. It’s also in theory things like centre-periphery, and I remember reading all these postcolonial articles when I was a student because that’s what we were taught. In relation to your last question about your own value system, this is the topic that was described by Gadamer in his ‘Double Hermeneutics’. There is a lot of theory about this point. if you are looking for meaning in the past, the ‘doubleness’ is that you cannot get to meaning without studying context, because all meaning derives from context, this of
course we know, but secondly, meaning depends on the value system of the researcher, so basically this is how I teach it to students: here is the fish bowl, if this is the present and this is the past, we as researchers are kept within our own value system, and the only thing that any kind of meaning that we apply to the past is part of our own value system; you cannot think of anything else because this is it. Of course we are looking for meaning in the past, and they would have to have the same things as well, so I pose the question: do they ever meet?

S: That’s a question I gave to Margarita (Diaz-Andreu), when you go into regional/national identities you are going into a field of philological issues, so you cannot actually prove by evidence how they were thinking, which values were the base for their line of thoughts... and what she told me is that at the end Archaeology is all about conventions, and that’s the bottom line, so as long as you can actually back those conventions that you are proposing with reasonable certainty, that’s OK, it doesn’t need to be accurate 100% or true 100% (she agrees). It’s not so much about going into detail into the phycology of the people who were writing about those things in the 16th century, for instance.

HL: No, but I think there is a whole theoretical debate that started in the 80s and 90s about contextual archaeology, which was all about the meaning and getting to the heads of the people of the past. The thing is that if you study context, which is going to Gadamer’s Hermenutics, you can read into codes, for instance linear A writing, so you don’t at first recognise any logic, but after studying you can see patterns, and you might interpret them and eventually get to an alphabet. So I think that by studying context and context of action in the past you can get reasonably close. And then of course the focus and the interpretation you give is all here (she points to her drawing of the fishbowl, the value system of the researcher).

S: So it’s like the glass that you look through.

HL: Yes

S: I’m also exploring this idea of the German-British influence on the archaeological discourse in the Netherlands, a mix of both traditions; that is the general idea that I have been getting. Some people have also told me that that is not right because Dutch academia has its own original path, it probably has influences, but it’s not a mix in itself, it’s a middle way of Dutch academia.
HL: I think it’s more complicated than that (laughs). Well, it has to do of course with research traditions. I think one great example is that one of the researchers, she is now retired, she was a close friend to Louis Binfford, so in this institute there was this huge influence of New Archaeology and the influence of the sciences, which was basically an anthropological point of view, positivists theory... so there, I would say, was a lot of influence from the US. Then there is a sort of stereotype of what kind of archaeology we do in the Netherlands, so I think the Germans are stereotyped as being very thorough in descriptive terms, not big in interpretation, but very good in documentation, so their books are like bibles with typo-chronologies and stuff. Whereas in the UK the stereotype is that it’s all very conceptual, and that of course the Netherlands is right in the middle, which I think is vanity more than anything else. So this is how we would like to perceive ourselves. I think that in practice, if you look at commercial archaeology is not very theoretical at all. I think that we do have good standards concerning documentation, and if you look at academic archaeology it is getting there conceptually but is not necessarily very good at documentation.

S: So it’s like a double sphere. Commercial archaeology is more getting the influence of German methodical approach and good at that kind of documentation but not analysing it, and then academia is really good at conceptualizing data and...

HL: Well, it has to do with the stereotyping. If you say that the English are conceptual and the Germans are very practical, you don’t necessarily have to make that stereotype. I think that people that leave universities here and go into commercial archaeology in practice are not very conceptual.

S: OK, I get it. So in terms of academia that conceptual approach might be more of an influence from that British stereotype...

HL: Yes.

S: Which I have to say it’s quite accurate from what I have experienced. They are good at doing archaeology but they are really good at theorising and conceptualising, analysing results.

HL: Yes, but I’m not really sure there are really good people in the UK on documentation and commercial archaeology.

S: There are some, but I think is a minority. You have commercial archaeological units for instance, most of them are based within Universities though, which is slightly different to the
situation here, and they are probably more used to process data and catalogue it. But if you go into academia I would say 90% of the research that is done is more conceptual and related to the analysis of results within theoretical frameworks.

HL: I think Dutch academia is basically empirical research with conceptual frame on top of it.

S: So in that sense, if we follow those German and British stereotypes, it is a kind of mix?

HL: Yes.

S: That’s the impression I have from what everyone has told me.

HL: But it’s not clear of vanity, the way we see ourselves. We are very content that we are sort of in the middle.

S: It’s good because that’s what everyone is telling me, so that’s how you archaeologists in the Netherlands are conceptualising your position within European academia, which is kind of interesting.

HL: Yes. Yes it is.

S: How these regional, national and European agendas and identities operate, because they are opposite in some instances. If you go to European level, the aim is to try to find these kind of common roots, at least it was in the 90s and early 2000s, you had these exhibitions on the Celts as the first Europeans, and things like that.

HL: Well if you look at the EU conventions, the Valetta convention, the European landscape convention and the Faro convention, is very explicit that all the member states that do sign up promote European identity, it’s there, it’s very explicit. So these conventions say “if you do this, if you sign up, you need to promote European identity”.

S: And that’s the thing, how do you promote at the same time European identity, national identity and regional identities?

HL: Well, it’s regional and European identity that goes together, and it’s the national identity that it’s squeezed.

S: Together in which sense? They don’t clash because Europe is a Europe of regions?
HL: The European identity is based on diversity, so if you have a good regional identity this will fit right in. But if you are going to go on a path of sovereign nations, this will clash immediately with the European ambition.

[note to self: that’s what it’s weakening the Union now in times of crisis]

S: And do you think those kinds of clashes are affecting the way in which agendas are...

HL: Absolutely. Absolutely. This is what I’m studying now through landscape biography, which is focused on the region. And there is a lot of money now available for creating regional identities and if you look at politicians at their municipalities, they are all interested in their own cultural DNA. These are the words they use.

S: So there is not much focus on national aspects.

HL: No, I think we are very allergic to creating national identity as a result of the second world war, but there is no hesitation in creating regional identities, which I think is curious because in science, in academic practice, the constructs that you make are very much the same, so from a methodological point of view there should be more criticism and I find that there is not. And this is what I find interesting: is it because regions do not have armies and that there is sort of... there is a Dutch writer who said that cats are very attractive to pet because of their fur, it’s the pet-able factor in things. I thing regions have a high pet-able potential in that sense (laughs), it’s cute...

S: It has the good things about cultural identity but not the bad things about nationalism.

HL: So we don’t perceive regional identity as dangerous at all, what we do see is that national identity is dangerous.

S: Because it is equalled to nationalism?

HL: Yes! And we see that regional identity will attract tourists,...

S: While national identity won’t?

HL: While national identity won’t, no. So this is my line of research now, and I’m going to analyse all these landscapes identities written for the regions, to see if there is a main narrative there.

S: It is very interesting.

HL: Yes, it is. I’m very excited about this (laughs)
S: It’s like when you do a cut in a cake and you see different layer... that’s what I’m trying to do too. I’m very aware of these European, national, regional, and even local if you go further down (she agrees), agendas, and they are all operating at the same time (she agrees), and most of them are opposing to each other, or at least not operating along each other. It is striking to see how people manage to operate within those spheres in academia, but if you go down to a personal level or a social level you also have to deal with your own personal identity,... so it’s really complex but very interesting at the same time. That’s why I talk with people from Leeuwarden for instance. I talked to Evert Kramer at the Fries Museum...

HL: Oh, they are good at creating identity (laughs). The most famous example...

S: The Tolsum tablet?

HL: Yes. In the Frisian museum, they got everybody’s attention (laughs).

S: That’s what I’m trying to talk to people from different universities, not just with Nico and his people at Vrije, but with as many people as possible, also historians and in museums.

HL: Go to her (Maria Grever).

S: Where is she based?

HL: In Rotterdam Erasmus University.

S: Ah, I was yesterday there. But I’ll try to go again. That’s Margarita’s point about following the networks of people... when I talk to people they always come up with names of other people who would be interesting to talk about certain things.

HL: She would be good for you on what’s happening in history and which publications you should not miss.

S: I was yesterday in Rotterdam and Willem Frijhoff didn’t mention her, and they are supposed to work in the same field in the same department.

HL: Yes, yes.

S: So that’s what I’m finding, that depending on whom you talk to you have this networks.

HL: Yes, you have these networks.

S: Except for a few people who are mentioned by everyone.

HL: And who do you find is mentioned by everyone? The people at power positions?
S: Pretty much. Obviously Roymans is mentioned most of the times. Carol has been mentioned quite a lot too, maybe because it represent the opposing view (she agrees). And Johan Nicolay was mentioned because of his views on the North. Those are three names that I have been referred to many times, but that’s mostly on Batavians, and I’m not just interested in Batavians, so that’s why I try to look for a more open view of the interaction in antiquity. Because if I talk about ancient interactions in the Netherlands I cannot just talk about Batavians; it’s that simple. Or I would be biased by the current situation if I just talk about Batavians (she agrees)... it is obvious that there is a lot of material on Batavians so it would be a bigger part on Batavians than Caninefates or Frisians, but my aim is to try and minimize that impact of Batavians in the thesis.

S: Why that early-modern focus on Batavians and not on others. You mentioned earlier that is because of the written evidence and the translations of Tacitus in the 16th century, but is there any other factor that you can think of? Because in the mid-19th century Frisians are kind of coming up as forefathers of the nation.

HL: I think is basically because of the Batavian revolt.

S: ...and the political use of the label Batavian?

HL: Yes

S: It’s not because Frisians or Caninefates were not as a good example for national identity as Batavians were? That’s what strikes me; Batavians are chosen because of the written text, translations....

HL: It’s the occurrence of the Batavian revolt that makes them interesting, because they were looking for the origins of the Republic.

S: But the Frisians had also a revolt and Caninefates were also involved in the Batavian revolt. That’s why I don’t really...

HL: I think they were pars pro-toto.

S: And also maybe because it was called the Batavian revolt and not the Cananefatean revolt... it’s possibly the name (she agrees).

HL: Caninefates were long time seen as the lesser tribe

S: For...?
HL: In relation to their big brother the Batavians

S: But just because of the interpretation that was made in the 16th century?

HL: I think so.

S: OK.

[irrelevant chat. End of interview]
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Interview 2 – 21/11/2013 Informal meeting, notes.

Context:

Professor of Museum Archaeology at the University of Amsterdam and Curator of the Classical Department in the National Museum of Antiquities (Leiden).

Interview 1 notes:

He will give a paper in my session of TRAC 2014 on religious and cultural interactions between Celts, Germans and Romans in the Netherlands. He also passed me an abstract for 2012 (check the both)

Caspar Reuven (1793-1835) was the first professor of archaeology in the world, in Leiden, and founder of the National Museum of Antiquities, also in Leiden. 200 anniversary of the museum in 2017.

Halbertsma book in Routledge: “Scholars, travellers and trade” (on 19th century archaeology in the Netherlands)

About the Batavian myth, it’s a 16th century product when territories were looking for identity. It’s when there is a political use of barbarian revolts (e.g. Arminius, Civilis, etc.). In the case of the Batavians, the rediscovery of written records (i.e. Tacitus and Pliny) brought them back to live; there importance grew to the point in which there where regional battles to decide where the insula Batavorum was placed, between the West (Holland – we are Holland it must have been here) and the East (it must be here as we have found remains). The battle for the appropriation of Batavian location and therefore identity.

3 levels of discourses/agendas/identities:

- As the European union grows, people tend to look more for local identities; [it’s a kind of reaction, similar to what Muhammad Zahir told me about identities of emigrants, who radicalize their original identities when they emigrate (keeping traditions, creating ghettos, etc.)]. Museums are a good tool to guide this and even more their finances, so “Who funds what?” (e.g. International exhibition in Venice about the Celts as forefathers of Europe).
- National museums are dedicated to the archaeological history of the nation. The national museum of the Netherlands presents Romans as an interlude, as they didn’t change dramatically the Germanic cultural landscape that they encountered and that will follow their departure.
At the same time the regional interest in history is growing and regional museums are claiming back artefacts that represent their history, which takes us to the debate of “who owns the past?” So you can see regional differences in these museum’s claims, but also a growing regional interest.

How is scholar discourse transmitted to people via museums (role and methods of the museum)? New theories are presented in exhibitions because this is a discipline that is not stable and if you don’t keep people updated you run the risk to be outdated pretty quickly. However, there is no revival of Batavians ideologically (that was in the past), just a new peak of archaeological research interest. The role of the museum is to show the past as it could have possibly been (archaeology) but not to show national identity through the past; that would be dangerous, e.g. IIWW (Italy using the Roman Empire and German/Dutch Nazis focusing on Germanic people; territorial claims based in archaeology). In the past items were presented in typological-chronological order; at present, these are presented by topic or region.

How does the fact that the Netherlands is both within and outside the empire affects the way archaeology is done (regional differences)? There is no regional difference on how to approach this, but more discipline differences on how to approach this. North to the Limes there is pre- or proto-history, while to the South it’s simply Roman archaeology (with epigraphy, textual sources, classical archaeology oriented to these topics,...). However, you need to be trained on Roman Mediterranean archaeology to understand the Roman provincial archaeology of this area.

Collaboration with European colleagues: You need interaction with German and Belgian colleagues for instance, e.g. the Netherlands was part of the Germania studies run from Cologne (Corpus Barbaricum, Erdrich).

**Interview 2 Notes:**

When transferring knowledge to the public the curator has to make a choice on what to display and how to present it (what story of the object to tell). So there is a very important personal factor (the curator’s view) on what public perceives as history. However, objects and history must be display in a way in which there must be always room for different interpretations as you have many different audiences (professors, housewives, etc.).
Dr Miguel John Versluys

Interview 1 – 23/05/2011 Interview, notes.

Interview 2 – 21/11/2013. Informal meeting, notes.

Context

Reader in Archaeology at the University of Leiden. Specialized in theoretical archaeology and Roman Egypt.

Interview 1 notes:

He has a very interesting approach to theory that he applies to his research on the Romanization of Egypt. But he shows a bitter disagreement with the current use of postcolonial theory, especially by British scholars, as he thinks it is perpetuating the Roman-Native dichotomy, this time from the local, native extreme; while colonial perspectives (derived from the 19th century colonial discourses – “Romans were great and they had an Empire”) were mostly focused on the study of Roman elites, post-colonial deconstruction shifted that approach towards a negative view of imperialism in general and Roman imperialism in particular (this being the eponymous Empire taken as example to compare modern ones: Carlomagno, Spanish and Portuguese, China, British, etc.), and refocuses the debates around Native societies and non-elites groups. In the Netherlands, until 1995 it was all about the archaeology of the elites and central places; after 1995 research shows a postcolonial embracement based on surveys and focus on peripheral studies. This extremism in theoretical positions is not detectable in other academic communities, e.g. France. In the 90s and 2000s the British postcolonial discourse has led the academic scene, but the last few years new debates have been generated in other countries.

Post-colonial studies out of archaeology have gone much further, while in archaeology we are still stuck with David’s model. Yes, he opened the debate but he has gone too far and too local [check for the review of his work by a French scholar]. Romanization is still a useful paradigm to explain the processes of interaction because it is not just about Romans; it is about a Roman citizen, born in Hispania, brought up in Italy or Greece and serving the Roman army in Britannia. That individual is the one responsible for the process of Romanization of native populations, so those natives will follow a similar process of assimilation, just as those Roman citizens previously did. There are no Roman-Native categories or confrontation in a cultural perspective of the interactions. In a military sphere Romans were very bad for native communities, but in cultural terms they promoted diversity and survival of local cultures. I guess what he meant to explain is that you cannot see everything in extreme terms and that different aspects might throw different conclusions. That negative view of Romanization comes from the application of post-colonial approaches.
Dutch archaeology has absorbed uncritically the theoretical influence of Great Britain (as Van Dolmenen pointed out in Exeter 2011 - Globalization and the Roman World). Despite not everyone engages entirely with post-colonial perspective, very few recognise that disagreement and we all follow the Anglo-Saxon debates and perspectives because they are very good at proposing interpretative models and because the British mainstream still very powerful. However, just very recently some voices have risen to challenge post-colonial perspectives.

According to him, post-colonial perspectives reinforced the Roman-Native dichotomy, but simply from a different perspective. He bets Globalization and multiculturalism are much better frameworks, as these can involve both Roman and Native perspectives and focuses.

Globalization has brought time-space compression, just like in the Roman Empire but to a different scale. All in all, connectivity was institutionalized by the Roman Empire (Roads, etc.). So how can we then study provincial roman archaeology without looking global. Well, paradoxically that’s what it’s been done right now. Provincial Roman Archaeology has been done as pre-historical archaeology, i.e. with no link to Roman Archaeology as a whole, to the empire; it’s too local to be able to understand the potential of globalization. It needs to engage with what was going on in other areas of the Empire, as processes are the same and actually connected (e.g. the Nile inundations meant a lack of grain in Hadrian’s Wall).

Dutch archaeology is a bridge between the theory-based approaches of GB and the methodology-based approaches of the Germans. Germany has traditionally focused on method and artefacts (i.e. catalogues, find reports, etc.) but in the last few years it has started to engage with theory [e.g. Michael Sommer from Liverpool? One could argue that is simply because of his closeness to British theoretical work method]

Differences between disciplines (and areas): While prehistory is approached from the classical archaeology perspective, provincial Roman archaeology is approached from a theoretical positions. Classical archaeology and History of Arts have been stereotyped for the last 20 years but they have evolved in a way that has much to offer; Classical archaeology has evolved towards survey archaeology (typologies of material but no interpretative analysis), that’s why there is specific money available for projects which aim is to analyse and interpret excavated material that has not been studied yet (commercial archaeology, where around 90% of archaeology graduates from Leiden end up working); History of arts has evolved to more theoretical approaches. [link to what Willems says about more info available from excavations since Veletta]

A difference needs to be made between “Dutch archaeology” (archaeology made by Dutch archaeologists) and “Archaeology of the Netherlands” (which is archaeology that verses exclusively about the Netherlands); archaeology of the Netherlands is not aware of Dutch archaeology.

Three levels of discourse/agenda: regional discourse is linked to ancestry. Arhaeology is attractive both for regional and national purposes and they provide ground for Roman-Native opposition (us and them).
Batavian identity is not real. They were a result of Roman driven demographic movements (they were Chatii and only obtained name Batavians through their link to their new settlement in the Betuwe), so there should be no national identity based on them. It is a Roman discourse again that we follow. Similar case with the Frisians, who disappear with the Franks and reappear in modern times, but not any more related to the original ones. The Batavian primacy in the historical and archaeological discourse is due to the fact that we have historical narratives about them and their leader Civilis. But they are Roman narratives, and we follow them uncritically; we follow Roman inventions, Roman depictions of their world and ancient discourses in general. However, there is a lack of historical discourses on Frisians. Civilis revolt was basically a civil war among Batavians.

Archaeological dialogues 1st volume, Jan Slofstra (who is a key theoretical figure, “beyond Romans and Natives”, one of the main theoretical developers of modern Dutch archaeology). “Dutch perspectives on contemporary issues in archaeology”.

Interview 2 Transcript:

[unrelated topics]

S: I’m involving now in my study, not only archaeologists but also historians, and museum curators...

MJV: Yeah, they have very different views.

S: It’s maybe more complicated, but I didn’t want to leave the historical perspective out, because that historical perspective affects archaeological discourses...

MJV: Of course, of course

S: ...so I didn’t want to leave that out while I’m analysing the trends within Dutch archaeology. It makes it more complicated but hopefully more interesting.

MJV: Yes, it will. The only worry is of course if you talk about that you have to talk about images about antiquity in general and there is such a big...

S: Yes, it becomes bigger and bigger. I’m not going to go into much detail in that sense but I didn’t want to leave it out.

MJV: No, no... it’s good, and it also gives you a much better perspective probably on how the archaeological debates are actually influenced by the actual context, because otherwise you are just doing archaeology that is not related to other things which is of course not true at all.

S: Well, that’s at the base of my own discourse and ideas. So there is obviously a context and ideology behind all the modern archaeological discourses.
MJV: And it’s interesting, because what I found out in writing this Dialogues article (Archaeological Dialogues 2014) is that that context about how we conceptualize Rome is extremely important for what we say about it.

S: It’s at the base of all the discourses, not only the British one, in which is quite obvious because they have actually described that process quite clearly...

MJV: Yeah

S: ...but any other discourse has the same kind of biases. It’s just a question of identifying it and try to ‘soften’ it a little bit... if you actually identify there is a bias or an underpinning behind your discourse you have to be aware of it first of all.

MJV: I was surprised... I read it when it came out, a small booklet by Richard Hingley about perceptions of Rome... but they have sales and I bought it, and when I looked at it again, it’s interesting because it’s... well, it’s very much not what we want, what we want is your PhD about how to deal with it, but... it’s so immensely interesting to see how difficult perceptions of Rome have developed in all those different countries. I mean, in all those countries Rome, the term Rome, evokes totally different perceptions.

S: Of course. But that’s the thing. That’s because of the context they had.

MJV: Yes.

S: And that’s one of the essential parts of my PhD... [unrelated chat]

MJV: What I find very interesting is that the piece I sent you of Dialogues, I also sent to someone else who said: well, is so interesting now, because Andrew Gardner has just published in Britannia (2013)... apparently there is a feeling, I have realized apparently there is a feeling amongst the youngest generation of, well, what is the situation? but also what do we have to do? I did not know about his article and I think he doesn’t know about my article, but, well, they will be published somewhat contemporaneously and then...

S: This article has a very similar title to my presentation in your session in Frankfurt.

MJV: Yes.

S: Strikingly similar. I’m not saying anything, but that the ideas we are managing are very, very similar.

MJV: Because he wasn’t there, I think.

S: I don’t think so. I don’t recall seeing him.

MJV: But you are right. Now I recall... I did not realize.

S: But yes, it doesn’t have to be a closed debate, right now, at least for the people of my generation. Because at you were saying in your article it seems that it has been imposed on us, and why does it have to be like that? For me it’s even curious because I’m coming from a
tradition that is not so much keen on theoretical positions. So all these Romanization debates I only learnt about it when I came to the UK. So I’m kind of an outsider of that tradition. I benefited a lot from being in the UK but then I’m also benefiting from not coming from that tradition, because I managed to see that from a completely different angle.

MJV: Very much. Yes. And one of the reasons for me to write the article... one of the incentives was really Frankfurt (session at TRAC 2012), because there I saw that, let’s say your generation, I think I’m a bit older, but your generation is really...has the same worries that I always had, but when I tried to voice them everybody was always looking: “are you stupid?”... so this is something important. But also the other perspective that when I was teaching in Toulouse for a while, nobody ever there... I mean, when I mentioned all these things people were laughing a little bit, they read it, but they did not take it very seriously. And ten years ago we could say the Anglo-Saxon world “ah, they don’t know about it”, but now it’s no longer true. But this is why it’s very, very good that you come from really different backgrounds.

[unrelated chat]

S: You were saying that you are not part of my generation, but I think you think pretty much on the same lines. Because one thing I realized is that before your generation it was mostly about postcolonial or colonial views, while your generation and probably mine and probably the next ones, are probably influenced by this kind of Globalization ideas.

MJV: Yes, I think so.

S: So that’s our time... I mean the same way colonialism was there, the time of post-colonialism was there too and now is the time of globalization.

MJV: What it’s strange is that debates about what Rome is go so much behind...when I read about all this... this was on the part where you PhD should come in... I mean, we have now people like Richard (Hingley) of course, and also David (Mattingly), that brilliantly contextualized colonial visions of Rome, but now, what do we not have is intellectual contextualization of post-colonial images of Rome. And your PhD is the first that will provide, because I was so socked when I read, I don’t know if you recall, but this... it’s just a book that I found by this Carr???, but is incredible what has happened in Britain. It really that culture is always part of power and politics, and that’s something very strange, I think.

S: It’s intermixed, it’s not separated.

MJV: It’s not separated.

S: Which is quite dangerous too.

MJV: It is very dangerous, yeah.

S: Especially if you don’t recognise it.
MJV: But that’s a very important point for this whole debate about Romanization. Because I always wondered how can it be that people are... and also, that Andrew Gardner, that he writes a piece, a was flabbergasted, if you want to talk about Roman imperialism that’s Ok, but one of the many lessons I thought it was that Rome is not about imperialism alone, and then you think about an agenda for the future, and then you call it debating Roman Imperialism (laughs).

S: Yes, it’s contradictory.

MJV: Yes, I find it so... but of course I always the critique: “don’t you forget the concept of power, because power is all this very important...”... of course it is.

S: But it’s not exclusive.

MJV: It’s not.

S: It’s an important concept, but it doesn’t need to be the only concept.

MJV: No.

S: And that’s something people tend to forget. And the problem is that because we reproduce these discourses again, and again, and again, we engage in very specific debates... we forget to try and get our heads out it, and see it from another perspective.

MJV: Yes.

S: And I think that, probably, one of the good things I’m trying to do is to go out, from outside this perspective and look at different ways of looking at the same topics, to see if there are similarities or not, and when those ways and perspectives are coming. It’s not always self-produce by the academic community; it’s mostly imported, by academic fashion, by current debates that are happening elsewhere, in the UK. And the parameters from which postcolonialism evolved in the UK are not present in other communities.

MJV: No

S: But they still use the same patterns.

MJV: Your PhD... it was originally intended, if I recall, to do more countries included and then compares them?

S: Yes, but the problem is that if i try to do Germany... I mean, I will still be using Germany and the UK as a contextual framework...

MJV: To understand what goes on

S: Especially because there is this kind of dichotomy between the German tradition and the British tradition...

MJV: Yeah
S: ... so then I try to go out of those traditions and stereotypes and go to Danish and...

MJV: …and Dutch

S: ...and Dutch. Because it’s a different axe, and also because it doesn’t focus on such a big academic communities as Germany and the UK. I’ll try to develop that into other academic communities after the PhD, but right now, for the PhD, I need to look into 2 case-studies in a comparative way, and then using the UK and using Ireland and Scotland, and Germany as a kind of contextual... kind of pan-European, kind of pan-northern European, I would say.

MJV: You should really be very positive, even if it’s your last year... I have several PhD students now who are in the last year, so I can imagine how you feel. But I think the fact that everybody wants to talk to you, and everybody has something specific to say... it shows how important it is what you are trying to do. So I think already the attempt, of course you will never end, there are always more countries, there are more perspectives... but already the fact that you are so brave to try to do this is fantastic.

S: That’s really good to hear. Because that’s the kind of thing that as a PhD you never realize. Your work might be important... it might not be, you never know how things will go,...

MJV: But the fact that everybody just makes time, and also what you did in TRAC, I think it really shows that.

S: I’m really happy with that, also with the networking has been amazing for me so far. The part that I really enjoy most about it is this kind of (interviews)... because it has become a kind of anthropological study

MJV: Yes!

S: I’m interviewing people, I’m just getting their ideas, and...

MJV: It will also be very interesting for you to see all the differences talking to all these people.

[unrelated chat]

MJV: Now, be prepared because for the Dialogues piece I got thee reviews, the all three very much disagree about the historiography, so all three were saying “you are wrong”, but all three for different reasons and contradictory, so you will see everybody has his or her own take on the historiography. So what for me was clearly a development from postcolonial, which is actually anti-colonial, for Gardner was postcolonial developing to Globalization... I think it’s something totally different but everybody has a totally different take on how things develop.

S: So it’s not going to be possible to make everyone happy.

MJV: No, so be prepared. But you shouldn’t.
MJV: It’s a strange thing that all this stuff about identity has really been mainly reinforcing categories, so we first though that, well, archaeology might give us a different perspective on the Roman World... it’s giving a different perspective, but it stayed within the same Roman-Native...which is a surprise because material culture in itself [22:55]... and this is where material culture can help.

S: Well, at the end of the day archaeologists are part of that context, when they are influenced by their own context, and the context they are living in is the one that they apply.

MJV: Yes, yes, yes.

S: I know, it sounds quite obvious but some people don’t actually think about it.

MJV: But also the object influences context, it’s also the other way around.

[unrelated chat]

MJV: It’s interesting, we just discussed this... I was in Cologne last week...and also here was one about Arminius, but it’s... this were also a little the same... it was because 30 years ago ‘The invention of tradition’ was published as a book, I think it has been widely influential in Roman studies, but not explicitly so, and where it has been influential it’s influenced by the Roman East, so the second sophistic and Greek is part of Rome, but not on the Celtic West. So what we tried to do is, first some theoretical lectures, and then we had... what is Egypt doing, what is Greece doing in the East, and then we turned to the Celtic World, which was fascinating. There was one lecture about Arminius, and there you really see how Germans, again, do it in a really different way, which has obviously a lot to do with Julius Civilis... it’s a little bit the same discourse about how it works.

S: Yes, that’s something I have in mind, and I will probably mention it in the thesis, but I’m not going to focus on that, except maybe on a paper at some point. All this dichotomy between Roman tradition in Europe and national identities based on Barbarian characters.

MJV: Yes.

S: All of them, all of the Western nations have a barbarian leader who has become a national heroes.

MJV: Yes. But a figure like that is not in Denmark.

S: No, there’s not. But that’s the thing. They don’t have the figure of a barbarian opposing the Empire. It’s more Viking.

MJV: Vercingetorix in France, and Arminius in Germany and Julius Civilis with us, and Boudica...

S: And Boudica, and in Spain you have Viriatus, in Romania you have Decebalus.

MJV: Oh Yes!
S: So, I know Rumania is not Western as such, but you still have all those Roman related provinces or areas that had a close relationship with Rome... they all have this kind of heroes, all of them. And their national identity is mostly based on those kinds of figures. While their cultural heritage is Roman.

MJV: It is a very interesting dichotomy. How is it possible that they do it... yes.

S: I guess it might have to do with the fact that what for us looks odd, it might not have been odd back in the time, when those identities were being created. It reminds me an example that Simon James gave me once: for the founding fathers in the States, they were all about liberty and independence but they were in favour of slavery. And for them it was not a paradox.

MJV: It was not a conflict.

S: So it depends also in the context.

MJV: Very much

S: For them it was not a dichotomy. It’s the same case here in the Netherlands. If you look at the use of Civilis and the Batavians... you have this kind of liberty lovers and brave fighters against the oppressors, but then you also have the colonial use of it, when they give the name of Batavia to the colonial capital. And that is all about imperialism, colonialism... while in theory what Batavians are about is...

MJV: ... all liberty against the oppressor.

S: So it’s the same kind of dichotomy again, but for them it was not an issue. It was within their moral values, so it was not something weird for them. For us it looks weird because we don’t see...

MJV: Also there, the concept of biography, in this case, is useful. Because what use to be freedom when it became part of Dutch identity, became not freedom anymore, became Dutch identity. Batavia is not related to freedom anymore, it was then related to 19th century definition of what is to be Dutch.

[unrelated chat]

MJV: There are ideas enough in it (thesis), so just write it up. And when in doubt, leave out. There is always an article or another session, or... that you can use things, but... line that goes A-Z and guides you through the book.

S: I’m pretty sure I know how to do that with the Dutch case [...] The Dutch case for me it’s quite clear, you can go directly from ancient Batavians, Cananefates, to early modern interpretations and how those have affected modern views, debates... that’s a kind of coherent line... [...]
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Dr Wouter Vos

26/11/2013 – Interview, transcript and notes

Context:

Manager of Vos Archaeology, a commercial Archaeology unit. He has a long-standing publication record on Batavians.

Interview Notes:

Wouter considers himself part of the Van Es school (he was his mentor). Van Es was the director of the state service. But he did his PhD with Nico just due to circumstantial reasons, at the same time, under the same project and as part of the same generation as Stijn Heeren and Maaike Groot.

While Ton Derks is more based on data and quite good at that, Nico is more theory based. Nico neglects data that doesn’t fit with his preconceived ideas or aims.

The dispute Nico-Carol: They both have different networks; Carol is the link with the UK (she tells students to go out there and discuss ideas with foreigners). When Wouter was considering the possible members of his thesis panel, Nico banned Carol. There is no debate; for instance, there is this discrepancy in terms of whether the Roman label Batavians refer in the pre-Flavian period to many tribes (Nico) or to a unique tribe (Carol); if makes a difference in terms of understanding the post-revolt situation, as the military levying is different if applied to a wider demographic span than if it’s to one sole group; in other words, the numbers of troops levied affected differently one tribe than several tribes. But there is still no debate on it. And all this is bad for Dutch archaeology.

The State service used to provide material and data through the excavations they run. Now it’s divided in private archaeological units, so its role is not that important any more. In the meantime interpretation is not carried out by those units but by university archaeology departments, which are very specific on what they look for, apply their own views and agendas and are very regionally divided. E.g. the materials coming from Brabant is always for Nico and Derks; the Nijmegen team is the one doing Limes stuff (although not any more since the death of the former chair of...).

Why Batavians?

Willems was the first one combining in an innovative way archaeological evidence and Tacitus, which is a fashion still used today. Then the “Campeng gang” (Nico, Ton, etc.) took over as they knew each other because they studied together and excavated together in Brabant. Nico has run 3 NWO projects on Batavians very successfully since then, so his position is dominant. Now Batavians seem to have lost their academic momentum and the
focus has shifted to Late Antiquity (especially in Nijmegen and with Stijn’s new project on 
late antique demography).

But there is research on other tribes:

Bloemers is the first one looking at Cananefates, when he applied local evidence to a wider 
area. Now is Jasper de Bruin who is doing good stuff on it. There is no lack of materials, but 
it has simply not been put together. Jasper is going through deposits, museums and 
collections. He is taking Batavian models and frameworks and applying them to Cananefates 
(e.g. returning veterans) and it fits! Then, Heleen van Londen did some Cananefates too, but 
Wouter is not so kin on her ideas (e.g. she tried to fit settlement distribution to the roman 
ideal of the golden rule. Of course the evidence is so scarce that any model would fit).

He is trying to put together an international project to study the coastal settlements all along 
the NW European coast (like the Dutch castles of Brittenberg and Eidenbergh). He needs to 
get universities involved, and currently Carol and Willems are trying to start it. It’s 
Universities that have to run this kind of research.

In terms of internal Dutch collaboration and debate and exchange of ideas, he mentioned two 
instances: The Archom and the “Newcastle Group”.

The Archom (research school), led by Nico, organize formal bi-annual meeting in which they 
bring people (often foreigners) to present ideas. This should be in charge of organizing 
internal debate and exchange of ideas but it’s not very active.

Nico also organizes the Roman tag (Roman day) every December in Vrije, and he controls 
what is said...even cutting people off if necessary (he highlighted the contrast in this sense 
with the UK, where they are much more polite and ready to discuss).

The Newcastle group (around 15 people, Carol is the chair of the group) is an informal 
discussion group that gathers twice a year to exchange ideas and information about new 
discoveries and projects and problems they are encountering. It is called the Newcastle group 
because they all met in Newcastle in a conference and Bill Hanson apparently told them “you 
Dutchies should talk to each other”.

In Dutch archaeology there are what Wouter called “Sacred houses”, once everyone goes in 
one direction is difficult to leave that line and contradict.

The UK link is Carol and Willems and it’s more focused on Limes stuff. Nico is not so much 
interested in the Limes, but on Southern Netherlands.

While Carol is highlighting the female perspective of Batavians (saying that Batavian society 
was mainly a female one, due to the heavy levying of male troops among them, they were 
only women, child and elderly people), Nico dismisses such views and centres his discourse 
on male-centred elites and martiality.

“We are very national on our research”. We don’t look out of our own territories.

****recording starts****
Research Limes: It is indeed a tough border in academia. There is a separation between archaeologists working in the North and those working in the South. The North-East of the Netherlands is Roman free, and no one is doing Roman stuff in northern contexts, with very few exceptions like the research on OverIjssel. No one is researching Roman stuff in Groningen. Gallestin is not doing that; she is interested in Frisians, not in Romans. Also there is regional territoriality among universities. The North Eastern part of the Netherlands is Groningen territory, not VU or UvA or Leiden. It would be interesting to compare both areas (N-S) but no one does it. E.g. Ede settlements (large settlement excavation beyond the border, showing Germanic style 10-12 houses, which is very different to the 2-3 houses we find in the settlements in Roman contexts, Batavian area).

Also, North to the Limes is quiet archaeologically in Roman terms (not much evidence available) for the 1-3 centuries, so it’s prehistory that has to be used.

I think you’ll find out at the end of your study that we are very bad at relationship in between our own people. For instance, Nico publishes a series with University of Amsterdam press, where all his stuff is coming out. Those books are not in the bookshop in Leiden Museum. Which is not logical. In the National museum bookshop you should find books by the biggest archaeologists, but you can’t. There are clusters and domains and islands... this is my territory. That’s so different in the UK and in Germany... they work together. There are bridges between the islands but you have to ask permission to cross those bridges

Generally accepted that there is no debate, except for Nico who thinks there is debate. Nico has debates with his own people, but not with other scholars

German-British influence: We provide students with a typical German practical training and if they want to work on theoretical aspects they have to go to postgrad university.

UK community is open and not so aristocratic (class system). Germans are like Spain, a very aristocratic academic community. Dutch are in between, not so open, not so closed.

The theoretical framework is imported, not developed nationally, mainly because of the lack of debate already mentioned.

There is no leader in Dutch archaeology and no one wants to assume that role internationally; that might have to do with the character of the Dutch. But nationally there are people with a dominant grip on Dutch archaeology, and it has been like that for the last 20-30 years, when Professor Bogaers had such dominant grip and even dominated his successor Prof. Jonker Haleboz. When Haleboz took over, he did exactly the same. He dominated Dutch archaeology, didn’t give any chance to PhD students, it is a kind of power status thing. Once these key figures get the power they don’t get rid of it. And now Nico, in his way, is doing the same (First Bogaers, then Haleboz, and now Nico). If he organized it in another way then probably the Dutch school would have much more influence in the European stage… as it is, Dutch school sticks to Dutch stage, and there is nobody in the stage. There are clusters and dominant positions within Dutch academic archaeology but no one assumes the role of leading character in the international stage.
There is also no head of discourse. Nico probably thinks he is but he has discussions with no one; of course they talk to each other but it’s not a real academic discussion. Discussing with people that agree is no discussion.

Erdrich and Graafstal are out of the box thinkers. Graafstal (they are good friends and he has his contact details, tried to contact him by phone) – very good ideas about European frameworks, etc. he is very interesting for the wider picture, he is very European. He has a lot of contacts in England.
Prof. Rob Van Der Laarse

26/11/2013 – Interview, transcript and notes

Context:

Research director of the Amsterdam School for Heritage and Memory Studies (ASHMS) at the UvA’s faculty of humanities.

Let him know I have talked to Heleen van Londen at Archaeology UvA and would like to talk to Bloemers and Chiara de Cesari. Talked already to Lotte Jensen at Nijmegen (doing also things on memory and patriotism pre 19th century) and to Willem Frijhoff at Rotterdam (VU dean)

His research topics are: Significant sights/ Sites of significance (Places of Memory) / Lieaux de Memoire, a project you share with Willem Frijhoff...is it just post-war?

There was a conference early in November organized by him: Competing memories.

AHRC-NOW research awards British-Dutch cooperation in the humanities.

Heritage and identity politics (and musealization): museums as identity producers?

The dynamics of memory (research project)

Landscape and Heritage. Theoretical Perspectives (book...my idea of heritage landscape)

Interview Transcript:

S: I’m looking at Batavians and also looking at other ancient peoples of the Netherlands. I’m trying also to compare the Netherlands with Denmark, as academic communities... all related to the interactions between Romans and ‘barbarians’ in both areas.

RL: Aham.

S: So I’m interested in Batavians and all the historical developments, but I’m also interested in why, for instance, Cananefates or Frisians have not developed so much historical context.

RL: Well, Caninefates, they were called here in the Netherlands, played a role let’s say from the 16th century onwards... the Batavian myth, as it’s called, up to the 19th century I guess. Even when I was at school, you could hear some people talk about of Caninefates as have been living there, on the coastal borders of the Netherlands, in the dune areas... well, today this sort of knowledge is not existent anymore, but I guess school children don’t even know what Batavians are. (laughs)

[unrelated chat. Offers coffee]
S: You are saying, basically, that they were relevant but not anymore...

RL: Let’s say it depends, they are closely related in the Netherlands. In my view, you could make a difference in three periods (such division is present in Parker 1979 – 1st revolt 1565-8; 2nd revolt 1569-76; 3rd revolt 1576-81): the first one is when the Netherlands was still part of the Hapsburg empire, already in the late 15th-early 16th century you could see that’s the early start of the Batavian archaeological research, when dynasties, particularly noble aristocratic families were searching for inscriptions... very famous for example are the Wassenaer family near Katwijk, at the border of the sea there are also lots of plates, I even wrote an article on them (searches for it). This is Jan van Wassenaer he is a famous noble, he was an Earl in the Netherlands, they were also high in the Hapsburg Empire related to the Egmonts??? [02:55]... and this sort of noble families were claiming, you could say, the regions in which their families’ states were, and of course they were trying to create for themselves a genealogy, and they used antiquities to make clear that they had always been there, and that they are sort of descendants of old Batavian military elites. And that’s why they created the Batavian myth in the first instance. So I wrote an article, there should be also a German version but it takes a lot of time, which is about the... not the ‘invention’ of antiquity, but let’s say the unearthing of the past in a sense...because he also started, he and other families, with archaeological diggings when they had the idea, in Utrecht this happens and also in the southern parts of the Netherlands,... everywhere where they expected inscriptions to find and take antiquities under the ground which could say something about old Batavian tribes, like in Nijmegen for example, which is exactly the same period...then noble families started to unearthing the past with the idea that this should honour them as being very famous, from a very long descendance, going back to antiquity itself.


S: That’s very interesting, because as far as I knew, I thought it was only a kind of a very broad political use that was made of Batavians...

RL: No, there are loads... not many people know this, because historians are mostly interested in the second phase, the second period, during the Republic of the Netherlands, when you see that the Batavian myth, these families are gone then, most of them were Catholics and they were going to... after, let’s say, 1570, most of these families only have to restate on the Netherlands, on the Southern part of the Netherlands, on the catholic part, in the still Spanish part of the Netherlands or in Germany, so the Batavian myth was then nationalized during this revolt and interesting enough, the same research was taken over but given new interpretations. So the Batavian myth is then became not the Batavian noble families (of the first period), the elite, but then the emphasis was more on the aspects, let’s say, of the revolt, that the Batavians were the first to revolt against the Roman Empire, just like the Dutch revolted against the Hapsburg empire. So they were use, the same antiquities, the same stones, and inscriptions, and foundations found, and a whole castle (Brittenburg) found near the coast of the Netherlands, near Katwijk, the Brittenburg was then interpreted as being the first defences of sort of former Dutch group of people called the Batavians
and also Caninefates and the others...and they were not related then to former noble families but they were related to tribes or provinces. So let’s say the Dutch would have a different descent than the Frisians, and others...in Drenthe they claimed they sort of descended from the Saxons, so they all wrote their own regional history because the republic in essence was not one state and was not built around a court, but it was a group of eleven provincial elites, bourgeois families in most of the cities, with noble families but of lower nobility and what they did was giving them this Batavians myth, with a new connotation, and then you see the separation of the Batavians in Nijmegen, for it as the Gelders people, and the Batavian myth used as it was in Holland, and at the end ‘the Dutch are the Holland’ version won in the whole Dutch Republic, because this was the strongest group of course, with Leiden, and Amsterdam and all those cities...but in essence you could say that all the regions in the Netherlands had new variations of this sort of archaeological research, digging into the same past but giving it all sorts of regional interpretations. But that was the second phase...and ended up somewhere in the middle of the 17th century. And then there was a sort of school version, you could say of this old Batavian mythology, which was no longer based,... of course still there, there was...even in the school books people like Jan van Wassenaer... but then in a sort of national role, and no longer as being people who created their own genealogy almost in the same way as the emperor, the Hapsburg emperor...the idea of going back to Troy or something like that. Well, that aspect, which still works through the names, you could say that the famous castle of Brittenburg, it’s called Brittenburg because the idea was that Troy, after its destruction, not only created Rome but also created Brittany and from Brittany they created the Netherlands, because the Brittenburg was the place where this Troy elite families, who were also greater than the existing people, and larger and taller, that they could find the places where they originally landed, still back in all sort of names, like Katwijk, Wijk was claimed by people who claims “well, we are descendants from the Vikings, the Norway people”, but before that there was the idea that Wijk was the name use by the people from Troy. So let’s say, later on, they have a different aspect, in the republic period, when they say “well, we have to do with the people when this Viking tribes creating this destruction around 1000AD, but this was a different idea than before, they thought it was based on Troy, let’s say 1000BC (laughs)...so the same place gets different...

S: So different myths are structuring the kind of identity that they were creating?

RL: Yes, yes

S: That third phase in which the regional interpretations becomes...

RL: This you could say is the second phase, the period of the Republic, basically the 16th but more strongly the 17th century, because 16th was still based in this Hapsburg idea of going back to genealogies of rich and famous families, but then in the second phase it was more a national myth created in the end out of all those regional variations and then, the third phase is more or less the end of the 18th century when you have this Batavian revolution in the Netherlands, the Batavian revolt, or it can also be named the Netherlands or the Dutch revolt, the second revolt, and that was basically a revolt
against the old regent families, this was the new class created from the late 16th century onwards of large lower nobility and city bourgeois families, these groups then got opposition from...it’s a very complicated national opposition movement... basically they called themselves the nation, patriots, and these created more or less with the help of the French after 1794, this patriot revolt was from the early 1780s, but then the second phase of this revolt ended up in a sort of New Dutch Republic, which became part of France also, shortly also a kingdom of France, and then after 1813 you could say you have this lets say ‘modern’, strangely enough, monarchy of the Netherlands... we were first a Republic and then we ended up from the 19th century, and still are, a monarchy,... and in that phase, this is more or less the outcome of that third turbulent revolutionary phase, then you see that the eye of Batavians has changed again, because the Batavians, the Batavian revolutionaries of the late 18th century, they used the name Batavians, but in a completely different way than earlier, because they used it in a very nationalized way, as being one country, and not being all separate provinces and states, provinces were called states originally... so then you see that the Batavians have become a new concept, a sort of national concept, but just to give some sort of identity to a sort of new state, which basically differentiates themselves from the French in France, from the Saxons in Germany, the Anglo-Saxons in England, and so on... so it is more of a general concept, it’s not very closely, not very well defined anymore, it’s more a literary concept also,... but then you see that what happens during the 19th century, when you get all this process of nation building, then you see that new disciplines, like archaeology, are going back again to this old antiquities and they start again with this sort of archaeological research, and strangely you get a new sort of debate in which many of these old findings are playing a part, playing a role again...and that’s interesting because then you see new connotations given to old findings, but strangely enough, most of these archaeologists are also going back to the old chronicles, already started in the late medieval times, but basically all published in the late 15th century, and they are more or less, well you could say, they reconstruct a lot of those late Hapsburg empire archaeological research without much critical thought, and it’s interesting to see now in 19th century museums, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden in Leiden, that you see a whole group of findings there that go back to the 16th century without much newer connotations, basically they have this old inscriptions again... and they use this old concept of Batavian identity still... but we don’t know anything about the Batavians of course, a lot of archaeologists today are working still on this tradition, using names like Batavians, but only the Romans invented the name Batavian, but we don’t know anything about it.

S: Yes, it’s a Roman construction and formulation of an identity.

RL: Yes. That is interesting also because if you look at England... if you go to the Roman Wall in England, if you look down in these museums they have all sorts of Roman finds, but they also have some letters there, and when you see where those letters came from, you see they came from the Netherlands, originally, in Roman times... and when you see they were written in a sort of Dutch, it’s a very pre-...sort of,...
S: The Vindolanda tablets?

RL: Yes, yes. So you could say in that sense that the Romans in England were Batavian troops, which of course is the idea they had already in the 16th century, but it’s basically interesting that what we conceptualize as Romans in England, are conceptualized as Batavians in the Netherlands.

S: In a kind of native...

RL: Yes. So you see how it works together. Nobody, in fact, knows what Romans were,... were these peoples Italians? Could come from everywhere of course, and what Batavians are...I mean, what are Batavians? This people living here, in the Netherlands, or were they living everywhere in, let’s say, the German part of the Empire, and being a sort of troops? It could be everything but of course already in Tacitus and so on, you see there are some sort of regional identities related to that, but nobody knows really if this is based on ethnographic research, or if it’s true...

S: Or if it’s just labels...

RL: Just labels... yes.

S: So... I’m very interested in this historical; process on how Batavians evolve within the national identity and regional identities too. What I have read is that once the monarchy is installed in the early 19th century Batavians lose a little bit that kind of national role, mainly because of the political use that has been made of it during the last revolt, the patriots’ revolt. And then they don’t come back to the public life until the mid-20th century, after the WWII. Is that accurate?

RL: I don’t know. In political life I don’t see them coming back never again, also not after WWII war. Of course there was maybe some sort of attention to the Batavian concept, but it’s not really used during the German occupation (note to self: why used during the previous episodes of revolt and unrest and not in the German occupation???). I’m also a professor in Holocaust research but we don’t have a huge resistance movement called the Batavians for example, even the word patriots is not really used, because it has to do with something very strange. The Germans used archaeology in that period for doing exactly what the Dutch did in the 19th century, namely finding their old Rome by let’s say politicizing all sorts of Saxon heritage, these Hunebedden, these stone construction going back to prehistory, so what the Germans did, in fact, was politicizing archaeology and there were archaeologist in the Netherlands also working within this German framework of an highly dialogized Nazi-kind of archaeology and because of that you could say that the resistance movement didn’t use it, or couldn’t use it, because it was already being used by the occupying forces. They use all these concepts, even concepts like patriots could not be used because the national-socialist movement in the Netherlands was called themselves patriots, because they called themselves ultranationalist, of course they were pro-German, but they were also using a sort of patriotic vocabulary, even more, let’s say fascist historians in the Netherlands in the 1930s, 1940s, were writing very
positive about the patriot revolt of the late 1780s. So more or less, the right wing fascist movement in the Netherlands was appropriating this Batavian patriotic myth of the late 18th century, which is strange but it also meant that the liberation of 1945 in the Netherlands was conceptualized in the same terms as the liberation of 1813 after France. Because this France period was more or less regarded the same as the Batavian period, the patriot revolt ended up in the French occupation of the Empire, the Napoleonic period, and you could say that after 1945, everybody regarded the occupation of Napoleon more or less as the occupation of Hitler, so you see that Hitler is Napoleon and the NSB, the fascist collaborators in the Netherlands were more or less like the patriots groups of the late 18th century.

S: That is very interesting because you can also draw parallels in that sense, but in a completely different perspective, with the 16th century revolt. There were parallels then between Batavians and the Dutch revolting against the Hispanic empire, and then also between characters, between Civilis and William d’Orange, and...

RL: Yes, but that was the other way around, because then they made the resemblance between William of Orange and Julius Civilis. So then the different connotation...but it changes in the 20th century. But it’s not changed in the sense... let’s say Julius Civilis is not really problematic and not even the Dutch revolt (16th century), because that doesn’t even play a role but more the patriot revolt (late 18th century). Although the patriots (late 18th century) themselves used the Dutch revolt (16th century), that why they called themselves Batavians, so it’s a very strange situation, but it’s the way it worked out.

S: I read you are also quite into looking at the effects of post-war ideologies and identities. I have this idea, which is probably quite common amongst anthropologists that after periods of stress, of war, normally people tend to look for identity, and if you actually look at the evolution of the Batavian myth you can actually see that it has always been after a period of stress that that kind of national identity has been looked for... I’m interested on that factor as a creator of identity.

RL: Yes. There was a whole debate already during the war about post-war debts???

[22:10] identity, which is a very remarkable debate, because even people who belonged to the socialist party were thinking in terms of using this war as a chance of creating a new sort of Netherlands, with a new man and so on, which you also find in arts and so on. But basically the idea of what we call, well a German word because strangely enough the social-democrats are very German oriented before the war, Gemainschafkunst, art for the people, you could say, and in this idea was that socialists should be ethical and cultural, but in the first war years, that’s very interesting, there was the idea that the Netherlands should again go together with Belgium, but without the French speaking part of Belgium (laughs)... even there is one of the political leaders who wrote a pamphlet, who never wanted to be reminded of course after the war, it was in fact anti-Semitic, because he wrote: “of course we were not against the Jews”... you must know that half of the socialists and communist parties have been Jews formerly, but then of course they were already taken to the camps... “but this is not a bad moment
in fact...”, because the Jews were not taken to the camps, only the Christian Jews, they were taken to the camps transported later, but that was at this moment that had not happened yet, ... “it’s good that we now have the Christian Jews here in the Netherlands, because we should become a sort of, let’s say, socialists Christian society with this part of the Flemish part of Belgium also, and with the Christian Jews, but not the Jewish Jews” (laughs). So, you see how strange this debate has already... in what strange directions it went. It became a little bit different immediately, in the last year after war, when the southern part of the Netherlands was already liberated then by English, American and Canadian troops, and there was a debate going on, much more realistic of what sort of Netherlands should arise. And that was sort of, let’s say, modern democratic Netherlands, but then interestingly without the pillarized parties, so not the Catholic parties, or even the socialist parties, but rather with let’s say a people’s party, but a sort of national people’s party.... so even socialists were going in a very sort of, you can’t say the word anymore, but sort of national socialist way of thinking, and they had some sort of opinion, also the Catholics, if we socialists and Catholics go together, that was the basic idea of what was called then the National People’s Movement, and the word party wasn’t used because they used themselves Movement, they had the idea that when they have this sort of National People’s Movement this should be based on the former, the pre-war, social-democratic party, which had more or less 25% of the votes, and the Catholic People’s party, which has also something like 25% of the votes, now together they could become a large enough to govern the country. And this happened after the War, because the first 10 years after the War, it’s called the Reds Roman Catholic coalition; so these two groups were not going in the end as one party but they did go together in one political coalition, and this coalition was a very strange coalition because they were very right wing, although the socialists were important in them, and the Prime Minister was always a socialists, they were in fact doing extremely militarist and nationalists policies... let’s say to take just one thing, to have this word in Indonesia. The Social-Democratic party as such was for decolonisation, they were for freedom of the Dutch Indies, but what happened when they governed together with the Roman Catholic party, which were strongly opposed against decolonisation, the socialists immediately changed their policies and sent troops, the socialists Prime Minister, to Indonesia, among them my own father. Of course, what they had to do was terrible, in fact they had to do exactly the same of what the Germans did in Poland, only one example, and a lot of massacres. And this created a lot of opposition, and what you saw of course was a very anti-Communist policy, the Communist party lost... anyway very strong at a local level, in many cities also, because they were leading the resistance movement,... and they lost control immediately after the war, also because of the Cold War of course, so in the end you could say there was a sort of debate about the Netherlands, but if the Batavian myth played a role on that I don’t think so. No, nobody used it again.

S: It was not an issue anymore.

RL: No, it was not an issue. You could say it became special, I think, of archaeologists to research. And it only comes back... it did come back maybe only 20 years ago, or 15,
when it played a role in regional heritage policy. Not even in school books because, before the war you had this strange thing that the Batavians came in the country with the end of the Roman Empire, but when I was young, let’s say in primary school, I didn’t hear anything about Batavians, yes I heard something about it, but about Batavian facts and so on, and people’s migrations movements at the end of the Roman Empire, but it was not basically a thing Dutch people have learnt as a sort of start of their national identity politics.

S: Now I know there is this Canon for schools, and I know Batavians are mentioned as part of the Roman Limes.

RL: Yes, the Limes plays a role, but that’s all... there is a sort of strange that Belvedere Programme started in 1990s in which all those old concepts play a role again. It’s now going back, old 19th century and early 20th century nationalist frames are now coming back into a sort of new government policy, but basically is more of a tourist kind of folklore thing that has to do with Europe probably. Because in Europe you have now what it’s called the Europe of the regions and what you see is that some regions play sort of regional policy, like lets say North Holland, by finding suddenly a sort of prehistoric dead girl that is then called the Batavian girl, it’s absolute nonsense, it’s not even based on DNA research or something... it’s a very strange policy but regional governments are now trying to create regional mentalities. I don’t know why, it’s not based on anything at all, except for architects and planners and designers, regional politicians.

S: I’m very interested in this kind of interaction between regional, national and European agendas.

RL: Yes, yes.

S: ...and how that affects the way people look at materials and evidence. Basically, what I have kind of realized is that European agendas are very much connected to regional agendas somehow...

RL: Yes.

S: ... so the national agendas are kind of, not dismissed, but neglected, because they are in the middle, they are on the way.

RL: Yes, in the Netherlands it’s quite strong because what happened from the 1980s onwards, let’s say from the 1990s much stronger,...we first started with a long period, for the first time...because this Christian democratic party which during the first period after the war governed with socialist, but then they let the socialists get out, and only governed with liberals, with the exception of just one government in the early 1970s, but even then this was a new red KEU[31:03] coalition, but then for all the rest, let’s say from the 1880s to the 1980s you could say all governments were...the Christian democrats were part of them. And then in the 1990s there was certain moment, let’s say 10 years, at least two governments, when you had sort of left liberal coalition which
was quite interesting, because then you had socialist together with liberal parties, and the liberal parties were quite right-wing, and the socialist said: “ok, we are now going to govern with the liberals and we forget everything which is socialist, so we are now just a neo-liberal party like all the others, and only in culture we are more humanitarian”, so that’s what’s left from all the socialism. So it had nothing to do at that time anymore, like today, with socialist policy or whatever. What you see is basically that the socialist policy creates a sort of...they are very strong in regionalism, and what they say is that, let’s say liberals have this ideology of privatization, they say “we have to end up the national state, everything has to be privatized, energy, security, public health, everything should be privatized”, and the socialist said, “well, we want to have a buffer in between but not the old type of buffer, the pilarized organizations, and these were basically Christian -Democrat, but we want to have something new and this is regional. So then it created strange sort of programmes like the Belvedere programme, but a lot of others, in which you see that the government in fact has lost its power: it’s central planning institutes, for example, in economics but also in planology, so the central government was very strong in the Netherlands in planning the whole nation, planning the income policy, planning spatial environment, planning energy and so on, and it was absurd success formula, and without any reason, because this was probably the best formula the Netherlands ever had, they stopped that, they privatized the whole thing, and they said in the same sort of movement from the 1990s onwards: “the national government has nothing else to say any more about incomes, about economy, about industrialization, about agriculture, about ecology, about planning, about building programmes...everything now goes to the provinces and the municipalities. And from that moment on all laws have been changed and now you see that the lead in government policy is municipalism but of course these communities, these local communities, don’t have any power at all, because the privatized institutions are extremely strong, because you have now building corporation with an extreme power and a lot of capital, and own almost all these privatized areas in the Netherlands, let’s say what was basically farms up to the 1990s are now all bought by corporations. And these corporations are in control, they are sort of mafia institutes, although they are not called mafia in the Netherlands because we don’t believe there is a Mafia...

S: It’s a kind of taboo word...

RL: (laughs) They don’t need violence because there is no state to oppose them so they can do what they want. And this is a completely liberalized situation in which there is no control whatever, not from below, not from above, not ever. In this situation of course, municipalities have to deal with extreme strong parties with lawyers and so on, which say: “well, we have now bought this whole area of your community and we are going to buy, let’s say, industry parks , or houses, or whatever you want, we own them, we build the houses, we contract the industries, the shops, shopping moles...”, and local municipalities can’t do anything at all, they have the illusion that they can decide a little bit but in fact it’s all privatized. And national government doesn’t have anything to say about it anymore. So this is what phase we are having.
S: That fits with a kind of absence of a national...

RL: Yes, it’s a kind of illusion. The institutes still exist. There is a SRA Rijksinstitute of cultural heritage, a national cultural heritage institute. Well, this was a very strong institute up to the early 1990s; if you wanted to build something in an area where there are archaeological findings, or where there were monuments which couldn’t be destructed, then this institute could simply say stop and it was ended. Now they have no power at all, they can advise the local community, which has to deal with these privatized partners. And privatized partners were very small in the 1990s because this were basically, most of them were at that period only a sort of socialist corporations created for building houses for labour class people, that basically how they all began. And now this groups have grown out, they are related to banks and all sorts of institutions, they are now mostly working internationally, and people earn more than the Prime Minister, a simple director of this sort of privatized corporations could earn something like 5 million a year or something, while a local politician probably earns 70.000€. This is an absurd situation, and there is no control mechanism anymore, it can never be ended, it’s really, it’s sort of the selling out of the nation, in that sense. These groups are strong in Europe as well, as a sort of lobby organization, and that’s basically what happens.

S: That explains very well the contextual factors of how agendas of research develop around these topics, both at European level obviously, because there is a kind of identity that is, not imposed but looked for, and what you have said explains very well why there is no national input and there is so much regional input, with this kind of constrains from the privatized groups. That’s the kind of triple agenda that I was trying to identify within archaeology of the ancient peoples.

RL: Yes.

S: So that’s one aspect. If we go back to the historical context... normally, when people talk about national identities and nationalism people just talk about the 19th century and early 20th century, but I’m pretty sure, from what i have been reading and talking to people, that in terms of uses of past peoples in order to build an identity, that’s previous to 19th century in the Netherlands. You obviously have the 16th century use of Batavians, but that has actually been building up, it’s not just something isolated in the 16th century, so could you actually talk about national identity in the Netherlands from the 16th century or is just a shared conscience of common origin?

RL: Of course what were created from the 19th century onwards in historiography is going back to the middle ages, and then you find let’s say from the 13th century onwards this municipalities came up; everything that is called town nowadays came into existence basically between 1200 and 1400, in these two centuries every city was created including Amsterdam, which was then of course a very unimportant town, didn’t have anything to do with real big cities like Utrecht at the early period or Nijmegen or whatever... in this whole process where cities have to compete with monasteries in particular, because religious orders paly a huge role in the Netherlands
also in the reclamation of agriculture, what we call now Polders, were basically created in this same period, and some of them were created by the people in the cities and other were created by people from the monasteries, and above them were the Earls, and were the Royalty and the nobility and so on, so you see this whole organizational movements are more or less in preparation since the Burgundian period onwards, some would even say going back to Charles the great in the 9th century, but this is not quite clear. There were all sorts of movements in some parts of the country; you could say it’s clear from Maastricht and these areas, which is near Arnhem and so on, but basically from the Netherlands, I think something like this regional mentality, people would call their own region their nations in a sense that started somewhere in the 11th, 12th, 13th century, that’s more or less the moment when you could say that you can also see different...you can also see it in literature, for example... and you see it in art... and it’s relatively fast movement, because already you see in the religious movement also a sort of pietism which grows in some monasteries centres in the Netherlands. So in the 14th and 15th century you have already a very early Renaissance movement here in this northern part of Europe, which is quite closely related to also Northern Italy, but let’s say the invention of a lot of... like Erasmus, which goes back to monasteries circles already two centuries before, which is called back then the reformation or the Reformation Movement within Christianity, which is typically something from the Northern Netherlands, and that’s related also to arts, people working in let’s say Utrecht or in Antwerp, also in these towns of the low countries, you see a lot of trade and art and religious movements going together, and yes, this has to do with the sort of identity concept which you could call, it has to do with the idea that they belong together in a certain way, but it’s quite complicated to make clear how, because still there are all sorts of noble groups which can change the borderlines between these different ‘countries’, to call them this way, and people migrate from one place to another and this is quite heavily I guess, because you see towns growing in one part and then you see other towns growing, and new harbours come to existence, so there is a lot of migration going on in this period. And also the relationship between the Netherlands and England, and Germany and so on. So yes, it’s a very important period but it’s difficult to say, what you see happening is that people from monasteries are starting to write in Holland and in other parts chronicles, so they invent some kind of history going back to Roman past and even, and what they also do is chronologize the history that goes back from oral history, so let’s say, if they start writing in the early 12th century you could say that there is some sort of information going back already to the 11th century is reasonably true, could have a sense of truthiness in it. It’s not completely mythical, of course before that it becomes a sort of mythologized history, but you could say from that period onwards, earliest the 11th century, there is a sort of written history in the Netherlands, and in that written history already there is some sort of idea that antiquity plays a role even without doing archaeological research and finds...

[Telephone rings. conversation in Dutch starts]

RL: So, what you see is that history starts, history in the sense of written history, somewhere on the 11th century and that’s also the period when the earliest literature
can be found; there are literary historians who say that the first words in real Dutch, different from German and from other languages, is also from this period. And it’s of course the period when we find the first sculptural art and the first oil paintings and so on, which goes on to the van Eyck brothers, so this is basically what happens, and already the idea that all this goes back to Roman period came into in existence also in this period. But yes, then towns and monasteries are still part of, and sometimes even owned, by noble families. So even then there is still this relationship with the nobility.

*S: Because I was talking to Lotte Jensen from Nijmegen university...*

RL: Yes

*S: ...she is writing a project on identifying the kind of patriotic views before the actual 19th century. Normally national identity is linked the creation of nations, just because of that label,...*

RL: Yes

*S: ...which I think it’s an artificial label, I don’t think it can actually be applied, so she is actually looking into that kind of common pre-19th century identity, and she actually is talking about two factors: language and common history.*

RL: Yes

*S: Language, as you said, there are people sustaining that from the 12th century, you have already a kind of common Dutch language in use literally, and then in terms of common history, at least from the 15th century, you have this kind of “ok, we identify ourselves, or we create analogies with these people from Roman times, Batavians and such”... so that’s why in my opinion there is a kind of, you can actually talk about national identity, with lots of constrains, but a kind of common identity before the creation of the nation. And actually, if you can actually create a nation is somehow because there is a link before the creation of that nation.*

RL: Yes, well, the nation concept from the 15th, 16th century is quite difficult, because what you see in the Hapsburg empire is this kind of Batavian crises, sort of these regional states which belong together from an imperial policy, but it also has to do with the interesting fact that the Hapsburg empire was basically the Burgundian empire, which was governed from the Southern Low Countries, let’s say from Brussels, from Antwerp, from Leuven, from ??? [48:10], and had this direct relations with the northern towns, especially Utrecht, and den Voss??? Hague??? [48:22] and so on... not from Viena or something like that, which is a later situation which has to do with the 1570 war and even somewhat before 1550 the divorce of the Hapsburg empire, where you see the Spanish part and the Austrian part, and that’s the separation of the Netherlands, because then they should have belonged to the Austrian part or to the German part but then suddenly they came to belong to the Spanish part, and they didn’t want that, because the situation is different. In that process the sort of national identity came into existence which later has become explained as it would have been normal for the
Netherlands to have become part of the German empire. But it’s questionable, because a lot of German noble families had relationships, let’s say the Orange family, was directly related to the Mendoza family in Spain, so there were a lot of relationships in the Hapsburg empire which were not basically Dutch-German, but there were also lots of relationships between Dutch and French families for example, and Italian families and Spanish families and also loads of states and in the art movements you see it too, so it’s not as easy as people thought it was. What you can say it’s that in the Netherlands there is a sort of new invention after this whole Hapsburg break of finding out what the Dutch republic really was; it was not only opposed to Spain, but it was also opposed to France and it was also opposed to Hapsburg, so they have to take three positions then, and it’s quite complicated, because already very soon after the Dutch revolt certainly after 1612-1620 you see that the Netherlands and Spain were more or less in one line, opposing together France, so it’s quite difficult to find out what Dutch identity really is and how they would identify themselves and also in the earlier period, during the Hapsburg period, you see that even then it’s quite difficult to find out how deeply this idea of being part of a Dutch,... well, Dutch is not the word that they would use in this period, but let’s say a Batavian cries??? [51:10] really is. Because, let’s say Gelders doesn’t really feel related to Holland, still a lot of opposition also in terms of violence and military war between the Duke of Gelders and the Earl of Holland; the earl of Holland was basically part of the Hapsburg empire, while Gelders didn’t want to become part of the Hapsburg empire. Well, regionally this is a strange situation, that Holland, at a coastal region, felt themselves part of the Hapsburg empire, while Gelders, which was directly related to Germany, didn’t feel themselves part of the Hapsburg empire. So you could say that this for us now completely normal topographic spatial sort of identity politics was not really in existence then; Gelders felt much more related to France and to England, and it has to do with dynastic relations and you can find it back also in art and all sort of relationships. So it could have been...so if nations should not be territorially defined then you could say that Gelders had become part of the French empire, kingdom, or of the English kingdom, while Holland could have become part of Spain. So even a city as Amsterdam in the 1570 revolt, Amsterdam was not pro-Orange, Amsterdam wanted to become still part of Spain, they felt themselves pro-Spanish, so it took really a siege to make Amsterdam take the side of the revolt. This identity politics are not as easy as they look like.

S: So basically the only factor in common they could find was the threat of being absorbed, or to disappear....

RL: Yes, it was power politics of regional and local families who were governing a region or governing a country, governing a city, and of course it has to do with trade policies, with loyalties also in futile sense of the word...there were also cities who got their rights from the Hapsburg empire, and then said “well, we don’t want to revolt against the king of Spain because still he is the son of the former Hapsburg, or he is the nephew of the former Hapsburg emperor, who gave us our right and we don’t want to lose that...so yes, there is a lot of complicated policies in a very regional and local level, before this nations started to become in the 17th century something fitted together.
S: It makes sense. I was having the idea that you could trace it back to the early stages of the revolt against the Spanish empire, but I didn’t actually take into account this kind of regional different approaches to that same situation. I was thinking in terms of one whole unit reacting against the...

RL: No, it’s very complicated because the revolt in Holland did not start as many people think I Holland, but it started in Flanders, and it didn’t even start in Flanders, basically it started in what is now Balunia [54:50]. Even Dutch families like the Egdmunds, which are very closely related to Holland, they were always Stadholders of Holland, but most important, castles were in the French speaking part of Belgium nowadays, and there they had the library collections and so on, and they were opposing the king of Spain, together with France, so the Dutch revolt was supported in first instance by France and had to do also with the former Guelder’s struggle against the Hapsburg empire, this old loyalty also plays a role. People like William of Orange, for example, were very strongly related to the King of France, which was the reason why the king of Spain felt them, this highest nobility in the Hapsburg empire, and he accused them of being treacherous because they were related to the king of France, and they were, I mean, he was right in that sense. In terms of futilism [55:55] you could say that his most loyal top nobility was in fact betraying him, which is true, because they got the troop from France. And this has to do also with the fact that the king of France, who was Henry IV was still protestant in that period, it’s unbelievable now, but then it was France supporting the protestants, against the Spanish. So it was so complicated this whole situation.

S: But that makes sense in terms of Gelderland being one of the focus because it’s supposed to be, I mean archaeologically, Batavians are from Gelderland and the family of Orange is also from that area...

RL: In this period they used this myth, yes.

S: Yes, it makes sense that they are the ones actually using them, because they had the archaeological support, they could make the analogies and they did. But again, that’s a kind of regional use of it, is the Gelderland using that kind of myth but not the whole nation. There is not like a national myth back then. That’s the difference

RL: Yes, yes, yes. I have to stop now because... this is just to give some aspects of the very complicated history of the Netherlands which you really have to understand up to the late 18th century as a sort of compilation, a mosaic of completely different sort of former states which still have their different mentalities and their different historical backgrounds, and different dynastic loyalties, and one of the strangest outcomes of all this is that everybody would have expected that the Dutch revolt its centre was in the southern part of the Netherlands, Antwerp for example, and what happened in fact was that the southern part in the end stayed catholic and stayed pro-Spanish, while the Northern part of the Netherlands, where everyone would have expected that they become...they were more pro-Spanish in the early period than the southern part... in the end this (northern) became the Republic. And no historian ever questions it but...I’m
not a historian of that period, I write about it from a different standpoint, because as a heritage specialist, but if I was a historian of the Golden Age or something like that, I would be much more interested in the question of why the Netherlands would have started where they started, because it’s a very strange situation, even William of Orange his whole family business was in the Southern part of the Netherlands, in Antwerp, in Brussels, there were his castles, even in the northern Netherlands he didn’t have much...in Holland he didn’t have anything at all, his basic castle was also in the southern part, almost near Belgium, Breda, that was his most famous castle...so everybody would have expected Brabant, Flanders, even Bologna, Den Haag, being part of the centre of the revolt and in the end it became Holland and Gelderland and even Friesland, which nobody would have expected because of what is Friesland. So this is a strange outcome of a series of historical events which has to do also with economic aspects, because after the fall of Antwerp, the bourgeoisie, the trade people, the bankers, they all fled to Amsterdam, and from that moment on Amsterdam had 40% of people from the southern Netherlands, and the city of Amsterdam changes its policy and became supporting the revolt. But you could say in the 19th century, most rich families herein Amsterdam, were originally from the South, and that goes for Leiden and goes for most of Dutch cities, they grow extremely fast after 1570, because all these protestant families from France, from the Southern part of the Netherlands all went to the northern part of the Netherlands, but in many ways these people from the Northern part of the Netherlands were immigrants, they were not really from the northern part of the Netherlands.

S: So they don’t have an original sense of belonging?

RL: No, in that sense you could say that the original part of northern Netherlands is catholic probably. The old elite in Amsterdam were 100% catholic. Only they didn’t have political power, but they still have religious power, and economic power, and intermarriages. So you could say that for a very long time the old catholic nobility and bourgeoisie was allowed to go on, and intermingle, and have their context in Hapsburg empire, were most of them were called noble man, noble titles there. They were not allowed to have them here, so they had different names here than they had in the court of Maria Teresa in Vienna. But it’s a very strange situation because we have here people that we know as intellectuals because they were doctors doing something in science at Leiden, and then they become noble man at the Viennese Hapsburg court. The same people, the same families, so they have double lives and this also is a very intriguing aspect of the Dutch republic. The tolerance we have now in the Netherlands was basically created in that period. Because this was not a completed revolt, the revolt stopped in a certain way, became no a new monarchy, everybody would expect they have become a sort of protestant monarchy, related to the English court, it didn’t work out, in the end it became the Republic because nobody in fact wanted to have a protestant king. They also didn’t have a catholic king anymore; formally the Spanish king still exists but nobody recognised him at different states. There was nothing else, so what came in place was the only Stadtholder... every province had a Stadtholder in the past... but after the Hapsburg Empire and during the Republic, the only Stadtholder...
still living in the Netherlands was the Orange family and they became then the Stadtholder of all the provinces, which is basically of course a de facto royalty, only not recognised.

S: Not formally

RL: No

S: It’s terribly complex and that’s why is so interesting. My idea is to try and understand all that context so that I can draw lines modern discourses in archaeology and historical circumstances, because that’s what has been done in Britain. They talk about post-colonialism in terms of archaeological ideas because they have actually deconstructed their own inherited discourse, those were colonialists and colonial, imperialist discourses, they were reproducing that in terms of archaeology and they have deconstructed those discourses and realized that, and go and move on into post-colonialism. The thing is that I’m recognising those post-colonial discourses also here in Dutch academia, but I’m not sure they are coming from the same kind of development. I think it’s actually an import of those models, British models in terms of theoretical framework, but there is no match of local development of those post-colonial positions. And that’s what I’m trying to see.

RL: In Dutch archaeology there is not a theoretical debate. As a historian when I look into what’s happening there, if I compare to England, you could say we have a lot of people...there’s been done a lot of digging in the Netherlands, so quality is based on empirical research, but there is no much theoretical debate, and compared to England you could say maybe the English have not dig that much but they have a lot of post-processual debate about what archaeological knowledge really means, and about what political identity are behind it, and that sort of debate doesn’t exist in the Netherlands, and strangely enough, what you see in the Netherlands is that there is not much connection made between Netherlands archaeological research and our research in the colonies, because we have a lot of research done, let’s say 50% or more of Dutch archaeology is restrained in the Dutch Indies in the past. I don’t know how many people you spoken but I guess that there were not many people who could tell you what’s about this relationship, because all those archaeologists have colonialists pasts, they were trained in the Indies and that’s where they learned also to think in terms of religion, in terms of identity prescriptions, they found a lot of course also, there is the tropical museums, the colonial museums in the Netherlands but also in the Dutch Indies themselves, Batavia, which is now in Indonesia national museum...it’s incredible what they found, the whole Buddhist past you could say it’s been invented there by the Netherlands, and still is being shown as taken over by the new colonials, by the new national state, but it’s the old colonial past that is still represented there. And that’s remarkable, because even in the museums in the Netherlands you would expect some sort of debate on this but there isn’t, and I don’t know why, but the Netherlands, after they lost the Indies, in 1949, they had a very strong policy of forgetting, so most young people nowadays don’t even know that the Dutch Indies were ever part of the Netherlands. I mean, Indonesia is the largest, in terms of population, the largest Muslim state in the world. In the Netherlands we have this populist movement now...
if you ask people what we Netherlands have to do with Muslims, everybody would say first Muslims came with the Moroccan people as labour class people in the 1970s, they all forgot that we had for four centuries the largest Muslim empire in our national state, it’s unknown. So that’s also one of the reasons why this immense tropical museum we had up to last year is now being privatized by the Dutch government, the library is now sold to Egypt, we had the largest library in Europe on colonial literature and a few weeks ago it was sold to Egypt, so it will now become part of the New Alexandria probably. It is really unbelievable, we sell everything we can, if you want to have the national monuments in the Netherlands, national monuments in terms of built monuments, they were already from the 16th century onwards bought by the Dutch state, first by the Orange family and then they became nationalized, as a kind of national collection, so the lest say the castle of the ??? [1:07:22], which is one of the oldest noble families in the Netherlands, which is near the Castle of Egmont for example, you can now buy a castle if you want, Dutch state is selling in a website all its national monuments, even if museums are in there, so everything is being sold.

S: It’s a kind of disintegration of the national label.

RL: Yes, well, the state doesn’t want to have anything to do with culture anymore so they say culture is something for tourism and if someone is interested then they should pay for it, and then they can buy it. So it’s extreme at this moment, it’s a sort of tetric Reagan policy you could say. But there is not much debate on it because basically it is also supported by the socialists, and there is no opposition left and only people in the professional field themselves but they don’t have a voice, because people let’s say in museums or in monuments or in all sorts of heritage organizations, or in different parts of culture, like classical music or popular music or whatever,... everybody thinks they already own, that happened to them, they don’t see the relationships, because they are quite difficult to see. But basically what you see here is a sort of theme??? [1:08:45] experiment, where the state is selling itself, so on one side you have this kind of Europeanization, in which Brussels takes over national power, and on the other side you have this sort of populist opposition against that; and then you have a government which sells itself out to all sorts of private partnerships. That is an interesting situation, and I guess in ten years even Universities will be sold probably to Rockefeller Foundations or anyone who wants to have a University. We have already the first private universities now, the Roosevelt University is sort of an American University and it’s quite successful, and a lot of our students are really now wanting to have university colleges which are now being created by University of Amsterdam, the Vrije University, Utrecht University, but you can wait for the moment when a private partnership shall exists, and say “well, we start our own university college and then create our own master” because why not, it can. And then you have your public school system, like in England.

[unrelated chat]

RL: You mentioned the limes, which also an interesting aspect. There is a sort of interest, let’s say you have two developments in the Netherlands besides Mediterranean
archaeology, which was for a very long time part of Humanities faculties, you have from the special sciences a different sort of archaeology which was more prehistoric archaeology and now it has been fused in most universities it’s now related, although digging in the Netherlands is not being done anymore by academic archaeologists, most is commercial. But strangely, in this archaeological policy, the Belvedere policy, you see that the Roman limes plays an important role because of planning institutes; they have this idea that the Roman limes is something to do with Dutch identity and then you are being part of this grand European heritage community, so you see it in Germany, you see it England, and you see it in the Netherlands. That plays a role, because limes is also an interesting concept which can be related to local/regional heritage policy, it can be related to design, to planning, in the province of Utrecht you even have a sort of... near the city of Utrecht, yes, a new area where the Roman Limes is being part of the planning, you can see it from an aerial photography... but basically why is difficult to say, because there is a sort of Roman thing in the Netherlands going on, and it’s basically a thing of town institutes, town councils you could say, they would like if they city goes back to Roman times, you also see it in agrarian areas, where they have some sort of new identity, what we call ‘phoenix’ locations, ‘phoenix’ is this sort of new urban area which has to be related to old heritage identities, so it’s more or less obliges that planners should do something with that. Planners are not interested in the biography of the place, they don’t want to have all this layers and hear what really was historically going on, so they want to have some kind of icon, and Roman period like the Batavian myth or something like that could be a very good icon.

S: One of the things I discussed with a few archaeologists is the idea of a ‘research limes’, the impact that the limes has in the way that research is done North to the limes and south to the limes, still within the modern Netherlands, but there is a division in the way research is done, and also the topics that are actually researched. North to the limes is more of a prehistoric approach, south to the limes is more of a Roman Provincial archaeology.

RL: Yes, yes.

S: Also the fact that the chronologies have to be different because you cannot relate them directly in the North to Roman chronologies, they can be related but they still need to be typological and not so historical.

RL: Which means maybe that for your comparison with Denmark, North of the limes could be more related to Danish archaeology.

S: It’s the same kind of process, but the difference is that Denmark has no division, it’s just a prehistoric approach that they have. Actually, I was talking to Lars Joergensen, who is in the National museum in Copenhagen, and he was talking about the prehistoric approach; lately, because of all this new studies that some researchers in Denmark are being running, in terms of the relationship between the Roman empire and Denmark, they are starting to talk about it in terms of Roman archaeology, but just because they are choosing to develop those topics, otherwise they talk about the materials in terms of prehistory, and ‘Roman Iron Age’ (label) is the closest they get to the Roman context...related to the Romans but prehistoric
perspective. I call it ‘research limes’ but it’s a concept that doesn’t exist as far as I know, because there is that division and that in academic terms is quite strong.

RL: Yes

[phone rings; unrelated chat; end of interview]
Dr Louise Swinkels

28/11/2013 – Interview, transcript and notes

Context: He is the principal curator of the Roman collection at the Valkjoff Museum in Nijmegen. He organized the exhibition on the Batavians (2004) an edited the subsequent catalogue.

Questions:

How is the past presented in this museum?

Is national identity transferred somehow through the materials exhibited or the displays? Or is it more regional/local?

What was the aim behind these exhibition...the motivation...the justification...the excuse?

Have you detected an interest in the public or that was what you wanted to wake up?

If there is no social interest why did you do it? And if there is no social interest why these exhibition was so successful? Was it successful and did it have an impact? At a local/regional level or at a national level

Transfer of knowledge between academia and society and mutual influence. Role of exhibitions and museums on this process?

How do you think it affects you the fact that you are studying and presenting your own past?

Is the postcolonial academic swift towards natives also visible in museums?

Regional-National-European agendas, identities and perspectives. Is there a very heavy regional bias/input (political) in terms of Batavians?

Why the emphasis (not only in academic research but also in your exhibition) on Batavians? Why not Cananefates or Frisians? Title seems to suggest that they are the lost forefathers, which is an idea developed since the 15th century. Is it because the exhibition has a regional focus and audience?

Role of Batavians/Batavian myth in national identity/discourse both academic and general? And what is the role of the other tribes?

“Sons of our times” (what defines our times and how does it affects our interpretations?-Postcolonial times? Global times?). How do current situations of cultural exchange, adaptation, identity creation (immigration) affect your views on ancient one?
Interview Transcript:

[irrelevant chat. He asked if I had visited other museum professionals, and I told him I talked to Ruurd Halbertsma and wanted to speak to the organizers of the Batavian commission exhibition in the Royal palace, but they were too busy. Also told him I have been talking to historians, commercial archaeologists and academic archaeologists in different universities because I’m starting to see regional differences in discourses. He agrees. He also agrees with the idea of a pre-19th century common identity in the Dutch territories]

S: One of the aspects that I’m more interested in of your work here is the way in which the academic discourses around Batavians, especially Batavians in this case, but also other ancient peoples in the Netherlands, is transferred to the public sphere and how it is received. The exhibition that you have here, and published, is one of the main examples of that, and the idea is... how do you present your own past to the public and why? There must be a reason, or an interested detected, otherwise...

LS: The exhibition was for us really the first time that we focused on the Batavians; in the Roman exhibition of this museum the Batavians hardly play a role except for a few minor elements. You can find them but they are not a separate topic in the permanent exhibition which is rather general... it’s about prehistory, the roman age, early Middle Ages, and it largely focuses on Roman remains in Nijmegen, and the surroundings. Nonetheless, the academic research from the 1980s onwards, the Batavians play a big role. The dissertation by Willem Willems in the 1980s and then the research by Nico Roymans and his team in Amsterdam are very important. There have been new excavation is the Batavian region, the sanctuary of Empel near ‘s-Hertogenbosch in the early 1990s, very important, but also the settlement excavations in the river area here, Tiel is the best example, they have brought a lot of new data, and a new way of looking at the Batavians, and you could say that the Batavians as a topic for presentation to the public became available again for the museums. Before that when i started working in the museum in the late 1980s it would have been very difficult to make an exhibition on Batavians because there was hardly any literature focusing on the topic and that’s part of a tradition in scientific research from the early 1800s. Batavians were very important in the national historiography until the end of the 18th century and then from the beginning of the 19th they seem to disappear from research. They get mentions now and then but the archaeological literature talks about Germans and Celt but not about Batavians or Caninefates or Frisians. So it’s the early populations in the Netherlands are named under the general terms, and that remains until the 1980s with this new research and then Batavians are studied again as such with new scientific methods and excavations methods, new types of settlement research that it becomes possible to discuss them again

S: So there like a pre-19th century important role of Batavians and then they kind of disappear and they don’t come back as such until the last 3 or 4 decades...

LS: Yes, you could say that. From the 16th to the 18th century they are very important in historiography, they are considered to be the national forefathers of the Dutch and
especially the Batavians uprising against Rome is very important in the national self-esteem, and this is written about and you find it in the paintings.

*S: So if pre-19th century was more of a national issue in terms of how Batavians were depicted, described, and how people looked at them, and the last 4 decades is more of an academic issue, it’s not so much of a national...*

LS: No, because when you look at the public perception of Batavians in the 16th to 18th century this also changes in the 16th and 17th century, the Batavians are seen as equals, as people who lived hundreds of years ago but were the same as us, with the same kind of civilizations, living in cities, and that’s how they are represented in the paintings by Rembrandt and others. In the 18th century there is changes, antiquarians are looking at reading Tacitus and they conclude that the Batavians were not civilized as we are, they lived a primitive life as Tacitus describes, in their way of living, their houses, their clothing... and this primitive image of the Batavians then predominates in about the 1800s, that’s the general idea, and they are considered to be a noble people with high moral standards but their material life is primitive. That stays like that until well into the 20th century and basically is still the same for the general public who hasn’t read the scientific discourse and hasn’t seen the exhibition, Batavian is synonymous with primitive, crude, people with animal skins and clubs, and they drink loads of beer, that’s what still is (the public image)... [he opens a book, presumably the exhibition catalogue]... a bit like Axtex, like this... that’s Batavians for the common Dutchman who doesn’t know what has happened in scientific research. That also creates a problem. the first archaeologists who started studying the Batavians had to compete with this public image, and you can read in their publication “what we find as archaeologists is completely different to what the public understands”, and this primitive view of the Batavians also made the Batavians less interesting as the national forebears, so other peoples were moved forward, the Frisians, the Saxons, the Franks... and it was also believed that the present day Dutchman are the heirs of these peoples because in written source the Batavians disappear at the end of the Roman age. It was generally believed that the original Batavians had left the Netherlands, had moved to the south and had amalgamated with the peoples there and there were no Batavians left, so in the 19th century, when people were looking for national identities, these later German Germanic tribes were more interesting.

*S: Frisians have that kind of medieval or early-medieval presence, while Batavians and Caninefates didn’t, so that’s probably one of the reasons.*

LS: That’s why we called the exhibition “The Batavians: stories of the people who have disappeared”. After the Roman age we only have stories about Batavians, some Roman stories, Tacitus in particular. And then from the 16th century onwards there are new stories, and they are continuously told and re-told

*S: Batavians myth...*

LS: Yes.
S: I’m looking at the evolution and effect of the Batavian myth has on modern discourse. It’s striking because the early 16th century myth I think that’s the only one based on the original accounts, on Tacitus, from then onwards all the variations, all the uses of the myth, I think they are used on the 16th century view, not on the original accounts.

LS: That’s not completely true, in the 16th-17th century the focus is different, and the Batavian rebellion is the main point. This story in the Historiae of Tacitus is what people focuses on... and in the 18th century and 19th century also, then the Germania of Tacitus is more important, which describes daily life and the culture of the people living here and the rebellion is less important there, so it a different use of the sources, and the Germania of Tacitus is ignored in the 16th-17th century, and it’s brought forward in the 18th and 19th century and that’s a very important difference. Both times use ancient sources but they chose the source and that is a very important difference. And you can see it not only in the historiography but also in art, this (shows a picture) is a 17th century painting of one of the key moments of the Batavian rebellion, the end and the peace negotiations between romans and Batavians, who are identical practically, and they stand on a stone bridge. And later on there is a big difference, the Romans are depicted as Romans and the Batavians as primitive people and the bridge is also very primitive in the Netherlands, a wooden bridge, so you see that this primitive view of the Batavian civilization here is prevailing in 18th and 19th century, both art and historiography. And this primitive image makes them less interesting for using them in a national identity. You see that Nijmegen city was first proud of both roman and Batavian origins, its identified with the Oppidum Batavorum mentioned in Tacitus, the city of the Batavians, and Nijmegen calls itself until the beginning of the 10th century ‘Stadt Batavieren’, city of Batavians, and then that disappears and the Roman origin of Nijmegen is put into focus much more, and the Batavians disappear, and you can see that Nijmegen celebrates its Roman past, not its Batavians past. In 1955 there was a great jubilee celebrating the fact that approximately in 105 AD Nijmegen may had get city rights, become a municipium, by Emperor Trajan, and the jubilee was again celebrated in 2005, 50 years later, and again the Roman past was celebrated and the Batavian past has disappear from the public attention. In this exhibition, and the accompanying book, we have tried to put that into the focus, under the attention, how these views of the Batavians changed through the past 5 centuries.

S: One of the other issues that I am curious about is these different uses of the Batavians from the 16th to the 19th century... how they actually chose what they want to use from the Batavian character or the Batavian aspects... because you have the 16th century liberty lovers, fighting against the oppressing Spaniards, and at the same time in the early 17th century you have the use of Batavians as a symbol for the colonial setting, which is a completely different point of view, you are talking about your own imperialism and you are using Batavians to leave your mark in the capital of the East indies... very different uses, the liberty lovers, fighting against oppression Roman imperialism but we use Batavians as a symbol for our own imperial quest.
LS: I’m not a historian, but I don’t know if they were used as a symbol in this colonial enterprise. As far as I know names were used, also for ships, but...

S: Maybe they are not using Batavians as a model, but as a label for Dutch people, in which case it’s like saying this is a second homeland.

LS: Yes.

S: Even if they use it just as a label, that label has some kind of ideological load. Calling yourself Batavian is not just a label, it has something of the idea of being Batavian. In this case, if it’s inherited from this 16th century idea, is all this brave-like people, war-like, very combative, loads of virtues and moral standards... so I guess it might be considered just a label, but with all the loads that brings.

LS: I’m not familiar with the history. As far as I know Batavians... there isn’t really a Dutch people at that time, and the term Batavian is used to create such an identity, an identity that is already very old. I’m not familiar...

But reading these text from the 16th-17th century, as far as I understand it it’s a way of claiming a national history, and in that sense also an identity, which wasn’t there before the rediscovery of Tacitus, there hardly was any national history, so as in Germany these text have a huge influence in defining self-awareness of a history that goes back a long time.

S: That comparison with Germany can also be drawn with many other European countries, because they have these claims of Roman heritage in one hand, and on the other they always used these ‘barbarian’ leaders that fought against the Romans as national heroes. You have Vercingetorix in France, Arminius in Germany, Civilis in the Netherlands... so it’s kind of a double identity.

LS: Yes, that’s true.

S: We are part of the very prestigious Roman Empire but at the same time our identity is based on rebelling against the empire, and we have these heroes which are actually the ones that resisted the Roman Empire.

LS: Yes, yes... you see, here in Nijmegen, from the 12th century onwards there is a tradition which claims that the city was founded by Julius Caesar, you see it in the castle built by Frederik Barbarossa...

S: The one here in this park?

LS: Yes... in 1155 the building starts, and there is an inscription here in the museum that records Barbarossa rebuilds the castle previously built by Julius Caesar, and this tradition remains until the 20th century referring to Julius Caesar, but at the same time, from the 16th century onwards, the Batavians come into view, and there is a tradition that the Batavians have founded this city, and they coexist. There is on one hand the Batavian rebellion, the uprising, and on the other hand there is the tradition, especially
here in Nijmegen but in the Netherlands as a whole, the pride in the fact that there was a treaty between Batavians and Romans, the ‘antiqua societas’ mentioned by Tacitus, and we have a painting here in our museum that was made for the city hall here in Nijmegen in the 17th century, at the same time that the paintings were made for the city hall in Amsterdam, and the painting here in Nijmegen does not focus on the Batavian rebellion but on this treaty, and it shows Roma and Batavia shaking hands and making a treaty and making peace, and this aspect is highlighted, the peace between Batavians and Romans as equals, as here in this painting (shows painting on the book) are shown as equals. But at the same time there are texts about this Batavian rebellion so they really coexist and they can be used at liberty when the occasion occurs.

S: If you look at all the accounts on Batavians in antiquity, the rebellion is literally just one year and a half, while the whole spectrum of the Batavian presence in the sources talk about treaties, ancient treaties with Rome, the treaty they sign after the rebellion again, so it’s more of a peaceful comfortable relationship according to the sources... and is only this one year and a half of rebellion that is actually the one highlighted... I don’t know if there is a reason, I guess the historical context in which Batavians were brought back in the 16th century is precisely that on one of a rebellion, so that’s why is highlighted. My other doubt is why Batavians, and not, for instance, Caninefates, who also play an important role on that same rebellion, or Frisians, who were revolting against the Roman Empire even earlier than the Batavians, and there are sources also for them?

LS: The Caninefates probably because they were ignored as they were on the Western part of the Netherlands, but that part of the Netherlands, the province of Holland, claimed to be the ancient Batavia, so in the 16th and still the 17th century there was a very big discussion about where did these ancient Batavians lived and the western part, which was the most important part of the Netherlands, still is, also claimed to be the territory, the land of the Batavians, not the eastern part of the Netherlands were we are here. They also claimed that the city of the Batavians was not here in Nijmegen but to the West. So there was little room for the Caninefates, but i think, it’s just a guess but very important. Caninefates are not mentioned very many times in the ancient sources while the Batavians are, and this text by Tacitus about the Batavian rebellion is a huge text in terms of the ancient sources available for the Netherlands, otherwise we only have very short remarks by Pliny and others. So I think that must have been a very important factor that you have a very important and extensive text on this topic and in the political circumstances of the age it became very important.

S: When I’m looking at how these discourses are created I’m also looking at different discourses at regional, national, and even European level... and it’s confusing because you have discourses about Batavians and the relationship between Batavians and Romans in the three levels basically. My doubt is whether this exhibition and all the research that has been done on Batavians in the last 20-30 years has to do with any kind of agenda, either regional, national... I wouldn’t say European because probably is not a European issue, but is definitely affected by the European agendas imposed so whether there is a kind of agenda behind it, not in a negative way... (he understands) I mean like an underpinning or
motivation, regional or national. Because the projects that for instance Nico Roymans has developed are mostly funded by the National research Committee (NWO), I’m not sure about this exhibition but I presume is more of a regional/local idea... did it have a national impact?

LS: No, it was... there were no national funds, it was relatively cheap exhibition. For us, we had the idea to make an exhibition on the Batavians probably ten years before, after the excavations in Empel and when new research has started in Amsterdam, the settlement excavations in Tiel were very important, there were new excavations here in Nijmegen where you got new data, real archaeology, not only the Roman stories and the stories written from the 16th century onwards, but you also got the archaeological finds that you could compare with them, and that’s what we did in the exhibition, so we took the stories as a starting point, the different stories... Tacitus reports that they came originally from Germany, that they were a German tribe, their coming to the Netherlands is one story, their treaty with the Romans is another story, the rebellion with all its different sub-stories is another one, the way they live is another story, their houses, their religion, and some of the individuals, Civilis mainly, but other ones... and what we tried to do is present the stories in the way they have been depicted in art and then see what we now at this moment about these topics: what is the archaeological evidence for the coming of Batavians?, for instance,....

S: Is more of a regional push, it’s not national... you are not presenting or looking at this as a symbol of national identity because there is a national interest on it... it’s more regional...

LS: No, you could say, we use these stories to look at the archaeological evidence and as a way of introducing them to the public, as, it’s not the same of course, but we have the Museum in Leiden had for 20 years, I believe, an exhibition on the Romans, a general exhibition, it’s for families, for children, and they used the cartoons on Axterix as an introduction, drawings from Axterix were used to look at archaeological evidence behind these scenes. And these stories about the Batavians are hardly part of the national identity, people hardly know them anymore, they are not taught at schools any more, it was the case until the 1950s, 1940s, but after that they have disappear from the curriculum, pupils at school don’t know who the Batavians are, and the stories about rebellion are not being told anymore. So, also that was interesting for us to revitalize these stories because they are interesting as they have been important in our national history in the past 5 centuries. It was for us an interesting topic, we are a museum that presents archaeology, we are not a historical museum, we have no historians in our staff, we have archaeologists, art historians, and we present art and archaeology. The history behind the Batavians is for us a very interesting means to present the new evidence from archaeological research; that was for us the main focus.

S: So it came as a consequence of all the new research that has been done.

LS: Yes, that’s been the trigger to make this exhibition, and what for us of course was very interesting is that the topic has been forgotten, there has been no exhibition on Batavians... well, I don’t know if there has ever been an exhibition on the topic, at least not an archaeological exhibition... there has been an exhibition on the excavations at
Empel in ’s-Hertogenbosch, in the North-Brabant museum, but that was focused on this excavation, and not on the Batavians as a people, and all the art work from the past 5 centuries wasn’t used in that exhibition, so the later history of the Batavians wasn’t used in that exhibition. So it was for us a very nice opportunity to present a new topic, with new evidence. As a museum we have no agenda and we are not funded by national authorities to do so.

S: So it was more of a private initiative of this museum

LS: Yes, initiative of this museum. And yes, the first ideas are from shortly after the Empel excavations, and that was for me also the first time that I became acquainted with this later history of the Batavians; I knew about it but i hadn’t studied it before, and together with a colleague here, and Art Historian, we started to develop the programme for this exhibition.

S: In terms of transfer of knowledge between academia and the general public, what is the role of museums? I know it’s one of the most important tools, apart from publications, but mainly because academic publications are not getting to the general public. What is in your opinion the role of the museum in that sense?

LS: Well, I see it as a natural role for museums to play. Museums hardly have staff to do the research themselves, I have very little time to do so... so I make exhibitions and the other museum work, but my research time is very limited, and that goes the same for my colleagues, so we are dependants of the research carried out elsewhere, on the universities. We have our relationship here with the University of Nijmegen, it’s very important for us. Also the art historical exhibitions, part of them come forward out of research that has been carried out at university, so that’s very important for us as a museum, to be able to make exhibitions, because we can’t do that stuff all by ourselves, it’s impossible. And also, it’s of course interesting for a museum to present new ideas, new evidence, new material, especially when it brings into focus the collections that you already have, and puts into a new perspective. So academic research is vital for us, and for our function.

S: So the way Batavians were portrayed in this exhibition was drawn from the new academic perspectives.

LS: Yes, both the archaeological and also the historical evidence. In the book a lot of historians participated to present the latest views on the Batavian myth and other topics. And also new elements were described for the first time. The Batavian reception in the 18th and 19th century wasn’t discussed before in academic research, and for the first time two historians discuss this material in this book on our invitation, so the focus has always been on this Batavian myth of the 16th century... whereas the Batavians became less interesting from the 1800s onwards but they do not disappear from the public view, in the schools the stories about the Batavians were told until the end of the 1940s as I said,... so older people still know all the facts about the Batavians, and there were still drawings, and books with illustrations and historical novels being written on the
Batavians until these days. Just appeared a new historical novel on the Batavian rebellion, so they have not disappear but it’s interesting to know what happened from then on, that was also part of this exhibition.

*S: So in that sense you are mostly drawing from the research that is made at universities, the perspectives and theoretical frameworks that they are use at University are also transferred to the exhibitions and to the public.

LS: Of course, yes

*S: I’m thinking about all this postcolonialism that is now been discussed in the archaeological circles in terms of how to present native populations and not to focus so much on the elite and focus on daily life, on how people lived their lives, that is somehow also present and transferred through this kind of interpretations in the exhibitions and also goes all the way to the public.

LS: Yes, of course. For instance, on the Batavians and on Nijmegen as a Batavian city, you have different views on that. You have the view put forward by Willems and Bloemers in the 1980s, that the city of Nijmegen was called city of the Batavians but wasn’t really of the Batavians but a city in the country of the Batavians, where hardly any Batavians live, but it was mainly Roman settlement in Batavian territory to be a basis for the administration and so on. Nico Roymans and Stijn have changed this view somewhat, putting into view that the Batavian element is important and not so much looking from the Roman viewpoint but taking a Batavian stand, to see how a city here in Nijmegen may have been part of Batavian life in this part of the Netherlands. And this discussion is still going on, how we have to view Roman Nijmegen, was it mainly a Roman city, an enclave in native territory or was it also a city that had any importance to the native population. There is no definitive answer yet but these discussions are going on, and are of course important for us to follow and to use in the stories we tell to the public. My part in this book has been to summarize the way archaeologists have studied Batavians from the early 1800s to the research of Roymans, and the different focus that you can see in this research and how that has of course influenced research results. So that is certainly, as I see it, a part of our job, to follow these academic discussions and to look at ways to present it to the public. It is difficult of course to use all the new answers but to make it clear to the public that it is possible to take different stands and see things differently as it’s done in academic discussion.

*S: One of the reasons for creating this exhibition is to create awareness of the Roman past for the public in the area. How the new sociological composition of Dutch society, not only Dutch, has loads of immigration, emigration... there is not any more “this is the Netherlands and Dutch people live here”... well, it is Dutch people but Dutch people made of people coming from many other places. Is there a component in this kind of exhibition in which you are trying to make those people aware how the past of the region has been developing?

LS: We haven’t made a specific topic yet. You could say that it’s implicit in this exhibition, also in the fact that we highlighted the fact that the Batavians have
disappeared. The word Batavian is still known to every Dutchman, everybody has a notion of primitive club and animal skin, but that is all. The notion that they are our forebears is still common, but actually 100 years ago in schools you were told... education was by year numbers (dates), so for example you learnt that in the year 1500 there was the battle of... and in the school books of a century ago, around 400 the Batavians disappear. And we have tried to bring that back. The idea that there was a people here called Batavians, or who called themselves Batavians, or were called by the Romans Batavians, and that has gone, and nobody has a problem with that. On the other side, the Frisians are very proud of the fact that the Frisians were being named by Roman authors and that they are still being called like that, so they are the oldest people in the Netherlands. Whereas archaeological research has shown that there is an occupation gap in Frisia at the end of the 4th and 5th century, and probably new people settled the area, so there is no continuity of occupation, and that is not a popular message in the North. It’s different here in this part of the Netherlands, we have no problem at all in saying that the Batavians have disappeared and that there are new people. But the fact that there have been so many new identities is of course a very interesting thing to use in our national history; there has been a coming from people from the prehistoric times onwards. And there is at this moment obviously a strong sense of longing for national identity and when our present Queen, Maxima, said in a speech some years ago “I don’t know what the Dutch identity is because it’s so pluriform” she was heavily criticized but of course she is right, you cannot define a Dutch national identity in terms of specific peoples, there are so many characteristic. So it is a theme that is interesting for us as a museum to use in the future... I don’t know, we haven’t got any plans for exhibition on these issues for a near future. We are going to change our permanent exhibition in the coming years and probably will be an element on the new element in the new permanent exhibition.

S: The Batavians you mean?

LS: No, well, this changing of inhabitants in this areas, not only the Batavians. But we are just starting to discuss how to do that (laughs)

S: It’s very interesting. I think we should strive towards that kind of presentation; we need to reflect our own time...

LS: Yes, of course...

S: ...and our own times are the times of heterogenic societies, immigration, emigration, movement of people and globalization (agrees), so that’s one of the other things I was interested in when asking you about the postcolonial discourse that has been transferred. Because from my point of view, postcolonial discourse is at the end of its life (agrees); we are now talking more about Globalization now. We defined ourselves for a while as what we were not, we were not colonialists anymore, we were postcolonialists, but we didn’t know exactly what we were, and now we are kind of defining ourselves as globalizing, and hybridity and these ideas.
LS: Yes, you may very well be right. It’s getting to terms with this pluriformity, and you cannot use easy etiquettes and names any more. There are so many new answers and differences.

[End of the interview; chat while walking through the exhibition]

LS: There is little on the Batavians; it will be more in a few years’ time certainly. We have loads of school visits.

S: Is it normal then to bring school kids to reinforce the history lessons they have at school?

LS: Yes, there are two moments in school life when Romans are a standard topic, when they are about 10 years of age and then again when they are in secondary school, the topic comes again. We try to have programmes for both these ages’ groups and for teachers to use and get them to the museum. The topic of the Romans, Roman history, together with the museum in Leiden, we are the most important museum in the Netherlands, so a lot of school, not only from the region but from the whole Netherlands come and visit us.

S: But is more focus on the Roman aspects than on the Batavian aspects.

LS: Yes, and when this museum opened in 1999 there was still too little archaeological information, new finds from the new excavations where not available yet, and they were presented for the first time in the exhibition at the end of 2004, now we have a lot of new material, both from Nijmegen and surrounding area. So it is much easier now to make a completely different presentation and one of the main ideas is to use the Roman names, they call Nijmegen ‘the city of Batavians’, as a label for a label for presentations, and also the land of the Batavians, the countryside, the native settlements as a different topic. Of course the Roman military sites are important, and their finds, but thanks to the research of the last 10-15 years we can present a completely different picture of the archaeology of the Roman period in this region.

LS: There is this painting round the corner (the one with Batavians and Romans in the peace treaty over the bridge)... as I said, it was made for the city hall (in Nijmegen), made by a pupil of Rembrandt and it shows Rome shaking hands with Batavians, also St. Angelo in Rome, Valkhof castle, river Waal and mass, and river Tiber, so it’s completely focusing on this piece treaty between two equal peoples. There is no sign of rebellion as in Amsterdam city hall. And together with this showcases, the only element we have of the Batavian rebellion, the Batavians settlement here, the Oppidum Batavorum, was destroyed as described by Tacitus. There has been excavations in the past 20 years in this area which brought to light the traces of destruction, several cellars of houses filled with debris, for instance a cellar completely filled with amphorae and this are three of them that got destroyed during this rebellion, and this silver bronze name plate with the name of Caius Aquilius Poculus, centurion of the 8th legion, and in Tacitus account, the centurion Aquilius is
mentioned as the last Roman officer to oppose Batavians at the start the rebellion, before he retired to the legionary forts of Xanten, and this may be the person...

LS: Perhaps for the identity of Nijmegen... I told you about the celebrations of 1955 focusing completely on the Roman past of Nijmegen and the Roman city rights and that focus on the Emperor Trajan, and on the same year this Bronze ??? (1:08:50) was found, allegedly dragged from a plough here not far from Nijmegen... we now know it must have been dragged during ploughing activities near Xanten, in the nearest Roman town. In 1955 Trajan was highlighted and celebrated and there was a new statues being placed in the square nearby, which is still called the Trajan square, but 50 years later, in 2005, Trajan almost got forgotten and the emperor Tiberius got now more into focus. this was found in 1980, on the square here in front of the museum, and of course is older, and it shows a Roman emperor here in Nijmegen somewhere at the end of the Germanic wars, in the year 17 or 19, not sure, so the idea was in 2005 that there must have been a kind of city life here in Nijmegen at that time because otherwise there wouldn’t be such a monument here, and that was the reason for making a new monument for this celebrations and that is the monument that you see in front of the museum (the obelisk). These blocks were used for a cast in bronze at the bottom and then a new monument was put on top.

S: so the monument for Trajan disappeared?

LS: No, it’s still there, but this is much more important now. And Nijmegen has always been very proud, since the 12th century onwards, on being the oldest city in the Netherlands. Julius Caesar has already come here and founded Nijmegen, and that’s still part of the city’s identity, still calls itself ‘the oldest city of the Netherlands’. So as a Museum, we have to deal with that, also because it’s very important for the city, but the scientific evidence is not always that conclusive or what the city wants.

S: It’s interesting... local use and local agenda, but on the other hand the academic perspective is contrary to some of those ideas, so you need to deal with both at the same time.

[offers coffee, irrelevant chat]
**Prof. Emer. Marteen de Weerd**

23/5/2011 Interview notes

**Context:**

Professor Emeritus, Institute of Pre- and Protohistoric Archaeology (IPP), University of Amsterdam.

**Questions:**

*Different archaeological agendas: EU, national and regional (regional discrepancies)*

*Institutional agendas and academic community division*

*Importance of the Batavian myth in the creation of the national identity. Why not Frisians or other peoples? What is the effect of this in the archaeological interpretation?*

*Political use of archaeology and history related to the Batavians in the past and nowadays. Does this affect academic interpretations (past and present)?*

*British deconstruction of the colonial discourse. If we do the same for the Netherlands, is struggle for independence basic to understand the Batavian monopoly? Any other moments*

*How has the discipline and the positions/interpretations within the academic community changed and evolved in the last decade?*

*Latest conferences, publications, etc.*

**Interview notes:**

According to Drinkwater (2007, chapter 1 on western Europe) Germanic people were not a threat and as violent as sources make us think.


van der Leeuw (1981) would be of possible interest if you like to study archaeological thinking in the late seventies.
van der Leeuw, S. E. 1981. Archaeological Approaches to the study of complexity. Cingula VI. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam/IPP.

Ecology as a factor of movement and therefore clash (landscape, food production,…).

One of Roymans’ student, Tom Buij tendorp wrote his dissertation (Free University, 15.12.2011; http://dare.ubvu.vu.nl/handle/1871/16369), on the Roman city of Forum Hadriani, near The Hague in the Netherlands, presenting interesting models related to this issue, especially in is third chapter dedicated to economic-historical analysis.

Also an interesting model is the one presented by Duncan Jones.

Bosman/Lendering: de rand van het Rijk, on the location of Varus’disaster.

For materials in the north of the Netherlands, Erdrich. For materials in the South-East, Roymans. Bazelmans (heritage) and Bloemers (theoretical archaeology) are also interesting names, both coming from Amsterdam and linked with Amersfoort (where there is a heritage library).

The primacy on Batavians comes from Tacitus’ mentions. In the old days the way things worked was: ‘Can we prove Tacitus through archaeology’. Now archaeology of the Batavians has evolved on its own and does not depend on textual sources.

Nijmegen: Ylva Klaassen PhD student (specialized on Tacitus and imperial image), with Prof. Olivier Hekster (specialized on imperial image).

Mark Driessen (University of Amsterdam), about Velsen (point 24 in the map), describing early phases of contact in the coast around the North Sea.

Erik Graafstal (e.graafstal@ziggo.nl), Utrecht Municipal Archaeological Service, has conducted a series of interesting excavations in 'Leidsche Rijn' (points 22 and 23 in the map), with a great variety of Roman military infrastructure, informing military interactions 1-3 century AD. The first building phases of those structures are from the 0-70 AD. Are those structures early forts to facilitate Claudius’ invasion of England or to fight Frisians? The origin of auxiliary troops in the Rhine goes back to 1-2 century AD.

Michael Erdrich mapped artefacts in the Netherlands (giving phases and distribution), and he points out 6 different phases:

- The earlier contacts, with some weapons and coins in Frisia, but no pottery or structures.
- 100-160, with activity along the Limes but not artefacts North to the Limes.

Before his research it was though there was constant contact with the North but now they can only see some phases.

Velsen shows structures but no artefacts.

********
When he started in 1958, it was forbidden to say that some pots were related to tribes. No one discussed identity until a period in which...

19th century nationalism brought identity issues. Identity is difficult to define without relation to political ideas.

Tacitus mentions Frisians too but archaeology says Roman and Early Medieval Frisians are not the same, so Frisian component of Dutch identity is difficult to sustain (Roman or early medieval Frisians?)

Carol represents? or studies? Dutch colonial perspective (Indonesian colonies). Indonesian colonial forts hosted also families, just like the Romans.

3 levels of agendas and discourses: Research turned to Celts studies and discussions around the Celts when the Dutch were looking for a European identity as looking for a proto-European identity. For funding you mention Celtic id. Money drives archaeology and interferes with identity studies.

Queen’s anecdote: She once said, when visiting a site, that “Batavians were not Dutch because they deserted the “Dutch” army (her army) to join the Roman army. Clear connection with identity issues.

Talanta: Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society

Dr. Wouter Vos also. His specialism is the Batavian countryside in the Roman period

He sent me copies of Cingula VI and I

The relations to the North required equilibrium between roman society, military organization and native societies. The relations with the East and North-East are different; on that issue of N-E regions look at Henk van der Velde’s thesis (Free University, 2011) on Roman/Medieval archaeology in the Eastern part of the Netherlands. Also on the special Iron Age farmhouse settlement of Feddersen Wierde, beyond the borders on the coastal areas of Germany, near the Wessel’s river mouth (W. Haarnagel, Die Grabungen Feddersen Wierde (1979)). New results of research in the Frisian-Roman contact zone are given by Peter Schmid (123-45): Bentumersiel was a mixed farming settlement ?connected with army supply; Feddersen-Wierde is a terp in the marshland, containing eight stratified villages; and Flögeln, on the sandy deposits, had farmsteads grouped into units of 'Vielbetriebsgehöfte'.

Between Germany and UK

German discussion is much more based on archaeological features (distribution maps and good publications of maps), while Anglo-Saxon approach to Roman archaeology is much more theoretical. Although Dutch archaeology is more related to the Anglo-Saxon tradition, there is a mixture in methods and approaches (treatment of archaeological material relates Dutch and German ways, while the Dutch way of thinking relates it to GB)
ON regional variations: The Netherlands is a small country, so there is no space for regional differences (just like Willems said). There is of course a different in focus: while Groningen looks more for a Barbarian perspective, Nijmegen looks more into the Batavian-Roman military interaction.

On the interest of General public: At a local level, the interest is on the remains available in the area. Identity is related to what people recognize on those remains. Unfortunately, if there is something in my garden that means I can sell my garden for more money. During crises time like these ones it’s difficult to retain cultural heritage. Matilo, a neighbourhood in the outskirts of Leiden, is called so after the Roman fort found there, which represents a clear local use of Roman identity. In a town 10 kilometres from Leiden there is a street called Castellum straat, after the remains found there too.

But the way in which for instance Chinese scholars think of heritage is different; they think of reconstruction.

Alfredo Jimeno – Ignacio de la Torre, doing a PhD in Leiden on the political use of Numancia.
**Prof. Willem Willems**

25/5/2011 Interview, notes.

**Context:**

Professor of Roman Provincial Archaeology and Heritage Management, and Dean of the Faculty of Arts at University of Leiden.

**Questions:**

*Evolution of archaeology in the Netherlands and evolution of the interest on Batavians (when does it starts?)*  

*Main debates and positions (is there a regional academic division?). Main schools*  

*Batavians in the national identity*  

*Political and ideological use of the Batavians in the archaeological discourse during the 16th century (why focus on 1.5 years of Batavian history?)*  

*Batavianist monopoly: centrality of Batavians in archaeological discourse (why them and not others like Frisians or Cananeiates?)*  

*EU/National/Regional agendas and discourses*  

*Academic influences and interaction with other communities (Germany, UK or own path?)*  

*Classical archaeology vs. Prehistory*  

*“Sons of our times” (what defines our times and how does it affects our interpretations?)*  

*His views on the nature of interactions between Romans and Batavians*

**Interview notes:**

His work on Batavians was one of the First attempts in the Netherlands of de-colonization of the discourses.

He studied in Amsterdam and also in America during the times of the New Archaeology.  

Post-colonial views - native perspective ("the Indian behind the artifact"). He decided he wanted to do that, to apply that method, to say things about the people through data.

*At this point, asked about the risks of unbalancing discourses towards the native view, he admitted the risk but said it was avoidable by confronting sources and material culture.*
The power difference between societies in antiquity was not so big technologically. But the power difference in modern colonial world was much bigger. And this conception was applied to views on the Roman Empire. Thus, the resulting unbalanced power view, colonial-imperial discourses.

**********

The ‘research limes’

How does territorial division of the Netherlands by the Limes affect interpretations and discourses, both in terms of approaches to the topic and chronologies?

Regional differences/characteristics within the Netherlands:

Most of the institutions dedicated to this topic are located in the area of the former frontier of the Empire, except for Groningen. He thinks there is not so much difference, but just different ways of looking at things. Maybe because of the lack of literary evidence for Northern Netherlands Groningen is more tending to use a prehistorical approach (e.g. Bloemers work) while the rest of institutions apply a more historical-archaeological approach to the Roman period. So in his opinion, that is not so much regionalism or regional differences but more of a discipline-based or methodological difference, imposed by the availability of literary sources.

About the problem with the different chronologies:

What for the territories to the north of the frontier is Roman Iron Age, for the territories in the frontier and to the south is simply the Roman period; it is the same time-frame. The northern chronologies are, according to him, based on materials which are not much different in terms of typology from those encountered in the frontier system. The chronologies in the south are fine due to the quality of the material encountered there.

**********

Batavian monopoly of Dutch archaeological-historical discourse is recent:

Before the World Wars use to be more Frisians (more evident back in the day due to the existence of a modern people called Frisians). This rise of Frisian back in the day was due to the factor of Dwelling mounds (de Terpen), promoted by the national government, not due to nationalist interests but because they just wanted to know how to protect Netherlands (and its heritage?) from the rising water. Thus, Groningen was asked to research on previous rises of water.

After the war, the evolution of academic research about the ancient people of the Netherlands is:

- Bloemers (Willems’ supervisor) was focused in Cananefates
- Then, more sources became available and more excavations took place in Nijmegen (Boegards was pivotal in this sense to develop provincial archaeology by collecting Batavian materials).
- Willem’s thesis (first contemporary serious work on the relationship of Batavians and Romans) derives from all those collected materials by Boagers, and was his last approach to it.

- Roymans picked up the baton with his studies on Batavian coinage, and then he created a new “school on Batavian studies” with all his projects and PhD students analysing different aspects of these ancient people. Tried to transfer new academic trends (big funds) to public interest. Roymans was good in highlighting this and that’s why he got all those funds and projects going on.

- While Roymans focuses on the native rural side of things, with no research on military settlements, Carol, Groningen, Willem, Rieen, Bloemers have a military perspective. It’s interesting that Willems says that, because Carol thinks that Roymans focuses on the warrior-military-male aspects, her reaction is to focus on military and gender-focus issues. But according to Willems there is not so much distance between disciplines nowadays.

*The Veletta convention (1992; prepared to tackle changes during late 80s) change the way archaeology was practiced, from big long projects to many smaller excavations (mostly commercial units), providing archaeologists of that generation with more materials, resulting on not so hypothetical approaches to Batavians.

*The 16th century is indeed a time for national praise of Batavians and their glorious past (Colony in Indonesia), poems about Batavians. During the 2nd WW, Batavians seen as a Germanic tribe...

But all in all, Batavians are not for the Netherlands what Franks are for France; yes, there is a spread knowledge (national myth of Batavians sailing down the Rhine in their canoes was taught in school in the 50s), but still not same importance as the Franks for France. Frisians are important for Frisia, and Cananefates are well unknown.

**********

Politics changed his career. He started with an interest in Batavians and Roman provincial archaeology. Then he was offered a position as state archaeologist and then another one in Leiden following the study line of Heritage.

He still wants to publish 2 roman villas from the 80s. Willems thinks there is no point on trying to compete with Nico in order to go back to his original interest in Roman-Batavian interactions (Roman provincial archaeology, instead of his current heritage focus). He keeps it as a hobby.

**********

Regional/National/European agendas and discourses:

Willems is in a perfect position to talk about this as he was Dutch representative at the EU Veletta convention (also called the Malta convention).

Regional/Local variation (slightly different priorities)
National research agenda is not connected to the EU agenda (general and provincial priorities go first, but not very strong provincial ones)

The more European identity imposed, the more regional identities that appear or the stronger they express themselves. The Europe of the Nation-State was a 19th century invention and it’s disappearing. The rise of regional identities is giving place to the Europe of the regions to rise, which is good for the disappearance of the nation state and therefore for the evolution of an integrated Europe. The problem with the Netherlands in this framework is that because it’s too small, it has no multiple regional identities, except for Frisian.

An example of a very explicit political use of archaeology was the Bronze Age campaign backed with lots of funds from the Council for Europe. They were looking for the pre-Celtic world to embody European union values, trying to erase the Roman frontier from the European subconscious. But it failed politically, because it was too far, just like attempts to use the Stone Age. Celtic common identity with the exhibition in Venice.

******

The Netherlands in between UK and Germany archaeological trends:

The Netherlands is influenced by German and Anglo-American research, but it carries its own course, a kind of middle ground. He thinks that is the case also in Denmark. He thinks in the Dutch case it’s because it’s too close to them (especially to Germany) to release itself from their influence. But there is an anti-German folklore.

E.g. The editions of “Saxons symposium” are normally dominated by German scholars, but they focus more on late roman-early middle ages themes.

*Roman provincial archaeology in France is dominated by traditional classical archaeology. They are out of the European debates, a kind of spot in the pan-European connection. France is not participating in the Limes or European debates, with the exception maybe of Redé.
Dr Rien Polak

24/5/2011 Interview, notes.

Context:

Auxilia Archaeological unit, Radboud University Nijmegen

Questions:

What is project Auxilia and who is involved in it?

Museum Valkhof: Is the peoples Museum? No, it’s a topographical name

- How is the past presented in there?
- How do you face such responsibility
- Is national identity transferred somehow through the materials exhibited or the displays?

When you talk about Dutch ancient past, do you talk about both pre-historical Northern Netherlands and Roman provincial history for the southern Netherlands?

What are the main material evidence to study Roman-Barbarian interaction in the North?

How do chronologies work at both sides of the frontier?

How does this duality around the frontiers affect the archaeological discourse (you have notha roman and a barbarian past)?

Political use of the Batavians?

Why national identity has made so much use of the Batvaians and not so much of the Frisians or Cananefates (all of them coexisted in the territories of modern Netherlands)? Does this affect somehow your interpretation of archaeological material related to Roman-Barbarian interactions?

Batavian lobby or Batavian monopoly?

Current scholarly situation:

- How has archaeology and academic community evolved in the last decades?
- Is there a recent change on interpretation?
- How are the main figure and which are their interpretative positions
- Main debates alive
- Is there an unbalance between field archaeology and projects based on analysis and research?
Regional-National-European agendas, discourses and identities:

- Regional discrepancies within the Netherlands (academic division, different interpretations of evidence).

Interview Notes:

Auxilia, which opened its activities in 2003, is not a project, is an externally funded firm, with 10 members working for different commercial units. Its main aim is to conduct research in Roman provincial archaeology. Because its externally funded, research themes are not chosen by Auxilia researchers but by chances and opportunities (by contracts offered to them by universities who want data for research). They basically produce data through excavation for other projects, mostly on Roman military sites and focusing on pottery.

e.g. they collaborate with the Valkhof museum producing reports on pottery finds that the museum researchers analyse and interpret.

e.g. right now interpreting field maps of excavations at Nijmegen looking for military sites (10BC-AD69) for Eef Stoeffels; Auxilia provides contextual data for those projects.

Since the 80s and the birth of commercial archaeology most of the excavation projects are done externally. Due to the current archaeological law, reports of excavation finds have to be done within two years of excavation, not allowing time enough to do interpretation. So they run projects in the hope that someone will do deeper analysis on the data.

*******

For the University of Nijmegen pottery is the basic informant, and they start research from the material evidence and not from theoretical models.

*******

There is a renewed interest in Roman-Barbarian interactions in Northern Europe (Kalkriese, Nico’s research, etc.)

*******

Batavians yes – Frisians no: There is an inherent attraction to Batavians due to the existence of ancient sources. There are indeed relevant episodes of interaction with the Frisians (Frisian revolt AD28), but not so many sources about them, maybe due to its lower importance to the Empire or weaker connection with the area. There is indeed very little knowledge about the people that inhabited Northern Netherlands in the Roman period.

However, it is too simplistic to say that Batavians are the central identity of the Dutch. Reception of identities are linked to silly myths; the 16th century myth on the Batavian revolt is a western Netherlands formulation, when Batavians inhabited the Eastern part of the Netherlands. Batavians are a Roman simplification of a complex situation in the periphery of
the empire. But common people, if they identify with Batavians is with the ancient view (as they are not aware of the new academic views), but it’s mostly anecdotic, not a main element of identity.

The academic views on Batavians changed 20-30 years ago with the new research projects. From “Batavians were puppets” (40 years ago, Romanized imperialist view) to “Batavians were good” (more recently, post-colonial views). Paradoxically, modern term for the tribe is “Bataven” but most of the mentions nowadays are to “Batavieren” (the 16th century archaic terminology); this indicates that broad views of Batavians are still link to the 16th century myth and views on Batavians.

Differences between Northern and Southern Netherlands:

Roman provincial archaeology is limited geographically to the southern Netherlands. 200-300 years of excavations is impossible to embrace all the archaeology. That’s why metanlyses (of sources?) and primary data are approaches that need to be connected. Finds are only important in context. E.g. According to Corvulos, Claudius built the forts in the Western Rhine in AD47. However, dendrochronology says these were built in AD40, just after Caligula’s attempt to annex Britannia. This points towards the construction of those forts in preparation of the British invasion. Thus, Caligula’s attempt was much more serious than an isolated reading of Tacitus implies.

Saying that North and South have different identities is a simplistic view. For instance, in AD 55 (or 58) Frisians ask the commander of the Lower Rhine Roman army to settle in the Northern bank of the river. There are also inscriptions on fishing rights in Frisian territory dating from the second half of the 2nd century AD. That speaks about a direct influence across the river and frontiers, so not so much regional difference back in antiquity. It’s a modern construct.

In terms of difference in research tradition between the “Barbarian” North and the “Roman” South, traditionally the Northern institutions, mainly Groningen, has been dealing with Pre-historic finds with very little interest in Roman finds; while the southern ones, like Nijmegen, do both pre-history and Roman archaeology, with special emphasis in Roman military sites and little interest in rural sites with native evidence. The main difference would then be thematic choice (rural or military focus). But that is all changing: While southern scholars like Nico Roymans are starting to focus on rural settlements, others like Van Es (at Vrije, predecessor of Roymans) started looking for Romans in the North (also Ernst Taayke).

In terms of chronologies at both sides of the border there is a regional difference, as in the North there is not so much Roman materials to date contexts and sites; it’s mostly native material, with three ceramic regions (which are?). Iron Age there is a regional subdivision in periods between areas with different landscapes and ethnographical developments related to those landscapes (e.g. farmers and animal husbandry). The differences between North and South are therefore observable in settlement patterns and material culture.
European-National-Regional agendas/discourses and identities: The focus on Roman military sites is more regional, while the regional focus is more on native materials. Regions are now financing more archaeology than in the past, and therefore their research aims differ from those by European. There is no apparent national level in his opinion; there is a National Archaeological Research Agenda (NoaA - Nationale Onderzoeksagenda Archeologie), which is simply a compilation of research themes and regions, but with very little common approach in terms of aims and priorities (check Bazelmans and Willems -pag 13- PDFs on this topic). What are the reasons behind the 2005?? National agenda? It is a political instrument to make archaeological discipline more serious and it’s also a way of securing that commercial archaeology do important research and explains why (research driven).

The evolution of the discipline: Traditional focus was on the military evidence, because of the influence of Tacitus’ perspective and because of funding reasons (it’s an attractive story that brings money... Nico Roymans very good at spotting this). But recently there is a turn to rural settlements in the Batavian area. The 60s and 70s large scale projects focused on rural Batavians (e.g. Willem’s Eastern Batavians) were not due to an interest on Batavians themselves, but a state service driven project to obtain a bigger picture and clearer knowledge of archaeology in the Netherlands, with regional emphasis and division.

But funding is an important factor both in commercial and academic archaeology. Nico Roymans’s project focusing on Batavians came 10 years ago when Roman material was not interesting; that Batavian project contained a “sexy” research question and attractive stories. Nevertheless, under this project, Roman military stuff has still its niche, as illustrated by Johan Nicolay’s PhD thesis.

Politico-ideological use of archaeology (in two ways):

- General use: building constructors and developers use it to improve the image of the projects they run. Thus, the cultural side of archaeology is being used.
- Specific sense: Some towns recognised the potential of archaeology as a thing to attach to new urban development (some other’s not...link with De Weerd’s mention to local use of roman past in Leiden); e.g. In Western Nijmegen (an ex-industrial area), the site were Ulpia Noviagamus is located, the Roman and industrial past are mixed and used in the design of the “Roman Quarter”

There is no crown involvement at all and in terms of government involvement here are just cuts, not real interest in the discipline. Malta convention has been translated into national laws and with the current revision possibly rules will be stricter: expectations of results from archaeology must be high enough, as a lot of recent sites have not produced enough outcome.
Roman-Barbarian interactions are complex, like a difficult puzzle with missing pieces and an incomplete and reliable reference image. This allows partial reconstructions and many possible approaches. Therefore, it is normal to account different “School” of thinking: Maybe the division Nico, Carol and Gallestin might be correct but there is no fight but mutual acceptance of positions and debate. 20 years ago there was no mutual acceptance between scholars.

However, this academic division is not peculiar from the Dutch Roman archaeology but common to studies of the past in general. “Your own training, background, environment, context, influences inform your approach and conclusions” (e.g. Carols feminist perception). What is true though, is that an outsider will recognise peculiarities better than insiders.

There is collaboration with other academic communities (e.g. the annual pottery conference at Vrije with participation of Germans and Belgians)

Journal of archaeology in the Low countries (2006-8) reaction to the disappearance of the National museum of antiquities as professional archaeology deposit (it turned in 1996 into a public-aimed museum) and the national service of archaeological investigation (which after a reorganization now forms part of cultural heritage structure in the Netherlands)

After the regionalization of a previous national task, every province has its depot, although 3 northern provinces have just one depot (Nuis?); there are also some local depots.

20 years ago: 80 archaeologists/40 devoted to academic research
Now: 800 archaeologists/less than 40 dedicated to academic research

The good thing about the Malta convention with respect to commercial archaeology is that they are obliged to provide a site report. Before Malta and the appearance of commercial archaeology there were many finds in deposits with no report or identifiable context, so you couldn’t do surveys or analysis reports. Now there is money for projects in which you deal this unreported data.
Dr Ernst Taayke

26/5/2011 Interview, notes.

Context:
University of Groningen. Ceramics typology for Northern Netherlands.

Interview notes:
The river area is still a boundary today; it’s a Roman legacy. The North has remained separated from the South due to political differences 16-19th centuries; now, despite there is no separation, there is a dislike, it’s a psychological thing. In 1806 Napoleon was defeated in Northern Belgium, then the area remains stable until 1831 and an uprise provoked Belgian separation in 1835.

Within the North there is also a difference between provinces: on one side Drenthe, Groningen and Frisia, and on the other the rest of northern provinces.

From a prehistorical perspective, material remains (pottery and bronze weapons) tell us that the boundary was further North (around the Vecht river). There is no hermetic boundary either in Roman period. Winsum (Gallestin) was a meeting point between Roman and Frisians in the early Roman period (Caesar’s coinage); Bentumersid showed in excavations 30-40 years ago the presence of Roman weapons and the possibility of being a harbour (evidence of Roman military presence, when evidence is normally scarce for North-of-the Rhine presence). Additionally we have the historical evidence which says Romans went all the way to the Elbe (Velsen harbour, near Amsterdam, might have been the point of departure of that campaigns to the north). Also, in 47AD it was part of the Empire still; even when Velsen is abandoned there is still contact. So there is plenty of evidence to suggest Frisian importance (not only Batavian has historical sources and material to support that idea, as Nico and others tend to justify the reason why the focus on Batavians). But the amount of shreds of Roman pottery is very low in comparison with local made pottery. This might suggest that Romans were not interested in the area but in the goods coming from it.

In terms of the military uprising of AD28, then they are quiet for centuries until the 3rd century. It was a stable period except for Chauci raids in 181 which invaded the territory of the modern province of Groningen, as suggested by pottery. Chauci’s pottery has appeared in Utrecht, which suggest that people settled there during the first half of the 1st century, probably in order to trade with the Romans. In 250 nothing was left, only temporary fortresses, as the Limes fortresses were burnt down by raids of Germanic groups; no historical record of the 150-200 incident (Marcomannic wars)
North of the borders research is carried out as pre-history. There is no interest (or means) for a historical approach to the past. They have been working more with C14 (at Groningen’s laboratory) and dendro-chronologies for the last decade.

No big deposits of military material in the North; metal is often scrap metal (parts of helmets maybe, but no weapons). The absence of military material shows a Roman lack of interest in the area. The interest was more in the area of the CHauci, Wesel and Elbe rivers, and Denmark. Fibulae are very simple until the more elaborated ones in the 4th century. The first weapons date from the 4-5th centuries and are Frankish weapons (battle axes). There is historical evidence of Roman trade with Eastern Germany, but there is no archaeological trace in the Netherlands, as there are no gold finds recorded. Coins 250-270 point out that population in the area could have participated in the army, not a direct presence or contact. Ecological factors might have made push people to complete abandonment of the Northern coast in the 3rd-4th century; there is no Frisian pottery in the South either in this period, so where did all this people go is one of the big question (Stijn new research)

The trade of grain starts in 100-50BC and continued independently from Roman occupation (evidence through mill stones and hand mills)

In the Eastern Netherlands Roman military evidence is absent and just a couple of 4th century inhumations

********

Taayke was based in Vrije Universiteit 10 years ago, when research on the relationship of Rome with Northern Netherlands was still carried out there by Van Es (until 1978?). Then Nico Roymans and Theuws arrived and all focused shifted to Batavians (he thinks the reason for this shift is that people in charge of Vrije are from the province of Brabant, where Batavians are from?)

********

Batavian national identity....not so much in the 16th but in the 18th century. The myth of the real Dutch was created then (those images of Batavians in wooden canoes) and there was a political use back then, but not now any more national myth has now then disappeared, but not so the historical research and archaeological interest; from a national myth it has become a research topic.

The Batavian myth is located in central Netherlands, the core region of the Netherlands while Frisian role ended in the 7th century with the Franks. That might explain the superiority of their role in national consciousness.

As for the influence of the myth in general public’s identity, they learnt about the wooden canoes Batavian myth, but the really important myth for their national identity is the struggle against the Spanish empire and the commercial empire (16-17th century). In any case, he thinks that a 2 years period out of 200 years of service to Rome, is a too small period to serve as base for the 16th century building of national identity.
European-National-Regional agendas-discourses-identities:

The national focus is on the Roman period. Then there local/regional agendas (e.g. Groningen) that have changed a lot because they have undergone a profound development during the 20th century (house, kettle??), without historical labels. After II WW the peoples of these regions lost their names; the interest was not any more in the labelled groups, the peoples, but on the regions themselves.

War-Peace topics disappeared already before the ars, and in Groningen is still difficult to treat this topic.

There is an exception (of what?) in 1985-1995 with the studies carried out on Frisian identity in the 6th and 7th century and the Frisian Kingdom (Johan Nicolay)

Research on those areas in Groningen has stopped now as the head of the department is interested in Neolithic; something similar happens in University of Amsterdam, where since Stews is head of department, research interest has turned towards Southern Netherlands and the Early middle ages.

Interest in looking at the development of the landscape in the river area. Ecology in Roman times played an important role in the archaeology of that area until 40-50 years ago, but today lack of funding has stopped this kind of research.

Themes, names and publications in academia:

Gallestin (early period, but doubtful quality); Van Es (1991) is part of the older generation publicizing in the 60s and 70s; Heidinga (later Roman period), predecessor of van Stews (head of Amsterdam)

The national research agenda decide on topics and it’s run by the State Department at Aarmsfort

Sarfatij (ed.) Taayke 1999 The smell of higher Nectar; Taayke 2003 essays on the early Franks.

Willems Rome and the Barbarians

Theuws and Hiddink 1996, Der contact zu Rom (exhibition, catalogue?)

Institute Groningen annual meeting and the Saxon symposium annual meeting (North-Western Europe), based more on the study of material than in theory, and useful to point out similarities and differences among regions.
Germany-GB influence: Until 30 years ago, pro-German style, no theory. Then came the influx of ideas first from America and then from UK, introduced mainly by Amsterdam and especially by Leiden (Binford was involved with Leiden). However, there are differences between the Dutch and German ways of conducting archaeology. In the Netherlands we run large-scale excavations (hectares), which is an innovation and an improvement, as you can excavate whole settlements, not just parts. You lose detail but gain overview, you don’t have to guess so much.
**Dr Johan Nicolay and Dr Evert Kramer**

26/5/2011 Interview, notes

**Context:**

Kramer is Curator of Prehistory and Medieval collections at the Fries Museum, Leeuwarden.

Nicolay is Doctor in Archaeology, specialized on Batavian materials in non-military contexts.

**Interview notes:**

I meet both of them in the archives and deposit of the Fries Museum in Leeuwarden.

After 200 years of archaeological tradition, the uncontextualized collection of Frisian materials still has to answer many questions: is the economic transition linked to the Roman period and presence? What happened with the Frisians at some point? All present categories of materials include: coins, bronze statuettes, imported pottery and 1 seal box and some *militaria*, but not much (all of it coming connected with veterans or trade). Paradoxically the territories of Frisia are the Dwelling terps with sea clay (ideal conservation), in comparison with the river area clay less appropriate for conservation (*so if there is nothing in Frisia is because there was nothing originally??*). Thus, there have been found lots of raw material. Maybe some militaria found in Wijnaldum (Excavations at Wijnaldum 1999).

Erdrich thinks that the presence of this materials in the area is due to diplomatic payments, while Eggers (60s) and Lund Hansen think that its due to trade and commerce. But other reasons could also be military interaction and returning veterans: Tacitus records the visits from princeps in Rome as hostes; the Praetorian guard was also composed by Frisians; there were also Frisians in Hadrian wall.

Nicolay has established 4 phases of interaction:

1. 0-70 Military interaction was the driving force, represented by finds of sword.
   *pre-0 no military influence (Eburones)
2. (and 3) 70-270 Civil interaction through commercial exchange, represented by horse gear
3. (4) 270-450 Mixed military-civil interaction, with a germanic influence and political gifts

The Tolsum tablet was thought to be the earliest source on Frisians but after a recent retranslation it was prove of Batavian activity in the area.

*******

*Why Batavian and not Frisians?* Before 1580 there were no universities in Holland; they started because after the expulsion of catholic priests they needed to train new ones (seminar
like). Is also the time when they need to create a national myth (like Israel); Batavians were known better (sources) and history was written by scholars at university of Leiden (area of Batavians). Frisians had already a regional identity and language, and their own original myth (Frisian revolt), so they couldn’t provide the newly founded political entity with a myth.


As for why that primacy in modern research? They can’t see political reasons behind the decision to fund big project on Batavians; there are simply not such projects in Northern Netherlands. There might be luck, personal preferences affecting the research trends but not a deliberate political use. For instance, Van Giffen, national archaeologists in Groningen was more interested in other areas because he didn’t found what he expected in Groningen and never came back. Other reasons: chosen for better conservation conditions and therefore better expectations of finds. It’s also a more complicated area to research than the Limes.

In the 19th century materials were collected without context. Leiden archaeological unit was the only one and made no control excavations in the North, and these were item focused (from time to time they came, collected items and left). In 1915-20 first serious excavations. In 1950 Boeles (“Friesland...”) presented new ideas about the area, and then Erdrich, Galletsin, Van Es (coin hoards) were giving more or less importance to each one of those ideas presented by Boeles.
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Differences prehistory (North) and roman archaeology (South): not so many. Chronologies used in Frisia are the same as in the south and different from Scandinavian chronologies. There are some critiques but the Roman impact is so clear that Roman-Southern chronologies still apply.

European-National-Regional agendas-discourses-identities:

- Regional Frisian agenda is marked by Groningen university, which in the last 10 years has turned towards Neolithic studies; another reason why a decrease on research on Frisians has helped a pre-eminence of Batavian focused research. The only research in this area is around the topic of economic development of the area in the Roman period. While in the museum, the goal is to attract people to its past through regional identity, with exhibitions such as icons of the Frisians? (with brooches of the 7th century)” or “Frisian Golden Age”. However, the “Frisian freedom” (AD128) theme is not alive anymore. Today academic communities are regionally mixed in terms of staff, and the aims are scientific data, not regional or national agendas. Regional division is a factor that explains differences on areas of interest, but not on interpretations.
- In Europe there is context of professional collaboration and international exchange (e.g. Germans, Danes and British about their migration period contacts).

- National agenda only when objects are rescued in a national funded rescue excavation or through the national research agenda. But there is no nationalism behind national agendas.

- Personal agenda (4th level): But the major setback and driving force for research in the area are the personal preferences and biases, with great impact, especially at a local level.

*********

**Current situation in the Netherlands:** Nico’s main focus is on Romans, and Carol has been left behind in a medium size department focusing on women (applying her own personal preferences to her research). Nicolay is focused in the North, trying to look for medium explanations to interactions against Ulla’s search for broader Scandinavian pictures.

Dominant position of very few people writing about certain ideas on interaction in these nations. Universities’ staff reduced everywhere leaves less and less people but more influential; it also results in more difficulties to do research in areas such as Frisia. Money, time, staff, publications help to the pre-eminence of Nico’s research and results (Batavian project: Derks, Nicolay, Roymans and Slofstra on earliest phases of Batavian).

There is not much change in the new generations because most of them studied under Nico’s point of view in Vrije; Nicolay might be one of the exceptions, as he is opening the door to Scandinavian perspectives and traditions.

Is Roman provincial archaeology too local? No, the model applied to research Batavians is being extrapolated; although Amsterdam is not looking to the North itself, its model have been extrapolated, for instance by Nicolay.

Research has moved from focus on aspects of national identity (16-20th century) to focus on mundane aspects (thematic, 20-21st century).

There are not that many people working on trans-frontier interaction, the focus is more on the Roman area.

Nico Roymans focuses on military aspects due to the military context in which Batavians developed; the innovative thing on his research is that militaria and seal-boxes (closely related to military contexts) were found in rural contexts (although still within the military context of a Roman province). Carol van Driel-Murray criticises that military aspects are too predominant on the studies about Batavian; she also focuses on gender studies and the role of Batavian women. As for the northerners, Erdrich, Lund Hansen and Hedeager, they have a too simplistic and focus interpretation of interaction. Erdrich is neglecting trade materials but has produced a very good chronological development because of the interpretation in which he was fitting all the material catalogued by him. They don’t go for a middle ground like Nicolay or Xenia, with several reasons at hand; they actually fight for one unique reason against each other.

******
German-British influence: Dutch archaeological tradition is influenced by German, Scandinavian (especially in the Frisian case) and British archaeology, but it has its own ways: a lot of anthropological perspective is being applied lately (e.g. Use of Beowulf in Scandinavia; use of Tacitus for the Roman period, how does he look at natives). It doesn’t remain too attached to traditional perspectives.

******

A glance over the collection at Fries Museum: There is a variety of materials and therefore of possible interpretations (not just a single one).

- Statuettes from Wijnaldum (the only site excavated with context); local God in farm houses (gifts or bought at the market)
- Militaria, which suggests veterans coming back after years of service in the Roman army.
  - Medusa head: typical from a leather shirt given to soldiers to commemorate battles, great deeds, etc.
  - Seal-boxes (decorated): very early 1st century; and another 2-3 in private collections.
  - Horse gear (eye protection)
- Roman scale and weights, pointing towards trade
- Bronze bucket (like the ones found in Scandinavia), which possibly indicates political gifts.

There are many more material in the approximately 5000 private collections existing in the Netherlands than in the Fries museum, and that is a problem for this kind of studies. There is no law on archaeological property in the Netherlands.

Evert Kramer, notes:

The Tolsum tablet was found while looking for military sites. Originally linked with Frisian national identity, as it was thought to be a document of a Frisian cow sold to the Romans (Frisian cows, like Scottish or Irish sheep are part of the modern imagery of Frisia). However, a new reinterpretation of the tablet after a new transcription and translation by the Oxford team who deciphered the Vindolanda tablets, points out towards the fact that this is actually a loan document and that actually Batavians are involved in the transaction.

The collection contains many coins and less of the rest of materials, but the kind of materials represented is the same as in the south. The interpretations of these materials is more complex than that simplistic ones given by Ulla or Erdrich (not just one reason, but several, like Nicolay suggests).

There is no interest or collaboration from Amsterdam among other reasons because they have so much material of their area that they don’t need to. Nicolay has the good thing of having work with Roymans et alii and being familiar with the Scandinavian traditions and ideas.
Erdrich’s work focuses on the North of the Netherlands. (could we then say that while the South is focused on Roman provincial archaeology and the frontiers, the North is more focused on trans-frontier interactions; also, the north has much more perspective links with Scandinavia than the south, mainly because of the nature of their research and aims as peripheral areas to the Empire)

Excavations in Germany: Bentumersiel site in Wilhelmshaven by the Lower Saxon Institute of Coastal Research. The coordinator is Hauke Jons (contact through Nicolay maybe)

Batavus is a brand in modern Netherlands.
Dr Stijn Heeren

Interview 1 – 30/5/2011, notes.

Interview 2 – 5/11/2013, notes.

Context:

Expert on Batavians, dissertation under Nico Roymans’s supervision at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

Questions:

New Generation proposing new perspectives, positions, interests and ideas?

Current positions (Nico-Carol-the North): differences in approaches and debates

Batavian monopoly in research (when it started and why?; any political interest in boosting Batavians)

Role of Batavians/Batavian myth in national identity/discourse (academic and general). Why 1.5 years? Why Batavians and not Frisians?

Any political use of Batavians or Frisians in history (even recently)?

German-GB external influence in academia (collaboration internal or external; post-colonialism too much emphasis on native aspects)?

European-National-Regional agenda-perspectives-identity

Separation N-S in research (“The research Limes”, the Limes effect on research)/Chronologies

Publications

Interview 1 notes:

His thesis available in VU Dare: Romanisering van rurale gemeenschappen in de Civitas Batavorum (2009).

It is a case study on Romanization; Romanization might not be valid for the Mediterranean or Gaul or GB, but is valid for the Batavian area as it was the Roman army ho brought the change. It is based on site reports (1992-2004) of Tiel-Passewaij, the largest rural settlement with cemeteries associated (i.e. complete communities) of the river area. It show several phases of occupation: 50BC (earliest phase of occupation); 50BC-AD40; 40-150; 150-220;
220-270; 270-450 (when changes in building types and material evidence point out to migrations coming from the north).

In terms of population there are more people in the cemeteries than the two centers would have been capable of containing, which means there in another unexcavated site in the area related to that same cemetery.

Material culture shifts from hand-made to imported pottery (wheel thorn), which indicates the presence of veterans returning and settling in these rural contexts.

They are clearly integrated in the Roman economy: In AD50 very early consumptions of Mediterranean goods (romanization); 70-100 food processing in Roman ways; they also have Mediterranean table-ware (pointing towards new imported ways of eating); they acquire textiles; they create a surplus to exchange (indicated by a bigger settlement, less population).

(5.11.2013) He is now focusing in Late Antique period in the Netherlands, a field hardly explored. Why are there demographic disappearances in certain areas once we get to 4-6 century? Opening new fields of research in Dutch archaeology.

*****

The reasons for an increasing interest in Batavians are the amount of finds (clay preserve metal better), which are the base for theoretical research.

*****

*New Generation proposing new perspectives, positions, interests and ideas?*

I don’t think there is generation change. Maybe just this work work is much more precise and focus on Romanization than that of Nico’s generation. The new generation is focusing more on the villa landscape to the South, not on Batavians. Evidence on how this has evolved would be that Nicolay (military focus) is part of the first Batavian research programme run by Nico and Maike Groot (zoological analysis), Walter Vos and myself (rural) are part of the second Batavian research programme. Now the research is moving further, we are closing the subject.

*Current positions (Nico-Carol-the North): differences in approaches and debates*

Despite the share similar research interest (Batavians) there is a basic disagreement between Nico Roymans and Carol van Driel-Murray, the emphasis on the military aspects of Batavians. Nico and Nicolay emphasize the militaristic nature of Batavians; Carol thinks that the pre-eminence of too much macho values, returning veterans, etc... is mining the possibility of studying other aspects (her academic reaction was to write about Gurkash and focus on gender issues -“those who wait at home”).

*Does Post-colonialism put too much emphasis on native aspects (like Versluys said)?*

I disagree with Versluys assertions that Roman provincial archaeology is made in the Netherlands too local and with no context. It is aware of the Roman context. Also,
postcolonial approaches retain the Romanization framework but with a new stress in the native aspects of it. The just made themselves aware of the colonial discourses, but they haven’t changed 180 degrees. There is a balance between the general roman context and aspects of local development of it. One of Carol’s critics is that Nico focuses only on Roman perspectives. In any case, Stijn is the only one going so deep in local aspects.

**Batavian monopoly in research (when it started and why?; any political interest in boosting Batavians):**

The potential was saw by Willems and developed by Nico: “Willems opened the door and Nico invited people in”. Among the reasons why Nico took on Batavians were his interest in ethno-genesis, the good representation of Batavians in written sources and the rich archaeological materials coming from the area.

There was/is no political agendas behind its boost as a research topic. Research proposals are sent to the Dutch organization for archaeological research and then read and rated by a panel of foreign researchers and rated; only AAA+ get national funding.

**********

**Role of Batavians/Batavian myth in national identity/discourse (academic and general). Why 1.5 years? Why Batavians and not Frisians?**

In the 16\textsuperscript{th} century it was assumed we all came from the Batavians; however, archaeology shows that after the 4\textsuperscript{th} century settlements in the South and the river area are empty, so there is no continuity and therefore Batavians are not forefathers, just a created myth in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century. Also Civilis was not so much of a hero fighting the oppressor; he was more of a Roman officer fighting other Romans, not a revolt. The political use of Batavians in the Batavian republic went against their popularity, as the Batavian republic was seen as puppets of the French. Then, during the 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century their popularity continue decreasing. But after the 2\textsuperscript{nd} world war, they were retaken as there was a need for heroes (against Germany). The 70s will see a revival of archaeological interest on the Batavians.

Why 1.5 years? Because the sources translated and available were those of Tacitus talking about the revolt.

As for the impact of Batavians in National identity nowadays, national identity is characterised by features such as freedom, tolerance and trade, not by Batavians. Batavian knowledge in secondary school is not present. They don;t have a public presence anymore.

**********

**Any political use of Batavians or Frisians in history (even recently)?**

Frisian independent movement is small, and the differences are more in language than any other thing. There is nt a use of ancient Frisians as part of that movement.
German-GB external influence in academia (collaboration internal or external)?

We have German practice and Anglo-American models of theoretical interpretation. Netherlands has its own new way. We don’t just use imported models but create our new ones.

Interview 2 notes:

On Anglo-German influence: to put it in a cartoon way, Germans need 5000 finds to get to conclusions and British need 4 to produce a model of interpretation. Dutch are looking for around 400 finds and apply British theoretical models to it. Some Germans leave conference theatres when they realize it’s a paper based in theory, they get angry.

External collaboration is more on personal connections (although Leiden is more international). Internally VU, UvA and Groningen have no structural contact with each other.

There is no collaboration or discussion on topics between universities; Groningen is a kind of island (they never attend to the annual Roman symposium organized by Vrije. There is decreasing debate within Dutch academia).

European-National-Regional agenda-perspectives-identity:

No European funding seeking. Some attention to contacts but no political motivation.

There is a national archaeological research agenda (NOaA); its chapters are regional but the topics are wider (national or international), pointing towards a wider picture.

Separation N-S in research (“The research Limes”, the Limes effect on research)/Chronologies

There is no Limes separation, it’s more of an institutional division: Leiden (pre-history), VU and Nijmegen (Roman) and UvA (Medieval). There is also research on the Romans coming from barbarian territories, so definitely no “Limes effect”.

It doesn’t affect either the chronologies used. The Roman period chronologies are widely used both sides of the Limes: early (until AD70), middle (AD70-270) and late Roman period (AD270-450).

Publications
Walter Voss, Stijn Heeren and Henke van de Velde-ADC (available through VU Dare archives)

Berger and Lorenz: The contested nation...national histories
Dr Ton Derks

30/5/2011

Context:
Vrije Universiteit

Interview Notes:

Batavian monopoly in research (when it started and why?; how has it evolved; why not the same interest on Frisians?)

Interest on Batavians still continue because is necessary in order to get better results.

Historical and epigraphical approaches to the topic were drained; no progress was expected as once you have studied the evidence there is not much more you can do with it. Thus, the archaeological approach had to be exploited:

- 30s there were trench excavation without a context
- 40s After some land redevelopment and reallocation of the soil, some attempts like Moderman’s 1st distribution map (from Leiden?).
- 50-60s there is a change and large scale excavations take place
- Early 80s first surveys and distribution maps were produced, with a limited number of Roman settlements. Large excavations only in Paasewaaij (Stijn’s focus of study)

Then, more complete excavations were needed for comparison purposes. The general picture will probably not change much but it would provide us with better empirical base for quality studies.

The first serious studies on Batavians were those of Willems, basing them on the huge corpus of material evidence from the State service deposits. Up to then most of “Roman archaeology was Limes archaeology” (Willem van Es) and most archaeologist were trained as prehistorians (low interest in roman archaeology), until Nico arrived (he was trained as a historian); other change in the 80s was the influence of post?-processual? archaeology.

Why not research on Frisians? Because large projects on Frisians are focused on early middle ages, not so much on Roman times. Their focus is the issue of continuity in population (are ancient Frisians the same as modern, post-medieval ones?)

*******

With processual?? archaeology native became the focus (emancipation of native population in research terms: Greg Woolf giving voice to the colonized native).
Postcolonial perspectives started to shift the focus of military Roman archaeology back to the romans (but in a negative perspective)

Romans (+) Roman military archaeology; Natives due to processual archaeology; Romans (-) due to Post-colonial approaches

******

“Research Limes” (differences between the North and the South)

There are hardly any excavation in the North; the Terps excavation in the 30s and then silence. They are also protected by the monuments act, so no major developments because of that reason. The economic development is weaker in the North, so the need for archaeology (linked to urban development, commercial archaeology and the archaeological law) is lower too.

******

Role of Batavians/Batavian myth in national identity/discourse (academic and general). Why 1.5 years?

The 16th century as instrumental on the creation of the original myth around Batavians.

In the 18th century, the colonial use of the myth is natural as the myth was part already of the culture, so you just use it, no need to link it to the original reason (thus another interpretation).

????2nd WW Utrecht University reworking of the Batavians in recent times??????

Nowadays, every school talks about Batavians and not other tribes. Batavians are part of the popular culture. Popular knowledge is not very deep but quite extended.

******

Why so much emphasis on Batavian research?

National sentiment might be behind the reason why research grants were given for research projects focusing on Batavians. They are part of an abroad tradition and shared feeling. Cananefates would have received the same money?

Personal preferences are surely part of the reasons.

Geographical circumstances: lack of material evidence on the period you want to research or abundance of it in the case of Batavians; it’s the “richness of the database available”. In the central area of the Netherlands metal finds are very rich, while in the north there is a lack of research material.

The research cyclical component: Research is self-repeated; the more you research the more you research opportunities you open within that same topic
Different groups and approaches:

Recruitment of Roman soldier was evaluated. Carol emphasizes the implications of that process, while Roymands and Derks provide a more descriptive point of view (according to Carol male biased).

Triple agenda European-National-Regional agendas-perspectives-identities:

It’s impossible to follow the three of them at the same time because they are very different. They represent different audiences, mindsets and background information.

European: Batavians are used as one of the best research tribes in Roman Empire; allows a regionalization in europaena context, highlighting different results of Romanization processes in different areas of the empire.

National: Batavians are popular (e.g. exhibiton 2004 was a success and increased popular interest).

Regional/Local: More linked to political-ideological interest. It explains the profit of this research for local communities. ??Catch the attention with cliché and then try to deconstruct it??

National-international collaboration: There is no much collaboration with the North, and there are not many foreigners excavating here either. Dutch archaeology still is very national.

German-GB influence: The Netherlands is greatly influenced by German, very traditional, empirical approach (although German style is changing now allowing more theory), and also by British theoretical models, but it has its own middle way. E.g. BAR Series volume on Spheres of interaction between Romans and natives was criticized both as ‘speculation without material base’ and simple descriptive reports’; blame for this could be also attributed to the director of these commercial archaeology companies for their decision of just focusing on description and not to analyse. However, the differences between the academic communities of these three countries are being reduced lately.
**Prof. Nico Roymans**

Seminar at Edinburgh University – 9/3/2011


Interview 2 – 22/11/2013. Interview, notes.

**Context:**

Professor of Archaeology at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

**Edinburgh’s Seminar notes:**

The last 15 years have seen an awful lot of research done on the formation and development of a Batavian identity as a group and Amsterdam has been its focal point.

Ethnic recruitment is characterized by regional variation, by its use as a kind of taxation. Among the Batavians was extreme. Tacitus (Germania 29 and Historiae 4.12) talks about huge number of recruits among the Batavians. The impact of mass recruitment on the Batavians generated cultural responses (Batavians becoming Roman, there is a clear process of Romanization proven by the material evidence; Romanization is still valid in Batavian case) and social changes. There is archaeological evidence for this responses and changes.

Roman-Batavian treaty means the militarization of Batavian society. Military exploitation (5000 soldiers out of an approximate population of 40000) is an intense pressure that generates a direct demographic impact: higher birth rate, returning veterans within a generation, and a rise in the number of rural settlements during the 1-2nd century AD in clusters of farmsteads. Why Roman exploitation? Due to the inherited perception from Caesar experience in the area of Batavians as a warlike people, because there were no other resources available and because the recruitment became systematic.

The image of Batavians in the Roman psyche: ethnographically Germanic (i.e. barbarians and inferior), impulsive-brave (less intelligent). (shows image of an anonymous painting 1830 Landscape with Batavians). Roman poems highlight military abilities and the roman stereotype is the description of bodyguards of Julio-Claudian emperors “fidelissima”. So for the Romans they are Germanic, barbarian, large, warlike, loyal to the emperor, which means they are good people to be exploited militarily. Tacitus descriptions are bilateral as shows Batavian opposition to Rome in the Batavian revolt.

Batavian self-image: They keep their fame for centuries, they earned a life as soldiers. They confirm Roman stereotypes via archaeology; Nicolay’s research shows weapons in non-military context, which is unparalleled in other areas of the frontier (as militaria were found in the settlements not in the graveyards, which means they took these objects back as souvenirs from their service in the Roman army.) This military identity is also proven by the
syncretism of Hercules Magusanus (Hercules being a Roman military good); important sites for this aspect are the temples in Empel, Kessel and Elst.

Material culture and the construction of Batavian identity: there are a few other points in the notes.

**Interview 1 notes:**

*Why Nico’s attention to Batavians (and not in Frisians):*

Mainly because of the high quality of the evidence available for the group and the area, the availability of historical sources (Tacitus) and epigraphic evidence (due to the intensive recruitment for the Roman army Batavians are a group with one of the largest number of inscriptions), and the high quality of the rural settlements, cemeteries, ritual sites and military infrastructure in the area. All these factors allowed the development of complex models, more than in any other area or with any other group.

If there was as much data available in Frisia I would have researched the Frisians, not the Batavians; Frisians have a much better ethnographical context than Batavians. Chances would have been even better there as there is still a Frisian modern sentiment present in modern times.

There are no political or ideological reasons behind my interest or any intention of boosting the role of Batavians in the national identity.

That was more in the 16th-18th centuries; since the 19th century the presence of Batavians in the national imagery has decreased; nowadays it’s limited to schools. There is no national Batavian pride.

*Why the emphasis in those 2 years?*

In the late 15th century Tacitus’ manuscripts describing the Batavians and some of their historical episodes were rediscovered by humanist scholars. They created a series of analogies (links) with their own historical context. Picking certain elements of Tacitus’ description and modifying the evidence, they tried to back their ideals and political intentions (e.g. the political heart of the Netherlands was in the coastal provinces of Northern and Southern Holland, but Batavians were located in the eastern interior area of the Dutch territories; they tried to locate Batavian related sites in the coast to back the legitimacy of the main role of Northern and southern Holland).

*What role did Batavians play in the colonial context in the 18th century?*
The Dutch empire is different to the British empire in the sense that the later has the Roman Empire as a model and reflect their ideals in their colonial enterprise. The use of the name Batavian could be seen as a provocation in that sense. The Dutch present themselves in the colonial context (to other colonial systems) using the Batavian myth, already rooted in national consciousness. It’s an ambivalent structure, in which Dutch proudly make use of the Batavians, who paradoxically are still depicted as barbarians (17th century representation of Batavian settlements still show round houses, native barbarian).

*Since 19th century:* Batavian issue is not so prominent in national identity, more marginal. It’s more based on Germanic identity.


*Now in terms of general public perception:* Trying to create broader interest through a local approach based on broader knowledge; school’s briefly touch on it.

So, what is the effect of your research in that reduced perception? Do you think once transferred to general public it will bring more awareness to Batavians as part of a national past (maybe not the most important one)?

*Evolution of the topic:*

Earlier studies, mostly in Dutch language and reproducing historical stereotypes with a very traditional approach.

80s and Willems: First publication in English (he studied in USA and had an anthropological background) and using all sorts of evidence.

Then the NWO funded two waves of research on Batavians run by Nico Roymans: First one, in which Nicolay was involved, with a focus on the ethnic identity of Batavians, and a second one, in which Stij Heeren and Walter Vos were involved, focusing on the integration of the Batavian rural communities in the Roman World.

The later publication is the Mythos volume of Varusschhlacht (2009).

Now he is still marginally working in the topic but from a different perspective. He feels the new evidence available through excavation reports is fascinating. His new focus is the transformation of the rural villa landscape, but it can be compared with the lack of development in the River area, so somehow is still linked to its first research projects.

*Current debates and positions:*

There is no basic disagreement between Nico and Carol, just nuances separate their positions. Carol critic is that Nico’s research on Batavians and the image he is picturing of Batavian society is too much male focused, because it is mainly focused on the military aspects. Nico
focuses on the impact of returning veterans reintegrated in the rural societies, bringing roman identities to the area from the bottom up; it is another perspective on Romanization, an original model on cultural change. She thinks women role deserves attention as they had to take on traditional male roles when these were recruited by the army.

Then, in the North, we have Nicolay (who obviously agrees with Roymans thesis) and Gallestin. Nijmegen has no professor on Roman Provincial Archaeology anymore, just pottery specialists (Rien Polak).

But there are no big internal debates within Dutch academia around this topic because it is a small academic community (many people producing excavations report, but very little interpretation and therefore opportunity for debate). Their arena for debating is an international one, mainly with the Anglo-Saxon community (e.g. TRAC); there is no possibility to discuss either with the German community because they are too far (have no influence) from British theoretical model and positions.

**German-British influence?**

There are very few German scholars interested in theory but they still appreciate Nico’s contribution. The idea of the Dutch middle way was criticized by Dirk L. Krausse (2004), from the Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Baden-Württemberg and University of Tuebingen, stating that models are not closed and complete truth and that they are opened to debate; he also criticized Nico’s idea that there is a cultural component on the economic development.

**The research Limes, N-S and Prehistory and Roman provincial archaeology and chronologies:**

That division is too simplistic; there is heterogeneity…Southern scholars also look at northern materials (and the other way around?). There are many kinds of backgrounds.

He thinks his research bridges Iron Age archaeology with Roman provincial archaeology (from rough to the plough???)

In terms of chronologies, they use the same Roman period chronologies in the S and the N (early, middle and late) (I think Stijn said exactly the same).

The Netherlands tries to make use of historical sources and have a historical approach, while other communities like Denmark have more problems to find historical sources and therefore apply a more prehistoric approach.

**European-National-Regional agendas-perspectives-identities:**
How does the crises of European Union and European identity (regional identities rising) affect this kind of research?

Field work projects are mostly carried out by commercial archaeological units in a very regional/local level and following those agendas. In the context of Malta convention (European level) these units can’t synthesize or analyze deeply the results of their excavations, but these are still carried out because they are still interesting to Universities’ research projects as case studies to be applied upon an international perspective. These academic projects at universities are bringing local/regional projects to the international sphere and integrating them into a global perspective.

There are both national and regional agendas.

Post-colonial perspectives:

These are coming mainly from British models (due to their colonial background), but in Nico’s opinion they went too far in their arguments. There is no evidence of cultural resistance, maybe not enthusiasm.

Romanization debate is not useful anymore as it has gone too far. Mattingly is stereotyping the concept in a way that doesn’t work, but it can be redefined in many other ways. Creolization and other terms are also problematic. So which ones would you use?

Recommended publications:

Stijn Heeren, Mythos volume, Willems revisiting Nijmegen JRA volume, Exhibition

Interview 2 Notes:

There is no special treatment for the Batavian topic in terms of funding and support given.

I then questioned him about the national NWO funding he got for his two Batavian projects in the past and he answered that NWO project proposals are assessed by external referees who make the final decision (normally UK or Germany).

So the reason why money was given to Batavians is not to be looked for in identity or political reasons, but on mere scientific bases. Simply, the available evidence is enormous and unique: The historical sources combined with a unique data corpus.

- The clay soils of the Batavian area preserve bronze objects very well (coins, statuettes, militaria, etc.)
- There is a huge amount of excavation data as large scale excavations have been carried out during the last 10 decades in the Batavian area, more than for any other areas of any other tribe in Gaul.
- Large quantities of epigraphy used by Batavians and about Batavians.
- Vindolanda tablets and Batavians in Hadrian’s Wall (another epigraphic evidence)

You can conclude that Batavians are unique and therefore interesting because of all the evidence available, which shows that Batavians were not a mere Roman imperial construct but an identity embraced by the peoples living in these area. They used this label to name themselves in epigraphy, not only here but also in Hadrians wall or in Rome. That makes them a unique and very important case-study for the discussion on native identities in Roman times.
Dr Carol van Driel-Murray and Dr Eef Stoffels

31/5/2011 Interview, notes.

Context:

Both at Universiteit van Amsterdam. Now both in Leiden. Eef is Carol’s PhD student.

Interview notes:

“Everyone has their own biases but no one recognise them; as an outsider you (Sergio) can critically look for the motifs behind people’s interpretations.” Carol about my project.

Difference between N and S?

The first difference is the starting points of view. South starts from a Roman point of view, while the North does it from a Native point view.

There is also the difference in discipline. South is classical archaeology (through Roman provincial archaeology) while the North is prehistory. Although Nico said that his research bridges Iron Age archaeology with Roman provincial archaeology (from rough to the plough)

But both are looking at their ancestors (N-Frisians/S-Batavians) and finding primus/princes (elite) and heroes.

Why so much research focus on Batavian?

If we just considers TRAC, one could think Batavians is the only research topic going on in the Netherlands (connects with Nico’s assertion that they are the best known Roman times tribe in modern archaeology)

According to Nico is because of the abundant material evidence available but Carol disagrees. Are the empty gaps in material, used as an argument to focus on Batavians and not to focus on other groups, real? Do these gaps represent absence of other groups (or lesser importance) or a simply a lack of found/available evidence? The reason for these gaps in the material evidence for other groups is the metal detectors policy behind the border, in Germany. Also, Nico has not chosen Batavians because of the material evidence available; he first initiated his research on Batavians and then gathered the data and created a solid data corpus. What is first, the data or the research?

Jasper de Bruin (University of Leiden) focuses in Cananefates, using very good materials, and there is not so much research on them.
Also, serious and systematic studies on other groups have not been carried out, making impossible a comparison with Batavians to sustain that special halo or status that Nico’s research has given them (maybe in Tracia or Hispania there are other groups equally skilful with the horse, but we don’t know because there are no studies) or to challenge the position and role as part of the Roman military strategy currently given (e.g. Eef’s research shows that Batavian native pottery can be found in Roman military context, i.e. forts, since the 20BC).

Dutch scholars are rather uncritical with their own work and their views are bought by international scholars, e.g. Batavians are these great and unique, elite and male dominated people in the Empire. This view has been generated mostly by Nico Roymans’ great research. However, he has never tackled issues such as gender or lower social classes. This male centred, military, unique people focus is evident in Nico’s title of his paper in Edinburgh: “The Batavians between Germania and Rome. The emergence of a soldiering people”.

Carol’s input into the debate:

There were no elites in Batavian society, where the equalitarian ethos was deliberate. Stijn studies of brooches shows that, and he has a much better approach to material evidence than Nico, not so much based on theoretical models. (New generations are much more opened to debate)

Also, women’s role in the economic development of the Eastern Netherlands, for instance through the study of pottery, where it has been proved that wheel thorn pottery, present in the Batavian territory (East), does not reach the West until 3rd century.

Why role of Batavians in national identity?1.5 years period?

*There is not much attention to post AD 70 Batavians (Gallic empire posthumous texts)

Why this preeminent role of Batavians? Because the novelty and timing of the discovery of the texts; it seize the imaginations of these 16th century people who were looking for an identity. Whenever there is a period of crises Dutch have turned to Batavians:

- 16t century: uprising against authority (Spain). *There was a political struggle against provinces to see in which one where Batavians really located.
- 18t century: freedom against tyranny (French??) as an unifying factor.
- Colonies: The use of Batavia for the colonial capital is like an alias (e.g. New York). It is a message for other nations. The rooted rights on the land by using a rooted (ancient) name; name not related to the native barbarian idea but a national image.
- 2nd WW: resistance.

German-GB influence:
Carol comes from UK and she was struck by the different languages known in the Netherlands; she thinks that the knowledge of other academic languages make Dutch community more permeable to other influences.

In the 70s-80s there was an ecological approach but it’s lost now; that has been a dreadful step back for Dutch archaeology. Now things are changing, there is a complete mix, a Germano-British marriage in the Netherlands. The British method is to chase theory and apply it to data. In Germany there is a new generation more committed to theory.

It would be interesting though to see how the British change towards a more data-based research. That process is much more complicated than the other way around (from data to theory), i.e. what The Netherlands has done and Germany is starting to do; they know the data and they just need to interpret them within a theoretical context. GB is too theoretical and they are just not tackling the evidence.

National and international collaboration:

Internationally collaboration depends on personal contacts, there is no institutional collaboration. Nico has more contact with German scholars, while Carol’s personal input and interest has made TRAC a meeting point for Dutch scholars and students with the international community. But in general terms are the Belgians that work more closely with them.

Nationally there is no collaboration or debate (she feels isolated). She wanted to debate with Nico because she thinks debate stimulates, but Nico has never shown interest. Only lately, since 2009 they have a meeting twice a year, Limes, in which people with a military research focus on the Limes (including commercial units) meet and discuss (it certainly activates the debate).

The Netherlands is too small of a community to cope with British schools of thinking but still diverse and individual.

There are examples of collaboration though. The Auxilia unit from UvA?, the University of Leiden and the city of Nijmegen are collaborating in research on the Kops Plateau (a site in Nijmegen), with its results published and the materials and data digitized.

10 years ago UvA was a very active department but due to retirements and scholars moving to other universities, now it has become a low profile department.

Nijmegen are doing their research but not sharing it out properly. Not taking it out there.

Impact of postcolonialism:

The new generation of researchers are looking more to for the detail, the daily life, the highest level of detail on the lower levels of society. Then they are moving the results of this
local-low approach to political-historical generalizations (bottom-up); but this is not so much because of the influence of post-colonial theory but because of a general feeling of dissatisfaction with how things were being done. So Postcolonialism reflects, but not drives, the new trends. We are becoming more contextual, going more into detail; not so much interested in processual archaeology, i.e. the processes (such as Romanization). That unease with processual top-down looks and the fact that IT (as Pim Allison’s distribution maps show) is helping to cross data and look into specific details of ancient life are marking the way.

Carol considers herself a contextual archaeologist, data driven.

**EU-national-regional:**

There are no general agendas in the Netherlands, approaches are too individual (and departments are small).

There is the NoaA, which is an official document but not practical. It’s mostly used to show commercial archaeology units how to operate, what are the gaps in research, what questions need to be answered, in order to prioritize that work. (But, who chooses those questions and for what reasons?). But this NoaA still reflects 1950s ideas and is not updated in Carol’s opinion. The positive side of this document is that it has led to better developed and more effective regional agendas.

Obvious different audiences addressed depending on the level (EU, national or regional), but we also have to take into account the barrier that languages represent, especially in terms of published materials (e.g. in Dutch).
**Rolan Emaus**

31/5/2011 – Interview, notes.

**Context:**

PhD candidate, University of Amsterdam.

**Interview notes:**

He does political geography applied to archaeology. He is interested in the implications of the Limes, not only the reasons or causes for it to be there (not just tax, trade or military), that’s too simplistic. He looks at the re-categorization of people due to the Limes: what message is send by the Limes in the landscape, what are the scales of impact in daily life. *Mark Driesen (interdisciplinary approach is essential, social sciences). Data is there, it only needs to be analysed from that perspective. There is a slow change in the Netherlands towards theoretical approaches like this one.

Archaeology in the Netherlands is very fragmented. Due to the little number of universities approaches can’t be very different, so that fragmentation should be coming from personal choices, more than institutional. In any case, there is no institutional collaboration between universities in the Netherlands.

Another problem is that most of the data comes from commercial archaeology firms rescue digs due to urban developments. Universities are not involved in that, just in the interpretation. So there is more and more data, poorly written, and less and less time to look at it critically.

Secondary school students are only taught about the Batavian revolt, not about the Frisian revolt. Batavians have sex-appeal, ‘mojo’, and the Netherlands were looking for role models for nation building.