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Abstract


This is a study of the Roman Iron Age in both Sweden and Britain but with a focus on the latter. The study includes a comparative analysis of selected goods in the material culture at a number of different sites in Sweden and Britain in the aim of understanding the extent of the Roman influence at these sites. The aims of the essay is to investigate if we can notice similarities between the Swedish and British setting and thereby draw conclusions regarding the Roman influence or lack of it in the Rural setting of Britain as well as the chosen settlements in Sweden. Was the Romanization of Britain for everyone or was it reserved for the elite?
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1. Introduction

The idea behind this investigation took form one year ago during a semester of studying in Leicester, England. What is the difference between the rural settlements in Sweden and the rural non-villa settlements in Britain during the Roman Iron age, around the period of year 0 and up to 400 AD? There is an ocean and a great deal of landmass between Sweden and Britain, and taking into account that Sweden is well past the Roman limes it is sometimes logical to draw the conclusion that this should exclude the country from Roman influence. However, it is not that easy, we know that the Roman world had influences far and wide past its own borders and indeed much of its strategy in dealing with non conquered peoples was in fact to trading, dealing and in other ways pacifying them. Recent survey work by Jeremy Taylor(2007) has shown that some regions of England had over a 60:1 ratio between more native styled settlements of either rectangular or roundhouse design and Roman villas. The heartland of the Roman province in the south east had ratios lower than 20:1. This raises some interesting questions regarding Roman dominance and influence.

1.1 Aims

The question at hand is if the Roman invasion and settlement actually changed the rural society in a mayor way or if it was left largely unscathed in Britain? After the conquest a new architecture was introduced to some settlements, that of the rectangular design which many adapted to. The real villa constructions however were true rectangular houses using Roman styled building materials instead of the traditional stone foundation, often became notably larger and with more than two rooms and with different sections and wings built to it (Hingley 1989: 36-52)

We already know that the larger so called villa settlements was inspired from the Romans or at least the Romano-Gallic styles of building and imported large amounts of pottery and other luxury goods. However, this study will investigate the, perhaps poorer, settlements in the periphery of the province. To make this discussion easier to follow in terms of aim five questions have been constructed.

- Was the Roman way of living limited to the local elite or did it actually affect the ordinary human?
• Can this effect or influence be traced in the material culture of the settlements by comparing it to a non Roman setting like Sweden?

• Is there a similarity in the number of Roman finds or indeed the lack thereof?

• How large is the difference between the regions of England and Sweden?

• In which of the chosen items can those differences be traced?

• And can we speak of the cultural impact of the Roman influence on the rural setting as a form of creolization or was it in fact a case of the Roman world being the centre and Sweden as well as Britain being the periphery?

1.2 Objectives
The objective of this investigation is to participate in the current scientific debate regarding Roman Britain and indeed Roman provincial influence as a whole. The research regarding the Roman occupation of major parts of Europe, northern Africa and the Middle East is a gigantic topic, but for most parts it has been static for quite some time (Millett 1990:1-8). The case studies in this investigation together with recent work done in England might shed some new light on the provincial government of England, the influence on the neighbors of the Roman Empire. This could possibly also help us understand how the other provinces in the Roman empire was governed.

1.3 Material, Method and Source criticism
So in what way can this subject be investigated? To begin with I will touch upon different aspects of the vast past research done regarding the different aspects of this topic. The Roman occupation and its effects on Britain is something that has been discussed for the greater parts of the last 100 years and the view has changed a great deal over time. However, the focus of these investigations have always been towns and the settlement form that from this point on will be referred to as villas, i.e. a settlement bearing clear resemblance with Roman architecture, building material and techniques (Taylor 2007: 1-3). It is not until recently that any serious light has been shed on the non-villa settlements. To understand the case of the Roman non-villa settlements we will use some of the literature and recent surveys of the British countryside along with excavation reports from Dragonby in North Lincolnshire in the
heartland of the province, Pegswood Moor in Morpeth across Hadrian’s wall in the north and three excavations along the A5300 road between Prescot and Widnes in Merseyside to the North west of the province From an English setting (see Map.1). We will then investigate the literature dealing with the Roman influence on Sweden as well as excavation reports on Vallhagar on Gotland and Helgö close to Stockholm in the Mälaren area in the Swedish setting (see Map.2). By looking at the material culture and the number or Roman finds in each of these excavations we will most likely see a pattern or lack thereof. From that and with the help of the past research we aim to see if more light can be shed on this highly debated subject.

When dealing with a topic that is so extensive it is always easy to get ahead of oneself and get literally smashed by it. However, by limiting this analysis to the items in the excavated material that indicate clear influences of Roman design, or indeed more importantly, direct imports the picture of the Roman influence in the different settlement contexts might emerge. By comparing these in with the aid of simple statistics or a textual comparison I hope to show that the material influence of the Roman Empire on the rural settlements of Britain might not have been more
extensive than on a settlement in Sweden. One problem encountered is the variation of the presentation of the data in the excavation reports and the way they are presented. The way archaeologists choose to present their finds is hardly uniform, some interpreting the finds in an easily understandable manner and some just list the finds with a short physical description of the find which leaves much to be wanted for a researcher trying to review the reports. This along with the fact that we have to assume that their interpretation is indeed correct makes it even more complicated.

Then there is the question of the whole investigation being representative or not. By picking various excavations from different regions of England and Sweden the hope is to cover possible differences in material culture in various regions. There will also be an inclusion of data from literature covering Scotland as a reference to obtain more information about what happens outside the borders of the Roman Empire in Britain.

Another problem is the dating of the different settlements. The Swedish excavations were selected because of their long continuity which covers the Roman Iron Age and beyond and with limited previous knowledge of them by me. The English settlements were selected by the same reason but for the most parts they have a continuity from the Late Pre-roman Iron Age (LPRIA) and into the Roman Iron Age and possibly onwards. This brings a very real possibility of pre-Roman and post-roman finds in both scenarios which we need to be trickled through to reach the relevant material for the research questions of the thesis.

The analysis will not go into the detail of the artifacts or compare the different artifacts found in the Swedish or English setting as that would be to take them out of their context. Instead it will focus on the amount of different kinds of artifacts with either local or foreign origin to identify imports from the area dominated by the Roman Empire. The analysis will also be limited to the amount of glass vessels (excluding beads), brooches, Roman coins and pottery.

The settlement structure will only briefly be mentioned in the analysis and discussion to give a broader picture of the case studies that are being investigated. Reference literature dealing with these things is being included to be able to broaden the thesis and incorporate it into the recent research debate.
Another thing that might be briefly mentioned but largely ignored in the analysis are graves and their grave goods. The analysis is based on material found in the actual settlement for the reason of trying to get closer to the items that people actually used, or eventually lost, and not just stored as prestige goods to be buried with. Some of the grave goods might have been used by the people who was buried with it but most likely with such care that they were largely intact when the person died. That however is oblivious for this investigation and will not be addressed here.

2. Previous research

As mentioned above the Romanization of Britain and the influence the Roman Empire had on its provinces and its neighbors is a subject that has been highly debated back and forth since the dawn of archaeology. Along with this concept a great deal of theoretical models have been either created or adapted into archaeology with the aim of producing more correct interpretations of the past. Below the researchers and their ideas that led up to this analysis will be briefly presented as well as a short theoretical chapter. This will be further presented and discussed in later in the essay.

2.1 The Romanization of Britain

In Barri Jones and David Mattingly’s An Atlas of Roman Britain (1990) the invasion and direct results of the Roman presence is presented in a general overview and act as one of the pillars of this investigation.

Martin Millett takes this one step further in his book The Romanization of Britain (1990) by investigation the concept of Romanization in more detail when it comes to Britain. He discusses how Britain was different from other provinces, and how it was not, in the terms of how the Romans acted as provincial overlords.

A more worldwide overview of the Roman Imperialism is presented in Craige B. Champions book Roman Imperialism: Readings and Sources (2004). In this book different authors investigate the concept of Romanization in general from the written sources in an empire wide scene.

Last but not least is Jeremy Taylor’s survey of Roman Britain in An atlas of Roman rural settlement in England (2007) where he investigates the rural setting in Britain in regards of size, field form and building remains.
2.2 General theory on cultural contact and Rome’s influences on its neighbors

How the Romans might have perceived the Germanic peoples past the *Limes* and how the Germanic peoples might have perceived the Romans have been discussed by Ann Carlie among others in the book *Germaner och Romare* (The Germanic people and the Romans) (2009). She discusses several possible aspects of the cultural meeting between the two.

To widen the picture even further we will also take a look at the relation which the Roman Empire had with north of England and Scotland past Hadrian’s wall and the export of glass and alcohol discussed in Dominic Ingemar’s PhD work *Glass, alcohol and power in Roman Iron Age Scotland* (2003).

2.3 Creolization and Centre and Periphery models

In recent years the concept of Creolization has been discussed as a possible model that can be applied to different cultures and especially as a way of explaining Roman influence in both a provincial setting or as in Lotta Fernståls article *Where Different Waters Met* (2003), outside the Roman empire. The terminology of this model comes from linguistic studies of the creation of *Creole* as a language. This was a mix of different words and grammar from a lot of different languages that in the end took the form of an entirely new language (Fernstål 2003: 25-27). The way a Creole language takes form has many twists and turns but comes down to a concept of intertwining of two or more languages through contact or by means of second language learning and most of the time this takes a few generations. In the early stages a form of proto-Creole type of language called pidgin often takes shape which basically is the native language with a few grammatical and lexical changes to it. Examples of this can be seen in many parts of Stockholm where large amounts of immigrants have taken residence (Smith & Veenstra 2001: 1-7, Kotsinas 2001: 125-127). In archaeological terms this model becomes wider still by mixing in biological and cultural aspects into the mix. An archaeological Creole is basically a active blend of cultural aspects from different cultures to create something entirely new, some researchers even mix in biology to discuss an entirely new creolized population by mixing different populations together (Orser 2002: 156-157).
We will now take a look at the general thought around the centre and periphery theories presented in Timothy C. Champions book *Centre and Periphery: Comparative studies in archaeology* (1989). When discussing this topic it is important to see the method behind it. The whole idea of centre and periphery derives from Wallenstein’s economic and political model of world economies in the modern world which was used to see the way the western world their more underdeveloped neighbors. The model was in a way flawed as it built upon the capitalist ideas where the developed nations moved technology and know-how to these peripheral locations. In a pre-capitalist environment however, this was not necessarily the case (Champion 1989: 5-13). In this essay it will be quite easy to identify the centre (Roman) and the periphery (Swedish and to some extent British). We need to start off by accepting that the pre-capitalist societies used their periphery as production sites for wares the dominant central area wanted to consume. It is also important to identify how difficult it would be for the two regions to break off the contact. In the case of the Roman Empire it needed the raw material to keep the huge apparatus of the Roman provincial administration in check (Champion 1989:15).

The question concerning these models is how much did the rural population in Britain need the Romans, and how much did the Germanic people of Sweden need them? Thirdly, can creolization or centre and periphery be used to help interpret the situation in Britain and Sweden? This will be discussed further in the discussion chapter of this essay but first we will turn to the material culture of the sites to see what evidence and patterns can be uncovered.

**3 Analysis of the finds**

To begin with it is important to state that this will be a solely quantified analysis. The focus will be on the number of items but at the same time it is meant to open up for a deeper interpretation by adding some description where possible. The problems with adding descriptions in this case have been that different archaeologists display a striking difference in how they choose to present their findings. But where a short description of the different items was possible, they have been added.
3.1 Dragonby
The settlement in the north east part of England was excavated by Jeffrey May. The settlement area was determined to be around 8ha in size and two sites were excavated covering roughly 10% of the surveyed settlement area with a grand total of 9 buildings with enclosures, wells, four pottery kilns and a road. Of the nine buildings two were so called aisled rectangular buildings, six were rectangular buildings and one was a rectangular house with rounded edges. Under one of the Aisled houses remains of a roundhouse was found as well. The enclosures around the houses were not fully linear; however they seem to have been placed in accordance to the road which indicate that the settlement was planned. All in all it becomes evident that this is a large, village sized settlement that at least on a later date bear clear influences from Roman Architecture through the Aisled buildings and the rectangular design on most of the buildings. The continuity of the settlement remains range from 100BC to around 400 AD. (May 1996: 51-62, 69-106)

3.1.1 The coins
On the site 51 coins were found with LPRIA dating, 12 of them bear Latin inscriptions and are interpreted as being created after Julius Caesar’s conquest of Gaul. Two solid gold coins, six gold coins with copper alloy cores and the rest are silver coins. (May 1996: 217-222).

263 Roman and one Greek coin were found on the site. Of These 263 coins 223 coins were dated to be coined after 250 AD and two of them (including the Greek one) being dated before the year 0(May 1996: 224-229).

3.1.2 The Brooches
To begin with, the finds from the excavation needed to be organized so that the quantity of imported or locally made brooches could be reached. From the interpretation and descriptions the following list was made (see appendix 1). Where there are two similar posts a difference between the materials has been made in accordance with the commonly accepted idea that most brooches made of brass in the mid 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD was imported (May 1996: 249). Posts 1-7 as well as post 9 in the table have been excluded because their date predates the Roman Iron Age in Britain and are therefore not relevant for the analysis. A number of Samian ware is
included in the excavation report however they are stated as a selection, and can therefore not be included (fig.1)

![Brooches import/local production](image)

The amount of brooches included in the analysis was 138 of 157. 33(24%) of those brooches were interpreted as directly imported and 105(76%) as manufactured locally in Britain. It is important to notice that we will not go further into the Roman or later influence on local produced brooches and instead concentrate on clear imports.

### 3.1.2 Glass

100 shards of Roman glass were excavated, 24 shards was from common blue-green glass bottles, 23 are listed below and the rest are not presented in any detail in the excavation reports. Glass beads are not included in this analysis; however it can be interesting to mention the six inscribed Roman Intaglios found at Dragonby.

One fragment was interpreted as being from a Cast ribbed bowl made from polychrome and Monochrome glass, dated between 1st century BC to 1st Century AD and manufactured in the Mediterranean(May 1996: 323).

Four Fragments of Jugs interpreted as being from the Seine-Rhine and dated towards mid 1st century to early 2nd century AD. Two of the shards were blue; one was blue-green and the last one yellow-green (May 1996: 323).

Three Fragments of two bowls with folded tubular rims, one blue-green and two shards of dark blue glass and dated towards the 1st to 2nd century AD (May 1996: 323).
One fragment of amber glass, possibly from a bowl, dated from the color to 1\textsuperscript{st} or early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD (May 1996: 323).

Three Fragments interpreted as being from facet cut beakers, two blue-green and one colorless (May 1996: 323-324).

One body fragment from a colorless beaker with self colored decoration. The type is uncommon in Britain, draws resemblance to vessels from Cologne. Dated to mid 2\textsuperscript{nd} to mid 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD (May 1996: 324).

Three fragments from two flasks, two colorless and one green-colorless. Probably Itings shape and dated towards late 2\textsuperscript{nd} century to 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD (May 1996: 324).

Two fragments of mould-blown blue-green bottles which were common throughout the Roman Empire between 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD (May 1996: 324).

One fragment of a mould-blown pale green bottle most likely dated towards 3\textsuperscript{rd} or 4\textsuperscript{th} century AD and probably produced in the region now known as northern France (May 1996: 324).

Apart from this one disk and two partial hair pins of blue green or dark almost blackish glass were found (May 1996: 325).

The amount and type of glass were interpreted by excavators as being quite typical from a settlement of this size and status.

3.1.3 The Pottery
8440 complete or partial Iron Age vessels were excavated, 779 of which have been published more detailed information about. No such limitation was published in the excavation report regarding the Romano-British material and so the conclusion is drawn that every piece is included (May 1996b: 399). Only the stratified and dated material belonging to late pre-Roman Iron Age and Roman Iron Age in Britain will be included in this investigation however. 506 Romano British vessels were published of which 191 are Mortaria of which 166 are local British. 41 imported Terra Nigra and Terra Rubra vessels, 31 British made copies of them. 142 Butt-beakers and imitations however no copy/original distinction is included in the excavation reports. Into this analysis 141 vessels of the selected Iron Age collection that are dated into
the period after the conquest are included. 24 possible vessels of Samian ware presented in the report are added as well. The different kinds of Amphorae that are presented have not been quantified and are only presented in weight (roughly 72gms) and will not be included in the analysis (May 1996b: 513-559, 565-573, 587-598) (Fig.2).

From this we can conclude that 845 vessels (roughly 78.5%) of the assorted pottery was manufactured in on site or in Britain and 66 (roughly 8.5%) was direct imports and the rest is posted as unknown as this distinction is excluded from the excavation report.

3.2 Thornhill farm

The Thornhill farm excavation headed by David Jennings was a very large excavation, with trenches and salvage operations covering over 40ha. The excavated remains consisted of a high amount of enclosures ranging from 3rd century BC to late 2nd Century AD along with limited structure remains from four roundhouses in the middle Iron Age, three roundhouses from the Late Iron Age and one from the early Roman Iron Age. After the 2nd century AD the pattern changes and a road and linear ditches is found that crosses the excavated area and the smaller round or rectilinear enclosures disappear. Activity in the area seems to decline rapidly around the 4th century AD (Jennings et al 2004: 15-19).

No glass items relevant for the analysis were found at Thornhill Farm.
3.2.1 The coins
Six coins were found during the excavations, two were identified as Iron Age coins, two as Roman silver republican denarius and two was labeled post-medieval and unknown (Jennings et al 2004: 69-70).

3.2.2 The Brooches
In total 41 whole or fragmented brooches were recovered on the site. Of these, post nr 1 (see appendix 2) clearly predates the Roman invasion and are excluded from the analysis. Posts 8, 15 and 16 were too fragmented to be positively identified according to the excavation reports.

[Fig. 3 Number of Brooches of different origin at Thornhill Farm]

Of the 38 brooches that remained to be compared 19 (50%) were labeled local, 10 (26%) were imported and the rest were unknowns (Fig. 3). Post 8s two fragments might represent parts from Colchester derivatives and post 15s fragments are made of Iron which points towards being local, however as no positive identification was made they cannot be included in neither imported nor local setting. However, it is interesting to add that the local productions might be higher (Jennings et al 2004: 70-79).

3.2.3 The Pottery
In total 11450 sherds of pottery were found on the site, 2291 of those were dated towards the period prior to the Roman conquest and is therefore excluded from this analysis. Another 3820 sherds were of later date than our period and therefore excluded as well (Jennings et al 2004: 94). Of the 5339 sherds that remain 499 were of unknown origin or type, 9 were from Dressel 20 amphorae, 9 from imported coarse
ware, one from Dressel 2-4, one from North Gaulish Mortaria and 14 from Samian ware. The rest were termed as local or regional productions (Jennings et al 2004:91).

![Fig. 4 Number of sherds of different origin at Thornhill Farm](image)

This gives us a total of 34(roughly 0, 6%) sherds of imported pottery, 499(9, 3%) unknown and 4806(90, 1%) sherds of British native pottery (Fig. 4).

### 3.3 Pegswood Moor

This excavation was a rescue excavation performed by Jennifer Proctor in the year 2000. The settlement which lies roughly 25-30kms north of the Hadrian’s wall on the eastern side has continuity from the Late Iron Age into the early and middle of the Roman Iron Age (Proctor 2009: 7). 16 round houses and an enclosure system were excavated and one of those round houses has been safely dated towards the Roman Iron Age (Proctor 2009: 13-41). However the house have been interpreted as too small to be a place of living which might explain the complete absence of reported metallic items or coins in the report, instead it is interpreted as a storage house of some sort (Proctor 2009: 70-71).

No metal finds were present at the site. However, some artifacts that are closely associated with metal objects like sharpening tools were found (Proctor 2009: 85).

#### 3.3.1 The Glass

Two pieces from two unique glass armlets were recovered from the Roman Iron Age enclosure, one brownish in color and one icy blue. These were mostly made from
recycled glass and were common in the military zones and in and around the Roman Army (Proctor 2009: 60).

3.3.2 The Pottery
The pottery and settlement chronology were divided into five phases and one unknown, 1-2 representing the early prehistoric time period, phase 3 representing early unenclosed settlement during the Late Iron Age and phase 4 representing the later, unenclosed phase of the Late Iron Age. Phase 5 was the one chosen to the Roman Iron Age during the 1st and 2nd Century AD. In this analysis phases 1-3 have been excluded because of being dated long before the Roman conquest. Phase 4 however, is included because it covers the period of the conquest and close before it (Proctor 2009: 13-41).

The excavation revealed 242 shards of which two sherds were dated towards phase 3, 222 sherds were dated towards phase 4 and 13 sherds towards phase 5. Five sherds were found in which the context did not fit the pottery type (Proctor 2009: 43-46). All of these vessels have been handmade by using coils smoothened by hand and without a pottery wheel. None of the collected sherds are imported and all seem to be made of material that can be gathered in the close vicinity of the settlement (Proctor 2009: 83-84, Rice 1987: 115-119, 125-128).

3.4 Road A5300 Excavations:
When the A5300 road was being built a series of archaeological investigations and rescue excavations managed by Ron Cowell were made in the area of the road stretch. Like all rescue excavations they are often made quickly and great deals of finds might be missed, however some indications can still be made visible through the results of the excavations. Four places of interest were picked out for further fieldwork and three of these had Roman Iron Age settlement remains (Cowell & Philpott 2000: 1-6).

3.4.1 Brook House Farm, Halewood
At this settlement 5 phases have been identified:
Phase 1: Late bronze age
Phase 2: Mid/late Iron Age
Phase 3: Late Iron age/Roman Iron age shift
Phase 4: Roman Iron age
Phase 5: unidentified possibly later (Cowell & Philpott 2000: 34-42).

Six structures and a number of inner and outer enclosures were found in the area. Only one of the structures were interpreted as being clearly Romano-British however (phase 3 and 4) from the finds found inside it (Cowell & Philpott 2000: 38).

No metal or glass finds were recovered on the site.

3.4.1.1 The Pottery
The finds of pottery during this excavation 90 pieces of Cheshire very coarse pottery were found, of these six sherds were found in a Roman Iron Age setting (phase 3 and 4) even though the style predates it in general. Other than that 18 typical local Romano-British sherds were recovered and three Samian sherds were recovered (Cowell & Philpott 2000:44-46)

![Fig. 5 Number of pottery sherds of different origin at Brook House Farm](image)

The result is that roughly 67%(18) of the sherds came from a established Romano-British local setting, 11%(3) were imported ware in the form of Samian ware and the rest of the sherds were counted as unknown in the terms of dating although clearly local in origin(Fig. 5).

3.4.2 Ochre Brook, Tarbock
The 2nd of the excavated settlement areas along the A5300 road construction consisted of a rectilinear enclosure and two structures dated towards 2nd century AD and into the 4th century AD which means that this settlement was founded and used
during the middle of the Roman Iron Age and disused during the late Roman Iron Age. After the disuse of the Romano-British settlement, the first reuse of the area came in the medieval period around the 14th century (Cowell & Philpott 2000: 69-79).

No brooches were found in the area and only a few metal finds. Among these are a full stylus which indicates that someone in the settlement might have been literate (Cowell & Philpott 2000: 101-102).

One glass vessel of blue-green glass was found (Cowell & Philpott 2000:102).

3.4.2.1 The Pottery
959 Sherds were found during the excavation of this settlement and were dated to the Roman Iron Age. There were a number of imports among these: 10 sherds of Samian ware, one white ware sherd and one white ware mortaria sherd and 12 sherds of Dressel 20 amphorae. In reference 700 of the sherds was handmade oxidized ware which indicates that the wheel thrown pottery was not dominant at this location (Cowell & Philpott 2000: 85-89).

![Fig. 6 Number of pottery sherds of different origin at Ochre Brook](image)

The imported pottery consists of 2, 5% (24 sherds) of the full collection (Fig. 6).

3.4.3 Brunt Boggart, Tarbock
Four phases of activity has been identified on the site.
Phase 1: Mesolithic.
Phase 2, Neolithic and Bronze Age.
Phase 3, Roman Iron Age.
Phase 4, medieval period.
Phase 3 being the relevant for this analysis contained one oval shaped house with a clear wall divide in the middle which raises the possibility of the house having two rooms (Cowell & Philpott 2000: 120-125).

3.4.3.1 The Brooches
One single copper alloy brooch of Colchester IV type was excavated. Like other Colchester type brooches this one was interpreted as local and dated towards the 1st century AD (Cowell & Philpott 2000: 156).

3.4.3.2 The Pottery
108 sherds of pottery were recovered and dated towards the Roman Iron Age. Of these one (less than 1%) sherd was Samian ware and therefore imported. Much like in Ochre Brook a large amount (58) was handmade oxidized ware which indicates a focus on non wheel thrown pottery (Cowell & Philpott 2000: 137-138).

3.5 Summary of the English analysis
After having analyzed the English sites we can establish some things regarding the size and material culture. To begin with we can clearly establish that Dragonby is more of a rural village rather than an actual farmstead. It is also situated just south of a major port in the north east of England which might explain the slightly higher amount of imported finds recovered at the site (Jones & Mattingly 1990:198). Surprisingly enough Thornhill Farm did not show as much imported Roman goods as might be expected with its location in the heartland of the Roman province. Imported brooches were the only things that Thornhill Farm had a lot of in comparison to the others, even above Dragonby percentage wise. When we come to glass we see that Dragonby has a clear lead on the other sites, the others only showing 1-2 pieces of glass per site. The sites all show a focus on local ware which is an important outcome of the analysis.

3.6 Helgö, Uppland
The excavation at Helgö was headed by Wilhelm Holmqvist in the 1950s and onward and others that followed. The investigation has resulted in numerous published reports and interpretations over several years. The settlement is situated in an island in the region around the lake Mälaren. Several building groups and a number of workshops, mostly for metalworking were uncovered. The settlement has a very long
continuity, covering large parts of the later Roman period and all of the British Roman Iron Age and going on to the Viking Age.

3.6.1 The Coins
The first of the notable finds on Helgö is the deposition of 49 Roman Solidi along with a Kolben Armlet. This has been interpreted as being deposited in a hoard during the late Roman Iron Age (Kyhlberg 1986: 13-72). The Solidi is however not interesting to this investigation as the retrieval of these coins probably have a much later dating than its minting, and for the coins it is important to add that the coins in the Swedish setting might have been imported much later than the minting (Kilger, muntl. medd. may 2010). One denarius dated towards 1st century AD and one silver bracteates and two gold ones (Holmqvist 1970:50, Holmqvist 1961: 111).

3.6.2 The Brooches
24 Bronze brooches and fibulas were found, five of them have either been found in the deeper layers dated towards the Roman Iron Age (5 and 6) or been dated towards the earlier dates by type (Holmqvist 1964: 60-62, Holmqvist 1961: 114-115, Holmqvist 1970: 50-52). One of the five brooches found is determined as an absolute import from the Western Europe (Holmqvist 1961: 122-123).

16 Iron Brooches and fibulas have been found on site, however none of them have been found in the deeper levels where relative dating by using the method of stratification was used, and none is clearly dated as belonging to the Roman Iron Age (Holmqvist 1964: 70-72 Holmqvist 1961: 158-159, Holmqvist 1970: 55)

Not much attention has been placed on the brooches except for the Relief brooches manufactured in the Workshop area in conjunction to the settlement area. The interpretation of these brooches in the excavation report left much to be wanted and gave me limited access to the dating of the brooches. The five non-relief brooches that were relatively datied using stratification have been included in the analysis.

3.6.3 The Pottery
The coarse ware on the site has been divided into three groups and all three groups exist during the whole settlement period, which makes it impossible to extinguish
what pottery dates to the Roman Iron Age. The only indication is that inverted rims seem to exist in a greater number in the later periods (Holmqvist 1964: 261-268).

Several stamped vessels of black polished ware were found at the site. These vessels have a clear resemblance with provincial Roman pottery from the middle to late Roman Iron Age. However they have been interpreted as imitations of the original designs (Holmqvist 1964: 269-271).

The earliest kind of clearly imported turned pottery in the Helgö material is a Jug dated to the mid 5th century. The major import of wheel-thrown ware (called turned ware in the excavation report) seems to date towards the 6th - 9th century AD, which places most, if not all, of the vessels to a period after the fall of the Western Roman Empire. An interesting note is that many of these vessels have a clear resemblance of vessels been made in the Mediterranean area (Holmqvist 1964: 281-290).

3.6.4 The Glass
Of 1600 sherds of glass found at Helgö all are currently interpreted as imported from different places in the world including the Frankish empire that inherited the Roman industry during the migration period after the fall of western Rome in the 5th century. 132 of these sherds have been interpreted as imports from the Roman provinces in the middle and Late Roman Iron Age around 1st to 5th century AD.

108 polished beaker sherds of different colors were found that date towards the 3rd and 4th century (Holmqvist 1964:137,243-246, Holmqvist 1970:79, Lundström & Clarke 1981: 2).

8 sherds of gold foil decorated glass dated to 4th century AD (Holmqvist 1964:137, 247-248).

15 sherds of bichrome glass dated towards the 1st century AD (Lundström & Clarke 1981: 2).

1 turquoise colored glass dated towards the 2nd century AD (Lundström & Clarke 1981: 4).
3.7 Vallhagar, Gotland
The excavation of the Vallhagar settlement was an extensive headed by Mårten Stenberger and many Nordic archaeologists after the 2nd world war. It revealed 24 rectangular houses, three grave fields and a hill fort. The settlement was dated to the early Roman Iron Age and well into the Migration period with continuity of about 400 to 500 years and perhaps even with some activity up to the Viking Age (Stenberger 1955b: 1144-1154).

3.7.1 The metal finds
Very limited finds of metal and glass were found during the excavation and in the ceramic material there was a very low amount of imports. The following finds are those of interest of the investigation.

One Almgren type 8 arched brooch dated towards the first centuries AD (Stenberger 1955: 1071). One brooch bow dated towards the 5th century AD, both are considered to be imported from the continent (Stenberger 1955: 1072).

One Roman denarius was found and dated to the late 2nd century AD (Stenberger 1955b: 1086).

3.7.2 The Glass
Two types of glass were found on during the Vallhagar excavation.

Three Pieces and an almost complete vessel of a yellow-green bowl of Roman design dating to the early migration period, the place of production was according to Stenberger in Belgium (Stenberger 1955a, 1955b: 1109-1110).

One folded rim fragment of a transparent olive-green bowl was found and has been dated towards the Roman Iron Age, it has been interpreted, though not stressed, as a direct import from the Roman empire(Stenberger 1955b: 1110)

3.7.3 The Pottery
Out of a total material of 15865 registered sherds 19 vessels could be completely reassembled (the rest of the material was too fragmented), some 40 sherds of the same black polished stamped ware as on Helgö were recovered (Stenberger 1955a:
It is important to mention that some of the posts in the finds registration were estimates of the number of sherds.

1 possible imported pot of fine material from the Roman provinces with clear La Tené ties dated to the early Roman Iron Age. It has been found as grave pottery in Denmark and southern Sweden. The part of the vessel was reconstructed with 384 sherds (Stenberger 1955a: 225, Stenberger 1955b: 1130). The number of sherds for each of these reconstructed vessels was not mentioned and no wheel thrown pottery was found on the site. To trickle through the above mentioned pottery when it comes to dating has turned out to be problematic due to the fact that Stenberger gathered and presented reports of the 20 archaeologists that presented it in the first place. The problem here was that they did not present it in equal detail or in the same way, therefore making it impossible to produce a recollection of the different types of coarse and fine ware on the site.

Roughly half of the finer decorated ware that was used for dating was dated towards the early Migration Period or later and the rest dated earlier. In the light of this half of the coarse ware will be excluded by default in the analysis resulting in a total of roughly 7500 sherds.

3.8 Summary of the Swedish analysis

Vallhagar and Helgö are both quite extensive settlements and looking at the large amount of pottery on both sites it becomes apparent that both sites have had their own production. Both settlements show similar amounts of Roman silver coin and imported brooches. Glass however, is the item that really brings them apart. Helgö shows a very high amount of imported glass both from the Roman period and most definitely the periods after. The Solidi coins found on Helgö, even though dated later indicates that the site was a place of importance in the period after the Roman Iron Age. This is reinforced by the fact that there was a local production of pins and relief brooches in the later periods. The high amount of glass on the site however might very well indicate that it was an important place even before the migration period.
4. The Results

4.1 The Brooches
Personal adornments such as brooches should be treated as being luxury objects and the imports of such was probably prestigious for the owners both before and during the Roman Iron Age (Jones & Mattingly 1990: 198).
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Except for the settlements of Dragonby and Thornhill farm where a lot of brooches of both local and imported design was found, the mere absence of brooches in general for the period seems to be the pattern (Fig. 7). That Dragonby has a lot of brooches might be explained with the sheer size of the settlement whereas Thornhill farms higher amount of brooches might be explained with the fact that it is located near the heartland of the Romano-British province. Helgö showed a high amount of brooches but very few were safely dated towards the Roman Iron Age and only one was interpreted as an import whereas Vallhagar only had two brooches, both interpreted as Roman imports. It is striking to see how The northern and north western settlements in England show a resemblance to the Swedish ones in that they show a low amount of imported brooches.

4.2 The Pottery
In this investigation Helgö is being excluded firstly because of the difficulty in establishing which kinds of pottery was manufactured in what time as well as the fact that the first import was interpreted as being manufactured roughly around the time of
the fall of Rome. It is presented in percentage because some of the excavation reports were presented in pottery vessels and some in shards of pottery as well as the amount differed so much.
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In the presented pottery we can see a clear focus on the local pottery in all settings (Fig. 8). The imported ware however is more prominent in the settlements of Dragonby and Brook House Farm and Vallhagar. Brook House Farm in this case is very interesting as it differs from the other A5300 excavations. Interesting enough Thornhill Farm shows very limited amounts of imported pottery even though it is close to the heartland and having a lot of imported brooches.

### 4.3 The Coins

![Number of Roman Denarii](image)

Here we can see a clear pattern except for Dragonby in the absence of coin finds.
Dragonby was because of its size and close proximity to the sea probably more involved with the Roman trade network than the others (Fig. 9). Thornhill farm however seems to be less included in the same network than Dragonby but it also seems, due to the high amount of brooches mentioned above that it was more integrated than the others. It would be dangerous to fully compare the find of denarii in a provincial and non-provincial setting as the Denarii in the Swedish settlements might have been imported much later than its actual minting. But it is still interesting to see that the number of coins, or rather lack thereof, coincide with most of the British settlements as well as the Swedish ones.

4.3 The glass

![Glass items excluding beads](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Glass items excluding beads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dragonby</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornhill Farm</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helgö</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 10 Table of number of glass shards from all investigated settlements

Here we see an interesting pattern (Fig. 10); Helgö and Dragonby have a high amount of glass whereas none of the other settlements show an amount even close to these two. Dragonby being a sizeable settlement and probably being better integrated into the trade network of the Romans might be the reason for its high amount of glass objects. The rest of the settlements show a very low amount of glass if any at all which hints towards an exclusion from the glass trade. Helgö on the other hand is not as sizeable as Dragonby but with its metal workshop and pottery production it seems it is highly integrated in the North European trade sphere and therefore quite a wealthy settlement and in such probably a very interesting trading partner for the Romans. Vallhagar on the other hand has not proved to be as wealthy in the finds investigated by this analysis. The glass finds of Vallhagar is considerably lower and it lacks the metal workshop of Helgö and seems to coincide nicely with the
rest of the British farming settlements that are covered in this analysis. Helgö is very likely a trading center whilst Vallhagar is not.

4.5 The general patterns
The general pattern we can see here is that the settlement of Dragonby strikes out the most with its high amount of coins, brooches and glass and a reasonably high amount of pottery. Other than this only Helgö with its high amount of glass and Thornhill farm with its higher amount of brooches stand out to compete with Dragonby. The rest of the settlements follow a general pattern in the fact that it largely lacks the Roman imports we set out to track. Without taking anything but the analysis into account we can already see that these settlements seem to be excluded from the general import when it comes to the selected ware. Whether this is because of most of these settlements being poor or a general lack of interest for the Roman imports is something that will be discussed further later on.

5. A discussion of Roman influence on settlements
To start things off we will take a look at the general studies that have been carried out concerning the Roman invasion and what changes it implemented in both Britain and past the limes before taking another step into the trade and the analysis that has been done in this essay.

After the initial invasion the Roman presence in the heartland of Britannia started to form. The most notable of the changes that were introduced were the urbanization and road network. It has been clear from reasonably recent studies that the first number of Roman provincial towns grew out of or in conjunction to old LPRIA Oppidas (a form of proto-town) or hill forts. These were more or less concentrated to the heartland with only a few being established north of Dragonby and the A5300 excavation sites. A number of fortified military habitation sites called vici was established and which spread up to the Antonine wall (Jones & Mattingly 1990 153-161). The towns and vici grew at a large rate as the local elite rushed to them; but they grew even more when the Roman administration started giving away land to the legionary veterans for service in the military as suggested from literary sources (Millett 1990: 87). It is probably from the military and its engineers that the greatest impact was to be seen. Wherever the Roman army marched, roads were built and
where the legions made winter camp towns often started to appear. These marching camps often had a clear design and from them spawned many of the major provincial centers including forums, storage facilities, council chambers (curus), baths and other facilities that all took a very clear Roman form that could be tracked all the way to Italy (MacMullen 2004: 216-219). It is also important to add that in the few descriptions that have been found of the Roman plan for the colonies it is clearly stated that the so called barbarians were adapting to the Roman customs rather than being forced (MacMullen 2004: 218).

Now after this very short general review we take a step to the rural setting. As previously mentioned the rural settlements can be divided in two groups, villa and non-ville settlements. The term villa is not to confuse with the Latin term villae which refers to the country retreats of wealthy Romans. In Britain the administration was built up around the same land based system that the old LPRIA societies had used. And so the base of the power of the local elite was still land, and the villas were the country farming estates of the elite to which they reinforced their position in the local or regional government rather than being leisure estates (Millett 1990: 91-93, Carlie et al 2009: 78-80). The Villas came in many different forms and sizes but they were always square or rectangular designed and the fields surround them was for most parts linear. However it is not as easy as it seems to differentiate the villa from the non-ville settlements. After the invasion there was an increase in rectangular buildings with stone foundations but made of wood that by all means are grouped into the non-ville type (Hingley 1989: 35-37). On top of this the fact that several settlements that do not have the classical villa structures have linear field systems (Taylor 2007: 26, 34). These linear field systems seem to be one of the more durable aspects of what the Romans introduced. A striking fact in the discussion is also that during the 3rd century AD the Iron Age settlement of Gyllings trädgårdar, Malmö shows roughly the same shift to more linear field systems as well as showing a slightly different building pattern with considerably larger houses (Carlie et al. 2009: 51-54, 59-67). None of these clear linear systems have been found at Vallhagar or Helgö though. The so called Aisled buildings mentioned earlier in the essay was a kind of proto-ville and that 2 of these were found in the Dragonby setting can be seen as an increased level of influence from the more urban Roman scene (Hingley
Another interesting addition to this discussion is that the rural settlements seem to increase in number rather dramatically during the shift between LPRIA and the early Roman Iron Age in the 1st century AD and then starting to decrease equally fast after the 3rd century AD. This is adjacent with the rise and fall of the Roman activities in Britain. This is interpreted as the population moving out from the villages, oppidas and hill forts of the LPRIA in the beginning of the Roman Iron Age and into single enclosed settlements of different kinds. With the decline of Roman activities in Britain and the withdrawal of the Legions the pattern shifts and people start gathering up into the hamlets and villages that are visible in medieval Britain (Taylor 2007: 110-113).

5.1 Trade with the continental Roman Empire.

It is now time to turn to the trade and how it affected different regions at the time in both general terms and the settlements that have been analysed in this essay.

The imports from the time following the Roman invasion of Britain was roughly what you could expect in a non-provincial setting including high status items like glass, fine pottery, brooches, oil, marble, wine and fish sauce from the continent and exporting mainly raw materials. In later periods this changed slightly with the province becoming more self sufficient in terms of pottery, however glass, brooches and some special pottery were still imported (Jones & Mattingly 1990: 196-200). The individual value of the pottery has come under discussion as having a low value and for most part existing along with other, more important wares. One can thus with reasonable safety say that the places where you find a lot of imported pottery is a place that has seen a lot of trade (Millett 1990: 157-159). Here we can see the settlement of Dragonby having a generally higher amount of imported pottery along with Brook House farm. For Dragonby this does not come as a surprise as it lies just south of a major port during the Roman Iron Age. It is quite interesting to see that the import to Britannia is so alike the generally accepted ideas on the export to the Germanic world and more specifically to the Nordic regions where glass, wine, bronze items (for example brooches) and to some extent pottery was exported (Burenhult 1999: 175-185). These items were few in number in both the English and the Swedish setting as the analysis indicated and probably held in high regard. However, it is important to add that they were found in a settlement context and hence not just deposited in a
chiefly grave. Some items, for example glass, continued to be found in the north from the province up to Scotland. Dominic Ingemark (2003) has raised some very interesting ideas on the natives adapting Roman drinking habits in these areas, or more specifically their drinking ware, but probably using local beverages due to the high price of wine. It is also very interesting that in some of the Scottish native settlements the number of Roman finds are very low, if existent at all, even though they are situated just next door to a Roman fort (Ingemark 2003: 10-11). This might explain the very low amount of imports that Pegswood Moor yielded even though being just outside eyesight range of Hadrian's Wall. The analysis above show very interesting patterns emerging in terms of the imported items where even Thornhill Farm that lies in the heartland of the province show low amounts of imported wares. Even Dragonby with its close proximity to a trade port had a clear focus on local produced wares. The glass in all the above settings, except for Pegswood Moor and a few items from Dragonby, have been part of (where they have been identified) bowls, jugs and flasks which can constitute serving and drinking wares. In this perspective Dragonby and Helgö stands out by having a lot of glass. Can these trends be the same as the ones described in Ingemark's paper?

The exports on the other hand were mostly raw materials from the British setting, salt, cereals, metal, slaves and hunting dogs are mentioned as exports during the early Roman Iron Age. This changed slightly to Wool, Beer and metals as well as some pottery in the later Roman Iron Age (Jones & Mattingly 1990: 198-200). As for exports it seems that our Scandinavian setting, in one of the few places where clear exports could be traced show a similar pattern. On Öland in the Baltic sea Swedish archaeologists have found a great deal of so called half-moon knives which they interpret as being tools of a large scale leatherworking trade, this along with large enclosure systems have been interpreted as being the scene for horse breeding. Furthermore a high amount of Roman coin and high priced wares has been seen as proof enough of a direct trade with the Roman Empire (Hagberg 1976:17-21).

5.2 Cultural contact, Romanization, Creolization or Periphery?
How intense was the contact with the Germanic people in northern Europe, and how can we interpret this contact and the Roman influences there and in Britain? Can we discuss this in the terms of the models of creolization or centre periphery that was
presented in chapter 2? In Tiberius memoirs and in Plinius the elder’s *Naturalis Historia* a number of expeditions that the Romans did in the 1st century AD is mentioned where they seem to have come into contact with present Denmark and Sweden either directly or indirect contacts (Carlie et al 2009:17-19). Initially the contact with the Nordic region is interpreted as being strictly a tribute giving contact, with rich finds from graves, however in the later Roman Iron Age around the 3rd and 4th century AD this contact seems to intensify into trade patterns (Carlie et al 2009:19-21). The analysis we have conducted in this essay seem to point towards some of these wares being used in a settlement context rather than in a grave context. With the increasing number of Imported Roman items during the later Roman Iron Age it seems to be a shift in how power was manifested in the Nordic region as well as other non-Roman settings. Possession of Roman artifacts seems to be translated into power. This has been interpreted as, like other Germanic people, some Nordic people possibly served in the Roman army and returned with new ideas and an abundance of Roman wares (Carlie *et al*. 2009:119-120). The concept of bringing new ideas to an old system and thereby changing it to something entirely new for the region might be a form of creolization as discussed earlier in this essay.

An example of possible creolization in Sweden is discussed by Lotta Fernstål (2003) when it comes to the possible connection between a bronze urn cremation burial at Fycklinge in Västmanland and the inscription on the vase itself. On the vase was an inscription bearing the name Apollo Grannus, a provincial Roman god connected to the springs of Aachen. The god himself seems to be an object of some sort of creolization as it has been interpreted that the god Apollo Grannus probably was a god of healing combined with water, and probably deriving from the original Roman god Apollo who among other things was the god of healing and curing (Fernstål 2003: 25-32). The vase that contained cremated remains and a number of broken and melted glass items was found in a stone setting overlooking the outflow of Sagån where fresh and salt water meet. This in turn can be seen as a continuation of the god’s connection to water and indeed an understanding of the tradition from where the vase originated. This as well as combining it with the Scandinavian tradition to use imported bronze vessels as burial urns, after first being used as mixing or serving
pots for drinks points towards mixing the traditions and therefore giving us indications of a case of creolization for this particular vase (Fernstål 2003: 34-42).

But can we in the light of the amount of the selected finds in the different settlements analyzed really define the rural British countryside or the Swedish setting as a cultural Creole during the Roman Iron Age? Or was the creolization limited to the urban centers of the British province? It is now time to turn to the Centre and Periphery model to test this theory.

In my opinion two different centers need to be identified and in such two different peripheries, one in an imperial setting and one in a provincial. To begin with the continental Roman Empire is one of these theoretical centers and Britain and the Nordic regions is the periphery. The Imports from the Roman world to Britain and the Nordic regions in the early Iron Age has been interpreted as somewhat similar in the types of items. As for exports there might be a slight difference as very few exports have been identified from the Nordic region. When it comes to Roman Britain we have a considerable military presence of the Romans as well as the local elite being friendly towards the idea of being Roman and to get their hands on Roman wares. On the Roman side we have the urge for raw materials. In the Swedish examples, alike their Roman counterparts, a reasonably Roman friendly elite might have taken form in the later stages of the Roman Iron Age can be interpreted from the amount of Glass at for example Helgö or the linear field systems in Gyllings trädgårdar. There was no possible threat of force from an army in later Roman Iron Age though, but the power of the local elite has been interpreted as being counted in the number of artifacts he owned to a large extent. The high amount of glass found on Helgö might very well indicate this; the single pot in Vallhagar and the limited number of the rest of the items on the other hand indicates that this was not uniform for the whole of Sweden. On the Roman part of things it can be discussed that pacifying the Germanic tribes across the limes as well as some resources that were needed were the driving force for the interaction or trade. It is however important to note that most of the wares that the Romans exported to Britain during the 1st and 2nd Century AD were roughly the same that they exported to the LPRIA societies in south eastern England, centered at the settlement of Hengistbury Head, in the century before the Roman invasion(Williams 1989: 143-148).
The 2nd set of centre and periphery that is interesting to the discussion is that of the Romano-British urban centers and the rural countryside. From the evidence gathered from this analysis we can see that this center and periphery contact seems to be one-sided. The urban centers and its administration were the lords and spenders and as we have seen from the material, not much of the wares could motivate the people, as seen in the 1st set of centre and periphery, actually reached the countryside. We can track this pretty well in the items selected in the analysis, with Dragonby being the settlement that strikes out as being most different in comparison to the others in both size and the number of imported ware on the site.

To conclude this discussion about the center and periphery model it needs to be added that these systems were never static, centers were moved, and eventually the periphery were often incorporated into the core or turned into a so called semi-periphery that could be interpreted as the middle way. In the same way the centers could decline and with it the limits of the so called periphery which seems to have been the case with the Roman province and its mainland overlords (Champion 1989: 16-17).

6 Conclusion
So what is the outcome of this investigation? Firstly the analysis revealed patterns that together with the discussion raised some interesting thoughts regarding the relationship between the continental Roman Empire and its province in Britannia. How extensive was the impact of the invasion? What changed? In the Urban centers we can definitely discuss the type of creolization that Lotta Fernstål describe with a clear focus on Roman influenced architecture and wares, but the general way in which power was manifested and in the way the province was administered we can clearly trace pre-Roman tendencies.

When discussing centre and periphery we could probably see these tendencies in early stages of the Roman presence but in the later Roman Iron Age this changes. With the province becoming more and more self sufficient regarding some of the specialist trades like fine pottery and other wares previously imported it seems it turns into a more semi-periphery kind of contact with the continental empire.
On the countryside and especially on the outskirts of the province it seems the only thing that really changed was field systems and in some cases the building designs. This can possibly be interpreted as the administrations way of making the farming community more effective in producing surplus. From the authors perspective this is probably the clearest case of centre and periphery yet. An interesting observation was that Thornhill Farm did not stand out in the way it might be expected due to its close proximity to the provincial core as mentioned before. Instead it showed the same low amount of imported ware except for brooches.

As for the comparison to the Swedish material it has already been mentioned earlier that the imported wares in the early Roman Iron Age was roughly the same as for Britain. The number of coins and glass roughly coincide with all the settlements except Dragonby. Dragonby was most likely was more involved in the trade network as well as turning out to be more of a village than an actual farmstead. The number of brooches found and dated towards the Roman Iron Age was generally low except for Thornhill Farm and Dragonby. The high amount of brooches at Thornhill farm can probably be explained by the location of the site even if it could not be traced in any of the other items analyzed. As for the pottery we see a reasonably low amount of imports in all investigated cases and the situation between Sweden and Britain seem to coincide nicely. When it comes to glass we can see a clear difference in the large amount that is revealed at Helgö and Dragonby. All the other settlements show the same low amount of glass finds. This raises some interesting questions about Helgö’s status in the Swedish setting. It is very likely that Helgö already was a chiefly settlement with its elaborate metal workshops and pottery production whereas Vallhagar was more of a farming community in the Roman Iron Age?

Maybe it is safe to say that the Roman influence was reserved for the rich? In a way yes, the only settlement that showed a generally larger amount of Roman imports was Dragonby and as established earlier this is considered as an actual village and not merely a farmstead. This can clearly be tracked in the material, however, there are slight differences in the imported ware between Sweden and Britain. But these differences were mostly seen in Dragonby, Thornhill Farm and Helgö whereas the rest generally showed similar patterns. The difference was seen in the high amount of glass at Helgö and for Dragonby and Thornhill farm that showed larger amounts of
brooches. Dragonby was also the only settlement that showed large amount of Roman denarius.

7. Summary
In the 1st century AD the Romans invaded England and in the wake of the armies the urban centers started to develop. As the provincial administration took form the import of wares stayed largely the same.

The Nordic and more specifically Swedish setting started seeing Roman imports that have been excavated in both grave and settlement scenes.

So how did these two scenarios affect the population?

In this essay the concept of Roman influence is discussed through a comparative analysis of the certain items in the material culture in Sweden and in the British rural setting. This is made in the aim of identifying how extensive the influence really was. By turning to the previous research an effort was made to understand the impact the Roman occupation of Britain and on the other hand their trade of prestigious goods to the Germanic world really had.

The shape this influence took is also discussed by using the centre and periphery and creolization models the essay hopes not to prove, but to open up this topic to more investigation as both the British setting and the Swedish/Germanic setting has focused on its own back yard. It is in the regional and international investigations we can form a more accurate view of the Roman Empire and its influences.

The investigation showed us there is no clear picture when it comes to the British rural settlements or the influence of which the Romans imposed on their subjects. Furthermore it is interesting to see how the extensive similarities in terms of imports from the Roman Empire to both the British provincial non urban setting and the Nordic region past the limes.
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**Appendix 1. Brooches Dragonby:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Dating</th>
<th>Local/Import</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>La Tené type I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4th century BC</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Straight/ Bevelled head form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1st century BC</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Disc Threaded P-shaped brooch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mid 1st century BC</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>La Tené III Beaked bow brooch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1st century BC</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Penannular brooch Fowler type A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mid 3rd century BC</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Penannular brooch Fowler type Aa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2nd century BC</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Continental form</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Late 1st century BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Penannular brooch Fowler type early C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Early 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unidentified, penannular brooches, possibly Type A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3rd century BC</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Simple wire British Brooches</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Early 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Flat triangular bow form</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wire Bow Brooches</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Almgren type 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Unguiforme type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2nd half of 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Simple Gaulish brooches Brass</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1st half of 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Simple Gaulish brooches other material</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1st half of 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Colchester brooches</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2nd half of 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Thistle brooches, Brass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Thistle brooch, Copper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rosette brooches, Brass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rosette brooch, Copper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Late 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Aucissa brooches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bagendon Brooch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Simple Hod Hill, Brass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Simple Hod Hill, other material</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hod Hill brooches, brass</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Late 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hod Hill brooches, other material</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Strip Bow brooch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Late 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dolphin Brooch, sprung form</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dolphin Brooch, hinged form</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Late 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Polden Hill brooch</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sawfish hill brooch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Early 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Headstud brooches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Early 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Trumpet brooches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Early 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Half disc and trumpet brooch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2nd half of 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Wroxeter brooch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>Local/import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Trumpet derived brooch w. bow plate and fantail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Bow and fantail brooch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Knee brooch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mid 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Late Alcester brooch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Plate brooches, early</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mid 1st century</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Enamelled plate brooches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd century</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Non-reeded bow form</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Penannular brooch Fowler type C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Penannular brooch Fowler type C, late</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st - 3rd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Penannular brooch Fowler type D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2nd – 3rd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Penannular brooch Fowler type D1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2nd – 3rd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Penannular brooch Fowler type D2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd – 4th century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(May 1996: 231-263)

Appendix 2. Thornhill Farm Brooches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Dating</th>
<th>Local/import</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Late La Tené 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late 1st century BC - early 1st century AD</td>
<td>import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late La Tené 1 (square stamped)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st – 4th century AD</td>
<td>import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Iron Late La Tené 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Early 1st century AD</td>
<td>import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Colchester type</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1st half of 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>British bow brooch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st – 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plain Brooch (Harlow spring)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Polden Hill type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fragments of plain brooches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Early – mid 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Late La Tène 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aucissa type</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mid 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hod Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Trumpet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Late 1st – early 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Plate brooch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Late 1st century AD</td>
<td>Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Penannular brooches, probably type C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unknown brooch fragments (Iron)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Springs and pins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Jennings et al 2004:70-79)