

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLOMOUCI
Pedagogická fakulta
Katedra anglického jazyka

Radmila N'jai
3. ročník – kombinované studium
Obor: speciální pedagogika pro 2. stupeň ZŠ a střední školy a anglický
jazyk zaměřený na vzdělávání

**The Face of Britain before and after the Roman
Invasion**
Bakalářská práce

Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Světlana Obenausová, Ph.D.

OLOMOUC 2013

Prohlášení:

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně a použila jen uvedených pramenů a literatury.

V Olomouci

Acknowledgement:

I would like to thank my supervisor PhDr. Světlana Obenausová, Ph.D. for her valuable advice, support, help and useful remarks.

Table of Contents:

Introduction	5
1 Pre-Roman Britain	7
1. 1. The Celtic Culture.....	7
1. 1. 1. The Celtic family.....	8
1. 1. 2. The Celtic society.....	9
1. 1. 3. The Celtic army.....	10
1. 1. 4. The legacy of the Celts.....	11
2. Romans and their attempt to conquer	13
2. 1. The first conquest.....	14
2. 2. The second conquest.....	15
2. 3. Britain between Caesar and Claudius.....	17
3. Claudius' invasion and the beginning of Roman rule	19
3. 1. The final invasion.....	20
3. 2. The new face of Britain.....	21
3. 2. 1. Caractacus.....	22
3. 3. The beginnings of Romanisation.....	23
3. 3. 1. The Queen Boadicca's uprising.....	25
4. Agricola and final Romanisation of Britain	28
4. 1. Julius Agricola.....	28
4. 2. Romanisation of Britain and Roman legacy.....	30
4. 2. 1. London.....	30
4. 2. 2. Roman towns.....	32
4. 2. 2. 1. Town walls.....	33
4. 2. 2. 2. Town layout and life in general.....	33
4. 2. 2. 3. Roman Baths.....	34
4. 2. 3. Roman Villas.....	35
4. 3. Other aspects of Romanisation.....	36
Conclusion	38
Bibliography	40
Annotation	42

Introduction

The aim of this thesis is to compare the lives of people who inhabited Britain before the first Roman invasion in 55 BC and afterwards. The reason I chose this historical topic was because I was interested in finding out how much Britain was transformed thanks to the Roman occupation and especially how the native Celts responded to such changes. I have often wondered whether the Celtic people welcomed the introduction of the numerous advanced developments that came with Roman culture and happily accepted their new neighbours or rather whether they wanted to keep their simpler but free way of life. As we will see, there were both advantages and disadvantages of so-called Romanisation and even the Celtic people's attitude toward it was not unified. Some were more inclined to accept the new era but others were willing to lose their own lives to expel the invaders.

While studying both cultures and their differing approaches to the situation, I found it essential to summarize first the lifestyle of the Celts as it was before the arrival of the Romans. So the first part of my thesis deals with this and is clearly divided into individual areas connected with Celtic culture.

The second part focuses on the very first attempts of the Romans to find out what Britain was all about. At that time the island was somehow mysterious and any newcomers were not quite sure what to expect. Then it deals with the second invasion which could, in the light of history, be viewed both as a failure and a success. After that the Celts were left alone for nearly a hundred years and in this part I have tried to capture the main features and significant changes slowly introduced into Celtic culture.

The third part deals with the period after the final conquest in 43 AD by Claudius and depicts some interesting details about his epic voyage and what came afterwards. This is followed by a description of the first noticeable changes implemented by the Romans and how they started to oppress the native Celts in a cruel manner. I also felt it was necessary to mention the ongoing struggle the Celts had to keep their freedom and their traditions alive. This struggle was exemplified by such leaders as Caractacus and the brave Iceni queen - Boudicca.

The final part discusses the times when Britain became fully Romanised (especially in the south) and the role the Roman general Agricola played in it. The very last section is devoted to the individual aspects of Romanisation, especially the early ones, such as the development of towns, baths and country villas. These were completely new to the Celts. At the very end, I briefly summarise some other changes that Roman culture brought along

and how the Celts slowly started to lose their own identity until the times the Romans left for good.

The study gives a picture of two very different worlds of the Ancient Celts and the much more modern Romans and looks into their mutual interaction as well as their gradual voluntary or involuntary assimilation.

1. Pre- Roman Britain

Britain in the first century BC was inhabited by Celtic tribes, who had settled there hundreds of years before from central Europe. They were an important ethnic group who dominated Britain from about 600-500 BC until the arrival of another notable group of invaders- the Romans.

Explanations as to reasons for the arrival of the Celts on the island vary and the nature of these invasions and their supposed dates are still disputed. But the most probable reasons given by many historians are over-population, hunger for land and pressure from other more powerful neighbours forcing them to leave their home territory (Webster, 1980). Maurois (1993) makes an interesting point when he says that certain elements of human nature must have played a part in these events, such as the desire to conquer new lands as well as the thirst for adventure. The vast majority of scholars however agree that their arrival, and most of all their settlement, has greatly contributed to British history.

Since the Celts remained the foundation of the population throughout the long years of Roman occupation, and since the interaction between the native civilisation and that of Rome forms one of the main topics of this thesis, I would like to examine some primary aspects of Celtic life.

1. 1. The Celtic Culture

“Who were the original inhabitants of Britain, whether they were indigenous or foreign, is, as usual among barbarians, little known. Their physical characteristics are various and from these conclusions may be drawn. The red hair and large limbs of the inhabitants of Caledonia point clearly to a German origin. The dark complexion of the Silures, their usually curly hair, and the fact that Spain is the opposite shore to them, are an evidence that Iberians of a former date crossed over and occupied these parts. Those who are nearest to the Gauls are also like them, either from the permanent influence of original descent, or, because in countries which run out so far to meet each other, climate has produced similar physical qualities“ (Tacitus, ch. 11).

Some historians, such as Collinwood (1968) viewed the early Celt's culture as uncivilised. Comparing Britain to the continent at the time of the Late Bronze Age, Collinwood describes this people as: *“primitive in its civilization, stagnant and passive in its life, and receiving most of what progress it enjoyed through invasion and importation from overseas“*(Collingwood, 1968, p. 20). On the other hand, Timagenes (in Scullard, 1975) describes them later on as *“exceedingly carefull of cleanliness and neatness, nor in all the country could any man or woman however poor, be seen either dirty or raggeed“*

(Scullard, 1979, p. 15). As we can see, it is not easy to make generalisations about the Celts, however there is some widely recognised evidence, that especially in later times, Celts not only dramatically progressed in their way of life but in some cases were even ahead of their time¹.

Celts lived in groups of tribal societies from which they had originated. As Maurois (1993) claims, they were military people and tribe warred against tribe on regular basis. Scullard (1979) explains, that bravery exhibited in battle was considered to be of the highest virtue and even savage practices such as human sacrifice and head-hunting were not uncommon. But in general, the Celts were an adaptable, hospitable and fairly stable people committed to their own tribes.

When it comes to their physical appearance, they are often described as tall with fair skin, blue eyes and fair hair. There were two types of skulls discovered in Celtic graves. There are remains of round-headed men, which supposedly belonged to the descendants of the older Bronze Age population and long-headed remains which represent the younger Celtic type. Both types lived together but the chieftains and warriors were chosen mainly from the tall, long-headed men in order to impress and terrify their enemies in battle (Scullard, 1979). Maurois (1993) clarifies that some Latin and Roman writers also depict Celts as people with light complexion and blond hair but he adds that in fact many Celts had dark hair which they deliberately bleached and they pasted their bodies with white pastel. Celts themselves wanted to create this ideal or superior look of human race and tried anything to achieve this. This is why the Romans called the Celts from Northern Ireland *Picti*, as it means *painted man*² (Maurois, 1993).

1. 1. 1. The Celtic family

According to Scullard (1979), Celtic families exercised the principle of headship, meaning the head of the family had absolute power over all his household. Nevertheless, the woman's position within the family unit was quite extraordinary. Some classical writers were impressed by Celtic women and described them as great in stature, strong and blue-eyed, and when it came to courage, equal to their men. On occasion, magnificent

1 Within the Celtic society, woman's status was equal to that of a man. Women could choose their husbands, they could own property and interestingly even fight in wars (McDowell, 1989).

2 According to one theory, Picts were a group of Celtic people living in ancient eastern and northern Scotland, however another theory claims that they had inhabited Scotland before the actual arrival of the Celts from Europe. They were first mentioned by Roman orator Eumenius in connection with Hadrian Wall attacks. They are known for their body painting practice and their extraordinary artistic skills (Wilde, online).

authority was imposed upon women, such as Boudicca and Queen Cartimandua¹.

In contrast with the Romans, they could freely enter political life. This must have been a great surprise to the Romans when they found out because Roman women did not participate in any important parts of public life whatsoever.

When it came to marriage, Celtic women could marry the men of their choice but it was also common, that female members of the aristocracy wedded purely for political reasons or to improve their social role (Filip, 1962).

1. 1. 2. Celtic society

A social unit used by the Celts was called the tribe. Each tribe had its own territory with fixed borders, consisted of several families and had its own chieftain or king whose main role was to act in connection with warfare or make decisions regarding relationships with other tribes. Their wealth depended mainly on the amount of stock and the number of slaves they owned (Mathewes, 1996). As Penrose (2007) explains, new kings and tribal chieftains were usually chosen from the aristocracy simply because they had the most power.

Most historical publications indicate that Celtic society was divided into three main classes. Caesar himself stated that Gaulish society consisted of the Druids, who ranked the highest, followed by the honourable aristocracy (mainly warriors or knights) and then the common people (freemen and small farmers) who in Scullard's (1979) opinion lived in very bad conditions. Some of the commoners in time slipped into such positions as serfs or even slaves.

The Druids are described by Todd (1983) as Celtic priests who possessed the greatest authority above all. Their duties were of course religious, such as ministering at the altar, but they also played a major role in educating the young and had the privilege of acting as judges. Klímová (2009) points out that they were also great healers and interestingly even musicians. Primarily, Druids were concerned with the organisation of their religion, which was closely connected with nature² and the agricultural seasons, but they also regulated seasonal festivals and had semi-magical duties. One might think that

1 Cartimandua was a pro-Roman queen of the Brigantes tribe in the first century. She is known for handing Caractacus in to the Romans because she wished to be their ally and keep her status among her subjects. (Salway, 1981).

2 The Druids did not use temples for their worship. They would meet in holy places within nature, such as hills, forests, river banks, isolated wooded groves, sacred pools and lakes. (McDowell, 1989)

the Druids fulfilled a role similar to current day priests, helping people as well as looking after the communities' well being. But Todd (1976) reveals their rather shocking dark side. He states: "*Whoever refused to submit to their decree was exposed to the most severe penalties*" (Todd, 1983, p. 5). Such penalties would normally involve excommunication, which meant that, beside others sanctions, there would be no access to public worship or the possibility of offering sacrifices. The person being punished would not be allowed to communicate with his fellow citizens as his company would be unwelcome, viewed as dangerous and sinful. Legal protection was also refused. The only way out of such misery and infamy for such an individual would be death itself. The Druids were violent, they tortured people and were even involved in evil human sacrifices. Todd summarises Druids in these words: "*No idolatrous worship ever attained such an ascendant over mankind as that of the ancient Gauls and Britons*" (Todd, 1983, p. 6).

Even though many historians doubt that the Druids practised human sacrifice and assert that there is simply not enough evidence for it, Caesar himself mentioned it. He stated that the Druids used to put men into wicker cages, burn them and from their agonising movements formulated various prophecies (Scullard, 1979).

1. 1. 3. The Celtic army

As I have already mentioned, the Celts were great warriors and they regarded warfare as part of life. In some ways, war was viewed as the chief's main occupation bringing great admiration and inter-tribal warfare was an essential part of Celtic aristocratic life. One well known fact about the Celts is that they lacked proper discipline in battle and their fighting tactics were disorderly. As Scullard (1979) says, even when in danger, a tribe often preferred to fight another tribe rather than to join together and cooperate against their common enemy. As will be explained later, the fact that they were not able to establish a strongly united military force might have ultimately proven fatal in their ongoing struggles against the excellently disciplined Roman army.

According to Scullard (1979), the Celts used light vehicles called charriots which carried their troops in and out of the battle. The purpose of these charriots was to drive rapidly into enemy cavalry making as much noise, chaos and confusion as possible.

At the same time, the menacing charioteers discharged their deadly missiles. After they had worked their way through, the warriors jumped down to fight on foot. This might have given the impression that the enemy was seriously disadvantaged but as Scullard goes on to explain, in reality this way of fighting, combined with the specific Celtic weaponry,

was not always that effective. Their broad swords were very heavy, designed mainly for cutting or slashing in open areas, but not for thrusting in cramped conditions. Salway (1981) adds, that the Celtic warrior's equipment was rather scanty. Apart from the sword, most of the warriors had no armour and some went into the battle dressed only in a pair of trousers. However, he makes clear that there were some Celts who wore helmets and used protective shields but these were available most likely only to the nobility.

1. 1. 4. The legacy of the Celts

Many people believe that the Celts bequeathed to European civilisation not only exquisite art but also a way of thinking and a certain life philosophy. In other words, the Celtic legacy extends beyond the often mentioned areas of art¹, poetry, music and storytelling, into spirituality, divination and heroism. Duffy (1996) sums it up nicely when he refers the Celtic culture to our modern time: *“The legacy of the Celts is everywhere. It is hard to escape. From bluegrass music to the iron ploughshare, from residents of the White House to Boston's NBA team, from Halloween to the Gaelic language still spoken in Ireland – these ancient Europeans left their mark “* (Duffy, 1996, online).

One of the main elements of Celtic influence was surely the introduction of the Celtic languages. Even today, many place names and names of rivers derive from Celtic words (Klímová, 2009). After the Germanic invasions the Celtic language was almost extinguished but thanks to the Celtic women who married Anglo- Saxons, a few original words survived (Maurois, 1993).

However, for the purpose of this thesis I would like to briefly examine, how the gradual arrival of the Celts from Europe affected the lives of the islanders, in particular after the last wave of Belgae tribes in pre-Roman times. Churchill (1996) states, that around 400-300 BC, Celtic people started to build small hill forts, which were made of stone walls and strengthened with wooden beams. These forts served as places of refuge in times of need but often stayed permanently inhabited. They were built gradually in line with the increasing number of incoming Celtic people and possibly because of the danger of never ending tribal wars.

The last wave of Celtic invasions came at the beginning of the first century BC.

1 Celtic art was abstract and artists avoided straight lines or human figures. Waved and curved lines were preferred. There are some well known Celtic masterpieces such as the bronze mirror from Birdlip (with plant patterns), the bronze horned helmet from the Thames (with red enamel decoration) and the Battersea shield (curvilinear decoration) (Scullard, 1979).

Churchill (1996) emphasises that the Belgae tribes, as they were called, were the most enlightened of all the invaders¹. They started building new settlements near valleys, introduced the use of silver and copper coins and had a significant influence on the indigenous population. In the course of time, they abandoned the hill-tops and started to build their own towns. In the east they set up St. Albans and Colchester and in the south they founded Silchester and Winchester. Johnson (2002) also describes the Belgae as those responsible for notable cultural, political and agricultural developments². Their way of farming enabled the cultivation of heavy soils with the use of iron ploughs but they had other iron tools, especially axes. With these they cleared large areas of forest which then became suitable for settlement, thus the population quickly doubled from a quarter to half a million. All aspects of life in Britain prospered. Trade also flourished, mainly due to the previously mentioned coins which were now used instead of the outdated standard weight iron bars. Johnson (2002) views these fast and fundamental changes in Britain as revolutionary.

-
- 1 Before the Belgae started to settle, there had already been two other main tribes on the island: the Goidelic tribes (around 700 BC) and the Brithonic tribes (500 BC). The Brithonic tribes forced the Goidelic tribes to move northwest (especially into the area of Scotland and Ireland) and they remained in the south (England, east Wales and northwest Scotland) (Klímová, 2009).
 - 2 Johnson (2002) states, that the Celts were becoming more professional, specialised and organised in pre-Roman times and interestingly, some of their products even influenced Roman factory production (Johnson, 2002).

2. Romans and their attempts to conquer

The Roman Empire was one of the largest and most enduring in world history. At its height, it stretched across Western Europe all the way to the Middle East and Northern Africa. In the first century AD, the Empire ruled over an area of almost 5 million square kilometres. So why would a nation of such proportions want to conquer Britain, a relatively small island, when some mainland people doubted its very existence¹? How did the Romans get to know about the Celts and what did they think of them when they arrived? What impact did they have on the Celtic tribes and was the invasion considered successful?

I would like to examine these questions and supply detailed information about the sequence of events involved. This will provide an overall picture of the fundamental changes of that time.

In the early days, the people of Britain didn't actually have much to do with the continent of Europe. The sea between Britain and France was wide and for sailors quite dangerous. Only the daring would sail across to Gaul to sell goods made in Britain or, in turn, to buy from the Gaul's (Peach, 1959) The very first piece of information about Britain, dating from the 4th century BC, appeared in the Roman's writings gathered by a great Greek geographer called Pytheus². He described the island's inhabitants as quite civilised, people who grew wheat, drank fermented grain with honey and traded in tin with the Gaul's. Two hundred years later explorer Poseidonios also mentioned the tin mines and depicted how bars of tin were carried on donkeys and on horseback to Saint Michael's Mount. The British Isles were known to the Romans as the "Tin Islands" by traders and merchants who later engaged in commerce with the Celtic tribes (Maurois, 1993).

Because the Celts did not write, we rely on valuable sources of information written by Roman authors such as Caesar, Dio Cassius and Tacitus. However, the Romans often described the Celts as barbarians or savages but that was probably part of the propaganda, designed to bring Roman civilisation to the undeveloped non-Roman world.

Caesar himself said of the Celts: *“All the Britains, indeed, dye themselves with wood, which occasions a blueish color, and thereby have a more terrible appearance in fight.*

-
- 1 There were very indefinite beliefs about the western islands. The oldest known geographers denied their existence totally but around 445 BC Herodotus heard about the tin coming from some rather mysterious islands in the far west (Churchill, 1996).
 - 2 Pytheus of Marseilles was the first Greek to sail to Britain toward the end of the 4th century BC. He was appointed by a group of merchants to go and investigate the Atlantic Ocean area (Maurois, 1993).

They wear their hair long, and have every part of their body shaved except their head and upper lip“(in Churchill, 1996, p. 26). Collingwood (1968) clarifies this by saying that Caesar knew that Britain’s inhabitants, compared to those of Gaul, were less civilised and less organised both in politics and warfare.

So what were the reasons for Caesar’s expedition? According to Maurios (1993), there is more than one reason. Caesar, who was a great Roman general at that time, needed a major victory to impress Rome and money to pay his soldiers and supporters. Moreover, he hoped to find gold, pearls and slaves on those mysterious islands by means of which he would bring fame and wealth to Rome. Roman historian Suetonius claimed that Caesar was after pearls from the oyster –fisheries too but it is widely recognised that Caesar also had in mind an important strategic objective. He intended to frighten away and punish those British Celts who helped the Celts of Gaul who were living and fighting against the Romans on the European mainland (Rowse, 1993). As Salway (1981) puts it, the situation in Gaul “*was not an entirely happy one for Caesar*“(Salway, 1981, p. 25). On one hand, he felt he had to attack Britain because it served as a place of refuge for dissident Gauls but on the other hand it was risky to withdraw his army from the newly conquered Gaul¹ (Salway, 1981). As it turned out, he decided on the first option.

2. 1. The first conquest

In 55 B.C. Caesar sailed to Britain but many historians claim that this time he did so mainly to conduct a survey. Before he sailed, he tried to get as much information as possible from the merchants of Gaul but either because of ignorance or deliberately they did not tell him the whole truth. This voyage was all in all not very successful. Churchill (1996) describes this anticipated event in detail. The Celts were already waiting, aware of him and his ships coming. The Roman soldiers had to jump into the deep sea and managed to get to the shore only with great difficulty. What was worse, before they even got there, the fighting had already started. The Celts hurled themselves into the deep water with charriots and cavalry and faced their unwelcomed enemy with rage. After a short but tough clash the Celts decided to withdraw but by this time Caesar surely realised that the locals were not prepared to give their island up easily.

Unfortunately for Caesar, there was another unpleasant surprise waiting for him.

¹ Caesar realised that once his army was in Britain, in case of any problems back in Gaul it would be very difficult to return to mainland speedily (Salway, 1981).

He was expecting 18 more ships to arrive any time but a sudden storm and its wind took them all back toward The English Channel. What was more, his own ships got severely damaged and a lot of the armies' tools and weaponry got lost in the sea. The army was in chaos. No ship was left seaworthy. This must have been very frightening for the Romans as they had not enough food to stay over the winter and they were now isolated in the unknown world. The Celts took immediate advantage of this and decided to destroy the Roman's food stock. Nevertheless, the highly skilled and organised Roman army made them to retreat again.

At the end, a kind of compromise was reached between the two sides. The Celts let their enemy to repair their boats and the Romans, once they did so, were more than happy to sail with few hostages back home as fast as possible.

It is interesting, how seemingly insignificant matter such as bad weather could have possibly completely changed the course of history. Had the storm never come, the Celts might have quite likely lost their freedom there and then.

I would also like to mention how Caesar viewed this military adventure himself, although there are different accounts on this. According to Churchill (1996), Caesar never pretended success and to erase his bad memories, he took it as a challenge to invade Britain one year later again. On the contrary, Maurois (1993) claims, that Caesar speedily sent wonderful news about his voyage to Roman Senate and to celebrate Caesar's victory they announced twenty days of *supplicatio*¹. Penrose (2007) confirms, that Caesar gained prestige and after crossing the Channel acquired greater popularity than Crassus and Pompeus had ever gained in Rome.

2. 2. The second conquest

The question that probably now comes to mind is why did Caesar decide to sail to Britain again. Was it because this time he wanted to subdue the whole island or was it to impress the Roman Senate even more? As Sulway (1981) clearly puts it, we will never know. Caesar himself never gave any statements about his intentions and we have no other option but to guess. But he suggests, that the most probable motive for the invasion was profit in cash and kind.

The scale of the voyage undertaken in the year 54 BC was overwhelming with

1 *Supplicatio* was a formal occasion when prayers were offered to the gods either at times of danger or at news of a victory (Gill, online).

800 ships, 5 legions and 2000 cavalry. Surely, this could have not been an expedition. This time there was no problem with the landing as Caesar learned his lesson and had new, more suitable ships built for him in Gaul. His army marched inland at night. The first collision with the Celts took place at a river bank but then the Celts withdrew into a fortress in a thick wood. Nevertheless, it did not take much for the Romans to take over. But history repeated itself and once again, the weather turned against them. They were about twelve miles inland, preparing to attack, when Caesar learned that a strong storm destroyed a large number of his fleet. They had to return to the shore and spend ten days dealing with the situation. The Celts wasted no time. In Caesar's absence, they assembled under one leader, Cassivellaunus¹, who is believed to be the king of a southern tribe in Hertfordshire. Even though they were doing quite well at first, mainly because of their fast charriots and unexpected attacks, they were forced to pull back once more because the Roman army was far dominant.

Churchill (1996) believes that at that time Caesar started negotiations. He actually used raising jealousy of some Celtic chiefs and instigated them against Cassivellaunus. As Cassivellaunus' allies of tribes were falling away, he eventually abandoned all hope of winning and decided to ask for peace. As a result, Britain was forced to agree to pay an annual tribute and some hostages had to be provided. All this achieved, Caesar returned to Gaul and the Roman legions did not come back to Britain for another 97 years.

Some might ask why Caesar, as he was doing so well, decided to leave Britain at that point. The whole of the south-east was in his hands. Sulway (1981) makes an interesting point when he says that in fact, this success of Caesar could be viewed as a Pyrrhic victory. It is very likely that Caesar would have withdrawn from Britain whatever the outcome. He already scented rebellion in Gaul, which turned to be a great Gallic revolt later on, and also did not intend to stay for the winter, as his forces would have not coped in the harsh British winter conditions.

Although it is disputable what exactly Caesar's motives were, Sulway (1981) admits that if his main intention was to stop the Celts from helping the Gauls, the mission could be viewed as successful. However, the fact that Caesar refrained from clear account of his intentions, it is possible that he himself realised that he somehow failed. This time, there was no *supplicatio* decreed by the senate, possibly thanks to Caesar's enemies in Rome

1 Cassivellaunus was probably the king of the Belgic Catuvellauni who ruled north of the river Thames. He is believed to have been very energetic and powerful leader of the Celtic tribes who pursued the policy of unification against the Romans.

who assessed the conquest as victory thrown away. The writer and politician Cicero also talked about a failure, as hardly any silver was found in Britain¹ and apart from hostages and slaves there was not much to be gained. In other words, the financial expectations were not met and therefore his actions could be interpreted as being motivated by his desire for military success. Looking at it from the British side, both of Caesar's triumphs are summed up nicely in the words of William Shakespeare, when in one of his plays he says:

*“ A kind of conquest
Caesar made here; but made not here his brag
Of 'Came' and 'saw' and 'overcame: with shame
(That first that ever touched him) he was carried
From off our coast, twice beaten; and his shipping
Poor ignorant baubles! upon our terrible seas,
Like egg-shells moved upon their surges, cracked*

As easily 'gainst our rocks“ (in Rowse, 1979, p. 8).

Last but not least, whether the conquest was on the whole considered as being successful or not, one important aspect of Caesar's invasion must be mentioned. According to Webster (1980), the most important effect of Caesar's appearance in Britain was to divide the south-eastern tribes into anti-Roman and pro-Roman groups. Those tribes who got defeated had to pay an annual tribute which made them hate Rome even more. But those who became allies benefited. They were rewarded with political alliances and an access to trade with Rome. Webster makes it clear: *“As far as Rome was concerned, south-eastern Britain had been conquered and treaty relationships had been established with a powerful group of tribes. The next stage would have been to allow the effects of trade and cultural contacts to prepare the way for full occupation with all the apparatus of government and law“ (Webster, 1980, p. 46).*

2. 3. Britain between Caesar and Claudius

For almost hundred years Britain was left to its own devices. Churchill (1996) defined this century as tranquil because the Celts were not harassed by any unwelcomed intruders. However Scullard (1979) points out that dynastic internal fighting still carried on. But on the whole, Britain's development was definitely on the increase in many areas

¹ The information about lack of silver was wrong. After Claudian conquest, silver started to be mined but not in the parts of Britain penetrated by Caesar (Salway, 1981)

of life. By now, their commercial and cultural contacts with the Continent enabled some Celtic kingdoms to develop into more stable political and social units and thus ensured considerable economic progress. On the contrary, the situation in Rome was unstable and the whole structure of Roman government was changing. A small island on the side of the English Channel was probably the last thing to worry about. Even though in Britain some trade suffered, such as the trade with tin, the pattern of life was changing for the better. Morgan (1984) explains that the division of labour was more common, which meant that various products were made by craftsmen rather than domestically. Also, Celtic art reached its peak, especially in metalwork. Apart from that, the hill-forts seemed to lose their importance and people started to live in large settlements on lower ground. These could be seen as the forerunners of Roman towns which were set up later on. And when we think about the landscape of Britain, it was this period that marked the beginning of land-division as we know it today because the country settlements started to have definite boundaries.

Salway (1981) adds that due to new trade routes from the Continent to Britain, the southern and the eastern sides incredibly flourished. It is not surprising, that these areas enjoyed more cultivated manner of life and the greatest wealth. What made Britain more and more rich was the export of many commodities across the sea such as corn, hides, cattle and iron. Interestingly, these items were very important to the Romans, as they permanently occupied a lot of mainland sites.

Even Johnson (2002) states, that the Celts were doing rather well. On one hand, they imported enormous amounts of products (especially ceramics) from the Continent and on the other hand, they made a lot of their own advanced products. They also opened their own mines. Britain also enjoyed diplomatic and trading links with the Romans themselves (wine was imported in bulk from Central Italy) and Roman economic and cultural influence was indisputable. Strabon, an important geographer of that time, said that the rulers of Britain almost turned the island into a Romanlike colony without being disadvantaged by any political or other kind of submission to Rome. The standard of living was on the increase and finally, after all that time, the Celts started to act more and more as a nation. At the time of Claudius' invasion, especially the southeast of Britain was almost unified. It is possible, that if Claudius had invaded ten or twenty years later, the lowland of Britain might have been united into one military state and any attempt to occupy would have been extremely difficult. In that case, the history of northwest Europe would have taken completely different course.

3. Claudius' invasion and the beginnings of Roman rule

Why did the Romans invade Britain in 43 AD? Again, for many experts in history this must be at least a thought provoking question. In this part of my thesis I would like to look at the possible causes of the conquest and then go over the individual stages of it because the importance of this event is from Britain's point of view fundamental. This time the Romans not only managed to sail across the Channel successfully and defeated the Celts again but they managed to stay as a nation and occupy the previously faraway and mysterious island for another nearly four hundred years.

The general reasons given for Claudius' invasion are nicely summed up in the words of Maurois (1993) when he says that there were various groups of people who demanded some kind of military interference for their own specific reasons. The army leaders viewed it as a chance to gain great fame and profit, the merchants called for security of their trade, the officials kept enhancing the bad influences of the Druids (their active centre was still in Britain) and countless of others were hoping for new profitable lands in this desired province.

Scullard (1979) complements this by saying that it must have been Britain's wealth that attracted many and he also mentions druidism as one of the reasons. Claudius wished to stomp it out at its very source because the Druids represented not just a religious hierarchy, but real political and administrative authority among the Celts¹. He was also determined to conquer Britain because Rome's military prestige needed to be strengthened and his army would have liked to see him extending the empire.

Salway (1981) goes into more detail and considers another two possible main reasons for the invasion, based on two well known ancient writers. According to Suetonius², Claudius wanted to earn the right to a triumph at Rome by significant victory in war (he was eager for military reputation) rather than by the vote of a fawning senate. This theory supports the fact that Claudius made sure he would be present at the final victory of the conquest and he would ceremoniously enter the enemies capital city of Colchester. On the other hand, Dio³ suggests that Claudius was persuaded into it. A British

1 Druids had major political power both in Britain and Gaul. However, most likely the Druids of Gaul were even more influential than the Druids from Britain (Salway, 1981).

2 Suetonius was a Roman scholar and official, best-known as the author of the Lives of the Twelve Caesars. He lived during the end of the 1st and the first half of the 2nd century AD (Chlubný, 2005)

3 Dio was a Roman senator of Greek descent, historian, author of a very important Roman History which he wrote for 22 years and which consists of 80 books (Chlubný, 2005)

exile called Bericus drew attention to a suitable moment for attack, as in his opinion the Celts were still not unified enough, and warned Claudius of the real possibility of their unification in the very near future.

Claudius started off his reign as emperor with some instability and a lack of support from all the people. Under these circumstances, he had no time to spare because if he did not make an impression quickly it would soon have become apparent that promoting him to such a high position was frankly foolish. He was eager to gain the loyalty of the army and win the respect of the Roman people otherwise his own life would have been at stake and a more promising candidate would have been selected as the new emperor of Rome (Salway, 1981). Claudius decided to go ahead and revive the dream of expanding the Empire to the British Isles.

3. 1. The final invasion

The situation in Britain was in favour of its enemy. Conobelius, a British king, ruled from Colchester and when he got old, the internal fightings weakened his already vulnerable position. After his death, his sons Caractacus and Togodumnus became the main leaders of the anti-Roman campaign. But not all tribes agreed with their leadership and therefore it was impossible for them to create a unified resistance (Churchill, 1996).

In AD 43, Claudius sent in four legions under the command of Aulus Plautius, who became the first governor of Roman Britain. The expedition was formidable in terms of its size and strength. The legions totalled 20,000 legionaries, with an additional 30,000 in auxilia forces¹.

Webster (1980) states that the landing at Richborough was not opposed and therefore Plautius had difficulty in making contact with the enemy. He must have found it quite surprising but Salway (1981) explains the reason. The Celts sensibly retreated to deep forests and swamps and refused to fight at first. This is most likely because they were not assembled into one large strong enough group to face such well organised army.

Churchill (1996) actually claims that the Celts didn't have the right information and did not expect the Roman's arrival. Nevertheless, when news of the landings reached Caractacus, who was a chieftain of the Catuvellauni tribe, and his brother Togodumnus, they tried to assemble a force big enough to fight the Roman legions and led the initial

¹ In Claudius's time, the auxiliary units consisted of about 500 men and were considered satisfactory sources of archers, cavalry and infantry. In the past, they were often unreliable, poorly disciplined and likely to desert as they were not Roman but recruited from within the empire (Salway, 1981).

defence of the country. They tried to slow down the advance of the Roman army and stood their ground at the River Medway, ahead of their enemy.

Details of this crucial battle, which was the turning point of the campaign, are described clearly by ancient writer Dio: *“The barbarians thought that Romans would not be able to cross it without a bridge, and consequently bivouacked in rather careless fashion on the opposite bank; but he sent across a detachment of Germans, who were accustomed to swim easily in full armour across the most turbulent streams. These fell unexpectedly upon the enemy, but instead of shooting at any of the men they confined themselves to wounding the horses that drew their chariots; and in the confusion that followed not even the enemy's mounted warriors could save themselves”* (Dio, book LX).

At first, the Britons thought themselves protected from the Romans by the river but at the end, they could do nothing to stop them.

However, although the Celts lost the battle, they made another stand the following day. But even this time they got beaten and the Romans were victorious again. In just over a fortnight the whole of the south of Britain had been subdued. In some way, Plautius gained his victory too soon and something needed to be done to make it seem as though final victory could only be achieved with the emperor's presence on the battlefield. So Claudius sailed across the Channel bringing with him reinforcements including elephants with a view to intimidating the natives (Churchill, 1996). Scullard (1986) adds that Caesar then led his troops to the north of Thames and soon after him and his army stormed into Colchester, which he established as the capital for the newly acquired province of Britannia. When Claudius returned after sixteen days to Rome, he received from the Senate the title *Britannicus* and was finally permitted to celebrate his resounding triumph. The first time in seventy years that such a triumph had been held (Scullard, 1979).

3. 2. The new face of Britain

As it was mentioned above, even though the Celts did their best, they did not manage to protect their mysterious island in the end. Some must have been worried about their new situation and feared their own lives but others were perhaps relieved to have become part of such magnificent empire and looked forward to new opportunities or lifestyle. So what happened to the Celtic people after Claudius had left and what happened to Caractacus himself? What did Romans decide to do with their new territory and did they succeed? To get a clearer picture of what followed, I would like to look into the so called *Romanisation*, discuss some of its most important aspects, such as how Roman and the

native Celtic culture became mixed to create a complex and diverse society in Britain, and compare both advantages and disadvantages of this lengthy but explicit process.

A time of uncertainty followed. Even though Britain was now officially a part of the Roman Empire, the Celts did not give up. There were many British men and women, hidden away in the great forests and swamps, who refused to submit. These men were fierce fighters, and at times they would come out of their hiding places and attack small Roman forts or outposts. Then, when the Romans brought up reinforcements, they would again disappear into the forests where they could not be found (Churchill, 1996).

3. 2. 1. Caractacus

In the meanwhile, Caractacus gathered groups of men who supported him but gradually, the Romans drove him and his followers westwards into the mountains of Wales. However, even there he had a very strong influence on the local tribes and they willingly helped him to fight the Romans for another six years (Churchill, 1996). Salway (1981) describes, how things changed after new Roman general Marcus Ostorius Scapula was appointed to govern Britain. Unfortunately for the Brits, who disliked the unwelcomed intruders, under his command the brave Celtic hero Caractacus got eventually beaten. This important battle took place somewhere by the River Severn and again, the Celts relied on their position and expected the Romans to have great difficulties getting across the water. Caractacus expressed the importance of that battle when he said: *“This day and this battle will be the beginning of the recovery of our freedom, or of everlasting bondage“* (Tacitus, Annals, 12.33, 34). But once more, the Romans tactics, equipment and their well trained warriors proved to be superior to the Celts. Caractacus’ wife and daughter got captured and Caractacus himself managed to escape to the shelter of the British tribe called the Brigantes. But the queen of the Brigantes treacherously handed him over to the Romans, who must have been very glad to capture the leader of the British still fighting against the Roman Empire.

To explain what happened to Caractacus next, it is important to be aware of the Roman’s tradition when it comes to war. When the Romans won a war or conquered a new country, they held what was called a *Triumph*. This was a procession through the streets of Rome when everyone crowded the pavements to cheer the victorious general and his soldiers. Caractacus was the chief prisoner in this Triumph. Often the prisoners taken in the campaign were afterwards either killed or sold as slaves. But Caractacus overwhelmed everyone with his famous speech and impressed the emperor so much that he was shown

mercy and Claudius pardoned both him and his family by which he once again outdone his ancestors.

3. 3. The beginnings of Romanisation

Britain began to change into a province. The Romans started to exploit Britain's mineral resources straight away (Morgan, 1984). According to Johnson (2002), for the majority of British people the Roman occupation was a disaster and the Celts revolted often in the early years. The first economic impact experienced by the Britons as a result of Romanisation was taxation. Also, mining of tin was stopped for the time being to make sure the profits made in tin mines in Spanish parts of the empire would not be threatened. Many agricultural activities were banned and some of the best lands were taken and used for the imperial nobility. The wealthier Brits were expected to copy Roman traditions to gain better position or status. Especially in the south, some members of the Celtic aristocracy started to adopt many of the Roman lifestyle habits, including learning Latin language or dressing in the Roman fashion. This incorporation of Celts into Roman culture was to prevent the natives from any unwanted resistance.

However, there were some Celtic tribes who genuinely welcomed the Romans or they foresightfully preferred to sign peace treaties with them rather than fight them. Especially the upper class slowly began to assimilate into the Roman society. But because the Celts never managed to create one united Celtic kingdom many chiefs now had to accept their degrading role as puppet rulers. Some of them had to face the fact that their own people were not allowed to wear protective arms any more, which was very humiliating especially for those tribes who had submitted to Rome voluntarily. The tribe of Icenii protested against this new policy straight away but their revolt was stamped out.

Soon, new principles of organization started to spread throughout the country. Morgan (1984) states, that a long established aspect of Roman foreign policy was to transfer as much administrative load on to responsible loyal locals, whose authority was to some extent allowed to continue. Employing so called *client kings*¹ was simply the most economical method. This way the Romans could easily impose general over-all control of the colony, with voluntary cooperation of the natives. However, these arrangements lasted

1 In the period of conquest, there were three main tribal areas with their kings recognised by Rome. The south, which was put into the hands of king Cogidunus (the Atrebate tribe), the Icenii of Norfolk, which were kept as allies under the Celtic king Prasutagus and the Brigantes, who were to secure the province from attack from the north (Morgan, 1984).

only for limited periods. What is interesting is that there were some sides of Romanisation, which at first must have been rather tempting for the Celts. Johnson (2002) mentions, that those Celts, who were rich, discovered a new kind of adventure. Roman credit market opened to them, which was new in Britain, and they very quickly borrowed enormous amounts of money that they used for buying various luxuries. These were constantly offered by persistent merchants who used the opportunity and came to Britain immediately after the legions. Nevertheless, later on, the issue of lending money to the Celts proved to be one of the reasons for Celtic uprising, as it caused some unpleasant disputes between the two nations.

The 50s were a decade of urban development and that surely was what noticeably transformed the face of Britain. Scullard (1986) explains that the main point of the Roman conquests was the policy of *assimilation*, the main secret of their success. Regardless their size, towns were essential elements to achieve this. Town life was a real social revolution for the largely rural Celtic society.

Beside the towns, the other sign of Romanised civilization was the growth of villas in the countryside, which were simple and modest at first. They were comfortable Roman houses that probably gradually replaced some of the Celtic native homesteads (Morgan, 1984).

Despite the growth of towns, development of villas and bureaucracy and all the other essentials of civilization that came with the Roman conquest, the very first generation of Brits had rather bad experience with their new rulers and angrily turned against them. The Celtic people started to object the occupation as it showed clear signs of racism and systematic exploitation of all social classes, especially by restricting their freedom, forcing them to pay high taxes, interfering with their traditions and treating them in ruthless manner. Tacitus makes a comment about the attitude of the Celtic society of that time:

“The Britons bear conscription, the tribute and their other obligations to the empire without complaint, provided there is no injustice. That they take extremely ill; for they can bear to be ruled by others but not to be their slaves” (Morgan, 1984, p. 21). This unsatisfactory situation led to a violent, bloody revolt, led by a Celtic woman, Boudicca, the Queen of the Iceni (Johnson, 2002).

But there was one more thing the Romans decided to do in order to gain even more control over the island. Todd (1983) adds, that on top of everything, in AD 60 the Roman general Suetonius decided to break the power of the Celtic Druids, whose center was on the island of Mona mainly because they maintained ongoing resistance against the

Romans. Mona was an island that was difficult to attack. The Druids tried to obstruct Romans landing both by force of their arms and their frightening appearance but all of them got eventually killed and their graves and altars were completely destroyed.

After his victory, Seutonius assumed, that once the very roots of the Celtic religion were cut, the future progress of the enemies subjection would be easy. But he must have been very dissapointed to find out that in his absence the Celts were all in arms again as they would not yield to the Roman tyrants yet.

3. 3. 1. The Queen Boudicca's uprising

“She was huge of frame, terrifying of aspect, and with a harsh voice. A great mass of bright red hair fell to her knees: She wore a great twisted golden necklace, and a tunic of many colors, over which was a thick mantle, fastened by a brooch. Now she grasped a spear, to strike fear into all who watched her“ Dio (in Dudley and Webster, p. 54)

Dio described her also as a woman of a royal background who possessed *‘greater intelligence than often belonged to women’* (Dio, LXII. 1-2). As already mentioned, Celtic women knew a level of freedom and rights in the ancient world. In Celtic society, women held positions of prestige and power. That is why Dio's description is perhaps not quite objective when he openly doubts women's intelligence. It seems as if he was talking about a woman purely from the Roman's point of view, rather than about objective reality. In fact, under Roman law, it would have been illegal for a woman to succeed as ruler.

Queen Boudicca¹ and her army gave the Romans a major challenge. Morgan (1984) explains, that Boudicca's rebellion arose from the serious failure of the early governors of Britain to get their relations with their local inhabitants right.

At the time of the conquest, Boudicca ruled the Iceni tribe of East Anglia alongside her husband King Prasutagus, who was a client-king. Before he died, he had left half of his possessions to the emperor and hoped that in return his family would be protected. Instead, after his death, the Romans confiscated his property, the nobels were driven out from their ancestral estates, members of the royal house were treated as slaves and unjust taxation was imposed. The widow Boudicca protested against such treatment but as a warning she was publicly flogged and her daughters raped. Not surprisingly, these outrages provoked the Iceni and in addition many other tribes rebelled because they also suffered in a like

¹ Boudicca had been given many names, for example Bunduica, Voadicia, Bonducca or Boadicea. However, her name stands for „the victory“ and all these names are only the wrong transcriptions originating in medieval manuscripts (Stewart, Matthews, 66).

manner. But the tribe of Trinobates had their own particular reason for hating their new masters. As Salway (1981) points out, they disliked the discharged Roman soldiers in the colony of Colchester, who had settled there, because they had driven them out from their homes, took their lands and treated them as captives. As a result, the Trinobates faced serious financial ruin. To make matters even worse, they were asked to return monies they had been granted in the past by Claudius, and Seneca, the famous play-writer and moralist, also demanded money he had initially lent. This was most likely because he had heard of arousing discontent of the Celts and anticipated some oncoming trouble. Scullard (1986) adds, that they were also angry about the enormous cost of the upkeep of Claudius' temple at Colchester, which openly symbolised the unvoluntary Celtic subjection.

After Boudicca was scourged, the whole Iceni tribe along with the Trinovantes rose in revolt, most probably in the year 61 AD¹. The first Roman stronghold to fall was unsurprisingly Colchester. The nearest Roman legions were miles away and with Suetonius and most of the Roman forces fighting in Wales, in only two days the town got completely obliterated. All the Romans got killed. Next, Boudicca marched on Londinium. Suetonius, fighting the Druids in Mona, hurried from Wales back to London to help to protect it but on his arrival he found out that it was safer to simply abandon it, because he was short of sufficient amount of legionaries. At this point in time, Londinium was a major trading center, already flourishing Roman colony. It was not a military stronghold and again, those who did not manage to flee were slaughtered and the town got burned to the ground. Verulamium, present day St. Albans, perished in the same way. All together, about 70 000 were cruelly massacred and the Romans wanted nothing else but bloody revenge. Churchill (1996) states that Suetonius and his army were ready to fight immediately. Thus, 80 000 of Britons were killed in a great and decisive battle and after the Roman's victory, Boudicca herself, rather than falling into the hands of her enemy, put an end to her own life by poison². The defeat of Boudicca and the crushing of the great revolt brought with it inevitable consequences. Suetonius wanted revenge and to bolster his forces the Roman emperor Nero sent reinforcement of 2000 men. By the means of fire and swords they victimized all opposing or unreliable Celtic tribes. Even though there were Britons who were ready to fight for their freedom again, by now they were faced with another major

1 Tacitus placed the date of the rebellion firmly on AD 61 but some modern historians argued that it could have possibly been AD 60 (Salway, 1981)

2 What happened to Boudicca is uncertain. Not all historians agree about the cause of Boudicca's death. In the account of Dio she died not because of poison but due to illness and apparently the Britons gave her a very rich burial (Salway, 1981).

problem. Because they had expected to beat the Romans in the great revolt and seize their food stock, they failed to sow new crops that year. They were faced with a winter without supplies. Soon, famine broke out. Yet, the Celts were not prepared to give up. Perhaps they would have fought till the very last man but Roman provincial procurator Classicianus wanted to put stop to this bloodshed¹. He kept sending letters to Rome telling them about the escalation of the problematic situation in Britain until the Romans finally realised that the only way to go forward was to reach some kind of agreement.

Scullard (1979) explains that the violent general Suetonius was eventually replaced and Britain very slowly settled down to a period of peace and growth under Roman rule.

1 Churchill (1996) mentions another reason for the peace arrangements in Britain. At that time Romans were having some difficulties with the Germanic people in the area of Rhine and preferred not to lose their army forces in far away territories.

4. Agricola and final Romanisation in Britain

Julius Agricola was a Roman general and governor of the province of Britannia from 78AD. He is credited with a very large campaign turning Britain into a region of the empire that would fully accept the Roman way of life and with overseeing the final conquest of Britain. The way he approached the native Britons was completely different to all the Roman generals before. So why is it that he was so different and how did he eventually manage to subdue the Celts?

In the next part of my thesis I would like to examine how Agricola influenced the development of Celto-Roman relations, how he contributed to more profound Romanisation and look into the way this process affected specific areas of life in Britain.

4. 1. Julius Agricola

Agricola's life is well known to us today because his son-in-law, the historian Tacitus, wrote a detailed biography of him¹. Churchill (1996) describes Agricola as a talented man who believed that not much can be achieved by fighting only. However, Salway (1981) points out that one of the first things Agricola did after his arrival to Britain was to find the tribe of Ordovices in north Wales and destroy them all because they still actively opposed the Roman rule. When he put their revolts down he moved north to Anglesey to complete the subjugation of its inhabitants and forced them to sue for peace. When it comes to warfare he was undoubtedly very skillful. Todd (1983) adds that Agricola's intentions were to secure Roman Britain from any incursive attacks from the barbarous inhabitants and reduced every state to subjection in the southern parts of the island.

This is why we can not say that even though he was one of the most popular Roman governors of Britain he conquered the island without the use of any violence. He was determined to take over the island like those Roman generals before. But there was something rather special about him. The Celts had a certain weakness for him because originally Agricola was provincial, just like them. Maurois (1993) explains that Agricola was born in the colonia of Gallia. Because of that the Celts had greater trust in him and found him a little bit more likable than all of his cruel and exploitative predecessors. Scullard (1979) believes he was honest, moderate, straightforward and impartial and

¹ Scullard (1986) makes an interesting point when he says that Tacitus' biography of Agricola could have been influenced by the fact that Agricola was his son-in-law.

openly showed genuine concern for the feelings of the native population. He was even willing to pardon smaller offences and repressed many kinds of abuse, such as the unfair tax-collecting system.

Indeed, Agricola's approach to conquer was very original and Tacitus spoke highly of him on many occasions. There is one very famous passage which I believe deserves quotation:

“In order that a people, hitherto scattered, uncivilized and therefore ready for war, might become accustomed to peace and ease, Agricola encouraged individuals and helped communities to the build temples, fora and houses. Further, he trained the sons of the chiefs in the liberal arts and expressed a preference for British natural ability over the trained skill of the Gauls. The result was that the people who used to reject the Latin language, begun to aspire to rhetoric. Further, the wearing of toga came into fashion. And so little by little, the Britons were gradually seduced into alluring vices: arcades, baths and sumptuous banquets (Tacitus, 1976, p. 309.)“

Yes, by many historians Agricola is viewed not only as a „good man“ but also as a man of action. Maurois (1993) states that Agricola encouraged the Celts to take participation in the Roman way of life. He appealed to them to build towns, baths and markets and he did not forget to praise them for all their hard work and efforts. Basically, he swapped the tactic of harsh *compulsion* to more acceptable tactic of *competition*. At this time, the Celts started to wear the same clothes as the Romans (especially on special occasions) and began to speak and write in two languages¹. It was mainly the upper class who could speak Latin but there is some evidence that even some of the lower class Celts could speak it. An old brick was found on which one worker had written an amusing comment about his co-worker: *“Anstilis takes a week off every day“* (Maurois, 1993, p. 19).

In addition to Agricola's military and other abilities, he also participated in major projects of roads and forts building across the island. Over 1300 miles of roads and at least 60 forts were built in his time and thus the spread of Romans civilisation was even more encouraged (Scullard, 1979). Peach (1959) explains that the Romans needed roads not only for their legions to march from one place to another but they were also a vital feature by means of which business could be conducted more efficiently and quickly throughout the Empire. It is interesting that despite Agricola's encouragement for peaceful

1 According to Maurois (1993) Latin was used mainly in London and Greek and other foreign languages could have been heard around the costal areas because of the accumulations of Mediterranean sea men.

life full of newly introduced pleasures, educating children of the leading Britons, helping the Celts both privately and officialy to build and praising those who responded to him, Tacitus conclusion is an eye opener in his already mentioned quotation. At the very end, when he talks about the Celts, he sais: *“In their simplicity they called such novelties civilization, when in reality they were part of their enslavement“* (Tacitus, 1976, p. 309)

4. 2. Romanisation of Britain and Roman legacy

Despite the growth of towns and bureaucracy and all the other essentials of civilization that came with the Roman conquest, the lot of the majority was unchanged. But when we compare the lives of Celts before the very first arrival of Caesar and his army with the lives of people in Agricola’s times, it is undeniable that Britain was not the same place any more. Whether the lives of the native Celts changed for better or not, many historians agree that the Roman invasion had an enormous impact on English culture and on England as a whole. The indisputable significance of the Roman conquest is very well summed up in the words of Roman military historian Dr. Mike Ibeji, when he says: *“The Roman invasion of Britain was arguably the most significant event ever to happen to the British Isles. It affected our language, our culture, our geography, our architecture and even the way we think. Our island has a Roman name, its capital is a Roman city and for centuries the language of our religion and administration was a Roman one“* (Ibeji, 2011, online).

This last part of my thesis will deal in detail with the most important individual innovations introduced by the Romans, describe how they came into existence and why, and also discuss how and to what extend they influenced and changed the lives of British people throughout the unique period of over 350 years.

4. 2. 1. London

If it was not for the Romans, London would have never existed. Before it was set up, the capital city of Britain was Colchester and the area of todays London was rather insignificant. At first, a bridge was built to help the Roman army advance further inland. Until than the Romans occupied mainly the area of Kent (Roman London, online). Romans must have noticed this potentially suitable spot, where the river was narrow enough to build a bridge across but also deep enough for merchant ships. Around 43 AD, new settlement known as Londinium was established (History of London, online).

Within the next ten years it prospered enormously. It was a city of trade with newly built up roads, a city of opportunities for both incomers and the natives. However, this did not last for very long.

As it was already mentioned, the Celtic Queen Boudicca decided to stand up to the Romans and bravely led her tribe against them in a wild revolt. As a result, Londinium was completely obliterated with thousands of people being killed. But surprisingly, the Romans did not abandon this place of destruction. Instead, they rebuilt it in no time and made it even better. They planned it and built it as a proper Roman city in a grand style with a stone wall around it. By 100 AD, the new settlement flourished. The town and its trade was at its peak, with goods continuously going in and out of the city, probably around the year 122 AD. The population had risen to approximately 45 000 and it boasted with a palace, a temple, bathhouses, an amphitheatre and a large fort (History of London, online). Maurois (1993) states that various roads radiated out from London linking it with other parts of the country. The most well known of these was Watling Street linking London and Chester.

In the middle of the second century, Londinium replaced Colchester as the capital. The city spread both north and south of the river but the very heart of it was in the area that we know these days as the City of London. But unavoidably, these prosperous days could not go on forever. In the third century the Roman Empire experienced serious problems. The recession and political instability across the Empire along with barbarian attacks took their toll. Expensive building of magnificent projects came to its end and many buildings had to be pulled down. Over the next two hundred years, due to this systematic demolition policy, London was getting smaller and smaller and by the beginning of the 4th century the area south of the river got abandoned (History of London, online). Churchill (1996) explains that because of the fear of violent barbarian attacks, stone from the demolished houses was used for safety structures, such as the city walls or new towers. People were scared of their new enemies and wanted to strengthen their defence.

As the barbarian invasions were taking place in other parts of Europe too, the Roman army was forced to leave London behind and fight their enemies elsewhere. By the mid 5th century all Roman military troops had finally left and Londinium got completely abandoned. However, due to London's position, trade and a well planned net of roads, this was not to be for long. The next incomers more than keen on this great settlement were the Saxons (History of London, online).

4. 2. 2. Roman towns

Roman towns are without a doubt one of the main characteristic features of Roman Britain and many of them are still in existence today. The Romans built towns as centres to administer the people they had conquered. Many of these new towns grew either out of already existing Celtic settlements or out of military camps or even market places (McDowal, 1989).

Andrew McCloy sums it up very nicely when he says: “ *To the Roman’s developed and organised minds, towns played a crucial role. They were the administrative nerve centre, a market place and focus for craftsmen and professionals. Above all, towns were civilised and ordered places, with a methodical street system and clearly defined layout. In the Roman Silchester and St. Albans you can see the birth of our modern town halls and open squares, shopping parades, public baths and sewerage systems. Urban planning effectively began with the Romans*“ (McCloy, 2006, p. 38).

According to Scullard (1986) the main Roman towns are classified into three major types: *coloniae*, *municipia* and *civitas capitales*. *Coloniae* were Roman towns in conquered territory administered by the invaders to secure it. The population consisted of Roman citizens mainly and the towns themselves were organised similarly to Rome. The citizens of *coloniae* were mostly retired legionaries. Because of the presence of the Romans, in time many native inhabitants became Romanised themselves, they willingly assimilated with their previous enemies and fully adopted their way of life. They even acquired Roman citizenship. The main four *coloniae* in Britain were York, Lincoln, Colchester and Gloucester. *Municipia* were also chartered towns but compared to *coloniae* they were lower in rank. The population was more of a mix of the Romans and the native inhabitants, and whereas *coloniae* copied the arrangement of Rome, *municipia* included local laws and local practices. The best known examples of *municipia* are Verulamium (St. Albans), Leicester, Dorchester and Canterbury. *Civitas Capitales*, or *civitates*, had the lowest rank out of the three. These towns were based on pre-existing Celtic tribal territories, where the Celts were involved in the basic administration of the local government and the development of the town.

Ross (2001) confirms that there was an obvious advantage for the Romans in the Celtic aristocracy running their local affairs. This way, the Celts made allies with their enemies and importantly, the Romans avoided the cost of administration.

4. 2. 2. 1. Town walls

One of the most obvious features of Roman towns, unlike in the Celtic settlements, were their defensive walls. At first, Roman towns were also unprotected but during the first and second century fortifications begun being built to provide protection. At that time, the walls would have been no more than earthen banks with ditches but later on, with the increasing danger from invasive barbarians, most of these earthen walls were replaced with stone ones (Lambert, online).

Scullard (1979) points out that by the fourth century most towns had thick stone walls backed up by earth banks and ditches. And they served their purpose rather well. Even though there was a vast number of the unwelcomed barbarians and they were a big threat, they lacked the skill to storm the walls. An anti-Roman Gothic leader called Fritigern pointed out to his troops that they were frankly inexperienced and advised them to “*keep peace with the walls*” (in Scullard, 1979, p. 96), meaning that the intruders (the Goths) lacked the resources and skills to take cities. Even in the fifth century, when the Roman government abandoned Britain, those good old walls played a major role in the lives of the islanders. They protected them from the Anglo- Saxon raiders by holding them at bay for a significant amount of time. Also, people from the nearby villages could find a refuge in cities defended in such an efficient way.

4. 2. 2. 2. The town layout and the town life in general

As Romans liked everything to be well organised and orderly, it is not surprising that Roman towns were exemplary well planned. McCloy (2006) explains that the most important buildings in any Roman town were the forum, the basilica, and the baths. The streets were laid out in a neat grid-like system and this resulted in a network of crossing roads and subsequently square shaped blocks called *insulae*. These blocks contained various public buildings, shops and houses.

Scullard (1979) claims the centre of a typical Roman town was an open rectangular area called the *Forum*. Along three sides were colonnades, which were in other words covered walkways enclosing the courtyard leading to various shops and offices. The fourth side was occupied by *basilica*, which dominated the whole square. However, there is an evidence that in some Roman towns the dominating feature of the forum would have been a temple- the *Capitolium*. Traces of such temples can still be found in places like St. Albans and Cholchester.

Basilica was a town or meeting hall. It was a building for local governmental

activity and justice with law court and a centum for administration. It was about 70 m high, often supported by imposing Corinthians columns (McCloy, 2006).

Haywood (1996) adds that the Forum also functioned as a trade centre. It would have a market hall and another public building called the *mansio*- a kind of a hotel used mainly by officials.

Despite of spectacular buildings and many popular amenities, Roman towns had their bad side too. Haywood (1996) describes Roman towns as very noisy and also rather crowded. Most people lived in dirty conditions and there was an ongoing danger of crime and fire. The streets were not lit at night and eventhough every town had its own fire brigade and policemen, bad traffic and road accidents happened on regular basis. Some towns actually prohibited the use of charriots during the day to eliminate such problems. Nevertheless, the Romans still loved their city life. They had access to commodities they viewed as necessary and could not imagine living without them. These were for example semicircle shaped theatres, amphiteathres (used mainly for watching bloody gladiator games), horse race tracks, public spas, pubs and great variety of shops full of delicious food.

But even with these modern developements, on the whole, Roman Britain remained an agriculture society and most people lived from farming in the countryside. Thus, only about 10% of people could enjoy, inspite of some assosiated inconveniences, the busy and often sophisticated life in towns (Lambert, online).

4. 2. 2. 3. Baths

Public baths¹ were a very important feature of the towns and were extremely important for a Roman town citizen. They could be either in public or in private ownership. Even though we could view bathing as a rather private home activity, bathing in Roman baths was not the case. This public facility somehow resembles our modern time spas or health clubs. People did not use it only to get clean but also to take exercise, to relax and to talk to other people. It was a place where people socialised, played games and had discussions on various topics which varied from unimportant neighborhood gossip to a serious business-talk. People could go for a swim, have a massage, some spas had even

1 It is interesting that the best known spa town in Britain called Bath was set up by the Romans around 44 AD thanks to hot springs (with constant temperature of 46 degrees) but these springs had already been known to have therapeutics effects to the Celts. Romans called this town *Aquae Sulis* (Else, 2010).

food vendors, gardens and library facilities. Surprisingly, the entrance fee was very low which meant that those who had plenty of free time would come every day, even the poorer ones (Haywood, 1996).

Scullard (1979) points out that visitors entered through *portico* which was an imposing entrance consisting of a sheltering roof supported by several columns. Then they would get to a courtyard, where they could enjoy various sports and do some exercise. From the courtyard they would walk into the undressing room which would include clothes lockers. When it comes to the bathing procedures, there was a certain arrangement of the individual bathing rooms. First there was the *frigidarium*- the cold room, which had a bath with cold water. This was followed by the *tepidarium*- a warm room, aimed mainly at warming up and relaxation and then the *caldarium*- the hot room with hot bath. If required, there was also a sweating hot room available- the *sudarium* where people scraped themselves down with a small curved metal tool called strigil and they could also enjoy a massage. For those who wished, the whole procedure could be finished off with dipping into a cold pool in the very last room.

It is easy to imagine that Roman baths must have been extremely popular and to all appearance spectacular. For that reason some towns had more than one.

4. 2. 3. Villas

Churchill (1996) speculates that *Villae* (large country houses) were built by the richer part of the Roman population on the most beautiful places in the midst of old forests and nearby vivid rivers and streams. Nevertheless, Ross (2001) states that it was common practice to build large villas close to towns, so the owners could reach it at reasonable time. In spite of being in the countryside, some villas were not purely agricultural. There were villas known to prosper in other forms of industry, such as pottery or metalworking.

Villa was more than somebody's home. It was a centre of a rural industry, agriculture and a centre of local economy, which was nearly or fully self-sufficient, especially when the town life began to decline. It is believed that life in villa was rather comfortable. Woodward (1966) makes an interesting point when he says: “None the less nearly all of these country houses were more comfortable than the homes of the English kings throughout the greater part of the Middle Ages“ (Woodward, 1966, p. 7). But of course, the variation in villas was great. Some were bigger than others and some had luxuries, that others could not afford.

Variations in mind, the layout usually followed some general patterns. At first, villa

was most often rectangular in shape, having a lane of rooms linked by a corridor with wings at either end. Later on, during the fourth century, the main corridor sprouted some more wings. A typical villa would be one story in high, built on a stone foundation and have tiled roof. However, because there is no intact villa in existence, when it comes to the amount of stories, it is impossible to make this generalised believe. Even thick walls of the foundations do not prove anything (Bédoyère, 2012).

To build such a house, timber and stone were essential. Marbled or mosaic floors, painted scenes on plaster walls, underfloor heating system, glazing, Roman wooden furniture and heated baths would surely make life in the countryside both very pleasant, peaceful and comfortable (Rose, online).

4. 2. 4. Other aspects of Romanisation

The overall effects of Romanisation were of course wider than the building of towns, town walls, baths and the country villas. I have already mentioned that the Celts actively began learning the Roman language around the time of Agricola and this process must have continued throughout the long period of Roman occupation. Scullard (1986) explains that the Celts had had some contact with Latin even before the invasion of Claudius, mainly due to already existing trade with the Continent. However, when Agricola deliberately encouraged the education of sons of the Iron Age chiefs, some schools must have been established and therefore Latin language, literature and rhetorics must have been officially taught. Beside that, Latin was also extended through the Roman army, visiting merchants and traders and of course during the course of the every day lives of both the Celts and Romans. It is well known that the Celts had been illiterate in the past and there was an absence of the written language. Therefore, the Celtic people had to rely on their memories to preserve both their traditions and their way of life. The knowledge of writing must have opened up a number of new and challenging opportunities.

Another area of development is connected with the introduction of new foods into the isolated island. With the Roman invasion came increased access to a new world of sophisticated tastes. The Romans were responsible for the import of a number of sources of food. They introduced delicacies such as pheasants, peacocks, guinea fowl and fallow deer. They also introduced fruit and nut-bearing trees into cultivation, for example vines, figs, walnut, mulberry and sweet chestnut. When it comes to fruit and vegetables, the Celts could now enjoy the taste of cabbage, lettuce, turnip, leek, olives, grapes and many other products. In contrast with the past, the rich Celto-Romans now held elaborate dinner

parties which often lasted up to eight hours. To make the occasion more significant, they lay on sloping couches situated around square tables and had slaves to help them.

But unsurprisingly, the Celtic peasantry, who formed the mass of the population, would have seen the least change to their diet (Renfrew, 1985).

According to Morgan (1984) there were many important innovations introduced in Roman times, such as well planned infrastructure and sewage systems, water piping, roof tiles, changes in the law, education, art and others. But there is one important change which contributed enormously to Celto-Roman assimilation, namely religion. Classical Roman deities started to be amalgamated with Celtic ones. This process was difficult because Celtic religion identified its deities much less clearly than Roman religion did but interestingly this fusion became widespread. On one hand old Celtic shrines were rebuilt in Roman style and on the other Romans found no difficulty in accepting deities of places they conquered. Therefore, many Romano-Celtic temples can be found all over Britain (Renfrew, 1985).

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to compare the lives of the Celts prior to the Roman invasion with their way of life during the lengthy process of Romanisation as well as examine the resultant changes to Britain as a whole.

As I found out, Roman's invasion brought many changes indeed and a significant portion of the Celtic population was exposed to a completely new way of life. They went from living in family units under Druid influence, hunting and intertribal fighting to life in sophisticated Roman-like towns full of splendid food, plentiful commodities and various forms of entertainment. Also, the capital city of London was established as a result of the Roman arrival and the Latin language spread throughout the country. The face of Britain also changed due to new nets of roads, which contributed to the fast growing trade and enabled easier access to more remote areas. Roman villas began to dominate the British countryside.

What I consider rather surprising is the fact that despite the great difficulties the Romans initially had while conquering Britain they did not seem to have any concrete plans regarding their new colony. Caesar managed to take over most of the southern area but left the inhabitants to their own devices. Claudius was also successful when it came to invasion but did not stay very long either. With the exception of Agricola, who dedicated significant part of his life to Britain's development, the majority of Roman rulers considered Britain a sort of experiment and never really finished what they had started. Even though they tried, they never managed to take control of the whole island, especially due to the resistance of the Scottish Picts who were not prepared to give in. I learned that the Celts of the south and in Wales were also reluctant to accept Roman domination but because of their way of life and lack of discipline they never managed to unite and drive the enemy out. In spite of Caractacus's and Boudicca's uprisings, Celtic culture and traditions were mercilessly trampled upon, never to be the same again.

However, I realised that the Celts saw that there were some advantages to be gained as a result of the occupation. The Celtic population became more educated, trade opportunities were opened to them and many enjoyed the conveniences of town life, for example use of the Roman baths. Also, in time the Romans provided a kind of protection against new intruders.

I believe that the process of assimilation was slow and that it must have taken some time for these two cultures which were so different to accept each other. The Roman

occupation of Britain lasted until AD 410 and the withdrawal of Roman influence was also a gradual affair which began about the middle of the fourth century.

Indeed, the Romans had a profound influence on the development of Celtic civilisation and although not all the new ways were adopted by the indigenous population a great many of their sophisticated systems of doing things continued to be copied for centuries.

Bibliography

- BÉDOYÈRE, G., *Roman Willas in Britain*. [online] 2012. [cit. 2012-10-04]. Dostupné z <http://www.romanbritain.freemove.co.uk/villa.htm>
- CASSIUS, D., *History of Rome*. [online] Year unknown [cit. 2013-02-22]. Dostupné z <http://roman-britain.org/books/dio.htm/>>
- CHLUBNÝ, J., *Antika*. [online] 2005. [cit. 2013-02-24]. Dostupné z <http://antika.avonet.cz//article.php?ID=2027>
- CHURCHIL, W., *Zrození Británie*, přel. Radka EDEREVOVÁ, Praha: Český Spisovatel, 1996. ISBN 22-042-96.
- COLLINGWOOD, R. G., *Roman Britain and the English settlements*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968. ISBN 0-19-821703-X.
- DUFFY, K., *Who were the Celts*. [online]. 1996. [cit. 2013-02-18]. Dostupné z <http://suite101.com/article/who-were-the-celts-a181196#.UWmoAERoyeY>
- ELSE, D., *Anglie*, přel. Milica KOLÁŘOVÁ, Praha: Svojtka Co, 2010. ISBN 978-80-256-0269-0.
- FILIP, J., *Celtic Civilization and Its Heritage*. Prague: Publishing House of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and ARTIA, 1962. ISBN not stated.
- Gill, N., *About Antient History*. [online] Year unknown [cit. 2013-02-25]. Dostupné z <http://ancienthistory.about.com/od/sterns/g/010711-Supplicatio.htm>
- HAYWOOD, J., *Římané*, přel. Jiří PROSECKÝ, Praha: Ikar, 1996. ISBN 8071764019.
- History of London* [online]. Year unknown [cit. 2012-08-20]. Dostupné z <http://www.history.co.uk/explore-history/history-of-london/the-rise-and-fall-of-londinium.html>
- IBEJI, M., *An Overview of Roman Britain*. [online] 2011. [cit. 2012-09-20]. Striving to be Roman. Dostupné z <http://europeanhistory.about.com/old/history>
- JOHNSON, P., *Dějiny Anglického národa*. Praha: Rozmluvy, 2002. ISBN 8085336367.
- KLIMOVÁ, B., *An Introduction into the Culture and History of Great Britain*. Hradec Králové: Gaudeamus, 2009. ISBN 978-80-7041-983-0.
- LAMBERT T., *Everyday life in Romain Britain*. [online] Year unknown [cit. 2012-09-30]. Towns in Romain Britain. Dostupné z <http://www.localhistories.org/romlife.html>
- MATHEWS, J., STEWART, B., *Keltští vojevůdci*. Brno: JOTA, 1996. ISBN 80-85617-89-7.

- MAUROIS, A., *Dějiny Anglie*. Praha: Lidové Noviny, 1993. ISBN 80-7106-084-4.
- McCLOY, A., *Exploring roman Britain*. London: New Holland Publishers, 2006. ISBN 1845372417.
- McDOWALL, D., *An Illustrated History of Britain*. Harlow: Longman, 1989. ISBN 978-0-582-74914-6.
- MORGAN, K., *Dějiny Británie*. Praha: Lidové Noviny, 1999. ISBN 978-80-7106-432-9.
- PEACH, L., *Julius Caesar and Roman Britain*. Loughborough: Wills and Hepworth Ltd., 1959. ISBN not stated.
- PENROSE, J., *Řím a jeho nepřátelé*. Praha: Fighters Publications, 2007. ISBN 978-80-86977-10-2.
- RENFREW, J., *Food and cooking in Roman Britain*. Birmingham, CBE Design, 1985. ISBN 1 85074 080 1.
- ROSS, D. *Britain Express*. [online] 2001. [cit. 2012-10-04]. Cavitas. Dostupné z <http://www.britainexpress.com/History/roman/civitas.htm>
- ROWSE, A., *The Story of Britain*. Twickenham: Tiger Books international, 1993. ISBN 1-85501-392-4.
- SALWAY, P., *Roman Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981. ISBN 0-19-285143-8.
- SCULLARD H., *Roman Britain*. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1999. ISBN 0-500-27405-3.
- TACITUS, *The Annals*. [online]. Year unknown [cit. 2013-02-22]. Dostupný z <http://athenapub.com/tacitus1.htm>
- TACITUS, *The Life of C. Julius Agricola*. [online] Year unknown [cit. 2013-02-22]. Dostupné z <http://nlp.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:abo:phi,1351,001:11&lang=original>
- TACITUS, C., *Z dějin císařského Říma*. Praha: Svoboda, 1976. ISBN not stated.
- TODD, W., *The History of England*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1983. ISBN not stated.
- WEBSTER, G., *The Roman Invasion of Britain*. Trowbridge: Redwood Burn Limited, 1980. ISBN 0713413298.
- WILDE. R., *European History*. [online]. Year unknown [cit. 2013-02-20]. Picts. Dostupné z <http://europeanhistory.about.com/od/historybypeoples/a/picts.htm>
- WOODWARD, E., *History of England*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1947. ISBN not stated.

ANOTACE

Jméno a příjmení:	Radmila N'jai
Katedra:	Katedra anglického jazyka
Vedoucí práce:	PhDr. Světlana Obenausová, MLitt, Ph.D.
Rok obhajoby:	2013

Název práce:	Tvář Anglie před Římskou invazí a po ní
Název v angličtině:	The Face of Britain before and after the Roman Invasion
Anotace práce:	Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá obdobím Británie od prvního století př.n.l, včetně obou Římských invazí, až po období Římské Británie. Začíná popisem života Keltů, a jak se ten postupně měnil díky Římskému vlivu. Detailně popisuje události invazí jak Caesara, tak Claudia, a zmiňuje Keltskou obranu především prostřednictvím Caractacuse a královny Boadiccy. Také se zabývá postupným procesem asimilace Keltů do života Římanů i jinými aspekty Romanizace, kterou podporoval především Agrikola. Práce se zaměřuje na typické rysy Římského života, a jak ten Keltsko-Římskou populaci ovlivnil během období trvajícího téměř čtyři století.
Klíčová slova:	Británie, Keltové, Římané, invaze, charakteristika, srovnání, důsledky, Caesar, Claudius, Boudicca, Agricola.
Abstract:	The thesis is focused on the period which runs from the first century BC through both Roman invasions and on into post-Roman Britain. It begins by giving an account of Celtic life and how this gradually changed due to Roman influence. It outlines detailed events related to the invasions of Caesar and Claudius and describes Celtic resistance movements namely those of Caractacus and Boudicca. It also describes the gradual process of assimilation of the Celts into Roman life and the various aspects of Romanisation implemented primarily by Agricola. The thesis focuses on Roman innovations and how these affected the lives of the Celto-Roman population over a period of nearly four hundred years.

Key words in English:	Britain, Celts, Romans, invasion, description, comparison, consequences, Caesar, Claudius, Boudicca, Agricola.
------------------------------	--