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Chapter One: The Study of Roman Culture and the Importance of Cremations

One of the defining and most well known characteristics of the Roman Empire was its army and its ability to conquer. At its peak, the Empire stretched from the Northern Africa north to the British Isles, and from the Spanish Coast east into the Middle East [see image 1.1]. The provinces of Rome became as important as the city itself, opening new opportunities for wealth and new lands farther outside the borders of the Empire with which they could trade. Consequently, much has been written concerning the provinces and its relationship to Rome, comparing the two and looking for ways the cultures of the provinces were changed by the influence of the Romans. However, the provinces themselves are rarely compared to each other in the same way, nor are their relationships to Rome nor their cultures set next to each other to connect what was going on in the different areas of the empire. Instead the provinces tend to each be looked at alone, or in relation to other nearby provinces with whom they had frequent contact.

It has become clear that the culture of the Romans influenced the cultures of the provinces. Many theories have been developed to explore the nature of the
exchanges between the Romans and the peoples of the provinces, and how they affected the culture and the material remains within the provinces. Yet many of these theories and their applications are still restricted to single provinces. I want to see if this thinking can be expanded to include various traditions from various provinces, and see what conclusions, if any can be made about the Romans from the comparisons of the provinces. This study will not be comprehensive enough to definitely prove one way or another whether or not this kind of analysis will successfully improve our understanding of the process through which Roman culture and native culture merged, but it might provide an indication.

**Defining Culture through Remains**

In the field of Roman studies, scholars have sought to understand the presence of the Romans in the provinces partly through the influence of Roman culture on the cultures of the indigenous people. However, an obstacle trying to find links between Roman culture and the cultures of the provinces is that presence and practice of culture have to be inferred primarily from archaeological remains. The conclusions
can never be certain. Interpretations are made using objects, the contexts in which objects are found and textual evidence. The nature of interpretations themselves, informed by biases and personal theories, makes them not infallible. A common misconception in Roman studies had been that in similarity form between objects indicates similarity in function or practice. We know that this is not always true. Roman culture in the provinces was not a carbon copy of Roman culture in Rome leaving scholars with the problem of trying to describe the process of cultural influence in the provinces and explain why objects might be visually similar. As more excavations of Roman provincial sites are carried out and more evidence is collected, past interpretations will be reinforced or refuted and replaced with new theoretical models within the context of Roman studies.

This study will look for links not only between the cultures of the provinces and Rome, but also between the varying provinces themselves to examine any common threads in the processes of Roman influence. Since a complete description of all aspects of culture would not be possible, the focus here will be on the burial practices, specifically cremation, of the provinces and how they relate to those in Rome. The cremation rite was chosen because it was the dominant burial custom in Rome during the early imperial period, the period of greatest expansion. Three provinces were chosen to be case studies concentrated on three burial sites from each. The three provinces are Britannia, Africa Proconsularis, and Asia Minor. While such a narrow sampling of sites cannot define patterns in practice, they will be used to approximate the cremation practices of the respective provinces. The cremation practices will be compared to look at the differences and similarities, if any, between
the provincial practices and those observed in Rome. If there are any links between the sites of the varying provinces to each other and to Rome, they may be indicative of an underlying theme in the transfer of culture in the Roman Empire. The next step would be to see if this ‘theme’ would be applicable to other forms of culture, outside the burial practices. However, this would be outside the scope of this study which seeks only to identify such a theme, if it exists. To discern this, the standard Roman cremation practice to which the provinces will be compared must first be defined.

**Roman Cremation Practices**

In general, from the period of about 475 through 200 BCE, inhumation appears to have been the predominant burial rite in Republican Rome; after 200 BCE, cremation became the *mos Romanus*. However, the rite of inhumation remained in restricted use with certain aristocratic families continuing to favor inhumation even after the shift. Inhumation began to become popular again during the reign of Hadrian beginning in 117 CE and the increase of Hellenistic influences, although it did not completely replace cremation. From the period of the mid 2nd century CE through about 300 the two rites were practiced side by side. However, the use of multiple rites was found predominantly amongst the lower classes; the upper class, greatly influenced by the fashions of the emperor, almost entirely switched to the new inhumation rite within a single generation, from the period of about 140 to 180 CE.

---

1 Morris 1992: 31, 47.
2 One reason some families, like the Cornelii, may have retained the inhumation rite was to keep visible continuity between themselves and their ancestors. Toynbee 1971: 39-40. However, by 78 BCE, even the Cornelii were practicing cremation, indicating that it had been fully embraced by the wealthy as the ‘norm’. Morris 1992: 42.
3 Toynbee 1971: 40.
4 Morris 1992: 54. Embalming was a less commonly used burial rite within Rome, adopted from the Egyptians, but it remained seen as a foreign practice and never caught on. One of the more infamous examples of embalming in Rome was when Nero had his wife Poppaea embalmed after her untimely
It appears that there was some variation of the type of tomb used for a cremation burial within Rome, typically a distinction based on wealth, but the common early imperial cremation tomb type was called a *columbarium*.\(^5\) These barrel vaulted masonry tombs had walls lined with niches to hold multiple cremation urns, and while the tombs generally got bigger as time went on, the inclusion of 50 to 100 urns remained standard.\(^6\) While the *columbarium* was the most common type, it is not certain that the poorest members of Roman society were buried in them. *Columbaria* were relatively expensive to build and consequently were often funded by wealthy patrons or *collegia*.\(^7\) *Collegia* were funeral ‘clubs’ whose members would meet socially at times throughout the year and pay contributions to fund the construction of tombs they and their families could be buried in. However, not everyone could afford the fees to be a member of these clubs, and it is neither clear what percentage of the population could afford to be buried in a *columbarium*, nor what happened to the people who could not.\(^8\) Few cemeteries for the poor have been identified.\(^9\)

It is assumed that, even though these cemeteries of poor burials have not been conclusively found, they too practiced cremation.\(^10\) It has been suggested that the use of cremation was a unifying practice throughout Rome, centered on the idea of the *columbarium*.\(^11\) Citizens, freedmen and slaves could all be buried in them as long as they were not interred in the Mausoleum of Augustus. Morris 1992: 31; Toynbee 1971: 41.

\(^5\) These are ‘typical’ in that they have been most commonly discovered by excavation. There may be more tomb forms that have not been identified yet. One found in Rome in 1726 contained 3,000 urns. Morris 1992: 44.

\(^6\) Morris 1992: 44.

\(^7\) Toynbee 1971: 55.

\(^8\) Morris 1992: 44.

\(^9\) These graves generally consist of simple pit burials. Morris 1992: 45.

\(^10\) Morris 1992: 45.

\(^11\) Morris 1992: 47
they could afford it and would be treated and commemorated together in a similar fashion. Even if a person could not afford a place in a *columbaria*, being buried in simple pit graves instead, they were connected by the common burial practice. Of course social distinctions could still be maintained within this system as the wealthy could build their own individual tombs and the poor could not. However, there was no distinction in the ritual itself; the poor could practice the same rites of their betters.\(^{12}\)

There were many codified laws in Rome that affected burial practice and dictated the terms of practice. For example, all burials had to take place outside of the city walls, with exceptions given to emperors and other individuals of high standing. There were even laws regarding the amount of money that could be spent on a burial and the amount of goods that could be buried with a body.\(^{13}\) However, the majority of laws restricted the placement of burials within the cemetery boundaries and the actual ritual. The end result of these regulations was a culture of competition and spectacle that became characteristic of wealthier tombs when they loosened. Often, these more extravagant tombs would be arranged in a single file alongside the road leading to and from the city where they would be most visible to travelers.\(^{14}\) These tombs were the antecedents of monumental tomb architecture and eventually morphed into such monumental structures.

There were also more specific burial traditions regulated by law that were dependent on the place of the individual in society. These were usually reserved for men who had died a ‘Roman’ death, that is, a death that conveyed some sort of larger

\(^{12}\) Morris 1992: 47.

\(^{13}\) Toynbee 1971: 73.

message.\textsuperscript{15} For example, when soldiers were killed on the battlefield, dying for Rome as it were, they would be given the \textit{funus militare} where they would be collectively buried on the battlefield. However, a higher ranking officer, whose death would have served as morale motivation and a rallying point for the soldiers, was afforded higher individual honors. And since it was an embarrassment for a general to survive a military catastrophe, it is possible that military leaders would purposely put themselves in harms way to achieve the spectacle of a good death to both avoid the embarrassment of having a military failure on ones record and to encourage the soldiers to fight harder.\textsuperscript{16} Regardless, the expenses of these rites would be paid for by their comrades with portions of every soldier’s wages being set aside for this very reason.

The \textit{funus publicum} was another rite, used more during the republic, that could technically be awarded to all citizens, but was reserved for those who were considered ‘benefactors of the state,’ generally the wealthy aristocrats. These rites would be paid for by the state and usually also included the spectacle of the gladiatorial games.\textsuperscript{17} Spectacle as part of the funerary ritual was already something that had been associated with the upper class. Outside of the city of Rome, these types of funerary rites could be given to citizens who had rendered noteworthy service to their respective cities. Women were also able to qualify for this honor.\textsuperscript{18} The final tradition from the imperial period, which derived from the public funeral rite, was the rite of \textit{funus imperatorium} which was almost exclusively reserved for the emperors.

\textsuperscript{15} Edwards 2007: 3.
\textsuperscript{16} Dying on the battlefield was still exulted, to a degree, in the Roman world as it had been in the Greek world. Edwards 2007: 27.
\textsuperscript{17} Toynbee 1971: 56.
\textsuperscript{18} Toynbee 1971: 56.
and members of the imperial family. Like both the military and public funeral rites, the *funus imperatorium* relied heavily on spectacle including both public processions and games.

Roman funerary culture also consisted of cults for the dead, friends and families of the deceased who would observe the death both at the time of the actual interment of the remains and at certain times of the year with feasts at a memorial site or at the grave itself. Many individuals would leave money behind in their wills specifically for these ritual meals.\(^1^9\) The cults would then reinforce the connection between the living and the dead through the reenactment of the dining ritual associated with the burial and remembrance. Offerings of food were often left for the deceased and it was not uncommon for both inhumation and cremation graves to have either jar tops, pipes, or simple holes over the graves through which food and drink could be deposited during these feasts.\(^2^0\)

As stated before, there were marked differences between the burials of the upper class and those of the lower class, though the rituals themselves seem to have remained relatively constant. Where there were differences, they were mostly reserved for the treatment of the body immediately after death. First, regardless of the burial rite chosen, the body of a lower class individual was traditionally removed from the city soon after death and buried quickly while the body of a member of the aristocracy would be ceremonially laid out for a viewing and taken through the streets.

---

\(^{19}\) Edwards 2007: 164.

\(^{20}\) Toynbee 1971: 62.
in a formal funeral procession. For these individuals, the whole process could take up to a few days.\textsuperscript{21}

For the actual process of the cremation, the act differed very little based on class. The body was usually laid out on a couch on top of a wooden pyre, either at the site where the ashes were going to be buried (an \textit{in situ or bustum} burial) or a locale that was specifically created for the purpose of cremation. The pyre was generally a rectangular pile of wood, sometimes with other types of fuel such as pinecones to facilitate the burning process. Additional pyre gifts and personal possessions were also placed on the pyre to burn along with the body.\textsuperscript{22} After the cremation was finished, the ashes and bones were collected and were generally placed in a vessel. For the wealthy, these vessels could look similar to the sarcophagi of the aristocratic class in the inhumation rite; elaborately carved marble, alabaster ash or other stone ash chests. Some of the more popular shapes for these chests were altars, houses, baskets, boxes, or caskets, all similar to objects found in everyday Roman life. These urns could also be decorated with additional marble, alabaster, gold, silver or bronze elements. Such elaborate decorations were smaller details that would contribute to the spectacle of a wealthier burial. The urns of the lower class consisted of much simpler lead boxes, glass jars, and earthenware pots.

As previously discussed, the wealth of an individual was primarily displayed through tomb or grave markers, as these would have been visible to others. Spectacle and competition were major components of the burial practices of the Roman upper

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{21} Adkins and Adkins 1994: 356.
\textsuperscript{22} These goods included jewelry, weapons, pieces of armor, toilet boxes, toilet articles, precious metals, eating and drinking vessels and utensils, tools, dice, game pieces, children’s toys, funerary portraits, and images of deities, items that would be considered useful in the afterlife, as well as pet animals that had been killed to accompany the soul (Toynbee 1971:52-53).
\end{flushleft}
class. Therefore, wealthier individuals would strive to be interred in free standing ‘house’ or chamber tombs, large mausoleum type structures. The lower classes would be placed either in a *columbarium* or, as is most likely the case for the very poor, directly in the ground beneath a small masonry tomb, gravestone, or other small grave marker. Similar rites were also performed even if the body was not present for cremation resulting in a ritual deposit of grave goods and sometimes an urn. The resulting deposit was called a cenotaph.

In Roman practice, if the urn was not placed within a *columbarium* it was usually placed within a box structure of tiles, large flat bricks, or stone slabs set directly into the earth. All but the very poorest were able to afford the cheap materials required for the construction of these tile and stone tombs, although there was a range as with most tomb types. These tombs in general required little skilled craftsmanship to construct, unlike the masonry and brickwork tombs which tended to protrude above ground and were more expensive. The most expensive of these was a chamber tomb whose interior and façade had been elaborately carved with portrait busts and figurative scenes on them. These detailed tombs were of the type often found lining the roads leading to and from the city, displays of wealth and importance.

There is still some question as to why inhumation experienced a revival towards the end of the 2nd century and beginning of the 3rd century CE while cremation essentially became extinct as a practice in the Empire after about the end of the 3rd and beginning of the 4th centuries. Whatever the reason, there is little mention of the burial rite shift in the literature of the time. While there are many theories
concerning why this may have happened, neither inhumation nor the shift in practice are within the scope of this study, and will therefore not be discussed.

**Choosing the Sites**

It has already been established by scholars that it was the elites of an indigenous society who were most likely to conform to the foreign Roman culture to the greatest degree.\textsuperscript{23} This was especially true for those who were involved with the government or who sought to solidify their social standing through emulation of the ruling Romans. Just as the cremation rite created unity within Rome, there may have been an attempt on the part of the indigenous elites to create unity between themselves as the locals and the imperial Romans. In many cases, this is reflected in the burial practices of the elites in certain provinces, who also created monumental tombs as displays of their power and position within the Empire, much in the same way the wealthy Romans used spectacle in their own burials. The elites were also making statements concerning their identity as Roman subjects.\textsuperscript{24} However, these monuments do not reflect on the non-elite populations, their wealth and power, or how they were affected by the culture of the Romans. The elites represented only a small proportion of the populations of the provinces, and therefore cannot be the sole indicators of culture within the Roman Empire. The non-elite population must also be taken into account as representing the popular cultures of the time.

It is for this reason that this study will mainly focus on the burial rites exhibited in provincial city cemetery sites, where the range of society could be buried, rather than just looking at the elite free standing monumental tombs that were

\textsuperscript{23} Mattingly 1997: 5.
\textsuperscript{24} Roth 2002: 40-41.
markers of wealth. As these burial sites are less visible and less outwardly impressive than the monumental tombs, there have been fewer excavations of cemeteries in general, and they tend to be underrepresented in the literature compared to the larger stone structures.25 This resulted in some difficulty in finding enough sites that had been adequately recorded to use as case studies.26 The final sites used range in size, period of use, and demographic population to provide a wide spectrum of funerary practice in the Roman Empire. The degrees of difference among the sites will be useful in identifying underlying themes of Roman cultural influence as similarities between the sites will be more apparent.

The provinces of Britannia, Africa Proconsularis (the area of coastal Tunisia and Libya), and Asia Minor (Turkey) were chosen for this study not only because of their spatial distribution [see image 1.1] but also for their different political histories preceding Roman conquest. Britannia had a long tribal tradition with little enforced centralized control or nationalistic tendencies, Africa Proconsularis had been the seat of the Carthaginian Empire, an earlier enemy of the Romans, and Asia Minor had been a part of many different empires. Therefore it would be expected that the people would react to the Romans in different ways based on these experiences. It would also be expected that there was a certain amount of cultural exchange going on,

25 One exception to this during my research was in the province of Britannia excavations associated with funerary practice seemed to focus exclusively on cemetery sites. An explanation for this regionalized focus might be that there were fewer monumental tombs in this region than in other parts of the Roman Empire, and based on my studies, the cemeteries seemed to be less disturbed than in other areas. Therefore, the focus on cemeteries might reflect a combination of availability and preservation. However, I think that the focus on funerary customs within the provinces is shifting more and more to include cemeteries as they are slowly being excavated and published.

26 Language was also an issue as in the area of Tunisia, many sites are published in French and German, and in Turkey, what was then Asia Minor, many sites are published in German and Turkish. In a similar vein, the variation in the scholarly traditions of the different areas also proved to be challenging as not only was information not presented in the same way, but the same types of information were not always deemed important enough to make it into the final publications.
whereby the indigenous people would begin to exhibit traits of ‘being Roman’ and utilize Roman customs and practices.\textsuperscript{27} As stated before, the purpose of this study will be to look for similarities in the cremation practices of the provinces and Rome, and then look for links between all of the provinces. It will look to see if ‘being Roman’ was expressed in the cremation burials, and if there might be larger empire wide implications.

The first province to be discussed will be Britannia. The sites in this section were chosen based on both the prominence of the cemetery and the type of settlement with which they were associated [see image 1.2]. Verulamium, around which the King Harry Lane cemetery developed, was classified as a \textit{municipium}, the second highest order of a Roman city, and was one of the largest cities in Roman Britain. Londinium, whose eastern cemetery is the second site from Britannia, was also a \textit{municipium}, although in later centuries it may have attained the rank of \textit{colonia}, the highest rank of Roman city. In contrast, the final site chosen, the cemetery of Westhampnett, is associated with a smaller rural settlement. The area of Chichester was classified as a \textit{civitate}, semi-autonomous civil administrations that were closely allied with the Romans and set up around pre-Roman Iron Age sites.\textsuperscript{28} Therefore, a range of Roman political involvement is represented in the sites of Britannia.

The sites of Africa Proconsuaris were chosen for slightly different reasons [see image 1.3]. The city of Leptiminus, a previously Punic city and the first cemetery researched, grew in prominence during the Roman period and became one of the major port cities.

\textsuperscript{27} The obvious counterpart would be the Romans doing to same to some extent with the indigenous cultures, but this is not going to be discussed in this study.

\textsuperscript{28} Fitzpatrick and Powell 1997a: 8-9.
of the province, eventually being elevated to the rank of *colonia*.\(^{29}\) The city of Pupput, the settlement associated with the second cemetery, was also raised to the rank of *colonia* in the later imperial period, and the necropolis of Pupput is one of the largest to have been excavated in the province. The final cemetery discussed for the province of Africa Proconsularis, the Yasmina Necropolis, comes from rebuilt Roman Carthage, one of the largest cities in the entire empire. Therefore, unlike the sites from Britannia, these cemeteries do not represent the populations of different types of Roman settlements but from cities with different histories. Whereas Leptiminus and Pupput had been cities during the Punic period, Punic Carthage was completely

\[^{29}\text{Desrochers 2002: 8, Ben Lazreg and Mattingly 1992: 9.}\]
destroyed and rebuilt centuries later by the Romans. Consequently, it is possible and seems probable that the experiences of the Romans in each of the cities, and the proportion of Romans to indigenous people, would be different. This may have created varying cultures in each city.

The selection for the sites of Asia Minor posed a problem [see image 1.4]. Of all the provinces discussed in the study, the burial practices of Roman Asia Minor were the most regionally varied and finding sites where cremation was used was difficult.\(^{30}\) Secondly, poor preservation throughout Asia Minor left less evidence associated with the cremation practices of the area. Finally, there are large numbers of the previously mentioned elite monumental tombs found in Asia Minor, and

\(^{30}\) The rite of cremation is still viewed as rare in Asia Minor, but further excavation appears to indicate that cremation was more common. Spanu 2000: 174. The significance of this will be discussed later.
comparatively less research has been done on the cemetery sites of Asia Minor. As a result, there are only two actual cemetery sites discussed in this section, and all three sites were chosen more for their displays of regional variation rather than the size or the population make up of their related settlements.

The first of these sites, the cemetery of Pessinus, is most similar to the cemeteries from the other provinces. Pessinus was already a major city before Asia Minor became part of the Roman Empire. It remained a prominent city, included in the Galatia region, and marked the easternmost reach of Roman control in Asia. The second site is also a cemetery site, the Necropolis of Anemurium. Anemurium was the largest city of Rough Cilicia, another region of Asia Minor. The final site used for is not a cemetery, but instead is one of the monumental tombs that are found in great number in the region of the Alpu plain. Although this was most likely an elite burial, it is included in this study because it displays multiple practices within the one tomb, a trait not generally found within the empire.
Variation was important in picking sites; if there was an underlying link to the influence of the Romans in the burial rites, they would be most apparent in sites that were outwardly dissimilar. However, in order to examine this supposed link, it will first be necessary to recount past theories and interpretative models of how cultural exchange took place between the Romans and the peoples of the provinces.

**The Introduction of Theory and Models of Interpretation: the Problem with Romanization**

For many years the model for understanding the spread of the Romans into the provinces and the spread of Roman culture has been that of acculturation, the central theme behind Romanization. Through this model, traits of the ‘dominant’ Roman culture were seen as being adopted by the indigenous people who recognized Roman culture as inherently superior to their own. Recent scholarship has criticized this idea as being the product of the post-colonial European outlook on the world. Just as the Europeans saw themselves ‘civilizing’ the other cultures they brought into their empires, they saw the Romans as ‘civilizing’ the barbarians in the provinces.\(^{31}\) First, as a method of information transfer, Romanization was seen as too one directional. It addressed only the influence of the Romans on the native peoples, without any discussion of how the native cultures could have been used by the Romans who settled the area and within the Italian peninsula itself. More importantly was that it created a ranked value system in terms of culture, where Roman culture was the best and was recognized as such by the other cultures it came into contact with.\(^{32}\) With this view, finding an object of Roman origin in the provinces would imply function as it was seen in Rome. This seems unlikely and creates a very polarized view of the

Roman and the pre-conquest provincial societies. In many cases, the Romans had continuous contact with the people of the provinces before the conquest in one form or another. This would have lead to a more gradual process of culture exchange than the seemingly spontaneous nature of Romanization by which indigenous people would have immediately sought to emulate Roman culture.

Romanization also did not allow for any agency on the part of the provincial people to change the Roman culture or to adapt it to suit their own needs. Romanization only allowed for the simple adoption of culture. By assigning an object from the provinces a function without objectively looking at how that object was actually used or how it came to be in the province, one is not really studying the provincial culture. Instead it is a reiteration of what one already thinks is true. Romanization removes any political, economic, or ideological significance that might be associated with an object in the provinces, and it also removes the significance of the context. It failed to describe how the members of the different classes would have come into contact with the Romans or their culture, or how the process of acculturation would have proceeded in light of class difference. Overall, the concept of Romanization was much too simplified and rigid.

As a result, many scholars have attempted to offer alternative methods of interpretation, so called ‘revisionist studies’. These began with an approach derived through the study of Roman Britain. The “Nativists” were a group who chose to look at Roman artifacts in the provinces as a form of resistance to Roman authority instead of the predominant Romanization interpretation. Under the Nativist theory, Roman

---

34 Webster 2001: 212.
culture was not the inherently best culture that others strove to emulate, but was merely the politically dominant one that was forced upon native peoples. In response, the native people would devise their own means of resistance within the confines of the Roman culture. To support this point, Nativist scholars pointed to the slow adoption of Latin as a common language throughout the Empire, the demise of the political infrastructure that kept the smaller towns and villages running, and an apparent revival of the old Celtic traditions in the later part of the imperial occupation.\textsuperscript{35} Under this interpretation, these were all signs of native resistance and were contradictory to the theory of Romanization.

With Nativist theory, the apparent adoption and emulation of Roman culture was seen as little more than a veneer masking the traditional Celtic culture which remained as people purposefully chose to not identify themselves as Romans. However, while Romanization was too extreme in not giving agency to the provincial people, the Nativist model did the same. There was no room for adoption or emulation of any kind, regardless of possible motivation. The problem was similar to the problem with Romanization. The Nativist theory also failed to explain how the amount of interaction between the Romans and the provincial people might have influenced the degree to which the people appeared to be Roman, or to address the aspects of culture that appeared to be hybridized, where Roman culture was seemingly altered to better fit within the provincial contexts. While the Nativist theory took steps forward in acknowledging some of the short comings of Romanization, mainly the internal Euro-centric bias on which the theory was based, it

\textsuperscript{35} Webster 2001: 212.
also failed as a model of interpretation for many of the same reasons as
Romanization.

In the early nineties, British scholars, with Martin Millet at the forefront,
attempted to overhaul the traditional view of Romanization again. Instead of making
Romanization an imposition by the Roman onto the native peoples, which was
necessary for the resistance under the Nativist model, Millet described a situation
where the emulation and adoption of Roman culture was promoted and accelerated by
the native peoples themselves in an effort to court the Romans and win influence.36
For example, they may have altered their dress in an effort to appear more Roman.
Under this model, the elites of a provincial society would be the first to adopt Roman
culture as they would have the most to lose by the new threat of Roman authority. By
adopting Roman culture and the visual markers of what it was to ‘be Roman’, they
could liken themselves to the Roman ruling class in hopes of keeping or even
bettering their social position.37 Since the rewards for emulation decreased as the
individuals went down in social standing to the lowest classes of society, the degree
to which adoption occurred would be expected to also decrease. The lower classes
would have less power and position to lose or gain from the Roman intrusion, and
therefore less need of Roman cultural markers. Consequently, there would be less
archaeological evidence of Roman material culture in the poorer provincial contexts.

Under Millet’s theory, Roman material culture became a marker of social
status, and would thereby be desirable to people who wished to gain standing or give
the impression of a better place in society by the imitation of higher society. This

36 Millet 1990a: 82.
37 Millet 1990b: 37.
accounted for the differing degrees of discernable Roman culture and Roman identity. It did not treat the provincial cultures as one homogenous group but rather as a diversified group of different people from different regions, classes, and in some cases religions. It allowed for variations in people’s identities. However, a problem with Millet’s theory was that its attention was focused on the elites, as they were the ones seen making more choices concerning Roman culture. The less wealthy within the society, which may have had less in terms of Roman material remains, are essentially ignored and written off as having nothing to gain from the use of Roman culture. Any part that the lower classes may have had in the cultural negotiation between the Romans and the provinces was bypassed.38 This theory also maintained that the divisions and social organizations of the pre-conquest societies remained basically static through the Roman transition, and that the over all level of Romanization achieved by a society was dependent on the amount of pre-conquest exposure the society had to the Romans rather than specific post-conquest choices on the part of the society. Romanization would have proceeded at an equal rate everywhere if all the provinces had come into contact with the Romans and started the process of Romanization at the same relative times in their histories.39

One of the recurring issues in the various interpretive models discussed was what would have made Roman material culture desirable to the people of the provinces. What came out of these studies was the conclusion that Roman symbols and material culture were not necessarily adopted and imitated for their own sake, because they were better, but for more aesthetic and practical reasons such as a visual

38 Webster 2001: 214.
39 Webster 2001: 214.
agenda or recognition of efficiency.\textsuperscript{40} Millet’s theory also incorporated issues of class and power negotiations into the discussion. Jane Webster took these two ideas and came up with her own revisionist theory based on the idea of Creole cultures as a description for cultural interaction.\textsuperscript{41} By focusing on adaptation over straight adoption, Webster claimed that the theory of Creolization utilized elements of many of the previous theories and therefore was more all encompassing than one alone.\textsuperscript{42}

Through adaptation, the provincial peoples would have taken certain forms of Roman material culture but used them in a different way, adapting the form to a function more in line with their own needs and customs.\textsuperscript{43} This provided a way for provincial artifacts to be indicative of either negotiation with or resistance to the intrusive Roman culture. It is suggested that through Creolization, the lower echelons of the society could be studied because adaptation gave them the ability to exert a modicum of control in their socially stratified environment by allowing them to negotiate Roman authority on their own terms, or resist it, all through their use and adoption of Roman culture. They were not necessarily accepting Roman culture as it was presented by the Romans; they were changing it to their own ends. However, just as Romanization and the other previous theories concentrated mainly on the elites of the society, Creolization concentrates on the lower classes without really allowing the same choice of adaptation for the elites. The elites were required to adopt culture so

\textsuperscript{40}Woolf 1998: 13.

\textsuperscript{41}Creolization is a linguistic term that literally means the merging of two languages into a new hybrid language consisting of elements of both of the initial languages. It has more generally come to be used to describe the cultural interaction between European/American, Native American and African cultures in the Americas, which resulted in the creation of new African American and African Caribbean cultures. Webster sees this process as applicable to the study of the Roman provinces as well. Webster 2001: 217.

\textsuperscript{42}Webster 2003: 43.

\textsuperscript{43}Webster 2001: 219.
the lower classes could adopt it. Likewise, there is no allowance for emulation within the lower classes for any purpose beyond the political, such as economic incentive.

David Mattingly consequently proposed a theory that took the idea of Creole cultures and combined it with a new theory of emulation strategies, a combination which would create a less polarized view of the function of Roman culture in the provincial societies. Under this view, adaptation was the result of cultural negotiation and resistance, but selective adoption and emulation allowed the peoples in the provinces to use the Roman culture to their best advantage. To this end, Mattingly suggests looking not for the similarities in practice among the people of the provinces, but instead to look at the diversity of practice among the people of the provinces, using these slight variations to identify groups. The groups were exploiting different advantages. Looking at the differences not only define groups, but would also aid in describing and understanding the culture exchange between the Romans and the provinces, and how this process might have differed from province to province. There is a basis for a comparison between not only the Romans and the provinces, but between the provinces themselves, something which was not really addressed previously. It allowed for the identification of how different groups sought to construct their own versions of Roman or non Roman identity, and to decide what aspects of material culture would be deemed more conspicuously Roman than others. Mattingly’s theory treated the different classes of a society not as polarized stratifications, but as segments of a whole society informing each other. By looking at
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41 Mattingly 2004: 9
45 Mattingly identified multiple factors that would have had bearing on the creation of both individual and group identities, including status, wealth, location, if living under civil or martial law, employment, religion, ethnic affiliation, language, literacy, gender, and age. Mattingly 2004: 21.
46 Mattingly 2004: 22.
the differences between not only the provincial culture and the Roman culture, but also the different cultures of the Roman provinces, it may be possible for the entire empire to be understood.

Greg Woolf, who had already adopted a similar line of thought, claimed that the only way to really overcome the post-colonial biases that have shaped so many theories would be to dissect the theories of Romanization and its revisionist study counterparts, and examine each element of culture singularly. Instead of competition between the two cultures, there was the creation of a completely new culture.47 He claimed that it was only in culture historical approaches such as acculturation where there is a defined core culture through which similarities can be found, enabling the claim to be made that something is more or less “Romanized”. Instead, like Mattingly, Woolf suggested that it is more useful to look at the diversity of practice, and that this would make both the similarities and differences in cultures more apparent. Then the ‘structuring principles’ could be discerned.48

Both Mattingly’s and Woolf’s theories take into account that fact that there was no single unifying idea of what it meant to ‘be Roman’. The culmination of the interactions between the Romans and the people of the provinces was not necessarily full cultural uniformity, making the experience in each of the provinces different.49 This may seem to contradict the stated goal of this study; however, I am not looking for a signifier of cultural uniformity throughout the empire. It is unlikely that any burial practice would have been practiced in the same way in any two regions of the empire. Instead, I am looking for something more subtle, a theme that would related

---

the provincial cultures to each other, a similar process that may have had different results.

Therefore, to accurately identify aspects of a new culture and to discern which were influenced by the indigenous pre-Roman cultures of the provinces and which were influenced by the Romans, one has to look at the differences as well as the similarities of the post-conquest society. The pre-Roman burial practices as well as the situation of the Romans within the society will have to be taken into account. While the difference between the provinces will distinguish them, they will also hopefully create a process through which the provinces can be related to each other. They can help us understand what was important to the people of the provinces when it came to their indigenous practices, what was enticing about the Roman culture and why.
Chapter Two: The Case Study of Britannia

Introduction

The Roman province of Britannia was one of the last territories successfully added to the Empire. Its relatively isolated location combined with its predominantly tribal history made it very different from the other provinces incorporated by the Romans. Africa Proconsularis had previously been part of the Phoenician Empire and then the base of the Carthaginian Empire, and Asia Minor had been incorporated into numerous empires including the Phoenician and the Seleucid Empires, creating complicated histories of competing local and imperial administrations. Britannia’s history had been one of tribal rivalries and feuding kings. It did not have the same history with an imperial infrastructure as Africa Proconsularis and Asia Minor did. Nor was it incorporated into the empire for the same reasons. Whereas the other two provinces were important for trade and the exploitation of natural resources, Britannia was neither a trading hub nor a major source of raw materials. The exact nature of Britannia’s annexation, which was more political rather than economic, will be discussed later.
The three cemetery sites discussed here represent three different areas, settlement types, and slightly different time periods. The cemetery with the largest number of cremations, King Harry Lane, does not come from the largest settlement. It represents the earliest of the cemeteries with use beginning in the period before the arrival of the Roman conquerors. It therefore offers insight into the immediate period of contact and how burial ritual may have progressed. The cemetery that does correspond to the largest of the Roman settlements discussed, the Eastern Cemetery of Londinium (Londinium), is from a later period in the Roman occupation, and spans the transition from the rite of cremation back to inhumation. The final cemetery under consideration, the Roman cemetery at Westhampnett, is associated with a smaller, more rural settlement in the Chirchester area. As the settlement at Westhampnett was not one of the main Roman centers, one might expect that the level of influence of the Romans would be different from what was found in the other city centers. While this does appear to happen to a small degree, the practices identified at each of the cemeteries are very similar to one another and the difference seem to have more to do with the period of use. There appears to have been a common practice to all of the rites.

Pre-Imperial Contact between Rome and Britannia

The British province was one of the last to be conquered by the Romans, yet the people of Britannia had been in contact with the Romans and their culture, both directly and indirectly, through trade, previous military campaigns and emigration from neighboring Gaul.\(^{50}\) As a neighbor of the Italian peninsula Gaul not only became

\(^{50}\) It has been documented that Roman merchants set up long-term settlements in the frontier areas known as *consistentes*, and the same occurred in pre-conquest Britannia. Salway 2001: 37.
a conduit for the Romans and traders into other areas of Europe, but was also one of the first areas to be conquered beginning in 121 BCE and ending with the Gallic Wars in 58-51 BCE, nearly 100 years before the final campaign in Britannia. In 55 BCE, Julius Caesar made his first of several campaigns into Britannia to gain more prestige after successes in Gaul, and to solidify his control of the area as it was suspected that the tribes of southern Britannia were assisting the Gallic rebellions. While the invasion was an immediate success, with the defeat of multiple tribes after only two years fighting and promises of tribute from several of the tribal chiefs, after Caesar pulled out in 54 BCE. After he left, there was no real establishment of Roman authority. It would be nearly a century before the Romans sent another expedition into Britannia.

**Inclusion of Britannia into the Roman Empire**

The final impetus for the eventual inclusion of Britannia into the Roman Empire was more than the expansionist policy that may have been implemented before. By this point, Roman society had been conditioned to respond both economically and politically to the success of the military. Rome itself had little in the way of natural resources and was therefore required to import large amounts of raw materials from the provinces. As the demand grew, so did the exploitation of the provinces, especially as more elites became dependant on the provinces as the source of their income and slaves. However, at the time Britannia was conquered, there were political factors more pressing for the Emperor Claudius. Since the army had been transformed into a professional venture in the 2nd century BCE, soldiers were
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51 Salway 2001: 37.
52 Millet 1990a: 2.
53 Millet 1990a: 3.
fighting for specific generals, not the city of Rome or the emperor. After a failed coup attempt in 42 CE, Claudius, acknowledging his precarious political situation, sought to regain credibility with armies. Precedent had shown him that the armies could be used against him and that expansion could strengthen moral, as it had done for his predecessors. He also saw the possibility of the British tribes uniting under a single king as a situation which would be dangerous to Rome’s position in Britannia and the perfect opportunity to reassert his power with the Roman armies. In conquering Britannia, Claudius could protect his position by keeping the armies busy fighting in a foreign land and giving the appearance of a strong expanding empire.

While the elites in Rome certainly benefited from the conquering of new lands, there was no centralized force to develop and organize Britannia for any kind of economic growth, and the province was certainly not as rich as some of the others. The first colony was established in Britannia in 49 CE for the groups of legionaries who were due to be discharged and for those willing to explore the new territory in search of the wealth that was usually promised with such conquests. Further colonies began to be established as well as towns near the forts and military institutions, creating a wider net of Roman influence. Because the invasion was not for purely economic gain, exploitation of the province remained opportunistic and on a smaller scale, presumably for the growth of the local economies rather than
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54 Salway 2001: 57.
55 Salway 2001: 57.
56 Millet 1990a: 6. For example, Africa Proconsularis was thriving at this time and became known as the “Bread Basket” of the Roman Empire.
57 Salway writes, “Under the Roman early Empire, a colony was a deliberate foundation, all of whose members were Roman citizens, generally time-expired soldiers.” The incorporation of Britannia into the Roman Empire followed a strict set of rules that had historically been applied to all provincial states after they had been acquired. Salway 2001: 78.
development at the imperial level. After the initial invasion, it seems Rome lost some interest in the British province.

There were several distinct features of the Roman influence in Britannia that attested to their control of the new Roman cities. Towns were developed on street grids with accommodations for Roman public buildings, replacing the isolated settlements of the Iron Age communities. The tribal leaders who had previously held positions of power were able to retain their titles, incorporated into a Roman civitas, such as Chirchester gaining greater influence and wealth while in the sphere of the Roman administration. This political background is needed for understanding the place of the Romans within Britannia as it would have influenced the contact between the indigenous people and Roman culture. However, looking at what the burial practices were before the arrival of the Romans will help clarify what really changed after the Roman conquest.

**Pre-Roman (Iron Age) Burial Rites**

The traditional burial rite in pre-Roman Britannia was inhumation in isolated burials either within the settlements or outside, rather than within formal cemetery settings. While most of the traditions associated with Iron Age burials were regionally based, there were a few general practices that were utilized throughout the various tribes and regions. Bodies were either deposited in pits, which were not necessarily dug specifically for the burial of a body, usually old storage pits, or in
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60 Millet 1990a: 69.
simple shallow graves and ditches under hills or ramparts. There was an almost universal preference for burial in the crouched position with the head facing north. There also seemed to be an overall concern with providing the deceased with various material goods, from ceramic vessels and eating utensils to personal ornaments such as weapons and brooches. This custom continued even after the adoption of the cremation rites.

Cremation was an intrusive burial rite in pre-Roman Britannia. It was not a native innovation. The development of this rite is associated with the formation of trade relationships between the tribes of southeastern Britannia and the Belgic tribes of Northern Gaul, specifically in Normandy, and their consequent immigration. While the coinage indicates that there was infiltration of the area of South Eastern Britannia starting around 120 BCE, evidence of cremation rites in Britannia do not appear until the last four decades of the 1st century BCE. Cremation rites were not uniform within Gaul at the time, and Normandy was the closest region where the rite of cremation was practiced at such an early date. This might indicate that movement from Gaul into Britannia occurred in waves, the initial from an area that did not practice the cremation rites, and the second from the area of Normandy that, importing the cremation rite with it.

After the initial introduction, the rite of cremation flourished mostly within select wealthier communities in the area of southeastern Britannia until the time of the Roman conquest, when the rite became more prevalent in all conquered regions.
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64 Whimster 1981: 158, 194.
65 Fitzpatrick and Powell 1997b: 208.
This created ‘blank areas’ where inhumation was still the sole burial practice existing in between communities that had embraced cremation.\(^{68}\) However, the majority of cremations from this time period are not found in large groupings with other burials, but in small isolated groups, if near other cremation burials at all.\(^{69}\) This indicates that even in areas where the rite had infiltrated, it was not wholly adopted by all the individuals in the communities of southeastern Britannia. The rites in these communities were selected by individuals, with a mix of the traditional inhumation rites and the new intrusive cremation rites.

There does not appear to have been much uniformity in the practice of cremation either. While the most common evidence is for the use of wooden pyres in the pre-Roman Britain, there is also evidence that some bodies may have been burned directly in their graves.\(^{70}\) There was also a lack of uniformity in the method of interring the remains after they were burned. While the most common way was to bury the remains within an urn container, burial without the use of a cinerary vessel also occurred in both supposedly wealthy contexts (determined on the basis of grave goods) and impoverished contexts (without and grave goods).\(^{71}\) As the rite became more established closer to the time of conquest, the development of formal burial areas began. This suggests that there was a permanent adoption of the new rite by some communities. Information on the organization of these formal groups of cremations is scarce, but it appears that the burials began to be arranged in ring clusters, which were thought to be indicative of family or lineage groups, sometimes

\(^{69}\) Whimster 1981: 156.
\(^{71}\) Urns were usually ceramic vessels, although presumably wealthier individuals have been found in bronze and iron bound wooden containers. Whimster 1981: 157.
centered around one central burial, and sometimes isolated within small rectangular enclosures. The later developed into formal cemeteries. So while cremation had appeared in Britannia by the time the Romans conquered it, its presence was the result of contact between the native people and the Romans, although the practice was slightly different than what would be found in Britain after the conquest.

**Romano-British Cremation Rites**

With the arrival of the Roman soldiers, the rite of cremation spread throughout Britannia. Even though the incoming Roman administrations, as well as the immigrant populations setting up colonies across the landscape, were ethnically and culturally diverse, they all practiced a similar cremation rite when they reached Britannia. It spread quickly beyond the southern limits of the pre-conquest rite and became common in all parts of Britannia where contact with Roman forts and towns allowed for continued exposure to Roman culture and influence. However, the rite was short-lived in Britannia since the mid-2nd century CE saw a movement back to inhumation which was adopted first in Italy and consequently throughout the Roman Empire.

In many ways, cremation remained similar to the pre-conquest rite. The bodies were burned on a pyre near, but not at, the final burial location. While there may have been some variation in the form of the pyres, they all required a stable base
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72 Whimster 1981: 156.
73 Philpott 1991: 7
74 For the most part this did not include the area of Wales or Scotland.
76 Pyre sites from Romano-British contexts are scarce because they were generally above ground, exposed to the elements and soil movements, and made of ephemeral materials and consequently not preserved well. Identification of pyre sites can be attained from excavation of ritual pyre deposits or “negative pyre related features” which were below the ground of the pyre, ie. post hole. Mckinley 2000: 38-39.
for the body and cremation furniture to rest on, for oxygen to flow around, and for the accommodation of enough fuel to allow thorough burning of the body.\textsuperscript{77} After the body was burnt, the ashes were collected and placed either in a vessel and then in the grave or directly in the ground without a container.\textsuperscript{78} These graves were increasingly incorporated into formal cemeteries opposed to the formerly isolated burials. The urns used were generally simple domestic jars, but other ceramic forms were occasionally used including beakers, flagons, and small jars.\textsuperscript{79} Grave goods were often included in the burial, similar to the Iron Age practice; they were usually ceramic vessels but could also include personal items of adornment and everyday use.\textsuperscript{80}

The degree of oxidation which the body needed to achieve to be considered completely cremated seems to have varied a great deal, even within the same cemetery. Full oxidation was not always required for burial, with cremation samples ranging in the degrees to which they were burnt.\textsuperscript{81} Additionally, the entire cremation was rarely collected for the interment, but a selection of bones and ash, usually somewhere between 40 and 60 percent, were actually deposited.\textsuperscript{82} The collection of bones generally seems to be random and probably has more to do with the fragmentation of the bones during the burning than anything else. A fair amount of the bone appears to have been left in the pyre debris, indicating that perhaps the

\textsuperscript{77} McKinley 2000: 38.
\textsuperscript{78} Such urns were usually ceramic vessels, but occasionally could have been made out of glass or word, with organic containers that have simply decomposed suggested by well preserved cremation burials (not extensively disturbed indicating it was once contained) found without any sort of container. Philpott 1991:7.
\textsuperscript{79} Philpott 1991:30.
\textsuperscript{80} The number of pottery vessels included in graves could reach fifty or more, although between one and three was standard. Additional items used as grave goods included brooches, bracelets, pins, finger rings, beads, mirrors, tweezers, shoes, coins, lamps, glass unguent phials, styli, belt buckles, knives, textiles, or weaving equipment. Philpott 1991: 8.
\textsuperscript{81} McKinley 2000: 39.
\textsuperscript{82} McKinley 2000: 41.
significant portion of the rite was the burning itself, not the burial of the resulting bone and ash.\textsuperscript{83} The transformation of the body was more important than the physical remains.

Within the context of more formal cemeteries, there are often grave like features which contain grave goods and pyre debris, but relatively little bone, if any. These were most likely cenotaphs, memorials for those who were dead but whose body was not present for the rite of cremation for whatever reason (ie. a soldier who died while on a campaign), or ritual deposits of the remaining pyre goods that were not included in the actual grave. An interesting note, which is demonstrated repeatedly in the cemeteries of Britannia, is that there appears not to have been as great of a concern with tomb marking as there was in Rome, where even the poorest graves would be expected to have simple markers, and the wealthy to have the most extravagant of the monumental types. For the most part in Britannia, there were neither. If the idea of spectacle was an issue in Britannia, it seems to have manifested itself quite differently than in Rome.

The three cemeteries in this study exhibit many of these general trends. Those three cemeteries are the King Harry Lane site in Hertfordshire near St. Albans, the Eastern Cemetery of Londinium, and the Roman cemetery at Westhampnett.

**Introduction to the Cemeteries**

*King Harry Lane*

King Harry Lane was a cemetery for the Roman city of Verulamium, one of the largest in Britannia, but the cemetery’s use actually spanned from the pre-Roman Iron Age through the early Romano-British period. Excavation there uncovered a

\textsuperscript{83} McKinley 2000: 42.
total of 455 cremation burials and 17 inhumation burials, accounting for most if not all of the burials in the cemetery. The chronology of the cemetery was divided into four phases by the excavators, from 1 CE through 160 CE, comprising of two pre-conquest and two post-conquest periods, with the greatest period of use during phase three, the time of the conquest and immediately following. However, the cemetery does not represent use by the larger Verulamium community, although it is one of the largest Romano-British cemeteries to be excavated [see image 2.1]. In all, the burials seem to span only two to three generations, most likely for a community of no more than 200 individuals. Most of the burials were of adults, though 24 were identified as less than 12 years of age, including three who died in their first 6 months.

The arrangement of King Harry Lane was very similar to the Iron Age burial arrangements of familial groups. There were seven major grave sites which were surrounded by smaller satellite graves, all encircled by ditch enclosures. These were termed ‘enclosure groups’ by the excavators. There were also three prominent graves with more minor burials grouped around it, but with no main enclosure structures. These were called ‘family groups.’ In both cases, it was thought that the individuals included in such groupings were most likely family or individuals closely related by social ties. The main burials of the family groups were also in line with some of the
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84 Stead and Rigby 1989: 80.
85 Stead and Rigby: 84. This is interesting because it implies that there must be at least one other cemetery site somewhere nearby. Until it is found, it cannot be claimed with any certainty that cremation was the dominant burial form for the people of Verulamium, only that there was a significant presence of the rite.
Image 2.1. Overview of phasing from the King Harry Lane Cemetery. Stead and Rigby 1989: 85.
central burials in the largest enclosure groups. The enclosures were arranged in two rows with a five meter corridor running in between them, and with more graves infringing on the corridor as time went on. Phase one was concentrated in four enclosure groups and two family groups, phase two added one more enclosure group, phase three added two more enclosures and one family group, and during phase four a Roman road was constructed across the middle of the cemetery. During all these phases, satellite burials continued to be added to the established groupings, and there was no apparent spatial separation in the cemetery for the cremation burials and the inhumations.

The Eastern Cemetery of Londinium

The eastern cemetery of Londinium was established at the end of the 1st century CE and its use continued into the 4th century, possibly even the 5th. Since 1983, rescue operations have worked to uncover at least 159 cremation burials and 575 inhumations [see image 2.2]. Large areas of the Roman deposits in this area had been disturbed and in some cases completely removed during activities carried out during medieval times. Consequently, there is evidence that several of the burials were at least partially destroyed, and other may have been removed completely. The level of preservation of the artifacts also varies across the site. Almost no organic material has survived, and the level of bone preservation varied from burial to burial as a result of the microenvironments of each
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88 Stead and Rigby 1989: 84.
89 Stead and Rigby 1989: 84.
90 Barber, Bowsher and Whittaker 1990: 2.
The Eastern Cemetery of Londinium was arranged slightly differently from King Harry Lane. There was little evidence of pre-Roman activity at the site as there
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91 Barber, Bowsher and Whittaker 1990: 2.
was at King Harry Lane, so its construction most likely began in the Roman period. Two pits produced some pieces of Bronze Age pottery, but little else was recovered. The site was typical of other Roman urban cemeteries as it sat beyond the city limits and is adjacent to one of the roads leading to and from the city. Apart from a single ditch positioned to the north, there was no evidence that boundaries were created to enclose the cemetery itself. However, a series of ditches were dug in the early Roman period that, along with the road positioned through the middle of the site, cut the cemetery up into delineated plots with most containing more than one burial.

Towards the beginning of the cemetery’s use burials were generally placed in the eastern end of the cemetery, utilizing more of the space in the western end, nearer to the city, during later periods of use. The burials at the eastern end tended to be cremation graves suggesting that this was the predominant rite at the beginning of the cemetery’s use, though inhumation did also occur. At the eastern end, there also tended to be more space in between the burials as opposed to the western side where the burials were much more cramped. Both cremation and inhumation continued to be practiced into the 3rd and 4th centuries, but inhumation rapidly became the preferred rite as it also did on mainland Europe during the same period. By the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th centuries, when the cemetery finally went out of use, inhumation was really the only rite.

The Roman Cemetery at Westhampnett

The cemetery at Westhampnett in the area of Chichester dated from the late 1st century through the 3rd century and was composed of entirely cremation graves, 36
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92 Barber, Bowsher and Whittaker 1990: 2.
93 Barber, Bowsher and Whittaker 1990: 4.
in total. It was located near an Iron Age cemetery, appeared to have shared a border with this cemetery, and comprised of a number of apparent pyre sites and 161 cremation graves. The cemetery is much smaller than the previous two cemeteries discussed, and is associated with a much smaller settlement than Verulamium or Londinium. There was also an Anglo Saxon cemetery made up of ten inhumation graves which were associated with 5th through 7th century artifacts. The date ranges of the Romano-British cemetery were divided by excavators based on pottery found within the site, and were categorized into four phases: pre-Flavian, mid 1st to mid 2nd century, early 2nd century, and 2nd to 3rd century [there was no plan of this cemetery provided by excavators, but a distribution map of ceramic types will give some idea of how the cemetery was arranged: see image 2.3].

The cemetery at Westhampnett measured approximately 25 meters east to west and 21 meters north to south making it substantially smaller than the other two cemeteries. The Iron Age cemetery appeared to be the central attribute of the site, with more pyre structures and more burials than either the Romano-British cemetery or the Anglo Saxon cemetery. The Romano-British cemetery was actually arranged around one of the features of this Iron Age cemetery, an undated ring structure, the importance of which has still not been determined. This ring structure was 6m in diameter, contained no other features, such as post holes or burials, and did not yield any finds. There did not appear to be the same level of organization as was found in the previous two cemeteries. Unlike at King Harry Lane and the Eastern
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94 Fitzpatrick and Powell 1997c: 240.
95 Fitzpatrick and Powell 1997c: 252.
Cemetery of Londinium, the cemetery at Westhampnett did not exhibit any kind of groupings in the burials, with the exception of some pairs of burials which were set away from the main grouping. The rest of the burials, the majority of the 36 cremations, were clustered around the ring enclosure. There also appears to be no distinction between the placements of burials from the different date ranges.\(^98\) They are all grouped together.

---

\(^{98}\) There are several possibilities for this. First, because there are so few graves, it is possible that the cemetery is made up of graves from a single family. The enclosure associated with burial 241 at King Harry Lane contained 47 associated burials, so it would not be out of the question for the entire cemetery to represent a single family. Another possibility is that this was an area where the cremation rite was never universally or near universally adopted, and that the cemetery therefore represented individual choices of the rite, thereby uniting the burials even if the individuals themselves were not related. Fitzpatrick and Powell 1997: 279.
An interesting feature of these three cemeteries that is not seen in the cemeteries from in the other provinces studied is that there were no stone or built masonry monuments associated with the burials. There were no monumental tombs for the elite burials and there were not any structures even resembling the *columbaria* that seem to have been such an important feature of the burials of certain non-elites in Rome. Yet, cremation was an intrusive practice that came from the Romans. One possible explanation for this discrepancy might be a simple lack of building materials or favorable conditions for such tomb structures. However, another implication might be that because this province was not as economically important as others, there was not as much of an emphasis on spectacle. If it was seen as of lesser importance to the good of the empire, there may have been fewer people passing through and less people developing such immense amounts of wealth. In Britannia, there were not just as many people to impress. Continuity to pre-conquest practice might have been another factor. Although the ritual practice was different, the end result resembled the pre-Roman landscape of the native people.

**The Cremations**

*King Harry Lane*

At King Harry Lane, the main burials within the ‘enclosure groups’ and the ‘family groups’ were all cremations. Seventeen inhumations were found in total, three in ditches, four within enclosures, and the remaining ten distributed randomly throughout the cemetery, most at least corresponding to the alignment of the enclosures. The inhumations were very badly preserved, with very few bones surviving. In only ten of these burials was it possible to distinguish the head from the
foot. Of these, five had the head pointing northwest, similar to the traditional Iron Age practice of inhumation where the body was positioned with the head to the north, while the remaining five burials had the head positioned to the south east. This seems to indicate that the community using this cemetery was more interested in keeping with the alignment of the main burials than with the pre-Roman traditions of body placement. This was a distinct shift from the Iron Age practices. The grave goods also displayed a shift from the Iron Age rite as these burials were limited to four pots in one grave and a copper alloy ring with glass beads in another. In Iron Age Britain, there was a greater emphasis on the inclusion of grave goods.

The majority of the cremations at King Harry Lane were in urns. Most of these graves were set in shallow trenches while the more elaborate burials tended to be dug a little deeper. Several of the burials had been covered by wooden boards, evidenced by black streaks and the marks of wood grains on the soil; there was no evidence that these wooden boards were ever part of a box or other type of container. A practice that has been observed in many of the more elaborate cremation burials during the Romano-British period was lining the graves with wood, stone, or baskets to form cists. Cists were differentiated from boxes as they did not have a base and usually had another primary vessel containing the remains of the individuals inside. The presence of a wooden plank above the cremations could have been a precursor to the practice of utilizing cists. Only one of the burials from

100 Stead and Rigby 1989: 81.
103 Philpott 1991: 7, 12.
King Harry Lane had a wooden board on the floor of the grave as well as over the burial, although there were no indications of vertical pieces of wood which would have made it a box, and another burial contained remains of what are thought to have been a basket.\textsuperscript{105} There was clearly an interest in somehow protecting the remains with the use of urns and such cists, similar to tombs but without the spectacle.

While most of the cremations from King Harry Lane were urned, a lack of urn was not indicative of a difference in socio-economic class. While many of the simplest burials lacked any sort of container, the same was true for many of the elaborate burials. Only about a third of the graves from the site had any sort of accessory vessels besides the urns included in the burial, similar to the sparsely furnished inhumations, although the central burials from the “enclosure” and “family” groups tended to be very richly furnished.\textsuperscript{106} Besides a large amount of ceramic vessels, the largest group of artifacts represented from the burials were brooches (273), followed by knives (15), mirrors (6) and a few other toiletry instruments.\textsuperscript{107} Otherwise, no single artifact type was found in more than three graves.\textsuperscript{108} It is interesting that no weapons were found. However, the large amounts of artifacts included with the burials are more similar to the Iron Age burials rather than the burials in Rome.

\textsuperscript{105} Stead and Rigby 1989: 81, 83.
\textsuperscript{106} Burials 9, 241, 325, and 346 were among the richest burials in the entire site. Burial 41 had been robbed and burial 272 was the only burial on the site with a complete amphora. Burial 148 surprisingly lacked the same level of furnishing as the other central burials. Of the remaining richly furnished graves not within the enclosures, two were located together in the central corridor between two of the enclosures. Stead and Rigby 1989:81.
\textsuperscript{107} Stead and Rigby 1989: 83.
\textsuperscript{108} Some of the miscellaneous items found in the burials were three bracelets, copper handles, copper alloy spoons, two pairs of iron shears, two hammer heads, needles, discs, keys, bone belt with an iron buckle, bone pegs, game pieces, dice, spindle whorls, copper alloy hinges, nails, and other copper alloy fragments. Stead and Rigby 1989: 102-111.
Eastern Cemetery of Londinium

As at King Harry Lane, the burials in the eastern Cemetery of Londinium appeared to be arranged in groups based on shared burial rites; it is also possible that these could have represented family associations.\textsuperscript{109} The cremated remains were recovered from five different types of contexts: possible \textit{in situ} burning and burial, urned deposits, unurned deposits, pyre deposits, and cremation backfill. The pyre deposits and cremation backfill were presumably the leftovers of the cremation collection, both ritually and randomly discarded. The containers for the urned deposits were divided into two categories: primary containers, in which the cremations were actually interred, and the secondary enclosures in which the primary were placed. While the primary containers were generally ceramic, the secondary containers were ceramic vessels, tile cists or enclosures made of organic materials, for example wooden boxes. The use of such secondary vessels to house the primary urn is a practice which is not seen at King Harry Lane, but appears to be reminiscent of the wooden cists which were found there and seem to replace tomb structures in Britannia.

70 of the ceramic vessels recovered were used as primary cremation containers, urns, representing about 67 percent of the cremations.\textsuperscript{110} It is possible that some of the other cremations were placed within organic containers for which there is no longer evidence. Wood stains on the surrounding soil as well as patterns of nails indicate wooden boxes were being used as secondary containers, again, even though

\textsuperscript{109} Barber, Bowsher and Whittaker 1990: 4.
\textsuperscript{110} Barber and Bowsher 2000: 106.
no actual pieces of wood were recovered. In two cases, the primary urn was found inside a mortared cist. However, the most common secondary container used was an amphora, either completely covered in the burial or recessed with the lip remaining above ground. This physical link would have allowed access to the burial for the ritual feasts of remembrance similar to those performed in Rome, as offerings could be directly deposited into the burial. In many cases both the primary and the secondary containers had lids to protect the interred items. Only 16 of the burials had any unburnt non-ceramic grave goods associated with them, and only seven had ceramic vessels other than the enclosure vessels, a marked difference from King Harry Lane where a larger proportion of burials at least multiple ceramic vessels in the grave. Of the total 159 cremation burials, only 33 had burial goods of any kind. This could indicate that there was a shift from King Harry Lane to the eastern cemetery in value and emphasis from the remains and their physical state to the action of the ritual.

Roman Cemetery at Westhampnett

Like the other two cemeteries, the cemetery at Westhampnett contained both urned and unurned burials accompanied by up to eight accessory pottery vessels and occasionally other objects such as wooden caskets or boxes. It is also possible that
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111 Barber and Bowsher 2000: 106.
112 Barber and Bowsher 2000: 107.
113 Barber and Bowsher 2000: 108.
114 There is also evidence of memorial structures being placed over both cremation and inhumation graves, varying from four post wooden constructions over cremations to monuments requiring flint and mortar foundations over some of the inhumations. These are aspects that are not present at either of the other cemeteries but is similar to the practices in Rome. Barber, Bowsher and Whittaker 1990: 9
115 These grave goods included amphorae, coins, a mirror, a lamp, a stylus, hairpins, a pewter plate, and a prehistoric flint blade. Barber and Bowsher 2000: 109.
116 The cremated remains were placed in some sort of container in 24 of the graves. Fitzpatrick and Powell 1997c: 242.
some of the remains were deposited in organic containers for which there is no longer any evidence, as at the previous two cemeteries. However, unlike at King Harry Lane and the Eastern Cemetery of Londinium, there is no evidence in elaboration of the burial through grave linings, as at King Harry Lane, or secondary urn containers, as at the Eastern Cemetery of Londinium. As stated in the first chapter, it was common in Roman times to create some sort of tomb or other structure for a cremation, even if it was only lining the grave with stone, tile, or wood. This was not a practice at Westhampnett and would seem to indicate less Roman influence over the practice of cremation than at the other two cemeteries.

This lack of burial structure could represent either a distinct choice to practice the more traditional Iron Age form of the burial rite (even though this was already an intrusive right from the Romans) or it could represent a distinct choice to resist or compromise Roman influence in a way by altering a long standing Roman practice. A third possibility is that the community represented in this cemetery was not as wealthy as the communities feeding into the other two cemeteries, as it was more rural, and therefore was not able to put the same expense into their burials as the communities at Londinium or Verulamium. A final possibility is that because this community was outside the main centers, it did not have the same amount of contact with the Romans, and therefore the practices of the Westhampnett cemetery remained largely unaltered from the first introduction of the burial rite. These possibilities will be looked at in greater detail later.
114 complete or partial ceramic vessels were recovered from 36 of the 37 graves at the cemetery at Westhampnett.\textsuperscript{117} A total of 183 pieces of metal came from the Romano-British context, with the majority of objects, 149, found within 9 out of the 37 graves.\textsuperscript{118} Of these metal objects, there was not a great variety found. There was one mirror, two wooden boxes or caskets with metal fittings, and the rest of the objects were nails, most likely from the pyre itself. The lack of accessory objects outside of ceramic vessels could support the idea that the community associated with this cemetery was not as wealthy, although the eastern cemetery also had relatively few accessory goods in the graves. This is interesting as the inclusion of burial goods was important to the Iron Age Britons and was generally a feature of both their cremations and inhumations, while it was also an aspect of the Roman rite but to a lesser extent. It seems more likely that these two cases could be representative of a shift in the practice, from the Iron Age emphasis on the remains to a stronger and more ‘Roman’ emphasis on the actual ritual.

This shift may also be represented in the actual amounts of cremation that were collected for the burial. The average adult will yield about 1625.9g of cremation under the conditions with which the Romans were using for cremation, while tests showed the variation to be from 1001.5g to 2422.5g based on the age, gender, and size of the individual.\textsuperscript{119} At King Harry Lane, none of the cremation weights collected were greater than 2250g, although twelve were within the range of 1500g to 2250g. 105 of the cremation weights were less than 250g with the remaining burials falling in

\textsuperscript{117} One of these graves was not a cremation burial but rather a ritual memorial deposit of debris. Fitzpatrick and Powell 1997c: 255.
\textsuperscript{118} Fitzpatrick and Powell 1997c: 256.
\textsuperscript{119} McKinley 1993: 4.
between the two.120 The remaining two cemeteries show similar variation, with a maximum cremation weight of 1948.2g and a minimum of 2.2g at the Eastern Cemetery of Londinium,121 and a maximum of 618.3g and minimum of 1.1g from the cemetery at Westhampnett.122

Because the lower figures at each of these cemeteries are the result of disturbances such as ploughing and other farming activities, according to excavators, only the maximum figures, representing largely undisturbed burials, can be used here. There was often variation in the relative ‘completeness’ of Romano-British cremation burials indicating that the collection of the full body was not necessary or an important part of the cremation ritual. It also appears to have not mattered which bones were collected for the burial as some may have become too brittle or fragmentary in the process of cremation to make accurate collection feasible.123 However, the differences between the three cemeteries here are still interesting.

King Harry Lane was the oldest of the cemeteries studied, spanning from the Iron Age through the early Romano-British era and it therefore had certain characteristics that were unique. For example, it had the highest cremation weights, with four of the burials weighing in at over 2000g.124 The Eastern Cemetery of Londinium’s maximum cremation weight was close at 1948.2g falling within the range of a complete cremation based on variation in age, gender, and individual size.
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120 Stead and Rigby 1989: 240.
121 The minimum figure is most likely a result of disturbance during medieval times.
122 At the cemetery at Westhampnett, of the 37 graves identified, only 30 actually contained bones and cremated remains. The rest appear to have been memorial deposits. Of those 30, only 4 were undisturbed burials. The burial from which the maximum figure was attained was an urned undisturbed adult burial, while the burial from which the minimum figure was attained was an unurned disturbed immature burial. Fitzpatrick and Powell 1997c: 250.
123 McKinley 2000: 41.
The maximum from the cemetery at Westhampnett is very different. At 618.3g, it is nearly a quarter of the weight of the maximums at King Harry Lane and the eastern cemetery of Londiniumium, and comes from an undisturbed adult burial. While all the cemeteries were disturbed enough to one degree or another, making it difficult to draw any definite patterns, this discrepancy may be an indication that while at King Harry Lane and the eastern cemetery of Londiniumium there was more of an attempt to collect the full body, at the cemetery at Westhampnett there was not even a concern to collect the majority of the remains. This could also be representative of an ideological shift, where the body itself and the physical remains had little to do with the ritual of the cremation rite, and therefore did not have to be complete or representative of the individual.

While this would definitely signal a change from the pre-conquest rite as evidenced by King Harry Lane, the question remains as to whether or not it is an indication of a higher degree of acclimation to the Roman rites which could indicate a continuation of cultural exchange or simple regional variation. One indication of Roman influence might be that, as seen in the previous chapter, cremation was used throughout the Rome as a unifying practice, indicating that the group and the group identity was more important than the individual.\textsuperscript{125} A growing disinterest in the physical remains could signal a growing importance of the ritual instead and identity through a common group practice.

Emphasizing the sense that it was the ritual of cremation that was more important than the actual burial was the treatment of the pyre and the pyre debris. At King Harry Lane there were no pyre sites recovered although both pyre offerings and

\textsuperscript{125} Morris 1992: 46.
pyre debris were found in cremations in the main burial groups suggesting that the pyre was a significant aspect of the rite. At the eastern cemetery of Londiniumium, there was only one definitive pyre site, but sixteen contexts in which pyre debris was found. At the cemetery of Westhampnett, there was also only a single pyre site that could be conclusively dated to Roman times; there were other pyre sites around the Romano-British segment of the site, but they could not be dated to Roman times, and were more likely used more for the nearby Iron Age cemetery. There was also one small area of cremated bone that may have been a pyre feature. Although there was no evidence that could be used for conclusive dating, this feature did seem to fall within the boundaries of the Roman cemetery, unlike the other pyre related features. The pyre features tended to be shallow oval pits containing pieces of charcoal, cremated bone, nails, burnt sherds of ceramic pottery, sherds of molten glass and other artifacts. These make them very hard to identify. Because the pits are so shallow, they are easily disturbed and the ephemeral nature of charcoal and other organic material makes them very delicate. In the case of these cemeteries, there were most likely more pyre sites which were not preserved. Ritual deposits of pyre goods also indicate the presence of and use or pyres, as well as their importance within the ritual.

Conclusions

With the arrival of the Roman conquerors, the practice of cremation that had initially reached the south-east of Britannia spread to the larger areas of the Roman
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126 Niblett 2004: 34
127 Pyre debris consisted of charcoal, cremated bone, charred seeds, remnants of fuel, ash slag and both burnt and unburnt artifacts. Barber 2000: 63.
128 McKinley 1997: 244.
129 McKinley 1997: 244.
province. There were many similarities in the cremation practices of the various
cemeteries. The majority of the cremations seemed to take place at pyre sites around
the edges of the cemetery. After the initial burning, the remains and pyre goods were
collected, seemingly not systematically, interred in an urn, and placed within a grave.
However, there were also many characteristic differences.

They layout of the burials is one of these characteristics. King Harry Lane
and, to a lesser degree, the very early stages of the Eastern Cemetery of Londinium,
exhibited a very purposeful arrangement of the burials into groups of individual
burials through enclosure ditches and delineated plots. This was not apparent in the
later stages of the Eastern Cemetery of Londinium or the cemetery at Westhampnett.
There are several explanations for this. As the Romans began forming the shape of
cities and surrounding areas, the idea of cemetery boundaries may have been
reinforced and separated family groupings may have been impossible due to
crowding issues. Additionally, there was no apparent commonality to the structures
that burials were placed in, whether cists or some other type of secondary enclosure,
or nothing at all. This might be more of a reflection on the type of settlement
associated with the burial more than a conscious development; the two larger city
cemeteries did tend to exhibit some sort of internal grave structure while the smaller
of the cemeteries did not. Likewise, there were varying degrees concerning how many
grave goods were included with the burials and the amount of bone and cremated
remains collected for the burial.

These difference may have derived from a shift in ideology from away the
more physical concerns of the Iron Age burial practices, both cremation and
inhumation, to focus more on the ritual itself. During the Iron Age, burial practices emphasized the body, from the position within the grave, the inclusion of grave goods, and through the physical arrangements of the bodies in the cemeteries. These practices were gradually discarded during Roman times.

This points to the adoption of something similar to the Roman rite where the individual was de-emphasized through a unifying rite of cremation where the body was completely disarticulated and was no longer treated as a complete individual. However, there were still many differences, most notably that many of the cremations were not provided with built tomb structures. This, along with the previously mentioned variations, can be used to recreate the idea of a new culture as introduced by Woolf, one where ‘being Roman’ was displayed through ritual rather than commemoration. As stated before, Britannia was not as politically or economically as important as some of the other provinces within the Roman Empire; there were fewer natural resources and it was isolated, out of the way of the major trade routes. Therefore, the inhabitants may have felt less of a pressure to display the same markers of spectacle and ‘being Roman’ than in other provinces which were seen as more important. They adopted the practice, but not the physical markers of it. The funerary landscape therefore remained more similar to that of pre-conquest Britannia.
Chapter Three: The Evidence from Africa Proconsularis

Introduction

The province of Africa Proconsularis marked the most southern border of the Roman Empire. This region had a much different pre-conquest history from Britannia because it had an adversarial and violent relationship with Rome culminating in the Punic Wars. This created a complex context for the exchange of cultural information and influence in the area since Rome really only destroyed one of the Punic cities, Carthage, the capital of the Carthaginian Empire. The other cities were left standing and were forced to transition from Punic to Roman port cities. The cemetery sites chosen represent three separate areas along the coastline of modern Tunisia, all of which had been cities during the Punic periods and which became important centers in the Roman period. Even though the cities were not that spatially distant, they still displayed regional variation in cremation practice to a greater extent than in Britannia. The most similar of the sites in terms of their practices, Leptiminus and Pupput, were Punic cities that became Roman cities while Roman Carthage was completely rebuilt by the Romans and re-established as a city years after its Punic
predecessor was leveled to the ground. Therefore, the layout and architecture of Carthage would have been entirely Roman and the population would have been substantially more Roman as new populations would have been needed to inhabit it. Therefore, the initial landscapes of these cities were most likely different. This might account for some of the difference.

As stated before, the variations in the scholarly traditions of the different regions made research for this section slightly more challenging. It has been pointed out by previous scholars that periodicals focusing on this area have not been systematically or routinely published, and there is a backlog of information.\textsuperscript{130} Areas where preliminary excavation reports have been published, such as the Yasmina Necropolis where excavation was completed in the mid 1990s, have not seen complete excavation reports published, and there is not much information on planned cemeteries, or cremation, in the area anyway.\textsuperscript{131} However, it is an important province to look at because of its economic importance within the Empire and its political infrastructure.

**North African Occupation**

North Africa was subject to colonial expansion and urbanization for hundreds of years before the Romans arrived. The native peoples were subjected to varying amounts of contact and cultural exchange between themselves and the Phoenicians, Greeks and finally Romans. Consequently, there was little in the way of a distinct ‘native’ culture as found in the relatively isolated Britannia.\textsuperscript{132} It was more of a

\textsuperscript{130} Mattingly and Hitchner 1995: 167.
\textsuperscript{131} Part of this may be because many modern cities have been built over the ancient cities and expanded, so that the cemeteries are not completely covered.
\textsuperscript{132} Relatively because there was pre-existing contact with Gauls and Roman traders.
conglomeration of the cultures of the various previous world powers. However, the occupation of North Africa was restricted to the coastal areas, which had the most contact with nearby regions. The interiors were left largely undisturbed and benefited from trade relations with the established coastal cities. Therefore, unlike in Britannia or some of the other colonies where the Romans sought to acquire as much land as possible, Roman influence in North Africa really only extended to the established cities and their neighboring villas. There was no drive to conquer all the indigenous people or to move farther into the interior. The same was true in the time of the Phoenicians and Greeks, and therefore the burial practices of the native people varied depending on which area of the province they were living in. This study will focus on the areas of the greatest foreign influence, the coastal areas.

Carthage was the most powerful city settled in North Africa. Established in the 8th century BCE, there were many myths surrounding the foundation of the city, but however started, the first Phoenicians there were merely following the expansionist example of their fellow countrymen. By this period, Utica in the northwest and Gades in Spain were already Phoenician settlements. Initially, there seems to have been little in the African landscape itself that would have attracted the Phoenicians to set up such an extensive city. In fact, the environment was dangerous and hostile, with foreign wild animals and native tribes reluctant to submit themselves or their lands to foreigners. However Carthage, like Utica and Gades,

---

133 In the 3rd century CE the Greek historian Timaeus wrote that Carthage had been founded 38 years before the 1st Olympiad, around 814 BCE, but the Phoenician princess Elissa (Dido in some traditions) who left Tyre when her husband was murdered by her brother Pygmalion. Raven 2002:8.
134 There were vast beds of murex, whose shells provided the Phoenicians with the purple dye they were so famous for. Raven: 2002: 9.
was along the sea route to Spain where the Phoenicians traded for tin and silver. These settlements and others like them formed a chain which provided way stations and refuges for the ships, and later as bases for protecting the sea routes from the Greeks.

By the 6th century BCE Carthage was the largest of the Phoenician colonies and had begun to found its own satellite colonies. They had established trade routes with the interior and were actively participating in trade with the Berbers, although it seems apparent from what few texts there are left from Punic Carthage and the writing of Greek authors, very little was known at this time about the interior.136 However, the Greeks were becoming a naval strength and challenging the Phoenicians for control over maritime trade routes. The Greeks were eventually replaced by the Romans, who had previously been allies of Carthage through the Etruscans, as the main competitor for trade supremacy. The conflicting interests and tensions came to a head in 264 BCE with the First Punic War when the Romans attempted to expand into Carthage-controlled Sicily and some of the Berber tribes that had been allied with Carthage switched allegiances and began to support Rome.137 By the end of the Third Punic War in 146 BCE, the Romans had taken over the entire Carthaginian Empire in the western Mediterranean and completely razed the city of Carthage itself. Utica, which had been part of the Carthaginian Empire but which had surrendered to and eventually allied with the Romans, was made the capital of the new province. This was the first Roman city in North Africa.

---

136 Raven 2002:45.
137 Phillipson 2005: 219
Political annexation of the rest of North Africa by the Romans was slow at first. Caesar was the first to take responsibility for the creation of Roman settlements in Africa, and his initial project was to rebuild Carthage near the site of the destroyed Punic city which by that time had been deserted for nearly one hundred years. This new Carthage quickly became one of the largest cities in the western half of the Roman Empire. Augustus continued the development of the area to settle large numbers of soldiers who had been used in the battles against Antony and Cleopatra, but who were no longer needed in the imperial army.\textsuperscript{138}

The peak of the Roman presence in North Africa was the 2nd century CE when other major cities were built beyond the Tunisian coast, such as Timgad in eastern Algeria.\textsuperscript{139} There was also a substantial increase in the construction of public buildings, roads, aqueducts, irrigation networks, agricultural developments and other technologies associated with the Roman World. As a consequence, the area, especially around Roman Carthage, became the ‘breadbasket’ of the empire and an economic force, not to mention one of the few provinces with a fully developed Roman political infrastructure.\textsuperscript{140} However, Roman North Africa was not immune to the fall of the greater Roman Empire the way it had been when the Phoenician Empire had slowly pulled out of the area, allowing Carthage to become its own Empire. In the 3rd though the 4th centuries CE, Berber uprisings led to a reduction of the Roman presence in North Africa and its cultural influence. In 429 CE the Vandals crossed over into North Africa from Spain, and Carthage fell six years later.\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{138} Raven 1993: 56.
\textsuperscript{139} Phillipson 2005: 219-220.
\textsuperscript{140} Phillipson 2005: 219.
\textsuperscript{141} Phillipson 2005: 220.
Pre-Roman Burial Practices

The funerary practices of pre-Roman North Africa were a homogenous mix of influences from the east and the west, vestiges of the previous empires. The predecessors of the Phoenicians practiced inhumation in rock-cut tombs or simple dolman style megalithic tombs.142 These tombs occasionally had burial furniture, such as a funerary bed, and were characterized by sculpted and painted decoration.

The Phoenician and Punic peoples also practiced inhumation but in shaft tombs.143 Within this category, there are two different traditions. The first group of tombs, constructed by the Phoenician settlers, was similar in form to those found in the Eastern Mediterranean area, and are simple shaft graves, sometime with a lateral chamber cut at the bottom. The second group of tombs was constructed by native peoples with the influence of Phoenician culture. These were similar structures, but with differences in size, shape, accessibility, and accompanying grave goods. In the pre-Roman period, all three burial practices were still being used, including the pre-Phoenician rite, through some survived longer into the Roman period than others. This could have been dependant on both the origins of the rites and the people.144

Phoenicio-Punic tombs were by and large subterranean with access to the burial chamber being provided by a descending shaft. In the Phoenician tombs, descent was provided by foot holds cut into the shaft whereas in the Punic tombs, where there was more regional variation relating to the depth of the tomb, there was

---

142 Ben Younes 2007: 32-34.
143 These tombs are mainly found in the coastal areas and are much more rare moving into the interior of Northern Africa.
144 While there is debate as to which structure was used first, the megalithic tomb or the rock-cut tomb, it is known that the megalith survived longer into the Roman period. The Phoenicio-Punic traditions were carried on through the 1st century BCE before giving way to the more standardized Roman practices. However, diversity in tomb architecture and style continued to a lesser extent in Roman North Africa. Ben Younes 2007: 36.
generally a staircase to provide access. Both the Phoenician and Punic tombs were usually single roomed, although there were rare instances of multi-roomed chambers. In the Punic tradition, there is also evidence of multiple people being buried in the same tomb, either on one large funeral bed or on two individual beds.145 The Punic traditions also exhibited more varied burial furnishings including a funeral bed, sometimes with either a pillow or mattress, benches, sculpted sarcophagi and plain sarcophagi. These carved features were generally absent in the Phoenician tombs, where plain sarcophagi are usually the only furnishings found.146 A final difference between the two is that in the Punic traditions, there were painted architectural elements on the walls and ceilings, usually in red and sometimes with blue. There was also some figurative decoration. This does not appear in the tombs within strictly Phoenician contexts.147

There are also similarities between the rock-cut tombs, usually on a hillside or cliff face, and the Punic style tombs which would seem to indicate a blending of the rock-cut form with the Phoenician shaft tombs to create a new tradition. The shapes of the chambers in both the rock-cut tombs and the Punic style tombs are similar, with both rectangular chambers and chambers with domed roofs. There are also similar furnishings found within the rock-cut chambers, including low-lying beds. Finally, the painted elements of these tombs are similar to those found in Punic tombs, and provide another link between the two traditions. As in the Punic shaft tombs, the rock-cut chambers utilize similar painted architectural motifs. Of note for the pre-

145 Ben Younes 2007: 38.
146 Ben Younes 2007: 38.
147 Bénichou-Safar 1982: 114.
Roman tombs in North Africa is that they were mostly underground with limited marking on the ground above.

**Burial Traditions in Roman North Africa**

The general burial trend associated with the Roman occupation of Northern Africa is the shift from inhumation to cremation in the late 1st century BCE through the early 1st century CE and back to inhumation in the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE.\(^{148}\) However, vestiges of the earlier Punic rituals remained. In the Punic cities such as Carthage, wealthy citizens had displayed their power through the construction of large tower mausoleums within the vicinity of the habitation areas of the city so they would be visible and on display to everyone in the city.\(^{149}\) This Hellenisitic quality was also being used by the Romans at the time to create competition in the display of wealth through tomb architecture both in Rome and Africa Proconsularis. This practice appears to have carried over into the earlier periods of the Roman cremation rite, as will be seen in the Yasmina Necropolis of Roman Carthage. In Rome, as elsewhere, the use of monuments as spectacles became popular displays of wealth, influence and identity. They were elaborate performances bred in a culture of competition. In Roman North Africa, funerary monuments seem to have also preformed this function and consequently there seems to have been a higher incidence of grave markers, even with the cremation rite which in Britannia had left few if any above ground visual markers.

In North Africa, while large stone mausoleums are found in association with some cremation burials, the most common type of tomb or grave marker was the

\(^{148}\) Stone and Stirling: 17.  
\(^{149}\) Stone and Stirling: 15.
The *cupula* was a long rectangular structure, similar to a sarcophagus, with a larger rounded ‘headstone’ on one side. The remains of the individual were then either placed within this monument or below in. *Cupula* are found mainly in North Africa, and are seen marking both cremations *in situ* and inhumation graves. In *in situ* burials, where the body was placed in a long shallow grave, burned and then buried, are often found to predate off-site cremations where the remains were collected after they had been burned on a pyre and deposited in the ground in an urn. It has been speculated that the *in situ* burials actually represent an intermediate phase between inhumation and cremation as the people adapted and became used to the new rite. They were leaving room for the body as a whole even though they were also physically destroying it. The boundaries of the *cupula* structures closely follow the extent of the pits used for the cremation instead of consolidating the remains or trying to save space. What finally may have forced the inhabitants of North Africa to practice pyre cremation and deposition in urns, more similar to the way cremation was practiced on the Italian peninsula, may have been overcrowding in the cemeteries and the need to use space wisely. In all the cemeteries discussed in this study, there were often burials abutting and cutting into each other, if not layered on top of each other.

These funerary monuments not only asserted ownership, but served as a focus of ritual behaviors associated with the rite. And they were significant because they
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150 Sterling : 110.
151 *Cupulae* tombs have also been identified in Spain, Italy and Sicily, but not in the numbers that are found in North Africa. Sterling : 110.
represented a shift from below ground burials to above ground, where everyone would be able to see. But this shift to above ground was not just for the wealthiest burials. It also became a feature for lower class burials and was a trait of most of the burials in the cemeteries studied, and a distinct difference from Britannia.

**Introduction to the Cemeteries**

*Leptiminus*

The ancient Roman port city of Leptiminus (Lepti Minus and Leptis Minore), located on the east coast of modern Tunisia is one of a string of port cities the Romans founded on the Mediterranean coast. It had already been established as a Punic city, but very little is known about this period in its history.\(^{155}\) The city rose in prominence during the Roman period, receiving a mint from Augustus and the rank of *colonia* under Trajan. The citizens of Leptiminus were claimed to have belonged to four of the Roman tribes (voting groups), the Palatina, Claudia, Quirina, and Papiria. Those belonging to the Palatina and Claudia tribes were most likely descendants of the original Roman settlers who moved there upon the foundation of the Roman city in the 1st century BCE.\(^{156}\) There are not many remains that survived above ground, and consequently there have not been many archaeological investigations carried out at the site. Some of the areas that have been excavated include the amphitheatre and a series of cemeteries dating from the Punic period through the Christian era, including the Roman period.

The cemeteries of Leptiminus were badly damaged by pillagers and in some cases the contents of the burials were completely robbed and destroyed. This looting

\(^{155}\) Ben Lazreg and Mattingly 1992: 60.

\(^{156}\) Ben Lazreg and Mattingly 1992: 61.
was particularly intense in the period after the systematic excavations of the late 19th and early 20th century. The largest necropolis excavated at Leptiminus was a reused cemetery of Punic origin just to the south of the amphitheatre excavated at the end of the 19th century [see image 3.1]. This cemetery has been looted many times over but is still valuable to the understanding of the site since there were several layers of tombs placed on top of each other attesting to the multiple phases of use. It is even possible that the cemetery was in use without interruption through the 3rd and 4th centuries. There were four discernable layers: a Punic necropolis on the bottom, then two layers of burials from the pagan Roman period and a final layer from the Christian period. The lowest phase of tombs consists of a series of shaft tombs with a rectangular burial chamber and a shaft with a stairway allowing access. This would correspond to common Punic burial practices. Several of the chambers excavated were still intact, and in general the inhumed body was positioned towards the north.

Within the final three phases, the majority of the burials were cremations. There were some inhumation burials, but they were primarily located in phase one and three, representing the earliest and the latest phases of cemetery use. The lowest phase was the transition from the Punic inhumation rite to the Roman cremation rite, and the phase closest to the surface was the transition from cremation to the late Roman inhumation rite, although it is also apparent that cremation and inhumation were being practiced side by side in the cemetery. Most of these graves,

---

158 Ben Lazreg and Mattingly 1992: 56.
159 The published accounts of the excavation of this cemetery categorize the Roman periods into three phases the lowest two phases, the Pagan phases, as 3 and 2, and the topmost phase as 1. Hannezo et al. 1897: 289-300.
160 Hannezo et al. 1897: 289-300.
both cremation and inhumation, were equipped with some sort of funerary furniture.

While there were various objects in each layer, the second layer, which was comprised of predominantly cremation burials, on average had fewer items of funerary furniture but more ceramic vessels of a finer quality.\(^{161}\)

More recent excavations at the site have been conducted at a 3\(^{rd}\) and 4\(^{th}\) century necropolis to the east of the main section of the city and the Punic/Roman cemetery [see image 3.2]. The project was set up as a rescue excavation before the government constructed a new sports field at the site. A number of trenches were cut, and the information therefore represents a sample of archaeological remains present, not the complete contents of the cemetery. Most of the burials in this cemetery were

\(^{161}\) Common items of funerary furniture included lamps, ceramic, glass and metal vessels, cookware, coins, some statuettes, and a pair of hair pins. Hannezo et al. 1897: 289-300.
inhumations, which is to expected because of its later date, but there were some interspersed cremation burials, and it may be assumed that had the necropolis site been fully excavated, there would have been more, indicative of the combined practice of cremation and inhumation found at the Punic/Roman cemetery.

Because the cemetery was excavated by means of a series of trenches, the full layout of the cemetery remains unclear. There were actually two distinct cemeteries in the area, bisected by an aqueduct, designated site 8 on the south side of the aqueduct and site 10 on the north side. As site 10 was in the most immediate danger

Image 3.2. Overview of the Roman Cemetery at Leptiminus, indicating where trenches were cut. Mattingly, Pollard and Ben Lazreg 2002: 108.
from the current construction projects, it was excavated and recorded to a greater
degree than site 8. At minimum, the boundaries for the Roman cemetery site 10 were
50m north by south and 50m east by west.\textsuperscript{162} The evidence also shows that within the
period of the cemeteries’ use, there was intense activity, and that crowding may have
been an issue. Various burials were placed at the borders of others and in some cases,
they cut into each other. Nearly all of the burials excavated at the site were
inhumations, but there were some notable examples of the cremation funerary rite.

\textit{Pupput}

The second site is the necropolis of the ancient city Pupput (Hammamet) excava
ted by a French team from 1995 to 1999. Pupput was located about 70 km to
the southeast of Roman Carthage. During their several campaigns, researchers did
not excavate the entire cemetery, but they uncovered several hundred burials, most of

\begin{figure}[h]
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image3.3}
\caption{Photograph of surface of cemetery. Ben Abed and Griesheimer 2004b: 8.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{162} Ben Lazreg, Matingly and Stirling 1992: 306.
which were cremations. The cemetery was about 300m from the ancient city, and covered at least 15000m², but sporadic finds outside of this zone indicate that the cemetery may have been larger, up to seven hectares [there were no plan drawings of the overall site, but detailed photographs provides insight into the layout; see image 3.3]. Of this area, only about 5000m² were actually excavated, but this area had a high concentration of burials. The burials in this cemetery were grouped together and separated by a series of about 70 enclosures. Each of these enclosures marked off an area of between 17 and 156m², with walls of varying heights and levels of preservation. The oldest finds from the necropolis at Pupput date from about the late 1st or early 2nd centuries CE and use of the cemetery continued into the 3rd century CE.

**Yasmina**

The third site is a necropolis of Roman Carthage called the Yasmina Necropolis for the suburb of present-day Carthage in which the cemetery is now located. It was discovered in 1981 when a bulldozer constructing a road uncovered a 3rd century marble statue of a charioteer. From 1992 through 1997, an American team excavated only a portion of the cemetery, exposing burials that spanned nearly the entire period of the occupation of Roman Carthage, from the late 1st century CE through the end of the 6th century CE [see image 3.4]. Although other cemeteries

---

164 Ben Abed and Griesheimer 2004a: 1.
165 Farming activities in the area has reduced most of the walls to their foundation levels. Ben Abed and Griesheimer 2004b: 6.
166 Norman 2002: 303.
have been uncovered at Carthage from other time periods, the Yasmina Necropolis represents the longest period of continuous use at a Carthage cemetery.\textsuperscript{167}

While there was expansion of the cemetery in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century, after the rite of inhumation had replaced cremation as the predominant rite, there was also an increasingly high density of graves indicating that crowding was a problem as well. From the foundation of the cemetery through the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century, all of the burials seem to have been cremations, and it appears that many different segments of society were

\textsuperscript{167} Norman 2002: 304.
represented at the site.\textsuperscript{168} The predominant features of the site that have been excavated so far surround a 3\textsuperscript{rd} century ashlar tomb, which was likely for an inhumation, and six stucco tombs to the north from the late 1\textsuperscript{st} and early 2\textsuperscript{nd} centuries CE which originally contained cremations.

**The Cremations**

*Leptiminus*

In Leptiminus, at what has been designated site 10, there were two, possibly three cremation burials. One presumed cremation was indicated by sandy charcoal layer that spread to less than one meter and was thought to represent the top layer of an earlier cremation burial.\textsuperscript{169} However, this area was not excavated so it is still of questionable status.

There was also evidence of a disturbed cremation burial inside a barrel vaulted tomb. This represented one of the larger structures at the site, and was most likely a *cupula* tomb.\textsuperscript{170} The mortared rubble was faced with a fine stucco, though the structure had largely been reduced to base level.\textsuperscript{171} The burial chamber was lined by tiles and the roof of the tomb had been broken and the topmost layer of the fill was an ashy layer containing pieces of charcoal, burned pine nut shells indicating the presence of pine cones as fuel for the pyre, burned human bone and some metal fragments, possibly nails from the funeral pyre.\textsuperscript{172} It appears that the cremation was deposited directly onto the ground level without any urn after being burned at a

---

\textsuperscript{168} Norman 1994: 11.

\textsuperscript{169} This burial (72) was located in trench 1 of site 10. Mattingly, Stirling, and Ben Lazreg 1992: 201.

\textsuperscript{170} This burial (425) was located in trench 9 of site 10. Ben Lazreg, Mattingly, and Stirling 1992: 308.

\textsuperscript{171} Mattingly, Pollard and Ben Lazreg 2001: 126.

\textsuperscript{172} This layer was the only burial found in the tomb, and was partially disturbed during the course of the excavation. Mattingly, Pollard and Ben Lazreg 2001:127.
different pyre site, and then the tomb was sealed over it. There may have been some sort of urn that was destroyed in the process of the tomb being robbed, though this seems unlikely as there were not any sherds documented in the burial. Because it was known that the tomb had been robbed, it was not a surprise that there was no funerary furniture or accessory grave goods found in it.

The third and final cremation from site 10 is from the same area as a cupula tomb. It consisted of a rectangular straight edge cut cremation pit in which the body had been burned in situ and then buried under multiple layers of unmortared cobbles. Within the cut cremation pit, there were fragments of burned human bone, nut shells, nails and an intact burned lamp. Again, multiple burnt pine nuts suggested that pine cones were used as fuel for the fire similar to the other cremation from the same area, and excavators also determined that it was likely that there was a wooden coffin placed on top of the pyre structure. Like the cupula tomb burial, it is most likely that this cremation burial took place early in the development of the cemetery. The cobble structure was then surrounded by another walled enclosure, but this feature did not survive long after its construction as evidence of subsequent grave cutting into its foundations indicate that it had collapsed to foundation level during a time when the cemetery was still in use.

This was also the only cremation burial which underwent extensive analysis, perhaps due in part to the levels of disturbance of the other cremations. It was

173 Sherds of pottery from the 7th century CE provide an approximate date for the disturbance and robbing of the tomb. Fragments of a 1st century jug provide an earlier date for that actual construction of the tomb, although there is no other evidence that the cremations at the site pre-date the late 2nd or early 3rd centuries CE. Ben Lazreg and Mattingly 1992: 245-246; Mattingly, Pollard and Ben Lazreg 2001: 154.
174 This burial (1048) was located in trench 9 of site 10. Mattingly, Pollard and Ben Lazreg 2001: 154.
175 Mattingly, Pollard and Ben Lazreg 2001: 115.
determined that the remains from this burial contained about twenty percent of a complete skeleton.\textsuperscript{177} The majority of the bone was completely blackened. There was also one non-human bone with incising found among the human remains, possibly from the pyre goods.

Site 8, which was also unearthed during the construction of the sports field, and is about 50 meters west of the southwest corner of site 10, represents a distinct cemetery from site 10 as the alignment of the burials and other funerary structures was different. There was one intact cremation grave recovered from site 8. It was found at the base of a \textit{cupula} tomb and consisted of a dish placed upside down over a flagon containing the burnt remains of possibly a child. The cremation was just below the ancient ground level and the dish appeared to date from either the 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE. There were no other associated grave goods found, and no information was provided as to the burial method of the urn and covering container. It would seem that there were many variations as to how cremation was practiced at Leptiminus Pupput

\textit{Pupput} Excavations at the necropolis of Pupput revealed many hundreds of cremations, in addition to inhumations. Both \textit{in situ} (called ‘primary’ cremations by excavators) and urned pyre cremations (the ‘secondary’ cremations) were present at the site, although the \textit{in situ} cremations were far more common.\textsuperscript{178} These cremations were carried out in a shallow pit, and were then either covered by a sand tumulus, or in rarer cases, the remains from the cremation were collected and placed in an urn or

\textsuperscript{177} Walth 2001: 192.
\textsuperscript{178} Ben Abed and Griesheimer 2004a: 9.
The pyre cremations required the installation of an *ustrium*, a place for the pyre to be burned which appeared to be lacking during the height of the cemetery’s use. The remains were then collected in an urn, generally ceramic, though a small number of glass and lead urns were recovered.

The history of the cemetery has been divided into eleven phases. Cremation burials began to appear in phase four and lasted through phase six. Phase four was characterized by primary cremations where the body was burned *in situ*. Excavators chose one cremation to represent the typical burial from this period. The burial was a primary cremation of an adult, most likely a male, buried under a simple sand tumulus. There was limited funerary furniture and accessories included in the burial. These were restricted to a single ceramic lamp of African origin dated to around the end of the 2nd century CE.

Phase five was also characterized by predominantly primary cremations interred in constructed masonry tombs. The burials used as examples in the phase all came from one enclosure group [see image 3.5]. Six of the tombs contained primary cremations below a masonry tomb. One of the burials contained a primary cremation and a secondary cremation in an urn within the same tomb. The primary cremation was a female young adult while the secondary cremation was a male young adult. The funerary furniture consisted mostly of lamps and ceramic vessels. The double interment lacked any sort of accessory goods, save the ceramic urn, as did one

---

179 Ben Abed and Griesheimer 2004a: 9-10.
180 This burial was designated tomb 672 by excavators. Ben Abed et al. 2004: 103-104.
181 Ben Abed et al. 2004: 104.
182 The tombs discussed were designated 135, 137, 601, 602, 603, 604, and 1165. There was also an amphora inhumation of an infant, tomb 664, which was also included in the enclosure and was attributed to phase five. It dated from the end of the 1st century and beginning of the 2nd. Ben Abed et al. 2004: 106, 125.
of the primary cremation burials. Based on the accompanying funerary furniture, when available, the burials were all given a date of sometime in the 2nd century CE.

During phase six, there is evidence that overcrowding within the cemetery was becoming a problem, and many burials were placed either abutting or cutting into earlier burials. As examples of this, the excavators chose to discuss the burials that were later inclusions into the same enclosure group as introduced for phase five [again see image 3.5].\textsuperscript{183} Two of these later tombs were wedged between the

\textsuperscript{183} These burials were designated 134, 138, 196, and 1167. There was also an inhumation of an infant, similar to the one seen in phase 5. Ben Abed et al. 2004: 130, 137.
enclosure walls and the earlier pre-existing burials, one was stuck in between two of the earlier burials, abutting one and cutting into another, and the final burial was placed directly next to one of the earlier pre-existing tombs. Three of these burials were primary cremations with similar built masonry tombs constructed over them. One was a secondary cremation in a jar urn which was then entombed within a masonry structure. A libation tube fed directly from the outside into the urn. As in the earlier phases, the common items of funerary furniture were lamps and ceramic vessels, which dated the burials to the end of the 2nd century and beginning of the 3rd century CE.

Phase seven marked the decline in the rite of cremation and the resurgence of the rites of inhumation, which were slightly different than they had been during the Punic era. However, this change in rite did not result in a shift in the use of space in the cemetery, and the same enclosures continued to be used in the construction of new tombs, resulting in even more crowding.

Yasmina Necropolis

The Yasmina Necropolis represents yet another type of funerary architecture for cremation burials. The six stucco monuments which are a predominant part of the cemetery landscape, were among the earliest built at the site,184 and represent a very different type of funerary architecture than seen at the previous two cemeteries. These structures, dating from the 2nd century, had small arched niches built into them for the placement of cremation urns, some on the exterior and some on the interior. The cremation urns were then cemented into these niches [see image 3.6]. Libation tubes

offered access to the urns that had been deposited before the cremation had been interred in them.\textsuperscript{185}

Image 3.6. Example of niche meant for a cremation urn in one of the stucco monuments from the Yasmina Necropolis. Norman and Haeckl 1993: 245.

The largest of these structures, named the Tertullus/Vibilis monument for the marble funerary inscription found recording the death of Marcus Vibius Tertullus, was three stories high, decorated with relief all the way around and had three urn niches on its south side.\textsuperscript{186} On the front of this monument, two pigs were depicted running through the landscape, indicated by a single tree. On the west wall, the funerary inscription was placed above the figure of a man wearing a toga, presumably an image of Tertullus, sitting in a chair reading a scroll. Below him was the figure of

the she-wolf with Romulus and Remus, all of which were similar to funerary art found in Rome and the Italian peninsula during the 1st and 2nd centuries CE.  

Tertullus was clearly trying to create connections between himself and the funerary practices of the peninsula. It is possible that he was a citizen from Rome who wanted to make sure that he was still included in the unity of Roman practice, or it may have been someone who desired to portray himself in as a Roman, in Roman dress and with images relating to the city. The lowest register of the structure depicts a rider on horseback on all four sides. A later cremation tomb was built up against the face of this structure, but the new construction was careful not to obscure the image of the rider. Later generations were still respecting the monuments of earlier individuals and may have been incorporating the image into their own depicted funerary identity.

A second structure comparable to the Tertullus/Vibilis monument was the Scribonia Felicula monument, which also bore a marble funerary inscription and a wheat garland down the side. Excavators noted the similarity between this decorative motif and a similar ash urn of a woman in Perugia. In that case, the wheat garland was taken to be a representation of the cult of Ceres. While that interpretation might apply to the Scribonia Felicula monument, linking the provincial people of Africa Proconsularis back to the peninsula, it might also be a recognition of the role of North Africa as ‘the bread basket’ of the Roman Empire at the time, and simply refer to the means of family wealth through grain production. Either way, the

The iconography of the tomb is showing something of the family’s greater relationship to the Empire.

The structures like the Tertullus/Vibilis Monument and the Scribonia Felicula Monument tended to have a solid rubble core, and were constructed purely for their exterior space. Others, like the so-called Vaulting Tube monument, were hollow and had a narrow doorway leading to a center room. It was originally thought that these structures were for inhumation, but further excavation revealed that this was not the case. When the Vaulting Tube monument was cleared of fill, which contained two cremation urns and 3 funerary inscriptions, seven small arched niches for cremation urns were discovered on the interior walls. All the urns were still in situ but only one still contained cremated remains, along with a small amount of gold foil. The others may have been emptied when the tomb was broken into and robbed during the 6th century. An offering cist was built into the southern interior wall with a libation tube inserted through the stucco so offerings could be poured directly into the monument.

By the time of the last publication reporting on the excavation of 1995, five other cremation burials had been identified in the area between the ashlar mausoleum and the six stucco monuments. Three had been damaged by subsequent activities in the cemetery, but two were relatively well preserved. One cremation was placed within a cooking pot that was dated to the 5th century, a very late date for cremation.

---

190 Sometime later the room was completely filled to accommodate two inhumation burials. This may have been how the other two cremation urns got into the structure. Norman 1995: 17.
rites.\textsuperscript{192} The urn was then buried in a shallow rectangular cist. This date is significant because inhumation had been nearly universally adopted by the 5\textsuperscript{th} century.

While there was no evidence described for \textit{in situ} burning of the bodies at the Yasmina Necropolis, there was also no discussion of a pyre site or other structure for the burning of the bodies. This may be because the full extent of the cemetery was not excavated. In the examples from the Britannia cemeteries, the full extent of the burial grounds were known and there was the ability for more complete excavations. This appears to not be the case in many of the North African cemeteries. It might be that these ‘off site’ burning areas were at or around the edges of the cemeteries, and have yet to be excavated. However, the presence of the urned cremations attest to their existence. This represents yet another form on the cremation burial rite within Africa Proconsularis.

\textbf{The Conclusions}

The overall picture from the cemeteries at Leptiminus, Pupput and Carthage is that the typical Punic age burial rite, outside of the monumental tomb structures, was inhumation in shaft style tombs. However, the arrival of the Romans brought about near complete adoption of cremation. This was followed by the later transition back to inhumation. This basic chronology seems to be supported by the cemeteries at all of the cities which had multiple periods of use, and in some cases, multiple layers. As in other parts of the Roman Empire, cremation and inhumation were often practiced side by side at these cemeteries, with reuse and concentrated burial space resulting in a layering of graves and cutting of previous burials.

\textsuperscript{192} Norman 1993: 15; Norman 1994: 13.
While at Leptiminus there appears to have been a limited presence of cremation graves in the later Roman cemetery, further excavations may uncover more from this later date, such as are found in both Pupput and Yasmina. These both push back the date for the continued use of cremation. As it is, with this limited evidence, it appears that the cremation rite at Leptiminus utilized both pyre sites away from the actual burial site and *in situ* cremation. It also appears that the resulting remains were buried in both urns and without, and then entombed in varying ways. This presents one of the more interesting comparisons between the different cemeteries, as there was a wide variation in both the ritual and the commemoration monument used.

However, in Leptiminus, the scant cremation evidence does not seem to lend itself to a discussion of broad trends as the evidence from Pupput and Yasmina does. At Pupput, there was a common use of simple tumulus, *cupula* and built masonry tombs, most of which housed single cremations. In Yasmina, there are larger stucco structures in the early phases of the cemetery, many of which were meant for multiple interments, followed by much simpler cist graves and tumuli. Such difference could be merely regionally based variations in the incorporation of pre-Roman burial practices, if any. The tombs from both of the cemeteries, Pupput and Yasmina, displayed a greater interest in the idea of spectacle and the lasting visual elements of burial.

While the tombs from Pupput are not such literal interpretations of the Hellenistic monumental tombs used by wealthy Romans and Punic people, they do show an interest in the form of architecture that was used by the elites to display wealth and identity outside of cemetery contexts and the idea of spectacle. Because
wealth and privilege allowed monumental tombs to be set apart from each other, and by virtue of their size, they became parts of the landscape. In switching to an above ground funerary architecture, the non-elites in the cemeteries of Africa Proconsularis were also creating a funerary landscape, and in their own way, emulating the idea of spectacle. This is certainly true of the tower structures found at the Yasmina necropolis which may have been the tombs of elites, but it can also be applied to the tombs of Pupput, which were smaller and lacked the same iconography.

In Mattingly’s view, there would have been an advantage to the use of spectacle in Africa Proconsularis that might have been considered a disadvantage in Britannia, where it was not used, and this would account for why it was embraced in one province and not the other. On the one had, Africa Proconsularis was an economically important city within the empire, and there would have been frequent contact between the people of the province and the wealthy Roman traders, merchants, and aristocrats. There would have also been more opportunities for people to acquire wealth in prestige than in Britannia which was not as important and was much more isolated than North Africa. In Africa Proconsularis, one would have wanted to make a visual statement for one’s family and display wealth to increase the importance of the family and open up new economic ventures; a family that portrayed itself as wealthy and respectable might have made a more desirable business partner than a family which was unknown and seen as without influence. Therefore, there was a benefit to the cost of spectacle type burials and lasting markers of commemoration. The family history would always be on display. This was not so in Britannia, where the economy was not booming on the national level. The gain from
such displays would not have been worth the expense. So whereas in Britannia there was no need for spectacle and the emphasis was on the ritual, in Africa Proconsularis there was less of a concern with a unified ritual and more interest in the funerary landscape and the spectacle of commemoration.

This was also not the only difference in practice between the cemeteries and the practices of Rome. While in both the Leptiminus and Pupput necropolei there were limited grave goods and funerary accessories, unlike what was seen in Britannia, the Yasmina Necropolis yielded none except for gold foil in one of the undisturbed cremations. Part of this might be the apparent disturbance of the burials by both later use of the cemetery and theft, but it would also seem that part of this was caused by the nature of the interment itself. In Britannia, accessory goods were often included in the burial pit along with the urn, but not directly inside. This also seems true for the cemeteries of Leptiminus and Pupput. However, at Yasmina the urns were actually cemented into the stucco funerary monuments. There was no room for any other goods that were not included in the urn.

This would seem to indicate that funerary goods were not an important aspect of the cremation ritual in Roman Carthage. Otherwise, it would seem that there would have been a way of accommodating them devised in the creation of the tomb monument. The limited finds in the other cemeteries of Leptiminus and Pupput might indicate that these types of goods were not an important part of the ritual in general in Roman North Africa as they do not even come close to the quantity or variety of goods that have been recovered from cemetery sites in other provincial areas and the Italian peninsula.
The iconography from the Yasmina Necropolis is also important in comparing the cemetery to Roman practices. The reliefs on both the Turtullus/Vibilis Monument and the Scribonia Felicula Monument seem to be Roman in character, and could be a declaration of the patrons attesting to their 'Romanitas' despite being in a province.\textsuperscript{193} He was dressed like a Roman, there was imagery relating to the foundation of Rome, and the inscription was written in Latin, as was the inscription on the Scribonia Felicula monument, all attesting to a Roman identity. The only problem in fully ascribing this meaning, and one which appears to not be fully discussed in the literature, is that in Roman North Africa, it is not always clear who the occupants of the cities were, whether they were Roman settlers, people of Phoenician descent, native Africans, or any combination. By the time the Romans incorporated the area of Africanus Proconsularis into its Empire, North Africa had already had a long imperial history which had resulted in a mixing of people and cultures. Yet these cemeteries still demonstrate, in different ways, how the idea of spectacle was adopted and incorporated into the commemoration monuments.

\textsuperscript{193} Norman 1994: 12.
Chapter Four: Culture Variation in

Roman Asia Minor

Introduction

The region of Asia Minor had been the subject of multiple imperial conquests before it finally became incorporated into the Roman Empire in the last few centuries BCE. It was a wealthy province which the Romans exploited for many generations with varying degrees of political involvement, and therefore is an interesting comparison to the relatively economically insignificant province of Britannia and the “breadbasket” of the Roman Empire in Africa Proconsularis. However, whereas the Romans followed a strict pattern of authority consolidation in other provinces through the creation of planned Roman cities and imposed Roman government structures, a different strategy was used in Asia Minor.

While this same pattern of authority consolidation occurred to some extent in Asia Minor, the long history of the various civilizations there meant that the majority of the larger cities were already established, and while the Romans did institute their own government structure within some regions of the province, others were allowed to remain semi-autonomous with dynasts in power rather than appointed governors.
Therefore, the presence of the Romans in the province of Asia Minor was distributed differently than in many of the provinces of the west, including Britannia and Africa Proconsularis.

The sites chosen for the Asia Minor section of this study are slightly different from those seen in the previous provinces discussed, although they are not the most famous or outwardly impressive sites in Asia Minor. While two of the sites are cemeteries, at Pessinus and Anemurium, only at the cemetery of Pessinus were cremated remains actually uncovered. At Anemurium, there were structures that were interpreted as tombs meant to house cremation, even though cremated remains were not discovered. The nature of the structures can still indicate the nature of the cremations, and in themselves are evidence of the rite. The lack of preservation admitted by excavators at each of the three sites indicates that in the study of Asia Minor, researchers cannot rely only on human remains to show the presence of cremation. The absence of cremated remains cannot be immediately taken to mean there is a definite absence of the rite being practiced at the site; interment containers and structures are also evidence of the practice.\(^\text{194}\)

The final site discussed in this section is not a cemetery but rather an individual tomb with multiple interments, both inhumation and cremation, called the Kocakizlar Tumulus on the Alpu plain. This site was chosen because it presents an interesting practice that is not seen in sites from the other provinces: the burial of both cremations and inhumations within the same tomb. The significance of multiple practices will be discussed later.

\(^{194}\) There are several reasons why cremated remains might not be preserved at a site, including later disturbances of the site and conditions not conducive to preservation of such ephemeral materials.
These sites are not the most well known by any means, nor are they the most well preserved of the burial sites from Roman Asia Minor. In Asia Minor, there is an abundance of funerary archaeology in the form of rock-cut tombs and monumental tombs similar to those seen lining the roads leading from Rome. However, these tomb types largely contained inhumations, with some exceptions such as the Kocakizlar Tumulus. And in the case of the rock-cut tombs, they did not resemble any form of Roman antecedent from the peninsula. While that in itself is important, highlighting the regional variation of the province, the purpose of this study is to look specifically for signs of cultural exchange through the rite of cremation. The significance of the cremation rite to this time period is that cremation was the dominant burial rite for the Romans, and as seen in the previous two provinces discussed, it was largely adopted by the provinces after they were conquered. However, Asia Minor was different in many ways, one of the most important of which was in its political history and form of government under the Romans.

The History of Civilization in Asia Minor

The region of Asia Minor had been incorporated into many different kingdoms and empires before it became part of the Roman Empire. The Hittites ruled the region from about the 20th century to the 13th centuries BCE, which then eventually fell to the Phrygians. During the mid 6th century BCE, Asia Minor was ruled by the semi-historical King Croesus from his seat in Lydia. However, he was eventually defeated by the growing Persian Empire and the King Cyrus. From that time through the period of Alexander the Great’s invasion and conquest of the region
beginning in about 334 BCE, Asia Minor was at the center of the battle between the Greeks and the Persians for dominance over the Mediterranean and eastern world. Alexander’s death ten years later in 323 BCE marked the beginning of a period of division and competition between neighboring kingdoms within the region of Asia Minor. Alexander’s lack of heirs broke his eastern empire up into several separate kingdoms which over time began to impinge on each other; in Asia Minor the Seleucid Dynasty took over in the east, the Kingdom of Pergamum formed and slowly began to gain dominance in the west and Celtic tribes began to trickle into the coastal regions, mingling with the native populations. In 196 BCE, the Seleucid King Antiochus III moved through Asia Minor hoping to conquer Thrace and expand into Roman territories. His army was beaten by the Romans in 191 BCE at the battle of Thermopylae. The Seleucids returned to Asia Minor and instead sought to spread their influence there. When they began to encroach on Pergamum, the kingdom looked to their Roman allies for help. This began the Roman presence in Asia Minor.

By 188 BCE, Rome had subdued the entire area and turned control of Asia Minor over to Pergamum. In 133 BCE, the king of Pergamum, having no heirs, willed his kingdom back over to the Romans. The Romans chose to not exert much control over the area, and the city of Pergamum remained largely independent. However, the Roman presence in Asia Minor was gradually increasing as they slowly conquered the neighboring territories, exerting a greater amount of power than Pergamum wanted. Led by Mithridates VI of Pontus, Pergamum attempted a series of revolts from 88 to 63 BCE resulting in the deaths of large numbers of Roman citizens.

\[195\] A law passed in 123 BCE by the Tribune C. Gracchus gave the Roman equestrian class the right to collect taxes in Asia Minor. This became an incentive for the eventual increase of Roman activities in the region. Mitchell 1995: 29-30.
who had settled in Asia Minor. Mithridates was finally defeated by Pompey in 63 BCE. Rome now had a base for the control of the province of Asia Minor.

Roman influence and control of the province continued to develop slowly, although exploitation seemed relatively heavy from the beginning. Individual Romans began to accumulate property in the province either through the default of debt payments or by direct purchase of the lands from the indigenous people not able to raise the money to pay the Roman taxes. The pressure to pay these taxes also forced many cities to sell off assets to Roman buyers in order to raise enough money. These included works of art, manufactured goods and slaves. However, it was not until Augustus that control over the province was solidified. Instead of allowing all the kingdoms of Asia Minor to function semi-autonomously, he began to assign them selectively to Roman governors. Some of the lesser cities were allowed to remain under dynastic control, but under the supervision of Augustus. During the following centuries, the emperors systematically interfered in the political makeup of the cities of Asia Minor, taking power away from dynastic rulers only to have it reinstated by later emperors. The regions of the three sites to be discussed each fit into this political history differently. Pessinus had been a major city in the Galatia region since the 4th century BCE, and had originally been part of the Seleucid Empire before being taken by Pergamum and willed over to the Roman Empire. Anemurium, located in the region of Cilicia, was also part of the Seleucid Empire, although being farther

---

196 When Mithridates came to power in 88 BCE, he ordered the slaughter of all Romans or Italians in general in the province of Asia Minor regardless of their age or status. Mitchell 1995: 30.
198 It appears that this was not always part of Augustus’ plan for the region of Asia Minor, but was more a matter of opportunity as the Roman rule in the cities became threatened. Gruen 1996: 153.
west, it was also was incorporated into Egypt by the Ptolemies at various points. The final site, Kocakizlar Tumulus, was actually in an area that was originally called Phrygia, although the western area, in which the site is located, eventually came under the control of Pergamum and passed over to Rome with the rest of the kingdom.

**Pre-Roman Burial Practices in Asia Minor**

In contrast to the other provinces discussed, a form of the cremation rite was practiced during the pre-Roman Hellenistic period that had nothing to do with Roman influence. However, it was not the predominant practice. In fact, in pre-Roman Asia Minor there seems to have been just as much regional variation as in the Roman period, although inhumation appears to have been more popular than forms of cremation. For cremations, there is evidence that the remains were interred in simple clay pots covered by earth to form a kind of tumulus, as at the necropolis of Pitane. Other cremations were placed in various types of stone cists as were the Late Hellenistic cremations at the Pessinus cemetery. It was also not uncommon for cremation and inhumation to be found within the same cemetery site, as found at the site of Gedikli.

Inhumation was more common but was no less variable in its regional practice. The only common practice seems to be the establishment of extramural cemetery sites, removed from the cities. Inhumations from the pre-Roman Hellenistic

---

200 Cremation burials from the Hellenistic period have been uncovered at Mylassa, Myrina, and Sagalassos, as well as other locations. Spanu 2000: 174. There is also evidence of Hellenistic cremation activity from the cemetery at Pessinus. Vermeulen 2003c: 46.
201 Cook and Blackman 1964-1965: 35.
202 Vermeulen 2003c: 46.
period are found in rock-cut tombs, like those found on the southwestern coasts in the Cilicia and Isauria regions, with varying numbers of chambers and degrees of decorations.\textsuperscript{204} In these rock-cut tombs, the chambers were cut deeply into recessed frames in the cliff face. The tombs were both expensive, time consuming, and susceptible to theft which might be one reason why in Roman times, this tomb type was largely abandoned in favor of stone sarcophagi which may have been seen as more economically viable and safer.\textsuperscript{205} Similar to the rock-cut tombs in terms of scales were the constructed masonry tombs and mausolea. As with the rock-cut tombs, these larger built tombs tended to be reserved for the wealthy, and varied regionally in their size, shape and decoration.

Another form of inhumation burial that closely resembled both earlier Greek and later Roman amphora burials in other provinces was the \textit{pithoi} burials where the body was covered by fragments of the large storage jars. Like many of the cremation burials, these were then covered in earth to form tumulus like structures. Children and infants were sometimes interred in whole \textit{pithoi} jars or other smaller ceramic vessels. Of the types of inhumation, these \textit{pithoi} burials are the most common in the area of Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{206} In some areas, cist graves where the burial pit was lined in some way, whether with tiles, stones, or masonry bricks, were also a common burial type, especially for the poorer segments of the society who could not afford the more elaborate burial types.

While this is not a comprehensive listing of all the burial types found in the cemeteries of Hellenistic pre-Roman Asia Minor, it demonstrates some of the

\textsuperscript{204} Cevik 2003: 99.
\textsuperscript{205} Cevick 2003: 99.
\textsuperscript{206} Wheeler 1974: 418.
regional variation in practice. The lack of standardized burial practices throughout the
region may reflect the political disunity of the kingdoms, even as they were
incorporated into various empires, or could be a reflection of the different cultures
coming into contact with each other in each region and exchanging practices. This
represents a very different picture than the one seen in the previous provinces
discussed. In the province of Britannia, there was limited variation of the inhumation
and cremation rites, but overall the basic form of the burials was the same. Similarly,
in the region of Africa Proconsularis, the predominant pre-Roman tomb form was the
Punic inhumation shaft tomb.

**Roman Period Burial Practice in Asia Minor**

Throughout the history of Roman Asia Minor, inhumation remained the
predominant burial practice, even as cremation was the favored rite of the Roman
Empire in the west.\(^{207}\) However, there were certain regions within the province where
the rites of inhumation and cremation were practiced side by side, though still not
with equal representation. Some of these regions included Cilicia, Ionia and Phrygia.
While the evidence for the rite is still limited, as excavations of burial monuments in
Asia Minor continue, it may become apparent that cremation was more common than
has been previously thought and discussed.\(^{208}\)

In addition to the limited number of cremation burials that have been
uncovered in the area, other evidence is being looked at to expand our knowledge of

\(^{208}\) Recent scholarship has looked to the wide variety of funerary monuments as well as the more
ephemeral quality of cremation and the lesser preservation of remains associated with the rite to
explain why cremation has not had a greater presence in the documented burials of Asia Minor. Spanu
2000: 174. Certainly at all the sites used in this study, the low quality of the preservation of the
cremated remains and later disturbances of the sites was an issue. Another factor may be that because it
was accepted that inhumation was the predominant rite in Asia Minor, indicators of the cremation rite
were ignored or reasoned away.
the cremation rite within Asia Minor. The majority of this evidence is in the form of urn identification. For example, it has been suggested that *osteothekai*, which had previously been understood as containers for secondary burials, where bones were removed from a central area in a collective tomb to make way for new interments, may have actually been containers for cremations.\(^{209}\) The practice of using an *osteotheke* as a cremation container can be seen at one of the sites in this study, the Kocakizlar Tumulus, indicating that the containers were in fact used for this purpose. A large group of ossuaries found at Ephesos with production dates from the 1st century BCE through the 2nd century CE were also interpreted as evidence of the practice of the cremation rite.\(^{210}\)

Ossuaries have also been discovered in other cities such as at Selinus in Cilicia, one of the regions where cremation is known to have been practiced, although they were not found in or near any of the known tombs of the necropolei. Most of the evidence that has been taken to be indicative of the practice of the cremation rite, including the actual burials and the containers that may have been used to inter cremated remains, suggest the body was usually cremated in one location and then buried in some sort of urn container in a different location.\(^{211}\)

**Introduction to the Cemeteries**

---

\(^{210}\) At Ephesos, ossuaries decorated with garlands were suggested to be representative of Roman citizens, particularly freed persons, and an indication of the influx of Roman citizens into Asia Minor, bringing their own burial rite (cremation) with them. Ossuaries with Greek names on them indicate the practice was also adopted by a portion of the non-Roman society. Cormack 2004: 109.  
The largest grouping of burials studied is the cemetery at Pessinus in the region of Galatia, which was in use in the Early Roman period, about 100 BCE, through the 5th century CE, a very long period of use [see image 4.1]. The cemetery was located near the northern boundary of the ancient city. However, only a small portion of the cemetery was excavated, and even within these sections, the excavation methods offered an admittedly restricted view of what was going on in the cemetery.212 Further difficulties in studying the individual burials were the result of looting beginning in antiquity and the excavation method of leaving graves that were only partially within the boundaries of the trench unexcavated. The result is a less

212 Excavations at the ancient city of Pessinus began in the mid 1950s and continued through the early 1990s. The excavation strategy was to dig trenches around the site to obtain general information about the nature of the site. Vermeulen 2003a: 10-13. The result “allows hardly anything more than some general remarks on layout.” Vermeulen 2003b: 31.
detailed report than those of the cemeteries from Roman Britannia, more in line with the results from Africa Proconsularis, but it is no less helpful in looking at the burial trends from the Roman period in Asia Minor.

The larger concentration of graves is located at the southern edge of the cemetery, consisting mostly of monumental structures which would have been visible from the north/south running road leading from Pessinus to the town of Germa. These constitute mostly inhumation graves. A 2nd concentration is found in the northwestern section of the cemetery, and is made up of an equal number of inhumations and cremations. Within this group, there appears to have been a lack of planning in the positioning of the burials as several graves cut into each other. However, throughout the cemetery, disturbance by intercutting of other graves is relatively limited, indicating that most of the burials were marked in some way on the surface. There is no visible evidence of burial plots or enclosure structures of any kind, but there does seem to be some clustering of graves.

There also appears to be a spatial differentiation between the cremation and the inhumation graves at the cemetery. The inhumation graves are spread evenly across the area with the exception of the northeastern edge, where there are very few. The cremations, on the other hand, are clustered in certain areas, predominantly in the northern section of the cemetery. The concentration of some of the clusters is higher in some areas than in others, leading excavators to believe that these areas may have

---

213 For the poorer graves, this may have only consisted of a low lying mound of earth and rubble. For the richer graves, this could include a tomb monument or stele. Reused steles from the 1st through 3rd centuries are found included within the structures of later cist graves, indicating not only that early Roman graves were marked with tombstone, but also that there was a long period of use of the cemetery. Vermeulen 2003b: 35. However, the reuse might also be an indicator of discontinuity in use in that people either did not recognize the tombstone as grave markers, or did not associate themselves with or care about the desecration of earlier graves.

214 Vermeulen 2003b: 35.
been reserved for specific groups of people throughout multiple generations.\textsuperscript{215} This practice might be similar to the family clusters found in the cemeteries of Britannia.

The second site discussed is also a cemetery, the Necropolis of Anemurium, where there were no cremated remains found, but there were indications of the practice of the cremation rite. The majority of burials at the site appeared to be inhumations. The evidence for the practice of cremation comes from monuments that probably had once contained cremation burials, although all traces of these burials have since disappeared. The necropolis itself, which was in use from the 1\textsuperscript{st} through the 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE, has managed to survive with limited disturbance from later human activity, but nevertheless has suffered as a result of exposure to the coastal environment.\textsuperscript{216} It would also seem that the tombs became the victims of grave robbing long ago as there is very little human bone found throughout the site, nor any accompanying grave goods which might be expected, seen in the other cemeteries of Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{217}

The Necropolis of Anemurium consisted of two main parts which were separated from each other by a deep narrow valley running east to west. The southern and eastern boundaries of the cemetery are delineated by portions of the city walls. The northern limit of the cemetery is no longer well defined, but a modern day road which runs on the line of the north south city wall creates a present boundary on its

\textsuperscript{215} Excavators do not make a distinction about the nature of these supposed groupings, whether they are familial, occupational or otherwise, as was done by excavators of the King Harry Lane and Eastern Cemetery of Londinium sites. Vermeulen 2003c: 39.

\textsuperscript{216} The western coast of Cilicia, the province in which Anemurium was located, was nearly deserted during the Middle Ages, and the site remains uncovered by human occupation with the exception of a few nomadic peoples who have turned some of the tombs into their living quarters and others into stables for goats and sheep. This has resulted in the destruction of a limited number of tombs. Alföldi-Rosenbaum 1971: 89; Russel 1977: 45.

\textsuperscript{217} Alföldi-Rosenbaum 1971: 100.
western side, with only a few badly preserved tombs identified on the east side. On the west side of the cemetery, the farthest tombs run in a line parallel to the upper aqueduct, finishing off a bounded square form for the necropolis.

The cemetery is characterized by predominantly barrel vaulted structures, some standing alone, some connected to others to form larger blocks of structures, some single storied and some multistoried. The layout, instead of being a grid as is commonly seen in such cemetery compounds, is formed by narrow winding streets that connect the different groupings of tombs, as would be found in the layout of a city. Amongst these larger tombs, which most likely all contained inhumation burials at one point, are smaller tombs which have been interpreted as for the rite of cremation by excavators, and will be discussed below [see image 4.2].


The third site is not a cemetery but an individual tomb structure in which both

---

218 Alföldi-Rosenbaum 1971: 89.
219 Excavators drew comparisons between this “city of the dead” and examples from the Italian peninsula where the more common practice was to line the roads leading away from cities with individual tombs. The closest parallel to this type of cemetery layout outside of Asia Minor, according to excavators, was the Necropolis of Portus on Isola Sacra, near Ostia. Excavations within Rome itself has uncovered more cemeteries of this kind which have similar layouts and tomb formations, such as the necropolis under St. Peter’s, but they are not nearly as well preserved. It seems that besides these few examples within the western Roman world, the closest parallels to this form of cemetery are in Etruscan cemeteries. Alföldi-Rosenbaum 1971: 89.
cremations and inhumations were enclosed. The Kocakizlar Tumulus from the Eskişehir district in Turkey is located 3km to the northwest of the Alpu plain. It was between the ancient cities of Midaeum and Accilaeum in the ancient province of Phrygia Epictetus, and was near major roads leading from Dorylaeum to Ancyra and Pessinus making the plain an ideal spot for the creation of visually impressive tombs. Numerous other tumulus tombs and mounds have been identified in the Alpu plain, and while the area can not be considered a cemetery site as the others the previous sites studied, it was a necropolis area, and an apparently important one.221

The diameter of the tomb is about 80m across and it was built into a small mound. The tomb was oriented in the east west directions with the entrance on the west side. It was divided into two consecutive dromoi and three vaulted chambers (one front, one back, and one off to the side) with a marble osteotheke in the front chamber, another in the last chamber, and two marble sarcophagi also in the last chamber [see image 4.3].


221 Atasoy 1974: 255.
These chambers are always filled with water as the tumulus is now below the modern water table, making excavation difficult.

During the clearing of the two dromoi, terracotta ceramic vessels, perfume flasks, lamp fragments, iron nails, and other goods were discovered. The second dromos opened up into the first of the vaulted chambers in which traces of a geometric fresco were found. It is in this chamber, in the osteotheke, that the first evidence for cremation is found. The side chamber also contained evidence that it had once been frescoed, and three inhumation burials were found side by side in the ground with the heads facing to the south. There were also gold leaves found in the corner of this chamber. The final chamber, also frescoed with geometric designs, stylized flowers and a smooth mortared floor, contained two marble sarcophagi and the final osteotheke in which there was also evidence of cremation.

**The Cremations**

*Pessinus*

At Pessinus, there were a total of 60 cremations excavated and 78 inhumations.\(^{222}\) Of these 60 cremations, 31 contained grave goods. The rest either had no included goods or they had been plundered or disturbed in some other way.\(^{223}\) The cremation burials were then divided into four types by excavators: cremations with pyre remains in a simple pit, urned cremation graves, *in situ* (*bustum*) cremations, and cremation graves lined with mud bricks.\(^{224}\)

---

\(^{222}\) This represents the largest collections of cremation burials in Asia Minor within a single cemetery discussed in this study and is a clear indication that cremation can no longer be ignored as a legitimate burial rite within the Roman Asia Minor province.

\(^{223}\) Thoen 2003: 111.

\(^{224}\) Vermeulen 2003c: 40.
42 of the cremations belonged to the simple pit graves, representing the majority of the cemetery. These burials dated from the 1st through the 3rd centuries CE, with the oldest dating from the Augustan period and the newest from about 300 CE.\[^{225}\] In these burials, the remnants of the pyre were deposited into deep pits of variable shape, though rectangular seems to dominate.\[^{226}\] The pits were roughly the size and shape of the inhumation pits, meaning the pit was dug for the full size body even though the body was being disarticulated for the cremation, and in at least seven of the pits, there was a thin white lime slip used to cover the walls.

The fills of the graves were generally a scattered mix of cremated bone, pottery fragments, burnt iron nails, charcoal, and in some cases, complete objects such as lamps. However, there were two cases where the fills were different. In one, there was found to be two charcoal layers separated by a thin layer of earth. It was unclear to excavators if this grave represented two different individuals or if both layers originated from the same individual. The second grave contained a thin layer of cremated bone topped by a layer of sand and a thicker charcoal layer. Excavators saw this as evidence of deliberate bone selection and collection from the pyre, a practice which was not seen in the other cremations from the area and which was not generally a practice in any of the areas studied (Rome, Britannia, Africa Proconsularis and Asia Minor).\[^{227}\]

\[^{225}\] These dates were based on the few undisturbed graves where accurate dating was a possibility, and therefore does not represent detailed dating of all the graves of this kind but rather a probable range. Vermeulen 2003c: 43.

\[^{226}\] Within the graves, charcoal, cremated bone and sometimes burnt objects were found. However, the nature of the excavation allowed for the full excavation of only a few of them: seven graves had been left more or less intact by later activities at the cemetery site and of these a complete plan was able to be drawn of only three. Vermeulen 2003c: 41.

\[^{227}\] The 1st grave was designated grave 7.39 while the 2nd was 8.61. In either case, the practice would appear to be unique within the larger context of cremation in the Roman world. Perhaps more complete
The remaining bone quality was very poor, and in general the weights of the human bone fragments collected did not exceed 300g, a small portion of the expected remains as shown by McKinley.\textsuperscript{228} While this might represent merely the bad conditions for the preservation of bone within the charcoal layer, it might also be an indication that, as was seen from the burials in the cemeteries in Britannia, only a small portion of the cremated remains and the pyre debris were collected for the actual burial while the rest of the pyre debris was deposited elsewhere with the unexcavated sections of the cemetery or outside the boundaries of the apparent cemetery compound.\textsuperscript{229}

Other finds within the graves indicate that there was a certain level of richness to the rite. Iron nails, fittings, hobnails, leather and textile fragments suggested that the bodies were burnt either in coffins or on biers, either clothed or alongside articles of adornment. Bronze plated nails associated with wood fragments also suggest that the coffins or biers were decorated.\textsuperscript{230} Within the less disturbed burials, fragments of pottery, jewelry and other personal items were also found in the graves, having been burned with the individual.\textsuperscript{231}

There was only one excavated cremation found in an urn in the most common Roman cremation type from the peninsula. For this burial, a shallow pit was dug into the fill of an earlier cremation sometime in the later half of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE and the graves able to be excavated would have provided additional insight into these apparent anomalies. Vermeulen 2003c: 42.

\textsuperscript{228} Refer to the second chapter where cremation weights are discussed.
\textsuperscript{229} Vermeulen 2003c: 42.
\textsuperscript{230} Vermeulen 2003c: 42.
\textsuperscript{231} The object most commonly found (in ten instances) was a terracotta lamp which was either burnt with the individual or later interred with the body. In one case, there were two lamps accompanying the cremation. Vermeulen 2003c: 43.
1st half of the 5th century CE.\textsuperscript{232} The earthenware jar was simply placed in the pit with a dish as a lid and remained undisturbed throughout the rest of the history of the cemetery. Within the jar there were 500g of cremated bone, again representing a small portion of the expected total remains, along with some pot sherds and a small number of burnt personal bone objects.

There were 13 probable \textit{in situ} or \textit{bustum} graves uncovered. These were all located in the northern part of the cemetery, and seem to represent a cluster, although they lack any strikingly common details and have diverse orientations.\textsuperscript{233} The earliest date for these types of burials is the 1st century CE, while at least two of the graves were dated to the Late Roman Period, between the 4th and 5th centuries CE.\textsuperscript{234} The shape and scale of the cremation pits is similar to those of the first type, the simple pit burials. However, the walls were not lined with the same white slip as in the first type, instead being reddened by oxidation and in some cases burnt.

The fill of these burials consisted of charcoal, cremated bone and pyre goods similar to those of the simple pit burial type. This similarity, particularly in the pyre goods, including pottery, a lamp, iron nails, bone objects, etc, gives no indication that the appearance of these pyres or their furnishings were significantly different from those observed in the first cremation burial type. There was also correspondence in the weights of the cremated bone collected, which has called into question whether or not

\textsuperscript{232} As at the Yasmina Necropolis of Carthage discussed in the previous chapter, this is a very late date for a cremation in the Roman Empire, taking place in a period where inhumation had been the predominant practice for nearly a century.

\textsuperscript{233} As in the simple pit cremations, only a select number (3) of the graves were in complete enough condition for complete excavation and only one yielded a complete plan. Vermeulen 2003c: 43.

\textsuperscript{234} As with the urned burial, these later dates for cremation are interesting as it had been thought that the practice had largely been abandoned.
not these burials really were *in situ* or merely a variation of the simple pit burials.\textsuperscript{235} The excavators have provisionally determined that poor preservation conditions are accountable for the discrepancy in bone weights and that this cluster of burials in the northern section of the cemetery is a group of *in situ* burials. This distinction is important because although *in situ* cremations are seen throughout the provinces of the empire, the practice was relatively rare in Rome itself.

The final cremation burial type at Pessinus was the more carefully constructed mud-brick lined grave. Only four cremations of this type were uncovered, and they were all located in the southern part of the cemetery forming a distinct cluster. Unfortunately, later activity in the cemetery as well as a major Byzantine disturbance has left these graves badly preserved. The pits were all of similar rectangular shape, although of different orientations. All of these graves contained cremated bone fragments, but only the least disturbed of the four contained any identifiable grave goods.\textsuperscript{236} Only two of these burials were able to be accurately dated, although the similarities between them suggest that they are from the same period. The two were dated to the Late Hellenistic and Early Roman period of the site, making them the oldest burials excavated at the site.\textsuperscript{237}

*Anemurium*

\textsuperscript{235} Because in *bustum* burials the pyre collapses into the grave with all the accompanying ash and debris, it would be expected that the bone weights from these burials would be higher than those of the burials where the body was burned at a pyre site located away from the actual grave. One possible explanation is that these are not actually *in situ* burials, but rather represent the pyre sites for burial of the remains elsewhere, and that the fill is merely pyre debris. However, the excavators claim that to assume this conclusion, the other cremation pit burials have to be assumed as pyre sites because they too yield insufficient amounts of bone to make up for the discrepancy. Excavators also note that this phenomenon in bone weights has been documented in *busta* cremations within the western provinces. Vermeulen 2003c: 44.

\textsuperscript{236} This burial, designated 3.67, contained two *unguentaria* and a finger ring. Vermeulen 2003c: 46.

\textsuperscript{237} Vermeulen 2003c: 46.
In addition to the large barrel vaulted inhumation tombs that were discovered at the Necropolis of Anemurium, there were a few different tomb forms, one of which was interpreted as a tomb for cremation. These tombs were in the form of truncated cone shapes raised on stepped platforms, similar to earlier tomb types. They are divided into multiple stories, and each of the stories has its own small window like door opening framed by large blocks of a dark limestone. While nothing was found within these tombs, perhaps due to later theft as the doors were all above ground, the diameters of the structures themselves were determined to be too small for an inhumation.238 It was therefore suggested that they might have held cinerary urns, representing an, albeit unusual, form of columbaria.

This type of columbaria is not entirely without parallel.239 Excavators noted the similarities between these tower structures and those found in Palmyra and other parts of Syria as well as some found on the Italian peninsula. In Palmyra, the tower tombs were raised on stepped square pedestal bases, as at Anemurium, and in at least one case there was an opening on the lower level of these multi-storied towers as well as an opening higher up. A similar structure was also found in the excavations of Dura Europos, where a circular structure on a raised platform was found amongst other tombs. The interior was deemed too small for an inhumation, and no burial was found to be beneath the structure, suggesting that it was a cremation burial, although the structure was in such a deteriorated state that its function could not be ascertained with any degree of certainty.240

238 Alfödi Rosenbaum 1971: 94.
239 I will later suggest that they are similar to the tower tomb structure of the Yasmina Necropolis in Carthage.
240 All such tombs are discussed in Alföldi-Rosenbaum 1971: 95.
A parallel structure found on the Italian peninsula is the columbarium at Quarto di Marano in Campania. This tomb, dated to the 1st century CE consists of a cylindrical base with a six sided pyramid on top. The actual columbarium, in which the cremation urns would have been placed, was located in the cylinder base while there were two rooms hollowed out of the pyramid structure, although it is noted that their function was possibly to lighten the weight.241

The cone structures at Anemurium also seem to be similar to the tower cremation structures found at the Yasmina Necropolis in Carthage. These similarities will be discussed further later on. Suffice to say though, none of the parallel structures looked at are exactly the same as the tomb structures at Anemurium. The most common similarities are only superficial, and it cannot conclusively be said that they display indications of the same function. However, there are other indications that the rite of cremation was practiced at Anemuirum that would support this interpretation of the truncated cone structures. Another multi-storied vaulted tomb had deep niches on either side of a shallow arcosolia. Like the cone structures, the purpose of these niches was not able to be determined with certainty, but it seemed most likely that they were used for the deposition of cinerary urns or osettothekai, which were also used at times as containers for cremations. The author also makes reference to a mosaic arcosolia which also gave an indication of the presence of cremation at the site, but did not give any details as to what that evidence might be.242

Kocakizlar Tumulus

242 The author cites a mosaic arcosolia from the tomb AII 14 as suggesting evidence of cremation in a footnote, but does not describe what this evidence, or the arcosolia in question, anywhere else in the text. Alföldi-Rosenbaum 1971: 100.
At Kocakizlar, there were at least seven individuals represented: two cremations in the *osetotheke*, two inhumations in the sarcophagi, and three inhumations buried beneath the floor layer in the side chamber. However, the piles of bone and ash found beside the *osetothekei* as well as the pile of bronze vessels found in the front chamber attest to an earlier use of the tomb structure and that the remains and grave offerings of the original burials were discarded and thrown aside during the later periods of use at the site.\(^{243}\)

The first cremation was in the *osetotheke* in the northeast corner of the first chamber. The *osetotheke* had a spout, a feature which suggests that it was a reused item and had originally been created for another purpose.\(^{244}\) A fragment from a marble column provided the lid while another piece of marble served as the base. Inside the *osetotheke* there were both burnt fragments of bone and gold jewelry. Another collection of bone and ash was found in the northwest corner of the chamber and contained gold leaves of a wreath, ivory fragments, the legs of a couch, nails, and various bronze vessels.\(^{245}\)

The second conclusive cremation in the Kocakizlar Tumulus was also in an *osetotheke* located in the final chamber with the two marble sarcophagi. It is carved out of the same marble as the first *osetotheke*, also had a marble lid and contained burnt bone fragments as well as gold jewelry just as the 1st burial did. There was not

---

\(^{244}\) Excavators did not give a possibility as to what this original purpose might have been, but they do note that the interior of the *osetotheke* was carved. Atasoy 1974: 258.  
\(^{245}\) Excavators did not directly claim that the ash and bone fragments found outside of the *osetotheke* were part of an earlier cremation, but they allude to the possibility. Atasoy 1974: 258, 260. However it would seem likely that they are the remains of earlier cremation burials that were destroyed during the period of reuse of the tumulus. While a prospective date for the burials was not given, the excavators did note the prevalence of the Late Hellenistic and Early Roman period pottery found in and around the mound.
really any more information provided about the cremation burials, and the state of the
tumulus, continually under water may have hampered further investigations at the site.

Excavators were able to determine that, based on the unusual amount of
associated grave goods found with both the cremation and inhumation burials,
especially the gold jewelry, the tomb probably belonged to a wealthy aristocratic family. 246 Dating based on the masonry of the walls, the frescoes, the grave offerings and coins found were all from the Late Hellenistic-Early Roman period. Excavators concluded that the tomb was used for several generations by the same family from the 1st century BCE through the 1st century CE, although they also acknowledged that the opportunity for further investigation was needed for conclusive dating for the entire history of the structure. 247

The Conclusions

The evidence for the rite of cremation in Asia Minor provided by these sites shows that, unlike the more standardized forms seen in the previous provinces, cremation within Asia Minor was subject to vast difference based on regional variation, if it was even present at all, and even then was never adopted as the predominant burial rite of the region. 248 These variations may be a reflection of the political structures of the province under the Romans. Unlike in the other provinces, the presence of the Romans in Asia Minor seemed reluctant, and there was no single

246 There were also amber ornaments that were included with the burial goods. Amber was only available in Asia Minor through trade, and was therefore a luxury item and another indicator of the wealth of the family. Atasoy 1974: 261.
247 The water that filled the tumulus made excavation and accurate dating of the phases of the structure difficult. Atasoy 1974: 262.
248 Although there is a certain degree of variation seen in the burials from Africa Proconsularis, they are not to the same degree as those found within Asia Minor.
political unification of the province. Many of the larger cities were able to retain their own rulers and dynastic systems while others were forced to submit to an imperially appointed governor. And while it seems apparent that there was heavy exploitation of Asia Minor at the hands of the Romans, they did not seem to exert control to the same extent as they did within the western provinces.

Therefore, it seems that regional cultural variation which developed during the period of individual kingdoms within Asia Minor continued into the Roman period, and in terms of burial rites, there was no large scale importation of a foreign rite. While there was cremation present, cremation had been a practice during the Hellenistic period and cannot necessarily be seen as a form of incorporation of Roman cultural influence into that of Asia Minor. Instead, the lack of presence of cremation on a greater scale would seem to argue for the opposite point. Where cremation does appear in Asia Minor, it appears to be limited and in a form highly variable to that found in Rome and the other provinces in terms of both ritual and funerary architecture. Unlike in either Britannia or Africa Proconsularis, where there were some variations between the cemeteries, there was no common element that could be used as a descriptor for the cemeteries in Asia Minor. Whereas Britannia had a common focus on ritual, and Africa Proconsularis seems preoccupied with the spectacle of the funerary rite, the differences in Asia Minor were too great for such a generalization of practice across the province. There was no apparent ‘structuring principle’ as Woolf called it.

Part of the reason for this might be that when Asia Minor was created as a province, it was a political designation rather and a cultural or ethnic one. The
Romans included many different kingdoms within the new province, regardless of the people or the political organization that had been in place before. The province was not one isolated region, as Britannia had been, nor had it all been controlled under a single empire in the period before the Roman conquest, as Asia Minor had been. Therefore the cultures of the different areas of Asia Minor would be expected to have been quite different.
Chapter Five: Implications of Results

By looking at the cremations of Britannia, Africa Proconsularis and Asia Minor and comparing them not only to a generalized Roman practice but to each other as well, two of the provinces, Britannia and Africa Proconsularis, exhibited clear instances of Roman influence in their cremations. As there was a combination of both elite and non-elite burials represented in the cemeteries, it appears that the adoption of the Roman rite of cremation was not restricted to the elites, who are usually highlighted in provincial studies for their apparent emulation of Roman culture.\(^{249}\) However, this pattern was not present in one province, Asia Minor. While this does not indicate that there was no Roman influence on the burial practices, and more generally, the culture, of the people of Asia Minor, it suggests that there was something else going on in this province that prevented the establishment of commonalities in practice as was seen in the previous two provinces. While utilizing Mattingly’s idea of advantage to describe the process of emulation, negotiation and

\(^{249}\) In Britannia, the elite burials were represented primarily by the rich burials at the center of ‘enclosure’ and ‘family’ groups in the King Harry Lane cemetery, as well as some of the more elaborate burials from the eastern cemetery of Londinium. In Africa Proconsularis, elite burials are most likely represented by the six stucco towers which were a main feature of the cemetery and, in two cases, were decorated.
adaptation of culture in the provinces does draw a parallel between the adoption of
cremation in Britannia and Africa Proconsularis, the evidence from Asia Minor is so
varied it really cannot be compared. Based on these three provinces, a common theme
of Romanizing influence through the provinces cannot be widely discerned, although
the possibility of such a theme is suggested.

As stated before, the differentiation between the non-elite and the elite burial
site is important because most of the theories concerning cultural influence within the
Roman provinces incorporate the assumption that the elites of an indigenous society
would be more inclined to utilize Roman culture to solidify their own position.
However, only recently have there been discussions of the strictly non-elites in the
provinces and how they may have been influenced by the Romans. The recent interest
has become evident in the recent focus on theoretical models that would consider the
non-elites and give them agency similar to the elites in the creation of new post-
conquest cultures.

I wanted to look at sites that were specifically outside the norm of the elite
burial setting, but which could include non-elite and possibly elite burials alike.250
The common elite burial forms included the famous monumental tombs that have
been the subject of a great deal of study. Non-elite burials are generally found both as
isolated graves and within cemetery sites, although cemeteries were not restricted to
only the non-elites as was the case at King Harry Lane and the Yasmina Necropolis.
In the province of Britannia, where there was not the same tradition of monumental
tomb architecture as there was elsewhere, the elites seem to have also been buried in

250 An exception was made for the Kocakizlar Tumulus because the inclusion of multiple rites within a
single tomb seemed unusual as it would be expected for a family, who would generally share such a
tomb, to be practicing the same rite.
the cemeteries with few visual markers distinguishing class.\textsuperscript{251} The study of non-elite burials was more difficult for Africa Proconsularis where the practice of monumental tomb architecture had been adopted before the arrival of the Romans and had continued for many centuries. These tombs have been a predominant feature of the funerary archaeology of the province. The situation was even more complicated in Asia Minor where there were many different practices, including monumental tombs, associated with elite burials. Cremation was the limiting factor in these provinces and the sites, while most likely not the burial grounds for the very poor, portrayed a variety of practices from different classes, including the non-elites. The goal was to see if Roman influence reached the burial practices of all segments of society, especially the non-elites which have been studied less.

In the provinces of Britannia and Africa Proconsularis, while the rites of cremation were manifested in different ways, they represented a shift from the pre-Roman rites of inhumation that were generally found in both. The adoption of the cremation rite, and the adaptation of it to create a unique form, is evidence not only of the influence of Roman culture and what may have previously been termed ‘Romanization,’ but also of the agency of the indigenous people. They transformed the Roman rite as it was brought to them into something that was unique to their own customs and also reflected their own cultural differences.

In Britannia, the cremation rites of all three sites were more similar than in any of the other provinces. In general, the bodies were burned at a pyre site removed from the cemetery, as seemed to have been most common in Rome, especially as the

\textsuperscript{251} It is possible that there were separate cemeteries for the wealthy that would have displayed more indications of class, but they have as of yet not been identified.
majority of cremations there come from *columbaria* where the cremation would have had to take place elsewhere. A seemingly random selection of bone and ash was collected after the cremation was finished, along with any relevant pyre goods, and were either interred in an urn, as the majority of cremations were, or deposited directly into the ground. In either case, there were no tombs or tumulus structures involved. The remains were placed within simple pit burials and there is evidence that at least some of these graves had some sort of above ground marker, other than enclosure walls, but none survive to this day. They were either made of ephemeral materials or not meant to be lasting structures. This would seem to indicate that there was a fundamental difference in the way the people of Britannia looked at death and commemoration, and the way the Romans did, though exactly what that difference may have been is hard to say. Either way, it appears that in this particular province, lasting spectacle as an integral part of the funerary customs and landscape was not part of the rite that was transferred from the Romans. The common use of urns is similar to the rite of Rome; the lack of a funerary monument and tomb is not.

In Africa Proconsularis, there was a greater degree of variation in the cremation rites between the sites discussed. Whereas in the Yasmina Necropolis all the cremations excavated appear to have been burned on a pyre elsewhere, in both Pupput and Leptiminus there were quite a few instances of *in situ* burials. Also, the funerary monuments at each of the sites was different, where Leptiminus showed evidence of just simple earthen tumuli being constructed over the graves, most of the burials at Pupput were covered by a built masonry *cupula* or tumulus. However, although the building materials in these tombs were different, the forms were not.
Finally, the tombs from the Yasmina Necropolis displayed the greatest amount of variation of all the cemeteries. Here, there were both what appeared to be elite tower structures where the cremation urns were either placed on an inner wall niche or cemented into place on an outer wall, as well as tombs which were more similar to the earthen tumuli of Leptiminus with urns placed underneath. There were also graves where the urns were simply placed into the ground between two previous burials, as the cremations from the 5th century CE were. While there was no spatial differentiation between the different types of graves, there was a temporal gap. The tower structures, based on the iconography of the Tertullus/Vilius monument, probably dated to around the 1st or 2nd century CE. The other forms date to much later periods of use of the cemetery.

The cremation rites exhibited in Africa Proconsularis cemeteries, while not an exhaustive study, indicate that there was a fair amount of regional variation going on with the practice. However, there is one trait that is shared by all of the burials; they were enclosed within a tomb structure. This is similar to the practice in Rome, although the *columbaria* in Rome were meant to house multiple cremations while the in Africa Proconsularis the cremations were interred separately. Yet, the cemeteries can be seen as exhibiting the same idea of the unity of practice and common burial that were displayed in Rome. While it is not in the same building, as would have happened in Rome, it is in the same geographic area and within similar tomb formations. However, this is merely a superficial similarity. It only shows that there was the same interest with spectacle within Africa Proconsularis.
Comparing the cremations from these two provinces, Britannia and Africa Proconsularis, and the two different patterns that emerged, the differences in the adaptation of the rite within their respective provinces become clear. First, and perhaps most importantly, is the different treatment of physical display and spectacle of the funerary rite. This was something that was apparently more important in the creation of the cemeteries in Africa Proconsularis and the practice of the funerary rites. In all of the cemeteries, tombs were grouped together and exhibited similar characteristic to become one larger part of the landscape; they were unified through the use of the cremation rite, but they were also creating a physical display by changing the landscape around the cemetery. There was a balance between the competition that dominated the elite burials and the ideas of unity as expressed by Morris; while these would seem to be contradictory, it appears that in Africa Proconsularis, these ideas were not polarized in Africa Proconsularis and could occur together.

For example, even if a person could not afford to build one of the large monumental tombs that were favored by the elites, the could join with other people to for a large group of smaller burials that would have expressed more of a group identity, but would also be exclusionary as with any manifestation of group mentality. People could belong to a group and still give the appearance of being better than others. This seems to be similar to the idea of the *columbaria*, where lower class individuals were buried together in large expensive tombs that they all collectively paid for. The tower structures from the Yasmina Necropolis, one of which was decorated in a way that would seem to indicate that individual patron of the tomb was
trying to establish continuity with Rome displays another aspect of combining the individual with the group.

Regardless, this idea of spectacle and group identity is something that as stated before, is not found in Britannia. In Britannia there seems to be more of a concern with the actual ritual of the cremation rather than the interment or any physical markers for it. Therefore, the cremations themselves are very similar, right down to the use of the funeral pyre, the interment in an urn, and the inclusion of select pyre and grave goods. They are just not translated into the culture of competition that was developing in Rome and Africa Proconsularis; as stated before, there was less advantage.

With these two provinces, it appears that there might be a common theme that could be used to look at the development of the cremation rite, and the greater provincial cultures, namely, the recognition of place within the empire and how culture could be manipulated to reach a higher standing. As stated before, this could explain the difference in the above ground markers of cremation, and why cremation was adopted in Africa Proconsularis in the first place. However, it does not really explain why it was adopted in Britannia. While there may have been an aspect of advantage playing out, further study would need to be done to answer this question.

Asia Minor was completely different and calls into question any sort of larger common theme that could unite the practices within the provinces. Within this area, cremation never took over as the dominant burial rite as it did in the other two provinces. Where it was practiced, sporadically within a few regions of the province, there were no apparent similarities in how it was performed, in ritual or in tomb
structure which could lend to a comparison with one of the other provinces. While it is true that part of this apparent dissimilarity may be due to the lack of preserved cremated remains from many sites, there are currently no indications that such evidence would yield any other result. The tomb forms were all different, and practice of ritual appears to have little continuity, and since cremation was a rite practiced in Asia Minor, to a small degree, before the arrival of the Romans, even its presence in Roman times cannot be attributed to any form of Roman influence.

Ultimately, it appears that while the Romans may have had varying levels of influence over the burial practices of the provinces, there was no unifying link that tied the practices of the provinces together. At this time, they must each be looked at individually to understand how Roman culture was incorporated into the new post-conquest culture, and what occurred in one province cannot be seen as having any bearing on what may have happened in another. When it comes to the burial practice of cremation, each province has to be studied independently and given its own model to work with, although the ‘almost’ link between Britannia and Africa Proconsularis might be an indication that with further study and greater understanding of the native peoples, a common premise might be found.

There are several factors which could account for the kinds of differences that make it difficult to compare the provinces, the first and foremost being the political structures instituted in a province by the Romans. For example, within Asia Minor, there was little unity in the treatment of the different regions of the province in terms of their government. Some were allowed to keep the preexisting structure that they had before the Romans, and some were given new governments with Roman
governors who would exert varying amounts of control. The situation was different in Britannia, where the Romans established cities and then imposed their own governments on them. This leads to the 2nd possible cause for the variability within the empire. Within Asia Minor and African Proconsularis, there were already major cities that had been established by empires and kingdoms that had existed before the Romans. Especially in the case of Asia Minor, which seemed to be a nexus of civilization and whose designation as a single provincial unit was based on Roman politics rather than on cultural unity of the people, there were multiple cultures coming into contact with the Romans. Therefore, it would seem that the very reason the provinces and sites were chosen, for their variation, was the reason there was no underlying link between them.

In terms of cremation, there was no single way, it entered into the cultures of the provinces. Each provinces adopted different aspects of the rite, if they adopted any at all, and consequently the same result was never achieved in the provinces. Both Africa Proconsularis and Asia Minor had influence from multiple different cultures in them, but Africa Proconsularis adopted the rite while Asia Minor did not. Britannia had regional variations in culture based on its Iron Age tribal systems, similar to the variation found in Asia Minor, though admittedly to a lesser degree, but again, Britannia was the only province that adopted the rite. The only factor which follows the pattern of these three provinces is the degree of political involvement that the Romans exerted on the cities. Asia Minor appeared to have less than the other two provinces, and this may have been a factor in its not adopting the cremation rite.
However, without a comparable situation elsewhere, this cannot be determined as a pattern.

What is apparent is that the Romans were not necessarily interested in creating an empire unified by any form of custom. Instead, the Empire was held together through the armies and the economy; they both drove the expansion of the Empire and were responsible for making sure the interests of Rome were met. If this is true, the Romans were not interested in imposing their culture on anyone else. It was the motivation of the indigenous people that appears to have driven such acts. This would tend to argue against any sort of unifying practice carried out through the provinces as the Romans themselves were the only thing that all the provinces for certain had in common.

This is something that seems to be forgotten in some of the theoretical models discussed earlier. It would seem that with these models, scholars are trying to find some way to create a unifying theme for what happened in the provinces, if only in describing a probable behavior for the people involved. However, as has been seen, the amount of variation from province to province does not seem to support this idea. Many of the theories begin with basic assumptions of commonality between the provinces, whether the idea of similarity of form means similarity of function, as is the case in ‘Romanization’ or that the same motivations will drive people to similar action, as in ‘Creolization.’ This study showed that neither of these assumptions are true. The wealthy pit graves in Britannia outwardly resembled the poor pit graves in Rome, though they certainly had different functions and meanings. Similarly, it would be expected that there would be motivated individuals within Britannia as there
were in Africa Proconsularis who would have sought entrance into the political and
economic spheres of the Romans as a means of acquiring wealth. However there was
apparently very little concern with spectacle and competition, unlike in Africa
Proconsularis. As more differences, or similarities, are exposed through further
excavations, theorists may have to make more allowances for individuality amongst
the provinces in order to create a new model for cultural influence. I believe
Mattingly’s model, which begins on the very premise of difference, is the closest to
achieving this.

While this study only looked at the cremation practice in the provinces of the
Roman Empire, such limited results may still be used as indicators of other cultural
practices and to approximated how they may have been influenced by the Romans.
However, while direct comparisons cannot be drawn, it may be safe to say that, as in
cremation, the range of influences throughout the Empire had created a cultural
picture too complicated to be explained with an idea of a unifying practice of cultural
exchange.
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