CODE-SWITCHING AND IDENTITY IN THE WESTERN PROVINCES

Louise Revell
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

Introduction

From the origins of archaeology as a field of enquiry, material variability has been at its heart. This variability has been taken to mean differences in people: synchronous variability pointing to differences in social groups, diachronous variability either the movements of peoples, or internal social change. This connection between material and people has been fundamental to post-processual archaeology, with the formulation of more explicit theories about the relationship between material, people and society. At the same time, as part of wider post-modern agendas within humanities and social sciences, ideas of fixed and normative social relations have been declared suspect, and replaced by concepts of negotiation and fluidity. Thus the past has been reformulated as a place of ongoing recreations of context-dependent social systems and personal identity.

Within these new agendas, identity has emerged as a central topic, and as an important approach to material variability. Through ideas of agency and social practice, the relationship between people and material has been reconceptualised. In this intellectual climate, Andrew Wallace-Hadrill's *Rome's cultural revolution* offers a further theory for combining cultural traditions: that of code-switching.[1] Focussing on a specific moment in the history of Rome, he argues for the application of a particular linguistic theory to the material evidence. He explicitly focusses on cultural identity, but in this paper I want to open up the debate to consider its applicability to identity more broadly.

---

1.   Wallace-Hadrill 2008.

In order to do so, I shall first consider approaches to identity more widely, arguing for identity as created through performativity. I shall then move on to consider the specific case of Roman ethnicity, before asking whether code-switching can be of value as a theory for understanding artefact variability and change within Roman Britain.

Identity and material culture

There have been two stimuli to the emergence of identity as a core part of post-processual approaches to archaeological material:[2] feminist archaeology which has led to a new interest in gender and, more recently, age;[3] and secondly, new approaches to cultural, or ethnic, identity.[4] Although often treated as such, theories of identity in archaeology do not form a homogenous school of thought, but instead draw on a range of literature from sociology, anthropology and philosophy. Furthermore, the archaeological literature has tended to be fragmented into discrete strands which focus on specific or related aspects of identity. For example, the study of ethnicity in the Roman Empire can be seen as completely separate to the study of gender. Often, researchers draw on different bodies of theoretical literature, with those investigating gender reading predominantly feminist theory, and those studying ethnicity concentrating on post-colonial theory and work on national identities.

Nevertheless, much of this theory overlaps in both assumptions and approaches. One idea which is common to much of the literature is that identity is not primordial or fixed at birth; it is situational, and specific to the social context. Simone de Beauvoir's famous comment that 'one is not born a woman, but rather becomes one' can be applied to all aspects of identity. Gender, age, religion or ethnicity are not universal, either in how each category is divided into groups or the way in which these groups are marked out. The number of genders within a society is not necessarily fixed at two, nor are they defined by ideologies of economically active men and nurturing women. Instead, ideologies of identity are particular to specific societies, and an individual is socialised into the rules and mores of particular social groups during their childhood. There is considerable debate about the relationship between the physical body and social identity, but most would agree that there is some relationship and that identity is to some extent embodied.[5] For example, in

2.   Díaz-Andreu and Lucy 2005.
3.   Conkey and Spector 1984; Gero and Conkey 1991.
4.   Jones 1997; Shennan 1989.
5.   Meskell 1998; Sofaer 2006.

dealing with age, archaeologists and non-archaeologists recognise that there can be a chronological measure of age, as well as the physiological processes of the aging body.[6] Nonetheless, the aging process is socially mediated, both in terms of how the life-course is divided into aged groups such as children or the elderly, when the transitions occurred between the various stages, and the ideologies associated with each. The same debate can be articulated about the relationship between race and ethnicity, or sex and gender.

Thus identity categories cannot be taken as universals, and this has led Sørensen to argue that identity should be seen both as a category of difference and as a process.[7] It is both the values and rules of behaviour associated with a specific category, and the everyday practices through which those expectations are enacted, and the sense of self renegotiated. If we say that identity is a social construction, we need to think of that construction as much as a verb as a noun. Consequently, our focus should be on the processes through which identity was constructed, maintained and transformed in the past, rather than specific material correlates uncritically used to recognize the identity of an individual. This ties in with ideas of identity as formed through performativity or praxis.[8] Our sense of who we are and which social groups we feel an affinity to are created through everyday practices. These practices also create differences from other groups, marking out "us" from "them".[9] It is within this idea of performativity or social practice that material culture becomes important. Specific forms of material can constitute an act of communication, marking membership of specific groups, and boundaries between them.[10] However, material does not carry an inherent meaning which ties it in to one particular identity or another, but instead, it is given meaning through specific to particular contexts.[11] Similarly, it is not necessarily single items which form the act of communication, but may be combinations of items, or even the specific practices they enable.[12] Finally, not all items may function as boundary markers, and so some will cross social groups.

The result is that an archaeology of identity is more problematic than is sometimes allowed for in archaeological studies. Rather than assuming that a certain item of material culture, such as an ear-ring for example, stands in a direct one-to-one relationship with a specific aspect of identity, such as

6.   Arber and Ginn 1995; Gowland 2006; Sofaer 2011.
7.   Sørensen 2000.
8.   Bourdieu 1977; Butler 1999; Giddens 1984; Goffmann 1959.
9.   Barth 1969.
10.   Hodder 1982.
11.   Hodder 1986.
12.   Revell 2009, Sørensen 1997.

gender, we need to interrogate whether this was necessarily the case, how it was given that meaning, and what other meanings it might have held. Allason-Jones' work on ear-rings in Roman Britain points to some of these questions.[13] In Roman Britain, as with other forms of jewellery, ear-rings are only found in graves with sexed female skeletons, suggesting that they are bound up in the ways genders were distinguished.[14] Although our interpretation of their meaning comes from the context of the grave, the more common act of performance was the ear-rings being worn in life, whether by the specific deceased individual or not. Dress and jewellery formed a means of communicating social roles and social differences,[15] and so if wearing ear-rings was restricted to one group, they, possibly in association with other forms of dress and jewellery, formed a way to structure differences between the genders. However, in other cases, understanding the relationship between material culture and identity could be less straightforward. In the eastern half of the empire, ear-rings were also worn by men. Although no ear-rings have been found with sexed male skeletons in Roman Britain, the epigraphically attested presence of troops from the eastern half of the empire serving in Britain raises this as a possibility (it should be noted that few military cemeteries have been excavated). If the grave of a male was found with an ear-ring, it would then raise questions of whether the meaning of the ear-ring was associated with the deceased's gender, or with his eastern ethnicity.

These questions are raised in the case of a small number of anomalous male graves in Britain: sexed male skeletons wearing jet jewellery usually associated with women.[16] The most well-known is the so-called Gallus from Catterick,[17] where a sexed male skeleton, aged 20-25 years, was buried with a jet necklace around his neck, a jet bracelet and a bead bracelet on his left arm and an anklet on his right leg. The jewellery is unusual for male burials, and jet is usually associated with female skeletons.[18] In this case, we are left with alternative explanations for understanding the identity of the deceased man. Did he wear such jewellery during his lifetime, or was it only used for his burial? Furthermore, was it being used to differentiate a third gender,[19] or was the gendered material being used as a metaphor to denote a different aspect of identity, such as the religious identity of the Galli, the castrated

13.   Allason-Jones 1989; 1995.
14.   See also Swift 2011.
15.   Sørensen 1997.
16.   Booth et al. 2008, Cool 2011, Cool *et al.* 2004, Wilson 2002.
17.   Cool 2002.
18.   Allason-Jones 1996.
19.   Swift 2011.

priests of Cybele?[20] The meaning of material culture such as this jewellery cannot be assumed through "common-sense", but needs to be identified through a full contextual study.

Thus, a fundamental issue for an archaeology of identity is understanding the processes through which identity is formed, and the difficulties in associating these with items of material culture. However, there are further problems. The first is the question of whether we are looking for individual identities (categories) or the way in which the group formulates its sense of self (processes). There is a tendency to associate identity with the individual, possibly because identity within the modern world is tied up with a very individualised sense of self. Whether this is really the case in the contemporary west is open to question, but its applicability for the past is highly contentious. This has led some to question whether identity can be identified from material culture alone. Ton Derks argues that we cannot detect a person's ethnic identity without an explicit written statement, such as on an inscription.[21] However, even if we are uncertain about whether a specific individual would ascribe themselves to a particular identity or not, we are still able to investigate the processes through which identity was negotiated. There may be cases where we can pinpoint the identity of an individual with certainty, usually from inscription evidence, or from the goods included in their burial. Yet even in these instances, we are often left with the labels, and without the wider viewpoint, we cannot understand the processes through which these labels were given meaning, and differences constructed between groups.

A second issue to consider associated with the idea of the individual is that a single person's identity will not consist of one identity, but will be a palimpsest of multiple aspects: ethnic identity, family identity, gender, age, social rank or class, occupation, religion, health/disability amongst others. Again, objections to the idea of a single category have arisen from a number of sources, feminist as well as post-colonial perspectives. These have been taken on board by archaeologists, and within Roman archaeology by Andrew Gardner and David Mattingly amongst others.[22] Whilst it is important to be aware of the intersection of these multiple aspects, in reality, not all will be dominant in particular social circumstances. Furthermore, it raises again the focus on categories rather than processes: we can acknowledge that a single person was male or female, child or adult, Roman or non-Roman etc., but without understanding how these categories were

20. Cool 2002.
21. Derks 2009. Similarly Hall 1997, but see Antonaccio 2010.
22. Gardner 2002; Mattingly 2004. See also Revell 2000; 2009.

maintained, we cannot hope to understand what being a woman, or an adult entailed for the individual in the past.[23]

It is within these theoretical approaches to identity that we should consider whether code-switching can be used to understand artefact variability. Initially devised as a linguistic phenomenon,[24] the fundamental questions are whether it can be applied to material culture, and if so, what problems there might be. The move from language to material culture is not in itself unprecedented, as linguistic theory has already been successfully used within post-processual approaches to material culture.[25] Within the approach to identity I have outlined, there seem to be two issues which need to be resolved: the first, the relationship between utterance and performativity; and second, how we, as archaeologists, identify meaning. The utterance is encapsulated within a single moment: a single act of communication from one person to another. However, the idea of performativity or social practice is that it is ongoing: the performance of acts on a repeated basis. Within the act of burial we can perhaps find a direct analogy between the two, but other circumstances are more complicated. As archaeologists, we need to have a more flexible timescale for the occurrence of the code-switching, as the same level of resolution is not possible, or even possibly, applicable. More problematic is understanding the codes themselves: identifying the two codes at play, and also what their meaning might be. Wallace-Hadrill's identification of the cultural meanings ascribed to different forms of material are largely derived from textual sources. For the Roman provinces, we cannot necessarily rely on these: the artefact variability within the archaeological record precludes a straightforward mapping of textual sources derived from Rome onto the material found elsewhere. Instead, we need to rely upon the interpretations we can derive from the particular archaeological context, warning against focussing on the possible incidence of code-switching in isolation, but instead considering it within wider patterns of usage.

Ethnicity in the Roman Empire

In order to test the value of code-switching in Roman archaeology, I want to consider questions of ethnicity and code-switching. Since the 1980s, Romanization has been increasingly deconstructed as a concept, particularly within Anglo-American scholarship, and questions raised of its applicability

23. Sørensen 2000, p. 13.
24. Adams 2003.
25. E.g. Hodder 1986.

as a concept.[26] As identity has emerged as a central topic of post-processual archaeology, the idea of ethnic identity has been adopted by Roman archaeologists as an alternative means of understanding archaeological change.[27] However, there is the danger that identity has been laid over the existing Romanization paradigm: the terminology is different, but the idea of a defined cultural package remains. As I have argued above, theories of identity stress the fluidity of identity, with material culture as bound up in practice rather than merely correlates of an identity. These core concepts have not necessarily been seen as part of the new approaches to Roman ethnicity. In particular, there has been limited discussion of how Roman ethnicity was constructed. There is some research on this question for Rome itself,[28] but much less considering the question of how to define a Roman identity within the provinces. This may be a product of the rejection of Romano-centric views, part of post-colonial approaches to cultural change, alongside the lack of engagement between archaeologists of Rome and Roman Italy, and those of the western provinces. The unintended consequence is that whilst we have concentrated on regional responses, the question of what constituted a shared Roman identity has been left unexplored.[29]

Modern definitions of ethnicity cannot be mapped unproblematically onto the Roman world, as these are strongly tied into the definition of the nation-state. Nevertheless, we can use them as a means of understanding how a Roman ethnic identity might be formed. There is no agreement on the definition of ethnicity, with individual authors arguing for varying combinations of a shared history, consanguinity, association with a specific territory, a collective name, and shared customs.[30] Nevertheless, all definitions include the idea of shared customs and culture, such as religion, dress, architecture, and language. We can tie this into identity being formed through performativity: specific forms of behaviour reproduce cultural values which tie the group together, but also separate it from other ethnic groups. Sian Jones has used these ideas to argue for an archaeology of ethnicity based around social practice, specifically Bourdieu's idea of habitus.[31] However, whilst shared cultural practices can be seen as an important element of an ethnic identity, tying them into specific elements of material culture is something of a misguided methodology. In Roman Britain, changes in the practices of worship as well

26. Hingley 2005; Keay and Terrenato 2001; Mattingly 1997; Millett 1990; Webster 2001; Woolf 1998.
27. Mattingly 2011; Pitts 2007.
28. Dench 2005; Farney 2007; Wallace-Hadrill 2008.
29. Woolf 1994; 1998 represent exceptions to this.
30. Compare for example, Barth 1969; Nash 1989; Smith 1986; Weber 1968 [1956].
31. Jones 1997.

as the deities being worshipped are evident, but the resulting archaeological record does not show uniformity in material expression of this. Two new forms of material culture are part of these changes, dedicatory stone altars and temples, but these show quite different distributions: temples tend to cluster in the southern, civilian zone, whilst inscribed altars are found predominantly in military zones.[32] Both forms of material are part of the post-conquest cultural changes, and both are part of distinctive religious practices we can broadly see as "Roman".[33] However, neither can be taken as a stand-alone indicator of Roman ethnicity.

This could be applied to all forms of material culture we broadly think of as Roman: it is not possible to use the presence or absence of particular artefacts as diagnostic of Roman identity. This can be attributed to discrepant impacts of Roman imperial structures,[34] but it should also be seen as part of the fluid relationship between identity and material culture. Rather than looking for diagnostic items of material culture, recent work on Roman identity has stressed the idea of shared cultural assumptions and practices. John Barrett, for example, has argued for a repositioning of the study of Roman imperialism and cultural change, and that a Roman identity revolves around common cultural values which penetrated the routines of the daily lives of the people of the provinces, and the ways these were expressed materially.[35] A similar approach underpins Woolf's study of the Romanization of the Gallic provinces, in which he argues that the adoption of Roman culture should be seen as encapsulating 'the range of objects, beliefs and practices that were characteristic of people who considered themselves to be, and were widely acknowledged as, Roman'.[36]

We can apply these ideas to the study of Roman urbanism, and the role of towns in the ongoing maintenance of a Roman identity.[37] Within Roman textual sources, urbanism was a marker of correct modes of living, which (literally) set the civilized apart from the barbarians.[38] The appearance (or not) of towns with Roman-type buildings and legal codes has been seen as an archaeological marker for Romanization. However, rather than looking specifically at the collection of buildings, we should also examine the types of activities it might enable, and whether these were part of wider practices

---

32. Mattingly 2006; Millett 1995.
33. Revell 2009.
34. Mattingly 2011.
35. Barrett 1989; 1993; 1997.
36. Woolf 1998, p. 11.
37. For a fuller discussion, Revell 2009.
38. Richardson 1995; Roda 1995; Rykwert 1976; Zanker 2000.

and ideologies of urbanism. The town of Tarraco developed out of a military camp adjoining the Iberian settlement of Kesse in the 2nd century BC, and was later refounded as *colonia (Iulia) Urbs Triumphalis Tarraco*.[39] By the 1st century AD it possessed the urban facilities we might expect in a provincial capital: a colonial forum, theatre and public baths in the lower town, and a temple to Divus Augustus in the upper town. During the second half of the 1st century, the upper town was turned into a more monumental complex, incorporating the temple, a provincial forum and a circus; in the 2nd century, an amphitheatre was built outside the city walls. The epigraphic evidence points to the adoption of Roman style socio-political systems.[40] These changes to the settlement centre are echoed in the surrounding countryside:[41] in the pre-Roman period, Kesse was one of three local centres, but over the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, the other two declined whilst Kesse/Tarraco became dominant. Thus the people of the hinterland became dependent on Tarraco for urban facilities.

From this broad overview, what can we say about the role of urbanism in the ethnic identity of the people of Tarraco and its territory? There is a tendency to focus on the urban lives of elite families, but the town formed a stage for the daily practices of the non-elites, and those living in its hinterland. Assuming the colonia was granted a charter similar to the *lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae*,[42] we can begin to identify some of these practices. The (male) citizens of the colonia, including those who lived in the surrounding countryside, were expected to take part in annual elections for the chief magistrates, which took place within the colonial forum. They and their families might attend religious festivals, either sacrifices, or games and dramatic spectacles in the theatre or amphitheatre. If they were prosecuted for debt, or involved in any other legal action, their cases would be heard within the town and overseen by the local magistrates. The charter refers to market days, when people from the surrounding territory may have come into the town to sell their wares and buy goods. They had an obligation to work for the community for up to five days per year, and could be compelled to take up arms as a local militia. The town had official record offices, suggesting that their tax obligations and any proof of land-ownership were also kept within the town. There are other events not recorded in the extant sections of the charter, such as the payment of taxes and the taking of the census. Although less than a fifth of the population of Tarraco lived within the town walls, the requirements of the charter

39. Macias Solé *et al.* 2007; Ruiz de Arbulo 2006.
40. Alföldy 1975.
41. Carreté *et al.* 1995.
42. Crawford 1996, pp. 393-454

applied to those living within the territory. Through such visits to the town, the citizens of the colonia and their families would become familiar with the spaces of the town, how to act within them, and how to read the iconography decorating them. Through such activities, we can understand how an ideology of urbanism became a shared element of a Roman ethnicity.

Code-switching and Roman ethnicity

This reformulation of ethnicity as performative raises the question of how code-switching might be used to gain further insight into the processes of identity maintenance. Wallace-Hadrill's argument is based within a specific context where the switching between two cultural languages was made meaningful in a specific series of socio-political circumstances. His study concentrates on a particular moment, when identity in Rome itself was contested in the context of a growing appreciation of the city as the centre of a large empire, and its relationship to the Hellenistic kingdoms and Greek culture. In contrast, within the context of the Roman provinces, for archaeologists the key question is that of cultural change or Romanization. Within the last two decades, this has become an area of intense research, and one key element of this debate has been the role of material culture in this debate. Variability within the material assemblages of different regions (and at times, within the same region) is a key characteristic, and it is one archaeologists have sought to explain. Early explanations that this was due to the apparent backwardness of the provincial communities have been replaced by more theoretically-aware models, such as resistance, creolization, or briccolage. The retention of elements of pre-conquest forms of material culture alongside the adoption of new elements raises the question of whether code-switching can also be used to understand the ways in which provincial communities adjusted to new social and political realities. This is not to argue for a return to the bounded cultural blocks which have underpinned older studies of Romanization,[43] and which have been heavily critiqued,[44] but to understand the deliberate retention of material in contrast to the adoption of the new.

We can see this interaction in the Romano-British town of Verulamium (modern St. Albans). During the century before the conquest of AD 43, there was a reorganization of the settlement systems to produce the oppidum of

---

43. E.g. Haverfield 1915.
44. Freeman 1993.

Verlamion.[45] This was a dispersed settlement comprising a series of enclosures on the plateau overlooking the River Ver, and an important central enclosure on the slopes below. There was a high status residential area at Gorehambury, a cemetery at King Harry Lane, and some form of enclosure at Folly Lane. The two hectare Central Enclosure was surrounded by an unusually substantial ditch. In this area, a number of pellet moulds were discovered, which are usually found on high status Iron Age sites. The function of the site is unclear, whether it was a royal residence associated with a pre-Roman mint, or some form of ceremonial or religious site.[46] Whichever was the case, the finds point to it being a key place in the routines of the inhabitants.

Following conquest, the earliest changes respected the pre-Roman monumental landscape rather than eradicating it. In particular, in the immediate post-conquest period, an unusual cremation took place in the high status funerary complex at Folly Lane.[47] It was carried out in the enclosure, and was distinguished by the richness of the pyre goods, including at least 2.5 kg of silver objects, bronze and enamel horse gear, and a tunic of iron mail. A few metres away, a shaft of approximately 3 m deep was constructed, with at its base, a sunken funerary chamber. Within this chamber were the remains of a feast: a large quantity of tableware, wine amphorae and fragments of furniture. A small amount of the pyre material was placed in a shallow pit, and this, the shaft and chamber then covered with a turf mound, with the site of the pyre marked by a wooden post. This funerary complex is key to understanding the initial layout of the town: a trackway linking it with the King Harry Lane cemetery became the axis of the town, with the central enclosure, the new bath-house in insula 19 and the shops in insula 14 lying to either side of it. The other enclosures on the plateau seem to have been abandoned. In this way, the initial construction of the town, a new form of settlement, included key places from the pre-Roman landscape. Their memory was preserved, but new forms of architecture were being introduced, bringing new forms of routines and ideas.

This amalgamation of new and the old continued as the town developed during the Flavian period, with the trackway from the Folly Lane enclosure to King Harry Lane remaining focal. Along this route, a series of buildings were constructed which conformed to new ideas of architecture and social routines: the forum, and a temple. The forum was constructed on the site of the

45. Creighton 2006, pp. 124-130; Haselgrove and Millett 1997; Niblett and Thompson 2005, pp. 23-40.
46. Niblett 2001, pp. 42-43.
47. Niblett 1999.

Central Enclosure, retaining its significance, but with a new form of architecture setting it within the context of a new political system.[48] Although the inscription is very fragmentary, it seems to have been dedicated to Titus and Domitian, probably in the name of the townspeople.[49] A Romano-Celtic temple was constructed in the late 1st century AD in insula 16, on a site which may have already had a ritual significance through burials and possible ritual pits.[50] During the following centuries, the town developed, with elaborate town houses, and a theatre. However, the zones of the Folly Lane burial, the Central Enclosure/Forum and the temple-theatre complex remained key.

Therefore, at Verulamium we see the construction of a town which incorporated architecture enabling Roman ideas and routines, but retaining elements of the pre-Roman in the sense of place. This could be identified as a case of code-switching, but it returns us to the problems I raised earlier: the relationship between utterance and performativity, and the question of meaning. As argued earlier, identity is created through repeated acts of social practice, therefore rather than a single utterance, within the context of Verulamium, code-switching needs to operate through the acts of inhabiting or dwelling within the context of the town. As at Tarraco, this could be the more formal activities connected with political activity and religious activities, or alternatively, more informal daily activities. Whichever form these activities took, through moving between the spaces of the Folly Lane complex, the forum and the insula 16 temple, the inhabitants were confronted with an architectural language derived from (although not identical to) that at Rome, but with an organised townscape that highlighted areas which had pre-conquest significance. Therefore, rituals enacted at the site of the Folly Lane burial were carried out with the knowledge of its pre-conquest significance. Similarly, once the Romano-Celtic temple was constructed at the heart of the town, rituals carried out there were done so with the sense of continuity. We can carry this over to the forum site, where the political significance of the central enclosure was maintained through the new Roman structure, but the forum in turn was given authority through the previous importance of the site. Approaching the forum as a magistrate, or a citizen of the town to vote, recreated both meanings or codes. Rather than a single utterance, code-switching needs to be located within the ongoing routines of dwelling within a place.

However, the question of meaning is more complex than that of utterance/performativity. It is unlikely that the selection of key places in the pre-conquest

48. Frere 1983.
49. RIB 3123.
50. Niblett and Thompson 2005, pp. 92-93.

landscape as the sites for the most important monuments of the Roman town was coincidental. Therefore, arguing that initially at least, there were two codes at play in the early development of Verulamium is persuasive. Whilst there was a hiatus of up to four decades between conquest and the construction of the forum on the site of the central enclosure, there is evidence for some form of continuous use of the site, with evidence for burials, and a structure which might have been some form of proto forum.[51] This would have allowed the significance of the site to be retained. Its physical link through a road with the Folly Lane enclosure would have added to this meaning. John Creighton has argued that the ritualization of the Folly Lane enclosure was part of a strategy by a local elite family to maintain their social and political power within the changing post-conquest society.[52] If this is the case, it points to one reason why the significance of the burial may have been retained, and its link to pre-conquest social hierarchies. However, how long did these areas retain their pre-conquest meaning? The Folly Lane temple and the Branch Lane bath-house associated with it both seem to have gone out of use in the early 3rd century. In contrast, the Insula 16 temple and its associated theatre continued to be used, altered, and in the case of the theatre, rebuilt c. AD 300. This represents a restructuring of ritual space within the town, suggesting a change in the attitudes of the townspeople to the places of the town. It suggests that either previous significance of the Folly Lane enclosure had been forgotten, or that it was no longer deemed significant. The ties into theories of memory and memorialisation which argue that social memory is mutable, and the past subject to active recreation.[53] It suggests that over time, this idea of negotiating between two cultural codes became less important, and either the meanings were forgotten, or they lost their significance.

If this is a case of code-switching, it raises the question of why it made sense within this moment in time. Amongst those studying ethnicity within modern contexts, there is an acknowledgement that the identity of a person can encompass more than one element of ethnicity. This contrasts with the ideology of the nation-state, which saw the eradication of local culture to produce a single series of elements which bound the nation together. However, Eriksen's studies of Mauritius and the Sami of Norway has demonstrated that this is not always the case.[54] In both, he argues that an ethnic identity derived from the political state co-exists with a second, more regional ethnic identity. This idea of poly-ethnic identities can be posited for classical Greece, where

51. Niblett and Thompson 2005, p. 82.
52. Creighton 2006.
53. Alcock 2002; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983.
54. Eriksen 1991; 1993; 2001.

there was a similar layering of communal identity: polis, ethnos, federal, intra-Hellenic and Pan-Hellenic.[55] I would argue that we can see a similar situation within the Roman Empire. One consequence of the paradigm of Romanization is that we tend to see ethnic identity in terms of either-or: either Roman or still local. Instead, we can reconceptualise Roman ethnicity in terms of the two levels co-existing. The local ethnic identities, whether tribal or urban, were not antithetical to a Roman identity. There is participation in shared Roman institutions, such as dependency on an urban centre, the definition of the group through the nomenclature of the town, activities such as bathing, watching performances at the theatre, and participation in religious activity focussed on architectural homes of the gods. However, at the same time, the local identity is maintained, in part through the name of the town, Verulamium, derived from its Iron Age name of Verlamion, but also the continuity of the local history through the ongoing commemoration of the individual buried at Folly Lane, and the re-use of places within the landscape. This is not to suggest that the local identity was unchanged during this process of integration. For the people of Verulamium, their identity came to be defined through the urban centre; nevertheless, some element of its pre-Roman significance remained and was expressed through the materiality of the urban landscape. The two elements of identity, and codes of material, were not fused or hybridised, but came into play in their own right to communicate different messages. This maintenance of a local past is not unique to Verulamium, but can be seen in Colchester and Silchester amongst others.[56]

Conclusion

The case study of Verulamium brings us back to the original question about the utility of code-switching as a means of understanding the lives of people in the past, and their use of material culture. It is clear that it does not provide a stand-alone insight, nor can it be directly translated from a linguistic setting to a material one. Instead, it needs to be set into a wider theoretical approach which allows its strengths to be maintained, but to be reconceptualised for the material turn. In particular, social identity, its ongoing recreation, and its relationship to material culture needs to be more explicitly theorised, bringing in other theoretical approaches. Social practice and performativity have proved central to theories of identity, and one problem in applying linguistic theory to material culture is the relationship between the speech act (or utterance) and performance. As demonstrated, we need a more flexible

55. Crielaard 2009; Malkin 2001.
56. Creighton 2006, pp. 130-148.

definition, which can encompass a longer timeframe and repeated activity. It may initially seem difficult to equate inhabiting a townscape with a single act of speech, but we need to be able to do so to apply code-switching to material culture. For other forms of archaeological material, the temporality of the act of combining two codes may be briefer, but such flexibility is still needed.

More problematic is the question of recognising the material codes at play, and how meaning is assigned to particular artefacts. It is an oft-quoted truism that material culture is multi-vocal, and it is this multi-vocality which adds a complexity to material code-switching: how do we as archaeologists establish that material retained its meaning within the process of amalgamation. This is not an easy question to answer, and it requires that we continue to be rigorous in our approaches to material assemblages. The attraction of code-switching is that implicit within it is the idea that the two cultural codes will maintain their meaning. However, archaeology deals with longer timespans than the utterance, and meaning of material is mutable. The original meaning may not remain, and may be transformed into new understandings of the original codes. In the case of Verulamium, although we can see code-switching in the 1st century after conquest, were these meanings retained, or did they change so that the combining of old and new took on a different meaning and code-switching no longer remains a viable explanation? The archaeological record is a witness to the complexity of human activity and social organisation in the past, and warns against monocausal explanations for variability. Code-switching can be applied to certain situations, such as Augustan Rome or Verulamium, but it cannot be applied to all. Bilingualism as a wider theory includes different approaches to combining multiple languages[57] and we need to be aware that in certain situations, these may be more applicable. Ultimately, code-switching is a one means of understanding artefact variability and questions of identity in the past, but it can only be one of a range of approaches utilised by the archaeologist.

57.   See Mullen this volume.

References

Adams 2003 = J.N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin language.* Cambridge, 2003.

Alcock 2002 = S.E. Alcock, *Archaeologies of the Greek past: landscape, monuments, and memories.* Cambridge, 2002.

Alföldy 1975 = G.Z. Alföldy, *Die römischen Inschriften von Tarraco.* Berlin, 1975.

Allason-Jones 1989 = L. Allason-Jones, *Ear-rings in Roman Britain,* "British Archaeological Reports British Series" 201, Oxford, 1989.

Allason-Jones 1995 = L. Allason-Jones, *'Sexing' small finds*, in P. Rush, ed., *Theoretical Roman Archaeology: second conference proceedings,* Aldershot, 1995, pp. 22-32.

Allason-Jones 1996 = L. Allason-Jones, *Roman jet in the Yorkshire Museum*, York, 1996.

Antonaccio 2010 = C.M. Antonaccio, *(Re)defining ethnicity: culture, material culture and identity*, in S. Hales, T. Hodos, eds., *Material culture and social identities in the Ancient World,* Cambridge, 2010, pp. 32-53.

Arber and Ginn 1995 = S. Arber, J. Ginn, *'Only connect': gender relations and ageing*, in S. Arber and J. Ginn, eds., *Connecting gender and ageing: a sociological approach,* Buckingham, 1995, pp. 1-14.

Barrett 1989 = J.C. Barrett, *Afterword: render unto Caesar ...*, in J.C. Barrett, A.P., Fitzpatrick, L. Macinnes, eds., *Barbarians and Romans in north-west Europe from the later Republic to late Antiquity,* "BAR International Series" 471, Oxford, 1989, pp. 235-239.

Barrett 1993 = J.C. Barrett, Chronologies of remembrance: the interpretation of some Roman inscriptions, "*World Archaeology*", 25, 1993, pp.236-247. *http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00438243.1993.9980240*

Barrett 1997 = J.C. Barrett, *Theorising Roman archaeology*, in K. Meadows, C. Lemke, J. Heron, eds., *TRAC98: proceeding of the sixth annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference,* Oxford, 1997, pp. 1-7.

Barth 1969 = F. Barth, *Introduction*, in F. Barth, ed., *Ethnic groups and boundaries. The social organization of cultural difference,* Boston, 1969, pp. 9-38.

Booth *et al.* 2008 = P. Booth, A.-M. Bingham, S. Lawrence, *The Roman roadside settlement at Westhawk Farm, Ashford, Kent: excavations 1998-9,* Oxford, 2008.

Bourdieu 1977 = P. Bourdieu, *Outline of a theory of practice,* Cambridge 1977.

Butler 1999 = J. Butler, *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity,* New York; London, 1999.

Carreté *et al.* 1995 = J.-M. Carreté, S.J. Keay, M. Millett, *A Roman provincial capital and its hinterland: the survey of the territory of Tarragona, Spain, 1985-1990,* "*Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series*" 15, Ann Arbor, 1995.

Conkey and Spector 1984 = M.W. Conkey, J.D. Spector, *Archaeology and the study of gender*, "*Advances in archaeological method and theory*" 7, 1984, pp.1-38.

Cool 2002 = H.E.M. Cool, *An overview of the small finds from Catterick*, in P.R. Wilson, ed., *Cataractonium: Roman Catterick and its hinterland. Excavations and research, 1958-1997, Part II,* "*Council for British Archaeology Research Report*" 129, pp. 24-43.

Cool 2011 = H.E.M. Cool, *Funerary contexts*, in L. Allason-Jones, ed., *Artefacts in Roman Britain: their purpose and use,* Cambridge, 2011, pp. 293-312.

Cool *et al.* 2004 = H.E.M. Cool, J. Bond, L. Allason-Jones, *The Roman cemetery at Brougham, Cumbria: excavations 1966-67*, London, 2004.

Crawford 1996 = M. Crawford, *Roman statutes*, London, 1996.

Creighton 2006 = J. Creighton, *Britannia: the creation of a Roman province*, London, 2006.

Crielaard 2009 = J.P. Crielaard, *The Ionians in the Archaic period. Shifting identities in a changing world*, in T. Derks, N. Roymans, eds., *Ethnic constructs in Antiquity. The role of power and tradition*, Amsterdam, 2009, pp. 37-84.

Dench 2005 = E. Dench, *Romulus's asylum,* Oxford, 2005.

Derks 2009 = T. Derks, *Ethnic identity in the Roman frontier. The epigraphy of Batavi and other Lower Rhine tribes*, in T. Derks and N. Roymans, eds., *Ethnic constructs in Antiquity.* Amsterdam, 2009, pp. 239-282.

Díaz-Andreu and Lucy 2005 = M. Díaz-Andreu, S. Lucy, *Introduction*, in M. Díaz-Andreu, S. Lucy, S. Babić, D. Edwards, eds., *The archaeology of identity: approaches to gender, age, status, ethnicity and religion,* London, 2005, pp. 1-12.

Eriksen 1991 = T.H. Eriksen, *Ethnicity versus nationalism*, "*Journal of Peace Research*", 28/3, 1991, pp. 263-278. *http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022343391028003004*

Eriksen 1993 = T.H. Eriksen, *Ethnicity and nationalism: anthropological perspectives,* London, 1993.

Eriksen 2001 = T.H. Eriksen, *Small places, large issues: an introduction to social and cultural anthropology.* London, 2001.

Farney 2007 = G.D. Farney, *Ethnic identity and aristocratic competition in Republican Rome,* Cambridge, 2007.

Freeman 1993 = P.W.M. Freeman, *'Romanisation' and Roman material culture*, "*Journal of Roman Archaeology*", 6, 1993, pp. 438-445.

Frere 1983 = S.S. Frere, *Verulamium excavations* II, London, 1983.

Gardner 2002 = A. Gardner, *Social identity and the duality of structure in late Roman-period Britain*, "*Journal of Social Archaeology*", 2/3, 2002, pp. 323-351. *http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/146960530200200303*

Gero and Conkey 1991 = J.M. Gero, M.W. Conkey, *Engendering archaeology: women and prehistory,* Oxford, 1991.

Giddens 1984 = A. Giddens, *The constitution of society. Outline of a theory of structuration,* Oxford, 1984.

Goffmann 1959 = E. Goffmann, *The presentation of the self in everyday life,* New York, 1959.

Gowland 2006 = R. Gowland, *Aging in the past: examining age identity from funerary evidence*, in R. Gowland, C. Knüsel, eds., *Social archaeology of funerary remains,* Oxford, 2006, pp. 143-154.

Hall 1997 = J.M. Hall, *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity,* Cambridge, 1997.

Haselgrove and Millett 1997 = C.F. Haselgrove, M. Millett, *Verlamion reconsidered*, in A. Gwilt, C.F. Haselgrove, eds., *Reconstructing Iron Age societies: new approaches to the British Iron Age,* Oxford, 1997, pp. 282-296.

Haverfield 1915 = F. Haverfield, *The Romanization of Roman Britain,* Oxford, 1915.

Hingley 2005 = R. Hingley, *Globalizing Roman culture: unity, diversity and empire,* London, 2005.

Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983 = E.J. Hobsbawn, T.O. Ranger, *The invention of tradition,* Cambridge, 1992.

Hodder 1982 = I. Hodder, *Symbols in action: ethnoarchaeological studies of material culture,* Cambridge, 1982.

Hodder 1986 = I. Hodder, *Reading the past: current approaches to interpretation in archaeology,* Cambridge, 1986.

Jones 1997 = S. Jones, *The archaeology of ethnicity,* London, 1997.

Keay and Terrenato 2001 = S. J. Keay, N. Terrenato, eds., *Italy and the west: comparative issues in Romanization,* Oxford, 2001.

Macias Solé *et al.* 2007 = J.M. Marcia Solé, I. Fiz Fernández, L. Piñol Masgoret, M.T. Miró I Alaix, J. Guitart I Duran, *Planimetria arqueològica de Tàrraco,* Tarragona, 2007.

Malkin 2001 = I. Malkin, *Introduction*, in Malkin, ed., *Ancient perceptions of Greek ethnicity,* Cambridge, Mass., 2001.

Mattingly 1997 = D. Mattingly, ed., *Dialogues in Roman imperialism: power, discourse and discrepant experience in the Roman empire,* "Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series" 23, Portsmouth, 1997.

Mattingly 2004 = D.J. Mattingly, *Becoming Roman: expressing identity in a provincial setting,* "Journal of Roman Archaeology", 17, 2004, pp. 5-25.

Mattingly 2006 = D.J. Mattingly, *Britain: an imperial possession,* London, 2006.

Mattingly 2011 = D.J. Mattingly, *Imperialism, power, and identity: experiencing the Roman empire,* Princeton, N.J., 2011.

Meskell 1998 = L. Meskell, *The irresistible body and the seduction of archaeology*, in D. Montserrat, ed., *Changing bodies, changing meanings. Studies on the human body in antiquity,* London, 1998, pp. 139-161.

Millett 1990 = M. Millett, *The Romanization of Britain: an essay in archaeological interpretation,* Cambridge, 1990.

Millett 1995 = M. Millett, *Rethinking religion in Romanization*, in J. Metzler, M. Millett, N. Roymans, J. Slofstra, eds., *Integration in the early roman west,* Luxembourg, 1995, pp. 93-100.

Nash 1989 = M. Nash, *The cauldron of ethnicity in the modern world,* Chicago, 1989.

Niblett 1999 = R. Niblett, *The excavation of a ceremonial site at Folly Lane, Verulamium,* London, 1999.

Niblett 2001 = R. Niblett, *Verulamium. The Roman city of St. Albans,* Stroud, 2001.

Niblett and Thompson 2005 = R. Niblett, L. Thompson, *Alban's buried towns: an assessment of St. Alban's archaeology up to AD1600,* Oxford, 2005.

Pitts 2007 = M. Pitts, *The Emperor's New Clothes? The Utility of Identity in Roman Archaeology*, "American Journal of Archaeology", 111/4, 2007, pp. 693-713. *http://dx.doi.org/10.3764/aja.111.4.693*

Revell 2000 = L. Revell, *The creation of multiple identities in Roman Italica*, in G. Fincham, G. Harrison, R. Holland, L. Revell, eds., *TRAC99: Proceedings of the ninth annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference,* Oxford, 2000, pp. 1-7.

Revell 2009 = L. Revell, *Roman imperialism and local identities,* Cambridge, 2009.

Richardson 1995 = J.S. Richardson, neque elegantem, ut arbitror, neque urbanum: *reflections on Iberian urbanism*, in B. Cunliffe, S. Keay, eds., *Social complexity and the development of towns in Iberia: from the Copper Age to the second century AD,* Oxford, 1995, pp. 339-354.