

5-2019

Romanization Through Mosaics: Transition at Fishbourne and Colchester

Elizabeth Kurtulik Mercuri

The Graduate Center, City University of New York

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds

Part of the [Classical Archaeology and Art History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kurtulik Mercuri, Elizabeth, "Romanization Through Mosaics: Transition at Fishbourne and Colchester" (2019). *CUNY Academic Works*.

https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/3191

This Thesis is brought to you by CUNY Academic Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Dissertations, Theses, and Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of CUNY Academic Works. For more information, please contact deposit@gc.cuny.edu.

ROMANIZATION THROUGH MOSAICS:
TRANSITION AT FISHBOURNE AND COLCHESTER

by

ELIZABETH KURTULIK MERCURI

A master's thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Liberal Studies in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, The City University of New York

2019

© 2019

ELIZABETH
KURTULIK MERCURI

All Rights Reserved

Romanization through Mosaics: Transition at Fishbourne and Colchester

by

Elizabeth Kurtulik Mercuri

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Liberal Studies in satisfaction of the thesis requirement for the degree of Master of Arts.

Date

Elizabeth Macaulay-Lewis

Thesis Advisor

Date

Elizabeth Macaulay-Lewis

Acting Executive Officer

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

ROMANIZATION THROUGH MOSIACS: TRANSITION AT FISHBOURNE AND COLCHESTER

by

Elizabeth Kurtulik Mercuri

Advisor: Elizabeth Macaulay-Lewis

Romanization has been discussed extensively by scholars as a way to describe the acculturation of provinces under the Roman Empire. This thesis will look at mosaics from two early sites in southeast Britain and examine their connection to the Roman Empire. Fishbourne, Roman Palace presents us with a detailed view of a private villa from the first century. The city of Colchester provides a non-elite, urban perspective from the second century. Both sites contain surviving mosaics that provide a lasting imprint of the visual and material culture that was valued in Britain during its early years under Roman occupation.

In many ways, Romanization was not a result of influence from Rome alone. It was an amalgamation of cultures and influences from the other provinces within the Empire, not only Italy, but also in particular Gaul. Communication and trade with Gaul was already established at this time, so it is unsurprising that many first century mosaics found at Fishbourne have connections to this area of the continent. The mosaics at Colchester provide a smooth transition from the Fishbourne mosaics that rely heavily on imported artisans. The use of mosaics in the second century was more extensive in Britain and locally skilled mosaicists were used, as seen at Colchester.

Through the mosaics at these two sites, this thesis will look at the people who inhabited the villa and city, respectively, the iconography and design of the mosaics, and the connections they had to the continent, other cities in southwestern Britain, and each other. The fusion of ideas, workmanship, and themes within these Romano-British mosaics allow us to view the gradual Romanization taking place in southeastern Britain following Roman conquest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Elizabeth Macaulay-Lewis, D.Phil. Her patience throughout this process was greatly appreciated, as was the significant amount of time that she devoted to the creation of this thesis. I would also like to thank Josephine Dunn, Ph.D. for first introducing me to the fields of art history and archeology. She instilled in a young woman a passion that would become a career. Additionally, I must thank my parents, Susan and Raymond Kurtulik, for their extraordinary support as I pursued my academic and career goals. Finally, I would like to thank my husband, John, who has supported me tirelessly as I finished this thesis. This is dedicated to you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	vii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: DISCOVERY AND EARLY OCCUPATION OF FISHBOURNE	3
CHAPTER 3: FISHBOURNE, FLAVIAN PLACE	6
CHAPTER 4: SECOND CENTURY CHANGES AT FISHBOURNE	16
CHAPTER 5: OBSERVATIONS	21
CHAPTER 6: THIRD AND FOURTH CENTURIES AT FISHBOURNE	27
CHAPTER 7: CAMULODUNUM: BEGINNINGS AND REBUILDING	29
CHAPTER 8: MOSAICS FOUND INSIDE THE WALLS AT COLCHESTER	34
CHAPTER 9: MOSAICS FOUND OUTSIDE THE WALLS AT COLCHESTER	50
CHAPTER 10: OBSERVATIONS	54
CHAPTER 12: CONCLUSION	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY	63

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1: Plan of Fishbourne
Figure 2: Plan of West Wing
Figure 3: Mosaic from Room W3
Figure 4: Mosaic from Room W8
Figure 5: Mosaic from Besancon
Figure 6: Room W22
Figure 7: Mosaic from Besancon
Figure 8: Plan of North Wing in 1st century
Figure 9a: Mosaic in Room N7
Figure 9b: Detail from Room N7 mosaic
Figure 10: Mosaic from Room N19
Figure 11: Mosaic from Besancon
Figure 12: Mosaic from Room N20
Figure 13: Mosaic from Room N21
Figure 14: East Wing of Fishbourne
Figure 15: Plan of 2nd century North Wing
Figure 16: 2nd century mosaic in Room N5
Figure 17: 2nd century mosaic in Room N7
Figure 18: 2nd century mosaic in Room N13
Figure 19: 2nd century mosaic in Room N8
Figure 20: Colchester, Period 2
Figure 21: Map of Colchester
Figure 22: Pavement A from *Insula* II, No. 18 at North Hill, mid-2nd century
Figure 23: Pavement 4 from *Insula* II, No. 18 from North Hill, mid 2nd century
Figure 24: North Hill, Hall's Garden, House 5, Room 1, mid-second century
Figure 25: 30 East Street, Chichester, Second century
Figure 26: Building 2, Room 24 from Verulamium, late second century
Figure 27: North Hill, Hall's Garden. House 5, Room 5, mid-second century
Figure 28: Building 113, Room 2 from *Insula* XXXIV at Colchester, later second century
Figure 29: Building from *Insula* X with three surviving mosaics
Figure 30: Mosaic A from North Hill, *Insula* X, mid-second century
Figure 31: Mosaic B from Room 3 at North Hill, *Insula* X, mid-second century
Figure 32: Mosaic C from Room 5, North Hill, *Insula* X, mid-second century
Figure 33: Mosaic from Building 1, Room 5 at Verulamium, second half of second century
Figure 34: Fragment A from Lion's Walk, *Insula* XXVIII, mid-second century
Figure 35: Fragment B from Lion Walk, *Insula* XXVIII, mid-second century
Figure 36: Panel A and B from Building 2, Room 29 at Verulamium, late second century
Figure 37: Panel E and F from Building 8, Room 6/7 at Verulamium, probably third century
Figure 38: Panel A and B from Building 123, Room 12, *Insula* XXXV, late second century
Figure 39: Panel A and B from Building 19, Room 11/15 from Lion Walk,
Insula XXXV, early 4th century
Figure 40: Mosaic from Bury Field, *Insula* XL, late second century
Figure 41: Bottom rectangle from mosaic at Bury Field, *Insula* XL
Figure 42: Left rectangle from mosaic at Bury Field, *Insula* XL
Figure 43: Top rectangle from mosaic at Bury Field, *Insula* XL
Figure 44: Right rectangle from mosaic at Bury Field, *Insula* XL
Figure 45: Middleborough, Building 70, Room 7, ca. 150-75 A.D.
Figure 46: Detail of Middleborough mosaic, Building 70, Room 7
Figure 47: Mosaic from Building 2, Room 4 at Verulamium, later second century

- Figure 48: detail of scroll from mosaic in Room N7 at Fishbourne,
late second or early third century
- Figure 49: Drawing of mosaic from Building II in *Insula XXXIX*, second century
- Figure 50: Mosaic from Room N7 at Fishbourne, late second or early third century
- Figure 51: Mosaic from Room N20 at Fishbourne, late first century
- Figure 52: Mosaic from Building 70, Room 4 at Middleborough, mid-second century
- Figure 53: Mosaic from North Hill, *Insula 2*, No. 18 (Bryant's Garden),
mid-second century
- Figure 54: Mosaic from Room W8 at Fishbourne, late first century
- Figure 55: Mosaic from *Insula II*, No. 17/18, late second century
- Figure 56: Room N12 from Fishbourne, late first century
- Figure 57: Mosaic B (Room 3) from North Hill, mid-second century
- Figure 58: Room W22 at Fishbourne, late first century
- Figure 59: Mosaic from Bury Field, late second century
- Figure 60: Mosaic from Middleborough, Building 70, Room 7,
mid-late second century

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The invasion and successful acculturation of a new territory into an empire is typically not a smooth transition, especially for the native people. The blending of two different cultures takes time and often results in the fusion of ideas and lifestyle. This was certainly the case with the conquest of Britain by Rome in 43 A.D. under Emperor Claudius. The introduction of Roman culture to the native Britons was a result of the Romans military presence that included the construction of Roman housing and urban planning as well as other Roman public and religious buildings. One cannot discuss this new Romano-British territory without the discussion of Romanization and how it is defined in its regional context.

There are a number of interpretations of Romanization.¹ First, that it extinguished the distinction between Roman and provincial. Second, it did not destroy every trace of native ideas or manners and thus, there was a mesh of influences from diverse origins rather than influences purely from Rome itself.² This idea can be seen and interpreted through the mosaics that were constructed in the first and second century A.D. In southeast Britain, these mosaics, functional and decorative, provide a lasting visual illustration of the cultural landscape as well as highlight the changes that occurred as Britain became more acclimated under Roman rule.

In examining these mosaics, particular attention will be given to two sites in southeastern England that span the first two centuries of Roman rule: Roman Palace at Fishbourne and the city of Colchester. Fishbourne Roman Palace, the earliest Roman residential villa in England, has a number of well-preserved mosaics from the first century A.D. The massive villa provides insight

¹ For more on Romanization, please see Haverfield 1915; Hingley 2000; Millett 1990

² Millett 1988, 1.

into first-century mosaic design in Britain and the modifications made in the second century. The mosaics highlight valuable information on materials, labor and influences from the continent. They also provide a glimpse into the wealth that Romans or Roman allies had after the occupation. The Roman city of Colchester began as a small military town and grew into a prosperous city. The majority of surviving mosaics date to the second century A.D. and provide a good juxtaposition to those at Fishbourne. Colchester provides an urban and public view of life after Roman occupation, where Fishbourne offers a private residential perspective.

These two sites represent a culture occupied by the Romans and reflect the modifications in material culture, particularly mosaics, that took place during the first two centuries. These influences, although considered Roman and within Roman buildings, are not always directly from Rome or Italy, but originate from other provinces, particularly Gaul. The mosaics at Fishbourne and Colchester therefore represent a mixture of influences from across the Roman Empire. I will examine the mosaics at these two sites to observe the similarities and differences based on continental influences, workmanship, style, themes, and evolution that took place over time, particularly during the first and second centuries. In doing so, it will reveal that the mosaics found in southeastern Britain demonstrate an amalgamation of influences found throughout the Empire, regardless of whether they are in a villa or city setting.

CHAPTER 2: DISCOVERY AND EARLY OCCUPATION OF FISHBOURNE

Discovery

The Roman Palace at Fishbourne was discovered in 1805, when foundations for a new house were being investigated. A mosaic (now lost) from the south wing of the palace was discovered; however, no location or design was ever noted. Additional finds, such as pottery and tiles, were found throughout the nineteenth century, and it is thought that by the 1930s the south and west wings of the palace had been found but no extensive archaeology had taken place. In the 1960s, after mosaics were discovered interest in the site increased, and it was determined that a large structure, dating to the Roman occupation, lay on the site. Excavations took place in the 1960s and were led by Barry Cunliffe of Oxford University, who has produced the only extensive excavation reports on the site.³

Early Site Occupation

Military

The earliest buildings discovered at Fishbourne date sometime after Emperor Claudius' invasion of 43 A.D. and had apparent connections to the military. The site was of obvious interest to the Romans as it lay in close proximity to a harbor, within a well-protected inlet. One of these early buildings was constructed of timber, and based on posthole spacing, vertical timbers were spaced about three feet apart, with piles projecting no more than two to three feet above the soil.⁴ This raised floor provided ventilation and reduce rodent exposure, and suggests that the building was most likely used as a granary, based on similar types found at other Roman

³ See Barry Cunliffe, *Excavations at Fishbourne. Vol. I: The Site and Vol. II: The Finds* (Society of Antiquaries, London: 1971).

⁴ Cunliffe 1998, 26.

military sites. Coins found at the site also support early military beginnings. Two types of coins were found: small silver *denarii*, used to pay soldiers, and larger bronze issues (*asses*) of Claudius. More than sixty of these *asses* have been found at Fishbourne. In addition to coins, other items such as belt buckles, strap buckles and a legionary's helmet were all discovered at the site.⁵ It is evident from structural and physical finds that Fishbourne was an important early site in Roman occupation in Britain, possibly acting as one of the military landing zones for the invasion in 43 A.D.

Neronian Buildings

When the military was no longer required, many of the timber storehouses were dismantled and converted into timber residential units. At this time, Fishbourne was used as a port for the town of Chichester, to its east. During the Neronian era, a number of the timber structures were leveled and new masonry buildings, in the Roman style, were constructed on both sides of the stream that flowed through the site. Three main buildings have been dated to the Neronian period. It is thought that Building M3 was either a temple or a shrine as it seems to have consisted of a pair of rooms to the west and a larger room to the east of a walled enclosure. Building M2 has been incompletely identified due to the fact that it lies under a road and modern-day buildings. However, a general idea of the plan has been determined from trial trenches. Building M2 has been called the 'proto-palace' for it was constructed with rooms around a courtyard with a bath suite on the south end. None of the floors survive in situ, however, they would have contained *opus sectile* pavements and black and white mosaics.⁶ Building M1 sits on higher ground and remained unfinished. It is thought that these plans were

⁵ Cunliffe 1998, 28-29.

⁶ Neal and Cosh 2009, 528.

thwarted to begin construction on the larger palace dating to A.D. 75 to 80.

CHAPTER 3: FISHBOURNE, FLAVIAN PLACE

Based on coin and pottery evidence found below the floors, construction on the Flavian palace began sometime between A.D. 75-80.⁷ The building faced east towards Chichester and was linked to the town by the southern road from its military occupation. The building consists of four wings surrounding a central garden with continuous colonnaded porticos (Figure 1). The so-called ‘proto-palace,’ Building M2, was incorporated into the south wing of the building as a bath-suite. The main entrance hall to the palace was located in the east wing. It is thought that the entrance hall, garden and west wing ‘functioned as a single unit’ and connected physically with the outside world. The north and south wings and remaining parts of the east wing seemed to have been private quarters.⁸

Nearly every room has evidence of floor mosaics, with roughly sixty to seventy in total.⁹ Most of these mosaics were black and white and in the Italian style. Two notable exceptions are the audience chamber in the west wing and a room in the north wing, which were polychrome. Given the way the mosaics were laid and their very early date, it is believed that they were executed by mosaicists from the continent, most likely Gaul or Italy.¹⁰ There has been a number of comparisons between the Period 2 (A.D. 70-80) mosaics at Fishbourne and those found in southern Gaul (particularly Besancon and Vienne) and Italy.¹¹ The idea that craftsman from the continent were active in Britain is plausible as there was no indigenous knowledge of the art, and the scale in which the Fishbourne mosaics were executed were so large that expertise was required. There is limited evidence that the materials used also came from the continent and this

⁷ Cunliffe 1998, 49.

⁸ Cunliffe 1998, 53-54.

⁹ Neal and Cosh 2009, 529.

¹⁰ Neal and Cosh 2009, 530.

¹¹ Wootton 2016, 79.

is an intriguing aspect of the relationship between the making of mosaics and materials used.¹² Scholars believed that the materials came from the Isle of Purbeck, Dorset , as the blue-grey Purbeck marble was used in early polychrome mosaics and tesserae were also being manufactured at Norden.¹³

West Wing

The West Wing contained twenty-seven rooms, including an apsidal audience chamber. Many of the rooms open up on to the *porticus* (portico) and were considered semi-public and official. The audience chamber, done in contemporary Italian style, was conveniently placed in the center of the west wing, opposite the main entrance. Considering its prominent position, it must have had a significant facade to impress visitors. By the mid-second century (Period 3a), some of the rooms were partitioned; however, the mosaics were not changed and the wing was still in considerable use. Unfortunately, the west wing suffered considerable damage from post-Roman agricultural methods during the Saxon and Medieval periods.

Mosaics

A plan of the west wing superstructure shows the twenty-seven rooms (Figure 2). Most of the rooms in the west wing have evidence of floor mosaics, which would have consisted of black and white pavements. Mosaics from rooms W1, W2, W4, W7 have been completely lost. Room W3 contained a black and white mosaic, discovered in 1963 (Figure 3). Only the southwestern corner of the L-shaped room survives to reveal a design of latchkey-meander with square compartments in five rows. Six of these compartments survive and vary in geometric design. A white band is laid between two black bands and all three bands surround the pavement. This type

¹² Wootton 2016, 79.

¹³ Neal and Cosh 2009, 530; Cunliffe 1998, 73.

of mosaic arrangement was popular in Italy in the first century and parallels can be made to sites in Rome and Pompeii.¹⁴ Only a very small section of the mosaic from W5 survives. From the room's northwest corner, a black border with volute tendrils that sprint from a yellow sheath. One of the volutes is terminated with two leaves, the other with a heart shaped leaf. A very similar volute pattern can be found on the border in room W8. A larger part of the mosaic from room W6 survives to reveal a seven by two square grid in the western end of the room. Each square is quartered at a diagonal staggering rows of squares, alternating in black and white. Towards the center of the room the pattern changes to a panel of black triangles with two black bands and a white band as a border.

Room W8 was a large space, that with room W7, opened directly onto the veranda. The mosaic design found in W8 was black and white with an octagon arrangement of box within box patterns with lozenge stars, squares and black triangles (Figure 4). This design is very similar to one found at Besancon (Figure 5).¹⁵ The east and west borders contained long tendril panels, similar to the one found in room W5, in black, yellow, red against a white background. Only about a quarter of the mosaic survives, along the southern and western walls of the room. Most of the other rooms in this section of the wing either have no documentation of floor mosaics and the fragments found reburied, or they have been completely lost. Room W22, one of the largest rooms, contains a black and white mosaic of square compartments, each with a different design inside (Figure 6). Black squares form a border and surround each square compartment. As with room W8, this mosaic closely resembles one found at Besancon (Figure 7).¹⁶

Of the surviving or known mosaics from the west wing, it is important to note that some

¹⁴ Cunliffe 1998, 58.

¹⁵ See Stern 1963, no. 297A, Pl. XII-XIV.

¹⁶ See Stern 1963, no. 297E, Pl. XVII.

of the same motifs and designs appear in more than one room, with slight variations. There is very little evidence of the decor found in the rooms, leading to an open interpretation of how the rooms were used, what relationship the decor had with the mosaics, and if they were taken into account throughout the design process. There is fragmentary evidence of wall plaster in rooms W3, W6 and W11.¹⁷ Red, white, purple, pink, and blue plaster evidence provide a colorful juxtaposition to the black and white mosaic floors. The surviving Flavian mosaics from this wing point to influence from the continent, a subject that will be further discussed below.

North Wing

While the West Wing has evidence of a more public purpose, the North Wing seems to have been more secluded with private rooms and suites. The north wing had twenty-three rooms arranged like the letter E, with the spaces containing small private gardens with colonnades surrounding them on three sides and a fourth closed wall (Figure 8). The verandas of the gardens would have had sloped roofs with clerestories in the center to provide light. The mosaic and decor evidence suggest lavish spaces used as a residence or for guests. Three separate suites can be distinguished: N1-5, N9-N13, and N18-N23.

Mosaics

Suite N1-N5 had a similar layout to the west wing, with all the floors having black and white mosaics. Room N1 is the largest within the suite and only a small fragment of the mosaic survives. It consists of a geometric pattern of squares, rectangles, and octagons with a three-band black border. The best-preserved square has evidence of smaller squares of blue and red. This particular mosaic is significant as it is very unusual to have color in a purely geometric design

¹⁷ See Cunliffe 1998, 61, 62, 63-64 for brief description; Also see Cunliffe 1971, 80-81 for detailed description of finds.

at this time.¹⁸ Room N2 was heavily modified at a later time and thus no Flavian decoration survives. The black and white mosaic in room N3 consists of a double black band border against a white background. The motif is an arrangement of square panels linked by a scheme of diamonds and is simpler than some of the ones found in the west wing. Room N4 has a repetitive mosaic arrangement of large and small squares on a white ground. Portions of the mosaic survive from the southwest and northeast corners. Where room N3 has a lighter, more open feeling, room N4 has a darker and heavier feeling. The room was later used as a kitchen in the second century, which most likely added to its worn appearance, whereas room N3 was later used for storage.

Room N7 is set between the west and central suites and fronts one of the colonnaded courtyards. This room was most likely used as a dining room. The Flavian mosaic was discovered in 1980 when the later (dolphin) mosaic was removed for conservation. Only about a quarter of the mosaic survives, mainly in the north and western margins (Figure 9a-b). The design consists of a central panel with sixteen squares, each with complex geometric motifs of squares and triangles. Surrounding the central panel is a border that is a schematic representation of a crenellated city wall with towers at the corners and gates on the sides, both done in grey and red tesserae. Although mosaic representations of city walls are common throughout the Roman Empire during this time, this mosaic is the only true example of a city wall mosaic in Britain.¹⁹ It is interesting that this small detail connects the iconography to a larger trend that existed in the Empire. Other mosaics that represented city walls around this time are found at Ostia, Switzerland, and Carthage. It is important to note that there is evidence of stucco moulding from room N7. The best-preserved piece depicts a repetitive upper frieze of two birds with fruit in their mouth flanking a vase filled with fruit. The discovery of this moulding is exceptional since

¹⁸ Neal and Cosh 2009, 537.

¹⁹ Neal and Cosh 2009, 540.

this technique was not very popular in Britain. However, this kind of moulding was not uncommon throughout Italy at the time.²⁰

The mosaics from the first three rooms of the central suite are for the most part completely lost. Room N12 contains complex motifs and arrangements in black and white. The floor is mostly preserved because it was not later remodeled or refloored. The room was later divided by a timber partition, which cut through the mosaic itself. The mosaic pattern consists of a series of cross motifs of alternating patterns (solid black or superimposed triangles) between squares that are super-imposed within squares, rosettes, and fleurs-de-lis. These motifs are linked by square and diamond background. The complex design creates an illusion to the viewer depending on how they view the patterns. The room was heavily used throughout the second century A.D., as evidenced by repairs and errors on the mosaic that were done by less-accomplished mosaicists. Nevertheless, the fact that the room was not remodeled and care was taken to the floor indicate that the space was favored for some time. Very little of the mosaic from room N13 survives. The mosaic was partially sealed by having a later 'Medusa' mosaic placed on top of it. From the small surviving fragments, square panels with geometric designs are represented.

The eastern suite has the finest surviving mosaics from the palace, however, it differs from the previous two suites as it does not have a concourse. The mosaic in room N18 has been lost. Large fragments from room N19 reveal a scheme of squares made up of three rectangles surrounding a smaller square (Figure 10). The scheme is surrounded by a simple thin black and white band. A very similar mosaic was also found at Besancon, only with simple decoration (Figure 11).²¹ Contrary to room N19, N20 contained a large polychrome mosaic, one of the few

²⁰ Cunliffe 1998, 70.

²¹ See Stern 1963, no. 297D, Pl XVII.

found at the palace (Figure 12). It consists of a large circular design, set within a square surrounded by a quadruple black lined border. The corners within the border contain a variety of different motifs. The central design is completely lost. Surrounding the central panel was a circular band of alternating leaves and rosettes followed by a circular band of twisted rope-like braiding. The colored tesserae used are in red, orange, yellow, grey and white, with the motifs outlined in black tesserae. The corner spandrels each contained small designs and figures. The central focus of each spandrel seems to be amphorae, with either two dolphins or two fish flanking two of the spandrels. The other two spandrels contain larger volute leaves on either side of the amphorae. The three surviving amphorae each have a different handle design. The most curious characteristic of the mosaic is that there is a lack of symmetry: the dolphins and fish appear on one side, instead of being at opposite ends of each other. David J. Smith has questioned the dating of this particular mosaic.²² Barry Cunliffe provides a late first-century date, where Smith argues that due to the quality and the extensive use of color that the mosaic is probably from a later period and points out that the room was in use well into the second century.²³ Smith also applies the same theory to room N21.²⁴ Room N21 was most likely an anteroom to room N20. The mosaic in this room was black and white with overlaid red and blue squares, connected by interlocking white frames (Figure 13). In the southeast corner, there is a small diamond shape that does not seem to be linked to the rest of the mosaic. It is possible that the design is the mosaicists signature or trademark.²⁵ Regarding the dating for Rooms N20 and N21, polychrome mosaics existed prior to the first century A.D. in Italy and elsewhere within the Roman Empire. It is reasonable that the mosaics from these rooms date to the late first century.

²² See DJ Smith 1983.

²³ DJ Smith 1983, 357.

²⁴ DJ Smith 1983, 357.

²⁵ Neal and Cosh 2009, 543; Cunliffe 1998, 78.

Artistic preferences wax and wane overtime. For example, black and white mosaics were favored in the first and second centuries, however, polychrome was favored particularly in the fourth century. It is certainly possible that the patron of the house was willing to pay extra for polychrome, especially if the mosaicists from the continent had experience in laying them and if the room itself was of particular importance.

The floors in the remaining rooms of the north wing do not survive. The mosaics from the north wing, as with the west wing mosaics are predominantly geometric and black and white. The notable exception is room N7, N20 and N21. Unfortunately, wall painting from the latter two rooms with polychrome mosaics no longer exist, as it would have been informative to see how the walls were designed with the colored floors in mind. There is one interesting observation regarding wall painting from the north wing. Outside of the north wing, a large amount of wall plaster was carried out and dumped as a result of a demolition or possible redecoration at a later date. One particular plaster fragment is of significance because it depicts an identical painting found at Stabiae, one of the towns destroyed by the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79.²⁶ The fragmented scene shows a colonnaded building with a sea background done in a color range of blue, brown and white. The similarities between the color scheme, subject and use of brush strokes suggests that the two paintings might have been carried out by the same school of artists.²⁷

East Wing

There are no surviving mosaics from the east wing that date to the first century. However, The east wing is important structurally since it contained the front entrance to the palace. The

²⁶ Cunliffe 1998, 80; see Plate 10.

²⁷ Cunliffe 1998, 80; see Plate 10.

wing was an amalgamation of several architectural elements (Figure 14). The central feature was the entrance hall. Unfortunately, very little interior decoration survives from this space.

However, some findings include evidence of panels of red on the walls and marble cornices.²⁸

The most northern room of the wing was an aisled hall. The function of this room is not clear but might have had a semi-public use since it is open to the exterior.²⁹ Between these two halls were two colonnaded courtyards flanked by a series of rooms. The northern courtyard was larger and colonnaded on three sides. The southern smaller courtyard was colonnaded on two sides. Both gardens provided a quiet walking and relaxing space for those who supposedly were residing in the flanked rooms. It is assumed from the plan that the space was used for lower ranked visitors. South of the entrance hall contained a series of unusual rooms. Part of the symmetrical confusion of these rooms might be a result of an integration of buildings from the proto-palace and more contemporary structures. The very southern series of rooms were used as a small bath complex.

South Wing

There are also no surviving mosaics from the first century in the south wing. Excavations confirmed that it was likely a south-facing colonnade stretched across the southern part of the wing. Like the east wing, there were parts of the Neronian proto-palace that appear to have been incorporated into the eastern part of the south wing. The central part of the wing was done in the Flavian style. In 1805, men digging a foundation for a new house, stumbled upon a 4.15m wide nondescript black and white mosaic. Unfortunately, it was documented that there were “no figures or anything to convey any idea of the time or purpose of its erection.”³⁰ Although, its precise location is unknown, it was certainly located in the region of the south wing. Once again,

²⁸ Cunliffe 1998, 83.

²⁹ Cunliffe 1998, 84.

³⁰ Neal and Cosh 2009, 532.

there is no evidence of interior decoration as a result of severe looting and later construction projects on the property. The exact layout and rooms of the south wing are unknown, but colonnaded gardens suggest some residential significance. Cunliffe points out that although the north wing was thought to have been the owner's residence, it didn't make sense that the bath suite was so far away in the southeastern corner of the east wing. Cunliffe suggests that the south wing might have been the official residence with the baths more conveniently located.³¹

³¹ Cunliffe 1998, 81.

CHAPTER 4: SECOND CENTURY CHANGES AT FISHBOURNE

During the second century, a number of changes took place at the palace. The first major change was the conversion of the aisled hall in the north wing into a bath suite in the early second century. The exact location was between the hall and east end of the north wing, with the aisled hall serving as a possible *palaestra*. The reduction of the aisled hall seems to indicate a decrease in public or official use in that area of the palace. Cunliffe questions the need for these new baths, since the baths in the southeast were still in use and suggests that there is a possibility that the palace was now split between two owners and thus two separate baths would be needed.³² However, he does not provide any evidence to support for this theory. Additionally, the owners of the palace from the second and third centuries are currently unknown. A more realistic reason for the new baths was that the southeastern baths had become unsuitable due to the high water table and nearby marsh.³³

By the mid-second century, the north wing saw more changes, including the demolition of the east end of the wing, along with the relatively new baths. The reasons for this were due to subsidence, as this part of the north wing was built on an earlier timber structure. These new baths were well planned and much grander than the previous ones. This suggests that the owner was still affluent and could pay for the modifications, construction and upkeep of the baths. The west end of the north wing also underwent renovations where many of the larger rooms were divided into smaller spaces by a partitioned timber walls.

Second Century Mosaics

As these new rooms were partitioned and re-floored, the older Flavian mosaics were

³² Cunliffe 1998, 111.

³³ Cunliffe 1998, 111.

replaced. New complex mosaics were laid directly over the Flavian ones in many of the rooms. These mosaics are a stark contrast to the Flavian ones. First, the new mosaics are polychrome and instead of being strictly geometric, they contain a number of figural representations. Second, where the Flavian mosaics were primarily constructed by mosaicists from the continent, these later mosaics were done by local craftsman, as there was no longer a need to import these artisans.

North Wing

As mentioned above, many of the rooms in the north wing, were divided by a timber wall to make two separate spaces (Figure 15). Within room N5a, there is a rectangular mosaic set towards the southern part of the room (Figure 16). In the center of the panel are two scallop shells flanking a compartment. The shells and flutes alternate in a red, black and white sequence with a single fillet in red, and black with white interchanged when the flute is black. At the base of each flute are yellow arches, each with a pair of red semicircles surrounding a black semicircle. Only the western part of the rectangular panel survives and shows four diamonds within a square latticework. Above this rests two facing dolphins, where only their rear and fins survive, with their fins in red. The entire central panel is surrounded by a black and white band and a red outer border. The red (samian) tesserae give a *terminus post quem* of mid-second century for the mosaic.³⁴

One of the finest and most complete mosaics from this period is located in room N7 (Figure 17). The central panel consists of tangent semicircles and quadrant circles that surround a central circle. All semi-circles and quadrant circles are surrounded by a braiding motif with strands of red and white, outlined in black. Contrarily, the central circle is surrounded by a

³⁴ Neal and Cosh 2009, 545.

double braid outlined in black with stands of red, yellow, and white. The entire panel is surrounded by a square braided frame of red, yellow and white, with the exception of the northern third of the room, in which brown replaces the yellow. The central circle faces the entrance of the room and contains a cupid sitting on a dolphin, holding the reins in one hand and a trident in the other. Below the figures lay two shells to emphasize the marine setting. The quadrants contain a shell motif in yellow, black, and red with black scallops along the border. The semicircles each contain a sea creature, paired with one on the opposite side of the floor, two sea panthers and two seahorses. The sea panthers are done in yellow, red, black, and white, with one containing fangs and claws, possible to distinguish the difference in gender. The two seahorses are done in black and white with red tongues. The space between the panels were black and white vases, each with varying decor on the body and tendril handles. The entire scene is bordered by a red, yellow and white braiding, a row of superimposed thorn pattern in black and white and a scroll pattern with red sheaths and black leaves. The center of each scrolled border are vases with a red bowl and the corners contain black lozenges flanking circles. The entire panel is surrounded by a black and white checkered border. The southern side is shorter, which probably indicates that the room was used as a *triclinium*.³⁵ If a *triclinium*, the couches would have been set up so that guests may view and discuss the mosaic in the center of the room. This indicates not only an understanding and appreciation of Roman ideas, also but the engagement in the Roman dining, a significant activity in Roman life. The southern side also has a smaller checkers with each square containing a balanced square and the black and white colors counterchanged. In the northwest corner, there is a slight anomaly that indicates another doorway within the room. The entire mosaic is interesting in that it is evidence of varying degrees of

³⁵ Neal and Cosh 2009, 549.

workmanship. The northern part of the mosaic is less ambitious in terms of color but was more technically skilled, particularly with the braided borders. The southern part has more color variety but the braided design was incompetently handled. This double braided design of the central round panel is not common in Britain; however, it was in Gaul.³⁶ It is well laid and highlights the juxtaposition of a more skilled Gaulish master and working with British apprentices. One fascinating aspect of the border with the volute vines is in the northwestern side, on the third leaf from the central vase, there is a small black bird resting on one of the leaves. It is thought that this might have been the mosaicists signature.³⁷ However, this might be unlikely given that small figures and creatures are common on mosaics.³⁸ In terms of dating, it was determined after the work was lifted in 1980 that the mosaic dated sometime after A.D. 160.³⁹ It has also been suggested that a later second century date or early third century date is possible.⁴⁰

Room N13 contains a late second or early third century mosaic that overlaid an earlier geometric Flavian mosaic (Figure 18). The central scheme is based on a four by four plan with the central four squares replaced by a medallion. The medallion is bordered by a double guilloche of red, yellow and white with the head of Medusa, facing west, in the middle and urns placed within the spandrels. Only the right side of Medusa's face survives revealing hair in tiny red and white tesserae and tiny snakes. The squares surrounding the medallion contain octagons with varying motifs within them. The squares at the corners contain a black and white checkered pattern. The entire scheme is bordered by superposed thorns, scrolls, which are replaced on the

³⁶ Neal and Cosh 2009, 549.

³⁷ Cunliffe 1998, 129.

³⁸ Neal and Cosh 2009, 549.

³⁹ Cunliffe 1998, 129.

⁴⁰ Neal and Cosh 2009, 549.

east side by checkered squares and triangles, and superimposed concave black and white squares. Thin black and white borders follow, with a thicker red border surrounding the entire panel. The workmanship of the mosaic is not of the best quality. There seems to be a difference between the east and west sides, especially with the guilloche of the medallion and the quality of the octagons. The work is not symmetrical and is irregular, which could have been the result of repairs. These repairs can be seen in the use of yellow tesserae used over brown throughout the mosaic and the replacement of the east side of the scroll border with a geometric pattern. An early second century date has been suggested based on samian tesserae that date no later than A.D. 100. Samian pottery was in wide use throughout the Roman Empire and is easily datable due to the producers stamp on the wares. Evidence of tesserae cut from samian ware was found in this mosaic and, ideally, confirming its date. However, the use of small amounts of samian are not always reliable for dating, especially if the stamp was not included.⁴¹ The workmanship and motifs are more aligned with the second century and therefore, a later date is more likely.⁴²

⁴¹ For more see Smith 1980, 14.

⁴² Neal and Cosh 2009, 552-3.

CHAPTER 5: OBSERVATIONS

Influence from Continent

Many observations can be made from the mosaics found at Fishbourne. First, there are the obvious links to the continent. As stated above, there are clear similarities between the Flavian-era mosaics and those found in Gaul. These similarities are so striking that scholars have suggested the possibility that the same workshop or individual that worked in Bescancon also worked at Fishbourne.⁴³ There are similarities in the mosaics in Room W8, W22, and N19. Although artisans would travel for work throughout the empire, the construction of Fishbourne was done relatively early in the Roman occupation of Britain. The obvious presence of artisans from the continent makes the ownership and significance of Fishbourne important. It reflects the extent of the patron's influential connections in securing these laborers. The transportation of artisans to Britain would have been no easy or cost-effective option. A lot of consideration and money went into the construction and decoration of Fishbourne. It is unclear if the owner was looking for high quality workmanship or was faced with the reality that there were no mosaicists in Britain at the time. It was probably a combination of both and brings up the question of whether or not other artisans were also brought over from the continent to work at the villa. It is obvious to assume that if there were no mosaicists in Britain so early in the Roman conquest, there was probably also no other artisans able to work on the walls and other decorative details. It is possible that along with mosaicists, other artists traveled from the continent to work on the wall paintings and detailed moldings during the Flavian period.

The scale and construction of the palace indicates that it was for someone with very close connections to Rome and who wanted his residence in the style that was prevalent in

⁴³ Wootton 2016, 78-79.

contemporary Italy. David J. Smith has stated that the mosaics that date from this period must be “regarded as irrelevant to the history of Roman mosaics in Britain: they were but one result of the requirement of the palace, and as yet they appear to have established no tradition.”⁴⁴ I disagree with Smith’s statement based on the fact that mosaics from the first century do exist at Fishbourne. Their presence, along with the construction of the palace, represents a direct connection to the Empire and desire to assimilate Roman art and culture in Britain immediately after occupation. Mosaics were not part of native Briton’s building décor and thus, there was no established tradition of mosaics in Britain before Roman occupation. Fishbourne contains some of the earliest mosaics and therefore, their presence is important to understanding the evolution of their presence in Britain. A lack of established tradition, as Smith refers to it as, in the first century, could be a result of geography, cost of the mosaic and labor by continental mosaicists, or political circumstances at the time. The owner of Fishbourne obviously had the financial resources to build a villa and in Italy was a structure created for the wealthy elite in Rome. The ability for one to be able to construct and build a villa in Britain during the first century, meant that the owner was part of the small number of elite in Britain. For these reasons, the early mosaics at Fishbourne are currently an anomaly in Britain. However, they are important to highlight intercontinental relationships and the desire to introduce and integrate Roman culture to Britain, even if the mosaic tradition they embodied was not widely adapted at the time.

Relationship to Interior Decoration

Unfortunately, very little is known about the interior decoration of the rooms at Fishbourne.⁴⁵ A small amount of moulded stucco has been found, particularly in room N7. Its

⁴⁴ Smith 1983, 357.

⁴⁵ See Cunliffe 1971, 51-82 for a more detail and description of plaster fragments found.

decoration is composed of a repetitive pattern of birds with fruit flanking a vase. As mentioned above, this find is quite remarkable since it was a common decorative element in Italy, but was not used in Britain. Although a large amount of colored plaster has been found, it is almost entirely fragmentary. This is most likely a result of later decline, subsequent fires and eventual destruction. Only a few observations can be made from the remaining fragments. Plaster from the Neroian proto-palace for the most part was green with white floral details, superimposed with red, yellow and blue. White was probably reserved for ceilings, friezes and decorative details. Fragments that have been associated with the villa reveal quality that is exceptionally high and consist of yellow, deep blue, red, pink and green. These colors would have contrasted well with the black and white floor mosaics from the Flavian Period, however, it is difficult to determine the exact period that the fragments belong. As mentioned above, due to the high quality of some of the fragments found, it is plausible that artisans were also brought over from the continent to work on the wall plaster and moulded stucco in the villa.

Room Importance in Relation to Decoration

The mosaics and decorative elements of certain rooms indicated that they are more significant. Some rooms clearly had more skilled mosaicists working in them and incorporated polychrome elements during the first century. Room N7, in particular, stands out from the other rooms in the north wing (Figure 9a-b). As discussed above, It contained a first-century, predominately black and white and geometric mosaic. The outer border features a city wall with grey and red towers at the corners and double arch gateway on the surviving north side. The representations of city walls, although found throughout the Roman Empire, were an anomaly in Britain. Additionally, the bird and vase moulding found in the room was also unique at the time. Room N7 is also the only room from the first century that has any surviving figural or structural

representation.

The inclusion of such high-quality decoration reflects the importance of these rooms within the villa, but also of the north wing. The north wing is thought to have had a number of functions including private and possibly official use. If parts of the wing were used for private purposes and the owners could afford more lavish decor it is certainly represented in the layout and mosaics that survive. Room N7 may have functioned as a dining room, due to its position off the courtyard; however, there is no indication of how the room could have been used or arranged. If this room was used as a dining room, was it used for dining in traditional Roman style and can room décor provide us with signs? Symbols of conviviality and plenty were popular and suitable for dining rooms at this time.⁴⁶ The stucco moulding with birds and vases of fruit dating from the first century and the volute vines and cantharii found on the second-century mosaic are supportive of this argument. These decorative elements as well as the sophistication of the second century mosaic could indicate a desire to impress visitors in a dining environment.

The decoration and select designs might have reflected the owner's personal preferences. There were stylistic groups or schools of mosaicists that were found in Britain. An owner would have worked with a specific workshop and these craftsmen would stay on with a patron for several years, often leading to new patrons and clients. Different regions would have resulted in different artistic preferences and mosaic representations.⁴⁷ Many of the mosaics are geometrically themed, with very few having common classical elements. Scholars have recently investigated the possibility of Gnostic iconography within early mosaics in Britain.⁴⁸ This is difficult to argue as many of the Gnostic imagery are identical to most Roman mythological

⁴⁶ Perring 2002, 130.

⁴⁷ See Perring 2002, 131.

⁴⁸ See Supperich 1980 and Perring 2002, 133-39 for a more in-depth discussion.

themes. However, Dominic Perring, in his writings on Gnosticism in Romano-British mosaics, has included Room N7 at Fishbourne as one of his early possible examples.⁴⁹ Although the motif seen in N7 was prevalent in Gnosticism, it is hard to argue in support of this theory at such an early date. Though, it is worth reflecting on this subject as many later mosaics in Britain contain Gnostic themes.

Ownership

The ownership of Fishbourne has been a matter of debate. It is assumed that the individual must have been someone with connections to the continent and sympathetic to the Roman conquest in Britain. Many scholars believed that local king, Tiberius Claudius Cogidubnus, was the original owner of the villa. Though his origins are unknown, it is thought that he was a member of the ruling household and controlled the Atrebatian kingdom. A lack of coinage leads scholars to believe that he did not rule independently until A.D. 43.⁵⁰ Cunliffe speculates that Cogidubnus fled the country, possibly as a child, and lived in exile in Rome while plans for the future invasion were being arranged, ultimately being sent back by Claudius to stabilize the area under Roman control.⁵¹ Cogidubnus is mentioned twice in contemporary sources. Tacitus mentions Cogidubnus's loyalty when he writes about the early years of the Roman conquest: "Some of the states were given to king Cogidubnus, who lived down to our day a most faithful ally."⁵² An inscription on a piece of Purbeck marble found at Chichester also mentions him. The inscription records the erection of a temple to Neptune and Minerva in honor of the Emperor under the patronage of: *Tiberius Claudius Cogidubnus rex, legatus Augusti in Britannia*. As a supporter of Claudius, he was eligible for Roman citizenship, taking the

⁴⁹ Perring 2002, 138.

⁵⁰ Cunliffe 1971, 13.

⁵¹ Cunliffe 1971, 13.

⁵² Tacitus, Agricola, 14.

praenomen and nomen of the Emperor. However, it is unclear when he was given the title of *legatus Augusti*. It might have been a result of his loyalty to Vespasian while the army in Britain was divided among allegiance.⁵³

Cogidubnus' association with Fishbourne is still conjecture as there is no actual evidence to support his ownership. However, Cogidubnus' career narrative and the archaeology at Fishbourne do develop jointly. Perhaps the first building on the site was used by Cogidubus while he was a local king and Roman citizen. The palace, being constructed during the Flavian period, would have reflected Cogidubnus' rank and status with Rome, and thus, a lavish living and entertaining space would have been necessary and expected. The ca. A.D. 80 date for the palace is based on coins and pottery found within the palace. Although no other possible owner of Fishbourne has been identified, not all are convinced of this theory. E. W. Black has questioned Cunliffe's early date for a number of reasons. He argues that because of the large quantities of soil that were removed, the soil may relate to the building of the proto-palace and therefore can only be *terminus post quem*.⁵⁴ He also noted a relief patterned tile discovered within the bath during renovation is similar to a tile that was found at the baths at Colchester, arguing that they were contemporaneous, dating to around A.D. 90-110.⁵⁵ It is possible some craftsmen worked at both locations and the pattern was a popular choice in the region. There was not a large market in Britain for this work, so it is possible that the same relief patterns were used throughout the years and updated patterns were not available or needed to display to clients. Nevertheless, another likely owner of Fishbourne has not been proposed. It is hard to imagine that someone else other than Cogidubus would go unnoticed or undocumented during this

⁵³ Cunliffe 1971, 14.

⁵⁴ Black 1987, 13; Cunliffe 1971, 530; Black 1993 for a detailed article on the first century baths.

⁵⁵ Black 1987, 13; Cunliffe 1971, 530.

tumultuous time. His personal story arch of being an influential person with connections to the continent and Rome make his ownership conceivable. There were not many individuals at the time who could have had the money and resources to build and decorate such a magnificent villa.

CHAPTER 6: THIRD AND FOURTH CENTURIES AT FISHBOURNE

The villa continued to be in use through the third century and, though well maintained, faced a number of changes. The floor in Room N8 was remodeled in the early third century with a simple knot and guilloche mosaic with dolphins on the corners (Figure 19). During the second century, the room was divided into two rooms. The northern room had a pillared hypocaust and the southern room was the *praefurnium*. At some point, the hypocaust was no longer used and the southern room was floored with a mosaic. It contained a rectangular panel surrounded by a thick red border, with the north side broader, possibly indicating that the room was used as a *cubiculum*.⁵⁶ The panel consists of a central square that is flanked on the north and south sides with rectangles containing two lozenges, one inside the other. The center of the square contains a medallion with a double guilloche of red and white on a white background with a braided knot within it. The corners of the square contain scallops, outlined in black, with the two northern ones fluted in red, white and black and the surviving southern one fluted in red and white. The space between the scallops contains dolphins with long tails. The center of the surviving sides, between the dolphins, contain vases that vary in design. The only noteworthy observation is that this mosaic is not as competently done as the earlier mosaics, leading to the assumption that the mosaicists available in the third century were not as skilled as previous mosaicists. After two hundred years, there is evidence of work being done throughout the villa. The third and fourth centuries in Britain were a period of major building construction and renovation, and the evidence at Fishbourne reflects this. Rooms in the west and north Wings contained uprooted tesserae piled in a corner. Unfortunately, it seems that the mosaics were uprooted in anticipation of a new ones to be laid, but this never occurred. Throughout the villa there is evidence of

⁵⁶ Black 1987, 13; Cunliffe 1971, 530.

renovation and upkeep towards the end of the third century,⁵⁷ however, it seems that many of these plans were never realized.

The fourth century saw a fire and ultimately destruction at Fishbourne. The fire took place towards the end of the third century and completely destroyed the inhabited north wing. The damage was extensive, leaving mosaics discolored. The fire most likely spread to the west wing but spared the east wing, particularly the baths, due to their isolated position. The fourth century was a period of prosperity under Roman rule and the reasons why Fishbourne was not renovated and rebuilt are unclear. The foundation of the palace was strong enough for reconstruction, yet a decision might have been made to not restore. It is possible that natural flooding had become an issue at the site and it was determined that rebuilding would not be a worthwhile endeavor. This is not the first time that the building was influenced by flooding. There was evidence of flooding during the second century, with the construction of the new bath suite in the north wing a direct result of ground saturation.

Where the mosaics at Fishbourne date predominantly from the first century, Colchester has no surviving mosaics before the second century. Stark contrasts between the two sites can be made; not only in terms of dwelling space and location, but in the mosaics themselves. The Colchester mosaics contain more figural representation than at Fishbourne. Additionally, it seems that by the second century, most mosaicists were local, no longer imported from the continent with other artisans. This factor certainly influences the mosaic outcome and its errors and oversights. Nevertheless, the city of Colchester and its mosaics offers a juxtaposition to the villa setting of Fishbourne.

⁵⁷ Cunliffe 1998, chapter 10 for a more detailed explanation.

CHAPTER 7: CAMULODUNUM: BEGINNINGS AND REBUILDING

Colchester was first excavated in the mid-1800s by William Wire, an amateur archaeologist. He kept meticulous diaries on the site and created a museum for the material found. Many of the discoveries were made by descending into unsafe trenches. The excavation method was done by cutting a series of pits along the roads and connecting the tunnels between them. The tunnels were frequently beneath the Roman floors so the mosaics could be viewed from the sides of the pits.⁵⁸ Mark Reginald Hull contributed greatly to the understanding of the mosaics found from each *insulae*, working at the site during the mid-1900s and published extensively on the pottery found there. In conjunction with excavations, he also recorded every building, mosaic, and tessellated pavements known and how they related to the road system and the forty *insulae*.⁵⁹ Additional excavations were carried out by B. K. R. Dunnett (on the North Hill and *Insula* 2) and Paul Crummy (Lion's Walk and *Insulae* 29 and 30) in the latter part of the twentieth century.

Colchester had a long history before the Romans occupied it. Based on numerous Iron Age coins found, it is evident that early tribes had an advanced culture, shedding light on the life and culture that existed before the Roman invasion of A.D. 43. The area was surrounded by natural advantages, with river systems and dykes for security. At the time of the Roman invasion, the city, called Camulodunon, meaning 'fortress of Camlos', was ruled by King Cunobelinus, who made the city a large center in the region and for much of his reign had political primacy and commercial wealth. However, in A.D. 40, Cunobelinus expelled his son, Adminius, who went to the Roman emperor Caligula for help. In A.D. 43, feeling the time was right, Emperor

⁵⁸ Neal and Cosh 2009, 83.

⁵⁹ Neal and Cosh 2009, 83.

Claudius ordered the invasion of Britain. The invading force was roughly 40-50,000 men, under the leadership of Aulus Plautius. The future Emperor Vespasian was one of the leaders of the Leg. II Augusta.⁶⁰ The army took the city with ease and Claudius left to return to Rome after being in Britain for only sixteen days.⁶¹

Roman Camulodunum

It is assumed that Aulus Plautius remained within the city with an army. The city became a colony for retired veterans and was named *Colonia Claudia*, after Claudius, in A.D. 49-50. Though second century A.D. inscriptions call it *Victricensis*, 'Of the Victorious,' and also continue to call it by Camulodunum, the Latin form of its Celtic name. The location for the colony was on top of a hill just east of old Camulodunon. This location had not yet been occupied and it was easily defensible and protected with natural valleys and rivers. The only part of this early colony that is known is the area around the Temple of Claudius. The foundations of the temple survive because they were used as foundations for a Norman castle in the eleventh century.⁶² The remains were found in 1919, showing that the castle enclosed the podium of the temple.⁶³ Under the Romans, Camulodunum grew in population and saw the construction of public buildings, a forum, baths, and a temple. There is evidence of a large volume of pottery from the continent, reflecting extensive connections abroad, most likely with Gaul.⁶⁴ However, the Romans treatment of the native people was harsh. They collected heavy taxes, confiscated land, and placed the cost of maintaining the Temple of Claudius and its priests predominantly on the Britons.⁶⁵ Eventually, the natives organized a revolt that nearly led to the fall of Roman rule

⁶⁰ Hull 1961, 8.

⁶¹ Hull 1961, 10.

⁶² Colchester and Essex Museum 1966, 11.

⁶³ Wheeler and Laver, 1919.

⁶⁴ Rivet 1958, 44-47.

⁶⁵ Hull 1961, 14.

in Britain.

Boudicca Rebellion

When Prasutagus, King of the Iceni, died and left his fortune to his two daughters and the Emperor and the Romans seized it and mistreated the people.⁶⁶ This was the event that final trigger that caused the people to revolt against the Romans. Prasutagus' widow, Boudicca, reached out to the neighboring tribes to join their cause. Discontent with the treatment by the Romans, led to an overwhelming call to arms by the natives to take back their independence. The Roman colonists of Camulodunum were taken aback and soon quickly collected bronze to turn into weapons. The fragments of these weapons have been found above the native town.⁶⁷ However, the Roman colonists were no match for the reported 230,000⁶⁸ warriors under Boudicca. The colonists also had no walls or fortifications to defend themselves, a fact recorded by Tacitus and is supported by archaeological evidence.⁶⁹ Outnumbered, the Romans barricaded themselves within the Temple of Claudius. After a two-day siege, the temple roof was set on fire and all were killed. London and Verulamium were also burned. The rebellion, which took place between A.D. 60 and 61, saw roughly 80,000 killed.⁷⁰

City Layout

It is understood that the city of Camulodunum was completely destroyed during the rebellion. Its status as the premier town in Britain declined and London became the more

⁶⁶ Hull 1961, 14

⁶⁷ Colchester and Essex Museum 1966, 16; Hull 1961, 16.

⁶⁸ Hull 1961, 16.

⁶⁹ Tacitus, XXXI.11; Crummy 1997, 74-75, 79-84; Rivet 1958, 77.

⁷⁰ Dio, LXII.1-2.

preferable location. After the rebellion, there does not appear to have been a delay in rebuilding the town. The native aristocracy had continuous contact with Rome through trade, which improved their lifestyle and provided access to fine food and pottery. It is hard to say for sure who was living in the city after the rebellion. Through excavation, Roman military equipment has been found that dates to the Trajanic period.⁷¹ It is assumed that there was a Roman military presence, however, the percentage of native people, sympathetic to Rome, living there is more difficult to confirm. There was an effort to Romanize the people through oppression and numerous public projects. The native aristocracy was slowly embraced this new culture adopting the Roman style of dress, baths and elegant dinner parties. Tacitus writes that ‘all this in their ignorance, they called civilization, when it was but a part of their servitude.’⁷² While Tacitus interpreted these changes made by the native people as a sign of decline, it is possible the native Britons wanted to adapt Roman ways.

Pre-and post-rebellion saw a town plan with predominately elongated strip buildings and a few traditional courtyard houses. However, gaps in the street frontages reflect a reduced city population, most likely consisting of Roman veterans. By the second century, courtyard houses were standardized and the town layout was structured with numerous *insulae* (Figure 20). The previously defenseless town was finally given a wall, the first in Britain. Pottery and other finds date the rampart to sometime between A.D 150-200. However, Rosalind Dunnett’s excavation in the 1960s revealed that the wall was freestanding for some time before the rampart was built.⁷³ Evidence from Lion Walk and Culver Street strongly suggests that the wall was built early and sometime between A.D 65-80.⁷⁴ Changes were made to the road layout and the town was

⁷¹ See Crummy 1977 for more information.

⁷² Tacitus XXI.

⁷³ Crummy 1997, 86-89.

⁷⁴ Crummy 1997, 89.

expanded in the early 2nd century, particularly eastward, with the Temple of Claudius becoming more centrally located within *Insula XXII* (Figure 21). Interesting enough, even though there is evidence of wealth on a private scale, there seems to have been no increase in the construction or improvement of public works.⁷⁵

The city's residencies grew in size as the wealth of the city increased. Some of the residences were palatial in size with a courtyard, painted walls, tiled roofs, and mosaic floors, particularly in the northwest section of town. There are several homes within the town that occupy up to a quarter of an *insula*, including the house at Culver Street and Middleborough, which sits just outside the North Gate. One home, located on the North Hill, had mosaics in nearly every room in the main quarters. Even the smaller homes, by the second century, display great affluence and improved living conditions, such as private bathing suites. Most private residences had *opus signinum* floors at this time.⁷⁶ However, it was not until the second century that many of the residences had lavish mosaics.

⁷⁵ Crummy 1997, 99.

⁷⁶ Neal and Cosh 2009, 84.

CHAPTER 8: MOSAICS FOUND INSIDE THE WALLS AT COLCHESTER

Mosaics

It is not clear which buildings had mosaics in the first century. A large number of loose tesserae were found around the Temple of Claudius; there is pre- and post-rebellion evidence that the Temple of Claudius had black and white tessellated floors.⁷⁷ If mosaics are an indicator of wealth in Roman Britain, then by the second century A.D., then Colchester was quite affluent. By this time, the town had recovered from the rebellion and had become prosperous. Many of the mosaics that date to the second century at Colchester are some of the finest in Britain. There are a number of similarities between the workmanship found at Colchester and that at Verulamium, suggesting that the mosaicists were ambulant.⁷⁸ However, there are some stylistic parallels that can be found in the Rhineland, so it is possible that some mosaicists came from Germany via London.⁷⁹

By the late third and fourth centuries, there is evidence of decline within the city.⁸⁰ Some buildings were abandoned and mosaics were partitioned and not replaced after being stripped. Though, there was some recycling of material, it does not seem that the tesserae were reused. However, there are two fourth century mosaics found within a building at Lion's Walk that are of notable exception. These two mosaics are so unusual that it is possible the mosaicists were brought in from afar to complete it.⁸¹ There is also evidence that the fortunes of the districts varied as well. Although, some of the grandest houses are from the northwest section of town, by

⁷⁷ Neal and Cosh 2009, 13, 84.

⁷⁸ Neal and Cosh 2009, 85.

⁷⁹ Neal and Cosh 2009, 85.

⁸⁰ Neal and Cosh 2009, 85. Crummy 1997, 113-8.

⁸¹ Neal and Cosh 2009, 86.

the fourth century, many of the repairs that were made to the mosaics were done so by unskilled workers. This is curious because if the owners still had status and wealth, presumably they would have wanted the mosaics to continue to impress their visitors and not contain stylistic inconsistencies. Therefore, a change in ownership is suspected, with many of the buildings being abandoned and mosaics damaged.⁸²

Iconography of Mosaics

There are forty *insulae* at Colchester and mosaics have been found in most of them. There are also a number of mosaics found outside of the city's walls. The mosaics are predominately polychrome with various geometric, guilloche, and floral arrangements. A few also contain images of objects and animals. Many of the same themes and iconography found within the mosaics at Colchester can also be found at the Roman Palace at Fishbourne. Since there were mosaics found both within and outside the city walls at Colchester, I will first look at the mosaics from within the walls in each *insula*, then examine the surviving mosaics from outside the city walls. Mosaics that are fragmentary or lost primarily are excluded from this survey.

Insula II

Insula II is located in the north-western corner of the city within the North Hill. It extends north to the town wall and Northgate Street. Nun's Road crosses through it. Two mosaics were found at No. 18 North Hill (Bryant's Garden), known as pavement A and pavement B. Pavement A crossed into Bryant's Garden to the east and pavement B crossed the southern border into the garden of No. 17. Both mosaics were discovered and documented in the early twentieth century.

⁸² Neal and Cosh 2009, 85.

However, the original plan of the building is not known, except for the fact that it occupied the south west corner of the *insula*, with the North Hill to the west and a small east to west road to the south. It is believed that the building was terraced with views to the north.⁸³

Pavement A

Pavement A dates to the second century A.D. (Figure 22). The arrangement is made of large squares tangent to smaller ones, with lozenge stars filling the spaces. The center of the mosaic contains a large central octagon with rectangular panels on each side. The central octagon contains a large flower with eight red overlapping, pointed petals. The overlapping petals are in blue-grey, grey and white tesserae. The large corolla has four red and yellow, heart-shaped, inward pointing petals. These petals alternate with four calices with red and yellow outgrowths, their tips pointing into the clefts of the petals. The rectangles around the octagon have strips of guilloche with strands of white, yellow and red. Black squares are tangent to them. The corner squares have flowers with four red-tipped petals with alternating blue-grey and grey outgrowths. Its corollas follow the same pattern as the flower in the octagon. The fourth flower is a result of a later repair and does not match the others in quality or aesthetic. The rectangular panels at the axis and panels tangent to them at forty-five degrees, have a large pelta. The lozenges containing small black rhomboids. The entire panel is surrounded by black and white alternating bands, with their widths varying.

The quality of the workmanship is very good. The pattern of the mosaic is not seen elsewhere at Colchester. There is no dating evidence for this mosaic. However, due to the quality of workmanship and the dating evidence of the mosaic in the adjacent room, it is thought that the mosaic dates to the Antonine or Hadrianic period.⁸⁴ The complexity of the mosaic and the use of

⁸³ Neal and Cosh 2009, 86.

⁸⁴ Neal and Cosh 2009, 86-87.

lozenges is also typical of the early second century.⁸⁵

Pavement B

Pavement B was first discovered in 1845 by William Wire (Figure 23). It was the reexposed periodically over the next one hundred years as it faced various stages of preservation and conservation. A fragment of the mosaic is currently in the Colchester Castle Museum, with parts of it possibly still *in situ*.⁸⁶ The south and west parts of the mosaic survive, representing a large grid pattern. The motif includes nine square panels superimposed over intersections creating cruciform interspaces occupied by squares with their tips tangent to the grid and their axes tangent to the corners of the squares. The compartments of the four corners have squares and the panels of the axes and center are medallions. All but the center panel are outlined in simple guilloche. The guilloche outlining the panels in the corners are made of dark grey, white, yellow and red tesserae enclosing four-petalled flowers with turned blue-grey tips. The panels at the axes, where only one survives, have circles of simple guilloche of white, light grey and blue-grey with a flower containing red tipped petals and enclosing a flower with red petals that alternates with guilloche of red, yellow and white. The rectangular spaces have strips of simple guilloche of red, yellow and white. The entire panel is surrounded by a band of triple fillets with red tips. Their points alternate between pointing upright or curled to the right. Surrounding the fillet band is a band of grey-blue, surrounded by a red band. A patch of plain red tesserae was made on the south side of the mosaic.⁸⁷

The workmanship of the mosaic is poor with irregularities throughout it. There is an inconsistency between the construction of the mosaic and the pavement in the adjacent room. Neal and Cosh are under the impression that the two mosaics were not done by the same team of

⁸⁵ Neal and Cosh 2009., 87.

⁸⁶ Neal and Cosh 2009, 89.

⁸⁷ Neal and Cosh 2009, 89-90.

worker and that the dates of the pavement constructions are separated by a number of years.⁸⁸

The dating evidence includes color-coated ware from below the pavement ‘which must be nearly mid-second century at the earliest...(and that)...the pavement can hardly be earlier than Antonine.’⁸⁹ The handle of an amphora was also found beneath the pavement with a stamp reading ‘TATI. ASIATCT’ and thus a later second century date is also possible.⁹⁰ This mosaic closely matches one found in *Insula IX* (Figure 24) and at Chichester (Figure 25) and Verulamium (Figure 26), all of which date to the mid-second century at the earliest.

Insula IXa

There are no documented mosaics from *Insula III-V* and those from *Insula VI* and *Insula VIII* are now completely lost. There are two surviving mosaics from *Insula IXa*, which lies between the North Hill on the east and the city wall on the west. The first excavations within this *insula* were done in the mid-nineteenth century and revealed a nine-room townhouse, where the two surviving mosaics are located. The mosaic in House 5, Room 1, which is located in the northwestern corner of the structure, dates to about the mid-second century (see Figure 24). The southern quarter of the mosaic survives, from which a scheme of a grid edged in black overlaid by white triangles. The pattern includes a grid of large squares containing squares outlined in simple guilloche of dark grey, red, yellow and white tesserae. Where the pattern meets the border, the squares are converted into triangles. The only surviving large square contains a flower with red petals and blue-grey corolla. The surviving corner has a triangular compartment with chequered triangles. The entire motif is surrounded by a guilloche band of dark grey, red, yellow and white. Surrounding this are bands of white and dark grey, and finally a white

⁸⁸ Neal and Cosh 2009, 90.

⁸⁹ Hull 1958, 79; Neal and Cosh 2009, 90.

⁹⁰ Neal and Cosh 2009, 90.

border.⁹¹ Neal and Cosh believe that the mosaic dates to the mid-second century because of the use of dark grey and white bands and white boarder, which are constructed in unusually small tesserae.⁹²

Room 5, located in the north-eastern corner of the same house, contains a mosaic that is surrounded by a tight double band of guilloche (Figure 27). The tesserae of this band are very fine and are bordered by a double fillet of white, a broader band of dark grey and a thick, course border of red that is seven inches wide on each side. Unfortunately, the central motif does not survive and it is impossible to reconstruct it. The design and form of the mosaic is similar to one found in *Insula XXXIV*, however, the scheme was most likely different (Figure 28).

Insula X

Insula X is located in the northwest section of the city, east of North Hill (see Figure 21). Previously, on this location, there was a storehouse, destroyed during Boudocca's rebellion in A.D. 60-61. Later, a rectangular structure was built and enlarged during the Antonine period (Figure 29). This structure had about seven rooms, with three of the rooms with mosaics and the other four with red tesserae. The three large surviving mosaics (Mosaic A, Mosaic B, and Mosaic C) were probably all done by the same mosaicists during the Antonine period.

Mosaic A

Mosaic A from Room 1 was found in 1965 and dates to the mid-second century (Figure 30). The pattern is based on an arrangement of large squares tangent to smaller poised squares with eight lozenge stars within the spaces. This mosaic has made small modifications by converting the four large squares in the corners to L-shapes outlined in guilloche. In the center, a large square superimposes with its corners surrounded by pairs of lozenges with L-shapes.

⁹¹ Neal and Cosh 2009, 92.

⁹² Neal and Cosh 2009, 92-93.

Poised squares with guilloche squares are situated tangent to the central square and corners of the L-shape. The central compartment of the mosaic contains an intricate flower with grey tips and four inward pointing hearts in white and yellow with red centers. The flowers are separated by blue-grey pointed outgrowths that spurt blue-grey leaf tendrils that are attached to the ends of the heart-shaped petals. Unfortunately, the central flower is lost. Each side of the poised squares are shortened by the border to form triangles. Within them, on one side, is a single, solid, dark grey pelta. On the other two sides, only one triangle survives and it is divided into four equal triangles with a linear dark grey triangle in center and dark grey peltae in the others. Lozenges fill the spaces with rhomboidal swastikas. The entire scheme is surrounded by inverted and reversed L-shapes that have dotted outlines. The east and west sides of the mosaic have bands of guilloche in red, yellow and white. This band is surrounded by a border of grey tesserae that goes around the entire pavement.⁹³ Mosaic A is most likely contemporary with Mosaic B and Mosaic C found in *Insula X*. Not only do they all date to the mid-second century, but their style and layout are all very similar. However, Mosaic A has evidence of superior workmanship. The tesserae used in the central flower are exceptionally fine and sophisticated. This might be the result of different, more experienced craftsmen or a variable date for this mosaic.⁹⁴ There is no other parallel for this scheme at Colchester.

Mosaic B

Mosaic B from Room 3 consists of two panels, Panel A and Panel B (Figure 31). Panel A is on the south. The scheme consists of nine panels; one central square surrounded by rectangles on all sides and squares at the corners. The panels are outlined and connected by a simple guilloche of red, yellow and white and outlined in dark grey. The entire panel is superimposed by

⁹³ Neal and Cosh 2009, 95.

⁹⁴ Neal and Cosh 2009, 95.

a circle of white and red guilloche and concentric designs. The fragmentary central panel has a medallion of simple white and red guilloche with yellow cantharus. The perspective of the cantharus is from above and reveals that it is full of wine. The handles are S-shaped and there appears to be a motif on the body of the cantharus, possibly a swastika.⁹⁵ The entire medallion is set within a square in black and white with flower petals in the corners and surrounded by a pattern of ovals containing red-tipped inward pointing petals with their tips pointing to the left, right or straight. The four rectangles surrounding the central panel contain the same décor of patterns. This includes a dark-grey double fillet, band of red, yellow and white guilloche, another dark-grey fillet and a band of waves. In the spandrels of the north and south rectangles are a triangular motif that is based off a flower with a circular corolla. The spandrel of the east rectangle has a pair of pointed petals connected by a stem. It is presumed that the west spandrel had the same motif. The squares in the two surviving corners have flowers with yellow and red petals. Bands of superimposed thorns surround the flowers.⁹⁶

Panel B sits just below Panel A and is a bit wider. The rectangular panel contains a grid of two rows of five octagons connected by squares in the interspaces. The parallel rows are separated and connected by four octagons with lozenges. The two rows of five octagons have motifs within medallions, each separated by a small square with guilloche knots. The medallions within the two central octagons contain canthari, the lower one almost completely lost. The cantharus on the surviving medallion contains S-shaped handles with a swastika-like shape on the neck. The bowl sits on a very tiny, triangular pedestal that spouts tendrils with a red-tipped leaf at the end of each. The other eight octagonal medallions contain floral motifs. The pair on either side of the cantharus octagons are the same. The two next to the surviving cantharus have

⁹⁵ Neal and Cosh 2009, 97.

⁹⁶ Neal and Cosh 2009, 97.

four white and red pointed petals with inward pointing heart shaped petals in grey. The other pair has eight overlapping petals in white and grey and red, yellow and white where the petals overlap. The medallion on the top left also follows this same design. The two medallions on the far right have been heavily repaired and are a blatantly different from the others in quality and design. The repairs done on right side, including the medallions, were done in yellow ochre and not white tesserae. The top right medallion has four red-tipped petals, while the other has twelve overlapping petals. A border of dark grey surrounds both Panel A and Panel B, as well as connects them.

Mosaic C

Mosaic C from Room 5 also has two panels that both date to the second century A.D. (Figure 32). Panel A sits to the south and is a nine-paneled scheme, similar to Mosaic B, Panel A. It also features a large central square surrounded by rectangles, with small squares in the corner, superimposed on concentric circles. The central square consists of a square surrounded by double guilloche of red and white, yellow, brown and white, and blue and blue-grey tesserae. The double guilloche encircles a flower with sixteen petals, of which, eight are in red, yellow and white, while the other eight are blue, grey and white. The double guilloche band is surrounded by a band of double half-circles. Working outward, the bands underlying the scheme and incorporated into the surrounding rectangles, are identical to the ones found in Mosaic B, Panel A. In the spandrels, of which, only one survives, are single leaves on a stem. Only a fragment of one of the four small corner square survives and it reveals traces of a possible floral design.

Panel B is separated from Panel A by a thick dark grey band. The main long, central scheme is of quadruple-strand guilloche in red, yellow and white. Surrounding this scheme are

double fillets and a band of dark grey triangles. Along one side of the pavement, a coarse red border is evident. It is through that this red border might have surrounded both panels.⁹⁷ The workmanship of Mosaic C is good and was most likely done by the same mosaicists responsible for Mosaic B. Although no identical work can be found at Colchester, there is a similar scheme that can be found at Verulamium (Figure 33).

Insula XXVIII

The *insulae* preceding *Insula XXVIII* all contain either lost mosaics or reburied pavements with fragmentary evidence. *Insula XXVII* sites between High and Culver Streets at Lion's Walk, which runs south from Culver Street. Excavations at this location have not been orderly and the Roman buildings are not well understood.⁹⁸ However, since the eighteenth century, mosaics have been found, yet all are lost but one. The mosaic in question was first discovered in 1858 and consists of two fragments. Although only about a quarter of the mosaic survives, the scheme of Fragment A can be easily recognized (Figure 34). The mosaic consists of a quincunx of large octagons separated by rectangular compartments. These rectangular compartments are equal in length to the sides of the octagon, thus creating irregular spaces. These compartments are filled with rectangles and lozenges and small squares. The surviving octagon has guilloche in grey, red, yellow white, surrounding grey waves and a double fillet encircling a flower with eight overlapping petals with red-tips. Two rectangular compartments survive depicting a scroll with two alternating heart-shaped buds with red tips. The survey done on the fragment from 1858 is erroneous in a number of ways. The band of waves is depicted as a wreath, the flowers in the rectangles are shown in trefoils, and finally the scheme was portrayed as a single fillet, not double.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ Neal and Cosh 2009, 99.

⁹⁸ Neal and Cosh 2009, 109.

⁹⁹ Neal and Cosh 2009, 110.

Fragment B was found separately, yet after studying the number of tesserae in the widths of the band border, it is believed that Fragment A and B are from the same pavement (Figure 35).¹⁰⁰ The fragment comes from a corner of the mosaic, situated just above Fragment A. The fragment has a compartment of triangles flanked by simple guilloche in dark grey, red and white. The outer border, done in thicker tesserae, consists of bands of white, grey, white and finally a courser red band. It has been noted that it is unusual that the medallion does not have yellow in its guilloche.¹⁰¹ However, it is significant to note that it is the only surviving mosaic from inside the city that does not have yellow in its guilloche. There are no exact parallels but similar elements can be found in other mosaics from Verulamium (Figures 36 and 37). Both mosaics date to the late second century, contain wave patterns, and have analogous overall design. However, the mosaic from Verulamium was most likely not done by the same mosaicists as it is poorly executed.

Insula XXXV

Insula XXXIV is flanked by Sir Isaac's Walk to the north and the city wall to the south. Mosaics were found within this *insula*, but are now all lost. However, *Insula XXXV*, which sits just east of *Insula XXXIV*, contains a large two panel mosaic from Building 123, Room 12 that is currently preserved in the Colchester Castle Museum (Figure 38). The mosaic only survived because it had receded into a pit within the undefined room. It was laid around the second half of the second century and was destroyed in the late third or early fourth centuries.¹⁰² Panel A is a nine-panel scheme outlined in dark grey with simple guilloche in red, yellow and white. It is comprised of a large central square panel, flanked by rectangular panels and with square panels

¹⁰⁰ Neal and Cosh 2009, 110.

¹⁰¹ Neal and Cosh 2009, 110.

¹⁰² Neal and Cosh 2009, 117.

in the corners. Only about less than one quarter of the panel survives. The central square compartment is outlined in double guilloche in red, yellow and white with round tongues in blue-grey. The compartment contains a flower, of which, only the bottom right corner survives. The surviving petals are white and dark grey with red excrescences. The spandrels of the corners are dark grey with a superimposed white triangle. The rectangles surrounding the center square each contain a lozenge in simple guilloche of blue-grey, grey and white. The guilloche encloses a small inward pointing calyx, mounted as an urn, on a pedestal with a noticeable red bud. Within the spandrels of the rectangle are triangular shaped motifs with red-tipped buds in the center. Only two of the corner squares survive, both with different flowers. The flower on the right has eight petals with blue-grey tips and overlap with petals in red, yellow and white. A crosslet in grey and white is depicted within the corolla. The flower on the left has four petals in white and yellow with red pointed petals and four blue-grey excrescences. The corolla is identical to the right side. It is thought that the same flower designs were repeated on the other side.¹⁰³

Panel B sits just north of Panel A and is separated by a white band. The rectangular panel is heavily lost but remains of an outlined dark grey double fillet and quasi-tangent circles enclosing buds are visible. The buds point in alternating directions and supported on reverse stems. The outgrowths between the circles are not consistent with one another and alternative between round arches and right angles. A thick border of white tesserae surrounds both panels.

Insula XXXVI

There are two significant mosaics from *Insula XXXVI* that date to the fourth century (Figure 39). Both mosaics are located within Building 19, which occupied the southeast corner of the *insula* by Sir Isaac's Walk and the town hall. The building, built around A.D. 150, had a

¹⁰³ Neal and Cosh 2009, 117.

number of rooms surrounding a courtyard with an extension on the north side added in the fourth century. The first mosaic, consisting of two panels, is from Room 11 and is heavily fragmented from medieval disturbance. Panel A is a large square panel bordered by double guilloche of stands of red, yellow and white and brown, grey and white. A circular motif is set within the square panel with a double guilloche band of grey, white, and red. The band surrounds sixteen compartments that alternate in size and contain figural and acanthus forms. These compartments surround a circle, which is just about completely lost, except for its border, which is slightly more preserved. This border has a complex laurel wreath in grey and probably subdivided into eight sections by reversed S-shaped bands, representing ribbons.¹⁰⁴ Only one of the compartments survives in its entirety. The smaller compartment contains an ornate acanthus outlined in grey with white leaves and branches in white and red connecting to form a heart shape. A larger compartment abutting with this smaller one contains evidence of figural content. The figure, most likely female, with a bare shoulder and arm, faces right and leans forward. Drapery surrounds her legs and a red cape hangs behind her shoulders. There is also evidence of a second figure in front can be seen. Above the figures, there is a fragmented inscription.¹⁰⁵ Only one of the spandrels partially survives. The spandrel contains an ornate acanthus similar to the one found in the smaller radial compartment.

Panel B is extremely fragmentary; however, it provides evidence of the double guilloche border that connects it to Panel A. The panel is rectangular and seems to have guilloche of red, yellow, white and grey and white framed by stepped triangles facing outward as seen in Panel A. The mosaic is well made and some similarities can be made to two other mosaics at Colchester that have circular arrangements (See Figures 31 and 32). Radial compartments are not common

¹⁰⁴ Neal and Cosh 2009, 120.

¹⁰⁵ Neal and Cosh 2009, 120.

in Britain but are smaller with animal themes and cannot match the quality.¹⁰⁶ Unfortunately, because the mosaic is so fragmentary, the subject cannot be identified.

Insula XL

Insula XL is located within the southeast corner of the town as Bury Hill. Although nothing is known of the building, one of the best-preserved mosaics from the late second century was found here. The mosaic was discovered in 1923; however, no archaeological excavation was done. The mosaic is almost complete except for two diagonal opposite corners, which have been lost (Figure 40). The scheme is nine-paneled in simple guilloche of red, yellow and white and outlined in grey. There is a large central square tangent to lateral rectangles and small squares in the corners. The central square contains a roundel of guilloche in dark grey, black, grey and white, encompassing a stylized flower with four inward pointing petals in red, yellow and white. Each petal is separated by calices of white and grey. The flower rim is emphasized by fillets of black and grey. Eight pointed excrescences in red, yellow, white and white and black surround it. The spandrels contain dark grey double fillets containing inverted triangles in the same color.

The four lateral rectangular compartments have a fillet of dark grey with square dentils. They enclose beasts, swimming clockwise, and chasing dolphins. The bottom rectangle (Figure 41) contains a marine bull and dolphin outlined in dark grey with inner fillets of black and light grey and bodies of white. The front legs of the bull are light grey with red fins and streamers. The next rectangle, clockwise, contains a sea-gryphon and dolphin with the same shading but with elaborate wing (Figure 42). The leading edge of the wing is red, yellow, white and red with feathers of light grey. The tails and streamers of both creatures are in red and pink. The sea-gryphon nips the tail of the dolphin, almost in play. The figures in this panel are more

¹⁰⁶ Neal and Cosh 2009, 120.

imaginatively and boldly illuminated.

The top rectangular panel has a sea-leopard chasing a dolphin (Figure 43). The sea-leopard is outlined in dark grey with a light grey and white body. It is also spotted and has red fins and streamers, except for under its belly where there is also some pink. The dolphin is yellow and white, with its red tail is being nipped by the sea-leopard. The remaining rectangular panel is damaged, with the head of the beast and dolphin lost (Figure 44). The beast is most likely a sea monster.¹⁰⁷ The monster is yellow and white and is also not central within the panel, with more space towards its rear. Thus, the dolphin is placed closer to corner of the panel.

Two of the four square compartments within the corners of the panel survive. The two diagonally opposite squares have identical flowers with four inward pointing petals. The petals are heart-shaped and are shaded light grey and white with black tips. The flowers are overlaid on squares, with their points forming petals and filled with concentric circles of black, grey, white and yellow. The two other square compartments are lost but most likely included a different flower type. The entire motif is surrounded by a band of white and border of red tesserae. The red border is wider on one side, most likely for couches, distinguishing the room as a *triclinium*. *Triclinium*'s typically contained scenes on the walls and floors that would offer lively dining conversation and discussion with guests, and this floor with beasts and dolphins would have encouraged this behavior.

The mosaics found within the walls of Colchester contain similar iconography and designs. Their designs are complex with beautiful polychrome imagery. Although these second century mosaics were all done by local mosaicists, their motifs of florals, geometrics, and marine scenes are seen throughout the Roman Empire. Connections to Italy and the Empire are seen in

¹⁰⁷ Neal and Cosh 2009, 128.

these mosaics even with local artisans no longer being imported during the second century. The mosaics show that there was an obvious desire by the residents of Colchester to incorporate Roman designs and themes into their residences.

CHAPTER 9: MOSAICS FOUND OUTSIDE THE WALLS AT COLCHESTER

Middlebrough Mosaics

There is also evidence of mosaics from outside the city walls at Colchester. At Middlebrough, near the north gate, excavations from the 1970s revealed three masonry buildings. Building 70 contains the finest mosaic found at Colchester. The building was excavated in 1970 by the Colchester Archaeological Trust and consisted of a L-shaped house with at least nine rooms and a south facing courtyard with a *porticus*.¹⁰⁸ The house later added an east wing with a shop that was parallel to the road and on a different alignment to the rest of the building. The mosaic paved a room within the west wing of Building 70 (Figure 45) and dates to about A.D. 150-175. The mosaic is exceptionally done, indicating that a master mosaicist was most likely commissioned.¹⁰⁹ The room had a *porticus* on both the east and west sides. On the west side of the mosaic, the border was set up directly against the wall, with a broad course red border on the east side and narrower borders on the north and south sides. Since the figured central panel is viewed from the west, it has been assumed that not only was the entrance to the room from the west *porticus*, but that the mosaic should be viewed from this side as well.¹¹⁰ This is unusual since another mosaic from the same house was approached from the south *porticus*, an extension of the east *porticus*; thus, might indicate some social division.¹¹¹

The mosaic is square with a central square panel tangent to lateral semicircles without straight lines joining the end of the arches. The central square panel is surrounded by round tongue-double guilloche band in grey red, yellow and white strands. The two main figures in the

¹⁰⁸ Neal and Cosh 2009, 131.

¹⁰⁹ See Crummy 1984 for a more detailed description of mosaic.

¹¹⁰ Neal and Cosh 2009, 131.

¹¹¹ Neal and Cosh 2009, 131.

central panel are mostly lost. Neal and Cosh have interpreted the figures as a representation of two-winged cupids wrestling (Figure 46).¹¹² Although the identity of these two figures is presumptuous, it is important to note that a winged cupid is found in room N7 at Colchester (Figure 17). The stand on a brown band that represents the ground. The heads and bodies of the cupids are lost but their muscular legs are done in yellow, orange and red. A wing of the left cupid is done in dark red and grey. The figures stand a bit off centered to the left to allow for a bird to face them. The bird is in red and dark red with red feet.

The lateral semicircles are outlined by round-tongued double guilloche done in the following sequence: dark red, red, and white; blue, light blue, and white; pink, yellow, and white; orange, yellow, and white. Each semicircle contains marine beasts of which, the top and bottom swim counterclockwise and the ones on the sides swim clockwise. The animal in the bottom semicircle is largely lost but from its head and tail has been identified as a sea-leopard.¹¹³ Clockwise, the animal in the next semicircle is also largely lost and unidentifiable. The top semicircle contains a sea-goat and the far-right one has a white and grey seahorse with a red trident. However, the seahorse has a possible 'red horn' which may indicate it was to be a bull.¹¹⁴

The four interspaces between each semicircle are divided into four isosceles triangles, with those flanking the semicircles slightly concave at the bases. Those in the bottom left and top right are identical with three containing a checkered arrangement of black triangles and one with stylized lotus with flared petals. Those in the bottom right and top left also contain four triangles. One has checkered squares and triangles, two contain crescent arrangements, and one has a pair of heart-shaped leaves connected by a thin stem. Surrounding the entire scheme are two bands of

¹¹²Neal and Cosh 2009, 133; Smith 1983, 364.

¹¹³Neal and Cosh 2009, 137.

¹¹⁴Neal and Cosh 2009, 137.

white and grey followed by a continuous frieze of an acanthus scroll in dark grey. The scrolls all contain lotus buds and heart shaped leaves, except at the axis where birds are perched. Three of the birds face left with the bird under the cupids who is turned facing its feathers. The frieze is followed by more bands of dark grey, white and dark grey. The west side of the mosaic has another band of dark grey that connects to the wall.

No other mosaics at Colchester have a similar arrangement. However, an almost identical one can be found at Verulamium (Figure 47). The mosaic at Verulamium has a few significant differences, including the subject of the central panel, which is of a lion holding a severed stag head, and the intended view, from the room entrance. The semicircles and interspaces are also different and contain canthari. Similar mosaics can be found at North Leigh, Oxen and Walton Heath, Surrey that also contain canthari, and along with the mosaic from Verulamium, have been identified as dining rooms. However, the mosaic at Colchester differs from these examples. Not only does the mosaic no contain canthari, it also has not been identified as a dining room.

The composition is also unique in Britain. D. J. Smith noted two close parallels. One from Vienne, France that dates to A.D. 150-200 and depicts winged, naked wrestling boys or cupids within one of six panels.¹¹⁵ Another from Thasos, Greece that also has birds facing the wrestlers.¹¹⁶ There has been debate regarding the mosaic from Thasos and whether or not the scene represents Eros and Anteros or two cupids.¹¹⁷ It has also been suggested that the image was inspired by the sculptural group of Cupid and Psyche that was found throughout the Empire.¹¹⁸ Too little of the figures survive to draw such a conclusion. It is also worth noting that the scroll surrounding the panel contains birds at its axis's. A similar bird found on the scroll can

¹¹⁵ Neal and Cosh 2009, 137. Also see Smith 1983.

¹¹⁶ Garland 1965.

¹¹⁷ Smith 1983, 364.

¹¹⁸ Neal and Cosh 2009, 137.

also be found on a scroll surrounding a mosaic from Fishbourne (Figure 48).

CHAPTER 10: OBSERVATIONS

Comparisons to Fishbourne Mosaics

There are only a few mosaics from Fishbourne that date to the second century. There are some similarities between these mosaics and the ones at Colchester. The mosaic from Room N7 at Fishbourne and the mosaic from Building II at Colchester both contain a design that was prevalent at the time. This design, based on circles, has a central full circle with lateral half circles and corner quadrants. The mosaic from Colchester has been nearly completely lost, but enough of it remains within the Colchester Castle Museum to determine the scheme, that it contained bands of guilloche that encircled at least three of the half circles and around the border (Figure 49). Enough of the bottom semicircle survives to make out a sea creature, similar to the ones found on the semicircles from the Fishbourne mosaic (Figure 50). There is one minor difference between the two mosaics. The Fishbourne mosaic contains canthari within its interspaces, while the one interspace that survives at Colchester shows remains of a floral motif.

Some comparisons can also be made between Room N20 from Fishbourne (Figure 51) and Building 70, Room 4 from Middleborough at Colchester (Figure 52). The scheme of a large central circle within a square is used in both. However, the mosaic at Colchester contained a central octagon surrounded by rectangles and triangles, alternating and separated by simple guilloche. The Fishbourne mosaic is just one large central surrounded by guilloche. Both have canthari within their corners, however, the Fishbourne mosaic has sea creatures alongside the canthari. The Fishbourne mosaic has been dated to the late first century, which has been questioned due to it being truly polychrome, use of canthari, sea creatures, and guilloche, elements that are usually not seen during this period. The mosaic from Colchester dates to the

mid-second century; however, the style of canthari lacks swastikas. If the mosaics were laid during their respective dates given, both can be exceptional for their time.

Second Century Traditions in Britain

The first century mosaics in Britain were predominantly black and white repetitive schemes. There are no surviving first century mosaics from Colchester and most of the floors in the city date to the second century. Second century mosaics saw a shift in design and motif, from their first century counterparts in Britain. D. J. Smith has argued that there are two mosaic traditions in regional Britain that existed during the second century: eastern and western. The western is represented by “designs of contiguous octagonal panels, typically nine in number, formed by continuous simple guilloche and generally containing a flower.”¹¹⁹ Most mosaics that have been found are on or near the Roman road known as, Fosse Way.¹²⁰ There are also a number of similar mosaics found at Silchester, and it has been suggested that an *officina* in the western tradition was established there for a period of time.¹²¹ The eastern tradition consists of nine-paneled schemes, which are either rectilinear or circular. Themes seen in both traditions include cornice patterns, squared rosettes, bulbous wave crests, swastikas on canthari, and double guilloche with varied colors. The eastern tradition, as Smith labels it, is particularly found at Colchester and Verulamium and goes as far as to suggest a Colchester-Verulamium school. Noting that the mosaics at Colchester are superior, he has also suggested that there was an *officina* in Verulamium as an offshoot of the original in Colchester.¹²² Johnson has further suggested that it is possible that each town had their own *officina* that exchanged mosaicists and

¹¹⁹ Smith 1983, 362.

¹²⁰ Smith 1983, 362.

¹²¹ Smith 1983, 363.

¹²² Smith 1983, 363.

sketches.¹²³ Both these propositions are possible, however, there is very little evidence for either. The eastern and western traditions mentioned above are not exclusive to their areas in Britain but they do seem to prevail there.

Mosaic Evolution Throughout the Second Century at Colchester

Although there are a number of mosaics found at Colchester that are in the eastern tradition as Smith has acknowledged, I would argue that there was a gradual evolution of mosaic schemes and style throughout the duration of the second century that would eventually produce the finest mosaics at Colchester. The earliest almost fully complete mosaic is from the mid-second century located in North Hill, *Insula 2*, No. 18 (Bryant's Garden). The mosaic is primarily black and white with the octagonal center panel, its surrounding rectangles and poised squares with flowers in polychrome (Figure 53). The general black and white geometric scheme is similar to a mosaic found in Room W8 at Fishbourne, which dates to the late first century (Figure 54). The mosaic from Colchester is noticeably more embellished and includes some second century traits, including lozenges in the rectangles, central and square floral motifs and simple guilloche in polychrome. However, as one of the earliest surviving mosaics that has been found and preserved at Colchester, it contains some elements that were commonly found in first century mosaics in the region.

From the same *insula*, No. 17-18 dates to the late second century (Figure 55). Stylistically, it is more complex than the mosaic in the adjacent room, No. 18, though its workmanship is poor with several irregularities throughout including the guilloche and border. As stated above, it is believed that although the rooms were in close proximity to one another, two separate teams worked on the mosaics. Neal and Cosh believe that because of the

¹²³ Johnson 1987, 17.

inconsistency of the workmanship and quality, that not only were the two mosaics done by different teams, but several years separate them.¹²⁴ The mosaicists working on the mosaic were most likely unfamiliar with the motifs they were tasked to produce, evidenced by the imperfections throughout the entire scheme. Yet, it makes a shift in mosaic complexity during the second century. It is primarily polychrome with a very busy scheme. It is reminiscent of a first century mosaic found at Fishbourne (Figure 56). The black and white mosaic, although a different scheme, the arrangement is just as busy. Both mosaics contain superimposed shapes that repeat in geometric form. However, the Colchester mosaic has a few second century traits that distinguish it, including the guilloche, variety of floral motifs within the squares, and the floral border.

Mosaic B (Room 3) from *Insula X* in the North Hill from the mid-second century offers the earliest surviving example of a clear transition from the earlier examples found at Fishbourne and Colchester (Figure 57). Containing two panels, the mosaic's Panel A consists of a new scheme that was found during the second century: nine panels superimposed on an arrangement of concentric circles. Panel B is a variant of first century mosaics found at Fishbourne (Figure 58). At Fishbourne most mosaics were black and white, repetitive, small elements on a grid of squares. Panel B uses these elements and enhances them. The squares are now octagons, and contain intricate floral designs with the interspaces filled with small squares of knotted guilloche. The schemes became more complex, intricate, included figures in its larger central panel.

There are two nearly complete mosaics from Colchester, the one from Bury Field and the other from Middleborough (see Figures 40 and 45 respectively). Both date to the late second century and are done in schemes that were prevalent at this time. Technically superior, they

¹²⁴ Neal and Cosh 2009, 90.

represent the quality of mosaics being done at the end of the century at Colchester. For both mosaics, especially the Middleborough mosaic, the mosaicists were extremely skilled. The mosaic from Bury Field contains many elements that are found throughout the pavements at Colchester: the scheme, figures, rosettes. The scheme of the Middleborough mosaic is a variant of a common second century arrangement. There are minor anomalies in the details, but they do not detract from the mosaic's magnificence. Based on the surviving mosaics from Colchester, the second century saw a shift in mosaic design that began with incorporating elements from first century mosaics and gradually evolved into entirely new schemes and enhanced, complex features.

CHAPTER 11: CONCLUSION

Both sites offer visual insight into Britain's early years under Roman control. Fishbourne represents the first extensively decorated villa in Britain. The villa is a fine exemplification of the social and political landscape of the early centuries under Roman occupation. Clearly, the villa was heavily used after its construction in both private and official ways. There was enough of a Roman presence in the area at the time to require a building with customary Roman architectural necessities. The villa also reflects the artistic landscape and resources that were available at the time. Many of these architectural requirements were novel in Britain and therefore required skilled artisans from the continent to work in the Roman style. A close connection is seen with mosaics in Gaul, with possibly the same workshop working there and at Fishbourne. The later mosaics illustrate that mosaicists were now available in Britain and importing these skilled workers were no longer a necessity. However, this resulted in less quality and competence in the work. It is assumed that other artisans were also imported, however, only fragments colored walls, moulding and stucco exist and thus, difficult to determine if there was a change in their quality as well and what their relationship would have been to the floor mosaics. The question of ownership of Fishbourne is still debatable. Cogidubnus is currently the only individual who has been associated with the villa. His personal history does run parallel with the construction of Fishbourne and his status with Rome would qualify him to have an expansive palace in Britain. However, until additional sources of evidence—archaeological or historical—are discovered, it is not possible to reconcile the current discrepancies.

The surviving mosaics at Fishbourne produce a linear timeline for the entire palace against a changing political and economic backdrop: the black and white mosaics during the first

century; polychrome mosaics during the second century, minor changes and destruction in the third and fourth centuries. Many of these surviving mosaics provide more questions than answers. Since the early possession of the villa is still debatable, and the owners of the second and third centuries completely unknown, it is hard to determine if the choice of the later figural mosaics had any significant meaning. Equally undetermined are the mosaics relationship to each room, its décor, layout and furniture. These first and second century mosaics represent an exceptional example of Roman occupation within an architectural setting in early Romano-British history. What makes Fishbourne an exceptional example is the fact that it is a villa, a Roman invention and creation for the elite. The villa's presence reflects Romanization at an elite form. In terms of Romanization, Fishbourne is significant in that not only is it one of the earliest Roman buildings in Britain, but that it's not a public building, but a private one.

The mosaics at Colchester almost pick up where Fishbourne left off in the second century. Most of the mosaics found at Colchester are exceptional and some of the finest found in Britain. After the Roman colony was completely destroyed during the Boudicca Rebellion, the city was rebuilt with fortifications, numerous Roman buildings and a large population. Who was represented within this population, beyond Roman veterans, remains uncertain. It seems likely that the people living there were supportive of Rome and welcomed the new developments and lifestyle. It is not known which buildings contained mosaics, however, a large amount of black and white tesserae were found around the Temple of Claudius and thus it is assumed that there were black and white mosaics during the first century, as at Fishbourne. Almost all of the mosaics found date to the second century and were done by domestic mosaicists. Their quality represents a vast wealth that existed in the city at this time. Some parallels can be made between mosaics found at Colchester and Verulamium their scheme and subject matter. At Colchester,

there was a gradual change and evolution of mosaic design throughout the second century. Earlier mosaics still contained black and white geometric elements and first century schemes with small amounts of polychrome and guilloche. However, by the mid-late second century new schemes and designs had emerged and took prevalence. Polychrome, rosettes, guilloche, and figures are seen throughout the second to early third century mosaics. The city of Colchester saw a decline during the beginning of the fourth century, making the mosaic a Lion's Walk a rare exception. The second century was a period of great prosperity at Colchester and the mosaics, confirm this, as they are some of the best found in Britain.

It is evident from the mosaics found at Fishbourne and Colchester reflect Roman influence after occupation. The first century mosaics have parallel workmanship and design to those found in continental Europe, a connection needed to foster and transport artisans, as there was no familiarity of the medium prior to this time. Second century mosaics come into their own with more complex designs and more local mosaicists, who have taken up the craft. Still, influence of the Roman visual culture is undeniable. Many visual features of these mosaics are found throughout the Roman Empire, including sea creatures, canthari, geometric and floral patterns, and figural representations. Later, the quality of the local mosaicists work in Britain was not always consistent, scattered with errors and poor-quality repairs. Yet, the prototype remained imported. The medium, designs, and figures are all a reflection of the influence from the continent. The inaccuracies of some of the figures, may lead one to believe that the mosaicists had never actually seen the being, and was just copying it from a pattern book.

The desire for those sympathetic to Rome were quick to assimilate Roman culture into their life in Britain. This resulted in a fusion of designs, figures, themes that came from various parts of the Empire, specifically Gaul and Italy. Unsurprisingly, there seems to be little or no

inclusion of the Britons previous life in any aspect of the surviving mosaics from either site.

Though there was no tradition of mosaics in Britain before the Romans, no Celtic iconography is seen in the surviving mosaics. This may shed some light on the who lived in both the villa and city. The visual evidence remaining from Fishbourne and Colchester are largely from those who were loyal to the Empire and quick to show allegiance. Nevertheless, the mosaics at the two sites reflect Romanization within Rome's northern most province and provide lasting visual evidence of Roman influence in Britain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alcock, S. *Beyond Boundaries: Connecting Visual Cultures in the Providences of Ancient Rome*. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2016.
- Baggs, A. P., et al, "Iron-Age and Roman Colchester," in *A History of the County of Essex: Volume 9, the Borough of Colchester*, ed. Janet Cooper and C R Elrington (London, 1994), pp. 2-18. *British History Online*. Accessed 26 February 2018. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/essex/vol9/pp2-18>.
- Barford, P. M. "A Fragment of Roman Stucco from Colchester." *Britannia* Vol. 18 (1987), pp. 273-274.
- Black, E. W. "The Period 1C bath-building at Fishbourne and the problem of the 'Proto-palace.'" *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 6 (1993), pp. 233-239.
- _____. *The Roman Villas of South-East England*. BAR British Series 171. Oxford: BAR Publishing, 1987.
- Blagg, T. F. C. and Martin Millett. *The Early Roman Empire in the West*. Barnsley: Oxbow Books, 2016.
- Cassius Dio. *Roman History*, trans. Ernest Cary. Loeb Classical Library, 1925.
- Colchester and Essex Museum. *The Beginnings of Roman Colchester: Camulodunum and the Temple of Claudius*. Colchester, 1966.
- Collingwood, R. G. *Roman Britain and the English Settlements*, Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937.
- Cosh, S. R. "Seasonal Dining-Rooms in Romano-British Houses." *Britannia* Vol. 32 (2001), pp. 219-242.
- Crummy, P. "Colchester: The Roman Fortress and the Development of the Colonia." *Britannia* Vol. 8 (1997), pp. 65-105.
- _____. *City of Victory: The Story of Colchester, Britain's First Roman Town*. Colchester: Colchester Archaeological Trust, 2001.
- _____. *Excavations at Lions Walk, Balkerne Lane and Middleborough, Colchester, Essex*. Colchester: Colchester Archaeological Trust, 1984.
- _____. *Excavations at Culver Street, the Gilbert School, and other sites in Colchester 1971-85*. Colchester: Colchester Archaeological Trust, 1992.
- Cunliffe, B. *Fishbourne Roman Palace*. Stroud: Tempus Publishing, 1998.

- _____. *Excavations at Fishbourne, 1961-1969. Volume 1: The Site, Volume 2: The Finds.* London: The Society of Antiquities, 1971.
- _____. *Chichester Excavations IX: Excavations at Fishbourne, 1969-1988.* Chichester: Chichester District Council, 1996.
- Davey, N. and R. Ling. *Wall-painting in Roman Britain.* Britannia Monograph Series 3. Gloucester: Sutton, 1982.
- Drury, P. J., et al. "The Temple of Claudius at Colchester Reconsidered." *Britannia* Vol. 15 (1984), pp. 7-50.
- Dudley, G. and D. R. Webster. *The Roman Conquest of Britain.* London: B. T. Batsford Ltd, 1965.
- Dunnett, B. K. R. *Excavations on North Hill, Colchester 1965.* London: Royal Archaeological Institute, 1967.
- Ellis, S. P. "Classical Reception Rooms in Romano-British Houses." *Britannia* Vol. 26 (1995), pp. 163-178.
- Garlan, Y. "Nouvelles mosaïques thasiennes." *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique*, Volume 89, Issue 2, (1965), pp. 567-583.
- Hawkes, C. F.C. and M. R. Hull. *Camulodunum: First Report on the Excavations at Colchester, 1930-1939.* Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London, 14. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Hull, M. R. *Roman Colchester: A Brief Account.* Colchester: Museum Committee of the Colchester Town Council, 1961.
- Hull, M. R. *Roman Colchester.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- _____. *The South Wing of the Roman 'Forum' at Colchester: Recent Discoveries.* Essex: Essex Archaeological Society, 1955.
- _____. *The Roman Potters' Kiln of Colchester: Reports of the Research Committee of Society of the Society of Antiquaries.* London: The Society of Antiquaries, 1963.
- Johnson, P. *Romano-British Mosaics.* Bucks: Shire Publications, 1987.
- Lancha, J. *Recueil general des mosaïques de la Gaule, Province de Narbonnaise 2,* Vienne, Paris: Edition du CNRS, 1981.
- Leeds., E.T. "Celtic Art in Britain." *Man* Vol. 32 (Sep., 1932), pp. 205-207.

- Ling, R. "The Seasons in Romano-British Mosaic Pavements." *Britannia* Vol. 14 (1983), pp. 13-22.
- _____. "Inscriptions on Romano-British Mosaics and Wall-Painting." *Britannia* Vol. 38 (2007), pp. 63-91.
- _____. "Mosaics in Roman Britain: Discoveries and Research since 1945." *Britannia* Vol. 28 (1997), pp. 259-295.
- Millett, M. *The Romanization of Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Millett, M., B. Dickinson, and B. Hartley. "Boudicca, the First Colchester Potters' Shop and the Dating of Neronian Samien." *Britannia* Vol. 18 (1987), pp. 93-123.
- Neal, D. S. and S. R. Cosh. *Roman Mosaics of Britain. Volume 3: South-East Britain, Part 1-2*. London: The Society of Antiquaries of London, 2009.
- Niblett, R. *Sheepen: An Early Roman Industrial Site at Camulodunum*. London: Council for British Archaeology, 1985.
- Perring, D. *The Roman House in Britain*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Rivet, A. L. F. *Town and Country in Roman Britain*. London: Hutchenson University Library, 1958.
- Scott, S. *Art and Society in Fourth-Century Britain: Villa Mosaics in Context*. Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology. Monograph no. 53, 2000.
- Smith, D. J. "Roman mosaics in Britain: A Synthesis." *Ill Colloquio internazionale sul mosaic Antico: Ravenna, 6-10 settembre 1980, Vol. 2* (1983), pp. 357-380.
- Smith, D. J. "The Later Mosaics of Fishbourne." *Mosaic* 2, (1980), pp. 13-16.
- Stern, H. *Recueil General des Mosaiques de la Gaule, 1: Province de Belgique; 3: Partie Sud*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1963.
- Stupperich, R. "A Reconsideration of Some Fourth-Century British Mosaics." *Britannia* Vol. 11 (1980), pp. 289-301.
- Tacitus. *Agricola*, trans. Sara Bryant. New York: Random House, 1876. Perseus Digital Library. Accessed February 5, 2018.
<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0081%3Achapter%3D14>.
- Tacitus. *The Annals*, trans. John Jackson. Loeb Classical Library, 1925.

Toynbee, J. M. C. *Art in Roman Britain*. London: Phaidon Press for The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 1962.

Toynbee, J. M. C. "Apollo, Beasts and Seasons: Some Thoughts on the Littlecote Mosaic." *Britannia* Vol. 12 (1981), pp. 1-5.

Wheeler, R. E. Mortimer and Philip G. Laver. "Roman Colchester." *The Journal of Roman Studies* Vol. 9 (1919), pp. 139-169.

Witts, P. *Mosaics in Roman Britain: Stories in Stone*. Stroud: Tempus Publishing, 2005.

_____. "Mosaics and Room Function: The Evidence from Some Fourth-Century Romano-British Villas." *Britannia* Vol. 31 (2000), pp. 291-324.

_____. "Interpreting the Brading 'Abraxas' Mosaic." *Britannia* Vol. 25 (1994), pp. 111-117.