

Olivet Nazarene University

## Digital Commons @ Olivet

---

Undergraduate Student Scholarship – History

History

---

Spring 4-12-2021

### Roman Britain and Anglo-Saxon Britain: Cultural Differences

Levi Michael Berg

*Olivet Nazarene University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/hist\\_ugrd](https://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/hist_ugrd)



Part of the [History Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Berg, Levi Michael, "Roman Britain and Anglo-Saxon Britain: Cultural Differences" (2021). *Undergraduate Student Scholarship – History*. 6.

[https://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/hist\\_ugrd/6](https://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/hist_ugrd/6)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the History at Digital Commons @ Olivet. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Student Scholarship – History by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Olivet. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@olivet.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@olivet.edu).

Roman Britain and Anglo-Saxon Britain:

Cultural Differences

Levi Berg

Medieval History

Dr. Kyle Robinson

April 12, 2021

## Roman Britain and Anglo-Saxon Britain: Cultural Differences

A role of historians is to distinguish between cultural groups. They must investigate the practices and artifacts in order to create a model. This model should accurately explain events such as celebrations, war, or in the case of Britain, cultural intertwining and invasion. Britain is an interesting case to study in the Middle Ages because of the amount of intermixing that takes place. Within the time period of a few hundred years, Britain had seen multiple different distinct people groups inhabit the island. This paper will focus on the major cultural differences of the two earliest invasions, the Romans and Anglo-Saxons, based on militaristic differences, societal differences, and daily life.

However, there is another question that may be answered within this research. It is the relationship between an invasion and the society that follows it. What type of society is built around different aspects of invasion? The motives are an important part in this question. If there is a certain motive to an invasion, will the society reflect it?

However, before looking into the foreigners, an understanding of the people group being invaded is necessary. These people were the Britons, sometimes called the Celts. Dr. Simon James makes the point that this is misleading since that term applied to the ancient Gauls on the continent.<sup>1</sup> The term “Britons” just applies to the previous inhabitants of the Roman “Britannia”. In other words, no matter what cultural ethnicity the peoples had, they were all Britons. They did not have a single cultural ethnicity, rather, they were a conglomeration of different tribes scattered throughout the island. This became the downfall of “Celtic” Britain, because since they did not possess uniformity, this made the invasion possible for the Romans.

---

<sup>1</sup> Simon James, “Peoples of Britain,” *BBC*. February 28, 2011, [http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ancient/british\\_prehistory/peoples\\_01.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ancient/british_prehistory/peoples_01.shtml).

Although Julius Caesar had tried to invade Britain a hundred years before, revolts in Gaul kept him from achieving his goal. This ultimately led to his forces being pushed out of Britain. However, in 43 AD, Emperor Claudius needed a way to secure his place on the throne.<sup>2</sup> Noticing that Britain had gone unconquered by the famous general Caesar, he felt compelled to advance. Because by this time the Roman lands were stable internally, he was able to concentrate his forces on Britain alone. However, within a few centuries, British resources had been depleted and Rome itself was under attack. Troops were pulled from Britain, and the Roman state of “Britannia” declined.

How does this invasion relate to the question pertaining to it? Since the Romans invaded for political purposes, the society should reflect that. Historians should not expect much settlement since that calls for resources and people. Those would only be invested if there is an economical reason or societal reason. This will make sense later.

The Anglo-Saxons appeared on the scene around the 470s. Different theories abound; however, there were probably multiple reasons for their invasion. Based on the climate, the lands that these peoples were from were flooding, making it hard to plant and grow sustainable crops.<sup>3</sup> However, the Romano-British monk Gildas records that because Britain had been left so desolate by the Romans, the Anglo-Saxons were invited in to stabilize it.<sup>4</sup> The northern tribes had increasingly upscaled attacks on the south and the southern tribes wanted protection. Gildas calls the invitation “pernicious” and “unlucky” and denounces it as foolishness.

---

<sup>2</sup> Neil Faulkner, “Overview: Roman Britain, 43-410 AD,” *BBC*. March 29, 2011, [http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ancient/romans/overview\\_roman\\_01.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ancient/romans/overview_roman_01.shtml).

<sup>3</sup> “Anglo-Saxons: a brief history,” *Historical Association*. 2020, <https://www.history.org.uk/primary/resource/3865/anglo-saxons-a-brief-history>.

<sup>4</sup> Gildas, “Gildas: from *Concerning the Ruin of Britain*,” *Fordham University*. <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/gildas.asp>.

This invasion also has a relation to the question. Since the Anglo-Saxons invaded for multiple reasons, one of which is a societal reason, historians should expect to find more evidence of Anglo-Saxon settlement than Roman. Again, the type of invasion plays an important part in the society that follows it. The Anglo-Saxons came with the intent to settle, so they did. It seems like easy logic, but the evidence supports. There will be more on that later too.

Both invasions left a lasting impact on Britain, to the extent that excavations are still turning up new artifacts today. These artifacts are coupled with texts from the time period in order to understand what life was like for both the Romano-British and the Anglo-Saxon British. Since the invaders came from different geographical and ethnical backgrounds, it is inevitable that Britain would become a hotpot for different cultures. Roman Britain was mainly Latin in nature, while Anglo-Saxon Britain was mainly Germanic in nature. It is important to remember however, that the older, “Celtic” Britons still had a distinct way of life and it was not killed off in some areas of the land.

The Roman military was the best in the world at the time. It was highly trained and disciplined, and utilized formations and innovative tactics.<sup>5</sup> Greek warfare was the inspiration behind much of Roman warfare. However, Romans made it their own. An example of this is the manipular legion.<sup>6</sup> Legions were nothing new, but Rome’s innovation of a legion made up of dense subunits was highly effective.

Beyond that, the military had its advantages. As long as you performed as intended, you were guaranteed shelter, food, and a salary.<sup>7</sup> Beyond that, entertainment such as amphitheaters and bathhouses were provided. All these advantages were incentives for joining the military.

---

<sup>5</sup> James Lloyd, “Roman Army,” *Ancient History Encyclopedia*. April 30, 2013, [https://www.ancient.eu/Roman\\_Army/](https://www.ancient.eu/Roman_Army/).

<sup>6</sup> James Lloyd, “Roman Army.”

<sup>7</sup> James Lloyd, “Roman Army.”

Also, for soldiers who were not Roman citizens, a diploma was awarded after discharge. This diploma stated that they had done their service and were now Roman citizens. This was important, as Roman citizens had many privileges that were inaccessible to non-citizens.

How Rome handled its distant provinces militaristically is fundamentally the same in every instance. Garrisons and forts were placed in places of strategic importance. This was for mobilization as well as awareness. Each garrison was responsible to the commander in the province, who was responsible to Rome. Britain was no exception, with around 400 camps and forts being built.<sup>8</sup>

Evidence of Roman military privileges in Britain exist. Near Hadrian's Wall is Vindolanda, an ancient Roman fort. The ruins of bathhouses still stand and remain open to visitors interested in Roman Britain.<sup>9</sup> London itself was a Roman settlement called "Londinium", and the amphitheater is also still open to visitors today.<sup>10</sup> Besides the privileges, it is not uncommon to find Roman coins in Britain, such as the famous Staffordshire hoard, and metal detectorists flock from around the world to try a hand at hunting among the countryside.

The Anglo-Saxons were tribal Germanic people, and their main avenues of attack were surprise raids.<sup>11</sup> Because of the surprise factor, they were not very disciplined in battle, instead relying on individual skill and prowess. However, this does not mean they did not have tactics. If they were fighting an enemy with long range weapons, they would use their shields to ward off the projectiles and wait until the enemy had depleted their resources. Then they would rush into hand-to-hand combat, which they were more comfortable with.

---

<sup>8</sup> Mark Cartwright, "Roman Fort," *Ancient History Encyclopedia*. November 2, 2016, [https://www.ancient.eu/Roman\\_Fort/](https://www.ancient.eu/Roman_Fort/).

<sup>9</sup> "Roman Vindolanda Fort & Museum," *Vindolanda Charitable Trust*. <https://www.vindolanda.com/roman-vindolanda-fort-museum>.

<sup>10</sup> "Roman London," *Visit London*. <https://www.visitlondon.com/things-to-do/sightseeing/london-attraction/historic/roman-london>.

<sup>11</sup> "The Anglo-Saxons in battle," *Edurete*. [http://www.edurete.org/pd/sele\\_art.asp?ida=3366](http://www.edurete.org/pd/sele_art.asp?ida=3366).

Since the Anglo-Saxons were a tribal people, the warriors were not enlisted men. Their oaths of fealty to their tribal king guaranteed that they would fight for him when necessary.<sup>12</sup> Breaking an oath brought consequences, and it was always a punishment. If it were possible to dive deeper into Anglo-Saxon oath-taking, that would be the next plan of action. However, the process and implications of oath-taking and oath-breaking are better understood with more time given to the subject.

Archaeological evidence shows that battle was central to the Anglo-Saxon culture. It is to be expected that warriors were buried with their weapons, such as they are in other cultures. However, excavations have shown that even non-warriors were buried with weapons if they were important members of society.<sup>13</sup> This highlights the emphasis placed on violence. Such a war-mongering culture would have no trouble invading a broken post-Roman Britain.

There are a few main differences between both armies. The first is the level of discipline. This does not mean that one army trained more or trained better. The word “discipline” here refers to the amount of organization. While both proved effective, it depended on the state of the victims at the time. Rome’s organization and maneuvers were more effective against the disunified tribal Britons, which allowed for their invasion. The Anglo-Saxons’ emphasis on individual battle malice and blunt attacks were more effective against a depleted army who no longer had the support of a central power.

Another major distinction between the armies are the bonds of service. The Roman soldiers enlisted, though there could be many reasons. Entertainment and stable finances are just a couple of those. The Anglo-Saxon warriors, as mentioned previously, joined under oath. This

---

<sup>12</sup> “The Anglo-Saxons in battle.”

<sup>13</sup> Mandy Barrow, “Were all Anglo Saxon people buried in Ships?” *Primary Homework Help*. 2013, <http://www.primaryhomeworkhelp.co.uk/saxons/suttonhoo/burials.htm>.

was a binding principle wherein if it were broken, both the breaker and their family could be punished accordingly.<sup>14</sup> Fealty was a two-way relationship, meaning both parties received positives from it.

Beyond militaristic differences, societal differences also abound. This is because of the reasons of invasion. While one invasion was purely political, the other was more of a cultural migration. It stands to reason that these different causes will therefore have different effects. This is precisely what archaeology tells us.

The Romano-British society is often misunderstood. Keep in mind that the invasion was *not* an Italian one. It was a Roman one, meaning that multiple ethnicities and cultures were being represented under one uniform society. After the acquisition of Britannia, Rome would continue this merging. Also keep in mind that the Britons were still distinct people groups, and their own cultures still had influence on the Romano-British society.

Rome is generally credited for introducing urbanization into Britain. However, this is not necessarily true. Although it is true that urbanization became upscaled and more of what is called Classical architecture, towns and cities still existed in “Celtic” Britain.<sup>15</sup> These were mainly for religious and governmental reasons (governmental reasons pertaining to a people group, not a uniform government). These “proto-cities” eventually became the upscaled Roman ones. However, with the introduction of Roman urbanization, markets focused on trading became commonplace, as did taxes.<sup>16</sup> The Romans are also credited with introducing paved roads. The

---

<sup>14</sup> Michael Wood, “Anglo-Saxon Law and Order,” *BBC*. September 18, 2014, [http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/trail/conquest/wessex\\_kings/anglosaxon\\_law\\_05.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/trail/conquest/wessex_kings/anglosaxon_law_05.shtml).

<sup>15</sup> “Roman Britain,” *The British Museum*. [https://www.britishmuseum.org/sites/default/files/2019-11/british\\_museum\\_roman\\_britain.pdf](https://www.britishmuseum.org/sites/default/files/2019-11/british_museum_roman_britain.pdf).

<sup>16</sup> “Roman Britain.”

key word here is “paved”. The Britons already had, at the very least, beginnings of engineered roads before the Romans invaded.<sup>17</sup> The Romans just made them more efficient.

To take you back to the second question, these roads were a direct result of the political invasion. The Roman military were the main foreigners, and in order to keep the peace they had to patrol not only the outside tribes, but the people on the inside as well. This called for paved roads so that the soldiers could minimize exhaustion and maximize transportation. Also, since the main export of the province were goods such as lead and wool, roads had to be built for traders so that they could get the materials they needed.<sup>18</sup> Of course, roads were only built to important sites since they were not interested in completely settling the land.

In terms of the society itself, Romanization was not as effective as some may think. Yes, there are Roman coins and pottery and architecture to be found, but all in all, the Britons were still very “Celtic”. Even the currency, which Rome introduced, had Celtic influence.<sup>19</sup> They still spoke their own Celtic dialects, and the lower classmen seemed to hardly be Romanized at all.<sup>20</sup> The upper classmen, the aristocrats, lived in villas and such. However, even they still spoke their Celtic language. The villas themselves were not truly Roman since they lacked many of the traditional Roman comforts. There are only a few exceptions, and these are from later in time.

Women in Roman Britain had tough lives. They were the ones left at home to cook the meals and run the house.<sup>21</sup> If she were married to someone who was wealthy, they would have slaves to do some of the work. However, it was still her job to raise the children as well. The men were usually out either in the field (if it was rural) or in the city (if it was urban), or they

---

<sup>17</sup> Steven Morris, “Britannia Superior: Why Roman roads may not be quite as Roman as we think,” *The Guardian*. March 15, 2011, <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2011/mar/15/britannia-roman-roads-iron-age>.

<sup>18</sup> C. N. Trueman, “Ancient Rome and Trade,” *The History Learning Site*. March 16, 2015, <https://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/ancient-rome/ancient-rome-and-trade/>.

<sup>19</sup> Stuart Piggott, *The Druids* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986), 39.

<sup>20</sup> “Roman Britain.”

<sup>21</sup> “What was it like in Roman Britain?” *BBC*. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/topics/zqtf34j/articles/ztqg4wx>.

could possibly be in the military as well. However, if the woman could not give birth to a son, she would most likely be divorced. In a patriarchal society, that is how the society will survive in the long run.

Religion is an important part of society. This is because all socioeconomical classes can relate to it, all under one umbrella. Romano-British religion was a conglomeration of Celtic myth and Roman myth.<sup>22</sup> Rome would introduce her gods to the invaded culture and expect them to worship, while at the same time drawing parallels so that the population would comply. For instance, the British Museum states that the Romans took the Celtic goddess Sul and identified her as the Roman goddess Minerva. Therefore, the lines between deities were ambiguous and both cultures could worship them as they pleased without religious persecution. This is important, because since religion is a crucial part to society, differences in religion could lead to revolt.

This merging of religions was not new to the Romans. When they merged Roman myth with Celtic myth, they were also bringing to the table other religions that they had picked up as well.<sup>23</sup> Of course, most of them were polytheistic since that was the easiest way to relate. For instance, Egyptian myth is one such religion. However, by the end of Roman Britain, Christianity was an official religion and that is how Gildas was able to be a monk in Britain during the time of the Anglo-Saxon invasion.

It is important to note that while Rome was pretty loose with religious practices, cults or religions that had potential to start revolts were condemned. This is why Rome persecuted Jews and Christians at first, and in Britain the Druids were persecuted as well.<sup>24</sup> While regular Britons

---

<sup>22</sup> “Roman Britain.”

<sup>23</sup> “Roman Britain.”

<sup>24</sup> Stuart Piggott, *The Druids*, 120-121.

were fine with worshipping Roman deities (because of the parallels), the Druids were akin to prophets of the deities. Besides this, they were the only form of what could be called “proto-nationalism” in Britain at the time, which conflicted with the wishes of Rome. Human sacrifice was also a problem, and the Druids practiced it.

The Romano-British society was a direct reflection of the political invasion. It was militaristic and only slightly economic, at least enough so that the province could stay afloat. Even though Romanization is touted as an absolute, it was actually not as effective as one might think. That is because Rome had no to little interest in settling. If they had, more effort would have gone into getting immigrants to settle, and therefore the Romanization would be more effective.

The Anglo-Saxon society was different from the Roman one in that they came with the intent to settle. This called for more drastic measures since the Anglo-Saxons wanted the land to themselves. Gildas recorded, “All the columns were levelled with the ground by the frequent strokes of the battering-ram, all the husbandmen routed, together with their bishops, priests, and people, whilst the sword gleamed, and the flames crackled around them on every side”.<sup>25</sup> This has sometimes incorrectly been interpreted as a complete destruction of the Romano-British. However, this is not the case.

Gildas recorded this about the response of the Romano-British: “Others, constrained by famine, came and yielded themselves to be slaves for ever to their foes”.<sup>26</sup> He also says that some fled to the hills and lived there. This is a complete contrast to the Romans. Whereas the Romans allowed Britons to become citizens of the Roman Empire, the Anglo-Saxons

---

<sup>25</sup> Gildas, “Gildas.”

<sup>26</sup> Gildas, “Gildas.”

slaughtered many and converted some to slaves. This is reflective of an immigrant society, such as the empirical colonies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The Anglo-Saxon society was structured around plots of land called hides. These were big enough to support one family. One hundred hides created a plot called a hundred, and multiple hundreds created a shire. Because of this rural, agricultural society, the Roman cities lost population, and some became deserted. Again, Gildas is the primary source. He said, “Neither to this day are the cities of our country inhabited as before, but being forsaken and overthrown, still lie desolate”.<sup>27</sup>

Keep in mind that Gildas said “as before”. There is no evidence that the cities were completely deserted, and while this is possible, it is not likely. Those cities had been places of settlement before Rome, and they would continue to do so until the Normans in 1066 would enter and drive up the population again. The Anglo-Saxons would still have needed places of trade. However, the basis of their society was the mead hall, not the market, so population in the cities dwindled.

The roads, which were reflective of the Roman invasion, are also reflective of the Anglo-Saxon invasion. If the society is based around the home and the mead hall, travel was not needed as much as the Romans needed it. This is why the roads fell into ruin and disrepair. A society devoted to settlement and working the land would have no need to travel across the island. However, there is another interesting evidence of the Anglo-Saxons intentions to settle Britain. It is called Offa’s Dyke.

Offa’s Dyke in and of itself is not proof of the intention to settle. Of course, Hadrian’s Wall also exists in Britain, and it was used as a buffer to deter the northern tribes. So why is

---

<sup>27</sup> Gildas, “Gildas.”

Offa's Dyke proof? This is because of the word used to describe the people behind it. The modern-day Offa's Dyke is the separation of England and Wales. However, "Wales" comes from an Anglo-Saxon word meaning "foreigners"<sup>28</sup>. In reality, the Anglo-Saxons wanted to keep the original inhabitants out of the land and pasted a label on them to stake their claim. In a sense, they degraded the Britons from inhabitants to invaders themselves.

Anglo-Saxon society was built around classes, with the king at the top and the slaves at the bottom. Directly below the "cyning" was the "aetheling", or prince. The root word, "aethel", is found in the names of many kings because of their parentage. Below the prince was the "reeve", who administered the shire courts and is where modern English gets the word "sheriff". "Ealdormen" are next, and this is where modern English gets the word "alderman". These people were the administrators of the militia (fyrd). "Thegns" were warriors under the ealdormen and they had five hides. Next were the "villeins", who were the serfs tied to the land. Lastly are the slaves.

Women in Anglo-Saxon Britain went through a change when Christianity was introduced. Beforehand, they were much like the Roman women: left to run the house and raise children. Besides this, they were grouped into more social classes than men. Instead of just slave, free, or noble, there was also an indication of married, unmarried, or widow.<sup>29</sup> The noble women were influential in court, with multiple accounts of them commanding the warriors or persuading their husband to make an action. However, after the introduction of Christianity, women who were not nobles were able to hold positions of religious power in institutions such as

---

<sup>28</sup> "A brief history of Wales," *BBC*. October 16, 2014, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/wales/culture/sites/aboutwales/pages/history.shtml>.

<sup>29</sup> Alison Hudson, "Women in Anglo-Saxon England," *The British Library*. <https://www.bl.uk/anglo-saxons/articles/women-in-anglo-saxon-england>.

monasteries. Women were also patrons of early English literature, which helped create a sustainable English literary type.

The king did not rule directly by himself. Another important aspect of Anglo-Saxon society was the “witan”. These were the trusted friends and advisors of the cyning. They had a dynamic relationship with the cyning in that they were only called together when he needed them.<sup>30</sup> Not only were they advisors, but they also helped the cyning carry out the legislative measures and helped to keep him informed of the other social classes.

Speaking of social classes, the Anglo-Saxon judicial system ran on what was called a “wergild”. Usually this word appears when mentioning homicide compensation, but it was also used to describe how much stock was put into one’s oath in court.<sup>31</sup> For instance, slaves had no wergild, whereas a thegn would have a larger one, et cetera. The wergild is important because it was primarily based on status, which allowed the court to run smoothly.

Another part of Anglo-Saxon society is the hierarchy of the kingdoms themselves. Remember that the Anglo-Saxons had no central ruler like Rome and were in fact tribal. This meant that there were multiple cynings and each one was different in power than the others. At times, one cyning had majority sway over the others and was called the “Bretwalda”. In other words, “overlord” might be a better term. The Bretwalda was not fixed in stone and could change with time. Northumbria, Mercia, and Wessex all held this title at one point. The Bretwalda was not just a title, but a position, as he could demand tribute from the rest of the other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms.

---

<sup>30</sup> “Witan,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/witan>.

<sup>31</sup> “Life in Anglo-Saxon England,” *Old English Teaching*.  
[https://oldenglishteaching.arts.gla.ac.uk/Units/2\\_Life\\_in.html](https://oldenglishteaching.arts.gla.ac.uk/Units/2_Life_in.html).

Anglo-Saxon religion was a polytheistic one which held many similarities to the Scandinavian religion held by the Vikings. However, it was not long before Christianity was introduced by Roman missionaries. Despite earlier emperors persecuting Christians, after his conversion, Constantine made it the official religion of the Empire. The form of Christianity that was most seen in Anglo-Saxon Britain was monasticism. It has been suggested that this is so because of the similarities it had to the Anglo-Saxons' emphasis on family.<sup>32</sup>

Anglo-Saxon Christianity was an important part of the society. Most of the literate people were monks, almost every village had a church, and tithes were collected to help financial troubles.<sup>33</sup> In fact, the peace treaty between the Anglo-Saxons and the Danish Vikings was on one condition. This condition was that the Viking king would become a Christian. Christianity was directly responsible for what is called the Northumbrian Renaissance, as both Bede and Alcuin of York were monks.

Romano-British society revolved transportation of both men and goods while Anglo-Saxon society revolved around the home. These differences allowed for the preservation of the previous culture on one hand, and the near destruction of the previous culture on the other. Besides this, religion played an important part in both societies for different reasons. While Roman religion was a test of loyalty and a political maneuver, Anglo-Saxon Christianity defined the culture later in time, allowing for an educational reform.

Another major difference in these two societies is the lack of a central figure in one and an abundance of central figures in the other. The Emperor was the central figure of Rome, but he was completely removed from the Romano-British scene except for legislation. The cynings of

---

<sup>32</sup> "Anglo-Saxon society pre-1066," *BBC*. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/z8f4mnb/revision/3>.

<sup>33</sup> "Anglo-Saxon society pre-1066."

the Anglo-Saxon society lived and fought on Britain itself in order to gain control of land. This had numerous societal outcomes such as tribute, loyalty, and inter-societal relationships.

Romano-British society was centered on cities. This allowed for trade and a public experience of Roman life. Anglo-Saxon society was centered on towns and the countryside. This allowed for a private experience of Anglo-Saxon life and a continuation of the home-oriented ideals brought from the continent. Of course, each society will then have different aspects of daily living as well.

Urban life in Roman Britain was very similar to other outlying Roman provinces. Everyone had to go to the city to pay taxes, whether you lived in the countryside or not.<sup>34</sup> The markets would be held in the central forum, where the public court cases would also be held. The public baths were also open to visitors. The life of a soldier was also a Romano-British daily routine. Of course, training would take priority. However, the forts also had civilian settlements that offered taverns and shops. Amphitheaters, as already mentioned, were also a big crowd pleaser...not just in Roman Britain, but the Roman Empire in general. Many of the army commanders also liked to hunt.

Rural life in Roman Britain was just that: rural. Because trade was so important, many of these people would spend hours on their products, then would go to the forum and sell them. Besides their products, they also had to take care of whatever livestock and land they might have. However, most of the people in the countryside were poor.<sup>35</sup> This means that they had to rely on the market to make ends meet, which, as already mentioned, meant that they would put primary focus on that.

---

<sup>34</sup> "Romans: Daily Life," *English Heritage*. <https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/learn/story-of-england/romans/daily-life/>.

<sup>35</sup> "Romans: Daily Life."

The Anglo-Saxon daily routine was mainly in the vein of a rural community. The farming of both agriculture and animals received a great amount of attention. Trade, although it was not the focus of the society, was still important. Artisans kept busy and sold their craft at markets. However, there were considerably more occupations that related to farming and home maintenance than mercantile. Some of these include beekeeper, cowherd, granary-keeper, and dairymaid.<sup>36</sup>

Leisure and recreation were abundant. The mead hall was the place of music, drinking, storytelling, and feasting.<sup>37</sup> Large numbers of people would gather here, which was the center of both entertainment and communication. It could be compared to a modern-day nightclub. Besides the mead hall, there was hunting, falconry, racing (both dogs and horses), and chess.

There are a few differences in each culture's daily routine. While Roman trade was the lifeblood of the society, Anglo-Saxon trade was more of a way of life. It was secondary to the home and allowed for transactions. While Roman craftsmanship was focused on exports, Anglo-Saxon craftsmanship was focused on the farm and home maintenance. Even leisure was different for the two. Romano-British leisure was innovative, such as the bathhouses or the amphitheaters, while Anglo-Saxon leisure was simple and revealed a sense of attachment to the community and the outside world.

To restate the answer to the second question, each of these daily routines, each way of life, was impacted by the cause of invasion that started it. Roman Britain's daily routine was a political and economical engagement. Anglo-Saxon Britain's daily routine was a societal engagement. These two very different invasions caused two very different cultures to emerge on the same plane, but during different times.

---

<sup>36</sup> "Life in Anglo-Saxon England."

<sup>37</sup> "Life in Anglo-Saxon England."

In conclusion, Roman Britain and Anglo-Saxon Britain were very different in terms of military, society, and daily routine criteria. Roman Britain was a political maneuver turned into an economic gain with innovations. Anglo-Saxon Britain was both an invitation to pillage and a last-gasp effort at preserving a Germanic way of life with its simple ideals of family and farming. While both cultures lived relatively close on the timeline, the first was less effective at total control than the second.

However, both invasions left a lasting impact on Britain. Many of the place names in England today derive from either Roman or Anglo-Saxon roots. Places such as London and Bath have both Roman ruins and Anglo-Saxon ruins. English itself, derived in Britain as a language, has both Latin words and Germanic words incorporated into it, which can be sometimes be used simultaneously.

The invasions of Rome and the Germanic tribes are still being studied today. Archaeologists and metal detectorists still go strong. New evidence might crop up that may either support this research or defeat it. However, the crux of the matter is that these invasions are what made Britain today. Therefore, they should have a lasting place in the study of history.