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1. **Inheritance**

1.1 Resource Assessment

The significance of Iron Age antecedence has long been recognised in interpretations of Romano-British rural settlement across southern Britain (Bowen 1969; Rivet 1969). These broad assumptions should be qualified by a clearer understanding of Iron Age chronologies, and the evidence for widespread change in the character and distribution of enclosed settlement by the end of the Middle Iron Age period. Cunliffe (1991, 544) has identified the increasing intensification of trade amongst a series of exogenous and endogenous agencies responsible for the breakdown of Wessex hill-fort societies, and the emergence of a new socio-political and cultural paradigm, characterised by increasing nucleation of settlement, evidence of increasing social ranking and adoption of continental culture traits (Cunliffe 1984a, 12-45; 1984b, 3-23; Cunliffe and de Jersey 1997). The evidence suggests a rapid process of political and cultural evolution (cf. Fried 1960, 713-31; Gibson and Geselowitz 1988, 3-37) and the emergence, over the first century BC, of a series of spatially structured and highly-ranked settlement groups across central-southern Britain, which have displayed many of the characteristics of archaic states (Brun 1995, 13-25; Gailey and Patterson 1987, 1-26). The transformation is manifest in increasing numbers of enclosed settlement forms, many of greater complexity and distinctive morphology, and of significant increases in the volume and diversity of material culture (Haselgrove 1995, 75-810). Widespread settlement discontinuity is reflected in evidence for the disproportionate abandonment of earlier settlement in many areas (Massey 2006, 315-29), and corresponding increases in settlement density around new conceptions of political power and Central Place. The degree to which concepts of pre-conquest settlement and culture maybe said to reflect those of the Middle Iron Age period, must therefore be considered to be highly limited although there is abundant archaeological evidence for the continuance of embedded ritual behaviours (cf Hill 1995; Fitzpatrick 2000, 15-29).
This pattern of change is widely reflected in the inception of many of the later Iron Age/Romano-British enclosed settlement in the excavated record (Fasham 1987, Fasham and Keevil, 1995, Dacre et al 1994, Oliver 1992 *inter alia*). While the evidence from a number of these sites reflects complex patterns of longer-term discontinuity (cf Fasham 1985), the density of *de novo* and re-occupied later Iron Age settlement across many areas of the Hampshire chalklands is remarkable, and individual settlement forms are by no means fully recorded (cf Palmer 1983, 41-53). Much of this matrix of settlement remains under modern conditions of intensive arable cultivation, and is hence understood through aerial prospection and surface survey. While levels of archaeological preservation are highly variable, the later Iron Age settlement record throughout Hampshire is remarkable for its complexity, diversity, artefactual richness and evidence of organisational coherence, and offers evidence for the understanding of social structure and processes of social formation. Of the evidence for pre-conquest urbanism within the county, only that of the oppidum at Silchester (Boon 1958, 9-21; 1969a, 1-82; Fulford and Timby 2000, 5-36) is attested by excavation, although there must remain scope for identifying and investigating other possible central places within the county.

The earthwork enclosure of Oram’s Arbour, Winchester, is of predominantly middle Iron Age date, although the general paucity of later Iron Age evidence (Qualmann *et al* 2004, 91) must refute some earlier interpretations of the site as an oppidum.

In this context could be mentioned the un-investigated earthwork complex at Avington (Crawford 1951, 107-11; Whinney 1987), a possible “territorial oppidum”, and a number of materially rich sites, including Fir Hill, Bossington, Grateley North and Ashley Camp, which although not oppida *sensu stricto*, are defined by complex and imposing earthworks and representative of settlement of the highest rank (cf Collis 1975).

The post-conquest continuity of this pattern of rural settlement is generally assumed rather than proven, as the conquest, as an event, is scarcely reflected in the material culture of rural sites. The character of post-conquest settlement transition and continuity, and its implications for understanding patterns of kinship, social rank and tenurial relations is of particular significance (Stevens 1966; Bowen 1969; Symonds and Whinney 1991; Cunliffe 1998;1999; Branigan 1982) especially in those cases where settlement continuity entails villa development.
The rapid development and increasingly lavish material culture of developing urban centres is not reflected in rural settlements, where structural and cultural change generally does not become apparent until the later first century AD. At this stage there is evidence, both from field survey and excavation, for widespread settlement discontinuity, with the apparent abandonment of up to fifty percent of rural settlement sites (Massey 2006, 664). This process may mirror the contemporary rise of the villa landscape, with consequent amalgamation of holdings and the economic attraction of urban centres.

The available evidence strongly suggests strong patterns of post-conquest continuity of ownership and tenure, although there is no evidence to suggest that patterns of ownership have origins which extend beyond the first century BC. A significant number of later Iron Age complex settlements are marked by later villa construction, and a phase of precocious early villa development may parallel that noted elsewhere in southern Britain (Rudling, 2003, 111-26; Blagg 1990, 194-209). There appears to be a distinct correlation between rank and continuity, in that disproportionately larger numbers of smaller, more peripheral settlements display evidence of abandonment, although it is clear that the economic dictates of new economic centres may have led to the abandonment of a number of highly ranked, but unfavourably sited settlements.

An important and frequently over-looked aspect of continuity remains the rural economic landscape, comprising matrices of field blocks, track-ways and linear boundaries, many of which may be of considerably earlier prehistoric date, and which remained in use, subject to modification, until the end of the Roman period. Much post-Flavian rural development appears to be de novo (Applebaum 1953, 123-4), and may result from opportunist expansionism resulting from the break-up of earlier estates, including those of former Royal estates following the death of Cogidubnus.

Although the inception of the settlement changes which anticipate those of the later Iron Age period may be assigned to the middle second century BC, the rapid processes of societal change which they precipitated should be considered as a major cultural and political discontinuity in understandings of the archaeological record cf Creighton 2001, 4-11).

It can be stated with confidence that the processes of later Iron Age change and development, themselves a manifestation of Romanisation and long-distance
acculturation (Haselgrove 1984, 1-49; Fitzpatrick 2001a, 83-97) offer a settlement template for subsequent developments in the later Roman period. This is manifest in the remarkably discrete patterning of Roman buildings, principally domestic, which closely mirror distributions of pre-conquest settlement, particularly in the Basingstoke and Andover areas. In this sense, the later Iron Age and succeeding Roman periods in Hampshire may be regarded as comprising a developmental continuum, within which the Claudian conquest was essentially an archaeologically invisible event (cf Clarke 1991). Within rural contexts, it is widely assumed that the early effect of Romanization was simply to reinforce and increasingly institutionalise existing social relationships. Beyond developing urban centres, the archaeologically detectable threshold of material, structural and institutional change may be set at the turn of the first century AD.

The Flavian-period reconstruction of the Hayling Island temple (Downey et al, 1979; King and Soffe 1998, 35-48), in a ground plan which closely reflects that of the later Iron Age precursor, suggests that widespread evidence of indigenous patterns of religious observance and ritual behaviour may represent the most persistent aspects of culture to survive from later prehistory into the Roman period. This is apparent in the continuing solstitial orientations of Roman period buildings and enclosures, patterns of structured deposition (cf Fulford 2001, 199-218), and veneration of earlier prehistoric monuments (Williams 1998, 71-85; Dark 1993, 135-146). Particularly notable in this context, is the evidence for the continuation of the rich late La Tène burial tradition into the Roman period, albeit in Roman material guise (Strück 2000, 85-96; Millett 1993 255-82; 1987 63-8). In this context, it is pertinent to consider the basis for understanding later Iron Age and early Romano-British cultural distinctions and the admittedly tentative evidence for patterns of ‘ethnic’ and cultural differentiation (cf Blackmore et al 1979, 93-117, Sellwood 1984; Blom 1969, 75-85; Hodson 1964a, 90-110). There exists widespread evidence for continuity of socially-embedded patterns of production and distribution throughout the early Roman period (Hodder 1979b, 189-96; 1979c, 7-23) with not only the development of regionally-significant production centres (Brown 1997, 4045; Swan 1975, 36-61), but the persistence of later Iron Age culture types well into the Roman period (Charles 1979).

1.2 Research Agenda
• Analysis of patterns of later Iron Age settlement change is largely confined to the archaeologically-visible chalk downland. Far less data are available from tertiary geologies, although some recent work (ie Rawlings et al 2003; Adam et al 1997) suggests that research potential exists. The relative paucity of aerial survey data in these areas has historically tended to introduce an element of bias in the later prehistoric record, although Romano-British sites are relatively well represented through field survey and excavation. There is currently little evidence to suggest that these may be the result of post-conquest continuity.

• Patterns of Middle Iron Age – Late Iron Age discontinuity are not well understood as spatial or diachronic processes. The quality of dating evidence does not permit a clear understanding of the time-spans involved – is this a slow process of change extending over perhaps a century, or a more rapid response to multiple agencies? These patterns of change need to be understood within the context of the evidence for later prehistoric movement and periodic character of occupation.

• Analyses have been based on surveyed and excavated enclosed settlement forms which, by definition, may be of higher rank. Relatively little is known of the significance of unenclosed settlement within the processes of later Iron Age and Romano-British societal change. To what extent may the material and cultural traits of the lower echelons of the settlement hierarchy represent a genuine survival of the Middle Iron Age tradition into the Roman period, and how might this be recognised archaeologically?

• The evidence for embedded ritual behaviours of long historical antecedence is now widely recognised within the Romano-British excavation record, particularly on rural sites. Collectively, these suggest the persistence of indigenous patterns of belief and religious observance throughout the Roman period, which are substantially removed from some conventional understandings of Romano-British religion (cf. Henig 1984). A synthesis of regional evidence might offer a clearer understanding of socially-embedded behaviours and suggest potential for further research.
2. **Nature of Evidence Base**

2.1 Resource Assessment

The assessment of the county resource for the later Iron Age and Roman periods is drawn primarily from an exhaustive appraisal of the county sites and monuments record and an extensive grey literature. This is augmented by the excavation record for the county, described below, which is excellently published within the county and other archaeological journals, and within a series of reports and monographs. A full record of excavated and surveyed sites within the county is presented in Appendix 1, and summaries of later Iron Age and Romano-British settlement data are presented in Appendices 3 and 4.

To achieve a more comprehensive understanding of the character of the settlement landscapes within the county, a search of the extensive air photographic archives contained in the NMR, County Council and Cambridge collections was undertaken. This entailed a long process of characterisation, interpretation and mapping of air photographic features and settlement forms of presumed late prehistoric and Romano-British date. These were then placed within broad chronological categories, following a programme of targeted surface survey and test-pitting. The results of this programme substantially confirmed and extended data-sets derived from SMR and excavation records, and offered a broad chronological framework for settlement change across the county to be developed. These results are summarised in Appendix 2.

The extensive work of antiquarian investigations, largely of Roman buildings, was imperfectly recorded in publication form, and the data accruing from much early work is lost, although some early work on Villas, with typical attention to recovery of ground plans and evidence of mosaic floors, was recorded (cf Stevens 1971, 327-36; Ingram 1851, 241-5; Colt-Hoare 1829, 49-52). The extensive work of the Rev. Engleheart in the Andover area was well recorded for the time (1897; 1920; 1924), and much of this was brought together, along with a synthesis of much earlier work, in a referenced review by Haverfield (1900, 293-343). This work remains an important basis for Villa data within the county (cf Scott 1993, 81-88). The classically-inspired approach to the study of the Roman period left little scope for understanding and investigation of pre-conquest settlement, although a number of pre-Second World War investigators (Andrew 1932, 1933) appear to have a keen
understanding of “Belgic” cultural traits. Antiquarian investigation at Silchester, the county’s most significant later Iron Age and Roman site, were well recorded and published by the standards of their time (Joyce 1881; Fox and St John Hope 1891-1906; St John Hope and Stevenson 1910) and admirably synthesised by Boon (1957, 1974). After intermittent smaller-scale investigations (Cotton 1947; Boon 1958, 1969a), interest in the site resumed with investigation of the defences and survey of the extra-mural area (Fulford 1984), the Amphitheatre (Fulford 1989b), and the Forum-Basilica (Fulford and Timby 2000). Current interest has centred on the character of later urban occupation within Insula IX (Fulford et al, 2006).

Hampshire, in common with much of the Wessex chalkland, featured prominently in the work of a number of early pioneers of aerial photography. The early work of Crawford and Keiller (1928) needs little introduction, and was followed by a limited amount of work in 1934 by Maj. W.G. Allen. A limited amount of work was undertaken during the Second World War by Derrick Riley, and it is to be regretted that the poor quality of film emulsions used has rendered much of this work, and to some extent that of Crawford, of little archaeological value. Of fundamental recent importance has been the Danebury Environs aerial survey study of Palmer (1984). While the mass of data accruing from the Danebury project region has done much to advance broad-scale understanding of diachronic landscape development, it is regrettable that it has not been possible to extend this approach to other areas of Hampshire.

The work of C.F.C. Hawkes in Hampshire, began with work on the defences of St Catherines Hill, Winchester (Hawkes 1930; 1976), followed by a synthesis of Hill-forts, which included a number of Wessex examples (Hawkes, 1931). This was followed by work at the later Iron Age and early Romano-British site at Twyford Down (Hawkes 1936), which, alongside the excavation at Worthy Down (Dunning and Hooley 1929), brought to prominence the distinctiveness and regional significance of the later Iron Age settlement record (Hawkes 1936, 208-12; Stuart and Birkbeck 1935, 188-207). Hawkes then carried out important early investigations of Quarley Hill, Hants (Hawkes 1936), and Bury Hill, Upper Clatford, Hants (Hawkes 1940). His regional synthesis of the Iron Age in Hampshire (Hawkes
1956) and of the chronological classification of Iron Age material culture (Hawkes 1958, 1-16) represent painstaking attempts to synthesise and systematise a vast and highly complex body of data. Both studies have contributed to understandings of the dating framework of the southern British Iron Age, but are now, alas, of purely historical interest.

Hawkes’ work was to some extent paralleled by that of Dorothy Liddell, with her important work at Meon Hill, Houghton (Liddell, 1933, 1935) and Choseley Farm, and Lodge Farm, Odiham (Liddell 1931; Morris 1986 respectively). A near hiatus in archaeological activity imposed by World War Two, was marked by the investigative work by Milner at Pinglestone Farm, Old Alresford (Milner 1944), and by the extensive survey work of Iron Age and Romano-British Sites undertaken by the Winbolts (1941-3, 239-244, 245-247) and Applebaum (1953, 119-38). To this period, too, belongs the valuable work of Cotton and Gathercole at Clausentum (1958), and early investigations at Winchester (Cunliffe 1964). The evidence of late Roman military fortification at Clausentum (Johnson 1979, 143-5), partly complements the results of Cunliffe’s later excavations (Cunliffe 1975) at Hampshire’s only other Roman–period fortification at Portchester.

A number of important and well-recorded investigations of late prehistoric and Romano-British sites were undertaken in advance of post-World War II urban development. These did much to advance understanding of regional settlement types and occupation sequences, and included Old Down Farm, Andover (Davies 1981), Portway East (Davies and Dacre 1982), Portway West (Startin, unpublished), East Anton (Startin 1971), Rucstall’s Hill, (Oliver and Applin 1979), Viable’s Farm, Basingstoke, (Millett and Russell 1982), Cowdery’s Down, Basingstoke (Millett and James, 1983) and Winklebury (Smith 1977). To this list should be added the activities of amateur and rescue archaeology groups (S.H.A.R.G. 1974; 1975) in recording important evidence, including that of the villa site at Purbrook, in a pre-PPG 16 environment.

This period also appears to have stimulated an interest, possibly inspired by a growing body of air photo evidence, in the date and character of rural settlement forms. The work of Collis at Owslebury (Collis 1968, 1970) indicated the potential of this avenue

---

1 An interest which may have owed much to Hawkes and Dunning’s treatment (1931) of the “Belgic” evidence in the light of literary references.
of research, and was followed by that of Perry at Bramdean (Perry 1974, 1982) and Collis and Fasham (1980) at Bazeley Copse, Micheldever.

The construction of the M3 motorway through Hampshire resulted not only in the complete or very substantial excavation of later prehistoric settlements at Micheldever Wood (Fasham 1985), Winnall Down, Winchester (Fasham 1985) and Easton Down, Winchester (Fasham et al 1989), but a large number of investigations of smaller sites (Fasham 1980b; Fasham and Whinney 1991), and an important programme of extensive earthwork survey (Fasham 1983, 5-45), which emphasised the great and largely unrecognised archaeological potential of secondary woodland in the region (cf Berkshire Archaeology Services 2001; Wessex Archaeology 2000). Other significant investigations arising from road construction include the work of Walker and Farwell at Twyford Down, Winchester (Walker and Farwell 1995) and Bellamy (1991) at Lain’s Farm, Thruxton. Similarly the construction of the Southern Gas Feeder Pipeline in 1977 produced a number of well-conducted investigations of affected sites, including those of Barton Stacey (Dacre and Warmington 1984), Middle Barn Farm, Chilbolton (Schadla-Hall 1984), Up Somborne (Neal 1980) and New Farm, Ashley (Neal 1980). The excavation of the only known major later Iron Age and Romano-British temple site, long known on Hayling Island from air photographic evidence, was undertaken from 1975 to 1978.

By far the most ambitious regional programme of archaeological research, extending from 1969 to 1982, concerned the hill-fort of Danebury Ring at Nether Wallop, Hants. The excavation of some two-thirds of the hill-fort interior and its defences has provided (Cunliffe 1983, 1995; Cunliffe and Poole, 1991) a definitive interpretation of occupation and defensive sequences in a “developed” Wessex hill-fort. The subsequent Danebury Environs Project was to some extent defined by an extensive exercise in aerial photographic transcription and mapping of a 1500 square kilometre transect between the Test and Avon valleys (Palmer 1984), which provided an understanding of a complex and highly integrated later prehistoric settlement landscape. An ambitious programme of excavation of a number of Danebury Environs sites was subsequently undertaken, including Suddern Farm, Over Wallop (Cunliffe and Poole 2000c), Houghton Down, Stockbridge (Cunliffe and Poole, 2000a), Nettlebank Copse, Wherwell (Cunliffe and Poole 2000b) and Bury Hill, Upper Clatford, (Cunliffe and Poole 2000d). The evidence from these sites, rather than directly complementing that from Danebury, has offered a broader impression of
diachronic settlement change within the Environs region. This work has been followed by a complementary set of investigations, yet to be formally published, at Fullerton, Hants (Cunliffe 2000), Grateley South, Hants (Cunliffe 1998), Thru... at Dunkirt Barn, Abbots Ann, Hants (Cunliffe 2004).

Other recent major investigations include those of Wainwright and Davies at the multi-period site at Balksbury, Andover (Wainwright and Davies 1995), Millett and Graham at the small Roman town site at Neatham (Millett and Graham 1986; Millett 1975; Graham 1989), and the pre-development excavation of middle and later Iron Age and Medieval settlement at Hatch Warren, Basingstoke (Fasham and Keevil, 1995).

The rise of developer-funded archaeological investigation within the planning process since the early 1990s has created a large excavation archive, much of which is represented within the “grey literature” in post-exavation assessment or preliminary assessment form. Much of this relates to urban development (cf TVAS 1993; 1996a; Teague 2003a; 2003b; Northamptonshire Archaeology 2022, inter alia) and represents an important correlative to the existing published record. Much of this work has also extended to non-urban sites and done much to further understanding of the rural settlement record, especially in those off-chalk areas which have traditionally been under-investigated (Teague 2000; Wessex Archaeology 2004; Berkshire Archaeological Services 1999 inter alia). The range of evaluations and site assessments involved has placed increasing emphasis on the diagnostic use of non-intrusive survey methods in determining levels of archaeological significance, and a number of recent surveys have greatly extended available data for rural sites which has augmented that previous available from aerial survey (GBS Prospection 2002; Bunn 2003) In this context may be mentioned the ongoing magnetometry and LIDAR surveys of the intra-mural area of Silchester (Creighton pers.comm.), which will extend the results of mapping from aerial survey (Bewley and Fulford 1996, 387-8).

2.1.1 Research Agenda

- There is a need to fully develop, update and systematise a county-based air photographic archive, which aims to be representative of the archaeological record of all parts of the county.
• The remarkably rich air photographic data for Hampshire should be included within the National Mapping Programme to permit a full programme of characterisation, interpretation and resource assessment. The initial limited mapping programme undertaken for the Danebury Environs by Palmer (1984) has been largely superseded by the additional data provided by subsequent programmes of aerial prospection.

• The excavation record reflects an obvious degree of bias resulting from patterns of post-World War II urban development. Wherever possible, this should be redressed in future research project designs.

• SMR and aerial photographic data reflect a clear bias in favour of archaeologically visible chalk-land sites. It remains unclear whether the relative paucity of data from area of tertiary geology accurately reflects the distribution of late prehistoric and Romano-British settlement data, or whether this simply results from lack of work. A comparative review of recent investigations undertaken under PPG 16 might resolve this question, as might targeted programmes of aerial prospection.

• The quality of data derived from antiquarian investigations is generally low. Much of this results from poorly recorded or unrecorded nineteenth century excavation which targeted known sites of Roman buildings. Where possible, the syntheses produced by Haverfield (1900) and Engleheart should be reviewed in the light of modern evidence and, where possible, by reassessment of archive material.

2.2 The Role of Material Culture

The role of material culture in the understanding of later Iron Age and Romano-British settlement within the county is fundamental, and its generally well-understood and diagnostic character permits a comprehensive range of archaeological interpretations. The later Iron Age sites of the county offer evidence of patterns of acculturation and the rapid emergence of more prolific and diverse evidence of material culture in the archaeological record. This rapid increase in archaeologically visible materiality and its increasingly diagnostic character is maintained and developed until the end of the Roman period.
Nearly all classes of material culture relating to this, including metalwork, imported and domestic pottery, objects of stone, building materials have been subject to intensive study and are understood within the context of published typological sequences or established patterns of production and distribution. Artefactual assemblages and environmental/organic assemblages have offered a rich source of data regarding Romano-British individuals and communities, particularly when integrated with contextual information and land-use analysis. The analysis of artefactual and ecofactual assemblages have provided much information relating to acculturation and change during the later Iron Age and post-conquest periods, in addition to understandings of social identity and rank, ethnicity, social movement and patterns of trade and material distribution. Evidence of literacy, and rare epigraphic evidence has provided some valuable correlative data to that provided by the material record.

Particularly significant within the Romanised countryside may be understandings of the differential materialities evident between urban and rural sites, and urban sequences of material change. Rich local pottery sequences have been well represented in number of seminal studies (cf Cunliffe and Poole 2000a-d; Fulford and Timby 2000; Fulford in Cunliffe 1975b *inter alia*). Regionally important pottery series are represented by a number of important corpuses and studies, notably Lyne and Jefferies (1979), Fulford (1975a), Hodder (1974b; 1974c) and Lyne (?2000). The incidence of this material in the archaeological record is well correlated with that of closely-dated imported and fine-wares (Timby 1987; Williams 1981; Fitzpatrick and Timby 2002 *inter alia*), together with other abundant aspects of material culture, including metalwork (of which coinage and personalia are particularly diagnostic), and objects of stone (Peacock 1987; Shaffrey 2003). The compositions of later Iron Age and Romano-British finds assemblages permit more nuanced, multi-variate approaches to inter-site analysis (Cool and Baxter 2002, 365-80; Booth 1991, 1-10; Evans 2001, 26-35), in which considerations of social rank and behaviour, patterns of trade and distribution, economic function, and diachronic change in taste and cultural norms are all valid research objectives. Significant here too is the evidence for multi-variate patterns of diffusionist culture change in the later Iron Age and early Roman periods and their impact on indigenous patterns of material behaviour and consumption (cf Hägerstrand 1967; 1972, 328-40).
Material culture patterning is more problematic during the later Iron Age and early Roman period, particularly in the broad mass of rural sites which lack the correlative dating evidence offered by metalwork and imported wares, and where precise chronologies are lacking. Relatively little is known about patterns of material distribution in this period (cf Charles 1979; Massey 2006, 200, fig.3.3.1; Hodder 1974b), which appear to remain embedded within socially-bounded systems of production and distribution (Polanyi 1968) and articulated within regional exchange/distribution networks (Irwin-Williams 1977, 141-151; Smith 1976a, 309-74).

Similar difficulties are evident at the end of the Roman period, where understanding of chronology after the early fifth century is hampered by the extreme paucity of diagnostic material evidence, and the generally poorly preserved nature of the latest occupation sequences (cf Boon 1969b, 79-88). These difficulties invoke consideration of the possible role of organic items of material culture a factor which may at least partly explain the marked material disparities evident between rural and urban sites (Fulford 1983, 403-19; Paynter and McGuire 1991, 31-34) and the evidence of long-term social and economic imbalance.

In this sense, the available evidence suggests a radical material disparity, not only between Villas and other classes of rural settlement, but between towns and their rural economic hinterlands. This evidence is deserving of deeper analysis, but suggests the existence of separate and articulated patterns of resource flow and artefact circulation (cf Bartel 1980, 11-26; Beaudry et al. 1991, 150-191; Fulford 1983, 403-19).

2.2.1 Research Agenda

- The rapid development of the material record offers valuable opportunities for understanding the processes of social change and acculturation during the later Iron Age, and for the emergence of new identities and behaviours.
- Specific aspects of material culture, including metalwork and pottery, offer a basis for the understanding of patterns of production and distribution in the later Iron Age and early Roman periods and for the development of new tastes and craft skills.
- Multi-variate studies of material culture offer valuable insight into the extent and character of acculturation processes in the Roman period, and the extent
to which material culture and behaviour reflected Roman identity and/or ethnicity. Particularly significant in this regard are the wide disparities evident between urban and rural sites, and between sites of different rank.

- Understanding of the role of material culture at the end of the Roman period remains problematic. Insufficient information is available regarding the persistence of Roman pottery manufacture and coinage and the social and ethnic implications of late Roman metalwork.

3. Chronology

3.1 Resource Assessment
Throughout much of the Roman period, chronological sequences are well established and understood. This is generally true of urban and villa contexts, where artefactually rich occupation sequences are well developed, relatively easily identified and largely continuous, although the necessarily more limited intra-mural investigations in Winchester have been qualified by the effects of widespread truncation by Medieval and later urban development (Cunliffe 1964; Collis 1978). Chronological frameworks for all Roman-period sites are based on established type-sequences for a wide range of artefacts, and strengthened by contextual association with more closely dated objects, including coins.

However, some difficulty in establishing chronological sequences have been encountered on a number of early Roman rural sites, where horizontal stratigraphic relations are poorly-developed (Fasham and Keevil 1995, 7; Fasham 1985) and contexts from isolated deep-cut features such as pits have to be linked by association. These difficulties are compounded by the relative absence of diagnostic and accurately datable material. The persistence of a heterogenous series of imitative sand-tempered ceramic typologies from the pre-conquest period to the later first century AD has been remarked on most excavated sites, but these remain under-researched and, in the general absence of contextual associations with fine-wares or imported material, lack any precise dating framework.

The latest Roman sequences are rarely intact on any site, either through the effects of over-ploughing or post-Roman development. Late Roman chronology and material sequences may therefore be as well understood through burial contexts as through re-deposited or truncated occupation deposits.
The securely dated and coherent chronological site sequences derived from largely materially-rich Roman sites have tended to preclude the use of scientific dating methods. These may have particular relevance in future research design in the dating of possibly contemporary but artefactually poor horizons associated with linear earthworks and cultivation lynchets (Whinney 1987).

3.2 Research Agenda

- To further refine understanding of the early phases of development within major urban centres, and the character of Claudio-Neronian urban settlement.
- To understand the structural, political and cultural changes involved in the transformation between pre-conquest and Romanised urban centres.
- To refine, where possible, the dating frameworks for later Iron Age and early Romano-British settlement.
- To elucidate relationships between urban centres and dependant villas and nucleated settlements, and to assess patterns of urbanisation and population movement.
- To review the structural and artefactual evidence from the end of the Roman period to assess the character of “sub-Roman” settlement and to refine understanding of post-Roman socio-cultural changes and assess the effect of those changes on the settlement landscape as a whole.
- To investigate the origins of Roman nucleated and secondary urban centres and examine their role and development in relation to their rural settlement hinterlands and the Roman Road network.
- To undertake further programmes of targeted site sampling to enhance understanding of the chronology and ranking of rural settlement forms, and the implications of spatially significant patterns of contemporaneity.

4. Landscape and Land Use

4.1 Resource Assessment
Understandings of late prehistoric and Roman period settlement landscapes and patterns of land use are overwhelmingly based on the evidence from archaeologically-visible and accessible chalk-land topography. Here the evidence suggests widespread reliance on indigenous patterns of agricultural production within a landscape whose largely cleared character may have differed little from that of the early Bronze Age (Ellison and Harris 1972). Extensive transcription of aerial photographic evidence (Palmer 1984; Massey 2006) suggests that much later Iron Age and Romano-British settlement existed within a dense matrix of contextual landscape features, many of considerable antiquity, including linear boundaries, field blocks and trackways (Bowen 1970, 62; Bowen and Cunliffe 1973).

A number of technical changes in farming practice are evident in the later Iron Age and Roman periods (Green 1981, 139; Haslegrove 1989, 4; Van der Veen and O’Connor 1998, 127-43), which are likely to have implications for the development of settlement and associated productive landscapes. Attendant on such changes may have been the need to more formally define holdings and estates, with the creation of a series of boundary earthworks. These, along with other aspects of the ancient agrarian landscape are rarely datable except by contextual relationship with settlements (Bradley et al, 1994, 102; Bowen et al 1978, 149-53).

The role of managed and exploited woodland in this economy is likely to have been fundamental and extensive, but difficult to quantify – it is probable that the least favourable clay-with-flints soils may have remained under woodland cover, and may be inferred by interpolating the gaps in plotted air photographic evidence. Existing woodland cover within the county comprises an archaeological resource of great importance. The extensive survey work undertaken in Micheldever Wood (Fasham 1983, 5-45), in identifying the well-preserved earthwork evidence for a late prehistoric and Romano-British settlement landscape, has indicated the great potential within the county for the survival of relict ancient landscapes within secondary woodland.

While the archaeological evidence for Roman period land use on chalk downland is considerable, there are few data relating to the exploitation of the areas of Tertiary geology of the north-east of the county and the Hampshire basin. These areas are characterised by dense woodland cover and high levels of modern urban development, and are generally unproductive in terms of aerial prospection. Extensive areas of infertile heathland in the northeast of the county and in the New Forest are likely to
have been exploited for fuel for adjacent pottery industries and have remained uncultivated. The extent of land directly or indirectly associated with the pottery and tile industries throughout the Roman period is likely to have been considerable. On the other hand, improved Roman plough technologies may have enabled areas of clay land to be brought into cultivation, as emerging evidence for settlement bears out (McDermott 1999; Adam et al 1997).

Some consideration should be given to patterns of land use in coastal regions, where the salt industry is likely to have remained significant throughout the later Iron Age and Roman periods in the vicinity of Langstone and Chichester harbours (Bradley 1975; Morris 2001, 41-66).

4.2 Research Agenda

- Continued extensive sampling of palaeoenvironmental data from small-scale archaeological interventions will provide information on changing patterns of landscape use, cropping regimes, and agricultural systems.
- Modern botanical survey and extensive mapping of aerial photographic cropmark and earthwork evidence for ancient field systems may offer some evidence of the extent of ancient woodland, particularly when correlated with the extent of predictive soil types.
- Investigation and sampling of sites on clay soils may offer an indication of how intensively these areas were exploited and provide an indication of the complementary economic relationships between different physiographic regions. i.e. was woodland resource exploitation more economically important than agriculture on the clay lands?
- Palaeoenvironmental and land-use data may provide insights into the changes in exploitation strategies and farming regimes following the breakdown of the Wessex hillfort system.
- Investigation of the economic landscapes of urban environs will further understanding of the local environmental and land use impacts of rapidly developing Roman urban centres.
- Investigation of linear earthworks and dyke complexes, particularly in the environs of Calleva, may enhance understanding of the significance of later Iron Age socio-political/ownership boundaries, and of land-use strategies
surrounding oppida and early Roman urban centres (Gaffney et al. 1985; Gaffney and Gaffney 1986).

- To investigate the evidence for different land-use patterns in the later Iron Age and Roman periods, based on topography, soil type, distance from urban centres etc. ie evidence for extensive ranching activity.
- To assess the evidence for economic specialisms within the villa landscape, and the possible extent of villa estates.

5. Social Organisation

5.1 Resource Assessment

Understanding of social structure in the later Iron Age and Roman period in Britain is not particularly advanced, and owes much to interpretations of classical texts and ethnographies. For example, there may be grounds for interpreting the ground-plans of villas in terms of indigenous patterns of social organisation involving extended family groups, rather than accepted patterns of Roman familial organisation (Smith 1982, 321-51; Rippengal 1993, 79-101; Wightman 1975, 1-18).

The rapid development of social hierarchies in the later Iron Age of Southern Britain, and the emergence of coherent social groupings is better understood in the light of comparatively well-understood post-Caesarian social developments in northern Gaul (Roymans 1988, 74; 1990, 18-21; Champion 1995, 8), which are likely to have been reflected in those in Britain. Continental models suggest segmentary arrangements of kinship-based social groups, organised on the basis of a common lineage. Such groups are likely to have adopted identities through socio-religious ideologies based on highly-developed concepts of ancestry and territoriality (Fox 1976, 107-11). Collectivities of such component groups comprised larger regional social groups, which are broadly discernible within the settlement record of the region (Massey 2006, 548-52), and may have formed the basis of pre-conquest social organisation and kingship. These social formations may, to some extent, be reflected in the settlement record throughout much of the Roman period (Stevens 1966, 108-28; Black 1987, 105). Cunliffe (1993, 221) has
suggested that such social groups, possibly identifiable as *pagi* on the Gallic model, formed the basis of the Roman-period *civitates* of the Atrebates, Belgae and Regnenses within modern Hampshire, and thus perpetuated pre-conquest conceptions of social organisation and identity. Hampshire may thus be exceptional in offering a rich body of settlement data which may allow such extensive socio-political analysis to be made. Comparatively little is known about the location and nature of later Iron Age social boundaries. These are likely to be defined by aspects of material culture patterning (Massey 2006, 201-10; Lerner 1984; Hodder 1979, Kimes *et al* 1982), which, in itself, indicates considerable scope for future research. In this case, the existence of complementary patterns of material type and distribution suggest a basis for the understanding of social-cultural organisation and economic activity (cf Findlow and Bolognese 1984; Gledhill and Larsen 1982, 197-130; Kowaleski *et al* 1983, 32-56). However, attention should also be drawn to the significance of major linear earthwork boundaries within the county, some of which remain extant as imposing monuments (Coffin 1979, 77-81; Foundations Archaeology 2000; Corney 1989) and, although largely undated, appear to display a coherent relationship with later Iron Age settlement groupings.

The settlement record within both the later Iron Age and Roman periods offers evidence of clearly defined social ranking and spatial ordering. In many cases it is possible to infer kinship and social relations within a settlement landscape on the basis of the size, complexity, material record and spatial patterning of settlement. In this sense, it may also be possible to cite the evidence for kinship and social rank inherent in patterns of post-conquest settlement continuity and the subsequent development of Roman-pattern houses and villas (Symonds and Whinney 1991; McCulloch 1996).

With the exception of the as-yet limited evidence of the Silchester *oppidum*, pre-conquest Central Place functions are difficult to define, except at a micro-regional level. The evidence suggests that major settlement clusters will have functioned in relation to larger, regional centres representing the establishment of royal authority and fulfilling the economic, political and ritual requirements of an emergent polity (Crumley 1976; 1987). It is suggested that, on the basis of known distributions of later Iron Age settlement, considerable scope exists for the identification of other *oppidum*-like settlement within the county.
While it is evident that the steeply-ranked structure of later Iron Age settlement landscapes became less marked in the course of the Roman period it is also evident that the most highly-ranked settlements, represented by extensive enclosure complexes display high levels of survival into the Roman period and a high propensity for villa development. However, beyond the correlates of ranking defining the most locally-dominant sites, it may be more difficult to identify lower-ranked settlements, particularly in the later Roman period. The large data sets (Appendix  ) for recorded Roman-period pottery finds and surface scatters which appear to be uncorroborated by any evidence of a building or enclosed settlement form, may be representative of a large number of lower status Romano-British settlements, possibly dependant on Villa estates and relatively ephemeral in character (cf Wightman 1975, 1-18; 1978, 97-128).

Understanding of Roman urban households and domestic life is drawn from the extensive series of nineteenth and early twentieth century excavations at Silchester (Fox and St John Hope 1991-1906; Joyce 1881 *inter alia*) and summarised by Boon in two valuable syntheses (1957; 1974). The Silchester work has been complemented by more fragmentary understanding of social organisation in Roman Winchester (Scobie et al 1991). The essentially chronologically static interpretations of early excavators have been qualified by recent evidence at Silchester for dynamic patterns of urban change throughout the Roman period (Fulford and Clark 1999-2006; Fulford and Timby, forthcoming). These suggest that expressions of social structure and organisation, and the character of urban life may have undergone significant change in the Roman period, and that early role of urban centres as expressions of local oligarchic prestige (Trow 1990, 114) may have become modified over time, perhaps as villa centres assumed greater significance (Clarke 1996, 73). The relationship of the villa landscape to urban centres is of particular significance in the understanding of patterns of post-conquest persistence of indigenous social structures, of the top-down acculturation processes inherent in Romanisation (Millett 1992, 1-5), and the dissemination of material culture. The villas of Hampshire are known principally through imperfectly recorded antiquarian organisation and observation, although there have been a number of more recent investigations (King 1987; Cunliffe and Poole 2000b, Cunliffe2003) Ground plans have been recovered in a large number of
cases, although many of these are known to be an incomplete record. Poor excavation techniques and rudimentary understanding of stratigraphy have generally offered little scope for understanding structural chronology or patterns of abandonment. By contrast, non-Villa sites are relatively poorly represented in the archaeological record, and it is difficult to assess their potential contribution to understandings of social organisation and structure. Since a number of such sites are likely to have contained timber domestic structures of Roman-style ground plan, this may be a significant omission. Similarly it is difficult to know what proportion of the rural population remained at pre-conquest levels of social organisation and occupation, throughout the Roman period. A number of excavated sites (Fasham 1987, Davies 1981, Fasham and Keevil 1995) indicate that such conditions certainly persisted until the end of the first century AD, although material evidence suggests that smaller rural settlements of “native farmstead” type were present in more remote rural areas until the end of the Roman period.

Remarkably little is known regarding the origins and identities of populations in that later Roman period, despite the literary evidence for population movements. Much current analysis is reliant on the distribution of artefact types (cf Swift 2000, 67-99), although recent work (Evans et al 2006, 265-72) has identified biometric approaches which may indicate high future research potential.

5.2 Research Agenda

- The targeting of rural settlement forms to further understand the implications of differentials in materiality (ie presence of imports, fine wares etc) for understanding social rank and regional patterns of social differentiation.
- A review of recorded evidence from antiquarian investigations of villas within the county, to enhance understand variations in size and ground plan, and their implications for domestic arrangements and social organisation.
- A review of recorded evidence from antiquarian and modern investigations of Roman town houses, to understand patterns of development and internal
arrangement, and their implications for understanding of gender roles and the existence of slave and servant classes.

- To further record and characterise earthwork and air photographic evidence for later Iron Age and Romano-British rural settlement in the county, to provide further understanding of the spatial patterning of settlements and its implications for the understanding of later iron Age and early Roman social structure and organisation.

- To assess the material evidence from villa and non-villa rural settlement as basis for understanding social hierarchy and its spatial expression.

- To understand the interaction of social elites with urban centres in terms of Romanised cultural norms and material linkages.

- To enhance understanding of later Roman rural settlement chronology, in terms of structural changes and patterns of abandonment, and its implications for social change and the presence of new ethnic groups.

- To examine evidence for the exercise of social and political power in the later Iron Age and Roman periods. This may embrace conceptions of social agency, evidence of patronage or the activities of elite social groups, including hunting.

- To investigate linear earthwork monuments within the county and assess their role as possible later Iron Age socio-political boundaries.

- To investigate the extent to which complementary distributions of material culture may be representative of social boundaries in the later Iron Age period.

- To investigate the earthwork complex at Avington, and assess evidence for the existence of a territorial oppidum.

- To investigate a number of elite later Iron Age and early Romano-British settlements west of the Test Valley, and assess their possible role as localised oppida or central places.

6. Settlement

6.1 Rural Settlement
The rural settlement record for the later Iron Age and Roman periods within the county is remarkably rich and diverse, and a relatively high proportion of representative examples have been excavated. These have generally comprised single enclosure types, whereas relatively little is known of patterns of intra-settlement organisation of the more extensive enclosure complexes. Large numbers of smaller, enclosed settlement forms are recorded from air photographic evidence, although the record is by no means exhaustive. Smaller settlement forms and unenclosed settlements are under-represented in the record, the latter being generally represented by surface scatters. Significant numbers of smaller enclosed settlements survived far into the Roman period, although too little is known regarding their chronologies or patterns of internal organisation. There exists great diversity of recorded ditched settlement type, including a large number of Banjo Enclosure types. Little is known of the significance of settlement morphology and its significance as an indicator of social organisation and structure (cf Perry 1969; 1972, 41-77; Hingley 1984b, 23-30; 1989b, 75-80).

The larger enclosure complexes are indicative of emergent rank and social complexity in the later Iron Age and may be associated with specialist economic functions and nucleation of population. There is currently no evidence to suggest the presence of large, open settlements, comparable with those of Hertfordshire, although the more imposing examples suggest the estate centres of leading members of the Atrebatic aristocracy.

There is relatively little attested evidence to suggest the precocious emergence of a villa landscape in the first century AD, although the emergence of early villas appears probable (Black 1987, 23-6; Blagg 1990, 2002-3). The archaeological record contains many examples of generic Roman buildings, many of which may be of domestic character, but not of villa status (Moss 1993). Similarly the progression to fuller expression of new urban and villa-based landscapes in the late first and early second century AD is not well understood (Teague 1989; Cunliffe 1964).

A significant number of villas are likely to reflect de novo development, and a small number, including those at Sparsholt and Rockbourne, may reflect the fullest extent of villa development in the late third and fourth centuries AD. The rise of large villa estates in the later Roman periods implies the existence of largely dependant rural populations and the nature of non-villa settlement. It is possible that the evidence for extensive later Roman settlements at sites such as Fernhill Farm, Braishfield and
Abbotstone Down is representative of such dependant populations, although this class of rural settlement requires far more research.

6.2 Urban Settlement
The site at Calleva represents the only attested oppidum within the county, and its most important Roman urban site. The extensive programmes of antiquarian and modern excavation have been described above. Current work (Fulford et al, 2006;) will greatly enhance understanding of occupational and functional change throughout the Roman period, and of the transition between later Iron Age and Roman conceptions of urbanism. Winchester (Oxford Archaeology 2005; 2006) is the only other major Roman urban settlement and civitas capital within the county. Knowledge of the Roman town is highly fragmentary (Qualmann 1997, 66-77; Collis 1978; Cunliffe 1964) and archaeological levels impacted by the extent of medieval and later development. It is significant that, hitherto, most investigation has naturally concentrated on the development of intra-mural areas within major towns (Fulford and Timby 2000; Teague 2002; 2003; Winchester Museums Service 1985; 1989), while knowledge of suburbs and immediate urban hinterlands is generally lacking (Corney 1984, 239-97; Teague 2000; Collis 1978).

The smaller urban settlements within the county remain relatively uninvestigated. Only two, Neatham (Millett and Graham 1986; Graham 1988; Millett 1875) and Clausentum (Cotton and Gathercole 1958) and East Anton (Startin 1971; Gardiner 1996) have been investigated to any extent. Others, including North Waltham, Nursling (Adam et al, 1997, 1-58) and possibly Horsebridge, Broughton (Wright 1978, 17-19), are of unknown extent and character and possibly representative of a large class of wayside settlements (Finch Smith 1987) or predictive lowest-order market centres (Hodder 1972, 887-907), which appear to relate wholly to the development of the Roman Road network. To this tentative list should be added the evidence for wayside development at Wickham (Winchester Museums Service 1991; Portsmouth Water Company 2000).

The role of the wayside and small “urban” centres within the context of the Cursus Publicus (Black 1995) is less easy to determine. Of the sites listed, only that at Neatham (Millett and Graham 1986; Millett 1975) has been associated with the identification of a possible Mansio.
6.3 Settlement Hierarchies

Roman settlement hierarchies are more easily defined in terms of size, building complexity and architectural distinction and material culture. Clear dichotomies are apparent in terms of villa and non-villa settlement and those non-villa settlements which are distinguished by domestic structures of Roman plan and those which are not. Similarly, Roman urban and nucleated settlements appear to occupy a simple three-tier hierarchy, based on size and assumed economic and administrative function (Hingley 1989a, 111-20; cf Corney 2001, 5-38).

Hierarchy is less easy to identify within the large and heterogenous record of later Iron Age settlement forms. In terms of size, materiality and complexity, these do not appear to fall into a stepped-rank pattern, but represent a continuum. Only a small proportion of the most highly ranked sites appear to be distinct in this respect, with a high proportion of settlements occupying a largely undifferentiated middle rank. There is thus a problem in identifying and understanding a numerically large but archaeologically less visible class of lower status and dependant rural settlements (Applebaum 1954, 199-38).

In this case, hierarchy may be best defined in terms of spatial relationships and localised patterns of spatial dominance, where ranking may decrease towards the periphery of the social group, with communication to dominant settlement only possible through middle-ranked intermediaries.

The character of urban settlement hierarchy is not well understood, with distinctions between established (although possibly unwalled) “small towns” and a class of more organically developed wayside or cross-road settlements for which evidence has often been scanty. These fall into the predictive patterns of locational and marketing and rural service function suggested by a number of commentators (Hodder and Hassall 1971, 391-403; Hodder and Millett 1980, 69-79). Important evidence for possible quasi-urban settlement has been established at Wickham (Edwards 1999) and Romsey (Scott 1992). Remarkably little is known of the origins and early development of these settlements (Burnham 1979, 255-72; 1986 185-203; Frere 1975, 4-8; Fulford 2001b, 95-104).

6.4 Permanence or Mobility

A number of important studies (Fasham 1985) offer evidence of the discontinuous or episodic character of some later prehistoric settlements. The relationship between
enclosed and unenclosed settlement appears, in a number of cases, to have been highly fluid, emphasising the ephemeral nature of much enclosed settlement (Bowden and McOmish 1987, 76-84; Hingley 1990, 96-103). While later prehistoric chronologies cannot be established with clarity, it is evident that later Iron Age re-occupation of earlier Iron Age enclosed settlement occurred, often after a considerable hiatus. Notable examples include Meon Hill, Houghton (Liddell 1933, 129; Cunliffe and Poole 1995, 187) and Rowbury Farm, Wherwell (Payne and Crutchley 2003, 42). Similarly, a number of smaller settlement forms appear, on the basis of limited ceramic evidence, to have had remarkably short chronologies. It seems likely that much smaller or lower status settlement may have been relatively ephemeral during the later Iron Age, with much attendant population drift. Similarly, rural settlement appears to demonstrate a high degree of impermanence during the early Roman period, with the abandonment of up to fifty percent of enclosed settlements by the end of the first century BC. Understanding of early villa chronologies in the county is insufficiently complete to offer firm opinion, but evidence elsewhere suggests the demise or change of use of many smaller villas by the early third century AD, and such may have been the case in Hampshire. Little is known regarding the relative significance of settlement on chalk-lands and adjoining tertiary clay-land areas, although a clear archaeological bias in favour of chalk-land settlement has long been recognised. Recent evidence suggests an emerging recognition of settlement and economic activity on the archaeologically less visible clays and gravels of north Hampshire and the Hampshire Basin (TVAS 2002; Keevil and Davis 1987; Teague 2000; 2002 inter alia).

6.5 Research Agenda

• To achieve enhanced understanding of the significance of spatial hierarchies in the ordering of settlement rank and social relationships in the later Iron Age and early Roman periods.

• To examine the phenomenon of later Iron Age re-occupation of earlier settlement forms and its implications for the understanding of rank and conceptions of ancestry and territoriality.

• To gain an impression of diachronic patterns of villa abandonment, and the influence of historical political and economic factors.
• To enhance understanding of the differential chronologies of Iron Age settlement forms and how these may relate to soil type, topography and established evidence for changes in climatic conditions.
• To understand the extent, character, chronology, and socio-economic functions of the class of Roman roadside/nucleated settlements.
• To identify different classes of later Roman rural settlement and investigate its relationship to villas and urban centres.
• To enhance understanding of the administrative functions and the regional economic significance of the smaller Roman urban centres.
• To establish estimates for the numbers and extent of unenclosed rural settlements in the later Iron Age and Roman periods.
• To enhance understanding of the intra-settlement character and economic role of enclosure complex settlements in the later Iron Age and early Romano-British periods, and their relationships to oppida.
• To enhance understanding of patterns of diachronic change within the broader non-villa settlement record throughout the Roman period.

7. The Built Environment

7.1 Resource Assessment
The only extant built structures relating to the later Iron Age and early Roman periods are the town walls of Calleva with its associated gates, and the later third century walls of the fort of Portchester. A large number of building ground plans have been recovered from rural and urban contexts. The evidence for communal structures includes a number of detached bath-houses (Rogers and Walker 1985) and the wealth of structures within Calleva, including temples, mansio, Forum and Basilica (Fulford and Timby 2000) which comprise part of the best known and most comprehensive of Romano-British townscapes. The extensive town plan, produced in the light of the Society of Antiquaries excavations, has since been augmented by the results of more recent air photographic transcription (Bewley and Fulford 1996, 387-8).

7.2 Research Agenda
It is considered that research objectives with regard to built Roman structures are amply covered within other core headings.
8. **Ceremony, Ritual and Religion**

8.1 **Resource Assessment**

The use of natural places with later Iron Age or Romano-British religious practice is well understood (Webster 1995b, 445-64). Little archaeological data is available from the small rivers and lakes of Hampshire to suggest patterns of ritual deposition comparable with those observed elsewhere in southern Britain (Fitzpatrick 1984), although an emerging body of data suggests the existence of a class of local *loci consecrati*, centred on waters or natural places (Bradley 2002), which may be poorly represented within the archaeological record and which may entail well-known problems of interpretation (Alexander 1979). Such sites may be identified only through local distributions of characteristic artefactual evidence. Examples here may include the sites at Sandford Farm, Kingsclere (Hants AHBR SU 55 NW 24.1) and Cannon Heath, Kingsclere (Hants AHBR SU 55 NW.35)

The isolated island context for the Hayling Island temple (Downey *et al* 1979) is, of course, highly significant in this context.

Funerary monuments of the later Iron Age and Roman periods are not well recognised. There is a notable paucity of epigraphic evidence relating to funerary monuments, although burial evidence and evidence of late la Tène funerary traditions are well represented. This evidence is principally in the form of small, square ditched enclosures, frequently attached to boundary earthworks, which are well represented in SMR and aerial photographic records. Excavated examples elsewhere in Wessex (White 1970, 26-36) suggest that they may have designated cremation sites as well as cremation burials, and the monument type is well represented in Gallo-Belgic contexts. A class of much larger rectilinear enclosures, frequently associated with earlier prehistoric funerary monuments, may represent *temenoi* associated with funerary rites (Hood and Walton 1948, 1-62). Evidence should also be included of a late la Tène and Roman barrow tradition (cf Knocker 1963, 125-40; Stead 1968; Jessup 1958) in northerm Hampshire, which may be highly regionalised in terms of its distribution and worthy of further research.

A regionally-distinct cremation tradition is attested by rich single and multiple burials (Collis, 1977c; Biddle 1967; Millett 1986), of which the early Roman group at Alton
(Millett 1987; Strück 1995 139-50; 2000, 85-96) remains representative (cf Black 1986, 201-39). Evidence for earlier cremation cemeteries throughout the county is not extensive but is becoming augmented by recent work (Priestley-Bell 2003). Later Roman inhumation burials are well-attested, notably at Kentsboro, Over Wallop (Piggott 1947), Andover (Jennings 2000) and the extensive urban cemetery at Lankhills, Winchester (Clark, 1979). Of particular significance may be the cemetery evidence from Owslebury (Collis 1994, 6-8), and the phenomenon of intra-site burial in the Iron Age and Roman periods (Collis 1977b, 1-13; 1977a, 26-34). The burial evidence appears to be indicative of the spread and acceptance of contemporary continental traditions, and illustrative of a broader pattern of acculturation. (Cunliffe 1984a; Strück 1995, 135-50; Lambot 1993; Lambot et al 1994; cf Roymans 1988).

Conversely, remarkably little is known regarding the extent and location of cemeteries at Silchester, although early cremation burials are known (Corney 1984; Boon 1957, 115; Fulford and Creighton 1998, 331-42). Investigation of the latest cemeteries here would do much to complement later occupation evidence.

Ceremonial monuments are difficult to characterise in later Iron Age and Romano-British contexts. Here it may be possible to assign a class of poorly-understood square and rectilinear enclosures, of largely late la Tène and early Romano-British date (Corney 1989, 115-6; Dewar 1926; Millett and James 1983, 43-87). Evidence for these is summarise in Appendix 6. While some examples offer evidence of structured deposition and non-domestic character, their general interpretation as ceremonial or socio-religious monuments in north-west Europe remains far from conclusive (Venclovà 1993). A rich body of comparative continental and British evidence (Wieland 1995; Waldhauser 1989; Piggott 1968; Büchenschütz et al 1989) suggests a strong regional affinity with the continental Viereckschanze phenomenon, and this interpretation maybe strengthened by the association of such monuments with boundary earthworks and earlier burial monuments. Archaeologically the best-attested example here is that in Blagden Copse, Hurstbourne Tarrant, excavated in the 1980s, but not published (Gardiner 1992; Poole (undated); Payne 1990). Blagden and its environs are associated with a significant contemporary earthwork boundary, and may be considered to represent an important collective expression of boundary maintenance strategy (Trinkaus 1984; O Riáin 1972, 21) in the late la Tène and early Roman period.
Temples and religious buildings are poorly attested outside major urban settlements. Beyond the recorded examples at Silchester and Winchester, the only attested example remains that at Hayling Island (Downey et al 1979). Mention may be made of the possible shrine structure within Danebury hillfort, and the polygonal structure associated with a barrow at Redenham, excavated by Dacre in the 1970s and unpublished (Dacre 1988). A detached polygonal structure at Stroud Villa, Petersfield may be interpreted as a shrine/mausoleum (Drury, 1980). A further example revealed by air photography at Overton, of square double-ditched or double-walled construction, may be tentatively added to this short list. The lack of current evidence of formal temple structures Drury 1980, 45-78) indicates the research potential within the county but also invokes the well-known difficulties in interpreting ritual function (Alexander 1979). A small square building at Popham (Hants AHBR SU 54 SE 28; Winbolt and Winbolt 1941-3, 240) may be identified as a shrine in this context.

This suggests that a more broad-ranging approach may need to be taken to the identification of rural religious sites, many of which may have been of relatively informal character, and represented by the rectilinear enclosures mentioned above (cf Fulford and Rippon 1994, 158-211). This approach might embrace analysis of a series of depositional activities and the significance of natural places. These activities might also relate to socio-political boundaries such as linear earthworks or rivers. Here it might also be possible to include the impressive body of evidence for the later Iron Age and Roman-period veneration of earlier prehistoric funerary monuments. Both Long Barrows and Round Barrows have attracted secondary burials, votive deposits and evidence of less specific activities (cf Allen et al 1995). Such locations are likely to have served as loci consecrati in their own right, and their apparent emphasis on ideologies of ancestry may indicate resistance to culture change on the part of elements of the rural population (Hingley 197, 145-65; Webster 1999, 1-20), possibly within the context of a pervasive mythology (cf Foley 1988a, 87-98).

8.2 Research Agenda

- To enhance understanding of the continuity of belief systems between the later Iron Age and Roman period, and between the Roman and early medieval periods ie to what extent does the location of pagan Saxon burial relate to earlier religious foci?
• To investigate the date, function and internal structure of square and rectilinear enclosures and their possible relationship to contemporary settlement.
• To assess the evidence for distinct regional patterns in votive activity, burial or religious cult.
• To investigate the evidence for depositional activities and square enclosures within the context of later Iron Age and early Roman socio-political boundaries.
• To investigate the significance of natural places within the ritual landscape – is it possible to recognise religious sites made significant by their location but not marked by formal temples or shrines?
• To investigate the extent and location of the “square barrow” funerary enclosure phenomenon, its relation to contemporary settlement, and its significance within the context of later Iron Age patterns of acculturation.
• To locate and investigate the later Iron Age and later Roman cemeteries of Calleva.
• To enhance understanding of the social and ideological context of the later Iron Age and Roman veneration of prehistoric funerary monuments.
• To assess the burial evidence for social change at the end of the Roman period, and the presence of immigrant social groups.
• To assess the role, chronology and religious identity of religious buildings within Roman urban settlements and their changing significance over time.
• To enhance understanding of the spread of Christian belief in the later Roman period, and to assess the evidence for Christian buildings.

9. Warfare, Defences and Military Installations

9.1 Resource Assessment

Within the later Iron Age record, few sites may be considered to be of authentically defensive character. Cunliffe (2000, 186) considers that the final abandonment of Danebury may have occurred in c. 70-60BC, a date which may be take to definitively mark the end of the Wessex hillfort tradition. Thereafter, elaborately defended sites,
including Bury Hill, Goodworth Clatford (Cunliffe and Poole 2000d) may reflect considerations of social prestige rather military necessity.

Evidence of early Roman Military activity is sparse. This doubtless reflects the philo-Roman character of the Atrebatic client state, and the strategic advantage of securing this area during the immediate aftermath of the Claudian invasion (Frere and Fulford 2001, 45-55). Military equipment of this period is therefore almost absent in the archaeological record, although the finds at Lane Field Buriton have attracted speculation (Des Brisay 1992, 95-105). Speculation has also been made regarding possible strategic Claudian military presence at Silchester (Fulford 1993, 210) and at Winchester (Biddle 1983; Millett 1990, 47), but this remains unconfirmed.

The later defences of both civitas capitals (Fulford 1984) suggest a military function and Boon (1974, 66-70) has catalogued a series of finds indicating a degree of later military activity at Silchester.

The only dedicated military structure in the county, that of Portchester Castle (Cunliffe 1975; Johnson 1979, 60-63) is a remarkably well preserved defence of later third century date with evidence of intermittent use throughout the fourth century. Evidence of massive walled fortifications at Bitterne, dating to post-AD 365 (Johnson 1979, 143-45) appears to represent modification of the Saxon Shore system contemporary with later occupation at Portchester.

9.2 Research Agenda
- Assessment of material evidence for Claudian-period military activity.

10. Material Culture

10.1 Resource Assessment

The analysis of material culture in the later Iron Age and Roman periods provides an invaluable understanding of many aspects of individual and societal activity and for the understanding of broader processes of social change. This may embrace such concepts as social class, identity, ethnicity, ritual behaviour, taste, fashion, economic change, human movement, acculturation, patterns of trade and economic relations between town and country. Within the later Iron Age record, conceptions of material
culture are more limited and relate principally to the development of pottery types, with metalwork and an emerging coin tradition offering complementary data sets on some sites. While many aspects of indigenous ceramic traditions remain imperfectly understood and untyped (Vince 2003; Morris 1995, 239-245; Rigby and Freestone 1997) they may have contextual associations with more diagnostic imported wares (Timby 1987; Cunliffe and de Jersey 1997). On a significant number of lower status rural sites, understandings of material culture patterning may be limited, although evidence for the distribution of fine-wares and amphora may indicate differentials in status and taste.

The post-conquest period is marked, particularly in urban contexts, by a dramatic increase in the volume and range of cultural material (Millett et al 1996, 1-6; Millett 1990, 1-5; Freeman 193, 438-45). This may embrace rapidly expanding ranges of indigenous and imported wares, glassware, metalwork, objects of stone, tile and palynological evidence for organic objects and foodstuffs.

Most classes of material culture are abundant and well typed throughout the Roman period. Understanding of regional material culture is greatly enhanced by the quality of the published excavation record within the county (Fasham 1985, 1987; Wainwright 1969 *inter alia*) and a number of seminal studies resulting from major excavations. Those resulting from the Danebury Environments programme (Cunliffe and Poole 2000a-d), Silchester (Fulford and Timby 2000) and Portchester (Fulford in Cunliffe 1975) are invaluable in this respect.

There is a need for a clearer understanding of the role of urban/market centres in the dissemination of material culture Millett 1983, 421-31). Evidence suggests highly discrepant material culture patterning between urban and rural sites (Fulford 1983, 403-419), which is suggestive of articulated socio-economic relationships (Bartel 1980, 11-26; Brookfield 1975, 54). Material culture as an index of Romanization process and the criteria underpinning culture change (Häussler 1998, 11-19; Hingley 1982, 17-45; Shennan 1987, 330-46).

While most pottery types may be securely related to established corpuses and studies, there remains a large heterogenous group of coarsewares, principally of early Roman date, which remain largely unresearched and which cannot be assigned to production centres or distribution ranges. Some speculative analysis (Massey 2006, 201-3) suggests that much of this material may be representative of patterns of later Iron Age
economic specialisation and that socially-bounded distribution ranges may be co-terminous with the territories of pre-conquest social groups (Hodder 1979a, 189-96; 1979b, 7-23). Much of this material may be regarded as being essentially transitional in nature (cf Collis 1974, 97-98). Within rural sites, querns comprise an important aspect of material culture, and here there remains much uncertainty regarding distribution patterns and the significance of different lithologies and production centres (Shaffrey 2003, 143-174; Peacock 1987, 61-85). The evidence suggests that Lodsworth may be only one of a number of centres exploiting Greensand sources.

The rapid diminution of material culture at the end of the Roman period and the disappearance of diagnostic classes of material from the archaeological record represent problems of long standing. There remains considerable scope for understanding patterns of material culture change in this period, and the persistence of Roman material in the archaeological record. Equally problematic may be the significance of material culture patterning as indicative of ethnicity/identity and social status, a distinction which appears to be thrown into particularly sharp focus towards the end of the Roman period (Allason-Jones 2001, 19-25; Cool and Baxter 2002, 365-80; Hill 2002a, 75-84).

10.2 Research Agenda

- To enhance understanding of the rapid development of archaeologically visible material culture in the later Iron Age, and its role in articulating social relationships, identities and patterns of acculturation.
- To investigate the role of Roman material culture within the broader processes of Romanisation, and the evidence for culture change in early Roman Hampshire.
- To enhance understanding of discrepant material culture patterning between urban and rural sites and between villa and non-villa sites, and its implications for socio-economic relationships and for the persistence of non-Roman tastes and patterns of behaviour.
- To investigate the impact of urban centres and the Roman Road network on the distribution of different classes of material culture.
- To investigate production centres and patterns of distribution of the Roman Tile industry.
• To investigate the emergence, production centres and patterns of distribution of an indigenous later Iron Age and early Roman wheel-made pottery tradition.

• To investigate evidence of the significance of items of organic material culture in the later Iron Age and Roman periods.

• To enhance understanding of regional distinctiveness of aspects of material culture patterning in the later Iron Age and Roman periods, and its possible implications for “tribal” or civitas identity.

• To review evidence for late and post-Roman items of metalwork, particularly from urban contexts, and its role in signifying socio-political change at the end of the Roman period, the presence of immigrant groups, and the persistence of aspects of Roman culture.

11. Crafts, Trade and Industries

11.1 Resource Assessment
The Hampshire area will have been relatively densely populated in the later Iron Age and Roman periods, and will therefore and will therefore have exerted a considerable influence on regional patterns of production, distribution and consumption (cf English Heritage 1991). The identification and investigation of industrial sites, in conjunction with artefact studies, may further understanding of the development of many different aspects of craft and industrial activity, including levels of technological expertise, sources of raw materials, influence of traditions and marketing structures (Museum of London 2002, 41). Understanding of patterns of artefactual supply and source may be used to identify economic territories and levels of import penetration. The early Roman period is likely to have witnessed dramatic increases in levels of economic and productive activity, but based in many cases on a series of economic specialisms which had emerged within pre-conquest societies (Brumfiel and Earle 1987, 1-9; Hodder 1979a, 189-196).

The function and organisation of craft and industrial activities remains imperfectly understood. Of these, the pottery industries of the Roman period are best investigated (Fulford 1975; Lyne and Jefferies 1979; Hodder 1974a, 1974b, 1974c; Allen and
 Fulford 1996; Pope 2003; Brown 1997, 40-45) and offer an critical understanding of regionally-based patterns of production and distribution, and the growth and development of major industrial centres. Unfortunately, relatively little is known of the social or settlement contexts within which these large industries operated.

Knowledge of the smaller, socially-embedded pottery industries of the later Iron Age and early Roman periods is still lacking (cf. Gibson and Lucas 2002, 3-37). Some of these developed into major industries of the later Roman period, while others may have intermittent or short-lived patterns of production. The transitional pottery industries offer considerable resource potential, particularly in those areas which remain little investigated (cf Lyne 2000).

The development of the closely-linked tile industry is likewise imperfectly understood. The development of tile kilns, some possibly under Imperial control, has been noted in the Silchester environs (Boon 1974, 275-7; Greenaway 1981 290-91; anon 1926, 75-76), and elsewhere in the county (Soffe et al 1989, 43-112), but more needs to be known regarding the location of tile industries, the implications for local resources and the distribution patterns of specific products (Darvill and McWhirr 1984, 239-61).

The quarrying, processing and transportation of building stones is likely to have been a major economic activity, and within Hampshire is likely to have embraced important sources of flint, greensand and hard chalk. The importation and transportation of stone from outside the county, including Bath, Purbeck, Binstead and Pennant sandstone types will also have been significant. In this context, the manufacture and trade in querns could be mentioned, although there exists no direct evidence for manufacture within the county (Peacock 1987 61-85; Shaffrey 2003; 143-174; Curwen 1937, 133-51)

Within urban production centres, smithing and bronze-working have been attested on a number of sites (Fulford and Timby 2000, 418-22), and to this must be added evidence for lead-working, glass-working, production of pewter vessels and the possible working of precious metals (Fulford et al 2006). While Iron bloomery slags have been recorded on a number of later Iron Age and Roman settlement sites (cf. Bayley in Fasham 1987, 24), iron production within the region was generally thought likely to have been undertaken only on a small-scale basis (Salter and Ehrenreich1984, fig. 10.3). More recent work, however, suggests that iron working may have been an important industry in many areas on Tertiary sands and gravels,
and particularly within the Hampshire Basin. Notable sites have been recorded at Wickham (Edwards 199) and at Denmead (Priestley-Bell 2004; Wessex Archaeology 1999).

The archaeological record offers little impression of the significance of organic items of material culture and what must have been the considerable role of industries such as weaving, woodcraft, timber and charcoal burning, leather working and carpentry. Such activities may be largely understood through the limited evidence offered by water-logged deposits and palaeoenvironmental data. In this respect, remarkably little is known regarding patterns of woodland management and the implications of heavy demand by urban centres for timber and fuel. Here, there is considerable scope for integrating artefactual and palaeoenvironmental data with land-use analysis to gain a clearer understanding of patterns of industrial production and resource mobilisation strategies. In this context might be mentioned for the tentative evidence for milling and water-powered activity on Hampshire’s major rivers and tidal inlets. The *Edictum Diocletiani* mentions a *gynaecium* at Winchester, possibly water-powered, and excavated evidence at Fullerton (Cunliffe 2001) has identified a mill establishment associated with a villa estate. It is likely that much specialist economic activity of this type was intimately associated with villas (Branigan 1988, 42-50).

Here should be mentioned the significance of coastal industries and their implications for resource movement and trade. The influence of fishing and shellfish production has long been recognised in the archaeological record of inland sites (Qualmann *et al* 2004, 69; Boon 1974, 195), while salt production (Bradley 1975; Lloyd 1967, 86-102)) remained an important industry throughout the late Iron Age and Roman periods.

### 11.2 Research Agenda

- To investigate economic relationships between urban centres and their settlement hinterlands and their influence on patterns of resource flow and distribution of imported and manufactured items.
- An assessment of the evidence for economic specialisation on villa sites, and for the evidence of the operation of market mechanisms and their local relationship with evidence of wealth and social status.
An investigation of Roman tile fabric types and their patterns of distribution.

Enhanced understanding of sources of building stone, and their distribution within the county in the Roman period.

To investigate the fabric types, patterns of distribution and possible production centres of the later Iron Age/early Roman wheel-made pottery tradition.

To assess the impact of urban/industrial energy consumption and demand for timber on patterns of land use and the development of urban hinterlands. ie. to assess the importance of woodland production centres within the Romano-British countryside, as well as agriculture.

To analyse patterns of artefactual distribution in enhancing understanding the economic territories of different classes of urban settlement, and how these may have varied with respect to different classes of artefact.

To assess changes in craft and trade specialisation over time in relation to economic and socio-political factors, and the growth of urban and villa-based economies.

To investigate patterns of raw material flow, manufacturing/processing activity and product distribution within the context of core-periphery relations.

To assess evidence for changes in productive technologies and levels of technical expertise (ie kilns) throughout the Roman period.

12. **Transport and Communications**

12.1 Resource Assessment

The Roman Road network throughout the county has been the subject of a number of studies (Clarke 1959, 83-92; 2003, 33-58; Margary 1973; Davies 2002), and is generally well understood, and although there remain a number of important lacunae, it is doubtful whether this represents an important topic of future research, although there have been a number of recent small-scale investigations (Fairclough and McCulloch 1999). Understanding of the chronology and sequence of development of the road system is generally poor. Most commentators (Davies 2001, 218; 2002, 113) emphasise the initial military significance of road construction, and it is reasonable to assume that principal elements of the network result from an intense episode of
construction in the decades following the conquest and are therefore substantially of Claudian date. A mid first century *terminus post quem* has been established for the road Margary 160 on its northern approaches to Silchester (Fulford *et al* 1997, 161) and available evidence suggests a comparable *terminus post quem* for a number of the radial routes connecting London (Davies 2001, 219-20). A coherent programme of works, embracing road building and the development of *Civitas* centres seems entirely logical, and it is tempting to interpret the confirmed early date for the Roman street grid at Silchester (Fulford pers.comm.; Fulford and Clarke 2004, 11-12) in this light.

The definitive period of road network planning in post-conquest Britain appears to be directly contemporary with and contingent upon a series of developments, including the establishment of Camulodunum as a *colonia*, the rapid early development of London (Millett 1990, 188-9) with its radiating network of road connections, and the conquest of Wales, requiring efficient east-west lines of communication. Direct road links between important pre-conquest political centres suggest a need to reinforce and formalise pre-existing axes of communication (cf. Davies 2001, 217), although the precise relationship between Roman Roads and pre-conquest settlement remains ambiguous. Finch Smith (1987, 3) has commented on the small number of Romano-British wayside settlements with attested late Iron Age antecedents. The picture is complicated by the association of forts with a number of these centres and the subsequent development of *vici* (Frere 1975, 5; Webster 1975, 31-43).

Abundant data, mostly drawn from air photographic transcription indicates that the Roman Road system was superimposed on a complex and highly developed matrix of inter-connective route-ways which were integral to the social and economic landscape of Iron Age societies, and which almost certainly represented a long-term process of organic development throughout later prehistory. The indigenous communications network may have functioned as an analogue of social structure in which patterns and frequencies of inter-connectivity signified spatial relationships between settlements and thereby social hierarchy and patterns of resource and information-flow. While this network, together with associated patterns of land-ownership, may have been radically disrupted by Roman Road construction, it is evident that many elements of it remained in use throughout the Roman period, and effectively comprised a lower-order communications system within those areas not directly served by the Roman
It is probable that a number of indigenous track-ways of late prehistoric date survive as fossilised modern landscape features.

The small, non-navigable character of Hampshire rivers is highly likely to have precluded their use for River transport in the Roman period. Some consideration should be given, however, to the probable presence of later Iron Age and Roman ports and entrepôt centres within the Solent region, which is likely to have been an important focus of maritime activity during these periods. The suggested significance of “Seine-Solent” trading axis (Cunliffe 1984b, 3-23) implies extensive use of the sheltered anchorages and natural harbourage of this section of the southern coast (Allen 1997) during the later Iron Age and Roman periods.

12.2 Research Agenda

- To consider the evidence for the role of coastal settlement as ports and centres of trade and transhipment.
- To enhance understanding of the dating and developmental sequence of major elements in the Roman Road network.
- To establish the course of unknown or uncertain sections of the Roman Road network, including the assumed section of the Winchester to London Road around Alton, and elements of the road extending westwards from Chichester.
- To assess the extent of survival of elements of the Roman Road system in the early Medieval period.
- To investigate the impact of the Roman Road system on the survival/development of rural settlements and the development of villa estates.
- To develop an understanding of the extent and complexity of later prehistoric indigenous networks of inter-settlement communication, and the extent to which these may have interacted with the Roman Road system.
- To assess the extent to which later-prehistoric and Roman period routes of communication may have survived as modern landscape features.
- To develop an understanding of the development and chronology of Roman wayside settlements and of their role, both as local market centres, and within the context of the function of the Cursus Publicus (Finch Smith 1987; Black 1995).
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