The principal gaps in our understanding of the Iron Age within the study area are not difficult to identify. The research priorities listed here include understanding the characteristic regionality of Iron Age communities within the study area, the organization of the landscape, and issues concerning societal complexity, ethnicity and the impact of colonial influences from the Roman world.

18.1. Identification and Investigation of Early Iron Age and Middle Iron Age Sites

There are simply not enough known sites of the Early Iron Age and Middle Iron Age within the study area to formulate any substantive theories about the nature of settlement. Any sites that date to this period, or sites that have well-preserved levels relating to these periods should be a priority for both excavation and preservation. We need to reach back into the Late Bronze Age and ascertain if the social dislocation suggested by the abandonment of rectilinear field systems is characteristic of our study area. If it is we need to suggest models of how, and into what, the landscape was transformed.

18.2. Clarification and Understanding of Complexity and Ethnicity

The explosion in the number and variety of sites in the Late Iron Age, coupled with the establishment of the Chichester Dykes at the end of the Iron Age, and the marked continental influences as indicated by imported coins, Gallo-Belgic imports etc., suggest major, and more complex, changes in social organization and the potential presence of different ethnic groups within the study area. That is how the data appears at present. We need to assess how many of those changes were the result of Continental influences of movements of communities, and how many draw on changes that began in the preceding Middle Iron Age. We also need to be more specific about the kind of complexities that emerged in the Late Iron Age (i.e. whether primarily economic, social/political, ritual) and strive to identify more clearly the different ethnic groups that may have been extant.

18.3. Regionality

The study area comprises a reasonably well-defined geographic and geomorphological region, a slice of south-central England from waterscape to coastal plain to downland. When do the communities who lived in the area during the Iron Age take on a regional distinctiveness particular to our area? Do they do this at any time in the Iron Age? And if some sort of regional distinctiveness emerges in the Iron Age what sort of distinctiveness is it, why does it emerge and how is it distinctive from other regionalities in Iron Age southern Britain? Here comparisons between areas will be extremely useful, such as with the Wessex environs study, and major centres such as Silchester and Colchester.

18.4. Unpublished Excavations

There are two excavations requiring full publication as a priority; both have considerable potential to improve our understanding of the Iron Age. The first is the excavations at Lavant, an apparently ‘planned’ Middle Iron Age site with at least 13 roundhouses alongside four- and six-posters (Fig. 20). Analysis of the settlement layout will provide us with our first indication of attitudes to spatial arrangements in an unenclosed Middle Iron Age settlement, and perhaps furnish some insights into cosmological attitudes to the landscape. In addition, a detailed artefactual comparison with finds from the nearby Trundle and with later Iron Age sites should provide information on availability and differential selectivity and use of material culture. The second major site is that of

the temple on Hayling Island. An understanding of its metamorphosis from Late Iron Age temple to Romano-British temple promises to illuminate the process of ritual syncretism across this crucial century, and, again, a detailed artefactual study of the Late Iron Age finds will provide much comparative data with other sites in the study area.

18.5. Landscape

The landscape within the study area comprises a variety of terrain from waterscape to coastal plain to downland (Figs 42 & 43). As such these three very different environments offer us the opportunity to investigate how Iron Age communities dealt with the different possibilities of these environments, both from an economic and political perspective and a phenomenological perspective. The latter approach will stress that the landscape, and individual site landscape locations, were not simply a backdrop to the various human activities that were played out on them, but that these macro and micro landscapes were actively engaged in shaping human attitudes (Fig. 44).

18.6. Key Sites

Some key sites will be crucial to a better understanding of the Late Iron Age. The recent discovery of a well-dated pre-AD 43 ditch at Fishbourne Roman Palace suggests that there is a Late Iron Age landscape awaiting discovery under and adjacent to the later Flavian Palace. The extent and character of that landscape will undoubtedly significantly change our current comprehension. In similar vein, the Late Iron Age phase of Chichester needs to be
reassessed, both from previous and current excavations. The current perception is one of minimal Late Iron Age activity underneath the later Roman town. If such a perception holds then Chichester will clearly be very different from Silchester to the north. Alternatively it is possible that the focus of Late Iron Age Chichester was not directly underneath Roman Chichester. Lastly, the Chichester Dykes require a renewed commitment to research, survey and excavation. The Dykes must hold the key to a massive land re-organization in the Late Iron Age, but our knowledge as to who laid them out, why and how, remains as incomplete as it was in the 1960s.

18.7. ARTEFACTS AND ECOFACTS

There is enormous scope to further our understanding of life in the study area through the assembly of detailed corpora of different classes of artefacts, and their contextual locations. The excellent work on Gallo-Belgic imports by Jane Timby and Val Rigby is demonstrative of this kind of approach. Currently, the visibility of the detailed variability of material culture is not easy to see from current records such as the HER, the Celtic Coin Index, museum databases and published and grey literature. We need, for instance, a corpus of all indigenous pottery, and a corpus of imported wares. In like manner a corpus of all metalwork, or coins, would be especially useful. These corpora also need to provide detailed drawings or photographs of individual objects, or pottery types, so that a more sensuous appreciation of artefactual variability can be obtained. The printed word is a particularly soulless mechanism for conveying the variability of the material world, and its potential interactions with human beings. A detailed corpus of all animal bone finds needs to be assembled, and the current collaboration between the University of Nottingham (Naomi Sykes) and
Sussex Archaeological Society may provide a useful model to follow. Getting accurate information on this detailed variability in the artefactual record is a prerequisite to attempting to formulate theories on why such variability (or the lack of it) existed.

Archaeological analysis and publication ultimately costs money and demands committed researchers. The organizational bedrock for research within the study area is provided by the Sussex Archaeological Society (at Fishbourne Roman Palace) and Chichester District Council (Museum and District Archaeologist). The best way forward to guarantee sustainable research, incorporating the efforts of the local public, is to involve these two partners in all major initiatives, and to ensure that each project has a considered community involvement. The attraction of funds could be generated by some over-arching, non-prescriptive, international theoretical framework (e.g. colonialism with reference to the Late Iron Age). Funds might be available from national bodies such as English Heritage or the Heritage Lottery Fund, or internationally from the EU. Collaboration with universities (as with the current project with Nottingham University on animal bones) might unlock AHHRB funds, and provide the dedicated PhD students to work on some of these research priorities. Input from archaeological curators needs to be increased into briefs for commercial archaeological units, so that these research priorities are addressed in commercial work and communicated to resident local researchers.
Table 10. Key Iron Age research projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iron Age projects</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Research importance</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ease</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Iron Age &amp; Middle</td>
<td>Fieldwalking; aerial photography; chance discovery; by individuals and organizations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity &amp; ethnicity</td>
<td>Synthetic studies by researchers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionality</td>
<td>Synthetic studies by researchers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Individual and organizational leads</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excavations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Synthetic studies by researchers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key sites</td>
<td>Individual and organizational leads</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artefacts and ecofacts</td>
<td>PhD students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
given the number and diversity of sites within the area (Figs. 45 & 46) it is not possible to provide a comprehensive list of putative research topics. Selectivity is therefore forced upon us, and not everyone's selection will be the same. However, the following will hopefully include at least a few topics that would have featured on everyone's list.

### 19.1. Unpublished excavations

We make no apologies for putting at the top of the list the need to get all major excavations of this period published. Some of the key unpublished sites include Hayling Island (temple), Westward House (east of Fishbourne), Batten Hanger and Watergate Hanger (villas) and North Bersted (rural settlement); in addition there are some key sites in Chichester still to be published. These were all substantive excavations and we need to assist, in every way possible and with some specific ideas, those now responsible for publishing these sites. Putting money into new projects is always going to be an ethically compromised strategy unless we are doing something tangible to bring these sites to proper publication.

### 19.2. Re-thinking older excavations

A related initiative is the need to make the data that has been published work harder. Some superb material has already been excavated and published from the study area, but published and analysed according to the paradigms of the day. For instance, Alec Down, who undertook pioneering work in the area, and who published regularly, excavated some impressive artefacts and structures that could be re-thought. The excavation of the cremation cemetery of Saint Pancras outside the east gate of Chichester, with its 326 burials, different burial types and extensive range of grave goods surely has more to tell us now about concepts such as ethnicity and individual beliefs than we can glean from the published report. In similar vein, the paradigmatic mindset that Alec was gripped by — i.e. the need to find a military origin for Chichester — must be re-evaluated. We need to look again at the Chapel Street excavations, the structures and the artefacts, to see if an AD 43 interpretation really still holds water. These sorts of re-evaluations will not be forthcoming from the printed reports. They need a proper project plan, which will involve looking at the paper archive and the artefacts themselves again.

### 19.3. Theoretical umbrella

We all think we know that an overriding concern in terms of this area, the ‘big story’ if you will, is the arrival of Roman power and influence (however defined); the establishment of a client kingdom; the end of that client kingdom; the perceived gradual acculturation of the indigenous population in the town and the countryside; the rural floruit of local villas on the Downs in the fourth century; the end of Roman ‘rule’ and the coming of the Saxons. It is essentially a chronological one, but the emphasis on chronology, vital though it is, can obscure the multiple interactions between different peoples, and between objects and peoples, across those centuries.

To that end we propose that much could be gained by viewing the archaeology of the area during this period though insights drawn from colonial and post-colonial theory. There seems to be at present a great interest, academically, in the idea of the process of colonization. Some of the interest seems to be in disproving the relevance of recent colonialism to ancient colonialism. Recent books (e.g. Hurst & Owen 2005) have, for instance, highlighted the fact that the Greek colonies in the West (i.e. on Sicily and the southern Italian mainland) have been interpreted erroneously for much of the twentieth century, because they have been viewed in the light of the eighteenth- and
nineteenth-century colonial model. In similar fashion writers, like Gosden (2004) have indicated that Roman colonialism does not fit the pattern of modern colonialism.

In all these works the role of material culture is the key to trying to understand the ancient processes involved. Gosden, for instance, makes a specific point of commenting on southern Britain in the Late Iron Age. According to Gosden, colonialism in the past was much more about exchange and consumption, and previous theories of colonialism have not given material culture enough prominence. Material culture has the capacity ‘to grip the minds of people’, moving their mental outlooks and changing their everyday behaviours. Material culture also acts on the minds of the colonizers and Gosden asks whether the Romans were as much ‘romanized’ by their contacts abroad, and the ensuing confrontation with other material cultures, as from within.

Gosden defines Roman colonialism as Middle Ground Colonialism. By this he means that, historically, there were areas beyond the formal limits of Roman authority, where two or more peoples (the Romans and an indigenous community or communities) created an elaborate network of economic, political, cultural and social ties to meet the demands of a particular situation. For instance, people in Gaul may not have so much adopted Roman provincial culture, as participated in creating it. In like manner southeast Britain was as much Gallicized as Romanized in the immediate pre-Claudian period. The key to Roman expansion was a whole series of Middle Grounds, just beyond the formal frontiers, in which new sets of cultural resources were presented to indigenous peoples. This form of colonialism differs fundamentally from the post AD 1750 Terra Nullius variety. The latter involved little previous contact, mass immigration, massive land takes by the colonists, dispossession
Fig. 46. Roman site distributions/superficial geology.

(or annihilation) of local people, and new forms of individual identity, and the emergence of new forms of class, gender and race.

Many anthropological perspectives on colonialism relate to exchanges, new cultural formations and the subaltern point of view. Although these concepts have been formed from ethnographic fieldwork in more recent colonial situations, they have the potential of illuminating the Middle Ground Colonialism which may have characterised the Roman annexation of southern Britain from c. 100 BC to AD 43. In particular they can provide insights into the potential mechanisms of colonial control, and the various indigenous attitudes to the changes that were taking place around them. They can throw light on the role of the indigenous community in actively cultivating Roman lifestyles, but lifestyles significantly modified by the specific southern British context in which they were created. Ultimately the culture of southern Britain in the early Roman period was different from that in Roman Italy. In addition, a new generation of classicists, inspired by post-colonial thought, is opening up exciting new perspectives on the Roman Empire. Terrenato (2005) argues that the need to find justification (or damnation) for modern colonialism in the ancient world has blinkered approaches to ancient colonialism for the last hundred and fifty years. She sees a formative role in imperial construction played by Roman and non-Roman elites, to such an extent that this interaction of heterogeneous small-scale communities may have been the real driving force behind the Roman Empire.

In the Chichester and Fishbourne Roman Palace areas we have a study area in which almost everything in the Late Iron Age and early Roman periods, including all the material culture, can be related to this theme of ancient colonialism. We would not want to coerce every research project to address the issue of colonialism, but it maybe that
the concept of colonial studies might provide us with an over-arching theoretical umbrella for our research work, and a framework to establish links with the international academic community.

19.4. THE CLIENT KINGDOM

Another research topic concerns the nature of the Atreatic client kingdom. Assuming the validity of the identity of Fishbourne Roman Palace as the residence of the client king Togidubnus, it would be worth exploring whether, through the material culture (including the built environment), it is possible to identify the material culture correlates of Atreatic identity during the life of the client kingdom. There are possible hints of this, for instance, in the early Gallic connections in the area such as the form of the Hayling Island Temple. This will, of course, necessitate comparing the evidence from our area with areas known to be outside the client kingdom. If material culture differences exist then we may be able to shed some light on how aspects of daily life in the client kingdom were different from those experienced in the rump of Roman Britain. It would also be interesting to see if there is evidence for a loss of such material culture distinctiveness within the client kingdom in the second and subsequent centuries AD, when the area was incorporated legally into Roman Britain.

19.5. REGIONALITY

Regionality is a related issue and by comparing the archaeology of our area with other, similarly-sized
areas in Roman Britain we may be able ascertain the material culture differences that are characteristic of our area. Productive comparisons can be made with major sites (and their regions) such as Silchester and Colchester, but probably also with lesser known areas such as the region in Yorkshire studied by Martin Millet and colleagues. If we are willing to invest agency in local populations, to the extent that they helped create the particular brand of Romanitas that was to their liking, then, with these comparisons, we might be able to go some way to understanding the nature of that brand in the Fishbourne and Chichester area.

19.6. Key Sites

It seems invidious to select a few key sites from amongst all those worthy of more investigation, yet two sites, by their very nature, are fundamental to our understanding of the area — Fishbourne and Chichester (Fig 47). There is still much to learn about Fishbourne Roman Palace, not least by revisiting aspects of the Palace 1960s archives, such as animal bones, the architectural reconstructions, or the use of stone. The phases of development leading up to the construction of the Palace are sparsely defined and therefore poorly understood. Our notions of the Palace setting, too, are in need of further evaluation. The discovery of intensive activity and buildings in front of the Palace during the 1990s excavations has undermined the concept of a semi-formal garden on the approach to the Palace. The entire field that was the subject of the 1990s excavation needs thorough evaluation in order to determine the extent, depth, and nature of the pre-Roman and Roman archaeology. In particular the pre-AD 43 ditch provides an obvious and highly important focus of research. Where that ditch goes and what it encloses will shed fundamental new light on the Late Iron Age landscape of Fishbourne. We need to clarify the nature of buildings and activities between Fishbourne and Roman Chichester. We still have inadequate physical and environmental information to the immediate south of the Palace, nor do we understand how the deep-water channel functioned, and how it linked to the Chichester channel. There is a presumption that the Palace possessed a large estate; if this presumption is correct then we need to try and ascertain the boundaries of that estate, and the character of the occupation inside and outside it. Naturally enough, when it comes to the Palace itself, most of our scrutiny has been on the first 25 years of its life, when it was the presumed home of...
Togidubnus. Yet the Palace lasted for approximately another 175 years after that; our appreciation of how the Palace functioned in those years is less well developed.

The Roman town of Chichester has to be a key site for the area. We have already noted the pioneering and remarkable work of Alec Down. Much of what we think we know about Roman Chichester stems from his work and the archaeological Unit that succeeded him, Southern Archaeology. As we have suggested already, however, there is a pressing need to re-evaluate some of Alec’s conclusions, through more contemporary paradigms. Is the search for a military AD 43 origin to Chichester, so dear to Alec’s heart, an illusion? Did Chichester, like Silchester, have an origin in the Late Iron Age? Why does Chichester seem to ‘take off’ in the Flavian period, with its grid of streets and masonry buildings? There are hints in the material culture that before that time the orientation of Chichester and the surrounding area was towards Gallo-Belgica, but during the Flavian period the town and its hinterland acquired a material culture more characteristic of the rest of southern Roman Britain (Gordon Hayden pers. comm.). The recent excavation on the old Shippams site near the city’s east gate, which amounted to some 2% of the Roman walled area, has thrown up some surprises in the paucity of high-quality Roman structures, and the character of some of the overlying Saxon occupation. There will always be a need to further our understanding of the development of Roman Chichester, century by century. Some basic questions remain to be tackled. For instance, the name of Chichester itself, Noviomagus, implies a new centre or market replacing an older one; but where was the older one? And while we know the approximate date of the City Wall, we have little knowledge of why it is where it is. It is likely also that the secrets of the transition from Roman urban form to Saxon settlement will be gradually revealed by more work in the city. This transition, especially in terms of settlement, also needs to be understood in the countryside around Chichester, where to date the cemetery evidence from sites such as Apple Down and Westhampnett has been more prominent.

There are numerous other sites that merit further investigation, and some of these have been summarized in the Roman Period Summary (Section 11). However, the lack of knowledge of one or two of these is quite striking. An intensive and considered programme of work at Broadbridge and Bosham would surely allow us to bring the nature of Roman occupation at these sites into sharper focus. In terms of industrial sites, greater understanding of the products, dates and exchange mechanisms associated with the Rowlands Castle pottery industries will have wide ramifications for material culture use across the study area; there are also significant shoreline industries such as the salterns (do they really decline at the end of the second century? — circumstantial evidence from Langstone harbour suggests that salterns are present there throughout the Roman period) and the area’s potential for tide mills needs further study. In addition it will be important to refine our understanding of the chronology of tile production at Dell Quay, and the extent to which the tiley supplied both Chichester and Fishbourne Roman Palace. Lastly, evaluating the presumed extension of Stane Street to Dell Quay will be important, not only for the dating and origins of Stane Street itself, but also for investigating a possible landing place used in AD 43 and subsequently a potential port to Chichester.

19.7. ARTEFACTS AND ECOFACTS

Investigating these elements with the subject of colonialism in mind should reap benefits. Nottingham University, in association with Sussex Archaeological Society, is currently sponsoring a PhD studentship into a study of animal bones within the study area, looking in particular at the Late Iron Age/Early Roman transition. We can expect the impact of Rome as a colonial power to be played out in changes in fauna themselves and to diet, not only through individual choices in terms of consumption, but also in changes to subsistence and farming regimes, and the organization of the landscape.

The work of Jane Timby, Val Rigby and Geoff Dannell on analyses of Gallo-Belgic pottery and Arretine and samian ware, all imports, should help us evaluate what effect these very novel forms of material culture had on the indigenous population. We need to ascertain how widespread the popularity and use of such ceramics was within our area, and, where such imported wares were being used, whether they were being used in the same ways as elsewhere in the western Roman Empire.
In a similar way, there is much more to be obtained from an increasing study of ceramics in our study area during the Roman period, work that has been pioneered by Malcolm Lyne. There is still some very fundamental work to be done — the establishment of a ceramic fabric series would be a very good start. But we also need to think through and beyond the ceramics to investigate the mechanisms of pottery production, exchange, use and consumption. The outputs of kilns like those at Rowlands Castle were some of the first mass-produced products in these islands. Colonialism again provides us with a vehicle for fresh insights. With the Romans came a monetized economy. But how did such an economy develop in the first decades after AD 43? And how did local people come to appreciate the exchange value of money (e.g. in exchange for pottery) when money was a novel object to most of them?

19.8. Methodologies and Perspectives

As well as our emphasis on colonialism as a theoretical underpinning, we can also utilize some other concepts and methodologies to flesh out our understanding of the Roman period in our study area. One of these concerns animism. We pay lip service to the fact that in the Roman world, and probably in Late Iron Age, concepts of life-force and agency were not restricted just to human beings and fauna. Objects, landscapes, buildings, paths could all be imbued with power, in much the same way as Andean mountains are said to possess a spirit and animism, and require offerings from miners before they will release their mineral wealth. Yet it really is only a lip-service and we need to look again at material culture to seek out signs of animism characteristic of certain types of object and reveal more the potential agency of landscape.

Syncretism is another useful conceptual tool, commonly applied in the field of religion, but with potential to be applied to other elements of material culture. Syncretism is an unfolding-over-time process, not an end-result event, and it may be possible from the changing form of sacrificial depositions at Hayling Island temple site (Fig. 48), to the copying and changing of pottery vessel forms, to chart synthetic journeys, as colonial impacted indigenous.

Landscape studies are also neglected, particularly from a phenomenological perspective. Why are sites in the Roman period where they are? How do those villas in the Chilgrove valley relate to their surrounding environments? How are sites intermeshed with landscapes and vice-versa? How did a person walk through the layout of that villa? What was the physical embodied experience like for someone who did that?

Ethnicity is yet another conceptual tool that sits comfortably under the colonialism umbrella. We imagine a multi-ethnic community within the area during the Roman period. But did those sharp ethnic boundaries exist, and, if they did, how did those ethnic identities show themselves? Or were identities much more fluid, short-term and exchangeable in that period, much more so than in our ethnically over-sensitized Britain.

Methodologically we also need to look at the great difficulties that still exist in trying to compare, say, the published pottery assemblages from one site to another. If we are to move beyond a simple qualitative assessment we need to make this easier for ourselves by trying to establish some metadata parameters for common data and information, such as pottery reports, which are to be published and which we know in advance we will want to use comparatively.

Lastly the re-furbished Fishbourne Roman Palace and the soon-to-be-built new museum in

Table 11. Key Roman research projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman projects</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Research importance</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ease</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished excavations</td>
<td>Dedicated institutions or individuals to bring these sites to publication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older excavations</td>
<td>Research by individuals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionality</td>
<td>Synthetic studies by researchers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client kingdom</td>
<td>Individual and organizational leads</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key sites</td>
<td>Individual and organizational leads</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artefacts and ecofacts</td>
<td>PhD students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chichester provides the area with two first-class facilities which will allow the show-casing of the results of these gap-filling exercises. They will also allow local people to become involved and even to tell us what they would like to know about their own area.
his discussion begins by examining the research themes relevant to the Fishbourne study area and then considers the potential of fieldwork archives. The third section identifies specific projects and relates the contribution that might be made by any study in the Fishbourne area to a wider research agenda. The proposed projects are evaluated in the fourth section. The final part identifies specific methodologies for five research projects identified as the most promising and considers possible partners.

20.1. Subjects for Future Research

We can identify three broad areas of understanding which might be addressed through further study of the Fishbourne area:

i) The transition from Roman Britain to Anglo-Saxon England exerts a perennial fascination, partly because we continue to find the change so difficult to imagine. In the Fishbourne area the survival of a number of villas into the fourth century — Batten Hanger, Chilgrove 1 and 2, and Watergate Hanger — has led to the suggestion that this part of the South East might have remained a Roman enclave when adjoining places fell under Saxon control (Cunliffe 1973a, 134–7). This idea no longer appears as convincing as it once did. Instead, the transition might be posed in new terms. How did ideas of Romanitas develop into a distinctive British or Saxon identity? And more specifically, how was the idea of Romanitas maintained when the economy had collapsed and the material goods associated with Roman culture were no longer available? By reformulating the Roman/post-Roman transition in these terms, it is possible to move forward to questions which can be usefully addressed through archaeology.

ii) We can assume that the disappearance of a coin-using economy sometime in the last decade of the fourth or the first decade of the fifth century is likely to have had a significant effect on the production and exchange of both industrial products and agricultural goods. However, Faulkner (2002) and others have emphasized that the collapse of Roman civilization was preceded by a period of decline. It is appropriate to regard the later fourth and first half of the fifth century as a period of transition to a new economic form. The impact of this on settlement structures and on the landscape more generally remains unclear, although the evidence available to study the problem is possibly better in the Fishbourne area than almost anywhere else in England. The studies by Cunliffe of the Chalton area and by Down of the Chilgrove valley provide abundant evidence for reconsidering the issue. Pottery continued to be made and used in the fifth century, though it was no longer in the Roman tradition, nor produced on the same scale. Excavations at a number of local sites, including Apple Down, Highdown and Botolphs, have demonstrated that the post-Roman ceramics were generally robust enough to survive in ploughsoil and might therefore be collected in fieldwalking (contra Down & Welsh 1990, 2).

The fifth century is marked by a shift away from an economy which was partially commercialized towards one which was largely self-sufficient, but the difference should not be exaggerated. Some level of trade continued and by the end of the seventh century this seems to have been sufficiently well established for landing places to have developed (Huggett 1988). Munby’s suggestion that Pagham Harbour might be such a landing place for trade in the eighth and ninth century seems more likely as the discovery of a number of such sites, including some in Kent and the Isle of Wight, has demonstrated (Gardiner et al. 2002; Munby 1984; Ulmschneider 2003).
iii) The final major gap identified here is the broad subject of authority, ritual and religion. This is indeed so broad that it is necessary to identify particular issues which might be usefully examined in the context of the Fishbourne area. We can recognize in the area a number of early and potentially significant minster churches, which have been listed above. The Singleton area includes both a minster church, the site of a ninth-century royal vill and that of an eleventh-century battlefield (Gardiner & Coates 1987). A detailed study of this area seems to hold considerable promise for an understanding of a Saxon ‘central place’ and its development into a later medieval manor. A second and associated issue would be a reconsideration of the role and significance of prehistoric enclosures in the early medieval period. Activity within or adjacent to these includes a headless medieval burial on the Trundle, possibly an execution, medieval round barrows on Halnaker Hill and burials recorded by Bedwin within Harting Beacon hillfort.

### 20.2. Potential of Existing Archives

Each of the above research areas has been chosen, not because there is a total absence of previous study, but rather because earlier work has already established that there are considerable possibilities for further work. It would, for example, be very useful to reassess the work undertaken by Down in the Chilgrove Valley. This should consider both the methods of survey used and also reappraise the odd sherds of early medieval pottery which are listed in the gazetteer (Down & Welch 1990, 2–8). Equally, the six sites of Early or Middle Anglo-Saxon date discovered by Cunliffe in Chalton require recon-
consideration in light of our present understanding of settlement evidence (Cunliffe 1978, 224).

A *sine qua non* for almost all work in this period, both for the re-examination of past finds, as well as for future excavations, is the establishment of a reliable pottery chronology. The materials for this are at hand. It would be based largely upon a review of the material found in the excavations at Apple Down (augmented by a review of the pottery from Botolphs and Highbury), Church Down in Chalton and Medmerry Farm in Selsey. From the tenth century onwards, the picture is already fairly clear due to work at Portchester Castle, Michelmersh and Chichester.

Armed with a thorough understanding of the ceramics, it would be possible to re-examine and draw more reliable conclusions from many earlier pieces of fieldwork. In particularly, it would be possible to reconsider the Roman–medieval transition by examining again the final phases of activity — so-called ‘squatter’ or ‘sub-Roman’ occupation — on Late Roman sites. A good pottery chronology would allow the unstratified finds from fieldwalking at Chalton and the Chilgrove valley to be reappraised, as well as the finds from the dry-valley colluvium recorded by Bell. A better understanding of the pottery would also enable the Iron Age and early medieval ceramics to be distinguished with greater certainty. Preliminary work on this problem some years ago with Sue Hamilton (pers. comm.) suggested that this could be done reliably. It may allow earlier finds from both periods to be reattributed. A further task which might usefully be done as part of the study of ceramics would be a re-examination of all the finds from the Pagham Harbour area to determine whether any imported pottery was present.

Much of the material already discussed has been published in one form or other, but two major excavations remain unpublished. These are the Middle Saxon site at Church Down, Chalton and Haying Island temple, a site later occupied by a medieval settlement. In addition to the excavation at Church Down, other work was undertaken at Manor Farm in Chalton and this too has not been
published in full. The state of work on these excavation archives is unknown, but it must be assumed since fieldwork was completed many years ago that no work is currently in progress. The completion of these reports would advance our understanding of patterns of the early medieval settlement and economy very considerably.

20.3. WIDER SIGNIFICANCE OF RESEARCH THEMES

Each of the research themes already identified is a subject of broad significance in a national and perhaps international context. The discussion in this section examines how specific studies in the Fishbourne area might hope to contribute to a wider understanding of the problems.

ROMAN–EARLY MEDIEVAL TRANSITION

Little progress has been made in recent years in understanding the processes of transition from the Roman to early medieval worlds which took place in this area around the start of the fifth century. It has already been suggested that the problem needs to be conceptualized in rather different terms, emphasizing continuity as well as change. In addition, there has been a tendency to view this period in terms of the grand narrative — the collapse of Romano-British civilization. Perhaps the most interesting recent work has been those studies which have taken either particular sites or aggregated the evidence from a number of sites to create a bottom-up perspective. One example of the first approach is a study in the east Midlands suggesting that Roman fields may have been transformed into medieval fields (Upex 2002). The second approach is exemplified by the papers by Faulkner on the decline in the number of occupied buildings in towns and in the number of rooms used in villas (Faulkner 2000; 2002). The study of the Fishbourne area might therefore usefully contribute to the wider problem through a detailed analysis of one area. A study of the decline of the city of Chichester might usefully be supplemented with a re-examination of the final periods of use of villas and with an examination of the persistence or otherwise of landscape features. Barber (above Section 13) has raised the possibility that the rectilinear fields of the Coastal Plain are in part a survival of Roman or even Later Bronze Age date. This hypothesis deserves further consideration, but within the broader context of examining the survival or otherwise of landscape features, including Roman roads and the possible re-use of earthworks as later boundaries.

The skills required for such a study are unlikely to be possessed by a single person. Such a project would require those with an understanding of ceramics, both of the Roman and early medieval periods, and of landscape history, amongst other skills. It would draw primarily upon the fieldwork and excavation already undertaken.

LANDSCAPE, SETTLEMENT AND ECONOMY

A study of the Roman–early medieval transition would necessarily overlap with any examination of the development of landscape and new patterns of settlement and economy. The prime difference is that any study of landscape and settlement development should examine a longer time-span than merely the transition to the medieval period. The Chilgrove and Chalton projects, although now somewhat dated in their methodologies, have

Fig. 51. An Anglo-Saxon grave being excavated at Apple Down, East Marden.
potential for reinterpretation using more recent understanding and current techniques of data analysis and display. However, the excavations at Church Down, Chalton and around Manor Farm will need to be brought to publication since they provide an important element in interpreting the results of surface collection.

The study of Pagham Harbour finds could contribute to the wider task of understanding the character of Middle Saxon trade. Earlier ideas about its organization have been silently discarded as new sites have shown that the interpretations were too simplistic. It seems more likely that not only was trade directed through a small number of wic towns, but also through a larger number of sites of only local significance. Munby is surely right that Pagham Harbour should at least be examined in some detail, since it seems to be the most promising location for such a site.

**AUTHORITY, RITUAL AND RELIGION**

Two particular projects have been identified above for the study of ‘central places’ and places of ritual significance. Singleton lay beyond the area of Chilgrove Valley survey. However, a concerted programme of fieldwalking and test-pitting within the village using the methodologies established at Shapwick and particularly in the Whittlewood project (www.le.ac.uk/elh/whittlewood/index.htm) seem to offer considerable promise. This needs to be augmented by a consideration of the later medieval historical evidence to show how the Saxon ‘central place’ and its estate developed into a manor, and to contrast patterns of lordship over time.

The second project is smaller in scope and requires a consideration of the prehistoric sites and their continuing significance and symbolic importance in the early medieval period. Some work has already been undertaken along these lines elsewhere (Williams 1998), but the approach might usefully be applied as part of a wider study of the development of landscape over time. The particular reason for taking this area rather than any other in order to examine the persistence of activity on prehistoric sites is that the Singleton area is relatively well understood. Near to Singleton was a royal site, a minster church and a hundred meeting place. Work in this area might establish a model which might be applied to other places where the pattern is less straightforward.

20.4. RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES AND PRIORITIES

We have so far identified a series of possible projects based both on gaps in our understanding and those which arise out of the possibilities from excavation and fieldwork archives:

i. construct a ceramic chronology for the period AD 400 to 1100, and use it to reappraise the pottery from selected sites;

ii. examine the post-Roman landscape of the Coastal Plain and the evidence for continuing activity on late Roman sites in the Fishbourne area;

iii. support post-excavation analysis of Church Down, Chalton;

iv. support post-excavation analysis of excavations at Manor Farm, Chalton;

v. appraise the fieldwork results from Chalton area;

vi. support post-excavation analysis of post-Roman remains at Hayling Island temple;

vii. re-examine pottery from Pagham Harbour;

viii. appraise the fieldwork results from the Chilgrove Valley;

ix. examine the Singleton area to look at landscapes of authority, ritual and religion;

x. consider the relationship of prehistoric enclosures and early medieval activity.

These projects may be scored by the methodology adopted for the Fishbourne study (Table 10).

20.5. METHODOLOGIES AND POSSIBLE IDEAS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The study above has identified the construction of a ceramic chronology as a major priority and indeed it was recognized above as a sine qua non for many other projects in the study area. The task, although not necessarily a long or complex one for an experienced pottery expert, is a specialist task and would be considerably more than might be expected of an undergraduate or even a masters student, for example. The methodologies for such work are well established and do not need to be detailed here. The number of assemblages which might be profitably studied for the period AD 410 to 1100 are limited, and the work would seek to build
upon studies of pottery made at Winchester, Southampton, in the Adur valley, as well as such work as has been undertaken in Chichester. It is estimated that this task would take about two months.

The second task of studying pottery from Pagham Harbour forms a natural extension of the first, applying the knowledge gained to a particular area, with the particular aim of identifying patterns of occupation in the area of the Harbour in the period from AD 400 to 900 and distinguishing any foreign imports. There are useful assemblages from Becket’s Barn and the churchyard (dug c. 1995) at Pagham, as well as from Medmerry Farm in Selsey. However, it would be worthwhile looking at all the early medieval pottery from sites within five miles of the harbour, since the quantities are likely to be quite small. This again is a task which requires an experienced pottery expert and one with access to information on, or a knowledge of, imported ceramics of early medieval date. It is estimated that this task would take about two weeks.

The third task identified was the completion of post-excavation analysis of church Down, Chalton. This excavation was undertaken by the University of Southampton who retain the finds and site records, and any further work must be undertaken in conjunction with them. Clearly, the first task is to appraise the state of post-excavation work and identify the tasks to be undertaken. It is difficult to chart a clear way forward until this has been completed.

The fourth task is perhaps the most complex of all possible research projects identified here, because of the need to approach the relatively intractable problem in an interdisciplinary manner. We can identify a number of lines of study. First, the landscape might be analysed using a retrogressive approach which is commonly employed in the study of historic landscapes. Features of more recent date than that of interest are progressively removed from the map leaving a residue of undatable and potentially early features. A second approach is to concentrate in particular on the final phase of Roman activity and consider whether there is evidence for the persistence of usage or settlement in the fifth century. This would require a re-examination of excavation archives and finds, but might also require a study of the results of the Chalton and Chilgrove Valley field surveys. This project has the potential for amateur involvement under professional supervision at a later stage with selected sectioning of field boundaries and other boundary features.

The last task was a reappraisal of fieldwork in the Chalton area. It is not known where the finds or records are from this study are lodged, although the University of Southampton and Barry Cunliffe might provide this information. The co-operation of Southampton and Barry Cunliffe would be essential for this work. Although this task has been distinguished from the reappraisal of the fieldwork in the Chilgrove Valley, there would be considerable value in creating a single project to undertake a comparative re-evaluation of both sets of results. The location of the finds and records for the Chilgrove Valley is unknown.

This is a specialist task and might best be done by an employed research assistant with knowledge of prehistoric, Roman and medieval ceramics, and field-survey methods. No estimate of the timescale can be given until the archives and finds material have been examined.

Table 12. Key Anglo-Saxon research projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglo-Saxon projects</th>
<th>Research importance</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ease</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Construct ceramic chronology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Roman–medieval transition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Post-excavation analysis of Church Down</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Post-excavation analysis of Manor Farm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Appraise fieldwork of Chalton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Post-excavation analysis of Hayling Island</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Pottery from Pagham Harbour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Appraise fieldwork of Chilgrove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. Examine Singleton area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Consider prehistoric enclosures and early medieval activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Gap analysis: the medieval period

by Luke Barber

with contributions by Mark Gardiner

21.1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid assessment of the later medieval data for the study area has shown the great diversity of archaeological remains. However, as for many of the earlier periods, the current archaeological record is fragmentary and inconsistent, with certain types of sites having received much more attention than others. Most work has not been conducted within broad or targeted research themes though the quantity of existing data means it can be put to good use in beginning to address such themes. The study area is lucky in that most of the main excavations have been published in some form though there are gaps in this record. The nature of the current study has not been such as to allow individual inspection of site archives and as such the exact availability and quality for all cannot be vouched for. However, Chichester Museum holds the archives for many important sites within the town and surrounding District, both published and unpublished and, if used to address specific research questions, most should prove invaluable. In addition there has been a great increase in the amount of PPG16 generated work in the last 15 years. The rapidity and quantity of this work has meant much new important data, often available as unpublished ‘developer’ reports, awaits assessment and synthesis. As such there is a vast data set for potential use. Once the key gaps in our existing knowledge are ascertained then future research on the existing archive material, and indeed new archaeological work, can be fruitfully targeted.

21.2. GAPS IN THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORD

When one considers the current evidence for the study area it becomes apparent that there are numerous gaps in our current knowledge. It is pointless listing all of these here for two reasons. Firstly, with the current data available it is very unlikely some would be successfully addressed and secondly, too many gaps/research questions would confuse and detract from what are considered to be the current key issues. As such a rigorous selection has resulted in five research themes/projects being suggested to address what are considered to be the key gaps in our knowledge. All of these, to greater or lesser extent, can be addressed by the bringing together and analysis of existing data. Most future excavations, whether developer-funded or not, should be easily slotted into one or more of the resulting research themes.

21.3. THE AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPE OF THE COASTAL PLAIN

On the whole, the Coastal Plain is currently characterized by a fairly regular pattern of ditched fields. However, this landscape has a significant chronological depth which is poorly understood at present. Recent excavations have uncovered numerous infilled ditches, many of which appear to indicate field systems in the area during the prehistoric and Roman periods suggesting the area was once covered by smaller fields. Although the origins of the agricultural landscape are a key issue they lie earlier than the current period considered here. However, how the existing field system was adapted, if indeed it was, during the Saxon and later medieval periods is crucial to our understanding of not only the manipulation of the landscape but to our understanding of the medieval settlement pattern and economy. For example, to take another study from the eastern end of Sussex, at Lydd Quarry on Romney Marsh, extensive excavations have shown how the marshland there was reclaimed and a system of small fields established during the twelfth century. Later, from the fifteenth century onwards, owing to the drop in population and the shift to a more pastoral economy, many field ditches were in-
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filled to make larger fields (Barber and Priestley-Bell forthcoming). The Coastal Plain offers an interesting comparison in that there probably was an ancient field system already existing. Did the post-1066 land division result in a spate of new boundaries to the existing system or were existing ditches infilled to make larger fields? It is equally possible that the increasing of field size by infilling existing ditches may have occurred, as on Romney Marsh, during the fifteenth century for similar reasons. The development of the agricultural landscape on the Coastal Plain thus has wider implications for other areas of the southeast and beyond and would help increase our understanding of the adaptability of the medieval population to different geographical areas.

The data currently available to study this theme would have to be drawn from a number of sources. An analysis of documentary sources would be needed along with cartographic regression back to at least the Tithe maps and analysis of the aerial photographic collection at Swindon. Analysis of the cartographic sources will also help understand the orientation of the field system and pick up later post-medieval changes. Data from excavations which had uncovered infilled ditches likely to be associated with a field system would also need to be studied although these on the whole are key hole insights considering the size of the Coastal Plain. However, some larger area excavations have taken places, such as those at Drayton, and these offer a better insight to the presence/absence of medieval fields. Owing to the size of the study area it would be wise to concentrate on one or two sub-areas, where most data is available, rather than try to tackle the whole. However, all archaeological excavations should be looked at and the orientation of dated

Fig. 52. Medieval site distributions/rivers and coastline.
infilled ditches compared with that of the extant surrounding boundaries. Perhaps the largest drawback for using the archaeological data would be the difficulty in dating the ditches. If the ditches were at some distance from a settlement, and the area was not subjected to manuring, there would be little pottery available to become incorporated during infilling. Added to this is the problem of residual pottery and the later de-silting of ditches removing earlier material if the ditch continued in use into the post-medieval period. As such data needs to be considered carefully and a more holistic approach adopted. Such a project would probably best be undertaken by an experienced medievalist and historian with help from a post-graduate research student, preferably with experience in GIS.

21.4. THE FORMATION OF VILLAGES

We know remarkably little about the pattern and development of rural settlement in the later medieval period in the study area, in spite of important work undertaken at Chalton (Cunliffe 1973b,c&d; Hughes 1984). Our understanding of the economy is dependent upon the historical work of Brandon (1963; 1971), some of which remains unpublished. The soils of the area are remarkably varied, providing both excellent arable land and some of the most intractable, which remained woodland throughout the medieval period. The expansion of settlement into these areas is abundantly documented in the records of the Bishop of Chichester and deserves further study (unpublished records in WSRO; Blaauw 1850). A starting point for the archaeology would be a consideration of the comments by Roberts and Wrathmell (2000, 44) which places much of the study area into the ‘East Wessex sub-province’. They suggest that settlement is largely nucleated, but this statement derived from the pattern in the nineteenth century requires some reconsideration. It is not clear whether it was true in the late medieval period and, if so, when village settlements
developed. The lack of archaeological excavations within the villages of the area has not helped this situation. Whether there was a shift from loosely scattered farmsteads to more nucleated villages or whether the villages formed in addition to the farmsteads has yet to be proven.

Although the current data set is unlikely to be able to conclusively answer this research theme it should provide an up-to-date account of current knowledge and suggest specific targets for excavation. Documentary sources would need to be consulted though emphasis would be on archaeological data. Analysis of all rural and village site excavations, together with fieldwalking data (often gathered by local amateur societies but not published) would be needed. The main aim would be to establish the distribution and date of the settlements. Knowledge of the form of them, although important, often could not be addressed without more extensive excavation. Existing dating evidence, particularly pottery, would need to be reassessed though there are still problems with the chronology of many of the local wares. Such a project would probably best be undertaken again by an experienced medievalist and historian.

### 21.5. A CERAMIC SEQUENCE FOR CHICHESTER

Although the chronological development of the ceramics in Chichester and its hinterland is better understood for the later medieval period than for the Saxon period there are still many gaps in our knowledge. There has been a vast quantity of pottery excavated and published for the town though no attempt has been made to establish a firm series since early work on the Saxo-Norman material in the 1950s and 1970s (Dunning & Wilson 1953; Down 1978). This early work concentrated mainly on forms and the understanding of fabric development is still in its infancy. No serious attempt has been made to undertake this work and some serious gaps remain. For example, the division (if possible) of pre and post-conquest wares (a problem noted in other towns such as Lewes) and the transition of the Saxo-Norman fabrics to the High medieval ones during the early thirteenth century are poorly understood. Establishing a secure fabric and form sequence for Chichester will allow the ceramics of its hinterland to be more securely dated. This will enable much more reliable dating, and comparison, of deposits in Chichester and the surrounding villages and rural settlements. This would help define settlement hierarchy as well as allowing a comparison of trade/supply to the different sites. Although this is a regional research agenda it is crucial in allowing other research projects (above) to be placed within a national context.

The large quantity of published pottery, as well as the archives/pottery itself, is all available to study, mainly in Chichester Museum. Careful consideration would be needed of the presence of residual/intrusive material in pit groups, particularly for the town itself. Good groups without danger of contamination would thus also be needed from the surrounding rural sites. The result would be a corpus of dated forms/fabrics for the town and District from the eleventh to early sixteenth centuries which would need to be published in the county journal. An experienced medieval ceramics specialist, perhaps helped by an assistant, and illustrator would be needed to complete this project.

---

Fig. 54. Reconstruction of the Market Cross in Chichester.
21.6. THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHICHESTER

There is still a limited understanding of urbanism and the advance of commercialization in the study area. The recent ‘Extensive Urban Survey’ of Hampshire did not examine many of the smaller marketing centres, which were locally important, with the exception of Havant; (see http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/projArch/EUS/hampshire_eus_2003/index.cfm). A starting point for this would be the list of fairs and markets prepared for the Institute of Historical Research (www.history.ac.uk/cmh/gaz/gazweb1.html), but in the meantime Munby’s study of the unusually well-documented manor of Portchester, which lies to the west of the study area, shows the relative importance of such places (Munby 1985).

Although the Roman period in Chichester has been synthesized (Down 1988) there is a huge body of data on the medieval period which, although usually published, has yet to be drawn together to address wider issues of urbanism. The ‘Intensive Urban Survey’ for Chichester is currently being undertaken by Chichester District Council and this should go some way to dealing with this obvious gap in our knowledge, particularly if it gives the medieval period equal attention as the Roman one. This survey will hopefully draw together all the strands and should make an overview of the development of the town during this period a much easier task. This will allow the town to be compared/contrasted with other medieval market centres in the southeast and beyond. It will also allow a better understanding of its role in the settlement hierarchy of the District.

Before the completion of the ‘Intensive Urban Survey’ it is not possible to gauge the amount of work required to complete this project. Indeed, a re-appraisal of the ceramics from the town (see above) may actually change the dates of some of the developments and thus call into question some of the results of the Urban Survey. Whatever the case, the project would require an experienced historian (probably mainly for published and cartographic sources) and an experienced archaeologist working toward an integrated analysis of the origin and development of the town and its internal spatial organization at different times. This would result in an overview publication either as a small book or an article in the county journal.

21.7. THE MARITIME ECONOMY

It is not really possible to understand the late medieval economy of the Fishbourne area, if the significance of the sea and maritime communications are ignored. Chichester stood in the same relationship to the sea as two other former Roman towns, Exeter and Colchester. By the late medieval period neither had good access to ports, but they both developed various mechanisms to ensure that goods might be brought in by water. In both cases this led to the development of ‘out-ports’, at Topsham for the former and at Hythe for the latter (Kowaleski 1995; Britnell 1986). The relationship of Chichester to Dell Quay and to Pagham Harbour remains to be examined in detail, although there is a preliminary study of the development of the second of these (Munby 1984). Exeter and Colchester might provide a model for investigating Chichester’s relationship with its ports, particularly since it has a much poorer documentary record. A reassessment of imported goods such as pottery and stone from excavations within the town would add to the documentary evidence.
The second aspect of the coast deserving of study is the importance of fishing. A very preliminary study has been made of the relationship of settlements and fishing sites in Sussex, but further work is needed (Gardiner 2001). Comments by Munby (1985) and Watts (1958), based on historical sources, show the importance of fishing and local waterborne trade and an appraisal of the archaeological evidence of fish and fishing tackle from excavations is long overdue. Other medieval Sussex ports with direct access to the sea, such as Hastings, Winchelsea and Shoreham are beginning to produce such evidence on a significant scale (Barber 1993; Martin & Martin 2004; Stevens forthcoming a) as well as more rural sites on Romney Marsh (Barber & Priestley-Bell forthcoming) and comparative material to compare/contrast sites within the current study area would help set the local industry in its wider regional and national contexts.

The project would require an experienced historian to bring together the primary and secondary sources as well as an archaeologist to assess the material evidence from excavations to date. Much of the former is available at places such as the WSRO. The archaeological evidence is more piecemeal as past excavations were not to modern standards, particularly with regard to the collection of environmental samples/fish bones. Despite this there are now enough newer excavations, most notably that at the Shippam’s site, which will provide enough data to comment usefully on this issue.

Table 13. Key medieval research projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medieval projects</th>
<th>Research importance</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ease</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The agricultural landscape of the Coastal Plain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The formation of villages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A ceramic sequence for Chichester</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The development of Chichester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The maritime economy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.8. Conclusion

The research themes have been scored by their importance, cost and ease in Table 13. The ceramic sequence for Chichester is considered to be very important as it will help with many of the other research projects if a refinement of chronology can be achieved. It is also relatively easy as there is likely to be enough data already excavated to achieve this and could be done by one/two experienced people with an illustrator. Similarly, an overview of the development of Chichester would be relatively easy, particularly following the completion of the ‘Intensive Urban Survey’. Work would concentrate on the excavated archives and historical sources, enough of which are available to complete the project. The other research themes are slightly more difficult to achieve. This is mainly due to the paucity, or at least inconsistency, of the existing data set and potential problems in being able to obtain such data through targeted fieldwork. However, research of the existing data set to address these themes would still be very useful even now as they would accurately assess the current knowledge and highlight the pressing need for excavations in key areas such as villages and rural coastal sites as well as the need to see larger areas in order to understand the development of field systems. Such issues could then be considered during the implementation of archaeological conditions on future developments within the study area and indeed the adopted methodologies for those interventions.

At this stage the suggested work on any of these projects would solely consist of historical research and/or work on existing published/unpublished archaeological data/finds. No intrusive fieldwork is suggested at this time though, once complete, future targeted research excavations could be undertaken on certain sites to address particular issues. As a result the current research themes would in the main only need limited staff, although they would need to be experienced in their field.

The completion of each research project would only be achieved by the production of a report which would be produced in full for a limited circulation and for placement on the Sussex Archaeological Society’s website. More summary articles would need to be produced for publication in the county, or other suitable, journal.