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Abstract

This thesis will examine the changes in the landscape of Britain resulting from the Roman invasion in 43 CE and their effect on the identities of the native Britons. Romanization, as the process is commonly called, and evidence of these altered identities as seen in material culture have been well studied. However, the manifestations of this process in the landscape have been less well examined. Applying current theories in landscape archaeology, the Selsey peninsula oppidum of the Atrebates and two hillforts of the Durotriges, sites that have been well excavated and examined, will be the focus of this thesis. The post invasion uses of these areas will be studied, including the palace at Fishbourne. The two tribes had differing relationships with the Romans, leading the Romans to occupy and modify these landscapes in different ways. The varying strategies both led to changes in how the Britons related to the elite members of their society and the ways in which they moved through and experienced their surrounding landscape. These changes resulted in an identity that was neither purely Roman nor Briton but rather a combined identity of Romano-Britain.
Introduction

When the Romans invaded Britain in 43 CE, the identity of the native Britons began to change, a process commonly called Romanization. These changes were reflected in the landscape of Roman Britain as it was shaped through the interactions of the natives and Romans. The formation of the landscape of Roman Britain and the identity of its people was an interactive process, with each contributing to the development of the other. Looking at the territory of the Atrebates, who were allies of the Romans, and that of the Durotriges, who resisted the Roman invasion, this thesis will examine the native use of the landscape and how it shaped their identity. The native landscape and identity will be compared with post invasion use and how it reshaped the identity of those who occupied it. As with other aspects of Romanization, the changes were more pronounced for elites willing to work within the Roman system. For those who resisted or were not members of the elites, the changes were more complex, generally reflecting a melding of British and Roman culture rather than a replacement of one with the other.

Roman-Briton Contacts through the Conquest Period

Rome’s first direct involvement in Great Britain occurred with Julius Caesar’s two invasions in 55 BCE and 54 BCE, neither of which established a permanent presence in the country. However, they did lead to expanding trade and political relationships between certain tribes and the Romans. Numismatic evidence indicates the formation of an increasingly stratified society in the south and east of Britain, with tribes led by self-described kings. The coins show Roman influence on several of these southeastern tribes whose leaders described themselves as Rex (Figures 1-2).

In the imperial era of Rome, expansion was often driven by concerns of prestige and status
rather than those of economy or security. When Claudius, uncle to the assassinated Caligula, became emperor in 41 CE, his position was weak. A military victory would solidify his position with the army and the people. In 42 CE, Verica, an ally of Rome and king of the British tribe Atrebates, was deposed. He fled to Rome to seek support, which provided Claudius with his excuse for an invasion and a way to improve his status. By working with friendly tribes, such as the Atrebates, Claudius’ armies conquered most of southern and eastern Great Britain in 43 CE, resulting in the triumph the new emperor felt he needed to improve his status. Despite politically driven honor granted to Claudius, Britain was far from subdued. Vespasian, who would later become emperor, served as the legate of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Augusta Legion in Britain. Between 43 and 47 CE, Vespasian fought 30 battles, subdued two tribes, and captured 20 additional settlements, in the territory of the Durotriges. Between 47 and 52 CE, tribes that had been subdued, such as the Iceni, in the east, and Brigantes, in the north, revolted. Meanwhile, the Silures, a western tribe, continued to resist the Roman invaders, despite having their territory garrisoned by Roman troops. In the next five years, the Silures’ resistance continued and the Brigantes revolted again. After their defeat, they became a client kingdom of Rome rather than under direct rule. Between 58 and 61 CE, the Roman governor of Britain campaigned against the Druids, an elite, religious group that continued to resist the Romans from their island stronghold of Anglesey. During this campaign, the Iceni again took the opportunity to revolt, led by Boudica, but were again defeated. In the early 70s, there was again conflict with the Brigantes, who were finally conquered. By 83 CE under the command of Agricola, Britain was considered subdued (Millett 1990: 43).

However, the entire island never came under the control of the Romans. Various groups in
what is now Scotland managed to resist the Romans. Eventually Hadrian constructed his wall, between the River Tyne and Solway Firth. Antonine later constructed a wall farther north between the Firth of Forth and the Firth of Clyde. This wall was begun in 142 CE and was completed a decade later, but, after about 20 years it was abandoned and the frontier pulled back to Hadrian’s Wall. The conquest of Britain was not a simple or quick process. The many tribes made their own decisions about degrees of cooperation or resistance with Rome. Additionally, the violent resistance of many tribes to the invasion by the Romans indicates many would likely have continued to resist subtly after their defeat. However, the Romans were frequently able to exploit the independent identities of the tribes, setting them against each other to their own advantage.

**Romanization**

Scholars of British history and archaeology have used various theories, collected under the name Romanization, to explain the adoption or rejection of Roman culture, during the contact period. Despite the ultimate abandonment of Britain by Rome and subsequent takeover of much of the island by the Anglo-Saxons, British historians and archaeologists for years identified more with the conquering Romans than they did with the native Britons who occupied the island in the Iron Age or the Anglo-Saxons who came after the Roman period. However, this admiration for Rome did not always exist. During the first three quarters of the 19th century, Rome was seen as decadent, and empire was more connected with France under Napoleon III than Great Britain (Hingley 2000: 20). But when Queen Victoria was made Empress of India in 1876, attitudes towards imperialism changed. Traditional imagery also becomes more important in times of rapid change, such as the last quarter of the 19th century, and classically educated politicians
began drawing on the analogy of Rome to explain the nature of British imperialism (Hingley 2000: 26). With much work done in the late 19th or early 20th century, when Great Britain was an imperial power, the scholarship reflected attitudes toward the imperial project at the time. Francis Haverfield, a British historian and archaeologist asserted that “whatever their limitations, the men of the [Roman] Empire wrought for the betterment and the happiness of the world” (Haverfield 1915: 10). The British saw themselves as bringing civilization to primitive parts of the world and were only too happy to interpret the Roman imperial project in the same light. As Johannes Fabian described in *Time and the Other*, these scholars created a temporal distance between themselves and the Iron Age tribes who lived in Britain at the time of contact with the Romans (Fabian 2002). The appellation “Iron Age,” a typological time in Fabian’s schema, gives the impression of an objective description of the time period in which these tribes lived. However, the words create a distance as “iron” describes a technological system of the past. The Romans were not described as coming from a similar age. Rather, the Romans, along with the Ancient Greeks, formed classical civilization. Furthermore, the Romans themselves considered the tribes of the lands they conquered to be primitive in comparison to themselves. The word “barbarian” itself comes from an Ancient Greek word, later adopted by the Romans, meant to evoke the speech of those who did not speak Greek. The Romans and the British of the 19th and early 20th century, in fact, shared a kind of intersubjective time. Both groups lived in a time period where they saw their civilizing force as necessary to subdue and improve the primitive people with whom they came in contact. The imperial Romans were seen as coeval with the British of the 19th and early 20th century and thus, the project of Romanization was seen as a positive process of civilizing primitive tribes. The British were happy to adopt the same distancing the Romans placed between themselves and the original Britons. They also took the
view that the Romans brought civilization to Britain much as the British were bringing
civilization to the world. The Pax Britannica of the 19th century was the equivalent of the Pax
Romana of the 1st and 2nd centuries.

From this background the concept of Romanization emerged. Haverfield suggested that the
Romans maintained their empire both with frontier defenses and through Romanization, which
he defined as the means by which natives were “given a civilization” (Haverfield 1915: 11).
Haverfield stated that Romanization resulted in the elimination of distinction between Romans
and provincials while also paradoxically asserting that not all traces of tribal culture were
eliminated (Haverfield 1915: 22). The focus remained, however, on cultural homogenization. It
was acknowledged that Romanization occurred differently among different classes and different
regions, being more successful among the elites than the peasantry. But its shortcomings in
describing the peasantry were chalked up primarily to persistent superstition among the lower
orders. It was successful among the elites and they were the important drivers in the conquered
territories. This conception of Romanization is a model firmly based on the theory of
acculturation, wherein one group unconsciously adopts the traits of another over time. And it
has all the shortcomings of the acculturation model that exists as applied to the arrival of
Europeans in the New World, described by Jane Webster as “comprehensively trounced”
because it implies a one sided transfer of culture (Webster 2001:210).

There was some debate about Romanization in its early days, with R.G. Collingwood
arguing for a degree of syncretism in the 1930s, but without a consideration of the differences in
power between Romans and Britons and the stratification within these societies (Webster 2001:
211). This lack ultimately made his theory a restatement of an acculturation model, where there
was more success with the elites and the hybridization of the peasantry resulted from a failure in
the Romanization program. The choices of the indigenous groups were left out of the process. Little changed with models of Romanization from the 40s to the 60s but a radically different model was proposed by Nativist scholars in the 1970s and 1980s. They asserted that Romano-British culture was largely British with a thin layer of Roman-ness over the top (Webster 2001: 212). But this seems more like a failed acculturation model and leaves no room for hybridization or resistance.

Martin Millett in the 1990s returned with a reformulated version of Romanization which attempted to accommodate opposition to the concept of the “given” civilization and give an active role to the native people in the process, suggesting one of “dialectical change” (Millett 1990: 1). Millett proposed a theory of progressive emulation in which native elites, who are given governing power by the Romans, emulate Roman material culture to reinforce their social position (Millett 1990: 68-69). This emulation of Roman material culture then works its way down the social scale in a progressive emulation. This theory makes Romanization a process participated in by the native population as something other than passive receivers of Roman culture. However, it remains primarily concerned with the relationship between the native elites and Rome (Webster 2001: 214). While it is useful in examining some portions of the process, it still leaves gaps in our understanding of what was happening with the lower social levels, still seen as following the lead of their superiors. Furthermore, some scholars have built on Millett to state that once the elites had adopted Roman ways, there was little interest in Romanizing those of lower status. So unless it was consciously pushed onto them, they merely received the “trickle down” from above (Webster 2001: 216).

While Millet’s view of Romanization remains popular and useful particularly in discussing the process among elites, in the last decade alternatives began to develop with room for concepts...
such as hybridization or resistance playing a role. In his essay “Beyond Romans and Natives,” Greg Woolf describes one alternative to these older concepts of Romanization (Woolf 1995). He points out that “Roman” did not describe a single monolithic culture. Nor did the people who were conquered by Rome end up possessing a single monolithic culture. Conquered people participated in the creation of a new social order incorporating Roman ideals and culture, meaning it was neither imposed on them or chosen by them (Woolf 1995: 347). In comparison to the Iron Age societies of Britain, the Romans were more differentiated by wealth, occupation, experience, and status (Woolf 1995: 344). The Britons, like the Gauls described by Woolf, were largely full time agriculturalists led by local warrior or religious elites. Contact with Rome broadened the choice and the differentiation available to local people. Many elites took advantage of this increased differentiation to place more distance between themselves and their subordinates. Furthermore, the Romans themselves favored those people who made what they perceived as more civilized choices, elevating the status of those people and helping guarantee their positions with support from Rome. Not all people in the newly conquered territories had access to these supposedly civilized choices and some people consciously made different choices, leading to a diversity in the “Romanized” cultures of various conquered regions, including Britain.

Jane Webster presents her own critiques of older concepts of Romanization and an alternative in her essay “Creolizing The Roman Provinces” (Webster 2001). Webster contends that by maintaining the Roman and native dichotomy, there is no room for ambiguity in the uses of material culture and no room for people to use material culture in the negotiation of new identities (Webster 2001: 217). She summarizes this view stating that where Roman material culture is found, “we find Romans and aspiring Romans. Where we do not find Roman-style
material culture, or find less of it, we are in the company of natives” (Webster 2001: 217). She points out that both Millett and Woolf accommodate the strategic use of Roman material culture by elites but do not provide the same option for non-elites. She proposes expanding this possibility of strategic use of Roman material culture be expanded to all levels of society. However, because the same ends are not available to non-elites, their uses of this material culture must have had other goals than simply maintaining status and currying the favor of the new foreign rulers.

Webster argues for a concept of creole material culture through which native culture is not replaced by Roman culture but rather both are blended in the context of a power imbalance between the Romans and the natives, especially those of lower status. The new elements are employed, but frequently in a native manner, making it a resistant adaptation. The material culture “can negotiate with, resist, or adapt Roman styles to serve indigenous ends (Webster 2001: 219). While this process has been well studied in the context of material culture, less attention has been given to how this blended identity is affected by and manifested in the landscape. And studies of landscape have only recently turned to an examination of how landscape affects and shapes the identity of those living within it.

Theories of Landscape

While the concept of landscape dates back to artistic movements in the 16th century, landscape archaeology is a more recent development, dating to the 1970s (David and Thomas 2008: 27). Prior to this date, landscape had been discussed in archaeology but primarily as a geographical unit. Since the 1970s, interest in landscape archaeology has grown and, at the same time, the direction of the field has changed. Landscape archaeology began primarily as a subset of environmental archaeology, focused on how humans physically interacted with their
surrounding environment. However, over the last three decades it has gradually focused more on the social and cultural aspects of that interaction, questioning how people are defined by the landscape and how they create concepts of landscape above the physical reality of their surroundings (David and Thomas 2008: 38). However, historical studies of the landscape began decades before archaeologists became involved and it is useful to examine how these earlier studies led to and influence current studies of the landscape in archaeology.

Discussions of the British landscape, and landscape theory as a whole, generally start with W.G. Hoskins and his seminal work *The Making of the English Landscape*, which was first published in 1955. Hoskins' primary concern was to study the landscape as it could be viewed in the present and understand how and when it came to look as it does, to understand “the evolution of the landscape as we know it” (Hoskins 1970: 13). This sentence from the introduction of the 1970 edition of his famous work lays out the elements of landscape study that were most important to him: understanding the processes that resulted in the landscape that a person in the present could experience.

For Hoskins, this experience of the past frequently takes on a nostalgic anti-modern tone. Although he is heavily influenced by the Romantic movement, Hoskins believes that a true appreciation of landscape requires training, guidance, and an understanding of the history that lays beneath it (Hoskins 1970: 14). While a nostalgic viewer of the landscape, he disapproves of nostalgia without comprehension. Appreciation requires understanding and this understanding requires a knowledge of the processes that led to the features presently seen. In his first chapter, Hoskins discusses hollow ways, sunken lanes often taken for cart tracks. As Hoskins points out many of these cart tracks appear to “begin and end nowhere” (Hoskins 1970: 32). Without walking them or tracing their course on a map, a viewer might not see this complete picture. And
without viewing the complete picture, inquiry might end with a sentimental, yet erroneous view, of farmers traveling through the countryside centuries earlier. In order to truly appreciate this feature, it must be connected to the process which created it. While some hollow ways did serve as cart tracks, they were created by landowners each digging a ditch along their side of a property boundary and piling the dirt from this ditch into an earthen bank on their side of the line. This process creates the sunken area with a slight raised area on either side (Hoskins 1970:31-32). Hoskins connects an existing feature with a past process allowing one to appreciate the landscape and connect with one's distant ancestors, whose activities created the landscape that can be viewed in the present.

Hoskins also dwells on these connections between the people of today viewing the landscape and those who came hundreds and thousands of years before.

We are seeing the natural world through the eyes of men who died three or four thousand years ago, and for a moment or two we succeed in entering into the minds of the dead. Or on some desolate English moorland it is even easier to feel this identity with the dead of the Bronze Age who lie nearby under a piled-up cairn (Hoskins 1970:17-18).

Hoskins is clearly more interested in finding the similarities between people in the present day and their ancestors living in the Britain of the past than he is in exploring the identities of those past denizens. While this is not without value, it must be remembered that these ancestors are not past versions of ourselves.

The tools that Hoskins has at his disposal further affect his view of the landscape. Primarily Hoskins recommends visiting various regions and walking. However, he relies heavily on maps, aerial photos, and records of land surveys. Matthew Johnson states that Hoskins view of landscape is “rooted in the gaze from above,” pointing out the large percentage of figures that
rely on either maps or photos from above (Johnson 2007: 43). The perspective chosen for the study of particular landscapes frequently comes to the forefront in discussions of the study of landscape generally and later commentators often criticize the detached view from above as belonging to the dominant visual model of the modern era, implying an empirical view of the landscape that does not truly exist (Wylie 2007: 55).

Hoskins' views and methods are still influential and useful today. Many critics points out that his conclusions were incorrect, and Hoskins himself acknowledged some of these mistakes. For example, Johnson discusses Hoskins' view that the size of churches reflected the size of the communities they served. Later researchers reached the conclusion that the size of churches often better reflected the wealth of the community than the size (Johnson 2007: 110-111). However, using the same methods to reach different conclusions does little to undercut the validity of Hoskins' method. Fieldwork handbooks, such as Richard Muir's *The New Reading the Landscape: Fieldwork in Landscape History* (2000), are still written today to aid in the connecting of place names and physical features with the processes that created them, following the methods of Hoskins.

Hoskins' approach came under increasing criticism with the rise of New or Processual Archaeology. In the early 1960s, American archaeologists attacked cultural-historical archaeology suggesting it be replaced by an archaeology that was more “evolutionist, behaviorist, ecological, and positivist in orientation” (Trigger 2010: 386). The New Archaeology preferred a more scientific approach relying on hypothesis and deduction rather than Hoskins' historical and inductive technique. Simply equating visible material remnants with a particular historical process would never be testable or improvable (Johnson 2007: 61-62). Without additional data, Hoskins could have no idea how typical his examples were and, therefore, in the
eyes of the New Archaeologists his conclusions remained anecdotal. Another point of concern for the New Archaeologists was the belief that archaeology needed to be more anthropological. While Hoskins enjoyed drawing attention to the connections between people in the present and their distant ancestors, New Archaeologists emphasized that these people were not just like us. Ancestors or not, these people had “different social rules, different relations of power, different habits of living and dying, different ways of looking at the world, different common senses” (Johnson 2007: 62-63). While Hoskins was able to identify certain historical occurrences, such as late Medieval desertion of parts of the English landscape, his methods were unable to provide much in the way of explanation.

However, praise and criticism aside, Hoskins simply has little to say about England prior to the Anglo-Saxons. Hoskins was able to identify very little in the present landscape that he could attribute to the activities of the Romans or the Britons who preceded them and so he concluded they had very little effect on the landscape. He discusses his belief about the population size of England during the Roman Era (Hoskins 1970: 33) and about the total land under cultivation during this period (Hoskins 1970: 42-43). Based on this evidence, he concludes “we must not overestimate the total impression made by the Romano-British generations upon the landscape” (Hoskins 1970: 42). By Hoskins' account, what little impact the Britons and Romans had upon the landscape had completely decayed by the time the Anglo-Saxon colonists had arrived and therefore, as Hoskins' says “[t]he work had to begin all over again” (Hoskins 1970: 44).

While Hoskins considered landscape something to be seen, many who came after him pursued the idea that it was a way of seeing. Seizing on the concept of landscape as a way of seeing, geographers, anthropologists, art historians, and authors moved to either extend or critique this formulation, even as the influence of Hoskins declined. John Wylie connects this
movement strongly with an analysis of landscape art and the development of linear perspective, with that perspective enabling “commanding, objective and controlled grasp of space and spatial relations” (Wylie 2007: 58). This way of seeing the landscape gives the impression of an objective and detached view and works to the advantage of the dominant group, where the subject chooses the way in which the object is represented and thereby masters the object (Wylie 2007: 59).

Particularly notable among scholars who view landscape as a way of seeing is Denis Cosgrove. In his book *Social Formation and the Symbolic Landscape*, he argues that landscape is a way of seeing particular to Europeans (Cosgrove 1998: 1). This way of seeing has its own history that is intertwined with the history of Europe and its economy and society. According to Cosgrove, this way of seeing supports and defines a range of assumptions that are part of the consciousness of European elite society (Cosgrove 1998: 1). The individual detached perspective implies ownership and Cosgrove believes that landscape thus supports the property relationships that exist in a capitalist and mercantile economy (Wylie 2007: 59; Cosgrove 1998: 4-5). This view of landscape also came to support of a cultural Marxist conception of landscape by emphasizing three aspects of landscape as a way of seeing (Wylie 2007: 68). First, landscape is a representation. Second, landscape is intensely visual. And third, there must be a specific interpretation of the purpose and status of this visual representation (Wylie 2007: 68-69). This way of seeing preserves landscape as a possession of the elite, symbolizing “their dominion over the land in the very act of ‘naturalising’ it, of making its particular representation seem the natural order of things” (Wylie 2007: 69). Don Mitchell furthers the Marxist conception of landscape by seeing landscape as something that is produced in a capitalist system and fetishized as a commodity (Wylie 2007: 106).
Postcolonial theory has also taken on the concept of landscape, treating it as a method used primarily by Europeans to present the non-Western cultures they encountered in a contrasting and negative way (Wylie 2007: 125). This theory of landscape is similar to those of Marxist and feminist geographers in that landscape is seen to normalize certain modes of looking at a landscape and create a contrast between self and the other. Places inhabited by non-Western cultures can be presented as wild, uncontrolled and, most importantly, not owned. This contrasts with the orderly presentation of the Western landscape and presents a justification for conquest. The Romans did see lands outside their borders as uncivilized, with a mix of disdain and awe. Writers such as Tacitus describe the inhabitants of these lands as strange and savage compared with Romans but also, as in the case of the Germans, he admires their race as “distinctive, pure, and unique of its kind” (Tacitus 2009: 36). However, these postcolonial conceptions of landscape are more focused on how the colonizer presents their conquests than how the native people perceive their place in the landscape.

Matthew Johnson expands on the notion of landscape as a way of seeing and focuses on its application to landscape archaeology and the tools used in landscape history and archaeology, particularly maps, aerial photographs, and hachured plans, which he believes conceal a continuing empiricism in landscape work. In the empiricist view, the past speaks for itself and no theory is required to interpret what it is saying but, as described above, this requires a denial of differences between ourselves and people in the past. It is a common sense view that does not acknowledge the different common senses that people may once have had. In discussing the three tools that contribute to this empiricist viewpoint, Johnson points out that they are easily accessible ways for viewing and appreciating the landscape. But all three incorporate a particular way of seeing, the objective and detached mode described by Wylie.
For Johnson, maps, photographs, and hachured plans are problematic because of their power. They all seem to represent objective reality when in obvious ways they are selective representations of reality or represent an entirely different view of the landscape than those inhabiting it would possess. Maps can, by the very act of selecting what appears in the center of it, encode a particular view of the world. They are also frequently criticized by post-colonial theorists as tools to aid the military and administrators in representing the land in a way different from the understanding of the indigenous people of a given area. Additionally, maps would often designate certain areas as empty, thus legitimizing their conquest. Aerial photography provides another powerful representation of the landscape. Photographs are appealing specifically because they seem unequivocally to represent reality. One points the camera and snaps and whatever is in front of the camera is captured. However, the very choice of vantage point from which to snap a picture can define the composition. With aerial photographing one gets a dominating view of the landscape. This view, however, was not available to those people who inhabited the landscape and thus does not capture the experience of those people within the landscape. Hachured plans, designed to plot earthworks, also represent a view from above. Johnson emphasizes that all these tools emphasize the plan view over the view of the ground level observer (Johnson 2007: 95). Johnson does not advocate discontinuing the use of these tools but stress that the theoretical framework embedded in these tools must be acknowledged. The data received from these tools already contains elements of theory and the user must be conscious of these elements (Johnson 2007: 96-97). These included assumptions can also be found in our choice of what landscape to study, as political divisions on which our choices are based may not have applied during the time period studied. Many of the assumptions relate to the type of power that is seen in the landscape, which is primarily juridical. However, that left little room to explore “human relationships and
ways of life that created that landscape” (Johnson 2007: 117).

Johnson wishes to develop a study of landscape from a specifically archaeological viewpoint, acknowledging the flaws of Hoskins’ methods. But he wishes to maintain the best elements, including some of the Romanticism, which he considers inspiring and motivating (Johnson 2007: 120). Johnson’s landscape archaeology should be able to contribute to general and comparative discussions despite its necessary focus on specific space and place. He places human beings at the center of his new study of landscape, because through their actions they have “constituted and reconstituted that landscape” (Johnson 2007: 120). Johnson points out that the engagement that these people had with the landscape is a practical one, which cannot be described by economic theory or as a symbolic experience. It also must be understood as a product of its time rather than of current common sense or ideals. Johnson wishes look at the people and the relationships between them more closely, rather than reducing them to components of a process that resulted in larger churches or depopulated villages or viewing them simply as our ancestors without studying them on their own terms.

Johnson roots his study of landscape archaeology in the concepts of practice and agency. He defines agency as the “simple observation that the archaeological record is created by the actions of individuals” (Johnson 2007: 142). He goes on to state that these individuals act within a cultural background or structure connecting to Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of habitus, described in his book Outline of a Theory of Practice (Bourdieu 1977: 72). Johnson defines practice as the “way in which abstract structures and norms of 'culture' are translated into actions on the ground” (Johnson 2007: 142). These actions include the commonplace activities of moving from place to place, working, and the day to day routine of maintaining a household, which are guided by social tradition and memory. The landscape or environment in which these activities happen is
simultaneously created and responded to by these human activities. Through practice people are bound to a real world but at the same time this world is created by these practices. Johnson recognizes that engagement with the real world can be constrained by powerful structures external to the actors themselves and describes the people who existed in the landscape as “real men and women who made their own history, though not in circumstances of their own choosing” (Johnson 2007: 145).

Johnson believes focusing on agency and practice in landscape archaeology allows us to take advantage of archaeological evidence, concentrating on those things that can be seen in the record rather than theorizing about those that cannot. Through remains of paths and roads, fields, locations of important buildings and dwellings, archaeologists can envision how people were moving through the landscape and what they were viewing as they did so. They can understand the everyday lives that resulted in the creation of these landscapes better than they can fit a theoretical framework to explain the processes of their creation. While Johnson never specifically mentions phenomenology, his vision of landscape archaeology seems to rely heavily on the phenomenological theories which have grown popular in this field in recent years.

Landscape phenomenology arose in response to theories of landscape which restricted it to being a way of seeing. Much of landscape theory revolved around observation and interpretations of the various scenes that were observed. Landscape phenomenology sees landscape not as a scene to be observed but rather as a world in which to live. Bruce Trigger describes the archaeological application of phenomenology as an understanding that human thought and behavior relates to things, man-made or natural. Behavior is learned through engagement with artifacts, buildings, and a natural environment that has been transformed by human use. By understanding how that environment was perceived and used by humans in the past, it should be possible to learn
something about the general beliefs, feelings, and attitudes that motivated these people (Trigger 2006: 472-473).

Trigger credits Christopher Tilley with introducing the phenomenological approach to archaeology in his 1994 book *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths, and Monuments*.

In his book *The Materiality of Stone: Explorations in Landscape Phenomenology*, Tilley explores themes he had introduced ten years earlier. He emphasizes that his approach is not dependent on the personal and subjective but rather an intertwining of subject and object with the grounds for “all feeling and all knowing taking place through persons with similar bodies” (Tilley 2004: 29). The interaction with the world is mobile in both space and time and movement through places and landscapes are important to how people experience them. Information and knowledge are not received in a passive manner and people “act in accordance with practical projects, values, needs, desires and interests. What information and knowledge is indeed received can only be understood in the context of these needs, desires, etc” (Tilley 2004: 30).

Tilley relates landscape phenomenology to identity stating that “[i]deas and feelings about identity are inevitably located in the specificities of familiar places together creating landscapes and how it feels to be there” (Tilley 2004: 25). Identities are put into a particular setting and are played out in these places, through emotions, feelings, dwelling, movement and practical activity (Tilley 2004: 25). Tilley claims that “to know a landscape is to know who you are, how to go on and where you belong” (Tilley 2004: 25). Understanding how people experience a landscape can tell us something about who those people are.

Phenomenology describes a general interaction between bodies and places and the effects this interaction has prior to cultural specificities (Tilley 2004: 31). However, these bodies all do carry a culture resulting from their place. In this way, landscape phenomenology, like Johnson's
vision of landscape archaeology, connects with Pierre Bourdieu's concept of habitus. Through being in a specific place individuals take on their specific cultural character. For Tilley, the landscape is not a sign or symbol or a text to be read which reflects the identity of those people who live and move through the landscape. Rather, the landscape itself is an agent that actively produces that identity (Tilley 2004: 31). This formulation is similar to that of Johnson although Tilley explicitly states that the landscape is itself an agent. But in both formulations the landscape and the people in it are acting on each other each creating and modifying the other. Tilley states that “producing human meaning in the world is all about establishing connections between ourselves and the disparate material phenomena with which and through which we live, the plants and animals, landscapes and artefacts that surround us” (Tilley 2004: 31).

Both Johnson and Tilley use the concept of habitus to connect actions within a physical or cultural space or structure to identity. Bourdieu states that habitus forms because “[t]he structures constitutive of a particular type of environment (e.g. the material conditions of existence characteristic of a class condition) produce habitus, systems of durable, transposable dispositions” (Bourdieu 1977: 72). These structures require neither obedience to rules nor a conscious intention to aim at a particular goal and are the product of past conditions. Habitus is created in members of a group through:

the product of work of inculcation and appropriation necessary in order for those products of collective history, the objective structures (e.g. of language, economy, etc.) to succeed in reproducing themselves more or less completely, in the form of durable dispositions, in the organisms (which on can, if one wishes, call individuals) lastingly subjected to the same conditionings, and hence placed in the same material conditions of existence (Bourdieu 1977: 85).

While habitus tends to reproduce the same behaviors for people within the same group, no individual in the group is exposed to the same conditions as any other. In his accessible
introduction to Bourdieu's concept of practice, G. Carter Bentley's article “Ethnicity and Practice,” uses the concept to explain how ethnicities are maintained and particularly focuses on its application to boundary areas, such as Roman Britain, where multiple ethnicities meet. He explains that through these variations among individual exposure to conditions, different practices may be introduced, sometimes slowly but sometimes, in the face of large changes in external conditions, quickly. The “changes in objective conditions and consequent life experiences generate changes in structures of habitus subsequently produced” (Bentley 1987: 29). As the environment changes, individuals are presented with new options and possibilities and develop new ways of interacting with their changed world (Bentley 1987: 43). However, different segments of a populations will adapt in different ways based on the options that the new environment presents them, often creating a tension within groups as changes to identity occur (Bentley 1987: 43). This tension can be seen between the elite and non-elite members of the native Briton societies as the conditions faced by each group differed, presenting different challenges and possibilities to each. As described earlier, this habitus can be strongly influenced by the place and material conditions of that place in which an individual lives.

The native Britons had maintained certain patterns and structures within the landscape for hundreds of years. These structures help to maintain and pass down the identities of these people from generation to generation, supplemented by other aspects of their material culture. However, when the Romans invaded Britain, they were able to use or destroy these same patterns within the landscape to begin effecting a change in the identity of the native Britons. In some cases, the Romans overthrew existing elites and appropriated their status bearing residences for themselves. In other cases, the invaders encouraged elites to maintain their positions in society and location in the landscape, but to adopt more Roman styles of displaying that elite status. At first the
locations of elites within the landscape remained the same. However, the identity of these elites or their presentation of their identity may have changed. For lower status Britons, the changes may have been more slowly progressing and more subtle. Only slowly was the focal point of their society transitioned to Roman towns that were built in the decades after the initial invasion. But in all cases, the changes to the landscape resulted in consequent changes in the practices of the native people, leading to the creation of a people with a new identity, that of Romano-British.

Pre-Roman Settlement Forms

During the late pre-Roman Iron Age, Britons occupied a variety of settlement types. Understanding these settlement types and how they were distributed through the landscape first requires a classification of their types, a subject which has sparked a great deal of debate, particularly in reference to larger settlement types (e.g. Jones 1987, Woolf 1993, Cunliffe 2005). Focusing on the southern and eastern areas of the country, later to become the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms of Wessex and Sussex, first small settlements and then larger settlements will be defined and discussed (Figure 3). The distribution of these forms will be discussed with particular emphasis on those larger settlements which later were sites for Roman settlements. Sussex was home to the Atrebates, who were allies of the Romans, while in Wessex lived the Durotriges, who opposed them, providing an opportunity to contrast changes in the landscape of two tribes with differing relationships to Rome. Furthermore, well studied sites in this region allow a detailed look at the changes in landscape that resulted from the Roman invasion.

Following Cunliffe (2005), smaller settlements referred to as homesteads, hamlets, or villages are generally those housing a single family up to several families. These settlements usually covered under 12 acres and, while some were unenclosed, others featured enclosures such as ditches, earthen walls or wooden palisades. These enclosures could exist for livestock
containment alone or could have some defensive purpose. There is a distinct pattern of chronological development displayed by these settlements as well. Toward the middle of the first millennium, palisaded settlements appeared throughout Britain. Cunliffe (2005: 239-241) details several examples of this form that existed in Wiltshire, at Little Woodbury and Swallowcliffe; in Sussex, at Hollingbury and Park Brow; and in Hampshire, at Meon Hill and Houghton Down (Figure 4). These sites all cover about a three and half acres and are roughly circular, although the settlement at Houghton Down was approximately twice the size and more oval in shape. While some evidence of the day to day routine of these settlement’s residents have been found, for the most part the focus has been on later phases of these sites when, by the Middle Iron Age, these sites were enclosed by earthworks.

Unenclosed settlements are also found in the south of Britain. These are primarily dated to the early and middle years of the Iron Age, seeming to have gone out of use in the same time period when earthworks were replacing palisades at other sites. Examples have been found at Boscombe Down West, All Cannings Cross, and Potterne in Wiltshire and Slonk Hill in West Sussex and Bishopstone in East Sussex (Cunliffe 2005: 247). The unenclosed settlements could be a phase of settlement before enclosure occurred such as at Bishopstone. Because these sites are not as easily spotted through aerial survey as ditched enclosures, they have not been as well studied. It is also possible that they were much more common in the Iron Age but simply remain unknown due to the greater difficulty in locating their remains.

The earthworks took a variety of forms, including ditches or ditches with either external or internal banks. These ditches are the defining structure for this phase. The settlements frequently took the roughly circular form that the earlier palisaded enclosures those sites possessed. This
pattern was the case at Little Woodbury and Meon Hill sites. At the larger Houghton Down, the earlier palisades were also replaced by a ditched enclosure by the Middle Iron Age. Inside the enclosure, there was often only a single building identified as a house, such as at Little Woodbury and Old Down Farm in Hampshire, with other structures identified as granaries and livestock pens also included (Cunliffe, 2005: 241). The ditches are not particularly large, generally about 3 to 6.5 feet deep and similar in width. Openings are defined in the ditches but remains of gates have not been identified. A form of ditched enclosure called a banjo enclosure had more defined entryways. These were ditched enclosures with a single entrance which incorporated a roadway defined by two ditches of about 3 feet depth leading to that entrance. Cunliffe mentions four banjo enclosures in Hampshire; Bramdean, Micheldever Wood, Owlseybury, and Nettlebank Copse as excavated examples of this form (Figure 5). The Late Iron Age saw the formation of more complex ditched enclosures as well, incorporating a variety of ditch patterns. These more complex form may have involved a community effort and may indicate villages or group meeting places (Cunliffe 2005: 248). These various forms of ditched enclosures continued into the first century CE in some areas of the south.

These enclosed settlements were often densely packed throughout the landscape. A survey in the area of Chalton, Hampshire revealed 11 settlements within a two square mile area. The settlements were connected by trackways and could be closer than a third of a mile from their neighbors (Cunliffe 2005: 252). However, the overall pattern is complex and it is difficult to generalize from a single survey. Often settlements clustered around a larger defensive structure such as a hillfort or were distributed throughout the landscape to take advantage of an important resource such as a waterway but still allowing contact with neighbors (Cunliffe 2005: 252). With these smaller settlements, it is also difficult to make any generalizations based on the size of the
settlement or enclosed area. While a larger settlement size could indicate a greater population, it could also indicate that the residents of the larger enclosures were of higher status. There is some supporting evidence of this latter position in the material evidence found at larger sites, such as the horse and chariot equipment found at Old Down Farm in Hampshire (Cunliffe 2005: 252). While many of these sites share common features with hillforts, which will be discussed later, these smaller settlements all lack the important defensive position that is common to sites characterized as hillforts. These settlements were all placed based on their accessibility to arable land while hillforts were placed to control and be visible from the surrounding area.

Hillforts and Oppida

Larger settlements in southern Britain took the form of either hillforts or oppida, which comes originally from a Latin word meaning enclosed space. Discussion and debate over the meaning of these terms has gone on for many years and has complicated the interpretation of these sites throughout Europe as a whole (Woolf 1993; Cunliffe 2005; Pitts 2010). Following Cunliffe, hillforts must be placed in a defensive position, usually a hilltop or ridge end, and require an enclosure of some sort (Cunliffe 1994; Cunliffe 2005). Cunliffe (1994) also describes other features of the hillforts, focusing on those excavated in Wessex: boundary earthworks were periodically redefined, usually making the fort appear increasingly massive; storage facilities existed either as pits or granary buildings; raw materials including metals and salt were manipulated on site, either worked or traded and distributed; far more material evidence such as tools or weapons at found at hillforts than at other settlement types; and structures, either storage or residential, were maintained over long periods. Furthermore, many hillforts show signs of battles being fought in and around them (Cunliffe 1994: 72).

Finding a workable definition of oppida is a more challenging task. Woolf and Pitts both
take the position that the term is too broad, encompassing many sites that have little in common with each other. Therefore, discussions regarding the functions of oppida are impossible from the start. In order to be a useful analytical category, the sites must have functional commonalities, making many attempts at discussing the significance of oppida circular ones. Oppida are frequently discussed in the context of urbanization in Iron Age Europe, but such discussions presume that oppida function as urban areas. To address these problems, both Woolf and Pitts suggest various limitations to the term, which result in a useful classification. Geographical limitations prove useful in this regard; discussing the oppida of Europe lacks value but discussing the oppida of southern Britain does provide a useful classificatory scheme.

Cunliffe uses a geographical limiter when discussing oppida, focusing largely on the settlements that exist in the south of Britain. He discusses the trend away from occupation of hillforts in the first century BCE toward massive ditched enclosures (Cunliffe 1994: 74). He believes that enclosed oppida are the final stage of hillfort development in south-eastern Britain (Cunliffe 2005: 406). These enclosed oppida are often located on valley side sites controlling major river crossings. According to Cunliffe there is then a continuing evolution toward territorial oppida, which are only partially enclosed by systems of earthworks, and open urban settlements. Cunliffe believes these changes were driven by changing economic systems resulting from more contact with continental Europe (Cunliffe 1994: 78).

While Cunliffe agrees with the majority position in considering oppida as a stage of urban development, Woolf particularly criticizes this position. He proposes two criteria for urbanism which can be spotted in the archaeological record (Woolf 1993: 227). The first is that urbanism is a product of settlement systems rather than particular individual settlements (Woolf 1993: 227). The settlement system must be hierarchically differentiated in that various sites must show
a specialization. Town sites produce certain goods, such as pottery or jewelry, while the
countryside may produce agricultural products for consumption by the town. The distinction
between town and country itself is a product of urbanization as described by Woolf. His second
criterion is that individual urban settlements must exhibit internal differentiation in terms of
different zones for particular activities (Woolf 1993: 227). He cautions that all sites exhibit some
differentiation, but in urban sites it is particularly pronounced with areas for artisans,
monumental architecture, elite residences, temples, markets, and so on. Under these criteria,
oppida cannot be classified as urban areas as they lack both interior differentiation and lack
differentiation within their regional patterns of settlement. However, Woolf recognizes that
certain social changes did occur which resulted in the formation of oppida throughout Europe.
Social changes were occurring that allowed the construction of these larger settlements which
were distinct from the defensive structures seen in hillfort construction.

Pitts also critiques the overly broad definition of oppida. He traces the confusion back to
erly usage of the term, which is Latin for town. While Caesar used it to describe large, defended
settlements he encountered during his conquest of Gaul, it was later used by Roman writers in
describing battles in Britain that clearly occurred at sites that today are more commonly
considered hillforts. The confusion continues with archaeologists from different countries
applying the word to different types of settlements. Pitts describes a useful classificatory scheme
applied to Britain which includes several sub-types:

- enclosed oppida (fully enclosed sites in excess of 24 acres);
- territorial oppida
  (typically larger multi-focal sites composed of expansive tracts of land and
  settlement partially defined by discontinuous lengths of linear earthworks or
dykes);
- undefended oppida (densely settled nucleated centres displaying some
  urban characteristics but lacking defensive arrangements);
- and so-called ‘ports-of-trade’ (coastal sites thought to act as entry points for the importation of
  commodities from the continent). (Pitts 2010: 35).
While acknowledging that this scheme encompasses a broad range of sites, Pitts uses it as a starting point to undertake an analysis of the category of settlements described as oppida based on the material assemblages found within them.

Pitts studies the assemblages of imported pottery and brooches found at 21 different sites classified as oppida, covering the full range of oppida sub-types described above. He found that imported ceramics showed consistency at all the oppida studied, showing a unity of supply and consumption patterns at these sites (Pitts 2010: 54). These imports showed some chronological variability but not much regional variability. Gallo-Belgic wares continued to be common at these oppida even after the 43 CE invasion. At the same time, at sites more associated with Roman presence, Samian wares, a Roman fineware, were more common (Pitts 2010: 54; Pitts and Perring 2006: 201-205). The brooch assemblages showed more regional variation at the various oppida sites, with geographically proximate oppida possessing similar brooch collections, distinct from oppida groupings in different regions (Pitts 2010: 53). These groups may indicate a distinct political or cultural identity in each region. Pitts made comparisons between the Southern Kingdom, considered the home of the Atrebates tribe; the Eastern Kingdom, of the Catuvellauni and Trinovantes; and areas of Roman presence (Pitts 2010: 46). He uses this collection of evidence to conclude that the term ‘oppida’ has more value than some recent commentators would like to admit, showing a uniformity of consumption patterns while showing some variations in regional identities. He links this the emergence and growth in influence of the two major kingdoms he describes, the Eastern and Southern. Pitts also believes that these oppida often appear on the edges of existing political boundaries rather than in locations central to a particular grouping, and theorizes that this may be the result of the
increasing importance of ties to other groups, particularly on the continent (Pitts 2010: 56). These oppida may have served as nodes in an increasingly complex network of exchange.

Ultimately, it seems oppida do represent a form of urbanization and while critics such as Woolf are correct in noting that oppida lacked the differentiation we consider as part of cities today, this particular development has not been seen in all urban spaces, geographically or temporally. So oppida are urban developments but organized in a different way than were the later urban developments of the Romans and subsequent developments in Europe after the fall of the Roman Empire. Establishing geographical boundaries, as does Cunliffe, and formulating a set of categorical types for these oppida, as does Pitt, result in a useful descriptor for certain settlement types common in Britain during the pre-Roman period. While there are differences in the urban strategies seen in oppida as compared with Roman towns, it is more important to acknowledge these differences and study what they meant for the people living in these areas, than it is to debate whether one was an urban area or not. Hillforts, too, may represent an early form of urbanism although with a more defensive motivation. These sites also provide a space for exchange and industry although, as with oppida, there is a lack of internal differentiation within the hillfort. However, both oppida and hillforts represent a way of using the landscape and organizing a group within the landscape that is distinct from the Roman approach to its use and organization. Looking first at Selsey in West Sussex, home of the Atrebates, and then at Maiden Castle and Hod Hill in Dorset, home the Durotriges, allows a comparison between their land uses and the changes brought by the Roman conquest in their lands.

The Atrebates of Selsey Territorial Oppidum

The Selsey Peninsula (Figure 6) near Chichester was the site of one of the territorial oppida, belonging to the Southern Kingdom of the Atrebates. Their ruler, Commius, fled there
from Gaul after he renounced his alliance with Julius Caesar in favor of one with Vercingetorix. Atrebian pottery and coins are both found in the immediate area of Fishbourne as well as throughout the region of south central Britain. Commius’s son, Tincommius, replaced him in about 20 BCE and quickly reversed the anti-Roman policies of his father. Again, numismatic evidence shows this development, as coins became more Roman in style and, according to Cunliffe, were the work of Roman engravers (Cunliffe 1971: 10). Verica became king sometime in the early first century CE and his coins continue to show the Roman influence, copying the coins of Tiberius and even including a vine leaf, a distinctly Roman image (Cunliffe 1971: 10). Additionally, more recent excavations have recovered examples of Roman pottery and amphorae dating from before the invasion (10 BCE-25 CE) indicating trade between the Romans and the Atrebates (Manley and Rudkin 2005: 75). However, Verica encountered difficulties with his expansionist neighbors, the Catuvellauni, and possibly from within his own tribe, and was forced to flee to Rome in 42-43 CE, setting the stage for the Roman invasion.

Archaeological evidence from the area indicating the political relationships between the various tribes and Rome include several defensive structures. In the southern portion of the Atrebian region, a strip of land along the coast stretching from the River Test to the Rover Adur, the excavated forts had all been abandoned before the Roman invasion. The desertion of these forts indicates that the population of this area was allied with Rome. Meanwhile, to the North, East, and West of these lands, the fortifications remained defended, apparently by tribes still hostile to Rome. The Atrebates were surrounded on three sides by their enemies and pottery evidence indicates that these tribes were slowly gaining territory at the Atrebates expense, as several areas where Southern Atrebian pottery has been found have pottery of other tribes found in later layers. Another indication of the political situation in this region in the time shortly prior
to the Roman invasion comes from the Chichester entrenchments. It is possible that the southern Atrebates led by Verica had fallen back into a small area of the coast under pressure from hostile tribes all around them. The Atrebates would have experienced this region as a center of their power from which their leader ruled their lands, even if they were decreasing in size. This land would also have been their point of contact with other groups, particularly those from the continent. It also would have provided important agricultural land for the group and served as a center for trade and distribution.

The territory was defined by the Chichester Entrenchments (Figure 7), a series of linear earthworks which protect the entire peninsula. These earthworks are constructed on a gravel plain at the foot of the South Downs and stretch between Bosham Harbour and the Lavant River. An additional earthwork extends to the east of the Lavant. A final smaller earthwork exists south of Chichester on the peninsula itself. The existing remains of these works run for 17.5 miles and the area enclosed by the entire earthwork system is about 60 square miles, comprising the Selsey Peninsula as well as the area between Bosham Harbour and Fishbourne Channel (Bradley 1971: 17). Several of the earthworks form a rectangular enclosure of about 10 square miles. The undamaged remains of the walls is up to 10 feet high and between 20 and 30 feet wide while the associated ditches average 20 feet across (Bradley 1971: 17). Bradley calculates the amount of labor it required to effect such a large scale change to the landscape. He estimates that approximately 237,500 cubic yards of material were moved with a mass of 340,000 tons and concludes that 1.5 million man hours were needed to construct the earthworks or 410 men working 10 hours a day for an entire year (Bradley 1971: 17).

Bradley believes that the earthworks were built in three phases. The first phase was the northernmost east-west running structures. These early works were built to take advantage of
natural obstacles such as rivers to define protected areas. With the completion of this first phase, the entire 60 square mile Selsey Peninsula comprising the territorial oppidum of the Southern Kingdom was protected. The second and third phases added more earthworks to supplement the natural obstacles (Bradley 1971: 32-34). However, it is also possible to see them as changing the focal point of the earthworks from the Selsey Peninsula north and west to an area north of Fishbourne. This does not necessarily mean the location of the oppidum itself shifted. These new enclosed areas may have simply delineated livestock areas or a particular area of settlement within the oppidum as a whole. These closed of areas could also have provided refuge in times of need much as hillforts had in earlier times.

The earthworks were part of a larger complex of settlement that covered the entire Selsey Peninsula. Cunliffe believes that the nucleus of the settlement was located at the southern tip of the peninsula and has been claimed by rising sea levels but is indicated by occasional coins and other material evidence washing up on the shore of the region (Cunliffe 2005: 172). The harbor near Fishbourne would have been protected by the system of earthworks and may also have been an important location within this large oppidum. The protected peninsula itself is covered in a rich brickearth soil that would have good for use as agricultural land. Meanwhile, the lands to the north where the earthworks were built and where rectangular areas are defined by the earthworks is on gravelly soil more suited to pasturing land than to intensive cultivation.

The earthworks themselves are dated to the late first century BCE or early first century CE, belonging to the period when contact with the continent and Rome had been established, but prior to the 43 CE invasion. However, the area situated at an end of Chichester Inlet (Cunliffe 1971: 2-3) had long been used by local populations. Its wetlands were well suited to hunting and fishing as well as the extraction of salt. Flint axes dating from the fourth or fifth millennium were
found in this area and signs of a temporary settlement were discovered. Remains of salt extraction operations, such as evaporation pans, have been recovered in the area.

The earthworks created a visual representation of the power and unity of the Atrebates in this area. They clearly defined the territory of this group and at the same time helped to define them as a group. Furthermore, the ability to organize and direct the building of such massive earthworks highlighted the power of the ruler of this group and his relationship to his people who was able. It is interesting to note the particular ways in which this was accomplished. The earthworks do not seem particularly massive in a vertical sense, only 10 feet high, possibly 20 feet high from the bottom of the associated ditches. They are entirely constructed of earth. However, the volume of earth that was moved and the horizontal scale involved would have been impressive to other native tribes who would be familiar with the effort involved in such constructions. These defensive structures were also useful in the context of native techniques of warfare at this time which involved mass charges often supported by chariots but no siege warfare or artillery weapons. Whether the Atrebates fortunes were declining or not, they were still able to control a large section of land and organize a large amount of personnel for its defense.

Fishbourne

However, against the Romans, the Atrebates required no defense and instead acted in support of the Romans. This cooperation led to the use of the Atrebates territory as a staging and supply point during the invasion. There were changes in the built landscape throughout this region, most notably the palace at Fishbourne and the town of Chichester, both located on the Selsey peninsula within the area defined by the earthworks built by the Atrebates. The area at Fishbourne where the palace was later sited was employed for military purposes by the Romans
at the time of the invasion and featured three timber buildings as well as two roads (Figure 8). The two roads ran east to west and divided the site into three sections from north to south, crossing a small stream at fords. The roads were laid on an unprepared surface and excavations beneath the surface of these roads showed no signs of previous occupation (Cunliffe 1971: 38). The middle section between the two roads, which is 110 feet wide, contained Building One to the east side of the small stream. Based on the remains of trenches to hold vertical posts and roof tile fragments, this building is thought to be a timber, military granaries, the vertical posts raising the floor to prevent dampness and intrusion by rodents. The complete building was about 100 feet long by 24 feet wide. Building Two was located just north of the northern road and was similar in design to Building One, likely serving the same function based on rows of post holes that form its remains. The building directly abuts the northern road which could have allowed for easy loading and unloading of carts. A third building is also known from this time period in the area south of the southern road but it has not been well excavated and little is known of it (Cunliffe 1971: 39-43).

While these buildings cannot be exactly dated, they both covered sites which had not been occupied and the layers associated with them contained pottery remains common in the late 30s to early 40s CE and coins from the reign of Claudius. Further, other items related to the Roman military were found in these layers as well, such as belt and strap buckles and strap hinges. This evidence supports use as a military supply point dating from the early invasion period. So the first use of this area by the Romans appears to have been a supply and distribution point. However, as this area was populated by tribes who largely supported and worked with the Romans, the military moved on from this area by the late 40s as the fighting moved north and
west. At this time, the site was returned to use of local tribes who as supporters of Rome would not interfere with the movement of supplies through the area. The Roman use of this territory was transitory but it did seem to result in a displacement of the power center of the Atrebates to this location about a mile to the south of their impressive earthworks. The arrival of the Romans, who were practiced at the art of siege warfare and artillery, rendered the defensive capabilities of the earthworks somewhat irrelevant. They also became less relevant to projecting power. New organizations and structures for asserting identity and power needed to be found.

An elite member of the Atrebates tribe appears to have taken over the location after Roman military use ended, with control of travel and supply routes becoming more important than the defensive power of the earthworks in defining power. The generally accepted theory is that Tiberius Claudius Togidubnus, a local client king and Roman citizen, took control of the site. Togidubnus seems to have succeeded Verica, the king of the Atrebates whose flight was a triggering event leading to the Roman invasion of Britain. However, sources attesting to his life and accomplishments are rare. His name appears on one inscription, dated to the first century, uncovered in Chichester in 1723 related to the construction of a temple to Minerva and Neptune. In this inscription he is referred to as “great king of the Britons.” He also appears in the book Agricola by Tacitus which states that estates were given to him in return for his loyalty to the Romans.

Beyond these traces of evidence, there is a great deal of speculation. His name indicates that he was given Roman citizenship, likely by the Emperor Claudius. Claudius’ allowed the admittance of Gallic senators, showing he believed in the importance of including provincials into the government hierarchy of Rome (Cunliffe 1999: 109). Evidence from other regions
indicate that Claudius often sought to preserve the lineal continuity of client kingdoms, even replacing rebelling kings with more loyal family members as opposed to overturning the line, giving support to the belief that Togidubnus was heir to Verica (Barrett 1979: 229). Cunliffe also theorizes that the presence of two well known lawyers from Rome in Britain in the early 80s may be linked to the death of Togidubnus, meaning he may have lived to see the completion of the later Fishbourne Palace (Cunliffe 1999: 109). Besides Togidubnus, there is evidence of other British elite living at the site. A gold ring was recovered with the name Tiberius Claudius Cataurus engraved in it, possibly a member of Togidubnus’ family.

At Fishbourne, new timber buildings were constructed and the road system was reorganized (Figure 9). The southern road was discontinued while the northern road continued in use and was resurfaced during the period. Additionally, a 10 foot wide bridge was constructed over the stream, likely intended for foot traffic only. The northern ford continued in use, for carts and livestock. Like the granaries, the bridge was indicated by signs of timber piles driven into the ground across and near the stream in the area of the northern road (Cunliffe 1971: 46).

Building One was demolished to make way for two new timber structures, Buildings Four and Five, which formed a residential compound. Building Four contained many of the service areas and Building Five contained the residential portion of the compound. Both buildings were located to the east of the small stream, set back slightly farther than Building One had been. Building Five was 18 feet wide by 60 feet long with a veranda along the east side and contained seven rooms whose remains consist of clay and mortar floors and the remains of some painted wall plaster (Cunliffe 1999: 36). Building Four was just to the north of Building Five and separated only by a narrow passageway, indicating they formed a single unit with different
functions in each building. Building Four had a row of rooms of the same width with two rooms forming a T shape at the northern end of the building. There was a working area to the east of this building containing an oven and fuel pit. A lump of bronze found near the oven indicates this may have been an area where metalworking occurred (Cunliffe 1999: 36). The remains of Building Four consist of clay and mortar floors and some rotted timbers forming sill beams which were laid over the piles of the old granary which had been cut down to ground level. These new structures would not have seemed out of scale to the residents of the area as a residents for an elite of their society. The structures were of timber which was not an unknown building material to the native people. Furthermore, these timber structures were not separated from the surrounding landscape and the people within it. No defensive structures or high walls surrounded the new compound. During the stage it would seem that the leader of the Atrebates was no more removed than he had been before the invasion.

This next phase involved the construction of what is referred to as the proto-palace, in the early 60s (Figure 10). The stream which had run to the west of the timber buildings was diverted from its previous course into a new bed about 100 feet to the east which remains its current course today. The old stream bed was filled with clay and rubble from previous construction. The southern road was reconstructed and a north south road that had run to the east of the timber buildings was resurfaced.

The proto-palace itself was located to the south of the southern road. It was a masonry building constructed of several stone types, both imported and domestic. The predominant stone was Purbeck marble from Dorset. Also found were chalk, again possibly from Dorset, grey silt stone from the Weald, and red silt stone from the Mediterranean. The building was 190 feet by
150 feet and was divided into a colonnaded courtyard, baths, and two groups of rooms used for residential purposes. Ground level stylobates have been found in the garden indicating that the courtyard was colonnaded. When excavating the main palace, remains of Corinthian capitals were found which were likely from the proto-palace and possibly from the colonnaded garden. Recovered remains of wall plaster show that the walls of the proto-palace were divided into rectangular panels, some painted in colors, others with floral designs. Some walls were divided by fluted pilasters made of stucco. The workmanship of the Corinthian capitals, the wall painting, and the pilasters had not yet been seen in Roman Britain and indicates the presence of foreign craftsmen to complete this work (Cunliffe 1999: 44).

The proto-palace represented a significant advance in construction at the site, with many details of the building among the earliest examples of particular Roman building techniques used in Britain. However, there were other masonry buildings of similar scale constructed in Britain at this time. The nearby villa at Angmering shows similar styles and skills employed in its construction. So there were clearly more members of the elite society ready to invest in these luxurious Roman style villas, perhaps due to an awareness that the Romans were established in the country (Cunliffe 1999: 46). But these new villas do represent a significant break with the past. Foreign craftsmen were brought in and even many of the building materials were foreign. The interior courtyards, essentially outdoor spaces, walled off for the recreational use of the elite residents also represents a change in practice.

The next phase of construction at Fishbourne reached a scale that was not seen anywhere else in Roman Britain during any period, with even the largest of other known villas able to fit within its courtyard garden (Cunliffe 1999: 105). Construction of this phase began between 75
and 80 CE. Important evidence for dating the start of construction comes from numismatic and pottery evidence found just beneath the floors. Coins were found from the early part of Vespasian’s reign, although none dated from after 73 CE. These coins were relatively unworn suggesting that while construction could not have begun before 73, it was started shortly thereafter. Additionally, pottery found came from the same factory as pots found in Pompeii buried in 79 CE. These pots help to support a construction date beginning in the mid to late 70s. This phase required many changes to the layout and landscape of the earlier site but also included elements from these early phases. The proto-palace was incorporated into the East Wing, forming the southeast corner of the new palace. Additionally the entire structure was aligned to situate the main entrance along the northern road. This road, likely from Chichester, would lead directly to the palace and, once inside the palace, directly to the audience chamber. The topography of the site required large scale changes. The eastern end of the site was about 10 feet lower than the western end so extensive leveling was needed. Topsoil was removed and reserved for later use in gardens and 36,000 cubic yards of subsoil were moved from the western portion of the site to the eastern portion. The west wing of the palace was left five feet higher than the other three wings. However, the builders began construction on the eastern section of the palace before the fill was put in place, enabling the walls to reach a level of earth capable of bearing the loads of the palace without as much excavation (Cunliffe 1971: 78). Because the proto-palace was incorporated into the Flavian structure, it too had to be raised to the proper level, by covering the existing floors with fill and building new floors at the higher level.

The palace itself was divided into four wings, each named today for one of the cardinal directions, surrounding a central, colonnaded garden (Figure 11). The West Wing was the public
section of the building, containing the audience chamber and administrative spaces. The North Wing contained suites that were likely used for visiting elites. The East Wing contained more visitor quarters for those of lesser status, in addition to an impressive entryway. The South Wing was likely used as the private residence of the owner of the palace, but as it lies mostly under the current main road and houses on the south side of that road, it has not been well excavated. It is assumed to be the private residence because of its position near the bath suite and the fact that it overlooks a private garden to the south.

The East Wing was almost 500 feet long and was the face that would greet visitors as they approached the palace on the road from Chichester, with an impressive entry hall that was 80 feet wide by 105 feet long (Figure 12). Each end had a pedimented façade with six columns 26 feet in height. Once inside the entrance hall, there was a large central area with small chambers to each side. These side chambers encouraged visitors to move forward, as the interiors could only be viewed from certain perspectives, a technique popular with Roman architects of the time (Cunliffe 1999: 82). While the entryway was likely not decorated in great detail, the scale and layout of the hall provided the appropriate feeling of awe upon entering the palace, far more impressive than anything else existing in Britain at this time. Two colonnaded courtyards were in the northern portion of the wing. Forming the corner between the East and North Wings was the Aisled Hall. It would have had a pedimented face to match the pediment over the entryway. This section of the building was open to the public but closed off from the rest of the palace so its function is unclear, although it is similar to the assembly hall found in Domitian’s palace (Cunliffe 1999: 84). After passing through the East Wing entrance, one would have been greeted by the interior face of the West Wing (Figure 13). The West Wing was part of the impressive
public face of the palace and measured 48 feet wide by 316 feet long. Entering by the main entrance through the East Wing, one would have first seen the façade of the West Wing, with the pedimented entrance to the audience chamber directly across the large central garden. The pediment had four columns of about 20 feet. After walking across the garden a short flight of steps would have taken visitors up the five feet of difference between the garden and the West Wing. The audience chamber was 31 feet by 35 feet with an apsidal recess 20 feet in diameter.

The central garden was also a distinctly Roman construction that would have appeared both impressive and unusual to those entering the palace. It was surrounded by colonnaded walkways with roofs sloping inward to channel rainwater to the gardens (Cunliffe 1999: 91-93). While bedding trenches have been found lining the central path and perimeter pathways, it seems that much of the area may have been maintained as short grass so as not to interfere with the views of the structure itself (Cunliffe 1999: 98). A lone tree may have been planted on either side of the central path to break up the horizontal views of the north and south wing. The plants themselves were brought by the invaders as much of the shrubbery was likely boxwood, introduced to Britain by the Romans (Cunliffe 1999: 99; van der Veen 2008: 13).

Like the earthworks that preceded it, the Fishbourne Palace served as a visually representation in the landscape for the power of the Atrebates and their king. However, the scale and construction were drastically different. In terms of its horizontal scale, the palace would have been large, covering around 4 acres, not including the surrounding grounds, though this size was within the existing footprint of many existing native settlements described earlier. However, the horizontal focus had changed drastically. The earthworks had defined a territory within which the Atrebates lived, their king among them. Although their king would have had a significantly
nicer dwelling than his subjects, the palace at Fishbourne took this difference to a new level in Britain. While previously they had not enjoyed equality, this difference created a separation between the ruler and his subjects that does not seem to have existed before. The feature in the northeast corner of the building, resembling as assembly hall, may have been where the subjects went to hear their king. While part of the building, it was still exterior to the building. The vertical scale also changed drastically. The earthworks rose only about 10 feet from the surrounding lands but the entryway to the palace was approximately 40 feet high. Even the standard sections of the palace likely rose about 20 from the ground level to the top of the roof line.

For the farming people of the area, while their day to day routines may have changed little, their position with respect to their rulers seems to have changed. While leaders in Britain had taken the title of king and even produced coins attesting to their kingship, their position relative to their subjects was not quite so distant. As is seen to the west in the hillforts at Maiden Castle and Hod Hill, their leaders lived within those hillforts among many of their subjects. This was likely the case on the Selsey peninsula as well. But with the construction of the Fishbourne Palace, the ruler of the Atrebates was distant from his people in a new way. Massive walls separated him from them, where before the massive walls had separated the Atrebates as a people from outsiders. Additionally, the process of construction would have created a separation as well. The earthworks were constructed by the Atrebates acting as a unit over time. Their massiveness and the cooperation it took to complete the process contributed to a feeling of group identity. However, the construction of the palace required a great deal of foreign craftsmen and material. Neither the people of the area nor the resources of the area were sufficient to complete
the Fishbourne Palace. It is interesting to note that while the northern part of the Atrebatic territory retained their name when it became a civitas, the area along the south coast surrounding the Fishbourne and Chichester area become known as Regni, defining the people living there as the people of the king.

**Chichester**

This palace at Fishbourne represented a transitional phase in the exercise of power in the region. Within a generation, the power center was shifted to the civitas capital at Chichester. Like the palace at Fishbourne, the town of Chichester, then known as Noviomagus Regnorum, started as a military installation and the earliest structures found at the site are timber structures. The area was occupied by Romans at the time of the invasion in 43 CE with the supply depot at Fishbourne likely providing this nearby military base. However, the exact layout of whatever military complex existed on this site cannot be determined from the available evidence (Wacher 1995: 261). Along with the remains of the timber structure, military equipment was found indicating the presence of a legion. Several ditches thought to make up military fortifications have been excavated although the exact time period has not been established (Wacher 1995: 262). Five different phases of timber building construction have been found in Chichester. The first three are thought to date to the military occupation of the site. There is then a gap in time when the site appears to be largely unoccupied and used for industrial purposes before building resumes toward the construction of a town rather than a military installation. Evidence of pottery manufacture has been found at the site dating to this interim period (Wacher 1995: 262).

The street grid and the major public buildings in Chichester were likely not constructed before the period 75-85 CE, meaning that Togidubnus may have died and the power center of the
region was shifting from his palace to the town itself (Wacher 1995: 259). It is possible that some construction at Fishbourne and at Chichester occurred at the same time. The Romans would have been anticipating the death of Togidubnus and the need to transfer his territory to direct Roman administration. With his death, the area would no longer have been a client kingdom but rather transitioning to a *civitas*. As mentioned earlier, the two famous Roman lawyers present in the area in the early 80s may have been intended to smooth the transition of Chichester and its surrounding region from client kingdom to *civitas*.

A large gravel area found near the center of the city seems to indicate some sort of leveling project associated with the demolition of earlier structures and the creation of a forum in the city center (Wacher 1995: 262). This project may indicate a need to development a Roman town planning and Roman architecture as Chichester became the *civitas* capital. But the dates are unclear on the timing of this project. The military buildings were demolished as well as some of the original native huts. There is some evidence of pottery and roofing tile that the leveling project continued in some parts of the town until the second century (Down 1988: 28-29). The project may have been carried out in stages as funds became available, slowly giving the town a more Roman character over time. Some construction of monumental architecture must have occurred prior to the death of Togidubnus and the subsequent landscaping work. A plaque of dedication to the Emperor Nero has been found dating between 58 and 60 CE. Additionally the plaque dedicating the Temple of Jupiter and Minerva references Togidubnus and is likely from during his lifetime.

No buildings within Chichester have ever been completely excavated but finds during construction and commercial excavations give some idea of types of structures and the general
layout of the city (Figure 14). Two main streets were laid out running north-south and east-west. However, the placement of the forum on top of a portion of the newly gravel leveled ground, just north of the east-west running road blocked the north-south road which continued to the north of the forum. A basilica, the center of Roman administration in the town, would have been located on one side of the forum (Down 1998: 31). A public bath structure, measuring 214 feet by 263 feet, was found during a construction project to the west of the forum location (Wacher 1995: 264). This structure had mosaics similar to those at Fishbourne Palace. It also incorporated imported marble and the details of the masonry work resemble that at Fishbourne. Workers from the palace may have worked contemporaneously in the town or may have moved from the construction of the palace to begin work on the Roman town (Down 1988: 20). Architectural fragments recovered during a commercial excavation indicate a possible theater, although the evidence for the building type is limited (Wacher 1995: 264). An amphitheatre has also been found outside of the city proper, to the east. The arena floor was 185 feet by 150 feet and was a gravel surface set four feet below ground level. It is believed to have been constructed between 70 and 90 CE (Wacher 1995: 265).

The town's water was supplied by wells due to the high water table in the surrounding area, which could be only 10 to 15 feet below the surface. Even the baths were fed by an enormous cistern which had been dug into the gravel beneath the site. A large tank sat atop this cistern and water was pumped from the gravel up into this tank. Remains of the tank itself as well as the water proof mortar which lined it have been found (Down 1988: 43). The town was equipped with sewers for water drainage, with a central sewer line running just to the west of the bathhouse (Down 1998: 45).
The fortifications of Chichester, like those of many Roman towns in Britain, are difficult to date. As Wacher points out, once defensive structures were begun, work on them was almost continuous throughout their life (Wacher 1995: 75). Walls were constantly being repaired or updated or added to and therefore establishing a firm date for first construction is often difficult. There are the ditches which may have been constructed by the Romans during the early phase of their occupation of the area. However, they may also have been part of the fortifications of the original oppidum which were co-opted for use by the Romans. Some form of earthwork defenses may have remained in use around the Roman town. However, most masonry fortifications around towns in Roman Britain were constructed in the mid third century, so it seems likely that this is when the town walls were constructed at Chichester (Wacher 1995: 266).

**Hillforts of the Durotriges Territory**

To the west of the Atrebates, in what is now Somerset and Dorset, lived the Durotriges, who unlike their eastern neighbors, had a hostile relationship with the Romans. The enmity between the Romans and the Durotriges may have dated back to the first century BCE when tribes in Britain, including the Durotriges, supported the revolt of tribes in the Armorica region of Gaul against the Romans. This support appears to have led to Julius Caesar’s invasions of Britain, shortly after the revolt was put down. While some tribes, including the Atrebates, subsequently made their peace with Rome, it appears the Durotriges remained hostile. The Durotriges were also distinguished from the Atrebates by their continued use of hillforts. Two important hillforts that acted as centers for the Durotriges population were those at Maiden Castle and Hod Hill.

**Maiden Castle**
In the 1930s Mortimer Wheeler excavated Maiden Castle (Figures 15-16) and his work continues to form the basis for current understandings of the site, although archaeologists today have drawn differing conclusions based on the evidence Wheeler uncovered. Wheeler’s report of the excavations published in 1943, first considers previous explorations of the area and the etymology of its name. It then moves on to a description of the site and its surroundings. He begins this section with a description of the hill from Thomas Hardy:

At one’s every step forward it rises higher against the south sky, with an obtrusive personality that compels the senses to regard it and consider. The eyes may bend in another direction, but never without the consciousness of its heavy, high-shouldered presence at its point of vantage. Across the intervening levels the gale races in a straight line from the fort, as if breathed out of it hitherward. With the shifting of the clouds the faces of the steeps vary in colour and in shade, broad lights appearing where mist and vagueness had prevailed, dissolving in their turn into melancholy grey, which spreads over and eclipses the luminous bluffs. In this so-thought immutable spectacle all is change. (Hardy 2013: 86)

Hardy’s description captures both the solid and dominating nature of the hill and, while he was referring to changes he was viewing as he gazed upon the site, he captures some of its changing nature through time. Wheeler describes the hill as a saddleback hill, although this shape is difficult to see in current profile shots (Wheeler 1943: 14). The eastern end of the hill was lower (434 above OD - mean sea level at Newlyn in Cornwall) but with steeper approaches and was occupied earlier than the western end (444 above OD) of the hill. While the hill stands out in its surroundings, Wheeler believes that its defensibility was primarily derived from the constructions upon it rather than the imposing nature of the hill itself (Wheeler 1943: 14). The hill itself affords long views to the north and east, with Wheeler claiming 40 mile visibility in these directions under proper conditions (Wheeler 1943: 14). To the west, views were constrained by Hog Hill, about a mile away in that direction, while a mile to the south, a chalk
ridge blocked views in that direction (Wheeler 1943: 14). From the vantage point of the hillfort, its occupants could command views of the farmland surrounding it. However, it was distant from and without clear view of travel routes that passed both north and south of the fort along ridges (Wheeler 1943: 15; Figure 17). Wheeler believes the site was relatively self sufficient, relying primarily on its associated farmlands, with less interest in distant commerce (Wheeler 1943: 15).

Within the larger region in which Maiden Castle is located, bounded roughly by the Thames, Avon, and Exe Rivers and the English Channel, more than 70 hillforts have been found, indicating they were an important part of the culture of the people living within this area.

Maiden Castle itself had been an important site for the people living in this area for millennia. Wheeler found a system of two ditches around the site which he believed were from around 2000 BCE which were connected with a Neolithic group living at the site (Wheeler 1943: 18). However, these ditches are now thought to date to around 6000 years ago (Sharples 1991: 34). Much of the evidence of occupation from these early dates was destroyed by later phases of occupation. However, a barrow existed on the site dating back to around 3500 BCE. The barrow was avoided during subsequent occupation of the site and therefore the initial surface of the hill is preserved beneath it. Some pits, a possible hearth, and post holes were found in this area. While little evidence was recovered from this era, the ditches themselves provides some information about the people who occupied the site during this early phase. The ditch was built in segments rather than as one continuous ditch. Partitions between these segments were then knocked down at the end of construction resulting in a single continuous ditch. This form of construction makes more sense if one assumes a large amount of laborers working for a short amount of time. With many people, groups can each be assigned to their own section and then the sections are connected at the end. In contrast, with a small amount of people it makes more
sense to have them work together over a longer period of time slowly and linearly expanded the ditch. It seems likely then, that the labor was drawn from a large area surrounding the site during a limited portion of the year to complete the work (Sharples 1991: 39). Much like the earthworks at Chichester, the act of creating the structure unified the surrounding population and then could be seen as a focal point for this group.

The site was largely unoccupied during the Bronze Age, but in the early Iron Age, around 600 BCE, it was occupied again in a significant manner, with the building of the hillfort itself. The first hillfort covered 16 acres. Wheeler identified the fortifications as being ramparts of earth and chalk approximately 12 feet wide and 10 to 12 feet wide (Wheeler 1943: 32; Figure 18). Around the exterior of the wall was a platform 6 to 10 feet wide which separated the rampart from a large ditch 50 feet wide and 20 feet deep (Wheeler 1943: 32). There were two entrances to the hillfort. One on the western side was a single entrance. On the eastern side of the fort was a more complex double entrance which does not exist at any other site in Britain (Sharples 1991: 72). Wheeler stated that the wall was fronted and back by a timber retaining wall (Wheeler 1943: 32). However, more recent excavations have shown that this timber facing only existed around the eastern entrance, which would have made this already unique entryway appear more imposing (Sharples 1991: 74). The remainder of the rampart was faced by turf. At some point in the early Iron Age, the eastern entrance was expanded. A rampart was built out from the wall between the two entrances and ramparts with fronting ditches were added to either side of this entrances (Figure 19). These additions slightly improved the defensive capabilities of the entrance but their primary purpose seemed the creation of an impressive appearance.

Around 450 BCE, the hillfort was expanded to 47 acres from the original 16 acres by enclosing additionally area to the west of the original hillfort. The expanded area was enclosed
by an earthen rampart fronted by a ditch similar to that which surrounded the original hillfort. Shortly after the expansion, the inhabitants began an expansion of the defenses. They increased the height of the original rampart and added ramparts. On the south side, there were a total of 4 ramparts separated by 3 ditches while to the north, with its steeper face, there were three ramparts separated by 2 ditches (Sharples 1991: 86). After these ramparts were added, the original rampart was again increased in height to 18 feet, requiring internal stone revetments to hold the rubble walls in place. The revetments were then covered in soil to preserve the appearance that they had previously (Sharples 1991: 86). Some of the other hillforts in the region were expanded at the same time that Maiden Castle was. However, many more hillforts and settlements were abandoned in this period, indicating that perhaps occupants of multiple settlements were choosing to group together within a single larger settlement (Sharples 1991: 84).

Within the expanded earthworks were found the remains of a variety of structures. In the earliest phase of occupation in this expanded hillfort, there were several square structures defined by the presence of 4 post holes. These structures have been variously identified as watch towers, granaries, or exposure towers for the deceased with granaries seeming to be the most likely explanation. Little other evidence aside from several pits and gullies date from this phase (Sharples 1991: 90). In the next phase evidence of residential occupation exists with an area containing three houses being uncovered. These houses were round and likely wattle walled structures. The area around the houses was cobbled and possibly partitioned by a system of fences (Sharples 1991: 90). After this phase, it appears the site was abandoned again for several decades. The next phase of occupation included several houses with one being constructed of stone. These houses were aligned in orderly rows on a street system unlike the previous phase.
which seemed to be organized by the clustering of family groups. The final phase indicates a breakdown of this structured settlement. Settlement was concentrated in the south west corner of the fort. While only a single house can be firmly identified from this period, the quantity of finds indicates considerable activity occurring in this phase (Sharples 1991: 97). During these later phases the eastern entrance was modified several times with the addition of numerous banks and ditches. Initially, the approach remained clear with the two entryways clearly defined. However, the final phase involved the creation of a system of banks and ditches to block easy access to the entrance (Figure 19).

In the late Iron Age from around 50 BCE until the Roman invasion, the orderly settlement and road system further deteriorated. The settlement in the south west portion of the fort was abandoned. A house was constructed at the center of the hilltop, directly on top of a road that had traversed the hilltop in earlier phases (Sharples 1991: 116). Around this house a large quantity of late Iron Age ceramics was found. Additionally, settlement concentrated around the eastern entrance with much construction outside this entrance. Several of the ditches were filled in and 5 huts were built in the flattened areas between existing banks as well as storage pits and facilities for iron working (Wheeler 1943: 118-120). A cemetery was uncovered with at least 52 burials, some of which showed signs of violent death including one with a Roman spearhead in his backbone (Sharples 1991: 119-120). During this era, smaller settlements and individual farmsteads again become more common in this region, although not to the degree they did to the east, where hillforts were entirely abandoned during this time. But much like with the Chichester entrenchments, the scale and continuity of efforts to build and maintain the hillfort would have created a sense of unity among the people who lived in the area and provided a focal point in the landscape for their identity.
Hod Hill

Hod Hill, about 20 miles to the northeast of Maiden Castle, was excavated by Sir Ian Richmond in the 1950s and, at the time, represented the only example of Roman reuse of a hillfort in Britain (Figures 20-21). The initial construction of the hillfort dates to the same early Iron Age period as does Maiden Castle. While there is not as much evidence of earlier occupation as exists at Maiden Castle, a round barrow exists on top of the hill, similar to the long barrow located in Maiden Castle. The hill itself rises 471 feet dominating the surrounding landscape in a manner similar to Maiden Castle. Like at Maiden Castle, the location does not seem to provide any degree of control of an important route or junction, but rather provides a commanding view over the surrounding agricultural lands. From the outset of construction at Hod Hill, the entire hilltop was developed and protected, covering 55 acres compared with Maiden Castle’s original 16 acres and subsequent expansion to 47 acres.

In terms of defensive structures, the phases of construction at Hod Hill were similar to those at Maiden Castle. However, at Hod Hill some of the later developments seem to be made in direct response to the invasion of Britain by the Romans. In the earliest phase, a timber framed rampart was built surrounding the hilltop. This rampart rose directly next to the exterior ditch which provided the material for it. The timber revetments were placed at both the front and back. The timber facing extended all the way around the ramparts, its completeness demonstrated by a continuous foundation trench into which the upright posts of the timber revetment were placed. The original rampart varied from 11 to 16 feet in width and is estimated to have been about 10 feet high (Richmond 1968: 10). Except in the area of entrances, the surrounding ditch in this early phase was subsumed into the later, larger ditches. But its size can be estimated, based on the amount of material that went into the construction of the original rampart, to be about 20 feet
wide and 10 feet deep, making the height from the bottom of the ditch to the top of the rampart approximately 20 feet (Richmond 1968: 10). From the initial construction of the fort until the Roman conquest, the fort was accessed by two gates, one in the northeast corner, called the Steepleton Gate, and the other, named the South-West Gate for its position. In the early phase, their existence can only be inferred by the size of the surrounding ditch in their vicinity. In the area of the Steepleton Gate, the original ditch was on 7.5 feet deep and 15 feet wide which would not provide enough material for a continuous rampart in this area (Richmond 1968: 14). It seems that later in this first phase, the front face of the entire rampart was shaved off to form a 34 degree angle (Richmond 1968: 10). This would have left little to no flat surface along the top of the rampart on which to walk or defend against attack.

During the second phase, the rampart was greatly increased in size. Some of the material came from the removal of the front of the rampart toward the end of the previous phase while the remainder came from quarry pits just inside the rampart. The resulting glacis rampart was 35 feet wide and 11 feet high (Richmond 1968: 11). Along the top of this enlarged rampart was a walkway approximately 10 feet wide and there is some indication that a flint block parapet provided the walkway with some protection (Richmond 1968: 11). Additionally, it appears a palisade fence was built exterior to the existing ditch (Richmond 1968: 12). Later in the second phase, the ditch was enlarged, resulting in the destruction of the palisade. The material from the ditch enlargement was used to create a mound exterior to the ditch. This enlarged ditch was 30 feet deep measured from its bottom to the top of the rampart and 47 feet wide measured from the top of the rampart to the top of the new exterior mound (Richmond 1968: 12). The gate openings are more obvious from this phase and include post pits which would have carried the frame for the gates (Richmond 1968: 15).
The final phase before the Roman conquest includes some improvements to the existing defenses as well as some indications of interrupted work, where defensive improvements were begun but not completed. A flint paved walk was added to the rampart increasing its width by 10 feet and its height by 3 feet. An additional ditch was being dug outside the existing counterscarp mound and another counterscarp mound was being constructed outside of this new ditch. These works were almost complete on the north, east, and south sides (Richmond 1968: 31) Work is seen in the areas of the gates to improve their defensive capabilities. At the Steepleton Gate a low rampart was constructed about 24 wide and slightly less than 5 feet high (Richmond 1968: 13). This rampart connected to the main rampart to the north of the gate and then curved for 220 feet to the south, preventing straight on access to the Steepleton Gate (Figure 20). At the end of this rampart is a ditch which appears to have been abandoned before it was completed (Richmond 1968: 17). At the South-West Gate, similar attempts at shoring up the defenses are seen but in a more incomplete state (Richmond 1968: 19). Subsequent phases show mainly destruction of existing structures consistent with Roman attempts to reduce the defensive capabilities of the hillfort as seen at Maiden Castle. The flint block paving stones of the improved rampart are either pushed down into the ditch or taken for reuse in projects such as roadways undertaken by the Romans.

A final point to note with respect to the constructions at Hod Hill is that these more complex structures were present in the north, east, and south faces of the fort. To the west, the steep face of the slope obviated the need for these stouter defenses. In the earliest phase, the timber revetment did not extend to this side. A glacis rampart was built during the second phase comparable in size to that existing elsewhere in this phase (Richmond 1968: 11). It appears that the rampart in this area was never improved on the scale that the other faces were due to the
limitations imposed by the terrain as well as the defensive strength inherent in that terrain.

**Roman Occupation of the Hillforts**

At Maiden Castle, the Romans encountered the relatively disorganized late phase settlement during their invasion in 43 CE. The Romans gained quick victories in the southeast and then used this region as a base from which to begin further campaigns, as described earlier in their use of the Selsey peninsula. It is from the region around Chichester and Fishbourne that Vespasian may have begun his campaigns in the southwest as legate of the *legio II Augusta*. Suetonius credits him with the defeat of two tribes, including the Durotriges, after fighting 30 battles, among them the conquest of what Suetonius describes as 20 oppida. It is likely that these oppida mentioned by Suetonius were actually hillforts, considering the settlement types prevalent in the areas Vespasian was fighting. One of these hillforts may have been at Maiden Castle.

Mortimer Wheeler provides an account of the action at Maiden Castle that is vivid but highly questioned by scholars today. He envisions an assault upon the eastern entrance to the fort with ballista bolts raining down on the defenders followed by an infantry assault. The huts in the area of the eastern entrance were burned and “men and women, young and old, were savagely cut down” (Wheeler 1943: 62). The legionaries, after defeating the defenders proceeded to tear down the gates and the high stone walls which flanked the gates. He bases this on arrow heads which he believes were common to Roman artillery as well as ash that covered the area. More oddly, Wheeler believes that after this pitched battle, the remaining occupants were allowed to bury their dead and then continue their occupation of a now somewhat reduced site.

While Wheeler’s explanation is exciting, it seems somewhat unlikely. While there was certainly a great deal of violence involved in the occupation and violence in the area of Maiden Castle, it may not have reached the scale described by Wheeler. More likely is a limited
engagement followed by a swift surrender from the Britons as is seen at Hod Hill. Faced with overwhelming force and unfamiliar tactics, the natives simply capitulated. The Romans then slighted the defenses and formatted the structure for their own use. It seems unlikely that the Romans would allow a recently hostile tribe to retain possession of such a defensible position. Rather the Romans, upon defeating the Durotriges either at Maiden Castle or somewhere in the vicinity, cleaned up the eastern entrance to be more usable for their army and took possession of the location themselves (Todd 1984: 254-255). In the southwest of Britain, evidence is growing that this was a somewhat common practice, occurring also at Hembury, Ham Hill, and Hod Hill (Todd 2007).

Finds within Maiden Castle support Roman use for several decades after the invasion. A rectangular building similar to Roman buildings found in other occupied hillforts was excavated although not extensively (Sharples1991: 126). Finds of samian tableware as well as pins and brooches are most suggestive of Roman presence at the site. In their article *The Making of Britain’s First Urban Landscapes*, Martin Pitts and Dominic Perring analyze finds of these types of objects and determine which assemblages correspond most closely with Roman military sites, Roman towns, and site more associated with native inhabitation. Samian wares, such as those found at Maiden Castle, were found to correlate with Roman sites such as *colonia* while sites of greater native inhabitation were found to have a larger percentage of gallo-belgic wares (Pitts and Perring 2006: 203).

While it seems likely that the Romans reused Maiden Castle for several years following the invasion, this reuse is more obvious at the Hod Hill site. At Hod Hill at the time of the Roman assault, it appears the residents were working to improve their defensive structures but were interrupted by the attack. Given the capabilities of the Roman army it seems unlikely the
outcomes would have been much different even were they completed. But as at Maiden Castle, while there is evidence for a battle, it appears similarly limited in scale. It is largely restricted to ballista bolts. The finds of ballista bolts were largely concentrated around one particular hut as though the Romans had found their target and focused upon it until the desired result was achieved (Figure 22). Richmond theorizes that their fire was concentrated on the chieftains hut and in the face of this assault the occupants surrendered (Richmond 1968: 33). This conclusion is supported by the fact that there is little evidence of destruction in the course of battle elsewhere in the hillfort. Much of the later destruction appeared to be more systematic demolition, with residential huts knocked down and flint block rampart structures being disassembled for reuse or simply tossed into the surrounding ditch. The residents of these hillforts were not prepared to face the systematic siege warfare, complete with artillery assaults, that the Romans were capable of waging. After the defeat of the occupants, they were removed from the hillfort, as they likely were at Maiden Castle as well. Considering these inhabitants had been farming the surrounding lands, an activity that the Romans were unlikely to want to disrupt extensively, they probably dispersed to individual farmsteads in the surrounding area.

While at Maiden Castle, the indications of Roman reuse are more circumstantial, at Hod Hill, they are readily apparent even to a casual observer. Aerial photographs clearly show the remains of a Roman fort in the northwest corner of the hillfort (Figure 21). While the evidence for their reuse of Hod Hill are clear, the reasons for their doing so are less so. The original hillfort was designed with an eye to the style of warfare generally practiced by the native Britons, which generally depended on rushing charges, perhaps accompanied by chariots. Defenses which could slow down these charges and prevent the use of chariots were valued. The native style of warfare did not include protracted sieges or artillery. Additionally, hillforts such
as Hod Hill and Maiden Castle were located primarily to provide a centralized administrative and
defensive location for people in surrounding agricultural lands rather than controlling travel and
trade routes. For these reasons, the fort inserted by the Romans into the interior of the Hod Hill
site seems to be a square peg in a round hole.

The Romans chose the northwest corner of the hillfort to place their own fort. This corner
contained the highest point on the hilltop allowing for the best views in all directions. They
retained the west and north ramparts with little change in their structure, building their own
defensive structures to define the south and east sides of their fort. The fort measured 753 feet
along the north-south axis and 587 feet along the east-west axis for a total of about 10 acres,
although only 6.86 acres of that was usable due to the quarrying pits left in the area from
previous rampart expansions (Richmond 1968: 66). Gates were built in the walls on the south
side and east side both allowing easy access to the existing gates of the hillfort.

The most important shortcoming for the Romans of Hod Hill site was the lack of water on
the hilltop. Until the arrival of the Romans, this had not been a problem for the natives as there
was access to water near the fort and captured and stored water could certainly see them through
any battles that occurred in the pre-Roman days. For the Roman army, this lack of water required
a great deal of adaptation. Even though they were unlikely to face a siege, the Roman army
depended on a large quantity of fresh water being available and easily accessible to them.
Romans used a great deal of water for cavalry and baggage animals. Additionally, sanitation
required water and the outflow from their sanitation system had to be kept distant from the
supply which was more complicated when starting with a hilltop location. Normally a running
water supply was used to flush out latrines, but this was clearly not possible on Hod Hill. Instead
each latrine had to be equipped with a portable tub that could be carried away and emptied into
the river down from the hill (Richmond 1968: 67). This waste would have to be released
downstream from the supply point. Latrines were built near the south gate of the Roman fort
which then allowed access to the South-West Gate. From here the latrine containers could be
emptied into the River Stour, just to the west of Hod Hill. The Romans then built a new gate in
the north rampart which had been part of the original hillfort. Stables were placed in the north
west corner of the fort near this water gate which led to a water supply upstream of the point
where the latrines were emptied.

A comparison of the Roman defenses with those built by the natives also demonstrates the
unusual nature of this Roman reuse. As has been previously described, the hillfort defenses were
primarily designed with a rushing charge in mind, with the hopes of slowing down the attackers
and allowing them to be struck with sling stones during the charge. While Romans certainly had
defense in mind when building their fortifications, their structures had a distinct offensive
posture to them as well. On the south and east faces of the fort where the Romans built their own
defenses, they created a rampart that was 10 feet wide by 10 feet high. It was revetted with turf
and then filled in with broken chalk (Richmond 1968: 68). It is likely based on other Roman
fortifications that there was a 5 foot palisade along the top of the rampart. However, it is the
system of ditches that provides the biggest distinction between Roman and native works. While
the native ditch systems functioned in a defensive manner, Roman ditch systems acted as traps
(Figure 23). Ninety feet from the rampart, the range of a thrown missile, was the first ditch. This
ditch was 5 feet deep and 20 feet wide but steep on the outer side and more sloping on the inner
side (Richmond 1968: 68). This allowed the attacker to jump down into the ditch and easily
climb the inner face. However, once he had done so, retreat was more difficult due to the steep
outer wall. Fifty five feet toward the rampart from the far wall of the outer ditch was another
ditch 7.5 feet wide and 5 feet deep. This ditch narrowed greatly at the bottom, leading to injuries to those who fell in (Richmond 1968: 68). The debris from these two ditches was used to flatten out the space between them creating a deadly zone where the Romans could rain missiles down upon them. A final ditch 11 feet wide and 5 feet deep was placed close to the rampart, making the distance between the top of the palisade and the bottom of the ditch 20 feet (Richmond 1968: 68). By reusing the native defensive structures on the north and west faces of their fort, they were sacrificing some of the effectiveness of their own fortifications which were designed specifically with Roman weaponry and training in mind.

Subsequent developments in the region also indicate that reuse of both Maiden Castle and Hod Hill was done to make a statement about Roman control of the newly conquered territories rather than for reasons of military efficiency and effectiveness. Within a few short years of the invasion, the hillforts were abandoned and the Roman center of power for the region was moved to Durnovaria (present day Dorchester). Richmond writes that the road systems had bypassed the immediate area of the hillfort and thus Hod Hill was abandoned. However, it does not seem that Hod Hill would have been retained as a fort regardless of the road course. Maiden Castle was abandoned in favor of the settlement at Dorchester although the two locations are only about a mile and a half apart and the road passed directly through Dorchester. These sites were not abandoned because the roads bypassed them. The Romans chose the location for their roads, connecting points that were important to them. Eventually the military relocated to the area of Dorchester, near to the crossing points of the River Frome. Although the site of the presumed original fort has not been found, finds of military equipment along with pre-Flavian coins and samian ware indicate a military presence (Wacher 1995: 323). Dorchester became the civitas capital for the Durotriges, developing much as had Chichester, with a bath-house, amphitheatre,
and forum. While early on it was useful for the Romans to adopt the locations that carried importance to the native population, eventually the transition was made to a more Roman mode and pattern of settlement.

Discussion And Conclusions

Throughout the Late Iron Age and into the Roman period in Britain, the act of shaping the landscape was an important element in defining the identity of the people living within it. The behaviors and action of changing the landscape contributed to the creation of identity for the native people. These changes shaped the specific relations among and between the groups living in these landscapes.

In the territories of both the Atrebates and the Durotriges, creation of large earthworks was a regular practice. The linear earthworks of Atrebates and the hillforts of the Durotriges both required vast amounts of human labor as well as the organization to direct that labor and provide for the people performing that labor during these massive public works projects. These projects would also have helped defined the relationship between those of elite status and the general population.

At Chichester, one and a half million man hours of work were performed to construct the earthworks in the area. The work would likely have been accomplished over several years, as those performing this work had their own farms to tend during much of the year. Day after day for years, the people’s routine would have been driven by their surrounding landscape and the work they were performing to shape this landscape, in coordinated efforts with the people around them. Beyond the construction itself, these earthworks were being constantly maintained and modified, meaning that work on the landscape was ongoing. This constant work of construction
in shaping the landscape is a practice, in the sense used by both Johnson and Tilley, to bind these people to a specific landscape and contribute to their definition of themselves.

The resulting structures from this combined and regular effort would then serve as a visual reminder to these people of who they were. The walls separated themselves from others and defined a specific territory which belonged to them. While not high, these earthworks stretched over a large horizontal distance and many people within the territory would have seen these structures on a daily basis. Furthermore, they would have clearly defined when one was leaving the territory and entering that of another group. These earthworks would also have defined specific routes which would be used to move through and to and from the territory of the Atrebates. Both the act of building the earthworks and the effect of the earthworks on those viewing and moving through the territory would have had a continual effect on people living within this area. The entrenchments would also have provided protection for the group from the predominant forms of warfare practiced in Britain. These large structures would have slowed down mass charges and made it difficult to employ chariots during charges. They would have been visual signs of security in the landscape.

The same is true of the hillforts in the territory of the Durotriges. While not linearly to the scale of the earthworks at Chichester, the innermost ramparts at both Maiden Castle and Hod Hill would have stretched over a mile in total length. Most sections of the structures had two or three concentric rows of ramparts, increasing the total length of the earthworks. While the Chichester earthworks were roughly 10 feet high with a similarly sized associated ditch, in the hillforts these structures could be more than twice as high. And much like the Chichester earthworks, construction at these sites was ongoing. Constant modifications and improvements were being undertaken. As has been described, these modifications frequently did little to improve the
defensive capabilities of the forts, but merely served to change the appearance in some way.

So these hillforts served, much like the Chichester earthworks, as a product of group work which served to define that group. The activity of shaping their landscape brought these people together as a unified entity. Also like the Chichester earthworks, they then served as a visual focal point for the group. These hillforts could be seen from throughout the territories of the people that built them, serving as a reminder of who they were and where they belonged. The hillforts also stretch back in time further than do the Chichester earthworks and both Maiden Castle and Hod Hill incorporate barrow tombs. These locations connect the local people with their ancestors, defining the territory as theirs deep into the past. Like the entrenchments, they would have defined a point of safety within the landscape.

Both the Chichester entrenchments and the hillforts serve to define the relationships between the elite status members of these groups and the people over whom they ruled. These constructions took place over years, involving large groups of people. The ability to organize and provide for these large groups year after year would have defined the effectiveness of their leaders. Directing the construction across miles of plain in the Chichester area or the modification of hill tops in the Durotriges’ territory would have required a great deal of control and skill. The end products would have defined the power of the leaders of these groups to both their own people and to outsiders. The laborers who built these sites also work their fields, with this produce going to feed the groups throughout the year. Providing for these groups would again have taken power and skill. Hillforts, in particular, became centers for the distribution of food and other goods throughout the population, as evidenced by the grain pits found throughout these sites. At least some of the grain would have gone into communal ownership or ownership of the leader of the group and the leader was then responsible for the distribution of these goods
throughout the construction process. These leaders would then be connected to the landscape with the visible constructions in it attesting to their accomplishments and power. The leaders were also responsible for providing safety and protection to their people. Their ability to construct and maintain these structures would have done so and their visibility would have been a sign of this protection seen throughout the area.

After their invasion in 43 CE, the Romans were able to modify or occupy the landscape in ways which effectively transformed the existing identity of the native people. These changes to the native landscape brought about consequent changes to the identities of both elites and common people, although at varying speeds and to varying degrees. Their strategies for this differed in the case of their allies and their enemies, but in both cases the ultimate goal was to move people into a mode of organization within the landscape that was suitable to Roman forms of administration.

Romans practiced a very different style of warfare from the native Britons, using siege warfare and artillery against well fortified locations. The Roman strategies would not have been unknown to the Atrebates who had more contact with the continent. Their knowledge of Roman tactics may have been part of the motivation to abandon their hillforts and shift to a different form of settlement. It would also explain the existence of the Chichester entrenchments in the northern part of the territory, while no similar structures existed in the south facing the continent. The fortifications would be effective against their native enemies, but useless against the Romans. Hillforts, too, were of little use in defending against Roman attacks, acting as traps for their defenders. However, the Durotriges were clearly less well versed in Roman warfare as they repeatedly turned to them for defense and were then repeatedly and swiftly defeated by the Roman army led by Vespasian. With the vast amount of work that had gone into constructing
these fortifications and the length of time they had stood as monuments to the strength and unity of their groups, once they Romans arrived, they were swiftly conquered. In the southern portion of the country after serving as a haven for centuries in some cases, these hillforts were swept away within five years of the invasion.

However, where these hillforts had been in use during resistance to the Roman invasion, the Romans were not content to simply defeat their inhabitants and destroy the forts. The Romans at Maiden Castle and Hod Hill specifically worked to reduce the quality of the defensive structures that the natives had spent so long developing. They then occupied the sites, building military camps of their own design, oddly worked into the native constructions. These sites did little to save the Romans time or material when constructing their camps. Furthermore, Roman strategy focused on defending route nodes and supply lines. The locations of these hillforts were ill suited to such tasks, being more focused on control of the surrounding agricultural land. However, because of their importance to defining the identity of the native people and unifying them as a group, the Romans chose a strategy of reuse, which would make a statement to the native people. What these sites formerly stated about the people who built them and their leaders was turned around and used against them. These spots no longer could act as a unifying focal point tying the people together and connecting them to their past. Instead, the Romans had taken over the spots that years of labor had gone into creating. They now controlled the places where their ancient ancestors had been buried. This was a distinct and likely demoralizing message to the native people, drastically underscoring the power imbalance they faced when contesting the Romans. Furthermore, the power of their leaders was emphatically undercut. Driven from these important nodes, they no longer could control any distribution of goods nor could they provide any defense for their people. Once forced from these locations, they no longer possessed
anything that made them leaders among their people.

Amongst their allies, the Atrebates, the Romans took a different but no less effective approach in changing the native relationship with the landscape and to each other. The Romans were willing to allow the Atrebates to remain a client kingdom while Togidubnus was alive. But during this period they encouraged changes that would alter the identities of this group although without the forceful methods they used with the Durotriges. The act of constructing the Chichester entrenchments had helped to unify the Atrebates under their leader and served as a visual reminder as to who they were and where they lived. However, after the invasion the focal point for Atrebian power shifted to the palace at Fishbourne. The construction of this palace could have no real unifying effect on the Atrebates. The techniques of the construction were foreign to them. Many of the craftsmen and much of the material used in building the palace were imported, some possibly from Rome itself. The entrenchments were constructed by the Atrebates out of Atrebian soil and stood as a monument to their unified efforts. The palace, although occupied by an Atrebian king, essentially stood as a monument to Roman power and culture.

The palace was an exclusionary structure. While the entrenchments had defined the territory of the Atrebates as a group, the most important structure in the area now stood primarily as monument to the power of the king and his relationship to Rome rather than to his people. While Romans visiting the palace would have been familiar with the decoration, layout, and building types, to the Atrebian people this structure, while undeniably impressive, would have been quite foreign. Furthermore, the structure of the palace implies an even greater distancing. The assembly hall is essentially an external structure exterior to the palace, meaning that most people were likely excluded from much of the palace. This separation is likely a change from the
time prior to the invasion when the elites may have had larger living compounds, but they were similar in design and construction to the compounds most people lived in. The distance between the elite members of society and the common people would not have been quite so stark as it became under the Romans.

In both the territory of the Atrebates and Durotriges, the important focal points in their landscape changed in meaning, either through a change in position or occupancy. The structures that the people of the areas had invested so much time in constructing and maintaining no longer served to identify them as a group. For the Durotriges, these places were occupied by Romans and at least temporarily served as focal points for their power. For the Atrebates, the places were simply robbed of relevance, with their leaders moving to new locations which defined their relationships with Rome rather than their people. As the people moved through the landscape they occupied, they saw symbols of the power of Rome, while their own works slowly decayed and were dismantled by the Romans. By encouraging allied elites to adopt more Roman ways and politically favoring those who did, the process of Romanization through progressive emulation as described by Millett can be seen. These elites were able to effect large changes in how their people organized themselves in the landscape. With the landscape drastically changed and the focal points of their people gone or moved, the daily routines of the people began to change as well. While the people farmed their lands much as they had for centuries, where and how business and government were conducted changed. While their lives in the rural areas were likely similar, they now focused on Roman towns for exchange and administration, resulting in a hybridized Roman British identity for the non-elites.

Ultimately, the Romans focused the power in the lands of both their allies and enemies into Roman style towns such as Chichester and Dorchester. By the time these towns were completed
the old locations of importance for these people had already been undermined and often, simply abandoned. In the face of this vacuum, there was little resistance to this change in the southern portion of the country. Other tribes to the north would specifically destroy the Roman built towns during revolts despite the fact that most of their inhabitants were native Britons. However, these towns symbolized a particular relationship with Rome, while undermining the relationships the native people had with their land previously. Eventually most Britons would have come to consider these towns as the important focal points, which still remain today, and this new focus would be enough to define them as Romano-British rather than simply British. These points were centers of Roman administration. The local government would now operate following a Roman model with administrators and council members meeting in the local basilica. Business would be conducted around the forum and in the public baths. Leaders would build temples and sponsor entertainments in the local amphitheatre. These changes to the daily routines of all levels of society would define the land as not just Britain, but Roman Britain.
Bibliography


Figures Following
Figure 1. Tincommius (Tincomarus) coin with Roman style head on one side and possible bull and TINO on other side. (Portable Antiquities Scheme. “Iron Age Coins.” http://finds.org.uk/database/images/image/id/426023 (accessed 5/29/2014)).
Figure 4. Small, enclosed settlement forms seen in the south of Pre-Roman Britain in the Late Iron Age (Cunliffe 2005: 240).
Figure 5. Banjo shaped enclosed settlements seen in the south of Pre-Roman Britain in the Late Iron Age (Cunliffe 2005: 245).
Figure 6. Selsey Peninsula with location of Fishbourne Place noted in red. Source: "Selsey Peninsula." 50°45'34.15"N and 0°47'52.25"W. Google Earth. June 5, 2013. Accessed May 21, 2014.
Figure 7. Chichester Entrenchments defining the oppida of the Atrebates on the Selsey Peninsula (Cunliffe 1971: 9).
Figure 8. Timber buildings layout during the military phase of occupation at Fishbourne (Cunliffe 1999, 29).
Figure 9. Early civilian layout after the departure of the Roman military from Fishbourne (Cunliffe 1999, 34).
Figure 10. Layout of the Proto-Palace in the early 60s CE. (Cunliffe 1999, 41).
Figure 11. The palace plan as constructed in the late 70s or early 80s CE (Cunliffe 1999, 51).
Figure 12. East Wing Palace Entrance with exterior view at top and interior view at bottom (Cunliffe 1999: 84).
Figure 13. Pediment and audience chamber with interior cutaway view at top, plan view at top middle, interior cutaway view at bottom middle, and eastern, exterior face at bottom (Cunliffe 1999, 53).
Figure 14. Roman Chichester (Wacher 1995: 258).
Figure 17. Maiden Castle in Region with darker areas showing heights above 400 feet with tracks running along ridges (Wheeler 1943: 15).
Figure 18. Rampart & Ditch Construction at Maiden Castle (Sharples 1991: 75).
Figure 19. Eastern Entrance Development at Maiden Castle. Phases 1 and 2 are Early Iron Age and phases 3 and 4 are Middle Iron Age (Sharple 1991:86).
Figure 20. Hod Hill Plan (Richmond 1968: Figure 3).
Figure 22. Roman use of artillery focused on a single hut within the Hod Hill hillfort (Richmond 1968: Figure 18).
Figure 23. Roman ditches systems designed to trap enemies within the target range of thrown spears (Richmond 1968: 39).