Dialogues in deposition
A REASSESSMENT OF EARLY ROMAN-PERIOD BURIALS AT ST PANCRAS, CHICHESTER, AND OTHER RELATED SITES

By Gordon Hayden

This article focuses on the social dynamics underpinning change and continuity during the Iron Age–Roman transition period in the area of Chichester and its immediate hinterland. Although the primary data is derived from a reassessment of selected burial groupings from the St Pancras cemetery, data from other sites has been used to put St Pancras into a wider context. Though it is generally accepted that the arrival of Roman power and the establishment of a post-Conquest client kingdom in this area influenced cultural change, the reassessed data suggests that external influences more probably merged with local traditions. As individual and social group identity is partly expressed through manipulating material culture, this article examines the social dynamics of those further down the social scale, by re-evaluating specific 1st-century AD indigenous pottery types and their significance as indicators of change and continuity. It places indigenous pottery in a wider context by examining the nature of sub-regional social preferences and the relationship between the Chichester area and the peripheral environment. The results suggest there was an initial degree of resistance to change amongst certain social groups, whilst others were in constant dialogue and renegotiation over what types of material culture could be perceived as culturally acceptable. This indicates the active role of the existing population in fashioning their own particular lifestyles.

INTRODUCTION

During the last two decades aspects of settlement patterning, ritual practices and changes to material culture from the Chichester/Fishbourne area have been used as examples in debates on the nature of social change and continuity in southern Britain during the Late Iron Age-Roman transition period. These debates focus on possible contact between British and Gallic tribal elites (Creighton 2000; Millett 1990) as well as Roman influence (Creighton 2006; Manley 2002; Russell 2006) and subsequent manipulation (Mattingly 2006). However, what is poorly understood is how this external influence merged with local traditions during what is perceived to be the gradual acculturation of the indigenous population. Presumably the indigenous elite would have adopted perceived ‘Roman’ visual trappings of power (Creighton 2006, 35–45), yet we are far from understanding what defines the post-Conquest client kingdom in the archaeological record, or how far the adoption of new ideas and forms of material culture permeated down the social hierarchy. This raises questions as to whether the material culture of the client kingdom would have had more or fewer perceived ‘Roman’ characteristics than the rest of the province, or whether indigenous resistance through the preferences of those further down the social scale can be recognised.

Most debates have tended to focus primarily on elite socio-political interaction, rather than the dynamics of those further down the social scale. Rather than concentrate on aspects of the elite, the aim of this particular research is to ascertain how individual and social group identity may have been expressed through a more mundane aspect of material culture — such as the humble coarseware pot — more likely to have been used by the non-elite indigenous population. To this end, the best preserved examples of structured deposition, and how objects were used in relation to each other, can invariably be derived from the burial record. Furthermore, a reappraisal of the evidence from the St Pancras cremation cemetery has been put forward as a key research topic in how people conceptualised aspects of their own identity and beliefs during the early Roman period (Manley et al. 2008, 93). This article also illustrates the usefulness of revisiting datasets held at the Collections Discovery Centre (Fishbourne).
ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

ST PANCras: SITE AND ARCHIVE

The site of the Roman-period cemetery lies some 315 metres to the east of the East Gate at Chichester. Three published excavations have so far taken place, and accordingly a repetition of these excavation reports was considered unnecessary. Suffice to say that the first excavation was undertaken between 1895 and 1896 by Councillor Butler, who owned a number of cottages along what was then known as Alexandra Terrace (Arnold 1898). This initial excavation recovered approximately 150 vessels, although no grave groups seem to have been recorded. This assemblage has become known as ‘The Butler Collection’ and is currently held, along with the bulk of material from the two subsequent excavations, in the Collections Discovery Centre at Fishbourne. Further work was carried out between 1934 and 1937 by Raymond Carlyon-Britton and Llewellyn White during which 65 burial groups were recorded (Clark 1939). In the mid-late 1960s further excavations were carried out under the direction of Alec Down which increased the number of recorded burials to 326, 9 of which were later Roman inhumations (Down 1971). Although an extensive illustrated cemetery pottery type series was created, specific aspects of manufacturing techniques, clay pastes and the likely production areas appear not to have been recorded. Based primarily on the dating of the samian found in several graves, the cremation cemetery at St Pancras commences c. AD 70 (Down 1971, 69), corresponding with the start of the Roman-period phase of the rural cemetery at nearby Westhampnett (Fitzpatrick 1997, 279).

As individual and social group identity is partly expressed through the manipulation of material culture, a reassessment of two specific indigenous pottery types datable to the first century AD has been undertaken from the St Pancras burial assemblages. The reasoning behind this was to establish:

1) whether external influences or the gradual adaptation of existing material culture by the indigenous population was the more likely mitigating factor in explaining the nature of change and continuity in this transitional period;
2) whether there existed a developmental phase between characteristically Late Iron Age and Roman-period indigenous pottery;
3) whether this phase is driven by sub-regional social preferences; and
4) whether vessels of a similar type were regarded and/or used differently by social groups on both regional and sub-regional levels.

RELEVANT POTTERY

Southern Atrebatic derivative wares

Southern Atrebatic pottery broadly has a distribution covering the southeastern part of Hampshire and West Sussex, and is characterised by beaded-rim, high-shouldered jars, and bulbous jars and bowls with constricted necks, wide mouths and cords which emphasise the junction between the neck and body (Cunliffe 1991, fig. A:31, nos. 9–14). Often wheel-finished, vessels are frequently decorated with incised or tooled geometric designs. Later forms were first classified as ‘Atrebatic Overlap’ by Down (1978, 187–9), with sand-tempering becoming the dominant feature. These were supplied to the area from the end of the first century BC until c. AD 60 (Lyne 2005a) and consequently later pre- and post-Conquest forms are difficult to differentiate.

The so-called Southern Atrebatic Overlap wares appear to the naked eye to be made in two very distinct coarseware fabrics. One is a very hard, grey fabric used primarily for making jars and bowls, although appreciably debased platters are also known. The other is a surface-blackened fabric appearing in a similar range of forms. Within the study area the most widespread variety of published forms has been found just to the east of Fishbourne Roman Palace. Most of these emanate from a ditch which lies to the east of this building, dated by the associated imported vessels found within it to c. 10 BC–AD 25 (Manley and Rudkin 2005, 80–83). Here, forms mostly consist of various bowls and jars, but lids and platters are also known (Lyne 2005b, fig. 8).

Imitation Gallo-Belgic wares

It has been suggested that so-called ‘imitation Gallo-Belgic’ wares were indigenously produced copies of imported fineware Gallo-Belgic forms (Gibson and Woods 1997, 170–71; Tyers 1996, 59, 65–6). These so-called imitations were broadly categorised in the Camulodunum type series (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 202–84). In the Chichester area common forms include platters, small bowls or cups, girth beakers and butt beakers, but these appear in both fine and coarse fabrics. Down (1971,
Table 1. Concordance of platter types from St Pancras with those from Fishbourne.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery type (Down 1971)</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Fishbourne type (Cunliffe 1971b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9e</td>
<td>Straight-walled platter – copying Gallo-Belgic</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25g</td>
<td>Shallow footing platter – Atrebatic derivative</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90i</td>
<td>Concave-walled platter – copying Gallo-Belgic</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110b</td>
<td>Concave-walled platter – copying Gallo-Belgic</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110c</td>
<td>Shallow footing platter – Atrebatic derivative</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183a</td>
<td>Concave-walled platter – copying Gallo-Belgic</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Atrebatic derivative fabrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A handmade hard, rough fabric with an irregular fracture which has a smooth surface where there are areas of burning. The surface is coloured black (Munsell 2000, 10YR 2/1) with a black (10YR 2/1) or dark greyish-brown (10YR 4/2) core. The thin section consists of a moderately sorted groundmass containing abundant sub-angular quartz inclusions of mostly 0.3mm, although a few grains are 1.0mm. Also present are sparse, sub-rounded black ferrous particles of 0.1mm and sub-rounded clay pellets of 0.3mm.</td>
<td>A surface-blackened Atrebatic Overlap fabric, made from Reading Beds clay in the vicinity of the West Sussex Coastal Plain, and dating from the Late Iron Age to c. AD 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A handmade hard, rough fabric with an irregular fracture. The outer surface is coloured light brownish-grey (10YR 6/2) or very dark grey (10YR 3/1) with a very dark grey (10YR 3/1) core. The thin section consists of a well-sorted groundmass containing abundant sub-angular quartz inclusions of mostly 0.3mm in size and smaller sub-rounded quartz of 0.1mm. Also present are sparse, elongated fine-grained sandstone particles between 0.6mm and 0.3mm in size, muscovite mica particles of 0.1mm, and rare, sub-rounded black ferrous particles of 0.1mm.</td>
<td>A surface-blackened Atrebatic Overlap fabric, made from Gault clay somewhere near the Arun Valley, and dating from the Late Iron Age to c. AD 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A handmade, wheel-finished, very hard, rough fabric with a hackly fracture. The surface colour varies from dark grey (10YR 4/1) to light grey (10YR 7/1), with a grey (10YR 5/1) or light grey (10YR 7/1) core. Occasional misfiring can produce reddish-yellow (5YR 6/6) margins and surface patches. The thin section consists of a well-sorted groundmass containing very common, sub-rounded quartz inclusions between 0.4mm and 0.2mm in size, common, sub-rounded black ferrous of 0.1mm and sparse, sub-angular flint particles of 0.2mm.</td>
<td>Early Rowlands Castle fabric variant dating from the Late Iron Age to c. AD 70.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pottery Analysis

FABRICS

Southern Atrebatic derivative vessels appear in both grey and surface-blackened fabrics. On closer inspection of the surface-blackened fabrics in thin section, two distinct clay sources have been recognised which are sometimes difficult to distinguish in the hand specimen. The grey and surface-blackened varieties are briefly summarised in Table 2. Fabrics used in the production of coarseware platters which appear to copy Gallo-Belgic forms are summarised in Table 3.

ASPECTS OF PRODUCTION AND USE

Using ethnographic examples, Peacock (1982, 6–11) illustrates several modes of production, moving from simple household/village production (pots perhaps made by women, usually handmade, without kiln technology, local distribution), through to workshop/industrial manufacturing (perhaps made by male potters/slaves, wheel-thrown, use of kilns, regional distribution) to create models in which Roman-period pottery production can be assessed. With this in mind, there is some circumstantial evidence from the St Pancras cemetery that in the post-Conquest period grey Southern Atrebatic derivative vessels were fired in kilns. At St Pancras the most common urns (Fig. 1: 1a) are in a very hard, well-fired fabric similar to that used for vessels with Atrebatic characteristics (Fig. 1: 5a, 11a and 18a). The fabric analysis undertaken indicates that both were made by the Rowlands Castle industry. Rowlands Castle
is considered primarily a post-Conquest industry, with grey wares occurring in mid-1st century AD levels and declining in the early 4th century at various sites in Hampshire and West Sussex (Dicks 2009, 65). However, recent discoveries at Fishbourne (Lyne 2005b, 65) and North Bersted (Lyne 2003, 142) now suggest a commencement date before c. AD 25, although wheel-thrown products appear to start c. AD 60. Apart from the vessel form, the only other difference at St Pancras is that the more common urns are completely wheel-thrown vessels, whereas the Southern Atrebatic derivative vessels are handmade but with the outer surface subsequently finished on a wheel following the initial forming process, after which very faint burnished line decoration is added. However, the hardness of the fabric and the appearance on some vessels of a red colourwash which appears on both the more Romanised wheel-thrown and the Atrebatic handmade examples, suggest some similarity in production techniques and, given the distance from the production area, probably similar marketing mechanisms. As to the gender of those making the pots, this is unclear.

Table 3. Fabrics used in the production of coarseware variants of Gallo-Belgic forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A wheel-thrown hard, rough fabric with an irregular fracture. The outer surface is coloured dark grey (10YR 4/1), with a grey (10YR 5/1) inner surface and a grey (10YR 6/1) core. Some examples are coloured grey (10YR 6/1) throughout. The thin section consists of a well-sorted groundmass containing abundant sub-angular quartz inclusions of mostly 0.3mm in size and smaller sub-rounded quartz of 0.1mm, and sub-angular ironstone of 2.0mm. Also present are rare sub-rounded black ferrous and muscovite mica particles of 0.1mm, and sub-angular opaque particles of 0.3mm which are possibly glaucitic.</td>
<td>Arun Valley coarseware fabric, dating from the mid-1st century to the latter part of the 2nd century AD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A wheel-thrown very hard, rough fabric with a hackly fracture. The surface colour varies from dark grey (10YR 4/1) to light grey (10YR 7/1), with a grey (10YR 5/1) or light grey (10YR 7/1) core. The thin section consists of a well-sorted groundmass containing very common, sub-rounded quartz inclusions between 0.4mm and 0.2mm in size, and common, sub-rounded black ferrous and sparse, sub-angular flint particles both of 0.1mm.</td>
<td>Rowlands Castle fabric, dating from c. AD 60 to the end of the 3rd century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A wheel-thrown, very hard, rough fabric with a fracture that varies from irregular to hackly, although on some examples the surface feels smooth where burnished. The surface colour varies from very dark grey (10YR 3/1) to grey (10YR 6/1), with a dark grey (10YR 4/1) to light grey (10YR 7/1) core. A few examples are coloured dark reddish-grey (2.5YR 4/1) with a reddish-grey (2.5YR 5/1) core. Other examples found on sites on the periphery of the study area appear in an oxidised colour of reddish-yellow (7.5YR 6/6) or strong brown (7.5YR 5/6) throughout. The thin section consists of a well-sorted groundmass containing very common, sub-rounded quartz inclusions between 0.4mm and 0.2mm in size, with sparse, sub-rounded clay pellets between 0.3mm and 0.1mm, and sparse, sub-rounded black ferrous particles of 0.2mm. Also present are common muscovite mica particles of 0.05mm and rare plagioclase feldspar of 0.2mm.</td>
<td>Alice Holt/Farnham reduced early fabric dating from c. AD 50–160 (Tomber and Dore 1998, fabric ALH RE).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pottery assemblage at St Pancras shows a distinct paucity of pre-Flavian imported finewares. Although so-called imitation Gallo-Belgic platters are present (Table 1), no imported Gallo-Belgic vessels appear. This is a pattern shared with Westhampnett. A number of Atrebatic derivative vessels used as urns appear warped, which Down (1971, 73) reasoned were wasters and examples of using ‘killed’ objects in mortuary practices. However, no obvious evidence of damage which would be associated with a kiln misfiring was
Fig. 1. Selected vessels from the St Pancras cemetery (redrawn from Down 1971).

Fig. 2. Burnt platters of cemetery type 25g from Burial 28 at St Pancras (scale = 5cm).
found during this reassessment, and it is therefore proposed that warping either occurred during the drying-out process prior to firing, or was caused by the weight of other vessels being stacked on top during the firing process. Either way, the finished product was still deemed to be adequate for use as a funerary vessel.

Another pattern noticed amongst the assemblage at St Pancras is the presence of burning to an off-centre area on the underside of the base on a number of platters (Fig. 2). Of 37 platters found in the assemblage, 10 show this phenomenon. Of these, eight are of cemetery type 25g — a platter with Atrebatic characteristics — six of which come from a single grave (Burial 28). This phenomenon is most likely to be a result of these vessels being placed alongside a heat source as part of a specific funerary rite associated with a particular social group, especially as this trait is not visibly common amongst grave goods in the rest of the assemblage. McKinley (2006, 83) illustrates that funerary pyre temperatures could reach somewhere between 1000 and 1100°C. This might be a potential cause of the burnt areas seen on some platter examples.

**DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS AND RELATIONSHIPS**
The Iron Age cremation cemetery at Westhampnett has been dated to c. 90–50 BC (Fitzpatrick 1997, 132) which significantly pre-dates the appearance of Atrebatic derivative Fabric 3, but there then follows a 120-year gap until the establishment of the cemeteries of St Pancras and Westhampnett which commence c. AD 70. During this 120-year gap the burial rite of those within the study area is unknown, so on present evidence Fabric 3 would appear to be used in early cremation urns alongside contemporary more Romanised forms which also originated from Rowlands Castle c. AD 70. At St Pancras, 62 burials include jars, bowls or platters in this fabric (Table 4). Of the jar or bowl forms, 43 have been identified as the cremation urn and 30 of these appear as single-vessel cremations. There are comparatively fewer burials which contain both vessels in the grey Atrebatic derivative Fabric 3 and more Romanised vessel forms, but this has been noted in 27 graves, eight of which are box burials. Of the 36 burials that comprise the Roman-period phase at Westhampnett (Fitzpatrick 1997, 279), six graves containing grey Atrebatic derivative Fabric 3 have been recognised. Of these, only one has been used as the cremation urn, which appears as a single-vessel cremation (Table 5).

At St Pancras only four burials contain grey Atrebatic derivative Fabric 3 and samian pottery, of which two have been disturbed. However, the dating of the samian and a reassessment of both disturbed burial assemblages indicate that it is unlikely that the Atrebatic and samian vessels would have been originally buried together, and that both disturbed burials contain vessels from more than a single grave. This leaves only two graves which contained both samian and Atrebatic derivative vessels, a similar number to that found at Westhampnett. These are the only two cemeteries where Atrebatic derivative vessel forms in Rowlands Castle fabric have so far been recognised.

---

Table 4. Gravestones containing Atrebatic derivative vessels from St Pancras.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of cremation</th>
<th>Total no. of examples</th>
<th>With samian or glass</th>
<th>With beaker, flagon or lamp forms</th>
<th>With metal object(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single vessel</td>
<td>30 (5 disturbed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple vessel</td>
<td>23 (5 disturbed)</td>
<td>1 (disturbed)</td>
<td>19 (3 disturbed)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyst burial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box burial</td>
<td>8 (2 disturbed)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 (2 disturbed)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Composition of relevant graves from Westhampnett.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pottery type</th>
<th>Type of cremation</th>
<th>Total no. of examples</th>
<th>With samian or glass</th>
<th>With beaker or flagon forms</th>
<th>With metal object(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atrebatic derivative</td>
<td>Single vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrebatic derivative</td>
<td>Multiple vessel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallo-Belgic copy</td>
<td>Multiple vessel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As stated above, only a few burials contain platters which appear to copy Gallo-Belgic forms, albeit in coarser fabrics. At St Pancras (Table 6) platters appear in Rowlands Castle, Arun Valley/Hardham and Alice Holt/Farnham fabrics, whereas at Westhampnett (Table 5) both platters found appear in Rowlands Castle fabric. Yet again a reassessment of the disturbed burial assemblages indicates that it is unlikely that any known burials would have originally contained both samian and coarseware copies of Gallo-Belgic forms.

### GRAVE GROUPINGS AND SOCIAL PREFERENCES

Probably the best illustration of social preference is in the mortuary practices which took place in the Chichester area, as the intact nature of the pottery concerned is greater than at sites where other activities took place. As shown above, vessels which have pre-Conquest Southern Atrebatic characteristics have been found in both the Roman-period cemeteries of St Pancras and Westhampnett. At St Pancras the largest area containing graves is Area 1, where 237 of the 326 burials were found (Down 1971, 56, 68–9). As part of this reassessment the burials from Area 1 have been sub-divided into four categories (Table 7).

As can be seen from the arrangement of burials in Area 1 (Fig. 3), the frequency of Group 1 burials is comparatively greater in the northern part of this area in relation to Groups 2–4, which are more evenly spread. It could be argued that this pattern is an indication that Group 1 burials are the earliest, and therefore the cemetery begins in this area and subsequently extends out from this point. However, this line of argument does not account for the presence of Southern Atrebatic derivative vessels in burials with other grave goods (Group 3), which are more evenly spread. If not chronological, possibly this pattern might be economic, as 93 of the 147 single vessel cremations found (Down 1971, table 1) appear in Area 1, which might therefore be the area where the poorer inhabitants of Chichester were buried. However, the depositional patterning of more Romanised single-cremation vessel forms (Group 2) suggests that graves with less disposable wealth were more evenly spread throughout the cemetery. Consequently, the choice of Atrebatic derivative vessels for use in mortuary practices within the cemetery would appear to be one of preference amongst certain social groups, especially as several more Romanised forms appear to be contemporaneous. However, the additional presence of these vessels in burials with more Romanised forms (including two graves with...
associated imported samian) would also suggest that some form of dialogue was taking place over what vessels were perceived as culturally acceptable for use as grave goods. This latter pattern has also been recognised in five burials at Westhampnett. Consequently, the choice to deposit Southern Atrebatic derivative vessels in some graves can be seen as a way to express identity, although the lack of detail so far undertaken on analysis of the cremated human bone from St Pancras makes it unclear whether one can imply age group, gender or another kind of affiliation, such as ethnic origins.

On present evidence the surface-blackened Atrebatic Overlap vessel forms appear to cease c. AD 60, so their presence at St Pancras, which does not start until c. AD 70, requires some explanation. Given that only two burials of 326 contained surface-blackened Atrebatic Overlap vessels, they appear not to be considered an appropriate type by most of the population who buried their dead here. These two vessels could be seen in the context of heirlooms, as objects may accumulate a history and acquire specific meanings during their manufacture and use through the social interactions that go on around them, but these meanings can change as they pass through the hands of a range of individuals (Gosden and Marshall 1999, 169–70; Gosselain 2000, 189). In other words, some significance, such as being personally made or how/where it was acquired, was attached to these vessels either by the deceased or by at least one of the mourners.

**A WIDER CONTEXT**

The nearest relevant early Roman-period cremation cemeteries to the Chichester area all lie within Hampshire. Owslebury is the nearest site which exhibits continuity of mortuary practices from the Late Iron Age to the Roman period. The Owslebury settlement was in existence from the fourth or third centuries BC until the second century AD (Collis 1994). One enclosure of Late Iron Age to early
Roman date contained a central cremated burial with others grouped around, and the grave goods included both Gallo-Belgic imported vessels and coarseware platters copying Gallo-Belgic forms. This contrasts with Westhampnett, where the Iron Age and Roman-period burials were spatially separated. The inclusion of Gallo-Belgic imported vessels and so-called imitation Gallo-Belgic platters is also known from early Roman-period burials at Winchester (Birbeck and Moore 2004, fig. 7; Collis 1978, fig. 37). However, in the early Roman-period cemeteries towards northeastern Hampshire at Alton (Millett 1986, table 2) and Neatham (Millett and Graham 1986, 78), coarseware platters copying Gallo-Belgic forms are present, but no Gallo-Belgic platter imports are known to exist.

Two patterns emerge from these cremation cemeteries in Hampshire. First, it has been noted that the rim diameters of coarseware platters copying Gallo-Belgic forms vary within individual graves at Milland (Winchester), Owlsbury, Alton and Neatham, with a preponderance of miniature platters measuring 5–8cm in diameter (Hayden 2009, fig. 5.15). These miniature platters appear only in Fabric 6 (Alice Holt/Farnham) and are likely to have been made specifically for mortuary practices as they appear to be absent from related settlement sites. Second, most burials contain several platters which are burnt on a specific area off-centre on the underside of the base, similar to the pattern described above on Atrebatic derivative platters at St Pancras. This practice would suggest a form of shared burial tradition between the cemeteries at St Pancras and in eastern Hampshire, albeit amongst a small percentage of the population. Evidence of burnt vessels has been noted as absent from grave goods in transitional cremation cemeteries at Verulamium (Struck 1995, 142).

Comment also needs to be made on the relationship between Gallo-Belgic imported wares and their supposed imitations. It is noticeable that large quantities of Gallo-Belgic imports and their so-called copies are found together at the major urban sites of Chichester, Winchester and Silchester, which are all believed to lie within the Atrebatic client kingdom (Wacher 1995, 274–5). This pattern is also present at the small settlement at Owslebury, but is rare at Alton and Neatham. However, burials produce a slightly different pattern (Table 8). It would seem the practice nearer to Winchester is for Gallo-Belgic imports to be used as grave goods, but rarer for so-called Gallo-Belgic copies to be deposited. At both Alton and Neatham there are a large number of ‘imitation Gallo-Belgic’ platters used alongside other vessels as grave goods, but Gallo-Belgic imports are virtually absent. Yet at St Pancras and Westhampnett copies of Gallo-Belgic vessels are used as grave goods comparatively rarely, but like Alton and Neatham the common practice was not to use Gallo-Belgic imports in burials. Owlsbury produces a unique pattern in that Gallo-Belgic imports and their imitations are both present, but do not appear within the same grave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name (reference)</th>
<th>Gallo-Belgic import</th>
<th>’Gallo-Belgic copy’</th>
<th>Deposited in same grave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alton (Millett 1986)</td>
<td>Rare (1 butt beaker)</td>
<td>53 platters (found in 7 graves)</td>
<td>1 example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurstbourne Tarrant (Hawkes and Dunning 1931)</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1 platter (found in 1 grave)</td>
<td>1 example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neatham (Millett and Graham 1986)</td>
<td>Rare (1 later bowl)</td>
<td>55 platters (found in 3 graves)</td>
<td>No examples (bowl form is a late example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owlsbury (Collis 1968; 1977; 1994)</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>10 platters (found in 4 graves)</td>
<td>No examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester-Milland (Collis 1978)</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1 platter (found in 1 grave)</td>
<td>1 example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester-Hyde Street (Birbeck and Moore 2004)</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1 platter, 1 cup and 1 butt beaker (all found in 1 grave)</td>
<td>1 example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pancras (Down 1971)</td>
<td>None present</td>
<td>14 platters (found in 13 graves)</td>
<td>No examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westhampnett (Fitzpatrick 1997)</td>
<td>None present</td>
<td>2 platters (found in 2 graves)</td>
<td>No examples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Gallo-Belgic imports and copies within burials in Hampshire and West Sussex.
The term ‘imitation Gallo-Belgic’ is slightly misleading, in that it implies that copies of imported Gallo-Belgic tableware forms would have the same ascribed function. In the case of fine fabrics this assumption may have some credibility, but a differential use pattern amongst coarseware platters has been noted. An analysis of rim diameters of platters from settlements presents a different pattern from that which is found in cremation cemeteries within and on the periphery of West Sussex (Hayden 2009, figs 5.9 and 5.15). This pattern appears to indicate a social preference for smaller platters in mortuary practices as opposed to larger sizes, which are preferential at settlements. Miniature platters measuring 5–8cm in diameter noted above from cemeteries in Hampshire do not appear in West Sussex, but some in the 9–10cm range appear at the St Pancras and Westhampnett cemeteries. However, a range of 10–14cm is more common at settlement sites in both Hampshire and West Sussex.

It has also been noted above that some coarseware platters show signs of burning consistent with being placed over, or near to, a heat source (Hayden 2009, table 5.18). This phenomenon has been noted most amongst sand-tempered platters in burials, as opposed to settlement sites, where burnt examples of sand-tempered platters are comparatively rare. The exception to this patterning at settlements seems to be at Fishbourne, where approximately 20% of sand-tempered platters show signs of being burnt. All the Fishbourne examples analysed were sealed by the construction levels of the Flavian building and therefore not susceptible to being burnt during the fire which destroyed Fishbourne in the late-3rd century AD (Cunliffe 1971a, 187). This peculiarity between Fishbourne and other settlements suggests a variable perception amongst sub-regional groups over what is a culturally correct and socially acceptable type of pottery for a particular use. Platters increase dramatically after the Conquest, indicating a shift for some in dietary habits. What was being cooked/warmed is unclear, but certainly the low wall height of platter forms would indicate foodstuffs with a dryer consistency.

CULTURAL CORRECTNESS AND ACCEPTABILITY

The examples set out above concerning the differential use of platter forms is an indication of the problems that can be encountered in using traditional typological analysis to determine the function of vessels. This type of analysis has been challenged by Blinkhorn (1997, 115–19) and Cumberpatch (1997, 127–8), who both argue that, rather than being a functional characteristic, subtle variation in shape, material content, surface treatment and/or the decoration or non-decoration of vessels becomes a medium for socially symbolic expression. Vessels have to be made in a culturally correct way and are therefore integral to the expression of identity, affiliation and differentiation. Consequently the physical properties of the pottery itself are manipulated by potters to produce something that is socially acceptable to other members of the community. Although both these authors used post-Roman pottery as examples, they illustrate that colour, texture and shape are not determined merely by technology or production processes, but are part of the relationship between what is perceived as being functionally efficient and the perception of people of what is socially and culturally appropriate.

It is likely that during the immediate post-Conquest period various members of the indigenous population would have had a differing view on what a ‘Roman’ identity meant. These viewpoints would have been a result of the dialogues and interaction between the indigenous population and Roman authority. The continued production, use and deposition of Southern Atrebatic derivative vessels suggest reluctance by some to adopt contemporary Romanised forms which were being made in approximately the same area. This is significant, as it indicates a developmental phase between characteristically Late Iron Age and Roman-period indigenous pottery, where handmade vessels continue albeit in a modified way and some wheel-thrown vessels retain characteristics seen in pre-Conquest pottery. These developed forms remained culturally acceptable to certain social groups, although amongst some members of the population buried at St Pancras these forms are found in graves with more perceived ‘Roman’ vessels, such as flagons, a pattern resulting from dialogues over what is perceived to be culturally acceptable to deposit into a grave. The demise of surface-blackened Southern Atrebatic Overlap wares c. AD 60 is most probably due to a change in what is perceived culturally acceptable, as there is no noticeable change to the clay pastes, the vessel
forms and the technology used in the production of this pottery type from the beginning of the 1st century AD to its demise. This suggests some form of resistance to change amongst certain members of the indigenous population. In terms of indigenous pottery, this developmental phase ceases some 25 years after the Roman Conquest, which is approximately the time it takes for a generation to be replaced by one growing up with more exposure to ‘Roman’ material culture.

The subtle variations in the production, use and deposition of indigenous transitional pottery suggest that the assumption that a perceived ‘Roman’ vessel form equates to perceived ‘Roman’ social norms is hard to validate. Webster (1999, 53–4) using the adoption of non-indigenous pottery forms by communities in the Outer Hebrides during the early 19th century as an example, illustrates how people renegotiated their identity in response to externally generated changes by acquiring non-indigenous material cultural forms but incorporating them in their own traditional social practices. Rather than resistance, this could be seen as a form of resistant adaptation. Gosselain (2000, 209) argues that, as indigenous social networks respond in reaction to historical events, people accrue a range of knowledge, abilities, preferences and practices which are linked to different aspects of their identity and can lead to the incorporation of varying pottery traditions. Therefore it could be argued that the length of time it took for Atrebatic derivative pottery to develop into what we perceive as more ‘Roman’ forms is an example of resistant adaptation.

The Late Iron Age phase to the cremation cemetery at Westhampnett ceases c. 50 BC, followed by a 120-year gap in the burial record, which suggests a change in burial rites in the Chichester area that is archaeologically invisible until c. AD 70. It could therefore be argued that the continuation of existing burial traditions within the client kingdom after the Roman Conquest until the formation of the cremation cemeteries of St Pancras and Westhampnett is another example of resistant adaptation. In this context, indigenous traditions and beliefs appear to be socially preferable to Roman influences until c. AD 70. Although exactly when the client kingdom became part of the Roman province is unknown, this transitional phase becomes less noticeable by the Flavian period when the cemeteries are created; possibly the client kingdom is absorbed into the province at this point.

CONCLUSION

It was stated at the beginning of this article that the problem of understanding the social dynamics underpinning change and continuity during the Iron Age–Roman transition period in the area of Chichester and its hinterland was complex, if we are to move beyond the sphere of elite socio-political interaction. This study has taken a more mundane form of material culture, namely two specific indigenous pottery types securely datable to the 1st century AD, and re-evaluated their significance as indicators of change and continuity for those further down the social scale. Despite the evident complexity of the problem, these two pottery types are significant in gauging the extent and speed of changes to material culture in the immediate pre- and post-Conquest periods.

A reassessment of Southern Atrebatic derivative wares has shown the importance of colour, texture and form of vessels in the expression of identity. The way this importance was expressed may have altered in the immediate post-Conquest period as the surface-blackened varieties began to go out of favour c. AD 60. Their demise is most likely to be due to a reconfiguration of what is perceived to be culturally acceptable, and suggests some form of initial hesitancy or resistance to change amongst certain members of the indigenous population. The continuation of grey, handmade, wheel-finished varieties produced mainly by potters at Rowlands Castle, and found mainly in burials at St Pancras and to a lesser extent Westhampnett, seems to suggest reluctance by some of the population to adopt more Romanised forms which were being made contemporaneously in the same area, at least until c. AD 70. Both the Atrebatic derivative and more Romanised forms appear as single-vessel cremations and in burials with more disposable wealth, which would suggest that adoption or resistance was not influenced wholly by economic factors. This is significant, because through the production, use and deposition of indigenous pottery the patterns recognised in this article can be seen as symbols of both the differentiation and the belonging of individuals and various social groupings. The production of Atrebatic derivative vessels is eventually eclipsed by more Romanised
wheel-thrown vessel forms in virtually the same fabric, which form part of the burgeoning Rowlands Castle repertoire of vessel forms, furthering the ambiguous blending of cultural traits.

In turn, a reassessment of so-called ‘imitation Gallo-Belgic’ wares has raised a question mark over the function of Gallo-Belgic copies, especially Gallo-Belgic’ wares has raised a question mark over the function of Gallo-Belgic copies, especially
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Castle repertoire of vessel forms, furthering the fabric, which form part of the burgeoning Rowlands wheel-thrown vessel forms in virtually the same fabric, which form part of the burgeoning Rowlands Castle repertoire of vessel forms, furthering the ambiguous blending of cultural traits.

In turn, a reassessment of so-called ‘imitation Gallo-Belgic’ wares has raised a question mark over the function of Gallo-Belgic copies, especially Gallo-Belgic’ wares has raised a question mark over the function of Gallo-Belgic copies, especially Gallo-Belgic imports occurs at the same time as the shift in favour of samian vessels and the copying of samian forms in the Arun Valley, which suggests a reconfiguration of social norms in what is perceived as culturally acceptable to various social groupings during the Flavian period.

The burial assemblages from St Pancras and related sites provide a clear demonstration of the transition into the Roman period. The hybridisation of form, use and deposition of indigenous pottery became manipulated through dialogues and the preferences and practices of various social groupings. Those further down the social scale had an active role in fashioning their own particular lifestyle. Some quickly adopted more typical ‘Roman’ forms of material culture, whilst others (in certain groups amongst the non-elite) initially tried to maintain a link with their own cultural traditions, a fully wheel-thrown pot being a step too far. This process of renegotiating local identities resulted in people retaining parts of their cultural heritage whilst simultaneously adopting and adapting new cultural traits. Yet clearly people within the Chichester area continued with their existing burial tradition(s) until c. AD 70, when archaeologically visible burials typical of the Roman period begin. It is significant that this transitional phase becomes less noticeable during the early Flavian period, as this would be roughly a single generational time-span after the Roman Conquest, which suggests a two-way process in which social norms and how people perceived their various ‘indigenous’ or ‘Roman’ identities were being reconfigured and becoming less polarised.
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