Notes

[1] The structure is numbered 3 because there are two other masonry buildings in proximity, which were constructed earlier than the main palace (Cunliffe 1971; 1998, 41, fig. 11). These are: Building 1/ M1 (under the west range of the palace) and Buildings 2/ M2 (the proto-palace).

[2] A fuller discussion of the design and layout of Building 3 can be found in Manley (2001a).

[3] Please note that the term 'greensand' used here could geologically describe a number of different rocks from totally different sources, eg the Upper Greensand malmstone, the Lower Greensand Midhurst Stone (or equivalents), the Upper Greensand of the Isle of Wight or the Lower Greensand Sandgate Beds of Kent. Some Tertiary rocks could also be described as 'greensand'. For more detailed information please refer to the section on Stone by David Bone in this report, for the relative occurrences of different types of greensand.

[4] Ernest Black pers. comm.

[5] An actus of 120 pes Monetalis is equal to 35.52 m if the value of a pM is taken to equal 296 mm.

[6] A quarter of an actus of 30 pes Monetalis is equal to 8.80 m.

[7] The excavation in 1935 to the rear range was incomplete so there is an element of doubt in the interpretation put forward by the excavators.

[8] The traditional form of the *principia* had an ambulatory to three sides of the courtyard, with a range of buildings including the *aedes* and its adjoining rooms together with the cross-hall where present, on the other. The entrance into the *principia* would pass into the ambulatory facing this range. Many *principia* were later altered with storerooms or *armamentaria* being formed within the ambulatories.

[9] There would seem to be few precedents for a building of this plan form in Britain.

[10] The authors are grateful to John Creighton for this point.

[11] From a study of late 4th century and later basilican churches in Syria (Butler 1969), it can be seen that a common dimension for the spacing of roof trusses was around 2.0 m.

[12] There are many examples of *spina* foundations similar to this which can be seen in the portals to the gates to the forts on Hadrian's Wall.

[13] During the excavation limited checks were made to see if these rows of post-holes occurred to the east or south of Building 3; none were found.

[14] Despite this curious alignment in relation to the north wall of Building 3 there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that rows 1 and 3 predated the construction of Building 3.

[15] Note that four of these post-holes were excavated by Alec Down in 1983.

[16] That is the row of post-holes furthest from the north wall of Building 3 — i.e. row 3.

[17] For an explanation of the fabric types see the pottery report by Malcolm Lyne.

[18] An interesting issue (raised elsewhere) is that the row 2 post-holes were not buried by the greensand road and were also made good with red clay after use, similar to rows 1 and 3. It may be that there were THREE phases of post-hole arrangements: (1 and 3); (2) and (4 and 5). Rows (4 and 5) are clearly the latest, with probably rows (1and 3) the earliest. It is even conceivable that the five rows could represent a fence-line replaced four times. However, the poor quality of the dating evidence from the post-holes indicates that this suggestion cannot be proven.

[19] Of all the features on the site these post-holes caused the most difficulty regarding interpretation. Our first thoughts were that the arrangement of posts might be reconstructed as a lean-to or free-standing building. Other suggestions were made ranging from timber supports for an aqueduct, timber supports for a walkway to an elaborate arrangement of holes for planting trees or shrubs in.

[20] An alternative would be to suggest that the greensand surface only ever formed a hard-standing at what was a temporary pinch-point, the crossing of the stream.

[21] Alternatively, the lack of a greensand surface in the eastern part of the excavation could be due to later ploughing. There is evidence for and against this. On the one hand the decreasing depth of the post-holes to the east suggests that the tops of them may have been ploughed off. Counter to this is the survival of an upright and in-situ iron collar for a wooden water-pipe that survived close to the present surface of the field at the far eastern extremity of the excavation (see note 27).

[22] Note that two of the post-holes were excavated by Alec Down in 1983.

[23] For original location of the stream see Cunliffe 1971, 1, fig. 11.

[24] This may mean that access across the stream was possible by foot but not by wheeled vehicle. Remember that the front of the Palace was the other side of the stream and would have prevented any further passage to the west.

[25] There were five rows of post-holes in all. These were labelled 1 to 5 with 1 being the nearest to the north wall of Building 3 and 5 being the farthest away.

[26] Note that three of these post-holes were excavated by Alec Down in 1983.

[27] There is an interesting issue concerning the survival, upright, of these collars. The top of one of the collars was quite close to the present-day ground level, suggesting that, despite medieval and occasional post-medieval ploughing, these *in-situ* collars represent a fortuitous and remarkable survival.

[28] There is other evidence to indicate that Building 3 was left standing when the main Palace was constructed around AD 75. Distribution of small finds indicates that the majority of finds were located to the north of Building 3, not underneath it. As many of these finds date to the second and third centuries the probable reason for their skewed distribution was that a standing Building 3 sealed and protected the ground underneath it, keeping it find-free. In addition, it is noticeable that the front face of the Flavian Palace is angled slightly a third of the way

along its face (from the south). Such a change of angle seems designed to give more space between the northern half of its façade and the western end of Building 3.

[31] More of this ditch was excavated in 2002 – see Manley & Rudkin (forthcoming a,b).

[32] See Assemblage 1 in Malcolm Lyne's pottery report.

[33] We are assuming that an open pit would have impeded access to the double portal in the eastern range; a pit covered by a wooden removable cover would not have done so.

[34] Readers will note that we favour a slightly earlier date for the construction of Building 3 than that proposed by Barry Cunliffe in the introduction to this volume. The relative scarcity of reliable dating evidence for the early phases at Fishbourne mean that a variety of interpretations are still possible! It is possible, however, that in revisiting the Fishbourne archive, one or two of the features excavated in the 1960s might be dated earlier than the published report. In particular this might apply to Ditch 21 and Gully 18, and to Gully 14 (Cunliffe 1971, 45, 52 and Cunliffe pers. comm).

[35] A glance at the three-dimensional model of the Palace displayed at Fishbourne shows clearly, from the layout of the roof lines, that the proto-palace could very well be a two phase structure. In addition, it can be noted that the wall footings of the bath-suite were wider than the walls to the north (Cunliffe 1971, 61). Direct dating evidence for the proto-palace was not precise or plentiful, and the rooms of the bath-suite itself do not seem to have sealed any earlier stratigraphy (Cunliffe 1971, 63).

[36] Interestingly, a reassessment of the coins from Down's excavations by David Rudling indicates a higher number of Claudian and Neronian issues than stated in the published report (Cunliffe *et al.* 1996, 193).

[37] More of this ditch was excavated in 2002 – *see* Manley and Rudkin (forthcoming (a) and (b)).

[38] Chichester District Council is planning to fund the outstanding publications, although it may be some time before the final reports appear.

[39] ACD indicates the annual publication *Archaeology of Chichester and District*.

[40] Subsequent work, by Southern Archaeology, suggests that these ditches do not relate to one another. James Kenny, Chichester District Council Archaeologist reports that the lowest fill of the ditch on the Needlemakers site contained an assemblage of large sherds of *terra nigra* and *terra rubra*, probably of early -1st century AD date. In addition, another early ditch seems to have been discovered at the Rowes Garage site in the same locality in 2002. There clearly is a complex patterning of early ditches just east of the later eastern walls of the Roman city; however, exactly what kind of enclosure(s) these relate to is, at present, far from clear.

[41] However, for the difficulties of distinguishing legionary equipment from that of non-legionaries *see* Sauer 2000, 22–9.

[42] In this context, it is sometimes difficult to separate the archaeologist from the archaeology. James Kenny, Chichester District Archaeologist, who knew and worked with Alec Down, has supplied the following qualification: 'It must be acknowledged that Alec had been a professional soldier and was, I think at least partly as a result, almost obsessed with a need to identify a military phase at Chichester (and Barry finding just such a phase at Fishbourne can't have helped!). Alec's first thought when presented with a particularly early Roman phase or a particularly V-shaped ditch was always "this must be military".'

[43] The Roman Albania (land adjacent to the western Caspian) not modern Albania.

[44] I am grateful to Creighton (2001) and to David Kennedy and Brian Bosworth for these examples.