

# ◆ Format of this report

Additional information relating to this report can be located on the Archaeology Data Service website <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/resources.html?sussexac>. The availability of such information will be flagged in the text by the appropriate symbol.

📖 textual information

■ photographic or drawn information

From time to time you may come across references to text, tables or figures which do not appear in the printed volume but are accessible on the ADS website.

At the time of writing this report, the authors are aware that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the format of the conventional excavation report, whose contents are usually constrained into a particular package: introduction–main chronological phases–numerous specialist reports–conclusion. This type of ‘package’ is a direct result of how the excavation and post-excavation tasks, and indeed the archaeological profession, are organized, with, usually, only the directors possessing an overall knowledge of the site. The various categories of finds are despatched to specialists who report on the objects sent to them, but in some cases they have limited time to appreciate the phases of the site, or the other categories of artefact and ecofacts. The resulting report is therefore a result of this fragmented approach, and there is limited integration of finds with other finds’ types, or with the site itself. This approach often produces a data-rich, but only partly digestible, expensive hard-copy publication. Now the growth of the internet has meant that much data can be made available, at a fraction of the cost, in digital form.

There is no agreed way forward at present on the ideal format for an excavation report. The current report betrays its origins in the kind of fragmented process outlined above. The approach adopted here, as the reader will see, is to place much supporting evidence, particularly from the specialists, on the internet. Such an approach will not please everyone. However, the format for excavation reports will be a matter for continuing debate and evolution both within the archaeological profession, and, more importantly, with those who have

to and want to read them.

The specialist reports provide detailed descriptions of different categories of artefact and environmental evidence found during the excavations. It will be quickly appreciated that the majority of artefacts (with one or two exceptions such as the flint objects) were found to the north of Building 3. **(Note that the artefact distribution maps printed in this report were produced using GIS software. Artefacts that did not have precise three-dimensional co-ordinates, for example because they were just ascribed a context number, were excluded from these maps; this is the meaning of ‘selected’ on the captions accompanying these maps.)** This also applies to some kinds of environmental evidence such as food debris represented by oyster shells and animal bones. Many of these items appear to have been deposited as part of a midden, which was building up to the north of the aqueduct in the latter part of the second century AD. The midden was presumably (although not definitely) formed by rubbish derived from the Palace next door. Other finds were deposited in particular features, such as the aqueduct, the stream and the fills of robber trenches. In all categories of finds it was difficult to associate objects with Building 3 itself.

*Please note the following notations used throughout this report.*

Year of excavation: 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999

Site Code: FBE

Context numbers: Introduced with a capital C and numbered from 1 to 967, occasionally followed by a decimal point (when the same context was divided into arbitrary 100 mm or 150 mm horizontal spits). *Please note that context numbers 901–940 relate to Area B (see Appendix E).*

Small Find numbers: 1 to 12372

Pottery fabrics (fine and coarse) are written F.6 or C.11

Sample numbers: 1 to 112

*Please note also that additional information pertaining to these specialist reports will be found on the ADS website. In particular note that some of the finds cata-*

logues have been divided into **Summary Catalogues** (reproduced in hard copy) and **Full Catalogues** (reproduced on the ADS website). Note also that most measured finds drawings are on the ADS website <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/resources.html?sussexac>. This splitting of the specialist reports (between the printed volume and the ADS website) is one of the less satisfactory aspects of this volume. The specialists were not told in advance this was going to happen to their reports, and therefore the dividing line between print and ADS copy has not been uniform in each report. From time to time corrigenda, addenda or comments post-publication specifically relating to this report may be placed on the ADS website. If you have difficulty accessing the internet, or the ADS website, a digital copy of the ADS material can be obtained at cost from Fishbourne Roman Palace, Salthill Rd, Fishbourne, Chichester, PO19 3QR, UK. Tel: 01243-785859 or email [adminfish@sussexpast.co.uk](mailto:adminfish@sussexpast.co.uk).

## HOW TO READ THIS REPORT

The authors suggest that you familiarise yourself first with the Phase Tables (30, 31, 32) for Areas A and B printed at the back of this volume. Then read the printed pages first, or those sections of the printed pages which interest you. Alternatively, some readers may prefer to read the General Conclusions first in order to get an overview of the results. When you see the symbols  or  then please refer to the additional information on the ADS website. Note that no index has been provided since the Table of Contents provides sufficient signposting. In addition, in due course, all of this volume will appear on the ADS website and be searchable by word. Tables numbered 51 and above are on the ADS website. Figures on the ADS website are clearly indicated in the list of Figures at the beginning of this volume.

---