



SECTION 4

DISCUSSION





CHAPTER 24

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

By Michael Fulford

INTRODUCTION

Three leading questions to consider in this concluding discussion are: what new information has the excavation of Insula IX added to the knowledge of late Iron Age Calleva obtained from the excavation beneath the forum basilica in the 1980s (Fulford and Timby 2000); how do the results from each area compare with one another; and does the new information contribute further to our understanding of late Iron Age enclosed and territorial *oppida* in south-east Britain? A starting point for this discussion is, therefore, the synthesis which concluded *Late Iron Age and Roman Silchester* (Fulford 2000, 545–64).

However, by way of background, a little more evidence has accrued for later prehistoric activity on the Calleva promontory before the late first century B.C. (Bradley, Durham, Ch. 3), including a late Neolithic radiocarbon date (p. 347), perhaps to be associated with some tree clearance. Valuable though these findings are, complementing the revised listings of later prehistoric artefacts from the Silchester promontory in Creighton with Fry (2016, 340) and providing further clues as to why the Silchester promontory became such a focus in the late Iron Age, they are comparatively trifling compared with the acquisition of a great deal of new knowledge about the late Iron Age occupation. With these prehistoric finds a distinction should be made between the lithic scatters as reported and discussed here and individual items, such as the Neolithic polished stone axe or the Bronze Age flanged axe (Boon 1974, 303), either associated with Roman contexts or unstratified without precise provenance, which could have been introduced as Roman-period ‘found’ items from locations other than the town itself. Even the Bronze Age flint arrowhead, though stratified in a Period 0 context, and the spindlewhorl (p. 75) could have been ‘found’ items brought into the Iron Age settlement as a curiosity.

DEVELOPMENT OF LAYOUT

A starting point is provided by a number of radiocarbon dates obtained from late Iron Age contexts (Ch. 21). These suggest the possibility of a slightly earlier start for the late Iron Age occupation than is indicated by the dating of the bulk of the material culture, particularly that of the relatively abundant pottery. The significance of these dates will be better understood in the context of the ongoing Silchester Environs Project which is exploring a number of sites, including enclosures and linear earthworks, usually associated with the territorial aspect of the Calleva *oppidum* (Creighton with Fry 2016, 302–38; Fulford *et al.* 2016). The programme of radiocarbon dating associated with the Environs Project will provide a landscape-wide chronology for the development of the *oppidum* and a more robust context for appreciating the significance of the dates reported here.

Setting aside the radiocarbon dates for the present, the earliest significant event of the late Iron Age occupation dated by material culture is the digging of Ditch 11631 on a north-west/south-east alignment across the excavated area. What purpose the ditch originally served and how it related to the Inner Earthwork remain unclear. The ankle-breaker at its base hints that it might originally have been part of an isolated, defensive, presumably rectangular enclosure, but the fact that it was superseded, more or less on the same alignment, by a major routeway across the settlement suggests the possibility that it was one element of a planned sub-division of the larger

space offered by the Silchester promontory. Indeed, one of the most important observations at Insula IX was the realisation that Trackway 1 was probably a continuation of the north-west/south-east-oriented street or lane identified by the forum basilica excavation (Fulford and Timby 2000, 26–9, fig. 6) (FIG. 2). The date of the ditch will be considered below.

CHRONOLOGY

At the forum basilica it was cautiously suggested that the first phase, Period 1, dated between *c.* 25 B.C. and *c.* 15 B.C., and was followed by the establishment of a planned layout from *c.* 15 B.C. (Period 2), indicated by the discovery of two streets or lanes more or less at right angles to each other (104°) (Fulford and Timby 2000, 545–6). Haselgrove notes (above, p. 84) that coin numbers at the forum basilica are highest in coin Phase 7 (*c.* 20 B.C.–A.D. 10), earlier than the peak in coin Phase 8 at Insula IX (*c.* A.D. 10–40), and consistent with an earlier start date from *c.* 20 B.C. Indeed, on the basis of the dating of the primary fills of Ditch 11631, the earliest dated feature in Insula IX, we have suggested that the start date is later than at the forum basilica, perhaps as late as *c.* 10 B.C.

Common to both locations (and the unprovenanced antiquarian finds from Silchester), however, is the absence of radially-stamped arretine, which is also the case at Camulodunum. It is also almost completely absent from Britain as whole (Bird, above, p. 214), but present in small quantities on Augustan military sites in Germany, with the largest amount known from Neuss where it accounts for about 5 per cent of the site's arretine assemblage as reported in Kenrick's revision of Oxé and Comfort's *Corpus Vasorum Arretinorum* (2000). Kenrick sees radial stamping as probably to be dated to before 10 B.C., but suggests that it had gone out of fashion by the turn of the first century B.C. and the first century A.D. (OCK, 8–9). Although we do not have a start date for the practice of central stamping of arretine, as found at Calleva and Camulodunum, it is assumed that it follows radial stamps which have a *terminus ante quem* provided by the foundation of the late Augustan forts in Germany. For Calleva, and for Britain more widely, if significant importation of arretine had commenced much before 10 B.C., it would be reasonable to expect an incidence of radial stamping comparable to that recorded in the German forts. While it may be thought risky to place too much reliance on one source of evidence, the evidence for the chronology of arretine is, perhaps, more robust than for any other category of material culture found stratified in the, albeit small, finds assemblages in late Iron Age contexts at Calleva.

There is, as yet, no pre-import horizon of occupation at Calleva, since the earliest contexts identified in both the Insula IX and the forum basilica excavations have all produced sherds of imported pottery alongside local wares, but in all cases from small assemblages. While arretine has not been noted from them, its absence perhaps a factor of the small size of the assemblages in question, there is no evidence to suggest the amphorae or Gaulish material associated with the earliest contexts are necessarily any earlier than 10 B.C. While such contexts from Ditch 11631 at Insula IX and from Wells F423 and F762 at the forum basilica produced sherds of Dressel 1sp alongside Dressel 2–4 (Timby 2000a, 291–4), the question remains whether any of the other Dressel 1B, Dressel 1-sp and Dressel 1–Pascual 1, all of which are present in small quantities from both sites, were imported before 10 B.C., which is considered to be about the time the Dressel 1 form ceased to be used for the transport of wine. The same question could be posed of the coin evidence. Haselgrove (above, p. 91) argues that the early Gaulish potins might well have reached Silchester earlier in the first century B.C. and reminds us of the early-to-mid-first-century B.C. Gallo-Belgic and British gold types from the immediate neighbourhood of the *oppidum* (cf. Creighton with Fry 2016, 340–3). As yet there is no structural context into which to place these finds or pottery imports, such as Central Gaulish wares, which were relatively more abundant at the forum basilica site than at Insula IX, and which could have arrived before 10 B.C. It is hard to know what weight to attach to these finds in assessing the nature of the settlement at Calleva before *c.* 10 B.C., but, as the developments at Insula IX show, there is a significant change in the intensity of occupation of the *oppidum* from around the last decade of the first century B.C., coinciding with the beginning of the importation of Italian and Gaulish arretine. This does not, however, downplay the possibility that, just as at the forum basilica, some or all of the

Insula IX Period 0, Phase 1 post-hole and beam-slot structures (above, FIG. 7), each producing very small collections of sherds, could pre-date 10 B.C. Nevertheless, as the secondary filling of the key early feature, Ditch 11631, appears to demonstrate, intensive occupation at Insula IX does not seem to start until the beginning of the first century A.D. This is consistent with the coin evidence where Phase 8 coins (c. A.D. 10–40) account for about half of those lost (p. 84). Although only some 150 m separates the forum basilica site from Insula IX, it would appear that the initial focus of late Iron Age occupation of the Silchester promontory was more to its centre at the forum basilica site, subsequently spreading out to occupy Insula IX, with the whole area eventually defended by the Inner Earthwork. Whether this early focus was unenclosed remains to be seen, but given the Iron Age tradition of enclosure evident in the Silchester environs, including at nearby Rampier Copse, it seems unlikely that the early settlement would not have been enclosed (cf. *ibid.*, 353–4, fig. 9.8). At Insula IX the total length of (late Iron Age) pre-conquest occupation appears to be about only 50 years.

SEASONAL TO PERMANENT OCCUPATION

Another approach to understanding the context of material which could have arrived at Calleva before c. 10 B.C. is that it was the product of an intermittent, seasonal occupation, such as the meeting of traders with representatives of local clans or tribes once a year, perhaps in the autumn, after the harvest. Against this background, the creation of the enclosure or sub-division of space represented by Ditch 11631 may be seen as evidence of the intensification of periodic meetings and an increase in the number of participants, which consequently required some formalisation of the way the land was used on the Silchester promontory. The micromorphology of the filling of Ditch 11631 suggests that it was intermittent, with rubbish being swept or cleared into it from time to time (above, p. 360). In this context Timby (above, p. 202) notes the relatively small size and the evidence of wear of the pottery sherds, which suggests that they had been exposed to trample and weathering on the ground surface for some time before final deposition. Such a pattern of behaviour at Insula IX might not be inconsistent with a periodic and seasonal occupation of the Silchester promontory.

The setting out of the trackways, the creation of compounds and the further sub-division of space in what we have termed the Central Compound and the construction of the hall, Structure 9, as well as other buildings less clearly defined, represent another important stage in the increase in intensity with which the Silchester promontory was used, and is precisely mirrored at the forum basilica site (Period 2) (Fulford and Timby 2000, 26–9, fig. 6). Indeed we believe that we have sections of one and the same trackway revealed in both excavations (above, FIG. 2).

However, we should also note the lack of wells and substantial rubbish pits which can be securely dated to before the time of the Roman conquest of A.D. 43, with the rubbish which did accumulate and become noisome being swept from time to time into Ditch 11631. Within the Central Compound there is evidence of only one pre-conquest well (10421) which appears to have remained open for any length of time — but not necessarily up to the time of the conquest; the other was apparently rapidly abandoned with no time for waterlogged plant remains or other material to accumulate in its primary fills. Well 8328 in the North-West Compound also appears to have been open for some time, though the finds from its lowest fills suggest that it is later, perhaps dating to around the time of the conquest. It is conceivable, therefore, that there may have been a period of 10 to 20 years when there was no active well at Insula IX. Although the excavated area at the forum basilica was only some 40 per cent of that at Insula IX, we can also observe there a similar lack of pits in the pre-conquest phases, Periods 1–2. However, there was a slightly greater number of wells, one probably pre-dating the layout of the streets, but two adjacent to each other in the centre of the excavated area, only one of which was completely excavated (Fulford and Timby 2000, 16–20, fig. 4). As at Insula IX, it is quite possible that neither of the two completely excavated wells remained open up to the time of the conquest (Timby 2000a, 291–3). In terms of numbers, if we allow for the much smaller area of the forum basilica excavation compared with that at Insula IX and scale it up *pro rata* by 2.5, the total number of wells in the centre of the *oppidum* might have been as many as seven or eight.

While the material culture is neutral on the question of a seasonal rather than an all-year-round occupation, the environmental evidence, which, in the case of plant and seed remains, is dominated by their association with crop-processing debris, can be argued as supportive of the case for a seasonal occupation in the autumn, after the harvest (cf. Campbell 2008, 57–9). Although the faunal assemblage is small, there is an absence of neonates of cattle, sheep or pig which could be associated with occupation in the spring. This is also true of the larger assemblage from the forum basilica (Grant 2000, 430–3). The presence of spindlewhorls, one of the few artefacts which can be associated with an activity, could also be associated with the availability of wool following shearing of the sheep in the summer. However, we should not, perhaps, press this evidence too hard for two reasons. It all would also be present had occupation been all-year-round, and it is harder to envisage positive categories of evidence (rather than negative, such as the absence of neonate fauna) which unequivocally could be associated with over-winter or permanent occupation. In similar vein, it is difficult to know what to make of the lack of evidence for hearths in contrast to the following post-conquest phase when they are very visible. While charcoal and charred cereals, for example, attest to burning, there is no trace of locations where fires were repeatedly set across the excavated area in Period 0. This was also the case at the forum basilica site. Another ‘negative’ is the lack of evidence for grain storage, including the absence of insects associated with stored grain. With the exception of one possible, very small, four-post structure in the north-west of the excavated area, there are no obvious grain-storage buildings or grain-storage pits. However, it is also the case that it is hard altogether to identify the footprint of individual buildings (below) and one or more of the clusters of post-holes might include a granary structure. Finally, we should note that the geochemistry of Period 0 contexts (Ch. 22) does not point to an intensive occupation until the latest phase of Period 0.

One inference to be drawn from Lodwick’s study of the crops would be to suggest that the cereals consumed in Calleva only supported a relatively small population, or perhaps a larger population over a shorter period, which might account for the apparent lack of facilities for over-winter storage. On the basis of the associated weed seeds she argues that the crops were locally grown, probably by farmers living in and processing their crops in Calleva, as well as by farms in the immediate hinterland. There is no evidence for the importation of cereals from different and slightly more distant geologies like the chalk of the Hampshire Downs, scarcely 10 km to the south, or the Berkshire Downs, 15–20 km to the north. Allowing for woodland and other ground useless for cultivation, a territory of some 10,000 ha (10 km by 10 km) around Calleva could have comfortably provided sufficient arable land to support a permanent population of some 500–1,000 inhabitants, or a combination of a smaller permanent and a larger seasonal population (cf. Boon 1974, 243–8).

In highlighting the lack of evidence for intensive occupation at Calleva we might then develop the scenario of a small permanent population, engaged in farming the surrounding countryside and managing nearby woodland, which was swollen once a year after the harvest, when traders gathered to exchange precious metal and base coin, imported amphora-borne wine and other foodstuffs, manufactured goods for a variety of commodities and raw materials, almost completely invisible in the archaeological record, drawn from across southern Britain (cf. Fulford 1989b, 176–7). While much was consumed on site, as the volume of ceramics indicates, very small quantities of luxury goods did penetrate the surrounding countryside (Timby 2012, 141–4). Does this imply that much of what was brought from across southern Britain to be sold or exchanged at Calleva was delivered as tribute, hence so little evidence of reciprocity with the hinterland?

Towards, or around the time of, the Roman conquest, the late 30s and early 40s A.D., there is evidence of a further change of tempo in the nature of the occupation which might be consistent with a shift from seasonal to permanent occupation or of an increased density of a permanent population. The majority, perhaps all, of the pits (Groups 1 and 14) which flank the two trackways appear to date late in our sequence, some with fills which are almost certainly post-conquest in date. It is also from the later well (8328) that we have the first evidence for the stabling and presumed over-wintering of animals (p. 301). The later pits are also substantial in volume, compared with those scattered across the Central Compound, one in Group 1 with

evidence that it had held latrine waste. With higher levels of phosphorus from such later Period 0 contexts, the geochemistry also supports an increase in the intensity of occupation (above, p. 356). The implication of a growing population is that its waste had to be better controlled than had happened previously, with deposition preferred at the boundaries of the compounds. Exactly the same patterning can be seen at the forum basilica site with large pits lining the streets or trackways in Period 3, from about A.D. 40 onwards (Fulford and Timby 2000, 30–4, fig. 7).

THE BUILDINGS

The nature of the built environment in the pre-conquest period also bears on the questions of the scale and the permanency, or not, of occupation through the year. Given the much larger area excavated at Insula IX it might have been expected that more, and more clearly defined, structures might have emerged. However, it has not proved possible to make sense of the majority of post-hole clusters and other potential structural remains. Most appear to represent small rectangular buildings of which Structure 15, measuring 5.6 m by 4.5 m and giving a floor area of about 25 m², in the north-east of the excavated area is probably the best preserved example. This compares with the two small rectangular buildings recovered from the forum basilica excavation, one 8.5–9.5 m by 3.5 m (29.75–33.25 m²), the other 3.5 m by 2 m (7 m²) (Fulford and Timby 2000, 23–4, figs 14–16). Other arrangements of post-holes recorded across the excavated area of Insula IX do not suggest any structures with lengths greater than 10 m, except for the halls, Structures 9 and 10, neither of which is paralleled at the forum basilica. This emphasis on rectangular buildings contrasts markedly with the structural evidence from the recently published excavations at the *oppidum* at Stanwick, N Yorks., where, in all periods between the first half of the first century B.C. and the second half of the first century A.D., the great majority of the buildings are roundhouses with a few rectangular four-post or similar structures (Haselgrove 2016, 51–120).

Although there are questions about the ground-plan, roof support and organisation of the internal space of both Structure 9 and 10, we are confident of our interpretation of them as halls. At 47.5 m in length, and with an average width of 7.5 m, the larger and earlier of the two, Structure 9, is certainly pre-conquest in origin, its life perhaps extending into the mid-40s A.D., up to the time of the construction of the north–south street. Its smaller successor, Structure 10, measuring 22.5 m by 12.6 m, with its tri-partite division of internal space, is more likely, therefore, to post-date the conquest. The difference in scale, and the implication for social organisation at Calleva, between Structure 9, with its floor area of about 350 m², and Structure 10, with a floor area of about 280 m² — the former some 14 times greater, the latter some 11 times greater than Structure 15 — and the floor areas of the lesser buildings collectively is very striking. Both of these buildings have a larger surface area than that of the 180 m² projected for the largest (circular) structure LS2 at Stanwick which is assigned to Period 4, *c.* 30/20 B.C.—*c.* A.D. 30/40, and thus contemporary with our Period 0 (Haselgrove 2016, 72–107, 411–14). Unlike circular buildings whose structural characteristics limit their capacity for enlargement, rectangular buildings are not so constrained. We argue below (p. 382) that there was a greater concentration of wealth and elite activity in the centre of Calleva, consistent with it being the location of successive ‘royal’ residences, probably built on an even greater scale than those in Insula IX. It is likely, therefore, that even more monumental hall-type buildings will be found there (cf. Bradley *et al.* 2016, 335).

The remaining building to be considered from Period 0 is Structure 14, which we have interpreted as a possible temple of Romano-Celtic type with an ambulatory of 10 m by 8 m enclosing a cella of 5.8 m by 4.8 m. Since there is post-conquest material from some of the post-holes, a post-conquest date for its construction is entirely possible, and the presence of later sacrificial offerings, notably small pit deposits containing the burnt remains of sheep, demonstrates continuity of use well into, if not throughout, Period 1. Indeed, it is the knowledge of the latter which has encouraged us to interpret Structure 14 as a temple. Though the nature of the late Iron Age structures interpreted as shrines at Heybridge, Essex, is different, it is, as at Insula IX, the evidence from the succeeding, earliest Roman phase which encouraged their

interpretation as temples (Atkinson and Preston 2015b, 87–92). The later evidence associated with Structure 14 will be described in the next volume reporting the Claudio-Neronian (Period 1) occupation at Insula IX. This building also provides a possible context for the several residual finds of a votive nature, including miniature and mutilated objects, such as brooches and axes and a deliberately-halved silver wheel amulet, which Crummy described and postulated as evidence for the existence of a shrine in or close to the excavated area (2012, 117–18).

Roundhouse structures dating to Period 0 have not been identified in Insula IX. Rather, roundhouses are a particular feature of the later, Period 1 occupation at Insula IX. However, three possible structures of this kind were recorded at the forum basilica and, on the assumption that roundhouse building was consistently earlier than rectangular building, they were attributed to the first phase of Iron Age occupation (Period 1) (Fulford and Timby 2000, 19–24, figs 4 and 9). In fact, only Structure a, which seems to have been cut by a rectangular Iron Age (Period 2) building, is certainly earlier than the Period 4 courtyard building dating from the later A.D. 40s. The other two structures could be contemporary with, or later than, the rectangular buildings as we have found at Insula IX.

THE COMPOUNDS

At Insula IX we have interpreted the space which occupies most of the excavated area (0.3 ha) as part, perhaps the larger part, of a compound, separated from its neighbours to the north-west and south-west by the two trackways. There is no trace of a major boundary to define a southern limit to the main compound, so we do not know its full extent. However, if the hall, Structure 9, was centrally placed within the compound, we might estimate its total area as about half a hectare. It would seem that the situation at the forum basilica site was similar, the excavation exposing a substantial transect of one compound separated by the streets or trackways from further compounds to the north-east and south-east. Together, the excavations account for a little more than 0.4 ha, or about 13 per cent of the interior of the Inner Earthwork (32.5 ha; the enclosed *oppidum*), giving indications between them of some six compounds. If each was about 0.5 ha in area, as we suggest for the Central Compound at Insula IX, and the total area within the Inner Earthwork was divided into compounds, some 65 compounds could be accommodated. But, if we allow for the possibility of fewer, larger compounds at the centre of the *oppidum*, including accommodation for successive ‘kings’ — Tincomarus, Eppillus and Verica — as well as some communal space, and the ground occupied by the network of lanes which defines the layout, we might reduce the total to, perhaps, 30–40.

Before we consider the question of who occupied the compounds, we should review the evidence for the activities which took place within the *oppidum*.

CHARACTERISING THE OCCUPATION

There is good reason to suppose that the majority of the evidence for the pre-conquest occupation at Insula IX is to be found residually in Period 1 and later contexts (p. 73). Otherwise we are reliant on the fills of the cut features which have been assigned to the pre-conquest Period 0. The most substantial cut feature of the late Iron Age occupation is also one of, if not, the earliest — Ditch 11631. From its primary, secondary and top fills a total pottery assemblage of some 6,016 sherds was recovered. This compares with 571 sherds from the primary fill of the broadly contemporary Well 10421 and 587 sherds from the primary fill of the later, Tiberio-Claudian Well 8328. Only two pits produced larger assemblages than the wells: 1,374 sherds from Pit 12462 in Pit Group 1 and some 1,200 from Pit 8580 in Pit Group 14. The main fills of both of these are late in the sequence, 12462 around the conquest, 8580 certainly post-conquest. Otherwise the pottery assemblages from individual pits and groups of pits are small, mostly with less than 100 sherds in the great majority of pits, though their groupings more or less coincide with the clusters of post-holes suggestive of buildings.

Nevertheless, pottery is altogether by far the most abundant artefact, accounting for 22,196 sherds (p. 150), compared with 7,815 hand-collected animal bones, its consumption evidence

for cooking, eating, drinking and, in the case of the larger Silchester ware jars, storage of food in the household. It is also evidence of the widespread trade links of Calleva, particularly, in terms of volume, across the Channel to northern France, but also to the centre and south of Gaul, and to the Mediterranean, to Italy and Spain. In ceramic terms this trade brought, in the main, wine, olive oil and other foodstuffs, including olives (p. 289), carried in amphorae, as well as table and drinking wares. It very rarely brought lamps or mortaria, vessels familiar in a Roman Mediterranean context. Flagons are also not common. The Insula IX pottery assemblage is almost identical in its range to that from the forum basilica site, though there are slight differences in relative proportions. For example, Timby notes a higher proportion of Baetican amphorae from Insula IX. Together, the range of imported wares, their typological profile and the proportions of the different forms of the pottery from the two sites underscore Pitts' (2010; 2014) observations on the distinctiveness of late Iron Age and Claudio-Neronian ceramic assemblages from south-eastern British *oppida* compared with their conquest-period 'military' counterparts.

Although we are dealing with a relatively short period overall of pre-conquest occupation with comparatively few securely dated deposits, there is some evidence from independently dated material to suggest a decline in continental trade in the Tiberian period. Replacing the arretine table ware, whose latest stamped examples at Insula IX take its importation to c. A.D. 20, is South Gaulish sigillata of which we have examples of plain wares stratified in Period 0 contexts (above, pp. 153–8). From residual contexts we also have three vessels of potters who worked exclusively in the pre-conquest period between c. A.D. 10–20 and c. A.D. 20–40 (p. 158). This compares with the 15 stamped arretine vessels from Insula IX. It is also possible that some of the South Gaulish stamped vessels which span the conquest period were imported before A.D. 43, but the vast majority, if not all, of the potters concerned are represented in unequivocal post-conquest contexts elsewhere in Britain. This recalls the arguments put forward by Sealey (2009) for a decline in the importation of wine into Britain after the end of the production of Dressel 1 amphorae at the end of the first century B.C. In support of his argument, he considered the evidence of the amphorae from Periods 1–3 at the forum basilica site at Silchester, noting the decline in the volume of Dressel 2–4 amphorae by 22 per cent in Period 3 (c. A.D. 40–50/60) compared with Period 2 (c. 15 B.C.–A.D. 40/50) (ibid., 22–3). Until we have completed the analysis of all the pottery, including both amphorae and samian, from Period 1 contexts at Insula IX, which we already know contain considerable quantities of material residual from the pre-conquest occupation, this conclusion of a decline in continental trade to Calleva in the Tiberian period must remain provisional.

The domestic pottery, by contrast, is mostly of local origin, though some regional sources have been identified, of which north Kent, as the source of the briquetage (and salt), is numerically the most important (p. 235). Closer to home, at a distance of some 25 km, we can now be confident of pre-conquest production of Alice Holt wares, accounting for some 5 per cent of the assemblage by sherd count. The coins, though few in number, significantly complement the pottery in illustrating the regional connections of Calleva within Britain, with those from Insula IX adding links to Kent and the Western and South-Western regions to those previously established at the forum basilica where the coins included Eastern and East Midlands types (p. 83). To the coins and pottery we should also add the greensand querns from Lodsworth, West Sussex, and the Kimmeridge shale from the Isle of Purbeck, Dorset.

But it is the pottery, whether imported from outside of Britain or from elsewhere in southern Britain, which is the principal archaeologically visible evidence of trade. Even though, as a type of artefact which survives well in the archaeological record, it bulks large compared with other artefacts and might, therefore, be regarded as unrepresentative, it still probably translates into a scale of trade which was a major, if not the major, non-domestic activity at Calleva.

To support this activity and the traders associated with it, food production, as we have seen, would also have been important. Though it is difficult to estimate scale from the surviving cereals and the associated processing debris, Lodwick equates the low density of charred plant remains with a low scale of cereal processing (p. 308), despite deposits occurring widely across the excavated area. It is likely that the land immediately around the *oppidum* was cultivated by its inhabitants and survey work has so far not identified any farm of certain or probable

Iron Age date closer than 1 km from the Inner Earthwork (Moore 2011; Silchester Environs Project, ongoing). Besides cereal cultivation there was also stock raising and there is no reason yet to suppose that most of, if not all, the animals consumed in Calleva were not reared locally. Within the *oppidum*, the development of the fenced trackways and the sub-division of the Central Compound into smaller enclosures would have allowed for the movement and penning of stock across the interior. The deposits of fodder (hay), bedding material and dung from Well 8328 confirm the presence of herbivores, probably horses, within the settlement, while the insect assemblage associated with Well 10421 indicates the nearby presence of grazing animals and heavily grazed ground (p. 282). If trading only occurred seasonally, farming, as an all-year-round activity, was probably the principal occupation of the permanent inhabitants, with land around Calleva perhaps allotted centrally to each compound.

One consequence of the lack of closed deposits dating to the pre-conquest period is that much of the evidence of occupation occurs residually in Period 1 and later contexts. While we can distinguish reasonably well between pre- and post-conquest in the case of artefacts such as arretine pottery and brooches with dated typologies, this is not so in the case of material which is less or completely typologically indistinctive, such as metal-working debris. Overall, there is very little of this across the excavated area at Insula IX. The evidence for the working of non-ferrous metals is limited to the coin moulds, but their low incidence and scattered distribution suggests that where they were used to produce metal pellets was elsewhere than the excavated area of Insula IX. There is also no trace of any furnace, perhaps of the reverberatory kind as suggested by Allen (above, p. 256), in which the metal would have been melted. That the working of non-ferrous metals took place very rarely or not at all at Insula IX is also borne out by the lack of crucibles and other forms of mould, such as for harness and vehicle fittings, both of which were relatively abundant at the forum basilica site (Northover and Palk 2000). Allen also comments on a few pieces of non-ferrous metal-working waste (p. 247), but these are all from contexts which *could* be Period 1. While it is always possible that they are residual from Period 0, there is no way of establishing this for certain. In the case of iron-making (smelting) and iron-working we do have positive evidence in the form of hammerscale and slag basins from pre-conquest contexts in Pit Group 2 and the primary fill of Ditch 11631, but also, as with the few pieces associated with non-ferrous metal-working, the majority of the slag basins are associated with late, possibly post-conquest contexts from the trackways, particularly from Pit Groups 1 and 14. They, too, *could* be residual, but, equally, they could be evidence of an increase in intensity of iron-making and iron-working after the conquest. Nevertheless the quantities altogether are small, as are the individual basins themselves, and, like the pellet moulds, they could have been introduced from elsewhere than the excavated area in Insula IX. This situation is very similar to that found at the forum basilica site, where a total of 4.4 kg of iron-making and iron-working slags was recovered from Periods 1 and 2 (Richards 2000b, 421; Allen 2012, where he grouped together the slags from Periods 1 to 3 at the forum basilica). One shallow pit from Period 1 at the forum basilica, which produced a quantity of hammerscale, is reminiscent of such material associated with Pit Group 2 in Insula IX. Together, the two excavations within the *oppidum* suggest itinerant iron-workers, smelting local ores episodically in simple bowl furnaces and then working them into artefacts in the same location, with no evidence yet within the *oppidum* of concentrations of debris (cf. Sharples 2010, 133–9). These indications for casual, non-intensive metal-working are consistent with the evidence of the geochemistry (Ch. 22). The most abundant iron artefact (including residual examples) dating from Period 0 is the brooch and on these grounds it is one likely product of the iron-workers at Calleva.

In the case of copper-alloy-working, the deposit of moulds for harness and vehicle fittings, crucibles and bronze-working slag from a single pit (F1297) at the forum basilica site is also consistent with the idea of episodic activity on the part of itinerant metal-workers (Fulford and Timby 2000, 29–31; Northover and Palk 2000, 395–413). This deposit, which has no equivalent from the Insula IX excavation, indicates the gathering up of waste from a short-lived phase of metal-working, similar in character to that evidenced at Gussage All Saints, Dorset, more than one hundred years earlier (Spratling 1979; Foster 1980; cf. Sharples 2010, 140–6). Overall the evidence from both Insula IX and the forum basilica for metal-working of any kind is slight, of a scale compatible with a seasonal activity.

Perhaps more important than metal-working at Calleva was textile production. Spindlewhorls made from pottery discs are one of the commonest 'small finds' from Period 0. Allowing for the likelihood of an even greater number on account of the incidence of likely residual examples in Period 1 and later contexts, the spinning of wool was clearly an important activity at Insula IX, but one very probably conducted in the household. Spindlewhorls were also found at the forum basilica, principally in Periods 2 and 3 (Timby 2000b). Together, the evidence from the two sites suggests that the spinning of wool was a widespread activity across pre-Roman Calleva. Loomweights, on the other hand, are very rare, with only one reported from Insula IX, and none from the forum basilica. However, it should not be inferred that weaving did not take place at Calleva, rather that the Iron Age warp-weighted loom had been replaced by the two-beam vertical loom which did not require weights (Wild 2002, 11). This seems a likely explanation for the general disappearance of loomweights from the archaeological record in southern Britain by the end of the first century A.D., their extreme rarity at pre-conquest Calleva representing an early instance of the change in technology. In addition to wool, we should also note the presence at Insula IX of flax, which might also have been used as a cloth fibre.

WHO OCCUPIED THE COMPOUNDS? INSULA IX AND FORUM BASILICA SITES COMPARED

It seems clear that trade was the principal non-domestic activity carried on at Calleva in the pre-conquest period so the *oppidum* would have accommodated, if only seasonally, the various parties bringing goods and commodities from the Continent and from southern Britain for exchange. Previously, on the basis of the great difference in diet and the character of material culture with what has been evidenced from contemporary rural settlements in the hinterland, we argued for a strong northern Gallic (Atrebat) component to the population (Fulford 2000, 545–64). That connection has been further strengthened by the discovery at Insula IX of food types such as celery, coriander and dill, which are also found in Gallic *oppida* (Lodwick 2014). Such a Gallic element might have included the traders responsible for the imports from the Continent, but there also has to be a context for those who represented the communities from across southern Britain and who brought the commodities and raw materials which we presume were exchanged. Were the spaces which they occupied within the *oppidum* mutually exclusive, or did they share compounds where the traders were the guests of the particular British group which was the focus of their attention at the time? That there was a degree of exclusivity among the compounds is hinted at by the difference in the composition of the coin assemblages between Insula IX and the forum basilica site, with only one coin type common between the two areas (p. 77). This perhaps points to a particular tribal or clan identity associated with each compound, precluding the need for interaction between compounds or for a common marketplace at Calleva where goods could be exchanged. Rather, we might envisage negotiations conducted between the traders and the individual tribal or clan representative(s) in each compound. If our hall, Structure 9, is typical of the buildings to be found in each compound, it implies that negotiations were in the hands of the leader or leaders of the community in question. Perhaps the Western and South-Western coins, exclusive to Insula IX, give a clue as to the territorial interests of the occupants of the Central Compound there?

There are few leads which take us further in discovering the identity of the occupants of individual compounds, but the largest area of one revealed at the forum basilica is only about half that of the Central Compound excavated at Insula IX. There are some distinct differences between the two (part) compounds, which can only be partly explained by the larger area excavated at Insula IX. Nevertheless, the absence of evidence of a large hall-type structure at the forum basilica is likely to be a product of the smaller area excavated. Also, the transect across the compound with the largest area exposed at the forum basilica site happens to be across one corner and not its central area. At Insula IX the fact that the Central Compound has yielded hobnails, including from the earliest dated contexts, which were not identified at the forum basilica site is almost certainly a product of a much more intensive sieving programme than that conducted at the forum basilica site (p. 6). Nina Crummy associates the hobnails with a military

presence (p. 116) and, in this context, we should note the strap-fitting fragment from a *lorica segmentata* from Pit Group 10. It is more than likely that further associated equipment of arms and armour is residual in Period 1 and later contexts. Following the Gallic Wars such Roman material would probably have been widely available so that, by the end of the first century B.C., such gear could have been worn or carried by Britons, Gauls or other groups from the Roman world, including detachments of the Roman military, who might have been permanent or temporary residents at Calleva, supporting Rome's clients in Britain. We would expect the retinues associated with the dynasts and other leaders at Calleva to be armed and armoured, consistent with the authority they apparently exercised over central southern Britain. We should not, therefore, be surprised by finds such as the Roman scabbard fitting from the pre-conquest (c. A.D. 25) ditch at Fishbourne, West Sussex (Manley and Rudkin 2005, 95–6; cf. Creighton with Fry 2016, 364–6). Indeed, arms and armour might very well have been regular components of pre-conquest cross-Channel trade.

The above provisos aside, there are some clear differences between the two areas. First, metal-working: the forum basilica site has positive evidence in the form of several fragments of crucibles from its Periods 1 and 2 for copper-alloy-working (Northover and Palk 2000, 395–8); there was no such evidence from Insula IX. The large deposit of Period 2 fragments of mould for casting bronze harness and vehicle fittings is also unique to the forum basilica site (ibid., 406–13); there is also no such evidence for comparable metal-working from Insula IX. A crucible from Period 3 at the forum basilica, which could well be residual from Periods 1–2, also has traces of silver. Although coin or pellet moulds are common to both areas, the great majority of fragments are residual in Claudio-Neronian contexts at both sites. The waste from non-ferrous metal-working is clearly present at the forum basilica site, but, as at Insula IX, there is no focus, such as a hearth or fragments of furnace(s), to link with the crucibles and moulds. To give an idea of relative abundance between the two sites, if we take the entire assemblage of pellet moulds from each site and compensate for the smaller area excavated at the forum basilica by scaling up the number of fragments (21) by a factor of 2.5, the total (52) doubles that from Insula IX (26). This is also true of the Iron Age coin assemblage at the forum basilica where the adjusted figure of 50 is about twice that of the Insula IX assemblage (25 coins).

The animal bone also indicates greater levels of food processing, reasonably to be equated with higher levels of consumption, at the forum basilica site than at Insula IX. The hand-collected animal bone assemblage from Periods 1 and 2 at the forum basilica totals over 10,300 fragments, already substantially more than the bone from Insula IX (7,815 fragments). If one scales up the forum basilica animal bone by 2.5, it amounts to nearly 26,000 fragments, over three times the size of the Insula IX assemblage. It is also worth noting the absence of oysters and mussels at Insula IX in Period 0 and their extreme rarity in Period 1 compared with the forum basilica where they are present in small quantities in its Periods 1 and 2, but in a comparatively larger quantity in Claudio-Neronian Period 3. Again, a significant proportion there is likely to be residual from late Iron Age contexts. Chicken, on the other hand, is present at Insula IX, albeit in small quantities, as well as at the forum basilica, along with duck and woodcock (Serjeantson 2000, 484).

Unlike at the forum basilica, with Insula IX we now have evidence from the analysis of the organic residues in the pottery for what was or was not cooked at Insula IX (Ch. 10). The most striking result of this research is the absence of evidence for milk, so evident at Danebury, earlier in the Iron Age, and the consistent presence of indicators for the fats derived from ruminants and, perhaps, also from pig, all of which are present in the faunal record. The combination of the evidence from the faunal remains and the organic residues at Insula IX underlines, just as was concluded at the forum basilica (Fulford 2000, 550–1), how different diet was compared with Iron Age settlements in the hinterland. This remains an important component of the argument that the first generations of residents at Calleva, or a significant proportion of them, were from outside of Britain, very probably from northern Gaul.

With greater levels of food consumption indicated at the forum basilica by the faunal evidence, it is not surprising that, when the pottery assemblage from Periods 1 and 2 at the forum basilica (11,588 sherds) is scaled up by 2.5, the total amounts to the greater figure of some 28,970

sherds. The difference between this figure and the total (22,196) from Insula IX represents an increase of about 30 per cent on the Insula IX total.

In comparing the two sites, we can also be confident of attaching significance to difference in, for example, some aspects of ritual behaviour. Although residual fragments may emerge in the analysis of Period 1 bone, human remains are not otherwise in evidence at Insula IX in Period 0, but they are at the forum basilica, where one complete skeleton and fragments of two others are associated with pre-conquest Periods 1 and 2. Remains of a further three individuals from Periods 3 and 4 (equivalent to Period 1 at Insula IX) at the forum basilica may be residual from the late Iron Age phases. On the other hand, at Insula IX we have what appears to be a deliberate burial of a miniature dog, a very rare breed, associated with the construction of the hall, Structure 9, but with no comparable disposal of animal remains as from Periods 1 and 2 at the forum basilica. But, as we have noted, the excavated area at the forum basilica is too small to have produced evidence of a high-status building comparable to Structure 9 at Insula IX. Grant notes possible deliberate deposits of dog and raven remains, but not of complete skeletons, from Claudio-Neronian contexts at the forum basilica (2000, 448) and there are instances of articulated animal remains from Insula IX, but also from similar types of context (p. 68), which are likely to be around or soon after the conquest. The practice of placing complete, or near-complete, pottery vessels, some with evidence of piercing, in the basal fills of wells is also common to both sites (above, p. 40; Fulford and Timby 2000, 17).

While the probable earlier start of occupation in the centre of Calleva may account for some of the difference in estimated quantities and range of artefacts and ecofacts between the forum basilica site and Insula IX, it cannot account for all of it. We interpret the greater concentration of finds at the centre of Calleva as an indication of comparatively greater wealth, arguably to be associated with the source of power of the Atrebatian or Southern kingdom, and presumably also coinciding with the residence(s) of the kings. Although large buildings have yet to be identified at the heart of Calleva, the hall, Structure 9, in Insula IX, or larger versions of it, may give an indication of their likely character. Just as in its local Insula IX context this building points up the sharp difference in wealth and status between its occupants and those of the smaller dwellings surrounding it, so, by contrast, the greater volume of food and material goods estimated to have been consumed around the forum basilica site points to the difference in wealth and status between the power at the centre of Calleva and the resident who owned or leased the Central Compound in Insula IX. Although we do not know what caused the deaths of the individuals buried at the forum basilica site, their very presence may be seen as in some way symbolic of the authority exercised from the centre of Calleva. Another facet of the wealth and power exercised from the centre may be seen in the percentage of imported fine ware which, though slightly higher at Insula IX, includes a particularly high incidence of drinking vessels (Timby, p. 206).

The occupants of the Central Compound clearly had farming interests in the immediate vicinity of Calleva, but the hint in the coin evidence of exclusive links to the west and south-west of southern Britain suggests that their leader also exercised a wider control from his great hall, Structure 9. Some of those connections may have been with the occupants of the complex ditched sites — Moore's polyfocal complexes — of the region, perhaps to be associated with the septs or pagi of the kingdom (Moore 2012). In the future particular connections with other parts of southern Britain may eventually be identified in other compounds, the composite picture reflected in the distribution of the gold coinage of the Southern Kingdom, the territory representing the area under direct control of those leaders affiliated to the Southern Kingdom (Fulford and Timby 2000, 561, fig. 238).

To conclude, we may return to the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter and consider what the excavation at Insula IX has contributed to our knowledge of late Iron Age Calleva and how it compares with what was found at the forum basilica site. We have seen that, while the layout of streets or lanes observed at the forum basilica site is replicated at Insula IX, albeit not in a rigid orthogonal manner, the larger area excavated at Insula IX not only provides us with some clearer building plans, including successive 'great' halls, but also allows us to envisage the development of a network of compounds across the interior of the *oppidum*, with its clear implication of a centralised authority. We might also observe that a gradual agglomeration of

rectangular compounds within the defended heart of the *oppidum* could also give the appearance of a planned orthogonal layout to the settlement.

Otherwise, there are considerable differences between the two excavated areas, particularly in the scale of consumption of both food (represented by animal bone) and material goods. The absence of evidence for non-ferrous metal-working at Insula IX is in marked contrast to the positive evidence for it at the centre, though the single large deposit of moulds for harness and vehicle fittings from the forum basilica site suggests that manufacture was still in the hands of itinerant bronzesmiths in the second quarter of the first century A.D. Of other activities, small-scale iron-making and iron-working are attested at both sites, as is the spinning of wool but, on the evidence currently available, Calleva cannot be considered as a centre of manufacturing or of significant craft production in the late Iron Age.

We have suggested that occupation of the Silchester promontory may initially have been seasonal, with a more permanent, but not necessarily large population — and one that could be supported by the produce of the immediate hinterland — resident from the end of the first century B.C. This coincides with a distinct import horizon marked by the appearance of types of imported arretine from c. 10 B.C, which are relatively common, not only in south-east Britain, but also across north-west Europe, and documented especially strongly among the Roman forts along the Rhineland. It is hard not to see a direct link between the appearance of the developed *oppidum* at Calleva and the twin demands created by the Augustan campaigns in Germany and the parallel investment in city building in Gaul. Unlike continental *oppida* Calleva does not emerge as the result of a centralising process with a long developmental history, but as a deliberate implantation, an imposed centralisation of power to take control of territory from which to procure the resources required by Rome across the Channel. Nor is there yet evidence for ritual playing a role in the development of Calleva, though the areas of late Iron Age occupation investigated either within the Inner Earthwork or in immediately adjacent areas remain very small. In time there may well prove to be an early origin to the sacred area, Insula XXX, evident in the plan of the Roman town, immediately to the east of the Inner Earthwork and the defended *oppidum* (cf. Fernández-Götz 2014).

The stimulus of continental trade appears to have slackened after about A.D. 10, perhaps coincident with the reduction in activity on the Rhine frontier following the Varian disaster of A.D. 9, but our Phase 3 deposits at Insula IX indicate a further intensification of occupation from around the time of the Roman conquest and this will be explored further in the next volume. Although we must recognise that up to about 80 per cent of the evidence with which to reconstruct the life and economy of late Iron Age Calleva is residual in Period 1 and later contexts, the collective evidence of the material culture found at Insula IX reinforces that from the forum basilica to emphasise overwhelmingly the role of trade (and tribute) in the life of the *oppidum*, where a very significant proportion of its content, as represented by the quantities of imported amphorae and other pottery, was consumed on site. In contrast, the difference in composition of the coin types from the two sites suggests weak circulation, indicating little or no market activity within the *oppidum*.

We have already noticed the distinction in architecture between the roundhouse tradition at the northern British *oppidum* at Stanwick and the rectangular buildings of Calleva. The difference between the two sites is further emphasised in other respects, such as in the consumption of material culture, with marked contrasts in the character of their material cultural assemblages, evidenced, for example, by the rarity of copper-alloy artefacts from Stanwick, such as dress ornaments. Although the excavation produced a relatively large assemblage of imported pottery, including of amphorae, but particularly of Claudio-Neronian South Gaulish samian (and so later in date than Period 0), compared to other sites in north Britain, it is only a fraction of that recovered from the forum basilica excavation at Calleva, an area almost identical in size to Site 9 at Stanwick (Timby 2000a; Haselgrove 2016). Except in their shared defensive characteristics, the two *oppida* could not be more different from one another.

Returning to south-east Britain, the nature of the archaeological record from Insula IX and the forum basilica site, with their poverty of negative features, may help us understand the archaeology of other southern British territorial *oppida*. For example, at Chichester, West Sussex,

a late Iron Age focus, centred on Fishbourne and protected by the Chichester Entrenchments, has long been mooted. Despite the amount of research and developer-funded excavation over the last 40–50 years, only one convincing late Iron Age feature has been identified, a ditch similar in character to Ditch 11631 at Insula IX (Manley and Rudkin 2005; Fulford 2015, 64–6). However, the 1960s excavation of the Fishbourne palace produced a significant collection of arretine which, at the time, was associated with army supply and the Period 1A Claudian military phase from A.D. 43, which preceded the development of the Neronian proto-palace and Flavian palace (Dannell 1971). A simpler explanation is to see this material as residual from a late Iron Age occupation with few negative features (as at Calleva), either obscured or destroyed by the overlying Roman buildings. This issue of residuality also has implications for Camulodunum and the interpretation of the evidence from the Sheepen site where we should think again about how much of what, such as the remains of military equipment, has always been thought to date after A.D. 43 and the Roman conquest, could simply be residual from the late Iron Age occupation (Hawkes and Hull 1947; Niblett 1985). The nucleated settlements at Calleva and the Sheepen site at Camulodunum have much in common, not least in the large quantities of imported goods consumed and the density of settlement and comparable richness of material culture in the Claudio-Neronian period, which set them apart, for the time being at least, from the other south-eastern British *oppida*.

