cover, and include an interesting bird’s-eye view of Roman Chichester c. AD 100 by Mike Codd, and the Patching hoard of late gold and silver coins.

Turning to the text, it becomes clear the book is intended for a popular audience, and although full of youthful enthusiasm, its variable style is often inappropriate for a serious study. Most annoying are the scattered modern analogies, such as the mafia and motorway toll-booths, and we read that “Julius Caesar was a war criminal plain and simple; he was a man whose actions can easily be compared with the more recent mass murderers such as Adolf Hitler, Joseph Stalin, Mao Zedong or Pol Pot” or that “a particular gripe of Tacitus that runs throughout the Agricola (like the name ‘Worthing’ through a stick of rock) is the feeling that his father-in-law had been recalled at the height of his powers…” In the introductory Acknowledgements the author thanks his teachers for helping him “to realise that one cannot understand Roman Britain without first understanding the inscriptions” and “one must keep an open mind at all times and question everything, even the most fundamental of assumptions”. There is clearly a warning here of what is to follow, for instead of an up-to-date survey and discussion of an exciting and growing corpus of archaeological evidence, we find that much of the book is given over to an exposition of the author’s very controversial theories, and these are accompanied by a number of irritating misunderstandings and mistakes. Some unfavourable reaction might have been expected; the author addresses his teachers: “you may not all agree with the conclusions reached in this book”.

There is only space here to examine a couple of the theories, starting with the “understanding of inscriptions”. We find a whole chapter discussing a story of Sallustius Lucullus, the Roman governor of Britain. The author claims he was actually the son of Amminus, the British Iron Age prince (known from his coins) on the basis of three inscriptions from Chichester. The most significant of these is only known from a seventeenth-century compilation which may well be, as Collingwood and Wright decided, a hoax. But even if it is accepted as genuine, and it refers to “C Sallustius Lucullus”, it is suspicious in exactly paralleling the well-known mention of Lucullus in Suetonius’s Life of Domitian. The second inscription is the much damaged altar set up by Lucullus son of Amminus (why should he be the same Lucullus and why is this Amminus the British prince?), and the third is the famous sculptured Jupiter Stone, set up by S… (p. 208), and here the author also misses Anthony Beeson’s important paper ‘A dedication to Jupiter, a sculptured base from Chichester discussed’ in Minerva, 4, 4 (1993), pp. 12-15. The whole argument is based on very dubious evidence and readers will find themselves wondering why, as the author claims, a senior Roman senator should have chosen to have his name appear in three different guises on inscriptions in the same town. In fact, it is unthinkable that he would have been prepared to see his own name given as just “Lucullus son of Amminus”. In the Roman system his family name was Sallustius and he was the only son of Gaius according to the author’s own suggestion for his father’s name (p. 51 and 301). Moreover, a single ‘S’ could not stand for Sallustius. To add to the incredulity we are told in the previous chapter that Tiberius Claudius Togidubnus (Cogidubnus), Great King in Britain, was one and the same as Togodumnus son of Cunobelinus, and therefore Lucullus’s uncle. By p. 245 all these ideas are regarded as “established”!

Another theory again centres around a wellknown historical figure, in this case the emperor Nero. The author is certainly right to remind us of the importance of the group of marble and bronze statuary from Bosham and Fishbourne and the possibility of an early palatial or religious complex at Bosham, but he has missed the article in ARA (8 [1999], pp. 8-10 ‘Roman marble and bronze sculpture in the kingdom of Togidubnus’) in which Martin Henig and the present writer assess the evidence. This is unfortunate, for in a lengthy discussion (pp. 106-13, 214-19) he misidentifies all three marble heads. The head of Germanicus from Bosham is said to be of Caligula and the colossal Bosham head of Trajan and the Fishbourne head are identified in no uncertain terms, as Nero—a personality, who along with Lucullus, seems to permeate the whole book. We then find a further revelation, that the famous bronze head of Claudius from the River Alde, Suffolk, has also become Nero. These ideas have been given a further airing in British Archaeology (July/August 2006, 42-5) in an article entitled ‘Nero to North Hero to South’. All this indicates a complete disregard for a long tradition of scholarship in Greek and Roman portrait sculpture. The damage to two of the marble heads and the Suffolk bronze is attributed to acts of damnatio memoriae on images of Nero immediately after his death. But as Jude Plowiez (Suffolk County Archaeologist) has pointed out in British Archaeology, the author should have given more consideration to the context of the bronze. Were it indeed Nero, its appearance in an east Suffolk river would be difficult to explain except as having been looted from the colonia and temple of Claudius at Colchester during the Boudiccan revolt. The colossal head from Bosham is certainly intriguing.
and may well be part of a statue which stood at the entrance to Chichester Harbour, but in identifying it with Nero the author is led to speculate that it was placed in the Fishbourne proto-palace, a parallel to the Colussus Neroni in the formal atrium of Nero’s Domus Aurea, a building he likens to the proto-palace! Again, a glance at figures 41 and 42 show that the Flavian palace at Fishbourne is hardly a “copy in miniature” of Domitian’s Domus Flavia. As the scales on the plans indicate, the latter was the smaller.

In the chapter on ‘palaces’ the author uses excavation reports and the work of Ernest Black to draw attention to a group of substantial early buildings situated along the south coast. These include the partially excavated sites at Langstone (Hants.), Fishbourne, Southwick, Pulborough, Angmering, Arundel, Preston (Brighton) and Eastbourne. These clearly resulted from the unique political and economic status of the area in the late first century, but to compare their builders with the “novyi Ruuskiy” or new Russians who “flaunt their wealth through the acquisition of expensive homes and gaudy western status symbols” seems rather inappropriate, if not extreme. The author fails to note the architectural connection with the temple complex at Hadley Island here, and in his discussion of this site he entirely misses the point of its strong connections with the Continent. Instead he draws inappropriate comparisons with the site at Muntham Court and the circular building at Wanborough in Surrey. This problem may derive from the author’s preference for secondary sources on Hadley Island rather than the abundant primary published material. Indeed, the research behind this book must have been patchy – there are many mistakes, important sources have been missed, and in some cases Harvard references in the text cannot be found in the bibliography, particularly in those parts of the book which actually discuss Sussex. The index has 75 entries for ‘Rome’ and this illustrates the over emphasis on imperial aspects. The author seems to have no conception of a Romano-British culture, or of relating it to what was developing across the Channel. Things are either ‘Roman’ (bad) or ‘British’ (good) and he actually refers to “those infected early by Rome” (p. 163).

One could go on, but to sum up, it does not seem fair that this book was published before undergoing some academic peer review, so that at least the worst of the errors could have been ironed out. Specialists in the Roman period will spot the mistakes and the many flaws in the arguments, but others may be misled. It is so disappointing that an opportunity to publish a really up-to-date study of Roman Sussex has been missed. Surely there is a scholar or group of scholars with a thorough knowledge of the subject who could fill the vacuum; perhaps something along the lines of the recent collection of papers on Roman Wiltshire or Tempus’s own Roman Surrey by David Bird?
trial trenching – of the depth and quality of surviving remains, was essential in order to explore ways in which damage could be reduced through redesign of the groundworks scheme. Generally, most of the project area was affected to a depth of c. 2 m, with disturbance to more deeply-buried deposits being reduced to that from augered pile foundations. Hence the excavation strategy concentrated on this top 2 m., with some excavation to a deeper level to record ‘hard’ remains, such as masonry features, through which the piles could not pass without causing unacceptable damage. Three large sites were selected for excavation on this basis, and a fourth was subject to more limited investigation. Inevitably, this strategy has introduced an element of bias into our impression of this quarter of the town, particularly in terms of the degree to which it was developed in the Roman period and the nature of the earliest timber building phases which were not subject to detailed investigation. However, the impression from the evaluation trenches and from ‘windows’ into the underlying stratigraphy through the excavation of pits, wells and robber trenches, was that the intensity of Roman development within the project area was not at all even. On only one site, Vine Street, was there structural activity from the early second through to the fourth century, with a progression from timber structures to stone strip-buildings and a substantial town-house. On the other sites, at Freeschool Lane, Vaughan Way and East Bond Street, this intensity of occupation was not so apparent, raising the question of whether the Roman archaeology had all been truncated through medieval cultivation, or whether it was never there in the first place. In some areas, the former is probably true – certainly at the eastern end of the adjacent site of Causeway Lane (excavated in 1991), one medieval pit contained a large chunk of Roman street metalling, and another contained several mortared courses of masonry superstructure, whilst all horizontal stratigraphy had been truncated to natural through cultivation.

Elsewhere, it is beginning to look as though there was comparatively little going on throughout the Roman period.

On the Vaughan Way site, the earliest activity identified consisted of a sand and gravel quarry. From
the fill came a column drum, presumably intended for a high status structure. By the third/fourth centuries the quarry had filled and was covered with a series of gravel surfaces, the last of which was strewn with tesserae, pottery and iron nails. Patches of lead droplets and copper fragments hint at small-scale metal working. Overlying the last surface, thought to be fourth-century, were traces of flimsy Roman foundations. They were of rubble with slate levelling courses, perhaps the bases for timber sill beams. Although much of this site was truncated by later activity, evidence of Roman structures and finds was small and it is likely this *insula* was never highly developed.

A similar picture emerged on the **Freeschool Lane** site to the south, where trial trenching has indicated a general lack of Roman structural activity over an area of c. 9,000 sq m, encompassing parts of several *insulae*. Close to the frontage of the medieval High Street (now Highcross Street), evidence for the principal north-south street of Roman Leicester was revealed with an adjacent ditch – probably dug to mark out the *insulae* rather than for drainage. The line of Highcross Street is almost certainly one of the earliest elements of the post-Roman street pattern, linking the Roman north and south gates and respecting the east walls of the *forum* and *macellum*, parts of which stood into the medieval period. The survival of Roman buildings into the Middle Ages is also demonstrated by later property and parish boundaries coinciding with Roman wall lines. In several areas of this site, patches of a cobbled surface represented the earliest Roman activity. Elsewhere in the centre of the Roman town, a similar surface has been detected in previous excavations, including those on the *forum* and public baths sites, and has been taken to be contemporary with the establishment of the street grid in c. 100, and perhaps intended to reserve a space for a market and/or the site of the principal public buildings constructed in the mid second century. In the second or third century a probable boundary wall was constructed along the eastern edge of the Roman street with a post and beam-slot building constructed against its east side, containing a hearth and industrial debris. Other hearths were found on the other side of the wall, but the industrial process remains to be determined.

Lying above these features was one of the most remarkable discoveries of the excavation. A substantial deposit of stone and tile rubble, covering an area of about five by six metres proved to be a collapsed wall of coursed granite rubble with ceramic tile levelling courses and traces of tile arches (Fig. 3). The wall had fallen from a major building on the opposite side of the street. None of the internal or external facing stones survived, suggesting they had fallen (or had been robbed) before the wall fell, thereby exposing the rubble core to the elements. Beneath the wall were rubble deposits – perhaps the remains of the external granite facings, which contained late Roman and Saxon pottery, whilst cutting the top of it was a Saxon building, suggesting the wall collapsed in c. 450-750. It seems clear that this wall is the gable end of a substantial third-century basilican building interpreted as a *macellum* (market-hall), partially excavated in 1958 by John Wacher at Blue Boar Lane. One tile feature appears to be a relieving arch in the centre of the nave, whilst another may relate to vaulting above one of the aisles. The
plan of the *macellum* indicates that this wall was 10 m or more in height (Fig. 4).

On the *East Bond Street* site, excavations were not as large scale, but important information was recorded including *insula* layout ditches partially overlain by the first street metallings and later road-side ditches of a north-south street. Later silting, subsequent street surfaces, and re-cuts of the road-side ditches were also revealed, dating to the mid second century and later. There was also evidence for early timber structures. The remains of a masonry building – perhaps connected with one excavated on Causeway Lane in 1991, was also recorded.

As noted above, Roman occupation on the *Vine Street* site (Fig. 5) was much more intensive. The excavations here are highly significant as they represent the largest-scale investigation of the Roman town so far, exposing a substantial part of an entire *insula* (V) and parts of three more (IV, X and XI). Much of *insula* V was occupied by a complex of buildings, comprising a courtyard house and adjoining ranges and a separate rectangular building assumed to have a 'public' function, due to the scale of its foundations. The complex (Fig. 6), exhibits an evolution from the second to the fourth century comprising successively, phases of timber buildings, masonry strip-buildings and their subsequent incorporation into a courtyard house of Mediterranean plan. Parts of the building fronting onto the street appeared to have had a commercial function whilst rooms were clearly residential, incorporating hypocausted bathing suites, tessellated floors and painted plaster walls. The fourth century may have seen the building sub-divided and its function changed to incorporate iron working and bone pin manufacture, as well as the burial of a coin hoard in the 330s and a lead ingot in the east range. The latest coins indicate Roman occupation up to the end of the fourth century.

The earliest activity identified related to the establishment of *insulae at the end of the first century. The investigations suggested that parallel ditches were cut c. 5 m apart to mark out the street lines, but that metalling followed later, as shown by evidence for the development (or in one area, deliberate placement) of turf within the ditches and below the first street surface. Before the first structures, there was a phase of gravel extraction, represented by a scatter of large quarry pits. Evidence for timber buildings of the early to mid second century, in the form of beam-slots and post-holes, together with associated hearths, yard surfaces and fence lines, indicate plot divisions on the street frontages of all *insulae*. To the north of the east-west street, a second timber structural phase of the mid to late second century was identified, separated from the early phase by a thick layer of make-up consisting of numerous large post-holes, shallow gullies or beam-slots, hearths and surfaces. Later in the second century, three stone-founded strip-buildings (A - C) were constructed on the street frontages of *insula* V (Phase 1). All had substantial wall foundations, with internal mortar surfaces and timber divisions, in the form of post-holes and post-pads. Outside were gravel yards. The utilitarian character of the buildings suggests shops or workshops and building A appears to have retained this function throughout its life, despite being incorporated into the courtyard house. The floors within strip-buildings A and B were sealed by another phase of make-up layers of the late second, early third century, in preparation for their conversion to courtyard house rooms. Three infant inhumations cut through these make-ups.

A new range was subsequently added at right angles to building B running north (Phase 2). The arrangement and dimensions of the rooms and the corridor or portico fronting onto the courtyard, suggests a residential suite of reception and dining rooms and a precursor to the full courtyard house. The corridor/portico was paved with red and grey tesserae in a grid pattern across one of the thresholds (Fig. 7). Unfortunately, only three small areas of this floor were preserved and there was no evidence of finer mosaic work of the kind discovered on Vine Street in.
1830, fragments of which are preserved in the City Museum, and which could well have derived from this building. Evidence that the rooms of this range were plastered and painted came from demolition dumps nearby. The courtyard house was then completed with the addition of a third phase, comprising the construction of a north range of rooms with a portico and the northern extension of building A to join its western end (Phase 3). At the same time, parts of the south range fronting onto the east-west street were demolished, to be replaced with a possible atrium and the pre-existing corridors were remodelled to create a continuous portico, looking out onto a peristylium. The latter may have had water features as there was evidence for a stone-lined well constructed as part of the north range portico and a culvert was found in the courtyard running into the west range. The new northern range (Figs. 6 and 8) included an apsidal room, suggestive of a triclinium set opposite the atrium in the south range, whilst other rooms at either end of this range were heated, as indicated by remnants of robbed hypocaust flues. The similarities between this range and the west range of the Norfolk Street villa (excavated 1975-81) west of the walled town, are quite remarkable, suggesting that they were contemporary and even designed by the same hand.

Building 3 was added to the eastern end of the south range and contained a bath suite represented by the remnants of a hypocaust in one room, with a possible plunge pool adjoining it to the north (Phase 4). It appears to have been short-lived, as associated pottery of the mid to late second century suggests both rooms were back-filled shortly after their construction. The abandonment of this building may have been the result of the construction of a second, larger bath suite added at right angles to the north range (Fig. 6, Building 5, Phase 5). This comprised two large rooms, one of which contained a heavily-robbed hypocaust with a stove-hole attached on the west side, adjacent to the street. Three small rooms and drains found at the northern end of the building suggest plunge pools. The street frontage elements of the courtyard house may always have had a commercial function. The timber partitions and utilitarian floors of strip-building A indicate a shop or workshop. By the third century, the subdivision of some rooms and the expansion of others suggests that this function had...
encompassed the whole of the south range, including the bath suite (Building 3). These rooms were remodelled with mortar floors and subdivided with timber and masonry walls.

To the north-east of the courtyard house a series of post settings with associated mortar floors were revealed which coincided with the wall lines of a later public building, suggesting a timber precursor dated by pottery to the mid to late second century. The masonry replacement (Fig. 6, Building 4) was constructed in the third century on a massive scale with walls 1.2 m thick and large rooms. The wall thickness indicates high ceilings or a multi-storey structure. Although the walls were extensively robbed, a significant stone foundation survived, together with fragments of superstructure and several phases of mortar flooring within one of the large rooms. Finds from the mid-third century were also recovered, along with extensive painted wall plaster and red clay from deposits which probably pre-dated the building. This demolition waste was either imported or re-deposited for re-use as make-up layers beneath successive floors. The utilitarian character of the floors suggest that the building could have been a warehouse or granary.

The courtyard house appears to have changed in status and function towards the end of the Roman period, with parts being used for industrial and craft activities, including smithing and bone-pin making. The frontage area along the east-west street including the atrium and the bath suite were remodelled with some walls demolished and new ones inserted, to create what were probably shop units. A series of post-holes in the southern part of the courtyard suggest timber structures attached to the house. Groups of third and fourth-century refuse pits were found in most parts of the house indicating that parts of it had been demolished by the fourth century. In the east range, several dispersed coin hoards, deposited c. 341, were found buried inside one room and appeared to have been disturbed in antiquity – perhaps during digging to retrieve hoarded items of greater value. In an adjacent room, a lead ingot had been deliberately buried and covered with roofing slates. The latest coins and pottery from the courtyard house suggest it was occupied to the end of the fourth century. Other notable finds from the Vine Street site have included three lead sealings, two of which are identifiable with Publius S (...) F (...) of the Sixth Legion and Gaius Julius T (...) of the Twentieth Legion. There are also two rare lead curse tablets, currently being translated. One is particularly difficult to read, since the scribe wrote the next line on top of the previous one. The
other, beautifully written, records the theft of a cloak from Servandus and asks the god Maglus to 'destroy' the perpetrator, followed by a list of the names of 18 suspects (Fig. 9). Only small areas of neighbouring insulae were investigated on this site, but it seems clear that only in insula X were the timber-phase structures replaced by masonry buildings. Elsewhere there seems to have been little activity following the demolition of the timber-phase structures.

In tandem with these excavations, another site was investigated on Sanvey Gate, nearby. This revealed evidence for the northern Roman town defences, which consisted of a 2.9 m wide stone wall foundation inserted into the front of the pre-existing turf, clay and gravel rampart of the second century. A short stretch of the town wall had toppled over in the post-Roman period, preserving for the first time, evidence for the outer facing stones of coursed, squared blocks of granite. Projecting 3 m from the internal face of the town wall was a 6 m wide rectangular interval tower or platform, the first example to be found in Leicester. It is similar to examples at Caerwent, where they are thought to have been either for staircases up to the wall-walk, or platforms for small ballistaria. Of particular interest was the discovery of a boundary wall running parallel with, and to the rear of, the defences, in effect creating a clear zone behind the tower/platform. Serving this was a street running at right angles to the defences. Fragments of the defensive ditches were located in front of the wall. Excavations behind the defences revealed two stone buildings, one a courtyard structure with four rooms and two corridors, fronting the street referred to. The second was a strip-building. Earlier activity pre-dating the defences consisted of timber structures, pits and ditches of the first/second centuries.

This concludes our summary of the most important results of the Highcross Quarter and Sanvey Gate excavations, and these are currently under analysis. It is planned to publish them in a single thematic volume in 2009. However, since these excavations were completed we have carried out another excavation with exciting results, between July and November 2007 at the Merlin Works Site on Bath Lane. These have revealed important new evidence for the pre-Conquest Late Iron Age oppidum, which immediately preceded the Roman town, and the north-western intramural area during the earliest period of the Roman town. Most significantly, this included pre-Conquest production of coin blanks in the form of ceramic 'flan tray' moulds, within possible workshops. Then the first century AD witnessed the construction of a substantial masonry building with two apses and associated structures (Fig. 10). The precise function of this remarkably substantial building for such an early period in the history of the town, remains unclear. It was soon demolished in order to accommodate the turf-and-timber and subsequent masonry phases of the town's western defences.