

THE PATTERN OF POTTERY SUPPLY TO HEYBRIDGE

Introduction

This section uses the data extracted from the key pottery groups presented in the [pottery sequence](#) section, along with the expanded pool of securely dated groups listed in [Appendix 00](#). In Ceramic Phase order, the trends in the pattern of pottery supply and assemblage composition are derived from the data. Quantities depicted on the maps are based on the EVE total for each fabric present in a given ceramic phase, expressed as a percentage of the EVE total for all fabrics. Where fabrics are not recorded by EVE, square symbols denote their presence. A discussion of supply pattern and changes through time follows these maps. Chelmsford and Colchester remain key points of reference, though other sites, mainly located within the region, are introduced for comparison. Following this is a discussion of assemblage composition. Again, changes through time are highlighted and comparisons are made between Heybridge and other sites.

Quantified groups from any period in Essex are comparatively few and are mainly late Roman in date. The groups presented in this report add significantly to the overall number, together with those from the settlement at Great Holts Farm, Boreham (Martin, forthcoming).

Context numbers given in the text usually refer to contexts from the expanded dataset ([the wider pool - Appendix 00](#)), otherwise they can be found in the stratigraphic narrative ([ref](#)). Note: Assemblages from the expanded dataset were used up to and including Ceramic Phase 10; for Ceramic Phase 11 (KPG37-9) and for KPG40, information has been extracted from the four relevant Key Pottery Groups only.

Versions of most form types mentioned are illustrated in the [pottery sequence](#) section. Otherwise, for the Roman period, forms can be found in the Chelmsford type series (Going 1987, 13-54), or the updated *Camulodunum*/Colchester series (Bidwell and Croom 1999, 468-487), with occasional reference made to regional typologies, such as Monaghan's Upchurch/Thameside series (1987) and Young's Oxfordshire series (1977). For the late Iron Age, Bidwell and Croom (1999) is also useful; and attention is drawn to the typology of late Iron Age forms published within this report ([ref.](#)), comprising types found at Heybridge but not attested at *Camulodunum*.

To avoid repetition, the word 'phase' is often used instead of 'ceramic phase'. These are one and the same. Naturally, the division of this section into ceramic phases results in a somewhat disjointed discussion. However, a more cohesive overview, drawing together the trends presented here and bringing in further interpretation, is taken up in the [synthesis](#) section.

Ceramic Phase 1: c. 50 - 15BC

Assemblages assigned to the first part of Ceramic Phase 1 include a significant element of locally-made, sand-tempered pottery, characteristic of the middle to late Iron Age transition, although grog-tempered fabrics generally form the major component. Dressel 1 amphoras occur sporadically, their numbers increasing towards

the end of the phase. Also late in the phase, other imports are apparent in the form of Central Gaulish micaceous flagons and platters. Ceramic Phase 1 heralds a change from local middle Iron Age traditions, marked by the introduction of grog-tempered pottery, closely followed by the establishment of wheel-throwing techniques and the increased importation of amphoras. This pattern, which is in keeping with settlements elsewhere in south-eastern Britain, is amply demonstrated by Key Pottery Groups 1 to 4.

Drury's discussion of the early and middle Iron Age pottery from Little Waltham (1978, 51-63) forms the basis for the study of Iron Age pottery in central Essex. At Little Waltham, a settlement at a distance of 14km from Heybridge, assemblages are dominated throughout by early/middle Iron Age, coarse sand-tempered pottery (Drury's Fabric H). Grog-tempered pottery (Fabric E) did not appear until *c.* 50-25BC, forming just 9% of the total overall (Drury 1978, table 10), whereas at Elms Farm this fabric comprises an average of 80% by weight in Ceramic Phase 1 assemblages. The reason for this may be largely one of chronology, as the settlement at Little Waltham was in decline in the later 1st century BC, in contrast to Heybridge.

The pottery from Heybridge is more comparable with pottery found at Kelvedon (Rodwell 1988), 11km distant. There, three main fabrics were identified, a coarse sand-tempered fabric, equivalent to Drury's Fabric H, a second tempered with grog, and another intermediate between the two, but with the addition of occasional flint grits. The forms present in these fabrics ranged from handmade vessels in sand-tempered fabrics, through to grog-tempered, cordoned, wheel-thrown bowls and jars (Rodwell 1988, 102). A large group (22.7kg) from Ditch 350, representative of all of these forms and fabrics, was assigned a mid to late 1st century BC date (*c.* 50-20BC). Grog-tempered pottery forms 77% of this ditch assemblage. At Heybridge, the proportions of forms and fabrics are entirely consonant with those at Kelvedon.

For Elms Farm, all pottery made in the middle Iron Age tradition has been assigned a single ECC fabric code, MICW. This code differentiates the sand-tempered late Iron Age fabrics from those tempered with either grog or shell. Most assemblages assigned to Ceramic Phase 1 contain this mainly sand-tempered fabric, in an amount averaging 11% of the total by weight. Only in one feature, ditch 25174, does sand-tempered coarse ware exceed 60%, although the quantity of pottery recovered is small (1.19kg). The potentially early date for this group, perhaps *c.* 50BC, is supported by the stratigraphy ([ref. strat. text](#)).

The similarity between the pottery assigned to the first part of Ceramic Phase 1 and that from Ditch 350 at Kelvedon indicates that a date of *c.* 50-20BC can also be confidently assigned to these assemblages at Elms Farm. Independent dating evidence in the form of two coins lends weight to the assigned date. A Class I/II potin (SF 5645) [[ref. coin report](#)] in the bottom fill of ditch segment 16018 (KPG2) supports a date in the 1st century BC, although most of the pottery present in this feature consists of handmade grog-tempered ware. The second coin, a Class II potin (SF 6871) [[ref. coin report](#)], is associated with handmade grog-tempered pottery only and also supports a date of *c.* 50-20BC.

A similar assemblage was excavated from Ditch AF1 at nearby Woodham Walter (Buckley *et al.* 1987), where the proportion of wheel-thrown grog-tempered and

handmade sand-tempered wares appears to be roughly equal. Unfortunately the pottery was not quantified, but Rodwell proposes a date towards the middle of the 1st century BC for its deposition (1987, 38).

Early shell-tempered ware appears in four Ceramic Phase 1 contexts, although the quantities are very low, amounting to an average of 3% by weight. This fabric is more common in the Thameside area of south Essex and north Kent, where it was probably produced, forming only a small component of central Essex assemblages. The pottery from Elms Farm conforms, with the fabric maintaining a low proportion in all ceramic phases.

The level of imports in Ceramic Phase 1 is low throughout, mostly appearing towards the end of the phase. Italian amphoras average 4% by weight. Imported finewares, forming an average of 3% by weight, consist of Central Gaulish micaceous wares and North Gaulish whiteware. Central Gaulish imports appear in Britain slightly earlier than Gallo-Belgic, which is more common from *c.* 15BC. The evidence at Elms Farm confirms that Central Gaulish micaceous wares arrive at least a decade before the more widespread Gallo-Belgic imports. Central Gaulish ware forms a major component at Elms Farm, compared with other imports, from the middle of this phase until the end of Ceramic Phase 2. North Gaulish white ware vessels were sporadic arrivals before the 1st century AD, but their presence in Ceramic Phase 1 groups confirms earlier arrival at Heybridge.

Imported pottery on other sites in the vicinity is scarce, especially that dated early in the late Iron Age. A possible *Cam* 165 flagon, probably from the New Cemetery, Heybridge, was donated to the Colchester and Essex museum in 1922 (Wickenden 1986, 55), but all other imports of this date found in the vicinity comprise amphoras (Wallace 1998, table 8). At Woodham Walter, a cream-slipped, two-handled flagon was found in Ditch CF101, dated mid 1st century AD, and described by Rodwell (1987, 32; fig.25.172) as a Gallo-Belgic copy. The vessel, *pace* Wallace (1998, 155), is probably not a Central Gaulish import, the form, as illustrated, and the fabric description indicate that the flagon is a later *local* copy of a Gallo-Belgic form.

Assemblage composition

The range of vessel forms in Ceramic Phase 1 is very restricted, mainly comprising jars and bowls in coarse fabrics. Vessels from the early Key Pottery Groups (KPGs 1 and 2) are generally handmade with little difference in style between sand-tempered and grog-tempered fabrics. Bowl types are largely indistinguishable from jars and together these predominate at 85% by vessel rim equivalence (EVE). Forms are simple with everted or bead rims and any decoration is confined to combing on the lower body or lines of stabbing along the shoulder. Wheel-thrown pottery seems to occur in slightly later groups, perhaps first appearing in the decade *c.* 40-30BC, although this is difficult to date with precision. The range of forms is again restricted to jars and bowls, either plain or with rippled or cordoned shoulders. The few identifiable bowl types, at 6% by EVE, are mainly those with one or more cordons at the mid-body constriction (*Cam* 211), reminiscent of vessels made in wood or shale. The only identified vessel form in early shell-tempered ware is the club-rimmed jar *Cam* 254; all Ceramic Phase 1 vessels in this fabric are handmade.

Platters, cups, beakers and flagons appear towards the end of the ceramic phase, but are few in number and mostly imported. There are also two examples of the carinated and pedestalled tazza-bowl *Cam* 210. Platters form 2% of the assemblage by EVE and comprise the micaceous *Cam* 1, grog-tempered copies of these, *Cam* 21, and later in the phase, a single grog-tempered *Cam* 28. Cups are grog-tempered and restricted to three examples of the carinated *Cam* 212; these are smaller versions of the *Cam* 211 bowl. Flavons are rare and consist of two examples of the Central Gaulish *Cam* 165, plus a grog-tempered handle, which is probably from a flagon. Grog-tempered flavons are an uncommon form, with a total of twenty-two examples identified at Elms Farm, mainly by their handles. Fifteen come from stratified contexts, ranging in date from late 1st century BC to late 1st century AD. Beakers are also uncommon, consisting of a single imported *Cam* 113 butt beaker and sherds from a ‘thorn’ beaker [archive 353], a rare British site find. The few grog-tempered beakers noted could just be small, ‘hand-sized’ examples of jars. There is one grog-tempered lid, from the later stage of the phase. At the end of Ceramic Phase 1 grog-tempered pottery is beginning to show the diversity of form which characterises Ceramic Phase 2. Amphoras form a small part of Phase 1 assemblages with examples in just four contexts, comprising neck and body sherds from Italian Dressel 1 wine amphoras only.

Ceramic Phase 2: c. 15BC - AD20

Grog-tempered pottery continues to dominate in Ceramic Phase 2, averaging 89% by weight. Sand-tempered coarse wares have virtually disappeared and are probably residual in most contexts assigned to this phase. Early shell-tempered ware also forms a minor component and is present in only three contexts. Assemblages display a greater diversity of fabric and form, as imports proliferate and the range of grog-tempered copies rapidly expands. Amphoras increase both in numbers and types present, with Catalan and *salazon* vessels from Spain making an appearance alongside Italian wine amphoras. Central Gaulish micaceous ware is present in many Ceramic Phase 2 contexts, showing a large increase on the quantities in Ceramic Phase 1. Gallo-Belgic and North Gaulish finewares are present in smaller numbers. Assemblages assigned to this phase begin to exhibit the result of increased trade with Gaul as the Augustan period progressed.

The earliest Key Pottery Group (KPG5) of this ceramic phase is typical in terms of the types of pottery present but atypical in terms of relative assemblage composition. The group differs in the proportion and quantity of imports present. The main deposit, 15416, is considered to be pyre-related debris (ref. burials section). The pottery, therefore, is likely to have undergone selection both before, and after, destruction on the pyre. Nevertheless, it illustrates the range of imports available during Ceramic Phase 2. The imported wares include the Central and North Gaulish wares found in Phase 1, with the addition of Gallo-Belgic ware in the form of *terra rubra*. The assemblage is dominated by the presence of substantial parts of three Dressel 1 amphoras, accounting for 72% of the total by weight. Grog-tempered pottery forms just under 20%, although this figure increases to 71% if the disproportionate weight of the amphoras is removed from the totals. The proportion of grog-tempered pottery is lower than the average, because of the variety of imported finewares which form 23% by weight (amphora weight excluded). Early shell-tempered pottery accounts for 2% of the total by weight (6% without the amphora) and is represented by a wheel-

thrown, near-complete *Cam* 255 jar. The presence of this jar is notable, as vessels in this fabric are normally handmade. Wheel-thrown forms in early shell-tempered ware occur in higher numbers from the second half of the 1st century AD in the rest of the assemblage.

Other than the amphoras in KPG5, Italian imports comprise a bead-rimmed Pompeian-red ware platter and a wall-sided, gritless, buff ware mortarium; both are typologically early in form. Italian Pompeian-red ware normally occurs in Britain in the mid to late 1st century AD, but is present on continental sites, including Haltern and sites in the Aisne Valley (S. Willis pers. comm.), in the Augustan period. The mortarium form is also present at Haltern (Loeschcke 1909, 242, type 59), with much variation in detail; some vessels do not have a bead rim and most lack internal grooving. These details are present on most British site finds (Hartley 1981, 196), but are absent on the mortarium from Elms Farm. A range of variations found at Haltern is illustrated (Loeschcke 1909, abb.33.1-10), but chronological details are not given. The closest parallel for the Elms Farm vessel is no.10. Loeschcke notes that this is the only mortarium form found in Germany in the Augustan period and suggests an Italian source, among others (1909, 242). At least twenty different examples were found at Skeleton Green occurring in features dated *c.* 10BC-AD20 (Partridge 1981, 32). Most of the mortaria illustrated have either trituration grits or internal scoring, but the closest parallel to the Elms Farm vessel is no.3 (Partridge 1981, fig.79).

All other Key Pottery Groups assigned to Ceramic Phase 2 are more typical, although, in general, most Phase 2 assemblages are characterised by a higher level of imports than those in any other ceramic phase. In spite of these imports, grog-tempered pottery continues to dominate with amounts averaging 91% of the total by weight. The vessels in this fabric now exhibit much diversity of form and decoration, consistent with trends elsewhere in the Essex-Hertfordshire region, probably as a result of experimentation and greater familiarity with wheel-throwing techniques. Copies of imported vessel types abound. Other coarse wares form a negligible component, and of these, early shell-tempered ware accounts for less than 1% by weight.

The imported pottery types include amphoras, Central Gaulish micaceous ware, Gallo-Belgic ware and North Gaulish fine whitewares, all present in some quantity and much variety. Other imports occur in much smaller numbers; these include Pompeian-red and Arretine wares, both never common in Britain. Pompeian-red ware, in particular, is rare in contexts dated earlier than *c.* AD40, as its distribution is more commonly associated with the Roman military. Its earlier importation into Britain is implied by Peacock (1977, 158), and there are early 1st century AD examples at *Camulodunum* (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 221). Arretine ware is present at Elms Farm in relatively higher numbers than is common at other regional sites with imported wares, but forms less than 1% by weight in stratified contexts. Two other examples of Arretine ware have been found in the vicinity; a platter cut down to form the lid for a cremation urn, from the New Cemetery, Heybridge (Kenrick 1986, 53), and a platter sherd from Slough House Farm (Dannell 1998, 143). A further platter sherd, stamped, was found in Ditch 424 at Kelvedon (Rodwell 1988, 123).

There is a wider range of Italian wine amphoras in this ceramic phase, augmented by Catalan and *salazon* vessels. Amphoras account for an average of 6% by weight,

although those used for transporting wine comprise the largest share. This is normally the case for amphora assemblages of this period in Britain and also in Picardy (S. Willis pers. comm.). Central Gaulish micaceous ware is present in most assemblages and forms the largest component of the imported wares, after amphoras, at just over 2% by weight. The range of forms now includes tazza-bowls and ledge-rimmed beakers, along with platters and flagons. The red-slipped micaceous fabric no longer occurs. Gallo-Belgic imports are more numerous and the range has expanded to include forms in *terra nigra*. This, and *terra rubra*, accounts for a combined average of just over 1% of the assemblage by weight. North Gaulish fine whiteware has marginally increased its presence to 1%, although the rouletted butt beaker *Cam* 113 is the main vessel type represented. This form is by far the most commonly found import from this source, and is widely distributed in Essex.

Small amounts of Gallo-Belgic wares have been found on sites in the vicinity, although none was recovered from the recent excavations at either Crescent Road or Langford Road in Heybridge. *Terra nigra* was found on two nearby sites in the Blackwater Estuary area, at Slough House Farm and Howell's Farm (Horsley and Wallace 1998, 143 and 146). The base and lower body from a *terra rubra* butt beaker were found at Woodham Walter (Rodwell 1987, 26; fig.19.97), where joining sherds were found in three contexts dated to the mid 1st century AD. Finds of North Gaulish whiteware in the area are more numerous, reflecting, perhaps, the continuing importation of this fabric into the later 1st century AD. Whiteware beakers occur at Colchester in contexts as late as Neronian to early Flavian (Bidwell and Croom 1999, 472). A sherd from a flagon was recovered at the Maldon Landfill site (Wallis 1991, 169), and several vessels were found at both Slough House Farm and Howell's Farm (Horsley and Wallace 1998, 143 and 146). The vessel types comprise *Cam* 113 butt beakers and *Cam* 161 two-handled flagons.

Assemblage composition

Although there is more vessel diversity in Ceramic Phase 2 than previously, jars still predominate at 56% by vessel rim equivalence (EVE). Plain bead-rimmed jars are still much in evidence, but vessels with rippled and cordoned shoulders are more prevalent. Pedestal vessels, such as *Cam* 204, are also more common. Early shell-tempered jars are few in number, mostly the handmade *Cam* 254, although there is one example of *Cam* 255 in Key Pottery Group 5. This is not a common form, and at *Camulodunum* the *Cam* 255 is rarer than the ubiquitous shell-tempered *Cam* 254, where 33 occurrences were recorded against a figure of 238 for *Cam* 254 (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 268). Storage jars are represented mainly by the *Cam* 270 and *Cam* 271 in coarse fabric. These are the most common storage jar forms until gradually superseded by harder-fired storage jar types, such as G44, during Ceramic Phase 4.

Beakers now form 17% of the assemblage by EVE, with Gallo-Belgic butt beakers and their grog-tempered copies accounting for the larger share. There is one example of the *terra rubra* girth beaker, *Cam* 82. Girth beakers are rare at Elms Farm, and are not commonly found imports in Britain. The reason for this is largely chronological; *Cam* 82 girth beakers had a short production span, which ended during the Tiberian period (Rigby 1989, 132). Only eight occurrences of *Cam* 82 were recorded at *Camulodunum*, where the type was superseded by *Cam* 84. Also present at Heybridge in small numbers is the ledge-rimmed beaker, *Cam* 102, in mica-coated Central Gaulish micaceous ware. Later in the phase examples of the *Cam* 114 beaker appear.

These whiteware vessels are decorated with herringbone-pattern barbotine, have mica-coating on the rim and are occasionally also red-painted. Their source has not been properly identified, but is likely to be Gallia Belgica (Rigby 1989, 134), and the vessels found in Britain are usually in contexts dated *c.* AD10-40.

Open vessel forms, platters and bowls, have increased both in number and variety, accounting for 19% of the total by EVE. The range of bowls, at over 5% by EVE, comprises the carinated *Cam* 211, tazza-bowl *Cam* 210, various hemispherical types, and the bobbin-shaped *Cam* 51 in micaceous *terra nigra*. Of all vessel classes, platters perhaps display the most diversity in this ceramic phase. They are present in some numbers, in contrast to the previous phase, and this indicates a change in eating habits, or rather, a change in food presentation. This change may also be inferred from the increase in importance of beakers in this ceramic phase. The earliest examples of platters are those in Central Gaulish micaceous ware (mostly *Cam* 1), and Arretine (ref. samian report), although the latter are few in number and largely represented by the shallow *Conspectus* form 12 (Ettlinger *et al.* 1990). The later *terra rubra* and *terra nigra* vessels are the most numerous of the imported types. Of these, *Cam* 2 and *Cam* 5 platters are the most frequent. Later in the phase, the *Cam* 17 platter in Pompeian-red ware makes an appearance; this is the classic Italian platter in this fabric, probably used for baking. Grog-tempered platters are also numerous, and the number in this fabric is approximately double the number of imported vessels. Many are copies of these imported forms, such as *Cam* 21 and *Cam* 28, but the quality of manufacture and finish of copied platters is highly variable and consequently there is less standardisation of form.

Other vessel types are few in number; flagons, lids and cups account for 4% of the total by EVE. Flagons are mainly represented by the cream-slipped, micaceous *Cam* 165, but there is one example of *Cam* 161 in North Gaulish whiteware. There are also two local copies; one is grog-tempered, a probable copy of *Cam* 165, the other is in white-slipped grey fabric, probably imitating double-handled North Gaulish flagons *Cam* 161 or 163. There are three cups; two examples of the grog-tempered, cordoned *Cam* 212, plus one *Cam* 56 in *terra rubra*, and there are just two lids in grog-tempered fabric. Pottery cups and lids appear to be rare at Heybridge in all phases.

Amphoras account for 4% of the total by EVE, although normally their presence is marked only by an abundance of body sherds. The range of forms has expanded to include Italian Dressel 2-4 wine vessels, which fully supersede Dressel 1 by the end of the ceramic phase. Amphora types from southern Spain include Pascual 1 wine amphoras, plus *salazon* vessels used for transporting fish products such as *garum*. At the end of the phase, the Dressel 20 olive oil amphora appears, marked only by the presence of body sherds. [ref. amphora report for the significance of this wide range?]

Ceramic Phase 3: *c.* AD20-55

This ceramic phase is characterised by a steady decline in the types of imported wares, an increase in the standardisation of pottery types and a gradual rise in the number of fully Romanized forms and fabrics. Grog-tempered pottery continues to dominate, but black-surfaced wares, sandy greywares and storage jar fabrics begin to make an appearance. Imported fabrics such as samian and Central Gaulish glazed

ware supersede Gallo-Belgic, Arretine and micaceous Central Gaulish wares, although the prominence of imports is lower than in the previous ceramic phase. There is a marginally smaller and more uniform range of forms than previously. Amphoras also decline in quantity; wine amphoras are few, though Dressel 20 and *salazon* vessels increase their share.

The proportion of grog-tempered pottery remains steady, averaging 88% of the total by weight. Early shell-tempered ware increases slightly to 3%, returning to the level which occurred in Ceramic Phase 1. Known production sites include Gun Hill (Drury and Rodwell 1973) and Mucking (Jones and Rodwell 1973) in Essex and perhaps the Black Shore area at Cliffe (Monaghan 1987, 33) in Kent. Production of wheel-thrown early shell-tempered ware at these sites occurs towards the mid 1st century AD, but vessels found at Elms Farm remain handmade until beyond the end of Ceramic Phase 3. Romanizing coarse wares, in the form of black-surfaced wares, sandy grey wares and storage jar fabrics, account for 7% of the total by weight, their numbers steadily increasing through the phase from less than 1% by weight at the beginning to 19% by the end (ref. pottery sequence section). Storage jar fabric occurs in three groups, only very gradually superseding coarse grog-tempered ware. Black-surfaced wares, at 4% by weight, and sandy grey wares, at 2%, are regularly represented throughout, although quantities are small. Colchester buff ware first appears in negligible quantities at the end of the phase. Verulamium region whiteware also appears in later groups, in the form of mortarium flange fragments, averaging just over 2% by weight. The end of Ceramic Phase 3 sees non-local Romano-British products showing a definite presence for the first time.

In contrast to Ceramic Phase 2, imports are less numerous. Central Gaulish ware accounts for less than 1% of the total by weight, and much of this is likely to be residual. Gallo-Belgic and North Gaulish ware quantities also remain low at less than 2% by weight. South Gaulish samian and Central Gaulish glazed ware are the only new imports, occurring in very small amounts at the end of the phase. Neither appears in Britain until the mid 1st century AD. Amphoras form a lower proportion of the assemblage, averaging 3% by weight. The Italian wine vessels comprise Dressel 2-4, but south Spanish Dressel 20 and *salazones* have the larger share, with the latter predominating at 2%.

Although the number of imports appears to decline markedly, compared to other sites in the vicinity the level and variety remains remarkable. A recent survey of sites which have imports of late Iron Age date in the Heybridge area (Wallace 1998, 155; table 8) has indicated that such find-spots are sparse. Most of these occurrences are of amphoras. Gallo-Belgic and Gaulish wares appear as occasional examples amounting to only a handful of vessels.

Assemblage composition

Jars remain the dominant vessel category at 60% by vessel rim equivalence (EVE), and many of the forms are becoming Romanized. Examples of these are the *Cam* 218 and *Cam* 220, which are antecedents of Going's G16/17 and G19/20 respectively. The latter continue as late as Ceramic Phase 6, but are recognised as *Cam* forms in the early part of Phase 3, and as G16-20 in the later part, as the shoulder cordons become less pronounced. Jars with shoulder cordons, plus plain bead-rimmed vessels, are the

most common in this ceramic phase, and the club-rimmed *Cam* 254 is again the sole type identified in early shell-tempered ware.

Platters are much in evidence at 13% by EVE and, similarly, the number of bowls remains constant at 5% by EVE. The most common platter form remains *Cam* 21, but numbers of *Cam* 28 increase steadily through the phase. The latter continue into the Roman period, identified in black-surfaced ware as Going's form A2. A samian platter, f18, appears in an assemblage placed at the end of the phase. Gallo-Belgic platters decline in numbers, and are restricted to the *Cam* 2 in *terra nigra*. The range of bowl forms has expanded to include the incurved *Cam* 252 and hemispherical forms, as well as the carinated *Cam* 211. An unusual form is also present; a grog-tempered, spouted strainer-bowl [ref. strainer report]. Towards the end of the phase, the samian bowl f29 occurs; the two examples present, plus the f18, see above, are dated to the Neronian period.

Beakers are somewhat in decline at 13% by EVE, consisting solely of butt beakers; *Cam* 112 in *terra rubra*, *Cam* 113 in North Gaulish whiteware, and their respective grog-tempered copies. Cups and lids are still much in the minority, although lids have increased their presence to 3% by EVE. Cups continue to be represented by the grog-tempered *Cam* 212 and by the *Cam* 56 in *terra rubra*. The later *Cam* 58 is completely absent from Elms Farm, although an example of this cup form was found at nearby Slough House Farm (Horsley and Wallace 1998, 143). Flagons have a much-reduced presence; dropping to less than 1% by EVE, and comprising whiteware *Cam* 161 and grog-tempered copies, one of which is a Hofheim type (J1). By the end of the phase, dishes are apparent, although just two types are identified; the B7 which has an out-turned rim, and the flanged B10, both in grog-tempered fabric. The latter has more in common with the North Kent form 5B2, which has continental prototypes (Monaghan 1987, 138). Mortaria form a very low proportion, accounting for less than 1% by EVE. This is consistent with the evidence from other non-military sites of this period. The form identified is the D1 type mortarium from the Verulamium industry. This is one of the first industries to be established following the conquest, and it seems that the products from Verulamium reached Heybridge before those from nearby Colchester.

Amphoras maintain their presence, but occur in all the key pottery groups as body sherds only. Dressel 20 olive oil containers are now in the majority, but *salazon* and Dressel 2-4 vessels appear occasionally.