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1 INTRODUCTION
The 1998 excavation (BWD98) yielded 865 sherds (11672 g) of late Iron Age and Roman pottery from 26 contexts: a further 2910 sherds (41444 g) of similarly dated pottery were retrieved from 135 more contexts during the 2000 excavation (BBW00). The overwhelming bulk of this material is late Iron Age in date.

All of the assemblages were quantified by numbers of sherds and their weights per fabric. These fabrics were classified using a x8 magnification lens with built-in metric graticule in order to determine the natures, forms, sizes and frequencies of added inclusions. Finer fabrics were further examined using a x30 magnification pocket microscope with artificial illumination source. Fabrics were coded using the systems created by the Canterbury Archaeological Trust for late Iron Age, early Roman and late Roman wares from east Kent (Macpherson-Grant et al. 1995).

The two pottery assemblages from ditches BBW00 1020 and 1022/1023 are the only ones large enough for more meaningful quantification by Estimated Vessel Equivalents (EVEs) based on rim sherds (Orton 1975).

2 FABRICS
Quantification of all of the pottery from the two excavations by sherd counts and weights per fabric (Table 1) reveals an assemblage totally dominated by grog-tempered ‘Belgic’ products in fabrics B1, B2, B2.1, B2.3 and B3: these wares make up just over three-quarters of the pottery by sherd count and 90% by weight. The next most significant component of the overall assemblage is the glauconitic sand tempered group of fabrics (B9.1, B9.2 and B9.3). These together make up 12% of the pottery by sherd count and 6% by weight; the first figure is, however, distorted upwards by the presence of 415 sherds from one vessel in fabric B9.3.

The other minority fabrics include sandy black wares in fabric B9 from the Folkestone area (1.5%), chaff-tempered salt-container fabric BER15 from the same source (2%) and Gallo-Belgic white ware fabric BER10 (0.1%).

Romanised fabrics R5, R14, R16, R25, R42, R43, R50, R73, 109 and LR2.2 span the period between AD 43 and 250 but account for a mere 8% of all of the pottery from the site. This suggests a low level of activity during the Roman period but it should be born in mind that grog tempered wares continued to be significant in this part of Kent throughout the Roman occupation.
Table 1: Quantification of fabrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Summary Description</th>
<th>No. sherds</th>
<th>% sherds</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>% weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIAB1</td>
<td>Profuse silt-sized quartz, sparse ferrous inclusions and occasional flint</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIAB4</td>
<td>Coarse calcined flint tempered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLIA2.1</td>
<td>Very-fine sand and calcined-flint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>'Belgic’ fine grog-tempered</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>'Belgic’ coarse grog-tempered</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>28930</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.1</td>
<td>'Belgic’ coarse grog-tempered (pale grog)</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>16179</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.3</td>
<td>'Belgic’ very fine grog-tempered, usually highly burnished</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>'Belgic’ grog-tempered with sparse flint</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>'Belgic’ grog-tempered with sand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>'Belgic’ coarse sandy</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9.1</td>
<td>'Belgic’ coarse sandy (glaconite)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9.2</td>
<td>'Belgic’ coarse sandy (glaconite &amp; flint)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9.3</td>
<td>'Belgic’ sandy (glaconite and ‘white’ grog)</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>Other coarse ware (unassigned)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BER10</td>
<td>Early Gaulish white ware: Rigby (1995, 648) fabric IIB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BER15</td>
<td>Chaff-tempered ware (Macpherson-Grant 1980b)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Canterbury coarse grey sandy (Flavian/Antonine)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>Black burnished 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16</td>
<td>Fine grey ‘Upchurch’ fabrics I and II</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R25</td>
<td>Lower Rhinelander Fabric 1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R42</td>
<td>South Gaulish samian</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R43</td>
<td>Central Gaulish samian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R50</td>
<td>South Spanish Dressel 20 amphorae</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R73</td>
<td>Coarse grey sandy ?Thameside</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R109</td>
<td>Other coarse ware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR2.2</td>
<td>?Local fine grey sandy overfired</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3775</td>
<td></td>
<td>53116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 FORMS/TYPES

All the rim sherds from the site were quantified by Estimated Vessel Equivalents (EVEs) and tabulated by form per fabric (Table 2). The assemblage has a predominance of cooking-pots and other jar types (81%); with just a few Gallo-Belgic platter and butt-beaker copies, lids and cups in grog-tempered fabrics. Most of the few open forms and beakers, and the flagon, are in post-Conquest Romanised fabrics; vessels in which account for 8% of the EVEs total.

Table 2: Vessel form/fabric correlation, quantification by EVEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>I Flagon</th>
<th>II Jar</th>
<th>III Beaker</th>
<th>IV Bowl</th>
<th>IV Dish</th>
<th>VI Cup</th>
<th>IX Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.1</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.3</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9.2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 CHRONOLOGY AND PHASING

4.1 Phase 2. ‘Belgic’ late Iron Age. c 25 BC-AD 25/30

4.1.1 Assemblage 1. From the fills of BBW00 ditch 1024 cut by ditches 1022 and 1023 (contexts 225, 227 and 514).

The 40 sherds (562 g) of pottery from this feature comprise 14 fragments in very fine grog-tempered fabric B1, one in coarser fabric B2 and 25 in siltstone-grog tempered fabric B2.1. These sherds include fragments from a polished jar of Thompson type B5-1 (Fig. 1, No. 1, 50 BC-AD 50) and a bead-rim jar of type B5-5 with furrowed body (25 BC-AD 50). Three jar sherds in fabric B2.1 covered with ring stamps (No. 2, not illustrated) and a butt-beaker copy of Thompson type G5-1 in similar fabric (Fig. 1, No. 3, c AD 1-50) are also present.

4.1.2 Assemblage 2. From the fills of BBW00 ditch 1020 (contexts 219, 508, 713, 720, 724, 746, 748, 768, 894, 961, 968, 969, 1008, 1019, 1453, 1458, 1469, 1474, 1479 and 1567)

The 660 sherds (6985 g) of pottery from this feature form an assemblage large enough for quantification by EVEs (Table 3). This quantification reveals an assemblage consisting very largely of ‘Belgic’ grog-tempered wares in fabrics B1, B2 and B2.1 (82%) and with a very high percentage of jars (98%). Other forms comprise a Gallo-Belgic platter copy of Thompson’s type G1-7 in fabric B2 (AD 20-70) and a bead-rim storage jar. The only other group of fabrics represented in Table 3 are the glauconitic wares B9.1 and B9.3. Their importance at 18% of all of the assemblage has been distorted by the presence of the greater part of a jar of Thompson type B2-3 in glauconitic-sand and grogtempered fabric B9.3 (Fig. 1, No. 9, c 50 BC-AD 50).

Table 3: Assemblage 2. Ditch 1020, vessel form/fabric correlation, quantification by EVEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>I Flagon</th>
<th>II Jar</th>
<th>III Beaker</th>
<th>IV Bowl</th>
<th>IV Dish</th>
<th>IX Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.1</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9.1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9.3</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The grog-tempered jars include fragments from an example of neck-cordoned type B1-1 (Fig. 1, No. 5, 50 BC-AD 70), one example of type B1-3 (Fig. 1, No. 6, 50 BC-AD 50), two examples of type B2-3 with corrugated shoulders (Fig. 1, No. 9, 50 BC-AD 25), one of type B3-5 (Fig. 1, No. 4, 50-1 BC), two of type B5-4 (50 BC-AD 50), two of type B5-5 (25 BC-AD 50), one of type C1-1 (Fig. 1, No. 8, 25 BC-AD 50), one of type C1-2 (25 BC-AD 100), three of Class C3 (Fig. 1, No. 7, 50 BC-AD 50), one of Class C4 (AD 25-100).

The dates given for these various vessel types suggest that the ditched enclosure was in use from the beginning of our era until some time after AD 25. A fragment from a South Gaulish samian Drag 33 cup may be intrusive.

4.2 Phase 3A ‘Belgic’ late Iron Age. c AD 25/30-50/60

4.2.1 Assemblage 3. From the fills of enclosure ditches BBW00 1022 and 1023 (contexts 210, 212, 214, 277, 278, 505, 511, 725, 783, 801, 814, 216, 275, 715, 727, 728 and 816)

Enclosure ditch 1022/1023 yielded 719 sherds (14011 g) of pottery: an assemblage large enough for quantification by EVEs, even after elimination of a complete jar (No. 21) thought likely to skew the results (Table 4). The EVEs total of this assemblage is twice that of Assemblage 2 and is therefore more reliable. It does, however, tell a similar story; of an assemblage with total domination by ‘Belgic’ grog-tempered ware fabrics B1, B2, B2.1 and B2.3 (98%) and a similar predominance of jar forms (90%).

Table 4: Assemblage 3. Ditches 1022 and 1023, vessel form/fabric correlation, quantification by EVEs

The largest single component of the jar part of the assemblage (32%) consists of fragments from at least 12 bead-rim jars of Thompson type B5-5 with horizontal shoulder groove below burnishing over the upper part of the body and a variety of treatments below the groove, ranging from simple rough finish, through combing to scratch-marking (Fig. 1, Nos
Other bead-rim vessels make up a further 16% of the jars: they include a single example of Thompson Class C4 from the Canterbury area (Fig. 1, No. 10, c AD 30-80) and a bead-rim vessel of type B2-2 with corrugated shoulder (Fig. 1, No. 15, c 50 BC-AD 50), possibly from the same source.

Neck-cordoned jars, together with miscellaneous everted-rim vessels, make up a further 41% of the jars: they include examples of Thompson’s type B3-5 with decorated shoulder band (Fig. 1, No. 13, 50 BC-AD 50), type B2-1 with corrugated shoulder (Fig. 1, No. 14, 25 BC-AD 50) and several jars of Thompson types B1-3 and B1-4.

Of some significance and perhaps explaining the overwhelming predominance of grog-tempered wares on the site are two kiln or clamp wasters. Neither of these vessels can be said to be of good quality: they comprise the fragmentary remains of a small heavily-spalled jar of type B5-4 in pink misfired fabric B2 (Fig. 1, No. 19, AD 1-50) and a complete small bead-rim vessel with scratch-marking in grog and sparse flint-tempered fabric B3 with a hole blown in its side (Fig. 1, No. 20, c 50 BC-AD 50).

Bead-rim jars of Thompson type B5-5 occur in significant quantities on sites in the Ashford area but are comparatively rare elsewhere. This suggests that they were a local product but whether they were made at the Beechbrook Wood industrial settlement is another matter. None of the numerous examples of B5-5 jars from the site can be said to be significantly misfired and their finish is much superior to that of the two waster vessels. It seems more likely that there was small scale pot production at Beechbrook purely to cope with the on-site demands of the inhabitants of the site and that larger scale commercial production of B5-5 jars and other forms took place elsewhere nearby.

Of some concern is the fact that the two waster vessels are in different grog-tempered fabric variants. This highlights the problems regarding the variable nature of native grog-tempered ware fabrics and identifying their sources through fabric alone. It appears probable that the small scale nature of pottery production at Beechbrook Wood, perhaps by individuals whose expertise lay more in the field of iron furnace technology, meant that different clay mixes were exploited on an ad hoc basis.

The few other grog-tempered ware forms comprise a squat cup of Thompson type E2-1 (c AD 1-50), much of a butt-beaker with comb-stabbed decoration between cordons and four perforations in its base made after firing (No. 17, c 10 BC-AD 15) and at least two bead-rim storage-jars. One of the latter has a shoulder cordon with incised lattice decoration (Fig. 1, No. 18, c AD 1-70). The only vessel without grog filler is a cup of Thompson type E2.3 in sandy black fabric B9 from the Folkestone area (25 BC-AD 50).

A total lack of Romanised fine and grey wares at first glance might suggest that ditches 1022 and 1023 are entirely late Iron Age in date but the presence of fragments from three tournette-finished and lid-seated jars in fine quality grog-tempered fabric B2.3 (Fig. 1,
No. 16, c AD 50-170) indicates activity into the Roman period. Preliminary work on the pottery from the late Iron Age and Roman site at Brisley Farm (Lyne Forthcoming a) also suggests the possibility that type B5-5 bead-rim jars may have continued being made locally until c AD 70, although more research is required on assemblages from that site. The absence of Romanised fine and grey wares at Beechbrook Wood may simply be due to the industrial nature of activities taking place within the ditched enclosure and the low status of the individuals working there. A date of c AD 25-50/60 is suggested for the assemblage. This falls within the range of a radiocarbon date (100 cal BC-130 cal AD) obtained from material in context 505 of ditch 1022 (Allen 2006).

4.2.2  Assemblage 4. From the fill of ditch cut BWD98 118 (context 117)

The 483 sherds (8656 g) of pottery from this cut have rim fragments from too few vessels to justify quantification by EVEs. Nevertheless, the assemblage has much in common with that from ditches 1022 and 1023, in consisting almost entirely of grog-tempered sherds in fabrics B1, B2 and B2.1. Another similarity lies in the profusion of bead-rim jars of class B5-5: pieces from between 10 and 12 examples are present and include fragments from jars with both body combing and scratch marking (No. 21, c 25 BC-AD 50). Other grog-tempered jar forms include a necked jar of Class C7-1 with body combing (Fig. 1, No. 22, c AD 1-55).

A variety of grog-tempered storage vessels are also present, including everted rim examples with raised and decorated shoulder cordons (Fig. 1, Nos 23-24, c 50 BC-AD 50): these may be inspired by east Sussex ware girth-cordoned jars (Green 1980, fig. 27.1) and indicate trading contacts with or cultural influences from the Weald of east Sussex. East Sussex ware girth cordoned jars had a long history and were made until the mid-3rd century: Middle Roman examples are known from Westhawk Farm a short distance to the south-east of Beechbrook Wood (Lyne forthcoming b). The assemblage also includes fragments from an everted rim storage vessel in a vesicular fabric B2 variant with body combing (Fig. 2, No. 25, c 50 BC-AD 150).

As with Assemblage 3, nearly all of the sherds from context 117 are of jars: the solitary open form fragment comes from a good quality copy of a CAM1 Gallo-Belgic platter in polished black fabric B1 (Fig. 2, No. 26, c 20 BC-AD 50).

This assemblage probably accumulated through both Phases 2 and 3A with a body sherd from a closed form in fine grey Upchurch fabric R16 and three from a ?flagon in Gallo-Belgic white ware fabric BER10 indicating activity continuing for a period after the Roman Conquest.
4.2.3 Assemblage 5. From cremation group 2441 associated with Iron Age outer enclosure ditch 2151.

Cremation 2029 (contexts 2028, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2036, 2037 and 2057)
This cremation contained the truncated remains of three pots, comprising 49 fragments (328 g) from a black hole-mouthed vessel of Thompson Class C3 in fabric B2.1 (Pot 2033, c 50 BC-AD 50), 44 sherds (702 g) from another jar of uncertain type in rough-surfaced similar fabric (Pot 2031) and 19 sherds from the lower half of a beaker of uncertain type in fine Upchurch grey ware fabric R16 (Pot 2032, c AD 43-250). Two abraded fragments from a South Gaulish Dr 29 bowl (Pot 2037, c AD 43-85) were found in close proximity to Pot 2031.

The limited evidence suggests a date for the interment soon after the Roman Conquest.

Cremation 2035 (context 2035)
This was a single pot cremation comprising 21 sherds (324 g) from the lower part of a jar in black fabric B2.1 and is impossible to date with any precision.

Cremation 2046 (contexts 2045 and 2046)
This truncated two pot cremation comprises the lower portion of an acute-latticed jar in fabric B2.1 (Pot 2045) and three sherds from a South Gaulish samian Drag 15/17R platter (Pot 2046, c AD 43-50).

A deposition date around the time of the Roman Conquest can be given for this interment.

Cremation 2047
This cremation yielded 17 sherds from a jar of uncertain form with lumpy finish in a slightly vesicular variant of siltstone-grog tempered fabric B2.1. No closer date than late Iron Age-early Roman can be given for this cremation.

Cremation 2049
The truncated remains of a single jar of uncertain form in black-brown fabric B2.1 came from this cremation. This burial can be dated no more closely than Cremation 2047.

Cremation 2056 (contexts 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043 and 2055)
This cremation contained three truncated pots: there are 61 sherds (551 g) from the lower part of a jar in polished vesicular fabric B2.1 (Pot 2043), 68 fragments from the lower part of beaker with basal foot-ring in fine Upchurch grey ware (Pot 2041, c AD 43-70) and much of a Gallo-Belgic platter copy of Thompson type G1-11 in patchy buff/black fabric B2 (Pot 2039, c AD 30-80). This burial can be dated c AD 43-80.

4.3 Phase 4. Roman. c AD 70-250
All the post AD 70 Roman pottery assemblages from the site are very small and contribute little to our knowledge of activities on the site during that period.
4.3.1 Assemblage 6. From the fill of Romano-British ditch 1747 (context 718).

The 69 sherds (921 g) of pottery from this ditch forms too small an assemblage for any kind of meaningful quantification. They do, however, include fragments from two everted rim jars with horizontal shoulder grooves in fabric B2 (c AD 70-150), an everted-rim bowl of Pollard (1988) type 34 in similar fabric (Fig. 2, No. 29, c AD 50-100) and an everted-rim jar in polished black fabric B2.1 (Fig. 2, No. 28, c AD 70-150).

The assemblage also includes 10 fragments from the lower part of an acute-latticed cooking-pot in sandy grey Thameside fabric R73 (c AD 150-250), one large sherd from a bowl of Monaghan (1987) type 5B1.1 in fine grey Upchurch fabric R16 (c AD 150-250) and 29 fragments from a cornice-rim colour-coated Cologne white ware beaker in fabric R25 (c AD 130-250).

All this suggests that the ditch remained open between c AD 70 and 250.

4.3.2 Assemblage 7. From the fills of pit 1039 associated with Romano-British ditches 1748-50 (contexts 1042 and 1043)

The 32 sherds (635 g) of pottery from this feature include six sherds from two refired plain ‘pie-dishes’ in BB2 fabric R14 (c AD 170-250), a neck cordoned jar of Monaghan type 2A3.2 in similar fabric (c AD 170-230) and one everted jar each in grog-tempered fabrics B2 and B2.1 (c AD 70-250). The indications are that this feature was dug sometime during the period AD 170-250.

An absence of late Roman pottery suggests that occupation on the site terminated during the mid 3rd century after this period of low-level activity during the early Roman period.

5 DISCUSSION

The Late Iron Age pottery from the site is characterised by an overwhelming predominance of ‘Belgic’ grog-tempered wares; most of which, and in particular the distinctive B5-5 bead-rim jar type, were manufactured locally in the Ashford area. A few of the simpler forms appear to have been made at the Beechbrook site itself (Fig. 1, Nos 20-21) and there are just one or two grog-tempered vessels from the Canterbury area (Fig. 1, No. 10). Some of the vessels display east Sussex ware characteristics (Fig. 1, No. 24, Fig. 2, No. 25) but whether this indicates importation of small numbers of pots from that source or absorption of east Sussex traits into the local ceramic traditions is uncertain.

Phase 2 saw the importation of tiny numbers of glauconitic sand tempered pots in fabrics B9.1 and B9.3 from a source or sources in the upper Medway valley but this trade seems to have ceased by Phase 3A. Similarly small numbers of vessels in sandy black fabric B9 were imported from the Folkestone area during the late Iron Age.
Very few vessels in Romanised wheel-turned fabrics arrived on site during the 30 years or so after the Roman Conquest. This may reflect the low social status of the inhabitants of what was a settlement involved in activities including iron-working and pottery production. The few vessels which were circulating before AD 70 include South Gaulish samian open forms, fine grey Upchurch ware beakers and at least one Gallo-Belgic white ware flagon. Otherwise, it would appear that local grog-tempered wares continued to make up the bulk of the vessels in use; with fine, tournetted pots in the distinctive polished B2.3 fabric beginning to replace those in fabrics B1, B2 and B2.1.

There is little that one can say about the changing pattern of pottery supply to Beechbrook Wood during the period AD 70-250. Amounts of pottery are very small, but there is no reason to believe that pottery supply was very different to that on other rural sites in East Kent during the period.

6 CATALOGUE

Note: vessel Nos 17, 19 and 21 were not located when illustration work on this report was carried out.

Assemblage 1 (Fig. 1)

1. Small polished black bead-rim jar of Thompson type B5-1 in fabric B1. Ext. rim diameter 90 mm. Twelve fresh fragments from this vessel are present. Context BBW00 225.
3. Large part of plain butt-beaker of Thompson type G5-1 in grey fabric B2.1 fired polished patchy black/brown externally. Ext. rim diameter 100 mm. Context BBW00 514.

Assemblage 2 (Fig. 1)

4. Neck-cordoned jar of Thompson type B3-5 in grey fabric B2 fired black with pink margins. Ext. rim diameter 140 mm. c 50-1 BC. Context BBW00 1567.
8. Bead-rim jar of Thompson type C1-1 in black fabric B2.1 with combed body and perforated base. Ext. rim diameter 160 mm. c 25 BC-AD 70. Context BBW00 713.

Assemblage 3 (Fig. 1)

12. Similar vessel in similar fabric but with combing below the shoulder groove. Ext. rim diameter 160 mm. c 25 BC-AD 50. Context BBW00 277.
17. Bead-rim storage-jar in black fabric B2.1 with incised latticing on shoulder cordon. Ext. rim diameter 280 mm. c AD 1-70. Context BBW00 715.

Assemblage 4

Figure 1

22. Bead-rim jar of Thompson type B5-5 with scratch-marked body below the horizontal shoulder groove. Ext. rim diameter 110 mm. c 25 BC-AD 50. BWD98 117.
23. Large part of necked jar of Thompson type C7-1 in light-coloured fabric B2 fired black externally with body combing. Ext. rim diameter 200 mm. c AD 1-55. BWD98 117.

Figure 2


Assemblage 6 (Fig. 2)

28. Everted rim jar with horizontal shoulder groove in polished patchy black/orange fabric B2.1. Ext. rim diameter 180 mm. c AD 100-150. BBW00 718.
29. Everted rim bowl of Pollard (1988) type 34 in patchy black/red fabric B2. Ext. rim diameter 180 mm. c AD 50-100. BBW00 718.
30. Bowl of Monaghan form 5B1.1 in fine grey Upchurch fabric R16 imitating Central Gaulish samian form Drag 38. Ext. rim diameter 140 mm. c AD 150-250. BBW00 718.

Assemblage associated with cremation burial 173 (not illustrated)

32. Everted rim jar similar to No. 31 in fabric B2. Ext rim diameter 140 mm. c 50 BC-AD 50. Context BWD98.173.
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