

## Ceramic Phase 4: c. AD 55-80

Mainly coming from the central and southern zones of the site, fifteen groups with a total weight of 118kg and vessel rim equivalence (EVE) of 86.5 have been assigned to Ceramic Phase 4. Four of these groups, totalling 405kg and 32 EVEs, are presented below. Phase 4 is a period of continuity and change: sand replaces grog as the predominant tempering agent by the end of the phase, but many of the forms are little altered from Phase 3. Chelmsford provides a number of comparable assemblages; namely groups 1-3 (Going 1987, Table 3) and the pottery from ditch K205 (Going 1992, 96).

### Area D: Ditch 9213, fill 9214 (fig.00)

<i>Fabric</i>	<i>Sherd no.</i>	<i>Weight (g)</i>	<i>Average sherd wt</i>	<i>% Weight</i>	<i>EVE</i>	<i>% EVE</i>	<i>Forms</i>
ASALA	1	159	159	2%			<i>Salazon</i>
BSW	29	536	18	8%	0.53	21%	Jar G20
BUF	1	2	2	<1%			
COLB	9	44	5	1%			Flagon
ESH	1	18	18	<1%			
GRF	5	78	16	1%	0.19	7%	Bowl, jar G19
GROG	126	1680	13	26%	0.92	36%	Platter A2, bowl C19, jars G19 G20 <i>Cam 232</i>
GROGC	30	1165	39	18%	0.48	18%	Jars G45 <i>Cam 259</i>
GRS	10	182	18	3%			
RED	3	16	5	<1%			
STOR	70	2650	38	41%	0.46	18%	Jar G3 G new
<i>Total</i>	285	6530			2.58		

This group is dated to, and is typical of, the early part of Ceramic Phase 4. Measured by EVE, grog-tempered pottery predominates, though less so than in Phase 3. Black-surfaced ware forms a larger proportion. A greater range of wheel-thrown sand-tempered pottery is also present in sandy and fine grey wares and buff ware, though in relatively small proportions, while imports typical of the late Iron Age are noticeably absent. A date around AD50/55-60 is supported by the presence of the *salazon* amphora, as well as the remaining forms. The condition of the pottery is generally good, and the group is coherent with no obvious residual element.

### Area D: Pit 9218, fills 9217, 9370 (fig.00)

<i>Fabric</i>	<i>Sherd no.</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Average sherd wt</i>	<i>% Weight</i>	<i>EVE</i>	<i>% EVE</i>	<i>Forms</i>
BSW	73	858	12	5%	0.90	7%	Jar G3, beaker H1
BUF	12	39	3	<1%			
COLB	96	297	3	1%	0.43	3%	Bowl, flagon
GRF	72	274	4	1%	1.40	10%	Bowl, beaker H1
GROG	580	5430	9	26%	6.15	44%	Platters <i>Cam 21</i> A2, jars <i>Cam 249</i> <i>Cam 258</i> G3 G19 G20, beakers H1 H7, funnel N2
GROGC	240	5887	25	28%	3.19	23%	Bowl C33, jars <i>Cam 249</i> <i>Cam 259</i> G45, lid K3
GROGRS	4	28	7	<1%	0.11	1%	Jar <i>Cam 249</i>
GRS	26	418	16	2%	0.57	4%	Jar G20

SGSW	31	324	10	2%	0.24	2%	Platter f15/17, bowls f29 f30, cups f27 Ritt.8
STOR	210	7470	36	35%	0.73	5%	Jars <i>Cam</i> 270 <i>Cam</i> 271 G44
TN	2	15	8	<1%	0.06	<1%	Platter <i>Cam</i> 13
TR	12	48	4	<1%	0.11	1%	Beaker <i>Cam</i> 112
TRCG	1	4	4	<1%			
<i>Total</i>	1359	21092			13.89		

Grog-tempered pottery still dominates this assemblage, but wheel-thrown, sand-tempered forms and fabrics are now common. Gallo-Belgic imports are barely represented and the forms present are among the latest to be produced. South Gaulish samian ware is present, with the range of forms falling within a date band of AD45-80. The assemblage as a whole can probably be more closely dated to AD55-65 because of the presence of two Colchester B brooches (ref.xxx). Jars, beakers and platters are still the most common vessel classes, but bowls, cups and flagons are also much in evidence. The pottery is fragmentary and the small Central Gaulish sherd is residual.

*Area L: Pit 20008, fill 20009 (fig.00)*

<i>Fabric</i>	<i>Sherd no.</i>	<i>Weight (g)</i>	<i>Average sherd wt</i>	<i>% Weight</i>	<i>EVE</i>	<i>% EVE</i>	<i>Forms</i>
BSW	202	5200	26	49%	6.66	53%	Platter A2, bowls C27 <i>Cam</i> 214, jars G17 G19 G20, beaker H1, lid K6
COLB	24	346	14	3%	1.00	8%	Flagon J3
GRF	19	1590	84	15%	3.11	25%	Bowl C12, jars G20 G40
GROG	36	432	12	4%	0.33	3%	Platter A2, jar G, lid K3
GROGC	15	620	41	6%	0.03	<1%	Jar
GRS	50	1925	39	18%	1.15	9%	Jars G17 G23
HGG	1	8	8	<1%			
IMIC	3	8	3	<1%			Beaker H1
NGWF	1	20	20	<1%			
SGSW	2	12	6	<1%	0.14	1%	Platter f18
STOR	6	525	88	5%	0.06	<1%	
<i>Total</i>	359	10686			12.48		

This assemblage, dating to *c.* AD70, demonstrates both typical and atypical aspects of the later part of this ceramic phase. Typically, grog-tempered pottery now forms a minor component, while wheel-thrown, sand-tempered pottery predominates. The assemblage is atypical in that it comprises eleven complete or near-complete vessels, with some of the remaining pottery being sufficiently preserved to gain complete profiles of another three vessels. The very low quantity of sandy grey ware is also unusual, and perhaps reinforces the view that all or most of the assemblage was deposited under special conditions, and cannot be regarded as a mundane rubbish deposit (ref. section 8 – ritual deposition). There were a number of sherds in this feature that joined sherds in the contemporaneous Area L pit 20010. The mica-dusted beaker from that feature is illustrated here.

*Area M: Pit 24013, fill 24014 (fig.00)*

<i>Fabric</i>	<i>Sherd no.</i>	<i>Weight (g)</i>	<i>Average sherd wt</i>	<i>% Weight</i>	<i>EVE</i>	<i>% EVE</i>	<i>Forms</i>
---------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	-----------------	------------	--------------	--------------

ABAET	1	12	12	1%			Dr.20
BSW	55	556	10	25%	0.34	11%	Platter A4, dish B8, jar, lid K3
BUF	6	12	2	1%	0.11	4%	
BUFM	2	60	30	3%	0.03	1%	Mortarium D1
COLB	2	20	10	1%			
GRF	11	174	16	8%	0.57	19%	Cup, jar G20
GROG	23	102	4	5%	0.28	9%	Jar
GROGC	5	148	30	7%	0.03	1%	
GRS	33	526	16	23%	1.18	39%	Platter A2, jar G3, beaker H1, lid K6
SGSW	2	14	7	1%	0.39	13%	Bowl f35
STOR	4	156	39	7%			
VRWM	2	394	197	18%	0.08	3%	Mortarium D1
<i>Total</i>	146	2174			3.01		

A large quantity of pottery was collected from pit 24013, and can be placed within the later end of Ceramic Phase 4. Grog-tempered pottery is present, but only in small quantities, while wheel-thrown, sand-tempered fabrics are predominant. The range of forms is wide. The Verulamium region white ware mortarium, with its deep and hooked flange, is one of the earliest products of that industry, dating to the pre-Flavian and early Flavian periods (Davies *et al* 1996, 47). This, plus the samian bowl, which dates no earlier than AD70, provides an AD70-80 date range for the deposition of the whole assemblage. As with context 9214, the condition of the group is poor, though fairly consistent. There is little that can easily be dismissed as residual, though the grog-tempered pottery could well be.

#### *Catalogue of illustrated pottery*

<i>Archive</i>	<i>Context</i>	<i>Fabric</i>	<i>Form</i>
245	9214	BSW	G20
246	9214	BSW	G20.1
247	9214	GRF	C-new (handmade)
248	9214	STOR	G-new
249	9214	STOR	CAM259
250	9214	GROGC	CAM259
251	9214	GROGC	G-new
252	9214	GROGC	G45
253	9214	GROG	A2
254	9214	GROG	CAM232
255	9217	BSW	G handmade [Rodwell 1988, fig. 90.232]
256	9217	GROG	G20
257	9217	GROG	G handmade [Rodwell 1988, fig. 90.232]
258	9217	GROG	CAM258
259	9217	GROGC	CAM259
260	9217	GROGC	CAM249
261	9217	GROGC	CAM249
262	9217	GROGC	K [cf. Hawkes & Hull 1947, pl. LXXXV, no. 9]
263	9217	TR	H7 (CAM112)
264	9217	COLB	C-new
265	9217	GRF	H1
266	9217	STOR	CAM271
267	9217	STOR	CAM270B
268	9370	GROG	G20

269	9370	GROG	CAM21
270	9370	GROG	N2 funnel
271	9370	GROG	G19.1
272	9370	GROG	CAM249
273	9370	GROG	CAM21
274	9370	GROG	A2
275	9370	GROG	H1
276	9370	STOR	G-new
277	9370	GROGC	K3
278	9370	GROGC	CAM259
279	9370	GROGC	C33
280	9370	GRF	F-new
281	9370	STOR	C-new
282	9370	STOR	C-new
283	9370	GRS	G20
284	9370	BSW	G3
873	20009	BSW	G19.4
874	20009	BSW	G20.1
875	20009	BSW	CAM108
876	20009	BSW	G20
877	20009	BSW	A2
878	20009	BSW	K6
879	20009	BSW	C27
880	20009	BSW	G17
881	20009	BSW	CAM214
882	20009	GRF	H7.1
883	20009	GRF	G40
884	20009	GRF	G20
885	20009	GRF	C12
886	20009	GRS	G17
887	20009	GRS	G23
888	20009	COLB	J3.2
889	20009	STOR	G44
916	20009/11	IMIC	H1
2273	24014	BUFM	D1
2274	24014	VRWM	D1
2275	24014	GRF	F-new, cf. Drag.27
2276	24014	BSW	A4
2277	24014	BSW	B8
2278	24014	GRF	G20
2279	24014	GRS	A2.2
2280	24014	GRS	G3
2281	24014	GRS	G3
2282	24014	GRS	H1
2283	24014	GRS	K6