

## **ROXWELL QUARRY, ESSEX (RXQ98)**

### **Phasing (3/3/14)**

#### **AREA 1**

##### Period 2: Late Iron Age/Early Roman

Ditches G22 and G23

Gully G18

Pits 101 and 140

##### Period 3: Medieval

Ditches G20 and G21

Pit Group G19

##### Period 4: Post-medieval and modern

Ditches G24 and G25

Wheel ruts G26

##### Undated

Pits 174 and 192

Inhumation 185

#### **AREA 2**

##### Period 1: Prehistoric

Structure G9 (MIA+)

Ditches G16 (MIA)

Ditch G13 (MIA or earlier)

Pit 231 (LBA)

Pits 60, 273, 275, 277, 258 (prehistoric or MIA)

##### Period 2: Late Iron Age/Early Roman

Pit group G1 (includes residual prehistoric pottery)

Cremation Group G8

Gully 70

Ditch G10

Gullies G2, G11 and G12

### Period 3: Medieval

Pit 56

### Period 4: Post-medieval and modern

Ditches G3, G4

### Undated

Ditches G5, G6

Structure G7

Gully G14

Cremation Group G17

Pit 74

## **AREA 3**

### Period 2: Late Iron Age/Early Roman

Ditch G27 (LIA to post-conquest)

Ditch G28 (LIA to post-conquest) Cuts G29

Ditch G29 (LIA) Cut by G28

Ditch G35 (LIA to post-conquest)

Ditch G39 (LIA to mid 1st century AD)

Ditch G40 (LIA to mid 1st century AD)

Ditch G41 (LIA)

Ditch G37 (Early 1st century AD)

Ditch G36 (LIA)

Ditch/Enclosure G33 (LIA)

Ditch 347 (LIA)

Pit 557 (Early Roman)

Pit 480 (LIA)

Ditch G43 (LIA/Early Roman)

Ditch G47 (Roman)

Cremation 445 (LIA)

Cremation 408 (LIA)

#### Period 4: Post-medieval and modern

?Ditch G45

#### Undated

Ditches G32, G48, G49 and G50

Ditches G30 and G32

Gully G52

Cremations 410, 425, 431, 597 (?LIA)

Ditch 634 (LIA+)

Pits 609, 391, 477

Gully 626 (LIA+)

Pit 475 (LIA+)

Gully 537

## EB515: Roxwell Quarry (RXQ98)

### Overview finds quantification (all areas)

<b>Material/type</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Ctxt ct</b>	<b>Box ct</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Shelf</b>
Prehistoric pot	916	3,982g	85	1	EIA-MIA?	547
IA & Rom pot	3291	27.9kg	117	6.5		345, 346, 354
Saxon pot	3	18g	2	1		267
Medieval pot	873	5.2kg	?			
Animal bone				4		527, 528
Human bone				1	From 1 inhumation	527
Crem bone					Inc assoc residues	
Cu alloy objects	9	-	7	1 plastic	Inc. 1 coin	354
Iron objects	22	-	10	1 plastic	Inc. 14 nails	
Baked clay	687	9,018g	95	1	Inc. loomweights	545
Worked flint	69	-	34	1	Neo-LIA	545
Briquetage	5	32g	5			
Brick & tile	16	512g	11			
Worked stone	11	1052g	6			
Glass	1	-	1		Post-med bottle frag	
Slag	45	783g	12			
Enviro	-	-	-		Flots and ecofacts	
Unworked stone	33	2509g	18	-	discarded	-
Burnt stone/flint	67	2018g	18	-	discarded	-
Shell	279	1,158g	48	-	Oyster, mussel, snail	Can't locate this material

## **P515 Roxwell Quarry**

### **Catalogue of miscellaneous finds**

by H. Major and R. Tyrrell  
July 2003

Ros's catalogue from the first season has been added in, and description, feature numbers and dates corrected where necessary. It should be noted that a number of features originally thought to be medieval are now deemed to be Roman, so the comments on dating in Ros's draft report are no longer relevant.

#### *Conservation requirements*

None of the iron requires conservation. The socketed knife from 109 was originally selected for X-ray, but it has now partly disintegrated.

The coin is in poor condition, but is identifiable, so is not worth conserving.

The following copper alloy objects will need to be cleaned (seven pieces):

366 SF1. Toilet set, comprising a nail cleaner and a toilet spoon on a penannular ring.

369 SF2 Colchester derivative  
451 Tweezers, in good condition.

451 Disc with a central perforation.

452 SF4. Brooch. Langton Down. In fairly good condition, with possible trace of gilding.

567 SF6. Brooch. Langton Down. Surface obscured.

567 SF5 Brooch. Colchester

#### *Drawing requirements*

366 SF1. Toilet set, comprising a nail cleaner and a toilet spoon on a penannular ring.

369 SF2 Brooch. Colchester derivative  
451 Tweezers.

451 Disc with a central perforation.

452 SF4. Brooch. Langton Down.

567 SF5 Brooch. Colchester

567 SF6. Brooch. Langton Down.

624 Iron projectile point,

Four cylindrical loomweights from Pit 231

433/434 Briquetage rim

366 Chalk. Truncated pyramidal object,

## Catalogue

### Coin

Cont.	F.	Pot Date	Description
529		LIA/ER	SF3. Charles I. Rose Farthing. In poor condition, with a very powdery surface. A small part of the inscription is legible ...ET H[IB REX]

### Copper alloy

Cont.	F.	F. type	Pot Date	Description
126	129	Pit	Med	Small fragment from the straight edge of a decorative sheet mount, possibly from clothing. The edge is beaded, with a repousse band parallel to the edge. There are two small holes through the band, 7mm apart. 11x5mm, hole diam. 1mm.
366	358	Ditch	LIA	SF1. Toilet set, comprising a nail cleaner and a toilet spoon on a penannular ring. The nail cleaner is flat, with the loop in the same plane, and small decorative projections at the base of the loop. There is no decoration visible at present. In fairly good condition, with some loss of surface. L. 38mm The toilet spoon has a rod handle, flattened at the end to form the loop. The bowl is now incomplete, but was probably oval. Surviving L. 51mm. The ring has a variable rectangular section. External diam. 12mm
369		Layer	Post Rom	SF2. Colchester derivative. This is a small brooch, probably a Colchester B, although the condition is poor, and the spring gear badly damaged. It could possibly have had a forward hook, but the presence of a circular perforation in the catchplate suggests that it is fairly early, and therefore more likely to be a Colchester B. There are transverse mouldings on the side wings. In poor condition, with little surface surviving. L. 33mm
451	445	Crem	LIA	Tweezers, in good condition. Plain, slightly flaring, with circumferential mouldings on the loop. There is a separate collar round the top of the blades, with bands of circumferential moulding. The tweezers are on a suspension ring made from thick wire. A well-finished, good quality pair of tweezers. L. 64mm, W. 2.5-5.5mm. Collar W. 5mm. Ring external diam. 12mm, wire th. 2.5mm. Fill of pot 447
451	445	Crem	LIA	Disc with a central perforation. Four notches are set symmetrically round the edge. Three are small, c. 1mm across; the fourth is larger, c. 3mm across. This appears to be original, rather than due to damage. Diam. 21mm, th. 1mm, hole diam. 4mm. Fill of pot 447

451	445	Crem	LIA	A hollow bangle made from sheet metal, with the edges butted together on the inner face. It is joined into a circle by an internal plug 12mm long, made from copper alloy sheet with the edges overlapped. This appears to have been riveted to the external sheet: there are two small holes visible in the plug, but the overlying sheet is missing. The outer face is decorated with two rows of punched dots along each edge, barely visible in places. The condition is fairly good, but the metal is very thin and brittle; it is in two pieces with some damage at the breaks. The surface is in variable condition, good in places, but starting to blister in others. Oval section. External diam. 72mm, internal diam. 55mm, ht. 13mm. A-M Bojko notes that there is a parallel from Stanway.
452	455	Ditch 640	LIA	SF4. Brooch. Langton Down. In fairly good condition, with possible trace of gilding. The spring is broken but still in position, with most of the pin present. The catchplate is incomplete due to recent damage. A large example with a parallel-sided bow with three longitudinal reeded bands, and possible moulding at the junction of the bow and spring cover. L. 64mm This brooch was almost certainly complete and serviceable when deposited. It is interesting to note that TSM has queried whether the feature has some kind of special significance because of the type of pottery found. While this brooch could represent just a casual loss, its completeness may indicate a deliberate deposit.
567	571	Ditch	LIA	SF6. Brooch. Langton Down. Surface obscured, ends of spring cover and catchplate damaged, most of pin missing. L. 38mm
567	571	Ditch	LIA	SF5. Brooch. Colchester with short side wings, eight coil spring, and long hook. The catch plate is missing. In poor condition, with no surviving original surface, surface powdery. L. 72mm

*Iron*

Cont.	F.	F. type	Pot Date	Description
80	79	Pit	Med	Part of a 'U' shaped staple, rectangular in section and with both tips missing. L. 71mm, W. 31mm, Th. 9mm.
80	79	Pit	Med	Fragment from a socket or reinforcement band. An almost flat, tapering strip, one long edge probably complete, the other broken across a bend. The length may be complete. There is a circular perforation towards the wider end. L. 70mm, W, 18-31mm, hole diam. 5mm.
109	108	Ditch	LIA/E R	Socketed knife blade, with a rivet through the socket. The tip of the blade is missing. The form is late iron age, rather than Roman. L. 106mm, max. W. of blade socket diam. 23mm.

118	120	Ditch	No pot	A complete horseshoe, Clark type 4 (Clark 1995, 88-91), with one calkin and the nailholes placed in two sets of three. In London, the type occurs in contexts of the late 13th to mid 15th centuries. L. 113mm, W. 124mm.
118	120	Ditch	No pot	Fragment from a small, wavy-edged horseshoe of Clark type 2 (Clark 1995, 86). In London, the type occurs in 11th to late 13th century contexts. L. 46mm, W. 80mm.
380	382	Ditch	LIA	Sub-rectangular plate with a slight flange at one end. 24x19x3mm
476	477	Ditch	LIA	Fragments, probably a small flat-topped staple. Arm L. 24mm
624		Surface of Ditch 369		Projectile point, now badly flaked. Flat, diamond-shaped blade with a closed socket with a notch in the bottom. The tip was missing when buried. This could be either a small spear-head or a flat-bladed legionary bolt-head. It closely resembles Manning 1985, V254, which is identified by him as a bolt-head, though the slightly more flaring socket of the Roxwell example might be more indicative of it being a spearhead. It is certainly within the size range that Manning gives for spearheads of his Group IIA ( <i>op. cit.</i> , 165). Both forms are of similar date, those illustrated by Manning being mid 1st century AD. L. 108mm, max. W. of blade c 35mm, socket L. 45mm, max. diam. 19mm.

#### Iron nails

Cont.	F.	F. date	No.	Description
48	50	Med	5	Two are very small, 20mm long.
80	79	Med	1	
126	129	Med	3	
132	131	ER	1	
567	639	LIA	4	Nail; round, offset head, shaft incomplete. Head diam. 16mm; nail shaft and two probable nail shafts

#### Brick and tile

Cont.	F.	Pot Date	No.	Wt. (g)	Description
48	50	Med	4	20	Spall.
55	56	Early med	1	36	15mm thick, a flat tile.
65	67	Modern	1	74	The edge of a brick, 61mm thick, probably post-med.
80	79	Med	2	190	1 possible brick and 1 tegula frag.
115	113	ER	1	8	Spall.
134	135	ER	1	6	Post-med brick
148	79	ER	1	116	Spall.
151	152	Med	1	4	Post-med brick.
349	353	No date	1	18	Post-med tile?
369	Layer	Post-R	2	37	Peg tile. Post-med
374	373	ER	1	3	Spall
Totals			16	512	



*Cylindrical loomweights and other baked clay from Pit 231*

Total – 14 pieces, wt. 3649g.

Nos. 1-6 are in a soft, slightly streaky oxidised fabric, with fairly sparse sand and small pebbles, and sparse vegetable temper. The surfaces are slightly eroded.

232 (1) Complete, with slight damage. An almost perfect cylinder, well made. Diam. 110mm, ht. 80mm, hole diam. 30mm, wt. 1190g

232 (2) Complete, with slight damage. Diam. 104mm, ht. 77mm, hole diam. 27mm, wt. 940g

232 (3) Part of side reduced. c. 90% present. Recent damage to side, and most of base flaked off in antiquity. Hole slightly oval. Diam. 108mm, ht. 78mm, hole 31x35mm, wt. 1060g

232 (4) Fragment. Diam. c. 100mm, hole diam. 22mm, wt. 230g

232 (5) Fragment with part of the hole, probably part of 232 (4). 11g

232 (6) Weight, presumably a small loomweight. Domed top, with vertical hole set off-centre. The other end is missing, so it is unknown whether it was flat, or similarly domed. Diam. 58mm, surviving ht. 82mm, hole diam. 12mm, wt. 166g.

232 (7) Eight fragments in fabric 2. Three are probably from structural daub. Two have flat surfaces, and the third has probable wattle impressions. Wt. 52g

*Baked clay*

'Loomweight' in the descriptions below refers to Iron Age triangular loomweights.

Cont	F.	F type	Pot Date	No.	Wt. (g)	Fa b	Description
7	8	Crem	no date	7	8	2	
12	13	Pit	Prehist	7	60	2	One with edge, two with flat surfaces. Probably loomweight.
12	13	Pit	Prehist	1	2	1	
14	15	Pit	Prehist	2	16	1	
73	74	Pit	Prehist	55	26	1	
80	79	Pit	Med	4	34	1	
111	110	Road-side ditch	ER	4	6	1	
121	108		LIA/ER	2	8	1	
121	108		LIA/ER	2	6	2	
123	122	Gully	ER	3	4	1	
126	129	Pit	Med	25	59	1	
126	129	Pit	Med	4	9	2	
151	152	Pit	Med	10	28	1	Three have flat surfaces
162	172		LIA	3	20	1	One with a rounded edge
193	194	Pit	Med	2	12	1	
195	199		LIA/ER	3	28	1	Has flat surfaces, poss

Cont	F.	F type	Pot Date	No.	Wt. (g)	Fa b	Description
							loomweight
202	206		ER	2	4	1	
208	206	Ditch	ER	2	17	1	Has a flat surface
208	206	Ditch	ER	1	5	2	
209	206	Ditch	ER	1	48	2	Roughly flat surface
209	206	Ditch	ER	2	60	1	Both with flat surfaces
212	210	Ditch		1	2	1	
214	215	Ditch	ER	1	70	1	Top of a loomweight
226	225	PH		2	2	1	
246	245	Ditch	LIA	1	10	1	Flat surface
247	245	Ditch	LIA	1	2	1	Flat surface
253	251	Ditch		25	44	2	
261	249	Ditch		5	4	1	
263	262	Ditch		1	4	2	
272	270	Ditch		39	82	2	Two with flat surfaces, one with a convex surface
296	281	PH		3	21		Probably loomweight. Hard fired, with some sand inclusions.
343	342	Pit	LIA	24	68	1	Loomweight fragments; one piece has the trace of a hole.
345	344	Ditch		3	3	1	
346	342	Pit	LIA	25	94	1	One with a flat surface
346	342	Pit	LIA	4	33	2	
347	347	Ditch		2	1	1	
351	354	Gully		3	2	1	One with a flat surface
352	355	Gully		5	52	1	Loomweight fragments. Two have flat surfaces and one has the trace of a hole
362	359	Ditch 356	LIA/ER	25	53	1	Most with flat surfaces
362	359	Ditch 356	LIA/ER	2	82	1	One with a flat surface. Probably loomweight
363	382	Ditch 356	LIA/ER	26	120	1	Six with flat surfaces
363	382	Ditch 356	LIA/ER	2	3	2	One with a vitrified surface
364	358	Ditch 356	LIA	1	1	1	
365	358	Ditch 356	LIA	3	19	1	Probable hole edge
366	358	Ditch 356	LIA	15	136	2	Two with a rounded edge, three with flat surface, one with the trace of a hole
367	357	Ditch 637	LIA	1	3	1	Flat surface
368	357	Ditch 637	LIA	1	4	1	Flat surface
370	393	Ring ditch	LIA/ER	2	186	1	Loomweight edge with probable trace of a hole. Side W. c 110mm. The second fragment is probably part of the same weight.

Cont	F.	F type	Pot Date	No.	Wt. (g)	Fa b	Description
372 & 394	361	Ditch 356	LIA	2	242		Fabric is hard-fired, with very sparse chalk. Loomweight apex fragment with complete width of face. Hole diam. c. 15mm, side W. c. 70mm; edge fragment, possibly from the same weight
374	373	Ditch 636	ER	2	35	1	From rounded edge
376	373	Ditch 636	LIA	1	3	1	
380	382	Ditch 356	LIA	2	47	1	Flat surface
380	382	Ditch 356	LIA	1	3	2	
381	382	Ditch 356	LIA	3	10	1	
381	382	Ditch 356	LIA	3	9	2	One with a flat surface
383	360	Ditch 356	LIA	1	5	1	Flat surface
392	391	Cut	LIA	1	9	1	Possible trace of a hole
398	359	Ditch 356	LIA	1	9	1	
401	400	Ditch 356	LIA	1	11	1	
409	410	Crem	LIA	21	35	1	
411	412	Gully 635	LIA	9	40	1	Five with flat surfaces
411	412	Gully 635	LIA	1	2	2	
413	414	Gully 635	LIA	1	5	1	Convex surface
413	414	Gully 635	LIA	2	2	2	
417	419	Gully 635	LIA	11	38	1	Three with flat surfaces
418	419	Gully 635	LIA	2	23	1	
420	422	Gully 635	LIA	21	55	1	Some with flat surfaces. All small pieces
433	450	Ditch 641	LIA	1	1	1	
433/434	450	Ditch 641	LIA	40	230	1	Loomweight fragments, not all from the same weight; includes two pieces with traces of different sized holes.
433/434	450	Ditch 641	LIA	1	5	2	
436	347	Ditch	LIA	2	50	1	One from a loomweight with the trace of a hole
436	347	Ditch	LIA	10	5	2	
441	643	check	LIA	2	30	1	<b>F should be 443?</b>

Cont	F.	F type	Pot Date	No.	Wt. (g)	Fa b	Description
459	501	Ditch 640	LIA	1	5	1	Loomweight edge
467	471	Ditch	LIA/ER	3	128	1	All with flat surfaces
467	471	Ditch	LIA/ER	1	7	2	
469	471	Ditch	LIA	2	61	1	One is the side from a loomweight, with part of the hole
469	471	Ditch	LIA	1	68	2	Flat surface
470	471	Ditch	LIA	3	66	1	Loomweight edge, and one piece with a flat surface
476	477	Ditch	LIA	6	22	1	One with a flat surface
476	477	Ditch	LIA	1	6	2	Flat surface
504	502	PH	LIA	1	28	1	Flat surface
509	503	Ditch 641	LIA	1	556	1	Joining fragments of a block with two surviving orthogonal faces with a sharp arris. The faces are well smoothed. Possibly loomweight, though no trace of holes, and the sharp arris would be unusual. The face widths are >80mm and >100mm.
511	513	Gully 635	LIA	1	5	1	
512	513	Gully 635	LIA	6	14	1	
514	516	Gully 635	LIA	18	51	1	
514	516	Gully 635	LIA	3	3	2	
515	516	Gully 635	LIA	11	30	1	Two with flat surfaces
517	519	Ditch 356	LIA	1	7	1	Flat surface
520	521	Pit	LIA	1	15	2	Very hard fired
522	523	Gully 635	LIA	1	23	1	
534	535	Gully	LIA	1	18	1	Flat surface, possible hole edge
538	539	Gully 635	LIA	2	1	1	
547	Find			1	1230		Loomweight, fragmented into a large number of pieces. The fabric is fairly fine, with sparse vegetable temper, with a very friable, reduced core which has disintegrated. The surfaces are brown, and rather irregular. This appears to be a large weight, but there are no hole traces present, and no measurements are possible.
552	551	Ditch 637	ER	1	51	1	Trace of a hole
553	550	Ditch	LIA	1	14	1	

Cont.	F.	F type	Pot Date	No.	Wt. (g)	Fa b	Description
		638					
554	557	Pit	ER	5	25	1	One with flat surface
555	557	Pit	ER	6	35	1	Two with rounded edges, rest with flat surfaces
556	557	Pit	ER	11	53	1	Two with a curved edge. Probably loomweight.
556	557	Pit	ER	3	22	2	
572	573	Ditch	LIA	1	8	1	Flat surface
579	582	Ditch 639	LIA	1	7	1	
579	582	Ditch 639	LIA	3	18	2	
580	582	Ditch 639	LIA	10	104	1	One with a flat surface
581	582	Ditch 639	LIA	1	14	1	
586	593	Ditch 636	LIA	1	33	1	Loomweight edge
589	593	Ditch 636	LIA	1	6	2	
592	593	Ditch 636	LIA	2	16	1	
594	577	Gully	LIA	1	13	1	
605	607	Ditch	LIA	6	60	1	Flat surfaces. Some barely fired
606	607	Ditch	LIA	1	7	1	
606	607	Ditch	LIA	1	8	2	Flat surface
608	609	PH	LIA	31	22	1	
620	623	Ditch 639	LIA/ER	7	18	1	One with flat surface
621	623	Ditch 639	LIA	6	26	1	Two with flat surfaces
Total				673	5369		

*Salt briquetage*

Cont.	F.	Pot Date	No.	Wt. (g)	Description
207	215	ER	1	4	No full thickness. Outer surface is ridged.
380		LIA	1	2	Abraded, burnt. Full thickness probably not present.
433/ 434		LIA	1	17	Flat rim with slight external flange, horizontally ridged outer surface. Th. 15mm <b>Draw</b>
441		LIA	1	7	Abraded, but probably with the full thickness. Th. 13mm.
621		LIA	1	2	No full thickness
Total			5	32	

*Worked stone*

Cont.	F.	F. date	No.	Wt. (g)	Description
-------	----	---------	-----	---------	-------------

80	79	Med	3	116	Abraded lava quern. Max. T. 21mm. Not datable, could be redeposited Roman.
112	110	ER	4	38	Abraded lava quern. (Not in the box. July 03)
121	108	LIA/ER	1	86	Natural sandstone pebble fragment. It was cleaved along the bedding plane, possibly deliberately, and used as a rubber. The other surface is natural. W. 70mm.
366	356	LIA	1	16	Chalk. Truncated pyramidal object, possibly a spindlewhorl. It has three sides, two sloping sides and one vertical. The 'top' has been roughly flattened, but the 'bottom' is more irregular, either through erosion, or possibly because the object was not finished. There is a groove along one face at the bottom, which may represent an unfinished cut. The object has been drilled vertically through the centre from both faces, forming an hourglass-shaped perforation. L. 32mm, W, 31mm, max. th. 23mm. <b>Draw</b>
398	356	LIA	1	150	Sandstone. The edge from a saddle quern, made from a boulder. The grinding surface is worn smooth, and almost flat. The edge has probably been trimmed, while the underside is natural. The thickness is fairly constant. c. 50x45mm, th. 39mm
468	471	LIA/ER	1	646	Sandstone. A large, fire-cracked, pebble, broken along the bedding planes to form a flat, triangular slab. The shape is probably fortuitous, but one face has smooth patches, possibly the result of use as a rubber. L. 105mm, W. 87mm, Th. 44mm.
Total			11	1052	

*Unworked stone* (all discarded)

The 'sandstone' from 134 recorded by RT was brick.

Cont.	No.	Wt. (g)	Description
71	1	70	Limestone with a small amount of shell, probably chalk deposit.
73	2	72	Grit. No trace of working
121	1	20	Limestone with a small amount of shell, probably chalk deposit.
211	1	36	Pebble
363	1	43	Limestone (chalk deposit)
401	4	25	Limestone (chalk deposit)
467	1	10	Limestone (chalk deposit)
468	1	72	Limestone (chalk deposit)
469	2	894	Limestone (chalk deposit); sarsen boulder fragment
552	2	400	Limestone (chalk deposit); pebble fragment
553	3	210	Limestone (chalk deposit)
362	2	212	Unworked flint
232	2	198	Pebbles
250	6	194	Four pieces limestone (chalk deposit); two pieces tufa
352	1	5	Unworked flint
345	1	40	Pebble

296	1	5	Unworked flint
295	1	3	Unworked flint. Bs 36
Total	33	2509	

*Unworked burnt stone (all discarded)*

Cont.	F.	F. date	No.	Wt. (g)	Description
7	8		3	8	Burnt flint. Bs 1
73	74	Prehist	7	302	Burnt flint
73	74	Prehist	5	222	Bs 5. Burnt pebbles
232	231	BA	1	20	Burnt pebble
232	231	BA	3	48	Burnt flint
250	249		1	7	Burnt flint
260	258		7	128	Burnt flint
295	294		12	70	Burnt flint
341	340		1	18	Burnt flint
345	344		2	68	Burnt flint
351	354		1	6	Burnt flint
363	382	LIA/ER	2	23	Burnt flint
374	373	ER	5	230	Heat-shattered pebbles
401	400	LIA	1	6	Burnt flint
413	414	LIA	2	49	Burnt flint
418	419	LIA	3	27	Burnt flint
453	455	LIA	1	37	Heat-shattered sarsen pebble fragment
528	527	Prehist	5	184	Burnt flint and pebbles
541	540	LIA/ER	2	208	Burnt sandstone pebbles
552	551	ER	2	348	Pebble fragments, scorched
552	551	ER	1	9	Burnt pebble
Total			67	2018	

*Worked flint*

This list does not include the flint from the first season (already seen by HEM).

Cont.	F.	F. date	No.	Wt. (g)	Description
232	231	BA	6	140	Five flakes and ?an attempted core
246	245	LIA	1	11	Flake
247	245	LIA	1	5	Flake
253	251		3	50	Flakes
260	258		2	12	Flakes
272	270		7	42	Four flakes, three blades
287	287		1	7	Flake
313	312		1	4	Flake
362	359	LIA/ER	1	2	Possible flake
364	358	LIA	1	2	Blade
366	358	LIA	4	198	Three small flakes, two rather dubious; large natural flake, possibly with some deliberate trimming of the edge
385	360	LIA	2	21	Flakes, one with small area of retouch
399	359	LIA	1	11	Tabular flint, possibly deliberately trimmed to a rectangle
401	400	LIA	1	16	Flake, bluish patination
417	419	LIA	1	37	Irregular lump, possibly with some flakes

					removed
420	422	LIA	1	20	Squat flake with broad striking platform
476	477	LIA	2	12	Blades, slight milky patination
528	527	Prehist	1	2	Flake, slight milky patination
538	539	LIA	1	8	Flake, white patination
556	557	ER	2	11	Flake; blade with slight milky patination
Total			40	611	

### Slag

The slag from all contexts except 48 looks very similar; light in colour and weight, with large vesicles, almost vitrified in places, with occasional flint inclusions. This is probably domestic fuel ash. The slag from 48 is denser and darker in colour, but still probably domestic rather than associated with metal-working.

Cont.	F.	F. date	No.	Wt. (g)	Description
48	50	Med	3	62	Dark and fairly dense
180	179	LIA	2	84	
401	356	LIA	25	242	Some with burnt clay adhering
468	471	LIA/ER	2	5	
470	471	LIA	1	60	
517	356	LIA	4	114	
541	540	LIA/ER	1	14	
552	637	ER	2	9	
556	557	ER	2	168	
586	593	LIA	1	16	
592	593	LIA	1	1	
620	623	LIA/ER	1	8	
Total			45	783	



## 515. Roxwell Quarry

### Prehistoric pottery by N. Brown and N. J. Lavender

A small quantity of pottery (916 sherds weighing 3982g) was recovered from the excavations, and has been recorded (details in archive) using a system devised for prehistoric pottery in Essex (Brown 1988). Fabrics present in the assemblage are: -

Fabric	%sherd count	% weight
A. Flint S 2 well sorted	<0.5	<0.5
B. Flint S-M 2	<0.5	2.0
C. Flint S-M with occasional L2	14.5	24.5
D. Flint, S-L 2, poorly sorted	32	19
E. Flint and Sand, S-M 2	12	13
F. Flint and Sand, S-M 2-3 With occasional L Flint	<0.5	<0.5
G. Sand S 3	4.5	9
H. Sand S 2	1.5	1.5
I. Sand S-M 2-3	1	<0.5
J Sand S 2 with veg. voids particularly on surface	3.5	3.5
M. Grog, often with some sand or flint and occasional small rounded or subangular voids.	23.5	21
P. Sparse very fine sand may have occasional flint or sparse irregular voids.	>0.5	<0.5
Q. Flint S-L, Grog S-M 2	<0.5	2.
T. Chalk	1	1.5
W. Flint S-L 2, with some sand and veg. voids, often on exterior	>0.5	
Z. Shell and Flint	<0.5	<0.5
Unclassifiable	1.5	1.5

Table 2 prehistoric pottery

### Illustrated Sherds

			<b>Middle Bronze Age</b>
X.1	232	E	Rim of globular urn with scar showing the position of a probable lug handle
			<b>Early Iron Age</b>
X.2	349	D	Rim of round-bodied bowl with post-firing perforation
			<b>Middle Iron Age</b>
X.3	398	C	Rim of a small plain cup or tub.
X.4	509	G	Rim of jar, Drury Form 4

In general the range of fabrics is typical of the Late Bronze Age to earlier Iron Age. Flint or flint and sand tempered fabrics (such as fabrics A-F) tend to dominate Late Bronze

Age and Early Iron Age assemblages (e.g. Brown 1988). The more diversely tempered fabrics (such as F-Z) are more appropriate to Middle Iron Age Pottery (e.g. Drury 1978).

Thirty two percent (by weight) of the assemblage was recovered from context 232 (pit 231) and is of Middle Bronze Age date. It was recovered alongside a group of four cylindrical loomweights. Densely flint-tempered sherds from a globular urn bearing the scar of an applied lug handle (Fig. X.1) are typical of this date, though unusual in Essex, where most Deverel-Rimbury type material comes from cremation burials and comprises bucket urns. Globular urns are more usually associated with domestic sites, which remain elusive in Essex.

A grog-tempered plain cup (Fig. X.3), residual in context 398 (Late Iron Age ditch 356) is essentially updateable, but likely to be Late Bronze Age or later. Given the context from which it was recovered, a date in the Iron Age is more likely.

The Roxwell pottery is largely devoid of diagnostic forms; however, a sherd of a round-shouldered fine bowl, which maybe paralleled in Early Iron Age assemblages (e.g. Brown, 1988, fig. 16.62; Brown 1992, fig. 5.10) was recovered from context 14 and part of a further round-bodied bowl from context 349 (Fig. X.2). The Middle Iron Age is represented by rim and shoulder sherds from context 36 and 261, which may be from vessels of Little Waltham form 2 or 4 (Drury 1978). A further large sherd from a Form 4 jar (Fig. X.4) was recovered from context 509, a fill of Late Iron Age ditch 503. This sherd, representing almost 25% of the vessel's circumference, shows almost no signs of abrasion, and is hard to see as residual. At Little Waltham some Form 4 jars were recovered from Period IV (Late Iron Age) contexts, though not in the same quantities as in earlier phases. On both sites, this represents a continuation of the coarse ware tradition after the introduction of grog-tempered, wheel-thrown fine wares.

Given the mix of fabrics and forms it may be suggested that most of the Iron Age pottery dates from a period late in the Early Iron Age or early in the Middle Iron Age. However, this would assume that all of the pottery is broadly contemporary, alternatively, it may be that two periods, Early and Middle Iron Age are represented. The pottery from context 509 would suggest that occupation was continuous from the Middle to Late Iron Age.

The material from pit 231 appears to be an isolated deposit, none of the nearby features producing any diagnostic Late Bronze Age pottery. It should be noted, however, that due to box-scraper stripping, it is possible that small features such as postholes may not have been distinguishable. Any interpretation of these finds as an isolated ritual deposit should, therefore, be treated with caution.

The materials for pottery production are readily available at the site, with the exception of oyster shell. It is likely, therefore that most of the pottery recovered from Roxwell Quarry was locally made. The 10g of undated shell and flint tempered pottery from the site indicates that a small quantity of material was being brought to the site from a coastal location.

## Roxwell quarry: the Late Iron Age and Roman pottery dating evidence

By T.S. Martin (11-08-2003)

### Summary of the dating evidence.

By and large, the pottery from Roxwell Quarry comprises Late Iron Age Grog-tempered wares (Going 1987, fabric 53). The only other local coarse wares of this period comprise South Essex shell-tempered wares and a small number of sherds designated as miscellaneous Iron Age coarse wares. Imports are restricted to a small amount of Terra Rubra, North Gaulish white wares, and Dressel 1 amphoras. It is notable that no sherds of Terra Nigra were identified. The bulk of the pottery appears to be of Late Iron Age date. Material of post-conquest is sparse on the ground and mostly comes from the top or uppermost fills of features. The pottery of this date is especially fragmented and often quite abraded, consequently, few vessel forms could be identified from any of the excavated sherds. Although several features produced large assemblages, these were generally fairly fragmentary with few individual contexts producing groups of more than 100 sherds. Compared with the Late Iron Age pottery, the Roman period material was in much poorer condition, being mainly derived from the top fills of features.

### Ditch 57

fill 58	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric GRS.
---------	-----------------------------------

*Dating:* This context contained 1 undiagnostic body sherd that is not closely datable. A post conquest date is indicated, however. Unphased.

### Ditch 63

fill 64	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric BSW.
---------	-----------------------------------

*Dating:* This context contained several very small body sherds. These are not closely datable and could be intrusive.

### Gully 70

fill 71	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
---------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* The dating of this group rests on the presence of a medium-sized group of sherds that are typically Late Iron Age date.

### Pit 101

primary fill 107	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabrics GROG, BSW & RED.
------------------	--

*Dating:* The presence of Romanising Black-surfaced ware in this small group points to an early Roman date.

### Ditch 108

Seg. 108	top fill 121	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Forms G3.2 (GROG), G20 (GROG), G5.2 (ESH), G4 (ESH). Fabrics BSW & MICW.
	secondary fill 109	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Seg. 210	top fill 213	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabrics BSW & GROG.
	secondary fill 212	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Form G19 (GROG). Fabric TR4.
	primary fill 211	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Form H7 [base] (GROG).
Seg. 215	top fill 207	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Forms G [necked] (GROG), G4 (ESH). Fabric COLB.
	quaternary fill 208	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Forms G [storage jar] (GROG), G [necked] (BSW).
	tertiary fill 209	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Forms G [storage jar] (GROG), G [necked] (GRS), G3.1 (GROG), G44 (GROG). Fabric MICW.

*Dating:* The three segments produced 341 sherds weighing 5kg with the largest amount, 160 sherds weighing 2.2kg coming from the top fill of segment 108. Judging by the absence of Romanised pottery in the primary fill of segment 210 and the secondary fills located in segments 108 and 210, the feature probably originated in the pre-conquest period. The presence of Black-surfaced ware in the top fills of segments 108 and 210 points to continued infilling into the conquest period. This is confirmed by the presence of Roman pottery in the fills

of segment 215. It is notable that the bulk of the pottery recovered from the feature is likely to be of Late Iron Age date.

#### Ditch 110

top fill 111	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Forms G19 (GROG), G3.1 (GROG), G4 (ESH), G5.2 (ESH). Fabrics BSW, STOR, RED & GRS.
primary fill 112	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Form G [necked] (BSW). Fabric GRF.

*Dating:* This feature produced 24 sherds weighing 0.1kg. The pottery recovered from this feature suggests an early Roman (?Pre Flavian) date. A medieval sherd was also recovered from this feature, but this is clearly intrusive.

#### Ditch 113

top fill 115	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Form G [necked] (BSW).
--------------	--

*Dating:* A fragmentary rim sherd, probably early Roman. A large abraded medieval sherd was also recovered from the fill of segment 161. However the feature is more likely to be early Roman.

#### Gully 122

Seg. 122	fill 123	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabrics GROG & STOR.
Seg. 136	fill 137	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabrics GROG & STOR.

*Dating:* A small group. The presence of storage jar sherds indicates a post-conquest date.

#### Surface 134

layer 134	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
-----------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* Probably Late Iron Age but dating is based on a very small amount of pottery. However, this context must be Early Roman on stratigraphic grounds.

#### Ditch 140, recut of ditch 108

top fill 138	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric BSW.
--------------	-----------------------------------

*Dating:* The dating of this group is based on the presence of a very abraded base. A post-conquest is indicated on fabric grounds.

#### Ditch 142

fill 141	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric BSW.
----------	-----------------------------------

*Dating:* A post-conquest is indicated on fabric grounds.

#### Pit 152

fill 151	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
----------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* This context contained a very abraded ?pedestal base of Late Iron Age date. It is residual in a medieval context.

#### Ditch 172

top fill 162	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
--------------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* This context contained a large number of sherds, although some were very abraded. A Late Iron Age date is suggested.

#### Ditch 175

top fill 180	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
--------------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* A small group of sherds were recovered from this feature. A Late Iron Age date is suggested.

#### Ditch 206 recut of Ditch 108

top fill 202	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabrics GROG, GRS, ESH & BSW.
primary fill 205	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Form C [Cam 211B] (GROG). Fabrics COLB, GRS & BSW.

*Dating:* Pottery of Roman date was present in both fills. An early Roman date is therefore likely.

### Cremation 233

Fill 234	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Forms G [pedestal base] (GROG), G [base] (GROG).
----------	--

*Dating:* A Late Iron Age cremation, although some intrusive post-Roman material was present as well.

### Cremation 236

Fill 235	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Form A [foot-ring base] (GROG).
----------	---

*Dating:* A Late Iron Age cremation, although most of the sherds comprised tiny little chips.

### Cremation 237

Fill 238	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Form K (GROG).
----------	--------------------------------------

*Dating:* A Late Iron Age cremation, although most of the sherds comprised tiny little chips.

### Post-hole 243

Fill 244	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
----------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* Probably Late Iron Age in date.

### Post-hole 265

Fill 266	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
----------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* This context contained a single abraded sherd, not closely datable, but possibly indicating a Late Iron Age date.

### Gully 297

Fill 298	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric BSW.
----------	-----------------------------------

*Dating:* This context contained a single abraded sherd, not closely datable, but possibly indicating a post-conquest date. However, this is in fact intrusive in a EIA/MIA feature.

### Ditch 332 (seg. 245)

Top fill 246	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
--------------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* Probably Late Iron Age in date.

### Post-hole 340

Fill 341	<i>Misc. Pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
----------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* The presence of a single small and abraded sherd means that this feature is not securely dated.

### Pit 342

Top fill 343	<i>Misc pottery:</i> Form G [large storage jar type] (GROG).
--------------	--

*Dating:* The top fill of Pit 342 contained a small amount of Late Iron Age pottery.

### Ditch 356

Seg. 358	Top fill 366	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [handmade neckless type] (GROG). Fabric ESH.
	5th fill 364	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G3 (GROG), ?G (GROG).
	4th fill 365	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics GROG & ESH.
Seg. 359	Top fill 362	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form ?G (GROG). Fabric BSW.
	Secondary fill 398	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms C/F [small bowls or cups - Cam 69B and Cam 217] (GROG).
	Primary fill 399	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [necked] (GROG).
Seg. 360	Top fill 383	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
	Tertiary fill 385	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
	Secondary fill 386	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Seg. 361	Top fill 371	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G20.2 (BSW), G [necked] (GROG).
Seg. 400	Single fill 401	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms A2 (GROG), G (Cam 254) (ESH), H [Cam 113] (NGWF).

Seg. 519	Top fill 517	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G3.2 (GROG), G [necked] (GROG).
	Primary fill 518	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Seg. 540	Single fill 541	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics BSW & GROG.

*Dating:* Altogether, seven segments through Ditch 356 produced 198 sherds weighing 1.6kg. The dating is fairly consistent with the lowest fills containing GROG and the occasional sherd of ESH. Several of the top fills contained small amounts of Romanising pottery (BSW) and some STOR. This indicates continued deposition into the mid-1st century AD and into the conquest period. The absence of Romanised grey wares is notable.

#### **Ditch 382, recut of Ditch 356**

Seg. 382	Top fill 363	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [Cam 254] (ESH), G5.1 [with incipient groove] (ESH), G [necked] (GROG), ?G44 [neck] (GROG).
	Secondary fill 380	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms ?A [base] (GROG), G19 [b/s] (GROG).
	Primary fill 381	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics ASS & GROG.
Seg. 393	Single fill 370	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [necked types] (GROG). Fabrics ESH & STOR.

*Dating:* This feature contained 59 sherds weighing 0.6kg. The latest pottery present suggests deposition continued into the early Roman period. The presence of South Spanish amphora sherd in the primary fill of segment 360 places this feature in the first half of the 1st century AD or later into the Claudian period. South Spanish amphoras, while not unknown in pre-conquest horizons are nevertheless rare.

#### **Pit 391**

Single fill 392	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [Hawkes and Hull 1947, fig. 56.12-3] (GROG).
-----------------	---

*Dating:* A poorly dated group, probably Late Iron Age.

#### **Post-hole 403**

Single fill 404	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
-----------------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* A tiny sherd of Late Iron Age pottery was recovered from this feature. This undiagnostic sherd is too small to provide a reliable date, however.

#### **Gully 405**

Single fill 406	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
-----------------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* This single fill feature produced a small amount of undiagnostic, handmade Late Iron Age sherds. **Small amounts of pottery. Phasing suggests transitional**

#### **Cremation 408**

Single fill 407	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [pedestal base] (GROG).
-----------------	--

*Dating:* This single fill feature contained the base of pedestal jar (or bowl) of Late Iron Age date.

#### **Ditch 415, cutting Ditch 638**

Single fill 416	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G5.1 (BSW). Fabric GRF.
-----------------	--

*Dating:* This single fill feature is probably mid-1st century AD in date. The GRF sherd is very small and could be intrusive.

#### **Ditch 423**

Single fill 424	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics COLB, BSW & GROG.
-----------------	---

*Dating:* This single fill feature contained a small amount of very abraded sherds. The COLB sherds ought to indicate a post-conquest date.

#### **Cremation 445**

Single fill 446	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [unclassified types] (GROG).
Vessel 447 within fill 446	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form C/G [pedestal base] (GROG).
Vessel 448 within fill 446	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [Cam 218Aa] (GROG).
Vessel 449 within fill 446	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [Cam 202/203] (GROG).

*Dating:* The pottery associated with this cremation amounted to 629 sherds weighing 2.9kg. Three vessels are probably represented all in a fragmentary state. All of these are Late Iron Age in date.

#### **Post-hole 475**

Single fill 474	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG
-----------------	-----------------------------------

*Dating:* This single fill feature produced a small amount of very fragmentary Late Iron Age pottery.

#### **Pit 480**

Single fill 478	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G3.2 (GROG), G20 (GROG).
-----------------	--

*Dating:* This was the only pit to produce a sizeable quantity of pottery (274 sherds weighing 1.6kg). The material present points to a secure Late Iron Age date. It is possible that these two vessels represent placed pots within a votive deposit.

#### **Pit 502**

Single fill 504	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [unclassified] (GROG).
-----------------	---

*Dating:* This feature contained a small amount of Late Iron Age pottery.

#### **Pit 521**

Single fill 520	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [rilled storage jar type vessel] (GROG).
-----------------	---

*Dating:* A small Late Iron Age group.

#### **Pit 557**

Top fill 554	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G (GROG & STOR). Fabric BSW.
--------------	--

Secondary fill 555	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
--------------------	------------------------------------

Primary fill 556	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form J [handle] (BUF). Fabrics GRF & GROG.
------------------	--

*Dating:* This feature appears to date from the early Roman period.

#### **Ditch 573**

Single fill 572	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [Cam 212A] (GROG), G3 (GROG), G [necked] (GROG). Fabric ESH.
-----------------	--

*Dating:* This single fill feature contained pottery that probably dates to the late Iron Age given the absence of any transitional wares.

#### **Ditch 599**

Single fill 600	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
-----------------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* This single fill feature contained two small and abraded sherds of Late Iron Age pottery. Not well dated. Stratigraphy suggests that this is an early Roman feature.

#### **Ditch 602**

Single fill 601	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics BSW, GROG, GRS & STOR.
-----------------	--

*Dating:* The range of fabrics present would suggest that this is a Roman feature. Close dating is not possible, however.

#### **Ditch 604**

Single fill 603	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
-----------------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* This single fill feature contained a sherd of Late Iron Age pottery. Not well dated.

#### **Gully 626**

Single fill 625	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
-----------------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* This single fill feature produced a number of very small sherds of Late Iron Age pottery.

#### **Ditch 630**

Top fill 631	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GRS.
--------------	-----------------------------------

*Dating:* This feature contained just two small undiagnostic sandy grey ware body sherds. It suggests therefore that this feature was in-filled sometime in the Roman period.

### Ditch 634

Single fill 633	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
-----------------	------------------------------------

*Dating:* This single fill feature contained a sherd of Late Iron Age pottery. Not well dated.

### Ditch 635

Segment 412	Single fill 411	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Segment 419	Top fill 417	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG
Segment 422	Top fill 420	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Segment 513	Primary fill 512	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.

*Dating:* The pottery recovered from the four segments through this feature was both homogenous and undiagnostic. The group comprises 26 sherds weighing 0.2kg. A Late Iron Age date can be suggested on fabric grounds, however.

### Ditch 636

Seg. 373	Top fill 374	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G40 type (GROG). Fabrics BSW, GRF & STOR.
Seg. 593	Top fill 586	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
	Intermediate fill 589	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [handmade vessel] (GROG).

*Dating:* This feature produced 20 sherds weighing 0.1kg. Segment 593 produced small quantities of Late Iron Age material in poor condition. The presence of Roman pottery in the top fill of segment 373 suggests that this feature went out of use in the post-conquest period even though the Roman material is in much poorer condition compared to the GROG.

### Ditch 637, re-cut Ditch 638

Seg. 357	Top fill 367	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [with horizontal finger-tipping] (GROG), G44 type (GROG). Fabric MICW.
	Quaternary fill 368	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G3.1 (GROG), G44.4 (GROG).
	Tertiary fill 388	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G3.2 [Cam 256A] (GROG).
	Secondary fill 389	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Seg. 551	Top fill 552	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G20 (GROG). Fabrics ESH, GRS & STOR.
	Secondary fill 558	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics GROG.

*Dating:* These two segments produced 192 sherds weighing 1.7kg. This material suggests that Ditch 637 probably originated in the Late Iron Age, although though it is likely that it remained open into the post conquest period as indicated by the presence of a small amount of Roman pottery in the top filling.

### Ditch 638

Seg. 546	Top fill 544	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Seg. 550	Top fill 553	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> platter/dish rim (GROG).

*Dating:* This single fill feature contained a small number of Late Iron Age pottery sherds. The total assemblage amounts to 20 sherds weighing 0.1kg. A Late Iron Age date is confirmed by the dating evidence recovered from ditch 637.

### Ditch 639

Seg. 582	Top fill 579	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [storage jar type vessel] (GROG), H7 (GROG). Fabric MICW.
	Secondary fill 580	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> unclassified vessel with rivet hole (GROG).
Seg. 623	Top fill 620	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G3.2 (GROG), G [necked] (GROG), G20 (BSW)
	Secondary fill 621	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.

*Dating:* The fills of this feature produced 64 sherds weighing 0.6kg. The pottery present probably indicates that it is a Late Iron Age feature with silting continuing into the mid-1st century AD.



**Ditch 640**

Seg. 443	Top fill 440	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics ESH, GROG & NGWF.
	Secondary fill 441	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics GROG & NGWF.
	Primary fill 442	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [Cam 254] (ESH), G [Cam 231C] (GROG).
Seg. 455	Secondary fill 453	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [Cam 254] (ESH), G [large necked type] (GROG), P [Dressel 1 shoulder]. Fabrics MICW & NGWFS.
	Primary fill 454	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [storage jar type] (GROG), G [unclassified] (GROG).
Seg. 471	Top fill 467	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [unclassified] (GROG), H7 (GROG). Fabrics BSW, ESH & MICW.
	Tertiary fill 468	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G3 (GROG), G20 (GROG), M [bases with holes made after firing] (ESH & GROG). Fabrics BSW & NGWF.
	Secondary fill 469	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [Cam 254] (ESH), G3.2 (GROG), G20 (GROG), H [butt or girth beaker] (GROG).
	Primary fill 470	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G17 (GROG), G [necked] (GROG), G [storage jar type] (GROG).
Seg. 503	Tertiary fill 508	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms A [foot-ring base] (GROG), G [Cam 254] (ESH), G [Cam 256A] (ESH).
	Secondary fill 509	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG. <b>MIA unabraded rim sherd</b>
Seg. 607	Top fill 605	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [Cam 254] (ESH).
	Primary fill 606	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G15 [Cam 229D] (GROG), M [base with holes made after firing] (GROG).

*Dating:* The six segments through Ditch 640 produced a large group comprising 538 sherds weighing 5.9kg. The bulk of the pottery was Late Iron Age in date. This feature could have originated as early as the late 1st century BC, although a date very early in the 1st half of the 1st century AD is perhaps more likely. Imports are confined to the upper fills, however. The presence of at least three vessels modified after firing to form strainer bowls is noteworthy. Could this feature have had some kind of special significance?

**Ditch 641**

Seg. 347	Primary fill 430	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Seg. 450	Top/tertiary fill 433/434	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [Cam 254] (ESH), G [Cam 211 type] (GROG), G [Cam 263/264 type but with rilling] (GROG).
	Primary fill 435	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [Cam 218A] (GROG).
Seg. 458	Primary fill 457	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Seg. 501	Top fill 459	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms P [Dressel 1], G [Cam 249D] (GROG).
	Secondary fill 460	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
	Primary fill 461	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.

*Dating:* These three segments produced a substantial amount of pottery (103 sherds weighing 1kg). All of this material would fit comfortably into a Late Iron Age date range.

**Ditch 643**

Seg. 439	Top fill 437	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G [Cam 225] (GROG). Fabric NGWF.
	Primary fill 438	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Form G16 [b/s] (GROG).
Seg. 473	Single fill 472	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Seg. 530	Single fill 529	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics BSW & GROG.
Seg. 535	Top fill 533	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
	Primary fill 534	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Seg. 577	Single fill 578	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics ESH & GROG.
	Single fill 594	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G20 [b/s] (GROG), H [Cam 76A] (TR1A), P [Dressel 1 spike].

	Single fill 617	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Forms G [Cam 218] (GROG), H7 (GROG), M [bases with holes made after firing] (GROG).
--	-----------------	---

*Dating:* These five segments produced large amount of pottery (176 sherds weighing 2.2kg). All of this material would fit comfortably into a Late Iron Age/transitional date range. Only, segment 530 produced transitional pottery, however.

## The Late Iron Age and Roman Pottery from Roxwell Quarry (ECC site RXQ98)

By T. S. Martin (20-9-00)

### Introduction

A total of 2656 sherds (21.2kg) of late Iron Age and Roman pottery was recorded from ninety-two contexts. This material was classified using the Chelmsford typology published by Going (1987, 2-54), as is standard for all Essex County Council sites, and the still useful *Camulodunum* typology (Hawkes and Hull 1947; Hull 1958 and 1963) for forms that are not present in Going. Analysis was primarily concerned with identifying the variety of fabrics and forms, and providing dating evidence for features and layers. Quantification was by sherd count and weight by fabric. As most contexts only produced small amounts of pottery, usually less than 1kg, none of the groups presented themselves for detailed quantification and analysis using EVEs. This suggests a complete absence of primary rubbish deposits on the site. A total of fourteen fabrics were identified and these are recorded in Table 1.

Code	Fabric	Fabric number (after Going 1987)
AMPH	Misc. amphora fabrics	
BSW	Misc. Black-surfaced wares (Romanising fabrics)	(34/35)
BUF	Unspecified buff wares	31
COLB	Colchester buff ware	27
ESH	Early shell-tempered ware	50
GRF	Fine grey wares	39
GROG	Grog tempered wares	53
GRS	Sandy grey wares	47
MICW	Misc. Iron Age coarse wares	
NGWF	North Gaulish white fine ware	
NGWF	North Gaulish white fine sandy ware	
RED	Unspecified red wares	21
STOR	Storage jar fabrics	44
TR 1 (A)	Terra Rubra	

Table 1: The range of fabrics present

### Site Chronology: the dating evidence by feature

Twenty-one ditches, five pits, two cremations and two post-holes produced some pottery dating evidence. All dated contexts fall within a Late Iron Age to early Roman date range. However, there is nothing to suggest that any of the Roman material extends the site chronology into the Flavian period or beyond, even though no vessel form could be identified in any of the fully Romanised fabrics to make dating certain. The bulk of the identifiable forms are in grog-tempered fabrics so typical of the pre-conquest period. Several of the ditches appear to have been relatively long-lived features with an extended sequence of infilling and recutting stretching from the Late Iron Age into the early Roman period, while others seem to be single period features.

The pottery seems to fit neatly within three distinct groupings, which have some from of stratigraphic and chronological basis to them. These groupings are defined as follows:

- Late Iron Age
- Mid 1st century AD
- Roman

The Late Iron Age group is mainly associated with the primary and secondary fills of ditches. In these groups, grog-tempered sherds predominate to the virtual exclusion of anything else. Next comes a group of contexts characterised by the presence of black-surfaced wares and storage jar fabrics. These are generally stratigraphically above the Late Iron Age group and are strongly associated with the intermediate and top

fills of ditches. Contexts within this group remain dominated by grog-tempered pottery. The final grouping is clearly Roman in date. These contexts are characterised by the presence of fully Romanised grey wares and very small amounts of buff wares from Colchester. This material is largely confined to the top fills of ditches, or is from single-fill ditches.

While it is possible to use the pottery to construct some form of tentative chronological outline, it must be acknowledged that study of the site's chronology is hampered by complete absence of samian. This is compounded by the scarcity of other closely datable fine wares. Few contexts contained an abundance of identifiable vessel forms. Only three groups contained more than 100 sherds. These were context 351, the top fill of ditch 640 in segment 443, cremation 445 and context 478, the top fill of pit 480. Cremation 445 is notable because it contained three very fragmentary vessels. These vessels were every broken comprising for the most part, tiny undiagnostic sherds. With the smaller groups, dating is based as much on absence as on what is present.

All but one of the five pits containing pottery produced material of exclusively of Late Iron Age date. Pits 342, 391, 475 and 480 contained just grog-tempered pottery, much of which was not especially diagnostic. Only pit 557 seems to extend into the mid-1st century AD in date, judging by the presence of small amounts of 'Romanising' black-surfaced ware. Both cremations contained Late Iron Age grog-tempered pottery only.

Six ditches (637/638, 639, 640, 641 and 643) provided useful sequences. All of these were sampled in more than one place and provided much of the site's pottery. All of the pottery recovered from the lowest levels of ditch 356 comprised either grog-tempered or early shell-tempered ware, while the upper fills produced small amounts of black-surfaced ware and storage jar fabric. This feature contained material not fully Romanised grey wares were entirely absent from the whole sequence. This suggests that the process of infilling/silting had been completed by the mid-1st century AD.

Ditch 638 is not well dated. The lower fills contained no pottery, while the top fill produced small amounts of grog-tempered ware. This feature was recut by ditch 637, the lower fills of which contained pottery comparable to that recovered from the top fill of ditch 638. However, the top fills of ditch 637 contained small quantities of fully Romanised pottery including some sandy grey ware. Ditch 639 produced a slightly less useful sequence. What pottery was present suggests that this was a Late Iron Age feature that finally silted up sometime around the middle of the 1st century AD. Ditch 640 provided the most pottery from any of the sequences encountered. The presence of small quantities of black-surfaced ware throughout imply that this sequence starts a little later, probably in the second quarter of the 1st century AD. The whole sequence within ditch 641 probably falls within a comparable date range, as does that of ditch 643. The remaining ditches and gullies provided little in the way of strong dating evidence and for the most part contain pottery from one segment only.

#### **Pit 342**

Top fill 343	<i>Misc pottery:</i> jar G [large storage jar type] (GROG)
--------------	--

The top fill of pit 342 contained a small amount of Late Iron Age pottery.

#### **Ditch 347**

Primary fill 430	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG
------------------	-----------------------------------

The primary fill of ditch 347 contained a small amount of Late Iron Age pottery.

#### **Ditch 356**

Segment 357	Quaternary fill 368	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G3.1 (GROG), G44.4 (STOR)
Segment 358	Top fill 366	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [handmade neckless type] (GROG). Fabric ESH.
	Quaternary fill 364	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G3 (GROG), ?(GROG)
	Tertiary fill 365	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics GROG & ESH

Segment 359	Top fill 362	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar ?G (GROG). Fabrics BSW & STOR
	Secondary fill 398	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> small bowls or cups C/F [Cam 69B and Cam 217] (GROG)
	Primary fill 399	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [necked] (GROG)
Segment 360	Top fill 383	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
	Tertiary fill 385	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
	Secondary fill 386	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG
Segment 361	Top fill 371	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G20.2 (BSW), G[necked] (GROG)
Segment 400	Single fill 401	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> platter A2 (GROG); jar G [Cam 254] (ESH); beaker H [Cam 113] (NGWF)
Segment 519	Top fill 517	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G3.2 (BSW), G [necked] (GROG)
	Primary fill 518	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG
Segment 521	Single fill 520	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [rilled storage jar type vessel] (GROG)
Segment 540	Single fill 541	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics BSW & GROG

Altogether, nine segments through ditch 356 produced 2.2kg of pottery. The dating is fairly consistent with the lowest fills containing GROG and occasionally small quantities of ESH. Several of the top fills contained small amounts of Romanising pottery (BSW) and some STOR. This indicates continued deposition into the mid-1st century AD and into the conquest period. The absence of Romanised grey wares is notable.

#### Ditch 382, recut of ditch 356

Segment 360	Top fill 363	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G [Cam 254] (ESH), G5.1 [with incipient groove] (ESH), G [necked] (GROG), ?G44 (STOR)
	Secondary fill 380	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> platter ?A [base] (GROG); jar G19 [b/s] (GROG)
	Primary fill 381	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics ASS & GROG
Segment 361	Single fill 370	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G [necked types] (GROG). Fabrics ESH & STOR.

This was a single fill feature in segment 361. It contained a small amount of pottery that suggests deposition into the early Roman period. The presence of a South Spanish amphora sherd in the primary fill of segment 360 places this feature in the first half of the 1st century AD or later into the Claudian period. South Spanish amphoras, while not unknown in pre-conquest horizons are nevertheless rare.

#### Pit 391

Single fill 392	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [Hawkes and Hull 1947, fig. 56. 12-3] (GROG)
-----------------	--

A poorly dated group, probably Late Iron Age.

#### Post-hole 403

Single fill 404	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG
-----------------	-----------------------------------

A tiny sherd of Late Iron Age pottery was recovered from this feature. This undiagnostic sherd is too small to provide a reliable date, however.

#### Ditch 405

Single fill 406	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG
-----------------	-----------------------------------

This single fill feature produced a small amount of undiagnostic, handmade Late Iron Age sherds.

### Cremation 408

Single fill 407	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [pedestal base] GROG
-----------------	--

This single fill feature contained the base of a pedestal jar (or bowl) of Late Iron Age date.

### Ditch 415, cutting ditch 638

Single fill 416	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G5.1 (BSW). Fabric GRF.
-----------------	---

This single fill feature is probably mid-1st century AD in date. The GRF sherd is very small and could be intrusive.

### Ditch 423

Single fill 424	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics COLB, BSW & GROG.
-----------------	---

This single fill feature contained a small amount of very abraded sherds. The COLB sherds ought to indicate a post-conquest date.

### Cremation 445

Single fill 446	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G [unclassified types] (GROG)
Vessel 447 within fill 446	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar or bowl C/G [pedestal base] (GROG)
Vessel 448 within fill 446	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [Cam 218Aa] (GROG)
Vessel 449 within fill 446	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [Cam 202/203] (GROG)

The pottery associated with this cremation amounted to 2.9kg. Three vessels are probably represented. All of these are Late Iron Age in date.

### Pit 475

Single fill 474	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG
-----------------	-----------------------------------

This single fill feature produced a small amount of very fragmentary Late Iron Age pottery.

### Pit 480

Single fill 478	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G3.2 (GROG), G20 (GROG)
-----------------	--

This was the only pit to produce a sizeable quantity of pottery (1.6kg). The material present points to a secure Late Iron Age date.

### Post-hole 502

Single fill 504	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [unclassified] (GROG)
-----------------	---

This feature contained a small amount of Late Iron Age pottery.

### Pit 557

Top fill 554	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G (GROG & STOR). Fabric BSW.
Secondary fill 555	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Primary fill 556	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Flagon J [handle] (BUF). Fabrics GRF & GROG.

This feature appears to date from the early Roman period (*check the buff*).

### Ditch 573

Single fill 572	<i>Misc pottery:</i> jars G [Cam 212A] (GROG), G3 (GROG), G [necked] (BSW). Fabric ESH.
-----------------	---

This single fill feature contained pottery that probably dates from the mid-1st century AD.

**Ditch 599**

Single fill 600	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
-----------------	------------------------------------

This single fill feature contained two small and abraded sherds of Late Iron Age pottery. Not well dated.

**Ditch 602**

Single fill 601	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics BSW, GROG, GRS & STOR.
-----------------	--

The range of fabrics would suggest that this is a Roman feature. Close dating is not possible, however.

**Ditch 604**

Single fill 603	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
-----------------	------------------------------------

This single fill feature contained a sherd of Late Iron Age pottery. Not well dated.

**Gully 626**

Single fill 625	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
-----------------	------------------------------------

This single fill feature produced a number of very small sherds of Late Iron Age pottery.

**Ditch 630**

Top fill 631	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GRS.
--------------	-----------------------------------

This feature contained just two small undiagnostic sandy grey ware body sherds. It suggests therefore that this feature was in-filled sometime in the Roman period.

**Ditch 634**

Single fill 633	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
-----------------	------------------------------------

This single fill feature contained a sherd of Late Iron Age pottery. Not well dated.

**Ditch 635**

Segment 412	Single fill 411	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Segment 419	Top fill 417	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Segment 422	Top fill 420	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG>
Segment 513	Primary fill 512	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.

The pottery recovered from the four segments through this feature was both homogenous and undiagnostic. A Late Iron Age date can be suggested on fabric grounds, however.

**Ditch 636**

Segment 373	Top fill 374	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G40 type (GROG). Fabrics BSW, GRF & STOR.
Segment 593	Intermediate fill 589	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [handmade vessel] (GROG).
	Primary fill 586	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.

Segment 593 produced small quantities of Late Iron Age material in poor condition. The presence of Roman pottery in the top fill of segment 373 suggests that this feature went out of use in the post-conquest period.

**Ditch 637, cutting ditch 638**

Segment 357	Top fill 367	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G [with horizontal finger-tipping] (GROG), G44 type (STOR). Fabric MICW.
	Tertiary fill 388	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G3.2 [Cam 256A] (GROG).
	Secondary fill 389	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Segment 551	Top fill 552	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G20 (GROG). Fabrics ESH, GRS & STOR
	Secondary fill 558	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics BSW & GROG.

These two segments produced 1.2kg of pottery. This material suggests that ditch 637 probably originated in the Late Iron Age, although it is likely that it remained open into the post conquest period as indicated by the presence of a small amount of Roman pottery in the top filling.

**Ditch 638**

Segment 546	Top fill 544	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Segment 550	Top fill 553	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> platter/dish rim (GROG).

This single fill feature contained a small number of Late Iron Age pottery sherds.

**Ditch 639**

Segment 582	Tertiary fill 579	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [storage jar type vessel] (GROG); beaker H7 (GROG). Fabrics MICW & RED.
	Secondary fill 580	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> unclassified vessel with rivet hole (GROG)
Segment 623	Top fill 620	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G3.2 (GROG), G [necked] (GROG), G20 (BSW)
	Secondary fill 621	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.

The fills of this feature contained a small amount of pottery indicating that this is probably a Late Iron Age feature with silting continuing into the mid-1st century AD.

**Ditch 640**

Segment 443	Top fill 440	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics ESH, GROG & NGWF
	Secondary fill 441	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics GROG & NGWF
	Primary fill 442	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G [Cam 254] (ESH), G [Cam 231C] (GROG)
Segment 455	Secondary fill 453	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G [Cam 254] (ESH), G [large necked type] (GROG), MICW, AMPH & NGWFS
	Primary fill 454	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G [storage jar type] (GROG), G [unclassified] (GROG)
Segment 471	Top fill 467	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [unclassified] (GROG); beaker H7 (BSW). Fabrics ESH & MICW.
	Tertiary fill 468	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G3 (GROG), G20 (GROG); strainers M [bases with holes made after firing] (ESH & GROG). Fabrics BSW & NGWF.
	Secondary fill 469	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G [Cam 254] (ESH), G3.2 (GROG), G20 (GROG); beaker H [butt or girth beaker] (GROG).
Segment 503	Tertiary fill 508	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> platter A [foot-ring base] (GROG); jars G [Cam 254] (ESH), G [Cam 256A] (ESH).
	Secondary fill 509	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Segment 607	Top fill 605	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [Cam 254] (ESH)
	Primary fill 606	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G15 [Cam 229D] (GROG); strainer M [base with holes made after firing] (GROG). Fabric BSW.

The five segments through ditch 640 produced 5.9kg of mainly Late Iron Age pottery. This feature could have originated as early as the late 1st century BC, although a date very early in the 1st half of the 1st century AD is perhaps more likely. Imports are confined to the upper fills, however. The presence of at least three vessels modified after firing to form strainer bowls is noteworthy. Could this feature have had some kind of special significance?

**Ditch 641**

Segment 450	Top/tertiary fill 433/434	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jars G [Cam 254] (ESH), G [Cam 211 type] (GROG), G [Cam 263/264 type but with rilling] (GROG).
	Primary fill 435	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [Cam 218A] (GROG)
Segment 458	Primary fill 457	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Segment 501	Top fill 459	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Amphora P [Dressel 1]; jar G [Cam 249D] (GROG)



	Secondary fill 460	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics BSW & GROG
	Primary fill 461	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG

These three segments produced a combined 0.9kg of pottery. All of this material would fit comfortably into a Late Iron Age date range.

### Ditch 643

Segment 439	Top fill 437	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [Cam 225] (GROG). Fabric NGWF.
	Primary fill 438	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G16 [b/s] GROG.
Segment 473	Single fill 472	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Segment 530	Single fill 529	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric BSW & GROG.
Segment 535	Top fill 533	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
	Primary fill 534	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabric GROG.
Segment 577	Single fill 578	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics BSW, GROG & NGWF.
	Single fill 594	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G20 [b/s] (GROG); beaker Cam 76A (TR1A); amphora Dressel 1 [spike].
	Single fill 617	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> jar G [Cam 218] (GROG); beaker H7 (GROG); strainers M [bases with holes made after firing] (GROG).

These five segments produced just over 1kg of pottery. All of this material would fit comfortably into a Late Iron Age date range.

Layer 369	<i>Misc. pottery:</i> Fabrics BSW, GRF & GROG.
-----------	--

### The illustrated pottery

#### Ditch 356

1. Jar, handmade vessel. GROG (context 366, top fill in segment 358).

#### Ditch 382 (recut of ditch 356)

2. Cam 254 jar, ESH (context 363, top fill in segment 360).
3. G5.1 jar with incipient groove. ESH (context 363, top fill, segment 360).

#### Pit 391

4. Jar corresponding to Hawkes and Hull 1947, fig 56. 12-3. GROG (context 392).

#### Ditch 573

5. Cam 212A, GROG (context 572).

#### Ditch 637

6. G3.2/Cam 256A jar, GROG (context 367, top fill in segment 357).

#### Ditch 640

7. Cam 254 jar, ESH (context 442, primary fill in segment 443).
8. Cam 231C jar, GROG (context 442, primary fill in segment 443).
9. H7 butt beaker. GROG (context 467, top fill in segment 471).
10. G3 jar, GROG (context 468, tertiary fill in segment 471).
11. G20 jar, GROG (context 468, tertiary fill in segment 471).
12. Strainer (M2) with holes made *post cocturam*. GROG (context 468, tertiary fill in segment 471).
13. Strainer (M2) with holes made *post cocturam*. ESH (context 468, tertiary fill in segment 471).

14. Cam 254, ESH (context 469, secondary fill in segment 471).
15. G3.2 jar, GROG (context 469, secondary fill in segment 471).
16. G20 jar, GROG (context 469, secondary fill in segment 471).
17. G15/Cam 229 jar, GROG (context 606, primary fill in segment 607).
18. Strainer (M2) with holes made *post cocturam*. GROG (context 606, primary fill in segment 607).

#### Ditch 643

19. Cam 218 jar, GROG (context 617, fill in segment 577).
20. Strainer (M2) with holes made *post cocturam*. GROG (context 617, fill in segment 577).
21. Pedestal beaker Cam 76A, TR1 (A) (context 594, fill in segment 577).

### Discussion

The absence of large well-dated deposits of pottery that lend themselves to quantitative analysis using estimated vessel equivalents (EVEs) means that only very speculative conclusions can be drawn on the matter of pottery supply. What follows can, therefore, only be regarded as a very tentative sketch. Having said this, the range of fabrics and forms identified at Roxwell is largely typical of Central Essex rural sites occupied in the first half of the 1st century AD. There are, however, several notable features that stand out that require detailed comment and these are focused on below.

The pottery assemblage recovered from Roxwell is notable for the complete dominance of locally made 'Belgic' grog-tempered wares (Thompson 1982) over anything else. These fabrics account for 82.8% of the total assemblage by weight recovered from the site, while South Essex shell-tempered wares comprise a further 3.9%. Gallo-Belgic imports represent just 1.2% of the total, while amphoras account for 6%. By comparison, the transitional 'Romanising' black-surfaced wares account for only 2% of the total assemblage (under 1%). This low incidence of transitional and fully Romanised fabrics is probably a strong indication of the site's early date range. Further data that lends support to this conclusion is discussed in more detail below.

The range of Gallo-Belgic imported fine wares is rather narrow, being restricted to North Gaulish white ware Cam 113 butt beakers and a Cam 76A pedestal beaker in a Terra Rubra like fabric from the fill of ditch 643 (Fig. 00.21). The form is conventionally dated Tiberio-Claudian. At Camulodunum it was considered to be the most common pedestal beaker type (Hawkes and Hull 1947). At Skeleton Green the form occurs in TR1(A) (Partridge 1981, fig. 125.16). The absence of Terra Nigra is noteworthy and may indicate that decline had set in fairly early in the site's history.

Turning to the coarse wares, the range of vessel forms represented is relatively narrow. Platters appear to be exceptionally rare with all examples of this vessel class appearing in grog-tempered ware. However, the only identifiable form falls within Going's A2 group, which continues into the early Flavian period. Grog-tempered ware bowls and cups were also rare, although a solitary Cam 212A vessel was identified. The only beaker type present comprised grog-tempered H7 (Fig. 00.9).

By far the bulk of the identifiable Late Iron Age vessel forms are jars and many of these find close parallels in the Camulodunum series. This seems to be the case throughout the life of the site. The dominance of jars is also a feature of other Late Iron Age rural sites in the county. Groups from Hatfield Peverel (Martin 1996, 4), North Shoebury (Thompson 1995, fig 71), Slough House and Chigborough Farm (Horsely and Wallace 1998, fig. 102 and fig. 104, nos 1-6 respectively), for example, show this trend clearly. At Roxwell, a wide range of grog-tempered vessels both necked and neckless types are represented within this class. Storage jars with rilled bodies were also present. The earliest jar forms appear to be handmade and tend to have very rounded profiles (cf. Fig. 00.00). A small number of pedestal jars are present, two of which were recovered from cremation 445. The only identifiable form corresponds to the Cam 202/203 group. Necked jars predominate, however. The range covers Cam 256A, Cam 229D, Cam 221, Cam 220A, Cam 225 and Cam 218Aa. One vessel resembles Cam 263/264 but has rilling.

The most common early shell-tempered ware jar form is the club-rimmed Cam 254 'saucepan' pot. Lid-seated jars are rare on the other hand. There is some evidence to indicate that Cam 254 is a pre-conquest form, while the lid-seated jar was a post conquest introduction. At Orsett analysis of the relationship between these types suggested that they tended to be mutually exclusive (Cheer 1998, 93). The evidence from Roxwell lends some support to this. If this dating is correct, it suggests that the bulk of the early shell-tempered pottery had arrived in the Late Iron Age rather than in the Roman period.

The range of vessel forms in transitional black-surfaced wares and fully Romanised fabrics is very limited and where identifiable can be paralleled in the Chelmsford typology fairly closely. Identifiable forms are restricted to G20 type necked jars and G44 storage vessels. The paucity of identifiable forms is partly due to the fragmentary nature of the pottery in general, but it also implies that there was a real decline in the level of activity at Roxwell in this period.

A notable feature of the assemblage is the presence of four strainer bowls. Three of these came from ditch 460 and a fourth came from ditch 643. Two vessels came from context 468, the tertiary fill of ditch 640 in segment 471. The third and fourth vessels came from context 606, the primary fill of ditch 640 in segment 607, and the fill of ditch 643 in segment 577 respectively. All of these vessels were recovered from undoubted pre-conquest levels and were fashioned from pre-existing vessels with the holes being made *post cocturam*. Most of these vessels are in grog-tempered fabrics, but one does occur in early shell-tempered ware.

The practice of drilling holes through the bases of vessels was widespread with examples being recorded over much of Britain and occurs throughout the Late Iron Age and Roman periods. Vessels of this type are also fairly common in Essex but do not seem to be associated with any particular type of site. What makes Roxwell unusual is that they are present in what appears to be an abnormally large quantity considering the size of the excavated assemblage. In the 'Belgic' levels at Verulamium several Braughing type jars with rough shoulder rilling were recorded (Wheeler and Wheeler 1936, fig 20, nos 61e and 62). The presence of vessels modified in this way was seen to be a common feature in these levels, although no indication of the actual number of holes per vessel is provided. At Chigborough Farm on the Blackwater estuary (Essex) a late shell-tempered ware vessel had also been converted into a strainer (Horsley and Wallace 1998, fig. 100.53) which demonstrates that the practice continued into the second half of the 4th century.

There is considerable variation in the number and the size of the holes provided. Some vessels have just one large hole placed centrally, while others may have two, three, four, five or six or more holes. Vessels with single holes are likely to have been ritually 'killed', although it has been suggested that they could have functioned as flowerpots (Hands 1993). Vessels with two and three holes pose something of a problem. Examples of these come from the villa at Keston, Kent (Cooper 1991, fig. 62.253) with two holes in a fine Late Iron Age glauconitic sandy fabric and Dorchester, Dorset (Seager-Smith and Davies 1993, fig. 138.77) with three holes in BB1. A vessel from Nazeingbury, Essex, also has three holes pierced through the base (Huggins 1978, fig. 14.70). However, it is difficult to envisage how these could have effectively operated as strainers as such. It is possible that they could represent more elaborately 'killed' pots.

However, it is the vessels with four or more holes that are represented at Roxwell. It is clear that these are not ritually 'killed' vessels, but were purely utilitarian. Some examples have as many as eight holes as at Ivy Chimneys, Witham (Turner-Walker and Wallace 1999, fig. 89.46). There can be little doubt that this vessel was intended for use as a strainer or sieve. Another example from this site in a grog-tempered fabric (Turner-Walker and Wallace 1999, fig. 87.33) had four small holes punched through the base and this vessel too seems to have been intended to serve as a strainer or sieve. This also seems to be the case with the example from Skeleton Green (Partridge 1981, fig. 49.93) where only two holes survive. The position of the surviving holes and the fragmentary nature of the base suggest that there were originally at least four holes, perhaps five. A vessel from Coggeshall, Essex, had five holes pierced through the base (Gurney 1988, fig. 9.18).

The range of vessel types selected for secondary use is also very restricted, being largely confined to jars. This is certainly the case at Roxwell where all of the bases that were modified in this way were from jars.

By and large, it would seem that bowls were not considered, even though purpose made strainers are always bowl forms and not jars. This is not the case with ‘killed’ pots, however. The range of vessels treated in this way can include flagons as at Brightlingsea (Martin 1996, fig. 8.6). This vessel had a single hole punched through the base and several more through the side-walls at regular intervals.

### Conclusions

The stage 3 excavations produced a small but useful pottery assemblage from which it is possible to draw a number of conclusions concerning the chronology and status of the site. Function, however, is a different matter, even though all the indications point to a typical rural site. The pottery dating evidence indicates that the site originated some time in the Late Iron Age, but had gone into decline by the conquest period. There are indications that the site may have had a relatively high status element to it at the beginning, given the presence of TR. However, if this was the case it did not last long. By the conquest period, the amounts of pottery being deposited had been severely curtailed. The main boundaries were then allowed to silt up slowly.

### Works cited

Cheer, P.	1998	‘Late Iron Age pottery’ in Carter, G. A., <i>Excavations at the Orsett ‘Cock’ Enclosure, Essex, 1976</i> , East Anglian Archaeology <b>86</b> , 89-93
Cooper, D.	1991	‘Catalogue of the illustrated coarse pottery’ in Philp, B., Parfitt, K., Willson, J., Dutton, M., & Williams, W. <i>The Roman Vills Site at Keston Kent. First Report (Excavations 1968-1978)</i> , Kent Monog. Ser. Res. Rep. <b>6</b> , 217-79
Going, C. J.	1987	<i>The Mansio and other sites in the south-eastern sector of Caesaromagus: the Roman Pottery</i> , Counc. Brit. Archaeol. Res. Rep. <b>62</b> .
Gurney, D.	1988	‘Roman pottery’, in Clarke, C.P., ‘Roman Coggeshall: Excavations 1984-5’, <i>Essex Archaeol. Hist.</i> <b>19</b> (3rd Series), 59-64.
Hands, A. R.	1993	<i>The Romano-British Roadside Settlement at Wilcote, Oxfordshire: I Excavations 1990-2</i> Brit. Archaeol. Rep. Brit. Ser. <b>232</b> .
Hawkes, C. F. C. & Hull, M. R.	1947	<i>Camulodunum. First Report on the Excavations at Colchester 1930-1939</i> , Rep. Res. Comm. Soc. Antiq. London, <b>14</b> .
Horsely, C. & Wallace, C.	1998	
Huggins, P.J.	1978	‘Excavation of Belgic and Romano-British farm with Middle Saxon cemetery and churches at Nazeingbury, Essex, 1975-6’, <i>Essex Archaeol. Hist.</i> <b>10</b> (3rd series), 29-117
Hull, M. R.	1958	<i>Roman Colchester</i> , Rep. Res. Comm. Soc. Antiq. London, <b>20</b> .
Hull, M. R.	1963	<i>The Roman Potter’s Kilns of Colchester</i> , Rep. Res. Comm. Soc. Antiq. London, <b>21</b> .
Martin, T. S.	1996	‘A group of finds from the vicinity of the Noah’s Ark Roman villa at Brightlingsea, Essex’, <i>Essex Archaeol. Hist.</i> <b>27</b> , 311-319.
Partridge, C.	1981	<i>Skeleton Green: A Late Iron Age and Romano-British Site</i> , Britannia Monogr. Ser., <b>12</b>
Seager-Smith, R. and Davies, S. M.	1993	‘The Roman pottery from excavations at Greyhound Yard, Dorchester Yard, Dorchester, Dorset’ in Woodward, P. J., Davies S. M. and Graham, A. H., <i>Excavations at the Old Methodist</i>

		<i>Chapel and Greyhound Yard, Dorchester 1981-1984</i> , Dorset Natur. Hist. Archaeol. Soc. Monogr. Ser., <b>12</b>
Thompson, I.	1982	<i>Grog-tempered 'Belgic' Pottery of South-Eastern England</i> , Brit. Archaeol. Rep. British Ser. <b>108</b>
Wheeler, R. E. M. & Wheeler, T. V.	1936	<i>Verulamium: A Belgic and two Roman Cities</i> , Rep. Res. Comm. Soc. Antiq. London, <b>11</b> .

### Roxwell Quarry (RXQ 98): Flots from Soil Samples

Sample No.	Context No.	Feature No.	Type	Date	Comments
1	7	8	Cremation pit fill	LIA?	Human bone, not enough for analysis. Discarded
2	84	83	Trackway ditch fill	Early Roman	Discarded
3	148	79	Pit fill	13 <sup>th</sup> century	Discarded
4	212	210	Ditch fill	LIA	Discarded
5	73	74	Pit fill	Prehistoric	Discarded
6	149	185	Fill around skeleton 150	Undated	Human bone, too fragmentary for analysis. Discarded
7	149	185	Fill around skeleton 150	Undated	Discarded
8	149	185	Fill around skeleton 150	Undated	Discarded
9	121	108	Ditch fill	LIA	Discarded
10					Number unused
11	407	408	Cremation pit fill	LIA	
12	409	410	Cremation pit fill	LIA	Missing
13	426	425	Cremation pit fill	LIA	
14	428	427	Cremation pit fill	LIA	
15	432	431	Cremation pit fill	LIA	
16	433	641 (seg 450)	Ditch, top fill	LIA	
17	436	347	Ditch, top fill	LIA	
18	479	480	Pit, 1 <sup>st</sup> fill	LIA	
19	478	480	Pit, 2 <sup>nd</sup> fill	LIA	
20	598	597	Cremation pit fill	LIA	
21	608	609	Pit fill	LIA?	
30	234	233	Cremation pit fill	LIA	Discarded
31	235	236	Cremation pit fill	LIA	Discarded
32	238	237	Cremation pit fill	LIA	Discarded
33	240	239	Cremation pit fill	LIA	Discarded
34	242	241	Cremation pit fill	LIA	Discarded
35	250	333 (seg 249)	Ditch, top fill (charcoal)	Undated	Discarded
36	295	294	Cremation pit fill	LIA	Discarded

## 515: Roxwell Quarry (RXQ98)

Shell by Joyce Compton (20/10/03)

The total shell collected from Roxwell Quarry amounted to one finds bag, amounting to a total of 279 pieces weighing 1158g from 48 contexts. It was decided to fully record and then discard the shell, as there was insufficient to warrant study. The minimum requirements as stipulated by the shell specialist are fifty, or more, shells per context. The shell mainly comprised oyster and garden snail; mussel and whelk were also recorded. Details are provided by context below:

Context	Number	Weight	Description
7	21	1	Garden and other, tiny, snails, from sample 1
48	12	8	Oyster fragment; garden snail x 11
66	14	14	Garden snail
73	-	2	Garden snail, many small fragments, from sample 5
80	26	222	Oyster, nineteen valves, and fragments
84	14	2	Garden snail, from sample 2
109	14	182	Oyster, eight valves, and fragments
112	3	2	Mussel fragments
115	10	6	Oyster fragments
121	2	1	Mussel fragments
124	1	1	Garden snail
126	36	182	Oyster, eighteen valves, and fragments; garden snail x 2; whelk x 1
128	1	12	Oyster, one valve
148	13	82	Oyster, five valves, and fragments; 4/8g from sample 3
151	8	52	Oyster, six valves, and fragments
187	2	2	Mussel fragments
193	1	16	Oyster, one valve
195	5	42	Oyster, three valves, and fragments
200	1	20	Oyster, one valve
208	1	6	Oyster, one valve
209	7	4	Garden snail x 3; mussel fragments
212	2	1	Mussel fragments
213	20	4	Mussel fragments
351	6	30	Oyster, four valves, and fragments
363	1	6	Oyster fragment
368	2	28	Oyster, two valves
376	1	1	Garden snail
380	1	6	Oyster fragment
381	1	1	Garden snail
383	1	1	Garden snail
385	1	1	Garden snail
386	5	4	Garden snail
388	1	1	Garden snail
416	12	2	Garden snail
417	11	20	Garden snail
436	15	1	Oyster fragments and tiny snails, from sample 17
437	2	42	Oyster, two valves
470	2	28	Oyster, two valves
478	5	<1	Fragments, from sample 19
479	11	<1	Fragments, from sample 18
514	9	6	Garden snail
533	4	60	Oyster, three valves, and fragment
534	3	42	Oyster, three valves
552	1	1	Garden snail
556	1	1	Garden snail
598	6	<1	Fragments from sample 20
601	2	2	Garden snail
603	8	8	Garden snail
<b>Totals</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>1158</b>	

## Roxwell Quarry Slag (RXQ 98)

NB. This is the final combined report from R. Tyrrell, substantially corrected & updated by H. Major in July 2003. All the slag was retained and was present when the reports were checked in 2014.

**The Slag** by H. Major and R. Tyrrell

The excavations recovered 45 pieces of slag, weighing 783g, from 12 individually numbered contexts. The full assemblage has been listed for archive. The majority of the assemblage is of Late Iron Age/Early Roman date though three pieces (62g) were recovered from a medieval deposit. The LIA/ER slag all looks very similar; light in colour and weight, with large vesicles, almost vitrified in places, with occasional flint inclusions. This is probably domestic fuel ash waste. The slag from the medieval context (48) is denser and darker in colour, but still could be of domestic origin rather than associated with iron smithing.

Archive table

Cont.	Feature	F. date	No.	Wt. (g)	Description
48	50	Med	3	62	Dark and fairly dense.
180	179	LIA	2	84	
401	356	LIA	25	242	Some with burnt clay adhering
468	471	LIA/ER	2	5	
470	471	LIA	1	60	
517	356	LIA	4	114	
541	540	LIA/ER	1	14	
552	637	ER	2	9	
556	557	ER	2	168	
586	593	LIA	1	16	
592	593	LIA	1	1	
620	623	LIA/ER	1	8	
Total			45	783	

No further work is required.



## Roxwell Quarry Geological Material (RXQ 98)

**NB.** Ros Tyrrell did original archive list and report (1<sup>st</sup> season). H. Major recommended it be rewritten with later material. July 2003 H. Major integrates both the Tyrrell and her own new report (2<sup>nd</sup> season). Also produced new integrated catalogue/archive tables of worked, unworked and unworked burnt stones. Latter two categories were discarded and not available for study in 2014. Worked stone all present in 2014 except the lava quern frags from [112] which were already missing by 2003 (probably discarded?). A quick search did not find a parallel for the chalk object and more prolonged search was not possible (or warranted) within the current budget.

### Worked Stone by H. Major and R. Tyrrell

A small amount of worked stone was recovered, comprising seven fragments of lava quern from both Early Roman (4/38g) and Medieval (3/116g) deposits. The probable piece from a saddle quern in a dull non-calcareous fine/medium sandstone is from a Late Iron Age deposit (context [398]) but the piece could be residual. The assemblage also includes two fine sandstone cobbles, probably utilised as rubbers (both from Late Iron Age/Early Roman deposits). The only other piece of worked stone consists of a truncated pyramidal chalk object, probably an unfinished or spoilt spindle whorl (Fig. \*\*). It has three sides, two of which slope, the other being vertical. The ‘top’ has been roughly flattened, but the ‘bottom’ is more irregular, either through erosion, or possibly because the object was not finished. A slight groove along one face at the bottom may represent an unfinished cut. The object has been drilled vertically through the centre from both faces, forming an hourglass-shaped perforation. Length 32mm, Width 31mm, Maximum thickness 23mm (16g).

### Archive Catalogue

Worked stone

Cont.	F.	F. date	No.	Wt. (g)	Description
80	79	Med	3	116	Abraded lava quern. Max. T. 21mm. Not datable, could be redeposited Roman.
112	110	ER	4	38	Abraded lava quern. (Not in the box. July 03)
121	108	LIA/ER	1	86	Natural calcareous sandstone pebble fragment. It was cleaved along the bedding plane, possibly deliberately, and used as a rubber. The other surface is natural. W. 70mm.
366	356	LIA	1	16	Chalk. Truncated pyramidal object, possibly a spindlewhorl. It has three sides, two sloping sides and one vertical. The ‘top’ has been roughly flattened, but the ‘bottom’ is more irregular, either through erosion, or possibly because the object was not finished. There is a groove along one face at the bottom, which may represent an unfinished cut. The object has been drilled vertically through the centre from both faces, forming an hourglass-shaped perforation. L. 32mm, W, 31mm, max. th. 23mm. <b>Draw</b>
398	356	LIA	1	150	Dull yellow sandstone (not calcareous). The edge from a saddle quern, made from a boulder. The grinding surface is worn smooth, and almost flat. The edge has probably been trimmed, while

					the underside is natural. The thickness is fairly constant. c. 50x45mm, th. 39mm
468	471	LIA/ER	1	646	Grey sandstone (not calcareous). A large, fire-cracked, pebble, broken along the bedding planes to form a flat, triangular slab. The shape is probably fortuitous, but one face has smooth patches, possibly the result of use as a rubber. L. 105mm, W. 87mm, Th. 44mm.
Total			11	1052	

*Unworked stone* (all discarded)

The 'sandstone' from 134 recorded by RT was brick.

Cont.	No.	Wt. (g)	Description
71	1	70	Limestone with a small amount of shell, probably chalk deposit.
73	2	72	Grit. No trace of working
121	1	20	Limestone with a small amount of shell, probably chalk deposit.
211	1	36	Pebble
363	1	43	Limestone (chalk deposit)
401	4	25	Limestone (chalk deposit)
467	1	10	Limestone (chalk deposit)
468	1	72	Limestone (chalk deposit)
469	2	894	Limestone (chalk deposit); sarsen boulder fragment
552	2	400	Limestone (chalk deposit); pebble fragment
553	3	210	Limestone (chalk deposit)
362	2	212	Unworked flint
232	2	198	Pebbles
250	6	194	Four pieces limestone (chalk deposit); two pieces tufa
352	1	5	Unworked flint
345	1	40	Pebble
296	1	5	Unworked flint
295	1	3	Unworked flint. Bs 36
Total	33	2509	

*Unworked burnt stone* (all discarded)

Cont.	F.	F. date	No.	Wt. (g)	Description
7	8		3	8	Burnt flint. Bs 1
73	74	Prehist	7	302	Burnt flint
73	74	Prehist	5	222	Bs 5. Burnt pebbles
232	231	BA	1	20	Burnt pebble
232	231	BA	3	48	Burnt flint
250	249		1	7	Burnt flint
260	258		7	128	Burnt flint
295	294		12	70	Burnt flint
341	340		1	18	Burnt flint
345	344		2	68	Burnt flint
351	354		1	6	Burnt flint
363	382	LIA/ER	2	23	Burnt flint
374	373	ER	5	230	Heat-shattered pebbles
401	400	LIA	1	6	Burnt flint

413	414	LIA	2	49	Burnt flint
418	419	LIA	3	27	Burnt flint
453	455	LIA	1	37	Heat-shattered sarsen pebble fragment
528	527	Prehist	5	184	Burnt flint and pebbles
541	540	LIA/ER	2	208	Burnt sandstone pebbles
552	551	ER	2	348	Pebble fragments, scorched
552	551	ER	1	9	Burnt pebble
Total			67	2018	

## HUMAN BONE by Lucy Sibun

### Introduction

A single, undated inhumation was excavated on site ([150]). The preservation of the human bone was good but all skeletal elements were extremely fragmented. Disarticulated human bone fragments were also recovered from pit [173].

### Methodology

A complete skeletal and dental inventory has been produced for skeleton [150]. Age estimation is based upon epiphyseal fusion data (Schaefer et al. 2009) and dental wear (Brothwell 1981). Due to the fragmentary nature of the remains no sexually dimorphic fragments were present and no metrical data was available. All skeletal elements were also examined for pathological lesions.

The fragments from pit [173] were also fully recorded and examined for pathological lesions.

### RESULTS

#### Inhumation [150]

The inhumation was incomplete and no complete elements were present. The elements recorded are tabulated below with more details housed with the site archive.

	Left		Right
Cranium		Highly fragmented	
Mandible		✓	
Humerus	✓		✓
Vertebrae		Fragments of cervical, thoracic and lumbar	
Scapula	✓		✓
Clavicle	✓		✓
Radius	✓		
Ulna	✓		✓
Carpals			✓
Phalanges			✓
Ribs	✓	Fragments only	
Innominate	✓		✓
Sacrum		Fragments only	
Femur	✓		✓
Patella			✓
Tibia	✓		✓
Fibula			✓

Table \* Skeletal elements present

In addition to the elements tabulated above, loose teeth from the maxilla and mandible were recovered, with 13 of the possible 32 adult teeth present.

Based upon epiphyseal fusion data the individual is a young adult and this is supported by tooth wear analysis. Unfortunately, no sexually diagnostic fragments were present and the

sex of the individual could not be confidently assessed. No complete elements were present so an estimation of stature was not possible. No pathological lesions were noted on the skeleton but a difference was noted in the humeral shafts, with the distinctly more robust right humerus perhaps indicative of a right-handed individual.

### Pit [173]

A small quantity of human bone was recovered from pit [173]. In comparison with inhumation [150] these bone fragments are in a poor state of preservation. The largest fragment was 45mm in length and all fragments have suffered some surface erosion.

The majority of this small assemblage comprised long bone fragments but six loose, adult teeth were also present and the Minimum Number of Individuals (MNI) for the assemblage is one. Unfortunately, there were no fragments that could be used for accurate age or sex estimations but all the teeth are unworn, suggesting a younger adult. No pathological lesions were noted on any fragments.

### Cremated bone

Cremated human bone was recovered from a total of four contexts. Environmental samples were taken from a further seven contexts thought to be associated with cremations ([409], [428], [433], [436], [478], [479], [608]). Of these, only one [428] produced a recoverable amount of bone but it was unfortunately unidentifiable. The remaining contexts did not produce a recoverable amount of cremated bone but small fragments in the unsorted residues (<4mm) have been scanned for anything of significance.

### Results

Of the five deposits that contained identifiable cremated human bone, three have been dated to the Late Iron Age/Early Roman GP51: SG435 [426]; SG437 [432]; SG432, [451]). Two further contexts are undated; GP443, [428] and [598]. Only one of these, [451] was recovered from a vessel. All deposits were recovered and processed as environmental samples.

### Methods

Recording and analysis of the bone followed the procedures outlined by McKinley (2004) Age estimations were carried out with reference to Bass (1987), Buikstra and Ubelaker (1994) but were only possible as adult or probable adult. No sex estimations were possible.

The results of analysis are tabulated (Table \*) and summarised below. Further details are housed in the archive.

Group Number	Context	frag size	weight per skeletal element (g)					% of whole	total
			skull	axial	Upper limb	Lower limb	unident		
	426	0-4					7.7	18.8	41
		5-10	6.3	0.7		1.9	15.4	59.3	
		11-20	2.3	0.5	4.4	1.8		21.9	
<i>Percentage of identifiable fragments</i>			48	6.7	24.60	20.7			
	432	0-4					7	1	

		5-10	33.9	0.9			203.1	34.7	686.3
		11-20	82.5	24.4	51.8	74.6	115.2	50.8	
		21-30	24	2.5	25.9	28		11.7	
		30+				12.5		1.8	
<i>Percentage of identifiable fragments</i>			38.9	7.7	21.50	31.9			
	451	0-4					246.4	20.6	1195.7
		5-10	35.1	10.4	30.1	6.1	325	34	
		11-20	94.3	41.2	67.3	111.2	60.2	31.3	
		21-30	41.4	20.5	8.9	81.3		12.7	
		30+					16.3	1.4	
<i>Percentage of identifiable fragments</i>			30.3	12.8	18.80	38.1			
	598	0-4					14.8	15.8	93.6
		5-10	9.5				26.8	38.8	
		11-20	10.8		10.4	6.9		30	
		21-30			6.2	8.2		15.4	
<i>Percentage of identifiable fragments</i>			39		31.90	29			

Table \*: Summary of results from analysis of cremation burials.

The burials appeared to contain the remains of single, adult individuals. Unfortunately, it was not possible to estimate age more precisely. The assemblages did not contain any sexually dimorphic fragments and no pathological lesions were noted.

### Pyre technology and cremation ritual

The assemblages range from 60% to 100% calcined with fragments the resulting off-white colour. The remaining fragments are grey or black in colour. The only efficient cremation, with temperatures reaching in excess of 600°C (McKinley 2004, 11) was [451], which was also the only assemblage to be recovered from a vessel. The other assemblages were between 60% ([432]) and 85% ([598]) calcined, suggesting a less efficient cremation process at lower temperatures. The internal surfaces of fragments were grey/black in many cases and in some instances entire fragments were charred black or grey. This variation could result from different areas of the skeleton being subjected to different temperatures throughout the pyre, but all areas of the skeleton seem to have been equally affected.

The quantities of cremated bone recovered ranged from 41.0 grams in [426] to 1195.7 grams [451] with a mean average of 504.15 grams. The 1195 grams represent approximately 73% of the expected weight of cremated bone produced by an adult, whilst the fragments from [426] represent approximately 2.5% (McKinley, 1993: 285). It is also worth noting that the 1195 grams was recovered from the urned and therefore protected vessel [451].

Un-urned cremation burials without the protection of a vessel are usually highly fragmented, with large percentages of the bone assemblage being recovered from the smaller fractions. In this assemblage there was no apparent difference between the urned and un-urned burials, with the majority, between 34% and 59%, being recovered from the 0-4mm and 5-10mm fractions in all but one burial ([432]). In [432] the majority was recovered from the 11-20mm fraction.

All burials contained fragments identifiable to skeletal area. The axial skeleton was represented in all but one assemblage and consistently formed the smallest percentage of

the identifiable fragments (6.7-12.8%). With the exception of [451] skull fragments formed the majority of identifiable fragments (between 39% and 48%). Lower limb fragments constituted the majority in [451] (38%) and between 20% and 31% in the other assemblages. The upper limb comprised between 19% and 32%. Unfortunately, as the deposits were not excavated in spits it was not possible to assess spatial patterning within each burial.

It is not surprising that the largest single fragment, which was from a femoral shaft and measured 53mm, was from [451], which had the protection of a vessel. However, un-urned burial [432] also produced a fragment of over 30mm (36mm). Smaller elements of the skeleton, for example tooth roots and small bones of the hands and feet, were recovered from all four assemblages. McKinley suggests that this may be a reflection of the burial ritual, suggesting en-masse collection, rather than hand selection (McKinley, 2006: 29). No animal bone was noted in any of the assemblages.

Bass, W. (1987) *Human Osteology; a Laboratory and Field manual*. 3<sup>rd</sup>ed. Special Publication No. 2 of the Missouri Archaeological Society, Columbia.

Buikstra, J. E. and Ubelaker, D. H. 1994. *Standards for Data Collection from the Human Skeleton*. Arkansas Archaeological Survey Research Series No. 44, Fayetteville, Arkansas

Brothwell, D. in Hillson, S 1996 *Dental Anthropology* Cambridge, University Press: p240

McKinley, J I, 2004 Compiling a skeletal inventory: cremated human bone, in Brickley, M, and McKinley, J I, (eds.) *Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains* British Association for Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology and Institute for Field Archaeology, 9-12

McKinley, J. 2006 Channel Tunnel Rail Link, London and Continental Railways, Oxford Wessex Archaeology Joint Venture, Human remains from Section 1 of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link, Kent  
([http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/catalogue/adsdata/arch-335-1/dissemination/pdf/PT2\\_Spec\\_Reps/05\\_Human\\_remains/HUM\\_schemewide\\_report/HUM\\_SSR\\_text.pdf?CFID=24&CFTOKEN=77235F2B-44C3-49ED-95724CB66F5E3277](http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/catalogue/adsdata/arch-335-1/dissemination/pdf/PT2_Spec_Reps/05_Human_remains/HUM_schemewide_report/HUM_SSR_text.pdf?CFID=24&CFTOKEN=77235F2B-44C3-49ED-95724CB66F5E3277))

Schaefer, M., Black, S. and Scheuer, L, 2009 *Juvenile Osteology: A Laboratory and Field Manual* Academic Press

## Roxwell Quarry

### The Animal Bone by Gemma Ayton

The animal bone assemblage includes 2166 fragments from phased contexts of which just 662 could be identified. The assemblage is characterised by highly fragmented and poorly preserved specimens that have been recovered from pits and ditches dating from the prehistoric to the post-medieval periods. The assemblage has been recovered through hand-collection and from bulk samples though most of the bone from the samples is unidentifiable.

#### Methods

The assemblage has been recorded onto an Excel spreadsheet in accordance with zoning system outlined by Serjeantson (1996). Due to the poor condition of the assemblage, all 'non-recordable' fragments (those which comprise of less than 50% of one zone) have also been quantified. Wherever possible the fragments have been identified to species and the skeletal element represented. Elements that could not be confidently identified to species, such as long-bone and vertebrae fragments, have been recorded according to their size and categorised as large, medium or small mammal. The assemblage does not contain any measurable bones.

#### Results

The general preservation of the assemblage is poor with just 662 specimens being identified to taxa (Table 1). The majority of the assemblage has been recovered from features dating to Phase2 (Late Iron Age- Early Roman) with insubstantial scatterings of bones recovered from other Phases.

<b>Phase</b>	<b>Number Of Fragments</b>	<b>Total NISP (Number of Identified Specimens)</b>
1	10	7
2	2078	623
3	61	21
4	17	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>2166</b>	<b>662</b>

Table 1: The total number of fragments and NISP (Number of Identified Specimen) counts by phase

The assemblage is dominated by domestic taxa, including cattle, sheep/goat, pig, horse, dog and domestic fowl, with very little evidence regarding the exploitation of wild mammals, birds or fish (Table 2).

	<b>Phase1</b>	<b>Phase 2</b>	<b>Phase 3</b>	<b>Phase 4</b>
Cattle	1	174	12	3
Sheep/Goat	3	60	3	
Pig		81	2	
Horse		36		
Dog		6		
Roe Deer		1		
Large Mammal	1	167	2	6
Medium Mammal	2	93	2	2
Domestic Fowl		2		



Bird		1		
Eel		1		
Fish		1		

Table 2: NISP (Number of Identified Specimen Counts) by Phase

## Phase 2

Animal bone was retrieved from 103 contexts from across the site with few contexts containing more than 20 identifiable fragments. According to NISP counts (Table 2), the Phase 2 assemblage is dominated by cattle followed by pig and sheep/goat. However, MNI calculations reveal that sheep/goat and the dominant taxa followed by cattle and pig respectively.

	<b>MNI</b>
Cattle	6
Sheep/Goat	7
Pig	3

Table 3: MNI (Minimum Number of Individuals) count for Phase 2

The three main domesticates are represented by both meat bearing and non-meat bearing bones and no activity areas can be identified. The cattle and sheep/goat assemblages contain few epiphyseal ends though the majority of specimens that have survived are fused suggesting an older population with an emphasis on secondary products. The pig assemblage is dominated by unfused elements as pigs would have been raised primarily for meat.

## Discussion

The late Iron Age and Early Roman assemblages from Chignall (Luff 1998) are similar in species composition with very few wild mammals and wild and domestic birds represented. However, in contrast, at Chignall cattle are the dominant species a trend that is reflected at other high-status Roman sites (King 1989). Excavations at Rayne Road, Braintree (Luff 1976) also produced assemblages dominated by cattle whereas contemporary sheep/goat dominated assemblages are more frequently recovered from non-Romanised settlements (Ayton 2013).

## Conclusion

The analysis of the Late Iron Age-Early Roman animal bone assemblage from Roxwell Quarry suggests that animal husbandry activity focused on the rearing of domestic mammals with wild and domestic birds and fish making minimal contributions to the diet. The dominance of sheep/goat indicates that the Roman conquest had no immediate effect on the husbandry regimes.

## Bibliography

- Ayton, G, 2013 'The animal bone' in Perring, D and Pitts, M *Alien Cities; consumption and the origins of urbanism in Roman Britain*. Spoilheap Monograph 7, 163-188
- King, A C, 1989, 'Villas and animal bones' K Branigan and D Miles (eds), *The Economies of Romano-British Villas*, Sheffield, 51-59.

Luff, R, 1976, 'The animal bones' in Drury, P. J, 'Braintree: excavations and research, 1971-76', *Essex Archaeol Hist* 8, 60-62.

Luff, R, 1998, 'The faunal remains' in Clarke, C.P, 'Excavations to the South of Chignall Roman Villa, Essex' *Essex Archaeol Hist* 83, 122-125.

Serjeantson, D, 1996. 'The animal bones' in Needham, S and Spence, T, 'Runnymede Bridge Research Excavations, Volume 2: Refuse and Disposal at Area 16 East, Runnymede'. London: British Museum, 194-223.

## Roxwell Quarry, Essex, RXB98 / EB515

### The Flintwork Analysis

Karine Le Hégarat

#### Introduction

A total of 60 pieces of struck flint as well as a flint hammerstone were recovered from the three monitoring and excavation phases at Roxwell Quarry. The assemblage is largely composed of unmodified pieces of flint débitage, and contains no chronologically distinctive types. Based on technological traits, the majority of the flintwork is likely to be of a late prehistoric date (Mid to Late Bronze Age/early Iron Age). A few pieces are possibly earlier such as the core face rejuvenation flake and some of the unmodified pieces of flint débitage.

#### Methodology

The flintwork from Area 1 was originally examined by Hazel Martingell (1998). This material was re-assessed, and the assemblage from Areas 2 and 3 was fully recorded. The artefacts were individually examined and classified using standard set of codes and morphological descriptions (Butler 2005, Ford 1987 and Inizan *et al.* 1999). Basic technological details as well as further information regarding the condition of the artefacts were recorded. Dating was attempted when possible. All data have been entered onto a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, and it is summarised by period in Table 1.

Category type	Period 1	Period 2	Periods 0, 3 and 5	Total
Flakes*	6	30	14	50
Blade-like flakes	-	1	2	3
Irregular waste	-	2	-	2
Cores, Core fragments	1	1	-	2
Retouched forms	-	-	3	3
Hammerstone	-	1	-	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>61</b>
%	11.48%	57.38%	31.14%	100%

Table 1: summary of the struck flint by period (\* includes core preparation flakes)

#### Provenance

The pieces of struck flint were recovered from all three areas of the site (Area 1, 25 pieces; Area 2, 21 pieces and Area 3, 15 pieces). Overall, the material was thinly spread with no features producing more than seven artefacts. The pieces were retrieved from several ditches and pits and from a posthole. The later, posthole [286] G9, as well as pit [231] are both dated to the Mid-Late Bronze period. They contained a small group of flints that could be contemporary with the features. The remaining material (88.52% of the total assemblage, n=54) comes from undated archaeological features and from Late Iron Age / early Roman or later features; and it can clearly be regarded as re-deposited material.

#### Condition and raw material

The condition of the flintwork varied within the assemblage. A large proportion exhibited only a moderate degree of edge damage, implying that the material had undergone negligible post-depositional disturbance. Nonetheless, four pieces displayed extensive edge chipping associated with successive re-deposition. Frost fracture was observed on one artefact. Twenty-one pieces were recorded as broken. Just over 60% of the artefacts (n=37) were free from surface cortication, but a small proportion exhibited incipient traces of bluish white surface discolouration. The majority of the flints were manufactured from brown or light to dark grey relatively fine-grained flint. Where present, cortex was off-white, slightly chalky, but principally weathered. This material would have been locally available from drift deposits (Hopson 1981).

### **Technology and dating**

The assemblage is dominated by knapping débitage including 48 flakes, three blade-like flakes and two pieces of irregular waste. A relatively large proportion of pieces were technologically poor. The flakes are largely small, and squard flakes with plain platforms predominate. Platforms were occasionally cortical, and most butts exhibited minimal or no preparation. It seems that cores were also made expediently. No efforts was made to prepare a platform edge for the multiplatform flake core recovered from pit [231].

Only three retouched pieces were recovered; a concave scraper made on a natural flake, a crudely worked piercer and a minimally retouched flake. None are particularly diagnostic. Overall, the assemblage displays characteristics which are consistent with flake-orientated industry dating to the Middle–Late Bronze Age/early Iron Age. Nonetheless, the core face rejuvenation flake from ditch intervention [270] as well as some of flakes would not be out of place in a Mesolithic / Neolithic context.

### **Discussion**

The archaeological work at the site produced a small assemblage of flint artefacts, consisting of unmodified pieces, cores and a few retouched artefacts. Although none of the flintwork is diagnostic, based on technological grounds, the assemblage is more consistent with a late prehistoric date. A small earlier element was also possibly present. The presence of an earlier component is unsurprising given the substantial concentration of flintwork recorded during the excavations carried out south of Chignall Roman Villa approximately 2km south of the site which contained numerous diagnostic Mesolithic pieces (Healey 1998).

### **References**

- Butler, C. 2005. *Prehistoric Flintwork*. Tempus, Stroud.
- Inizan, M.-L., Reduron-Ballinger, M., Roche, H., & Tixier, J., 1999. *Technology and Terminology of Knapped Stone*. Tome 5. Cercle de Recherches et d'Etudes Préhistoriques (CREP), Nanterre.
- Ford, S. 1987. Chronological and functional aspects of flint assemblages. In A. Brown and M. Edmonds (eds) *Lithic analysis and Later British Prehistory* BAR British Series 162 Oxford, 67-81.
- Healy, E. 1998. Chipped Stone Industries. In C.P. Clarke, *Excavations South of Chignall Roman Villa Essex 1977-81*, East Anglian Archaeology, Report 83. Essex County Council. Chelmsford.

Hopson, P.M. 1981. *The Sand and Gravel Resources of the Country West of Chelmsford, Essex. Description of the 1:25 000 resource sheet TL60.* Mineral Assessment Report 66. Institute of Geological Sciences, Natural Environmental Research Council. Her Majesty's Stationery Office. London.

Martingell, H. 1998. The worked flint. **In.....** *Lafarge Redlands Roxwell Quarry, Roxwell, Essex Interim Report 1998.* Unpublished report.

**Illustrations: none**