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APPENDICES

Introduction

The majority of the appendices attempt to present up to date and complete gazetteers of imported goods in later Iron Age Britain and provide the supporting material for the main text. The gazetteers are arranged by modern county boundaries (ie post 1974-75). The type of context, eg burial or settlement, is given and where it is a settlement, a simple categorisation is also given.

Very few sites can confidently be called oppida and the use of the term is fraught with difficulties (Bradley 1984, 150-2; Champion 1987, 103), however, a number of sites stand out because of the comparatively large quantity of imports and perhaps more importantly because they may be suspected to have been seats of authority in the Iron Age. The evidence is most clear cut at Colchester and Silchester and more ambiguous for Braughing, Canterbury, Chichester, Leicester and the St Albans sites. The evidence from Bagendon is rather more difficult to interpret as it suffers from many of the same difficulties of interpretation and phasing as Camulodunum (cf Ch 4.2) and there are chronological problems as to how much pre-conquest occupation there was (Swan 1975, 59-61). However, it seems likely that at least some of the material was imported before AD 43, but even period IA contexts include Claudian Lyon ware (Greene 1979, 17, 42; Ch 6.2). Hengistbury Head is classified here as a Port of Trade. The evidence from most of these sites is summarised in Haselgrove 1987a.

Most other sites are either clearly rural settlements or farms or
in some cases larger sites whose precise character is uncertain. Occasionally specialist sites such as the salt manufacturing 'Red Hills' of Essex have yielded imports and they have been classified simply as production sites.

Where a series of sites appear to form a single complex as at Braughing, Canterbury, Colchester, Leicester and Poole Harbour or the Welwyn A and B burials, they have been assigned the same number and subdivided alphabetically. The Lexden cemetery finds use the group numbers as for the forthcoming Camulodunum II volume. Where possible quantified data is given, almost invariably and unsatisfactorily in one form only, however, but it was impossible to examine all the material retained in museums or other collections to provide a standardised data set within the scope of this study (cf Introduction).

Stamps on amphorae and 'Arretine' are catalogued according to the standard works of Callender (1965) and Oxé and Comfort (1968) respectively. Pending the forthcoming publication of Timby's and Rigby's works on Gallo-Belgic stamps and the Leeds Index of Samian Stamps, comparanda to those stamps found in Iron Age Britain have not been included. For the stamps on Gallo-Belgic wares full details may be found in Timby 1982.

As stated in the Introduction one major body of material is not documented here: Celtic coins. These have been fully documented by Haselgrove (1978; 1983; 1987a) and Scheers (1977a) and it would be superfluous to repeat that documentation here.

However, for the sake of completeness of coverage of the material considered here those amphorae and bronze vessels not yet found in
Iron Age Britain but whose discovery is foreseeable are included in appendices. These two categories appear to be the likeliest to be found and potentially misidentified, other categories such as brooches are likely to be identified correctly if enough of the piece survives, otherwise they will be classified as unidentifiable.

Finally two appendices are devoted to consideration of literary topics, 'the Belgae' and the question of whether Julius Caesar intended to invade Britain in 56 BC, as detailed treatment would be inappropriate within the main body of the text.
APPENDIX 1

THE 'PROBLEM OF THE BELGAE'

It is necessary to discuss 'the problem of the Belgae' which, as Champion (1979, 415) has noted, has dominated explanations of the later Iron Age. A series of recent doctoral theses have regarded it as a problem still to be solved (Rodwell 1976a; Thompson 1982; Sealey 1981; Tyers 1981a; Timby 1982; Foster 1983). It will, somewhat reluctantly, be argued here that the only 'problem' is of the archaeologists' making.

The essence of the 'problem' is that a settlement attested by Caesar cannot be recognised unequivocally in either the archaeological or historical records. Caesar records that

'the coastal areas [of Britain] are inhabited by invaders who crossed from Belgium for the sake of plunder and then, when the fighting was over, settled there and began to work the land; these people have almost all kept the names of the tribes from which they originated,

(BG V, 12, trans Wiseman and Wiseman).

In an earlier passage Caesar records that the territory of Cassivellaunus was separated from the maritime tribes by a River called the Thames. As Champion, largely following Bushe-Fox (1926) has suggested (1979, 417), the simplest interpretation is
that Caesar's immigrants should be identified with the Belgae and
the Atrebates of the Roman period much as Bushe-Fox argued.
Cunliffe apparently unaware of Champion's or Bushe-Fox's arguments
has recently argued a similar case (1984b, 19-20). In contrast
with these economical suggestions, there is a tortuous series of
arguments which have sought to place the settlements in south-
eastern England as a whole (Ch 26) and it is these which have
created 'the problem of Belgae'. The 'problem' lies in the
assumption that the settlements were only in south-east England
and in the difficulties encountered in trying to associate any
archaeological material, let alone an 'archaeological culture'
with this assumption (Champion 1979, 416-17; cf idem 1975; 1982).
It is as well to remember that the identification of south-east
England as the subject of Caesar's comments was originally
prompted by archaeological finds (Evans 1890).
Allen's reassessment of the date of the Gallo-Belgic coins in 1958
suggested that these were earlier than the Aylesford-type pottery
previously thought to be contemporary with the coins, both dating
from c 75 BC (Allen 1960). As Birchall's thesis demonstrated,
most of the pottery probably dated after Caesar's comments, let
alone as early as the coins. It was she who christened this 'the
problem of the Belgae' (Birchall 1965). The datings of both coins
and pottery were accepted by Hawkes who dispensed with the pottery
as indicative of the settlements, and sought it in the earlier
Gallo-Belgic coins (1968). Hawkes, following Hachmann (1962),
pointed out that Caesar used Belgium in two senses. One was
gallia bellica as a whole, the other implying a much more
restricted area in western Gaul and it was from this restricted
area that the settlements probably took place (Hawkes 1968, 8-9;
Hachmann 1976, 119-29). Hawkes also noted that on these grounds
it was difficult to suggest that the Catuvellauni of Britain descended from the Catalauni of Gallia Belgica as they did not belong to the restricted Belgium. In itself Hawkes' suggestion that the invaders might be represented by the coins is plausible but is incompatible with Caesar's comments that the settlement was south of the Thames. The real problems as perceived recently, involving complex arguments, have been created in attempting to reconcile the coins and the pottery. As these arguments are frequently so involved, successive proposals will be summarised and then discussed.

The earliest proponent of reconciliation to Hawkes' argument was Avery in 1969 in a paper which remains substantially unpublished (Avery [1969]), other than in a short summary (Avery 1976, 142, n 103). Avery's arguments have, however, been published, if initially and accidentally without acknowledgement, by Harding (1974, 223-6; Antiquity 48, 1974, 292).

The central point in this argument is that Cassivellaunus, who was elected war-lord of the British confederacy against Caesar in 54 BC, was a member of the Catuvellauni (although Caesar does not record the name of his tribe) and that, contrary to most previous arguments, the Catuvellauni were not descended from recent settlers out of Belgium in contrast to the settlers in the region described by Caesar. Avery's argument is based on the suggestion that as Cassivellaunus was previously in a continual state of war with the other tribes (BG V, 11), these wars must have been against the recent settlers from Belgium. According to Avery Cassivellaunus was elected as war-lord because of his knowledge of the areas south of the Thames gained during these putative wars in these areas. The principal argument for this suggestion is that the account of Cassivellaunus is placed before
the description of the settlers 'out of Belgium' in Book V of *De Bello Gallico*, thus showing his indigenous origins in stark contrast to those of the maritime regions. Avery looked for archaeological evidence for this in Gallo-Belgic A and B coins (as did Hawkes) and in the choice of an indigenous prototype for British LA coins which were argued to be those of Cassivellaunus. Recognising that the Gallo-Belgic coins were found north of the thames, Avery suggested that those found south of the Thames arrived with invaders but those to the north arrived in the course of trade. Similarly, the Aylesford-type pottery and burials were interpreted as representing invaders south of the Thames but to the north they represented acculturation (Avery [1969]). Harding's interpretation was slightly different. He followed Avery's interpretation of the pottery and burials, but he suggested that the coins were only found south of the Thames with insignificant outliers to the north (Harding 1974, 224). Harding also added Fécamp ramparts previously considered by Wheeler and Richardson (1957), Cotton (1962, 147-8) and Hawkes (1968, Fig 2b) to the evidence suggested to be associated with the settlers (Harding 1974, 225). Harding considers the Catuvellauni to have invaded Britain in La Tène I.

It is difficult to accept the need to give two interpretations to what seem to be parts of the same archaeological phenomenon (Champion 1979, 431, n 43) and it is clear that the coins are spread on both sides of the Thames in significant quantities (Cunliffe 1981d, Fig 39-41; Fig 40-4). Leaving aside the equation of British LA with Cassivellaunus, it should be noted that it may have a Roman not an indigenous prototype (van Ardsell 1984b). Fécamp ramparts have such a wide distribution (Collis and Ralston 1976, 143-4, Fig 4; Ralston 1981) that it is impossible to see
them as anything other than a common form of defence, perhaps particularly useful for altering or refortifying ramparts while the claimed British examples are, in any case, far from convincing (Green 1979). The difficulty of the name Catuvellauna recognised as likely to be similar to Catalauna by Avery ([1969], n 6; Guyonarc'h 1967, 299-302) is effectively ignored. The principal evidence is badly undermined by Rambaud's recognition of the possibility that the chapters in Book V did not originally run in their present order of 11-14 but instead 11, 14, 12, 13 (Rambaud 1974, 34-8, 81, 87, 92; followed by Hawkes 1977a, 165-7). If this were the case then the contrast central to Avery's argument disappears. While this misordering of the folios is not proven, the demonstration of its possibility makes it very difficult to accept the arguments put forward by Avery and Harding. Rodwell has also taken up the issue, indeed his thesis is dedicated to demonstrating 'the rise of Belgic power in southeastern England, (1976a). Rodwell agrees that Gallo-Belgic A and B represent invasions and follows Hawkes (1968) in seeing Gallo-Belgic C as the coinage of Diviacus although this is not seen as representing an invasion because of its later date (Ch 15.3). However, Rodwell sees Fécamp ramparts as being introduced from Belgic Gaul at the same time as Gallo-Belgic C. Rodwell's major disagreement with Avery and Harding is in the need to interpret the distributions of the coins and pottery differently. While disagreeing with them over the interpretation of 'maritime', Rodwell agrees that Cassivellaunus and the Catuvellauni, to whom he also suggests Cassivellaunus belongs, were not Belgic (Rodwell 1976a, 214). The similarity of the names is sidestepped again. Rodwell is able to accept the coins and pottery as representing settlers by rejecting the traditional association of them in the
Hertfordshire region as being Catuvelauni and interpreting them as Trinovantian. Instead Rodwell identifies the territory of the Catuvelauni as 'central and southern Essex, most of Hertfordshire, all of Middlesex and south-east Buckinghamshire' (Rodwell 1976a, 210). Following Peacock's suggestion (1971, 175-8) that Dr 1 amphorae should not be found in the territory of the 'anti-Roman Catuvelauni', Rodwell equates Dr 1 amphorae, the cremation rite and Aylesford-type pottery and early Gallo-Belgic coins with the Trinovantes. He argues that this evidence indicates that only a small area of the area north of the Thames was non-'Belgic' and that area was the territory of the Catuvelauni. Rodwell concludes that 'this does not automatically imply that the lower stretch of the north Thames bank was not a maritime district or was non-'Belgic' (Rodwell 1976a, 210). The corollary of this interpretation is that "maritima" and "interior" are to a certain extent used loosely and cannot be interpreted as rigidly as Harding did' (Rodwell 1976a, 211).

It must be doubted if any of the coin distributions show a gap in the area which Rodwell claims to be Catuvelaunian or which is any greater than those gaps in areas accepted by him as being within the distribution. Similarly, the distribution of Dr 1 can hardly be held to indicate pro- or anti-Roman polities. In some instances it appears to be true (eg the Nervii, BG II, 15) but in many more cases amphorae are found widely in the territories of tribes known to have been, if only intermittently, anti-Roman, for example the Suessiones or Treveri (Fitzpatrick 1985a, 317, Fig 5). The idea that the absence of cremation burials indicates the tribe to which Cassivellaunus belonged is attractive and burials are indeed very rare there (Whimster 1981, Fig 52). However, despite Rodwell's assertions, later Iron Age sites are presently rare in
the apparently blank area, particularly in the Greater London area. It is also difficult to reconcile this definition of the Catuvellauni with his subsequent interpretation of the coins of Tasciovanus. Rodwell declares the coins of Tasciovanus to appear in 'the area which was, in Caesar's day, indisputably Catuvellaunian (Rodwell 1976a, 261), but it is quite clear that the earliest gold coins of Tasciovanus are also found in precisely the same areas as Rodwell would regard as Trinovantian (ibid, Fig 22). The later bronze coinages of Tasciovanus and Cunobelin clearly indicate two areas of coin circulation which broadly agree with the areas traditionally taken to be Catuvellaunian (although there is of course a strong element of circularity in this argument). However, the 'boundary' in these distributions seems to lie along the line of the rivers Lea and Stort. Rivers seem to be respected by a number of British Iron Age distributions (Kimes, Haselgrove and Hodder 1982, 127). The gold coins of both Tasciovanus and Cunobelin cut across this distinction in the bronze coinages, as might be expected if they had different functions. Because of this, it is difficult to follow Rodwell in his definition of the Catuvellauni and his subsequent interpretation of the Trinovantes as being descended from maritime settlers. The rarity of cremation burials commented on by Rodwell is still noteworthy, but on its own cannot be held to define a tribal group.

The next major contributions on the topic have been by Kent who has argued that it is necessary to reject the association of the coins with the settlers. Kent suggests that most of the Gallo-Belgic gold coins arrived in Britain at the time of the Caesarian campaigns (Kent 1978a; 1978b; 1981) and because of this they can have little if any bearing on the question of the
settlement out of Belgium. It has been argued earlier (Ch 15.3) that Kent's interpretation is refuted by the state of wear of the British coins and the contrast in the composition of what appear to be contemporary hoards in Britain and Gaul. For all Kent's suggestions that it is necessary to make a new start (eg Kent 1978b, 53), it is clear that his own interpretations are shackled by the very historical evidence whose avoidance he urges. Instead of the 'Belgic invasions' as a central point in the interpretation of the coinage Kent merely substitutes the Caesarian campaigns. Although Kent's arguments have been accepted by some (eg Cunliffe 1984b, 12) they have been doubted by others (eg Haselgrove 1984a, 50, n 5; 1987a, 79-80; Nash 1987a, 108-17, 119; Fitzpatrick and Megaw 1987, 440).

Although Whimster (1981, 147-66) has summarised the discussions the most recent major contributions to the debate have come from Hawkes while others have preferred to relegate the 'problem' to the status of a 'non-problem' (eg Champion 1979; Haselgrove 1984a).

In a series of papers Hawkes (1977a; 1980a; 1982) has accepted Rodwell's interpretation of the Trinovantes as being 'Belgic'. Hawkes does not discuss the difficulties in accepting Rodwell's arguments which have been adumbrated above, only citing it approvingly (Hawkes 1977a, 167, n 2) and adding it to his earlier interpretation of the earlier Gallo-Belgic coins (Hawkes 1968). It is important to recognise this point as it underlies much of Hawkes's conclusions. Equally important is Hawkes' analysis of the interpretation of 'maritime' in Caesar's book V.

Contained within book V is an ethnographic excursus on Britain (BG V, 12-14). The excursus interrupts the narrative of Caesar's campaigns and as we have seen this was taken by Avery and Harding
to form an implicit contrast implying that Cassivellaunus and by inference the Catuvellauni, were of native stock or at least of older stock than the 'new' settlers recorded by Caesar in the excursus. Hawkes' main concern, however, is in the way that 'maritime' is used.

In Book V, 11, before the excursus, Caesar states that the territory of Cassivellaunus was separated from the maritime tribes by the Thames. In the excursus, at V, 12, 'maritime' seems to imply a large area, while at V, 14 Kent is stated to be an entirely maritime area. From this it is clear that the word is used in a variety of scales, but all are consistent with the proposition that the maritime areas lie to the south of the Thames. Hawkes argues that Caesar's use varies by pointing out that while he says that the territory of Cassivellaunus was separated from the maritime tribes by the Thames he does not assign them to the interior, which is the contrast, between 'maritime' and 'interior', made in the excursus. Assuming that Cassivellaunus was a Catuvellaunian Hawkes, following Avery and Harding, suggests that the wars were against the maritime tribes south of the Thames. As Cassivellaunus was certainly responsible for the death of the father of Mandubracius, of the Trinovantes, Hawkes implicitly assumes that they too were of maritime descent. On the basis of this Hawkes suggests that 'between his excursus and narrative he [Caesar] juggled with maritime' (Hawkes 1977a, 169). Hawkes argues that Cassivellaunus did not belong to the maritime tribe but at the same time he need not be native. According to Hawkes the point is blurred: "'Native" thus does not mean "interior" as in the excursus; what it means is "not maritime" as either in that or in the narrative' (Hawkes 1977a,
170, n 1). Proof of this apparent ambiguity is sought in the fact that Cassivellaunus' tribe grew grain, for Caesar's troops collected it (BG V, 19), but the excursus characterised the interior as not growing crops (Hawkes 1977a, 171; 1980a, 55; 1982, 8), accordingly for Hawkes this cannot be 'interior' in the sense of the excursus. Because of this if at least one area north of the Thames was not part of the 'interior', then it is possible that other areas which are not mentioned by Caesar could be 'maritime' as the usage is not quite precise. Further weight is added by Hawkes' conclusion that Caesar's description of the river boundary between the maritime tribes and Cassivellaunus is to be calculated from the ford, near to London, at which Caesar crossed the Thames. Hawkes states that the boundary was calculated along the river and not the estuary and that the river Lea formed the eastern boundary of the tribe of Cassivellaunus (Hawkes 1980a, 55), therefore, the area north of the Thames estuary is not defined as maritime one way or the other. Hawkes concludes that Caesar's descriptions of the maritime regions are precise, in so far as he gives them, but as that in the excursus is broader it may not actually have been written by him. Instead he suggests that it is a compilation, some parts may have been drawn from campaign reports and staff notes, an example being the reference to tin which he suggests may have been recorded in 56 BC in connection with Cornwall (Hawkes 1977a, 166, n 3), and other parts may have drawn from older ethnographers including Posidonius (ibid, 165). Subsequently Hawkes has ascribed all the excursus to Posidonius (1980a, 55-6; 1982, 8). For Hawkes one central difficulty remains, if the Trinovantes were settled out of Belgium as the coins and pottery have been held to suggest, and Caesar had a Trinovantan prince Mandubracius in his train in 54 BC, why does
Caesar not say that they were a maritime tribe and that they bordered the tribe of Cassivellaunus along the Lea? Why does Caesar not give this information in V, 11 when he gives the border of Cassivellaunus and the maritime tribes as the Thames? For Hawkes the dénouement is to be found early in Caesar’s campaign in 54 BC. In essence Hawkes argument is that the flight of Mandubracius to Caesar in Gaul, gave him justification for invading Britain a second time. From the fact that Caesar left his fleet at anchor, perhaps off Worth, and then made a rapid assault through Kent, Hawkes deduced that his attention was to secure north-east Kent and with it the harbourage of the Wantsum Channel. From there he intended to cross to Essex and to attack Cassivellaunus from the east, thus justifying the invasion. However, the fleet was wrecked by a gale (BG V, 10) and was unuseable and, according to Hawkes, Caesar could no longer execute his plans. ‘The gale had ruined all. Only silence could save his face’ (Hawkes 1980a, 55). Thus according to Hawkes, Caesar does not describe the geography of the Thames estuary because it would show clearly that the territory of the Trinovantes lay to the north and this would show his original plans and Mandubracius is relegated to a late and insignificant role later on in the narrative in order to further mask the plan (Hawkes 1977a, 160-1; 1980a, 55; 1982, 8). As Caesar did not tell the whole truth, the apparent ambiguity of ‘maritime’ in the way that it is used in the narrative and excursus is, for Hawkes, resolved. In this light the coins and pottery of the Trinovantes (as interpreted by Rodwell) can, for Hawkes, be interpreted as representing settlement. Hawkes has sought other contemporary artefacts to accompany the early coins, which he would place in the mid-second century BC and these he suggests may be found in some La Tène II
swords which he regards as indicating an intrusive tradition in British Iron Age weaponry. Between them the coins and swords are held to represent a small, but important, martial invasion; they are not accompanied by pottery because, according to Hawkes, the application of the concept of an archaeological culture is incorrect here as the need for this idea is only felt in the study of full prehistoric periods, in a protohistoric period the need for it grows 'less and ever less' (Hawkes 1980a, 57; cf idem 1982, 10). Hawkes sees the Aylesford pottery and burial rites as being introduced subsequently through the links forged by these early invaders. In his most recent paper Hawkes (1982, 9) reiterates his idea of 'an accumulative story' comparable to that outlined by him as 'Cumulative Celticity' in 1973. While Hawkes places the invasions in the mid-second century BC he emphasises the possibility of very old cultural ties and it may well be that in his discussions of the possible connections of the Essex Iron Age with Germany he is looking to Caesar's comments that the continental Belgae were ultimately of German origin (BG II, 4). Finally in the last comments on the movement out of Belgium in his 1982 paper, Hawkes recognises the possibility that the definition of the invaders by coins may perhaps be too narrow a definition (1982, 9).

Hawkes' conclusions have not been challenged and while his arguments are cleverly and intricately argued it must be asked if they correct?

Firstly, it needs to be re-asserted that Caesar's comments do not need to be interpreted as contradictory. The comments may be taken to show that the settlers were south of the Thames (V, 11),
the maritime region in V, 12 is left undefined, but the statement that Kent is entirely maritime V, 14 does not contradict this. *A priori* Caesar appears to be indicating that the settlements were south of the Thames. Hawkes argues that the territory of Cassivellaunus is not ascribed to the interior parts and that he should only be thought of as 'not maritime'. It is difficult to see any justification for this argument. Hawkes draws the distinction too clearly, for the excursus does not say that no tribes living in the interior grew grain, only that most did not. The argument that Cassivellaunus had been fighting wars against maritime tribes south of the Thames is based on no more than supposition which is itself based on an uncertain ordering of the folios. If the folios were in a different order as Hawkes himself argues (1977a, 165-6), then the whole contrast central to the argument is lost. To argue on the basis of this that the Trinovantes must, because they too had been at war with Cassivellaunus, be of maritime descent (Hawkes 1977a, 169) builds supposition on supposition. Caesar makes a clear distinction between Cassivellaunus and the maritime tribes. However, the excursus is arranged, it is surely quite clear that Cassivellaunus was not of maritime stock. Only by drawing a distinction that Caesar does not appear to make is it possible to suggest that the tribe of Cassivellaunus belonged to neither the maritime or the interior. To draw from this the conclusion that as a 'non-maritime', 'non-interior' tribe is distinguished it is not possible to exclude the possibility of a fully maritime tribe to the east not being mentioned is tenuous. Indeed, it would appear to be contradicted by Caesar's statement that the Thames was the boundary. This is resolved by Hawkes by suggesting that in describing the river Thames as a boundary Caesar was implying a
contrast between the river Thames and the Thames estuary and that
the boundary from the maritime tribes was the river (1980a, 55).
This is difficult to understand, as Caesar clearly makes the
contrast between the sea and the river: there is no suggestion of
an estuary. Given the lack of comprehension of tides in the
Mediterranean world until Posidonius (Hawkes 1984, 221) and the
surprise by which a full tide had caught Caesar the previous year
(BG, IV, 29), it might be thought that if Caesar wished to be
specific about estuaries and rivers he would have done so. As
Hawkes suggests, Cassivellaunus' territory probably was upstream
from the confluence of the Lea (1980a, 55), but to suggest a
distinction between the tidal reaches of the Thames seems
unwarranted. Even so why does Caesar not mention the maritime
region north of the Thames estuary inhabited by the Trinovantes?,
surely this silence inexplicable unless the reader is meant to
assume that the tribes to the north are not native, of the
interior parts?

Hawkes' solution to this question has two parts. One is that
Caesar knew that the description in the excursus was vague -
because he did not write it, the other is that Caesar deliberately
suppressed the location of the Trinovantes. Hawkes suggests that
the excursus on Britain is a 'patchwork' (1977a, 167) and in this
he may well be right, the material may well have been put together
from a variety of sources but is it correct to suggest that the
principal source was Posidonius? It seems likely that Posidonius
had some knowledge of the trade in British tin and that this
information is preserved in Diodorus (Ch 18). But this
information relates to exchanges along the Atlantic seaboard.
Posidonius knew little of Gaul outside of the south and it is
difficult to see how he would have had this knowledge of Britain but less of Belgic Gaul or Germany. Although it has been suggested before (eg Hachmann 1976, 120) it is a suggestion unsupported by major studies of Posidonius (Edelstein and Kidd 1972; Theiller 1982 passim; Malitz 1983, 169-98). One other effect of Hawkes's suggestion is to relegate Caesar to the position of being little more than a poor hack of Posidonius, a position which Nash has argued convincingly to be unjustified (Nash 1976a). Hawkes suggests that Caesar will have 'shrewdly perceived' that Posidonius was vague about the precise area of the maritime part (Hawkes 1980a, 56) and was happy to leave the ambiguity. Again there seems little reason to discover a new passage of Posidonios for the sake of an assumed ambiguity in Caesar which is not apparent at a first reading.

It is difficult to follow Hawkes' suggestion that Caesar suppressed the location of the Trinovantes. In essence Hawkes' argument is that he intended to attack Cassivellaunus from Essex using the flight of Mandubracius as his justification. This plan was foiled by the wreck of the fleet. According to Hawkes the rapid excursion through north-east Kent was intended to secure the Wantsum Channel as an anchorage for his voyage to Essex. As this operation was to be completed rapidly the ships were left at anchor and to be moved on later. The storm intervened and in embarrassment Caesar had to conceal his plans and with them the location of the Trinovantes. Nowhere does Hawkes face the question that if Caesar intended to attack Cassivellaunus from Essex why did he not land in Essex with Mandubracius ensuring security? Equally baffling is why, if he so wished, did Caesar not anchor in the Wantsum in the first instance? Hawkes assumes that in his scouting voyage Volensus circumnavigated Thanet.
(Hawkes 1977a, 155-7, Map 8) but it is possible that he did not if he had he would have seen Richborough and it has long been a puzzle why, if the harbourage at Richborough was similar to that of a hundred years later, Caesar did not use Richborough? Caesar specifically states (BG V, 8) that the landing place had been chosen the previous year so presumably it was perfectly satisfactory. It may have been at or near Hythe. The reason for Caesar's dash is quite clear, it was as Frere (1978, 50) points out, speed. Caesar marched through the night trying to act as quickly as possible and to seize the initiative and this is completely in character with his campaigns throughout the Battle for Gaul. The reason the ships were not hauled up is that not only did Caesar feel them to be safe but that it would take a long time to secure them properly if they were ashore. Hawkes quite omits to mention that with over 25,000 men it took ten days working day and night to secure the fleet with defences when it was beached. Surely this is why Caesar did not haul them up, he wanted to strike as quickly as possible. Whether or not Caesar intended to campaign in Essex there is no subsequent opportunity for him to discuss the geography of Essex and that is surely why he is silent on the topic. Mandubracius is not omitted until the last to try and obscure Caesar's intentions. He is introduced at precisely the point when a Trinovantian embassy arrives and this would logically occur when Caesar was campaigning north of the Thames (BG V, 20). It seems unnecessary for Hawkes to suggest that this was his justification for the whole campaign. Throughout book V there is no attempt to justify Caesar's actions, it was apparently understood why he was in Britain and in any case Mandubracius could only justify attacking Cassivellaunus, not all of Britain including that south of the Thames so this would
provide only a feeble justification. Ultimately Caesar was successful in defeating Cassivellaunus and if this was originally his prime aim, why should Caesar suppress the successful conclusion of his campaign? Hawkes has no answer to these arguments and in the light of them it is surely impossible to accept his interpretation. As all of Hawkes' suggestions about the deliberate ambiguity and silence of Caesar about the maritime origin of the Trinovantes ultimately rest on this supposed motive for the invasion, then they also collapse with it. Indeed even if one were to accept Hawkes' main argument it would still be difficult to accept his interpretation of the political geography.

Hawkes' interpretation of the coins and swords is bound in a circular argument as to whether the Trinovantes as defined by Rodwell, were Belgic. It has been observed earlier that the suggestion that the early Gallo-Belgic coins indicate settlement is not in its self implausible, although contradicted by the evidence of Caesar. It is curious, however, that while Hawkes refers several times to Kent's work (Hawkes 1977a, 143; 1980a, 56; 1982, 5) nowhere does he cite Kent's publications or refute Kent's arguments for a late dating for the introduction of the early Gallo-Belgic coins. It is impossible, however, to follow Hawkes in seeing the La Tène II swords as intrusive (1980a, 56) for they reflect no more a change in fighting practise in Britain than they do in contemporary continental Europe. They represent part of the evidence for the widespread change in weaponry throughout Europe in La Tène II. Some of the swords could be imports but there is nor reason to identify them with invaders. Whatever the merits of Hawkes' assessment of the usefulness of the concept of an archaeological culture (1980a, 57; 1982, 10) his arguments over
the absence of associated pottery, fall prey to Bradley's earlier criticism of Harding's conclusion that if 'we are obliged to apply less rigorous criteria' (Harding 1974, 230 quoted by Bradley 1978, 2), then we are guilty of changing the questions to accommodate the answers. In a different way from the Childean culture discussed by Bradley the 'problem of the Belgae' is in Hawkes' argument an idée fixe. In this case the attempt has been made to alter the written text to fit the archaeology although the original archaeological interpretation was determined by that same history. Hawkes' statement that 'Caesar critically read has nothing against this' (1980a, 56) is surely testimony to la Déformation historique, but of a different sort to that considered by Rambaud (1966). It is possible to agree with Hawkes (1982, 9) that the definition of the invaders by coins may be too narrow and that the tradition recorded by Caesar may be of antiquity. As Nash has suggested, ties between Kent and Belgium could date from at least the later third century BC (Nash 1984, 104), but contra Cunliffe (1984b, 19-20) it is not necessary to look in solely one region or another (cf Nash 1987a, 109, 119-22). The coins may provide another and more obvious indication. To what date the oral tradition of the people of the interior Britain, which claims them to be indigenous in apparent contrast to the people of the coastal areas, belongs is uncertain, so too is the area covered by Caesar. But there is no ambiguity in Caesar's statements that it was south of the Thames and as Nash argues some of the Gallo-Belgic coins in Kent may be related to this and the possibility of Belgic expansion within Britain should not be excluded. As Hachmann has warned, the archaeological and philological arguments must be kept distinct (Hachmann 1976). But as Thompson unwittingly demonstrates in seeking to prove the
contrary (Thompson 1982, 3) the problem is really of the archaeologists own making and the more important wider context and ideologies in which Caesar's comments should be viewed (eg Shaw 1982/83) have been ignored because of this.
APPENDIX 2

DRESSEL 1 AMPHORAE FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

2.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF DRESSEL 1 AMPHORAE

BERKSHIRE

1. Reading – Thames Valley Park. Rural settlement: one body sherd, almost certainly Dr 1 from the associated pottery (L. Mepham pers comm).

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

2. Dorton. Burial: one Dr 1B with two Italian Dr 2-4 (Farley 1983, 291, Fig 11, 1; Sealey 1985, 137-8).

CAMBRIDGESHIRE

3. Cambridge, Jesus Lane. Burial?: one Dr 1, probably 1B (Peacock 1971, 183).

4. Trumpington, Dam Hill. Burial?: one Dr 1, probably 1B (ibid).

CORNWALL

5. Carn Euny. Rural settlement: one, possibly two, Dr 1. A base fragment has been suggested to be Dr 1A but the
evidence is inadequate, however, the piece described as a body sherd is actually a Dr 1A rim (Truro Mus; Christie 1978, 396, 403, Fig 52, 22).

DORSET

6 Gussage All Saints. Rural settlement: three+ Dr 1. Although one is suggested to be Dr 1A on the basis of the fabric by Peacock (in Wainwright 1979, 72, 191) and Williams (1984a), there is insufficient evidence (cf Ch 26.1), while contextual evidence is also inconclusive.

7 Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: thirty+ Dr 1A and six+ 1B from (apparently) nearly all of the various excavations, one Dr 1B stamped B M (Peacock 1971, 181, Fig 37; App 14.2, 5; Williams 1987, 271-2, Ill 189-91).

8 Lake Farm, Wimbourne. Settlement?: two Dr 1A (M.J. Darling pers comm; Fitzpatrick 1985a, 323; Williams 1987, 272).

9 Maiden Castle. Hillfort: two+ amphorae, probably including Dr 1A and Dr 1B. Some of the sherds were associated with Wheeler's Phase IV, Iron Age 'B' (1943, 47, 116, 231), and although the dating of this remains uncertain (Frere 1960a, 88-90), it is likely to be in the later second or earlier first century BC and the associated sherds from Graeco-Italic or Dr 1A vessels. Those sherds from the Iron Age 'C' levels (Wheeler 1943, 57, 64, 117, 238) may date to the second half of the first century BC, or possibly earlier (Cunliffe 1978a, 57; 1982a, 50). There are further finds from Sharple's excavations (pers comm).
Poole Harbour - Furzey Island. Settlement: three sherds identified as Dr 1 (Cox 1985, 158 and pers comm).

Poole Harbour - Green Island. Settlement: one Dr 1, possibly 1A (Peacock 1971, 180).

Poole - Hamworthy. Settlement?: three+ Dr 1 (ibid). Cunliffe (1982a, 46) asserts that they are Dr 1A while Williams also suggests this on the basis of the fabric (1984a) but this is not proven (cf Ch 26.1).

ESSEX

Colchester - Colonia, St Mary's Rectory. Settlement: one Dr 1B (Dunnett 1971, 73, Fig 26, 8).

Colchester - Lexden Tumulus. Burial: six+ Dr 1B (Foster 1986, 124-32, Fig 39).

Colchester - Lexden Group 12 (Park Field). Burial: one Dr 1B (Peacock 1971, 183).

Colchester - Lexden Group 21 (St Clare Drive). Burial?: Dr 1B stamped HI[E] (op cit, 184; App 14.1, 5; 8.1, 3a).

Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: Hawkes and Hull (1947) recorded 46 diagnostic sherds of Dr 1B, but only 16 survive, one of which is a Pascual 1. Five Dr 1B from the 1970 excavations (Sealey 1985, 102); MNV 20. One illegible stamp and one perhaps on a Dr 20 (App 14.2, 3-4).

Gestingthorpe. Rural settlement: one Dr 1B. Going in Draper (1985, 97).

Great Canfield. Burial?: one Dr 1B. (Saffron Waldon Mus; Fitzpatrick 1985a, 324).

Great Chesterford. Burial?: one Dr 1B now in Audley End
House, possibly associated with the Great Chesterford Bucket Burial (*ibid*; C.J. Going pers comm).

15a Heybridge - Osea Road. Salt production site: one Dr 1B (Rodwell 1976a, 319) called Osea Road, Maldon by W.J. Rodwell (1979, 155).

15b Heybridge - Langford Junction. Settlement?: two Dr 1B rims in the Fitch Collection. One stamped PE twice, originally provenanced as Maldon by Peacock (1971, 184) but first corrected to Heybridge by Rodwell (1976a, 319) (Wickenden 1986, 57-8, Fig 26, 28-9; App 14.1, 6).

16 Kelvedon. Rural settlement/village: at least one Dr 1B from excavations by K.A. Rodwell (Rodwell 1976a, 319), four-seven Dr 1B in excavations by Eddy (Eddy with Turner 1982, 26-8, Fig 12, 1; C.E. Turner pers comm).

17 Lindsell. Burial: one Dr 1B (Peacock 1971, 184).

18 Mount Bures. Burial: one Dr 1B (possibly Dr 2-4; *cf* Sealey 1985, 149) with four Dr 9 (*cf* App 7.3.1).

19 Mucking. Rural settlement: one Dr sp. (Rodwell 1976a, 318).

20 Orsett, 'Cock'. Settlement: Dr 1 handle sherd (P.R. Sealey pers comm; *idem* 1981) (for the site see Toller 1980).

21 Sampford. Burial: one Dr 1B provenanced as Thaxted by Peacock (1971, 184) but the Saffron Waldon Museum catalogue of 1886 (MS) provenances it as Sampford (Fitzpatrick 1985a, 325).

22 Sandon. Burial?: two Dr 1B, provenanced as Danbury by Peacock (1971, 184) and corrected to Sandon by Rodwell (1976a, 318).

23 Stansted - Airport catering site. Rural settlement: at
least three Dr 1A and five Dr 1B (Brooks and Wall 1986, 13; C.J. Going pers comm).

24 Thaxted area. Burial: one Dr 1B. Originally provenanced as the White Colne area by Rodwell (1976a, 319) but corrected to the Thaxted area by Rodwell (1976c). It was probably found with a Pascual 1 (Williams 1981, 130; App 4.1, 5). This find will be discussed by C.J. Going in a forthcoming paper; I am grateful to him for his help.


GLOUCESTERSHIRE


HAMPSHIRE

27 Danebury. Hillfort: six Dr 1, three of which are suggested by Williams (1984a) to be Dr 1A on the basis of their fabric, but there is insufficient evidence (cf Ch 26.1) and the chronology of the site may be too early (Haselgrove 1986a). On stratigraphic grounds (Cunliffe 1984d, 326) some vessels could be Dr 1B.

28 Hayling Island. Temple: one+ Dr 1A (Downey, King and Soffe 1979, 7; A.C. King pers comm).

29 Hook. Rural settlement: one body sherd, perhaps Dr 1B
30 Horndean. Rural settlement: one Dr 1 (Peacock 1971, 181). The ceramic assemblage (Cunliffe 1961, 25-6, Fig 2) is comparable to Danebury Cp 8 so the vessel is likely to be Dr 1 and perhaps 1B, but the possibility of it being from a Dr 2-4 should not be excluded totally.

31 Owslebury. Rural settlement: one+ Dr 1 (Peacock 1971, 181; J.R. Collis pers comm).

32 Silchester. Oppidum: Dr 1 may have been found in older excavations (ibid) and there are Dr 1B from the recent excavations (Fulford with Corney 1984, 127, 233, 251; Timby in Fulford 1985a, 26; Fulford 1987).

33 Winchester. Rural settlement?: one+ Dr 1B (Peacock 1971, 181; Biddle 1975b, 99-100).

34 Winnall Down. Rural settlement: one, possibly three Dr 1(A?) (Fasham 1985, 73; Site Archive and P.J. Fasham pers comm). There may have been a break in occupation from the late second or early first century BC until the first half of the first century AD (ibid, 69-76), so, accepting the finds as Dr 1 and not Dr 2-4, although they were residual in Roman contexts (ibid, 71-2), the vessels are likely to have been Dr 1A.

HERTFORDSHIRE

35a Baldock - The Têne. Burial: one Dr 1A (Stead and Rigby 1986, 53, Fig 21).

35b Baldock - Walls Field. Settlement: one Dr 1B, possibly two others (ibid, 235, 279).

36a Braughing - Gatesbury. Settlement: one+ Dr 1 from near

culiffe (1982c, 442) suggests that there are Dr 1A from the site but this is not stated in the report (Partridge 1981, 334-5) and so this is presumably a misprint.

36b Braughing - Gatesbury Track. Oppidum?: one Dr 1A and two+ Dr 1B, one stamped J.R or B (Williams and Peacock in Partridge 1979, 114, Fig 34, 1-3; App 14.2, 1).

36c Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: one Dr 1, probably 1B (Peacock 1981, 202).

36d Braughing - Station Road. Oppidum?: two+ Dr 1B (Peacock in Partridge 1979, 47-8, Fig 12). Contra the report, the palmette stamp on one is paralleled at Basel-Gasfabrik, Basel-Münsterhügel and Roanne. The Basel-Gasfabrik find is probably Dr 1A (cf App 14.3, 1).

36e Braughing - Wickham Kennels. Oppidum?: Dr 1 sp. (Partridge 1980-82, 43, Fig 10, 15).

36f Braughing. Surface finds: two finds of Dr 1 east of the Rib (Partridge 1981, Fig 3).

37 Crookhams. Rural settlement: two+ Dr 1, probably 1B (Rook 1968, Fig 58, Fig VIII, 10a-b; Peacock 1971, 184).


39 Hadham Ford, near Bridgefoot Farm. Burial?: probably Dr 1B. Incorrectly provenanced as Welwyn by Thompson (1982, 853). Hadham Ford is in the same parish as L. Hadham but it seems unlikely to be the same as no 41 as the records of discovery are different (C. Saunders pers comm).

40 Hertford Heath. Burial: one Dr 1B (Hülsen 1983, 24-5, 44, Fig 8, 1). A Dr 1B was also found nearby.
Little Hadham. Burial?: one Dr 1, probably 1B, now lost, cf no 39 (Stead 1967a, 60).

St Albans - Verulamium. Oppidum?: a base identified as from an Italian Dr 2-4 and from a context dated AD 230-50 (Frere 1984a, 201, Fig 80, 189B), is more probably from a Dr 1B.

Standon, Ralph Saddlier Middle School. Rural settlement: Dr 1B (Partridge 1977, 89, Fig 34, 6).

Watton-at-Stone, Broomhall Farm. Settlement: one Dr 1B, stamped VAMP (Rook et al 1982, 21 and pers comm; App 14.1, 8).

Welwyn A and B. Burials: one Dr 1B stamped SOS or just possibly PAPI (cf Aulnas 1980-81, 67, no 68, Pl 12, 68; App 14.1, 7) in burial A. Five Dr 1B from burial B, one stamped AA (Peacock 1971, 185; App 14.1, 1).

Welwyn - Mardleybury. Burial?: Dr 1B (ibid); its discovery is recorded by Andrews, who notes a possible second find (1905, 32-3). It is not clear why Rodwell declares that three Dr 1 were found (1976a, 321).

Welwyn Garden City. Burial: five Dr 1B, one stamped HIE or HIB (Peacock 1971, 185; App 14.1, 4).

ISLE OF WIGHT


Gills Cliff, Ventnor. Rural settlement: probably Dr 1, as, despite the excavators' uncertainty over the stratigraphy (Benson 1953, 303) it does now appear to be chronologically significant.
Knighton. Rural settlement: four+ Dr 1A (Peacock 1971, 181; Williams 1984a).

Yarmouth Roads. Seabed at, Wreck or anchorage debris?: sixteen sherds of Graeco-Italic or Dr 1A (Peacock 1984, 38; Maritime Heritage Bull 1987, 5-6; D.J. Tomalin pers comm).

KENT

Bigberry. Hillfort: one Dr 1 (Thompson 1983, 265, Fig 12, 105).

Canterbury - Bridge Hill. Settlement: one+ Dr 1 (Peacock 1971, 182).

Canterbury - Rose Lane. Oppidum?: three+ Dr 1, probably Dr 1B (ibid).

Canterbury - various sites. Oppidum?: at least nine+ Dr 1B from old and recent excavations (Thompson 1983, 265; Arthur 1986, 239, n 1, 240-2, 256-7, Fig 2, 1-5).

Highstead. Rural settlement: at least one Dr 1B with a fragmentary stamp .A... (App 14.2, 6). Arthur has suggested that a further vessel may be southern Spanish (1986, 257), but an Italian source should not be excluded (ibid; N. Macpherson-Grant pers comm).

Quarry Wood, Loose. Hillfort?; one Dr 1B stamped EB (Kelly 1971, 84, Fig 12, 33; Arthur 1986, 257, Fig 2, 9; App 14.1, 3).

Rochester. Settlement: one Dr 1B (R.J. Pollard pers comm; Fitzpatrick 1985a, 323).
SUSSEX

57 Boxgrove. Rural settlement: one Dr 1, probably 1B (D.R. Rudling pers comm).

58 Carne's Seat, Goodwood. Rural settlement; one Dr 1(B?) handle (Holgate 1986, 45). Three other Dr 1-4 sherds were found but were not from certainly Iron Age contexts, as was also the case with the handle.

59 Chichester. Oppidum?: one Dr 1B stamped AVALER (Down 1978, 243, Fig 10.15, 13; App 14.1, 2).

60 Fishbourne. Settlement: one Dr 1B (Cunliffe 1971, 208, Fig 100, 159).

61 Oving, Copse Farm. Rural settlement: at least two Dr 1(B?) from trenches B and F (Williams in Bedwin and Holgate 1985, 229, 236-8, M 24).

WORCESTERSHIRE


2.2 ITALIAN AMPHORAE FROM IRON AGE CONTEXTS WHICH MAY BE EITHER DR 1 OR DR 2-4.

1 Castle Dore. Hillfort: probably at least two vessels (Harris and Quinnell 1985, 129; Truro Mus).

2 Trethury. Rural settlement (Round): a piece suggested to possibly be Dr 1A (Cunliffe 1982a, 63; Fitzpatrick 1985a, 323) is an undiagnostic body sherd, while the context is not closely datable.
DORSET

3 Maiden Castle. Hillfort: some of the Italian vessels from Iron Age 'C' contexts could be Dr 2-4 (cf no 9 above).

ESSEX

4 Canvey Island, Thorney Bay. Settlement: one vessel (Rodwell 1976a, 318).

5 South Benfleet. Salt production site (ibid).

6 West Tilbury. Rural settlement: one vessel. Drury and Rodwell (1973, 94-5) suggest that it is Dr 1. The sherd was unstratified in the enclosure ditch of mid-first century AD date. Although there are Iron Age finds from the ditch (op cit, 59, 102), it was suggested that there was no significant domestic activity on the site during this period and that the sherd was to be explained as being introduced as secondary refuse from a nearby settlement, (op cit, 94-5). Alternatively it may be suggested that the sherd is residual from an Iron Age settlement and is to be associated with the Iron Age pottery or that it is a Dr 2-4 deposited at the time the enclosure was constructed.

HAMPshire

7 Riseley Farm. Rural settlement: one sherd from an Iron Age context, perhaps likelier to be Dr 2-4 (E.L. Morris pers comm).
HEREFORD AND WORCESTER

8 Kenchester. Rural settlement: some amphorae are identified as Dr 1 (Wilmott and Rahtz 1985, M2: D6-7 [= no 48]) but they do not occur in Iron Age contexts and are apparently featureless sherds. On the chronology presented the pieces could be Dr 1A and associated with occupation in the first half of the first century BC rather than later (ibid, 115-17). However, the authors of the structural report are very cautious as to the dating value of the sherds (ibid, 110-13, 115) and the identification of the sherds is open to question.

ISLE OF WIGHT

9 Redcliff. Rural settlement: three sherds described as Dr 1 in *Proc Prehist Soc* 45, 1979, 340 now seem more likely to be Dr 2-4 and possibly not necessarily of Iron Age date (D.J. Tomalin pers comm).

KENT

10 Canterbury - Rose Lane. Oppidum?: a find from the 'occupation layer' which Frere (1954, 111) described as *Cam* 181-4, but Thompson's description of it as 'reddish ... and full of shining white grits' suggests that it may be Catalanian (1982, 661) (*cf* App 3-4).
SUFFOLK


SUSSEX

12 Carne's Seat, Goodwood. Rural settlement: some vessels, if Iron Age imports, could be from Dr 1 or 2-4 (Holgate 1986, 45; no 58 above).

13 Oving, Copse Farm. Rural settlement: at least three vessels from Iron Age contexts (Williams in Bedwin and Holgate 1985, 236-8, M 24).

2.3 FINDS FOR WHICH THERE IS INADEQUATE INFORMATION

BEDFORDSHIRE

1 Old Warden. Burial: Dyer (1976, 16) states that a Dr 1 was found with the Old Warden I mirror. There is evidence for an amphora being found but not for its type. The dating of the mirror probably excludes Dr 1 (cf App 10, 1).

ESSEX

2 Danbury, Twitty Fee Camp. Rural settlement: one vessel. Hull suggests that if the sherd was from an amphora, of
which he was uncertain, then it may have been from a Dr 1 (1935-37, 113, 119). On the basis of the associated pottery this is likely to be true, but it has not proved possible to locate the sherd to verify the identification (cf Bull 1935-37 for the site).

3 Heybridge - Bouchernes Farm. Settlement?: part of an Italian Dr 1-4 perhaps of Iron Age date (Wickenden 1986, 62).

4 Marks Tey. Burial?: a group of 'tall red pots, about four feet high' were found in road works. Rodwell (1976a, 319; 1976b, 251) suggests they were Dr 1.

HERTFORDSHIRE

5 St Albans - Prae Wood. Oppidum?: some amphorae may be Dr 1 (Thompson 1982, 869-938. Haselgrove excludes this (1987a, 176), but it is not clear why.

6 Westmill. Burial?: Three amphorae, now lost, may have been Dr 1 (Peacock 1971, 185).

SUSSEX

7 Lancing Down. Settlement/shrine?: Haselgrove (1987a, 293) suggests that amphorae from the site could be Dr 1, but there is insufficient evidence, while the other finds might suggest a later date, if the amphorae are of Iron Age date.
2.4 CORRIGENDA

ESSEX

1 West Mersea. Thompson (1982, 860) states that there is a Dr 1B from the island, but the vessel, now in Mersea Museum, is an early Rhodian form and to judge from its encrustations and completeness is probably a modern introduction which was found in the Mediterranean. The first recorded location was at Bawdsey Manor, Suffolk and not Mersea Island (P.R. Sealey pers comm).

HERTFORDSHIRE

2 St Albans - King Harry Lane. Cemetery: a vessel earlier identified as Dr 1B by Rodwell (1976a, 321) and Stead (1976a, 402), has been reidentified as a southern Spanish vessel (Hülsen 1983, 28, n 43; App 7.4, 1).

2.5 FALSA

HERTFORDSHIRE

1 Datchworth. Whimster (1981, 374) states that there is a Dr 1B from Datchworth and cites Peacock (1971, 185) as evidence for this but Peacock makes no mention of this find.
Richborough. Cf App 14.6, 2.
APPENDIX 3

DRESSEL 2-4 AMPHORAE FOUND IN LATER
IRON AGE BRITAIN

3.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF DRESSEL 2-4 AMPHORAE

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

1 Dorton. Burial: one Italian and possibly also a southern Spanish but likelier Italian vessel (Farley 1983, 289-91, Fig 11, 2-3; Sealey 1985, 137-8).

DORSET

2 Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: one sherd from an Iron Age context (Williams 1987, 273).

3 Poole Harbour - Hamworthy. Settlement: some of the vessels could be Iron Age (Peacock 1971, 180).

ESSEX

4a Colchester - Lexden Tumulus. Burial: at least 11, possibly 13 vessels (Foster 1986, 124-32, Fig 40).

4b Colchester - Lexden Group 24 (St Clare Drive/Lexden Road). Burial: (Peacock 1971, 184), not certainly Iron Age.

4c Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum. At least two Cam 182 and one Cam 183 were stratified in Iron Age contexts (Hawkes
and Hull 1947, 251, 280).

5 Kelvedon. Rural settlement/village: (Eddy with Turner 1982, 28).

HAMPSHIRE

6 Silchester. Oppidum. At least two, perhaps three, vessels (Fulford with Corney 1984, 127-9; Fulford 1985a, 26, Fig 8, 24; cf Peacock 1971, 180) with further vessels from Fulford's recent excavations (J.R. Timby pers comm).

HERTFORDSHIRE

7a Braughing - Gatesbury Track. Oppidum? At least one vessel which is described as 'probably a Spanish imitation' but it is not clear if this means a Catalanian or Baetican source (Partridge 1979, 113-16).

7b Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum? At least four vessels (Peacock 1981, 201-4, Fig 81, 2-5).


9 St Albans - Wheathampstead. Settlement. Saunders and Havercroft suggest that some sherds may be Iron Age imports, possibly from the same vessel (1980-82, 18, 25, 30). Sherds from Feature 41 were the only imports associated with indigenous pottery while sherds from Feature 53 were associated with Roman material of post-conquest date. The two features are not in close proximity so the sherds may be from two vessels or the sherds in Feature 53 may be residual.
LEICESTERSHIRE

10 Leicester - Jewry Wall. Oppidum? One Catalonian vessel, perhaps an Iron Age import (Kenyon 1948, 134, Fig 36, 31; Jarvis 1986, 13, 15).

3.2 ITALIAN AMPHORAE FROM IRON AGE CONTEXTS WHICH MAY BE EITHER DR 2-4 OR DR 1.

Finds from Canterbury, Castle Dore, Canvey Island, Maiden Castle, South Benfleet, West Tilbury and Burgh-by-Woodbridge may be Dr 2-4 (cf App 2.2).

3.3 FINDS POSSIBLY OF IRON AGE DATE

BEDFORDSHIRE


ESSEX

2 Heybridge - The Towers. Burial? Sealey (1985, 137-8) and Wickenden suggests that a Dr 2-4 could be an Iron Age import as it is in Peacock's Fabric 3 and this does not occur in the Claudio-Neronian examples from Colchester-Sheepen (Wickenden 1986, 55, 62). However, this fabric
is always rare in Britain (Peacock 1971, 164), so it would be unwise to suggest that the Iron Age import of the Heybridge vessel is more than a possibility.

MIDDLESEX

3  Stanmore Park. Burial? A complete vessel stamped MAR·OF on the spike (Peacock 1971, 185). As this stamp occurs at Pompeii (Panella and Fano 1977, 162; App 14.5.2) it is uncertain if the Stanmore find is an Iron Age import.

SUFFOLK

4  Kedington. Burial? The vessel is in Bury St Edmunds Museum (contra Rodwell 1976a, 323), as it is complete it may be from a burial (Fell 1949). E.J. Owles suggests that the amphorae is south Italian (pers comm).

5  Stratford St Mary. Burial? Incorrectly attributed to Essex by Peacock (1971, 184) (cf Rodwell 1976a, 323). As it is complete it is likely to be from a burial but its date is unknown.
APPENDIX 4

PASCUAL 1 AMPHORAE FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

4.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF PASCUAL 1 AMPHORAE

DORSET

1 Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: at least one vessel from an Iron Age context (Williams 1981, 128; 1987, 272, Ill 190).

2 Maiden Castle. Hillfort. (N. Sharples pers comm).

3 Poole Harbour - Ower. Settlement. Forty-three sherds in Iron Age contexts (Williams 1981, 128; 1986, 42, Tab 1, Fig 42, 47-8, 51).

4 Poundsbury. Settlement: at least one vessel identified as Pascual 1, residual in later contexts (Green 1987, 117, M3: C1-4).

ESSEX

5 Thaxted. Burial: one vessel associated with a Dr 1B (Williams 1981, 130; App 2.1, 24). The association with the Dr 1B is confirmed by the museum register.

HAMPShIRE

6 Silchester. Oppidum (Fulford with Corney 1984, 253; Fulford 1987, 275).

ISLE OF WIGHT

Knighton. Rural settlement (ibid).

4.2 CATALONIAN AMPHORAE FROM IRON AGE CONTEXTS WHICH COULD BE
PASCUAL 1 OR DRESSEL 2-4.

CORNWALL

Castle Dore. Hillfort, one vessel. Williams (in Quinnell and Harris 1985, 130) suggests that the piece is a Pascual 1 but the sherd is an undiagnostic neck sherd (Truro Mus).

DORSET

Gussage Hill. Settlement, surface find (J.C. Barrett pers comm).

Maiden Castle. Hillfort (N. Sharples pers comm).

Weymouth Bay. ?Wreck. Catalonian (in Williams Fabric 2) rather than Dr 1 as suggested by Peacock (1971, 180) and Fitzpatrick (1985a, 323). Stamped P (Damon 1890; App 14.4.1).

ESSEX

Ardleigh. Settlement: one vessel (J. Hinchliffe pers
6a Colchester - Colonia. Settlement: Williams following Hawkes and Hull (1947, 214) suggested that the find was unlocalised (1981, 130) but it is possible to locate the findspot as within the Colonia (P.R. Sealey pers comm). As Dr 1 have been found at the Colonia (App 2.1, 11a) the possibility that this find is an Iron Age import must be considered. Stamped BV. BI (App 14.5, 1).

6b Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum. One handle (Sealey 1985, 102).

HAMPshire

7 Silchester. Oppidum: From Fulford's excavations (J.R. Timby pers comm).

KENT

8 Canterbury - Rose Lane. Oppidum? One find listed above as Dr 1 or 2-4 could possibly be Catalanian (cf App 2.2, 10).

4.3 FINDS FOR WHICH THERE IS INADEQUATE INFORMATION

CORNWALL

1 Castle Gotha. Settlement (Round). One rim which could just possibly be Pascual 1 but the fabric appears to be southern Spanish. If the vessel is Pascual 1, then it is
likely to be an Iron Age import (Saunders and Harris 1982, 143, no 88, Fig 16, 6).

GLOUCESTERSHIRE

2 Bagendon. Oppidum?: sherds ascribed to Pascual 1 by Williams (1981, 130 - the same pieces as Peacock 1971, 181, no 4) but they could as easily be Dr 2-4 and as the stratification of the pieces is not given by Clifford (1961, 230), they could be of Romano-British date (cf Trow 1982b).
APPENDIX 5

RHODIAN AMPHORAE FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

5.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF RHODIAN AMPHORAE

ESSEX

1 Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: one vessel from Iron Age contexts (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 280).

2 Kelvedon. Rural settlement/village (Rodwell 1976a, 322).

5.2 FALSA

ESSEX

1 Colchester - Lexden Tumulus. Burial: one vessel described as Rhodian by (Peacock 1971, 183) but rejected by Williams (in Foster 1986, 125, 132).
APPENDIX 6

OLIVE OIL AMPHORAE FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

6.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF OBERADEN 83 AMPHORAE

DORSET

1. Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: one olive oil amphora sherd from a late Iron Age 1 context (Williams 1987, 273) which suggests that it is from an Oberaden 83, but the dating to the first half of the first century BC is unlikely to be correct.

ESSEX

2. Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: two vessels, from Roman contexts but probably Iron Age imports (Sealey 1985, 67-9, Fig 10, 79-80). There are at least two rims from the 1930s excavations.

HERTFORDSHIRE

3. Braughing - Gatesbury Track. Oppidum?: one vessel (Partridge 1979, 114, Fig 34, 4).

6.2 DRESSEL 20

CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF DRESSEL 20 AMPHORAE

DORSET

1 Hengistbury Head. Oppidum?: three sherds from Late Iron Age 2 contexts (Williams 1987, 273; Williams and Peacock 1983, 276).

2a Poole Harbour - Hamworthy. Settlement: some vessels may be of Iron Age date (Peacock 1971, 180).

2b Poole Harbour - Ower. Settlement: Williams and Peacock (1983, 276) are cautious whether any of the finds are Iron Age but Peacock (1984, 40) is more confident even though the published account is not clear on this point (Williams 1986, Tab 1).

ESSEX

3 Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum?: At least two vessels from Hawkes and Hull's excavations (1947, 280), it cannot be distinguished if these are the same as the Oberaden 81 rims mentioned above (App 6.1.2)


5 Naezingbury. Rural settlement: one vessel (Huggins 1978, 76, 78).

6 Wickford. Rural settlement: one vessel (Rodwell 1976a, 322).
HAMPSHIRE


8 Silchester. Oppidum: present in Iron Age contexts (J. R. Timby pers comm).

HERTFORDSHIRE

9a Braughing - Gatesbury. Settlement: some Dr 20 may be Iron Age imports (Partridge 1981, 334-5).

9b Braughing - Gatesbury Track. Oppidum?: a number from Iron Age contexts, (Partridge 1979, 113-16).

10 Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: at least two vessels and in terms of quantity the most common amphora (Peacock 1981, 201-2, Fig 81, 1).


ISLE OF WIGHT

12 Redcliff. Rural settlement: two sherds which may be Iron Age imports (D. J. Tomalin pers comm).

KENT

LEICESTERSHIRE

14  Leicester - Blackfriars Street. Oppidum?: one vessel (Clay and Mellor 1985, 49).

SOUTH HUMBERSIDE

15  Dragonby. Settlement: May claims one vessel as an Iron Age import (1976, 188, Fig 95, 6) but typologically the rim is Flavian or later (cf Martin-Kilcher 1983; 1987 Bell 1) and Williams and Peacock do not regard any of the finds as Iron Age (1983, 276). The associated finds suggest a Romano-British date (cf App 26.1, 48), however, Elsdon (pers comm) suggests some finds are Iron Age.

6.3 FINDS PREVIOUSLY SUGGESTED TO BE OF IRON AGE DATE

AVON

1  Camerton. Settlement: Wedlake, followed by Peacock (1971, 182) suggests that amphorae occur in Iron Age levels. Only one vessel is cited (Wedlake 1958, 33, 41) but the context, and probably also the vessel, which is repaired with lead rivets, are post-conquest (ibid, 154, Fig 56, 273 A).
APPENDIX 7

AMPHORAE FOR FISH-BASED PRODUCTS FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

7.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF BELTRÁN I AMPHORAE

CAMBRIDGESHIRE


DORSET

2 Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: four sherds from late Iron Age 1 contexts which are unlikely to be dated correctly and another four from later Iron Age 2 (Williams 1987, 273) plus further possible finds from the earlier excavations (Peacock 1971, 181).

ESSEX

3a Colchester - Lexden Group 13. Burial: one vessel. As most of the burials in the cemetery are Iron Age (Foster 1986, 1, Fig 2), this find may be also.

3b Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: one vessel (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 280).

4 Kelvedon. Rural settlement/village: at least one vessel (Rodwell 1976a, 322).

5 Layer-de-la-Haye. Settlement. Identified as Cam 185b, a form which may not have existed, but the fabric identified as Beltrán I (Turner, Turner and Major 1983, 132).
HAMPSHIRE

6 Silchester. Oppidum: (Fulford with Corney 1984, 253; further finds from the recent excavations (J.R. Timby pers comm)).

HERTFORDSHIRE

7a Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: at least six vessels (Peacock 1981, 202, Fig 7-11).

7b Braughing - Station Road. Oppidum?: one vessel? (Partridge 1979, 48).

8 St Albans. Oppidum?: sherds apparently from pre-conquest deposits (Rodwell 1976a, 324) but this is not clear from Frere's publications (1983; 1984a, 249).

7.2 FINDS POSSIBLY OF IRON AGE DATE

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

1 Wavendon Heath. Burial?: a nearly complete vessel probably from a burial but not certainly of Iron Age date (Peacock 1971, 182).

ESSEX

2 Colchester Area. Burial?: a complete vessel (Parker 1973, Fig 17), so probably from a burial, but of uncertain date.
3 Rivenhall End. Burial?: a near complete vessel, probably from a burial (Rodwell 1976a, 322; Peacock 1974, 242; Rodwell and Rodwell 1986, 19) but whose date is not known.

SUFFOLK

4 Cavendish. Burial?: a complete example, perhaps from a burial (Ipswich Mus, unpub; H.A. Feldman pers comm), but of unknown date.

7.3 DRESSEL 9

ESSEX


2 Mount Bures. Burial: four vessels (Smith 1852; cp von Schnurbein 1979, Bld 41) associated with a probable Dr 1B (App 2.1, 18).

7.4 UNIDENTIFIED SOUTH SPANISH AMPHORAE FOR FISH-BASED PRODUCTS OF IRON AGE DATE

HERTFORDSHIRE

1 St Albans - King Harry Lane. Cemetery (Hülsen 1983, 28, n 43; cf App 2.4, 2).
LEICESTERSHIRE

2 Leicester - Jewry Wall. Oppidum?: one vessel, probably from an Iron Age context (Jewry Wall Mus, unpub).

7.5 VESSELS FOR SOUTHERN SPANISH FISH-BASED PRODUCTS SUGGESTED TO BE OF IRON AGE DATE, BUT WHICH ARE PROBABLY ROMANO-BRITISH

ESSEX

1 Southend. Burial?: Rodwell (1976a, 310) suggests that the burial is of Iron Age date, but as Thompson has shown (1982, 827), it was probably deposited in the Romano-British period.

HAMPSHIRE

2 Silchester. Oppidum: two vessels, but both are apparently from Roman levels (Peacock 1971, 181).
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APPENDIX 8

HALTERN 70 AMPHORAE FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

8.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF HALTERN 70 AMPHORAE

CAMBRIDGESHIRE


DORSET

2 Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: one vessel from an Iron Age context (Williams 1987, 273), this could be the same vessel mentioned by Peacock (1971, 181).

ESSEX

3a Colchester - Lexden Group 21 (St Clare Drive). Burial: Thompson (1982, 765) suggests that it was associated with a Dr 1B but Peacock (1971, 184) does not support this and there is no documentary proof of the association (cf Sealey 1985, 148-9). As the Dr 1 is stamped it is unusual that such an association would not have been mentioned by Hull (Colchester Mus Rep 1932, 26, 32, 35, Pl VIII, 1-2; Parker 1973, 371, Fig 20).

3b Colchester - Lexden Group 23 (Lexden Park House). Burial: a separate find from the above (Parker 1973, Fig
19; P.R. Sealey pers comm). As most of the finds from the cemetery are later Iron Age (Foster 1986, Fig 2) this find may be also.

3c Colchester-Sheepen. Oppidum: one vessel (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 280).

GLOUCESTERSHIRE

4 Bagendon. Oppidum?: at least one vessel may be an Iron Age import (Clifford 1961, 230, 256; Peacock 1971, 180, n 1).

HAMPSHIRE

5 Silchester. Oppidum: present in Iron Age contexts (J.R. Timby pers comm).

HERTFORDSHIRE

6 Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: one vessel (Peacock 1981, 202, Fig 81, 6).

8.2 FINDS POSSIBLY OF IRON AGE DATE

ESSEX

8.3 VESSELS PROBABLY NOT OF IRON AGE DATE

CORNWALL

1 St Mawgan in Pydar. Rural settlement: probably Romano-British (Peacock 1971, 180).

8.4 FINDS OF UNCERTAIN DATE

A vessel from the Channel, perhaps from a wreck, may be of Iron Age or Romano-British date (Harmand 1966).
APPENDIX 9

DRESSEL 6 AMPHORAE FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

9.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF DRESSEL 6 AMPHORAE

HERTFORDSHIRE


APPENDIX 10

UNIDENTIFIED AMPHORAE FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

BEDFORDSHIRE

1. Old Warden I. Burial: an amphorae found with one of the mirror burials (Dyer 1976, 16; cf App 2.3, 1).

2. Old Warden - Quints Hill. Burial: two amphorae, described as 'earthern urns of large size, with long handles' (Dryden 1845, 20).

CAMBRIDGESHIRE


CORNWALL

4. Castle Dore. Hillfort: three unidentified amphora fragments, from different vessels from three different sources (Truro Mus, unpub; Quinnell and Harris 1985, 129).

DORSET

5. Poole Harbour - Ower. Settlement: four sherds (Williams 1986, 79, Tab 1).
GLOUCESTERSHIRE

6 Bagendon. Oppidum?: some vessels from Period II (Clifford 1961, 230) could be Iron Age imports (Peacock 1971, 180-1).

HAMPSHIRE

7 Silchester. Oppidum: (Fulford 1985a, 26, Fig 8, 23) one vessel. The rim is comparable to Richborough 527 but the fabric is apparently not that of the Richborough 527.

HERTFORDSHIRE

8a Braughing - Gatesbury Track. Oppidum?: a number of unassigned sherds from Iron Age contexts (Partridge 1979, 113, 116).

8b Braughing - Station Road. Oppidum?: a number of unassigned sherds from vessels probably of Iron Age date (ibid, 48).

9 St Albans - Prae Wood. Oppidum?: a number of amphorae probably from Iron Age contexts (Thompson 1982, 883, 896, 901, 907, 934).

KENT

10 Canterbury - Rose Lane. Oppidum?: two vessels (Thompson 1982, 661).
APPENDIX 11

SELECTED PRE-CLAUDIAN AMPHORAE NOT YET FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

This appendix details, in the same format as that employed in the main text in Chapter 2, the more common types of amphorae which have not yet been found in British later Iron Age contexts, but whose discovery may be anticipated. The appendix does not attempt an exhaustive analysis of all pre-Claudian amphorae types and types whose presence in Iron Age Britain seems unlikely on the basis of the evidence currently available are not considered. However, the justification for a type's inclusion is presented in each case.

11.1. LAMBOGLIA 2

This amphora is of later Republican date and contained wine from southern Italy.

Typology

The vessel characteristically has a small bulbous body with a marked shoulder carination. There is a short spike. The neck is quite long and widens at the mouth which has a simple triangular or near vertical rim. The handles are long and heavy, oval in section and curve away slightly from the body.
Provenance

Lamboglia 2 and Dr 6 have frequently been confused. It is evident that there is some typological similarity between the two and it appears that they do occur in the same fabric (Riley 1979). They are often considered together (eg Baldacci 1972a; 1972b; Peacock and Williams 1986, Class 8), but it is difficult to justify this as the Lamboglia 2 is earlier than Dr 6 and thought to have been made in Apulia in southern Italy and not northern Italy (Peacock and Williams 1986, 99; cf Ch 2.5, 2). The attribution to Apulia is in part due to the uncertainty over the products of the kiln at Apani near Brindisi. These appear to have been the 'Brindisi oil-amphorae' but Sciarri (1972) appears to suggest that Lamboglia 2 were also made there (Tchernia 1986, 54-5; cf App 11.2). Consideration of the fabric does suggest a source in southern Italy (Formenti, Hesnard and Tchernia 1978) but it has not been demonstrated conclusively.

Contents

In publishing amphorae from the Albegna wreck Lamboglia cautiously suggested that the type contained oil and subsequently it became known as the 'Albegna oil amphorae' or Lamboglia 2. As the type is, apparently, found widely in northern Italy, and the type is found at Delos where a collegium of olearii is attested epigraphically, Lamboglia's suggestion appeared to be supported (Tchernia 1969, 492, 498). However, the analysis of a Lamboglia 2 from the La Cavalière wreck by gas chromatography suggested that the amphora contained wine (Formenti, Hesnard and Tchernia 1978) and probably never oil as the amphora also has a resinous lining.
which is presently unknown in oil amphorae (Charlin, Gassend and Lequément 1978, 21-2).

The demonstration that the Lamboglia 2 was probably a wine amphora casts the relationship with the Dr 6 in further doubt as the Dr 6 is usually taken to be an oil amphora. However, as is argued above (Ch 2.5, 2), it seems likely that Dr 6 was not just manufactured in Istria but also in Cisalpine Gaul and contained wine as well as oil, the two types cannot be so easily disassociated. The capacity of one Lamboglia 2 from the La Cavalière wreck was 27L but it was slightly smaller than most on the wreck (Charlin, Gassend and Lequément 1978, 18), while there is a volume-weight ratio of 1.62L/Kg (Parker 1987, 268).

Chronology

The best dating evidence comes from wrecks as Lamboglia 2 are associated with Dr 1A and also Dr 1B (Tab 2) but they also occur at Athens in contexts dating to the last quarter of the second century BC (Tchernia 1986, 55). In the wrecks containing Dr 1B, Lamboglia 2 are only a minor part of the cargo (Charlin, Gassend and Lequément 1978). The latest wreck is the Tremiti Islands wreck of c 30 BC (Freschi 1982; Carre 1985, 211). The amphora appears to be generally absent from Augustan contexts with the latest find known being of early Augustan date (Tchernia 1986, 127).
Distribution

Little is known of the Lamboglia 2 outside of the Mediterranean world. Finds are known in the western Mediterranean and also in Spain (Beltrán-Lloris 1970) and particularly in the eastern Mediterranean (Tchernia 1986, 68-74), but their apparent rarity in France (two in Vienne Museum (op cit 69)) is in conspicuous contrast to their frequency as finds in wrecks off the French coasts, if not necessarily as an important component of the cargo. This may be partly explicable by conflation of Lamboglia 2, not with Dr 6, but with Dr 1A. The handles, necks and rims of Dr 1A and Lamboglia 2 are quite similar and without adequate fabric descriptions of most French finds, it seems likely that at least some Lamboglia 2 have been conflated with Dr 1A. Only one find is certainly known in Britain. There is a complete vessel in Ipswich museum but there are no records of its discovery and as there is a substantial collection of Italian antiquities in the museum it is possible that it is a modern introduction. A number of what have been identified as Dr 1A in Britain occur in what is described as an atypical streaky fabric (Danebury, Gussage All Saints, Hamworthy and Knighton), although these vessels are suggested, not necessarily correctly, as Dr 1A (Williams 1984a, M8: D13-E3; Ch 26.1 above) it may be wondered if some are not Dr 1, if they are Lamboglia 2. Vessels of this type from the La Cavalière wreck are described as having a very light brown, fine fabric with light yellow to brown surfaces. The only inclusions are described as being ochre-red and large nodules of red clay are also sometimes found. These could reflect the decayed lava up to 5mm across.
It is evident that the provenance of the Lamboglia 2 is not fully understood and its typology is still confused. While wrecks show it to have been an important later Republican amphorae it remains rare as a (land) site find. This seems likely to be due in part to the uncertainty which surrounds it and its widespread identification in France and perhaps also in Britain is to be anticipated.

11.2 BRINDISI

The type has a pear-shaped body and terminates in a small knob. The handles are circular in section and quite heavy. The neck is quite short and the rim is quite simple. The handles are often stamped. Will (McMann, Bourgeois and Will 1977, 294-6) distinguishes two variants, her Type 11a and 11b. The latter variety is similar in form but is characteristically much heavier in appearance particularly in its handles.

Provenance

A kiln is known at Apani, north of Brindisi. This has never been reported satisfactorily but a number of writers have commented on it (Will 1962; McMann, Bourgeois and Will 1977; Sciarra 1962; 1964; 1972; Baldacci 1972a). All agree that 'Brindisi' amphorae were made at the site but Will (1979, 350, n 41) states that Dr 1B and other types were made at the site. Sciarri (1972) appears to suggest that Lamboglia 2 were also made there. Will also suggests that there may be kilns at Lecce (1979, 349). It has been suggested that 'Brindisi' amphorae stamped M. TVCCI. LF. TRO
GALEONIS were made at the Apani kilns (Tchernia 1968-70) but Will (McMann, Bourgeois and Will 1977, 294-6) has argued that the fabric is not the same as finds from Apani, and that while the finds are related they belong to a different variant of the Brindisi jars and are later in date. These doubts are reinforced by Peacock and Williams's suggestion that the petrology of one 'Tuccius' vessel indicates a Campanian origin (1986, 69).

Contents

The contents are not known. Olive oil is usually suggested (eg Baldacci 1972a) but wine has also been proposed (Panella 1973) and if Dr 1B and perhaps Lamboglia 2 were produced at Apani this would support the latter suggestion. I am not aware of any published capacities.

Chronology

If Will's distinction between her 11a and 11b is accepted then it appears to be chronological. Type 11a is found in contexts dating to the first quarter of the first century BC but appears to be absent from the refoundation of Corinth in 44 BC. Type 11b, by contrast, does not appear at Delos which suggests that it did not appear until the mid-first century BC and it occurs at Corinth and also in the Planier III wreck (McMann, Bourgeois and Will 1977, 295). The type is found in both the early first century AD La Longarina and La Favorite deposits but it is rare (Hesnard 1980, 148, Pl VI, 3; Becker et al 1986, 80, Fig 13, 10-11). This distinction between the two varieties is important as the 'true' 'Brindisi' amphorae, Will's Type 11a, disappears in the mid-first
century BC but cannot be used to date all 'Brindisi'-like amphorae.

Distribution and Commentary

Type 11a appears to have a primarily eastern distribution, while on the basis of the 'Tuccius' stamps, 11b has a wider western distribution and is not uncommon in France (Tchernia, 1968-70, 60; Roman 1983, Fig 55). In view of the uncertainty over the products of the Apani kilns, it does not seem likely that the type has always been identified correctly while the apparent dating of the Type 11b later than the accepted dating for 'Brindisi' amphorae may hint that it has been identified as other types. As Will has pointed out there seems to be some typological relationship between her Type 11b and, especially, Oberaden 83 and Dr 20 ((McMann, Bourgeois and Will 1977, 295) and, it may be suggested, with Dr 26 also. It is possible that the 'Brindisi' 11b develops into the Dr 26 during the Augustan period but unfortunately the provenance of the Dr 26 is poorly known.

Galliou has stated that a number of Brindisi gréco-italiques have been found in western France (1982, 23) but it is not clear what type of amphorae he means. If 'Brindisi' amphorae are excluded, as appears to be the case, then it is possible that they are Lamboglia 2 (cf Fitzpatrick 1985a, 307) but is must be wondered if Brindisi amphorae are not intended even if termed incorrectly and also if the amphorae are correctly identified? 'Brindisi' Type 11a amphorae were certainly traded widely in the later Republic particularly in the eastern Mediterranean. They appear to be rare in western wrecks and as French site finds, but it is one of the amphora types presently absent in Iron Age Britain which is likely
to be found. The extent to which the later (?) Campanian Type 11b
was traded, and also its relationship to the 'true' 'Brindisi'
Type 11a, remain quite uncertain and require further research.
Misidentification with Oberaden 83 seems quite likely.

11.3 DRESSEL 26

Typology

The type has a large 'bag'-like body with a tapering base and
small spike. There are short, heavy, handles placed high on the
shoulder and meet the short neck just below the simple collar rim.
At La Longarina two sizes were represented, one apparently a
half-size although it was rare there (2 of 27). Considerable
confusion surrounds the type (Tchernia 1967, 222).

Provenance and Contents

Neither the provenance or contents of the Dr 26 are known. An
Italian provenance has been suggested by Zevi (1966, 24-5) but
this is based solely on its occurrence in Rome, Ostia, Pompeii and
Campania. Hesnard has suggested that it might be from Venafrum
and may have contained Venafrum olive oil for which there is
literary evidence but otherwise no epigraphical or archaeological
evidence (1980, 150). The La Longarina finds do not have a
resinous lining, which is compatible with oil as their contents,
and this is supported by analyses (ibid). No capacities have yet
been published.
Chronology

The finds from La Longarina are the earliest finds and the relatively large numbers there suggest that it was well established by the first decade AD. The latest finds are from Pompeii (Panella 1977, 142, Pl LXVII, 34).

Distribution and Commentary

The type is presently restricted to Italy. It is possible that the type is being conflated with Dr 20 or, as earlier confusion shows, with cylindrical Tripolitanian amphorae (Tchernia 1967, 222). Equally the possible relation between it and the 'Brindisi' amphora of Will's Type 1b which may be its typological predecessor is unclear. If Dr 26 did contain olive oil it seems that it was dwarfed by the export of Dr 20 and it seems unlikely, but not impossible, that it reached Iron Age Britain.

11.4 TRIPOLITANIAN AMPHORAE

Introduction

A variety of cylindrical amphorae were made in Tripolitania throughout the first four centuries AD. The earliest type, I, occurs in the La Longarina deposit.

Typology

The type has a long cylindrical body and tapers to a hollow point.
The handles which are short and quite heavy are set high on the shoulder and return to the short neck just below the simple collared rim.

Provenance

The type is certainly Tripolitanian as a number of kilns in Libya which produced types are known (Arthur 1982b) while thin-sectioning has distinguished two fabrics, one of which is probably from a coastal region (Peacock and Williams 1986, 167-8).

Contents

Panella has argued that the various types contained olive oil (1973; 1977) and this is supported by the discovery of oil processing plants at a number of sites in Libya.

Chronology and Commentary

The finds from La Longarina are apparently the earliest known (Hesnard 1980, 148, Pl VI, 4) but the type has a very long life over at least 300 years. The principal distribution appears to have been in the eastern Mediterranean and it appears unlikely that they will have reached Iron Age Britain (cf App 11.6). Hesnard suggests that another vessels from La Longarina is a Tripolitanian II amphora (op cit, 150, Pl VII, 4) but it is unlike vessels of this form and may actually be related to Neo-Punic vessels of van der Werff's Type 3 (1977-78).
11.5 KINGSHOLM 117

Typology

The type is cigar-shaped with a tapering bottom with a small terminal knob. There is no neck, the body narrows to a small, everted rim. The mouth is quite wide and there are two lug-shaped handles. The surface is rilled. The type has been dubbed Kingsholm 117 by Darling and Sealey (Sealey 1985, 89). It is possible that earlier vessels may be rather more squat (cp Becker et al 1986, 86, Fig 17, 2; 18, 6).

Provenance

The fabric is very similar to that of the Cam 189 and it seems likely that it was made in the same general region, ie the southern and/or eastern Mediterranean (Peacock and Williams 1986, 217) although Becker et al suggest a Spanish as well as north Africa source (1986, 86).

Contents

As with the Cam 189, tituli picti appear to be absent, so the only evidence for the contents comes from the vessels themselves. One vessel on the late first century BC La Tradelière wreck contained dates (Joncheray 1973a, 36-7; Fiori and Joncheray 1975, 62, Pl 1, 8) but this seems to be the only positive information available. Some of the unpublished analyses on what were taken to be Cam 189 cited by Sealey and which indicated that wine and oil were carried could relate to the Kingsholm 117 (1985, 88). The rilling on the
type might be thought to align it with a number of vessels considered to have contained dates. However, many later Roman amphorae from the eastern Mediterranean contained wine or oil (Peacock and Williams 1986, classes 43-4, 46, 48-9), so caution should be exercised in considering the Kingsholm's 117 contents. No capacities have yet been published.

Chronology

The earliest find is probably that from the La Tradelière wreck which probably dates to between 20 and 10 BC (Gallia 33, 1975, 603). There is a find from the early first century AD at Lyon, la Favorite deposit (Becker et al 1986, 86, Fig 17.2; 18, 6) and vessels also occur on the Tiberian (Joncheray 1973a, 22-3, 28-9; contra Sealey's 1985, 89 dating) Dramont D wreck. The eponymous vessel from Kingsholm (Hurst 1985, 75, Fig 28, 117) is probably of Neronian date, and is notable for its rarity as a site find although there may be another find from Cirencester. The type may be present at Dangstetten (Fingerlin 1986, 99, Abb 268, 69) and Oberaden (App 13.1). It is possible (but impossible to prove as the vessel was destroyed in the Second World War) that a vessel from Haltern was a Kingsholm 117 (Loeschke 1909, 317-18, Taf XXXIII, 12 a-d). Loeschke included the vessel with earlier medieval material but considered that it might be Roman, hoping for a better dating for the type. Loeschke describes the fabric as a red-brown. Schönberger and Simon (1976, 114, Anm 769) suggest that the Haltern vessel may be a Cam 189 but the handles are too large, while the small knobbed base not only excludes Cam 189 but also the possibility that they are from an amphora of Punic Tradition as these vessels have basal spikes (van der Werff
1977-78). Schönberger and Simon identify one rim sherd and numerous body sherds of what they take to be a Cam 189 (1976, 114, not illustrated). These could be Cam 189 but their identification as Kingsholm 117 is as likely.

There are a number of small storage vessels on Augustan sites which have a very similar mouth to the Kingsholm 117 (Vegas 1975, 43, 70, Taf 21, 27; 34, 14) and it is possible that the vessels may have been confused while their relationship to the small amphorae from the Aquitaine is also unclear (Santrot and Santrot 1979, 213-14, Pl 511).

Commentary

Virtually nothing is known of the type's distribution, but its presence on the La Tradelière wreck and in the la Favorite deposit and its possible presence at Haltern, and perhaps Rödgen, indicate that it may be found in Iron Age Britain.

11.6 'NEO-PUNIC'

The class has a long cylindrical body with a long spike. There are two small handles and a short expanding neck. The type has been fully discussed by van der Werff who has distinguished three principal types. Of these three only his classes 1 and 2 are likely to have possibly reached Britain. Type 1 has handles which are slightly everted while the rim flares outwards and sometimes has a flange and was stamped occasionally on the body. Type 2 has a slightly longer spike, the handles are symmetrical and the rim is a simple band (van der Werff 1977-78). Guerrero Ayuso has also
discussed these vessels (1986) but subdivides Mafia's original two types into six which seems overly-complicated, especially as the two typologies are essentially similar and van der Werff's approach is preferred here although it should be noted that Guerrero Ayuso's C2c type appears not to be found in northern Africa (op cit, Fig 16) and may ultimately prove to be a separate type.

Provenance

A kiln which produced Type 1 is known at Kouaess, near Tangiers in Morocco and others are suspected near the Atlantic coast of Mauretania Tingitana, while on the basis of the numbers found at Carthage van der Werff and Guerrero Ayuso also suggest production there (van der Werff 1977-78, 177; Guerrero Ayuso 1986, 163-7, Fig 13). Also on the grounds of the numbers found there, van der Werff suggests that Type 2 were also produced in Tunisia between Sousse, Sfax and El Jem and Guerrero Ayuso follows this. Van der Werff also suggests that the type may have been produced in Tripolitania too (op cit, 179). Van der Werff publishes thin sections and chemical analyses of the three types found at Utiza, 17km south of Sousse, and distinguishes three major categories but he was unable to localise these fabrics. His Fabrics A and C appear to be homogenous while B was rather less so. Types 2 and 3 occurred in all three fabrics but Type 1 only in his Fabric A which he regards as Carthaginian. As all the analyses are from one site it is difficult to assess the significance of these associations in view of van der Werff's suggestion that the forms were made across northern Africa. Nonetheless the work holds out considerable promise.
The commodities contained are not known, however, van der Werff suggests that the Morrocan finds may have contained salazones and fragmentary epigraphic evidence (*CIL* XV, 4730) supports this (Guerrero Ayuso 1986, 167-8, 175, 177). The Kouass kiln is only 500m from a fish-processing site with which van der Werff suggests it may be contemporary (van der Werff 1977-78, 182, n 70). Van der Werff suggests that oil may have been carried in the eastern products but wine is also a possibility (Guerrero Ayuso 1986). No capacities have been published.

**Chronology**

Type 1 was current by the mid-second century BC and also appears in a number of Augustan contexts but not in later ones and Guerrero Ayuso suggests a range of 125-50/30 BC (1986, 174-5). Type 2 appears to be contemporary with Type 1 although it may commence slightly earlier, but Type 3 appears to antedate both 1 and 2, at least in its export.

**Distribution**

Van der Werff has published excellent, quantified, distribution maps for each of the types (1977-78, Fig 9, 11, 13) which have been added to by Guerrero Ayuso (1986)). As already noted Type 1 has a markedly western distribution (*cf* Guerrero Ayuso 1986, Fig 14-16) which, in conjunction with its occurrence at Utiza only in Fabric A, suggests that it may be Morrocan. In comparison, Type 2 has a restricted distribution in the central Mediterranean with
finds in Europe primarily in France and, in contrast to Type 1, only one Spanish find, at Ampurias. Type 3 has a very similar distribution.

Finds in non-Mediterranean France are rare, known only at Mt Beuvray for Type 1 and for Type 2 at Mt Beuvray again and in Tournus Museum but there may be a find from Danstetten (Fingerlin 1986, 202, Abb 544, 130).

Commentary

Van der Werff's publication has received comparatively little attention, but the widespread distribution of Type 1 and to a lesser extent Type 2 in the later Republican period contemporary with Dr 1 and with which they are associated in wrecks (Guerrero Ayuso 1986) and which did reach northern Europe, suggests that it could have reached the same areas, if only in small quantities. As the class is poorly known misidentification is likely and van der Werff himself *(op cit, 182, n 69)* confuses some vessels with Kingsholm 117. As Type 2 occurs at La Longarina (Hesnard 1980, 150, Pl VII, 3 and possibly Type 1 as well, *ibid* Pl VII, 4) in addition to the French sites and as the possible presence of the species at Danstetten and perhaps Haltern has to be considered *(cf App 11.5)*, then its occurrence in Augustan or earlier contexts in Iron Age Britain is possible. Arthur has suggested that a handle fragment from Canterbury found in a later first century AD is from a 'neo-Punic' vessel and probably of Iron Age date (Arthur 1986, 252, Fig 6, 49). However, north African, probably Tripolitanian, vessels are known from later first century contexts from at least four sites in Britain (M.J. Darling pers comm; eg Cunliffe 1971, 208, Fig 148.3) and in view of the date of the
context in which the Canterbury handle was found, it may be likelier that it is from one of these vessels.

11.7 DRESSEL 21-22

Typology

The type has a cylindrical body which tapers to a solid spike. The neck and mouth are comparatively wide. The rim is generally of simple, rounded form. The handles are short but are quite heavy.

Provenance and Contents

Thin-sectioning suggests an origin for some vessels in Campania or Lazio (Peacock and Williams 1986, 97; Becker et al 1986) and tituli picti suggest an origin in the same region (Zevi 1966, 222). Beltrán-Lloris has drawn attention to what appear to be Catalanian vessels (1970, no 198) while Baetican production is apparently also attested (Hesnard 1980, 156, no 100). As Callender showed quite clearly, these vessels appear to have contained fruit (1965, 13-14). The tituli picti on which this evidence is based are Italian.

Chronology, Distribution and Commentary

The form appears to be of first century AD date, becoming increasingly common in the second half of it. The finds from La Longrina and la Favorite appear to be the earliest known. The
distribution of the type has never been studied systematically but it appears to be very rare outside of Italy and the Mediterranean littoral. There is a find from Lyon (Desbat and Picon 1986, Fig 2, 9; Becker et al 1986, 86, Fig 17, 1) and although a find has recently been recognised from a Roman context at Colchester (P.R. Sealey pers comm), at present it seems unlikely that the form reached Iron Age Britain, however, as both the La Longarina and Lyon finds are Augustan it remains possible that it may have done.

11.8 DRESSEL 12

Typology

The Dressel 12 has a narrow, almost cylindrical body with a short, solid, spike. The handles are heavy and quite long, often with external grooves. The rim is collar-like and slightly flared and is similar to that of the Dr 9 but lacks the thickening at the top.

Provenance

The type is usually taken to be southern Iberian (Beltrán-Lloris 1970) and it was certainly made at the El Rinconcillo kiln near Algeciras (Peacock 1974, 241).

Contents

Tituli picti indicate that the type contained fish-based products (Zevi 1966, 246; Beltrán-Lloris 1970, 454) and one vessel from the
Titan wreck contained what appeared to have been Tunny (Tailliez 1961, 184-5). Although one find from Rome has a titulus pictus which suggests that it contained fruit (mella; CIL IV, 2, 5742), Beltrán-Lloris suggests that the form may have been misidentified. No capacities have yet been published.

Chronology

The earliest securely dated Dr 12 was found on the Titan wreck of mid-first century BC date. Parker has suggested that the type could be as early as c 100 BC but neither the identification nor the association of the Mahdia find is certain (1972, 228) and it seems unlikely that the type is so early particularly as it is absent from the Cáceres el Viejo fortress (Ulbert 1985). The type is associated with Dr 1B on the Fos 1 (Giacobi-Lequémant 1987, 183, Fig 11, 4) and the Cap Bear III (Colls 1986, Fig 37, A) wrecks. Nonetheless, its development in the second quarter of the first century BC seems likely (Parker op cit). Beltrán suggests that the type continued into the second century AD but as Ettlinger notes it seems to be rare in northern Europe (1977, 11) and where it is found and is dateable, it is of first century BC date (Dangstetten: Fingerlin 1986, eg 94, Abb 244, 50, Taf 32; Goeblingen-Noespelt: Thill 1967a, 208, Taf III, 9; XII; Mt Beuvray, Bulliot 1899, Pl XIX, 2 (identification not certain); Steinfort: Engling 1856, 17, Pl II, 1-5 (two vessels, ?burial)). It certainly occurs at Pompeii and Herculanium and in the early first century AD deposit at La Longarina (Hesnard 1980, 148). This suggests that the type is being misidentified, possibly as Dr 9 or Cam 186A (Var A), in northern Europe. A less likely
explanation is that its absence is due to a dislike of its contents.

Distribution and Commentary

For the above reasons it is possible that the rarity in Europe may be more apparent than real. Similarly, its dating is not entirely clear and needs further study: it may prove to be early in the *salazones* series. Although not yet recognised in Iron Age Britain it is likely to be indistinguishable from other southern Iberian vessels in fabric and is one of the types not yet found in Britain which is likely to be. Why the Dr 12 should have a quite distinctive form than other *salazones* amphorae is not immediately obvious.
12.1 PROVENANCED FINDS

BEDFORDSHIRE

1 Mauldon Moor. Burial?: at least one amphora from a burial. Rodwell suggests that it may have been of early Roman date (1976a, 323; cf Peacock 1971, 182). There is no evidence on which to base any dating.

CORNWALL

2 The Rumps. Cliff Castle. Hawkes (1966) suggested that an amphora from the site may be Iron Age but the piece is not described or illustrated in the final report and on the basis of the stratigraphy there (Brooks 1974, 12) and in the second interim report (idem 1966, 7) it is likely that the context is Roman or later. Hawkes' description appears to be that of a late Roman Spatheia (Bonifay 1986, 275-7, Fig 4, 2-8; Dubuis, Haldimann and Martin-Kilcher 1987, 163-5, Fig 6, 4-10) and he now considers the amphora to be of this type (pers comm).
ESSEX

3  Canewdon. Burial?: three amphorae. Rodwell suggests that they were not Dr 1 (1976a, 322) although later on he argues from a similar lack of evidence that the finds at Mark's Tey were Dr 1 (cf App 2.3, 4).

KENT

4  Boughton Monchelsea. Burial?: two amphorae. Rodwell suggests that they may have been Iron Age imports (1976a, 324; Cunliffe 1982c, 46; Haselgrove 1987a, 153) but there is no evidence to support this.

12.2 OTHER FINDSPOTS

Thompson refers to a number of amphorae sherds from south-east England none of which need be of Iron Age rather than Roman date (1982, 604, 617, 620, 766, 814, 833 and 850). Of these only the sherd from Sturry, Kent, which seems as if it could be from a Dr 1-4 (ibid, 833) may be relevant here.
APPENDIX 13

AMPHORAE NOT CERTAINLY OF BRITISH LATER IRON AGE DATE

13.1 CAMULODUNUM 189

Typology

The traditional British description 'carrot amphora' describes this amphora well. It is very small and has a tapered body rarely wider than 15cm. There is no neck and the rim may be either a simple bead rim or a plain everted one. There are a pair of small lug handles either side of the mouth. The body is covered with rilling. It has a characteristically friable fabric.

Provenance

The surface texture of the quartz grains in the type were examined using a scanning electron microscope by Shackley (1975, 58-9) and this suggested an origin in a desert environment. Petrological analyses have not been able to demonstrate the origin of the type but Palestine has been suggested (Green 1980b, 45; Williams 1984b, 76). Sealey has doubted this, suggesting that it is apparently not found in Israel (1985, 88). However, a southern or eastern Mediterranean origin seems likely on the evidence presently available (Peacock and Williams 1986, 109). It is noteworthy that in describing finds from Carnuntum, Grünewald compares the fabric to Pompeian Red ware (1983, 34).
Contents

In an exceptionally fine discussion of the type, Loeschke suggested that the small size of the vessel suggested that it contained quite specialised contents and that as similar vessels in glass represented on wall paintings at Pompeii appeared to contain fruit and an actual vessel from Pompeii appeared to contain dried fruit, then it was probably a fruit amphora (1942, 105-14). Loeschke suggested that the vessel was called a \textit{cadus} but Reusch (1970, 61, Anm 52) doubts that there is enough evidence to support this. Sealey suggests that a \textit{Cam} 189 variant from Avenches contained dates (1985, 88). While the association with dates is clear (Reusch 1970, 58-9), the amphora is not a \textit{Cam} 189 variant but a distinct and later, third-fourth century AD type (Peacock 1977d, 298-9; Peacock and Williams 1986, 200-1, Class 50). In the light of Loeschke's comments about the 'loaves' in Pompeian Red ware platters at Pompeii (Ch 5.2), his comments about the fruit in vessels should be viewed cautiously. An example from London contained 3.15L (Sealey 1985, 88) but this may not be too relevant if fruit was the content.

Chronology

The earliest vessels may be from Oberaden, represented by handle fragments, which Loeschke took to be \textit{Cam} 189. Peacock and Williams (1986, 110), following Reusch (1970, 56), appear to have reservations over this and these may well be well founded. If this is the earliest date for the type it is curious that the next certain finds are of Claudio-Neronian date. Peacock and Williams (op cit) suggest that finds at Wiesbaden and Vindonissa are of
early first century date. The Wiesbaden find is probably from the Heidenberg and may be from the Domitianic stone fort (which is the likeliest context) or from the pre-Claudian wooden forts. The earliest date would be late Augustan or early Tiberian but the amphorae is likely to be later as are the bulk of the older finds from Wiesbaden (Reusch 1970, 54). The finds from the Vindonissa are not well dated, the earliest ones, ie those from the eastern Schütthügel, may be dated no more precisely than c AD 30-60. There is a fragmentary find from Rödgen which is identified as a Cam 189 (Schönberger and Simon 1976. 114). The gap between the Oberaden and Rödgen examples and the later finds is at the least c 20 years and possibly up to 50 years. As Reusch has noted the Oberaden handle fragments appear to be quite large, with the 'eye' of the handle being between 8 and 11cm (1970, 56) but the 'eye' of the Cam 189 handle is rarely larger than 3cm. These measurements in connection with finds from Haltern raise the possibility that the Oberaden and Rödgen finds are from the Kingsholm 117 amphorae. The present absence of finds of Cam 189 from Iron Age Britain may then be chronological and it is very likely that Sealey (1985, 88-9) is incorrect to suggest that the type appears under Augustus.

Distribution

The type is apparently found widely in pre-Flavian and early Flavian contexts in Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, Yugoslavia and Italy and it was clearly traded widely. As mentioned earlier the fabric is particularly friable and can often resemble daub. This has undoubtedly hindered identification, while as argued above (App 11.5), it seems very likely that the
type has been conflated with the Kingsholm 117 and many identifications should be treated cautiously. Even very knowledgeable commentators have confused the two types (eg Sealey 1985, 87-90).

13.2 DRESSEL 14

Typology

The vessel has quite slim ovoid body with a large pointed hollow spike. The handles are oval in section and are quite heavy. The rim is a quite thick bead rim. It is Beltrán’s form IV (Beltrán-Lloris 1970, 456-64, Fig 183-5) which has been subdivided by Parker into IVa and IVb (1977, 38). We are concerned with Beltrán IVa.

Provenance

A kiln is known at Calahonda in southern Spain (Beltrán-Lloris 1970, 459; 1977, 102; Parker 1977, 38) and others at Monte da Enchurrasqueira and Vale de Capo in the lower Sado valley (Dias Diogo 1983). Thin-sections made by Peacock and Williams (1986, 126-7) also suggest an origin in southern Iberia.

Contents

A number of tituli picti identify the contents of the vessel as fish-based products such as liquamen and muria (Beltrán-Lloris 1970, 462; Panella 1973, 516-19).
Chronology and Commentary

The earliest find known to Beltrán-Lloris (1970) was from the Stanfordbury A burial which is probably Romano-British but these amphorae are unusually small vessels. Sealey has suggested that their small size is explicable by the exceptionally large scale of the illustration in Dressel's table (1985, 150), but this does not explain their small size in comparison to actual Dr 14 and their identification as this seems doubtful. The earliest find is apparently from the Sud-Lavezzi 3 or C wreck where only one was found. The wreck is probably late Augustan-early Tiberian (Corsi-Sciallano and Liou 1985, 167, Fig 108, 3103; Panella 1973, 517 suggests that there is also a find from the Tiberian-Claudian Lavezzi I wreck). However, the type is apparently absent from Claudio-Neronian sites and its absence from the large Sheepen assemblage is probably chronological. Most dated finds are Trajanic or later (Beltrán-Lloris 1970, 457; Panella 1973, 516-19).

Farley has suggested that a southern Spanish vessel from Aston Clinton may be of Iron Age date (Farley 1983, 299-300, Fig 14). Farley suggests that the vessel is a Dr 2-4 but it appears to be a Dr 14 and therefore unlikely to be an Iron Age import.
STAMPS ON AMPHORAE FOUND IN
LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

14.1 ON DRESSEL 1

1 AA . On Dr 1B rim from Welwyn B burial (Stead 1967a, 8, Fig 6, 2; Callender 1965, 59, no 2; App 2.1, 45). Other finds at Mt Beuvray and the Titelberg. As Callender suggests, the find from Cirencester //AA is probably a misreading. The stamped Dr 1 from Leaholme (14.2, 2 below) is apparently a different vessel (A.D. McWhirr pers comm).

2 AVALER . On Dr 1B rim from Chichester (Down 1978, 248, no 3, Fig 10.15, 3; Callender 1965, 179, nos 162-3?: App 2.1, 59). This may be related to the stamps of A.V(aler1)? and A.Val(eri) Ius(ti)? from Peña de la Sal and Modena respectively. The former is stamped A.V? and because of its brevity may be on a Dr 1 but is as likely to be on a Catalanvian vessel.

3 EB . On the base of a handle from Quarry Wood Camp, Loose (Kelly 1971, 84, no 33, Fig 12, 33; Arthur 1986, 241, 257, Fig 2, 9; App 2.1, 55). A vessel from Nâges is stamped EB (Callender 1965, 124, no 567), possibly EB, and a Dr 1A from Alba Helviorum has a similar stamp from a different die (Lauxerois and Vichy 1975, 58, Fig 6, 10.)
HI. Stamped on the bottom of the neck of a Dr 1B from Welwyn Garden City (Stead 1967a, 8, Fig 5, 5; 6, 3; App 2.1, 47) and on the rim of a Dr 1B from Colchester-Lexden (St Clare Road) (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 214, Fig 45, 7; App 2.1, 11d). The two stamps are from different dies. Callender read the Lexden find as HIB (1965, 140, no 705, Fig 7, 41). A stamp HB occurs at Mt Beuvray (idem 138, no 685) but both could be HIB or HIE or either.

PE. Heybridge - Langford Junction. Twice on the rim of a Dr 1B (May 1930, 244, no 37, Fig 8, 37; Rodwell 1976a, 319; Wickenden 1986, 57-8, Fig 26, 28; Callender 1965, 204, no 1307, Fig 12, 45; App 2.1, 15b). May mentioned a dipento TML (op cit, Fig 8, 38), but this was not supported by Peacock and Rodwell, and examination of the feature shows it to be a dribble of pitch (cf Wickenden 1986, 58). The find is incorrectly attributed to Colchester by Callender.

SOS. On the rim of a Dr 1B from the Welwyn A burial (Stead 1967a, 8, Fig 6, 1; App 2.1, 45). The stamp is difficult to read and could perhaps be COS. There is a vessel from Sainte Colombe stamped COSP (Callender 1965, 110, no 433). It is just possible that the stamp is PAPI (cp Aulnas 1980-81, 67, no 68, Pl 12, 68).

VAMP. On the rim of a Dr 1B from Watton-at-Stone (Rook et al 1982, 21; App 2.1, 44).
14.2 UNCERTAIN READINGS ON DRESSEL 1

1 Braughting - Gatesbury Track. A fragmentary stamp perhaps reading J.R on a Dr 1B rim (Partridge 1979, 114, Fig 34, 2; App 2.1, 36b) which could perhaps be expanded to D.R.

2 Cirencester - Leaholme. On the base of what is identified as a Dr 1 (App 2.1, 26; A.D. McWhirr pers comm).

3-4 Colchester - Sheepen. One illegible stamp on the rim of a Dr 1B (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 214, App 2.1, 11e). Another stamp, apparently on a Dr 1 handle - which would be unusual - may have read (?N RVII). There is a N..RVII stamp from Villar de Brennes in Baetica (Callender 1965, 196, no 1225) which might suggest a Dr 20.

5 A Dr 1 intermediate between Dr 1A and 1B from Hengistbury Head has a stamp on the rim (App 2.1, 7). Bushe-Fox read it as BA•V (1915, 53 and illus) which has also been found at Nuits St George (BA•VE) (Callender 1965, 81, no 182(a)), but the illustration given by Peacock (1971, Fig 37, 16), although at a much smaller scale, could be read as JB M .

6 A fragmentary stamp on a Dr 1B from Highstead (App 2.1, 54) reads .A... (N. Macpherson-Grant pers comm).
14.3 ANEPIGRAPHIC STAMPS ON DRESSEL 1

1 A Palm stamp, perhaps on a Dr 1B from Braughing - Station Road (Partridge 1979, 48, Fig 12, 3; App 2.1, 36d). Although Peacock states that the stamp is unparalleled, there are related palmette stamps on what is probably a Dr 1A from Basel-Gasfabrik (Furger-Gunti and Berger 1980, Taf 169, 767), on the rims of two Dr 1B from Roanne (Bessou 1976, P1 21; Aulnas 1980-81, 68, P1 15, 88; 16, 89) and on a further vessel from Basel-Münsterhügel (Furger-Gunti 1979a, 99, Taf 7, 94).

14.4 STAMPS ON VESSELS OTHER THAN DRESSEL 1

1 P. On a Pascual 1 or Catalonian Dr 2-4 from Weymouth Bay, probably Pascual 1 (Damon 1890; App 4.2, 4). Beltrán-Lloris notes four related stamps on Pascual 1 (1977, nos 39, 47-8, 96, Fig 9, 15; 10; 13-14; 15, 11).

14.5 STAMPS ON VESSELS NOT CERTAINLY OF IRON AGE DATE

1 BV and BI. Two stamps on a Pascual 1 or Catalonian Dr 2-4 from the Colchester-Colonia (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 214, Fig 45, 2; Callender 1965, 83, no 195; App 4.2, 6a). Read as BARBARI or BARBARATI and BIBVLI or BITHI by Corsi-Sciallano and Liou (1985, 162-3).

The first stamp, apparently from the same die, occurs with the stamp IVC on a Dr 2-4 from Fos where it is read
by Amar and Liou as BAR (1984, no 81). It is also known on a Dr 2-4 from the Chrétienne H wreck (three times) and with the stamp RIM on a Dr 2-4 from the Diano Marino wreck (Corsi-Sciallano and Liou 1985, 79, 98). The former wreck is dated to between c AD 15-25, the latter to around the mid-first century AD by Corsi-Sciallano and Liou (ibid, 94, 106). The BAR stamp is attributed to Can Tintores.

The possibility that the Colchester piece was an Iron Age import, is strengthened by the stamps documented by Corsi-Sciallano and Liou and by the occurrence of a Catalonian Dr 2-4 stamped CIT and A·B from Augustan-Tiberian levels at Xanten (Heimberg 1987, 454, Abb 16, 13).

On an Italian Dr 2-4 from Stanmore Park (App 3.3, 3). Not certainly of Iron Age date as there is an example from Pompeii (Callender 1965, 175, no 1019; Panella and Fano 1977, 162).

14.6 STAMPS ON VESSELS PROBABLY NOT OF IRON AGE DATE

1 AQA . Apparently on a Cam 186A from Colchester (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 214, Fig 45, 1). Following Hawkes and Hull, Callender compared the piece to A A stamps from Forêt de Compiègne and Mt Beuvray and suggested that it was Italian and dated to between 25 BC and AD 25 (1965, 72, no 116). However, Cam 186A were rarely stamped and the form of the stamp suggests that it may be Catalanian.
The similarity of the A A and Q stamps is insufficient evidence on which to ascribe an Iron Age date.

PILID (ES) or ILIB. A stamp from Richborough (Callender 1965, 206, no 1333, Fig 13, 1; idem in Cunliffe 1968, 164, no 70). Gianfrotta suggests that the stamp is on a Dr 1B and reads it as PILIP (1982, 20, Fig 24) and this has been followed by Tchernia (1986, Carte 6) and Boudet (1987, 211). Irrespective of how the damaged Richborough stamp should be restored, Callender is specific that the stamp is on the handle of a Dr 20 and there seems no reason to doubt this.
APPENDIX 15

BESANÇON TRADITION; CAMULODUNUM 102, 262
AND UNSPECIFIED VESSELS FOUND IN
LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

15.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF CAMULODUNUM 102 JARS

ESSEX

1a Colchester - Lexden Tumulus. Burial: (Foster 1986, 118-20, Fig 37, 3).

1b Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: four vessels (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 278).

HERTFORDSHIRE

2 Baldock. Settlement: (Stead and Rigby 1986, 285, Fig 111, 92). Tyers (1981b, 103, n 3) gives the total of vessels from the excavations as four but it is not clear how many were Iron Age imports. Stead and Rigby state, however, that there is only one Cam 262 (1986, 231).

3a Braughing - Gatesbury. Settlement: (Partridge 1981, 336, Fig 126, 6).


4 St Albans - King Harry Lane. Cemetery: (Stead and Rigby

KENT

5 Farningham Hill. Rural settlement: probably Cam 102 (Philp 1984, 41).

15.2 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF CAMULODUNUM 262 JARS

ESSEX

1 Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: three vessels (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 281).

HERTFORDSHIRE

2a Braughing - Bathhouse. Oppidum?: (Partridge 1977, 45, Fig 16, 8).

2b Braughing - Gatesbury. Settlement: seven vessels (Partridge 1981, 335, Fig 126, 7-13).

2c Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: 29 vessels (Partridge 1981, 56-7, 64-6, 74, 77, Fig 22, 49-54, 56-9; 28, 32-8, 40; 34, 12-13; 37, 14; Tyers 1981b).

3 St Albans - Prae Wood. Oppidum?: two vessels (Thompson 1982, 938, Fig 119, 12).
15.3 UNSPECIFIED *BESANÇON TRADITION* VESSELS PROBABLY IN IRON AGE CONTEXTS

DORSET

1 Poole Harbour - Ower. Settlement: (Galliou 1984, 34, n 14; Timby 1986, 78, Tab 1).

KENT


LEICESTERSHIRE

3 Leicester - West Leicester. Oppidum?: Unpub.

Additionally some of the Silchester finds could be Iron Age imports (Tyers 1981b, 103) although some of the Colchester-Sheepen finds (Rigby and Freestone 1986, 13-14) do appear in Romano-British contexts, they could be residual.
APPENDIX 16

CENTRAL GAULISH FLAGONS FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

16.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF DORTON FLAGONS

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

1 Dorton. Burial: two vessels (Freestone and Rigby 1983, Fig 12, 1-2).

DORSET

2 Poole Harbour - Ower. Settlement; sherds probably from one vessel may be pre-conquest (Timby 1982, 335-6; 1986, 77).

ESSEX

3 Burnham-on-Crouch. Burial: (Thompson 1982, 650, Fig 25, 775).

4a Colchester - Abbey Field. Burial: (Birchall 1965, 310, Fig 20, 172).

4b Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: it is impossible to assess how many of the eleven Camulodunum vessels in Period I contexts were imports but the similarity of some to known imports (eg Hawkes and Hull 1947, 248, 279, Fig 52, 1) suggests that some were.
GLOUCESTERSHIRE

5 Bagendon. Oppidum?: at least one example (Clifford 1961, 228, Fig 63, 71), although its context is not certainly Iron Age, the piece may well be residual.

HAMPshire

6 Silchester. Oppidum: a number of vessels likely to be Iron Age imports (May 1916, Pl LX, 105-6, 108-9; Boon 1969, 73, Fig 14, 165), even though Boon regards the single piece published by him as post-conquest.

HERTFORDSHIRE

7a Braughing - Gatesbury. Settlement: possibly five vessels (Partridge 1981, 337, Fig 128, 19, 19a-e).


7c Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: eight+ vessels (Partridge 1981, 64, no 28-31, 82, no 1, 93, no 61-3, 190, Fig 28, 28-31; 40, 1; 47, 61-3).

8a St Albans - King Harry Lane. Cemetery: AA Burial 17. Two vessels (Freestone and Rigby 1983, 292; Rigby and Freestone 1986, 11).

8b St Albans - Prae Wood. Oppidum?: at least two vessels (Thompson 1982, 529, 533; 12, D1; 12, [555]).

9 Welwyn Garden City. Burial: (Stead 1967a, 14, Fig 9, 36, Pl III, d).
10 Weston. Settlement?: one possible example (Thompson 1982, 860, Fig 83, 726).

KENT


LEICESTERSHIRE

12 Leicester - Blackfriars Street/Bath Lane. Oppidum?: one vessel (Clay and Mellor 1985, 41, 51, Fig 32, 35). Two others, *ibid*, nos 80 and 90 may be residual in Roman contexts.

16.2 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF CENTRAL GAULISH CAMULODUNUM 161

Ab OR 163 FLAGONS

HERTFORDSHIRE

1a Braughing - Gatesbury. Settlement: two vessels, one of which (no 23) may be a waster (Partridge 1981, 337, Fig 128, 22-3).

1b Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: two vessels (*ibid*, 74, 182, Fig 34, 9).

KENT

2 Canterbury. Oppidum?: a possibly Central Gaulish vessel
16.3 UNIDENTIFIED CENTRAL GAULISH FLAGONS

HAMPShIRE

1 Silchester. Oppidum: sherds from Fulford's excavations (J.R. Timby pers comm).

HERTFORDSHIRE


16.4 UNCERTAIN FINDS

DORSET

1 Poole Harbour - Ower. Settlement: one flagon could be an Iron Age import, but it is not clear from the published account (Timby 1986, 77, Tab 1).

GLOUCESTERSHIRE

2 Bagendon. Oppidum?: one vessel, likely to be a Cam 163 contra Clifford (1961, 228-9, Fig 63, 71), might be an Iron Age import.
APPENDIX 17

CAMULODUNUM 166 'FLAGONS' FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

17.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OR CAMULODUNUM 166 'FLAGONS'

ESSEX

1 Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: five vessels occurred in Period I-III/Iron Age - Conquest period contexts (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 249, 279).

HERTFORDSHIRE

2 Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: (Peacock 1981, 201, Fig 81, 14).
APPENDIX 18

GALLO-BELGIC FLAGONS FOUND IN LATER
IRON AGE BRITAIN

18.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF GALLO-BELGIC FLAGONS

BERKSHIRE

1 Burghfield. Burial: one Cam 140B could be of Iron Age
date (Boon and Wymer 1958, 48, Fig 3, 2).

CAMBRIDGESHIRE

2 Snailwell. Burial: Two Cam 136, with rilled rims, two
Cam 163A and one Cam 163B (Lethbridge 1953, 35, Pl
II-III).

ESSEX

3a Colchester - Lexden Group 10. Burial: one Haltern 45 cf
Cam 140 (Sealey 1985, 150).

3b Colchester - Lexden Group 21 (St Clare Drive) Sheepen
Park. Burial: one Cam 161A (Colchester Mus Rec 1931-32,
26; Hawkes and Hull 1947, 14, n 5, grave 5).

3c Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: one Cam 140; one Cam
140D; 27 Cam 161; two Cam 162; four Cam 163
GLOUCESTERSHIRE

4 Bagendon. Oppidum?: two Cam 153 and one Cam 163 may be Iron Age imports plus unidentified vessels (Clifford 1961, 229-30, Fig 51, 1).

HAMPShIRE

5 Silchester. Oppidum: (Timby in Fulford 1985a, 26).

HERTFORDSHIRE

6a Braughing - Gatesbury. Settlement: one Cam 141A (Partridge 1981, 335, no 2, Fig 126, 2), one Cam 161A and one Cam 163A (contra idem 335, nos 26-7, Fig 128, 26-7).

6b Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: one Oberaden 50 (Partridge 1981, 56, no 46, Fig 21, 46), one Cam 136C (ibid, 189), eight Cam 161, (ibid, 55, no 45, Fig 21, 45; 64, nos 26-7, Fig 28, 26-7; 182-5, 192), three Cam 163 (ibid, 183, 185, 192), two Cam 161/163 (ibid, 186-7), fifteen unidentified (ibid, 184, (one described as one-handed), 186-90, 193-4).

6c Braughing - Station Road. Oppidum?: seventeen Cam 161, one Cam 163 and nine unidentified (Partridge 1979, 107-13).

7a St Albans - Prae Wood. Oppidum?: Thompson 1982 Area 1, Enclosure A, four Cam 165 (Thompson 1982, 874, 901, 907); one Cam 161 (ibid, 905); Area 2, one Cam 140B (ibid, 913; Wheeler and Wheeler 1936, 171, Fig 22, 1); Cam 165 (Thompson 1982, 918); Cam 155 (ibid, 926). The last two may be indigenous copies (ibid, 929).

7b St Albans - King Harry Lane. Cemetery (Stead 1969).

7c St Albans - Verulam Hills Field. Cemetery: a Cam 161A from grave 17 (Anthony 1968, 17, Fig V, 17; Thompson 1982, 847).

LEICESTERSHIRE

8 Leicester - Blackfriars Street. Oppidum?: six vessels, unidentified (Clay and Mellor 1985, Tab 2).

18.2 UNIDENTIFIED GALLO-BELGIC FLAGONS FROM LATER IRON AGE SITES

HAMPSHIRE

1 Owslebury. Rural settlement and cemetery: pipeclay flagons from both, some described as 'Hofheim' (Collis 1968, 23, 27; 1970, 250).

HERTFORDSHIRE

3 Crookhams. Rural settlement: one Cam 161/3, probably an Iron Age import (Rook 1968, 60, Fig 9, 21).

WILTSHIRE

4 Casterley Camp. Rural settlement: one Cam 161? (Cunnington and Cunnington 1913, 102, Pl V, 11).

18.3 UNCERTAIN FINDS

DORSET

1 Poole Harbour - Ower. Settlement: one flagon could be an Iron Age import, but this is not clear (Timby 1986, 77, Tab 1).

HERTFORDSHIRE

2 Lockleys. Settlement: Ward-Perkins suggested that a flagon could be an Iron Age import (1938, 357-8), but the context is poorly dated and only vaguely associated with Ward-Perkins' 'earliest Belgic level' and so need not be Iron Age rather than Roman.

SOUTH HUMBERSIDE

3 Dragonby. Settlement: a number of PC flagons occur in contexts ascribed to ceramic stage 8 (eg 2100/C, Elsdon and May 1987, 124, Chart 1-2, Diag 1) or 9 (1477, op cit,
125, Chart 1-2, Diag 1-2). However, South Gaulish Samian was associated in 2100/C so it is possible that a later date should be entertained, and there appears to be no unambiguous evidence to support a pre-conquest date for ceramic stage 9. While the pre-conquest import of flagons alongside TR, TN and other PC vessels may be thought likely it cannot be demonstrated stratigraphically.
CAMELODUNUM 139 'JUGS' FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

19.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF CAMELODUNUM 139 'JUGS'

DORSET

1 Poole Harbour - Ower. Settlement: at least one vessel (Williams 1986, 80-1).

HERTFORDSHIRE

2a Braughing - Gatesbury Track. Oppidum?: (Partridge 1979, 113, Fig 34, 6).


LEICESTERSHIRE

3 Leicester - West Leicester. Oppidum?: likely to be of Iron Age date (unpub).
APPENDIX 20

BLACK CORDONED WARES FOUND IN LATER
IRON AGE BRITAIN

20.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF BLACK CORDONED WARES

DEVON

1 Mount Batten. Settlement: (Cunliffe 1983a, 125; 1987a, 310).

DORSET

2a Bournemouth - Burleigh Road. Settlement: (Calkin 1965, 127; Cunliffe 1982a, Fig 8; 1987a, 312).

2b Bournemouth - Tuckton Farm. Settlement: not cited by Calkin (1965, 127) but plotted by Cunliffe (1982a, Fig 8; 1987a, 312) who cites Calkin as an authority.

2c Bournemouth - Wick. Settlement: (Calkin 1965, 127; Cunliffe 1982a, Fig 8; 1987a, 312).

3 Christchurch, Mill Plain. Settlement: (Calkin 1965, 127; Cunliffe 1982a, Fig 8; 1987a, 312).

4 Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: 252+ vessels from Cunliffe's excavations (1987a, 310) excluding the earlier finds (ibid, 208) and two+ vessels from site 6 (ibid, MB: A4-5).

5a Poole Harbour - Furzey Island. Settlement: three sherds
(P.W. Cox pers comm; Cox 1985 for the site; also Cunliffe 1987a, 310, 314).

5b Poole Harbour - Green Island. Settlement: (Cunliffe 1982a, 46, Fig 8; 1987a, 310, 312).

5c Poole Harbour - Hamworthy. Settlement: (Cunliffe 1982a, 46 but not plotted on Fig 8 or his 1987a, Ill 219; Jarvis 1982, 182).

20.2 FINDS FOR WHICH THERE IS INADEQUATE INFORMATION

DORSET

1 Redhill Common. Settlement: listed by Calkin (1965, 127) but not cited by Cunliffe (1982a, 66, Fig 8), however, on his Fig 16 Cunliffe plots the site as having produced imports, presumably Black Cordoned ware. Not mentioned in Cunliffe 1987a.
APPENDIX 21

GRAPHITE COATED WARE FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

21.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF GRAPHITE COATED WARE

DORSET

1 Christchurch, Mill Plain. Settlement: (Calkin 1965, 127; Cunliffe 1982a, 66, Fig 9; 1987a, 310, Ill 223).

2 Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: 241+ vessels from Cunliffe's excavations (1987a, 310), excluding the earlier finds (ibid, 208).

3a Poole Harbour - Green Island. Settlement: (Cunliffe 1982a, 66, Fig 9; 1987a, 310, Ill 223).

3b Poole Harbour - Hamworthy. Settlement: (Cunliffe 1982a, 46, 66, Fig 9; 1987a, 310, Ill 223; cf Jarvis 1982, 182).

21.2 POSSIBLE FINDS

SOMERSET

1 Meare Village West. Settlement: one vessel is described as wheel-made and graphite coated and compared to the Hengistbury Head finds (Bullied and Gray 1948, 20, 34, Pl XVI, P 90; XIX, P 90). The omphalos base of the vessel is
difficult to parallel but this may be due to the reconstruction.
APPENDIX 22

RILLED MICACEOUS WARES FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

22.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF RILLED MICACEOUS WARES

DORSET

1. Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: 60+ vessels from Cunliffe's excavations (1987a, 310) excluding those from the earlier excavations (ibid, 208).


APPENDIX 23

MORTARIA FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

23.1 CERTAIN OF PROBABLE FINDS OF MORTARIA

ESSEX

1 Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: at least nine Cam 191A and one 191B vessels were recovered from Iron Age contexts (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 221, 280, Fig 53, Pl LXXIII, 191, A & B). No mortaria were found in pre-conquest contexts in the 1970 excavations, although two could be Iron Age imports (Hartley 1985, 92, Fig 49, 3; M2: E8, F4).

GLOUCESTERSHIRE

2 Bagendon. Oppidum?: one Cam 191B (Clifford 1961, 230, Fig 64, 80).

HERTFORDSHIRE

3a Braughing - Gatesbury. Settlement: at least four Cam 191. Almost all are probably pre-conquest imports (Partridge 1981, 335, Fig 126, 14-17).

3b Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: although no quantified data is presented in the report, according to the contexts given at least five mortaria were found in
certain Iron Age contexts (Hartley 1981, nos 2, Fig 79, 6, 7, 11, 17; Fig 79, 5, 21; Fig 79, 7) while another two were found in contexts probably of Iron Age date (ibid, nos 1, 14, Fig 79, 9). Hartley notes nos 3, 5, 12, 19 and possibly 17 as typologically early, but as only no 17 comes from an Iron Age context these others may be residual in later contexts.

23.2 FINDS POSSIBLY OF IRON AGE DATE

HAMPshire

1 Silchester. Oppidum: a mortarium found in third-fourth century AD context could possibly be residual from the Iron Age (Boon 1969, 60, Fig 11, 15).

HERTFORDSHIRE

2 St Albans - Prae Wood. Settlement: a ?mortarium sherd could possibly be an Iron Age import (Thompson 1982, 887, no 41, Fig 96, 41) but could be intrusive.

23.3 FINDS PREVIOUSLY SUGGESTED TO BE OF IRON AGE DATE BUT WHICH ARE PROBABLY ROMANO-BRITISH

1 Oldbury. Hillfort: Ward-Perkins (1939, 153; 1944, 139, 143) states that two sherds were found in late Iron Age contexts. However, other Roman pottery including burnt
samian and a colour-coated rouletted beaker was found in what Ward-Perkins took to be a fortification against the Claudian invasion (Tyers 1981a, 271) and excavations by Thompson suggest that this phase may be of late Roman date; as is the mortarium (Thompson 1986, 275-7).
APPENDIX 24

POMPEIAN RED WARE FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

24.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF POMPEIAN RED WARE

ESSEX

1 Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: three Cam 17A platters, but no accompanying lids, were recovered from Period I contexts. One example whose context was not stated has a bead rim (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 221, 227). All probably in Peacock's Fabric 1.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE

2 Bagendon. Oppidum?: one vessel from an Iron Age context (Clifford 1961, 217).

HAMPSHIRE

3 Silchester. Oppidum: at least one vessel (J.R. Timby pers comm).

HERTFORDSHIRE

5a Braughing - Gatesbury. Settlement: one vessel, probably Iron Age (Rigby 1981d, 332).


24.2 FINDS POSSIBLY OF IRON AGE DATE

SURREY

1 Walton-on-the-Hill. Settlement: one Cam 17 which appears to be in Peacock's Fabric 3, thought to be from an Iron Age context, although the dating is not entirely clear (Lowther 1950, 78, Fig 5, 6).
APPENDIX 25

TERRA SIGILLATA FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

No attempt has been made to standardise the various usages of the Dragendorff, Haltern, Loeschke, Ritterling or other site-specific internal typologies employed by different authors as these may reflect important typological nuances.

25.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF TERRA SIGILLATA IN BRITAIN

AVON

1 Steep Holm. Settlement?: one Drag 11 (Boon 1987). A small fragment of the decoration is present and is similar to works by M. Perennius Tigranus probably made in Arezzo (Brown 1968, 18, no 45, Pl XII, 46). There is no certain evidence for Iron Age activity on the island and while the piece may be associated with an early Roman signal station contra Boon (1987), it would be a very old 'heirloom'.

CAMBRIDGESHIRE

2 Barrington. Burial?: complete L 7 stamped CHRESTIO TITI%

(O/C 2084, k). ?Arezzo (Haverfield 1915-16, 53-7,
Fig 1-2).

3 Foxton. Burial: Drag 11 stamped CNATEI internally (O/C XANTH 176, 110) and XANTHI externally (O/C 177, 341) (Babington 1851-59; Krüger 1904; Walters 1906-8; Haverfield 1915-16; Oxe 1933, 82, Taf XXXVIII, a-c; Oxe 1930, 39 following Krüger’s suggestion that the vessel arrived with its shipwrecked owner, cf Tacitus Ann II, 24; Ch 17.2.3).

DORSET


5 Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: one sherd of 'Arretine' was recorded by Bushe-Fox (1916, 47; Cunliffe 1978a, 57, 79). Boon appears to suggest that the piece is Gallo-Belgic (Boon 1969, 29, n. 4) and the piece was rejected by Hull (1961, 210-11) but it is a L 1A probably from Arezzo (Cunliffe 1987a, 281).

6 Poole Harbour - Ower. Settlement: a L 2? from Lyon and an unidentified piece from Iron Age contexts. However, a L 1, L 2, two L 8 and one Ritt 5 from Roman contexts are all from Lyon and typologically pre-conquest. Also typologically pre-conquest are a vessel from Puteoli, an unprovenanced Drag 17 and another unprovenanced vessel (Pengelly 1986, 71, Fig 39, 7-8; Timby and Williams 1986). There is also a decorated Lezoux ?crater from an Iron Age context (Pengelly 1986, 71-2, Fig 39, 9).
Colchester - Lexden Tumulus. Burial: a Ha 8 may come from the burial (Foster 1986, 120, Fig 37, 4; cp von Schnurbein 1982, 40-1, Abb 10.2).

Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: 1930s excavations (Hawkes and Hull 1947).

Decorated Wares

Ten Drag 1ls could be Iron Age introductions but only one, one of Hawkes and Hull's un-numbered finds was found in a context taken to be Iron Age (*ibid*, 168-9, Pl XX). Five vessels are described as 'Arretine' (nos 1-3 and the last two un-numbered vessels.

Attributions suggested by Hawkes and Hull are (1) M. Perennius and Bargates, and (2) Bargates. The last of the pieces has a Xanthus stamp. Reviewing the volume Comfort (1949, 329) suggests that Ateius or P. Cornelius may be a more likely attribution for vase number 1, but the piece is very fragmentary.

Two Tiberian, probably early Tiberian vessels are illustrated on Pl XXI, the second of which is stamped OFI. MACCA; twenty-eight Tiberian Drag 29 are illustrated on Pl XXII. Plate XXIV, 2 is also regarded as Tiberian while Pl XXIII, XXIV, 1 and XXV illustrate 57 early Claudian pieces some of which, particularly Pl XXIII, 1, 3, 7-9, 18 and 20, could be Tiberian. None of the pieces are certainly attributable.
Plain Wares

Hawkes and Hull (op cit, 188-9) regarded approximately 250 vessels as 'Arretine' and state that 'the odds are at least twenty to one that any given Arretine piece here is in fact a pre-conquest import' (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 190).

According to Hawkes and Hull the forms were represented in the following quantities, the numbers in brackets are the number of sherds stratified in contexts taken by them to be of Iron Age date (Tab 25).

On the evidence presented by Hawkes and Hull (1947, 188-9) it is not possible to distinguish which of the vessels ascribed by them to southern Gaul may have arrived in the Iron Age.

The forty-five stamps can be tabulated as in Table 26.


Decorated Wares

Dannell ascribes 21 vessels to the Tiberian period. Of these no 1 may be ascribed to Cadmus, 10 to Bilicatus or Balbus and 28 to Igenuvs. Numbers 11 and 70 belong to Vernhet's Potter G1 of La Grafesenque. Number 8 is a Drag 11 from Arezzo of later Augustan-early Tiberian date. Only one vessel no 32 is an early Tiberian piece,
TABLE 25

'ARRETINE' FROM HAWKES AND HULL'S COLCHESTER - SHEEPEN EXCAVATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Total Sherds</th>
<th>Sherds in Period I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14A</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(other forms not represented)

TOTAL 190 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camulodunum Arretine Stamp</th>
<th>Oxe and Comfort Number</th>
<th>Camulodunum Arretine Stamp</th>
<th>Oxe and Comfort Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2292/2295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>26a</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>26b</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>212/1084/1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>35a</td>
<td>?1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Not 'Arretine'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>?685</td>
<td>cf Comfort 1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82/551/566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>425/155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>?63</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>?1058</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1188/1581</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hawkes and Hull (1947, 192-3).
c AD 15-30, although no 2 is not much later. The rest are dated by Dannell from c AD 25 onwards.

Plain Wares

Dannell does not distinguish any specifically Augustan pieces but in general his datings seem rather later than is demanded by the continental European evidence rather than by Dannell's interpretation of the British material (eg 1977). Dannell ascribes a number of vessels to an unexplained 'Ateius B' fabric which I am unable to correlate with any published fabric. It may be a Lyon or Pisan fabric and if so a rather earlier dating may be required than Dannell proposes. The pre-Claudian material or material possibly of this date is tabulated below (Tab 27), the datings are Dannell's:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120, 5</td>
<td>Ritt 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>L 11</td>
<td>?Arrezo</td>
<td>Probably pre-Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt 5</td>
<td>provincial Arretine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 17</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERIOD IV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>site i, 101</th>
<th>Ritt 5</th>
<th>Ateius B</th>
<th>Tiberio-Claudian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Arretine</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17/18 R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Claudian or possibly pre-Claudian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>site i, 120, 3</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>probably Ateius B</th>
<th>Claudian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| L 8 | proto South Gaulish | pre-Claudian/
Gaulish | Claudian |
| Drag 18 | Ateius B | Claudian |

**PERIOD IVb, 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>site iii, 323</th>
<th>Drag 17R</th>
<th>?Arretine</th>
<th>Tiberio-Claudian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Drag 17</td>
<td>Ateius B</td>
<td>Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>340 Plate</td>
<td>proto South Gaulish</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Probably Ateius B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 17</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Tiberio-Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>339 L 1B</td>
<td>Ateius B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERIOD IVb, 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>site iii,</th>
<th>?Drag 17</th>
<th>proto South Gaulish</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layer 4</td>
<td>&quot; rouletted Arretine</td>
<td>pre-Claudian</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERIOD IVb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Drag</th>
<th>Ritt</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i, 102</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ateius B but</td>
<td>Claudian smaller, ?proto South Gaulish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>15/17</td>
<td>Unusual fabric - ?Claudio-Neronian sub-Arretine slip but buff/pink paste and plain rim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>?provincial</td>
<td>Claudio-Neronian Arretine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Probably Arretine</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Provincial Arretine</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, 132</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Arretinische [sic] fragments, more orange than Ateius B fabric but probably from the same source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Drag</th>
<th>Ritt</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii, 203</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Ateius B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>?South Gaulish, large and heavy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>?Tiberio-Claudian</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>Drag 17x2</td>
<td>Ateius B</td>
<td>Claudio-Neronian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERIOD III-IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Drag</th>
<th>Ritt</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii, 213</td>
<td>24/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tiberio-Claudian</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v, 503</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td></td>
<td>?Arretine</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 795 -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii, 242 Drag 17</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Arretine</td>
<td>Tiberio-Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 277 Drag 17</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Protosty South Gaulish Tiberio-Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 242, Drag 17</td>
<td>Layer 2</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Probably Tiberio-Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, L5</td>
<td>Layer 2</td>
<td>Inkwell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tiberio-Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, L5</td>
<td>Layer 2</td>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>possibly provincial</td>
<td>Arretine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, L1a Drag 17R</td>
<td>Layer 2</td>
<td>Ateius B</td>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, Ritt 9 Drag 17</td>
<td>Layer 2</td>
<td>Ateius B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tiberio-Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, Ritt 5 Drag 24/5</td>
<td>Layer 2</td>
<td>? provincial Claudian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tiberio-Claudian or Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, Ritt 5 Drag 24/5</td>
<td>Layer 2</td>
<td>? stamped Arretine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly an Ateius TVS stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dannell 1985.
Colchester. Williams (1978, 6) attributes a stamp of MAEIS (O/C 169) apparently from Colchester to Arezzo, which does not correlate with any published stamp from the site. Williams also attributes another sherd to Rome (ibid, 7) but does not state its provenance but it may be suspected to come from Hawkes and Hull's Sheepen excavations.

Fingringhoe - Wick. Settlement?: one vessel stamped CN.ATEI (O/C 145) and two other sherds L 19 or Drag 11 in the Benton Collection (P.R Sealey pers comm).

Goldhanger - Salt Production site: one sherd described as "Arretine" (Reader 1907-9, 194).

Heybridge. Burial: platter, stamped PER I. x 4 rad. Comfort (1942, 92, n 15) reads the stamp as P. Hert(ori) (O/C 788, 118) as does Kenrick (in Wickenden 1986) (Birchall 1965, Fig 16, 139; Wickenden 1986, 53, Fig 26, 9; 27, 9).


Plesheybury. Burial?: L 2? platter stamped IGNATEI ZOILI (May 1918; O/C 180, 32). Thin sectioning by D.F. Williams shows it to be from Arezzo (pers comm). A Drag 29 stamped ACVTIM, possibly from La Grafesenque (May op cit, 230, Pl II; Simpson 1976, 252-3).

Wickford. Settlement: some material may be Iron Age (Britannia 1, 1970, 291).
15 Bagendon. Oppidum?: Dannell (1977) classifies the assemblage from Clifford's excavations as Ritt 5 (x2), Drag 17 (x3), Drag 15/17 (x1), Drag 24/5 (x2), Drag 29 (x1) and Drag 33 (x1). Dannell recognises fourteen sherds from Lezoux, 'many' from La Grafesenque and one piece from Italy, which is presumably the sherd Williams (1978, 9) assigns to Arezzo. Dannell considers most of the assemblage to be pre-conquest in date but much is in post-conquest contexts (cf Trow 1982b).

15(1) Silchester. Oppidum: the majority of the finds have been described but not quantified by May (1916) and Boon (1969). Seven Drag 11 are known, one is stamped CN.ATEI EURYALUS (O/C 164, 10) and two others are attributable, one to Ateius and the other to CN Ateius Xanthus. Boon illustrates an 'Italic' L 3b (1969, 58, Fig 10, 28). A further fourteen stamped vessels have been published (Tab 28).
TABLE 28

'ARRETINE' STAMPS FROM SILCHESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>(O/C 88, 91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ATEI</td>
<td>(O/C 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-ATEI-</td>
<td>(O/C 144, 795)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ATEI</td>
<td>(O/C 144, 796)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td><del>ATEI</del></td>
<td>(O/C 144, 797-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ATEI#</td>
<td>(O/C 144, 799)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>:C+N·ATEI:</td>
<td>(O/C 145, 347A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CN ATEI EH</td>
<td>(in trefoil, O/C 160, 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ATEI M</td>
<td>(O/C 168, 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>(O/C 292, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AVILL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>IVCUNDI</td>
<td>(O/C 835, n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>XANTH</td>
<td>(O/C 177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>XANTI</td>
<td>(O/C 177, 339)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Boon 1969.
TABLE 29

TERRA SIGILLATA FROM SILCHESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pit 1, South Gate</td>
<td>Drag 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Tiberio-Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 South Gaulish</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drag 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Italian or very early South Gaulish</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drag 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Surface Finds, Group 1 L 1</td>
<td>Arezzo? Augustan-Tiberian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 L 2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 L 8a</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 ?</td>
<td>Augustan-Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Surface Finds, Group 9 L 2</td>
<td>&quot; Augustan-Tiberian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Drag 27</td>
<td>South Gaulish Tiberio-Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 ?</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fulford with Corney 1984.
Following Hawkes and Hull (1947), Boon (1969, 29) discounts the possibility that much, if any, South Gaulish material arrived before the conquest but notes three decorated pieces (May 1916, Pl 2, 10; 11, 1-2) which may be of Tiberian date and a Drag 27 (Boon 1969, 56), and points out the difficulties in Hawkes and Hull's arguments. Boon has noted early Montans ware (May 1916, Pl 81A, 1, 3, 15; 81C, 1-3; Boon 1969, 29, n 9) and also three early pieces of Lezoux ware, with two vessels by VITLUS, (Boon 1967, 30-2, 36-8, 1, 1B, 7) which may be Iron Age imports.

16(ii) Three sherds of Arretine, apparently Italian, were found by Collis (1983, 64-5), two pre-dating the bank, and there is further material, including stamped vessels, from Italy and southern Gaul, from Fulford’s excavations (1985a, 3, 26).

Earlier excavations by Fulford published a number of vessels likely to be of pre-conquest date (Fulford with Corney 1984, 128-36, 253). The identifiable vessels are given in Table 29 above.

HERTFORDSHIRE

17 Baldock. Settlement: one Ateius stamp, ATE[...]E, suggested to be Cn Ateius Mahes (O/C 168, no 39) or Cn Ateius Xanthus (O/C 176, no 57-65) and from Arezzo of Augustan date (Stead and Rigby 1986, 202). However, a Pisan or Lyon origin is more likely. One early La Grafesenque Drag 29 could also be an Iron Age import (ibid, 215, Fig 89, 20) but came from a mid-fourth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arezzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are further unidentified sherds.

Source: Dannell 1981a.
century AD context (*ibid*, 215, 369).

18a    Braughing - Bath House. Settlement: two L 1A apparently from Arezzo with a further unidentified vessel from there and four L 2A from an unidentified source. Dannell describes them as micaceous but does not suggest that they are from Lezoux (*in* Partridge 1977, 40-1). There is also a Ha 7 from the river (*ibid*, 103).


18b    Braughing - Gatesbury. Settlement: Dannell identifies fourteen vessels all from Arezzo (Tab 30). Although Dannell states that all the vessels are from Arezzo (1981a, 327) elsewhere he states that there is a L 4 from an unidentified source (1981b, 152). There is an unidentified radial stamp, another of CRESTI (O/C 425) while another stamp is recorded by Westell (1936, 362) but not mentioned by Dannell. The stamp is LTAR (O/C 1902) and is almost certainly radial (Westell 1936, 362) and a further ATEIUS stamp (O/C 144) is mentioned by Corder and Pryce (1938, 276).

18d    Braughing - Gatesbury Track. Oppidum?: Partridge states that the material is earlier than that from Skeleton Green but does not provide further details (1979, 103). I have been unable to examine the material.

18e    Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: Dannell quantifies the Italian sherds as follows (Tab 31):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>AREZZO</th>
<th>AREZZO?</th>
<th>POZZUOLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crater</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 17 var</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt 5 var</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Σ</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dannell 1981b.

There are six stamps: 1, EROS‡ (O/C 2096); 2, XANTHII TITI‡ (O/C 177); 3, RASN (O/C 1485); 4, SECU (O/C 1719, b, i, NDI
k, 1); 5, TITI§ (O/C 1997); 6, ΑΤΕΙΞΙ (O/C 176, 66 or 84).
One of the Craters is probably attributable to Tellius (Dannell 1981b, 154, no 2, Fig 75, 2).

Dannell also notes the following South Gaulish vessels from contexts dated to before AD 45 some of which may well have arrived before the Roman conquest (Tab 32).

---

**TABLE 32**

**SOUTH GAULISH TERRA SIGILLATA FROM BRAUGHING - SKELETON GREEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drag 15R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>Southern Gaul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tiberian-Claudian</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 15/17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 24/25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tiberian-Claudian</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt 5 var</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tiberian-Claudian</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Plates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 24/25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Lezoux</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 30

Source: Dannell 1981b.
From post-conquest contexts the following vessels possibly of pre-conquest date were recorded (Tab 33).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritt 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tiberian</td>
<td>Southern Gaul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 17R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tiberian-Claudian</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 15/17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 16

Source: Dannell 1981b.

Braughing - Wickham Kennels. Oppidum?: the following vessels probably or possibly of pre-conquest date were found (Partridge 1980-82, 58; Tab 34):
TABLE 34

TERRA SIGILLATA FROM BRAUGHING - WICKHAM KENNELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 7b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Augustan</td>
<td>Arezzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Augustan-Tiberian</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tiberian-Claudian</td>
<td>Southern Gaul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Partridge 1980-82.

18g Braughing, River Rib. Settlement?: (Partridge 1977, 103).
20 Park Street. Settlement: a L 8a is probably of pre-conquest date. The stratigraphical context of the sherd is unclear as it appears to be from the lowest silt of a second century AD pit (Rubbish Pit II) which O'Neil seems to suggest is in some way 'Belgic' (O'Neil 1945, 48, 77, no 4, Fig 15, 4). However, O'Neil calls contexts which are clearly of early Roman date 'Belgic'.
21a St Albans - King Harry Lane. Cemetery: five Samian vessels, some of which may be Iron Age imports (Stead 1969, 49).
21b St Albans - Prae Wood. Oppidum?: the vessels are noted (Tab 35) according to Thompson's groupings but corrected according to Wheeler and Wheeler's publication.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Augustan-Tiberian</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2b/3b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tiberian</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Augustan-Tiberian</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Augustan</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Thompson 1982, 874; Wheeler and Wheeler 1936, 155, Fig 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 1a/b</td>
<td>7 rim sherd</td>
<td>Augustan-Tiberian</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further unidentified sherds

(ibid, 903, 905)

AREA 2

Black Ditch

Burnt Footring

(ibid, 918)
AREA XXII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Augustan-Tiberian</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Thompson 1982, 922)

"Black Ditch"

One vessel not identified, burnt

(ibid, 928)

AREA 2

One L 1a/b

(ibid, 933)

TOTAL 20+


Dannell notes a stamp AGATHERMVS (O/C 1086d) (Dannell 1977, 232, n 5) and there are 'possible yellow-grey Arretine sherds' (Thompson 1982, 901).

KENT

22a Canterbury - Butchery Lane. Settlement: a stamp C.SENTI (O/C 1732) (Williams and Frere 1948, 16, 35, Fig 13, 6) probably from Lyon (cp von Schnurbein 1982, 106-11, Abb 29, 6).

LEICESTERSHIRE

23a Leicester - Blackfriars Street. Oppidum?: three vessels were discovered (Tab 36).

---

**TABLE 36**

**TERRA SIGILLATA FROM LEICESTER - BLACKFRIARS STREET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>13/16</td>
<td>1 Augustan/Tiberian</td>
<td>Dannell suggests Arezzo but it may be from Pozzuoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 Augustan/Tiberian</td>
<td>Southern Gaul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Augustan-Tiberian</td>
<td>Arezzo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 3

Source: Clay and Mellor 1985, 59, Fig 36, 1-3.

23b Leicester - Jewry Wall. Oppidum?: none of the material published by Kenyon is necessarily pre-conquest (1948)
but there is one unpublished L 2 from the site (Jewry Wall Mus Acc No LP. 115, 2).

23c Leicester - St Nicholas Street. Oppidum?: a fragment from a crater assigned by Oswald (1933) to M. Perennius Bargates but the combination of the grapes and vines suggest that it may actually be a piece by M. Perennius Tigrates (cf Dragendorff and Watzinger 1948, 202, Taf 22, 279, 282-3; Chase 1908, Pl XXI, 131) although Comfort regards it as the work of P. Cornelius (1962b, 454). Comfort dates the piece to the late Augustan-early Tiberian period. The sherd appears to have a reliable context, although it also does look like a collector's piece.

NORTH HUMBERSIDE

24 Redcliff (North Ferriby). Settlement: two vessels might be Iron Age introductions (Corder and Pryce 1938, 264-5, no 1, Fig 2, 1; 1939) but the bulk of the material from the site is later (Stead 1976b, 133-4). However, as Corder and Pryce (1939) pointed out, the second vessel is paralleled in Augustan-Tiberian contexts and might be a contemporary import and Roman imports may have been arriving at the site before AD 43 (cf Crowther 1987, 285).

OXFORDSHIRE

25 Dorchester-on-Thames. Settlement: one L 5 which Frere
suggests may be an Iron Age import (1962, 129, 133, Fig 14, 15; 1984b, 105-6).

SUFFOLK


SUSSEX

28 Chichester. Oppidum?: the finds from Down's publications are considered most conveniently separately (Tab 37-40) with the pit group x 165 (D) also presented on its own.

---

TABLE 37

'ARRETINE' FROM CHICHESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>AREZZO</th>
<th>POZZUOLI</th>
<th>LYON</th>
<th>LEZOUX</th>
<th>PROVINCIAL?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 3</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is one stamp ATEI/XANTHI. It is a cross-shaped stamp not paralleled in Oxé and Comfort (1968) (Dannell 1978, 227, Fig 10.10, 2).
TABLE 39

TERRA SIGILLATA FROM CHICHESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>AREZZO</th>
<th>LEZOUX</th>
<th>SOUTH GAULISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 1A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1+?1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 8A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 8B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1(Tiberian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 26

Source: Dannell 1981c.

There are stamps of XAN\(\) (O/C 177, 31); M\(\) JAEIS (O/C 169, 35) and an illegible one (Dannell 1981c, 263-4, Fig 11.1, 1-29).
### Table 40

**Terra Sigillata From Pit X, 165 (D) at Chichester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Arezzo</th>
<th>Southern Gaulish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 15/17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag 27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dannell 1981c.

The group probably dates to the 30s AD (Dannell 1981c, 264, Fig 11.1, 30-40).

Fishbourne. Settlement: (Dannell 1971).

Dannell distinguished four fabric groups (Tab 41).
TABLE 41

TERRA SIGILLATA FROM FISHBOURNE

'ITALIAN'

| Drag 11  | 1 | Perhaps by CN. Ateius Xanthus |
| Ritt 5   | 1 |
| Ritt 9   | 1 |
| Drag 17 sp | 4 |

'ATEIUS'

| L 1A/B  | 2 |
| L 1     | 1 |
| Ritt 5  | 2 |
| Drag 17 | 9 |
| Drag 33 | 2 |
| Pedestal | 1 |

'PROTO-SOUTH GAULISH'

| L 1A    | 1 |
| Drag 15/17 | 1 |
| Drag 17   | 4 |

'MISCELLANEOUS'

| Drag 17 stamped ATEI O/C 144 |
| Drag 15/17 |

TOTAL 32

Source: Dannell 1971.
There are also stamps of ATE, ATEI (retrograde) (O/C 144), CRE2TI (O/C 425), a further probable Ateius stamp and an unidentifiable stamp.

Dannell is rather optimistic in including some of the vessels as 'Arretine', for example the Drag 33s, while the rarity of cup forms from the 'typical' Arretine assemblage amongst the Fishbourne finds suggests that many of the Drag 15/17 vessels may be rather later than he suggests. Analyses of some sherds has indicated that one of the Ateius vessels (Cunliffe 1971, 282-3, Fig 121, 32; 122, 1A) is from La Grafesenque (Dannell 1978, 225; Williams 1978, 7) while six sherds are attributed to Arezzo, one of which Williams states to be stamped XANTHUS (ibid, 6), but none of the stamps published by Dannell can be plausibly read as this. Lastly one piece is attributed to Lyon and one to Lezoux (Williams 1978, 8).

Selsey. Context not known: stamped CANIS/IVS (O/C 96?). Dannell (1977, 231, 233, n 13) seems to imply that the piece is from Lezoux. The provenance has not been verified (Pitts 1979, 73, no 56; Aldsworth 1987, M1:810).

WILTSHIRE

Oare. Settlement?: two pieces, one Ritt 9 stamped PLEV, which should be Tiberian and a Ritt 4b may be pre-conquest introductions. Both are probably from La Grafesenque (Swan 1975, 59). Hartley (in Swan 1975, 59) suggests a Romano-British rather than Iron Age date, specifically because of the supposed rarity of
25.2 BRITISH FINDS PREVIOUSLY SUGGESTED TO BE OF LATER IRON AGE DATE

DORSET

1 Poundsbury. Settlement: Bird (in Green 1987, 119) suggests that one piece may be early Italian or Gaulish [sic] but it is not clear if it may be an Iron Age import.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE

2 Rodborough. Settlement: one fragment of a Drag 17 possibly of Tiberian date was found but it is impossible to locate where from the evidence published (Rennie 1959, 42, Fig 6, 30). The O'Neils and the Royal Commission regard the site as a Roman camp (O'Neil and O'Neil 1952, 27; RCHME 1976, 98) while Rennie regards the earthworks as medieval (1959). The possibility that the vessel was an Iron Age import should not be discounted (cf Swan 1975, 44-5).

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

3 East Bridgford (Margidunum). Roman fort: the piece may
be by Cornelius rather than by M. Perennius Tigranus, but
if it is a Tiberian vessel then it was probably
introduced after the Claudian conquest (Oswald 1940;
Comfort 1962b, 454-5; Todd 1967), if indeed this broad
attribution is correct. Marsh has stated that G. Simpson
has reidentified the piece as an early second century AD
Drag.37 of Potter X-2 of Les Martres-de-Veyre (Marsh
1979, 127). Oswald claimed that the sherd was found in a
Claudian pit but it is difficult to support such an early
date (Todd 1967; 1968).

Oundle. Settlement: suggested to be Arretine by Hull
(1961, 211) but Dannell (1979, 180) identifies it as
Central Gaulish beaker by Libertus.

NORTH YORKSHIRE

Stanwick. Fortified settlement: as Hartley and Fitts
(1977) point out, none of the material need be earlier
than AD 43 although their reasoning is not entirely
convincing (Chadburn 1983, 17; Haselgrove and Turnbull

OXFORDSHIRE

Bicester. A decorated sherd probably by M. Perennius
Tigranus (Comfort 1942; Stenico 1960b, 59; Brown 1968,
13, Pl IX, 25, Fig 1, 25). Comfort has proposed that the
vessel is later than AD 43 (1959b, 6; 1962b, 456) but has
subsequently retracted the suggestion (1975). The
authenticity of the findspot is not guaranteed (Haverfield 1905-7).

STAFFORDSHIRE

7 Hanley. Comfort (1962b) suggests that the vessel may be a product of Tindari and while it may be of later Tiberian date, it seems unlikely to have been introduced to Britain in the Iron Age and possibly not even in antiquity (Simpson 1968, 36; Marsh 1979, 129, n 34).

SURREY

8 Walton-on-the-Hill. Settlement: a L 2 from a Roman context and while possibly residual it seems likelier to be a Romano-British introduction as there is scanty evidence for Iron Age occupation (Lowther 1950, 78, Fig 9, 41).

WEST YORKSHIRE

9 Almondsbury. Hillfort: although often stated to be 'Arretine' (eg Branigan 1984, 29; Hanson and Campbell 1986, 74), the description of the sherd is hardly suggestive of it (Varley 1976, 130) and while Collis' scepticism is perhaps too much (1984c, 89), the sherd is not accepted as an Iron Age import here.
25.3 Falsa

Cambridgeshire

1 Bartlow Hills. A stamp of L.R. Pisanus taken by Fox (1923, 203, n 1) and Rodwell (1976a, Fig 44) to be genuine but there are no records of its discovery and as the piece is apparently tardo-italic and the stamp is not found in western Europe and also looks to be a collector's piece, it is very unlikely to be a genuine find (cf Hawkes and Hull 1947, 190, n 1, who appear to imply, somewhat misleadingly, that the piece is from Cambridge rather than in the museum there).

Essex

2 Maldon. Hull mentions a find from a burial at Maldon (1961, 210) but not from the one at Heybridge and it seems likely that the two were confused (cf Rodwell 1976a, 319; App 2.1, 15b) and the find is from the Heybridge New Cemetery (cp Wickenden 1986, 53; = App 25.1, 10 above).

Middlesex

3 London. Based on careful research into the history of the pieces Marsh (1979) has shown that all the pieces must be regarded as modern introductions (cp Rodwell 1976a, 308).
Finds apparently from collections (e.g. Hildyard 1951; Detsicas 1964) are not considered here.

25.4 REPUBLIC OF IRELAND

The sole piece of Roman material which is thought to have been imported into Eire from continental Europe during the British later Iron Age is included here for the sake of completeness.

CO. OFFALY

Ballinderry Crannog No 2

A single sherd of 'Arretine' was identified by Wheeler (Hancken 1942, 48) and this has been upheld by subsequent commentators (Ó, Riordáin 1947, 66-7; Bateson 1973, 27, 66) although the sherd itself does not appear to have been checked. It is uncertain if the sherd is 'Arretine' or later along with most of the terra sigillata from Ireland.
APPENDIX 26

GAULISH FINE WARES FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

26.1 CERTAIN OR POSSIBLE FINDS OF GAULISH FINE WARES

BERKSHIRE

1 Cunning Man. Burial: TN Cam 7 stamped NOVIIDVS. A vessel identified as a TN Cam 21 but possibly a MicTN Cam 2B, and a PC Cam 113. The stamps (cf Rigby 1981a, 169) and the possibility that the unstamped vessel may be MicTN (Timby 1982) suggests that the burial may be Iron Age (Boon and Wymer 1958, 48-50, Fig 3, 1, 3-4).

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

2 Bierton. Rural settlement: MicTN Cam 52, TR 1A Cam 74 and 76, TR 1C Cam 7B (Rigby in Allen 1986, 21-3, Fig 14, 34; 16, 90).

CAMBRIDGESHIRE

3 Foxton. Burial: TN, two Cam 8, one stamped TORNOS/ VOCAO [sic] (Fox 1923, 201).

4 Snailwell. Burial: TN, two Cam 56, one stamped IVLIO: TR, Cam 7A stamped CARIVIR, Cam 74; Cam 112A; PC Cam 113
DORSET

5 Gussage All Saints. Rural settlement: TR Cam 5. This vessel and possibly some of the PC Beakers from the site may be Iron Age imports (Wainwright 1979, 73).

6 Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: one TN Cam 2, possibly of pre-conquest date (Bushe-Fox 1915, 56, Pl XXVII, 28) and a Central Gaulish Butt Beaker Cam 112/115, with notched scroll decoration (ibid, 47, Pl XIII, 8). There is another beaker from Cunliffe's excavations as well as a small number (five) of certainly Aquitanian wares; a Santrot and Santrot (1979) Form S 175 tazza, one or two bowls (58a), a platter (A216) and a closed form (225?) (Rigby 1987, 279-80, Ill 192, 2584, 2586, Not illus, 2587, 2585) plus a further five possible ones (idem, M8:A14). In general, however, Rigby inclines to date most of the assemblage to the post conquest period.

7 Maiden Castle. Hillfort: the TR Cam 2 could be an Iron Age import (Wheeler 1943, 242, Fig 76, 1; Rigby 1987, 278), although it could possibly be associated with the early Roman occupation (Todd 1984; Rigby in Green 1987, 118, M3:C6).

8a Poole - Hamworthy. Settlement: some TN and TR platters may be Iron Age imports (Smith 1930; Timby 1982; Rigby 1987, 278) as there may be other Iron Age imports (App 2.1, 10c), but some could be associated with an early military phase (cf Cunliffe 1982a, 46).

8b Poole Harbour Ower. Settlement: it is difficult to
ascertain which pieces are from Iron Age contexts from the published evidence (Woodward 1986). However, there is one TN vessel, a TR 1A Cam 73/74, a TR 2 and a TR3 vessel, one MicTN Cam 1 or 2 and a PC Cam 113. One Aquitanian tazza (Santrot and Santrot Form 171) (Timby 1986, 77, Fig 41, 32) and a platter (ibid, 78, Fig 41, 34). There is also a beaker whose origin cannot be discerned.

ESSEX

9 Burnham-on-Crouch. Burial: TN Cam 2, PC Cam 112. Although not certainly Iron Age imports none of the other material from the site is demonstrably Roman so the vessels are included here (Thompson 1982, 650, Fig 25, 668).

10a Colchester - Lexden Group 21 (St Clare Drive). Burial: TR Cam 76A (Colchester Mus Rep 1932, 26, 32, 35, Pl VIII, 1-2). The Camulodunum type figure (cf App 8.1, 3a).

10b Colchester - Lexden Tumulus. Burial: TR?, one, possibly two, Butt Beakers = one 115/16 and one Cam 112 (Laver 1927, 246, Pl LII, Fig 2, where Laver conflates a Cam 102 as well; Foster 1986 113-16, 120-1, Fig 37, 1, 5; 38). According to Rigby (in Foster 1986) the Cam 112 may not actually be from the burial and the 115/16 is suggested to perhaps be a British product, although a central Gaulish source should not be excluded.


10d Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: Hawkes and Hull did not
distinguish between TR and TN in their summary of finds from the Periods while very few Gallo-Belgic wares (six) were certainly stratified in Iron Age contexts in Niblett's excavations (1985, M1: F12), accordingly they are presented together (Tab 42) rather than separately as with the Terra Sigillata (Tab 25-7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>At least one in TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>At least one in TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14B/C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>At least one in TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>in TR 3 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82/84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>in TR 3 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115/16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hawkes and Hull 1947; Rigby 1985.

Stamps of the potters Acutus, Acuto, ..V.TO (rad), Andica, AT.., Bitvol, [B]ovit (rad), Durotix, Iiudo, Iappi, Iulios (rad) Ivlio, Ivijo, Ti.RJ.O.X., Viscros, Vritves (rad) were found in Hawkes and Hull's excavations (1947, 208-12) and locin from the 1970 excavations (Rigby 1985, stamp GB no 69, M1: F6). A number of other stamps from the recent excavations could also be pre-Claudian products (ibid, nos 8, 11-12, 14, 25, 27-8, 38, 46).


13 Heybridge - Langford Junction. Settlement: (Fitch
Collection). The Fitch collection has many Gallo-Belgic wares, some of which, eg the Cam 1 and 2s, are likely to have been Iron Age imports (Wickenden 1986, 57).

14 Kelvedon. Rural settlement/village: TN and TR are known but not fully published (K.A. Rodwell 1979, 330; Eddy with Turner 1982, 28-9, Fig 12, 2-10, 13).

15 Layer-de-la-Haye. Settlement: MicTN Cam 1; TR Cam 84B, Cam 116A, Cam 116B, Cam 119B and PC sherds (Turner, Turner and Major 1983, 132-3, Fig 7, 1, 4-6, 10).


17 Orsett. Burial?: a Cam 1 in MicTN? may be an Iron Age import (Thompson 1982, 793, Fig 63, 1050).


GLOUCESTERSHIRE

19 Bagendon. Oppidum?: TN Cam 3, Cam 5, Cam 7, Cam 8, Cam 12, Cam 13, Cam 14, Cam 16, Cam 56; TR Cam 3, Cam 5, Cam 7, Cam 8, Cam 56, Cam 73, Cam 74-9, Cam 84; PC Cam 112 (Clifford 1961; S.D. Trow pers comm). Despite Swan's (1975) argument, some of these finds may well be Iron Age imports (cf Rodwell 1976a, 308-9; Champion 1979, 430, n 38), recent excavations (Trow 1982b) may help to resolve this. Stamps of AN[DECOS] and BENTO[S] and CAN[NIC[COS from possible Iron Age contexts from Clifford's excavations.

20 North Cerney. Hillfort: TN, TR and PC vessels have been found, some of which, notably TR platters, are probably
Iron Age imports (S.D. Trow pers comm; cf Jarvis 1986, 13).

HAMPSHIRE

21 Hayling Island. Temple: Gallo-Belgic wares have been found, some of which may be in Iron Age context (A.C. King pers comm).

22 Hurstbourne Tarrant. Burial: TN Cam 2A, Cam 4B; TR Cam 112/115 (Hawkes and Dunning 1930, 306-8, Fig 32, 4-8; cf Knocker 1963; Foster 1986, 115-16).

23 Owslebury. Settlement and cemetery (Collis 1968, 23; 1970, 250 notes TN, TR and PC Butt Beakers from the settlement and PC Butt Beakers and TN and TR from the cemetery, two of the TR platters being stamped IIII (Collis 1968, 27, Pl X b; 1977a, Tab 1, Fig 7-8).

24 Riseley Farm. Rural settlement: TR 3 vessels (E.L. Morris pers comm).

25 Silchester. Oppidum?: There are TN, TR, MicTN and PC vessels as well as Central Gaulish roulette decorated beakers from the current excavations (Fulford 1985a, 26). The stratification of the older finds is far from clear. Boon hints that TN vessels stamped by Acutus and Bovti could be pre-conquest as well as a PC Cam 114 but it is impossible to be conclusive (Boon 1969, 29-31). Quantified data is available from Fulford's earlier excavations (Tab 43).
TABLE 43
GAULISH FINE WARES FROM PIT 1, SILCHESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cam Form</th>
<th>TR1</th>
<th>TR2</th>
<th>TR3</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>MicTN</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56A/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73/79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fulford with Corney 1984, 128-36, Fig 42-4.
Extra-Mural Sites

Cam 2, 5, 7, 12/13 and 56 are likely to be pre-conquest in manufacture.

26 Winnall Down. Rural settlement: it is possible that the MicTN found in Roman contexts could have been Iron Age imports (Fasham 1985, 69, 72, Tab 10).

27 Worthy Down. Rural settlement: TN Cam 8, 14, possibly pre-conquest imports (Hooley 1930, 186, Fig 55).

HERTFORDSHIRE

28 Baldock. Settlement: one TN Cam 2; TR 2 Cam 6; TR 3 Cam 84; TR3 Cam 112 from Iron Age contexts (Stead and Rigby 1986, 283, 285, 287, 292), with (and including) the following vessels considered to be pre-conquest typologically (ibid, 230-1, Tab 10-11) (Tab 44).
TABLE 44

POSSIBLE LATER IRON AGE IMPORTS OF GAULISH FINE WARES FROM BALDOCK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cam Form</th>
<th>TR 1A</th>
<th>TR 1C</th>
<th>TR2</th>
<th>TR3</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>MicTR</th>
<th>MicTN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldock 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam 79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam 82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam 84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam 112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL    | 7     | 3     | 4    | 3    | 1   | 11  | 2     | 6     | 37    |

Source: Stead and Rigby 1986.

29a Braughing - Bath House. Oppidum?: apparently a pre-conquest collection which can be tabulated as follows (Tab 45) (Rigby 1977b).
### TABLE 45

**GAULISH FINE WARES FROM BRAUGHING - BATH HOUSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cam Form</th>
<th>TR 1</th>
<th>TR 2</th>
<th>TR 3</th>
<th>MicTN</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or 8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54/56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beakers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rigby 1977b.

There are stamps of Julios and Andocaulo or Andicovilo.
The same Julios die was found at Haltern (Rigby 1977b, 1981b).

---

**29b** Braughing - Ermine Street. Oppidum?: Gallo-Belgic wares (Haselgrove 1987a, 432).

**29c** Braughing - Gatesbury. Settlement: a comparatively large assemblage (Rigby 1981d) (Tab 46).
| Cam Form | TR TR 1A TR 1B TR 1C TR 2 TR 3 MicTR MicTN TN PC TOTAL |
|----------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1        | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 5                 | -                 | -                 | 5                 |
| 2        | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 13                | 13                |
| 3        | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 3                 | 5                 |
| 5        | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 6                 | 12                |
| 7        | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 13                | 19                |
| 8        | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 4                 | 4                 |
| 10       | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 1                 | 2                 |
| 11       | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 1                 | 3                 |
| 13       | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 2                 | 2                 |
| 15       | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 1                 | 1                 |
| 51A      | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 1                 | 1                 |
| 53       | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 1                 | 2                 |
| 54       | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 1                 | 4                 |
| 56A      | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 5                 | 8                 |
| 76/7     | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 3                 | 3                 |
| 79       | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 4                 | 4                 |
| 112      | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 12                | -                 | -13-16            | 25                |
| 113      | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 9                 | 9                 |
| 114      | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 1                 | -                 | -                 | 1                 |
| 120      | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 1                 | -                 | 1                 |
| Rigby 44 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 1                 | -                 | 1                 |
| Ob 87    | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 1                 | -                 | 1                 |
| Ob 91    | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 2                 | -                 | 4                 |
| TOTAL    | 19                | 9                 | 2                 | 12                | 3                 | 13                | 5                 | 2                 | 42                | 23                | 130               |

Source: Rigby 1981d.
All of these vessels could be Iron Age imports. There are a number of stamps: Acutus x 2, Attisus, Canicos, Cicarus, Julios, Lullos, Smertuccos, Tornos (?), Vritves and an unidentified stamp. Additionally Westell (1936, 362) notes stamps of VIR (Viriodacus?) and MOTTA.

29d Braughing - Gatesbury Track. Oppidum?: (Rigby 1979). It is possible to divide the finds into those certainly of Iron Age date (Tab 47) and those possibly so (Tab 48).
TABLE 47

CERTAIN LATER IRON AGE IMPORTS OF GAULISH FINE WARES FROM BRAUGHING - GATESBURY TRACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cam Form</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TR 3</th>
<th>MicTR</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>MicTN</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74/9</td>
<td>1(TR 1C)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76/7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hol 9b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 21 14 1 9 4 20 69


A stamp of Acutus was stratified in a secure Iron Age context. The rest of the material from the site although
not in secure contexts is possibly also of Iron Age date and the following vessels were represented (Tab 48).

TABLE 48

POSSIBLE LATER IRON AGE IMPORTS OF GAULISH FINE WARES FROM BRAUGHING - GATESBURY TRACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cam Form</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TR 3</th>
<th>MicTR</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>MicTN</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3var</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76/7</td>
<td>2(Tr 1C)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It should be noted that the totals given by Rigby (1979, 113) do not tally with the vessels documented by her.
Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: a major assemblage, fully documented by Rigby (1981a). The securely stratified and identified Iron Age material is tabulated in Table 49 and the unidentified material in Table 50.

### Table 49

**Identifiable Gaulish Fine Wares from Securely Dated Later Iron Age Contexts at Braughing - Skeleton Green**

<p>| Cam Form TR TR 1A TR 1B TR 1C TR 2 TR 3 MicTR TN MicTN PC TOTAL |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 1                | -                | -                | -                 | -                 | -                | -                | -                | -                | 1                | 14               | 15               |
| 2                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 28               | 2                | 30               |
| 3                | -                | -                | 4                | 6                | -                | -                | -                | 2                | -                | -                | 12               |
| 4B               | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 1                | -                | -                | 1                |
| 5                | 2                | 7                | 1                | 5                | -                | -                | -                | 13               | -                | -                | 28               |
| 6                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 13               | -                | -                | 28               |
| 7                | 1                | -                | 5                | 10               | -                | -                | -                | 2                | -                | -                | 18               |
| 8                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 1                | -                | 1                | 2                |
| 10               | -                | 1                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 1                | -                | -                | 2                |
| 11/12            | -                | -                | 1                | 1                | -                | -                | -                | 5                | -                | -                | 12               |
| 12/13            | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 8                | -                | -                | 8                |
| 13               | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 6                | -                | -                | 7                |
| 14               | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 5                | -                | -                | 5                |
| 15               | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 3                | -                | -                | 3                |
| 16               | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 1                | -                | -                | 2                |
| 51               | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 1                | 7                | -                | 8                |
| 53               | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 1                | -                | -                | 1                |
| 54               | -                | -                | 1                | 3                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | -                | 4                |
| 56               | -                | -                | 4                | 1                | 1                | -                | -                | 4                | -                | -                | 10               |
| 56A              | -                | -                | 1                | 3                | 2                | -                | -                | 8                | -                | -                | 14               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TR 1A</th>
<th>TR 1B</th>
<th>TR 1C</th>
<th>TR 2</th>
<th>TR 3</th>
<th>MicTN</th>
<th>TN MicTN</th>
<th>PC TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Platters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup/Bowl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following stamps were found in secure Iron Age contexts: Atepos, Attissus (rad) Eilo, Julios, Tiotagos (not certain), Vritves, IOS, a potters mark. Additionally these stamps may have been imported during the Iron Age: Acutus, Ata, L:IEC, Dannomarus, IOS or IVS; IVT; IV; IV, and an unidentifiable stamp.

29f Braughing - Station Road. Oppidum?: (Partridge 1979, 43-5) (Tab 51).

### TABLE 51

**GAULISH FINE WARES FROM BRAUGHING - STATION ROAD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cam Form</th>
<th>TR 1A</th>
<th>TR 1B</th>
<th>TR 1C</th>
<th>TR 3</th>
<th>MicTR</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>MicTN</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7var</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74/9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84/112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 5 | 2 | 2 | 20 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 10 | **45**

Additionally a Cam 1 platter in MicTN is probably an Iron Age import residual in a Roman context.

29g Braughing - Wickham Kennels. Oppidum?: (Partridge 1980-82, 58-9) (Tab 52).

--------

TABLE 52

TYPOLOGICALLY PRE-CLAUDIAN FINE WARES FROM BRAUGHING - WICKHAM KENNELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cam</th>
<th>Form TR 1A</th>
<th>TR 1B</th>
<th>TR 1C</th>
<th>TR 3</th>
<th>MicTR</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>MicTN</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>CG?</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestalled Cup</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Partridge 1980-82.
The two MicTN vessels are considered to be early Central Gaulish vessels by Rigby and Freestone (1986, 8).

30 Crookhams. Settlement: MicTN Cam 2a; TR 3 Cam 83/5 rather than TR 4 as Rook (1968) suggests (contra Thompson 1982, 687), PC Cam 113 (Rook 1968, 58, Fig VII, 4, 5).

31a St Albans - King Harry Lane. Cemetery: Rigby (1981a, 195, Tab IV) lists the vessels from the cemetery most of which appear to be of Iron Age date (cf Stead 1969). Rigby appears to be using another classification for this material but this is not explained so the correlation with the Cam series presented in Table 53 is not absolutely certain.

TABLE 53

GAULISH FINE WARES FROM ST ALBANS - KING HARRY LANE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cam Form</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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31b St Albans - Prae Wood. Oppidum?: Wheeler’s excavations (Wheeler and Wheeler 1936) have been exhaustively reassessed by Thompson (1982; cf Hunn 1980; Tab 54).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Enclosure A</th>
<th>Cam Form</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>MiCTN</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 36 38 74

TABLE 54

GAULISH FINE WARES FROM ST ALBANS - PRAE WOOD
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL  6  21  2  6  35


**AREA 2**

'Black Ditch One PC Cam 113 (Thompson 1982, 918).

'U' Ditch = Group C

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stamped ..JAN

(Thompson *op cit*, 922, 926)

- 844 -
AREA 3

Area Z  One TN Cam 13, (ibid, 933).


31c  St Albans - Verulam Hills Field. Cemetery: TR Cam 7 with illegible stamp, TR3? Cam 112 from grave 17 (Anthony 1968, 17, Fig V, 17A-B). The Girth Beaker, Cam 115, from grave 16 could be an import (ibid, Fig V, 16).

31d  St Albans - Verulamium. Oppidum?: some of the finds from the site of the Roman town could be Iron Age imports (cf Frere 1961) but this is not proven (idem, 1984a, 249).

32  Welwyn Garden City. Burial: two MicTN early versions of Cam 1 platters (Stead 1967a, 14, Fig 8, 29-30; Rigby and Freestone 1986, 7-8). Presumably the tazza in the burial (Stead 1967a, Fig 8, 18) imitates an imported Cam 51.

ISLE OF WIGHT

33  Gill's Cliff, Ventnor. Settlement: a TR Cam 7 and ?77 are probably Iron Age imports, as may be a TN? Cam 2 platter (Benson 1953, 307-9, Fig 4, 9-11).

34  Redcliff. Settlement: some pre-conquest imports (D.J. Tomalin pers comm).
KENT

35 Bexley, Cold Blow. Settlement: MicTN Cam 2 with PC Cam 112/113 (Caiger 1958, 187, Fig 1, 4) both may be pre-conquest.

36a Canterbury - Canterbury Castle. Oppidum?: Bennett, Frere and Stow (1982, 94-5, 126, 140) suggest only a MicTN Cam 1? and a TR Cam 3-5 as possible Iron Age imports.

36b Canterbury - Marlowe (Sites). Oppidum?: at least two early Central Gaulish vessels (Rigby and Freestone 1986, 8).

36c Canterbury - Rose Lane. Oppidum?: TN Cam 2-5 with PC vessels (Frere 1954, 103-12). The Cam 2 may be Central Gaulish (cf Thompson 1982, 793, Fig 63, 1050).

36d Canterbury. None of the material from the Defences sites need be pre-conquest (Frere, Stow and Bennett 1982, 140) but Arthur (1986, 256, n 80) states that something approaching 200 pre-Claudian vessels have now been identified from other sites in the city.

37 Faversham. Rural settlement: TN Cam 2c, two TN Cam 13/14, TN Cam 8 stamped SII = SIINODO or SINNORV?, PC Cam 112, 116 (Philp 1968, 78, Fig 24, 183, 195-9).

38 Gravesend. Settlement: TR Beaker? (French and Green 1983, 57, 64, Fig 5, 69).


40 Walmer. Burial: Augustan cup (ibid).
LEICESTERSHIRE

41a  Leicester - Blackfriars Street. Oppidum?: it is not possible to attribute many of the sherds to vessel forms but by fabrics the following vessels were found in certain or probable Iron Age contexts (Tab 55).

TABLE 55

GAULISH FINE WARES FROM LEICESTER - BLACKFRIARS STREET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>2B</th>
<th>2C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 1C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 3(A)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 3(B)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic TN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clay and Mellor 1985.

The MicTN vessel is a Cam 1 (Clay and Mellor 1985, 51, Fig 31, 1) additionally a further two vessels in the same fabric are likely to be Iron Age imports (ibid, 41). There is a stamp Lullos/Votis on a TN platter (Phase 1B) (ibid, 59, Fig 37, 1) while a stamps of Melos on another
TN platter is probably also an Iron Age import (ibid, Fig 37, 2).

41b Leicester - Jewry Wall. Oppidum?: the following vessels came from the 'Iron Age' pits and are likely to be of Iron Age date (Tab 56).

TABLE 56

GAULISH FINE WARES FROM LEICESTER - JEWRY WALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cam Form</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TR 1A</th>
<th>TR 1B</th>
<th>TR 1C</th>
<th>TR 2</th>
<th>MicTN</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LINCOLNSHIRE

42 Old Sleaford. Settlement: May (1976, 188) mentions a variety of Gallo-Belgic imports but illustrates only two PC Cam 112 and 113 (Fig 95, 4-5; cf Elsdon 1982, Fig 13, 61; Elsdon and May 1987, 61).

NORTH HUMBERSIDE

43 Redcliff (North Ferriby). Settlement: it is possible that a TN Cam 3 may be an Iron Age import, but the bulk of the older finds are later (Corder and Pryce 1938; Rigby 1976, 133-5). However, some material from the recent excavations may be earlier (Crowther 1987, 285).

OXFORDSHIRE

44 Dorchester-on-Thames. Settlement: MicTN Cam 2, TN Cam 12, 16, 17 and TR and PC vessels could be Iron Age imports (Frere 1962; 1984b).

SOMERSET


Dragonby. Settlement: only seven TR and TN vessels are suggested to be typologically pre-Claudian; TR 1C Cam 7/8; TR 3 Cam 84B; two TR Cam 72-9; two-three MicTN Cam 51C (Elsdon and May 1987, 63-5, Fig 39A, 1-4).

Of these only one MicTN Cam 51C appears to be from a Key Group probably of Iron Age date, 2086/E in ceramic stage 8 (op cit, 39, 41, 46, Chart 1-2, Diag 1-2).

One other group in the Key Sequence with TN might be of Iron Age date; 1682. However, this group is ascribed to both ceramic stages 8 (op cit, 39, 64, Chart 1, Diag 1), probably of Iron Age date) and 9, which spans the Roman conquest (op cit, 43, Chart 2), although it is sometimes also called Iron Age (op cit, 65) in the Draft Report.

From the description of the feature, a ditch (op cit, 43), it is apparent that it was open until well into the Romano-British period. The vessel itself is a TN platter stamped I PPOS, which may or may not be pre Claudian (op cit, 108, Fig 39A, 8).

It is also difficult to assess when PC vessels first appear. It is suggested that Cam 113 occur in ceramic stage 8 as sherds from the same vessel (op cit, Pot 1255, 92, Fig 16, 1255) were found in contexts 2086 and 1477 (op cit, 43, 46), the former being suggested to be of Iron Age date. However, the Cam 113 sherd is not mentioned in the descriptions of 2086 (op cit, 41) or of the pottery from it (op cit, 92-3, Fig 17-18), while in the dating summaries the sherd is described as an imitation but the vessel from 1477 is taken to be an
'original' (op cit, 124-5). On the basis of this join it is suggested that 1477 which contains other Gaulish finewares and a Dr 20 may be of pre-conquest date (op cit, 43) but the intaglio and coin of Nero (probably not issued until after AD 63) is commensurate with the parallels of the amphora rim with Flavian forms at Augst (Martin-Kilcher 1983, Fig 2-3; 1987, Beil 2) and their absence from the pre-Flavian Colchester – Sheepeen assemblage (Sealey 1985, 67-75, Fig 10-11) in suggesting that the feature was open until after the Roman conquest, while it is suggested elsewhere in the Draft Report that there is Claudian pottery from it (Elsdon and May 1987, 6) and that it belongs to ceramic stage 9 (op cit, 125, Chart 1-2, Diag 1-2). Because of this some doubt must attach to the suggestion that Cam 113 first appear in ceramic stage 8.

The typologically earliest PC Cam 113 was found in a Roman context 745/C (op cit, 39, 65, 108), while the TR 1C Cam 7/8 of pre-Claudian type (Pot 1148 from 1267) was associated with a post-conquest TN Cam 14 (op cit, 48, 98, Fig 26, 1148, 1147 [sic]), suggesting that the earliest material either continued in used for some time before breakage and/or deposition, or that it was old when it arrived. As typologically pre-Claudian pieces comprise 17% of the TR and TN collection (7 of 41), it is difficult to accept the latter argument, particularly as the MicTN Cam 51C are almost invariably of pre-conquest date, as indeed is suggested by the stratification of the Dragonby example from 2086/E.
Of the Cam 113, only c. 1.5% (2 of c. 142) may be pre-conquest pieces, but it is unclear how many pieces are Gaulish imports or their imitations. Related to these vessels is a Cam 114 (op cit, 65, 109, Fig 41B, 7) which could be an Iron Age import.

A number of PC flagons occur in contexts ascribed to ceramic stage 8 (eg 2100/C, op cit, 124, Chart 1-2, Diag 1) or 9 (1477, op cit, 125, Chart 1-2, Diag 1-2). However, South Gaulish Samian was associated in 2100/C so it is possible that a later date should be entertained, and there appears to be no unambiguous evidence to support a pre-conquest date for ceramic stage 9. Again while the pre-conquest import of flagons alongside TR, TN and other PC vessels is likely it cannot be demonstrated stratigraphically.

Lastly, the possibility that one vessel may be Aquitanian should be noted (op cit, 109, Fig 41B, 1), although it is not immediately comparable to the forms presented by Santrot and Santrot (1979). Where Aquitanian vessels have been recognised in Britain, at Poole Harbour - Ower and Hengistbury Head (nos 6 and 8b above) they have been considered to be of Iron Age date and it is just possible that, if it is Aquitanian, the Dragonby piece should be set alongside them, perhaps arriving alongside the Central Gaulish MicTN Cam 51C tazzae.
SUFFOLK

48 Burgh-by-Woodbridge. Settlement: TN Cam 8, TR 1A Cam 5 and 7A, TR 1B Cam 3 may be Iron Age imports (Martin 1975 and pers comm).

SUSSEX

49 Chichester. Oppidum?: very few pieces which are likelier than not to be pre-Claudian products in Rigby's opinion have so far been published and neither have any certain Iron Age groups. However, this is at odds with the terra sigillata (App 25.1, 28) and it seems that the Gaulish fine wares may be dated too late. Those pieces which Rigby (1978; 1981c) considers likely to be Iron Age imports are set out in Table 57.

---

TABLE 57

GAULISH FINE WARES FROM CHICHESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cam Form</th>
<th>TR 1A</th>
<th>TR 1C</th>
<th>TR 2</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72/9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fishbourne. Settlement: none of the Gallo-Belgic wares were attributed to the Iron Age but two stamps on TR platters are those of potters whose work reached Haltern, Attisus and Dannomarus. The Attisus stamp is from the same die as the Haltern find.

Rigby has reconsidered the finds in conjunction with the Chichester finds (1978). Rigby tabulates the Gallo-Belgic wares from Fishbourne as follows (1978, Tab 2; Tab 58).

---

**TABLE 58**

**PROBABLE LATER IRON AGE IMPORTS OF GAULISH FINE WARES FROM FISHBOURNE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cam Form</th>
<th>TR 1A</th>
<th>TR 1C</th>
<th>TR 2</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>MicTN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 3 8 3 50 1 65

Rigby recognises the MicTN *Cam* 1 platter as likely to be of pre-conquest date while the seven *Cam* 3 and 5 platters in TR 1 are also likely to be of pre-Claudian manufacture but the bulk of the finds could be of post-conquest date.

51 Lancing Down. Settlement?: a TR *Cam* 4B and a PC Butt Beaker *Cam* 113? from limited excavations (Frere 1940, 158, Fig 10, 2-3).

52 Lancing Ring. Shrine: a TN *Cam* 1 or 2A and a PC ?Butt Beaker may be Iron Age imports (Frere 1940, 163, 165, Fig 13, 25; 14, 28) as is a TR *Cam* 84 (Bedwin 1981, 50, Fig 7, a-c).

WILTSHIRE

53 Boscombe Down. Rural settlement: TN *Cam* 13? and two PC *Cam* 115/19. The former may be an Iron Age import (Richardson 1951, 149, Fig 12, 94-7; Brailsford 1958, 115).

54 Casterley Camp. Rural settlement: TN *Cam* 5A? and 3?; TR3?, 3 x *Cam* 82/4 - possibly from one vessel; PC *Cam* 113/15 and two or one possibly Central Gaulish *Cam* 113/15. A TR platter with an illegible stamp may be by ATTISSVS (Cunnington and Cunnington 1913, 101-3, Pl VIII, 31-2; V, 3-5; VI, 1; V, 1-2; Rigby 1987, 278-9; Hawkes and Hull 1947, 209).


56 Oare. Settlement?: TN and TR 1C platters. Two stamps of Attisus and a number of PC Beakers may be Iron Age
imports (Swan 1975, 56-9; Rodwell 1976a, 308-9; Champion 1979, 402, 430, n 38).

26.2 GAULISH FINE WARES NOT CERTAINLY OF LATER IRON AGE DATE

DORSET

1 Jordan Hill. Cemetery: a Cam 56 cup could be an Iron Age import (Rigby 1987, 278; and in Green 1987, M3:C6) but the associations are uncertain (Chambers 1978, 3; Whimster 1981, 260).

ESSEX

2 Woodham Walter. Rural settlement: one TR 3 beaker could be an import (Rodwell 1987, 26-7, 39, Fig 19, 97), but it is of unusual form and could be an indigenous imitation.

HAMPshire

3 Southampton. Settlement: Hawkes (in Waterman 1948, 166) suggested that some of the Gallo-Belgic wares may be Iron Age imports, but the bulk, if not all, of the material appears to be associated with the early Roman occupation.

HERTFORDSHIRE

4 Park Street. Rural settlement: TN cup possibly from an Iron Age context (O'Neil 1945, 77, Fig 15, 5), but the
stratification is ambiguous.

NORFOLK

5 Thetford. Settlement: some TN may be pre-conquest in manufacture but the site is thought to date to after the conquest (A. Gregory pers comm; cf Current Archaeol 7, 1981, 294-7).

NORTH HUMBERSIDE

6 Rudston. Settlement: TR3 Cam 82/3; PC Cam 113 (Stead 1980, 41, Fig 24). These two finds could be Iron Age as there are some brooches possibly of this date (ibid, 95), but they could equally have arrived with the pottery after the conquest to which period the bulk of the earlier Roman material on the site dates.

7 Hayton. Roman fort: one piece may be a TR Cam 76 (Johnson 1978, 92, Fig 23, 17) and could be an Iron Age introduction, although it is perhaps likelier to be an old vessel brought by the army.

NORTH YORKSHIRE

8 Stanwick. Defended settlement: it is possible that some of the fine wares from Wheeler's excavations (1954b, 32-7) and perhaps some of the recent finds (Haselgrove and Turnbull 1983, 6; 1984, 15; Chadburn 1983) could have arrived before AD 43.
Old Winteringham. Settlement: it is possible that a single TN Cam 2 might be an Iron Age import (Rigby 1976, 129, Fig 60, 1) but in view of the date of the assemblage it is perhaps likelier to be an old vessel (cf Elsdon and May 1987, 64).
APPENDIX 27

GLASS BRACELETS IN IRON AGE
BRITAIN AND IRELAND

27.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF GLASS BRACELETS IN BRITAIN

CORNWALL

1 Castle Dore. Hillfort: two bracelets, one Haevernick Group 1 in green glass with yellow glass on the inside face, the other a Group 14 type in ultramarine (Radford 1951, 68-9, Fig 8, 1-2; Fitzpatrick 1985c).

DORSET

2 Gussage All Saints. Rural settlement: fragment in light blue metal, perhaps Group 3a (Wainwright 1979, 104, Fig 79, 6010; Fitzpatrick 1985c, 134)

3 Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: fragments of two plain purple bracelets of Haevernick Group 3a and 2 (Henderson 1987a, 161, Ill 116, 131 A-B) two purple examples with yellow zig-zag decoration of Haevernick Group 3b and 6b (ibid, 161, Ill 116, 129-30) and one cobalt blue bracelet of Haevernick Group 3a (ibid 161, Ill 116, 131C) from the various excavations (Bushe-Fox 1915, 62-3; Cunliffe 1978a, 44; 1982a; 1984e; Henderson 1987a and pers comm).

4 Poole Harbour - Hamworthy. Settlement: fragment of a cobalt blue Haevernick Group 3b bracelet with yellow
zig-zag decoration (Smith 1934, 14, Pl III; 1948, Fig 19, 4; I.P. Horsey pers comm).

HAMPShIRE

5 Hayling Island. Temple: at least one bracelet, apparently of Iron Age date (Downey, King and Soffe 1979, 6).

HERTFORDSHIRE

6 Welwyn Garden City. Burial: one, possibly two, brown Group 3b bracelet(s) with yellow zig-zag decoration (Stead 1967a, 17, Fig 10, C-F, Frontispiece).

ISLE OF MAN

7 Ballacagen A. Rural settlement: one bracelet of white glass with moulded decoration and with yellow glass internally, and two bracelets of pale green glass (Bersu 1977, 63, 84-5, Fig 21, A 43-4, Pl II, A 43-4). Perhaps Group 10 and 6a respectively.

SOMERSET

8 Meare Village East. Settlement: fragment of a Haevernick Group 7b deep blue bracelet with opaque white chequered decoration on central rib, with traces of opaque yellow decoration on another rib (Henderson 1987c, 87-8, 170, 182, Fig 3.23, G 66.55). Henderson suggests that the
find could be third or early second century BC (*ibid*, 182), but this is on the basis of the earliest rather than general currency of the finds. 

Ormes, Coles and Sylvester suggest that a bangle of bluish-green glass with yellow decoration is of first century AD or later date (1982, 68, Fig 69, 480; cf Coles 1987, 88, 170; Fig 3.23, G 82.480). On the presently available evidence this is true, but as the bulk of the activity at the site is Iron Age, a prehistoric origin for the type should not be excluded.

27.2 IRELAND

CO. DOWN

1 ‘Loughey’, near Donaghadee. Burial: two purple bracelets of Haevernick Group 3a possibly of first century BC date or earlier (Jope and Wilson 1957, 82-3, Pl V, lower; Raftery 1983, 175, Fig 152, 462-3; 1984, 151, 196; Henderson 1987a, 162; 1987b).

27.3 GLASS BRACELETS POSSIBLY OF IRON AGE DATE

ESSEX

1 Harlow - Holbrooks. Settlement: purple Group 3b bangle with zig-zag opaque yellow decoration (Harlow Mus,
This piece might be of Iron Age date but a Romano-British date is perhaps more likely.

GWYNEDD

2 Bryn y Castell. Hillfort: at least seven bracelets; (i) four green bracelets with purple and white decoration, (ii) one green bracelet with red and white decoration, (iii) one blue bracelet with yellow-green decoration and (iv) one plain green bracelet (Crew 1985).

HAMPshire

3 Silchester. Oppidum: one bracelet, possibly Iron Age (Boon 1974, 137).

ISLE OF MAN

4 Close ny Chollagh. Rural settlement: blue glass bracelet (Gelling 1958, 94, Fig 4, 3).

5 Port e Candas. Settlement: at least one bracelet (P. Crew pers comm).

27.4 GLASS BRACELETS PROBABLY NOT OF PRE-ROMAN IRON AGE DATE

The Irish finds from Dunadry and Freestone published by Raftery (1983, 175-6; 1984, 196-7) and others from Rathinaun, Tara and Dun Ailinne, Co. Kildare (P. Crew pers comm; Henderson 1987a, 162) are either of third-fourth century AD date or undatable, but likely
to belong to this period rather than earlier although Henderson (1987a, 162) suggests an Iron Age date. It should be noted that the Feerwore find published by Raftery (1983; 1984) as a bracelet probably is not one as it has an internal diameter of only 20mm.
APPENDIX 28

ROMAN GLASS FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

28.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF ROMAN GLASS

ESSEX

1(i) Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: a polychrome or layered blown bowl (\textit{Überfangglas}) of Isings Form 12. The exterior is pink and in the interior colourless (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 297, no 37, Pl LXXXVII, 37). This technique appears to have been developed in the later Tiberian period and may not have outlasted the Claudian one (Berger 1960, 37; van Lith 1977b, 28-9).

1(ii) A blown, undecorated bowl or flask in opaque blue metal (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 299, no 46). In view of the dominance of Isings Form 12 bowls at Velsen and Valkenburg, and the general absence of the flask, it seems likely that the vessel was an Isings Form 12 bowl. Other possibilities are a Form 16 flask or Form 14 flagon both of which occur at the Magdalensberg. Van Lith and Randsborg (1985, 467-8) note that the \textit{Camulodunum} report conflates jugs and flasks.

1(iii) An Isings Form 12 blown bowl in bluish-green metal with a band of wheel turned grooves near the rim (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 303, no 74a). This form first appeared in the Tiberian period and was popular until the Flavian period.
Mount Bures. Burial: a small unguentarium similar to Isings Form 6 or 26a was found but was broken and destroyed shortly after (Smith 1852, 28, 34, Pl XII). Smith, quoting Jackson, describes the vessel as 'of variegated colours inlaid in the glass' (op cit, 28). It is not entirely clear what technique Jackson was describing as, although it is possible that the vessel was core-formed, this would be a very rare find at this time and contemporary vessels made of variegated glass are also uncommon (Isings 1957, 41). Other possibilities are that the vessel was decorated with gold 'ribbon' (Berger and Jouve 1980), or that Jackson was misled by the glass laminating. Without the vessel it is now impossible to decide how the vessel was made and the rather schematic illustration published by Smith is not particularly helpful in deciding what type the vessel was and there are three main possibilities: (i) Isings Form 6. Isings (1957, 22-3) documents a number of Augustan finds, but the Form continued to be made throughout the first century AD; (ii) Isings Form 26a, which was dated by her from the mid-first century AD into the second century (ibid, 40-1) or (iii) small brightly coloured unguentaria which Grose describes a 'similar but not identical to Isings, Form 6' and which were made in Italy possibly from as early as c 40-30 BC but which only became widespread under Augustus (Grose 1977, 25-7; 1982, 28). The illustration is closest to Isings Form 26a but this may be fortuitous and the vessel could belong to any one of the three types all of which could occur in the
Augustan-Tiberian period, to the earlier part of which the Mount Bures burial probably dates.

**GLOUCESTERSHIRE**

3 Bagendon. Oppidum?: four fragments of glass from the same context dated by Clifford to AD 20/25-41 (and likely to be pre-conquest, despite Swan (1975, 59-61)). One fragment is from the side or base of a dark green bottle, the other fragments are of green, amber and dark blue glass respectively. They may be from four different vessels (Clifford 1961, 199).

**HAMPshire**

4 Hurstbourne Tarrant. Burial: fragments of a vessel in a thin brown metal are reported but not illustrated (Hawkes and Dunning 1930, 304). The description of the vessel as thin-walled suggests either an unguentarium of Isings Form 6 (or similar), 8 or 26a (cf Mackenson 1978, 56) or a bowl of Isings Form 1 or 2 as these were the most widely available pre-Claudian thin-walled vessels.

**Hertfordshire**

5(1) Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: a fragment of a millefiori vessel was recovered from an early Tiberian context (c AD 15-25) (Partridge 1981, 119, no 1, Fig 64, 1). Although the technique is known from the second century BC (Oliver 1958), the earliest dated vessel from
Italy is in a context with a terminus ante quem of 25-15 BC (Grose 1982, 26). Vessels occur at Dangstetten and in Augustan and Tiberian contexts at Haltern, Xanten and Vindonissa but are very rare in Claudian contexts (Berger 1960, 16-17; van Lith 1977b, 12-13). Van Lith suggests that the type was not manufactured after c AD 40 (cf also Harden in Hawkes and Hull 1947, 293).

Charlesworth (in Partridge 1981) drew a parallel with an Isings Form 1 bowl in millefiori glass (Harden et al 1968, no 44 (and not 43 as cited by Charlesworth)) and millefiori vessels of this form are known from Dangstetten (Fingerlin 1971, 18, Abb 9; 1986, 30, Abb 52, 8) and from some Augustan burials at Trier (Goethert-Polaschek 1977) and an Augustan or early Tiberian burial from Minusio Cadra, grave 4 (Berger 1960, 16). However, millefiori vessels of Isings Form 2 which also have very thin walls are also found at this time (eg Haltern; Mitt Altertumskomm Westfalens II 1901, 172, nos 4-6; Velsen; van Lith 1977b, 12-13) and so the Skeleton Green vessel could be from either form, both of which are widely distributed (Czurda-Ruth 1979).

5(ii) A polychrome rim sherd of a bowl made in 'strip-mosaic' (Partridge 1981, 72, Fig 33, 18), so-called after the technique of manufacture (cf Goethert-Polaschek 1977, Taf 1). The technique appears to be restricted to simple bowls of Isings Form 1. Berger (1960, 9-16) and Czurda-Ruth (1979, 16-18) suggest that the type was current from the Augustan to Claudian periods, but it is absent from both Valkenburg and Hofheim and occurs only rarely at Camulodunum so it appears possible that, as
with millefiori glass, the technique was not employed after the Tiberian period. The best parallels for the lace-like decorative strip on the Skeleton Green example are, naturally enough, on reticella vessels, for example on a find from Haltern (Mitt Altertumskomm Westfalens III, 1906, Abb 20; ibid V, 1909, 373, Taf XXXVIII, 8). Czurda-Ruth (1979, 16-18) suggests that mosaic glass was made in Campania.

5(iii) The neck and rim of a small unguentarium was found in an Iron Age pit (F 24). The vessel is illustrated by Partridge 1981, 78, Fig 36, 7) but not described. The vessel is of Isings Form 6 or a form similar to it. Vessels of this form could date from the late first century BC until the end of the first century AD (Isings 1957, 22-3; Grose 1977, 25-7; 1982, 28).

6 Hertford Heath. Burial: a shallow pillar-moulded bowl in a translucent greenish yellow metal, with three sets of two shallow grooves internally (Holmes and Frend 1955-57, 9, Pl 4; Hülsen 1983, 9-11, Fig 8, 2, Pl IV). Although the form cannot be precisely paralleled (Hülsen 1983, 9) it approximates to Isings Form 3a. Berger suggests that the internal grooving indicates an eastern origin (Berger and Jouve 1980, 13) and van Lith also suggests that Tiberian pillar-moulded bowls at Velsen are eastern, but Grose (1982, 26) has provided evidence for the manufacture of vessels with similar grooving in Italy in the last quarter of the first century BC. Discussing the Isings Form 3 bowls from the Magdalensberg, the earliest of which may be about the same date as the Hertford Heath example, c 25-20 BC, Czurda-Ruth (1979, 26-34, 234-5)
suggests that they may originate from Alexandria or Campania or possibly northern Italy. Hüssem (1983, 10-11) following Hayes (1975), reviews the date of the key finds and it seems possible to suggest a date between c 50-20 BC for the Hertford Heath find although it should be noted that the vessel form was probably in production much earlier than Hayes would allow (Ch 7.3.1; Grose 1977, 11-13, n 12, 24, n 59; 1981, 67-9).

28.2 ROMAN GLASS POSSIBLY FROM LATER IRON AGE CONTEXTS

HAMPShIRE

1 Silchester. Oppidum: Boon suggests that a fragment of a vessel 'cased white-and-blue with two zones of opaque twist' (Boon 1969, 34) may have been imported during the Augustan period. Boon compares the sherd to a straight-sided vessel from Haltern, probably belonging to a deep version of Isings Form 1 (Isings 1957, 16) but the Haltern vessel is made in strip-mosaic and is not cased like the vessel from Camulodunum which Boon also cites as comparanda (Boon 1969, 34). Boon is unable to give the precise provenance of the Silchester vessel and as similar vessels occur in Claudian contexts it is impossible to decide if it was imported during the Iron Age. This is neatly illustrated by two similar vessels at Skeleton Green, one is from an Iron Age context (no 5(ii) above), while the other (Partridge 1981, 119, Fig 64, 3) was found in a Roman context.
28.3 FINDS PREVIOUSLY SUGGESTED TO BE OF IRON AGE DATE

ESSEX

1 Southend - Southbourne Grove. Burial: although Rodwell (1976a, 322) has suggested that this burial is pre-conquest in date, the coarse pottery, particularly the Cam 58 suggests that it is post-conquest (Thompson, 1982, 827). The vessel is an Isings Form 6 unguentarium (ibid, Fig 71b) and could be of either pre- or post-conquest date.

HAMPshire

2 Silchester. Oppidum: a piece of strip inlay with a yellow flower with a red-and-yellow floret reserved against a royal blue ground was excavated in 1895 by St John Hope (1897, 430). Boon suggests that it might be an Augustan import (1969, 34, Fig 8A, 2). The only parallels which I am aware of are all Egyptian and are thought to be of first century BC - first century AD date (Glass from the Ancient World (1957), 67-79, esp 75, Fig 117; Harden et al 1968, 48). All are mosaic tesserae as the Silchester piece clearly is, as indeed St John Hope noted (1897, 430). In the absence of reliably provenanced finds outside Egypt the likelihood of the Silchester piece arriving in the Iron Age is slight. If it was introduced in antiquity it is probably a Roman period introduction.
3 Stevenage. Burial: Holmes has suggested that Burial 1, which contains an Isings Form 6 unguentarium, may be of Iron Age date on the basis of the single pot included (Holmes 1950-54, 211) but it seems likelier to be of Roman date (cf Thompson 1982, 950).

28.4 FALSE

MIDDLESEX

1(i-iii) London. The three Hellenistic vessels illustrated by Price (1978, 71, Fig 51) and allegedly found in London although accepted by Hülsen (1983, 27, n 20) are rejected here because of both the absence of adequate evidence for an Iron Age settlement and the considerable suspicion that must surround any undocumented London findspot (cf Marsh 1979). Price suggests the type was not made after c AD 25 (Parker and Price 1981, 224-5) although examples were found in the Port Vendres B shipwreck which sank c AD 41/42 so it is possible, although unlikely, that they are Roman period introductions.
# APPENDIX 29

**BRITISH IRON AGE COINS WHICH CERTAINLY OR PROBABLY IMITATE ROMAN GEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MACK</th>
<th>METAL</th>
<th>AUTHORITY</th>
<th>MOTIF</th>
<th>REFERENCE IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Verica</td>
<td>Boar. Gem or a denarius of M. Votieus 76-71 BC</td>
<td>p 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HENIG 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124-5</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Vine leaf. The possibility that it is a representation of a poplar or maple leaf or some herb should not be overlooked</td>
<td>220, n 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Caduceus between cornucopiae Gem or denarius of Marc Antony</td>
<td>221, n 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Tasciovanus</td>
<td>Standing sphinx</td>
<td>215-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Coinage</td>
<td>Emblem</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Tasciovanus</td>
<td>Pegasus. Gem or possibly coin of Augustus c 18 BC</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Obv: panther. Rev: sphinx</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183a</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>219, Pl XIII, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Pegasus. Gem or possibly coin of Q. Titius 90-79 BC. Also occurs on Gaulish coins</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Ruis</td>
<td>Gem or denarius of Marc Antony c 43-31 BC</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Tasciovanus/Dias</td>
<td>Centaur playing double pipes</td>
<td>214-15, Pl XI, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Andoco</td>
<td>Pegasus, as M 185</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Griffin copying M 225?</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Cunobelin</td>
<td>Sphinx</td>
<td>216, n 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>217-18, Pl XII, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234a</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Centaur carrying a branch.</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gem or denarius of M. Aurelius</td>
<td>Cota c 150-125 BC. M. 134a is silver not gold as Henig states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pegasus, M 185</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sphinx. Gem, more likely than eastern coinage of Augustus?</td>
<td>215-16, n 67, Pl XII, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apollo holding plectrum, altar. Gem rather than Mercury figures on coins of Augustus</td>
<td>210-11, Pl XI, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obv: Huntsman in tunic with <em>Lagobolon</em>, bow and <em>?food</em>. Rev: Huntsman in tunic with dead animal over shoulders. Gem or less likely a coin of Augustus</td>
<td>213-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241a</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Cunobelin</td>
<td>211-12, 220, n 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Centaur blowing horn</td>
<td>214-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith seated</td>
<td>212, Pl XI, C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sow</td>
<td>218, Pl XII, G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lion</td>
<td>218, Pl XII, F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Hercules with club</td>
<td>212-13, Pl XI, E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Griffin, after M 225 ?</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Obv: Crouching sphinx. Rev: Priest at altar holding a head or Perseus with head of Medusa. The sphinx may be from a gem or a denarius or T. Carisius of 46 BC.</td>
<td>213, 216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Epaticcus</td>
<td>Boar</td>
<td>219, Pl XIII, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Dubnovellaunus</td>
<td>Henig suggests that the Apollo and Dolphin may copy M 241a but this coin could be earlier</td>
<td>212, n 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Eppillus</td>
<td>Lion. As M 189</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 313 | " | Amminus | Obv: Fruiting Palm tree
Rev: Pegasus | 220, n 120 |
| 314-15 | " | " | Hippocamp
(cf Allen 1976d, 96, Pl XI, 1, 2, 6). | 219-20, Pl XIII, E |
| 316 | " | " | Passerine on a branch
(cf Allen 1976d, 97-8; Henig and Nash 1982, 243-4) | 220, n 111, Pl XIII, G |
| 316a | AE | ? | Lion, as M 189 | 218 |
| 316c | " | " | " | " |
APPENDIX 30

LATER REPUBLICAN METAL VESSELS
NOT YET FOUND IN
LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

Introduction

Buckets of Eggers types 4-9 are not considered here as there is no
evidence to suggest that they are of Italian, rather than
'Germanic' origin, or as Redlich (1980) has suggested Celtic, from
southern Germany and eastern France.

30.1 EGERS TYPE 16 BUCKETS

Typology

This is a simple bucket with vertical sides, flat bottom and a
slightly everted rim. It has a simple iron handle crimped rather
than looped around bronze lugs on the bucket walls.

Chronology

The bucket occurs in Graue's phase II at Ornavasso but the simple
form also appears in second and third century AD context although
by then some vessels were apparently made of copper (Kunow 1983,
17). A number of vessels come from first century BC contexts but
there are no vessels which suggest continuity with the later
vessels.
Function

Kunow argues that the bucket was for cooking in (1983, 69-70) but obviously it could have been used for many purposes.

Distribution and Commentary

There are occasional finds from Germany (Eggers 1952, 160; Fischer 1959) but most finds are known from the southern and eastern Alpine region particularly Ornavasso and Idria bei Bača (Drescher 1969, 33-5; Graue 1974, 23) and northern Italy (Tizzoni 1983, 142) all of first century BC date. As the vessel is so simple it must be wondered if all the German finds are imports rather than locally manufactured versions but this does not preclude the possibility of it having been traded widely.

30.2 FÄLLANDEN BUCKETS

Typology

The bucket has an elegant vase shape with a flared mouth. There are three feet soldered to the base. Two variants may be distinguished on the basis of the handle mounts. The Fällanden-Vahrendorf variant has heavy triangular bucket mounts with fleur-de-lys mouldings. The Fällanden-Marronniers variant has vine-leaf mounts. Both variants have a similar handle which has a circular moulding on the top of the bow and the ends have simple lobate mouldings.
Chronology

Both variants appear to be contemporary and while the number of finds is quite small, a number come from well dated sites or burials and provide a dating of c 90-20 BC, possibly ending sooner rather than later (Fitzpatrick 1987b).

Function

What the buckets contained is not known but it is associated with strigils in a number of burials which suggests that it may have been part of a toilet set rather than part of a wine service, although it is much larger than vessels normally thought to contain oil. Ladles are also frequently found with the bucket.

Distribution and Commentary

Finds are known from Spain, France, north Germany, Italy, Switzerland and Romania most of which were wrongly identified as the later Eggers type 36 bucket. The handle mounts are characteristic but the handle could be mistaken for Eggers type 18 and 19 buckets and the body and feet mistaken for a number of other later Iron Age types. As the type has only recently been characterised and it is widely distributed it is likely that others await recognition (Ibid). There is no obvious reason why it should not have reached Iron Age Britain.
30.3 EGERS TYPE 19 BUCKETS

Typology

This bucket is very similar to the Eggers type 18 and is distinguished only by having a slightly less pronounced rim and instead of opposed dolphins on the handle mounts there is a heart-shaped mount with a fleur-de-lys terminal. The rest of the handle mount is generally slightly simpler. The handle terminals may have birds' heads on them.

Chronology

The dating of the type is uncertain as few finds come from well dated contexts (Werner 1954, 57). Werner suggested that the type may be slightly older than the Eggers type 18 bucket and the fleur-de-lys terminal is similar to those on Fällanden-Vahrendorf buckets which are clearly dated to before c 20 BC (at the latest) which would support this idea. Werner's first century BC dating seems likely to be broadly correct.

Function

Perhaps part of a drink service, but other uses should not be excluded.

Distribution and Commentary

Virtually all the known finds come from Free Germany (Werner 1954, 57; Kunow 1983, 155) but there are finds from Landau in the Pfalz
and Stradonice (Svobodová 1983, 656, Obr 1, 7, 10, 12) which suggest that it was widely distributed and could have reached Iron Age Britain.

30.4 EGGERS TYPES 20-21 BUCKETS

Typology

These buckets have a very simple situla-like form not dissimilar to that of Eggers types 18-19. Type 20 has, according to Eggers, a bronze handle mount riveted on. The mounts are rectangular and have a simple loop. Type 21 is marginally larger in Eggers type figure (1951, Taf 4) and has simple iron attachments in the form of a simple loop and two leaf-shaped plates. The handles are simple iron loops on both types. It is convenient to consider the two types together as they are so similar in form.

Chronology

Eggers dated the types to the first century BC but is clear that this simple form continued well into the second century AD and Kunow is pessimistic about the dating possibilities (1983, 18). However, it does seem possible to distinguish between types 20 and 21. It should be noted that it can be difficult to decide whether a vessel is of Eggers type 19 and 21 particularly because as we have seen early forms of type 19 may have a more sinuous profile. Eggers type 21 buckets are known from contexts likely to be or certainly of first century BC date at Giubiasco grave 425 where it was associated with a pan transitional between the Dühren-Moosburg
and Aylesford-types and a La Tène II-III sword (Ulrich 1914, 414, Taf LXXV, 11), in the Grand Bassin B wreck dated early in the first century BC (Solier 1981, 73, Fig 31), Birlăiești (Glodariu 1976, Pl 52, B3) and Villeneuve-Saint-Germain (Debord 1982, 249-50, Fig 40, 047). None of the finds from Free Germany have useful associations but no finds appear to be later than the first century BC.

In contrast the Eggers type 20 where dated seems to be first century AD or later (den Boesterd 1956, 40; Kunow 1983, 18) and it appears that the version with iron handle mounts, Eggers type 21 is quite distinct chronologically despite the pessimism of Werner (1954, 56) and Kunow (1983, 18).

Function

Kunow suggests that the bucket was a cooking vessel (1983, 70) but this may not have been its only use.

Distribution and Commentary

The Eggers type 21 is poorly known particularly as it has previously been considered with later types and there is no compelling reason why fragments should be considered as imports. The finds identified here are widely dispersed suggesting that the type was traded widely and could well have reached Iron Age Britain. It should not be overlooked that the type could easily have been imitated.
Typology

This type has flaring walls and then a pronounced shoulder carination. A short neck rises almost vertically. The handle loop links two large iron plates each held by two rivets. The handle is also iron. The type is quite close to Eggers type 21 buckets.

Chronology

The earliest known bucket of this type is from Giubiasco, burial 291 which is probably of first century BC date (Ulrich 1914, 366, 625, Taf LXII, 5). The best dated examples come from burials at Goeblingen-Nospelt A, Idria-bei Bača and Ornavasso-Persona and the Kappel hoard all of which date to about the last two decades BC (Kunow 1983, 18; Drescher 1969, 34-5) but other examples appear to be much later in date (den Boesterd 1956, 29-40) and the form appears to have been made over many centuries.

Function

As with other buckets of this kind it is suggested to be a cooking vessel but other uses should not be discounted.

Distribution and Commentary

The type is found in the Alpine area and central Europe but is apparently rare in France but it seems unlikely that much weight
should be placed on this particularly as only a relatively small number of finds are known.

30.6 WEHRINGEN JUGS

Typology

This jug has a squat body with a pronounced shoulder and a short neck. There is a simple upright rim and the base is slightly raised. The handle has a heart-shaped mount at the foot and rather than just gripping the rim there is also a hinged lid. On some vessels there were three small feet soldered on. Christlein has called it the Wehingen type (1972).

Chronology

The type may date from the penultimate decade BC or earlier (cf Thill 1967b, 90, Taf I, 2; IV, 3, V, 1). A find from Port, Switzerland is undated (Wyss 1974, Abb 25, 14) and although it is usually assumed to be Iron Age because other finds from the river Zihl at Port are Iron Age, it should be noted that there are also Roman finds. The find from Wehingen in Bavarian is also undated (Christlein 1972). Finds from Hohlač in Russia appear to be of later first century AD date (Raev 1979, 237, Pl 135, 12; 136, 13) suggesting that the type was manufactured for some time.

Function

Thill (1967b) asserts that the find is a wine jar, probably
because he accepts the Kelheim-Kjaerumgaard variant jar from the same burial as a wine jar. This may be true but there is no evidence to support or disprove it.

**Distribution and Commentary**

I am aware of only four finds. Raev (1979) suggests that the Hohlač finds are of Thracian manufacture but the central European finds are more likely to be of provincial or Italian manufacture and this may suggest that the type was manufactured widely and perhaps over a century or more (cf Raev 1986, 37-9). The type is little known and therefore likely to be unrecognised. There seem to be no grounds on which to exclude the possibility that the type reached Iron Age Britain.

**30.7 CÁCERES JUGS**

**Typology**

This is a double handled jug. It has a very squat body with a long narrow neck with an everted rim. There is a footring. There are two handles which have sinuous profiles, their feet have heart-shaped plates. The tops have two arms which grip the rim and there may be a small knob placed centrally (Ulbert 1985, 79-81, Abb 21, 5; Taf 13, 77; 60, 77; 70; 71, 1).

**Chronology**

The only dated find is from Cáceres el Viejo which dates to c
83-80 BC. The rim is typologically similar to that of the Kelheim-Kappel variant jug which also suggests a date in the first half of the first century BC.

Function

The function of the jug is not known. The two handles may be decorative rather than functional. The Cáceres find contained a Gallarate type ladle, necessary as the lip does not have a spout. The presence of the ladle may suggest that it was used as table ware.

Distribution and Commentary

Ulbert has only recently characterised the type and at present finds are known from Cáceres, Pella in Macedonia and from the Mediterranean off Agde. There is also an unprovenanced vessel in the Museo Nazional in Rome (op cit, 79). As with other newly recognised types further finds will doubtless be identified but whether this will be beyond the Mediterranean world remains to be seen.
APPENDIX 31

EARLY IMPERIAL BRONZE VESSELS
NOT YET FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

31.1 EGGERS TYPE 24 BUCKETS

Typology

This is a massive bucket. It has shape similar to that of Eggers types 18 and 19 but is much larger. There are three very large bronze feet soldered to the base. The shoulder and rim have a number of incised grooves. The handle mounts have a bust within a floral? surround and two canine heads spring from the shoulders of the bust. There is a suspension loop above.

Chronology

The dating is not entirely clear but most vessels are thought to be pre-Flavian after which it was replaced by smaller buckets which also have heads on the handle mounts (Eggers types 25-26). Eggers regarded the quite numerous finds from Free Germany as belonging to the first half of the first century AD.

Function

Kunow suggests that the bucket was used for containing drinks (1983, 70).
Distribution and Commentary

These buckets are known primarily from finds in Free Germany but the wide spread of finds there suggests that there is no obvious reason why they should not have been available in Iron Age Britain.

31.2 EGGERS TYPE 94 BOWLS

Typology

This basin has a deep, carinated body with a simple deep, overhanging rim. The handles are elaborately cast in the form of vine leaves. There is a small, slightly ungainly, pedestal base.

Chronology

A find from Ornavasso-San Bernardo grave 7 dates to the first half of the first century BC (Graue 1974, 29) but most finds date to the second half of that century (Kunow 1983, 21-2; Moser 1975, 134).

Function

There is no direct evidence for the intended use of the bowl but as with other basins it is likely to have been a wash basin.
Distribution and Commentary

The type is found in the Alpine region and in Free Germany (Werner 1954, 70) and there are also finds from the Saône at Lyon (Boucher and Tassarini 1976, 114, type 128) and Kalinovka in Russia (Moser 1975, 133-4, Taf 43, 1) which suggest that the type was very widely distributed and its reaching Iron Age Britain is possible. Eggers illustrates a fragmentary British find which is unprovenanced but it would be rash to suggest that it is an Iron Age import to Britain (1966, 110, Abb 64).

31.3 HOBY AND LÜBSOW TYPE BASINS (EGGERS TYPES 97 and 99)

Typology

This simple basin has a plain footring and the two types are distinguished on the basis of the rim and handles. Type 97, the Hoby type, has an overhanging rim with an ovolo. The handles have elaborate terminals. The Lübsow type (Eggers type 99) has a simple rim and plainer omega-shaped handles, the feet of which have serpent-like terminals.

Chronology

Most of the Hoby type finds are Claudio-Neronian or later and the earliest find is probably that from Hoby which is probably Tiberian or later (Kunow 1983, 22-3; Graue 1975). Similarly the bulk of the Lübsow type and its successor, Eggers type 100, are later first century AD and later but Kunow (op cit) suggests that the type may have first been made in the Augustan period.
Function

These basins were probably wash basins (Kunow 1983, 72-3).

Distribution and Commentary

The basins are very widely distributed in Italy and beyond (Kunow 1983, 23; Raev 1986, 21-2) but as virtually all the dated finds postdate the Roman conquest of Britain it seems unlikely that either the Hoby or Lübsow types will have reached Iron Age Britain, or if they did if it would be possible to recognise them as such.

31.4 STRAINER SETS (EGGERS TYPE 159)

Typology

This set consists of a long handled pan, a smaller similarly shaped strainer fits inside it. Both have a bulbous body which flares at the mouth. The handle, which is positioned at right-angles to the rim, is made of thin sheet metal and expands at the terminal to a lozenge shape decorated with volutes. Eggers distinguishes small versions as type 159a.

Chronology

The type occurs in the Goeblingen-Nospelt A and B burials (Thill 1967b, 90-1, Taf I, 8-10; IV, 4; VII, 1-2) and in large numbers at Haltern (eg von Schnurbein 1979, 58, Bl 43) but it is rare in
Claudian contexts (Kunow 1983, 27) where it is replaced by Eggers types 160-2.

Function

Literary sources do not indicate what this set was for and archaeologists have suggested their use either as a drink strainer or a food strainer (Kunow 1983, 75-7).

One find from Pompeii was apparently left in a meat dish, however, from literary sources it is clear that strainers were not generally used in cooking (Hilgers 1969, 150-1). It has been suggested that the set was used to cook over an open fire the food being cooked in either water (suggested by Mau) or oil (suggested by Radnóti). Kunow has argued that this is unlikely because the rounded bottom of the vessel means that it could not easily have been placed in the fire and the all metal construction would have made it too hot to hold. Further objections are made by Wielowiejski (1977, 158).

Conversely, if the vessels were part of a drink service the right angled handles are hardly the best design and they are completely absent from the many representations of wine services discussed by Nuber (1972). However, interesting evidence for their use comes from a burial at Juellinge on Lolland (cf Wheeler 1954a, 41-3, Pl III-IV). This burial contained a pan and strainer set (Eggers type 162), a bucket and two glass beakers. Chemical analysis of the contents of the bucket indicated that it contained a drink made from berries, perhaps a local 'wine'. Kunow concludes that this was a drink service (1983, 76) and that a similar service included in a burial at Uggeløse on Zealand (op cit, 75-6, Abb 14) was also a drink service. This still leaves unanswered the
question as why two vessels were necessary to strain the liquid unless the set was used to ladle it out and then it was decanted into a drinking vessel. Even then the right angled handle is impractical and there is no pouring lip on the rim and as Kunow concludes the function of the set is not understood completely.

Distribution and Commentary

The Eggers 159 is a common find in continental Europe (Werner 1954, 64, 72; Kunow 1983, 160) but appears to be most frequent in the provinces rather than in Italy and this may be due to the drink(?) being primarily a northern taste. If this were to be the case it is possible that its absence from Iron Age Britain may be cultural, but there seem to be no good reasons why it should not yet be discovered in an Iron Age context here. It is possible that the apparently unique find from Fontillet which is a Giubiasco type ladle with a strainer at the handle end may be related to these later sets (Werner 1954, Abb 6, 2).
DISC BROOCHES FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

32.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF DISC BROOCHES

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

1 Bierton. Rural settlement: one example, perhaps an Iron Age import (Olivier 1986, 72, Fig 36, 7).

ESSEX

2 (i-ii) Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: two brooches are probably Iron Age introductions (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 313, nos 65-6, Pl XCII, 65-6 (Type VIII)).

3 Baldock. Settlement: two brooches (Stead and Rigby 1986, 113, Fig 46, 96-7).

4 (i-ii) Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: (Mackreth 1981, 133, nos 9-11, Fig 70, 39, 41). Number 10, Fig 70, 42 may also be of this type.

5 Braughing - Station Road. Oppidum?: (Mackreth 1979b, 37, no 8, Fig 6, 8). There is a related decorated disc brooch from the Augustan grave 39 at the Titelberg (Metzler 1977; Thill 1969b, 144, no 55, Abb 5, 55). The
Braughing find should date to the penultimate decade BC or earlier as it is less advanced than the Dangstetten example (cf Mackreth 1987, 149).

KENT

6 Stone. Burial: not securely stratified but possibly of Iron Age date (Cotton and Richardson, 141, Fig 5, 4).

NORFOLK

7 Uncertain Provenance (Hattatt 1985, 38-9, Fig 17, 276).

Feugère notes unpublished brooches from Canterbury, Peterborough and Mildenhall (Wiltshire) (1985, 269) which could be Iron Age imports, while Olivier (1986, 72) notes further examples.
APPENDIX 33

ROSETTE BROOCHES FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

33.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF EARLY ROSETTES

BEDFORDSHIRE

1 Odell. Rural settlement: Class 16a2 (Feugère 1985, 274).

DORSET

2 Hengistbury Head. Port of Trade: a typologically early example likely to be an Iron Age import (Mackreth 1987, 149-50, Ill 108, 19).

ESSEX

3(i-iv) Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 314, no 68, P1 XCIII, 68, (Type X, A(ii)), Class 16a1 (citing similar finds at Faversham and Silchester). (ibid, no 78, P1 XCIII, 78) (Type X, C(ii)), Class 16a2. These two brooches were associated with a Langton Down and a Colchester brooch. It is also possible that brooch no 77, (ibid, P1 XVIII, 77 (Type X A(i)) (Class A1)) may also be of Iron Age date. The same may be true of no 69 (Class A 1).
Harlow - Temple. Sanctuary: Class 16a2 (France and Gobel 1985, 76, no 16, Fig 39, 16). The brooch is from a pre-Flavian context and so could be of Iron Age date. It is very similar to the Hurstbourne Tarrent find (no 5) below.

HAMPshire

Hurstbourne Tarrent. Burial: Class 16a2 (Hawkes and Dunning 1930, 305, Fig 31, 1). Feugère suggests that the piece is Claudian (1985, 274) but the associated material is earlier (App 26.1, 22).

Hertfordshire

Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: Class 16a1 (Mackreth 1981, 131, 133, nos 8, 10, 12, Fig 70, 38, 40, 42).

St Albans - King Harry Lane. Cemetery: many examples (ibid, 131).

Kent


Sussex

Fishbourne. Settlement: Class 16a2. Possibly a
pre-conquest introduction (Cunliffe 1971, 100, Fig 38, 22; Feugère 1985, 273.

The find from Duston, Northamptonshire is not securely dated to the Iron Age (Whimster 1981, 386, no 141) nor are finds from Hauxton, Cambridgeshire (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 315), Wakerley (Northamptonshire) and Brixton Deverill (Wiltshire) (Feugère 1985, 274 (Class 16a2), 273) and Lower Hackeston (Suffolk) (Hattatt 1985, 39, no 277, Fig 17, 277 (Class 16a1)) and so they are not included here. Feugère (1985, 274) cites an early rosette from Hod Hill. Although published by Brailsford in the guide to the antiquities of Roman Britain in the British Museum (1951, 20, Fig 11, 33), it was not included in the Durden collection (idem 1962) and its provenance may be suspect (cp Stead 1984a, 59) but it could perhaps still be an Iron Age import.

33.2 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF DEVELOPED ROSETTES

HERTFORDSHIRE

1(+) St Albans - King Harry Lane. Cemetery: a large number (Mackreth 1982, 312-13).
33.3 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF DEVELOPED ROSETTE WITH ENAMEL INLAY

HERTFORDSHIRE

1 Baldock. Burial (Feugère 1985, Class 20b, 292-99). Feugère dates the type to the Claudio-Neronian period but in discussing the Baldock find Hull (in Westwell 1935, 350, Fig 2) argues that the pieces is typologically earlier than examples in later Augustan-Tiberian examples (cf Hawkes and Hull 1947, 316).

33.4 FINDS OF UNCERTAIN DATE AND ORIGIN

SOUTH HUMBERSIDE

1 Dragonby. Settlement: an example apparently from an Iron Age context could be an import (May 1976, 169, Fig 84, 2).
APPENDIX 34

LANGTON DOWN BROOCHES FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

34.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF LANGTON DOWN BROOCHES

BEDFORDSHIRE

1 Odell. Rural settlement: an early example (Mackreth 1987, 150).

DORSET

2 Gussage All Saints. Rural settlement: the piece could be from the Iron Age phases but the context (hollow/pit 522 (5), Area H) is not dated in the report (Wainwright 1979, 113, Fig 86, 3066).

ESSEX

3(i-iii) Colchester - Sheepen. Oppidum: (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 319, nos 94-6, Pl XCIV, 94-6).

HAMPSHIRE


5(i-ii) Silchester. Oppidum: at least two brooches, an identical
pair, are of Iron Age date (Corney in Fulford 1985a, 20).

HERTFORDSHIRE

6 Baldock. Settlement: (Stead and Rigby 1986, 113, 124, Fig 45, 87).
7(i-ii) Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: (Mackreth 1981, 133-4, no 13, Fig 71, 43 and probably also no 35, p 139, Fig 71, 46).
8 Crookhams. Rural settlement (Rook 1968, 65, Fig X).
9 St Albans - King Harry Lane. Cemetery: many examples (Mackreth 1981, 134).

KENT

10 Canterbury. Oppidum?: an early example (Mackreth 1987, 150).

OXFORDSHIRE

11 Sutton Courtenay. Burial: one brooch although the exact associations are problematic (Whimster 1979, 95, Pl II, 5; Thompson 1982, 834).
34.2 FINDS OF UNCERTAIN DATE AND ORIGIN

SOUTH HUMBERSIDE

1 Dragonby. Settlement: one example may be Iron Age (May 1976, 169, Fig 84, 4)

34.3 FINDS PREVIOUSLY SUGGESTED TO BE OF IRON AGE DATE

DORSET

1 Litton Cheney. Whimster suggests that burial 6 might be Iron Age (1981, 257) but the associated finds, and the developed form of the brooch suggest that Bailey may be correct to suggest that the burial, and cemetery, are post-conquest (1967, 156, 158, Fig 11, 4).

ESSEX

2 Great Wakering. Burial: Thompson considers the burial to be of Roman date (1982, 709, Fig 38b).

GLOUCESTERSHIRE

3 Lydney Park. Settlement?: Wheeler and Wheeler (1932, 12-13, 72, Fig 8, 2) suggest that the piece is Iron Age, but there is very little later Iron Age material (eg ibid 96, Fig 25, 22) and there may be a gap between the Middle Iron Age and Roman use(s) of the site.
KENT

4 Allington. Cemetery: described as a Langton Down by Bushe-Fox and followed by Stead (1976a, 412) but Thompson's publication shows the brooch to be of a different type (1978, 137, Fig 4, 2).

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

5 Duston. Cemetery: there are Langton Down brooches from the cemetery but there are no associations preserved and the bulk of the material is Romano-British (Whimster 1981, 386).
APPENDIX 35

AUCISSA BROOCHES FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

35.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF AUCISSA BROOCHES

HERTFORDSHIRE

1 Baldock. Settlement: (Stead and Rigby 1986, 113-20, no 105, 124, Fig 46, 105).

2(i-ii) Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: (Mackreth 1981, 134-5, no 15, Fig 71, 50 and no 36, p 139, Fig 71, 51 is probably also of Iron Age date).

KENT

3 Canterbury - Rose Lane. Oppidum?: (Frere 1954, 140, Fig 23, 1. The head is decorated with leaves).
APPENDIX 36

HOD HILL BROOCHES FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

36.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF HOD HILL BROOCHES

HERTFORDSHIRE

1(i-ii) Baldock. Settlement: (Stead and Rigby 1986, 120, 124, nos 112, 114, Fig 47, 112, 114).

2 Braughing - Skeleton Green. Oppidum?: (Mackreth 1981, 134-5, no 16, Fig 72, 53). A further find might possibly be pre-conquest (ibid, 141-2, no 55, Fig 72, 55; idem 1987, 150).

SUSSEX

3 Chichester. Oppidum?: Mackreth (1974, 143, Fig 8.15, 15) initially ascribed the brooch to the Romano-British period but has subsequently proposed an Iron Age date (1981, 135).
APPENDIX 37

A PRELIMINARY GAZETTEER OF AMBER FROM
BRITISH LATER IRON AGE SITES

37.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF AMBER

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

1 Bierton. Rural settlement: one bead (Allen 1986, 69, Fig 35, 11).

DEVON

2 Kent's Cavern. Settlement?: Gray suggested that three beads could be of mid-late Iron Age date (1966, 283). There are at least five beads, plus a further lump. In publishing them Silvester does not consider an Iron Age date but follows Pearce in suggesting a later Bronze Age one (Silvester 1986, 18, 30-2) but this possibility should not be dismissed given the evidence for Mid-later Iron Age occupation.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE

3 Birdlip. Burial: seventeen beads from a necklace, with two beads of 'jet' (perhaps shale?) and one described as
'marble' (Bellows 1881, 139, Pl XIV) which is probably pyrophillite.

HAMPSHIRE

4 Danebury. Hillfort: one bead from a ceramic phase 7 context (Cunliffe 1984d, 396, Fig 7.42, 5.3).

HEREFORD AND WORCESTER

5 Bredon Hill. Hillfort: two beads are probably of later Iron Age date (Hencken 1938, 86, Fig 12, 4-5).

HERTFORDSHIRE

6 Welwyn Garden City. Burial: half a bead (Stead 1967a, 17, A, Fig 10, A and frontispiece).

ISLE OF MAN

7 Ballacagen A. Rural settlement: one bead perhaps of later Iron Age date (Bersu 1977, 64, Fig 21, A 54, Pl II, A54).

ISLES OF SCILLY

8 St Martin's. Burial: two beads, most likely to be of later Iron Age date (Whimster 1981, 275).
SOMERSET


10 Meare Lake Village. Settlement: six beads from Meare Village West (Gray 1966, 283-5, Pl LIV, A 1-6), the last three of which Gray considered to be pendants but they may be only large beads. A single find from the 1984 excavations at Meare Village East (Coles, Rouillard and Backway 1986, 51, Fig 31, 461) plus a further six finds from older excavations (Coles 1987, 50-1, Fig 3.1, A. 1-6).

37.2 CORRIGENDUM

NORTH YORKSHIRE

1 Collis (1973, 126) states that there is an amber ring from the North Grimston warrior burial but Mortimer states that the ring is from Arras (1905, 335-6).
APPENDIX 38

CONCEALED-LOOP STRAP UNIONS, SUB-GROUP A
(QUADRILOBATE)

38.1 BRITAIN

1 Polden Hill hoard, Somerset (Brailsford 1975, 228, Pl XXIIIa; Leman-Delerive 1986, 40, Fig 9, 1).

2 'London' (Kemble 1863, 194-5, Pl XIX, 2; Lessing and Krüta 1979, Abb 81; Leman-Delerive 1986, 34, Fig 5).

3-4 Hambledon, Buckinghamshire. The catalogues place Hambledon in South Buckinghamshire (Sothebys 1983, 34-5, nos 127-8; La rime et la raison 1984, 321, no 95) but Leman-Delerive places it, without explanation, in Dorset (1986, 34, Fig 7). There are a number of Hambledons in southern England.

5-6 Santon, Norfolk (Kemble 1863, 194-5, Pl XIX, 3; Megaw 1970, 163, Pl 8; top left; Leman-Delerive 1986, 40, Fig 8).

7 Norton, Suffolk (Kemble 1863, 194-5, Pl XIX, 4; Leman-Delerive 1986, 34, Fig 6).

8 Westhall, Suffolk (Harrod 1865; Clarke 1939, 68-9, Pl XVI-XVIII; Leman-Delerive 1986, 40, Fig 9, 1').
38.2 FRANCE

1 Paillart, Oise (Krůta and Lavagne 1984; Krůta and Forman 1985, 98, Pl on 98; Leman-Delerive 1986).
# APPENDIX 39

**BRITISH CELTIC COINS FOUND IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
<th>DENOMINATION</th>
<th>REFERENCE(S)</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>UNINSCRIBED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BRITISH B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(M32) Le Câtillon, Jersey (GB)</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Colbert de Beaulieu 1959, 71; Hoard Allen 1960.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BRITISH KB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BRITISH LX</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LX 6–10 Verneuil, Eure-et-Loir (F)</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Haselgrove 1987a, Fig 9:1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>and pers comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LY 6–10, LX 26 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIUS</td>
<td>(M92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coulommiers, Seine-et-Marne (F)</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Allen 1960, 208.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOSENIOS</td>
<td>(M298)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Eu, Bois l'Abbé, Seine-Maritime (F)</td>
<td>AV\textsuperscript{k}</td>
<td>Mangard 1978, 88; Delestrée 1984. Temple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANTII (Uninscribed)</td>
<td>(M 296)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASCIOVANUS</td>
<td>M179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Amiens, Somme (F)</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Allen 1960, 224.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>?Rouen, Seine-Maritime (F)</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M185 or 194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M168-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oostende, West-Vlaanderen, (B)</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Allen 1960, 224.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Katwijk, 'The Brittenberg', Zuid-Holland (NL)</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Allen 1975, 15, no 94, Pl IV, 94; N. Roymans pers comm.</td>
<td>Pierced. Found on the beach by the lost Roman fort. For the site see De Weerd 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vertault, Côte D'Or (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen 1960, 235; Haselgrove 1987a, 230.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fluy, 'Le Maulin', Somme (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Scheers pers comm.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Villers-Brettoneaux, Somme (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haselgrove 1978, 79.</td>
<td>Excavations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Boulogne, Pas-de-Calais (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen 1960, 235.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M254</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>?Normandy (F)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunobelin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Saintes, Charente-Maritime (F)</td>
<td>Blanchet 1905; Bertrand 1912; Haselgrove 1987a, 230.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUROTIRGES**

<p>| M319 | 22-8 | Le Câtillon, Jersey (GB) | AR | Colbert de Beaulieu 1958, 71; Hoard Allen 1960, 242, 298. |
| M321-1a | 29-34 | Le Câtillon, Jersey (GB) | ARₖ | Colbert de Beaulieu 1958, 71; 1959, 55; Allen 1960, 243, 298. |
| M320 | 35-8 | | ARₖ | Allen 1965. |
| 39 | Rozel, Jersey (GB) | AR | Colbert de Beaulieu 1958, 203. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Location</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Pernois', Somme (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bertrand 1912; Haselgrove 1987a, ? 230.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheingönheim, Speyer (BRD)</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>FMRZD, p 339, no 2210.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilly, Somme (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoard, in temple Pl V, 180.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont César, Oise (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen 1971a, 134, 147.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limetz-Villez, Yvelines(F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gallia 44, 1986, 278-81; Temple (4) CC Haslegrove pers comm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES

(1) It may be doubted if this coin is a genuine ancient introduction.

(2) Allen noted a M 289 from Bois l'Abbé (Haselgrove 1978, 54) but Mangard notes only a M 298 (1978, 88, no 336) which is presumably the same coin.

(3) Cf n 1.

(4) A number of coins are not included here:

(i) The coin from Velsen stated to be British by Vons (1977, 140) is actually Gaulish (N. Roymans pers comm).

(ii) The M184 cited by Allen as from Italy, perhaps Rome (1960, 224) is very doubtful and seems unlikely to be an ancient arrival, if it is identified correctly.

(iii) Uncertain British or Gaulish coins such as the Kentish minims (Haselgrove 1978, 116-17) are not included and it may be suspected that the Kentish coins nos 7-8 may prove to be continental European rather than British issues.
Following Stevens (1947, 4; 1952, 8-16) many authors have stated that Julius Caesar planned to invade Britain in 56 BC (eg Hawkes 1977a, 139; 148-9; Mitchell 1983).

The suggestion is based primarily on the statement of Strabo (IV, 4, 2) that the Veneti revolted in 56 BC in an attempt to stop Caesar sailing to Britain in order to protect the use they made of the emporion in Britain. This contrasts with Caesar's account which starts with the Veneti detaining high-ranking Roman soldiers who were in their territory trying to obtain food supplies in order to use them as hostages to ensure the release of Venetic hostages already taken. Ultimately this clash led to war (BG III, 7-16). According to Stevens, Hawkes and Mitchell, Strabo's comments indicate that the prime intention of the revolt was to stop Caesar crossing to Britain and that Caesar clearly intended to use the ships of the Veneti in the crossing. Support for this intention is seen in the large number of ships Caesar commissioned for this campaign which are held to indicate an invasion fleet for Britain (eg Mitchell 1983, 94) and the widespread support given to the coastal confederacy, including British tribes, (BG III, 9) is seen as showing widespread awareness of Caesar's intentions. The argument has been developed by Mitchell (1983) who argues that the interest in the planned 56 BC invasion was British tin. Hawkes (1977a, 139, 146-7) and Stevens (1980, 86 92, 96-7) have also suggested that Caesar was aware of the possibilities of British
tin and Stevens has argued that the tin route from Britain was controlled by an Arvernian empire (ibid, 86) although this argument is unconvincing (Ch 17-18).

One of the major points in Mitchell's argument is that the voyage of P. Crassus to the Cassiterides was made not by P. Licinius Crassus in the 90s BC but by P. Crassus, Caesar's legatus in Gaul 57-6 BC and that the voyage was actually to Britain probably in 57 BC. Mitchell argues Crassus' voyage must have been undertaken with the approval of Caesar and indicates that Caesar was interested in British tin. Realising this the Veneti revolted in order to protect what Mitchell calls their trading monopoly (1983, 95). Mitchell concludes that Caesar intended to launch a two-pronged attack on Britain; in the south-west and the south-east. According to Stevens the reason why this plan to invade Britain was not revealed by Caesar was that when the Venetic fleet was destroyed, with it went Caesar's chances of invading Britain so the plan was never revealed by Caesar and only Strabo records the truth. Mitchell's explanation is rather more elaborate. He suggests that while the prospect of mineral wealth being seized in conquest was both well known and widely practised in antiquity it was inappropriate to discuss it. Caesar's motives would have been readily intelligible to his contemporaries. Mitchell adduces Cicero's letters to Atticus and Trebatius noting the lack of booty from Britain as support for this. On the other hand Caesar would have wished to accrue all the glory from being the first Roman leader to land in Britain and for this reason he suppressed the account of the voyage of Crassus.

Perhaps surprisingly these arguments have gone unchallenged. It is convenient to consider Mitchell's developments first. Much of
his argument rests on accepting the identification of Crassus as the younger one. As we have already seen for a variety of reasons this seems unlikely (Ch 17-18). Mitchell's argument raises a further problem which he does not acknowledge and that is if Strabo did know the 'real' motives for Caesar's invasion, why does he place Crassus' voyage in his book III which is devoted to Spain rather than alongside his comments in book IV, 4, 1? If the identification is rejected then the supposed forewarning of the Veneti of Caesar's plans must also be rejected. While Mitchell draws the contrast with the voyage of Volusenus' exploration of the south-eastern English coast there is a difference between playing down the voyage and completely suppressing it. It is difficult to argue with Mitchell's suggestion that Caesar's motive would have been readily intelligible *ex silentis*. Indeed they may have been, but conversely Caesar's silence on the subject does not prove the case. Finally there is a major difficulty in Mitchell's arguments which is if Caesar really was interested in Cornish tin why did he eventually twice land in Kent? It is difficult to see any convincing answer to this question.

Stevens' argument is superficially less complex but it is equally difficult to accept. The principal conclusion that Stevens draws from Strabo is that Caesar intended to use the ships of the Veneti in his invasion (1952, 8-16). It is difficult to see how Strabo's comments can be taken to imply this.

'After the aforesaid tribes, the rest are tribes of the Belgae living by the ocean, of which the Veneti are those who fought at sea against Caesar, for they were prepared to
prevent his sailing to Britain, as they were using the trading centre.

(Strabo IV, 4, 1, trans Mays 1981, 55).

It is a possible interpretation, but hardly the most obvious one. Stevens also argues that as Caesar initially placed most emphasis on campaigning against the Veneti on land and only resorted to the fleet when this failed, this places the collecting of other ships by Caesar (BG IV, 11) in a different light. These ships he suggests were for invading Britain and it is this which suggests that Caesar also intended to use Venetic ships to invade Britain. Throughout no attempt is made to reconcile this with what Caesar said happened.

Firstly, if Caesar was planning to invade Britain in 56 BC, it is curious that he should leave Gaul for Illyricum. Even if it is not entirely certain if Caesar was actually there when the revolt broke out (cp BG III, 7, 9) even planning to leave when he was intending to invade Britain would be bizarre. It could be objected that this was merely a ploy on Caesar's part but even if it was he would surely never have gone to Illyricum once the war had started. Caesar's instructions are clear. Crassus was to build a fleet on the Loire, and that oarsmen were to be recruited from the Province while crews and pilots were also to be found (BG III, 9). Caesar arrived as quickly as he could from Illyricum and started campaigning before the fleet was finished. He rapidly concluded that this was a wasted effort as when the promontory forts of the Veneti looked likely to be captured, the inhabitants slipped away by boat. Only when the fleet was completed was Caesar able to challenge the Veneti effectively. Caesar states
that he had also ordered the Pictones, the Santoni and other pacified districts to supply ships (BG III, 11) but these formed part of the Roman fleet rather than an independent squadron. While this campaign was undertaken Caesar also sent forces under Crassus to Aquitania, another force under Sabinus to Normandy and a smaller force under Titus Labienus to the Treveri to keep the Belgae loyal and to block any reinforcements from Germany. From this it would appear that Caesar acted to prevent a complete uprising in Gaul by isolating potential trouble spots. While Gaul may have nominally been pacified, it is clear that Caesar was taking no chances. His recriminations against the Veneti were particularly savage, surely intended to impress the futility of rebellion (BG III, 16). Is this then the background to an invasion of Britain? According to Hawkes the intention was to send Sabinus to Normandy while Caesar captured the Venetic navy. This would give Caesar command of the whole of the Gaulish seaboard not just for internal security but also as a springboard to Britain. It is suggested, however, that the fleet for Brutus was actually ordained in the autumn of 57 BC and not in the spring of 56 BC when Caesar states it was, because it could not have been ready in time for the Venetic campaign otherwise. Also some of the ships from the other pacified regions not named by Caesar (BG III, 11) are suggested to have been from opposite Britain and that these ships with the fleet on the Loire were to have formed the right wing of a double invasion force. This 'truthful' version of the events is obscured, allegedly, by the fact that Caesar has completely concealed the chronology of the year. The destruction of the Venetic fleet completely destroyed Caesar's plans and so the plans for invasion were concealed. This is hard to credit. It is true that book III of the Bello
Gallic is sparing on dates but this barely warrants the suggestion that the starting date for the construction of the Loire fleet was some six to eight months earlier than Caesar states. It is almost inconceivable that the younger Crassus could or would have concealed this and that such a ploy would have been allowed to pass by his father, one of the triumvirate, without comment. Similarly much, if not all of the Channel seaboard rose with the Veneti, the Belgae had to be patrolled - and it does not seem likely that any Channel tribes provided ships for the Romans, particularly when the comments about the Pictones and the Santones probably implies that the other tribes are to be sought in Aquitania.

Similarly it must be asked would an invasion fleet planned for 56 BC really have not seen to gathering crews to man the ships? Finally there is the question of the Venetic fleet. Despite the impressions given by Stevens and Hawkes, Caesar does not say nor imply that the fleet of the coastal confederacy were destroyed. They do not appear in accounts of the British invasion although the ships built on the Loire do (BG IV, 21) but this may be because they were not the right sort of ships for Caesar's armies. Caesar's famous description of the Venetic ships (BG III, 13) emphasises the contrast, while throughout the invasions of Britain Caesar is concerned with transports and warships, ships which, unlike those of the Veneti, were also oar propelled and not at the mercy of the winds. It was the sudden calm which finally decided the battle. It may be worth considering the possibility that Caesar captured the fleet of the confederacy substantially intact but he chose not to use it.

In sum, there is no convincing evidence to suggest that Caesar ever intended to cross to Britain in 56 BC let alone in a
two-pronged attack. Nonetheless the discrepancy between the comments of Caesar and Strabo still remains but it is not solved by dismissing substantial sections of Caesar as false when it is clear that Crassus might reveal such deception and that Caesar's accounts of the capture of Silius, Velanius, Trebius and Terrasidius could not possibly have been fabricated. What Strabo may record is that the Veneti recognised the possibility that Caesar might invade Britain or that their influence over the Armorican and Channel seaways might be diminished by Caesar visiting Britain or through his occupation of Armorica. This would expand Caesar's commentary but it does not contradict and it is unnecessary to invent an invasion for 56 BC which can only be maintained by ignoring Caesar's own testimony.
APPENDIX 41

GRAFFITI FOUND IN LATER IRON AGE BRITAIN

41.1 CERTAIN OR PROBABLE FINDS OF GRAFFITI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>GRAFFITI</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>TYPE OF VESSEL</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESSEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Colchester-Sheepen</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>AR 'Arretine', L 8</td>
<td>'Arretine',</td>
<td>Hawkes and Hull 1947, 284.</td>
<td>Augustan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>M Stamped CN. ATEI</td>
<td>L 8</td>
<td>Ibid, 284, 192, no 3, Pl XLI, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>SEV II Severi?</td>
<td>'Arretine',</td>
<td>Ibid, 284, 193, no 35, Pl XLI, 35.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stamped HILARI/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OF PATT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERTFORDSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Braughing-Gatesbury</td>
<td>CIINATIN[</td>
<td>Cen(n)atus?</td>
<td>Coarse Ware</td>
<td>Partridge 1979, 117, Fig 35.</td>
<td>Pre-AD 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Braughing-Puckeridge ...RA[.../ ILVR[...

6 Braughing-Skeleton GRAECVS Graecus
Green

7 " " MIIVS
8 " " TE
9 " " SE
10 " " TE

Flagon Britannia 17, 1986, 443.

TR platter, Partridge 1982, 325, Fig 12, 1;
Stamped ATTISVS Iden, 1981, 166-7, Fig 76, 4.
(rad)

'Arretine', L 1b Partridge 1982, 325, Fig 12, 2.
'Arretine', L 1 Partridge 1982, 325, Fig 12, 3;
Stamped RASN. Iden, 1981, 153, Fig 74, 3.
Coarse Ware Partridge 1982, 325, Fig 12, 4.
TN platter Partridge 1982, 325, Fig 12, 5.

AD 15-25
AD 30-40
AD 15-25

41.2 GRAFFITI PROBABLY OF LATER IRON AGE DATE

1 Colchester-Sheepen \ / \ ? 'Arretine' Hawkes and Hull 1947, 284. Roman context
2 " " \ \ ? " " " "
3 " " \ K Ex " " " "
4 " " M " " Ibid, 284, 192, no 21, Pl XLI, 21 " "
5 " " VAT Vat 'Arretine' Hawkes and Hull 1947, 284 " "

Roman context

but similar to No 8
6 Colchester-Sheepen VE Ve 'Arretine' L 11 Hawkes and Hull 1947, 284 Roman context
7 " " SI or IS " L 2 Ibid, 284, 192, no 22, Pl XLI, 22 " " Stamped ROMVLVS
8 Colchester-Sheepen A 'Arretine' L 8 Hawkes and Hull 1947, 284 " "
9 " " VISI Visi " L 8 " "
10 " " VA ?

41.3 GRAFFITI NOT CERTAINLY OF LATER IRON AGE DATE

1 Silchester XIA Coarse Ware Boon 1969, 34, n 6

Boon argues that the pot is certainly of Iron Age date but it has no recorded context and the vessel he compares it to comes from a group which he suggests was deposited immediately before the conquest so there is in fact no certainty that the vessel is of Iron Age date, even though an earlier chronology could now be advanced (cp Fulford 1985a).
A lead stock from a wooden anchor of Mediterranean type from Porth Felen, Gwynedd, has been suggested by Boon to belong to a Roman ship which foundered there, probably in the late second or first centuries BC (Boon 1975b; 1977a; 1977b). Apart from some small fragments of bronze, possibly from the teeth on the anchor arms (Boon 1977a, 10; Haldane 1986, 185-6), no other evidence for a wreck has been observed at the place of discovery (Boon 1977a, 10).

In discussing anchors of this type (Class C, wooden with a lead stock), Boon divided them into three varieties on the basis of the bar across the bottom of the box: C(1) box without bar; C(2) box with lead bar; C(3) box with wooden bar extending well to either side (ibid, 11; cf Kápitan 1984).

The earliest dated examples of C(2) stocks are from the Grand-Ribaud A and Jeune-Garde B wrecks of the third quarter of the second century BC. Boon suggests that the find from Grand Congloué dates to c 180-160 BC but it is not possible to accept the remains as coming from only one wreck (Stöckli 1979a, 115-18; Liou 1987) and as the stratigraphic position of the stock is unclear (Benoit 1961, 170-4) it could be almost a hundred years later than Boon suggests. The latest certainly dated example of a C(2) stock is from the pleasure barges of Caligula on Lake Nemi which were destroyed in AD 39. There are two inscribed examples of Julio-Claudian date from the Rhine. One from Duisburg of Legio
V probably dates to between AD 9 and 69, while the other from Mainz of Legio XVI probably dates between AD 9 and 43.

It should be noted that Boon specifically argues that two Class C stocks both in Palermo museum which have been suggested to be of first century AD date are earlier, one a stock impressed with a lamp he suggests, citing Bailey, could be of first century BC date, possibly a 100 years earlier, but he does not argue this in detail, although lamps only became popular during the Augustan period (Liebundgut 1977; Pavolini 1981) while Bailey does not exclude a first century AD date (1975, 297, no Q677).

The other stock has an inscription interpreted as ΚΑΛΑΥ(Ω)ΒΙΟ (Ω) and an acclamation of the Emperor Claudius but Boon dismisses this as 'highly improbable' (Boon 1977a, 17) without any further discussion.

Despite Boon's lack of enthusiasm for the later examples of Class C anchors, it is not possible to suggest a narrower date range for the form of the stock than c 150 BC-AD 50. In an attempt to narrow this date range Boon examined the astragali impressed into the mould for the stock (ibid, Fig 2, Pl III, a). Of the 19 examples cited by Boon only two were from dated contexts, the Grande-Ribaud A and Jeune-Garde B wrecks (ibid, 20). Although Boon was later able to mention a further 36 examples documented by Käpitan, none were from dated contexts (ibid, 25). More recent finds, however, have extended the date range, both earlier to the early second century or even the late third century BC, but also later, to the second half of the first century BC (Perrone Mercanti 1979, 34, 39, 42ff; Käpitan 1982 and pers comm). This greater date range does not affect Boon's conclusion that the Class C anchor 'was obsolete by the time of the Roman conquest of
Wales, complete in AD 74-8, and may well have been obsolete by the
time of the Roman invasion in AD 43' (Boon 1977a, 17).

On the basis of this dating Boon explored why and when a
Mediterranean vessel would be off the west coast of Britain. A
number of historical contexts are examined but Boon tacitly
assumes that the only possible reason for the presence of a ship
would be related to the exploration of Welsh mineral sources,
probably tin. The voyage of Pytheas seems to be excluded on
chronological grounds and Boon accepts that the expedition of
Publius Crassus to the Cassiterides reported by Strabo (III, 5,
ii) was undertaken by Crassus the Elder and dates to the 80s BC
although this is debatable (Mitchell 1983, 82-3; Ch 17.2.1;
App 40). Boon concludes that an interest in British tin must
antedate the exploitation of the Spanish tin resources which he
suggests dates from the 80s or shortly after (Boon 1977a, 23; cf
Nony 1978, 667-8).

Boon adduces three points as evidence for direct Roman contact
with western Britain. The first point is the knowledge of Ireland
in Augustan or later sources which Boon suggests may derive from a
Mediterranean source. The other two points are the Paul hoard of
Cisalpine tetradrachms (Allen 1961) which even if the hoard is a
genuine find (cf Ch 15.5), are of doubtful relevance to Roman
contact, and the direct Mediterranean trade suggested in 1971 by
Peacock on the basis of the distribution of Dr 1 as then recorded.
This apparent direct contact is, despite Boon's assertions (1977a,
24), more apparent than real (Ch 1.2; 24.2). Although there may
have been some interest in Welsh mineral resources during the
Romano-British period (Boon 1971; André 1976-78), there is no
acceptable evidence either for arguing that the Porth Felen stock was necessarily lost, or deposited (cf Kõpitan [1985]), before the 80s BC or that it has anything to do with a direct Mediterranean route. It is also only an assumption that the findspot betokens an interest in Welsh mineral resources for, as Boon admits, the ship may simply have been blown off-course (1977a, 25) and if the anchor was lost before the Claudian conquest, it is difficult to offer convincing reasons as to why the ship should have been off Porth Felen. But was the anchor lost before the Claudian invasion? Boon is sure that it was, as is Sealey (1979, 172-3), but we should note his dismissal of finds possibly of first century AD date in Palermo museum and there are two certainly Julio-Claudian examples from the Rhine. Boon's comment that the Class C anchor was obsolete by the time that the Roman conquest was completed AD 74-8 may well be correct but it should not be forgotten that military interest in Wales may date from the late 40s AD perhaps in cartographic expeditions (Sherk 1974). We may note that Tacitus specifically states that no fleet was available in the taking of Anglesey (Agric 18) but if it is necessary to look for a historical context for the loss of deposition of the Porth Felen stock then an early military context is surely the most plausible one and on the dating evidence presently available does not exclude this possibility. As McGrail has commented there is no reason why the presence of the Mediterranean type vessel off Porth Felen may not have been intentional (1983a, 321-2; 1987, 253; cf in general Moore 1977).

However, we do not need to look for an historically attested situation in which to place the loss or deposition of the Porth Felen anchor. The dating of the Class C anchor extends from the
late third or early second century BC to the Julio-Claudian period but no stocks with astragal can be dated later than the second half of the first century BC. The archaeological evidence suggests then that a Mediterranean vessel may have been off North Wales in the later Iron Age, but perhaps the most likely historically recorded context is the early Roman military activity in or around Wales. At present, however, there is no way of deciding either when the anchor was lost or deposited or if the vessel carrying it was engaged in an attempt to exploit Welsh mineral resources, or was on an exploratory or cartographic voyage or involved in a military campaign or if it was simply blown off-course. While Boon's interpretation may be challenged, the Porth Felen stock remains an enigmatic find, of uncertain date and context.
REFERENCES


ALBRECHT, C. 1942: Das Römerlager in Oberaden, II. (Dortmund, Veröff Stadt Mus für Vor- und Frühgesch Dortmund II, 2).


BANNERT, H. 1977: Caesars Brief an Q. Cicerco und die Verbreitung von griechischer Sprache und Schrifte in Gallien (zu BG 1, 29, 1.5, 48, 4 and 6, 14, 13). Wiener Stud NF 11, 80-95.


BARFORD, P.M. 1983: Chaff-Tempered Ware, A New Type of Salt Vessel? Iron Age Pot Grp News1 3 (Dec 1983), [n.p].


BELTRÁN-LLORIS, M. 1970: *Las ánforas romanas en España.* (Zaragoza, Monogr Arqueol (Anejos de 'Caesaraugusta') 8).


BENOIT, F. 1962: Nouvelles Épaves de Provence (III). Gallia 20, 147-76.


BERTRAND, E. 1912: Monnaies gauloises regionales. Rev Prehist Est France Ser 3, 6, 161-82.


BESSOU, M. 1976: Étude des vestiges de la Tène découverts à Roanne. (Saint Etienne, Centre Étud Foréziennes Archéol 3).


BIHAN, J.-P. LE, 1984: Villages gaulois et parcellaires antiques au Braden en Quimper: une recherche en milieu périurbain. (Quimper, Cah Quimper Antique 1).


BONNER, S. F. 1977: Education in Ancient Rome from the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny. London.


BOUDET, R. 1987: *L'Age du Fer récent dans la partie méridionale de l'estuaire girondin (Du Ve au Ier siècle avant J.C.)* (Périgueux, Coll 'Archéologies' 2).


BŘEŇ, J. 1964: Význam spon pro datování keltských oppid v Čechach. (Prague, Sborník Národ Muz Praze 18(5)).


BUCHEM, H. VON, 1941: De fibulae van Nijmegen. (Nijmegen, Bouwsteenen voor een geschiedenis van Nijmegen 3).


- 953 -
CHAMPION, T. C. 1980: Mass Migration in Later Prehistoric Europe. 
Stockholm.

47, 355.

CHAMPION, T. C. n.d. [1982]: The Myth of Iron Age Invasions in 

49, 428.

CHAMPION, T. C. 1985: Written Sources and the Study of the European 

CHAMPION, T. C. 1987: The European Iron Age: Assessing the State of 

In Schadla-Hall, R. T. & Shennan S. J. (eds), *The Archaeology of 
Hampshire.*, 37-44. (Farnborough, Hampshire Fld Club Archaeol Soc 
Monogr 1).

CHAMPION, T. C. & CHAMPION, S. T. 1986: Peer Polity Interaction in 

CHAMPION, T. C. & MEGAW, J. V. S. (eds) 1985: *Settlement and Society: 
Aspects of West European Prehistory in the First Millennium B.C.* 
Leicester.

CHANTRAINE, H. 1984: Keltische Münzen in frühen rheinischen 

CHAPOTAT, G. 1970: *Le matériel de La Tène III trouvé sur la 
colline Sainte-Blandine.* (Lyon, Pub Centre Études Romaines Gallo-
Romaines Faculté Lettres et Sciences).


- 955 -


COLIN, A. 1984: Preliminaires à une étude chronologique des oppida au premier siècle avant J.-C. In Recherche 1984, 154-68.


COLLIS, J. R. 1977b: Owslebury (Hants) and the Problem of Burials on Rural Settlements. In Reece (ed) 1977, 26-34.


COMFORT, H. 1959a: An Arretine-Type Signature from Lezoux. American J Archaeol 63, 179-80.


CRUMMERY, P. 1979: Crop Marks at Gosbecks, Colchester. Aerial Archaeol 4, 77-82.


CUNLIFFE, B.W. 1972: The Late Iron Age Metalwork from Bulbury, Dorset. Antiq J 52, 293-308.

CUNLIFFE, B.W. 1974: Iron Age Communities in Britain. London.


CUNLIFFE, B.W. 1978b: Iron Age Communities in Britain. 2 London.


CUNNINGTON, M. E. 1932: Was there a Second Belgic Invasion (Represented by Bead-Rim Pottery)? *Antiq J* 12, 27-34.


DILLY, G. 1978a: Céramique de tradition de 'La Tène' à Frencq (Pas-de-Calais). Cah Archéol Picardie 5, 127-34.


DOWN, A. 1974: Chichester Excavations II. Chichester.

DOWN, A. 1978: Chichester Excavations III. Chichester.

DOWN, A. 1981: Chichester Excavations V. Chichester.


DRAPER, J. 1985: Excavations by Mr H. P. Cooper at the Roman Site at Hill Farm, Gestingthorpe, Essex. (Hunstanton, E Anglian Archaeol 25).


DUNNETT, R. B. K. 1971: Excavations in Colchester 1964-68. (=Trans Essex Archaeol Hist, 3(1)).


FELLMANN, R. 1952: Basel in römischer Zeit. (Basle, Monogr zur Ur- u Frügesch Schweiz 10).


FONTES, P., LAUBENHEIMER, F., LEBLANC, J., BONNEFOY, F., GRUEL, K. 


FRENCH, D.A. & GREEN, P.W. 1983: A Late Iron Age Site at Thong Lane, Gravesend. Kent Archaeol Rev. 73, 54-68.


and Medieval Defences of Canterbury. (Maidstone, Archaeol 
Canterbury 2).

(Rome, Supp à Boll Arte 4).

FREY, O.-H. 1984: Die Bedeutung der Gallia Cisalpina für die 
Entstehung der Oppida-Kultur. In Schiek, S. (ed), Studien zu 
Siedlungsfragen der Latènezeit., 1-38. (Marburg, Veröff Vorgesch 
Seminars Marburg Sonderbd 3).

FREY, O.-H. 1986: Einige Überlegungen zu den Beziehungen zwischen 
Kelten und Germanen in der Spätlatènezeit. In Frey, O.-H., Roth, 
45-79. (Marburg, Marburger Stud Vor- u Frühgesch 7).


Celtic Art in Britain and its Continental Background. Proc 
Prehist Soc 42, 47-65.

FRISON, E. 1961: Examen anatomique des bois du puits romain num I 
de Harelbeke. Latomus 20, 800-5.

FROMOLS, J. 1938: L'atelier cérámique de Thuisy (Marne), découvert 

FROMOLS, J. 1939: L'atelier cérâmique de Sept-Saulx (Marne) 
découvert et fouille par M. Bry. Bull Soc Archéol Champenoise 33, 
31-77.


*Schweiz Numis Rundschau* 55, 33-76.

*Bonner Jahrb* 182, 241-64.

*Archäol Korrespondenzbl* 2, 169-77.

In Anderson & Anderson (eds) 1981, 265-76.

(Brest, Corpus des amphores découvertes dans l'ouest de la France 1 / Archéol en Bretagne Supp 4).


In Macready & Thompson (eds) 1984, 24-36.

In Johnston (ed) 1986, 75-88.

GALLIOU, P. 1987: Les amphores Pascual 1 et le commerce atlantique au 1er siècle de notre ère. 


GENT, H. 1983: Centralised Storage in Later Prehistoric Britain. 

GENTY, P.-Y. & FICHES, J.-L. 1978: L'atelier de potiers gallo-
romain d'Aspiran (Hérault). Synthèse des travaux de 1971 à 1978. 

Archaeonautica 7, 167-91.

GIANFROTTA, P.A. 1982: Archeologia sott'acqua. Rinvenimenti 
sottomarini in Etruria meridionale. Archeol Subacquea 1, 13-36. 
(Rome, Supp à Boll Art 37-8).

produzione schiavistica II. Il Merci, mercati e scambi nel 
Mediterraneo. Rome & Bari.


Ann Bretagne 71, 51-60.


protohistorique au Le Moulin de-la-Rive en Locquirec (29). 
(Rennes, Travaux Lab Anthrop Prehist Prot ohist Quat ern 
Armoricains).

originaux de la poterie de la fin de l'Âge du Fer en Armorique. 

GLASBERGEN, W. & GROENMAN-VAN WAATERINGE, W. 1974: The Pre-Flavian 
Garrisons of Valkenburg Z.H. (Amsterdam, Cingvla 2).

GLASS FROM THE ANCIENT WORLD 1957: (Exhib Cat) New York.


GOODY, J. 1982: *Cooking, Cuisine and Class*.


GRAFF, Y. 1978: *Liberchies. Site Augusteen (B).* (Braine l'Alleud, Romana Contact 1975 (1978), (I-IV)).


- 991 -


GROENMAN-VAN WAATERINGE, W. 1980: Urbanisation and the North-West Frontier of the Roman Empire. In Hanson & Keppie (eds) 1980, 1037-44.


GUŠTIN, M. 1977a: Relativna kronologija grobov 'Mokronoške Skupine'. In idem (ed) 1977b, 76-103.


- 997 -


HASELGROVE, C.C. 1984d: The Later Pre-Roman Iron Age between the Humber and the Tyne. *In Wilson, Jones & Evans (eds)* 1984, 9-25.


HENCKEN, H. O'NEILL, 1932: *The Archaeology of Cornwall and Scilly.* London.

HENCKEN, H. O'NEILL, 1942: Ballinderry Crannog No. 2. *Proc Roy Ir Acad (C)* 47, 1-76.


HENDERSON, J. 1987d: Chemical and Archaeological Analyses of Some British and European Glasses. *Annales 10e Congrès de*


HESNARD, A. 1977: Note sur un atelier d'amphores Dr.1 et Dr.2-4 près de Terracine. Mel École Franç Rome Antiq 89, 157-68.


ISINGS, C. 1957: Roman Glass from Dated Finds. (Groningen, Archaeol Traiectina 2).


JENKINS, I. 1985: A Group of Silvered Horse Trappings from Xanten (*Castra Vetera*). *Britannia* 16, 141-64.


*Int J Naut Archaeol Underwater Explor* 13, 33-44.


KENRICK, P. M. 1985: *Excavations at Sidi Khrebish, Benghazi (Berenice), Vol 3, 1. The Fine Pottery.* (Tripoli, Libya Antiqua Supp 5).


KOETHE, H. & KIMMIG, W. 1937: Trevergrab aus Wincheringen. Trierer Zeitschr 12, 44-64.


KUNOW, J. 1983: Der römische Import in der Germania libera bis zu den Markomannenkriegen. (Neumünster, Gottinger Schr zur Vor- u Frühgesch 21).


- 1016 -


LAMBOGLIA, N. 1959: Una fabbricazione di ceramica megarica a
Tindari e una terra sigillata siciliana? Archeol Classica 11,
87-91.

LAMBOGLIA, N. 1961: La nave romana di Spargi. Atti del II°
Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia Sottomarina, Albenga

LAMBOT, B. 1983a: Une fibule estampillée provenant de Chateau-

LAMBOT, B. 1983b: Les fibules gallo-romaines du sud du départe-

LANGLOUËT, L. 1978: Les cérámiques gauloises d'Alet. Doss Centre
Reg Archéol Alet 6, 57-105.

LANGLOUËT, L. 1984: Alet and Cross-Channel Trade. In Macready &
Thompson (eds) 1984, 67-77.

LANGLOUËT, L. 1985: Une cérámique Gauloise retrouvée dans le sous-
sol de la Fresnais (i-v). Doss Centre Reg Archéol Alet 13, 37-40.

Le, (ed), Au temps des Celtes, Ve – Ier siècle avant J.-C., 146-8.
Daoulas.

LARDY, J.-M. 1983: La nécropole d'Epiais-Rhus (Val d'Oise),
approche chronostratigraphique partie protohistorique. In Bardon
et al, 127-58.

LA RIME ET LA RAISON 1984 = La rime et la raison. Les collections

LASFARGUES, J. 1973: Les ateliers des potiers lyonnais: Étude

LASFARGUES, J. & VERTET, H. 1968: Observations sur les gobelets
d'Aco de l'atelier de la Muette. Rev Archéol Centre 7, 35-44.


LAVER, H. 1897: Discovery of Late-Celtic Pottery at Shoebury. 

LAVER, P.G. 1927: The Excavation of a Tumulus at Lexden, Colchester. 
_Archaeologia 76_, 241-54.

_In idem (ed), Archaeological Approaches to the Study of Complexity_, 229-329. 
(Amsterdam, Cingvla 6).


LEJÈUNE, M. 1983b: Recontres de l'alphabet grec avec les langues barbares au cours du Ier millénaire avant J.-C. 
_In Modes de contacts_, 731-53.

LEMAN-DELERIVE, G. 1976: Le cimetière gaulois de Port-le-Grand (Somme) - Essai d'interprétation des fouilles de 1833-1834. 
_Cah Archéol Picardie 4_, 97-115.

LEMAN-DELERIVE, G. 1984a: L'habitat protohistorique de Villeneuve d'Ascq (Nord). 

_Gallia 42_, 79-95.

_Gallia 44_, 29-53.

_In L'Âge du Fer 1981_, 319-30.


- 1020 -


LOWTHER, A. W. G. 1946: Iron Age Pottery from Sites at Ewell and Ashstead. *Surrey Archaeol Collect* 50, 139-43.


MATTHAEI, L.E. 1907: On the Classification of Roman Allies. Class Q 1, 182-204.


MÉNEZ, Y. 1985: *Les cérámiques fumigées de l'ouest de la Gaule.* (Quimper, Cah Quimper Antique 2).

MENGHIN, O. 1937: *Die vorgeschichtliche Funde Vorarlbergs.* (Vienna, Österr Kunsttopographie 27).


MODES DU CONTACT 1983 = Modes de contacts et processus de transformation dans les sociétés anciennes. (Pisa & Rome, Coll École Franç Rome 67).


- 1033 -


NEWTON, R. G. 1971: A Preliminary Examination of a Suggestion That Pieces of Strongly Coloured Glass were Articles of Trade in the Iron Age in Britain. *Archaeometry* 13, 11-16.


OLIVER, A. JR 1977: *Silver for the Gods. 800 Years of Greek and Roman Silver*. (Exhib Cat). Toledo, [USA].


OSWALD, F. 1940: Arretine Ware from Margidunum. *Antiq J* 30, 283-5.

OSWALD, F. 1951: The Volute in late-Arretine Ware and its Adoption in early South Gaulish Terra Sigillata in the Tiberius-Claudius Period. *Antiq J* 31, 149-53.


OXÉ, A. 1914: Die älteste Terra-Sigillata-Fabriken in Montans am Tarn. Archäol Anz 1914, col 61-76.


OXÉ, A. 1933: Arretinische Reliefgefäße vom Rhein. (Frankfurt, Mat röm-germ Keramik 5).


PÉRICHON, R. 1974: *La céramique peinte celtique et gallo-romaine en Forez et dans la Massif Central.* (St Etienne, Centre Étud Forèziennes, Thèses et Mém 6).


PUCCI, G. 1975: Cumanae Testae. La parola del passato 30 (164), 368-71.


RADNÓTI, A. 1938: Die römischen Bronzegefäße in Pannonien. (Budapest, Diss Pannonicae, Ser 2, 6).


RECHERCHE 1984 = Recherche sur la naissance de l'urbanisation au 1er siècle avant J.-C. dans le Centre de la France d’après les nouvelles données archéologiques. Levroux.


RÍORDÁIN, S.P., Ó, 1947: Roman Material in Ireland. Proc Roy Ir Acad (C) 51, 35-82.


RODWELL, W. J. 1976c: A Dressel 1 Amphora from the Thaxted Area (and Notes on the Amphorae from Sandon and Marks Teys). *Essex Archaeol Hist* 8, 250-1.


ROLLANDO, Y. 1971: La préhistoire du Morbihan à Vannes.


SCHNURBEIN, S. VON, 1974: *Die römischen Militäranlagen bei Haltern.* (Münster, Bodenaltertümer Westfalens 14).


SCHNURBEIN, S. VON, 1979: Die Römer in Haltern. (Münster, Einführung Vor- u Frühgesch Westfalens 2).


SÉNECHAL, R. 1975: Céramique commune d'Alésia, les cruches. (Dijon, Univ Dijon Centre Recherches Techniques gréco-romaine 5).


SIMPSON, G. 1976: Decorated Terra Sigillata at Montans (Tarn) from the Manuscript of Elie Rossignol at Albi. *Britannia* 7, 244-73.
SIMPSON, G. 1979: Some British and Iberian Penannular Brooches and other Early Types in the Rhineland and the 'Decumates Agri'. *Antiq J* 59, 319-42.


SMITH, H. P. 1948: *A History of the Borough and County of the Town of Poole: Origins and Development I*. Poole.


STENICO, A. 1960a: La ceramica arretina, I. Museo Archeologico di Arezzo; Rasinius, I. Milan.


STENICO, A. 1966: La ceramica arretina, II. Collezioni diverse; Punzoni, modelli, calchi, ecc. Milan.


STEVENS, C. E. 1927: Ancient Writers on Britain. Antiquity 1, 189-96.


SWAN, V. G. 1975: Oare Reconsidered and the Origins of Savernake Ware in Wiltshire. _Britannia_ 6, 37-61.


- 1070 -


*Památky Archeol* 75, 445-57.

VERMEULE, C. 1963: Augustan and Julio-Claudian Court Silver. 
*Antike Kunst* 6, 33-40.


VERTET, H. 1967: Céramique sigillée tibérienne à Lezoux. 

VERTET, H. 1971: Remarques sur les rapports entre les ateliers 
céramiques de Lezoux, de la vallée de l'Allier, de la Grafesenque 
et ceux de Lyon. *Acta Rei Cret Rom Favit* 13, 92-111.

VICHY, M., PONCHET, J. & PICON, M. 1981: Sur l'origine des 
exemplaires de 'terra nigra' de Roanne. *Colloques de Balbigny, 
(St Étienne, Centre Étud Foréziennes Archéol 7).

VICTORIA COUNTY HISTORY 1963: *Victoria County History of Essex, 
Vol III.* London.

Étude comparative des seaux de La Tène III. 
*Gallia* 34, 167-200.

VIDAL, M. 1978: Plaques à décor orne au repoussé trouvées à 
Pavillon-Saint-Julie (Aube). *Rev Archéol Est Centre Est* 29, 
303-4.

VIDAL, M. 1986: Note préliminaire sur les puits et fosses 
funéraires du Toulousain aux IIe et Ier siècles avant J.-C. 
*Aquitania* 4, 55-65.

VIÉRIN, J. & LEVA, C. 1961: Un puits à tonneau romain avec sigles 
et graffitis à Harelbeke. *Latomus* 20, 759-84.


WARD-PERKINS, J.B. 1940: The Pottery of Gergovia in Relation to that of other Sites in Central and South-Western France. *Archaeol J* 97, 37-87.


Archaeological Prospection 1978., 317-41 (Cologne & Bonn, Archaeo-
Physika 10).


WIGHTMAN, E.M. 1977a: Military Arrangements, Native Settlements and Related Developments in Early Roman Gaul. Helinium 17, 105-
26.


WILD, J.P. 1966a: Papyrus in Pre-Roman Britain. Antiquity 40, 139-42.


