Oppida: A Settlement Phenomenon of the later Iron Ages of Britain and Temperate Europe: An Analysis of Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury

Volume Three

A Synthesis

Emma Louise Jackson

Classical and Archaeological Studies

School of European Culture and Language

Thesis Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Kent

March 2017

11: Discussion

11.1: Chapter Aims

This the final chapter of the thesis seeks to ascertain whether the evidence presented within conforms to what we currently know of *oppida*, particularly in the cases of Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury. In doing this, thought will be given to whether the inferences drawn suggest that the continued use of this term is limiting our understanding of these sites and their contemporaneous settlements also labelled thus. In other words, does the term *oppida* overlook the individual nuances of these sites, in order to use an all-encompassing term that could be argued to limit the need for in-depth independent analysis if a site displays one or more of the characteristics identified as 'key' to the classification of *oppida* during the 1970s and 1980s (see Chapter 2)? By considering these points, the author will not only be bringing together all aspects of the thesis, but will be meeting the aims of the current project (Chapter 1.2).

Endeavouring to meet the purported aims of the thesis, while also bringing together the key aspects of the paper, the author engaged in a study of four parts:

1. An overview of the key characteristics of each of the thesis' case studies, coupled with a consideration of how well they compare to one another.
2. A consideration of how these characteristics compare with current thinking on *oppida*.
3. A comparative study within which occupation at the thesis' case sites was compared to that at some of the period's better known *oppida*.
4. A consideration of whether the thesis' case sites and comparative *oppida* can be said to share commonalities with contemporaneous non-*oppida*[1]; with particular thought being given to these sites' social, economic, and power connotations, those themes to which *oppida* are closely tied (see Chapters 2-5).

Hence, this was a study designed to determine the relevance of the term '*oppida*' today when applied to Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury; as well as their contemporaries. In doing this the author aimed to ensure that any issues with its continued use were clearly highlighted and founded within a secure body of evidence.

---

[1] Non-*oppida* are defined as those settlements that have never been considered *oppida* within the literature; in other words, these are farmsteads, villages, and open settlements (see Chapter 3.3).

The results borne out of the study outlined above are presented below following the author's chronological phasing of the later Iron Age (see Chapter 6.1). This approach was adopted because occupation at these sites was fluid, meaning that the nature of occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury during Period 1 was not necessarily reflected in later periods of their use. Consequently, by employing this structure the author was not only able to engage in a more in-depth study of the relevance of the term *oppida*, but ascertain whether it could be argued that the term continues to have some relevance for sites of a specific date and/or geographic location.

11.2: Period 1: 150/100 – 55/50 BC

11.2.1: Period 1 within the context of the later Iron Age

This timeframe is typically represented, both sides of the Channel, by agrarian societies who obtained that which they could not procure locally, through a combination of social and economic exchanges (Nash 1984, 95-96). These exchanges were generally founded upon the generation of surplus (ibid, 95-96), as was usually the case for this period (see Chapter 4.1); and typically took place between kin groups who engaged in the mutual trade of foodstuffs and other essential raw materials (Nash 1984, 96) (see also Chapters 4.1, 4.3).

Furthermore, this period is also portrayed as one of change. At this time, large areas of Britain were characterised by: increasing population numbers (Cunliffe 1995a, 26) and, as a result of these, a more advanced social structure comprising proto-states presided over by kings (Champion *et al.* 1992, 316; Collis 1984b, 145; Mattingly, 2007, 56; Nash 1976; 1978); an economy that was centred on the generation of surplus from mixed farming regimes (Millett 1990, 10), but saw an increased focus on products generated through industrial processes due to a number of technological advancements in this field, most notably the introduction of the potter's wheel (Collis 1984b, 162; Cunliffe 1984, 9; Mattingly 2007. 56); increased contact with the near Continent (Collis 1984b, 162; Cunliffe 1984, 4-5; Mattingly 2007. 56), that not only gave rise to Mediterranean goods in Britain (Cunliffe 1984, 4-5; 1995, 60), but socio-economic relationships between Essex, Kent, and their Gallo-Belgic neighbours (Cunliffe 1995a, 64)(see also Chapter 4); and the emergence of a cremation based burial rite in the south-east that resembled that which existed in both northern Gaul and western Rhineland at this time (Collis 1984b, 162).

Meanwhile, in some areas of Temperate Europe, but particularly Gaul, this period of occupation was characterised by its organisation into tribal 'states'/proto-states presided over by kings (Champion *et al.* 1992, 316; Collis 1984b, 145; Nash 1976; 1978); numerous economic advancements, particularly in iron- and bronze-working, the production of jewellery, coinage and other small artefacts, carpentry, leather working, and pottery production (Champion *et al.* 1992, 309; Collis 1976, 10-12; Jacobi 1974; Wyss 1974), that were accompanied by technological advancements such as the introduction of the potter's wheel (Champion *et al.* 1992, 300, 305-306; Wells 2001, 93; 2002, 369), and advancements in kiln technology (Champion *et al.* 1992, 305); the standardisation of both pottery (Kappel 1969; Maier 1970 *cf.* Champion *et al.* 1992, 306) and brooch (Champion *et al.* 1992, 306; Wells 2001, 93) forms; and the rekindling of economic relationships with the Mediterranean World (Champion *et al.* 1992, 308-309; Cunliffe 1995a, 59-60; Fulford 1985, 94; Wells 2001, 96).

For the purposes of the current chapter, in particular the first three parts of the study outlined above (see page 461), it is the changes witnessed both sides of the Channel in settlement patterns that are arguably the most pertinent. In c.150/100 BC there were five types of settlement in use across much of Britain: 'strongly defended homesteads, hillforts, villages, open settlements, and enclosed homesteads' (Cunliffe 1995a, Fig.3); by the end of Period 1 hillforts had more or less ceased to be occupied (Mattingly 2007, 56) with people instead preferring to inhabit defended/enclosed farmsteads and newly emerging types of agglomerated settlement including: trading ports and low-lying foci, or *oppida* as they are more commonly referred (ibid, 56). Within Temperate Europe, on-the-other-hand, the settlement pattern at the beginning of this period comprised small and/or open villages and farmsteads and some hilltop enclosure sites (Collis 1984b, 145; Wells 2001, 85). Over the course of Period 1 this changed, and led to the emergence of two new types of settlement. Firstly, the so-called *oppida*, which emerged from Gaul in the west to Hungary in the east (Champion *et al.* 1992, 306; Fernández-Götz 2014a; 380; Kappel 1969; Maier 1970; Wells 2001, 84-85; 2002, 366); and secondly, a series of 'much smaller unenclosed settlements' (Wells 2001, 85). Consequently, it is against the backdrop of these changing settlement patterns that the beginnings of later Iron Age occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury took place.

11.2.2: Period 1 occupation at the thesis' case sites

11.2.2.1: Colchester

Period 1 occupation at Colchester was difficult to verify within the archaeological record; comprising only an enclosure at The Garrison dated to between 75 and 25 BC by a vessel recovered within the roundhouse at its heart (see Chapter 7.3.1), 14 Dressel 1 amphorae, and 8 coins from the Roman republic (see Chapter 7.3.1.1). Despite this limited evidence, the author speculated that should Colchester have been occupied at all at this time Sheepen was used as both a port and religious centre, whilst The Garrison functioned as a farmstead that may also have fulfilled a religious role (see Chapter 7.3.1.3). Furthermore, it was speculated during the analysis process that the amphorae signified the existence of an elite population at Colchester and/or the hosting of communal events that fostered social cohesion (see Chapter 7.3.1.2); while the coinage may have been a symbol of relationships forged for social and/or economic gain (see Chapters 6.2.4, 7.3.1.2).

11.2.2.2: Titelberg

Period 1 occupation at Titelberg, unlike that which occurred at Colchester, was very visible within the archaeological record, comprising: 85 morphological entities (see Figure 9.12; Appendix 9.9), 443 ceramic vessels (see Figure 9.13; Appendix 9.10), and 59 additional artefacts (see Figures 9.14-9.15; Appendix 9.11). Using this evidence the author determined that the site was used for a combination of domestic occupation, farming regimes, and the industrial production of both coinage and pottery (see Chapters 9.3.1.2-9.3.1.3). In addition to this, the enclosed eastern area of the site functioned as somewhere the site's residents and neighbouring communities could come together to observe religious events (see Chapters 9.2, 9.3.1.2).

Furthermore, the author ascertained that Titelberg's population was differentiated at this time in terms of the roles individuals fulfilled, (see Chapter 9.3.1.3); comprising farmers, blacksmiths, bronze-smiths, potters, weavers, religious figures, and merchants. Additionally, it was surmised that this population was stratified, as evidenced by a number of the imported wares attributed to this period (see Chapter 9.3.1.2). Moreover, it was not just members of Titelberg's population that had power during this period, but the site itself, as ascertained through a consideration of the locally produced coinage (see Chapters 9.3.1.2-9.3.1.3).

Many of the aforementioned points can also be said to have led to the inference that the site was relatively self-sustaining, and used surplus commodities from its industries to obtain those goods that could not be produced locally, as well as imports from both the Mediterranean world and elsewhere in Gaul (see Chapter 9.3.1.2; Figures 9.20-9.21, 9.23-9.24; Appendices 9.10-9.11). An analysis of these imports provided further insight into the stratified nature of Titelberg's population by highlighting those goods that were used by the elite to demonstrate their social standing (see Chapter 9.3.1.2).

These use of the Lamadelaine cemetery at this time, evidenced by an extensive archaeological record comprising a rich ceramic assemblage (see Figure 9.16; Appendix 9.12) and wide array of grave goods (see Figure 9.17; Appendix 9.13) allowed the author to surmise that death was a communal event designed to honour both the deceased and those deities looked to at such times (see pages 320-324). Furthermore, a study of this cemetery also confirmed notions that Titelberg was occupied by a stratified community whose occupant's daily lives centred on traditional Iron Age activities (see pages 324-327).

11.2.2.3: Canterbury

Some areas of the Canterbury region were extensively occupied during Period 1, with this c.100 year period witnessing the use of at least four areas: Bigbury, Marlowe Car-park, St Edmund's School, and Turing College (see Chapter 10.3.1.1). It is however, curious to note that the archaeological record associated with this occupation was not as vast as one might have expected (see Chapter 10.3.1; Appendices 10.7-10.8)[2]; although, this is probably due to the fact that recent work at the latter of these sites has yet to be fully published (see page 409). Despite this, there was much available for analysis (see Chapter 10.3.1.1).

An analysis of the aforementioned dataset led the author to deduce that the site was used for a combination of domestic occupation, farming regimes, and craft production (see Chapter 10.3.1.2). The latter of these activities included metalworking and the production of both ceramics and textiles (see pages 411-412; Appendix 10.9). Consequently, the author surmised that the site was relatively self-sustaining, and as such, able to obtain that which they could not

---

[2] It should also be noted that the majority of those regions occupied during the later Iron Age have been built over in the intervening c.2000 years. Consequently, archaeological explorations of this period are fraught with problems, not least because the opportunity to reach the depth required to explore Iron Age deposits are rare.

manufacture themselves using surplus generated through craft and/or farming practices (see pages 410-412).

Furthermore, the author surmised that the Canterbury region had close economic ties to its hinterland, through the presence of ceramics produced in Kent, but not Canterbury itself (see page 412). The presence of some, though not many, continental imports (see Appendix 10.8), on-the-other-hand, gave rise to the inference that the site's population may have been stratified, as well as the notion that Canterbury's occupants may have used imports during communal events designed to foster social cohesion (see page 413).

In addition to the above, it is important to note that Canterbury's occupants, particularly those residing at Bigbury, may have used slaves as a means through which to obtain imported goods, as well as surplus local products (see page 413). An inference that is based upon the discovery of slave shackles and an associated padlock at Bigbury (see Appendix 10.9); further supporting the idea that Canterbury's Period 1 population was stratified.

11.2.3: A series of comparisons

11.1.3.1: A comparison of occupation at the thesis' case sites

When comparing the nature of occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury it became quickly apparent to the author that although there was some overlap in terms of the activities being conducted at these sites, they were not as similar as their categorisation as *oppida* might lead us to believe. With regards to the former of these observations, the first aspect to note is that all three sites were used for a combination of domestic occupation, farming practices, and craft production. Furthermore, they all produced evidence to suggest that they received goods from the near Continent as a result of revived trading relationships between Gaul and the Mediterranean World, a process that appears to have led to a visualisation of stratified communities at each of these settlements. However, when we take a closer look at these activities it becomes evident that there are subtle differences that can be said to set these sites apart.

Firstly, and most noticeably, Titelberg and Canterbury received far greater use than Colchester during Period 1. Moreover, while Titelberg and Canterbury were probably receiving imported goods in exchange for surplus grain and/or the commodities manufactured by local craftsmen, artefacts of this nature at Colchester are likely to have arrived at the site, at least in part, because

of its position as a port. It seems, therefore, that Titelberg and Canterbury may have shared more in common with each other than they did with Colchester at this time.

However, when we take into account the fact that both Colchester and Titelberg fulfilled religious purposes yet no evidence to this end has been identified at Canterbury, (at least in so far as excavations have yet to reveal one[3]), the extent to which this observation can be considered convincing is limited. Conversely, it is not only the apparent absence of a religious centre at Canterbury, and minimal use of Colchester that can be said to limit the extent to which these sites compare to Titelberg, because Titelberg also appears to have had more 'worth' within its wider landscape than either Colchester or Canterbury during Period 1. This observation is founded not only upon the notion that Titelberg was occupied/used to a greater extent than the other two sites at this time, but the fact that it was used to mint its region's coinage, and therefore likely enjoyed a position of regional power. Consequently, it can be said that while there were some similarities between the thesis' case sites during Period 1, it is clear that there were also considerable differences; and that these differences characterise the nuances of these sites, and the activities they supported, at this time.

11.2.3.2: How does occupation at the thesis' case sites compare to current thinking on *oppida*?
As so-called *oppida*, we would expect Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury to comply with current thinking on what makes a site warrant the label *oppidum*, (see Chapter 2); and it is to a consideration of this that our attentions now turn.

In light of the comparison of occupation at the case sites conducted above, (Chapter 11.1.3.1), the author entered into the current study with the mind-set that there were likely many areas where the use of the term '*oppida*' has over generalised[4] considerations of occupation at sites such as Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury, and in doing so misrepresented their true nature. This is a preconception that was proven true not only through the present study, but those which follow it.

---

[3] It is of course important to remember that religious structures of this date are notoriously difficult to identify.
[4] By 'over generalised' the author means that existing interpretations of *oppida* may have focused on those aspects of occupation at the *oppida* that we have come to expect them to display, as well as those features that ultimately led to them being placed within this class of settlement (see Chapter 2), and not on the site's individuality in terms of their functions and what might set them apart from their contemporaries.

Chapter 2 of the thesis detailed current thinking on *oppida* and in doing so provided a coherent image of what many today perceive the character of these sites to have been. Arguably, one of the most prominent interpretations of the so-called *oppida* is that they were large fortified urban centres that show signs of long distance trade and/or industry (see Chapters 2.2, 2.3). In order to ensure that this point-of-view, and how well it compares to the author's interpretations of Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury, is thoroughly explored, we must first define what we mean by the term 'urban'. Traditionally 'urban' is: something 'relating to, or constituting a town or city' (Collins 2000, 1675). However, as Iron Age settlements can rarely be considered towns or cities, (see Chapter 1.2.1), we as archaeologists are more likely to refer to the term 'urbanism' when demonstrating what we mean by 'urban', because this term by its very nature is defined by the physical attributes we would expect to find at urban centres, attributes that include: evidence of settlement planning, a large area of occupation, and the presence of both religious and political foci alongside residential areas (Darvill 2003, 448); in other words they would meet the criterion of early Roman towns in Gaul (see Chapter 1.2.1).

When considering the above criterion of *oppida* in conjunction with interpretations of occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury (Chapters 7, 9-10; Chapter 11.2.2), it became clear that there were several areas where current thinking on these sites complied little with the purported characteristics of *oppida*; however, this is not to say that there was not some cohesion. If we first consider the notion that these settlements, as so-called *oppida*, should have covered relatively large expanses of land and been fortified (see Chapter 2.2), a problem with this aspect of their classification emerges straight away. While all three sites appear to have covered considerable tracts of land, particularly Colchester and Canterbury whose centres of occupation were fairly well dispersed within the Essex and Kentish landscapes respectively, only Titelberg has thus far[5] produced evidence of this date to suggest that it was fortified; although Bigbury, at Canterbury, was in itself enclosed by a significant ditch and bank rampart. The lack of fortifications at Colchester, and most of Canterbury, is vitally important to the authors' fulfilment of the thesis's aims, because, over the years the presence of fortifications is one characteristic of the so-called *oppida* that has never waivered (Woolf 1993a, 225). In other words, for a site to be classified as an *oppidum* it invariably needs to have been defined by

---

[5] That is to say future explorations at Canterbury and Colchester might yet reveal evidence for fortifications dating to between 150/100 and 55/50 BC.

earthworks that would have enclosed the majority of its occupied space and in some cases served a defensive function.

Our attention now turns to a consideration of whether Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury had urban characteristics. One of the first characteristics archaeologists look for in potential urban centres is a large area of occupied land, something, as was noted above, that all three of our settlements possess. Additionally, we would expect to find evidence of a settlement plan, primarily in the form of formalised street grids, which none of the case sites possessed at this time. Finally, urban centres, such as the so-called *oppida*, are presumed to have possessed both political and ritual foci alongside domestic occupation.

Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury have all produced convincing evidence for domestic occupation over the course of Period 1, (although it could be argued this was more evident at Titelberg and Canterbury than Colchester); and whilst both Titelberg and Colchester certainly had a religious focus, with the former being more closely situated near domestic occupation than the latter, (at Colchester potential domestic occupation was situated at The Garrison while the site's religious focus was at Sheepen), there is currently no evidence to this end linked to Canterbury.

Finally, for a settlement to be considered 'urban' it must also display evidence of a political focus[6]. Based on the evidence compiled and analysed in conjunction with Period 1 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury it can be said that only Titelberg may have had a political focus during Period 1; an interpretation that is based upon the site's connection to the production of the Treveri's coinage at this time. Consequently, neither Colchester nor Canterbury can be said to have been 'urban' during Period 1, as they lack at least three of the five characteristics sought of sites. In the case of Titelberg, on-the-other-hand, a case could be made that the site was 'urban' as it is only missing a formalised street plan. However, as it is likely oversights such as this, that is overlooking the absence of one or two of the characteristics expected of *oppida*, that have led to the confusion associated with this term today, the author feels it would be wrong to consider Titelberg wholly 'urban' between 150/100 and 55/50 BC, and instead suggests that we do not consider any of the case sites to have met this criterion.

---

[6] A political focus can be identified archaeological in a number a ways, as can be seen from see Chapter 2.3.5.

In addition to the above, current thinking on *oppida* tells us that these sites were also centres of industry and/or long distance trade (see Chapters 2.2, 2.3). We would therefore expect to find considerable evidence at potential *oppida* for one or both of these processes. At Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury there is evidence of imported wares, and therefore evidence to suggest that their occupants may have engaged in long distance trade. At Colchester evidence for long distance trade exists in the form of 14 Dressel 1 amphorae and 8 Republican coins that likely entered the site through the port at Sheepen whose merchants had forged links with their Gallic counterparts (see Chapter 7.3.1.2). Similarly, evidence of this activity at Canterbury is also represented by Dressel 1 amphorae; however, in this case the vessels were likely obtained from a trading post in the site's hinterland, rather than directly from the continent as this was likely the most efficient manner in which to obtain imports (see page 413). At Titelberg meanwhile, there is evidence for a number of imported wares, including both ceramics (see Figures 9.20-9.21; Appendix 9.10) and brooches (see Figure 9.24; Appendix 9.11), that likely reached the site directly from a trading centre elsewhere in Gaul (see pages 316-317). Consequently, although there is evidence for imports at all three of the thesis' case sites, but particularly Colchester and Titelberg, that may have been obtained through long distance trade, the number of imports circulating at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury during Period 1 is minimal and arguably not enough to suggest that this activity was a primary practice for occupants of these sites. Were they then centres of industry?

As was the case with long distance trade one would expect industry to be well represented within these sites' archaeological record if this practice was one of their primary functions. At Colchester industrial processes have only been inferred through our knowledge that domestic craft production tended to take place alongside domestic occupation and farming regimes (see Chapter 7.3.1.2); therefore, this site cannot be said to have functioned as either a centre of long distance trade or an industrial hub at this time. Canterbury, on-the-other-hand, does have the potential to be viewed as an industrial centre as both Bigbury and Turing College have provided evidence to suggest that their occupants engaged in a range of industrial processes including blacksmithing, the production of textiles and ceramics, and potentially also small scale bronze-smithing (see Chapters 10.3.1.2-10.3.1.3; Appendix 10.5). However, as many of these goods were produced for the purposes of local consumption as well as to ensure that the site's occupants could gain access to items Canterbury's occupants would have used on a daily basis, such as a broader range of ceramics than were produced at Turing College, and brooches for which there is no evidence of local production at present, one has to wonder whether the

production of these goods was actually a matter of necessity rather than as an identifying feature of the site; because without the generation of exports it is possible that Canterbury would not have been able reproduce itself, and develop into the flourishing centre of activity it became over the course of the later Iron Age.

In contrast to the above, there is much evidence to suggest that one of Titelberg's primary functions during Period 1 was to act as an industrial centre. This site shows signs of not only producing metalwork and ceramics at this time (see Figures 4.23, 4.24), but some of the region's coinage (see Chapter 9.3.1.2). Furthermore, the fact that the 'Foundation House', a specialised building used for the production of coinage and a range of other metal artefacts, emerged in its first incarnation during Period 1 tells us that there was a conscious decision by the site's occupants to ensure that they were able to meet the demands put on their industries. Consequently, the author feels that of the thesis' three case studies only Titelberg convincingly displays evidence of the final primary characteristic expected of *oppida*.

The interpretations of *oppida* discussed above are, however, not the only ones to exist within the literature pertaining to these sites. From Chapter 2, it is evident that in addition to the above many also perceive these sites to have been centres of power and/or ceremony, or even central foci within their respective landscapes. In being centres of power, potential *oppida* are expected to have fulfilled administrative and other political tasks, comprised tribal/elite residences, or a combination of both of these (see Chapters 2.3.4-2.3.5; Table 2.4). Meanwhile, those who characterise these sites as ceremonial believe that they were used for religious events and/or as funerary complexes; although, others have argued that their ceremonial function may have lain with their use as places for public gatherings designed to foster social cohesion (see Table 2.4). Finally, the notion that these sites were central places saw them depicted as settlements to which their hinterland were apparently beholden for success (see Table 2.4).

When contemplating whether the thesis' case sites adhere to the above characteristics, the first thing to note with regards to them being potential centres of power is that part of this defining function has already been considered. In being centres of power *oppida* are believed to have been used to fulfil administrative and other political roles, therefore they are expected to have been political foci. When the author explored the possibility of the case sites displaying urban characteristics they had to ascertain whether Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury served as political foci during Period 1. In doing this it was determined that only Titelberg met with this

expectation, because it was used as a mint for its region's coinage at this time; a process that was likely controlled by a central administration.

In terms of whether Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury can be considered tribal centres and/or elite residences, Titelberg can be said to have more in common with the so-called *oppida* than either Colchester or Canterbury; however, this is only true in so far as this site can be considered a tribal centre. One can label Titelberg thus because of its connection to the Treveri, (the tribe associated with this region of Gaul (see Chapter 9.3.1)), and the fact that it was responsible for minting a proportion of their coinage (see page 317-320). At Colchester and Canterbury, on-the-other-hand, no evidence, such as coinage, for the tribes regularly associated with these sites, the Trinovantes, (Dunnet 1975), and Cantiaci, (Detsicas 1983) respectively, is visible within their Period 1 archaeological records.

Finally, as centres of power *oppida* are expected to have contained an elite residence. Although, all three of the thesis' case sites appear to display evidence of stratified populations, none of them can be said to have been elite residences. An inference that is founded upon the notion that, while there is evidence for potential conspicuous consumption at all three sites, and therefore individuals of power, there is not enough of this material present to suggest that Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury were primarily elite residences. Had these sites been elite residences we might expect to see more in the way of luxury products, evidence that points towards a recognised leader, such as the coinage bearing an individual's name recovered in Britain, and possibly even a residence that stands out from others present either because it is larger or self-contained.

The next aspect of a site's characterisation as an *oppidum* to be considered here is their purported role as ceremonial centres. Part of the thesis' case sites adherence to this function has been considered above in relation to whether they contained religious foci; consequently, it can be said that only Colchester and Titelberg likely fulfilled this role. Further to this, *oppida*, as ceremonial centres, are expected to have been used for/be associated with a funerary complex; although, this is likely only expected of *oppida* in south-east Britain and Northern Gaul, because elsewhere in Temperate Europe funerary complexes are rare (see Chapter 2.3.5).

Of the thesis' three case sites, only Titelberg can be said to have potentially satisfied this requisite of *oppida*. However, the author feels that despite Titelberg's association with the

cemetery of Lamadelaine during Period 1, (see pages 320-327), we have to wonder whether it can be labelled a funerary complex. The author raises this doubt because the burials are not within the main confines of the settlement but situated on the northern slopes of its plateau, (see Figures 9.1-9.4, 9.11), and they feel that if an *oppidum* was a funerary complex the burials would be situated prominently within its main confines. It can therefore be said that none of the case sites wholly conform to this definition of *oppida*.

The last characteristic sought in *oppida* labelled ceremonial centres, is evidence for their use as centres where communal ceremonies designed to foster social cohesion were hosted. Identifying communal activities, such as those referred to here, is particularly difficult because the traces they leave within the archaeological record closely resemble those associated with traditional/typical activities conducted during the later Iron Age. However, this is not to say that it is impossible. For the most part, evidence of communal activities, such as these, is likely to comprise feasting debris located in/close to areas large enough to house a sizable population, in fact this evidence is likely to resemble that attributed to ritual/religious activities. It is for this reason that the author surmised that of the three case sites Colchester and Titelberg are those mostly likely to have been used for communal ceremonies, as these sites' religious zones likely had dual purpose (see Chapters 7.3.1.2, 9.3.1.2).

Finally, our consideration of how well Period 1 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury compares to current thinking on *oppida* turns to a contemplation of whether they can be considered central places. Of these sites only Colchester has been referred to as a central place within the literature (see Table 2.4); in light of this, the author engaged in a study of sites comprising Colchester's hinterland that have produced evidence of contemporaneous occupation (see Chapter 8). An analysis of these sites', (Ardleigh, Kelvedon, and Elms Farm, Heybridge), Period 1 occupation revealed that they were almost as sparsely occupied as Colchester itself at this time, despite being used for a range of different activities, including domestic occupation, farming, and craft production (see pages 235-237, 247-249, 263-264). This analysis led the author to conclude that Colchester's hinterland sites were relatively self-sufficient and able to obtain that which they could not produce themselves without needing to go through Colchester (see pages 237, 249, 265). Consequently, the author surmised that Colchester was not a central node to which Ardleigh, Kelvedon, and Elms Farm were beholden (see Chapter 8.4), but rather a settlement with which they had social, and possible economic, relationships of a similar calibre to those they likely had with the smaller sites within their own

hinterlands. As such it can be said that these sites highlight a break with the old convention of central-place/core-periphery models in their relationship to Colchester at this time.

Overall, it can be said that current thinking on the defining characteristics of *oppida*, (see Chapter 2), is only applicable to Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury to a degree at this stage of their development. In the case of the former and latter sites there are far more differences than similarities between the nature of their occupation and that which we have come to expect at *oppida*. Titelberg, on-the-other-hand, can be said to share much more in common with current thinking on *oppida* at this time; however, even this site does not wholly comply with this thinking, and therefore the author is unwilling to concede that this site can indeed be referred to as such. Consequently, this comparative study can be said to highlight the need to reassess the relevance of the term *oppida* today; a conclusion that is based on the fact that only Titelberg comes close to complying with current thinking on these sites; as well as the observation that, despite this class of settlement being portrayed as more or less uniform, (see Chapter 2), there are only two areas where the nature of the thesis' case sites overlap: their size and the fact that they were all to some extent used for domestic occupation. It can, therefore, be said that the continued use of the term '*oppida*' could result in the true nature of sites categorised as such being overlooked, simply because they display one or more of the same characteristics as those sites which do fit within this category. The relevance of this term can thus be said to have waned; however, it is not judicious to base these conclusions on this study alone, one must also consider how well the thesis' case sites compare to some of Period 1s best known *oppida*, including: Bibracte, Corent, Manching, Stradonice, Staré Hradisko, and Závist.

11.2.3.3: A comparison of the thesis' case sites and Period 1's best known *oppida*

In recent years, Wells has stated that Bibracte, Manching, Stradonice, and Staré Hradisko show signs of having been densely occupied, with this occupation comprising large populations, intensive industrial activity, and extensive trade (2001, 85; 2002, 366-367); while Corent is said to have begun life at the beginning of this period, (c.140/130 BC), as a sanctuary before developing into an *oppidum*, (c.120/100), (Poux and Garcia 2014, 300-301), that was densely occupied and specialised in industrial practices and trade with the Mediterranean World (Poux 2014c). Závist, by comparison, was utilised for similar purposes as the aforementioned sites, despite being more modestly populated (Wells 2001, 85). Furthermore, it has also been noted

that although these sites were all enclosed and of a reasonable size[7] their internal structures were variable with their differences possibly being regional (Wells 2001, 85; 2002, 367). This overview of the five comparative *oppida* therefore depicts these sites as similar in terms of their functions even if there were some morphological differences. However, when we look at some of the literature bearing reference to these sites, as individual entities, it is evident that they were not as similar as first believed.

The site of Bibracte has recently been interpreted as fulfilling a predominately politico-religious role (Fernández-Götz 2014a, 380); however, for many years prior to this the site was believed to have primarily been a centre for trade and industry (Guillaument 1991; Nash 1976, 107), where craft activities took place on an almost industrial scale (Dhennequin *et al.* 2008, 77 *cf.* Moore 2013, 506). In addition to this Bibracte is also cited to have been used for domestic occupation (Guillaument 1991); therefore, this *oppidum* may have had as many as five principal functions during Period 1.

Corent is believed to have been a site that comprised three primary zones of activity: 1) domestic occupation and farming, 2) an area for artisans, and 3) a commercial area (Poux 2014a, 21). The crafts engaged in within the area for artisans include carpentry (Demierre 2014a, 52), textile production (Guillaud 2014, 87), metalworking in the form of bronze working (Demierre 2014b, 110) and lead production (Demierre 2014c, 111), bone working (Dejean and Demierre 2014, 113), leather working (Foucras and Demierre 2014, 114), and the production of coinage (Gruel and Poux 2014, 174); while the commercial area, thought to have been a market (Demierre *et al.* 2014a, 90-111), primarily specialised in the importation of wine and the amphorae this was transported in (Poux *et al.* 2014, 117-133). Additionally, the site also fulfilled a number of religious and communal roles in the area occupied by the sanctuary (Guichon and Poux 2014), including celebrations following periods of warfare, as characterised by the deposition of weaponry within the sanctuary (Demierre *et al.* 2014b, 164-165), feasting and sacrifices (Foucras and Poux 2014, 170-171), the offering of libations (Poux 2014d, 172-173), and the hosting of royal banquets (Pranyies 2014, 196-197).

---

[7] Bibracte covered an area of 135ha, Manching 350ha, Stradonice 80ha, Staré Hradisko 38ha, and Závist 170ha (Collis 1984a).

Of the sites comprising this element of the present study Manching is possibly the best known. Despite not being excavated in its entirety, something that no *oppidum* has ever been, it is the site that has been the most extensively investigated (Collis 1984a, 36-37). Archaeological examinations at Manching have revealed that one of the site's most prominent functions was as an industrial centre (Cumberpatch 1995; Maier 1991, 331), with its primary role as such being to enable the mass production of iron artefacts (Collis 1984b, 150; Krämer 1960, 71; Wells 2002, 368), a process which appears to have led to as many as 200 different types of iron implement being manufactured at the site (Jacobi 1974 *cf.* Wells 2002, 368). In addition to this, there is evidence for a number of additional crafts at the site, including: bronze-smithing (Collis 1984b, 150; Krämer 1960, 73; Wells 2002, 368), textile production (Collis 1984b, 150-151), the minting of coinage (ibid, 150; Krämer 1960, 73-74), glass working (Krämer 2002, 73; Wells 2002, 368), and the production of ceramics (Wells 2002, 369; Krämer 1960, 71).

In addition to the above, Manching was also used for domestic occupation (Brun 1995b; Gebhard 1995; Maier 1991, 530); farming activities, both arable cultivation (Brun 1995b; Gebhard 1995; Körber-Grohne and Piening 1979, Fig. 1; Knörzer 1976 *cf.* Champion *et al.* 1992, 304; Maier 1991, 530) and animal husbandry (Boessneck 1971 *cf.* Champion *et al.* 1992, 304; Krämer 1960, 70); ritual/religious purposes (Wells 2002, 370); and as a trading centre (Collis 1984a, 96-98; Cunliffe 2011, 374; Gebhard 1995, 112; Krämer 1960, 74-77).

The third of the five *oppida* to which the thesis' case studies are to be compared shares a number of similarities with those considered above; however, there are also some areas where it differs. Závist like Manching appears to have been primarily used for industrial purposes (Motyková *et al.* 1991); in particular for blacksmithing (Motyková *et al.* 1978 *cf.* Cumberpatch 1995, 74), and the production of coinage (Jansová 1974; Motyková *et al.* 1978 *cf.* Cumberpatch 1995, 76). These industrial activities, like those at the above sites, were coupled with trade (Motykavá *et al.* 1991), and domestic occupation (Collis 1984a, 197; Motykavá *et al.* 1991). However, unlike both Bibracte and Manching this site does not appear to have been used for ritual/religious purposes; although this could be a result of the areas of the site that have been excavated to date. A similar pattern of site use is seen at the final two comparative *oppida*.

Stradonice at this time was used for domestic occupation and agricultural production (Cumberpatch 1995, 74), as well as a combination of both trade and industry (Bren 1991; Collis 1984a; Cumberpatch 1995, 74). Similarly, the site of Staré Hradisko was also designed to

support these activities (Collis 1984a, Fig. 8.10; Cumberpatch 1995, 74; Meduna 1991, 546-547). Consequently, these sites can be said to have more in common, in terms of the nature of their occupation, with Závist than with Bibracte, Corent, or Manching. It is with this, and the other observations noted above in mind, that our attention turns to a consideration of occupation at these purported *oppida* compares to that at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury.

Of the thesis' case sites Titelberg and Canterbury can be said to have more in common with the comparative *oppida* than Colchester. In the case of Titelberg it can be said that the site displayed the same characteristics as Bibracte, Corent, and Manching because it was also used for a combination of domestic occupation, farming regimes, industrial practices, trade, religious activities, and possible political/administrative tasks (see Chapter 11.2.2.2). Furthermore, the site also exhibits some of the same characteristics as Závist, Stradonice, and Staré Hradisko, as these sites, while not religious or political/administrative centres, were used for the other activities evidenced at Bibracte, Corent, and Manching. Meanwhile, the site of Canterbury can be said to have been used to the same end as Závist, Stradonice, and Staré Hradisko, and in doing so partially relate to Bibracte, Corent, and Manching because like the former sites it was not used for either religious or political pursuits. In the case of Colchester on-the-other-hand, we can say that in being tentatively linked to domestic occupation and farming activities during Period 1 the site shared similarities with all of the *oppida* noted above; while its potential use as a religious/ritual centre can be said to further link it to Bibracte, Corent, and Manching. However, unlike Titelberg and Canterbury, Colchester cannot be said to completely mirror any of the comparative *oppida*, because the evidence attributed to this site's Period 1 occupation, (see Chapter 7.3.1.1), cannot be used to definitively state that Colchester was occupied at this time, and even if it was this occupation was not as extensive as that at the other settlements under consideration here (see Chapters 7.3.1.2, 11.2.2.1).

Consequently, the above comparative study can be said to further highlight the need for us to question the relevance of the term *oppida* today. Although, occupation at Titelberg mirrors that at Bibracte, Corent, and Manching, and Canterbury that at Závist, Stradonice, and Staré Hradisko, these latter settlements do not display two of the key aspects of the former, thus the term *oppida* can be said to be, being used here to label sites which differed considerably from one another. If we continue to refer to these sites as such we run the risk of overlooking key aspects of a site's true nature because it shares one or more characteristics with sites currently labelled *oppida*.

These sites also call into question the relevance of the term *oppida* in their own right. This statement can be made, because in their similarities to both Titelberg and Canterbury, as well as to a lesser extent Colchester, these sites demonstrate an incoherence with current definitions of *oppida*. That is to say, current thinking on *oppida* does not completely reflect the true nature of these sites, as it highlights the similarities between them whilst overlooking the ways in which the sites do not adhere to the current model of *oppida* and their functions; even Manching which like Titelberg comes close to being the type of site those who defined this term sought cannot be said to completely adhere to current definitions of this term as it lacks the formalised layouts sought in urban centres.

11.2.3.4: A comparison of the thesis' case sites and contemporaneous non-*oppida*
This comparative study is designed to consider the extent to which the thesis' case studies, as well as the comparative *oppida*, can be said to compare to settlements that have never been considered *oppida* in order to further gauge the value of the term *oppida* today. Arguably, two of the best known examples of non-*oppida* occupied between the years of 150/100 and 55/50 BC in Britain are the Somerset lake villages of Glastonbury and Meare (Minnett and Coles 1996).

Over the course of this c.100 year period Glastonbury Lake Village was used[8] for a combination of domestic occupation, arable, as well as pastoral, farming regimes, and domestic/industrial craft production (Cunliffe 2005, 240-242; Jay 2008; Minnett and Coles 1996, 178, 192, 208-209). This site's exceptional preservation also indicates that the occupants of Glastonbury Lake Village developed a range of craft activities including: bronze-smithing (Cunliffe 2005, 456; Foster 1991), carpentry (Cunliffe 2005, 242), lead working (ibid, 460), pottery production (Bulleid 1948, 20), and weaving (Chittock 316; Cunliffe 2005, 242). Similarly, at the Meare Lake Village the site's occupants engaged in a combination of domestic occupation, farming regimes, and domestic/industrial craft production (Cunliffe 2005, 240-242; Minnett and Cole 1996, 178, 192, 208-209); however, there were some differences in the craft activities conducted at Meare. Although, Meare's craftsmen engaged in bronze-smithing (Cunliffe 2005, 456), as well as both the production of textiles (Bullied 1948, 62) and pottery (ibid, 18,20), they unlike their contemporaries at Glastonbury, were also engaging in the production of glass

---

[8] Possibly on a seasonal basis.

wares, in particular beads (Cunliffe 2005, 242, 461). Furthermore, it has been pondered that Meare Lake Village facilitated trade with the surrounding area (ibid, 174) by hosting annual trade fairs (Coles 1987 *cf.* Cunliffe 2005, 242).

In addition to the above, the author also considered a third British site, Little Woodbury, (which is defined as a farmstead), and the Gallic village site of Acy-Romance, Ardennes, as part of the current study. Like the two settlements detailed above, Little Woodbury was used for a combination of domestic occupation (Bersu 1940; Wainwright and Spratling 1973, 187-188), arable and pastoral farming regimes (Bersu 1940; Cunliffe 2005, 376, 381; Hill 2000, 15; Wainwright and Spratling 1973, 187-188), and domestic/industrial craft production (Bersu 1940; Wainwright and Spratling 1973, 187-188). In this case the craft production included: carpentry (Cunliffe 2005, 447), leather working (ibid, 215), and weaving (ibid, 215).

Similarly at Acy-Romance the site's occupants engaged in domestic occupation, a combination of both arable and pastoral farming regimes, and domestic/industrial craft production (Haselgrove 1996a, 143-144; 2007, Fig, 6; Lambot 1998b; 2002); with the site's industrial processes including blacksmithing, bronze-smithing, and weaving (Lambot 2011). In addition to this, Acy-Romance differed from the above sites, by fulfilling a religious role, an inference that is based on evidence from the main area of occupation, as well as both the cemeteries and mortuary enclosures with which the site is associated (Haselgrove 2007, 497, Fig. 6; Lambot 1998b; 2002; 2011; Lambot *et al.* 1994 *cf.* Haselgrove 2007, 497; Lambot and Méniel 2000, 104-120 *cf.* Haselgrove 2007, 497).

The base activities conducted at all four of the non-*oppida* sites noted above tally with those undertaken at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury, as well as the five comparative *oppida*. When we take into account the extent of the occupation conducted at these sites, as well as the scale of craft activities their occupants engaged in, it can be said that of the thesis' three case sites only Titelberg really compares; although so too do the five comparative sites. Furthermore, Acy-Romance's ties to later Iron Age religious practices can be said to highlight further similarities between it, Titelberg, Manching, Bibracte, and Corent as these sites have also produced evidence for ritual and religion; therefore, despite, Colchester, and to a lesser extent Canterbury, not comparing significantly to the non-*oppida*, that there are considerable similarities between the Lake Villages, Little Woodbury, Acy-Romance and the other so-called *oppida* tells us that a lack of compliance between current definitions of *oppida* and the nature

of occupation at these sites is only part of the problems we face with the continued use of the term. That is to say, these similarities raise another question that we need to address: why are some sites considered *oppida* over others when the nature of their occupation is arguably comparable?

However, before we address this question we need to first give consideration to some interesting data published in a recent paper by Fernández-Götz (2014a), as this further emphasises the conclusions reached above. Within his paper Fernández-Götz notes that it is not only *oppida* where we find evidence of industrial and trading activities on a scale that exceeds the norm form non-*oppida* sites (ibid, 381). In fact, Collis *et al*. 2000 and Salač 2009 suggest that considerable economic activity took place at many of the great open agglomerations occupied at this time (*cf.* Fernández-Götz 2014a, 381); including: Aulnat, Levroux, and Basel-Gasfabrik in Gaul; Berching-Pollanten in Bavaria, Bad Nauheim in Hess, Lovosice in Bohemia, Němčice in Moravia and Sajópetri in Hungary (ibid, 381). Furthermore, it is also important to note here that 'on occasion, the number of finds recovered at these open settlements rivals or even exceeds those produced by the *oppida*, as demonstrated by the following data given by Salač (2009); although, it has not yet been excavated, at the open site of Němčice some 518 glass bracelets have been found, nearly as many as in the intensely excavated *oppidum* of Manching (620) and many more than in *oppida*, like Stradonice (143), Závist (4); in Roseldorf, some 1500 coins have been found, more than in such important fortified sites as Manching (1342), Staré Hradisko (91) or Závist (16)' (Fernández-Götz 2014a, 381). It is however not only the number of finds that rival those at the *oppida*, at the site of Berching-Pollanten the range of objects identified during excavations mirrors those found at the near-by and contemporaneous *oppidum* of Manching (Schäfer 2010 *cf.* Fernández-Götz 2014a, 381). With these observations, which clearly demonstrate the need to re-evaluate our use of the term *oppida* in that they challenge the typical view that *oppida* were the most important sites within any given area and as such were their region's economic hub, in mind we return to the question: why are some sites considered *oppida* while others are not.

From the above considerations we know that there are many sites whose occupation was either on par with, or exceeded, that which had taken place at the period's *oppida*. It therefore leaves one pondering what, if anything, has ultimately been used to label the likes of Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury *oppida*, but not sites such as the Lake Villages, Němčice, and Berching-Pollanten. In order to answer this question we have to return to some of the earliest

classifications of these sites, the notion that *oppida* are both large in size and fortified (see Chapters 2, 11.2.3.2), because many of the other characteristics said to define an *oppidum* (see Chapters 2, 11.2.3.2; Table 2.4) occur so frequently at non-*oppida* sites, as we have observed above, that we cannot justifiably use these to label some sites *oppida* and others not.

Conversely, whilst these seem to be the most likely candidates for what ultimately sets these sites apart, our earlier consideration of how well the thesis' case sites comply with current definitions of *oppida* revealed that while all of these sites were large, in terms of the landmass they cover, only Titelberg was fortified (see Chapters 11.2.3.1-11.2.3.2). Furthermore, in order to accomplish the scale of industrial and economic success they did, the open agglomerated settlements in Temperate Europe noted above are likely to have been of a considerable size; whilst it is widely known that both the Lake Villages and Little Woodbury were palisaded, (Cunliffe 2005, 239-241, 255-269), and therefore arguably fortified, albeit not to the same extent as Titelberg and some of the other so-called *oppida* such as Manching and Závist (Wells 2002, 367). Consequently, it is evident that even the characteristics considered here are not exclusively associated with the so-called *oppida*; thus suggesting that the opinions of those writing on these sites, and the research interests of the time, heavily influenced their characterisation as *oppida*.

11.3: Period 2: 55/50 – 30/25 BC

<u>11.3.1: Period 2 within the context of the later Iron Age</u>

Much like Period 1 this c.30 year period is primarily characterised by agrarian societies who obtained that which they could not acquire/produce locally through social and economic relationships; relationships that were based on kinship and the generation of surplus respectively (see Chapter 11.2.1). Furthermore, Period 2 saw many of the advancements that had taken place/started to take place in both Britain and Temperate Europe between 150/100 and 55/50 BC intensify.

In Britain, the years of 55/50-30/25 BC saw the number of so-called *oppida* in southern and south-eastern regions increase (Cunliffe 1995a, 69-70; Mattingly 2007, 56), an intensification of trading links between Britain, Gaul, and the Mediterranean world, which ultimately led to the shifting of trading centres from central southern Britain and sites such as Hengistbury Head to the south-east and sites in the Thames region (Cunliffe 1984, 5-6; 1995a, 66-67; Collis

1984b, 163; Peacock 1971; 1984, 38; Mattingly 2007, 68), and the strengthening of relationships between communities in Essex, Kent, and Hertfordshire in Britain and Gallo-Belgic societies on the Near Continent, a process that led to these areas developing closely related cultural practices, but in particular an elite cremation burial rite (Birchall 1965, 270-279; Creighton 2006, 19; Cunliffe 1984, 13; Millett 1990, 31). Finally, many of the developments witnessed over the course of Period 2 in Britain have been attributed to Caesar's incursions of Britain in 55/54 BC and/or his conquest of Gaul that spanned from 58-51 BC (Collis 1984b, 163; Cunliffe 1984, 5-6, 13; 1995a, 66-67; Mattingly 2007, 56; Millett 1990, 31; Peacock 1971; Wells 2002, 370), because it is believed that these events led to 'large centres of manufacturing, commerce, and political power [emerging] at sites such as *Verlamion* (St Albans) (Haselgrove and Millett 1997) and *Camulodunum* (Colchester) (Millett 1990)' (Wells 2002, 370).

Within Temperate Europe this period saw not only the continued development of its settlement pattern, industries, and material culture, in particular ceramic styles (Champion *et al.* 1992, 300), but the intensification of economic relationships between Gaul and the Mediterranean World (Cunliffe 1984, 5-6). Furthermore, over the course of Period 2 the latter of these developments led to an increased number of luxury products circulating in Temperate Europe (Champion *et al.* 1992, 309); luxury products that found their way into the period's elite burials (ibid, 309), such as those at the cemetery of Goeblange-Nospelt situated 15km to the west of Titelberg (Thill 1966b; 1967 *cf.* Champion *et al*. 1992, 309).

Furthermore, this period also saw the introduction of new architectural styles, that is those that had affinity with the Roman World (Champion *et al.* 1992, 300), and in Gaul an apparently 'unprecedented degree of cultural homogeneity' (ibid, 300). Where present, these changes are believed to have been sparked by the political influence of the Roman World as a result Caesar's conquest of Gaul (ibid, 300); however, in areas not privy to these advancements it is argued that much remained as it had been prior to Caesar's conquest and the Roman interest this sparked in Temperate Europe (Millett 1990, 31; Drinkwater 1983); in other words, these areas remained much as they had been in the c.100 years prior to 55/50 BC. It is against the above backdrop that Period 2 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury took place.

11.3.2: Period 2 occupation at the thesis' case sites

11.3.2.1: Colchester

Between the years of 55/50 and 30/25 BC Colchester was almost as sparsely occupied as it had been during Period 2 (see Chapter 7.3.2; Figures 7.24-7.26; Appendix 7.14); despite a new centre of occupation potentially emerging at Gosbecks (see Chapter 7.3.2.1). This new area of Colchester, should it have been occupied at all at this time, was used in much the same way as The Garrison in that it was likely a farmstead. Other than this new addition to the site, however, Period 2 Colchester functioned in much the same way as its Period 1 precursor (see Chapter 11.1.2.1). That is to say, Sheepen continued to be used as both a port and religious focus, while The Garrison maintained its role as a farmstead whose occupants engaged in arable and pastoral farming regimes and most likely some form of craft production (see Chapter 7.3.2.2). Further to this, there is evidence to suggest that this period may have also seen the beginnings of a ceramic industry at Sheepen, and a wider pool of imported products used by the elite to display their social standing (see pages 180-181).

11.2.2.2: Titelberg

In contrast to Colchester, Period 2 occupation at Titelberg can be said to represent a considerable intensification of the site's use since Period 1 (see Chapter 9.3.2; Figures 9.37, 9.40-9.44). Despite this intensification, Titelberg continued to facilitate the same activities as it had between the years of 150/100 and 55/50 BC (see Chapter 11.1.2.2); in other words, it continued to be used for a combination of domestic occupation, pastoral, and to a lesser degree arable, farming, industrial, and religious activities (see Chapter 9.3.2.2). Although, of these activities it was the site's role as an industrial centre that became the most pronounced of all over the course of this 30 year period (see Chapter 9.3.2.3).

The latter of the above inferences is based on the evidence associated with the site's ceramic and metalworking industries. An analysis of this evidence suggests that the ceramic industry was responsible for producing c.50% more pottery than it had during Period 1 (see page 338); while the metalworking industries produced considerably more coins and other metal artefacts, such as brooches, than they had during the previous c.100 years (see pages 346-347). Accordingly, it is possible to surmise that Titelberg's primary function at this time was as an industrial centre.

Further to the above, Period 2 also saw the number of imports at Titelberg increase (see Chapter 9.3.2.2; see Figures 9.41-9.44). This tells us that the site's economic relationships with other communities within Gaul became more advanced/affluent at this time (see pages 340-346). Moreover, this increase in imported wares allowed the author to surmise that there was a greater desire amongst the elite to define their social standing, as well as increased interest in the use of imports, particularly imported vessels, during events of a communal nature, whether they were feasts designed to foster social cohesion or religious festivals carried out within the 'Holy Enclosure' (see page 340, 346). Finally, it is not just the use of the 'Holy Enclosure' that denotes the continuation of communal events at this site, so too does the continued use of the cemetery of Lamadelaine (see pages 347-350).

11.2.2.3: Canterbury

Canterbury underwent a number of developments and declines between Periods 1 and 2. The years 55/50 to 30/25 BC saw those areas of the site that had been most intensively used during Period 1 diminish: Bigbury ceased to be occupied (in so far as there is nothing known from the site datable to later than 10 BC (see Chapter 10.3.1-10.3.2), life at St Edmund's School was stripped back to its bare minimum, while that at Turing College was negligible (see Chapter 10.3.2.1-10.3.2.2). Contrastingly, the area now occupied by the modern city was more intensively inhabited than during Period 1; the Marlowe Car-park site continued to be used, and at least two additional areas of the city emerged as centres of later Iron Age occupation (see page 421). Furthermore, this period was associated with a more extensive archaeological record (see Figures 10.9-10.12; Appendices 10.11-10.13), therefore telling us that the site's population levels likely increased over the course of this c.30 year period.

Despite being significantly altered, in terms of its layout within the landscape, Canterbury continued to be used for the same purposes that it had during Period 1 (see Chapter 11.1.2.3). In other words, the site continued to support a combination of domestic occupation, arable and pastoral farming regimes, and craft production (see Chapter 10.3.2.3). With regards to craft production, Period 2 saw the site's craftsmen continue to produce, to varying degrees, textiles, ceramics, and metalwork. Conversely, in spite of local craftsmen continuing to produce these items Canterbury maintained close economic ties with its hinterland, through which its occupants likely obtained many of the products they required on a daily basis; including ceramics and brooches (see pages 427). Furthermore, Period 2 also witnessed Canterbury's merchants likely establish economic ties with Folkestone, and through them Gaul, as evidenced

by the increasing number of continental products circulating within its environs at this time (see page 425-427). The presence of these continental imports demonstrates the continued existence of a stratified community at Canterbury, and/or its population's engagement in communal activities (see page 424).

<u>11.3.3: A series of comparisons</u>
<u>11.3.3.1: A comparison of occupation at the thesis' case sites</u>
On the surface, Period 2 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury appears to have been quite similar, as all three of these sites were used for a combination of domestic occupation, farming practices, and craft production; just as they had been during Period 1. Furthermore, they also all appear to have continued to house stratified communities who had trading relationships with Gaul and/or the Mediterranean world through which they obtained luxury products. However, as was the case with their Period 1 occupation, (see Chapter 11.2.3.1), there are a number of differences that can be said to set the thesis' case sites apart, and in doing so demonstrate that these sites are not as uniform as their characterisation as *oppida* might lead us to believe.

As these differences (which include the scale of occupation at the sites, the types of craft production engaged in, the observation of religious festivals and burial customs, as well as the level of trade the sites' merchants were involved in) altered little between Periods 1 and 2 it is unnecessary to consider them in detail here. Instead the author feels it is enough to summarise these differences thus: of the three sites Titelberg was the most densely occupied during Period 2, and unlike either Colchester or Canterbury it was associated with the interment of the dead at this time. Furthermore, with many of the elevated areas at Canterbury ceasing to be occupied to the same extent as they were during Period 1 after c.55/50 BC it can be said that both this site and Colchester differed from Titelberg geographically, because unlike the latter site these settlements were located in valley bottoms; however this difference does not mean that the sites purposes did not overlap.[9] In addition to this, Titelberg and Colchester continued to differ from Canterbury because they had areas of potential religious import at this time; and in retaining its position of political power within its environs Titelberg can be said to have further differed from both Colchester and Canterbury, as neither of these sites display evidence, such as tribal coinage (see Chapters 7.3.2.1, 10.3.2.1), that could be used to suggest they were affiliated with

---

[9] These factors remain true for the remainder of these sites' later Iron Age occupation.

political activities at this time. Consequently, it can be said that while there are some similarities in Period 2 occupation at the thesis' case sites, it is actually their differences that characterise their purpose.

<u>11.3.3.2: How does occupation at the thesis' case sites compare to current thinking on *oppida*?</u>
During considerations of Period 1 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury it was noted that although all three sites adhered to certain aspects of the elements considered defining characteristics of *oppida*, it was Titelberg that most fully conformed; but even then this was not enough for the author to truly consider this site an *oppidum* (see Chapter 11.2.3.2). Similar inferences were drawn in relation to these sites' Period 2 occupation; it is therefore unnecessary to consider these in detail here.

Instead, the author feels it is enough to state that whilst all three of these sites continued to cover considerable tracts of land it was once again only Titelberg that displayed evidence of fortifications.[10] Furthermore, in terms of these sites displaying urban qualities it can be said that although all three sites meet the first requisite of urbanism, (size), none of them meet the second, (a formalised settlement layout, such as those seen in early Roman Towns (see Chapter 1.2.1)), only Titelberg and Colchester the third, (a religious focus)[11], whilst Titelberg alone complies with the fourth, (a political focus).

Additionally, sites labelled *oppida* are expected to show signs of industrial activities and long distance trade something that it could be argued all three case sites do; however, only Titelberg can be said to have engaged in industrial activities at this time on the scale one might expect of an apparent *oppidum*. With regards to long distance trade, on-the-other-hand, it can be said that whilst both Colchester and Canterbury's occupants engaged in this activity, only Titelberg displays evidence of this activity to the extent we might expect of so-called *oppida*.

Similarly, the final three characteristics sought in potential *oppida* were also not visible at all of the case sites. With regards to the notion that *oppida* were centres of administrative/tribal

---

[10] It should be noted that later Iron Age fortifications may have existed at Canterbury but they have not survived within the archaeological record due to later natural and cultural formation process, while those of a later date at Colchester could, with additional examination, prove to have been earlier in date, however, based on the evidence currently associated with them we cannot link them to the site's later Iron Age occupation (see Chapter 7.1.2.6).
[11] No such evidence exists at Canterbury, although it is possible that one may have existed below this site's Roman Temple; particularly when we take into account the fact that many Iron Age shires developed into Roman temples (Woolf 1998, 235-236).

power, it can be said that as the purported mint for much of the Treveri's coinage, (see Chapters 9.2; 9.3.2.2), Titelberg complies to this definition of *oppida*; whilst there is no evidence to suggest that either Colchester or Canterbury did. The second of these additional definitions desires *oppida* to display evidence of religious and/or funerary complexes; although both Colchester and Titelberg can be said to meet with the first of these stipulations neither of these sites display evidence enough to suggest that they were funerary complexes[12], even Titelberg which was associated with the cemetery of Lamadelaine at this time. Finally, those responsible for characterising *oppida* within much of the current literature view these sites as central places within their wider geographic setting. As was the case with similar considerations of the thesis' case sites it is only Colchester that has ever been labelled a central place (see Table 2.4); however, when we refer to Chapter 8, where the author considers occupation at a number of sites within Colchester's hinterland, it is evident that once again Colchester cannot be considered a central site because each of the hinterland settlements considered therein show signs of being relatively self-sustaining and having acquired their imports either directly from Gaul or via other sites within the Essex landscape (see pages 236-237, 247-349, 264-265).

Based on the inferences drawn above, it can be said that it is Titelberg that once again most closely complies with current thinking on *oppida*. Despite this, the author does not feel that this site complies enough to warrant its label thus. Furthermore, the author believes that this study further highlights the differences between the thesis' case sites, and in doing so demonstrates how labelling them *oppida* can overshadow their true nature and thus lead to their functions being over generalised.

11.3.3.3: A comparison of the thesis' case sites and Period 2's best known *oppida*

The process of comparing Period 2 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury with that which occurred at the period's most prominent/best explored *oppida* was made easier in that many of the sites that fall into this category are primarily the same as those considered in conjunction with Period 1 occupation at the case sites. Consequently, we have already established the functions of these sites, as well as the extent to which they compare to both the case sites and current thinking on *oppida* (see Chapter 11.2.3.3). With this in mind, the author only needed to consider whether developments witnessed at Colchester, Titelberg, and

---

[12] For a site to be a funerary complex one would expect this to be its primary purpose, and as such we might expect them to display evidence of ritual areas in which communal gatherings associated with death and burial could be performed as well as multiple burials, and possibly even multiple cemeteries.

Canterbury between Periods 1 and 2 affected the extent to which these sites did/did not compare to: Bibracte, Závist, Stradonice, and Staré Hradisko.

Based on the above observations, (Chapter 11.3.2) it can be said that Period 2 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury remained unaltered in terms of their essential make-up, and that it was only an intensification of earlier activities that can be said to set the two periods of occupation apart. With this in mind, it can be said that occupation at Titelberg continued to bear similarities to that at all of comparative sites, as did Colchester, only to a lesser degree given its negligible occupation at this time; whilst the use of Canterbury continued to most closely resemble that of Závist, Stradonice, and Staré Hradisko, because unlike Bibracte no evidence has been discovered to suggest that it contained a religious centre. Consequently, the author feels justified in stating that those conclusions reached in conjunction with a comparison of the thesis' case sites and the aforementioned *oppida* stand up here (see Chapter 11.2.3.3).

Conversely, in addition to the above comparative sites Period 2 also saw a number of *oppida* emerge within the Gallic landscape (Collis 1984a, 74). In light of this development, it was necessary to consider whether occupation at these sites can too be said to compare, on some level, with that at the thesis' case sites. Of these sites it is arguably Villeneuve-Saint-Germain that has been the most explored, thus making it the ideal site to compare to Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury, however, consideration will also be given to another Gallic *oppidum*: Pommiers.

Occupation at Villeneuve-Saint-Germain was characterised by domestic occupation coupled with both arable and pastoral farming regimes, and craft production (Auxiette 1996; Debord 1990; Fulford 1985; Haselgrove 1996a, 147-149; 2007, 507-511); with the latter of these pursuits comprising the production of coinage, bronze, iron, glass, pottery, and leather artefacts (Debord 1995; Guichard *et al*. 1993; Haselgrove 1996a, 147-149; 2007, 507-511; Tillard 1986). Furthermore, it has been surmised that the site's occupants also engaged in long distance trade (Haselgrove 1996a, 147-149), whilst its ditches are said to have formed symbolic boundaries (Peyre 2000 *cf*. Haselgrove 2007, 509) that may have denoted a public space used for political and religious meetings just as it is purported was the case at Titelberg (Metzler *et al*. 2006 *cf*. Haselgrove 2007, 509).

Meanwhile, at the fortified site of Pommiers, situated in the Aisne Valley, it can be said that occupation was characterised by its industrial activities (Collins 1998, 159); which involved metal working, but particularly the large scale production of coinage (Brun and Debord 1991; Debord and Nomine 1983; Foucart 1973; 1979; Vauvillé 1904 *cf.* Collins 1998, 159) and brooches (Vauvillé 1912 *cf.* Collins 1998, 159).

Villeneuve-Saint-Germain's principal functions can. Therefore, be seen to tally with those at the thesis' case sites; that is to say that like this Gallic site Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury were utilised for some degree of domestic occupation, farming activities, craft production, and long distance trade. Furthermore, like the case sites' occupants, Villeneuve-Saint-Germain's population engaged in long distance trade; whilst the site's potential use as both a religious and political foci can be said to link this site to Titelberg, and to a lesser extent Colchester which had a religious focus but not a political one at this time. In the case of Pommiers, on-the-other-hand, it can be said that occupation at this site differs considerably from that at the case sites, and adheres little with current definitions of *oppida*, particularly as its primary, and best understood function, was to act as an industrial centre specialising in metalwork. Therefore it can be said that some similarities exist between Titelberg and Pommiers in that the former of these sites was also utilised for the production of coinage at this time (see Chapters 9.3.2.2, 11.3.2.2), however little can be said to link it to either Colchester or Canterbury at this time. Consequently, it can once more be observed that of the thesis' case sites it is Titelberg that most closely resembles the comparative sites, and as such demonstrates how few sites can be said to wholly comply with the defining characteristics of *oppida*.

11.3.3.4: A comparison of the thesis' case sites and contemporaneous non-*oppida*

Two of the better known non-*oppida* sites occupied during Period 2 are the Glastonbury and Meare Lake Villages. As these sites were also occupied during Period 1 (see Chapter 11.2.3.4), and occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury remained largely unchanged between Periods 1 and 2, it can be said that occupation at the thesis' case sites continued to compare to that at these comparative sites (see Chapter 11.2.3.4). Consequently, it seems likely that this comparative study, like that which have come before it, will bear the same conclusions as those conducted in relation to Period 1 occupation at the thesis' case sites. However, the Lake Villages are not the only non-*oppida* settlements of Period 2 date for which we have understanding enough to make them suitable comparative sites for the current project.

In addition to the Lake Villages, the author compared Period 2 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury to that at the well-known site of Gussage-All-Saints in Dorset. Gussage-All-Saints is regularly viewed as a self-supporting farmstead (Foster 1991) that was utilised for a combination of domestic occupation (ibid; Wainwright 1973, 194; 1979), arable cultivation (Foster 1991; Wainwright 1973, 196; 1979, 188), animal husbandry (Cunliffe 2005, 376; Foster 1991; Harcourt 1979; Wainwright 1973, 192, 295), and domestic/industrial craft production including: blacksmithing (Foster 1991; Spratling 1973, 199; Wainwright 1973, 196), bone working (Spratling 1973, 201), bronze working (Cunliffe 1995b; 2005, 227, 456; Foster 1980; 1991; Spratling 1973, 198-212; 1979; Wainwright 1973, 194, 196; Wells 2001, 94; 2002, 370), pottery production (Foster 1991), and weaving (ibid; Wainwright 1973, 196). Further to this, the site of Gussage-All-Saints is believed to have been used for long-distance trade (Wainwright 1973, 192, 195), and in being so catered for the needs of an elite population; particularly those who reared horses (Foster 1991; Mattingly 2007, 58; Wells 2001, 94).

The above observations once more highlight the similarities between the thesis' case sites and those settlements that have never been termed *oppida*. Consequently, those inferences borne from similar considerations of Period 1 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, Canterbury and contemporaneous non-*oppida* can be said to stand up here (see Chapter 11.2.3.4). That is to say, the above observations leave us questioning why the thesis' case sites have been labelled *oppida*, whilst Gussage-All-Saints has not. In order to explore this question we have to once again consider the earliest definitions of *oppida*: that they were large, fortified, settlements (see Chapter 2.2).

Considerations of Gussage-All-Saints have revealed that this settlement was both relatively large and palisaded; thus meaning it could be viewed as fortified. It can therefore be said that, like Titelberg, this site complies with both of these defining characteristics of *oppida*, albeit not on the same scale as the so-called *oppidum* of Titelberg. Consequently, this comparative study, like that conducted in conjunction with Period 1 occupation at the thesis' case sites, can be said to reveal that it was the opinions of those writing of these settlements' later Iron Age occupation that led to some sites being labelled *oppida*, and others not.

11.4: Period 3: 30/25 BC – AD 20/25

11.4.1: Period 3 within the context of the later Iron Age

During this c.55 year period life in much of Britain and Temperate Europe, (with the exception of some areas of southern Gaul that fell under Roman control upon the ascension of Augustus, (see page 491 below)), continued along the same trajectory as it had in Period 2; that is to say, life in these regions continued to be characterised by a combination of domestic occupation, arable and pastoral farming regimes, and craft production. However, Period 3 was also a time of considerable change; whereby, the social, economic, and power connotations of these areas were altered by the many developments with which this period can be associated.

In Britain these developments can be attributed to one, or both, of the following processes: 1) the forging of diplomatic treaties between British tribes and Augustus (Haselgrove 1987, 201; Mattingly 2007, 72; Millett 1990, 33), which are believed to have led to allied nobles sending their sons to Rome to be educated (Creighton 2000, 137; Roymans 2009, 229-230); and 2) the "Romanisation" of Gaul (Creighton 2006, 19-20; Cunliffe 1995a, 116). Arguably some of the starkest advancements borne from these processes are visible within the region's economy; and included the strengthening of the Belgica-Thames trade link (Creighton 2006, 19; Mattingly 2007, 72), first established during Period 2 (see Chapter 11.3.1), which resulted in increased trade with Temperate Europe, and saw products arrive in the south-east of Britain from Gaul, Iberia, the Rhineland, and the Roman World (Cunliffe 1984, 15). Furthermore, if we are to believe the writings of Strabo, increased trade with Temperate Europe led to the appearance of ivory, chains, necklaces, amber gems, glass vessels, wine, and Roman ceramics in Britain (Cunliffe 1984, 13; Fulford 1985, 93; Strabo *Geography* 4.5.3); items for which they exchanged: grain, cattle, gold, silver, iron, hides, slaves, and dogs (Cunliffe 1984, 13; 1995a, 61; Fulford 1985, 93; Strabo *Geography* 4.5.2). In addition to this, the economic advancements of Period 3 also comprised the mass importation of Gallo-Belgic wares, after they started to be manufactured in 15/10 BC (see Chapter 4.2), and an increased use of coinage (Champion *et al.* 1992, 308; Haselgrove 1987, 201, Fig. 5.5; Millett 1990, 83).

Further to the above, this period also saw the social structures of the south-east develop into systems comprising local dynasties whose leaders are said to have had full political and military control of their local regions (Champion *et al.* 1992, 316; Cunliffe 1978a, 64-114). Moreover, it is curious to note that the literature often refers to this period as the time at which the *oppida* appear in both southern and eastern Britain (Champion *et al*. 1992, 311; Creighton 2006, 19;

Cunliffe 1978a, 243-286; 1995a, 69-79; Millett 1990, 33; Pitts 2010, 35), despite a number of sites occupied before this time being referred to as *oppida* within the literature, such as Hengistbury Head (Fitzpatrick 2007, 159, Fig. 2.13 *cf.* Jarrett 2010, 33; McOmish 2011, 2).

Meanwhile, in continental Temperate Europe some areas changed very little at this time, whilst others, such as Gaul, underwent a number of considerable, and at times drastic, developments. Arguably the most significant change within Temperate Europe at this time was the absorption of Gaul into the Roman Empire (Brogan 1953, 26; Drinkwater 1983, 20-21; Haselgrove 1987, 196; 1996a, 138; King 1990, 64; Millett 1990, 32; Woolf 1998, 32). Initially, this led to a precarious relationship between the indigenous populations and the Roman World whereby little was significantly altered; but over time, Augustus introduced towns, namely *civitates* (such as Autun and Nîmes (Woolf 1998, 113)), to southern Gaul that eventually spread further north (King 1990, c.3; Vanderhoeven 1996, 190; Woolf 1998, 118-119), as well as the taxation system that was in place elsewhere within the Empire (Vanderhoeven 1996, 190; Woolf 1998, 44-45). Conversely, the introduction of this tax based administration was not the only political development to have occurred in Gaul during Period 3. The newly emerged towns took on the same administrative roles as they had elsewhere in the Empire (King 1990, 64-66; Vanderhoeven 1996, 190; Woolf 1998, 32), however, a new system was also put in place whereby the indigenous elite could only obtain power if they served in the Roman army and showed signs of "Romanisation" (King 1990, 65); moreover, upon becoming members of this new aristocracy, the elite could expand their power and status by mediating between the Romans and Gallic population (Woolf 1998, 33).

Temperate Europe also underwent a number of economic advancements at this time. This period saw greater emphasis put upon the productivity of industries (ibid, 46); in fact, a number of new settlements emerged in the rural areas of both Gaul and the Rhineland for this very purpose (King 1990, 89-90). One of the most visible industries of this period was centred on the production of pottery (King 1990, 64; Woolf 1998, 190-191), particularly the Gallo-Belgic wares which started to emerge after c.20 BC (see Chapter 4.2). Furthermore, Period 3 also witnessed an increase in trade and exchange between communities within Temperate Europe itself, as well as between these communities and the Roman World (Woolf 1998, 181-185); a process which gave rise to a new trade axis spanning from Lyon to the Rhineland, and thus the new Roman frontier (King 1990, 115) and a material culture that was often very different from

that which had come before it (Woolf 1998, 181-185). It was within this framework of developments that Period 3 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury took place.

11.4.2: Period 3 occupation at the thesis' case sites

11.4.2.1: Colchester

Period 3 marks the emergence of intense occupation at Colchester; with Sheepen, Gosbecks, and The Garrison all being used extensively at this time (see Figures 7.27-7.30; Appendices 7.15-7.17). Furthermore, this is the period within which the Lexden Tumulus, one of the two burial complexes with which later Iron Age Colchester is associated, was established (see Chapter 7.3.3.1; Figure 7.35; Appendix 7.17).

Over the course of this c.55 year period both Gosbecks and The Garrison were used for a combination of domestic occupation, arable and pastoral farming regimes, and craft production (see Chapter 7.3.3.2). With regards to the latter of these pursuits we cannot at present ascertain the exact crafts The Garrison's occupants engaged in, craftsmen at Gosbecks produced metalwork, textiles, and woodwork (see page 196). Additionally, the author surmised that Gosbecks may have also been a centre of religious import at this time; an inference that is based on the existence of a sanctuary within its environs (see page 188).

Period 3 use of Sheepen, meanwhile, was characterised by its role as both a port and religious centre (see Chapter 7.3.3.1). In other words, this is the period within which those activities purported to have taken place here during Periods 1 and 2 can truly be said to have taken hold at the site. Furthermore, this period witnessed the possible emergence of a ceramic industry at Sheepen, in addition to one that may have specialised in metalwork (see pages 190-192, 197). This region of Colchester may also have been inhabited domestically, (see page 188); although, it is difficult to ascertain the truth in this notion using the evidence available.

In addition to the above, Period 3 occupation at Colchester was also characterised by developments in the site's social, economic, and power connotations. The economic developments of Britain and Temperate Europe, outlined in Chapter 11.4.1 above, led to the appearance of a sizable Gallo-Belgic ceramic assemblage at Period 3 Colchester (see Chapter 7.3.3.1; Appendix 7.16). The adoption of these ceramics can be said to have been directly

responsible for the changes witnessed in the site's social and power connotations[13]; which included: the probable adoption of Roman dining habits, the ways in which the site's elite displayed their social standing, and/or those products reserved for use during communal events be they designed to celebrate religious festivals or promote social cohesion (see pages 189-190).

Furthermore, these developments were also identified through an analysis of the Lexden Tumulus. However, in addition to further demonstrating the development of Colchester's economic relationships (see page 201), as well as the ways in which the elite displayed their status, and imported wares were utilised during communal events, this burial can be said to highlight the emergence of a new burial rite, (see page 200), and in doing so a change in the site's social connotations. In other words, the Lexden Tumulus can be said to illustrate the ways in which Colchester's resident population dealt with death, and the cultural practices associated with this.

Consequently, the above inference led the author to conclude that Period 3 occupation at Colchester was characterised by a stratified community who specialised in long distance trade and industry, whilst also engaging in traditional Iron Age pursuits.

11.4.2.2: Titelberg

Period 3 occupation at Titelberg left a considerable footprint within the archaeological record (see Figures 9.47-9.50; Appendices 9.21-9.23), and although life at the site underwent a number of changes these were slight in comparison to those taking place simultaneously at Colchester. This c.55 year period saw Titelberg continue to exist as a centre of industrial production that also retained its position of religious import (see Chapter 9.3.3.3); furthermore, Period 3 saw Titelberg continue to be used for the purposes of domestic occupation, arable cultivation, animal husbandry, and long distance trade (see Chapter 9.3.3.3). Additionally, Titelberg's craftsmen continued to produce ceramics, metalwork, and those goods that can be manufactured from the secondary products obtained through animal husbandry such as textiles (see Chapter 9.3.3.2; Appendix 9.23); however, whilst there was a definite upsurge in the

---

[13] Although, it should also be noted that these wares would have also supported the continuation of practices already in place at this time (Okun 1989, 50); in other words, Colchester's occupants would have also utilised these products in native dining situations.

number of ceramics being produced at Titelberg at this time (see Figure 9.55), there was also a decline in its output of certain metal products, particularly coinage (see page 369).

The decline in coinage suggests that in addition to a decline in the metal products Titelberg's craftsmen were manufacturing, a slump in Titelberg's regional importance occurred. That is to say, the limited output of Treveri coins at Titelberg during Period 3 likely reflects a diminishment in the site's status as a regional centre for this tribe, and the political importance it had likely enjoyed as a result of this (see page 369). This is, however, not the only development/change witnessed at Titelberg at this time.

Period 3 saw Roman table wares become common place at Titelberg (see Figure 9.55; Appendix 9.22), suggesting that these items were no longer reserved for the elite and/or events of special significance as they had been during Periods 1 and 2 (see Chapter 11.2.2.2, 11.3.2.2), but were used on a daily basis by everyone in residence (see pages 360, 365). Furthermore, the author associated this period with the emergence of settlement morphology more commonly associated with Roman Towns (see Appendix 9.21). These developments can, therefore, be said to represent the likely influence Gaul's absorption into the Roman Empire had had on the site, its occupants, and its material culture (see Chapter 9.3.3.3).

It is not only the evidence recovered from Titelberg's plateau that can be said to highlight the increasing influence Rome was having upon the occupants of this site, so too did that recovered at Lamadelaine (see Figures 9.51-9.52; Appendices 9.24-9.25). Despite the evidence of Period 3 date at this cemetery clearly demonstrating the continued observation of those burial rites first used at the site during Period 1, (see page 370), the discovery of figurines and gaming paraphernalia within one of the graves interred at this time (see Figure 9.52; Appendix 9.25), can be said to further denote the adoption of material culture more commonly associated with the Roman World (see pages 373). Furthermore, it became clear from an analysis of this evidence in conjunction with contemporaneous burials at the cemetery of Goeblange-Nospelt that these new items were associated with the elite (see pages 373-374).[14] It can therefore be

---

[14] Titelberg's association with burials on this scale is relatively unique, very few sites of Titelberg's size display such evidence at this time in Temperate Europe; it is therefore possible that the use of Roman material culture within grave deposits was a local preference, however, it is possible that it is also the result of northern Gaul's cultural ties with south-east Britain, (see page 78), as this practice can also be observed within the Lexden Tumulus at Colchester (see Chapter 7.3.3.2).

said that, in addition to daily life at Titelberg being altered by Augustus' annexation of Gaul, so too were the ways in which the site's elite displayed their status.

It can be concluded then, that despite the site continuing to adhere to traditional Iron Age pursuits its resident population, which was clearly stratified, adopted a number of Roman cultural practices; whilst the site as a whole lost some of its regional importance. This chronological timeframe was therefore a period of considerable change at Titelberg.

11.4.2.3: Canterbury

Period 3 at Canterbury, much like at Colchester, was marked by an intensification of occupation (see Figures 10.17-10.21; Appendices 10.14-10.16). This period saw not only the continued decline of the St Edmund's School and Turing College sites, but the expansion of later Iron Age occupation within the area now occupied by the modern city (see pages 431, 437). In addition to the Marlowe Car-park, this region of Canterbury was occupied by a further 18 sites (see page 429; Figure 10.17; Appendix 10.14).

All 23 of the aforementioned sites were utilised for a combination of domestic occupation, farming regimes, and craft production, (see pages 431, 437), just as those occupied during Periods 1 and 2 were (see Chapters 11.2.2.3 and 11.3.2.3). The continued use of the Canterbury region for craft production was, at this time, coupled with the emergence of bloomeries for the smelting of iron within the landscape (see page 431). In addition to ironwork, craft production at Canterbury included: small scale bronze-smithing, as evidenced by the discovery of crucibles and pellet moulds at the Marlowe Car-park site (see Appendix 10.16); the production of textiles, as indicated by the discovery of loomweights at both the Marlowe Car-park and Turing College sites, (see Appendix 10.16); and possibly even some degree of pottery production, as hinted at by the discovery of local flint tempered sherds at the St Edmunds School and Turing College sites, (see Appendix 10.15), which may have been produced at the kiln discovered at the latter of these sites (see Chapters 10.3.1-10.3.2). Despite the growth of the aforementioned industries, however, Canterbury continued to import the majority of those items its occupants would have required the use of on a daily basis; that is ceramics and brooches (see pages 441, 444-445).

In light of the above observations, and the fact that the region was more densely occupied at this time, (suggesting an increase in population numbers), it can be said that Canterbury's

economic relationships with both its hinterland and the merchants of Folkestone from whom they obtained continental wares were strengthened (see pages 441-442). These economic relationships not only give rise to those ceramic and brooch forms utilised by Canterbury's population on a daily basis (see Figures 10.18-10.19), but led to the importation of Gallo-Belgic wares (see Figure 10.26; Appendix 10.15); thus suggesting, that this site, like Colchester, was affected by the annexation of Gaul and the changes to material culture this process sparked (see page 438). Furthermore, this development not only altered Canterbury's economy, but the regions social and power connotations.

The importation of Gallo-Belgic wares can be said to have provided Canterbury's population with a chance to obtain Roman tablewares for the first time (see Figure 10.24), which, in turn, is likely to have led to the adoption of Roman dining habits by some/at certain times (see page 441). In fact, the author surmised that these products were utilised by the elite as a means through which to display their social standing and/or at communal events designed to both celebrate religious festivals and promote social cohesion (see page 441). It can therefore be said, that this period of the later Iron Age was one of change at Canterbury.

Conversely, it is not only in the aforementioned respects that life at Canterbury altered between the years of 30/25 BC and AD 20/25. Period 3 also witnessed the emergence of the only later Iron Age burials to have been identified, to date, within Canterbury's landscape (see Figure 10.17; Appendix 10.14). Interestingly, despite the close cultural ties between the south-east of Britain and the near Continent at this time, (see page 78), these burials appear to have been established following a different set of burial rites to those observed at both Colchester and Titelberg (see Chapter 7.3.3.2, 9.3.3.2) thus suggesting that death was not viewed in the same way at Canterbury. Regardless of this difference however, it can be said that Period 3 marks the first use of this region for religious/ritual practices.

11.4.3: A series of comparisons

11.4.3.1: A comparison of occupation at the thesis' case sites

Unlike Periods 1 and 2 when there were few similarities visible in the occupation at the thesis' case sites, Period 3 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury had much in common; however, this is not to say that there were no differences. Arguably, the clearest evidence for increased similarities between the case sites is the proliferation of occupation at both Colchester and Canterbury at this time; a process that led to all three sites being, for the first time, intensely

occupied (see Chapter 11.4.2). Furthermore, there is clear evidence at each of these sites for domestic occupation, farming regimes, and craft production; something with which Titelberg had been unerringly associated since Period 1.[15] Conversely, despite there being evidence of weaving, metalwork, and the production of ceramics at each of these sites, it is within their industrial activities that the first differences were identified.

Period 3 occupation at Titelberg was characterised by its industrial activities, which led the author to surmise that these pursuits were the site's main reason for existence. At Colchester and Canterbury however, craft production was less prominent and likely engaged in to sustain the sites' populations and supplement local economies; this is particularly true of Canterbury where the existence of a ceramic industry at this time is questionable,[16] and as such the site's occupants appear to have been reliant upon local trading network for these wares.

This latter point can be said to directly link to the second difference identified between the case sites. Although these sites all engaged in long distance trade at this time, the importation of products influenced by the Roman World had differing effects on their occupants. At both Colchester and Canterbury these wares were used by the elite to display social standing and/or at communal events designed to promote social cohesion; at Titelberg meanwhile, products in Roman styles had become common place and as such were likely utilised by the population as a whole on a daily basis. It can therefore be said that Roman influence, borne out of Augustus' annexation of Gaul, led to the adoption of Mediterranean cultural practices at Titelberg, while the occupants of Colchester and Canterbury made use of this material in the way that best suited them.

It is however, not only with regards to the consumption of imports that the case sites can be said to differ. The means through which trade, both local and long distance (see Chapters 7.3.3.2, 9.3.3.2, 10.3.3.2), was conducted at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury, as well as the reasons this process was engaged in, can also be said to set them apart. With Sheepen acting as a port, (see Chapter 11.4.2.1), it can be said that one of Colchester's principal functions was to facilitate the movement of tradable wares, be they of local or continental

---

[15] Although a case could be made for Canterbury having also been occupied and utilised for these purposes since Period 1 (see Chapter 10).

[16] Until such a time that the evidence at Turing College has been fully studied, sequenced, and published we cannot be sure that the kiln at this site was in use at this time, therefore we have to be cautious at present when stating that the occupants on Canterbury may have been producing their own ceramics.

origin. It is therefore possible that a number of the imports at this site were caches of wares readied for exchange (see page 189). At Titelberg, on-the-other-hand, trade was likely conducted between local Gallic merchants, with many of the imports entering the site in return for local products, (such as the ironwork known to have been at the heart of the site's economy (see Chapters 9.2, 9.3.3.2)), at the behest of the elite (see page 365); whilst the majority of tradable wares at Canterbury entered the site via Folkestone, with whom the merchants at Canterbury likely had well-established trading relationships that allowed products to move from the coast inland using both water and overland transport, but unlike the majority of those entering either Colchester or Titelberg, these goods were required by the site's occupants to supplement the local economy and ensure the site's survival (see pages 441-442).

In addition to the above, it can be said that the thesis' case sites also differ in their religious pursuits. Both Colchester and Titelberg continue to display areas used for the communal celebration of religious events; although, Colchester expanded in this respect during Period 3. That is to say, between 30/25 BC and AD 20/25 an additional religious centre emerged at Gosbecks, and co-existed with that at Sheepen for the remainder of the later Iron Age. Canterbury meanwhile appears to have remained devoid of a religious centre;[17] once again setting this site apart from both Colchester and Titelberg.

Period 3 also marks the emergence of the earliest later Iron Age burials at both Colchester and Canterbury, whilst the cemetery of Lamadelaine continued to be utilised at Titelberg. Although the appearance of burials at both Colchester and Canterbury could be said to put all three sites on an even keel, with regards to this aspect of later Iron Age religion, an analysis of these burials served to further highlight their differences. The aforementioned analysis allowed the author to surmise that the burial rites observed at Lamadelaine since Period 1 were mirrored by the mourners at Colchester who established the Lexden Tumulus during Period 3, whilst those who established the cremation burials at Turing College, Canterbury followed a different set of burial rites that can be said to further distance this site from the others.[18] It can therefore be concluded that despite similarities existing between the case sites, it was their differences that characterised them.

---

[17] It is possible future work at Canterbury could reveal a centre of religious import within the site's environs.
[18] It should, however, be remembered that burials of later Iron Age date are relatively rare archaeological discoveries, (see Chapter 3.2), and it is therefore possible that similar burial customs to those observed in association with the Lexden Tumulus and Lamadelaine cemetery did take place at Canterbury but they have yet to be discovered, or the remains of this were deposited in such a way that no traces of them exist today.

11.4.3.2: How does occupation at the thesis' case sites compare to current thinking on *oppida*?

In light of the above observations, it is evident that the thesis' case sites do not comply with the image this term conjures of a uniform class of settlement. We therefore need to consider the extent to which these sites do adhere to current thinking on what makes a site an *oppidum*. Similar considerations conducted in relation to occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury during Periods 1 and 2 revealed that only Titelberg came close to complying wholly with these definitions. Given the minimal/questionable use of Colchester during Periods 1 and 2, and the changing nature of occupation at Canterbury during these earlier periods, this inference was somewhat unsurprising; it will therefore be interesting to see whether increased occupation at Colchester and Canterbury during Period 3 alters this conclusion.

As was the case with earlier phases of occupation at the thesis' case sites it can be said that all three comply with the first defining characteristic sought in potential *oppida*: a sizable area of occupation; whilst only Titelberg can be said to fully adhere to the second: the presence of fortifications. Furthermore, there is potential evidence at The Garrison to suggest that fortifications were starting to emerge at Colchester at this time (see Chapter 7.3.3.2); however, this evidence has yet to be fully explored and as such it would not be judicious to state here that Colchester was fortified during Period 3.[19]

Furthermore, current thinking on *oppida* tells us that these sites have to display urban characteristics (see Chapter 2). All three case sites comply with the first aspect of this definition: size; yet, only one or two can be said to adhere to the others: the existence of religious and political foci in close proximity to domestic occupation, and a formalised site plan (see Chapter 11.2.3.2). From the comparative study considered in Chapter 11.4.3.1, we know that only Colchester and Titelberg can be said to have had religious foci during Period 3. With regards to the case sites having political foci on-the-other-hand, it can be said that despite Titelberg complying with this characteristic during Periods 1 and 2, none of the sites meet with this expectation during Period 3; an inference that is based on the absence of evidence at both Colchester and Canterbury to suggest political/administrative activities were engaged in at these sites, (such as the minting of coinage, but in particular coinage that denotes

---

[19] It is also prudent to note here that the dykes surrounding Colchester's ancient occupation, (see Chapter 7.1.2.6), have not been afforded detailed consideration since their discovery; therefore, their dating can be considered patchy at best, and cannot be satisfactorily linked to the site's later Iron Age occupation even though it is possible some of them were in existence at this time (see Chapter 7.1.2.6). In light of this, the author does not feel we can use them to definitively state that the site was fortified at this time.

a tribal leader or a tribe as a whole (see Chapter 2.3.5)), and the decline in Titelberg's minting activities. Finally, of the three case sites it can be said that only Titelberg show signs of having had a formalised settlement layout during Period 3. Consequently, we can conclude that despite losing its political foci during Period 3 it is Titelberg that once again most closely adheres to the definition of *oppida* as urban centres.

Furthermore, from Chapter 2 we know that in addition to being large, fortified, urban centres, current thinking defines *oppida* as centres of industry and long distance trade. Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury have all produced evidence to suggest that their occupants engaged in these activities (see Chapter 11.4.3.1). However, only Titelberg can be said to have engaged in industrial activities on the scale we would expect of a settlement characterised by this process; in other words, Titelberg is the only one of the three sites to have produced wares in quantities that exceeded local needs. Similarly, despite both Titelberg and Canterbury engaging in long distance trade, only Colchester in its role as a port, can be said to have complied with the notion that *oppida* were centres characterised by their engagement in long distance trade.

Finally, current thinking tells us that potential *oppida* must also have been centres of power/administrative and tribal/elite power, religious/funerary complexes, and central places (see Table 2.4). With regards to the former of these defining characteristics, it can be said that none of the case sites have produced evidence of Period 3 date to suggest that they complied with the notion that as *oppida* they were political centres associated with tribal/elite power. In fact, the closest they come to meeting this prerequisite is their inhabitation by stratified communities. Similarly, whilst both Colchester and Titelberg supported religious activities, neither of these sites, nor Canterbury, can be said to have acted as funerary complexes at this time. Had they done so we would expect to find extensive cemeteries within the main confines of these settlements not one off graves and burials interred within separate enclosures. What then of the last characteristic sought in potential *oppida*?

It is once more the case that of the three case sites only Colchester has been referred to as a central place. Furthermore, when comparing Period 3 occupation at Colchester to that taking place within this site's hinterland, (see Chapter 8), it was again evident that this site was not responsible for its neighbours' success. That is to say, despite the intensification witnessed at Colchester at this time, Ardleigh, Kelvedon, and Elms Farm continued to exist independently

of this apparently central node. These settlements, like Colchester, were more intensively utilised between 30/25 BC and AD 20/25, with their occupants continuing to lead apparently self-sufficient lives, importing that which they could not manufacture for themselves through trading relationships they had forged with merchants elsewhere in Essex (see Chapter 8).

Consequently, it can be said that despite Period 3 occupation at Colchester being consistent with current thinking on *oppida* to a greater degree than it had during Periods 1 and 2, and Titelberg maintaining its adherence to definitions of these sites to almost the same extent as it had during earlier periods of occupation, it can be said that none of the thesis' case sites completely meet with current expectations of *oppida*. In other words, those characteristics sought in potential *oppida* are not wholly reflected within the evidence attributed to Period 3 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury. One could therefore conclude that the use of the term *oppida* today needs to be re-evaluated; however, it is not prudent to base this inference on the above considerations alone.

11.4.3.3: A comparison of the thesis' case sites and Period 3's best known *oppida*

As Period 3 marks the emergence of many of Britain's so-called *oppida*, (see Chapter 11.4.1), it seemed appropriate that occupation at the thesis' case sites between 30/25 BC and AD 20/25 was compared to the better known of these. Consequently, this period of occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury was compared to that at: Bagendon, Baldock, Braughing-Puckeridge (Skeleton Green), Loose, Quarry Wood, Oldbury, Silchester, *Verulamium*, and Wheathampstead in order to further examine the extent to which the term *oppida* remains relevant today.

The site of Bagendon, situated in the Cotswolds, was enclosed by dykes (Moore 2012, 393-394), and served a number of purposes from domestic occupation (Clifford 1961), arable cultivation, and animal husbandry (ibid; Moore 2007, 55) to industry, including metalworking and the production of coinage (Clifford 1961; Moore 2007, 55; 2012, 394; forthcoming *cf.* Moore 2012, 394; Trow 1982), and long distance trade (Moore 2007, 55; 2012, 395). Similarly, the site of Braughing-Puckridge, (Skeleton Green), in Hertfordshire was also used for a combination of domestic occupation, farming, and industrial activities (Bryant 2007, 65; Mattingly 2007, 76; Partridge 1981); although, in addition to this, it was also utilised as a burial complex (Partridge 1979, 28-97 *cf.* Bryant 2007, 65; Mattingly 2007, 76), and an entrepot for

the trade and distribution of imported wares (Bryant 2007, 65; Bryant and Niblett 1997, 276; Mattingly 2007, 76).

The occupants of Silchester, a fortified settlement (Fulford 2000, Fig.232) in Hampshire, also engaged in a combination of domestic occupation, both arable and pastoral farming regimes, and domestic/industrial craft production (Fulford 2000, 552-555; Fulford and Timby 2000). This site's industrial activities saw its craftsmen engaging in blacksmithing, bronze-smithing, the production of silver jewellery and ceramics, weaving (Fulford 2000, 548 – 558), and the minting of coinage (Boon 1957, 56; 1974, 42). Furthermore, Silchester is cited to have been a tribal centre (Boon 1974, 38-42) whose occupants had strong economic ties with the near Continent and thus engaged in long-distance trade (Boon 1957, 60-61; 1974, 42; Fulford 2000, 559).

Verulamium was also used for a combination of domestic occupation and farming regimes (Dimbleby 1978, 114; Haselgrove and Millett 1997, 284; Niblett 1999; Stead and Rigby 1989, 112-218; Thompson 1982, 865-945), in addition to, industrial activities that included the production of pottery, textiles, metalwork, and coinage (Bryant and Niblett 1997, 273-274). Furthermore, the residents of *Verulamium* partook in long-distance trade (Dimbleby 1978, 114; Niblett 1999; Stead and Rigby 1989, 112-218; Thompson 1982, 865-945); whilst the area occupied by Folly Lane (Niblett 1993; 2006) acted as both a ritual centre and burial complex (Bryant and Niblett 1997, 273-274; Haselgrove and Millett 1997, 286).

Meanwhile, the so-called oppida of Oldbury (Cunliffe 1976a, 145; Ward-Perkins 1944) and Loose, Quarry Wood (Cunliffe 1976a, 145; Kelly 1972) have, until recent years, always been cited to have served only as centres of refuge during times on need (Kelly 1972; Ward-Perkins 1944). Consequently, these sites appear to have been very different to those considered above. However, recent work at Loose, Quarry Wood, a lowland settlement (Howell 2014, 10) surrounded by earthworks (Elsden 2006, 12), has revealed that this site, like the nearby Furfield Quarry complex, which Kelly (1972) viewed as part of the *oppidum*, was likely occupied domestically and used for the production of metalwork (Howell 2014, 46) and ceramics (ibid, 48). It has also been postulated that this site was used to mint coinage prior to the Claudian Conquest (Cunliffe 1982b, 40-47 *cf*. Howell 2014, 40). In light of these recent developments in our understanding of Quarry Wood, it is possible that the aforementioned interpretation of Oldbury is flawed and future research will expand our knowledge of this site also.

Finally, our attention turns to the so-called *oppida* of Baldock and Wheathampstead. Occupation at these sites differs from that at many of those considered above; although some overlap is visible. Baldock is regularly cited as both a centre of religious/cult activities (Bryant 2007, 69; Bryant and Niblett 1997, 278), and a political/administrative hub (Bryant 2007, 69); while Wheathampstead is believed to a have served ritual/ceremonial functions, in part because of its proximity to the Devil's Dyke (ibid, 74). These sites can therefore be said to compare, to a degree, to all those sites to have displayed religious/political import; however, one must be cautious of the extent to which we promote this notion, because these activities cannot be said to have characterised the other sites to the same magnitude that they do Baldock and Wheathampstead.

In light of the above, it can be said that, with the exception of Oldbury, Colchester, and Titelberg share something in common with all of the so-called *oppida* considered above; whilst occupation at Canterbury can be compared to that at Bagendon, Braughing-Puckridge, Silchester, *Verulamium*, and Loose, Quarry Wood. In other words, Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury all compare to those so-called *oppida* designed to function as domestic centres utilised for the purposes of inhabitation, farming, and craft production; in addition to those, whose occupants engaged in long distance trade; whilst Colchester and Titelberg can also be linked to those sites that had areas dedicated to ritual/religious activities. Consequently, this comparative study, like that detailed in Chapter 11.4.3.1 above, can be said to further call into question the relevance of the term *oppida* today; because we are once more faced with clear evidence to suggest that those settlements labelled thus are not part of a uniform category as the term might lead us to believe.

11.3.3.4: A comparison of the thesis' case sites and contemporaneous non-*oppida*
The final comparative study conducted in relation to Period 3 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury compares these sites to a number of settlements that have never been labelled *oppida*, in order to assess the value of the this term today. Three of the better known sites that can be said to fall into this category, that is Gussage-All-Saints, and the Glastonbury and Meare Lake Villages, were also occupied during Period 2 and as such were considered in relation to occupation at the case sites at this time (see Chapter 11.3.3.4). As occupation at the thesis' case sites did not alter in terms of the principal activities the site's occupants engaged

in between Periods 2 and 3 the author feels justified in stating here that occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury continued to compare to that taking place at these sites.

In addition to the above, Period 3 saw a number of new sites emerge within the landscapes of both Britain and Temperate Europe. The sites of Wetwang and Garton Slack in Britain were used for a combination of domestic occupation, farming pursuits, and craft production; whilst also doubling as burial complexes (Brewster 1980; Dent 1983, Fig. 3; Giles 2007). While, the site of Aulnat in Gaul was utilised for domestic occupation, arable cultivations, and industrial activities (Haselgrove 1996a, 144).

Like those settlements also occupied during Period 2 the non-*oppida* outlined above can be said to compare to Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury. All three sites compare to Aulnat, while the religious activities conducted at Wetwang and Garton Slack can be said to link these sites more closely with Colchester and Titelberg than Canterbury. Additionally, it can be said that the similarities between the thesis' case sites and non-*oppida* settlements noted above highlight parallels between the non-*oppida* and the comparative *oppida* considered in Chapter 11.3.3.3. That is to say, with the exception of Oldbury, Baldock, and Wheathampstead occupation at the comparative *oppida* can be said to compare to that taking place at Gussage-All-Saints, the Glastonbury and Meare Lake Villages, Wetwang and Garton Slack, and Aulnat. Meanwhile, Baldock and Wheathampstead's religious import can be said to link these settlements to Wetwang and Garton Slack which doubled as burial complexes. Consequently, we are once again left wondering why some of these sites have been labelled *oppida*, but not others.

In light of the above observations, we have to once again return to the initial definition of so-called *oppida* as large fortified settlements if we hope to gain an answer to this question, as these are the only characteristics that have not been noted in conjunction with the non-*oppida* considered above. However, even these features cannot be said to provide a satisfactory answer to this question. Although occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury, as well as the comparative *oppida*, was spread over sizable tracts of their respective landscapes, they were not all fortified. Furthermore, the non-*oppida* noted above were all of a fair size, that is to say that while they may not have been as big as the so-called *oppida* they were also not as small as some of this period's farmsteads; additionally, many of the non-*oppida* occupied during Period 2 as well as Period 3 were fortified (see Chapter 11.3.3.4). Accordingly, the author surmised

that it is the opinions and beliefs of those writing about these sites that govern whether they are labelled *oppida* or not; a conclusion that adds weight to earlier conclusions to this effect (see Chapters 11.2.3.4 and 11.3.3.4).

11.5: Period 4: AD 25/30 – 50

11.5.1: Period 4 within the context of the later Iron Age

This c.25 year period marks the end of the later Iron Age in much of Britain and some areas of Temperate Europe[20]. This led to some areas, particularly the south-east of Britain, being exposed to greater contact with the Roman World, a process that would eventually spark a decline in native practices and an upsurge in Roman culture. Although this latter development did not take place until after AD 50, a number of advancements were witnessed in both Britain and Temperate Europe at this time.

In Temperate Europe, but particularly Gaul, the aforementioned advancements took the form of an intensification of those developments witnessed in this region between 30/25 BC and AD 20/25. Consequently, Period 4 saw a greater number of Roman towns emerge within the Gallic landscape,[21] which ultimately led to an increase in Roman administration and a diminishment of native settlements in some parts of the region (Woolf 1998, 116).

Meanwhile, in Britain much appears to have remained the same as it had during Period 3[22] (see Chapter11.4.1), until AD 43 when Claudius' army invaded Britain; landing in Kent before then advancing on Colchester with Claudius at its head (Blair 1963, 36; Creighton 2006, 61, 69; Dunnett 1975, 31; Grainge 2005, 11, 117; James 2001, 29; James and Rigby 1997, 82; Mattingly 2007, 95-96; Millett 1990, 42). After taking Colchester, the troops advanced on much of lowland Britain, (Blair 1963, 36-46; Dunnett 1975, 32; Grainge 2005, 11; James 2001, 30-31; Mattingly 2007, 96), forging alliances with many tribes (Blair 1963, 36-46; James 2001, 30-31). However, not all alliances were forged peaceably, with tribes in the north and west of the island proving particularly resistant to Roman rule (Blair 1963, 36-46; James 2001, 30-31; James and Rigby 1997, 83). These are however, not the only changes to have taken place after AD 43.

---

[20] In some regions, such as Scandinavia, where the Roman's never gained control the Iron Age continued into the Medieval period.

[21] This process started earlier in southern Gaul but eventually spread north (Woolf 1988, 116).

[22] At least in so far as this is what existing evidence suggests.

By AD 49 a *colonia* of veterans had been established at Colchester that not only led to a permanent Roman population at this site (Blair 1963, 44; Creighton 2006, 61-110; Dunnett 1975, 45; Tacitus *Annales* 21.32), but the appearance of a fortress at Gosbecks (Creighton 2006, 62; Wilson 1977) and eventually a legionary fortress at Sheepen (Dunnett 1975, 33; Creighton 2006, 61, 69). Further to this, the last decade of Period 4 saw another legionary base established at Lincoln on the fringes of Roman control (Blair 1963, 44); a number of Claudian forts emerge throughout the British landscape, but particularly in the area of the Trinovantian canton (Dunnett 1975, 39, Fig. 12), and the first stages in the process to turn Silchester into a Roman town were undertaken (Creighton 2006, 135-136).

11.5.2: Period 4 occupation at the thesis' case sites

11.5.2.1: Colchester

Period 4 occupation at Colchester was, in many respects, identical to that which occurred at this site during Period 3 (see Chapter 11.4.2.1). In other words, Sheepen continued to function as a port; whilst also doubling as an industrial centre and potential seat of domestic occupation (see Chapter 7.3.4.3). Both Gosbecks and The Garrison meanwhile maintained their positions as farmsteads, whose occupants engaged in not only arable and pastoral farming regimes, but craft production too (see Chapter 7.3.4.3). Furthermore, Period 4 also saw Sheepen and Gosbecks retain their use as religious centres (see Chapter 7.3.4.3).

Conversely, despite much remaining the same at Colchester, with regards to its core functions, during Period 4 there were a number of developments witnessed at this site that can be said to have altered the site's social, economic, and power connotations. One of the most archaeologically visible of these, was the emergence of a mint at Sheepen that was responsible for the production of Cunobelin's coinage (see pages 216, 219; Appendices 7.4, 7.20). This development not only tells us that the site's metalworking industries expanded their repertoires after AD 20/25, but alludes to the fact that the site as a whole gained in political prominence. That is to say, Colchester likely came to be viewed as a settlement of status within the Essex landscape, if it had not been before, because of its connection to Cunobelin and his coinage (see page 219); just had been the case for Titelberg during Periods 1 and 2 when it had been responsible for the minting of the Treveri's coinage (see Chapter 11.2.2.2 and 11.3.2.2).

Furthermore, the appearance of this coinage can be said to highlight the strengthening of relationships between Britain and the Roman World at this time, as many of the coins produced at this mint bear imagery we would typically associate with Roman culture (see page 216; Appendix 7.4). The coinage is, however, not the only evidence attributed to this period to denote the strengthening of relationships between Britain and the Near Continent. Period 4 also witnessed an increase in the number of continental wares entering the site by way of trading centres in Gaul, (see Figure 7.45; Appendix 7.19), as well as the adoption of Roman cultural practices by certain members of Colchester's population; namely the elite. This latter process is best illustrated by the grave goods interred alongside the deceased at the Stanway Cemetery (see Figure 7.47; Appendices 7.19-7.20), (a new feature of Colchester's landscape for Period 4), in particular the gaming paraphernalia, inkwell, and probably the surgical kit (see pages 225-226).

Finally, increasing relationships between Colchester and the Roman World were also evidenced by the site's developing morphology. The ties to the Roman World noted above can be said to have led to an expanding economy, and a change in the way that Colchester's elite displayed their social standing; the developments to which our attentions now turn affected the site's society as a whole, as it led to frequent, and direct contact, between native and Roman populations. After AD 43, and Claudian's success at Colchester, a fortlet was established at Gosbecks; this was then followed 6 years later by the construction of a fort within the *colonia* established just outside of Sheepen (see page 221). These processes resulted in a permanent Roman population at Colchester, and ultimately increased the level of influence the Roman World had on native practices in the south-east of Britain. It is however, prudent to note that despite these significant alterations to the site's morphology native practices continued to prevail, even after AD 50; this is best evidenced by the Stanway Cemetery, a native burial complex, where mourners observed burial rites mirroring those followed at the Lexden Tumulus in c.15 BC (see pages 220, 222). This was therefore a period of considerable change for the occupants of Colchester, even if the site's primary functions remained unchanged.

11.5.2.2: Titelberg

Period 4 marks a time of significant change at Titelberg. Many have attributed the dramatic changes witnessed at this site to the emergence of the new Treverian capital at Trier (Daval 2008; Metzler *et al.* 1999, 15); for the purposes of the current study however cause is not

relevant. Instead, we are interested in the fact that while the site was not functioning on the same level as it once had, it was not abandoned at this time.

The evidence attributed to Period 4 occupation at Titelberg suggests that the site continued to be used as both an industrial and religious centre (see Chapter 9.3.4.3). However, there is limited evidence to suggest that the site retained its position as a centre where domestic occupation was coupled with farming activities at this time (see Chapters 9.3.4.1-9.3.4.2). Consequently, it is possible to surmise that Titelberg was no longer associated with a 'live-in' population, but rather frequented by those working in its industries, which continued to produce both ceramics and metalwork at this time (see pages 376, 380-382; Figure 9.62; Appendices 2.29).

Furthermore, Period 4 also saw Titelberg continue to receive imported goods, (see Figure 9.65) by way of trading centres in Gaul (see page 382). It is therefore possible that the site, in the apparent absence of domestic occupation, came to be identified as an economic hub from whence both local and continental wares could be obtained (see page 382).

Finally, it is not only within the evidence associated with Titelberg's plateau that a decline in the site's occupation can be identified. The cemetery of Lamadelaine also waned in prominence over the course of Period 4, with only one burial being interred at the site during the c.25 years this period spanned (see page 383; Appendix 9.30). Consequently, it can be said that Titelberg went from a flourishing centre of activity to one frequented only for economic gain over the course of the c.200 years this thesis considers.

11.5.2.3: Canterbury

Period 4 occupation at Canterbury was very similar to that which had come before it. In other words, this site continued to be used for domestic occupation coupled with arable cultivation, animal husbandry, and craft production (see Chapters 10.3.4.2-10.3.4.3); the latter of these processes saw Canterbury's craftsmen engage in metalworking, weaving, and potentially ceramic production (see pages 457, 459). Furthermore, this period also saw the site's occupants continue to receive, and consume, products from elsewhere in Kent as well as the near Continent (see page 457; Figure 10.36; Appendix 10.19). The continued existence of the former of these trading relationships led to the inference that Canterbury's residents continued to rely upon local trading relationships for products they would have utilised on a daily basis,

in this case ceramics, (see page 457); whilst the sustainment of economic relationships with the near Continent continued to give rise to those products reserved for use by the elite and/or at events of communal significance (see page 457).

Conversely, whilst much can be said to have remained unchanged in terms of the activities pursued at Canterbury, Period 4 has also been demonstrated to mark an apparent decline in the use of the Marlowe Car-park site (see Chapter 10.3.4.2). The author surmised that this process could be explained by either a shift in focus within the area now occupied by the modern city, or alternatively the nature of the archaeological excavations conducted in this region of the city. That is to say, it is possible that the Marlowe Car-park site was superseded by a settlement situated elsewhere in Canterbury, (one that has yet to be identified archaeologically), or excavations at this site did not target areas occupied at this time (see page 451). Despite this development, occupation at Canterbury as a whole cannot be said to have suffered; that is to say the site continued to function as a flourishing centre with close ties, economic and social, to both its hinterland and the near Continent.

11.5.3: A series of comparisons

11.5.3.1: A comparison of occupation at the thesis' case sites

Period 4 occupation at the thesis' case sites can be said to both differ and compare; however, this period saw occupation at Titelberg differ from that at either Colchester or Canterbury to a greater degree than during Periods 1 to 3. That is to say, for the first time the core activities at these settlements cannot be paralleled.

Although all three sites continued to be used for craft production, only Colchester and Canterbury maintained their roles as centres for domestic occupation coupled with mixed farming regimes. Furthermore, industrial activities continued to form a fundamental part of daily life at Titelberg, (just as they had been during Period 3 (see Chapter 11.4.3.1)), and as such can be said to have had more bearing on this site's existence than either Colchester or Canterbury's. Similarly, it can be said that despite all three sites continuing to engage in long-distance trade it was at Colchester where this activity governed, in part, the reasons for the site's existence.

In addition to the above, it can be said that the continued use of both Colchester and Titelberg for religious purposes set these sites apart from Canterbury where no evidence to this end has

been recovered. This is, however, not the only difference that can be said to exist between the thesis' case sites with regards to their religious pursuits. The founding of the Stanway Cemetery during Period 4 at Colchester sets this site apart from the other two because the cemetery of Lamadelaine at Titelberg ceased to be used at this time, and no evidence of a later Iron Age cemetery has yet been recovered at Canterbury.

Consequently, Period 4 occupation at the thesis' case sites saw Canterbury continue to differ considerably from both Colchester and Titelberg in terms of the additional activities these sites supported. Moreover, this timeframe marked a considerable decline in Titelberg's occupation. It can therefore be stated that the above observations further demonstrate how the thesis' case sites cannot be considered part of a uniform category of settlement to the extent that their characterisation as *oppida* suggests they were. That is to say, this inference reaffirms similar conclusions drawn in relation to occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury between Periods 1 and 3.

11.5.3.2: How does occupation at the thesis' case sites compare to current thinking on *oppida*?
Occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury between the years of AD 25/30 and 50 can be said to comply with current thinking on *oppida* to differing degrees. Period 4 occupation at Canterbury adheres to the definitions of *oppida* published within the literature, (see Chapter 2), to the same extent that the site's Period 3 occupation had, (see Chapter 11.4.3.2); consequently, it is unnecessary to detail this site's compliance here.

Similarly, Period 4 occupation at Colchester can be said to meet the same prerequisites of *oppida* as during Period 3, (see Chapter 11.4.3.2), but with two differences. This period of saw Colchester utilised to mint the coinage of Cunobelin, a process that can be said to have led to the site gaining a political focus. Consequently, Colchester can be said to have come closer to adhering to the characteristics said to denote urbanism at potential *oppida* than during any of the earlier periods of the later Iron Age considered herein. In fact, it is only an absence of a formalised settlement plan at this time that can be said to prevent the site's complete compliance on this point.

The development of the aforementioned mint, and the site's connection to Cunobelin, was also at the heart of the second change witnessed in Colchester's adherence to current definitions of *oppida*. In minting Cunobelin's coinage Colchester became visibly tied to the Catuvellauni;

the tribe that Cunobelin is said to have presided over, (see Chapter 7.2). Consequently, Colchester can be viewed as a tribal centre at this time, and in being so further display the political characteristics desired of potential *oppida*. It is therefore evident that the only defining features of *oppida* not reflected in Period 4 occupation at Colchester are: a formal street plan, and evidence to suggest that the site's principal purposes included its use as an industrial centre and burial complex.

Finally, our attention turns to Titelberg and its compliance with current thinking on *oppida*. During Periods 1 to 3 this site adhered to definitions of this term more fully than either Colchester or Canterbury; Titelberg's Period 4 occupation, on-the-other-hand, sees this site comply to a far lesser degree. Although Titelberg continued to cover a considerable tract of land and display evidence of fortifications at this time, alterations to the site's functions, in particular the absence of domestic occupation, after AD 25 prevented it meeting the urban requirements of *oppida*. Furthermore, this period of occupation, like that which came before it, (see Chapter 11.4.3.2), continued to see an absence of a political/administrative centre and tribal/elite residence at Titelberg; whilst the extent to which the site engaged in long distance trade prevented the author from considering this one of its primary functions. Consequently, it can be said that, size and fortifications aside, of the characteristics sought in potential *oppida* Titelberg adhered only through its use as both an industrial and religious centre during Period 4.

It is therefore evident that Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury do not comply with current definitions of *oppida* to the extent one would expect of a site labelled thus; accordingly the above comparative study can be said to call into question the relevance of this term today.

11.5.3.3: A comparison of the thesis' case sites and Period 4's best known *oppida*

The best known examples of *oppida* occupied between AD 25/30 and 50 are those which were also occupied during Period 3, and considered in Chapter 11.4.3.3 above. Occupation at: Bagendon, Baldock, Braughing-Puckridge (Skeleton Green), Loose, Quarry Wood, Oldbury, Silchester, *Verulamium*, and Wheathampstead remained largely unaltered between Periods 3 and 4, thus it is unnecessary to reiterate these sites' functions here. Instead, our attentions turn to a consideration of whether occupation at the thesis' case sites continued to compare to that at these so-called *oppida*; however, as much remained unchanged in terms of the principal activities engaged in at both Colchester and Canterbury this consideration is brief.

Period 4 occupation at Colchester continued to parallel that at all of the aforementioned settlements with the exception of Oldbury, which is cited to have acted solely as a place of refuge during times of need (see Chapter 11.4.3.3). Occupation at Canterbury meanwhile, can be said to have maintained its close resemblance to that at Bagendon, Braughing-Puckridge, Silchester, Quarry Wood, and *Verulamium*; but not Baldock, Oldbury, and Wheathampstead (see Chapter 11.4.3.3).

Despite the drastic changes witnessed at Titelberg over the course of Period 4, this site too can be said to share something in common with all of the comparative *oppida* noted above, with the exception of Oldbury. Titelberg, like all but Baldock and Wheathampstead, was used for industrial activities, whilst its religious centre links it, to a certain degree, with Baldock, *Verulamium*, and Wheathampstead. Furthermore, these similarities and differences between the case sites and comparative *oppida* can be said to highlight the non-compliance of the latter group with current definitions of this term.

Consequently, despite occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury continuing to resemble that conducted at the comparative *oppida* considered both here and in conjunction with their Period 3 occupation, (see Chapter 11.4.3.3), these similarities are not enough for these sites to be considered part of a uniform class of settlement. In other words, the labelling of these sites *oppida*, a term that promotes notions of uniformity, (see Chapter 2), likely overshadows their individuality. These observations can therefore be said to further suggest that our use of the term *oppida* today needs to be re-evaluated.

11.5.3.4: A comparison of the thesis' case sites and contemporaneous non-*oppida*
As was the case with the comparative *oppida* noted above, many of the best known non-*oppida* sites of Period 4 date are those whose occupation also spanned Period 3 (see Chapter 11.4.3.4); namely: the Lake Villages (Cunliffe 2005, 266; Minnitt and Coles 1996), and both Wetwang Slack and Garton Slack (Brewster 1980; Dent 1983, Fig. 3; Giles 2007). In light of this, it can be said that the *oppida* continued to have as much in common with the non-*oppida* settlements during this the final phase of their later Iron Age occupation as they had during Period 3 (see Chapter 11.4.3.4).

In addition to the above, a number of new settlements emerged within the British landscape over the course of Period 4 whose occupation can too be compared to that at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury. Both Little Waltham (Drury 1978a; 1978b), and Mucking (Going 1993; McDonnell 1993, 22) can be said to fall into this category. Occupation of both of these settlements was characterised by the same core activities; that is, domestic occupation coupled with mixed farming regimes, and craft production. Therefore, these sites like those listed above can be said to share much in common with not only the thesis' case sites, (although to a lesser degree in the case of Titelberg), but the majority of the comparative *oppida* noted in Chapter 11.5.3.3.[23]

Consequently, we are once again left questioning why sites such as Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury are considered *oppida* but not those such as Little Waltham and Mucking. As with earlier contemplations of this question it is the initial definitions of *oppida* as large fortified settlements that may be the key to understanding this divide. However, these features are not unique to the so-called *oppida* considered herein in conjunction with Period 4. In other words the non-*oppida* noted were also of a reasonable size, with many of them also showing signs of having been palisaded. The author was therefore left with only one possible conclusion: that the decision to label a site an *oppidum* was at the purview of those studying it.

---

[23] Only Baldock and Wheathampstead as religious and administrative centres, and Oldbury as a refuge can be said to differ, in terms of their primary functions, from both Little Waltham and Mucking.

12: Conclusions

Over the course of the preceding 11 chapters the author has examined current thinking on *oppida*, the prevalent themes of the later Iron Age, as well as occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury; three of the period's purported *oppida*. The purpose of the current chapter is to highlight the inferences borne through the author's analyses of Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury before bringing them together to ascertain an overall answer to the thesis' research question: 'is the term *oppida* still valid today?' Furthermore, the author will complete both this chapter and the thesis by considering the direction future work on this subject should take.

Through analyses of the archaeological records compiled for Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury the author established that each of these settlements was used for a combination of domestic occupation, farming regimes, and craft production at some point during the later Iron Age; for Colchester this was Periods 3 and 4, Titelberg Periods 1 to 3, and Canterbury Periods 1 to 4, although there was an arguable lull in this site's activities during Period 2. Additionally, Periods 3 and 4 saw Colchester act as both a port-of-trade and religious centre, (features that may also have been present at the site during Periods 1 and 2, but further research is needed to confirm this), whilst the site's Period 4 artefact record suggests that it was a tribal centre at this time. Occupation at Titelberg for the duration of the later Iron Age meanwhile, saw this site associated with a religious focus, whilst the scope of its craft production activities make it probable that it was also an industrial centre. Furthermore, between Periods 1 and 3 Titelberg acted as a mint for the Treveri, (the local Gallic tribe), and as such can be said to have been both a political foci and tribal centre between 150/100 BC and AD 20/25. The evidence associated with Canterbury, on-the-other-hand, produced little to suggest the site's occupants engaged in anything other than traditional Iron Age pursuits.

The above inferences saw the author surmise, in Chapter 11, that although Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury were similar, in terms of the core activities they supported, it was their differences that truly characterised their purpose. Consequently, as these sites are all said to have been *oppida*, a class of settlement whose core activities are by general consensus perceived to have overlapped, the author felt justified in stating that this conclusion alone could call into question the relevance of the term *oppida* today. Furthermore, this observation

allowed the author to ponder an answer to one of the thesis' sub-aims: a consideration of whether settlements situated in two very different geographic locations can be encompassed by the same term.

As the core activities of Colchester and Canterbury, two valley bottom settlements, and Titelberg, a plateau site, overlap it would appear that topographic setting had little bearing on these settlements similarities and differences. However, Titelberg's elevated position and location a short distance from, rather than on, its region's waterways would have made it difficult for this site to have controlled trade to the same degree that Colchester apparently did, and it is purported, within the literature, that Canterbury may have done. Consequently, if one of the defining characteristics of *oppida* is that they had direct control of long-distance trade it can be said that the differences observed here could prevent the case sites from being encompassed by the same term, and as such further call into question its relevance today. This latter point becomes all the more pertinent when we take into account the fact that many of the *oppida* in Temperate Europe are situated on plateaus, thus setting them apart, topographically, from their low-lying contemporaries in south-east Britain and some areas of Temperate Europe, (Paris (Lutetia) and Villeneuve-Saint-Germain (Roymans 1990, 200). In fact, the author believes it possible that an in-depth study on this topic in its own right could reveal a plethora of differences between these sites that are rooted in their geography; because after all the geographic setting of a settlement largely dictates the activities their occupants are able to engage in (Taylor 1997, 193).

Although the aforementioned comparative study was too expansive for inclusion within the current thesis, the author did compare their interpretations of occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury with the definitions of *oppida* comprising current thinking on this class of settlement; before then contemplating how well occupation at these sites can be said to have compared to that at their contemporaries. The former of these studies led the author to surmise that at no point over the course of the later Iron Age did Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury wholly comply with the definitions of *oppida* presented within the literature, as there were always one to two parameters that remained unmet; but particularly the presence of formalised street plans at both Colchester, and Canterbury, and the use of any of these sites as funerary complexes. This observation can therefore be said to further call into question the relevance of the term *oppida* today.

Conversely, it is not only the non-compliance of Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury to the prerequisites of *oppida* that can be said to highlight this need to re-evaluate our use of this term today, but the differences in the periods where they demonstrated their greatest adherence to it. Occupation at Titelberg most closely complied with current thinking on *oppida* during Periods 1 and 2, whilst that at Colchester most closely adhered to definitions of these sites during Period 4; although, Period 3 occupation at both Colchester and Titelberg can also be said to have conformed to a certain degree. Occupation at Canterbury, on-the-other-hand, failed to conform to the definitions of these sites presented within the literature in anything other than the most fundamental ways. That is to say the only characteristics desired of *oppida* reflected in Canterbury's later Iron Age occupation are its considerable size and its connections to both industry and long-distance trade; yet, neither of these latter pastimes were conducted on the scale one would expect of a potential *oppidum*. In light of the above observations one would be forgiven for supposing that there were points in both Colchester and Titelberg's later Iron Age chronologies where they could be considered *oppida*, whilst Canterbury is anomalous in its characterisation, thus. However, the author suggests that both the incomplete compliance of Colchester and Titelberg's later Iron Age occupation with definitions of this term, and the differing periods of their near compliance negate the value of the term *oppida*. The former because applying a term to a site that does not meet with its parameters breeds generalisations and ultimately leads to the individual nuances of sites labelled such being overlooked; and the latter because the wider contexts of the periods in which Colchester and Titelberg most closely comply with definitions of this term are so different it is possible that differing processes led to their emergence, and governed the activities they engaged in. In other words, Titelberg complies most closely with the term *oppida* during the earlier periods of the later Iron Age when Temperate Europe was privy to increased, and altered, economic relationships with the Mediterranean World, and well as extensive developments in the ways in which craft production was undertaken. Colchester's main periods of compliance with the term *oppida*, on-the-other-hand, fall at a time when economic relationships between Britain, Gaul, and the Roman world intensified, but as a time when Roman influence was noticeable in Gaul, and as such the repercussions of this were witnessed in the goods moving through the aforementioned trading relationships. Consequently, if we are ever to fully comprehend the reasons for these sites appearance, their functions, and their relationships to other settlements we need to consider them more within their Iron Age context and less in the shadow of the term considered here.

It is, however, not only the thesis' case sites that can be said to highlight the latter points noted above. The author's consideration of these sites in conjunction with some of the later Iron Age's better known *oppida* demonstrated how the functions of the comparative sites too differed and compared. This observation not only further illustrated how those sites currently labelled *oppida* do not comprise the uniform class of settlement we are led to believe they were, but also signified the non-compliance of the comparative *oppida* with existing definitions of these settlements.

Moreover, the aforementioned comparative study can also be said to further highlight the possibility that there are chronological differences between the *oppida* that may have governed their emergence, use, and eventual decline. The comparative *oppida* considered in conjunction with Period 1 and 2 occupation at Colchester, Titelberg, and Canterbury were all located in Temperate Europe, and, for the most part, occupied for the duration of both of these periods; although, Period 2 did witness the emergence of a series of new, but short lived, *oppida* in Gaul, in areas where none had previously been situated. By Period 3, however, many of these sites had ceased to be occupied, leading the author to identify a series of new comparative sites; all of which were located in Britain and occupied for the duration of both Periods 3 and 4. Should all of the so-called *oppida* considered over the course of this study have been part of the same class of settlement one would be forgiven for suggesting that their gradual appearance in Britain over the course of the later Iron Age was indicative of a diffusion of ideas from Temperate Europe to Britain. However, the author believed this to be further evidence to support the notion that our use of the term *oppida* today needs to be re-evaluated, because it is likely that the short lived sites emerging at the end of Period 1 and into Period 2 did not emerge for the same reasons as the long lived sites in both Britain and Temperate Europe. Furthermore, the wider Iron Age context of the sites occupied over the course of both Periods 1 and 2 is very different to that into which the sites occupied during Periods 3 and 4 were born; logically, it is therefore unlikely that they were established for the same reasons. This latter point is further substantiated by the earlier notion that whilst the functions of many of these settlements overlapped there were still differences, differences that characterised their true purpose and reasons for being, and which are most likely overlooked in favour of their status as potential *oppida*.

The final comparative study the author engaged in saw them compare the thesis' case sites with a number of settlements that have never been considered *oppida*. This process led the author

to conclude that the activities engaged in at the purported *oppida* were mirrored at some of the periods more iconic settlements, settlements that are typically labelled villages or farmsteads. In light of this inference, it was necessary to consider what factors may have led to Colchester, Titelberg and Canterbury being labelled *oppida* but not these comparative sites. This contemplation saw the author highlight the possible characteristics sought in potential *oppida* that may have governed their differentiation from the farmsteads and villages to which the case sites were compared: size and fortifications. However, upon further considering the comparative sites, it became evident that these characteristics were not exclusive to the purported *oppida*. This led the author to conclude that it was at the purview of those who have excavated, and published on, potential *oppida* that these sites were labelled thus. A conclusion that in and of itself can be said to call into question the relevance of the term today, but when coupled with the inferences noted throughout this chapter could be said to negate the value of this term altogether because it demonstrates how seldom the parameters by which it is currently bound are observed.

Overall it can be said that the current thesis has demonstrated the shortcomings of the term *oppida*. Current definitions of this term promote generalisations of these sites and their functions, preferring to focus on how they are/should be alike rather than appreciating their differences, differences that often have more bearing on their true nature than the similarities between them. Furthermore, the chronological and geographic differences of these sites likely had significant impact upon the reasons behind their emergence, functions, and eventual decline. Consequently, the author feels justified in stating that current usage of this term is limiting, and probably prohibits not only our appreciation of any one so-called *oppidum* in its own right, but a progression in our understanding of the later Iron Age as a whole. That is to say, current stigmas associated with this term have helped shape our knowledge of this period, and by considering those sites labelled thus from a new perspective, in other words not as part of a predefined category, could provide new insights into the later Iron Age that help us to better understand the developments witnessed in both Britain and Temperate Europe at this time. Accordingly, the answer to the thesis' overarching research question is that the term *oppida* has very little value today.

Finally, and in light of the conclusions outlined above, the author feels it is prudent to contemplate the direction future work on this subject could take. It is clear that in its current guise the term *oppida* has very little value today, and that its continued use in this guise is likely

to limit future studies on the later Iron Age and its settlements. The author therefore feels that in order to further both the research considered herein, and our understanding of the later Iron Age, all sites currently labelled *oppida* need to be reconsidered through an in-depth analysis of all evidence currently attributed to them, and any new materials that can be obtained through additional archaeological investigations, using the thesis' methodology which highlights the value of data in generating an understanding of a sites function(s). In doing this it will be important for any characteristics of these sites governed by their periods of occupation and/or topographic settings to be highlighted so that a true appreciation of their emergence and purpose can be gained. Upon completing this work it will be possible to compare the results of these studies so as to ascertain whether there are truly enough similarities between certain of these sites for some of them to be classified under one term.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Athenaeus, *Deiphnosophists,* trans. C. B. Gulick 1928, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Caesar, *The Conquest of Gaul*, trans. S. A. Hanford 1951, revised J. F. Gardner 1982. London, Penguin Classics.

Cassius Dio, *Roman History*, trans. E. Cary 1879, Loeb Classical Library, U.S.A., Harvard University Press.

Cato and Varro, *On Agriculture*, trans. W. D. Hopper and B. Ash 1934, Loeb Classical Library 283, Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *Letters to Atticus. Volume II*, trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey 1999, Loeb Classical Library 8, Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *Letters to Friends. Volume II*, trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey 2001, Loeb Classical Library 216, Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *On Old Age. On Friendship. On Divination*, trans. W. A. Falconer 1923, Loeb Classical Library 154, Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *Orations. Philippics 1 -6*, trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey 2010, revised J. T. Ramsey and G. Manuwald 2015, Loeb Classical Library 189, Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *Orations. Philippics 7 – 14*, trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey 2010, revised J. T. Ramsey and G. Manuwald 2015, Loeb Classical Library 507, Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *Orations, Pro Lege Manilia, Pro Caecina, Pro Cluentio, Pro Rabino Perduellionis Reo*, Trans. H. Grose Hodge 1927, Loeb Classical Library 198, Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *Orations, Pro Quinctio, Pro Roscio Amerino, Pro Roscio Comoedo, On Agrarian Law*, Trans. J. H. Freeze 1930, Loeb Classical Library 240, Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *The Verrine Orations. Volume I*, trans. L. H. G. Greenwood 1928, Loeb Classical Library 221, Harvard University Press.

Claudian, *Volume 1*, trans. M. Platnauer 1922, Loeb Classical Library 135, Harvard University Press.

Claudian, *Volume II*, trans. M. Platnauer 1922, Loeb Classical Library 136, Harvard University Press.

Diodorus Siculus, *Historical Library*, trans. C. H. Oldfather 1933, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Horace, *Odes and Epodes*, trans. N. Rudd 2004, Loeb Classical Library 33, Harvard University Press.

Horace, *Satires. Epistles. Art of Poetry*, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough 1926, Loeb Classical Library 194, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume I, Books 1 – 2*, trans. B. O. Foster 1919, Loeb Classical Library 114, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume II, Books 3 – 4*, trans. B. O. Foster 1922, Loeb Classical Library 133, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume III, Books 5 – 7*, trans. B. O. Foster 1924, Loeb Classical Library 172, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume IV, Books 8 – 10*, trans. B. O. Foster 1926, Loeb Classical Library 191, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume V, Books 21 – 22*, trans. B. O. Foster 1929, Loeb Classical Library 233, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume VI, Books 23 – 25*, trans. F. Gardner Moore 1940, Loeb Classical Library 355, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume VII, Books 26 – 27*, trans. F. Gardner Moore 1943, Loeb Classical Library 367, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume VIII, Books 28 – 30*, trans. F. Gardner Moore 1949, Loeb Classical Library 381, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume IX, Books 31 – 34*, trans. E. T. Sage 1935, Loeb Classical Library 295, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume X. Books 35 – 37*, trans. E. T. Sage 1935, Loeb Classical Library 301, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume XI, Books 38 – 39*, trans. E. T. Sage 1936, Loeb Classical Library 313, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume XII. Books 40 – 42*, trans. A. C. Schlesinger 1938, Loeb Classical Library 332, Harvard University Press.

Livy, *History of Rome. Volume XIII. Books 43 – 45*, trans. A. C. Schlesinger 1951, Loeb Classical Library 396, Harvard University Press.

Ovid, *Fasti*, trans. J. G. Frazer 1931, revised G. P. Goold 1996, Loeb Classical Library 253, Harvard University Press.

Ovid, *Heroides. Amores*, trans. G. Showerman 1941, revised G. P. Goold 1977, Loeb Classical Library 41, Harvard University Press.

Ovid, *Metamorphoses, Books 1 – 8*, trans. F. J. Miller 1916, revised G. P. Goold 1984, Loeb Classical Library 42, Harvard University Press.

Ovid, *Metamorphoses, Books 9 – 15*, trans. F. J. Miller 1916. Revised G. P. Goold 1984, Loeb Classical Library 43, Harvard University Press

Ovid, *The Art of Love and other Poems*, trans. J. H. Mozley 1929, revised G. P. Goold 1979, Loeb Classical Library 232, Harvard University Press.

Ovid, *Tristia. Ex Ponto*, trans. A. L. Wheeler 1924, revised G. P. Goold 1988, Loeb Classical Library 151, Harvard University Press.

Pliny the Elder, *Natural History. Books 3 – 7*, trans. H. Rackham 1942, Loeb Classical Library 352, Harvard University Press.

Pliny the Younger, *Letters, Books 1 – 7*, trans. B. Radice 1969, Loeb Classical Library 55, Harvard University Press.

Polybius, *The Histories*, trans. W. R. Paton 1922, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Posidonius, *Histories*, XXIII in Athenaeus.

Seneca the Younger, *Apocolocyntosis*, trans. M. Heseltine and W. H. D. Rouse 1913, revised E. H. Warmington 1969, Loeb Classical Library 15, Harvard University Press.

Seneca the Younger, *Epistles 66 – 92*, trans. R. M. Gummere 1920, Loeb Classical Library 76, Harvard University Press.

Seneca the Younger, *Natural Questions. Books 4 – 7*, trans. T. H. Corcoran 1972, Loeb Classical Library 457, Harvard University Press.

Strabo, *Geography*, trans. H. C. Hamilton, Esq., and W. Falconer, 1903. London, George Bell and Sons.

Suetonius, *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, trans. R. Graves, London, Penguin Books Ltd.

Tacitus, *Annals Books 4 – 6, 11 – 12*, trans. J. Jackson 1937, Loeb Classical Library 312, Harvard University Press.

Tacitus*, Annals Books 13 – 14*, trans. J. Jackson 1937, Loeb Classical Library 322, Harvard University Press.

Tacitus, *Germania*, trans, A. J. Church, W. J. Brodribb, and L. Cerrato 1942, New York, Perseus, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0083, first accessed Dec. 2014.

Tacitus, *Histories Books 4 – 5, Annals Books 1 – 3*, Trans. C. H. Moore 1931, Loeb Classical Library 249, Harvard University Press.

Tacitus, *The Annals*, trans. J. Church, W. J. Brodribb, and L. Cerrato 1942, New York, Perseus, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0083, first accessed Oct. 2012

Varro, *On the Latin Language*, *Books 5- 7*, trans. R. G. Kent 1938, Loeb Classical Library 333, Harvard University Press.

Virgil, *Eclogues. Georgics. Aeneid: Books 1 – 6*, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough 1916, revised G. P. Goold 1999, Loeb Classical Library 63, Harvard University Press.

Bibliography

Albarella, U., 2007. The end of the Sheep Age: People and Animals in the Late Iron Age in C. Haselgrove and T. Moore (eds.) *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 389 – 402.

Aldhouse-Green, M., 2002. Any Old Iron! Symbolism and Ironworking in Iron Age Europe in M. Aldhouse-Green and P. Webster (eds.) *Artefacts and Archaeology. Aspects of the Celtic and Roman World*, Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 8 – 19.

Allen, D. F., 1975. Cunobelin's Gold, *Britannia*, 6, 1 – 19.

Allen, D. F., 1976. Wealth, Money, and Coinage in a Celtic Society in V. Megaw (ed.) *To Illustrate Monuments*, London, Thames and Hudson, 200 – 208.

Allen, D. F., 1980. *The Coins of Ancient Celts*, edited by D. Nash, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Almagro-Gorbea, M., and Gran-Aymerich, J., 1991. *El Estanque Monumental de Bibracte*, Madrid.

Andrews, G., 1985. *A Report on the Archaeological Implications of Development in Canterbury*, Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England. – place of publication missing

Armit, I., 1997a. Cultural Landscapes and Identities: a Case Study in the Scottish Iron Age in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, Oxbow Monograph 71, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 248 – 253.

Armit, I., 1997b. Architecture and the Household: A response to Sharples and Parker-Pearson in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, Oxbow Monograph 71, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 266 – 269.

Arnold, B., and Gibson, D. B., (eds.), 1995. *Celtic Chiefdom Celtic State*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Arthur, P., 1986. Roman Amphorae from Canterbury, *Britannia*, 17, 239 – 258.

Ashbee, P., 2005. *Kent in Prehistoric Times*, Stroud, Tempus.

Atkinson, M., and Preston, S. J., 1998. The Late Iron Age and Roman Settlement at Elms Farm, Heybridge, Essex, Excavations 1993 – 5: An Interim Report, *Britannia*, 29, 85 – 110.

Atkinson, M. and Preston, S. J. (2015). *Heybridge: a Late Iron Age and Roman settlement, excavations at Elms Farm 1993-5: Volume 2*, Internet Archaeology, 40, Internet Archaeology e-monograph.

Audouze, F., and Buchsenschutz, O., 1980. *Villes, Villages et Campagnes de l'Europe Celtique*, Paris, Hachette.

Audouze, F., and Buchsenschutz, O., 1991. *Towns, Villages and Countryside of Celtic Europe from the beginning of the Second Millennium BC to the End of the First Century BC*, London, BCA.

Auxiette, G., 1996. La faune de l'oppidum de Villeneuve-St-Germain (Aisne): quartiers résidentiels, quartiers artisanales, *Revue Archéologique de Picardie*, 1(2), 27 – 98.

Barford, P. M., and Bayley, J., 1995. Evidence for Metalworking in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P. Blockley, S.S. Frere, and S. Stow, *The Archaeology of Canterbury Vol. V: Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas. Part I: The Excavated Sites*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 1100 – 1108.

Barford, P. M., and Carr, M., 1995. The Loomweights in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P. Blockley, S.S. Frere, and S. Stow, *The Archaeology of Canterbury Vol. V: Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas. Part I: The Excavated Sites*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 1173 – 1177.

Barker, A. W., 2009. Chiefdoms in R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner, and C. Chippindale (eds.) *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, Plymouth, Altamira Press, 515 – 532.

Barrett, D., and Westmacott, J., 2005. No. 6 – 8 Rose Lane, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Twenty-Ninth Annual Report*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 3 – 5.

Barrett, J. C., 1989. Food, Gender, and Metal: Questions of Social Reproduction in M. L. S. Sørenson and R. Thomas (eds.) *The Bronze Age-Iron Age Transition in Europe*, British Archaeological Report International Series 483, Oxford, 304 – 320.

Barthèlèmy, F., 1995. 'Le Potins à la tête diabolique' *Gallia*, 52, 27 – 36.

Bédoyère, G. de la., 2001. *The Buildings of Roman Britain*, Stroud, Tempus.

Benfield, S., 2002. *Excavations of Late Iron Age and Roman Features and a Roman Road North of Gosbecks Archaeological Park, Colchester, Essex, 1995 – 1996*, CAR 127, June 2008, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Bennett, P., 1977a. Excavations at 77 – 79 Castle Street, Canterbury, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust First Annual Report, April 1976 – April 1977*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 9 – 12.

Bennett, P., 1977b. Excavations at Rosemary Lane Car Part (Canterbury Castle), *Canterbury Archaeological Trust First Annual Report, April 1976 – April 1977*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 12 – 14.

Bennett, P., Frere, S. S., and Stow, S., 1982. *Excavations at Canterbury Castle*, The Archaeology of Canterbury, Vol. 1, Maidstone, Kent Archaeological Society for Canterbury Archaeological Trust.

Bernbeck, R., 2009. The Rise of the State in R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner, C. Chippindale (eds.) *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, Plymouth, Altamira Press, 533 – 546.

Bersu, G., 1940, Excavations at Little Woodbury, Wiltshire, Part 1: The Settlement as revealed by excavation, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 6(2), 30 – 111.

Bertels, J., 1606. *Deorum Sacrificorum Gentilium*, 40

Bertholet, J., 1741. *Histoire ecclésiastique et civile du Duché de Luxembourg et du Comté de Chiny*.

Biel, J., 1981. The Late Hallstatt Chieftain's grave at Hochdorf, *Antiquity*, 55, 16 – 18.

Birchall, A., 1965. The Aylesford-Swarling Culture: The Problem of the Belgae reconsidered, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 31, 241 – 367.

Blagg, T. F. C., 1991. The Marlowe Excavations: An Overview in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P. Blockley, S.S. Frere, and S. Stow, *The Archaeology of Canterbury Vol. V: Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas. Part I: The Excavated Sites*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 7 – 25.

Blair, P. H., 1963. *Roman Britain and Early England 55 BC – AD.871*, London, W. W. Norton and Company.

Blake, B., 1959. Romano-Celtic Temple, Sheepen, Colchester, *Colchester Archaeological Group Bulletin*, 2(3), September 1959, 36 – 37.

Blockley, K., and Blockley, P., 1981a. Bigbury Camp in T. Tatton-Brown (ed.) Interim Report on Excavation in 1981 by Canterbury Archaeological Trust, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 287 – 292.

Blockley, K., and Blockley, P., 1981b. Bigbury *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Fifth Annual Report, June 1980 – June 1981*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 10 – 11.

Blockley, K., and Blockley, P., 1989. Excavations at Bigbury, near Canterbury, 1981, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 107, 239 – 251.

Blockley, K., Blockley, M., Blockley, P., Frere, S. S., and Stow, S., 1995a. *The Archaeology of Canterbury Vol. V: Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas. Part I: The Excavated Sites*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust.

Blockley, K., Blockley, M., Blockley, P., Frere, S. S., and Stow, S., 1995b. *The Archaeology of Canterbury Vol. V: Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas. Part II: The Finds*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust.

Blockley, K., Blockley, M., and Blockley, P., 1995c. General Introduction in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P. Blockley, S. S. Frere, and S. Stow, *The Archaeology of Canterbury Vol. V: Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas. Part I: The Excavated Sites*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 4 – 6.

Blockley, K., and Day, M., 1979. 16 Watling Street, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Third Annual Report, April 1978 – April 1979*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 4 – 6.

Blockley, P., 1987. St John Lane, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Eleventh Annual Report, July 1986 – 1987*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 7.

Boessneck, J., 1971. *Die Tierknochenfunde aus dem Oppidum von Manching*, Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner.

Boon, G. C., 1957. *Roman Silchester*, London, Max Parrish.

Boon, G. C., 1974. *Silchester: The Roman Town of Calleva*, London, David and Charles.

Bourdieu, P., 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Bowden, M. C. B., and McOmish, D., 1987. The Required Barrier, *Scottish Archaeological Review*, 4, 76 – 84.

Bradley, R., 1971. Economic Change and Growth of Early Hill-forts in D. Hill and M. Jesson (ed.) *The Iron Age and its Hill-forts: Papers Presented to Sir Mortimer Wheeler on the Occasion of his Eightieth Year, at a Conference held by the Southampton University Archaeological Society, 5th – 7th March 1971*, Southampton, University of Southampton, 71 – 83.

Břeň, J., 1976. Earliest Settlement with Urban Character in Central Europe in B. Cunliffe and T. Rowley (eds.) *Oppida in Barbarian Europe,* BAR Supplementary Series II, Oxford, 81 – 94.

Břeň, J., 1991. Stradonice: A Celtic *Oppidum* in S. Moscati, O. H. Frey, V. Kruta, B. Raftery, and N. Szabó (eds.) *The Celts*, New York, Rizzoli, 541.

Brewster, T. C. M., 1980. *The Excavation of Garton and Wetwang Slacks*, Malton, East Riding Archaeological Committee Prehistoric Excavation Report 2.

Brogan, O., 1953. *Roman Gaul*, London, St. Bell and Sons Ltd.

Brooks, H., 2002a. *An Archaeological Evaluation by Trial-Trenching on Area C at Colchester Garrison PF1 Site, Colchester, Essex,* CAR 197, July 2002, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Brooks, H., 2002b. *An Archaeological Evaluation by Trial-Trenching on Areas E and F at Colchester Garrison PF1 Site, Colchester, Essex,* CAR 203, July 2002, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Brooks, H., 2002c. *An Archaeological Evaluation by Trial-Trenching on Area KR at Colchester Garrison PF1 Site, Colchester, Essex,* CAR 205, August 2002, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Brooks, H., 2002d. *An Archaeological Evaluation by Trial-Trenching on Areas A, B, D, GJ, H, J, N, V and YP at Colchester Garrison PF1 Site, Colchester, Essex, June – July 2002,* CAR 206, August 2002, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Brooks, H., 2002e. *An Archaeological Evaluation by Trial-Trenching on Areas DR,G, M, P, Q, R, RO, S and T at Colchester Garrison PF1 Site, Colchester, Essex, May – September 2002,* CAR 207, September 2002, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Brooks, H., 2004. *Colchester Garrison PFI Project: Stage 2 Archaeological Excavations Assessment Report*, CAR 270, March 2004, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Brooks, H., 2008. Colchester Institute, *The Colchester Archaeologist*, 21, 11 – 13.

Brooks, H., 2011. Garrison Roundup, *The Colchester Archaeologist*, 24, 8 – 9.

Brooks, H., and Benfield, S., and Garrod, S., 1995. Archaeological Assessment at Gosbecks Farm, Colchester, 1994, *Essex Archaeology and History: Transactions of Essex Archaeological Society*, Report 4, 26, 261 – 264.

Brooks, H., Brown, P., Corbishley, M., Crosson, C., Fawn, J., and Philip, A., 2002. A British Farm under the Romans, *The Colchester Archaeologist*, 15, 4 – 6.

Brooks, H., and Holloway, B., 2009. Back to School, *The Colchester Archaeologist*, 22, 2 – 7.

Brooks, H., Holloway, B., Masefield, R and Wimpey, T., 2007. *Interim assessment report on Stage 2 archaeological excavations, Alienated Land Area S2 (south), Colchester Garrison, Colchester, Essex, February-March 2007*, CAT Report 428, October 2007. Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Brooks, H., and Masefield, R., 2006. *A watching brief at Colchester New Garrison (Phase 1), Colchester, Essex February 2004-August 2005*, CAT/RPS Report 357, April 2006, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Brown, N. R., 1999. *The Archaeology of Ardleigh Essex, Excavation 1955 – 1980*, East Anglian Archaeological Report No. 90, Chelmsford, Essex County Council.

Brun, P., 1995a. From Chiefdom to State Organisation in Celtic Europe in B. Arnold and D. B. Gibson (eds.) *Celtic Chiefdom Celtic State*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 13 – 25.

Brun, P., 1995b. Oppida and Social 'Complexification' in France, in J. D. Hill and C. G. Cumberpatch (eds.), *Different Iron Age: Studies on the Iron Age in Temperate Europe*, B.A.R. International Series 602, Oxford, Archaeopress, 121 – 128.

Brun, P., 2001. Échelles d'Intégration Politique et Contrôle des Moyens de Production en Europe au cours du Ier Millénaire av. J.-C., in L. Berrocal-Rangel and P. Gardes (eds.) *Entre Celtes e Iberos, Las poblaciones protohistóricas de las Galias e Hispania*, Madrid, 29 – 43.

Brun, P., and Debord, J., 1991. Monnaies trouvées en fouille sur l'oppidum de Pommiers (Aisne), *Revue Numismatique*, 33, (6ᵉ sér.), 43 – 59.

Bryant, S., 2000. The Iron Age in N. Brown and J. Glazebrook (eds.) *Research Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern Counties 2: Research Agenda and Strategy*, Occasional Papers 8.

Bryant, S., 2007. Central Places or Spatial Places? The Origins and Development of '*Oppida*' in Hertfordshire in C. Haselgrove and T. Moore (eds.) *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*, Oxford, Oxbow, 62 – 80.

Bryant, S. R. and Niblett, R., 1997. The Late Iron Age in Hertfordshire and the North Chilterns in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, Oxford, Oxbow Monograph 71, 270 – 281.

Bulleid, A., 1948. *The Meare Lake Village: A Full Description of the Excavations and the Relics from the Eastern Half of the West Village 1910 – 33*, Somerset, Hammett and Company (Taunton) Ltd.

Burnham, B. C., Collis, J., Dobinson, C., Haselgrove, C., and Jones, M., 2001. Themes for Urban Research c.100 BC – AD.200 in S. James and M. Millett (eds.) *Britons and Romans: Advancing an Archaeological Agenda*, CBA Research Report 125, York, The Council for British Archaeology, 67 – 76.

Buchsenschutz, O., 2007. *Les Celtes de l'âge du Fer*, Paris.

Buchsenschutz, O., and Ralston, I., 1986. En Relisant la Guerre des Gaules, *Revue Aquitania*, Supplément 1, 383 – 387.

Buchsenschutz, O., and Ralston, I., 2012. Urbanisation et aristocratie celtiques in S. Sievers and M. Schönfelder (eds.) *Die Frage der Protourbanisation in der Eisenzeit*, Bonn, 347 – 364.

Carver, E., 2001. *The Visibility of Imported Wine and its Associated Accoutrements in Later Iron Age Britain*, BAR British Series 325, Oxford Press, Archaeopress.

Champion, T., 1976. *The Earlier Iron Age in the Region of the Lower Thames: Insular and External Factors*, University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis.

Champion, T., 2007. Prehistoric Kent in J. H. Williams (ed.) *The Archaeology of Kent to AD. 800*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press and Kent County Council, 67 – 134.

Champion, T., Gamble, C., Shennan, S., and Whittle, A., 1992. *Prehistoric Europe*, London, Academic Press.

Childe, G., 1956. *Piecing Together the Past: The Interpretation of Archaeological Data*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Chittock, H., 2014. Arts and Crafts in Iron Age Britain: Reconsidering the Aesthetic Effects of Weaving Combs, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 33(3), 313 – 326.

Clarke, C. P., 1988. Later Iron Age Enclosures in Kelvedon, Excavations at the Doucecroft site 1985 – 86, *Essex Archaeology and History*, 19, 15 – 39.

Clarke, D. L., 1972. A provisional model of an Iron Age Society and its settlements system in D. L. Clarke (ed.) *Models in Archaeology*, London, Methuen, 801 – 869.

Clarke, R. R., 1940. The Iron Age in Norfolk and Suffolk, *Archaeological Journal*, 96, 1 – 113.

Cleary, S. E., 1997. Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas by K. Blockley; M. Blockley; P. Blockley; S. Frere; and S. Stow: A Review, *Britannia*, 28, 491 – 492.

Clifford, E. M., 1961. *Bagendon: A Belgic Oppidum. A Record of the Excavations of 1954 – 56*, Cambridge, W. Heffer and Sons Limited.

Coles, J. M., 1987. *Meare Village East the Excavations of A. Bulleid and H. St. George Gray 1932 – 1956*, Somerset Levels Paper 13.

Collin, A., 1998. *Chronologie des Oppida de la Gaule non Méditerranéene: Contribution à l'étude des habitats de la fin de l'âge du Fer*, Documents d'Archéologie Française 71, Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'homme, Paris.

Collins, 2000. *English Dictionary 21st Century Edition*, 5th Edition, Glasgow, HarperCollins Publishers.

Collis, J., 1971. Functions and Theoretical Interpretations of British Coinage, *World Archaeology*, 3(1), 71 – 84.

Collis, J., 1976. Town and Market in Iron Age Europe in B. Cunliffe and T. Rowley (eds.) *Oppida in Barbarian Europe,* BAR Supplementary Series II, Oxford, 3 – 24.

Collis, J., 1977. An Approach to the Iron Age in J. Collis (ed.) *The Iron Age in Britain: A Review*, Sheffield, University of Sheffield, 1 – 7.

Collis, J., 1981a. A Theoretical Study of Hill-forts in G. Guilbert (ed.) *Hill-fort Studies*, Essays for A.H.A. Hogg, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 66 – 76.

Collis, J., 1981b. Coinage, *Oppida*, and the rise of Belgic Power: a reply in B. Cunliffe (ed.) *Coinage and Society in Britain and Gaul: Some Cultural Problems*, London, The Council for British Archaeology, 53 – 55.

Collis, J., 1983. Le Stratigraphie sud de Chantier d'Aulnat in J. Collis, A. Duval, and R. Périchon (eds.) *Le Deuxième âge du Fer en Auvergne et en Forez et ses relations avec les regions voisines: acres du colloque de Clermont-Ferrand, 1980*, Sheffield, University of Sheffield, J. Collis Publishing, 344.

Collis, J., 1984a. *Oppida, Earliest Towns North of the Alps*, Huddersfield, H. Charlesworth and Co. Ltd.

Collis, J., 1984b. *The European Iron Age*, London and New York, Routledge.

Collis, J., 1995a. States Without Centres? The Middle La Tène Period in Temperate Europe in B. Arnold and D. B. Gibson (eds.) *Celtic Chiefdom Celtic State*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 75 – 80.

Collis, J., 1995b. Visions of Power: Imagery and Symbols in Late Iron Age Britain, *Britannia*, 26, 1995, 285 – 301.

Collis, J., 1996. Hillforts, Enclosures and Boundaries in T. C. Champion and J. R. Collis *The Iron Age in Britain and Ireland: Recent Trends*, Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 95 – 116.

Collis, J., 2003. *The Celts: Origins, Myths, Inventions*, Stroud, Tempus.

Collis, J., Krausz, S., and Guichard, V., 2000. Les villages ouverts en Gaule central aux IIe et Ier siècles av. J.-C. in V. Guichard, S. Sievers, and O.H. Urban (eds.), *Les processus d'urbanisation à l'âge du Fer*, Glux-en-Glenne, 73 – 82.

Costin, C. L., 1991. Craft Specialisation: Issues in Defining, Documenting, and Explaining the Organisation of Production in M. B. Schiffer (ed.) *Archaeological Method and Theory*, Vol. 3, Tucson, Univeristy of Arizona Press, 1 – 55.

Cottam, E., de Jersey, P., Rudd, C., and Sills, J., 2010. *Ancient British Coins: An Easy Catalogue of the Iron Age Coins of the Pritani (c. 150 – AD 45)*, Norfolk, Chris Rudd Aylsham.

Couchman, C. R., 1975. The Bronze Age Cemetery at Ardleigh, Essex: A Further Consideration, *Essex Archaeology and History*, 7, 14 – 32.

Creighton, J., 2000. *Coins and Power in Late Iron Age Britain,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Creighton, J., 2001. The Iron Age-Roman transition in S. James and M. Millett (eds.) *Britons and Romans: Advancing an Archaeological Agenda*, CBA Research Report 125, York, CBA, 4 – 11.

Creighton, J., 2006. *Britannia*: *The Creation of a Roman Province*, London, Routledge.

Cross, R., 1991. The Western Part of the Valley of the Sarre Penn, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Fifteenth Annual Report, July 1990 – July 1991*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 2 – 6.

Crossan, C., 2003. *An Archaeological Watching Brief on Geotechnical Test-Pits at Colchester Garrison in Essex, Stage 2, May 2003*, CAR 231, June 2003, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Crossan, C., and Masefield, R., 2004. Camulodunum East, *The Colchester Archaeologist,* 17, 16 – 21.

Crowley, L., 2009. Creating a Community. The Symbolic Role of Tumuli in the Villa landscape of the *Civitas Tungrorum* in M. Driessens, S. Herren, J. Hendriks, F. Kemmurs, and R. Visser (eds.), *Trac 2008: Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference Amsterdam 2008*, Oxford, Oxbow, 113 – 126.

Crummy, N., 1983. *The Roman Small Finds from Excavation in Colchester 1971-9*, Colchester Archaeological Report 2, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Crummy, N., 2007. The Identities of the 'Doctor' and the 'Warrior' in P. Crummy, S. Benfield, N. Crummy, V. Rigby, and D. Shimmin (eds.) *Stanway: an Elite Burial Sites at Camulodunum*,

Britannia Monograph Series No. 24, London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 444 – 447.

Crummy, N., 2013. The Finds Evidence in A. Gascoyne and D. Radford, 2013. *Colchester Fortress of the War God: An Archaeological Assessment*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 38 – 41.

Crummy, P., 1974. *Colchester: Recent Excavations and Research,* Colchester, Colchester Excavation Committee.

Crummy, P., 1979. Crop Marks at Gosbecks, Colchester, *Aerial Archaeology*, 4, 77 – 82.

Crummy, P., 1980. Camulodunum*, Current Archaeology*, 72, 6 – 10.

Crummy, P., 1984. *In Search of Colchester's Past*, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust Ltd.

Crummy, P., 1993. Aristocratic Graves at Colchester, *Current Archaeology*, 132, 492 – 497.

Crummy, P., 1995a. Gosbecks Archaeological Park, *The Colchester Archaeologist,* 8, 7 – 14.

Crummy, P., 1995b. Kiln Road Excavations 1971 in in C. F. C. Hawkes and P. Crummy, *Camulodunum 2,* Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust Ltd, 131 – 137.

Crummy, P., 1995c. Dugard Avenue Excavations 1973 – 76. Iron Age to ?Early Roman Fields North of Gosbecks in C. F. C. Hawkes and P. Crummy, *Camulodunum 2,* Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust Ltd, 116 – 119.

Crummy, P., 1995d. Gosbecks in C. F. C. Hawkes and P. Crummy, *Camulodunum* 2, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust Ltd, 95 – 105.

Crummy, P., 1995e. *Camulodunum* – a review, in C. F. C. Hawkes and P. Crummy, *Camulodunum* 2, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust Ltd, 161 – 178.

Crummy, P., 1996. Your Move Doctor, *The Colchester Archaeologist,* 10, 1 – 9.

Crummy, P., 1997. *City of Victory*, Colchester, Colchester Archaeologist Trust.

Crummy, P., 1999. Gosbecks Archaeological Park: latest discoveries, *Colchester Archaeologist*, 12, 20 – 1.

Crummy, P., 2001. *City of Victory: The Story of Colchester – Britain's First Roman Town*, 2nd Edition, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Crummy, P., 2003. Camulodunum Explored, *The Colchester Archaeologist*, 16, 7 – 9.

Crummy, P., 2007. Aspects of the Stanway Cemetery in P. Crummy, S. Benfield, N. Crummy, V. Rigby, and D. Shimmin (eds.) *Stanway: an Elite Burial Sites at Camulodunum*, Britannia Monograph Series No. 24, London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 423 – 456.

Crummy, P., 2008. Druid or Romanised Briton? *The Colchester Archaeologist*, 21, 14 – 19.

Crummy, P., 2011. Garrison Round-Houses. *The Colchester Archaeologist,* 24, 16.

Crummy, P., 2013. The Current State of Knowledge in A. Gascoyne and D. Radford, *Colchester Fortress of the War God: An Archaeological Assessment*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 54 – 57.

Crummy, P., Benfield, S., Crummy, N., Rigby, V., and Shimmin, D., 2007. *Stanway: An Elite Burial Site at Camulodunum,* Britannia Monograph Series No. 24, London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Cruso, T., and Crummy, P., 1995. Pitchbury Rampart Excavations, 1933 and 1973 in in C. F. C. Hawkes and P. Crummy, *Camulodunum 2,* Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust Ltd, 138 – 154.

Cumberpatch, C. G., 1995. *Production and Society in the later Iron Age of Bohemia and Moravia*, in J. D. Hill and C. G. Cumberpatch (eds.) *Different Iron Ages: Studies on the Iron Age in Temperate Europe*, BAR International Series 602, Oxford, Archaeopress, 67 – 94.

Cunliffe, B., 1971. Some Aspects of Hill-forts and their Cultural Environments in D. Hill and M. Jesson (ed.) *The Iron Age and its Hill-forts: Papers Presented to Sir Mortimer Wheeler on the Occasion of his Eightieth Year, at a Conference held by the Southampton University Archaeological Society, 5th – 7th March 1971*, Southampton, University of Southampton, 53 - 69.

Cunliffe, B., 1976a. The Origins of Urbanisation in Britain in B. Cunliffe and T. Rowley (eds.) *Oppida in Barbarian Europe*, BAR Supplementary Series II, Oxford, 135 – 162.

Cunliffe B., 1976b, *Iron Age Sites in Central Southern England*, London, CBA Research Report No. 16, The Council for British Archaeology.

Cunliffe, B., 1976c, Danebury, Hampshire: Second Interim Report on The Excavations, 1971 – 5, *Antiquities Journal*, 56, 198 – 216.

Cunliffe, B., 1978a. *Iron Age Communities of the British Isles*, 2nd Edition, London, Routledge.

Cunliffe, B., 1978b. *Hengistbury Head*, London, Elek.

Cunliffe, B., 1981. Money and Society in pre-Roman Britain in B. Cunliffe (ed.) *Coinage and Society in Britain and Gaul: Some Current Problems*, CBA Research Report No. 38, London, The Council for British Archaeology, 29 – 39.

Cunliffe, B., 1982a. Britain, the Veneti and Beyond, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 1, 39 – 68.

Cunliffe, B., 1982b. Social and Economic Development in Kent in the pre-Roman Iron Age in P. E. Leach (ed.) *Archaeology in Kent to AD.1500*, CBA Research Report 48, London, 40 – 50.

Cunliffe, B., 1984. Relations between Britain and Gaul in the First Century BC and Early 1st Century AD in S. Macready and F. H. Thompson (eds.) *Cross-channel trade between Gaul and Britain in the pre-Roman Iron Age*, Bath, The Pitman Press, 3 – 23.

Cunliffe, B., 1988. *Greeks, Romans and Barbarians: Spheres of Interaction*, London, Batsford.

Cunliffe, B., 1994. After Hillforts, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 13(1), 71 – 84.

Cunliffe, B., 1995a. *Iron Age Britain*, London, B. T. Batsford and English Heritage.

Cunliffe, B., 1995b., The Celtic chariot in B. Raftery (ed.) *Sites and Sights of the Iron Age*, Oxford, Oxbow Monograph 56, 31 – 39.

Cunliffe, B., 1997. Amorica and Britain: The Ceramic Evidence in B. Cunliffe and P. De Jersey *Armorica and Britain: Cross-Channel Relationships in the Late First Millennium BC*, Studies in Celtic Coinage 3, Oxford, Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, 2 – 71.

Cunliffe, B., 1999. *The Ancient Celts*, London, Penguin Books.

Cunliffe, B., 2000. *The Danebury Environs Programme: The Prehistory of a Wessex Landscape. Vol. 1: Introduction*, Oxford, English Heritage and Oxford University Press.

Cunliffe, B., 2003, *Danebury*, London, B.T. Batsford/English Heritage.

Cunliffe, B., 2005. *Iron Age Communities in Britain*, Fourth Edition, London and New York, Routledge.

Cunliffe, B., 2011. *Europe Between the Oceans Themes and Variations: 9000 BC – AD. 1000*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press.

Cunliffe, B., and De Jersey, P., 1997. *Armorica and Britain: Cross-Channel Relationships in the Late First Millennium BC*, Studies in Celtic Coinage 3, Oxford, Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.

Cunliffe, B., and Rowley, T., (eds.), 1976, *Oppida in Barbarian Europe*, BAR Supplementary Series II, Oxford.

Curteis, M., 2006. Coinage and Territoriality in Iron Age Essex and Suffolk, *Essex Archaeology and History: The Transactions of the Essex Society for Archaeology and History*, Vol. 37, Third Series, 1 – 13.

Darvill, T., 1987. *Prehistoric Britain*, Batsford, London.

Darvill, T., 2003. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Archaeology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Daval, C., 2008. Titelberg in *Oppida: Premières Villes au Nord des Alpes*, www.oppida,org, first accessed 2012.

de. Jersey, P., 1996. *Celtic Coinage in Britain*, Buckinghamshire, Shire Archaeology.

de. Jersey, P., 2001. Cunobelin's Silver, *Britannia,* 32, 1 – 44.

Debord, J., 1990. Les fouilles du site gaulois tardif de Villeneuve-Saint-Germain (Aisne), *Mémoires de la Fédération des societies d'histoire et de l'archéologie de l'Aisne*, 35, 137 – 170.

Debord, J., 1995. Le Faciès monétaire de Villeneyve-Saint-Germain et ses éléments de datation in K. Gruel (ed.) Les Potins Gaulois: Typologie, diffusion, chronologie. État de la question à partir de plusieurs contributions, *Gallia*, 52, 61 – 78.

Debord, J., and Nomine, C., 1983. Nouvel additive aux découvertes monétaires sur l'oppidum de Pommiers (Aisne), *Cahiers Numismatiques*, 73, 211 – 225.

Déchelette, J., 1904. *Les Fouilles de Mont Beuvray de 1897 – 1901*, Paris, Picard.

Dejean, S., and Demierre, M., 2014. Le Travail de l'os et de la Corne in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 113.

Demierre, M., 2014a. L'atelier du Menuisier in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 52.

Demierre, M., 2014b. L'atelier du Bronzer in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 110.

Demierre, M., 2014c. L'atelier du "plombier" in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 111.

Demierre, M., Guillaud, L., and Poux, M., 2014a. La Place de Marché in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 90 – 111.

Demierre, M., Garcia, M., and Poux, M., 2014b. Trophée d'armes in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 164 – 165.

Dent, J. S., 1982. Cemeteries and Settlement Patterns of the Iron Age on the Yorkshire Wolds, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 48, 437 – 457.

DeRoche, C. D., 1997. Studying Iron Age Production in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, Oxbow Monograph 71, Oxford, Oxbow, 19 – 25.

Detsicas, A., 1983. *The Cantiaci*, Glouchester, Stroud.

Dhennequin, L, Guillamet, J-P., Szabo, M., 2008. L'oppidum de Bibracte (Mont Beuvray, Frane), Bilan de 10 années de recherches (1996 – 2005), *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 59, 1 – 152.

Dietler, M., 1990. Driven by drink: the role of drinking in the political economy and the case of Early Iron Age France, *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 9, 352 – 406.

Dietler, M., 2001. Theorising the Feast: Rituals of Consumption, Commensal Politics, and Power in African Contexts in M. Dietler and B. Hayden (eds.), *Feasts: Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Foods, Politics, and Power*, Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press, 65 – 144.

Dillon, M., and Garland, L., 2015. *Ancient Rome: Social and Historical Documents from the Early Republic to the Death of Augustus*, 2nd Edition, London, Routledge.

Dimbleby, C. W., 1978. A Pollen Analysis from Verulamium (St Michael's 1966), *Hertfordshire Archaeologist*, 6, 112 – 115.

Douglas, M., 1970. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, London, Cresset Press.

Drewett, P., Rudling, D., Gardiner, M., 1988. *The South-East to AD. 1000*, London and New York, Longman.

Drinkwater, J. F., 1983. *Roman Gaul: the Three Provinces 58 BC – AD. 260*, London, Croom Helm.

Drury, P. J., 1978a. Little Waltham and pre-Belgic Iron Age settlement in Essex 1970 – 71 in B. Cunliffe and T. Rowley (eds.) *Lowland Iron Age Communities in Europe*, B.A.R. International Series 48, Oxford, 43 – 76.

Drury, P. J., 1978b. *Excavation at Little Waltham 1970 – 1*, CBA Research Report 26, Chelmsford, Chelmsford Excavation Committee and the Council for British Archaeology.

Dungworth, D., 1997. Copper Metallurgy in Iron Age Britain: Some Recent Research in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, Oxbow Monograph 71, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 46 – 50.

Dunham, S. B., 1995. Caesar's Perception of Gallic Social Structures in B. Arnold and D. B. Gibson (eds.) *Celtic Chiefdom Celtic State*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 110 – 115.

Dunnet, R., 1971. The Excavation of the Roman Theatre at Gosbecks, *Britannia*, 2, 27 – 47.

Dunnet, R., 1975. *The Trinovantes: Peoples of Roman Britain*, London, Duckworth.

Dyer, J., 2002. *Ancient Britain*, London, Routledge.

Earle, T., 1978. Economic and Social Organisation of a Complex Chiefdom: The Halelea District, Kauai, Hawaii, *Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan Anthropological Papers No. 63*.

Earle, T., 1987. Chiefdoms in Archaeological and Ethnohistorical Perspective, *Annual Reviews in Anthropology*, 16, 270 – 308.

Earle, T., 1991. The Evolution of Chiefdoms, in D. W. Schwartz (ed.) *Chiefdoms: Power, Economy, and Ideology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1 – 15.

Eddy, M. R., and Turner, C. E., 1982. *Kelvedon: The Origins and Development of a Roman Small Town*, Chelmsford, Essex County Council Occasional Paper 3.

Eirth, F. H., 1960. Winter Ploughing 1959 – 60 at Ardleigh, *Colchester Archaeological Group Bulletin,* 3(1), March 1960, Essex, Essex Archaeological Society, 2 – 8.

Eirth, F. H., 1962. Iron Age "A" Pottery Found at Ardleigh, *Colchester Archaeological Group Bulletin,* 5(1), December 1962, Essex, Essex Archaeological Society, 76.

Eirth, F. H., 1967. The Iron Age "A" Farmstead at Ardleigh, *Colchester Archaeological Group,* 10(4), December 1967, Essex, Essex Archaeological Society, 54.

Eirth, F. H., 1969. The Threatened Belgic Site at Ardleigh, *Colchester Archaeological Group,* 12(2), 1969, Essex, Essex Archaeological Society, 40 – 44.

Eirth, F. H., and Holbert, P. R., 1970. The Iron Age "A" Farmstead at Vinces Farm, Ardleigh, *Colchester Archaeological Trust,* 13(1), March 1970, 1 – 26.

Eirth, F. H., and Holbert, P. R., 1974. A Belgic Pit at Ardleigh, *Colchester Archaeological Group,* Vol. 17, March 1974, Essex, Essex Archaeological Society, 3 – 16.

Elsden, N., 2006. *Furfield Quarry, Broughton Monchelsea, Maidstone, Kent, Earthworks Assessment*, Unpublished MOL Report.

Eluère, C., 1992. *The Celts: First Masters of Europe*, Trieste, Editoriale Libraria.

Ennis, T., and Foreman, S., 2002. The North-Western Town Defences of Kelvedon, Excavation of an Iron Age and Roman site on land to the rear of Lawson Villas, Kelvedon, *Essex Archaeology and History*, 33, 63 – 77.

Evans, J., 1864. *Coins of the Ancient Britons*, London, B. Quaritch.

Farley, M., 1983. A Mirror Burial at Dorton, Buckinghamshire, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 49, 269 – 302.

Ferdière, A. and Villard, A., 1993. *La Tombe Augustéenne de Fléré-la-Rivière (Indre) et les Sépultres Aristocratiques de la Cité des Bituriges*, Musée d'Argentomagus Mémoire 2/Revue Archéologique du Centre de la France Supplément 7, Saint-Marcel.

Fernández-Götz, M., 2012. Die Rolle der Heiligtümer bei der Konstruktion kollektiver Identitäten: das Beispiel der treverischen Oppida, *Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt*, 42(4), 509 – 524.

Fernández-Götz, M., 2014a. Reassessing the *oppida*: the role of power and religion, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 33(4), 379 – 394.

Fernández-Götz, M., 2014b. *Identity and Power: The Transformation of Iron Age Societies in Northeast Gaul*, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.

Fichtl, S., 2000. *La Ville Celtique. Les Oppida de 150 av. J.-C. à 15 ap. J.-C.*, Paris, Editions Errance.

Fichtl, S., 2003. *Les Oppida du Nord-Est de la Gaule à La Tène Finale*, Archaeologia Mosellana 5.

Fichtl, S., 2005. *La Ville Celtique. Les Oppida de 150 av. J.-C. à 15 ap. J.-C.*, Paris.

Fichtl, S. (ed.), 2010. *Murus Celticus. Architecture et Fonctions des Remparts de l'âge du Fer*, Glux-en-Glenne.

Fichtl, S., 2012a. *Les Premiéres Villes de Gaule. Le temps des Oppida*, Lacapelle-Marival.

Fichtl, S., 2012b. *Les Peuples Gaulois, IIIe – Ier siècle av. J.-C.*, Paris,

Fichtl, S., Metzler, J., and Sievers, S., 2000. Le rôle des Sanctuaires dans le Processus d'Urbanisation in V. Guichard, S. Sievers, and O. H. Urban (eds.) *Les Processus d'Urbanisation à l'âge du Fer. Eisenzeitliche Urbanisations-prozesse*, Glux-en-Glenne, 179 – 186.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 1985. The Distribution of Dressel 1 Amphorae in North-West Europe, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 4(3), 305 – 340.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 1986. Camulodunum and the Early Occupation of South East England. Some Reconsiderations in C. Unz (ed.) *Studien zu den Militägrenzen Roms III, 13 Internationaler Limeskongress, Aalen 1983*, Stuttgart, 35 – 41.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 1989a. The use of Roman Imperialism by the Celtic Barbarians in the Later Republic in J. Barrett, A. P. Fitzpatrick, and L. Macinnes (eds.) *Barbarians and Romans in North-West Europe*, British Archaeological Reports International Series 471, Oxford, 27 – 54.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 1989b. *Cross-Channel Relations in the British Later Iron Age: With Particular Reference to the British Archaeological Evidence*, University of Durham PhD Thesis, (Unpublished).

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 1992. The Roles of Celtic Coinage in south-east England in M. Mays (ed.) *Celtic Coinage: Britain and Beyond*, BAR British Series 222, 1 – 32.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 1993. Ethnicity and Exchange: Germans, Celts and Romans in the Later Iron Age in C. Sarre and F. Healy (eds.) *Trade and Exchange in Prehistoric Europe*, Oxbow Monograph 33, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 233 – 244.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 1994. Outside in: the Structure of an Early Iron Age House at Dunstan Park, Thatcham, Berkshire in A. P. Fitzpatrick and E. Morris (eds.) *The Iron Age in Wessex: Recent Work*, Salisbury, Trust for Wessex Archaeology, 68 – 72.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 1997a. Everyday Life in Iron Age Wessex in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, Oxbow Monograph 71, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 73 – 86.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 1997b. Camulodunum 2 by C. F. C. Hawkes and P. Crummy a Review, *Britannia*, 28, 500 – 501.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 2001. Cross Channel Exchange, Hengistbury Head and the end of Hillforts in J. Collis (ed.), *Society and Settlement in Iron Age Europe (Actes du XVIIIe Colloque de l'AFEAF, Winchester, April 1994)*, Sheffield, J. R. Collis Publications, 82 – 97.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 2003. Roman Amphorae in Iron Age Britain, *Journal of Roman Pottery Studies*, 10, 10 – 25.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., (ed.), 2007. Iron Age, *SWARF Resource Assessment: Later Bronze Age and Iron Age*, Taunton, 151 – 182.

Fitzpatrick, A.P., and Timby, J., 2002. Roman Pottery in Iron Age Britain in A. Woodward and J.D. Hill (eds.) *Prehistoric Britain the Ceramic Basis*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 161 – 172.

Foster, J., 1980. *The Iron Age Moulds from Gussage-All-Saints*, British Museum Occasional Paper 12, London, British Museum Press.

Foster, J., 1986. *The Lexden Tumulus. A Reappraisal of an Iron Age Burial from Colchester, Essex,* BAR British Series 156, Oxford.

Foster, J., 1991. Gussage All Saints in S. Moscati, O. H. Frey, V. Kruta, B. Raftery, and N. Szabó (eds.) *The Celts*, New York, Rizzoli, 608.

Foster, J., 2002. *Life and Death in the Iron Age*, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum.

Foucart, J., 1973. Les Récentes Trouvailles Monétaires au Plateau de Pommiers, point final á la querelle Centenaire de Noviodonum: Soissons ou Pommiers in *Mémoires de la Fédération des Sociétés d'histoire et d'archéologie de l'Aisne*, 81 – 91.

Foucart, J., 1979. Supplément á l'inventaire des monnaies Gauloises trouvées sur l'oppidum de Pommiers, *Cahiers Archéologiques de Picardie*, 6, 229 – 230.

Foucras, S., and Demierre, M., 2014. Le Travail des Peaux et du Cuir in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 114.

Foucras, S., and Poux, M., 2014. Du Sacrifice au Banquet in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 170 – 171.

France, N. E., and Gobel, B. M., 1985. *The Romano-British Temple at Harlow, Essex. A Record of the Excavations carried out by Members of the West Essex Archaeological Group and the Harlow Antiquarian Society between 1962 and 1971*, Harlow.

Frere, S. S., 1965. *Roman Canterbury the City of Durovernum,* Fourth Edition, Canterbury, J. A. Jennings Ltd.

Frere, S. S., 1987. *Britannia: A History of Roman Britain*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Frere, S., Bennett, P., Rady, J., and Stow, S., 1987. *Canterbury Excavation Intra- and Extra-Mural Sites 1949 – 55 and 1980 – 84*, The Archaeology of Canterbury VIII, Maidstone, Kent Archaeological Society for Canterbury Archaeological Trust.

Fulford, M. G., 1985. Roman Material in Barbarian Society c.200 BC – c.AD.400 in T. C. Champion and J. V. S. Megaw (eds.), *Settlement and Society: Aspects of West European Prehistory in the 1st Millennium BC*, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 91 – 108.

Fulford, M. G., 1987. Calleva Atrebatum: an interim report on the excavations of the oppidum, 1980-6, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 53, 271 – 278.

Fulford, M. G., 2000. Synthesis: The Oppidum – Latest Iron Age and Earliest Roman in M. G. Fulford and J. Timby. *Late Iron Age and Roman Silchester Excavations on the Site of the Forum Basilica, 1977, 1980 – 86*, British Monograph 15, London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 545 – 564.

Fulford, M. G., and Timby, J., 2000. *Late Iron Age and Roman Silchester Excavations on the Site of the Forum Basilica, 1977, 1980 – 86*, British Monograph 15, London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Gaeng, C., and Metzler, J., 2011. État des recherches en cours in Musée National d'Histoire et d'Art (ed.) *Unter unseren Füßen Sous nos pieds. Archäologie in Luxemburg / Archéologie au Luxembourg 1995 – 2010*, Luxembourg, Musée National d'Histoire et d'Art, 125 – 134.

Garrard, P. H., and Blockley, P., 1995. The Human Bones in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P. Blockley, S.S. Frere, and S. Stow, *The Archaeology of Canterbury Vol. V: Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas. Part I: The Excavated Sites*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 1261 – 1262.

Gascoyne, A., 2013a. The Roman legionary fortress, AD.43-49; The Archaeological Evidence, in A. Gascoyne and D. Radford *Colchester Fortress of the War God: An Archaeological Assessment*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 64 – 74.

Gascoyne, A., 2013b. The Roman legionary fortress, AD.43-49; Introduction and historical framework in A. Gascoyne and D. Radford *Colchester Fortress of the War God: An Archaeological Assessment*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 59 – 62.

Gascoyne, A., and Radford, D., 2013. *Colchester Fortress of the War God: An Archaeological Assessment*, Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Gebhard, R., 1989. *Der Glasschmuck aus dem Oppidum von Manching*, Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner.

Gebhard, R., 1995. The 'Celtic' *Oppidum* of Manching and its Exchange System, in J. D. Hill and C. G. Cumberpatch (eds.), *Different Iron Ages, Studies of the Iron Age in Temperate Europe*, BAR International Series 602, Oxford, Archaeopress, 111 – 120.

Gibson, A., 1996. The Art of the Potter in M. Green (ed.) *The Celtic World*, London, Routledge, 328 – 341.

Gibson, A., 2002. *Prehistoric Pottery in Britain and Ireland*, Stroud, Tempus Publishing Ltd.

Gibson, D. B., and Geselowitz, M. N., 1988a. The Evolution of Complex Society in Late Prehistoric Europe: Toward a Paradigm in D. B. Gibson and M. N. Geselowitz (eds.) *Tribe and Polity in Late Prehistoric Europe*, New York, Plenum, 3 – 40.

Gibson, D. B., and Geselowitz, M. N., (eds.), 1988b. *Tribe and Polity in Late Prehistoric Europe*, New York, Plenum.

Giles, M., 2007. Good Fences make Good Neighbours? Exploring the Ladder Enclosures of Late Iron Age East Yorkshire in C. Haselgrove and T. Moore (eds.), *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 235 – 249.

Giles, M., and Parker-Pearson, M., 1999. Learning to Live in the Iron Age: Dwelling and Praxis in B. Bevan (ed.) *Northern Exposure: Interpretive Devolution and the Iron Ages in Britain*, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 217 – 237.

Godelier, M., 1971. 'Salt Currency' and the circulation of commodities among the Baruya of New Guinea in G. Dalton (ed.) *Studies in Economic Anthropology*, Washington, American Anthropological Association Studies 7, 52 – 73.

Godelier, M., 1977. 'Salt Money' and the circulation of commodities among the Baruya of New Guinea in M. Godelier, *Perspectives in Marxist Anthropology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 127 – 151.

Going, C. J., 1984. An Iron Age Warrior Burial from Kelvedon, Essex, *Colchester Archaeological Group Bulletin,* 27, Essex, Essex Archaeological Society, 51.

Going, C. J., 1993. The Iron Age in A. Clark, *Excavations at Mucking Volume 1: the Site Atlas*, Archaeological Report No. 20, London, English Heritage and British Museum Press, 19 – 20.

Going, C. J., and Belton, J., 1999. Roman Pottery in N. R. Brown, *The Archaeology of Ardleigh Essex: Excavations 1955 – 1980*, East Anglian Archaeological Report No. 90, Chelmsford, Essex County Council, 125 – 157.

Gomer, K., and Rodwell, W., 1972. Excavation in the Kelvedon – Rivenhall Area 1970 – 1, *Colchester Archaeological Group Bulletin*, 15, March 1972, Essex, Essex Archaeological Society, 13 – 15.

Grainge, G., 2005. *The Roman Invasions of Britain*, Stroud, Tempus.

Griffiths, M., 2011. 7000 years of Nosterfield, *Past Horizons Adventures in Archaeology*, www.pasthorizonspr.com, first accessed August 2013.

Grocott, D., 2007. The Dykes of Camulodunum: Anti-chariot Defences or Boundaries of a Major Trading Centre? *The Colchester Archaeologist*, 20, 30 – 31.

Gruel, K., and Poux, M., 2014. L'atelier du Monnayeur in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 174.

Guichard, V., Pion, P., Malacher, F., Collis, J., 1993. À Propos de la Circulation monétaire en Gaule chevelue aux IIe et Ier Siècles avant J.-C., *RACF*, 32, 25 – 51.

Guichon, R., and Poux, M., 2014. Le Sanctuaire in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 141 – 163.

Guillard, L., 2014. Vêtement et production textiles in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 87.

Guillaumet, J.-P., 1991. Bibracte: An *Oppidum* of the Aedui People in S. Moscati, O. H. Frey, V. Kruta, B. Raftery, and N. Szabó (eds.) *The Celts*, New York, Rizzoli, 519.

Haevernick, T. E., 1960. *Die Glasarmringe und Ringperlen der Mittel- und Spätlatènezeit auf dem europäischen Festland*, Bonn.

Hamilton, E. G., 1996. *Technology and Social Change in Belgic Gaul: Copper Working at the Titelberg, Luxembourg 125 BC – AD 300*, MASCA Research Papers in Science and Archaeology Vol. 13, Pennsylvania, Museum of Applied Science Centre for Archaeology.

Hamilton, E. G., 2003. The Celts and Urbanisation, *Expedition*, 45(1), 20 – 25.

Hamilton, S., 2007. Cultural Choices in the 'British Eastern Cultural Area' in the Late Pre-Roman Iron Age in C. Haselgrove and T. Moore (eds.) *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 81 – 106.

Hanson, W. S., 1999. Roman Britain: The Military Dimension in J. Hunter and I. Ralston (eds.), *The Archaeology of Britain: An Introduction from the Upper Palaeolithic to the Industrial Revolution*, Oxon, Routledge, 135 – 156.

Harcourt, R., 1979, The Animal Bones in G. J. Wainwright, *Gussage All Saints: An Iron Age Settlement in Dorset*, London, Departments of the Environment, Archaeological Reports No. 10, 150 – 160.

Harding, A., 1984. Aspects of social evolution in the Bronze Age in J. Bintliff (ed.) *European Social Evolution: Archaeological Perspectives*, Bradford, University of Bradford Press, 135 – 145.

Harding, D. W., 1974. *The Iron Age in Lowland Britain*, London, Routledge.

Haselgrove, C., 1976. External Trade As a Stimulus to Urbanisation in B. Cunliffe and T. Rowley (eds.) *Oppida in Barbarian Europe,* BAR Supplementary Series II, Oxford, 25 – 50.

Haselgrove, C., 1979. The Significance of Coinage in Pre-conquest Britain in B. C. Burnham and H. B. Johnson (eds.) *Invasion and Response: The Case of Roman Britain*, BAR British Series, Oxford, 197 – 209.

Haselgrove, C., 1982. Wealth, Prestige and Power: the Dynamics of Late Iron Age Political Centralisation in South-East England in A. C. Renfrew and S. Shennan (eds.) *Ranking, Resource, and Exchange*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 79 – 88.

Haselgrove, C., 1984a. Comment on Hingley, *Scottish Archaeological Review*, 3, 27 – 30.

Haselgrove, C., 1984b. 'Romanization' before the conquest: Gaulish precedents and British consequences in T. F. C. Blagg and A. C. Kings (eds.) *Military and Civilian in Roman Britain*, BAR British Series No. 136, Oxford, 5 – 63.

Haselgrove, C., 1987. *Iron Age Coinage in South-East England: The Archaeological Context*, BAR British Series 174, Oxford.

Haselgrove, C., 1988. Coin and Complexity: Archaeological Analysis of Socio-political Change in Britain and non-Mediterranean Gaul during the later Iron Age in D. B. Gibson and M. N. Geselowitz (eds.), *Tribe and Polity in Late Prehistoric Europe*, New York, Plenum, 69 – 96.

Haselgrove, C., 1989. The Later Iron Age in Southern Britain and Beyond in M. Todd (ed.) *Research on Roman Britain: 1960 – 89*, London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 1 – 18.

Haselgrove, C., 1992. Iron Age coins and archaeology in M. Mays (ed.), *Celtic Coinage: Britain and Beyond*, BAR British Series 222, 123 – 137.

Haselgrove, C., 1993. The Development of British Iron Age Coinage, *Numismatic Chronicle*, 153, 31 – 64.

Haselgrove, C., 1994. Coinage and Currency in Iron Age Wessex in A. P. Fitzpatrick and E. L. Morris (eds.) *The Iron Age in Wessex: Recent Work*, Salisbury, Trust for Wessex Archaeology Ltd, 22 – 25.

Haselgrove, C., 1995. Late Iron Age Society in Britain and North-West Europe: Structural Transformation or Superficial Change? in B. Arnold and D. B. Gibson (eds.) *Celtic Chiefdom Celtic State*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 81 – 87.

Haselgrove, C., 1996a. Roman Impact on Rural Settlement and Society in Southern Picardy in N. Roymans (ed.) *From the Sword to the Plough: Three Studies on the Earliest Romanisation of Northern Gaul*, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 127 – 188.

Haselgrove, C., 1996b. Iron Age Coinage: Recent Work in T. C. Champion and J. R. Collis (eds.), *The Iron Age in Britain and Ireland: Recent Trends*, Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 67 – 85.

Haselgrove, C., 1997. Iron Age Brooch Deposition and Chronology in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, Oxford, Oxbow Monograph 71, 51 – 72.

Haselgrove, C., 1999. The Iron Age in J. Hunter and I. Ralston (eds.), *The Archaeology of Britain: An Introduction from the Upper Palaeolithic to the Industrial Revolution*, Oxon, Routledge, 113 – 134.

Haselgrove, C., 2000. The Character of oppida in Iron Age Britain in V. Guichard, S. Sievers, and O.H. Urban (eds.) *Les processus d'urbanisation à l'âge du fer: actes du colloque Glux-en-Glenne, 8 – 11 Juin 1998*, Glux-en-Glenne, 103 – 110.

Haselgrove, C., 2001. Iron Age Britain and its European Setting in J. Collis (ed.) *Society and Settlement in Iron Age Europe*, Actes du XVIIIe Colloque de l'AFEAF, Winchester (April 1994), Sheffield, J. R. Collis Publications, 37 – 72.

Haselgrove, C., 2007. The Age of Enclosure: Later Iron Age Settlement and Society in northern France in C. Haselgrove and T, Moore (eds.), The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 492 – 522.

Haselgrove, C., Armit, I., Champion, T., Creighton, J., Gwilt, A., Hill, J. D., Hunter, F., and Woodward, A., 2001. *Understanding the British Iron Age: an Agenda for Action*, Salisbury, Trust for Wessex Archaeology.

Haselgrove, C., and Millett, M., 1997. Verlamion Reconsidered in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, Oxford, Oxbow Monograph 71, 282 – 296.

Haselgrove, C., and Moore, T., 2007. New Narratives of the Later Iron Age in C. Haselgrove and T. Moore (eds.) *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 1 – 15.

Hattatt, R., 2000. *A Visual Catalogue of Richard Hattatt's Ancient Brooches*, Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Hawkes, C. F. C., 1995. *Camulodunum* in C. F. C. Hawkes and P. Crummy, *Camulodunum* 2, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust Ltd., 3 – 69.

Hawkes, C. F. C., and Dunning, G. C., 1932. The Second Belgic Invasion, *The Antiquaries Journal,* 12(4), October 1932, 411 – 430.

Hawkes, C. F. C., and Hull, M. R., 1947. *Camulodunum, First Report on the Excavations at Colchester,* Oxford, The Society of Antiquaries.

Hayden, B., 2001. Fabulous Feasts: A Prolegomenon to the Importance of Feasting in M. Dietler and B. Hayden (eds.) *Feasts: Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics and Power*, Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press, 23 – 64.

Hearne, C. M., and Cox, P. W., 1994. The Development of Settlement, Industry, and Trade on the Purbeck Heath and Southern Shores of Poole Harbour, Dorset in A. P. Fitzpatrick and E. L. Morris (eds.) *The Iron Age in Wessex: Recent Work*, Salisbury, Trust for Wessex Archaeology Ltd, 86 – 91.

Helm, R., 2004. Market Way, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Twenty-Eighth Annual Report, July 2003 – July 2004*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 10 – 12.

Helm, R., 2005. No. 8 Palace Street, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Twenty-Ninth Annual Report, July 2004 – July 2005*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 5 – 7.

Helm, R., 2008. Rhodaus Town, Canterbury, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Thirty-Second Annual Report, July 2007 – July 2008*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 1 – 6.

Henderson, J. C., 2009. *The Atlantic Iron Age: Settlement and Identity in the First Millennium BC*, London, Routledge.

Hendon, J., 1996. Archaeological Approaches to Domestic Labour: Household Practice and Domestic Relations *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 25, 45 – 61.

Hénon, B., 1995. Les Amphores de la Vallée de l'Aisne à La Tène Finale, *RAP*, 1-2, 149 – 186.

Hill, J. D., 1995a. 'The Pre-Roman Iron Age in Britain and Ireland (ca. 800 BC to AD. 100): An Overview', *The Journal of World Prehistory*, 9(1), 47 – 98.

Hill, J. D., 1995b. *Ritual and Rubbish in the Iron Age of Wessex: A study on the formation of a specific archaeological record*, BAR British Series 242, Oxford, Tempvs Reparatvm.

Hill, J. D., 2000. Great Sites: Little Woodbury, *British Archaeology*, 54, 14 – 17.

Hill, J. D., 2002a. Just about the potter's wheel? Using, Making, and Depositing Middle and Later Iron Age pots in East Anglia in A. Woodward and J. D. Hill (eds.) *Prehistoric Britain the Ceramic Basis*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 143 – 160.

Hill, J. D., 2002b. Pottery and the Expression of Society, Economy, and Culture in A. Woodward and J. D. Hill (eds.) *Prehistoric Britain the Ceramic Basis*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 75 – 84.

Hill, J. D., 2007. The Dynamics of Social Change in Later Iron Age Eastern and South-Eastern England c. 300 BC – AD. 43 in C. Haselgrove and T. Moore (eds.) *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*, Oxford, Oxbow, 16 – 40.

Hinchliffe, J., 1980a. Excavations at Ardleigh, *Catalogue. News of Archaeological Excavations in Colchester*, 6, Winter 1980, 7.

Hinchliffe, J., 1980b. Excavations at Ardleigh, *Colchester Archaeological Group Bulletin*, 23, 35.

Hinchliffe, J., 1981. The Ardleigh Project: A Summary, *Colchester Archaeological Group Bulletin,* 24, 2 – 5.

Hingley, R., 1984a. The Archaeology of Settlement and the Social Significance of Space, *Scottish Archaeological Review*, 3, 22 – 27.

Hingley, R., 1984b. Towards Social Analysis in Archaeology: Celtic Society in the Iron Age of the Upper Thames Valley in B. Cunliffe and D. Miles (eds.) *Aspects of the Iron Age in Central Southern Britain*, Oxford, University of Oxford Committee for Archaeology, 72 – 88.

Hingley, R., 1990. Boundaries surrounding Iron Age and Romano-British settlement, *Scottish Archaeological Review*, 7, 1990, 93 – 103.

Hingley, R., 1995. The Iron Age in Atlantic Scotland: Searching for the Meaning of the Substantial House in J. D. Hill and C. G. Cumberpatch (eds.) *Different Iron Age: Studies on the Iron Age in Temperate Europe*, BAR International Series 602, Oxford, Archaeopress, 195 – 191.

Hingley, R., 1997. Iron, Ironworking and Regeneration: a Study of the Symbolic Meaning of Metalworking in Iron Age Britain in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Communities*, Oxbow Monograph 71, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 9 – 18.

Hingley, R., 2006. Defining Community: Iron, Boundaries and Transformation in Later Prehistoric Britain in A. Harding, S. Sievers, and N. Venclová (eds.) *Enclosing the Past: Inside and Outside in Prehistory*, Bedfordshire, J. R. Collis Publications, 116 – 125.

Hingley, R., and Unwin, C., 2005. *Boudica: Iron Age Warrior Queen*, London and New York, Hambledon and London.

Hodder, I., 1979. Pre-Roman and Romano-British Tribal Economies in B. C. Burnham and H. B. Johnson (eds.) *Invasion and Response: The Case of Roman Britain*, BAR British Series, Oxford, 189 – 196.

Holman, D., 2005. Iron Age Coinage and Settlement in East Kent, *Britannia*, 36, 1 – 54.

Hone, D., and Bennett, P., 1989. No. 70 Castle Street, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Thirteenth Annual Report, July 1988 – July 1989*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 2.

Howell, I., 2014. Continuity and Change in the Later Iron Age-Roman Transition within the Environs of Quarry Wood *Oppidum*: Excavations at Furfield Quarry, Broughton Monchelsea, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 134, 37 – 66.

Hull, M. R., 1958. *Roman Colchester*, London, Society of Antiquarians London.

Hussey, R. C., 1874. British Settlement in Bigbury Wood, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 9, 13 – 15.

Jackson, R., 1988. *Doctors and Diseases in the Roman Empire*, London.

Jackson, R., 1998. Early Surgical Kit from Stanway, *The Colchester Archaeologist,* 11, 8 – 12.

Jacobi, G., 1974. *Werkzeug und Gerät aus dem Oppidum von Manching*, Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner.

James, E., 2001. *Britain in the First Millennium BC*, London, Hodder Arnold.

James, S., 1993. *Exploring the World of the Celts*, London, Thames and Hudson.

James, S., and Rigby, V., 1997. *Britain and the Celtic Iron Age*, London, British Museum Press.

Jansová, L., 1974. Zur Munzpragung auf dem Oppidum Závist, *Památky Archeologické*, 65, 1 – 33.

Jarrett, K., 2010. *Ethnic, Social, and Cultural Identity in Roman to Post-Roman Southwest Britain*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Sheffield.

Jay, M., 2008. Iron Age Diet at Glastonbury Lake Village: The Isotopic Evidence for Negligible Aquatic Resource Consumption, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 27(2), 2008, 201 – 216.

Jenkins, F., 1962. *Men of Kent Before the Romans,* Canterbury Archaeological Society, Occasional Papers No. 3, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Society.

Jenkins, H., 1842. Observations on the site of Camulodunum, *Archaeologia*, 29, 243 – 256.

Jessup, R. F. and Cook, N. C., 1936, Excavations at Bigbury Camp, Harbledown, *Archaeologia Cantiana* 48, 151 – 168.

Joy, J., 2011. Exploring Status and Identity n Later Iron Age Britain: Reinterpreting Mirror Burials in T. Moore and X-L. Armada (eds.) *Atlantic Europe in the First Millennium BC: Crossing the Divide*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 468 – 487.

Kaenel, G., 1998. Vevey, Münsingen, Saint-Suplice…Où sont les autres nécropoles celtiques du Plateau Suisse? In F. Müller (ed.) *Münsingen-Rain, ein Markstein der keltischen Archäologie*, 49 – 59.

Kappel, I., 1969. *Die Graphittonkeramik von Manching*, Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner.

Kelly, D. B., 1972. Quarry Wood Camp, Loose: A Beligic Oppidum, Archaeologia Cantiana, 86, 55 – 84.

Kent County Council, *Bloomery*, H.E.R Number: TR 05 NE 8, www.kent.gov.uk/exploringkentspast, accessed October 2012.

Kent County Council, *Belgic Occupation Site*, H.E.R Number: TR 15 NE 12, www.kent.gov.uk/exploringkentspast, accessed October 2012.

Kent County Council, *Iron Age Pit and Roman Building*, H.E.R Number: TR 15 NE 258, www.kent.gov.uk/exploringkentspast, accessed October 2012.

Kent County Council, *Late Iron Age / Early Roman Activity site near Diocesan House*, *26 Broad Street, Canterbury*, H.E.R Number: TR 15 NE 379, www.kent.gov.uk/exploringkentspast, accessed October 2012.

Kent County Council, *Iron Age Settlement*, H.E.R Number: TR 15 NW 22, www.kent.gov.uk/exploringkentspast, accessed October 2012.

Kent County Council, *Bigbury/Bigberry Camp, Harbledown*, H.E.R Number: TR 15 NW 33, www.kent.gov.uk/exploringkentspast, accessed October 2012.

Kent County Council, *Belgic Occupation Debris and Two Small Pits (68 – 69a Stour Street and Adelaide Place)*, H.E.R Number: TR 15 NW 211, www.kent.gov.uk/exploringkentspast, accessed October 2012.

Kent County Council, *Iron Age Building/Roman Street*, H.E.R Number: TR 15 NW 442, www.kent.gov.uk/exploringkentspast, accessed October 2012.

Kent County Council, *Late Iron Age – Early Romano-British Site at Sherford Farm Est., Broad Oak Road, Canterbury*, H.E.R Number TR 16 SE 88, www.kent.gov.uk/exploringkentspast, accessed October 2012.

King, A., 1990. *Roman Gaul and Germany*, London, British Museum Press.

Knörzer, K.-H., 1976. Späthallstattzeitliche Pflanzenfunde bei Bergheim, Erftkreis, *Rheinische Ausgrabungen*, 17, 151 – 185.

Körber-Grohne, U., and Piening, U., 1979. Verkohlte Nutz- und Wildpflanzenreste aus Bondorf, Kreis Böblingen, *Fundberichte aus Baden-Württemberg*, 4, 151 – 169.

Kornemann, E. 1942. Oppidum, *Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der klassichen Altertumswissenschaft* 18, 706 – 25.

Krämer, W., 1960. The *oppidum* of Manching, Antiqutiy 35 (135), in G. Carr and S. Stoddart (eds.) 2002 *Celts from Antiquity*, 63 – 78.

Krämer, W., and Schubert, S., 1970. Die Ausgrabungen in Manching 1955 – 1961 in W. Krämer (ed.) *Die Ausgrabungen in Manching 1*.

Kretz, R., 2008. The Trinovantian Staters of Dubnovellaunos in P. De Jersey and E. M. Screen (eds.) *The British Numismatic Journal*, 78, 1 – 31.

Kruta, V., 1980. La Gaule intérieure in G. Duby (ed.) *Histoire de la France Urbaine, I: La Ville Antique*, Paris, Le Seuil, 195 – 229.

Kunkel, O., 1961. Zur Frage keltischer Glasindustrie nach einer Manchinger Fundgruppe, *Germania*, 39, 322 – 399.

La Niece, S., and Cartwright, C. R., 2007. Examination of a bag of ?verdigris from AF18 in P. Crummy, S. Benfield, N. Crummy, V. Rigby and D. Shimmim, 2007. *Stanway: An Elite Burial Site at Camulodunum*, Britannia Monograph Series No. 24, London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 236 – 252.

Lambot, B., 1998a. Les Mortes d'Acy Romance (Ardennes) à La Tène Finale: Practique Funéraires, Aspects Religieux et Hiérarchie sociale, *Études et Documents Fouillés, 4: Les Celtes: Rites funéraires en Gaule du Nord entre le VIe et Ier siècle avant Jesus Christ*, Namier, 75 – 87.

Lambot, B., 1998b. Acy-Roman "La Warde", Ardennes: Travaux et recherché archéologiques de terrain in *BilanScientific DRAC Champagne-Ardenne for 1998,* Ministère de la Culture et de la Communican, 13 – 4.

Lambot, B., 2000. Victimes, Sacrificateurs et Dieux in V. Guichard and F. Perrin (eds.) *Les Druides*, Paris.

Lambot, B., 2002. Maisons et société à Acy-Romance (Ardennes) in P. Méniel and B. Lambot, 2002. *Repas des vivants et nourriture pour les morts en Gaule (Actes du XXVe colloque de l'AFEAF, Charleville-Mézières 2001)*, Reims, Mémoire de la Société Archéologique Champenoise 16.

Lambot, B., 2011. *Acy Romance Les Gaulois des Ardennes*, Ministère du la Culture et de la Communication, www.culture.fr, first accessed August 2013.

Lambot, B., Friboulet, M., and Méniel, P., 1994. *Le site protohistorique d'Acy Romance (Ardennes), II. Les nécropoles dans leurs contexte régional 1986 – 1988 – 1989*, Reims, Mémoire de la Société Archéologique Champenoise 8.

Lambot, B., and Méniel, P., 2000. Le centre communautaire et cultuel du village gaulois d'Acy-Romance dans son contexte regional, in S. Verger (ed.) *Rites et espaces en pays celte et m*éditerranéen, Rome, Collection de l'École Français de Rome 276, 7 – 139.

Lane, R., 2012. *Land adjacent to Giles Lane, St Edmund's School, St Thomas' Hill, Canterbury, Kent. Interim Report*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust.

Lane, R., 2014. *An Archaeological Excavations at Turing College, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust.

Laver, P. G., 1927. The Excavation of a Tumulus at Lexden Colchester, *Archaeologia,* 76, 241 – 254.

Leggatt, G., 1990. No. 30 North Lane, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Fourteenth Annual Report July 1989 – July 1990*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 5 – 6.

Lewuillon, S., 1990. Affinités, parentés et territoires en Gaule indépendante: fragments d'anthropologie, *Dialogues d'Historie Ancienne*, 16, 2 – 59.

Lufkin, T., and Smith, P., 1722. *Survey of the Earthworks on Lexden Heath*.

Mackreth, D. F., 1995. Pre-Roman and Roman Brooches in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P. Blockley, S.S. Frere and S. Stow *Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas*, *Part II: The Finds*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust Ltd, 955 – 982.

Mackreth, D. F., 2011. *Brooches in the late Iron Age and Roman Britain*, Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Maier, B., 2003. *The Celts. A History from Earlier Times to the Present*, trans. K. Windle, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Maier, F., 1970. *Die bemalte Spätlatènekeramik von Manching*, Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner.

Maier, F., 1991. The *Oppidum* of Manching, in S. Moscati, O. H. Frey, V. Kruta, B. Raftery, and N. Szabó (eds.) *The Celts*, New York, Rizzoli, 530 – 531.

Maltby, M., 1994. Animal Exploitation in Iron Age Wessex in A. P. Fitzpatrick and E. L. Morris (eds.) *The Iron Age in Wessex: Recent Work*, Salisbury, Trust for Wessex Archaeology Ltd, 9 – 11.

Maltby, M., 1996. The Exploitation of Animals in the Iron Age: the Archaeozoological Evidence in T. Champion and J. Collis (eds.), *The Iron Age in Britain and Ireland: Recent Trends*, Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 17 – 28.

Manning, W. H., 1996. Ironworking in the Celtic World in M. Green (ed.) *The Celtic World*, London, Routledge, 310 – 320.

Mattingly, D., 2007. *An Imperial Possession: Britain in the Roman Empire, 54 BC – AD.409*, London, Penguin Books.

May, J., 1971. An Iron Age Spout from Kirmington, Lincolnshire, *The Antiquaries Journal*, 51, 253 – 259.

May, J., 1976a. The Growth of Settlements in the Later Iron Age in Lincolnshire in B. Cunliffe and T. Rowley (eds.) *Oppida in Barbarian Europe,* BAR Supplementary Series II, Oxford, 163 – 180.

May, J., 1976b. *Prehistoric Lincolnshire*, Lincoln, History of Lincolnshire Committee.

McDonnell, G., 1993. The Slags and Metallurgical Residues in A. Clark, *Excavations at Mucking, Volume 1: The Site Atlas*, London, English Heritage and British Museum Press, 31 – 33.

McGrail, S., 1983. Cross-Channel Seamanship and Navigation in the late 1st Millennium BC, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology¸* 2(3), 299 – 337.

McGrail, S., 1996. Celtic Seafaring and Transport in M. Green (ed.) *The Celtic World*, London, Routledge, 254 – 281.

McOmish, D., 2011. *Oppida*, English Heritage, content.historicengland.org.uk, first accessed May 2015.

Meduna, J., 1991. The *Oppidum* of Staré Hradisko in S. Moscati, O. H. Frey, V. Kruta, B. Raftery, and N. Szabó (eds.) *The Celts*, New York, Rizzoli, 546 – 547.

Megaw, J. V. S., 1966. The Vix Burial, *Antiquity*, 40, 38 – 44.

Metzler, J., 1995a. *Das Treverisch Oppidum auf dem Titelberg Zur Kontinuitat zwischen der spätkeltischen und der frühromischen Zeit in Nord-Gallien, Band 1*, Luxembourg, Musée National d'Histoire et d'Art.

Metzler, J., 1995b. *Das Treverisch Oppidum auf dem Titelberg* (G.-H. Luxembourg) *Zur Kontinuitat zwischen der spätkeltischen und der frühromischen Zeit in Nord-Gallien, Band 2*, Luxembourg, Musée National d'Histoire et d'Art III.

Metzler, J., 2006. Religion et Politique l'Oppidum Trévire du Titelberg in C. Goudineau (ed.) *Religion et Société en Gaule*, Paris, 190 – 202.

Metzler, J., 2008. Du Titelberg à Trèves. De l'Oppidum Gaulois à la Ville Romaine in D. Castella, M.-F. Meyian Krause (eds.) *Topographie Sacrée et Rituels. La cas d'Aventicum, Capitale des Helvètes*, Basel, 155 – 165.

Metzler, J., and Gaeng, C., 2009. *Goeblange-Nospelt une nécropole aristocratique trévire*, Dossiers d'archeologie du musée national d'histoire et d'art XIII, Luxembourg, Musée National d'Historie et d'Art.

Metzler, J., Méniel, P., and Gaeng, C., 2006. Oppida et espaces publics in C. Haselgrove (ed.), *Celtes et Gaulois, l'Archéologie face* à *l'Histoire 4: Les mutations de la fin de l'âge du Fer*, Glux-en-Glenne, 201 – 224.

Metzler-Zens, N., Metzler-Zens, J., Méniel, P., Bis, R., Gaeng, C., and Villemeur, I., 1999. *Lamadelaine une nécrople de l'oppidum du Titelberg*, Dossiers d'archeologie du musée national d'histoire et d'art VI, Luxembourg, Musée National d'Histoire et d'Art.

Metzler, J., Waringo, R., Bis, R., Metzler-Zens, N., 1991. *Clemency et les tombes de l'aristocratie en Gaule Belgique*, Luxembourg.

Miles, D., Palmer, S., Lock, G., Gosden, C., and Cromarty, A. M., 2003, *Uffington White Horse and its Landscape: Investigations at White Horse Hill, Uffington, 1989 – 95 and Tower Hill Ashbury, 1993 – 4*, Thames Valley Monograph No. 18, Oxford.

Millard, L., 1975. *A Report of the Archaeological Implications of Development in Canterbury*, 2nd Edition, Canterbury, City of Canterbury Amenities and Recreation Department.

Millett, M., 1987. A question of time? Aspects of the future of pottery studies, *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology,* 24, 99-108.

Millett, M., 1990. *The Romanisation of Britain: An Essay in Archaeological Interpretation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Millett, M., 1999. Coloniae and Romano-British studies in H. Hurst (ed.) The Coloniae of Roman Britain: New Studies and a Review, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, Supplementary Series, 36, 191 – 196.

Millett, M., 2007. Roman Kent in J. H. Williams (ed.) *The Archaeology of Kent to AD. 800*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press and Kent County Council, 135 – 184.

Millett, M., and McGrail, S., 1986. Recovering the Hasholme Logboat, *Current Archaeology*, 99, Vol. IX,(4), 112 – 113.

Millett, M., and McGrail, S., 1987. The Archaeology of the Hasholme Logboat, *The Archaeological Journal*, 144, 69 – 155.

Milner, G. R., 1984. Social and Temporal Implications of Variation among American Bottom Mississippian Cemeteries, *American Antiquity*, 49(3), 468 – 488.

Minnitt, S., and Coles, J., 1996. *The Lake Villages of Somerset*, Taunton.

Moore, T., 2003. Rectangular Houses in the British Iron Age? – "Squaring the Circle" in J. Humphrey (ed.) *Re-searching the Iron Age*, Leicester Archaeology Monographs No. 11, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 47 – 58.

Moore, T., 2007. Life on the Edge? Exchange, Community, and Identity in the Later Iron Age of the Severn-Cotswolds in C. Haselgrove and T. Moore (eds.) *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 41 – 61.

Moore, T., 2012. Beyond the Oppida: Polyfocal complexes and late Iron Age societies in southern Britain, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 31(4), 391 – 417.

Moore, T., forthcoming. *Bagendon, the Birth of a Capital? Research and Excavations of a Late Iron Age Polyfocal Complex.*

Moore, T., Braun, A., Creighton, J., Cripps, L., Haupt, P., Klenner, I., Nouvei, P., Ponroy, C., and Schönfelder, M., 2013. Oppida, Agglomerations, and Suberbia: the Bibracte Environs and New Perspectives on Late Iron Age Urbanism in Central-Eastern France, *European Journal of Archaeology*, 16 (3), 491 – 517.

Morant, P., 1745. *Morant's Interpretations of Lufkin and Smith's Survey of the Earthworks on Lexden Heath*, held at the Essex Record Office (D/DQ 73).

Morant, P., 1748. *History and Antiquities of the Most Ancient Town and Borough of Colchester in the County of Essex*, Book 1, London.

Morant, P., 1758. *Morant's Plans and Maps of the Lexden Heath*, held at the Essex Records Office.

Morris, E., 1996. Artefact Production and Exchange in the British Iron Age in T. C. Champion and J. R. Collis (eds.) *The Iron Age in Britain and Ireland: Recent Trends*, Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 41 – 66.

Morris, E., 2002. Staying Alive: The Function and Use of Prehistoric Ceramic in A. Woodward and J.D. Hill (eds.) *Prehistoric Britain the Ceramic Basis*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 54 – 61.

Morris, E., 2007. Making Magic: Later Prehistoric and Early Roman Salt Production in the Lincolnshire Fenland in C. Haselgrove and T. Moore (eds.) *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 430 – 443.

Motyková, K., Drda, P., and Rybová, A., 1978. Metal, Glass, and Amber Objects from the Acropolis of Závist, *Památky Archeologické*, 59, 259 – 343.

Motyková, K., Drda, P., and Rybová, A., 1991. The *Oppidum* of Závist in S. Moscati, O. H. Frey, V. Kruta, B. Raftery, and N. Szabó (eds.) *The Celts*, New York, Rizzoli, 542.

Nash, D., 1976. The Growth of Urban Society in France in B. Cunliffe and T. Rowley (eds.) *Oppida in Barbaric Europe*, BAR Supplementary Series II, Oxford, 95 – 133.

Nash, D., 1978. Territory and state formation in central Gaul in D. Green, C. Haselgrove, and M. Spriggs (eds.) *Social Organisation and Settlement*, BAR S47, 455 – 475.

Nash, D., 1981. Coinage and State Development in Central Gaul in B. Cunliffe (ed.) *Coinage and Society in Britain and Gaul: Some Current Problems*, CBA Research Report No. 38, London, The Council for British Archaeology, 10 – 17.

Nash, D., 1984. The Basis of Contact between Britain and Gaul in the later pre-Roman Iron Age in S. Macready and F. H. Thompson (eds.) *Cross-channel trade between Gaul and Britain in the Pre-Roman Iron Age*, London, Thames and Hudson ltd., 92 – 107.

Nash, D., 1987. *Coinage in the Celtic World*, London, Seaby.

Nash, D., 1995. Introduction in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P. Blockley, S. S. Frere, and S. Stow, *The Archaeology of Canterbury Vol. V: Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas. Part II: The Finds*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 922 – 923.

Nash, D., and Sellwood, L., 1995. The Celtic Coins in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P. Blockley, S.S. Frere, and S. Stow, 1995. *Excavations in the Marlowe Car-park and Surrounding Areas, Part II: The Finds*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 922 – 926.

Nash Briggs, D., 1996. Coinage in M. Green (ed.) *The Celtic World*, London, Routledge, 244 – 253.

Niblett, B. R. K., 1988. Excavations in Areas E and F in K. A. Rodwell, *The Prehistoric and Roman Settlement at Kelvedon, Essex*, CBA Research Report 63, London, Council for British Archaeology, 12 – 14.

Niblett, R., 1985. *Sheepen: An Early Roman Industrial Site at Camulodunum*, London, Council for British Archaeology.

Niblett, R., 1993. A Royal Burial at St. Albans, *Current Archaeology*, 132, 484 – 488.

Niblett, R., 1999. *The Excavation of a Ceremonial Site at Folly Lane, Verulamium*, London, Britannia Monograph Series 14. London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Niblett, R., 2006. From Verlamion to Verulamium in P. Ottaway (ed.) *A Victory Celebration: Papers on the Archaeology of Colchester and Late Iron Age to Roman Britain presented to Philip Crummy*, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust, 19 – 26.

Northover, J. P., 1994. Bronze, Silver and Gold in Iron Age Wessex in A. P. Fitzpatrick and E. L. Morris (eds.) *The Iron Age in Wessex: Recent Work*, Salisbury, Trust for Wessex Archaeology Ltd, 19 – 22.

Northover, P., 1996. The Technology of Metalwork: Bronze and Gold in M. Green (ed.) *The Celtic World*, London, Routledge, 285 – 309.

Okun, M. L., 1989. An Example of the Process of Acculturation in the Early Roman Frontier, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 8(1), 41 – 54.

Orr, K., 2001. *An Archaeological Watching Brief at Colchester Institute, Sheepen Road, Colchester Essex, January – March 2001*, CAR 131, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Oswald, A., 1997. A Doorway on the Past: Practical and Mystic Concerns in the Orientation of Roundhouse Doorways in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstruction Iron Age Communities*, Oxbow Monograph 71, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 87 – 95.

Palmer, L., n.d. *Iron Age Kent 800 BC – AD.43*, Exploring Kent's Past, Kent County Council, www.kent.gov.uk, first accessed October 2012.

Parfitt, K., 1995. *Iron Age Burials from Mill Hill Deal*, London, British Museum Press.

Parfitt, K., 2013. East Wear Bay – A Port Trading with the Roman Empire? In I. Coulson (ed.) *Folkestone* to 1500: A Town Unearthed, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 36 – 37.

Parkes, P., 2006. Celtic Fosterage: Adoptive Kinship and Clientage in Northwest Europe, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 48, 359 – 395.

Parker-Pearson, M., 1996. Food, Fertility, and Front Doors in the First Millennium BC in T. Champion and J. Collis (eds.) *The Iron Age in Britain and Ireland: Recent Trends*, Sheffield, J. R. Collis Publications, 117 – 132.

Parker-Pearson, M., 1999. Food, Sex, and Death: Cosmologies in the British Iron Age with Particular Reference to East Yorkshire, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 9(1), 43 – 69.

Parker-Pearson, M., 2009. *The Archaeology of Death and Burial*, Stroud, History Press.

Parker-Pearson, M., and Richards, C., 1994. Architecture and Order: Spatial Representation and Archaeology in M. Parker-Pearson and C. Richards (eds.) *Architecture and Order: Approaches to Social Space*, London, Routledge, 38 – 72.

Parmenter, P., 2015. St Helena School, *The Colchester Archaeologist*, 27, (2013-4), 40 – 41.

Partridge, C., 1979. Excavations at Puckeridge and Braughing 1975 – 79, *Hertfordshire Archaeology*, 7, 28 – 132.

Partridge, C., 1981, *Skeleton Green: a later Iron Age and Romano-British site*, Britannia Monograph 2, London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Peacock, D. P. S., 1968. A Petrological Study of Certain Iron Age Pottery from Western England, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 34, 414 – 427.

Peacock, D. P. S., 1969. A Contribution to the Study of Glastonbury Ware from South-west Britain, *Antiquaries Journal*, 49, 41 – 61.

Peacock, D. P. S., 1971. Roman Amphorae in Pre-Roman Britain in M. Jesson and D. Hill (eds.) *The Iron Age and its Hillforts*, Southampton, Southampton University Archaeological Society, 161 – 179.

Peacock, D. P. S., 1977. Roman Amphorae: Typology, Fabric, and Origin, in G. Vallett (ed.) *Méthoes formelles dans l'étude des amphorae*, Collection de l'École Française de Rome 32, Rome, 261 – 278.

Peacock, D. P. S., 1982. *Pottery in the Roman World: an Ethnoarchaeological Approach*, London, Longman.

Peacock, D. P. S., 1984. Amphorae in Iron Age Britain: A Reassessment in S. Macready and F. H. Thompson (eds.) *Cross Channel Trade between Gaul and Britain in the Pre-Roman Iron Age*, London, Society of Antiquaries London Occasional Paper, 37 – 42.

Peebles, C. S., and Kus, S. M., 1977. Some Archaeological Correlates of Ranked Society, *American Antiquity*, 42, 421 – 448.

Petres, E., 1976. The Late Pre-Roman Age in Hungary with Special Reference to Oppida in B. Cunliffe and T. Rowley (eds.) *Oppida in Barbarian Europe,* BAR Supplementary Series II, Oxford, 51 - 80.

Peyre, C., 2000. Documents sur l'organisation publique de l'espace dan la cite gauloise. Le site de Villeneuve-Saint-Germain et al bilingue de Verceil,in S. Verger (ed.), *Rites et espaces en pays celte et méditerranéen*, Rome, Collection de l'École Française de Rome 276, 155 – 206.

Pitts, M., 2004. 'I Drink, Therefore I Am?' Pottery Consumption and Identity at Elms Farm, Heybridge, Essex, in B. Croxford, H. Echardt, J. Meade, J. Weekes (eds.) *TRAC 2003. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference Leicester,* Oxford, Oxbow, 16 – 27.

Pitts, M., 2005. Regional Identities and the Social use of Ceramics in J. Bruhn, B. Croxford, and D. Grigoropoulos (eds.) *TRAC 20004 Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference, Durham,* Oxford, Oxbow, 50 – 64.

Pitts, M., 2008. Globalizing the Local in Roman Britain: an Anthropological Approach to Social Change, *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 27(4), 493–506.

Pitts, M., 2010. Rethinking the Southern British Oppida: Networks, Kingdoms and Material Culture, *European Journal of Archaeology*, 13(1), 32 – 63.

Pitts, M., and Perring, D., 2006. The Making of Britain's First Urban Landscape: The Case of Late Iron Age and Roman Essex, *Britannia,* 37, 189 – 212.

Pleiner, R., 1982. Untersuchungen zur Schmiedetechnik auf den keltischen Oppida, *Pamatky Archeologické*, 73, 86 – 173.

Pollard, J., 1995. The Belgic and Early Roman Periods: Pottery from the Augustan to the Vespasianic Years in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P., Blockley, S.S. Frere, and S. Stow, *Exacavations in the Marlowe Car-park and Surrounding Areas, Part II: The Finds*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 585 – 629.

Pollard, J., 2002. The Nature of Archaeological Deposits and Finds Assemblages in A. Woodward and J. D. Hill (eds.), *Prehistoric Britain and the Ceramic Basis*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 22 – 33.

Pooley, L., and Benfield, S., 2005. *Excavations at Abbotstone Field, Bellhouse Pit, Tarmac Colchester Quarry, Warren Lane, Stanway 1999 – 2001*, Colchester Archaeological Trust Report 361, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust.

Pope, R., 2003. *Prehistoric Dwelling: Circular Structure in North and Central Britain c. 2500 BC – AD. 500*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Durham.

Poux, M., 2014a. La Ville in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 13 – 45.

Poux, M., 2014b. Sabrages d'amphores et cuves infernales in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 172 – 173.

Poux, M., ed., 2014c. *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance.

Poux, M., 2014d. Sabrages d'Amphores et Cuves Infernales in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 172 – 173.

Poux, M., and Garcia, M., 2014. Après la Ville Gauloise, in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 287 – 301.

Poux,, M., Pranyies, A., Vaudable, E., 2014. L'Entrepôt à vin in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 117 – 133.

Pratt, S., 2007. Whitehall Road, Canterbury, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Thirty-First Annual Report, July 2006 – July 2007*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 1 – 5.

Pratt, S., and Sweetinburgh, S., 2003. St Mildreds Tannery and Masons Yard, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Twenty-Seventh Annual Report, July 2002 – July 2003*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 10 -13.

Pranyies, A., 2014. La Société Urbaine in M. Poux (ed.) *Corent: Voyage au Coeur d'une ville Gauloise*, 2nd Edition, Paris, Editions Errance, 193 – 217.

Radford, D., 2013a. The Archaeological Evidence in in A. Gascoyne and D. Radford, 2013. *Colchester Fortress of the War God: An Archaeological Assessment*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 41 – 54.

Radford, D., 2013b. *Camulodunum* in the late Iron Age, c. 50 BC – AD. 43 in A. Gascoyne and D. Radford, 2013. *Colchester Fortress of the War God: An Archaeological Assessment*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 33 – 57.

Radford, D., 2013c. The early Roman *colonia*, AD.49 – 61 in A. Gascoyne and D. Radford, 2013. *Colchester Fortress of the War God: An Archaeological Assessment*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 77 – 98.

Rady, J., 1987. St Radigunds Street, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Eleventh Annual Report, July 1986 – July 1987*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 12 – 15.

Ralph, S., 2007. *Feasting and Social Complexity in Later Iron Age East Anglia*, BAR British Series 451, Oxford.

Ralston, I., 2006. *Celtic Fortifications*, Stroud, Tempus.

Rankin, D., 1996. *Celts and the Classical World,* London and New York, Routledge.

Reading, L. 1972. *Les Monnaies Gauloises du Tetelbierg*, Luxembourg.

Reinecke, P., 1930. Spätkeltische Oppida im rechtsrheinischen Bayern. *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsfreund* 9, 29 – 52.

Reynolds, P. J., 1974. Experimental Iron Age Storage Pits: An Interim Report, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 40, 118 – 131.

Reynolds, P. J., 1979. *Iron Age Farm, The Butser Experiment*, London, British Museum Publications Ltd.

Richardson, J. S., 2012. *Augustan Rome 44 BC – AD. 14 the Restoration of the Republic and the Establishment of the Empire*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Rieckhoff, S., 2010. Raumqualität, Raumgestaltung und Raumwahrnehmung im 2./1. Jahrhundert v. Chr., in P. Trebsche, N. Müller-Scheessel and S. Reinhold (eds.) *Der gebaute Raum. Bausteine einer Architektursoziologie vormoderner Geseuschaften*, Münster, 275 – 306.

Rieckhoff, S., and Fichtl, S., 2011. *Keltenstäde aus der Luft*, Stuttgart.

Rigby, V., 1986. Gaulish Fine-Ware Imports in I. Stead and V. Rigby, *Baldock: the Excavation of a Roman and Pre-Roman Settlement 1968 – 1972*, Britannia Monograph Series No. 7, London, The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 223 – 234.

Rigby, V., 1995. The Catalogue in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P., Blockley, S.S. Frere, and S. Stow, 1995. *Excavations in the Marlowe Car-park and Surrounding Areas, Part II: The Finds*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 653 – 663.

Rigby, V., and Freestone, I., 1985. Early Gaulish and Rhenish Imports: Discussion in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P. Blockley, S. S. Frere, and S. Stow, *The Archaeology of Canterbury Vol. V: Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas. Part II: The Finds*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 640 – 653.

Rigby, V., and Freestone, I., 1986. The Petrology and Typology of the Earliest Identified Central Gaulish Imports, *Journal of Roman Pottery Studies*, 1, 6 – 21.

Rigby, V., and Freestone, I., 1997. Ceramic Changes in Late Iron Age Britain in I. Freestone and D. Gaimster (eds.), *Pottery in the Making*, London, British Museum, 56 – 61.

Rodwell, K. A., 1988. *The Prehistoric and Roman Settlement at Kelvedon, Essex*, CBA Research Report 63, London, Council for British Archaeology.

Rodwell, W., 1973. An Unusual Bowl from Kelvedon, Essex, *Britannia,* 4, 265 – 267.

Rodwell, W., 1976. Coinage, Oppida and the Rise of Belgic Power in South-Eastern Britain in B. Cunliffe and T. Rowley (eds.) *Oppida in Barbaric Europe*, BAR Supplementary Series II, Oxford, 181 – 367.

Rodwell, W., 1978. Buildings and Settlements in south-east Britain in the later Iron Age in B. Cunliffe and T. Rowley (eds.) *Lowland Iron Age Communities* in Europe, BAR International Series (Supplementary Series) 48, Oxford, 25 – 42.

Rodwell, W., 1979. Iron Age and Roman Salt-Winning on the Essex Coast in B. Burnham and H. Johnson (eds.), *Invasion and Response: the Case of Roman Britain*, BAR 73, 133 – 179.

Roosens, H. (ed.), 1973. Grafveld met Gallo-Romeinse Tumulus te Berlingen, *Archaeologia Belgica*, 147, Brüssel.

Roosens, H. (ed.), 1974. Gallo-Romeinse Tumulus Te Helshoven Onder Hoepertingen, *Archaeologia Belgica*, 164, Brüssel.

Roosens, H. (ed.), 1976. Bestattungritual und Grabinhalt Einiger Tumuli im Limburger Haspengouw, *Archaeologia Belgica*, 191, Brüssel.

Rowlett, R. M., 1988. Titelberg. A Celtic Hillfort in Luxembourg, *Expedition*, 30(2), 31 – 40.

Rowlett, R. M., 1994. Did Iron Age Celts Really Hunt Wild Boar (Sos Scrofa)? *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, 14, 195 – 210.

Rowlett, R. M., Thomas, H. L., Rowlett, E. S – J., 1982. Stratified Iron Age House Floors on the Titelberg, Luxembourg, *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 9(3), 301 – 312.

Roymans, N., 1990. *Tribal Societies in Northern Gaul: An Anthropological Perspective*, Amsterdam, Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Roymans, N., 2007. Understanding Social Change in the Later Iron Age Lower Rhine Region in C. C. Haselgrove and T. Moore (eds.) *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 478 – 491.

Roymans, N., 2009. Hercules and the construction of a Batavian identity in the context of the Roman empire, in T. Derks and N. Roymans (eds.), *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: The Role of Power and Tradition*, Amsterdam Archaeological Studies 13, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 219 – 238.

RPS, 2011. *Colchester Alienated Land Project. Interim Report for the Phases 3 – 5 archaeological and heritage investigations*, London, RPS Group.

Salač, V., 2009. Zur Interpretation der Oppida in Böhmen und in Milleleuropa in R. Karl and J. Leskovar (eds.) *Interpretierte Eisenzeiten 3. Fallstudien, Methoden, Theorie*, Linz, 237 – 252.

Salway, P., 1981. *Roman Britain*, Oxford History of England, Oxford.

Sande Lemos, F., Cruz, G., Fonte, J., and Valdez, J., 2011. Landscape in the Late Iron Age of Northwest Portugal in T. Moore and X-L. Armada (eds.) *Atlantic Europe in the First Millennium BC: Crossing the Divide*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 187 – 204.

Sanders, W. T., 1974. Chiefdom to State: Social Evolution at Kaminaljuyu, Guatemala in C. B. Moore (ed.) *Reconstructing Complex Societies: an Archaeological Colloquium*, Supplement to the Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research No. 20, Cambridge Massachusetts, Henry N. Sawyer, 97 – 121.

Schäfer, A., 2010. *Berching-Pollanten II: Die Kleinfunde der jüngerlatènezeitlichen Siedlung Berching-Pollanten*, Rahden/Westf.

Schindler, R., 1971. Ein Kriegergarb mit Bronzehelm der Spätlatènezeit aus Trier-Olewig, *Trierer Zeitschrift*, 34, 43 – 82.

Sealey, P. R., 1985a. *Amphoras from the 1970s Excavations at Colchester, Sheepen,* B.A.R: British Series 142, Oxford.

Sealey, P. R., 1985b. The Amphoras Summary and Conclusions in R. Niblett *Sheepen: An Early Roman Industrial Site at Camulodunum*, London, Council for British Archaeology, 98 – 113.

Sealey, P. R., 1995. New Light on the Salt Industry and Red Hills of Prehistoric and Roman Essex, *Essex Archaeology and History*, 26, 65 – 81.

Sealey, P. R., 1996. The Iron Age of Essex in O. Bedwin (ed.) *The Archaeology of Essex Proceedings of the 1993 Writtle Conference*, 46 – 68.

Sealey, P. R., 1999a. Cauldron Pit in N. R. Brown, *The Archaeology of Ardleigh Essex: Excavations 1955 – 1980*, East Anglian Archaeological Report No. 90, Chelmsford, Essex County Council, 31 – 33.

Sealey, P. R., 1999b. Finds from the Cauldron Pit in N. R. Brown, *The Archaeology of Ardleigh Essex: Excavations 1955 – 1980*, East Anglian Archaeological Report No. 90, Chelmsford, Essex County Council, 117 – 124.

Sealey, P. R., 1999c. The Character and Function of the Cauldron Pit in N. R. Brown, *The Archaeology of Ardleigh Essex: Excavations 1955 – 1980*, East Anglian Archaeological Report No. 90, Chelmsford, Essex County Council, 178 – 180.

Sealey, P. R., 2004. *The Boudiccan Revolt against Rome*, 2nd Edition, Buckinghamshire, Shire Publications Ltd.

Sealey, P. R., 2006. The Kelvedon Warrior, *The Colchester Archaeologist,* Issue No. 19, 2006, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust, 30 – 31.

Sealey, P. R., 2007. *A Late Iron Age Warrior Burial from Kelvedon Essex*, East Anglian Archaeology Report, No. 118, Colchester, Colchester Museum.

Sealey, P. R., 2009. New Light on the Wine Trade with Julio-Claudian Britain, *Britannia XI,* 1 – 40.

Sealey, P. R., 2015. Where have all the People Gone? A Puzzle from Middle and Late Iron Age Essex, *Archaeological Journal*, 173, 1, 30 – 55.

Sealey, P. R., Forthcoming a. 'Amphoras', in M. Atkinson, M and S. J. Preston. forthcoming. *Heybridge: a late Iron Age and Roman settlement, excavations at Elms Farm, 1993-5*. Internet Archaeology, e-monograph.

Sealey, P. R., Forthcoming b., *The Iron Age of Essex Revisited*.

Sharples, N., 1990. Late Iron Age Society and Continental Trade in Dorset, *Revue Archéologie Ouest Supplement* 3, 299 – 304.

Sharples, N., 2010. *Social Relations in later Prehistory*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Sharples, N., and Parker-Pearson, M., 1997. Why were Brochs Built? Recent Studies in the Iron Age of Atlantic Scotland in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, Oxbow Monograph 71, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 254 – 265.

Sherwin-White, A. N., 1970. Oppidum, *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 753.

Shimmin, D., 2011. St Clare Road's Hidden Past, *The Colchester Archaeologist,* 24, 26.

Sievers, S., 2006. Oppida und ihre linearen Strukturen in A. Harding, S. Sievers, and N. Venclová (eds.) *Enclosing the Past: Inside and Outside in Prehistory*, Bedfordshire, J. R. Collis Publications, 126 – 134.

Smith, V., n.d. *The Defence of Kent*, Exploring Kent's Past, Kent County Council, www.kent.gov.uk, first accessed October 2012.

Sparey-Green, C., 2009. Preliminary Survey of Earthworks in the Vicinity of Bigbury Camp and in the Blean Woods, *Canterbury Archaeological Trust Thirty-Third Annual Report*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 32 – 35.

Sparey-Green, C., 2010. Homestall Wood Earthworks, Harbledown, Kent in *Kent Archaeological Society Newsletter*, 86, Winter 2010, 14-15.

Spratling, M., 1973. The Bronze Foundry in G. J. Wainwright and M. Spratling, The Iron Age settlement of Gussage All Saints, Antiquity 47 (186), in G. Carr and S. Stoddart (eds.), 2002. *Celts from Antiquity*, 187 – 214.

Spratling, M., 1979. The debris of Metalworking [from Gussage All Saints, Dorset] in Wainwright, G. J., *Gussage All Saints: An Iron Age settlement in Dorset*, London, Departments of the Environment Archaeological Report No. 10., 125 – 153.

Stead, I., 1967. A La Tène Burial and Welwyn Garden City, *Archaeologia*, 101, 1 – 62.

Stead, I., 1996. *Celtic Art in Britain before the Roman Conquest*, London, British Museum.

Stead, I., 2006. *British Iron Age Swords and Scabbards*, London, British Museum Press.

Stead, I., and Rigby, V., 1989. *Verulamium: the King Harry Lane site*, English Heritage Archaeological Report 12, London, English Heritage.

Steponaitis, V., 1978. Locational Theory and Complex Chiefdoms: A Mississippian Example in B. D. Smith (ed.) *Mississippian Settlement Patterns*, New York, Academic Press, 417 – 453.

Strong, D. E., 1967. 'Silver Cup' in I. Stead, A La Tène Burial and Welwyn Garden City, *Archaeologia*, 101, 20 – 22.

Stukeley, W., 1759. *Earthworks of Lexden Heath*, held at the Essex Records Office.

Symonds, R. P., and Wade, S., 1999. *Colchester Archaeological Report 10: Roman Pottery from Excavations in Colchester, 1971 – 86*, Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust Ltd.

Taylor, J., 1997. Space and Place: Some Thoughts on Iron Age and Romano-British Landscapes in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, Oxbow Monograph 71, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 192 – 204.

Tchernia, A., 1983. Italian wine in Gaul at the end of the Republic in P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins and C. R. Whittaker (eds.), *Trade in the Ancient Economy*, London, 87 – 104.

Thill, G., 1966a. Fouilles du Musée sur le Titelberg en 1959, *Hemecht* 18, 483 – 491.

Thill, G., 1966b. Goeblingen-Nospelt, *Hémecht*, 18, 482 – 491.

Thill, G., 1967. Goeblingen-Nospelt, *Hémecht*, 19, 87 – 98, 199 – 203.

Thill, G., 1968. Travaux de realisation du Musée, Rapport du Conservateur, *Publication de la Section Historique*, 84, 27 and Figures 2 – 3.

Thomas, H. L., Rowlett, R. M., Rowlett, E. S – J., Gilbert, B. M., and Rondinelli, R., 1976. Excavations on the Titelberg, Luxembourg, *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 3(3), 241 – 259.

Thompson, F. H., 1979. Interim Report on the Excavations at Bigbury, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 95, 301 – 303.

Thompson, F. H., 1980. Interim Report on the Excavations at Bigbury, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 96, 411 – 413.

Thompson, F. H., 1983, Excavations at Bigberry, near Canterbury, 1978-80, *The Antiquaries Journal*, 63(2), 237 – 278.

Thompson, H., 1993. Iron Age and Roman Slave Shackles, *Archaeological Journal*, 150, 1, 57 – 168.

Thompson, I., 1982. *Grog-tempered 'Belgic' Pottery of Southeastern England*, B.A.R. Series 108, Oxford.

Thompson, I., 1995. The 'Belgic' Pottery of Canterbury in in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P. Blockley, S. S. Frere, and S. Stow, *The Archaeology of Canterbury Vol. V: Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and Surrounding Areas. Part II: The Finds*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 625 – 629.

Thompson, I., and Barford, P. H., 1986. Late Iron Age Pottery and Briquetage from Elms Park House, Ardleigh, 1981, *Essex Archaeological and History: the Transactions of the Essex Society for Archaeology and History*, Vol. 17 (Third Series), Norfolk, Witley Press, 166 – 170.

Thompson, I., and Green, M. J., 1995. The pottery from Hut B3, Marlowe Theatre in K. Blockley, M. Blockley, P., Blockley, S.S. Frere, and S. Stow, *Exacavations in the Marlowe Car-park and Surrounding Areas, Part II: The Finds*, Canterbury, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, 629 – 632.

Tillard, L., 1986. *Contribution á l'étude du verre et du lignite dans les sites d'habitat du Bassin Parisiem á La Tène moyenne et finale. La material de Levroux (Indre): Memorie de Maîtrise, Université de Paris I*, Paris.

Tillard, L., 1989. Les bracelets et les perles en verre de Levroux in M. Feugère (ed.) *Le verre préromain et Europe occidentale*, Montagnae, M. Mergoil, 137 – 144.

Tilley, C., 1994, *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments*, Oxford, Berg.

Timby, J., 1982. *Gallo-Belgic Fine Wares: A Study in Characterisation, Distribution and Development During the First Centuries BC and AD*, University of Southampton PhD Thesis (Unpublished).

Timby, J., 2000. Gallo-Belgic Wares in M. G. Fulford and J. Timby, 2000. *Late Iron Age and Roman Silchester Excavations on the Site of the Forum Basilica, 1977, 1980 – 86*, British Monograph 15, London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 196 – 204.

Timby, J. R., and Rigby, V., 2007. *Gallo-Belgic Pottery in Britain*, Gallo-Belgic Database: Internet Editions, http://ox.ac.uk: first accessed September 2012.

Todd, M., 1981. *Roman Britain 55 BC – AD. 400*, Fontana.

Trow, S., 1982. The Bagendon Project 1981 – 2: A Brief Interim Report, *Glevensis*, 1, 26 – 29.

Tyres, P. A., 1996. *Pot Sherd: Atlas of Roman Pottery*, http;//potsherd.net/atlas/class/AMPH, first accessed: January 2013.

van Arsdell, R. D., 1992. Money, supply and credit in Iron Age Britain in M. Mays (ed.) *Celtic Coinage: Britain and Beyond*, BAR British Series 222, Oxford, 139 – 150.

Van de Noort, R., 2011. Crossing the Divide in the First Millennium BC: A Study into the Cultural Biographies of Boats in T. Moore and X-L. Armada (eds.) *Atlantic Europe in the First Millennium BC: Crossing the Divide*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 522 – 533.

van der Broeke, P., 1995. Iron Age Sea Salt Trade in the Lower Rhine area in in J. D. Hill and C. G. Cumberpatch (eds.) *Different Iron Ages: Studies on the Iron Age in Temperate Europe*, BAR International Series 602, Oxford, Archaeopress, 149 – 162.

van der Leeuw, S., n.d. *Chaos, information and urban systems*, Iron Age Symposium, Cambridge, 1988.

van der Veen, M., and Jones, G., 2007. The Production and Consumption of Cerals: a Question of Scale in C. Haselgrove and T. Moore (eds.) *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 419 – 429.

Vanderhoeven, A., 1996. The Earliest Urbanisation in Northern Gaul: Some Complications of Recent Research in Tongres in N. Roymans (ed.) *From the Sword to the Plough: Three Studies on the Earliest Romanisation of Northern Gaul*, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 189 – 260.

Vauvillé, O., 1904. L'Enceinte de Pommiers (Aisne), *Noviodunum des Suessions. Bulletin de la société archéologique de Soissons*, 12, 312 – 361.

Vauvillé, O., 1912. Fibules Gauloise de l'oppidum de Pommiers (Aisne) et de l'oppidum situé sur les territoires de Liercourt et Erondelle (Somme), *Bulletin de la Société Préhistorique Français*, 9, 303 – 307.

Venclová, N., 2006. Enclosing, Enclosures and Elites in the Iron Age in A. Harding, S. Sievers, and N. Venclová (eds.) *Enclosing the Past: Inside and Outside in Prehistory*, Bedfordshire, J. R. Collis Publications, 140 – 154.

Wacher, J. S., 1975. *The Towns of Roman Britain*, London, Batsford.

Wainwright, G., J., 1973. The Settlement in Wainwright, G. J., and Spratling, M., The Iron Age settlement of Gussage All Saints, Antiquity 47 (186), in G. Carr and S. Stoddart (eds.), 2002. *Celts from Antiquity*, 187 – 214.

Wainwright, G. J., 1979, Gussage *All Saints: An Iron Age settlement in Dorset*, London, Departments of the Environment Archaeological Report No. 10.

Wainwright, G. J., and Spratling, M., The Iron Age settlement of Gussage All Saints, Antiquity 47 (186), in G. Carr and S. Stoddart (eds.) 2002 *Celts from Antiquity*, 187 – 214.

Wanscher, O., 1980. *Sella Curulis: The Folding Stool. An Ancient Symbol of Dignity*, Copenhagen.

Ward-Perkins, J. B., 1944. Excavations on the Iron Age Hill-fort of Oldbury, near Ightham, Kent, *Archaeologia*, 90, 127 – 176.

Webley, L., 2003. Iron Age Houses and Social Space. A Case Study of the Three-Aisled Longhouses of Northern Europe during the Pre-Roman and Early Roman Iron Age in J. Humphrey (ed.) *Re-searching the Iron Age*, Leicester Archaeology Monographs No. 11, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 59 – 68.

Webley, L., 2008. *Iron Age Households. Structure and Practice in Western Denmark, 500 BC-AD. 200*, Aarhus, Aarhus University Press.

Webster, J., 1996. Sanctuaries and Sacred Places in M. Green (ed.) *The Celtic World*, London, Routledge, 445 – 464.

Wells, P., 1984. *Farms, Villages, and Cities: Commerce and Urban Origins in Late Prehistoric Europe*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Wells, P., 1987. Commerce and Temperate Europe's First Cities Preliminary Report on 1987 Excavations at Kelheim, Bavaria, *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 14(4), 399 – 412.

Wells, P., 1990. Iron Age Temperate Europe: Some Current Research Issues, *Journal of World Prehistory*, 4(4), 437 – 476.

Wells, P., 1995. Settlements and Social Systems at the end of the Iron Age in B. Arnold and D. B. Gibson (eds.) *Celtic Chiefdom Celtic State*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 88 – 95.

Wells, P., 1996. Resources and Industry in M. Green (ed.) *The Celtic World*, London, Routledge, 213 – 243.

Wells, P., 2001. *Beyond Celts, Germans and Scythians*, London, Duckworth.

Wells, P., 2002. The Iron Age in S. Milisauskas (ed.), *European Prehistory A Survey*, New York, Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers, 335 – 384.

Williams, D. F., 1981. The Roman Amphorae Trade with Late Iron Age Britain in H. Howard and E. L. Morris (eds.) *Production and Distribution: A Ceramic Viewpoint*, BAR International Series 120, Oxford, 123 – 132.

Williams, D. F., 1986. The Amphorae in J. Foster, 1986. *The Lexden Tumulus*: *A Re-appraisal of an Iron Age burial from Colchester, Essex*, BAR: British Series 156, Oxford, 124 – 132.

Williams, D. F., 1987. The Amphorae in B. Cunliffe *Hengistbury Head Dorset*, *Vol. 1: The Prehistoric and Roman Settlement 3500 BC – AD. 500*, Monograph 31, Oxford, Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, 271-275, 277.

Williams, J. H. (ed.), 2007. *The Archaeology of Kent to AD. 800*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press and Kent County Council.

Willis, S., 1994. Roman Imports into Late Iron Age British Societies: towards a critique of existing models in S. Cottam, D. Dungworth, S. Scott, and J. Taylor (eds.), *TRAC 94: Proceedings of the Fourth Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference, Durham 1994*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 141 – 150.

Willis, S., 2002. A Date with the Past: Late Bronze and Iron Age Pottery and Chronology in A. Woodward and J. D. Hill (eds.) *Prehistoric Britain and the Ceramic Basis*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 4 – 21.

Willis, S., 2007. Sea, Coast, Estuary, Land, and Culture in Iron Age Britain in C. Haselgrove and T. Moore (eds.) *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 107 – 129.

Wilson, D. R., 1977. A First-Century Fort near Gosbecks, Essex, *Britannia,* 8, 185 – 187.

Woodward, A., 1997. Size and Style: An Alternative Study of Some Iron Age Pottery in Southern England in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds.) *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, Oxbow Monograph 71, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 26 – 35.

Woodward, A., and Hill, J. D., 2002a. Introduction in A. Woodward and J.D. Hill (eds.) *Prehistoric Britain the Ceramic Basis*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 1 – 3.

Woodward, A. and Hill, J.D. (eds.), 2002b. *Prehistoric Britain the Ceramic Basis*, Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Woolf, G., n.d. *Assessing social complexity in the final Iron Age of Central France*, Iron Age Seminar, Cambridge, 1987.

Woolf, G., 1993a. Rethinking the Oppida, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 12(2) July, 223 – 234.

Woolf, G., 1993b. The Social Significance of Trade in Later Iron Age Europe in C. Sarre and F. Healy (eds.) *Trade and Exchange in Prehistoric Europe*, Oxbow Monograph 33, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 211 – 218.

Woolf, G., 1998. *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilisation in Gaul*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Wymer, J., and Brown, N. R., 1995. *North Shoebury: Settlement and Economy in South-East Essex 1500 BC – AD. 1500*, East Anglian Monograph 75, Chelmsford, East Anglican Archaeology.

Wyss, R., 1974. Technik, Wirtschaft, Handel und Kriegswesen der Eisenzeit, in W. Drack (ed.), *Ur- und frühgeschichtliche Archäologie der Schweiz IV: Eisenzeit*, Basel, Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Ur- und Frühgeschichte, 104 – 138.

Ylangisako, S. J., 1979. Family and Household: the Analysis of Domestic Groups, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 8, 161 – 205.