

**Channel Tunnel Rail Link
London and Continental Railways
Oxford Wessex Archaeology Joint Venture**

**The later prehistoric pottery from Eyhorne Street,
Hollingbourne, Kent (420 68+100-68+500 99)**

by Grace Pepetua Jones

CTRL Specialist Report Series

2006

©London and Continental Railways

All rights including translation, reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of London and Continental Railways.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	4
2	METHODOLOGY	4
3	CHRONOLOGY.....	4
4	TAPHONOMY	5
5	THE FABRICS	5
5.1	Fabric descriptions	6
6	THE FORMS	8
6.1	The footring bowl (R1, Fig. 1, No. 1).....	8
6.2	The conical cup (R3, Fig. 1, No. 2).....	8
6.3	Proto-saucepan pot (R2, Fig. 1, Nos 3, 5, 6, 9) and saucepan pot (R8, Fig. 1, No. 13).....	8
6.4	Neckless ovoid jars (R4, Fig. 1, No. 4 and R5, Fig. 1, No. 7)	9
6.5	Carinated jar (R6, Fig. 1, No. 8).....	9
6.6	Long-necked vessel (R7, Fig. 1, No. 10).....	9
7	SURFACE TREATMENTS.....	9
8	EVIDENCE OF USE.....	11
9	VESSEL SIZE.....	12
9.1	Rim diameter	12
9.2	Vessel capacity	12
9.3	Vessel wall thickness.....	12
10	DISCUSSION.....	12
11	CATALOGUE OF ILLUSTRATED SHERDS.....	14
12	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	14

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Eyhorne Street - Later prehistoric pottery, 1-13

1 INTRODUCTION

A Targeted Watching Brief at south-east of Eyhorne Street (ARC 420/68+200/99) produced pottery dating from the early and later prehistoric periods, the latter is reported on here. A total of 591 sherds (5006 g) of later prehistoric pottery was recovered from field excavation and environmental sampling, in accordance with the Fieldwork Event Aims. The material was in poor condition with a relatively high number of fresh breaks. The mean sherd weight (MSW) was 8.5 g. The pottery ranged in date from the early Iron Age to the middle Iron Age period, with a general focus on the early/middle Iron Age ceramic phase. The material derived from 26 contexts, representing three ditches, seven pits, three hollows and two layers (quantification by feature in Table 1).

2 METHODOLOGY

The complete later prehistoric pottery assemblage has been fully analysed and any earlier prehistoric pottery extracted for analysis by the appropriate specialist. The recording system recommended by the Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group (PCRG 1997) has been adhered to. All data was recorded onto pro forma sheets and then transferred to a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet for analysis. Each sherd, or group of related sherds, was given a pottery record number (PRN) as a unique identifier. The fabric codes used for the recording system are alpha numeric, the letter or letters, indicating the dominant inclusion, and the number used to differentiate between fabrics with the same major inclusions. Quantification was by count, weight and estimated vessel equivalent (EVE). Form type and vessel wall thickness have been recorded, plus the presence and location of surface treatments, decoration and evidence of use. All identifiable rims have also been recorded onto separate featured sherd pro formas and sketched.

Each PRN has been assigned an early and late date on the basis of both form and fabric. Phasing of the form types has been carried out using comparative material from other sites in the Kent region where possible, or from well known sites in the south of England such as Danebury (Brown 2000). Phasing of the fabrics has been carried out using comparative examples from other sites and the relationships with known form types. Radiocarbon dating will provide a means to create an absolute chronology for the route-wide phasing. Key groups of pottery have been selected for illustration, each group representing a single feature. All form types have been presented.

3 CHRONOLOGY

On the basis of the fabrics, forms and surface treatments of the later prehistoric vessels from Eyhorne Street the earliest features reported on here (see Table 1) are assigned to an

early Iron Age ceramic phase, and the latest features are assigned to a middle Iron Age ceramic phase. The single exception is ditch 229 which could only be placed in a general prehistoric phase. A number of key indicators support this chronology, including the rustication of vessel surfaces. Rustication has been recorded during the early Iron Age in the Kent area (Macpherson-Grant 1991), and has a widespread tradition in northern France throughout the fifth to the third centuries BC (T Champion pers comm). The footring bowl (R1) present in pit 226 is characteristic of middle Iron Age forms, and the conical cup (R3) in pit 226 is paralleled by vessels in French La Tène I cemeteries (cf. Rozoy 1987). The proto-saucepan pot is the most frequently occurring form, and may be assigned to the early/middle Iron Age ceramic phase. Therefore the diagnostic features within the assemblage may be placed within the early/middle Iron Age ceramic phase.

In this respect the pottery may be used to address chronological issues including *Updated Research Aim 1: to refine and confirm the chronology of the site*. It specifically addresses parts of objectives 2, 3, 4 and suggests that the later prehistoric activity commenced during the early Iron Age and therefore a considerable amount of time had lapsed since the earlier prehistoric use of the site. There is no evidence that the settlement continued in use after the end of the middle Iron Age.

4 TAPHONOMY

The bulk of the later prehistoric pottery recovered from Eyhorne Street came from pits, which accounted for 71% of the total sherd count and 90% of the total weight (Table 2). The next largest group came from features classified as hollows: 18% of the total count but just under 5% of the weight. Layers produced 8% of the count and 4% of the weight, and ditches accounted for only 2% of the count and less than 1% of the weight. This is reflected in the mean sherd weights with pits producing much larger sherds than other feature classes (Table 2). Only eight contexts produced over 25 sherds of pottery (contexts 11, 34, 117, 178, 220, 223, 224 and 225), the minimum number considered to be required for a reliable estimation of phase (PCRG 1997, 21). Of these eight contexts groups four had a mean sherd weight of under 5 g (contexts 11, 34, 117 and 223).

The bulk of the pottery was recovered from pits in the north-western part of the site, predominantly from adjacent pits 217 and 226, and pits 170 and 175.

5 THE FABRICS

Nine later prehistoric fabrics were identified in the assemblage and recorded with the aid of a binocular microscope (x10 – x30 power). Three samples were taken for petrological analysis to confirm the fabric description of QF1 and to ascertain the full range of inclusions present in fabrics GQ1 and Q3. The fabrics are detailed below and quantified in Table 3. The following

grain size classifications have been used: coarse silt, <0.06 mm; very fine sand, >0.06-<0.13 mm; fine sand, >0.13-<0.25 mm; medium sand, >0.25-<0.5 mm; coarse sand, >0.5-<1 mm; very coarse sand, >1-<2 mm; granules, >2-<4 mm.

5.1 Fabric descriptions

F1. A soft sandy fabric, containing moderate (10-15%) angular flint, ≤ 2 mm, moderately sorted, and the occasional piece of rounded flint detritus, ≤ 7 mm. Rare to sparse (2-3%) red iron oxides, sub-rounded to rounded, ≤ 1 mm. Rare (1%) organic matter. The earliest ceramic phase of this fabric is the early Iron Age, the latest phase is the middle Iron Age.

GQ1. A soft soapy fabric, containing very common (25%) sub-angular to angular black and red grog, finely processed, ≤ 0.5 mm. Sparse (3-5%) medium to coarse size quartz grains; sparse (2%) rounded iron oxides (black), ≤ 3 mm. May also contain clay pellets. The fabric is very fine; a thin section revealed that the silt sized quartz grains within the grog fragments were clearly smaller than the those of the clay matrix of the secondary vessel. An unidentified rounded, yellow inclusion was also visible. The clay matrix is iron rich, containing quartz sand and a possible piece of chert. The fabric had been used for a single early/middle Iron Age to middle Iron Age vessel, the R3 conical cup (PRN 1007).

Q1. A soft sandy fabric, containing abundant (50%) glauconite and quartz grains. The glauconite is ≤ 0.5 mm, rounded and very well sorted; the quartz grains are clear and glassy, sub-rounded, coarse to very coarse in size. The earliest ceramic phase of this fabric is the early Iron Age, the latest phase is the middle Iron Age.

Q2. A soft and sandy fabric, with very common (25-30%) sub-angular to angular quartz grains, coarse size, well sorted. Sparse (3-5%) angular flint, ≤ 1 mm, well sorted. The earliest ceramic phase of this fabric is the early Iron Age, the latest phase is the middle Iron Age.

Q3. A soft soapy fabric containing very common (30%) sub-angular to sub-rounded quartz grains, medium to coarse sized, poorly sorted. Smaller, silt sized grains are also present within the clay matrix. Thin section has shown the clay matrix to be distinctively iron rich with 7% rounded red iron oxides. A rare to sparse (2-3%) amount of voids are visible in hand specimen and thin section, some linear in shape, ≤ 8 mm, others are more rounded, 1 mm diameter. They result from the burning out of organic matter from the vessel and are not thought to represent temper. An unknown mineral was located in the hand specimen and thin section, it represented less than 5% of the inclusions present within the fabric. One piece of naturally occurring limestone was also present. The fabric was used to construct a single vessel, the R1 footring bowl (PRN 1002). It has been placed in the middle Iron Age phase.

QF1. A soft sandy fabric, containing abundant (40%) grains of glauconite and quartz. The glauconite is sub-rounded to rounded, ≤ 0.5 mm, very well sorted; the quartz grains are sub-rounded to rounded, medium sized with occasional coarse grains, moderately to well sorted. The glauconite is present in a larger percentage than the quartz. Moderate (10%) red iron oxides, sub-rounded to rounded, <1 mm, well sorted. Sparse to moderate (7-10%) angular calcined flint, ≤ 7 mm (most fragments are 1-2 mm), moderate to poorly sorted, angular. One piece of shell was observed in thin section. The earliest ceramic phase of this fabric is the early Iron Age, the latest phase is the middle Iron Age.

QF2. QF2 is a fine ware version of QF1. The clay matrix appears to be the same, containing abundant (40%) glauconite and quartz, the former is sub-rounded to rounded, ≤ 0.5 mm, very well sorted; the latter are sub-rounded to rounded, <1 mm. The fabric is sparsely (3-5%) punctuated by fine, calcined, angular flint fragments, 0.5-1 mm, well sorted. The earliest ceramic phase of this fabric is the early Iron Age, the latest phase is the middle Iron Age.

QF3. Intermediate between the coarse ware QF1 and fine ware QF2. Uses the same clay matrix as fabrics QF1 and QF2, containing abundant (40%) grains of glauconite, <0.5 mm, very well sorted and rounded; with coarse to very coarse rounded grains of quartz. It also contains sparse (3-5%) calcined flint, ≤5 mm (mostly 1-2 mm). The earliest ceramic phase of this fabric is the early Iron Age, the latest phase is the middle Iron Age.

5.1.1 Fabrics discussion

Four of the fabrics contained abundant glauconite grains and quartz, demonstrating a very similar clay matrix. The basic fabric, Q1, tended to be used for vessels that were unoxidised and occasionally burnished or smoothed on one or both surfaces. Sparse amounts of fine, well processed calcined flint had been added to this basic clay matrix and used for fine ware vessels, recorded as fabric QF2. Again vessels tended to be unoxidised with well finished surfaces. A much coarser version of the fabric is QF1, which was used for the formation of vessels with much thicker walls. The vessels were mostly irregularly fired and often demonstrated a roughened exterior surface and smoothed interior surface. Rustication may also be seen on the exterior surfaces, applied in the same fabric as the vessel walls. Fabric QF3 represents an intermediate glauconitic fabric. Together these fabrics account for 90% of both the total count and weight of the later prehistoric assemblage. The other fabrics identified did not contain glauconite and together represented only 10% of the assemblage.

5.1.2 Source of the raw materials

The site lies on a narrow band (1 km wide) of the Folkestone Beds of the Lower Greensand, at the junction with a band of Gault clay to the immediate north. Up to 2 km north of the site are bands of Lower Chalk and Middle Chalk with flints. Beyond 2 km lie drift deposits of Head Gravel and clay-with-flints. To the south of the site are large swathes of the Hythe Beds, pockets of Atherfield Clay and further drift deposits of Head. Small areas of Fourth Terrace river gravels were also accessible from the site (information from Geological Survey of Great Britain, Sheet 288, 1976).

The glauconite identified in 90% of the pottery is mostly likely to have derived from the Lower Greensand, on which the site is situated. The flint temper seen in the glauconite fabrics and non glauconitic fabrics was also available locally in the Middle Chalk, the drift deposits of clay-with-flints, or from river gravel deposits. Morris (1994a; 1994b) has advocated the use of Arnold's 1985 ethnographic study to define local resource procurement. Within the study Arnold found that the preferred distance potters are willing to travel for clay is less than 7 km, or up to 10 km for additional tempering material. Using this model, the inclusions identified in the later prehistoric pottery fabrics from Eyhorne Street may be interpreted as originating from local sources. One possible exception is fabric GQ1 which was used for pedestal cup form R3. The form is unusual, and petrological analysis revealed one unidentified inclusion, but no conclusions could be drawn regarding the source of this vessel.

6 THE FORMS

Eight form types were identified at Eythorne Street, each represented by a single vessel with the exception of the proto-saucepan pot, R2, of which a possible six examples were recorded. The maximum number of vessels identifiable by rim type is therefore 13. A further six vessels are represented by unidentifiable rim fragments, recorded as R99. The total number of EVEs was 1.98. The correlation between these forms and their fabric types is shown in Table 4, however the occurrence of single examples of nearly all the form groups precludes meaningful discussion of these correlations.

6.1 The footring bowl (R1, Fig. 1, No. 1)

Form R1 is an S-shaped necked bowl with everted, rounded rim, rounded shoulder and footring base. The vessel, from pit 226, was unique in this assemblage. Once reconstructed it was possible to see the unusual way in which the vessel had broken, appearing as if it had been vertically cleaved, leaving just over half of the vessel intact. It is not certain how this occurred, or if it has ritual significance.

The form is paralleled in the assemblages from Oldbury in West Kent and Crayford in north-west Kent (Champion pers. comm.). At Ardale School, South Essex, the form is seen in the middle Iron Age period (Hamilton 1988). A decorated version of the bowl was recorded from Shoeburyness, Essex, and also placed in the middle Iron Age period (Stamatakis 2000). Cunliffe suggested a date range of 5th to 3rd century BC for a footring vessel recovered during works on the A2 (Cunliffe 1980, 179).

6.2 The conical cup (R3, Fig. 1, No. 2)

Form R3 is a thin walled conical cup with solid pedestal base. The vessel is again unique in the assemblage and was also recovered from pit 226. No parallels have been identified from published sites in the UK, however similar forms have been recorded from La Tène I cemeteries in the Champagne region of France, classified as *Gobelet*: vessels under 12 cm tall (Rozoy 1987, 109).

6.3 Proto-saucepan pot (R2, Fig. 1, Nos 3, 5, 6, 9) and saucepan pot (R8, Fig. 1, No. 13)

Form R2 was slack-sided and had a squared undifferentiated rim, with slight internal bevel. Form R8 was better developed, having a well formed neutral shape with undifferentiated rim and burnished exterior. Vessels similar in form to the proto-saucepan pot have been identified at Ardale School (Hamilton 1988) and are dated to the middle Iron Age period. Vessels displaying the characteristics of forms R2 and R8 were also seen from sites along the A2 where they were believed to date to 500-350 BC (Cunliffe 1980, 179). Saucepan pots plus more primitive examples of the form were also recorded at Hawkinge, Folkestone (Thompson

2000). At Danebury saucepan pot PA1 was placed in ceramic phase (cp) 3-5, 470-310 BC, and PA2 in cp 4-6, 360-270 BC. The Eyhorne proto-saucepan pot shows some similarities to the more barrel-shaped JC1 vessels at Danebury, dated 470-50 BC (Brown 2000).

6.4 Neckless ovoid jars (R4, Fig. 1, No. 4 and R5, Fig. 1, No. 7)

The R4 ovoid jar has a squared, but otherwise undifferentiated, rim. Form R5 is similar but with a more well-sprung rounded body. Neckless ovoid jars have been recorded from Dumpton Gap, Kent (Bryan, unpublished). The form is difficult to date, but the presence of rustication on the lower exterior of both forms suggests an early-middle Iron Age range (discussed further below).

6.5 Carinated jar (R6, Fig. 1, No. 8)

Form R6 is a fine carinated jar with upright rim and sharply shouldered profile.

6.6 Long-necked vessel (R7, Fig. 1, No. 10)

Form R7 has a flat-topped upstanding rim, a long, slightly concave neck, and a sloping shoulder. A similar form was present at Baker Street, South Essex, where a Bronze Age/early Iron Age date was suggested (Hamilton 1988). At Eyhorne Street it was recorded from pit 170 in an early-middle Iron Age fabric and is therefore later in date at this site.

7 SURFACE TREATMENTS

It has not been possible to ascertain if certain form types were linked to specific surface treatments as most forms are represented by a single example; the results would therefore not be statistically viable. Form R1 was burnished all over, as might be expected for a fine ware bowl. Three examples of form R2 displayed surface treatments, one was smoothed on both surfaces, another wiped on both surfaces and one displayed burnishing and wiping on the exterior. The R3 cup was burnished all over, which may have been for functional reasons as burnishing will make the surface less porous, or alternatively the treatment may have been executed for purely aesthetic reasons as the cup was probably designed for use at social occasions. The R4 had a roughened applied clay finish on the lower exterior (rustication) and a smoothed interior. Rustication was noted in the same position on form R5, and the upper exterior and interior had traces of burnishing. Form R6 was burnished on the upper interior, possibly to aid the removal of contents, and form R7 was smoothed in the shoulder region. The R8 saucepan pot was burnished on the exterior. Danebury saucepan pot form PA2 was characterised by smoothed or burnished surfaces (Brown, 2000, 90).

The presence of surface treatments on the pottery has been quantified (Table 5) by the number of pottery records (a single sherd or group of related sherds, each representing no more than one vessel) and also by count of sherds. Weight is not shown as treatments such as

burnishing, which is often seen on very thin walled and therefore smaller, lighter sherds, may be poorly represented in the results.

7.1.1 Burnishing

Burnishing used as a single treatment was typically applied to thin walled vessels with wall thickness of under 9 mm, and most commonly on those under 7 mm (Table 6). No vessels of 13 mm and greater thickness had burnishing as their only surface treatment. It is therefore not surprising that burnishing was most commonly executed on vessels in the fine ware QF2 fabric (83% of the total number of sherds in that fabric group were burnished). The coarse QF1 fabric is rarely burnished (only 5% of the total number of QF1 sherds). Intermediate fabric QF3 was occasionally burnished (10%) and fine Q1 was often burnished (61%). Fabrics GQ1 and Q3 were each represented by single burnished vessels. Fabrics F1 and Q2 were never burnished.

7.1.2 Red finished vessels

Two sherds displayed a red finish on the exterior surface. PRN 1091 (weighing 4 g), had a red finished exterior surface and highly burnished interior surface, and derived from a round bodied bowl in fine ware fabric QF2. The second example was PRN 1155 (8 g), but the red colour was much more patchy and indeterminate on this sherd. The fabric was the coarser QF1, and the sherd formed part of a rim which was unfortunately unidentifiable. It had been smoothed on all surfaces.

Middleton (1995) has reviewed the evidence for red-finished pottery from eastern Kent and found that, with few exceptions, the finishes were achieved ‘by the oxidation of applied, iron-rich coatings, i.e. these are true hematite-coated wares’ (Middleton 1995, 209). They are found on sites from the late Bronze Age to middle Iron Age, including Minnis Bay, Highstead, Dumpton Gap, Ebbsfleet Farm and Folkestone (*ibid*). There was a general uniformity in the fabric of red-finished wares from these sites, consisting of silty, flint-tempered fabrics. Middleton concluded that although the similarity of fabrics was not conclusive evidence of the centralised manufacture and distribution of red-finished pottery in eastern Kent, ‘they certainly suggest that manufacture was in some way specialised’ (*ibid.*).

7.1.3 Smoothing and wiping

Smoothing was recognised on eight pottery records, ten sherds, either on the external surface or both surfaces. It was seen on vessels in fabrics Q1, QF1, QF2 and QF3, with a wall thickness of 7-14 mm.

The external surface of a small number of vessels had been wiped using vegetation or perhaps some kind of cloth. Finger wiping was also recognised. This amounted to four pottery records, 23 sherds, on fabrics QF1, QF3 and Q99.

7.1.4 Rustication

A number of the Eyhorne Street vessels had a rough exterior surface. This ranged from a quite heavily applied additional layer of clay (in the same fabric as the vessel: glauconitic sand with flint fragments) and recorded as rustication, to a more generally roughened surface, recorded simply as roughened. There is a continuum between the two and they have not been viewed as separate surface treatments as both created a similar effect. In total, 26 of the pottery records (15%) and 91 sherds (15%) had roughened or rusticated external surfaces. The technique was not recorded on sherds with a wall thickness of 9-14 mm (Table 7). It was found on only two fabrics, coarse ware QF1 (78 sherds, 30% of the count of this fabric) and the intermediate version, QF3 (13 sherds, 9% of the fabric count).

Where recognisable on rims it could be seen that this form of surface treatment was not applied to the uppermost portion of the vessel, but tended to start in the shoulder area. Rustication was often associated with smoothing or burnishing on the interior of the vessels, and this combination was recognised on 56% of the number of rusticated sherds. It was particularly evident on those with the more heavily applied clay and flint layer. At Dumpton Gap, where the technique is recorded during the early/middle Iron Age period (Bryan 2000), the most common surface treatments were burnishing and rustication (often in association on the same vessel), and again the applied clay was not present on the upper area of the vessels.

During the prehistoric period in Britain rustication may be viewed as a Kentish phenomenon, deriving from the Continent. It first appeared on sites such as Highstead, near Chislet, in the late Bronze Age/early Iron Age transition period (Period 3A) and became dominant there during the early Iron Age (Period 3B), when an increase in the wall thickness of vessels was also seen. It is not known for how long rustication remained in use. The technique was prevalent in the East Kent area, particularly from sites on the Isle of Thanet (Canterbury 1991, 41-48). At Ebbsfleet, Isle of Thanet, rustication was recorded on coarse ware jars of the early to middle Iron Age phase (Macpherson-Grant 1992, 289).

7.1.5 Decoration

Only two examples of possible decoration were noted on the later prehistoric vessels. PRN 1139 had possible stabbed decoration on the exterior, but the sherd was too small to confirm this (1 g). PRN 1147 had vertical scoring on its burnished exterior surface.

8 EVIDENCE OF USE

Traces of use in the form of sooting, abrasion, limescale and pitting were almost absent from the assemblage with the exception of one body sherd (PRN 1027), 14 g in weight, which had an internal burnt residue.

9 VESSEL SIZE

9.1 Rim diameter

Of the 19 rims recorded from the later prehistoric pottery at Eyhorne Street, 11 were too small to estimate the vessel diameter. The remaining rims had diameters between 60 mm and 340 mm, each represented by a single example with the exception of the 200 mm diameter size which had two examples, both of form R2 (Table 8).

9.2 Vessel capacity

Two complete profiles were reconstructable and the capacity of the vessels could be measured. The formula used ($\pi \times \text{radius} \times \text{radius} \times \text{height}$) is applicable to cylindrical shapes and should therefore be seen only as a guide to the estimated volumes. The footring bowl (R1, Fig. 1, No. 1) had an estimated capacity of 1.39 litres, and the conical cup (R3, Fig. 1, No. 2) a capacity of 0.13 litres.

9.3 Vessel wall thickness

Vessel wall thickness ranged from less than 5 mm to 21 mm, and is shown in relation to fabrics in Table 9. The finer ware fabrics QF2, GQ1, Q1, Q3 are clearly represented by thinner walled sherds, with the coarse wares such as QF1 used only for vessels of over 9 mm in thickness. It is also evident that the thicker walled vessels have broken into larger, heavier sherds than the thinner walled vessels, with a progression from a mean sherd weight of 1.2 g for thin walled vessels (thickness code 1, <5 mm), up to 133 g for very thick walled vessels (thickness code 9, 20-<22 mm). Vessels with a wall thickness of 9-11 mm had broken into sherds of a size that represented the site average.

10 DISCUSSION

The later prehistoric pottery assemblage from Eyhorne Street was recovered from 13 features representing low-level settlement activity in the form of pits, ditches and hollows. The collection was small (5 kg) and appeared to be confined to the early-middle Iron Age period. The focus of pottery deposition during this period appeared to be on the northern part of the site, in particular pits 226 and 217, pits 170 and 175, and also pit 14. The average sherd weight from these features was higher than elsewhere on the site and suggests that the material had been less subjected to processes of redeposition than that from other features on the site. The pottery may not have been moved too far from its last place of use or breakage (Hill 1995, 21). The remaining features on the site contained lesser quantities of material, and had far lower average sherd weights. The pottery from these features may therefore have moved a greater distance from its final place of use before burial.

By and large, the inclusions identified in the fabrics were available within 7 km of the site and may therefore be defined as local (after Morris 1994a; 1994b). The bulk of the pottery, 90% by count and weight, contained abundant grains of glauconite and quartz which are representative of the immediately local Lower Greensand geology. The clays were clearly felt to be adequate for potting and it appears that a basic clay matrix was used almost unaltered for a fine sandy ware (Q1). Sparse amounts of well processed flint were added to produce another fine ware (QF2), sparse amounts of slightly larger flints were then added to produce an intermediate ware (QF3) and moderate amounts of coarse flint were included for thicker walled vessels (QF1). A single geological source was therefore used for the bulk of the pottery, and represents a single ceramic tradition and possibly a single potter. The vessel forms are dominated by proto-saucepan pots and ovoid jars.

Two vessels stand out as clearly unique. One is a classic footring bowl, the other a small conical cup. Both were unique in fabric, the former dominated by quartz inclusions, the latter was grog-tempered, and both had iron rich clay matrices. Nothing specific was identified in the fabrics to suggest that they did not represent local clay sources, and indeed the form of the footring bowl finds a number of parallels across the region. The cup, however, is unique in form and firing. The surfaces are unoxidised, but both the internal and external margins are oxidised. This form of ‘sandwich firing’ was not seen on any of the other vessels in this assemblage. No comparable forms have been identified in the British literature, although examples may be found from excavation reports from the Champagne region of northern France (Rozoy 1987). Petrological analysis of this vessel has revealed that the fabric contains an unidentified rounded, yellow coloured inclusion. Further analysis by a specialist in this subject may clarify this, however it is currently not possible to ascertain if this vessel had indeed been imported from France, or represents a local imitation. It is, however, clear evidence of contact with the Continent, as is the presence of rusticated vessels. Macpherson-Grant (1992, 292-293) has commented that the early-middle Iron Age period is marked by its links with the Continent, which are visible by the occurrences of rustication and certain form types, as well as polychrome decoration (not present in the Eythorne Street assemblage) and describes the period as ‘a regionally unique cultural entity’.

Both the footring bowl and the conical cup were recovered from the primary fill (context 225) of pit 226. The cup had been deposited whole, and the footring bowl had been broken in a rather unusual way, with just under half being almost sliced vertically away, leaving a perfect profile. The completeness of these two unique vessels, placed together in the base of a pit without other forms of refuse such as animal bone, suggests that they may have been laid down according to rules of order and represent a structured deposit (Hill 1995, 100) rather than the casual deposition of domestic refuse.

11 CATALOGUE OF ILLUSTRATED SHERDS

(PRN, Pottery Record Number in database)

Figure 1

1. S-profile necked footring bowl with rounded shoulder and slightly everted rim. Burnished surfaces. Form R1, fabric Q3. PRN 1002, context 225, pit 226.
2. Conical cup with pedestal base. Burnished surfaces. Form R3, fabric GQ1. PRN 1007, context 225, pit 226.
3. Proto-saucepan pot with squared undifferentiated rim and slight internal bevel. Irregularly finished rim. Slack vessel walls. Form R2, fabric QF3. PRN 1003, context 225, pit 226.
4. Ovoid jar with flat-topped rim and slight internal bevel. Smoothed interior and upper exterior, rusticated lower exterior. Form R4, fabric QF1. PRN 1025, context 224, pit 226.
5. Squared undifferentiated rim, probably from proto-saucepan pot. Form R2, fabric QF1. PRN 1015, context 223, pit 226.
6. Flat-topped irregularly finished rim. Appears to be from a proto-saucepan pot. Form R2, fabric QF3. PRN 1051, context 220, pit 217.
7. Flat-topped rim, rounded on the exterior. Neck zone is slightly concave. Well sprung ovoid jar. Smooth on both surfaces, possibly once burnished, rustication on lower exterior. Form R5, fabric QF1. PRN 1057, context 220, pit 217.
8. Upright rim from fine ware carinated jar. Form R6, fabric QF2. PRN 1048, context 220, pit 217.
9. Flat-topped irregularly finished rim from proto-saucepan pot. Traces of burnishing and wiping are present on the exterior. Form R2, fabric QF3. PRN 1147, context 172, pit 170.
10. Flat-topped upstanding rim, on long necked vessel with sloping shoulder. The neck is slightly concave. Smoothed upper exterior. Form R7, fabric QF1, PRN 1153, context 172, pit 170.
11. Internally expanded rim, unknown profile. Form R99, fabric QF1, PRN 1155, context 173, pit 170.
12. Rim possibly from form R2 or R4. Form R99, fabric QF2. PRN 1156, context 173, pit 170.
13. Saucepan pot with squared rim and burnished exterior surface. Form R8, fabric Q1. PRN 111, context 34, hollow/pit 33.

12 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnold, D, 1985 *Ceramic theory and cultural process*, Cambridge

Brown, L, 2000 The regional ceramic sequence, in *The Danebury environs programme: the prehistory of a Wessex landscape* (ed B Cunliffe), Oxford, 79-126

Bryan, E V, 2002 Iron Age pottery from Dumpton Gap, Broadstairs, unpublished MA dissertation, University of Southampton

Cunliffe, B, 1980 Overall discussion of the Iron Age pottery, in Macpherson-Grant, N, *Archaeological work along the A2: 1966-1974*, *Archaeol Cantiana* **96**, 174-179.

Hamilton, S, 1988 Earlier first millennium BC pottery from Rectory Road and Baker Street, in Wilkinson, T J, *Archaeology and environment in South Essex, rescue archaeology along Grays bypass 1979-80*, *East Anglian Archaeol Report* **42**, Essex, 77-86

Hill, J D, 1995 *Ritual and rubbish in the Iron Age of Wessex*, *Brit Archaeol Rep (Brit Ser)* **242**, Oxford

Macpherson-Grant, N, 1991 A re-appraisal of prehistoric pottery from Canterbury, *Canterbury's Archaeology 15th annual report 1990-1991*, Canterbury, 38-48

Macpherson-Grant, N, 1992 The pottery, in Perkins, R J, Archaeological evaluations at Ebbsfleet in the Isle of Thanet, *Archaeol Cantiana* **110**, 286-293

Middleton, A P, 1995 Prehistoric red-finished pottery from Kent, in *Unbaked urns of rudely shape* (eds I Kinnes and G Varndell), Oxford, 203-210

Morris, E L, 1994a Production and distribution of pottery and salt in Iron Age Britain: a review, *Proc Prehist Soc* **60**, 371-393

Morris, E L, 1994b The organisation of pottery production and distribution in Iron Age Wessex, in *The Iron Age in Wessex: recent work* (eds A P Fitzpatrick and E L Morris), Association Française d'Etude de l'Age du Fer/Trust for Wessex Archaeol, Salisbury, 26-29

PCRG, 1997 *The study of later prehistoric pottery: general policies and guidelines for analysis and publication*, reprint, Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group, Occasional Papers **1** and **2**, Oxford

Rozoy, J G, 1987 *Les Celtes en Champagne, les Ardennes au second Age du Fer: le Mont Troté, les Rouliers*, Volumes 1 & 2, Charleville-Mézières, France

Stamataki, P, 2000 Report on the prehistoric pottery from Shoeburyness, Essex, unpublished MA report, University of Southampton

Thompson, I, 2000 Late Iron Age pottery from Hawkinge Airfield, Folkestone, Kent, unpublished draft report produced for Archaeology South-East