

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

**The Roman pottery from Little Stock Farm,  
Mersham, Kent (ARC LSF99)**

by Rachel Every

**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**

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>METHODS OF ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>FABRICS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>FORMS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>CHRONOLOGY AND PHASING.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>GENERAL DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>4</b>

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Fabric types by number and weight (g).....	3
---	---

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Only 9 sherds (47 g) of pottery of late Iron Age to early Roman date were recovered from excavations at Little Stock Farm. The fabrics all appear to be locally made with a single diagnostic sherd which cannot be assigned a form due to its size. The condition of the material is variable, but generally average to worn. No surface treatments were recorded and the mean sherd weight is 5.2 g.

## 2 METHODS OF ANALYSIS

The pottery was recorded using a project-specific Access database. Fabric types were defined following the Canterbury Archaeological Trust (CAT) type series for Roman pottery. Definition of vessel forms was based on established regional series (Marsh and Tyers 1978; Monaghan 1987). Details of decoration, surface treatment, manufacture, use-wear and condition were also recorded. Quantification in all cases is by both number and weight of sherds.

## 3 FABRICS

Seven different fabric types were recorded in five ware groups (Table 1). All the fabrics are coarse and locally made comprising; coarse oxidised wares (R70, R74.1 and R74.3), grey wares (R73 and R73.1), grog-tempered wares (B1.1) and a coarse sand- and flint-tempered ware (R102). Some of the fabric attributions were uncertain, principally owing to the small size of the sherds.

*Table 1: Fabric types by number and weight (g)*

Fabric Type	Fabric Name	Number	Weight (g)
B1.1	'Belgic' fine/coarse grog-tempered	1	13
R70	Pink buff fine/coarse sandy (some CC)	1	2
R73	?Coarse grey sandy (some CC) ?source	2	9
R73.1	Black-burnished-type	1	4
R74.1	?Coarse orange (some CC) ?source	2	2
R74.3	?Coarse buff (some CC) ?source	1	1
R102	?Local flint and sand-tempered	1	11
TOTAL		9	47

## 4 FORMS

A single rim sherd was recovered from ditch 2208. This was too small to allow identification of the form.

## 5 CHRONOLOGY AND PHASING

The overall distribution of pottery is sparse. Six contexts produced pottery. Layers 2301, 2508 and 2544 contained six sherds and ditches 2208 (Subgroup 5010), 2239 (Subgroup 5013) and 2323 (Subgroup 5014) yielded more than a single sherd each. These features are all situated at the far east of the site.

## 6 GENERAL DISCUSSION

The assemblage comprises certainly or probably locally-made wares, including a range of coarse wares but no fine or specialist wares. The lack of diagnostic sherds means that only a broad overall date range can be defined, from the late Iron Age through the early part of the Roman period (perhaps *c* AD 1-300) is proposed, but fabric B1.1 has quite a wide date range and the whole group could date after the Roman Conquest.

## 7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Marsh, G, and Tyers, P, 1978 The Roman pottery from Southwark, in *Southwark excavations 1972-1974*, Joint Pub No 1 London and Middlesex Archaeol Soc, Surrey Archaeol Soc, 533-582.

Monaghan, J. 1987 *Upchurch and Thameside Roman Pottery: A Ceramic typology for Northern Kent, first to third centuries A.D.* BAR British Series 173, Oxford