

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

**The late Iron Age and Roman pottery from White
Horse Stone, Boxley, Kent**

by Dan Stansbie

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	3
2	METHODOLOGY	3
3	FABRICS AND VESSEL TYPES	3
3.1	Late Iron Age	4
3.2	Early Roman.....	4
3.3	Late Roman	4
3.4	Pottery from contexts of broad Roman date.....	5
4	CHRONOLOGY AND DISCUSSION.....	6
5	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	6

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Roman Pottery Quantification.....	3
Table 2:	Roman pottery quantification, fabrics by phase	5
Table 3:	Roman pottery quantification, percentage of fabrics by phase	5
Table 4:	Vessel types by phase, quantification by rim count/EVEs.....	6

1 INTRODUCTION

Some 193 sherds, weighing 1122 g, were recovered from the site. Contexts yielded groups weighing an average of 33 g and the average sherd weight was 6 g, indicating that the pottery was in poor condition. Sherds were small and abraded and the size of some rim sherds meant that forms could only be identified at a very general level of confidence. The assemblage spanned the mid 1st century BC to the late 4th century AD, and was dominated by pottery from late Iron Age and early Roman contexts which made up 22% and 49% of the assemblage by weight respectively. Pottery from contexts which could only be assigned a broad Roman date range comprised 24% of the assemblage by weight, but pottery from late Roman contexts was relatively insignificant at 5% of the assemblage by weight.

2 METHODOLOGY

The pottery was recorded using the standard methodology devised for the recording of Roman pottery from sites along the CTRL Section 1 route. Fabrics were identified in terms of codes in the Canterbury Archaeological Trust series (see Table 1 below). Quantification was by sherd count and weight, and where possible, minimum number of vessels (MV) based on a count of rims, and estimated vessel equivalence (EVE), calculated from the surviving proportions of rim sherds. Forms were matched with the classes set out in the Southwark typology (Marsh and Tyers 1978; Davies *et al.* 1994, 6-8), although in practice Monaghan's (1987) corpus of North Kent and Upchurch ware types proved to be more useful for identification and dating.

3 FABRICS AND VESSEL TYPES

Summary fabric descriptions with quantification are given in Table 1. Quantification of fabrics in terms of site phases is presented in Tables 2 and 3. The correlation of fabric with broad vessel types is shown in Table 4.

Table 1: Roman Pottery Quantification

Fabric	Description	No. Sh	Wt (g)	EVEs
B1	Fine grog-tempered wares	23	55	0.02
B3	Grog-tempered wares with sparse flint	13	48	
B5	Grog-tempered wares with sand	3	12	
B5.1	Grog and shell tempered fabric	9	191	0.25
B6	Shell-tempered wares	9	52	0.10
B8	Fine sandy wares	1	7	0.07
B9	Coarse sandy wares	11	34	
LIAB1	Flint-tempered fabrics	17	60	
R15	Verulamium region white ware	1	3	
R17.1	Fine orange 'Upchurch'-type ware	19	102	
R18.1	Fine white-slipped oxidised 'Upchurch' ware	39	258	
R42	South Gaulish samian ware	1	1	
R73.3	Early Thameside medium sandy grey ware	25	168	0.36

Fabric	Description	No. Sh	Wt (g)	EVEs
R74.1	Coarse orange sandy wares	8	36	
R100	General grey/black sandy ware	6	11	
R150	White/buff fine fabric with black sand (?glauconite)	8	84	
Total		193	1122	0.80

3.1 Late Iron Age

Pottery from late Iron Age contexts accounts for 22% of the site assemblage by weight. Contexts containing exclusively grog-tempered pottery are common and grog-tempered wares (B1, B5.1) dominate the group, accounting for 50% by sherd count and 75% by weight. Non-grog-tempered 'Belgic' type wares including shell-tempered wares (B6), fine sandy wares (B8), coarse sandy wares (B9), and flint-tempered fabrics (LIAB1) are also present and comprise 42% by sherd count and 23% by weight. Some 'non-Belgic' fabrics, such as coarse orange sandy ware (R74.1) and white/buff ware (R150) were also present in late Iron Age contexts and together account for the remaining 8% of the pottery (2% by weight). Sherds in these fabrics may have been intrusive in this phase. Four vessels, three jars and one bowl, were represented by rims. One jar was in fine grog-tempered ware, a wide-mouthed everted rimmed jar (Monaghan form 3I1) was in grog and shell-tempered fabric and a bead rimmed jar (Monaghan form 3E1.2) in shell-tempered fabric. The bowl with a gentle everted rim (Monaghan class 4D) was in fine sandy ware.

3.2 Early Roman

A greater range of fabrics was recovered from contexts dating to the early Roman period and these account for 49% of the total assemblage by weight. The early Roman assemblage is dominated by fine white-slipped oxidised 'Upchurch' ware (R18.1) at 44% by sherd count and 47% by weight. Reduced fabrics in the form of grey sandy ware (R73.3) were also prominent (16% by sherd count and 12% by weight). Late Iron Age 'Belgic' type material from early Roman contexts was partly but probably not entirely residual - it amounted to 31% (22% by weight) of the pottery in this group, comprising flint tempered fabrics (LIAB1), fine grog-tempered wares (B1 - 8%), grog-tempered wares with sparse flint (B3), grog and shell-tempered wares (B5.1) and shell-tempered wares (B6 - 8% by sherd count and 7% by weight). The remaining material consisted of Verulamium region white wares (R15), unsourced white/buff wares (R150), fine orange Upchurch ware (R17.1) and South Gaulish samian ware (R42). The greater range of fabrics in this period is not mirrored in a wider repertoire of vessels. There were only two vessels represented by rims; a wide mouthed everted-rim jar in grog and shell tempered fabric and a carinated bowl (Monaghan class 4H) in grey sandy ware.

3.3 Late Roman

Late Roman contexts produced only eight sherds; just 5% of the total assemblage by weight. Six sherds were in grey sandy ware R73.3 (comprising 93% by weight) and the other two in

coarse orange sandy ware R74.1. The former fabric included a rim sherd of a flanged dish (Monaghan class 5A).

3.4 Pottery from contexts of broad Roman date

A number of contexts were not assigned to a specific phase within the Roman period. Pottery from these accounted for 24% of the total assemblage by weight. Much of this pottery consists of Roman material, but some ‘Belgic’ type wares are present (totalling 40% of sherds (36% by weight)). Most of these were presumably residual, but individual fabrics, grog and flint-tempered ware (B3) and flint-tempered ware (LIAB1) were significant components of the overall phase group, at 18% and 13% of sherd count respectively. Fine orange Upchurch ware (R17.1) is the single most important fabric at 21% by sherd count and 12% by weight. Grey sandy ware (R73.3), grey/black sandy ware (R100) and unsourced white/buff ware (R150) all amounted to 10% of the sherd count and together comprised 41% of the weight of pottery in this phase. A single jar in sandy grey ware was represented by a rim sherd.

Table 2: Roman pottery quantification, fabrics by phase

Fabric	Late Iron Age			Early Roman			Late Roman			Roman general		
	No. Sh	Wt (g)	EVE	No. Sh	Wt (g)	EVE	No. Sh	Wt (g)	EVE	No. Sh	Wt (g)	EVE
B1	14	41	0.02	7	11					2	3	
B3				2	7					11	41	
B5										3	12	
B5.1	5	145	0.15	4	46	0.10						
B6	2	12	0.10	7	40							
B8	1	7	0.07									
B9	10	26								1	8	
LIAB1	3	12		6	16					8	32	
R15				1	3							
R17.1				6	69					13	33	
R18.1				37	257					2	1	
R42				1	1							
R73.3				13	68	0.10	6	57	0.12	6	43	0.14
R74.1	2	3					2	4		4	29	
R100										6	11	
R150	1	1		1	27					6	56	
Total	38	247	0.34	85	545	0.20	8	61	0.12	62	269	0.14

Table 3: Roman pottery quantification, percentage of fabrics by phase

Fabric	Late Iron Age			Early Roman			Late Roman			Roman general		
	Sh%	Wt%	EVE%	Sh%	Wt%	EVE%	Sh%	Wt%	EVE%	Sh%	Wt%	EVE%
B1	37	17	6	8	2					3	1	
B3				2	1					18	15	
B5										5	5	
B5.1	13	59	44	5	8	50						
B6	5	5	29	8	7							
B8	3	3	21									
B9	26	11								2	3	
LIAB1	8	5		7	3					13	12	
R15				1	<1							
R17.1				7	13					21	12	
R18.1				44	47					3	<1	
R42				1	<1							
R73.3				16	12	50	75	93	100	10	16	100

	Late Iron Age			Early Roman			Late Roman			Roman general		
Fabric	Sh%	Wt%	EVE%	Sh%	Wt%	EVE%	Sh%	Wt%	EVE%	Sh%	Wt%	EVE%
R74.1	5	1					25	7		6	11	
R100										10	4	
R150	3	<1		1	5					10	21	

Table 4: Vessel types by phase, quantification by rim count/EVEs

Monaghan type	Late Iron Age	Early Roman	Late Roman	Roman general	Total
3 Jars	3/ 0.27	1/ 0.10		1/ 0.14	5/ 0.51
4 Bowls	1/ 0.07	1/ 0.10			2/ 0.17
5 Dishes			1/ 0.12		1/ 0.12
TOTAL	4/ 0.34	2/ 0.20	1/ 0.12	1/ 0.14	8/ 0.80

4 CHRONOLOGY AND DISCUSSION

Although the assemblage was very small its size and condition give some indication of the chronology of the Roman phases on the site. However, with the exception of some chronologically early jars and the late Roman flanged dish from context 2199 vessel forms were undiagnostic and dating was therefore based on the representation of fabric types. The presence of grog-tempered ware and other ‘Belgic’ type fabrics, indicates significant activity during the late Iron Age. However, the main period of occupation (in ceramic terms) appears to have been the early Roman period, when quantities of sandy grey ware and oxidised Upchurch ware were present. Curiously there is an absence of reduced Upchurch wares from this period, but this may be accounted for by the small size of the assemblage. The ‘late’ Roman period is represented by the above-mentioned flanged dish, but this may date to the earlier 3rd century rather than indicating genuine late Roman activity.

Regional and continental imports are scarce for all periods, being represented only by single sherds of Verulamium white ware and South Gaulish samian ware. This fact, combined with the narrow range of vessel forms suggests that the assemblage represents a low status rural settlement, the residents of which had limited contact with the world outside their immediate environs.

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Davies, B, Richardson, B, and Tomber, R, 1994 *A dated corpus of early Roman pottery from the City of London*, The archaeology of Roman London Volume 5, CBA Res Rep 98, Museum of London

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 Brit Ser 173, Oxford