7.1 Assessment of Ceramic Building Material

Louise Harrison and Lorraine Mepham

Introduction

7.1.1 A total of 111 fragments of ceramic building material (CBM) (weighing 4.527kg) was recovered, including 53 fragments of Romano-British date (weighing 3.683kg) and 58 of medieval/ post-medieval date (weighing 0.844kg). All of the material was retrieved by hand excavation, none (to date) having been retrieved from soil samples.

Methodology

7.1.2 The assemblage has been examined in conjunction with the CAT fabric series, and been quantified (count and weight) by type per context. The presence of distinguishing marks or features (such as signature marks) and (in the case of *tegulae*) flange profile or cutaway has been recorded. After recording the building material from CAT fieldwork events with no diagnostic features has been discarded. All material from WA fieldwork events is currently retained.

Quantification

7.1.3 The ceramic building material recovered is presented in **Table 17**.

Provenance

7.1.4 To the west of Stone Farm Bridleway, all CBM with the exception of one fragment was recovered from deposits of Romano-British date or later. To the east of Stone farm Bridleway, one piece of medieval/ post-medieval was intrusive in Early Bronze Age ring ditch W33, and five others of the same date intrusive in Late Bronze Age/ Early Iron Age ditches W161 and W162, Late Iron Age/ Early Romano-British ditch W54 and an Early Saxon grave (W77) respectively. In the western part of the site CBM was retrieved from late Roman deposits consisting mainly of ditches and deposits relating to trackways C1 and C2.

Conservation

7.1.5 Ceramic building material is a stable material and does not require any form of conservation. It is recommended that the diagnostic material retained so far is retained for long term storage. CAT's retention and discard policy for CBM has been followed, as noted above. It is recommended that a similar policy is adopted for the CBM from WA fieldwork events.

Comparative Material

7.1.6 Little or no comparative material for the Roman CBM has been produced from other CTRL sites. Quantities of Roman brick and tile have, however, been recovered intermittently by CAT from *Sandtun*, West Hythe just south-west of Saltwood.

Table 11: Ceramic Building Material by context

Site	Context	Context type	Count	Weight (kg)	Period	Type, Comments etc.
ARC SLT98	C2	Ditch 36	2	0.560	Roman	Brick
ARC SLT98	C2	Ditch 36	2	0.040	Roman	Tile
ARC SLT98	C2	Ditch 36	1	0.100	Roman	Tile, signature mark
ARC SLT98	C121	Trackway 814	1	0.045	Roman	Tile
ARC SLT98	C139	Pit 140	1	0.002	Post-med	Brick
ARC SLT98	C139	Pit 140	1	0.065	Roman	Brick
ARC SLT98	C143	Pit 147	1	0.390	Roman	*Tegula*
ARC SLT98	C179	Pit 178	1	0.005	Roman	Tile
ARC SLT98	C238	Layer 352	1	0.020	Roman	*Imbrex*
ARC SLT98	C238	Layer 352	4	0.105	Roman	Tile
ARC SLT98	C243	Surface, Track 1	1	0.020	Roman	*Imbrex*
ARC SLT98	C243	Surface, Track 1	1	0.185	Roman	Brick
ARC SLT98	C243	Surface, Track 1	5	0.060	Roman	Tile
ARC SLT98	C243	Surface, Track 1	1	0.020	Roman	Tile, signature mark
ARC SLT98	C276	Feature 855	1	0.010	Roman	Tile
ARC SLT98	C288	Layer	1	0.005	Medieval	Roof tile
ARC SLT98	C312	Pit 313	2	0.050	Roman	Tile, signature mark
ARC SLT98	C354	Ditch 357	1	0.040	Roman	Tile
ARC SLT98	C421	Ditch 795	1	0.010	Roman	Tile
ARC SLT98	C431	Post hole 432	2	0.020	Post-med	Roof tile
ARC SLT98	C621	Layer	1	0.080	Roman	Tile, nail hole
ARC SLT98	C622	Pit 896	3	0.010	Roman	Tile
ARC SLT98	C643	Pit 644	3	0.005	Post-med	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	C1046	grave C1048	2	0.030	Medieval	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	C1120	grave C1138	1	0.005	Medieval	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	C1130	grave	1	0.010	Medieval	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	C1130	grave	1	0.010	Post-med	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	C1134	grave C1132	2	0.003	Medieval	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	C1161	grave C1163	1	0.015	Medieval	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	C1180	Layer	3	0.015	Post-med	Brick
ARC SLT98C	C1187	grave C1188	1	0.004	Roman	Tile
ARC SLT98C	C1426	Post hole 1427	5	0.005	Post-med	Brick
ARC SLT98C	C1426	Post hole 1427	1	0.004	Roman	Tile, burnt
ARC SLT98C	C2602	Ditch 2603	1	0.005	Medieval	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	C2725		1	0.003	Post-med	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	C1037		2	0.040	Medieval	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	C2719/ 2721		1	0.010	Post-med	Brick
ARC SLT98C	-	Unstratified	1	0.015	Medieval	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	-	Unstratified	3	0.048	Post-med	Brick
ARC SLT98C	-	Unstratified	2	0.015	Post-med	Roof tile
ARC SLT98C	-	Unstratified	3	0.855	Roman	*Tegula*
ARC SLT98C	-	Unstratified	2	0.010	Roman	*Tessera*
ARC SLT98C	-	Unstratified	15	0.995	Roman	Tile (1 inc. sig mark)
ARC SLT99	C2130		1	0.010	Medieval	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W1000	Layer	1	0.017	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W1100	grave C1101	1	0.016	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W1355	Ditch 1353	1	0.008	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W1362	Pit 1361	1	0.005	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W1513	Ditch 1512	3	0.233	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W1598	Ditch 1466	1	0.008	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W1616	Ditch 1615	1	0.006	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W1651	Ditch 1650	1	0.002	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W1966	Ditch 1496	1	0.027	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W2001	Subsoil	1	0.006	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W3001	Subsoil	8	0.208	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W3511	Ditch 3510	2	0.024	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
ARC SFB99	W3523	Ditch 3522	1	0.013	Med/ pmed	Roof tile
		Totals	**111**	**4.527**		

Potential for further work

7.1.7 The small quantity of Roman brick and tile is both poor in quality and condition. Although the presence of the material suggests that there were substantial structures on or close to the site during the Roman period, the lack of large quantities of good quality material from secure contexts and features suggests that any further work on

the material is unlikely to contribute to the Land Zone Aims and The Fieldwork Event Aims. As a result, further dissemination of the results of this assessment should be achieved through a small note including the quantity, condition and location of the brick and tile in the final Saltwood publication. No further analysis is required.

7.1.8 No further work is recommended for the CBM of medieval/ post-medieval date.

7.2 Assessment of Fired Clay

Louise Harrison and Lorraine Mepham

Introduction

7.2.1 Most of the fired clay was hand-collected from excavated features, although a significant proportion of the total assemblage was retrieved from soil samples.

7.2.2 Due to both the small quantity and poor quality of the fired clay from well-stratified contexts, assessment indicates that the material is unlikely to address any of the Fieldwork Event Aims or Land Zone Aims. Its presence does, however, suggest that wattle- and daub-lined structures were present on the site, largely during the early medieval period.

Methodology

7.2.3 All the fired clay has been recorded by context and by number/ weight. From ARC SLT98 and ARC SLT98C, fired clay with diagnostic features such as wattle impressions and surviving surfaces has been kept for further study, while the remaining material has been discarded after recording. All fired clay from ARC SFB99 has been retained. This assessment deals only with the diagnostic, retained material.

Quantification

7.2.4 The total fired clay assemblage retrieved from Saltwood consisted of 954 fragments weighing 15.198kg. The discarded material (including all the fragments retrieved from soil samples), amounting to 667 fragments weighing 7.037kg, was abraded and had no diagnostic features. Thus, the retained assemblage includes 287 fragments (8.031kg) displaying features such as flat surfaces and wattle impressions.

Provenance

7.2.5 The retained fired clay presented in **Table 18** consist mainly of small to medium sized fragments. Although the majority of this material has wattle impressions and/ or surfaces, its condition is generally poor.

7.2.6 The majority of the fired clay was derived from the Roman and early medieval settlement excavation (C15). It was retrieved mainly from deposits, pits and post-holes dating broadly from the Late Roman to early medieval periods. Very small quantities came from prehistoric features (Early Neolithic and Early Bronze Age) to the east of Stone Farm Bridleway, and from later features in the same area.

7.2.7 A brief scan indicates that the fired clay consists of the same clay type, varying in colour from cream through to an orange to red shade. It has a fine, unsandy texture with no other common inclusions present. With the exception of three fragments

none of it shows any indication of being in contact with heat, such as vitrification or burning.

Table 12: Retained fired clay by context

Site	Context	Context type	Count	Weight (kg)	Comments
ARC SLT 98	C238	Layer, trackway C1	13	0.425	
ARC SLT 98	C280	Fill of pit C281	12	1.685	With surfaces/ wattle impressions
ARC SLT 98	C302	Occupation layer	7	0.150	With surfaces/ wattle impressions
ARC SLT 98	C351	Occupation layer	1	0.030	
ARC SLT 98	C352	Layer, trackway C1	2	0.130	With wattle impressions/ surfaces
ARC SLT 98	C405	Fill of gully C404	2	0.095	
ARC SLT 98	C413	Fill of pit C459	98	2.680	
ARC SLT 98	C415	Fill of feature C384	1	0.065	
ARC SLT 98	C437	Occupation layer	8	0.195	With impressions
ARC SLT 98	C472	Fill of post-hole C473	1	0.010	With wattle impressions
ARC SLT 98	C477	Fill of post-hole C478	2	0.140	With surfaces/ wattle impressions
ARC SLT 98	C479	Fill of post-pipe C480	4	0.130	
ARC SLT 98	C549	Fill of gully C520	4	0.110	With impressions
ARC SLT 98	C569	Fill of post-pipe C570	1	0.003	
ARC SLT 98	C583	Fill of pit C584	1	0.060	With wattle impressions
ARC SLT 98	C606	Fill of pit C607	6	0.160	With wattle impressions/ surfaces
ARC SLT 98	C608	Occupation layer	1	0.003	With wattle impressions
ARC SLT 98	C611	Fill of pit C612	4	0.030	With wattle impression
ARC SLT 98	C690	Fill of post-hole C691	1	0.015	With surface
ARC SLT 98	C791	Fill of pit C792	26	0.365	
ARC SLT 98C	C1262		7	0.020	
ARC SLT 98C	C1483		1	0.003	
ARC SLT 98C	C1483		1	0.040	With wattle impressions/ surfaces
ARC SLT99	C3717	Fill of pit C3718	5	0.005	
ARC SLT 98C	C6352		2	0.595	With wattle impressions/ surfaces
ARC SFB99	W1010	Ditch W1	1	0.003	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W1041	Ditch W8	1	0.005	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W1130	Ditch W7	1	0.004	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W1139	Ditch W7	1	0.004	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W1226	Ditch W1	1	0.004	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W1310	Pit W47	5	0.036	Undiagnostic; 1 vitrified
ARC SFB99	W1320	grave W185	2	0.004	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W1352	Trackway W34	1	0.010	Vitrified?
ARC SFB99	W1404	Pit W48	3	0.004	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W1513	Ditch W26	1	0.002	Could be CBM
ARC SFB99	W1515	grave W38	1	0.006	1 surface
ARC SFB99	W1598	Ditch W66	5	0.025	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W1659	Ditch W54	3	0.002	Could be CBM
ARC SFB99	W1706	grave W104	1	0.001	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W1950	Ditch W33	8	0.003	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W3001	Subsoil W15	1	0.001	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W3280	Pit W175	1	0.021	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W3285	Ditch W150	1	0.014	Undiagnostic; burnt
ARC SFB99	W3298	Pit W175	2	0.009	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W3493	Pit W136	1	0.005	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W3534	Pit W156	1	0.004	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W3540	Ditch W150	2	0.002	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W3542	Ditch W153	3	0.067	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W3616	Trackway W170	3	0.057	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W3644	Ditch W170	1	0.003	Undiagnostic
ARC SFB99	W4001	Subsoil W15	1	0.006	Undiagnostic
		Unstratified	24	0.585	
		Totals	**287**	**8.031**	

Conservation

7.2.8 The retained fired clay is in a relatively stable condition and no conservation work is appropriate. It has been stored in plastic bags with waterproof labels, placed in museum boxes.

7.2.9 The CAT's retention and discard policy for building materials has been adhered to, as described above. It is recommended that the same discard policy is adopted for the material from ARC SFB99, prior to archive deposition.

Comparative material

7.2.10 As a result of the general lack of research into fired clay, it is often difficult to find comparative material. The assemblages from two other CTRL sites at Mersham and Westenhanger, however, appear to be similar in terms of quality, and possibly date, to the Saltwood material (URL 1998; 2000).

Potential for further work

7.2.11 The fired clay was sparsely distributed over a large number of features varying in date from the Early Neolithic to the post-medieval periods, although concentrated in the Romano-British and medieval periods. Although wattle- and daub-lined structures were probably present at Saltwood in the latter periods, the limited size of the assemblage and the lack of well-stratified groups suggests that any further work on the material is unlikely to contribute to the Fieldwork Event Aims.

7.2.12 As a result, further dissemination of the results of this assessment should be achieved through a small note including the quantity, condition and location of the fired clay in the final Saltwood publication. No further analysis is required, and no illustrations are necessary.

Bibliography

Union Railways (South) Limited [URS], 1998, *North of Westenhanger Castle (ARC WGC97), An Archaeological Evaluation*, Museum of London for Union Railways (South) Limited

-- , 2000, *Mersham, Kent (ARC MSH98): Detailed Archaeological Works Assessment Report*, Canterbury Archaeological Trust for Union Railways (South) Limited