

## **APPENDIX 1: ASSESSMENT OF POTTERY**

Lyn Blackmore and Louise Rayner

### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Ceramic finds were recovered through hand excavation of 100% of all features on the site. A single pit that was half sectioned during the evaluation phase was subsequently fully excavated. The majority of the pottery recovered came from a series of early Iron Age rubbish pits with very rich assemblages. A number of complete and near complete vessels were recovered from Anglo-Saxon graves. The majority of postholes and the remainder of the pits contained little or no material.
- 1.2 All the pottery has been assessed.
- 1.3 The following fieldwork event aims are relevant to the study of this material:
  - Provide information on the Iron Age land use, environment and economy
  - To establish a chronology for the cemetery.
  - To help determine burial practices.

### **2. Methodology**

- 2.1 All of the sherds recovered were recorded using standard MoLSS recording methods. The material is recorded on a context by context basis using fabric, form and decoration as unique identifiers. The pottery sherds were recorded using the Canterbury Archaeological Trust (CAT) regional fabric codes and fabric reference collection. However, in general the use of these codes should be taken to indicate broad fabric groupings and not that defined fabrics occur in this assemblage.
- 2.2 The material is quantified by count and weight. The presence of diagnostic sherds and aspects of condition were also noted. The data was recorded on standard pro-forma sheets and on the MoLAS Oracle database, subsequently converted to RLE Datasets.

### **3. Quantification**

- 3.1 The Iron Age and Roman assemblage totalled 261 sherds (6777g). Of these only five are Roman, or of probable Roman date. The remainder are later prehistoric, predominately Early Iron Age in date, although one context [114] contains a sherd more characteristic of the Mid to Late Iron Age period.
- 3.2 The Saxon pottery comprises two complete chaff-tempered jars and one virtually complete imported bottle. In addition there is one small medieval sherd and two of post-medieval date.

#### 4. Provenance

- 4.1 The bulk of the assemblage is composed of flint-tempered material that broadly dates to the Late Bronze Age-Early Iron Age period. Where large groups were recovered ([342], [383]), the forms present suggest an Early Iron Age date, *c* 550/500-350/300 BC. The smaller groups of flint-tempered sherds were recovered from pits, postholes and tree throw holes. These probably represent activity contemporary with the larger pit group but at present are placed within a broader chronological span. More refined fabric analysis may relate the material more closely.
- 4.2 The largest and most important assemblage is a pit group from [342] and [383], between which there are sherd links. The details of this pit group are shown in the table below. These contexts contain a number of individual vessels and the condition and size of the sherds is very good. Many of the vessels are partially complete or are represented by large joining sherds. The condition suggests these assemblages represent primary deposition of material from a nearby settlement. There was also a quantity of daub recovered with these contexts supporting the suggestion that the pottery derives from a domestic settlement. The size of this group and number of definable vessels means this assemblage has the most potential to contribute to the research aims.
- 4.3 The [342] assemblage contained a minimum of 19 identifiable individual vessels. Most of these are worthy of illustration and therefore as a single closed group would be an important addition to the study of Early Iron Age ceramics from the region. The assemblage consists of both coarse ware jars and fine ware bowls and ?cups. Although most of the vessels are undecorated, there are some examples with finger-tipped impressions on shoulders and evidence for rustication on surfaces, as well as a vessel with a red-coated (or haematite) surface. Many of the more simple, utilitarian forms could be placed within the late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age transition period but the presence of two fine ware bowls with rounded shoulders and deep flaring rims, and a foot-ring bowl base suggest a date in the 5<sup>th</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BC. This concurs with the small quantity of pottery recovered in the evaluation phase which included a further rusticated sherd and vessel with dimpled decoration. These were dated *c* 550-350/300 BC.
- 4.4 The assemblage from [342] also contained an unusual 'oddity' vessel. This only consisted of two joining sherds and the fabric is flint-tempered, comparable with the rest of the assemblage. The unusual aspect of this vessel is the shape of the rim, which has either a spout or perhaps is more akin to 'horned' vessels as evidenced in assemblage from north France (Hurtrelle *et al* 1989). A further example has been recovered from another site within the CTRL project at White Horse Stone and a previous example from Hawkinge, although both of these locations are further east than ARC CXT 98.
- 4.5 The rim from an everted rim jar or bowl in a glauconite-rich fabric was recovered from [114] ditch fill. The use of glauconite-rich fabrics for similar forms can be evidence on Iron Age settlements in Essex and Kent. The assemblage from the Iron Age site at Farningham Hill included glauconite-rich fabrics, which occur in foot-ring bowls or jars. These are dated mid 3<sup>rd</sup> to mid 1<sup>st</sup> century BC. The use of glauconite-rich fabrics continued in use in Kent throughout the Later pre-Roman Iron Age, focusing particularly in the Medway valley (Thompson 1982, 31). These fabrics do not appear to have survived the

conquest, which would suggest that the sherd from [114] could range in date from *c* 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC – AD 50. The lack of glauconite-rich fabrics in the large pit group would suggest that this sherd relates to a later phase of activity. However this sherd is in a very abraded condition and was recovered from the fill of a ditch that surrounded a Saxon burial.

- 4.6 The Roman pottery was recovered as single sherds, in pit, ditch and posthole fills and one unstratified sherd. The pottery is, where identifiable, of local Kentish production and includes the rim of a Black-burnished fabrics 2 everted-rimmed jar (CAT R14.1) and North Kent /Upchurch fine grey ware (CAT R16). The grey sandy ware sherds are probably also local, but are unsourced at present. The diagnostic sherds date from the later 1st (CAT R16) and early 2nd century (CAT R14.1). There is nothing to suggest more than one phase of Roman is present. However all but one of the Roman sherds were recovered from the fills of ditches around Anglo Saxon graves and are therefore residual.
- 4.7 The Frankish bottle is an import from northern France. It was found in the grave of an adult male [246] who was also buried with a high quality silver buckle with garnet mounts and the latest shield found on the site. The pot was placed by the feet, on the right (south) side of the grave.
- 4.8 The tall-necked chaff-tempered jar from [290] is probably a local product. It was placed at the foot of the grave, on the right side of the grave. No bone survived but the presence of a spear indicates that this was a male grave.
- 4.9 The chaff-tempered jar from [293] is also probably a local product. It was found by the head of a child; the presence of a spear suggests that this was the grave of a boy.
- 4.10 The medieval sherd was intrusive in grave [214], while one post-medieval sherd was found in the ?geotechnical pit [112], the other is unstratified.

## **5. Conservation**

- 5.1 Two ceramic pots were conserved in 1999 to stabilise them.
- 5.2 There are no conservation requirements for the pottery or implications for long term storage posed by further analysis.
- 5.3 It would not be appropriate to consider discard for this material.

## **6. Comparative material**

- 6.1 The vessels from the large pit assemblage [342] and [383] find parallels amongst other contemporary groups from the region, particularly the material from Barham Downs and an enclosed Iron Age settlement (site 8) at Bridge (Macpherson-Grant 1980). This assemblage also contains both coarse and finer wares and importantly includes foot-ring bases amongst other vessels which arguably could be dated to an earlier period. In the discussion of this group Cunliffe states,

‘either the collection reflects earlier occupation of the site (Barnham Downs) or that the basic forms, once introduced in the earlier period (ie 1000-800 BC) continued in use for a long time. The two explanations are not mutually exclusive but in the absence of large well-stratified groups for study, it is impossible to be more precise’ (Cunliffe 1980, 178).

- 6.2 Clearly the Cuxton pit group is an important addition to this discussion as a well-stratified, large assemblage, which appears to derive directly from settlement activity. The regional implications of this are important because these comparative assemblages are some distance from Cuxton; published contemporary or comparable assemblages from the nearby locality are clearly lacking.
- 6.3 No exact parallel have yet been found for the very unusual form of the tall-necked jar from [246], which probably imitates a Frankish bottle. In this it may be compared with a bottle from Strood, which was thought to be of Franko-Kentish type (Swanton 1973, 146, Fig.55). It has a biconical body, rouletting on the shoulder, and a much wider neck than is usually seen on imported wares, with a marked cordon around it (*ibid*, Fig.55g); the fabric of this pot is unknown.
- 6.4 The profile of the jar from [293] is similar to a vessel from Sittingbourne, Kent (Myres 1975, Fig.16, No.3763).
- 6.5 Frankish bottles like that from [246] were produced at a number of centres in Northern France (Evison 1979, 30; Bayard and Thouvenot 1993, 317-8), where they were in use during the 5th and 6th centuries. Most known English examples are from sites in the eastern part of Kent which are near to the Channel, notably in Thanet (Sarre and Monkton, Margate and Broadstairs), and in the Dover area (*ibid*, 57; 92, Table 1; 110; Map 3); an example has also been found at Saltwood. The form of the Cuxton bottle is rather more rounded than most published English finds, which tend to have more ovoid or biconical bodies and slightly wider necks; a close parallel in form, although not in decoration, is published by Bayard and Thouvenot (1993, 317; Fig.15; No.3). Rouletted decoration like that on the Cuxton bottle (*ibid*, type 1d), however, has been noted at the cemeteries of Faversham, Buckland Kingston and St Peters, the latter having the closest parallel for the decoration on the Cuxton find (*ibid*, 8-13; 68; Map 3 and Fig.3b; Evison 1987, Fig.49, No.2).

## 7. Potential for further work

- 7.1 The study of the Iron Age material should assist the following Fieldwork Event Aims:
- *Provide information on the Iron Age land use, environment and economy.*
- 7.2 The size, condition and character of the Early Iron Age assemblage means it has potential to contribute to the Fieldwork Event Aim relating to the Iron Age land use and economy. The assemblage is also important for ceramic studies of this period and has the potential to provide information on the fabrics and forms in use and to compare these to the few other groups from the region.
- 7.3 The association of this well-dated assemblage with a well-preserved collection of daub has the potential to provide important information on construction techniques used in this period. From initial assessment the daub would appear to derive from a structural use.

- 7.4 The Roman pottery is of little potential beyond providing evidence for Roman activity in the area. No further work is recommended for the Roman material.
- 7.5 The study of the Saxon pottery should assist the following Fieldwork Event Aims:
- *To establish a chronology for the cemetery.*
- 7.6 The tradition of chaff-tempered pottery is long-lived, but the general dating of the other finds places the pots from [290] and [293] in the 7<sup>th</sup> century; it seems unlikely that they are heirlooms. Frankish bottles occur in both domestic and funerary contexts on the continent; it has been suggested that they mainly die out in the second half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century. In England, however, the type appears to continue rather later, and Professor Evison, favours a late 6<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> century date for both the Kentish examples and those from the Pas-de-Calais (Evison 1979, 45; MacPherson-Grant 1993, 171). The find from [246] is thus probably contemporary with the other grave goods.
- 7.7 The medieval sherd indicates that grave [214] may have been disturbed in the 13<sup>th</sup> century.
- *To help determine burial practices.*
- 7.8 All three Saxon pots were found in male graves. The simplest pot was from the child grave, and this was found by the head. The import and possible copy of an import either were, or probably were, associated with the adults, and both were placed at the feet. This indicates possible different burial practices for adults and children, and possibly a hierarchy in the males, as the imported bottle was from one of the richer male burials. On the Continent decorated bottles occurs in both domestic and funerary contexts, but in England they are primarily associated with Kentish burials which are considered to be Christian; they must, therefore, be part of some non-pagan ritual (Evison 1979, 57-8). There is scope to develop this field of research when the finds are considered together with full grave inventories.
- 7.9 The following Landscape Zone aims (towns and their rural landscapes 100 BC - AD 1700) may be addressed when the finds are considered together with the other accessions:
- *The economy of human populations using the landscape, including trade and contact with other populations.*
- 7.10 The chaff-tempered wares could have been produced quite locally, but the Frankish bottle is evidence of some contact, direct or indirect, with the Continent. It is probable that bottles such as the Cuxton find entered the country via Dover.
- *New research aims:*
- 7.11 The form and decoration of the imported bottle are new additions to the typological corpus for Kent and merit analysis and discussion as such. It is also important that the bottle from Strood and other relevant parallels within Kent, including the Saltwood bottle, are examined to compare their fabrics. Scientific analysis such as Inductively Coupled Plasma Spectroscopy (ICPS) or Neutron Activation analysis is desirable to relate the imported bottle to the data on other Kentish and continental finds which have already been studied (Cowell 1979) and to help establish whether the source is in Northern France or in Belgium.

### *Further Work*

- 7.12 It is recommended that further work on the Iron Age material should include:
- Define fabric descriptions for Early Iron Age pottery and integrate into CAT fabric series
  - Comparative study of other Early Iron Age groups from the region
  - Prepare publication catalogue for illustrated vessels
  - Prepare publication text for assemblage
- 7.13 It is recommended that further work on the Anglo-Saxon material should include:
- Fabric analysis of the imported bottle (including ICPS and comparative study of other bottles)
  - Comparative research (literature)
  - Discussion with other specialists, notably Prof. Vera Evison
  - Integration with stratigraphic and other finds data
  - Compilation of catalogue
  - Writing of report
  - Illustration
  - Photography

## 8. Bibliography

- Bayard, D and Thouvenot, S, 1993, Étude de la céramique du haut moyen age (Vème - Xème siècles) dans le département de l'Aisne (France): premier bilan' in D Piton (ed) *Travaux du Groupe de Recherches et d'Études sur la Céramique dans le Nord - Pas-de-Calais. Actes du Colloque d'Outreau (10-12 avril 1992)*. Nord-Ouest Archéologie (Hors-série), 291-340.
- Cowell, M R, 1979, 'Report on the analysis of some sixth and seventh century pottery from sites in southern Britain and northern Europe' in Evison 1979, 95-101.
- Cunliffe, B, 1980, 'Overall discussion of the Iron Age pottery' in N Macpherson-Grant 1980, 174-9
- Evison, V I, 1979, *Wheel-thrown Pottery from Anglo-Saxon Graves*. Royal Archaeological Institute.
- Evison, V I, 1987, *Buckland Anglo-Saxon Cemetery*. HMBCE.
- Hurtrelle, J, Monchy, E, Roger, F, Rossignol, P, & Villes, A, 1989 *Les débuts du second âge du fer dans le Nord de la France*, Les Dossiers de GAUHERIA 1
- Macpherson-Grant, N, 1980 'Archaeological work along the A2: 1966-1974', *Arch Cant* xcvi, 133-83
- Macpherson-Grant, N, 1993, 'Early-Late Saxon Continental Imports in Kent' in D Piton (ed) *Travaux du Groupe de Recherches et d'Études sur la Céramique dans le Nord - Pas-de-Calais. Actes du Colloque d'Outreau (10-12 avril 1992)*. Nord-Ouest Archéologie (Hors-série), 165-193.
- Myres, J N L A, 1977, *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Pottery*. Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, I, 1982 Grog-tempered 'Belgic' pottery of South-eastern England BAR British Series 108

*Table 1: Assessment of Prehistoric pottery, quantification and attributes*

Context	Count	Weight	Period	Comments
100	4	58	LBA/EIA	Flint-with shell temp.
105	1	10	LBA/EIA	Flint-temp.
109	4	49	LBA/EIA	Flint-temp with dec.
114	1	3	MIA/LIA	c 3 <sup>rd</sup> c BC – mid 1 <sup>st</sup> c AD Glauconite fabric everted rim.
147	5	11	LBA/EIA	Flint-with shell temp.
163	1	3	LIA/RO	Grog-temp.
242	1	4	LIA/RO	Shell-temp.
325	11	132	LBA/EIA	Flint-temp.
330	6	49	LBA/EIA	Flint-temp.
331	12	123	LBA/EIA	Flint-temp. carinated sherd.
332	2	4	LBA/EIA	Flint-temp.
333	4	32	LBA/EIA	Flint-temp.
338	1	1	LBA/EIA	Flint-temp.
340	1	6	LBA/EIA	Flint-temp.
342	176	5623	EIA	Large group; see table 5
383	20	544	EIA	Large group related to [342]

Temp. Tempered  
Dec. Decorated

*Table 2: Assessment of Roman pottery, quantification and attributes*

Context	Count	Weight	Period	Comments
0	1	2	RO	R73
102	1	9	RO	R73
116	1	2	RO	R14.1 (2F) everted rim jar; 120-300 AD
125	1	1	RO	R16; 70-120 AD
144	1	1	RO	R73



Table 3: Assessment of prehistoric pottery, additional detail

Context	Count	Weight	Fabric	Description	E Date	L Date	Period	Comments
342	1	18	FLIN	FND	500	300	EIA	Horizontal ?row of fingernail impression. Similar shd. in A2 site 8 no. 84.
342	1	27	FLIN	JAR RUST	500	300	EIA	Base of jar with rustication on surface
342	1	130	FLIN	JAR	500	300	EIA	Footring jar with cross lightly burnished on underside.
342	1	165	SAND	BOWL	500	300	EIA	Well made bowl in dark sandy fab. Well polished. Rounded shoulder & flaring rim. 5 <sup>th</sup> - 3rd c
342	2	28	FLIN	BOWL	500	300	EIA	Simple hemispherical bowl (cup?) Lightly burnished.
342	2	58	FLIN	BOWL SPT	500	300	EIA	Spouted/horned bowl? Very unusual vessel
342	5	421	FLIN	JAR FND	500	300	EIA	Shouldered jar with FND giving cabled effect on rim. Similar to A2 site 8 no. 134 (fig.15)
342	8	68	FLIN	BOWL RED	500	300	EIA	Fine ware bowl class iv with red coated surface, burnished int; carinated shoulder sl=383
342	13	420	FLIN	JAR FTD	500	300	EIA	Carinated jar with FTD on shoulder
342	14	339	FLIN	BOWL FTD	500	300	EIA	Most shds join; burnished inside; open form? Large vessel.
342	31	1716	FLIN	JAR	500	300	EIA	Illustrate x9; varying rim detail, mainly slack shoulder upright rim.
342	99	2343	FLIN		500	300	EIA	Misc body sherds both coarse ware and fine ware vessels
383	1	12	FLIN	BOWL RED	500	300	EIA	Red coated surface; fine flint in sandy matrix; burnished int.

Context	Count	Weight	Fabric	Description	E Date	L Date	Period	Comments
383	1	132	FLIN	JAR	500	300	EIA	Slack shouldered jar either warped from re-firing or has ?spouted rim. Rim undulates.
383	2	25	FLIN	BOWL	500	300	EIA	Well polished surfaces
383	16	375	FLIN		500	300	EIA	Coarse ware bs mainly from jars, although some have int surfaces with traces of smoothing

Key:

FLIN Flint Tempered

SAND Sand Tempered

RUST Rusticated Decoration

FND Finger Nail Decoration

RED Red-Finished Or Red-Coated Surfaces

FTD Fingertip Decoration

SPT Spout

*Table 4: Assessment of post Roman pottery, quantification and attributes*

Context	Count	Weight	Period (Spot date)	Comments (i.e. fabric groups/ form/ type/ presence of decoration)
380 (290)	1	877	EM	EMS4. Complete tall-necked jar. Handmade in a chaff-tempered fabric. Ovoid body, separated from the upright neck by a pronounced cordon. 580-700 AD
381 (293)	1	602	EM	EMS4. Shouldered jar with flaring rim and very slightly sagging base, containing a cremation. Handmade in a reduced chaff-tempered fabric. 580-700 AD
246	3=1	817	EM	EMS9? Frankish wheel-thrown bottle in a hard sandy greyware, slightly abraded. Light vertical burnish on the upper body; horizontal bands of unevenly applied rouletting or stamped decoration on the shoulder and girth. Where visible, this forms a segmented cable design (a closely spaced curving 'Z' motif). 580-700
214.7	1	2	MD	M19G jug 1170-1350 AD

Key to the post-Roman fabrics codes:

EMS9 Frankish

EMS4 Chaff-tempered ware

M19G Green glazed French whiteware