APPENDIX 1: ASSESSMENT OF PREHISTORIC POTTERY

Louise Rayner

1. Introduction

1.1 A small assemblage of Late Iron Age-early Roman and late Roman pottery was recovered from the excavation phase of Parsonage Farm. The sherds were recovered by hand collection during excavation predominately from deposits associated with the timber and brushwood structure identified in the evaluation phase.

1.2 The following fieldwork event aims are relevant to the study of this material:

- *To determine the function and economic basis of the site*
- *To establish a dated sequence of occupation and use*

2. Methodology

2.1 All of the sherds recovered were recorded using standard MoLSS recording methods but utilised fabric codes as outlined in The Canterbury Fabric Reference Collection. The material is recorded on a context by context basis using fabric, form and decoration as unique identifiers. The material was quantified by count and weight and aspects of condition were also noted. The sherds were recorded using CAT fabric codes to indicate broad chronological and fabric groups and should not be considered as an indicator of defined fabric types.

3. Quantifications

3.1 A total of 31 sherds (230g) of Late Iron Age-early Roman pottery and late Roman were recovered from the excavation phase of Parsonage Farm.

4. Provenance

4.1 The most important material from this assemblage are the sherds associated with the timber and brushwood platform: [183], [242]. Although many of these sherds were recorded as individual finds on the timber surface, many of the sherds clearly relate to the same vessels. All of the sherds from these deposits are grog-tempered (CAT fabric B2) and represent two or three jars. Where rims survive these are all simple everted types. Some of the sherds also show signs of wiped or combed surfaces and two have incised horizontal lines, which may have formed part of some decoration. One very small sherd appears to derive from a cordoned or corrugated vessel. However the condition of the sherds is relatively poor with abraded surfaces and edges, probably a result of the waterlogged depositional conditions softening the grog-tempered fabric.

4.2 The presence of grog-tempered fabrics suggests a date from the 1st century BC, when the use of grog-temper appears in the south-east alongside the introduction of wheel-made 'Belgic' style pottery. The forms identified are extremely long-lived and therefore are of little value as chronological indicators within the 'Belgic' period. Only one small sherd has evidence of a cordon or corrugation, which are characteristic traits of 'Belgic' vessels.

4.3 The absence of vessels closely imitating Gallo-Belgic imported wares and of any obviously wheel-made vessels may be of chronological significance although in a group as small as this such absences must be treated with caution. With this in mind, it may be suggested that the assemblage dates to the earlier part of the proposed date range, but could equally be a wholly 'native' style assemblage of slightly later date. The absence of Romanised material makes a post-conquest date less likely but potentially vessels of this type do persist into the conquest period. Work on the Canterbury assemblage demonstrated that a wide variety of 'Belgic' pottery survived in use into the half century following the Roman conquest (Pollard 1995, 592).

4.4 The grog-tempered fabric is unsourced at present, as is commonly the case with material of this sort. The vessels are probably locally manufactured; the products of a relatively short-lived and/or small- scale production. In National terms the fabric should be grouped as Southern British ('Belgic') grog-tempered ware (SOB GT) (Tomber & Dore 1998, 214).

4.5 The remainder of the assemblage, much of it residual with later material is of little potential. Much of this pottery is also in poor condition, which has hindered identification. The shell-tempered and grog-tempered sherds could be contemporary with the assemblage associated with the platform, but equally could be slightly later.

4.6 The further group of grog-tempered sherds from a series of pits, although likely to be contemporary with the platform assemblage, is very small and contribute little to the characterisation and dating of the assemblage as a whole.

4.7 The late Roman material was recovered solely as residual material with medieval pottery. The most diagnostic sherd is from an Oxfordshire red colour-coated ware flanged bowl (LR10; Young form 51), dated 240-400+ (Young 1977, 160). The sherd is very abraded. The other Roman sherds are a shell-tempered sherd, probably from North Kent (R69) and an unsourced reduced sandy ware sherd (R101).

4.8 Two sherds were recovered from chainage sites ARC430/85+100-85+350/99. These were a single grog-tempered body sherd and a sandy grey ware rim sherd.

5. Conservation

5.1 There are no conservation requirements for this assemblage.

6. Comparative material

6.1 The use of grog-tempered vessels is widespread across, not only Kent, but the south-east of England in general. Grog-tempered wares are common in pre-conquest and early Roman levels in Canterbury, where they remain an important component even in groups dated as late as mid 1st – mid 2nd century (Pollard 1988, 32).

6.2 The lack of diagnostic forms limits the potential to compare this assemblage to others from the locality. However the fabrics should be compared with contemporary assemblages to ascertain whether any occur elsewhere in the region.

7. Potential for further work

7.1 The condition and size of this assemblage does limit its potential to contribute to further work. Clearly the identification of a timber platform is important as a landscape feature and evidence for human activity. Unfortunately, the lack of clarity over the date of this structure at present makes it difficult to place this activity within a chronological framework. However the stratigraphic position of the platform and association with late Iron Age pottery does suggest it pre-dates the medieval activity also evidenced on this site and a Late Iron Age date or earlier is likely.

7.2 The late Roman assemblage is of little potential as it is only a small, residual assemblage. The pottery will require little further work as there is limited potential for refining the dating due to the condition and small number of sherds, and indeed vessels present.

7.3 The assemblage has the potential to address the following Fieldwork Event Aims:

- *to establish a dated sequence of occupation and use – this assemblage will be able to contribute broadly to the dating of the sequence.*

7.4 Any further work would be limited to the preparation of text for the publication of the assemblage. This would include the preparation of fabric descriptions, which would form the basis of a site fabric series that could contribute to a regional fabric series.

8. Bibliography

Pollard, R J, 1988 *The Roman Pottery of Kent,* Kent Archaeological Society Monograph 5

Pollard, R J, 1995, 'Belgic and Grog-tempered wares' in K Blockley, M Blockley, P Blockley, S S Frere and S Stow, *Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and surrounding areas: Part II The Finds* The Archaeology of Canterbury volume V

Tomber, R, & Dore, J, 1998 *The National Roman Fabric Reference Collection: A handbook*, MoLAS Monogr 2

Young, C J, 1977 *Oxfordshire Roman Pottery*, BAR 43

Table 2: Assessment of Pottery, quantifications and attributes

Context	Count	Weight	Period (Spot date)	Comments (i.e. fabric groups/ form/ type/ presence of decoration)
166	1	1	RO	R101: Residual; misc. reduced body sherd *c* AD 50-400
183	12	86	LIA	B2: Grog-tempered necked, everted rim jar; cordoned sherd. *c* 50 BC – 60/70 AD
242	3	38	LIA	B2: Grog-tempered jar *c* 50 BC – 60/70 AD
300	1	6	LIA	B9: Glauconite, organics, iron-rich incl. Open vessel sherd. *c* 50 BC – 60 AD
382	1	3	LIA	Residual; B6: Shell-tempered sherd *c* 50 BC – 70 AD
471	1	33	LIA	Residual; B6: Shell-tempered flaring rim, probably from storage jar. *c* BC 50 –70 AD
480	2	4	LIA	B2: Grog-tempered small everted rim jar. *c* 50BC – 60/70 AD
505	1	5	LIA	Residual; B2: Grog-tempered sherd. *c* 50 BC – 60/70AD
601	1	2	LIA/ER	B9: Sandy reduced ware.
1001	1	10	LIA	B2: Grog-tempered sherd with incised lines. *c* 50 BC- 60/70 AD
1002	1	8	LIA	B2: Grog-tempered jar sherd. *c* 50 BC – 60/70 AD
1003	1	8	LIA	B2: Grog-tempered jar sherd. *c* 50 BC – 60/70 AD
1004	2	4	LIA	B2: Grog-tempered jar with everted rim. *c* 50 BC – 60/70 AD
1060	2	3	LPR	FLIN: Fine flint-tempered
1069	2	19	RO	LR10 flanged bowl (Young form 51); R69 shell-tempered body sherd *c* AD240 –400+
Total	26	207		

Fabric codes are from the Canterbury Archaeological Trust series:

R101	CAT: HARD FIRED GREY/BLACK SANDY WARE (FINE)
B2	CAT: BELGIC COARSE GROG-TEMPERED
B6	CAT: BELGIC SHELL-TEMPERED (?N KENT)
B9	CAT: BELGIC COARSE SANDY
LR10	OXFORDSHIRE RED/BROWN COLOURCOATED
FLIN	FLINT TEMPERED

APPENDIX 2: ASSESSMENT OF MEDIEVAL POTTERY

Lyn Blackmore
Conservation by Liz Barham

1. Introduction

1.1 This assessment refers only to material from the 1998 phase of excavation; finds from the work in 1997 have been reported on elsewhere (URL 1997). The 1998 assemblage comprises a large collection of domestic pottery; most was recovered by hand, but some was recovered from the sieved samples. From the ceramic dating used by the Canterbury Archaeological Trust, the bulk of the collection can be related to occupation between *c*.1125-1250/1300.

1.2 The study of the material should assist the following fieldwork aims:

- *to determine the function and economic basis of the site;*
- *to establish a dated sequence of occupation and use;*
- *through snapshot profiles of the main groups, it can inform on the interaction of the site with the local area (in terms of pottery supply and use (see below).*

2. Methodology

2.1 The pottery was recorded on a context-by context basis using standard Museum of London proforma sheets. The different fabrics were isolated using a binocular microscope (x20) and compared with samples from the Canterbury Archaeological Trust reference collection, in conjunction with John Cotter (CAT). Once the identifications had been agreed, sherds of the same fabric types were recorded and bagged together, where possible by vessel or by form. For the Ashford ware, fabric code M39 is not used here as it is being phased out in Canterbury. The data was entered on the MoLAS Oracle database and the records converted to an Excel file in the CTRL standard tabulated format. More detail is, therefore, available, if required.

3. Quantification

Totals

3.1 Including sieved material, a total of 3,949 sherds of medieval pottery was recovered from 172 contexts (total weight 59.438 Kg). Only seven sherds are of post-medieval date (weight 16g). After sorting and reboxing the pottery fills 26 standard boxes. The distribution of the pottery by context is shown in Table 3, which shows that the finds from pit fills [166], [164] and the general occupation surface [382] amount to over half the assemblage by sherd count (47% by weight). Pit [918] and the primary moat fill [190] contained 110 and 91 sherds, but all other contexts contained less than 65 sherds. Of the other contexts, 124 have less than ten sherds, and most of the others have less than 50 sherds; the same pattern applies to weight, with 104 contexts having less than 100g.

Fabrics

3.2 In all 25 different medieval fabrics were identified, but the assemblage is overwhelmingly dominated by the local Ashford-type ware (Grove and Warhust 1952). The most common type, which contains abundant ?fossil shell (fabric EM.M5), amounts to c 80% of the total medieval assemblage by sherd count. The later Ashford fabrics M40A (which contains sparse shell), and fabric M40B (which contains no shell) each amount to c 5% of the material by sherd count. Fabric M40C amounts to 21 sherds, most from a jug with ring-and-dot stamps. These three fabrics grade into one another, and it is not always easy to draw clear distinctions between them. These totals must, therefore, be treated with caution, but give a good guide the overall composition of the group.

3.3 All other fabrics are very much in the minority. The most common types are the reduced greywares M38A and M38B (c.2.5% of the assemblage by count and weight) and Tyler Hill ware (fabric M1; Blackmore 1988, 252; 261-2), which amounts to 69 sherds (*c* 2% by count and weight). Other regional wares comprise a range of other sand-and-shell-tempered fabrics, with a few gritty wares which are probably from Kent. London finewares (M5) are quite well represented (36 sherds from up to 21 different jugs). Five sherds of green-glazed whiteware (M19G) are probably from France, but could be from Surrey, while other imports are limited to one sherd each of Saintonge polychrome ware, North French Monochrome ware, Langerwehe stoneware and Valencian lustreware.

Forms

3.4 Over 80% of the assemblage comprises locally made jars and cooking pots (the latter defined by external sooting); several of these have applied strips or dimples around the shoulder. The range of forms present in fabric EM.M5 is shown in Table 4. A range of different rim profiles was noted (including flat-topped, bevelled, inverted; rounded, hooked, squared). Locally made jugs and dishes are also well represented; many have incised decoration. A few jugs in fabric M40B are slip-decorated while one in fabric M40C has ring-and-dot stamped decoration ([166][190]). Also present are up to five cauldrons, a number of curfews, dishes and spouted bowls and a dripping dish. Several of these are decorated with incised lines or thumbing.

3.5 Two unusual straight-sided 'jars' inverted rims (or perforated bases) are identified as industrial vessels ([166][190]). Of special interest are part a model horse, possibly a toy ([335]) and a large flat-based dish (diameter c 350mm) with external flange and slot cut for drainage; the latter may be beehive base or a press used in a dairy or similar situation (see below)

Date

3.6 Almost all contexts are dated to after 1125, but four are broadly dated to 1075-1225/1350. Some finds from the evaluation and a few sherds from other contexts also appear to be typologically earlier than the main occupation and are possibly of Late Saxon date; the real amount of residual material needs to be confirmed. The end date for most groups is placed at 1250, but many could run to 1270-1300, while nine definitely date to after 1270; two of the latter are post-medieval.

Scanned pottery.

3.7 This would seem to comprise a range of similar wares as the above, with Ashford wares being by far the most common; some pottery was dated to the 11th century. One sherd of Saintonge ware was also found.

4. Provenance

4.1 Taken by sub-group, the most significant clusters are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: The larger pottery clusters by sub -group (over 1 kg)

Subgroup	Feature	Contexts	Total sherds	ENV	Weight
481	Destruction debris	480	56	11	1028
207	Rubbish pit	589	20	7	1032
272	Pit	560	23	6	1047
88	Non-structural cut	558	45	13	1110
156	Ditch/drain/gully?	190	922	60	1678
396	Rubbish pit	918	110	63	2396
81	Pit	280,600, 601,602	211	40	3050
359	Occupation	382	528	363	7271
179	Pit	164	527	391	8108
180	Pit	166	1081	467	12871

ENV Estimated number of vessels

4.2 The pottery from the 17 deposits below the general occupation surface in the central area of the site [382] was considered to see if there was any difference between the fabrics and forms between these and those in or above ([382] the large dumped layer). On the whole these groups are very similar to those on the rest of the site ([582], [593], [657], [825], [839], [887], [934], [935], [937], [946]). Two layers on different sides of building 3 could possibly be earlier in the sequence ([581], [847]) but these can only be broadly dated to 1075-1350. Three layers contain material dating to after 1225 ([361], [577] and [809]), suggesting that most of the occupation dates to the 13th century, or that the finds relate to the abandonment of the property.

4.3 A large amount of pottery (528 sherds) was found in the general occupation surface [382] around the buildings, but as this covered a large area the density of sherds is perhaps not that great. The date of this group is uncertain. The most notable finds are two decorated lugged handles from cauldrons which appear quite early in style, but the finds are dominated by local wares identical to those seen in the other contexts, notably [164] and [166]. There are, however, sufficient later sherds of Tyler Hill ware and M40C, to indicate that this group dates to after 1250, even if the Langerwehe stoneware and late medieval Tyler Hill ware are intrusive.

4.4 The most important concentration of pottery was in two large dumps of pottery in pits located well outside the area of the building, in pits cut by the moat of medieval phase III. Of these, pit fill [164] contained 527 sherds, while [166] contained 1081 sherds from up to 465 vessels. Both include fragments from several London ware jugs and numerous large sherds.

4.5 The presence of sherds from the same pots in pit groups [164] and [166] shows that they are contemporary. Pit fill [166] and the primary moat fill [190] are also linked by sherds from an M40C jug with ring-and-dot stamps. Context [190] can 0also be linked to the general occupation surface [382]. Contexts [308], [349], [361] and [375] are linked by the presence of sherds from the same north French whiteware jug.

4.6 Of the 136 sherds from the moat, 91 are from the primary fill [190], which contains other wares indicating that it relates to the general dumping in the late 13th century. All the other wares also appear to be contemporary with the main occupation.

4.7 Only two sherds of Ashford ware EM.M5 from the possible mill leet were examined in this assessment, but more pottery, thought to be of 11th century date, was noted in the evaluation report. The real amount of this earlier material must be established (see 7.1).

4.8 The industrial vessels were found in [166] (pit) and [190] (moat). The beehive base or dairy press was found in [767] and [769], with a similar sherd from [822].

Condition

4.9 Much of the pottery is abraded and comprises quite small pieces, but some contexts, notably [164] and [918] include some quite large and relatively unabraded sherds which cannot have travelled far. Most of the shell-tempered wares are leached, but this reflects the nature of the fossil shell rather than the conditions on the site, as the shell in other shell-tempered wares appears quite fresh.

5. Conservation

5.1 Up to ten pieces are worthy of reconstruction for display, but there are no other conservation requirements. The need for restoration work cannot be ascertained until the pottery has been laid out and studied in relation to the stratigraphic sequence, which may yield more sherd links.

5.2 A time estimate for conservation work on these items cannot be made until the chosen pieces are identified and examined.

6. Comparative material

General parallels for Ashford ware

6.1 The most relevant site is that of the supposed kiln at Potter's Corner, Ashford (Grove and Warhurst 1952; Streeten 1982, 87). Here a rather narrower range of very similar forms was found, including the same distinctive curfew form (published as a bowl: Grove and Warhurst 1952, Figs.4, 5). Many features of the Ashford wares are also seen on Tyler Hill wares.

Relevant sites

6.2 The closest comparable domestic site is the 13th century moated manor at Pivington (Rigold 1962). Finds from as Eynsford Castle (Rigold 1971; 1973) and other excavated moated properties in Kent are also relevant to the study of the material from Parsonage Farm.

6.3 Other assemblages to be considered include finds from the nearby site of Mersham (excavations of 1998). To the south, Ashford-type wares have been noted at the hospital of SS Stephen, New Romney, which spans the period 1190-1320 or later (Rigold 1964), at Westwood, Lyminge, just to the north of Hythe and at the Manor House, Hythe. At both the latter sites decorated M40C jugs similar to that from ARC PFM 98 have been found (J Cotter pers comm; Philp 1996, 137-41; Fig.4). In Dover, useful comparative material has been found at Townwall Street (Cotter in prep) and in 12th to 13th century levels at Dover Castle (Rigold 1967, 92). Fabrics EM.M5 and M40B have also been found at Church Hougham, near Folkestone (Cotter forthcoming). To the east of Ashford, a jug in fabric M40B has been found with pottery dated to 1125-1250 near the site of a probable ford across the Great Stour between Kennington and Wye, not far from Ashford (Cotter *et al* 1993, Fig.25). Canterbury was mainly supplied by the Tyler Hill kilns and offers fewer parallels.

Jug with ring-and-dot decoration

6.4 Parallels include a jug from Fordwich in fabric M40B or M40C (J Cotter pers comm). A Tyler Hill jug with similar ring and dot stamps was found in Canterbury in a context broadly dated to 1225-1300 at St John's Hospital, Northgate (unpublished, J Cotter pers comm).

Tyler Hill face jug

6.5 Jugs of this type have been found in Canterbury (*eg*. Wilson 1983, Fig.85, No.140; Fig.101, No.397; Fig.125, no.773).

London wares

6.6 These can be paralleled in the City of London (Pearce et al 1985).

'Industrial' forms

6.7 No parallels have been found for the two jars with inverted rims/perforated bases or the dish-shaped vessel with flanged base from [767][769]. Jars with unusual bases found at Laverstock were interpreted as beehive bases (Musty *et al* 1969, 107) but this is only one of the possible uses for the present find.

7. Potential for further work

7.1 The study of the material will assist the following Fieldwork Event Aims:

- *To establish a dated sequence of occupation and use.*

7.2 The finds show that most pottery is of much the same period and gives a good guide to the main period of occupation. Some pieces, however, appear to be stylistically earlier and suggest that there may have been earlier occupation in another part of the site which remains to be found. It should be a primary aim of the research to establish the date and quantity of the earlier finds (by stratigraphic, typological and comparative analysis) in order to gain a better understanding of the development of the site.

7.3 It would seem that the large groups from pit groups [164] and [166] were discarded at one time and that most finds from them should be contemporary. Closer analysis may reveal areas with greater or lesser amounts of residual or later pottery, which will help interpret the site and determine whether the larger groups of finds represent the clearance of the property.

- *To determine the function and economic basis of the site.*

7.4 Spatial analysis of the pottery may help determine the organisation of the building complex within the moat and the function of the different rooms. All the larger groups can be used to help to determine the function and economic basis of the site. Contexts with few sherds may be less significant for the pottery analysis, but they will to help define the extent and morphology of structures/features in which they were found and to interpret the function of these areas. The general lack of pottery in the moat, for example, suggests that it was regularly cleaned out (see above, 4.2.6).

7.5 The range of material suggests that most of the pottery is from a kitchen or food preparation area, although the jugs and curfews may have been used in other rooms. The number of cooking pots and their general homogeneity suggest that either catering was in bulk or that the pots were not long-lived and were regularly replaced (see below). The presence of jugs from London and the continent indicates the wide connections of the house and suggest a degree of luxury in the main apartments. Residue analysis of the beehive base/dairy or distillation vessel may help clarify its function.

7.6 The following Landscape Zone aims (Towns and their rural landscapes 100 BC-AD 1700) may be addressed:

- *Did population increase and concentration effect natural resource exploitation and accelerate environmental change?*

7.7 The Parsonage Farm site appears to coincide with the peak of the production period of the possible industry at Potter's Corner, Ashford, which probably exploited local clay resources and woodland. As an important client, it may have prompted the development of the local pottery, and the abandonment of the Parsonage Farm site may have contributed to the closure of the pottery. It is therefore important to establish that the pottery form the site is the same as that from the 'kiln' and the provenance of the clay. Inductively Coupled Plasma Spectrometry of ware EM.M5 from PFM98, sherds from Potter's Corner and clay from local deposits would help to determine whether the pottery exploited local clay deposits.

- *How were settlements and rural landscapes organised and how did they function?*

7.8 Comparison of the assemblage with others in the area will help understand the wider economy of the property at Parsonage Farm, and patterns of trade and communication. The relative proportion of different wares on the site is of interest, both as an indicator of the status of the site and in terms of pottery distribution. The number of imported London ware jugs were found, together with hints of continental imported wares used on the site suggests a relatively high standard of living at Parsonage Farm. Some forms in the local ware, such as the two cauldron rims with triangular lug handles from [382], appear to be unique in Kent and may indicate special commissions. Analysis of the distribution of the pottery on the site may help to show how it functioned.

7.9 The relationship of the pottery and tile industries, as reflected in this assemblage, should also be studied to better understand the interaction of the site with the local community.

7.10 The assemblage differs both from the moated site at Pivington, where no London wares were identified, and from sites closer to Dover, where Wealden and Tyler Hill wares are more equally balanced (Cotter in prep).). Special finds, such as the decorated M40C jug, are particularly suitable for plotting trade networks and distribution patterns that extend beyond normal consumerism. The distribution of continental imports in Kent is not yet well understood. Those from Parsonage Farm probably reached the site via Dover; although few in number they will help in future studies of marketing and trade in Kent (see also additional research aims).

7.11 The following wider research aim is important to this study:

- *How can the pottery contribute to the development of Kentish Pottery studies?*

7.12 If the pottery is fully analysed and published as a standard pottery report within the context of the site, the local landscape and other CTRL projects, the results would be of local and regional importance (see 1.2). The following seeks to demonstrate the value of the collection to pottery specialists, and the possible by-products of its publication. As noted by Streeten (1982, 87), archaeological evidence for medieval pottery production in Kent is more scarce than in other counties, the only definite kilns being at Tyler Hill and in Canterbury. The site at Potter's Corner, only a short distance from Parsonage Farm is one of only two other known earlier medieval production centres in the county; it was not properly excavated and the finds have never been fully published. The need to understand the site and the industry has been long recognised, and most recently highlighted by Cotter (in prep).

7.13 At present information on Ashford-type fabrics and forms is limited. The 'kiln' site was not properly excavated, the interim note contains nothing which hints at the presence of shell inclusions in the ware, and the forms are presented somewhat randomly (Grove and Warhust 1952). The textural analysis carried out by Streeten (1982) concentrated on sandy, rather than shell-tempered wares, and is based on the 1952 finds, which may not be fully representative. Most of his work is in an unpublished thesis, and only two fabric graphs of Potter's Corner ware have been published (*ibid*, 92; Fig.38B; Fig.41B). The descriptions by Cotter (forthcoming; in prep) are based on finds from Folkestone and Dover where, again, the full range of wares and forms is lacking. Comparison of the wares is required to ensure that they are the same.

7.14 Stratigraphic and typological analysis of the pottery from Parsonage Farm will also help refine the dating of the Ashford industry. The finds from the 'kiln' site were first dated to the 13th century (Grove and Warhust 1952), but the Parsonage Farm group and finds from other sites (J Cotter pers comm) suggest that it was active in the 12th century and that some sherds are even older than this. Fabric analysis and illustration, therefore, will be of great importance in helping to define the output of the Ashford pottery industry. The assessment of the pottery from Parsonage Farm has already shown that a form published as a bowl in the interim report on the Ashford 'kiln' (Grove and Warhust 1952), is in fact a curfew. New questions to be addressed include whether it can be shown that the stylistically earlier pieces in EM.M5 are genuinely older and if they are from the same source as the more sandy wares. Are the later sandy wares (M40A-C) all from the same source, or was the industry dispersed in a number of workshops? Until such time as a kiln is discovered, the report on the Parsonage Farm assemblage, if comprehensive, will become a standard reference for students of Kentish medieval pottery.

7.15 At present there are few well-stratified medieval assemblages from Kent which have been classified and quantified in an accessible manner, and pottery use and supply in rural south-east Kent is poorly understood. The data from the Parsonage Farm excavation will form a foundation block for the development of Kentish pottery studies. It will be an essential tool for comparing the site with other contemporary domestic assemblages such as finds from Dover (Cotter in prep; Cotter forthcoming), and for addressing questions such as the distribution of pottery and the relationship of the medieval markets to their hinterland (Streeten 1982, 87)

Further work

7.16 For the interpretation of the site, further quantification and stratigraphic analysis will help number of vessels present at different times, and determine the chronology of the different rim forms. Some of these finds are photogenic (eg decorated sherds, cauldron fragments, dripping dish) and many are suitable for illustration; they will offer an excellent snapshot of the range of wares in use in an upper class kitchen in mid-13th century Kent. Comparative studies (to include visits to other collections) will help show more clearly how the site compares to others in the region.

7.17 Thin section analysis and Inductively Coupled Plasma Spectrometry (ICPS) are recommended in order to identify the types of shell in fabrics EM.M5, and in M40A, M40B and M40C. It was formerly thought that the shell was of fossil origin, but some sherds identified as EM.M5 appear contain gastropods, which suggest that the clay was taken from more recent deposits which are adjacent to a lake or river. This needs to be verified and explained by analysing the clay and its inclusions. These fabrics should also be compared with the finds from other sites, such as Pivington, where Rigold thought that the pottery sufficiently different in colour from the Ashford wares to suggest that it came from a more local source, Mersham and Newchurch (Streeten 1982).

Table 4: The distribution of the forms in Ashford fabric EM.M5

Form	Count	Weight	Maximum vessels
Bowl	10	327	6
Socketed bowl	1	25	1
Cauldron	7	828	5
Cooking pot	2809	35777	1604
Curfew	126	3772	23
Dish	38	1092	20
Dripping dish	2	311	1
Industrial vessel	2	76	2
Jar	1	4	1
Jug	160	2410	25
Miscellaneous	3	3	2
Pipkin	2	95	1
Unidentified	40	495	19

8. Bibliography

Blackmore, L, 1988 'The Pottery' in D Sherlock and H Woods *St Augustine's Abbey: Report on Excavations, 1960-78*, 247-307. Kent Archaeol Soc Monograph Series IV, 247-307.

Cotter, J, Macpherson-Grant N and Savage A 1993 'River Stour, near Kennington, Ashford' in *Canterbury's Archaeology* 17th Annual Report, 43-5.

Cotter, J, forthcoming 'Medieval and later pottery' in K Parfitt and B Corke 'Excavations along the route of the Folkestone Transfer Pipeline 1998' for *Archaeol Cantiana.*

Cotter, J, in prep 'The pottery' in K Partfitt and B Corke 'Excavations at Townwall Street, Dover, 1996'.

Dunning, G C, 1955 'Pottery and other finds' in M M Rix and G C Dunning 'Excavation of a medieval garderobe in Snargate Street, Dover, in 1945' *Archaeol Cantiana* LXIX, 132-52.

Grove, L R A, and Warhurst, A, 1952 'A thirteenth century kiln at Ashford' *Archaeol Cantiana* LXV, 183-7.

McCarthy, M, & Brooks, C, 1988 Medieval Pottery in Britain AD 900-1600.

Musty, J, Algar, D J, & Ewence, P F, 1969 'The Medieval Pottery Kilns at Laverstock, near Salisbury, Wiltshire' *Archaeologia* CII, 83-150.

Pearce, J P, et al 1985 *A Dated type-series of London Medieval Pottery Part 2, London-type Ware*. London and Middlesex Archaeol Soc Spec Pap 6.

Philp, B, 1996 'Excavations at the Manor House, Hythe' *Kent Archaeol Review* 126, 130-41.

Rigold, S E, 1962 'Excavation of a moated site at Pivington' *Archaeol Cantiana* LXXVII, 27-47.

Rigold, S E, 1964 ‘Two Kentish Hospitals re-examined: S. Mary, Ospringe, and SS. Stephen and Thomas, new Romney’ *Archaeol Cantiana* LXXIX, 31-69.

Rigold, S E, 1967 ‘Excavations at Dover Castle’ *Journ Brit Archaeol Ass* XXX, 87-121.

Rigold, S E, 1971 ‘Eynsford Castle and its Excavation’ *Archaeol Cantiana* LXXVI, 109-172.

Rigold, S E, 1973 ‘Eynsford Castle: the Moat and Bridge’ *Archaeol Cantiana* LXXVIII, 87-116.

Streeten, A, 1982 ‘Potters, kilns and markets in medieval Kent: a preliminary study’ in P Leach (ed) Archaeology in Kent to AD 1500, *CBA Res Rep* 48, 87-95.

URL 1997 ‘West of Station Road, Parsonage Farm – An Archaeological Evaluation Prepared by MoLAS’

Wilson, M, 1983 ‘Description of the pottery’ in S S Frere and S Stow ‘Excavations in the St George’s Street and Burgate Areas, The Archaeology of Canterbury, vol.VII.

Table 5: Assessment of pottery, quantifications and atributes

Context	Count	Weight	Early date	Late date	Period	Comments (Fabrics, forms, decoration: see below for key)
0	1	13	1500	1600	PM	PM5 JUG MEDL
101	10	171	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M1 JUG; M40A CP; M5 JUG (NFR, BAL APST)
114	2	5	1075	1225	MD	EM33 CP
152	3	44	1200	1350	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40B JUG WSD
153	1	17	1175	1400	MD	M40B JUG
164	527	8108	1250	1270	MD	EM.M5 CP (APTH, DIMP), JUG LATT, CURF, DISH; links with 166, 382 and 190
166	1075	12850	1225	1270	MD	EM.M5 CP (APST, DIMP, INCH), CURF (APD,THD), DISH (DIMP/INCW, INCW), DRIP STAB/INCW, INDV, JUG (LATT, INCD, STAB), PIP DIMP; EM3 CP; M1 CP, JAR, JUG (RILL); M38A JUG; M40A JUG (STAB); LOND JUG (BAL, NFR, SQU, WPEAR); links with 164, 190, 382
167	3	21	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
168	2	43	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (RILL)
169	2	17	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
170	1	8	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
171	2	24	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 BOWL (IMP), CP
172	27	403	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 BOWL, CP; M1 JUG THBC
176	3	35	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M1 JUG
179	2	16	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40B CP
181	1	4	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
186	7	88	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40B JAR, JUG THM
189	1	11	1175	1350	MD	M38A CP
190	91	1622	1250	1270	MD	EM.M5 BOWL, CP (APST, DIMP), DISH, JUG, INDV; M1 JUG
197	3	19	1175	1250	MD	M40A CP, DISH
201	4	93	1200	1250	MD	EM3 CP; M100 JUG; M40A DISH
206	0	2	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M1 JAR
207	12	132	1270	1350	MD	EM.M5 CP; M5 JUG CON
207	1	5	1550	1700	PM	PM1 PIP
208	3	42	1225	1350	MD	EM.M5 CP; M1 JUG; M100 JUG BAL
213	11	204	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APST, DIMP)
225	2	8	1175	1350	MD	M38A JUG INCD M40A JAR
228	21	138	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 BOWL, CP; M40A CP
231	31	440	1225	1350	MD	EM3A CP; M1 CP; M100 JUG THD; M19G JUG; M38A CP (RILL, STAB), DISH RILL; M40A CP; M40B JAR, JUG
233	2	13	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40A CP

Context	Count	Weight	Early date	Late date	Period	Comments (Fabrics, forms, decoration: see below for key)
234	9	50	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
235	1	128	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CURF APST
236	0	9	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
237	3	84	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
245	1	3	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
253	54	830	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APTH,DIMP, INCH , RILL), CURF INCW, INDV; M1 JUG; M40A CP (RILL), JUG COMB; M40B CP, JUG BAL
255	3	14	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M1 CP; M40A JAR
262	1	7	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
279	21	323	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP, DISH, JUG RILL; EM3 DISH; M1 JUG (ANTH, INCW) ; M5 JUG (BAL, BAL WS)
280	46	1423	1380	1400	MD	EM.M5 BOWL, CAUL APTH, CP; EM1 CP; EM3 CP, DISH GRGL; M1 CP APTH
306	8	56	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
307	5	82	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
308	19	307	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (DIMP), CURF, DISH; M5 JUG; M19G? JUG
310	23	437	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APTH); EM3 CP; M38A CP
311	12	307	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APTH), DISH INCW; M40B JUG STAB
312	11	330	1250	1350	MD	EM.M5 CP CURF APTH, DISH, JUG; M38A CP; M53 JUG THM
318	3	43	1200	1350	MD	M40A CP; M40B JUG HD
327	25	636	1175	1350	MD	M40A CP
335	1	55	1350	1500	MD	M10 Figurine (toy horse)
344	2	209	1350	1550	MD	M10 JAR
349	4	27	1170	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; EM3A CP; M19G JUG
350	10	97	1250	1350	MD	EM.M5 CP DISH INCW; M38A JUG; M53 JUG; M5 JUG BAL
351	1	39	1475	1550	MD	CLM32 JUG STAB
356	1	13	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
359	2	29	1125	1225	MD	EM.M5 CP; EM3A CP
361	62	992	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 BOWL IMP, CP (APTH); EM3A CP; M1 CP; M19G JUG RILL
375	5	19	1170	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M19G JUG RILL
376	4	70	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M1 JUG THBC; M40B CP
380	27	311	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M1 JUG (GRGL); LOND JUG BAL WHSL

Context	Count	Weight	Early date	Late date	Period	Comments (Fabrics, forms, decoration: see below for key)
382	528	7271	1375	1400	MD	EM.M5 CAUL (APTH) ,CP (APTH, DIMP), CURF, DISH, JUG (STAB); EM3 CP; EM36 BOWL STAB; LM1 JUG; M1 JUG; M19G JUG; M38A CP, JUG INCD; M40A CP (STAB), CURF, DISH, JUG (LATT, INCD, RILL); M40C JUG RLD; M5 JUG NFR; LM8 JAR . Links with 166 and 190
383	2	64	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40B CP
390	27	740	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CAUL, CP (APTH, DIMP)
394	18	469	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M1 JAR; M38A JUG INCH
396	3	12	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
400	9	235	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40A CP
405	1	23	1175	1250	MD	M40A CP
406	1	9	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
409	1	6	1175	1250	MD	M40B CP
417	2	6	1200	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; LOND JUG BAL WHSL
419	4	159	1200	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M100 JUG; M40B JUG
426	2	73	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
429	1	16	1125	1350	MD	M38A JAR
431	1	3	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
435	1	7	1175	1250	MD	M40A CP
452	1	10	1075	1350	MD	M38A JAR
454	3	19	1175	1225	MD	EM3A CP; M40B CP
458	7	69	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40A CP; M40A JAR
461	19	202	1200	1350	MD	M40B JUG RSD
467	2	6	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
468	9	127	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (DIMP)
469	4	27	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
471	11	211	1150	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (DIMP), JUG
474	47	682	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APST, DIMP), DISH
480	56	1028	1225	1300	MD	EM.M5 CAUL INCW, CP; EM3 CP; M1 JUG; M38A JUG INCH; M40A CP (APST), DISH; CM40B JUG (BAL, WHSL)
481	2	20	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
487	1	8	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
489	1	13	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 DISH
492	1	14	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
496	3	22	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP APTH; M40B CP
499	3	34	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP DISH; M1 JAR
501	7	98	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40A CP
503	3	51	1280	1350	MD	EM.M5 CP; M38A JUG NFR; M22P JUG
505	3	40	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
508	5	60	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40A CP
513	1	31	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP APTH

Context	Count	Weight	Early date	Late date	Period	Comments (Fabrics, forms, decoration: see below for key)
515	15	144	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M1 JUG RILL
517	14	134	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; EM3 CP, DISH; M38A CP DISH M38A
521	1	4	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
527	63	825	1175	1225	MD	EM.M5 CP (DIMP), CURF APTH; EM3A CP; M40A JUG INCH; M40B JUG
540	1	13	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
546	1	24	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
558	45	1110	1250	1400	MD	EM.M5 CP, CURF, JUG COMH; M38B JAR; M53 JUG
560	23	1047	1225	1250	MD	EM3 CP; M1 JAR; M40A CP
565	1	16	1100	1200	MD	EM31 CP
567	3	15	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
569	1	30	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
570	1	43	1250	1300	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40C MISC
577	1	14	1225	1375	MD	M1 CP
581	1	10	1075	1350	MD	M40B CP RILL
582	6	72	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
584	3	27	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
585	16	283	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; EM31 CP; M38A CP; M40B JUG (RILL, THBC), MISC
589	17	1032	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (DIMP)
593	6	101	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40A CP
600	4	37	1125	1250	MD	EM3 CP
601	75	1453	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APTH); EM3 CP (DIMP, RILL); EM36 CP DIMP; M1 JAR; M38A CP; M40B JUG RILL
602	7	137	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (DIMP); M40A CP APTH; LOND JUG SQU
603	5	64	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
607	8	47	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M38A JUG INCD
610	5	36	1175	1250	MD	M1 JUG; M38A JUG
612	14	209	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M38A JUG COMB
613	1	4	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 JAR
614	1	23	1100	1250	MD	EM3 CP
615	4	43	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40B JUG
626	1	11	1225	1350	MD	M1 JAR
628	2	27	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
648	8	30	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
657	10	171	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APTH, IMP); M40B JAR
673	5	109	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (DIMP)
697	1	1	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
712	3	98	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M38A CP
743	6	11	1807	1900	PM	LPM7BJ SAUC
767	19	1232	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M40A CP APTH; M40B CP APTH, INDV
769	11	352	1250	1400	MD	EM.M5 CP M40B CP, INDV; M53 JUG

Context	Count	Weight	Early date	Late date	Period	Comments (Fabrics, forms, decoration: see below for key)
771	11	139	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
788	4	208	1175	1400	MD	M40B JAR
800	2	31	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP, M40A CP
809	20	159	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APTH); M1 JUG; M38A CP RILL; M40A CP
811	1	7	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
822	35	1037	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M1 CP; M40B CP (APTH, STAB), INDV
824	13	323	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APTH)
825	12	142	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APTH); M38A CP
836	2	26	1225	1375	MD	M1 JUG RILL
838	2	29	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
839	16	200	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 BOWL SP STAB, CP, CURF; EM3 CP; M38A CP, JUG
842	3	23	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (DIMP)
844	3	40	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (DIMP); M40B JAR
847	1	8	1075	1350	MD	M38A CP
854	1	23	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
887	1	21	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
905	3	9	1125	1250	MD	EM22 CP
913	1	8	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
918	110	2396	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APTH, DIMP, INCW), CURF
923	1	13	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
928	1	59	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
933	11	231	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CURF, MISC; M40A JUG INCH
934	7	53	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
935	1	10	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
937	8	124	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; M38A CP
946	5	57	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP; EM3 CP
980	2	19	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP, CURF APD
985	15	323	1225	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP, DISH INCW; M38B JUG (SLSH, STAB); M40A JAR
988	6	262	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
1042	1	5	1175	1400	MD	M40B JUG
1053	1	16	1175	1400	MD	M40A CP APST
1066	2	45	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APST)
1069	92	683	1175	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP, JUG; EM3 CP; EM31 CP; M38A CP
1082	1	52	1175	1400	MD	M40A JUG
1100	5	18	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP (APST); M38B JAR ; M40B JAR
1113	3	58	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP, CURF
1114	2	18	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
1148	2	49	1125	1250	MD	EM.M5 CP
1165	2	15	1175	1250	MD	EM28 CP; EM31 CP
1177	1	42	1175	1400	MD	M40B JAR

The comments field lists each Canterbury Archaeological Trust fabric code, followed by the forms present. The use of a decoration code beside the form code shows that this is the only type present in the context; the use of decoration codes in brackets shows that some, but not all sherds are decorated. Fabric codes are separated by semi-colons. This field also includes the date assigned to the pottery in the context.

Expansions for Canterbury Archaeological Trust fabric codes

Fabric	Expansion	Range
EM.M5	Ashford Potter's Corner Sandy Ware with fossil shell	1125-1250
EM1	Canterbury Sandy Ware	1050-1225
EM22	N/W Kent Fine Sandy with Sparse Shell And Sparse grits	1125-1250
EM28	Kentish Sandy Ware With Shell +Sparse Flint	1175-1225
EM3	Misc Shelly Ware	1050-1250
EM31	?Kentish Coarse Sandy Ware With moderate shell	1100-1200
EM33	?E.Sussex Shell+ Flint-Tempered Coarse Sandy ware	1075-1225
EM36	N/W Kent Sandy And Shell-Tempered	1100-1250
EM3A	Misc Shelly-Sandy Ware	850-1225
LM1	Late Med Tyler Hill Ware	1375-1550
LM32	Wealden Orange-Buff Sandy with reduced Streaks	1475-1550
M1	Medieval Tyler Hill Ware	1225-1375
M5	Fine London-Type Ware	1080-1350
M10	Wealden-Type Pink-Buff Sandy Ware	1350-1550
M19G	N. French/Rouen Green-Glazed	1170-1350
M22P	Saintonge Polychrome Ware	1280-1350
M38A	N/W Kent Sandy Ware (Mainly Reduced)	1175-1350
M38B	N/W Kent Fine Sandy Ware (Reduced)	1175-1400
M40A	Ashford/Wealden Sandy with Sparse Chalk/Shell	1175-1400
M40B	Ashford/Wealden Sandy with V Rare Shell	1175-1400
M40C	Ashford/Wealden Fine Ware with Chalk, Shell+Flint	1250-1450
M53	Surrey/Wealden Ware	1250-1450
M100	Misc Unidentified Medieval	1200-1400
LM8	Langerwehe Stoneware	1350-1500
LM11	Early Valencian Lustreware	1380-1450
PM1	Local Post-Medieval Redware	1550-1700
PM5	Frechen Stoneware	1550-1700
LPM7BJ	Transfer-printed ware	1807-1900

Expansions for form codes

Form	Expansion
BOWL	Bowl
BOWL SP	Spouted Bowl
CAUL	Cauldron
CP	Cooking Pot
CURF	Curfew
DISH	Dish
DRIP	Dripping Dish
FIGU	Figurine
INDV	Industrial Vessel
JAR	Jar
JUG	Jug
JUG ANTH	Anthropomorphic Jug
JUG BAL	Baluster Jug
JUG CON	Conical Jug
JUG SQU	Squat Jug
JUG WPEAR	Waisted Pear-Shape Jug
MISC	Misc
PIP	Pipkin
SAUC	Saucer

Expansions for decoration

Code	Expansion
APD	Applied
APST	Applied Strip
APTH	Applied Thumbed Strip
ARC	Arcaded Slip Or Decorative Arcs (Eg Dutsd Tgw)
COMB	Combed
COMH	Horizontal Combing
COMW	Combed Wavy Or Curvilinear Decoration
DIMP	Dimpled (Finger Tip) Decoration
GRGL	Green Glaze
HD	Highly Decorated Style (Lond King)
IMP	Impressed
INCD	Incised Decoration
INCH	Incised Horizontal Decoration
INCW	Incised Wavy Or Curvilinear Decoration
LATT	Lattice
NFR	North French Style (Lond King)
PELL	Pellet Decoration (Lond King)
POLY	Polychrome
RDS	Ring And Dot Stamp
RILL	Rilled Decoration
RLD	Diamond Rouletting
RSD	Red Slip Decoration
SCAL	Scalloped
SLSH	Slashed
STAB	Stabbed
THBC	Continuous Thumbing (Basal)
THD	Thumbed Body Decoration (Not Applied)
THM	Thumbed
WHSL	White Slip
WSD	White Slip Decoration (Lond Chear)
WSGR	White Slip Green Glaze