

APPENDIX 1 - CERAMICS

1.1 Medieval Pottery

by Paul Blinkhorn

Introduction

1.1.1 A small assemblage of early medieval (11th to 13th century) pottery was recovered by hand excavation primarily to provide dating evidence for the site. The small size of the assemblage is due largely to the fact that most of the site has been preserved *in situ*, thus limiting the need for intrusive investigation.

1.1.2 Methodology

1.1.3 The sherds were counted and weighed by context. Minimum numbers of vessels (MNV) were measured by rimsherd length. The sherds were recorded using the codes and chronologies of the Canterbury Archaeological Trust Fabric series for the county of Kent (Cotter forthcoming a and b), with the following types noted:

- EM3A, E Kent shelly-sandy ware, 1075/1100-1200/25. 294 sherds, 3002 g, MNV = 1.86
- M38B, N or W Kent fine sandy ware, 1225/50 – 1400. 1 sherd, 9 g, MNV = 0.06.
- M40B. Ashford/Wealden sandy ware, ?1200/25 - 1400. 5 sherds, 24 g, MNV = 0.
- M53, ?Wealden white/cream/buff sandy ware, ?1250-1400/1500. 1 sherd, 2g, MNV = 0.

Quantification and Provenance

1.1.4 The pottery assemblage comprised 301 sherds with a total weight of 3037 g. The minimum number of vessels was 1.92. This compares with 194 sherds with a weight of 2169 g from the evaluation (OAU 1999a). The pottery occurrence by number and weight of sherds per context by fabric type is shown in Table 1 below.

1.1.5 The majority of the assemblage comprised early medieval East Kent shelly sandy ware, most of which was noted in two related contexts which probably date to the later 11th or earlier 12th century, along with small quantities of slightly later medieval wares. The chronology and physical state of the assemblage suggest that the main period of medieval activity at the site began at that time, and that it was all but abandoned by the mid 13th century.

1.1.6 The majority of this assemblage (242 sherds, 2520 g) came from two contexts, 8 and 24, both upper fills in the enclosure ditch, with several cross-fits noted. This appears to be a primary dump of domestic pottery. The mean sherd weight of the group, 10.4g, does not entirely reflect this, due to the somewhat friable nature of most of the pottery, but the mean rim sherd size, 28.6% complete, is a better indicator, reflecting the presence of large fragments of a small number of vessels, with the bulk of the assemblage comprising no more than five vessels. The assemblage consisted entirely of jars, with large fragments of a very few vessels represented, and all were scorched and/or sooted to a greater or lesser degree. All were undecorated, apart from a single vessel with a thumbled applied strip. There appears little doubt that they were deposited very near to their point of breakage.

1.1.7 The assemblage from these two contexts comprised entirely East Kent shelly-sandy ware, suggesting that it had been deposited before AD 1200, as it appears that if such a large assemblage were later than this, it would have yielded contemporary

pottery, such as that noted in other, smaller groups (Table 1). As the data in Table 1 show, 13th century wares were extremely rare on the site in general, indicating that activity had all but ceased by that time.

Conservation

- 1.1.8 As evidence for the date of the pits in which they were found, and as a relatively rare assemblage of pottery of this date from this area, all of the medieval pottery should be retained.

Comparative material

- 1.1.9 Pottery of this date is poorly known in this area, and there is thus little material with which this assemblage could be usefully compared. Further material may become available from other excavations along the CTRL.

Potential for further work

- 1.1.10 The pottery can contribute little to the CTRL fieldwork aims, or to the interpretation of the site beyond its chronology. However, it is of some significance in terms of the relatively poorly known chronology of pottery in Kent in this period. This relatively small assemblage should, therefore, be published in full. No further analysis is required although it will be necessary to rework the text for publication.

Bibliography

Cotter, J, forthcoming a, The pottery, in K Parfitt, B Corke and J Cotter *Excavations at Townall Street, Dover, 1996*, Canterbury Archaeological Trust

Cotter, J, forthcoming b, The post-Roman pottery, in A Hicks and M Hicks (eds) *Excavations at St. Gregory's Priory, Canterbury*, Canterbury Archaeological Trust

1.2 Ceramic Building Material

by Leigh Allen

- 1.2.1 Two fragments of Roman tile with a total weight of 378 g were recovered from context 1, the topsoil (Table 2). The fragments are very abraded and neither has a surviving complete dimension. One is a fragment from a 'tegula' with a low flange and an angled cut away at the base of the flange where it would have overlapped with the tile below. The second fragment is from a large tile or brick which had a surviving thickness (not the complete thickness) of 47 mm.
- 1.2.2 Beyond indicating some Roman activity in the general area of the site, the finds are of little significance. The assemblage is very small and apparently residual and cannot contribute usefully to discussion of the landscape zone priorities. It is recommended that the material is discarded without further work.

Table 1: Summary of medieval pottery

Context	No	Wt (g)	Date	Comments
1	18	98	E13thC	Fabrics EM3A and M40B
8	174	2039	L11th-E13thC	Fabric EM3A
10	1	2	L11th-E13thC	Fabric EM3A
11	6	41	L11th-E13thC	Fabric EM3A
13	6	42	E13thC	Fabrics EM3A and M38B
14	21	287	L11th-E13thC	Fabric EM3A
16	3	25	M13th-M15thC	Fabric EM3A and M53
21	3	18	L11th-E13thC	Fabric EM3A
24	68	481	L11th-E13thC	Fabric EM3A
26	1	4	L11th-E13thC	Fabric EM3A
Total	301	3037		

Table 2: Summary of ceramic building material

Context	Count	Weight (g)	Type	Period	Comments
1	2	378	Tile	Roman	1 tegula, 1 fragment