

## Assessment of the Ceramic Building Material from the Easington to Ganstead Pipeline (EAG-06)

### *Alan Vince and Kate Steane*

A moderate collection of ceramic building material was recovered from fieldwalking on the line of the Easington to Ganstead pipeline by Network Archaeology and submitted for identification and assessment (Site Code: EAG-06).

The finds include a small quantity of ceramic building material of medieval or early post-medieval date and a small quantity of definitely modern material. The remainder can only be broadly dated to the later post-medieval period or later.

### Description

Following a similar protocol to that adopted for the pottery, all material of post-medieval and later date was recorded by fragment count by plot only whereas earlier material was recorded individually by fragment count and weight. In addition, the thicknesses of medieval tiles were recorded and any other details of potential interest. The digital record is deposited with the site archive rather than as an appendix to this assessment.

### Medieval

Twenty-one fragments of flat roof tiles, or probable flat roof tiles, were recorded. They include one fragment with a nib. The flat tiles range from 13mm to 20mm thick and visually appear to be different from the products of the Beverley tiler, which operated from the mid 12<sup>th</sup> to the late 15<sup>th</sup> century or later (VCH 1989).

Three of the flat roof tile fragments are overfired they come from Plots 63, 64 and 92. Given that Plot 92 is a considerable distance from the other two plots, these tiles are probably not evidence for production on or near the plots.

The fragments are distributed over 14 plots and range from 1 to 4 fragments per plot.

*Table 1*

Trench	FLAT	FLAT?	Grand Total
N05	1		1
N06	1		1
N07	3		3
N11	3		3
N14	1		1
N17		1	1
N28	1		1
N29	1	2	3
N63		1	1
N64	1		1

The Alan Vince Archaeology Consultancy, 25 West Parade, Lincoln, LN1 1NW

<http://www.postex.demon.co.uk/index.html>

A copy of this report is archived online at

<http://www.avac.uklinux.net/potcat/pdfs/avac2006007.pdf>

N79	1		1
N81	2		2
N91	1		1
N92	1		1
Grand Total	17	4	21

### Post-medieval

Fifty-four fragments of brick or pantile were recorded. Bricks were first used in East Yorkshire in the 14<sup>th</sup> century (VCH 1989) and there are no indications on these fragments to allow them to be dated closer than 14<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Pantiles were first introduced to eastern England in the later 16<sup>th</sup> century, although they never completely superceded flat tiles. These examples could therefore be any date between the later 16<sup>th</sup> and the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The bricks and pantiles occur on 27 different plots (Table 2). They range between 1 and 7 fragments per plot.

*Table 2*

trench	BRICK	BRICK?	PANT	Grand Total
N03	1			1
N05	1			1
N06	1			1
N07	1			1
N11	1		1	2
N13	1			1
N15			2	2
N17	3			3
N18	2			2
N28	4			5
N32	3			4
N34	1			1
N37	1			2
N40	3			3
N41	1			2
N43	1			1
N44	2			2
N48				1
N49	1			1
N53				1
N58	6			7
N63				1
N70	1			2
N77	2			2
N78	2			3
N81	1			1
N83	1			1
Grand Total	41		3	54

### Modern

Thirty-four fragments of ceramic building material of modern date (i.e. 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century) were recovered. They were recognised solely by form and include examples with a range of fabrics.

Thirteen were from structures, including air bricks, chimneys (in a stoneware fabric), drains (saltglazed stoneware) and wall tiles (unglazed black refined earthenware). The latter include one triangular tile. The remainder were fragments of unglazed earthenware field drains (Table 3 FD) or U-shaped field drains (UFD). The structural material came from eight plots, and ranged from 1 to 4 fragments per plot. The field drain came from 15 plots, ranging from 1 to 4 fragments per plot.

**Table 3**

trench	AIRBRICK	CHIMNEY	DRAIN	FD	UFD	UFD/PANT	UFD?	WALT	Grand Total
N43		1							1
N48				1					1
N49						1			1
N63						2	2		4
N11					1				1
N44				1					1
N70					1				1
N78			3					1	4
N28				1					1
N58				1					1
N10					1				1
N29			2	1					3
N33				1					1
N35				3					3
N39					1				1
N54			1						1
N56			2						2
N69								1	1
N79					1				1
N88					2				2
N89	1								1
N92			1						1
Grand Total	1	1	9	9	7	3	2	2	34

### Assessment

In the assessment of the pottery from the Easington to Ganstead pipeline a distinction was made between material of 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> century date, which seemed to reflect manuring from individual settlements, farms or villages, and in a few cases material from a DMV (Plots 78-81, SMR MHU 3234). Table 4 plots the incidence of this earlier medieval pottery and the flat roof tiles. There is no clear correlation of the two and in particular only three fragments of tile were found in the vicinity of the DMV compared with 20 fragments of pottery. This seems to be good evidence that the flat tiles are not of earlier medieval date.

*Table 4*

trench	CBM	POTTERY	Grand Total
N03		1	1
N05	1		1
N06	1		1
N07	3		3
N11	3		3
N14	1	1	2
N15		1	1
N17	1		1
N28	1		1
N29	3		3
N40		1	1
N54		1	1
N63	1	1	2
N64	1	1	2
N78		1	1
N79	1	18	19
N81	2	1	3
N91	1		1
N92	1		1
Grand Total	21	27	48

Table 5 shows the incidence of flat roof tiles and sherds of later medieval date (Humberware and Langewehe stoneware). There is a stronger correlation between these two finds types although four plots produced flat tiles and no later medieval potsherds.

*Table 5*

trench	CBM	POTTERY	Grand Total
N03		2	2
N05	1	4	5
N06	1		1
N07	3	5	8
N09		2	2
N11	3	2	5
N14	1		1
N17	1	4	5
N18		1	1
N22		4	4
N28	1	5	6
N29	3		3
N32		1	1
N37		2	2
N40		1	1
N41		2	2
N43		2	2
N44		1	1
N46A		1	1
N50		1	1
N53		2	2

N54		2	2
N56		3	3
N63	1	2	3
N64	1	9	10
N70		2	2
N79	1	1	2
N81	2		2
N82		1	1
N89		4	4
N91	1	4	5
N92	1	1	2
N93		2	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>94</b>

Similar tables (not included here) prepared for early and later post-medieval and modern pottery again show no close correlation and therefore it is likely that the flat tile is of later medieval date.

In general, however, the lower frequency of ceramic building material to pottery from the fieldwalking and the lack of significant concentrations of early modern material in certain plots supports the suggestion that the pottery was present in domestic organic waste which was used to fertilise the fields. Ceramic building material does not tend to be found in cess pit fills and other rubbish deposits and building waste probably had a more useful function as hardcore.

### **Retention**

The flat tiles should be retained for future comparison with the Hull fabrics. The bricks, because of their unstratified nature and long period of use could be discarded, along with all the clearly modern finds.

### **Further work**

No further work is recommended at this stage although it would be possible to test the suggestion that the flat roof tiles were included in refuse originating in Hull in the later medieval period by comparing their fabrics with those of tiles from Hull itself.

### **Bibliography**

VCH (1989) "Medieval Beverley: Trade and Industry." A History of the County of York East Riding: Volume 6: The borough and liberties of Beverley London, 34-42