REVIEW OF SAXON POTTERY CATALOGUE

Key: db = database, cp7 = Early Iron Age, cp8 = Middle Iron Age, cp9 = LIA

Contexts 'missing' from Sue's list:

db says prehist (cp8). Review
db says ?saxon, but could possibly be prehist.
db says saxon. Review
Db says 7 sherds of Saxon. Review
db says Saxon, but has triangular loomweight too. Probably prehist? Possibly early LIA?
db says 7 sherds of cp7 pot. Review
?Review
db says Saxon
19 sherds in feature over a LIA crem, should be okay as Saxon
db says Saxon, but in a LIA cremation. Is it early LIA?
dated as LR/Sax transition feature, however strat problems.
LR/Sax transition context including Saxon pot ID'd by ST
Could well be prehist, but presently grouped as a Saxon context. Review
LR/Sax transition context including Saxon pot ID'd by ST
LR/Sax transition context with Saxon pot ID'd by ST
LR/Sax transition context including Saxon pot ID'd by ST
LR/Sax transition context including Saxon pot ID'd by ST
LR/Sax transition context including Saxon pot ID'd by ST
all Saxon pot, ID'd by ST
LR/Sax transition context including Saxon pot ID'd by ST
LR/Sax transition context including Saxon pot ID'd by ST

Contexts on Sue's list which are not tagged as 'Saxon' in database:

- db says 7 sherds of prehist, but close to SFB. Review
- db says unidentified pot not claimed by Nigel. The feature assigned a cp9 date. Can pot be *early* LIA? Review
- This context only recorded as having some baked clay crucible fragments! Are these one in the same?

Other queries:

Some area W contexts, namely (65), (87), (92) and (93), are currently grouped as likely prehistoric though there is little stratigraphic ground for this. These need a second look.

Note from JC:

I have tried to track missing items and eliminate disparities with a little bit of success. Unfortunately, no record has been kept of the pottery first sent to ST as Saxon, so it is impossible to find out what has happened to it subsequently.