New evidence for Saxo-Norman settlement at Chantry Green House, Steyning, West Sussex, 1989

Maureen Bennell
Bennetts Cottage, Seal Chart, Sevenoaks, Kent, TN15 0EY.

with contributions by
Lucy Kirk, Keith Oliver & Janet Pennington

THE FINDS

THE POTTERY By Keith Oliver

Method of analysis

The sherds were sorted into fabric-types by visual examination as well as with the use of a binocular microscope up to ×30 magnification. The inclusions were identified using the binocular microscope and Peacock's (1977) key to identification of common inclusions, while the proportions of the inclusions present was determined using a percentage chart. The roundness, sorting, feel and fracture of the inclusions was ascertained following the guidelines in Orton *et al.* (1993).

Applying each of these methods enabled the classification of ten pottery fabric-types (as well as a category for daub). The description of each of these classifications follows and where possible they have been related to other fabric-types for the region which have been published elsewhere (Gardiner 1988; 1990; 1993; Gardiner & Greatorex 1997; Reynolds 1992).

Fabric types

Type A - This is a hard fabric with a rough feel and a jagged fracture. The main component of its temper is a fine quartz sand (>5%) up to 0.25 mm across and medium-sized sub-rounded flint (>0.5%) up to 0.5 mm across. The most distinctive feature, however, is the occurrence of larger, sub-rounded siltstone inclusions of around 1 mm across or sometimes larger. The overall sorting of the fabric can be described as fair. This fabric is the same as the Adur Valley Type DB.

Type B - This is a hard fabric with a harsh feel and a laminated fracture. It has abundant multi-coloured flint, shell and chalk temper (2–5%) which is generally between 0.5–1.0 mm in size, although occasional inclusions occur of 2 mm or more. All inclusions are sub-rounded while their sorting can be described as fair. This fabric is the same as the Adur Valley Type DC.

Type C - This is a hard fabric with a smooth feel and a sharp fracture. Its temper is composed of sparse, sub-rounded flint (<1%) which is generally between 0.1–0.25 mm in size, but the occurrence of larger grains, 0.25–0.5 mm, is not uncommon. Sorting is good. Examples are shown as numbers 1 and 2 on Figure 4 (above).

Type D - This is similar to fabric-type C, except that the temper is much more abundant (>2%). It is a hard fabric with a moderately rough feel and a sharp fracture. Its temper is again made up of sub-rounded flint which varies in size between 0.1–0.5 mm, with the occasional larger grain, 0.5–1.0 mm in size, and can be described as dense. Some occasional fragments of water-rounded chalk are included in the temper. Sorting is fair. This fabric-type is the same as the Adur Valley Type DE. Selected examples are listed as numbers 3 to 7 (above).

Type E - This again is a hard fabric with a moderately rough feel and a sharp fracture. It is similar to fabric-type D, but is distinguished from it by the greater proportion of chalk which is abundant in it. Overall density of the temper is *c.* 2%. This is the same fabric as the Adur Valley Type DH. An example is shown as number 8 on Figure 4 (above).

Type F - This fabric is similar to fabric-type B and is hard, with a rough feel and an irregular fracture. Unlike B, however, it has a finer temper mainly of flint (2–5%) measuring 0.1–0.5 mm across, but it also includes slightly coarser chalk and shell, measuring 0.5–1.0 mm across. Occasional larger flint grains >1 mm occur. The inclusions are rounded and sub-rounded and have fair sorting. This fabric is the same as the Adur Valley Type DD. An example is shown as number 9 on Figure 4 (above).

Type G - This is a hard fabric which is very smooth to feel and has a laminated fracture. It has a very fine temper (<0.1 mm) of flint or quartz sand and some red inclusions, either clay pellets or red iron ore of a similar size. The inclusions are very small and difficult to see even under × 30 on the binocular microscope. Sorting is good but it is impossible to discern the level of roundness even under the binocular microscope. This fabric-type is a post-medieval earthenware.

Type H - This is a hard fabric with a moderately smooth feel and with a smooth fracture. The temper consists of fine, sub-rounded flint measuring 0.1–0.25 mm, as well as voids measuring 0.25–0.5 mm, which represent dissolved-out chalk or shell. Mica also occurs measuring <0.1 mm. The inclusions are moderately dense (<2%) while the sorting is good. This fabric is a transitional ware dating to either the late medieval period or the early post-medieval period.

Type I - This is a relatively soft fabric, buff in colour, which is smooth to feel and has a smooth fracture. Its temper is made up of moderately dense, very fine inclusions of rounded and sub-rounded flint or quartz sand, along with red and black (possibly iron-rich) grains which can be detected only with difficulty under the microscope. Sorting of the inclusions is very good, while the whole sherd is covered with yellowy-green glaze on both the inner and outer surfaces. This fabric is likely to be Tudor Green (Pearce & Vince 1988), but could be differentiated from Saintonge only with difficulty.

Type J - This is a hard fabric, rough to feel and with a sharp fracture. Its temper is composed of very dense (10–15%) but very fine sub-angular to sub-rounded flint measuring <0.1 mm across. The occasional very large flint grain also occurs >2 mm with no intervening size of grains. Occasional voids also occur measuring 0.25–0.5 mm. The sorting can be described as very good since the very large flint grains are rare.

Discussion

The pottery from this assemblage has been laid out in Tables 1 and 2 giving alternative methods of quantification, by sherd

Table 1. Sherd number by fabric type.

Context no.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	8	7	45	49	5	15	2	2	1	0
3	0	4	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
5	1	2	3	7	1	17	0	0	0	2
6	4	4	0	18	0	37	0	0	0	1
7	1	0	0	2	2	6	0	0	0	0
Total	**14**	**17**	**48**	**76**	**8**	**81**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**3**

Table 2. Sherd weight (g) by fabric type.

Context no.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	48.7	69.2	402.8	742.3	32.4	139.2	8.4	24.6	22.9	0
3	0	58.4	0	0	0	41.4	0	0	0	0
5	3.6	17.4	70.7	70.7	4.7	295.6	0	0	0	13.8
6	20.1	22.2	200.3	200.3	0	357.1	0	0	0	2.9
7	9.7	0	9.1	9.1	7.0	32.1	0	0	0	0
Total	**82.1**	**167.2**	**414.0**	**1022.4**	**44.1**	**865.4**	**8.4**	**24.6**	**22.9**	**16.7**

Table 3. Mean sherd weight (g).

Context no.	Ave. sherd weight
1	11.1
3	10.0
5	12.3
6	9.4
7	5.3

number and by sherd weight in relation to the fabric type and context. Table 1 shows that 52.7% of the total number of sherds comes from the unstratified context 1, while Table 2 shows that in terms of sherd weight, the percentage is 55.6.

In Context 3 there are only two fabric-types found, types B and F. The two fabrics, however, are very similar, being distinguished from each other by the fact that F has a finer temper than B.

In the larger pit there are two fills, Contexts 5 and 6, both of which are dominated by the two fabric-types D and F. In context 6 a similar frequency occurs. Context 7 is adjacent to this pit, and is thought to be either the basal fill of a smaller pit cutting the larger pit or a continuation of context 6 rising at the sides. This is unclear due to machine damage. The fill (context 7) is also dominated by the two fabric types D and F. The similarity of Context 7 with Contexts 5 and 6 suggests that it is part of the same feature and that it is, as suggested, a continuation of Context 6. However, since the definitions have been blurred by modern intrusion and the context was seen mostly in section, we cannot tell for certain.

The majority of the sherds are quite large and have very little abrasion to their fracture surface indicating that they were not exposed for a long time on rubbish heaps but were quickly deposited into the pit. This low degree of abrasion is very evident on the eleven adjoining sherds from the side and base of a cooking pot (catalogue no. 7). The sherds fit tightly together indicating that they were thrown into the pit very soon after breakage.

The average sherd weight for each context is around 10 g (Table 3), except for context 7 which is around half this at 5.3 g. The lesser mean weight of the sherds from this context suggests that they have been exposed on a rubbish heap for a longer time than the other pottery, and become more broken.

Part of a glazed and decorated spout (of fabric C in Context 1) appears to be a waster. The glaze has run into the inner side of the spout through a small hole or break suggesting a flaw during firing. A considerable number of wasters were also found at the Tanyard Lane excavation (Greatorex, in Gardiner & Greatorex 1997) implying the presence of a kiln nearby. This spout, however, is of a different fabric and may indicate the presence of other undiscovered kilns in the vicinity.

ANIMAL BONE By Lucy Kirk

The species present and the percentages they make up within the identified assemblage are tabulated below.

Table 4. Percentage of identifiable assemblage by species.

Species	Percentage (%)
Bos taurus (cow)	21.2
Ovis aries/*Capra hircus* (sheep/goat)	66.7
Equus caballus (horse)	1.5
Sus domesticus (pig)	4.5
Small mammal	1.5
Bird	3.0
Fish	1.5

As shown in the table above, sheep/goat dominate the assemblage constituting 66% of the identified sample. Cattle are less prominent, constituting 21%, but more prominent than the remaining species which are represented only by one or two fragments each.

The assemblage is too small to enable any meaningful statistical analysis to be undertaken but a few general comments and observations can be made.

Both juvenile and adult individuals of *Ovis*/*Capra* and *Bos* are present within the assemblage. It is likely that in the case of *Ovis*/*Capra* wool was the primary resource but the presence of butchered bones suggests that they were also considered a food resource. *Bos* is more likely to have been the main food resource and butchered remains of Bos are also present. It is

possible that the *Sus* was also a food resource as was fish, represented by a single bone fragment. Horse, however, is more likely to have been used for transport.

Five skeletal elements (one of *Ovis* and four of *Bos*) have marks resulting from butchery. The presence of these marks indicates that butchery was carried out, but the relatively small number of elements affected suggests that it was not undertaken on a large scale. The butchered elements include both skeletal extremities (horn cores) and meat-bearing bones (ribs). Extremities are normally discarded during the initial stages but the meat-bearing bones may be discarded during food preparation or consumption.

REFERENCES

Gardiner, M. F. 1988. Excavations at Testers, White Horse Square, Steyning, 1985, *SAC* **126**, 53–76.

— — 1990. An Anglo-Saxon and medieval settlement at Botolphs, Bramber, West Sussex, *Archaeological Journal* **147**, 216–75.

— — 1993. The excavation of a late Anglo-Saxon settlement at Market Field, Steyning, 1988-89, *SAC* **131**, 21–67.

Gardiner, M. F. & **Greatorex, C.** 1997. Archaeological excavations in Steyning, 1992–95: further evidence for the evolution of a late Saxon small town, *SAC* **135**, 143–71.

Orton, C., Tyers, P. & **Vince, A.** 1993. *Pottery in Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peacock, D. P. S. 1977. Ceramics in Roman and medieval archaeology, in D. P. S. Peacock (ed.), *Pottery in Early Commerce*, London: London Academic Press, 21–34.

Pearce, J. & **Vince, A.** 1988. *A Dated Type-Series of London Medieval Pottery*, part 4: *Surrey Whitewares*. London and Middlesex Archaeological Society.

Reynolds, A. J. 1992. Excavations at Steyning New Museum, Church Street, Steyning, West Sussex 1989, *SAC* **130**, 60–68.