**Readme:**

**CTRL Section 1 Post-excavation specialist research archive;**

**Ceramics; Late Iron Age and Romano-British pottery**

**Recording method and explanation of database codes (extract from the schemewide pottery report) - Specific database codes are identified in a series of look-up tables extracted from the Microsoft Access 97 database template, which are included in the digital archive.**

In the absence of a well-established unified recording system for Roman pottery assemblages in Kent (notwithstanding the excellent synthesis of Pollard 1988) the recording methodology was based on the standard Oxford Archaeology system (Booth 1992-2005) with modifications to reflect the regional character of the project and ensure, as far as possible, compatibility with the analyses of other pottery assemblages of the period from Kent. In particular these modifications involved the use of fabric codes from the Canterbury Archaeological Trust (CAT) series (Macpherson-Grant *et al*. 1995) and 'Southwark' codes (Marsh and Tyers 1978; Davies *et al*. 1994, 6-8) to provide a consistent approach to classification of vessel types. A drawback of the CAT fabric codes is that they have no clear hierarchical structure and no framework for linking fabrics into larger groups for broad analytical purposes. To achieve this the individual CAT fabrics were also assigned a major ware group code from the OA system (see further below).

The principal ceramic attributes recorded included fabric (CAT code), ware group (OA code), vessel type (based on the Southwark system) and detailed vessel type (using eg the north Kent industries' type series of Monaghan (1987) and other well-known typologies, such as those for samian ware and amphorae, where appropriate). Codes for details of rim, base, handle, spout and decoration types were also provided, as well as fields for recording aspects of vessel use, reuse and sherd condition. The means of quantification were sherd count and weight, with rim count and EVEs (strictly REs - rim equivalents) used for quantification of vessel types. Chronology, both at individual record and context group level, was recorded using absolute dates (as discussed in the Schemewide report, general introduction). Two additional fields, recording 'interpretative type' and vessel completeness, were applied uniquely at the Pepper Hill cemetery in order to aid analysis of this complex assemblage.

Despite the application of a single recording system it is not claimed that the results achieved by a number of different workers with different assemblages will be completely uniform, for example in consistent attribution of sherds to the same fabrics or even to vessel types. This principally reflects the fact that pottery recording is not an exact science, but the difficulties of achieving precise consistency of recording are thought to be more than outweighed by the use of the same basic framework for sites along the entire CTRL Section 1 route. No concerted effort has been made to impose retrospective consistency of the use of fabric (and other codes) subsequent to initial recording, though a few adjustments have been made to datasets in the light of the overview of all the assemblages together. While chronology was usually established on the basis of a combination of ceramic and site sequence criteria, occasionally aided by the evidence of small finds, radiocarbon dating was also employed, particularly at Pepper Hill. Here, however, a number of the results were problematic and the radiocarbon dates, intended to assist in clarification of burial sequences, made no specific contribution to ceramic chronologies (Allen 2006).

**Fabrics**

Sherds were assigned to fabric either on macroscopically observed criteria or using a hand lens or binocular microscope at up to x20 or x30 magnification (where necessary) in conjunction with duplicated selections of sherds from the CAT fabric series. Not all the sherds could be assigned to fabrics in the CAT series and a small number of new fabrics was identified. These have now been added to the CAT series (new codes are indicated by an asterisk in Table 4.3 below). The fabric codes employed are tabulated with short summary descriptions (derived from the Canterbury documentation) or name labels in the case of well-known wares. More comprehensive descriptions, mostly based (except for the new fabrics) on information from the Canterbury Archaeological Trust, can be found in the project archive. The general ware group codes are also given, together with reference to the national Roman fabric reference collection (Tomber and Dore 1998) where appropriate. Approximate date ranges are also given where possible. It should be noted that these refer to the likely currency of

particular fabrics in Kent or (in some cases) in the CTRL area in particular, and may not correspond exactly with their incidence in other parts of Britain. Dates are AD unless indicated otherwise.

As is common in Roman fabric series, each code does not necessarily represent a single fabric in the sense of comprising a unique combination of clay matrix and inclusion types that can be assigned to a single production site. Many of the codes identify 'wares' - distinctive products often attributed to particular industries but encompassing a number of variations (usually relatively minor) in fabric. In some cases the codes identify traditions that could have been common to a number of production centres within a region at any given time (B1 and R1 and related fabrics are examples of this). A few codes (eg R109) are general groupings for miscellaneous fabrics that are not easily accommodated within the main framework.