

Rough Cilicia Survey Pottery Study Collection Codebook

Nicholas K. Rauh

Original draft, January 2016

Edited by Standa Pejša, 2018-02-12

SC_Item_No	Number of the item as entered into the dataset.
Drawing_01	Drawing of the sherds.
Photo_01	Photographs of the sherds, taken as individual sherds or as groups from the same unit or collection area. Sherds that were brought in from the field were typically photographed multiple times. Prior to the adaptation to digital photography in 1999, however, most sherds left in the field were not photographed, the cost of slide film and processing being prohibitive.
Chronotype	Once the classification is made we try to identify the sherd more specifically within that classification. If fineware, what type of fineware (in our region, typically Cypriot Sigillata or Cypriot Red Slip) cup, bowl, plate, pitcher, coarseware (basin, bowl), commonware (basin, bowl, jug, pitcher, mug, cup), cooking ware (frypan, casserole, stewpot), transport amphora (what type), etc.
Form	Based on the surviving diagnostic characteristics of the sherd, was the form a plate, a bowl, a cup, a basin, etc.?
Portion	The specific surviving feature of the sherd, such as a handle, a rim, a toe, a ring foot, a shoulder fragment, a bodysherd.
Chronology	Chronological classification of the sherd.
Collection_Link	Link to the dataset containing other sherds from the same location.
Site_Name	Name of site if available; either the modern Turkish name (according to available Turkish maps) or ancient name if known (Selinus, Lamos, Iotape, Nephelion, Antiochia ad Cragum, Kestros, Laertes). Lacking a modern name many sites along the coast were identified according to the Turkish cadastral maps used during the survey, as in 28-C-8-B-4 (cadastral map 28-C-8-B, site 4). Since these were the codes used by Richard Blanton in his preliminary publication of the survey, we retain these to enable cross-referencing.

Site_Code	All locations classified as “sites” received a code, i.e, RC 9601, RC (Rough Cilicia) 96 (year investigated, 1996-2011), 01 (site number in the order in which they were investigated). All our data is coded according to these codes. The team identified sites according to significant concentrations of sherds and/or features.
Location	This column allows for retention of alternate names to the site, particularly names assigned by the survey team while working there (“Cloud City”, “Dead Animal Site”, “Church Site,” “Farm Site”). Since these names occurred in notebooks and were used in preliminary published reports, we retain these for purposes of cross-referencing.
Transect	Transect area where the sherd was investigated, typically recorded with GPS reference at start and/or stop point. After 2001 individual sherds were GPS referenced using “flag survey” technique.
Unit	A segment of a transect. Typically, the team walked 100m long units in a sequence. At the end of one unit, we started another. If we moved to another location that was not contiguous in some manner to the last, we started a new transect. In 1998 we walked subunits as well, so 1998 184B reads transect 18, unit 4, subunit B.
Invest_Date	The survey year in which the sherd was investigated, between 1996 and 2011.
Sherd_Name	This is the unique designator for the ceramic sherd entry. It contains data enabling the user to identify the context of the sherd. Data includes trans (transect), year of survey (1996-2011), transect and unit codes (112B = transect 11, unit 2, subunit B) and sherd number (arbitrarily assigned). In the case of sherds from named sites it includes the name of the site (Selinus) as well as the year of the survey, transect, unit, or collection area (CA), and sherd number. Collection areas represent locations approximately 100 m square, where grab collections were conducted by the team.
Sherd_Description	A detailed description of the surviving portion of the ceramic form, including shape, portion, surface treatment, slip coloration, paint, stamping, rouletting, ribbing, vertical grooves, etc.
PH	Preserved Height – surviving height of the sherd.
PH_Notes	Notes related to measurements of the preserved height.
PL	Preserved Length– surviving length of the sherd, measuring across the sherd in its upright stance.
PL_Notes	Notes related to measurements of the preserved length.
PW	Preserved Width – Sometimes measured in a second way, for example the surviving height of the sherd.
PW_Notes	Notes related to measurements of the preserved width

Diameter	Preserved Diameter. If the form is round and a sufficient arc of the form survives on the sherd, team members employed a radius chart to estimate the approximate diameter of the overall form. Like many of the measurements, this was typically “eyeballed” in the field using a field chart.
Diameter_Notes	Notes related to measurements of the preserved diameter.
Original_Fabric_Description	Description of the clay in the interior wall of the sherd, looking at it from the break. Under the direction of Richard Rothaus and Kathleen Slane, team member Jason DeBlock wrote most of these descriptions in the pottery lab. Rauh completed all fabric descriptions after 2001. The Munsell soil coloration code number was assigned to all sherds that were investigated in the pottery lab upon return from the field survey.
Rothaus_Fabric_Description	During the 2005 season, Richard Rothaus reexamined various items in the Study Collection and enhanced fabric descriptions, focusing particularly on inclusions and commonalities in local fabric. These descriptions seemed particularly useful and were included.
Rothaus_No	The code employed by Richard Rothaus when compiling the Study Collection (Item 1, 1A, 1B, etc.).
Classification	In each instance, the team identified all ceramic remains according to their most general classification – fineware, coarseware, commonware, cooking ware, transport amphora, lamp, brazier, pithos, roof tile, etc.
Munsell_Outer_Face	Munsell coloration of the exterior surface of the sherd.
Munsell_Inner_Face	Munsell coloration of the interior surface of the sherd, if different.
Munsell_Core	Munsell coloration of the interior portion of the sherd wall, if different. Usually a result of over-firing.
Munsell_Slip	Munsell coloration of the slipped portions of the sherd.
References	An approximate comparandum for the form, as obtained from published archaeological reports and catalogues. Particular attention was devoted to imported wares with wider archaeological visibility (i.e., finewares, amphoras, and lamps).
Issues	Slane, Rothaus, and Rauh did not always agree on the identification of a given sherd. When considerable disagreement or doubt remained,

	Rauh felt it best to preserve alternative points of view.
Drawing_02 through 03	Profile drawing of the sherd.
Photo_02 through 7	Photographs of the sherds, taken as individual sherds or as groups from the same unit or collection area. All sherds that were brought to the lab from the field were cleaned, coded, and typically photographed multiple times. Prior to the adaptation to digital photography in 1999, however, most sherds left in the field were not photographed, the cost of slide film and processing being prohibitive.
Latitude	GPS location of the sherd in decimal degrees, converted from UTM field readings. Prior to 2000 these locations were for the site, transect, collection area, unit, or subunit in general.
Longitude	GPS location of the sherd in decimal degrees, converted from UTM field readings. Prior to 2000 these locations were for the site, transect, collection area, unit, or subunit in general.
X_Coord	GPS location of the sherd in UTM field readings (zone 36 N). Prior to 2000 these locations were for the site, transect, collection area, unit, or subunit in general.
Y_Coord	GPS location of the sherd in UTM field readings (zone 36 N). Prior to 2000 these locations were for the site, transect, collection area, unit, or subunit in general.