Roman Pottery Studies in Britain 1890-1919

Colin Wallace

The years 1890 to 1919 saw major changes in the progress of Roman archaeology in Britain, both in fieldwork and the presentation of results. This was in contrast to, for example, prehistoric archaeology, which was being extensively studied and synthesised much earlier.

Several archaeologists stand out from the others of this period. The principal one is Professor Francis Haverfield, who from the late 1880s up until the Great War, researched, wrote, lectured, organised and encouraged. Of especial note are the many county surveys done for VCH volumes. His death in 1919 is taken as a closing date for this survey.

A rather more neglected figure is John Ward, latterly of Cardiff Museum. It was he who produced the first authoritative general work on Romano-British archaeology, in 1911 for Methuen's 'The Antiquary's Books' series. Some eight years earlier he had written:

It is to be regretted that the Roman Occupation of Britain, though of nearly four centuries' duration and fraught with great and lasting issues, should appear on the pages of our national history as but a short and debatable chapter. This is mainly owing to the vague and conflicting character of the documentary material relating to that period, and it is difficult to see how our knowledge can be further enhanced from that source. Rather, must we turn to the evidence of the spade; and it cannot be doubted that the systematic exploration of Roman sites which has been an archaeological fashion of late years, is providing a rich store of material for the historian to work upon. The excavations at Silchester and Caerwent will deepen his insight into the conditions of Romano-British city life; while from those on the Wall in the North, and upon the sites of certain forts and camps, he will infer much concerning the military organisation and administration of the Province.

(Ward 1903, preface)

The year 1890 saw both the death of the acclaimed antiquary Charles Roach Smith and the start of the Society of Antiquaries' excavations at Silchester - it seems appropriate to begin my survey then.

The present paper looks first at the treatment of pottery from excavations in town, villas and rural sites. Attention is given to the publication of pottery kilns and to individual aspects like samian studies. There is a brief look at Continental scholarship and the survey ends by reviewing some of the many military sites excavated.

It is part of a much larger, continuing study of Roman archaeology in late Victorian and Edwardian Britain which is being made because I feel that the achievements of these years deserve more prominence – the history of archaeology at present displays a strong prehistoric bias. Comments on this first foray are welcomed.

In compiling it, I read through Bonser's Bibliography (1964) and picked-out site reports of the period. Concentrating on excavations, I have not noticed isolated finds of Roman pottery or Roman pottery found with burials. In order to keep the attached bibliography to manageable limits, reports are generally only cited in detail if quoted from, otherwise abbreviated entries, under site names, are given.

Previous Surveys
George MacDonald's 'Biographical Notice' gives a good account of the central character of this period (Haverfield 1924, 15-57). Roman pottery studies in Britain are briefly reviewed by Anne Anderson (1984, 25-28) and the development of detailed research in North Britain was sketched by Eric Birley (1977). Thomas May's contribution has been reflected on by Graham Webster (1977, 317-318).

Towns, Villas and Rural Sites
My chosen period is fairly neatly bracketed by the excavations at the Roman town-sites of SILCHESTER (1890-1909) and WROXETER (1912-1914). With all the Silchester finds, the plan was to wait until the whole site was excavated and then deal with them collectively. Thus Thomas May's rather daunting 1916 report is really a catalogue of the Reading Museum collection, like his similar works on York (in 1912) and Carlisle (1917). May's way of working, together with the separation of most of the pottery from its contexts, produced a report lacking a summary of dating or evidence for site history and function.

In contrast the three WROXETER reports by J P Bushe-Fox contain a dated form series for the coarse pottery (ordered with the help of the samian) and make much use of the pottery for elucidating site history.
scale of operations had also changed over the period — any three years digging at Silchester cleared a far greater area than at Wroxeter, gaining in plan but losing in sequence.

Two other campaigns of excavation at Roman town-sites can be linked to those at Silchester and Wroxeter. Like Silchester, the 1899-1912 work at CAERWENT gave short shrift to the finds. Unlike Silchester, no further work was done on the pottery after the end of the excavations. Wroxeter’s influence extended to the 1912-13 excavations at the small town of KENCHES. The report of them included a substantial pottery report largely produced by one of the Wroxeter team (A G K Hayter), let down by its illustrations.

As a fifth open site, the small town of MARGIDUNUM, the first of the long-running series of excavations was carried out in 1910-11, published by T D Pryce with F Oswald among his helpers. Naturally there is a detailed samian report, along with a selective coarse pottery report.

Working conditions in those modern towns with Roman predecessors were much less favourable. The reports by Philip Norman and Francis Reader on discoveries in LONDON during redevelopment in the 1900s are valuable accounts of hurried rescue observations, concerning themselves with structures rather than finds. By 1912, however, mere mentions of pottery have given way to a detailed samian report. The author of that, Frank Lambert, followed with a detailed study of the pottery from pit groups excavated in 1914 at the Old GPO site. His aim was ‘to obtain new evidence, by the association of dated with undated pottery, of the age of different types of coarse Roman wares’ (Lambert 1915, 244). Much use was made of the Wroxeter reports and the expertise of J P Bushe-Fox.

Going out on a high note, the report on the 1920 excavations in COLCHESTER has the coarse pottery well under control, with dating incorporated into the text and only a small amount of pottery of interest published in full. Of note is the discussion of the dating provided by three foundation pots, with Rhineland material being brought in.

Town sites can be expected to produce finds worth studying as much as the structural remains: what of Roman villas, where the often impressive remains (especially mosaic pavements) constrained excavation and, even as today, attracted the greatest attention? Out of a total of seventeen villa excavation reports published between 1889 and 1921, only two devoted more than a few lines to the pottery. The comments in the SPOONLEY WOOD report (Middleton 1890, 659) are echoed in almost all the other reports:

‘...the remains of Roman vessels found in this site are of a most varied description and are well worth careful examination’ (Walker 1911, 195 – nothing done)

Even in 1907 an archaeologist could write:

‘Pottery fragments were found in abundance, but in no instance was it possible to reconstruct a whole vessel. The commonest was the coarse black ware, but many pieces of Upchurch, New Forest, and Caistor pottery were found; a few also of Samian, and its British imitation’. (Williams 1907, 13)

The vast majority of these villa-reports gave little space to dating or the potential evidence of the finds – here archaeology really was a matter of removing the dirt from monuments. By the end of my period, however, the 1915 report on the COMPTON villa included an up to date discussion of the pottery (J P Bushe-Fox was involved) and the 1912 report on HAMBLEDEN boasted several specialist contributions, among them a characteristically weighty pottery report by Thomas May. An honourable mention also to PULBOROUGH with its samian mould fragments. A casualty of the War was Wheeler’s planned excavations at PLESHEY in Essex (1955a, 64) – what might he have produced ...

A contrast becomes apparent with sites in North Britain. In the Roman forts we again have impressive building remains, here laid out in standard shapes and positions as well — and yet chronology and the presentation of groups of dated finds are of paramount interest.

Towns and villas having been dealt with, I shall now turn to a variety of rural sites. At the beginning of the period come Pitt-Rivers’ excavations in CRANBORNE CHASE (1880-96), published privately in four volumes between 1887 and 1898. Great attention was paid to the potential worth of pottery studies (see his comments in vol III, pp ix-xi, too long to quote here), the volumes boasting excellent illustrations (to a scale) with full descriptions. Fabric classification, for the purpose of quantification, evolves over the years and the dating evidence is fully discussed in the many ‘Relic Tables’.

As with excavation techniques, the pottery publications of Pitt-Rivers had little effect, if any, on his contemporaries. They continued with their despairing notes or glib comments, like the following:

‘...the remains of Roman vessels found in this site are of a most varied description and are well worth careful examination’ (Walker 1911, 195 – nothing done)

Only at the end of the period, as we have seen with villas, were more substantial contributions being made eg HENGISTBURY HEAD or LOWBURY HILL, both by protegés of Haverfield.
Pottery Production

A look at the publications of Roman pottery kiln-sites (virtually all from the South) may be thought to provide a good indication of the level of inquiry – were the kiln products accorded as much attention as kiln structure and furniture, was the distribution of kiln products studied, did the publication of a kiln site have any impact on the reporting of pottery from neighbouring Roman sites? From my reading of reports from some thirteen sites, the answer to all the above questions is usually the same – no. Part of the problem may have been the distance between the excavated kiln-sites and the northern regions where pottery was being closely studied.

Often the Roman date of some of the sites was questioned because of the absence of ‘wasters’ – just such a comment was made in the discussion following the reading of a paper on kilns at HARTSHILL (with stamped mortaria) to the Society of Antiquaries.

Towards the end of my period, more detailed accounts were appearing – for example Thomas May’s publication of the SILCICHER kiln products. Note however the very poor treatment given to the pottery from the three kilns he excavated at WILDERSPPOOL, unillustrated and briefly described in comparison to the kilns themselves. Interest in kiln structures led the second excavator of HORNINGSSEA to compile a gazetteer of known Roman pottery kilns in England and to discuss the use of his seven kilns (two of which were removed to a museum in Cambridge) in the light of this comparative evidence.

Probably the best works on pottery production sites in this period were those written and illustrated by the artist, naturalist, topographer and archaeologist Heywood Sumner. Sumner dug some eleven NEW FOREST kilns between 1917 and 1925 in what was the first large-scale investigation of the industry. Prompt publication (two short monographs, succeeded by his 1927 book) and good descriptions and illustrations of the kilns and their pottery gave his work a long life and contributed to the early recognition of the wide distribution of New Forest products. J P Bushe-Fox, in reviewing Sumner’s first report, hoped that it would act as an example for the study of later Roman pottery. Closely involved with the late Victorian Arts and Crafts movement, Sumner’s maps and plans have a distinctive impact on the reader’s eye.

Samian

In most of the reports and notices of Roman pottery, 1890-1919, SAMIAN bulks large, either as a readily comprehensible ware eagerly seized upon to rescue what would otherwise be a set of rather despairing remarks, or as a welcome dating tool. Detailed samian reports, with photographs, drawings and a whole apparatus of scholarship, develop earlier than those on (less well-dated) coarse pottery.

Several scholars sought to use the dating potential of samian on a broader canvas than that of a single site. In 1913, J P Bushe-Fox published a study of the dating of early Roman North Britain arising from an examination of the decorated samian from some eleven sites while in 1915 Frank Lambert attempted to map the growth of Roman London using finds of coins and decorated samian.

Dragendorff’s listing of samian forms was added to by the work of H B Walters (in his B M Catalogue) and James Curle (from Newstead). Some British sites were established as key dated groups to rank alongside the continental evidence – the PUDDING PAN ROCK wreck (studied by R A Smith) and NEWSTEAD, for example. Haverfield’s pupil Donald Atkinson published the hoard of samian from AD 79 POMPEII, neglected after its discovery in 1881. A suitable culmination to all this came in 1920 with the publication of Oswald and Pryce’s enduring reference-work.

I do not propose to cover in detail here the cataloguing of potters’ stamps on samian, a major ‘industry’ established by the Victorian antiquarians and continued by the compilers of CIL.

Returning to more detailed samian studies, it should not be thought that this was a period wholly uncritical of the limitation of the available evidence. Dense and often circular arguments abounded in accounts of the dating of samian and Haverfield, for one, felt that too elaborate a structure was sometimes being erected. Here he is addressing the Society of Antiquaries in 1910, his gaze no doubt resting on Walters and Smith, of the BM, in his audience:

I hold strongly the opinion that many recent efforts of archaeologists to date Samian ware have gone too far. I find in books and papers which have some claim to be called authoritative far too much both of unproven conjecture and of demonstrable error, and these guesses and errors are copied by the smaller students in a way which is likely some day to cause serious trouble. The evil works somewhat as follows: Men are told, or deduce from the books which they consult, that such and such pieces of pottery date from, let us say, before AD 70, or that such a bowl is Rutenian. When they publish they add no means by which readers can check them. The truth may be that the pieces are a good deal later than 70, and the bowl is Lezoux fabric. But the wrong statements pass into our record and serve to mislead the future historian.

I do not wish to give instances. I am aware, by my own experience, how easy it is to date potsherds wrongly, and instances accompanied by names and details might seem a severer criticism on individual workers than I have any desire to make. But I do wish to urge even an excess of caution on those concerned with the study of Roman
pottery. Some points, of course, are certain, and sceptics who refuse these reserve their full share of blame. But any glance into recent English or German work on 'Keramik' will show that much is still admittedly uncertain, and that many confident assertions lack the proofs which alone justify such confidence.

(Haverfield 1911, 118)

Aside from samian, studies of specific wares of vessel types seem confined to later works like May's detailed catalogues. Museum catalogues of this period, aside from Thomas May's, stuck to old-established categories (like 'Castor' or 'Durobrivian' for most colour-coated pottery) for their descriptions. Earlier writers, like Roach Smith, were much concerned with sourcing the pottery (and demonstrating their classical scholarship) in their often rather discursive written accounts and their prevailing image was of a small number of major pottery production centres.

General surveys of Roman pottery in Britain began to appear in the 1900s. Prof T McK Hughes, who excavated and observed in and around Cambridge, published a paper in which he set out to demonstrate the value of the archaeological evidence to be obtained from pottery and to review current knowledge of classification and dating (Hughes 1902). Only nine years later, much more information was available for John Ward to synthesise, in his account of The Roman Era in Britain. He devoted a whole chapter to pottery, with general comments on sources, manufacture and decoration, followed by sections on particular wares (illustrated at quarter or one-third size) and ending with notes on kilns (Ward 1911, 153-178).

An even more detailed reference work was H B Walter's 1908 British Museum catalogue, drawing on collections like that acquired from Charles Roach Smith. For a more general audience, Walters had earlier drawn on his researches to produce a wide ranging, two volume, History of ancient pottery in 1905.

Pottery illustration can be seen to change during this period. By mid/late Victorian times, the best archaeological reports had well drawn and engraved illustrations which could closely characterise the pottery. With the new century came measured illustrations, easily repeatable and able to facilitate detailed comparisons. However, the excessively plain style adopted by some could often fail to 'capture' the pots. Another, unwelcome, innovation was the drawing of rim profiles alone, leading to crowded and uninformative pottery illustrations.

Before I move onto another topic, a caveat needs to be entered over the impression given of a lack of detail in most of the reports reviewed above. Very many of the papers published in the archaeological journals of this period were previously read to a meeting of a county or national society, when finds could also be displayed and examined. The speaker was then able to confine himself to general remarks on the pottery, needing no illustrations - a situation with affected the detail in any subsequent publication.

Continental Scholarship

Romano-British archaeologists did not work in isolation - Haverfield especially was in constant contact with colleagues in France and Germany. Major publications of the period 1890-1919 included the studies of samian by Dragendorff (in 1895/96), Déchelette (1904) and Knorr (1919), coarse pottery by Koenen (1895), sites like Augustan Haltén (1899) and Claudian Hofheim (1913) and (from 1894) the whole series of dated fort-sites published in the series Der obergermanisch-rätische Limes des Römerreiches.

All were eagerly made use of by British scholars - see for example the vast bibliography in May's Silchester volume (1916). First hand knowledge of Continental finds was less widespread, although Mortimer Wheeler was in Germany in 1913 studying 'Romano-Rhenish' pottery (1955a, 4). Alas, he never published any part of his subsequent D.Lit thesis.

Time has precluded for the moment the tracing of British influence (the British School at Rome was founded in 1901, its first Director being Thomas Ashby, of Caerwent fame) or of the impact of the Great War on any assessment of the worth of German scholarship.

Military Sites

If my conclusion that the fort was of short, and for Britain, of early occupation, is a right one, the Gellygaer 'finds' may prove to be an important factor in the chronological classification of objects, especially pottery, of Romano-British age. (Ward 1903, 74)

Thus John Ward in the report of the 1899-1901 excavations on the Roman fort-site at GELIGAER, summing up the value of military sites for the study of Roman pottery - very many of them could provide dated assemblages, often of quite short time-periods.

There had always been digging on Roman fort-sites, but from the late Victorian period onwards there was a gradual increase in both the number of excavations and their quality. The peak period began and ended c. 1905 and 1915 respectively. Earlier reports showed the lack of informed comment characteristic of southern sites. A typical statement is that of Joseph Anderson in 1896, true but hardly the best use of the material:

'The pottery found at Birrens is of the character usually found on sites of Roman occupation'. (Christison et al 1896, 179)
Landmarks in this early period are GELLIGAER and the report on the 1898 excavations at HOUSESTEADS on Hadrian's Wall. The latter treated of stamped samian, decorated samian and other pottery with scale drawings and attempts at dating individual pieces, although the conditions of excavation did not allow the site history to date the pottery.

The great authority on Hadrian's Wall, Dr John Collingwood Bruce, died in 1892. It was not long before a new phase of survey and excavation began on the wall:

'... a sort of archaeological renaissance, the re-opening of the questions of the date, making and purpose of the series of works whose main design was so self-evident, but the detailed evolution so baffling'

(Neilson 1912, 39)

The Cumberland Excavation Committee, between 1894 and 1903, carried out much fieldwork on the Wall, the Vallum and the forts (though its work was not of a kind to produce pottery worth reporting on). Chief among its discoveries was the (Hadrianic) Turf Wall, in 1895. Other organised campaigns of fieldwork on military sites were those of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland (8 sites, 1895-1903), the Roman Antiquities Committee, Yorkshire Archaeological Society (3 forts, 1909-1921) and the Liverpool-based Committee for Excavation and Research in Wales and the Marches.

To return to Hadrian’s Wall, prior to the discovery of the Turf Wall, the accepted orthodoxy was that the Wall system was Hadrianic. With the addition of the Turf Wall to the scheme of things, Haverfield had then argued for assigning the stone Wall to Severus and the Turf Wall to Hadrian (1906). The work of J P Gibson and F G Simpson in 1909-1912 first produced evidence to dispute this version (from POLTROSS BURN milestone) and then set out to test it on the part of the wall-line, west of Birdoswald, where the Stone Wall runs on a different line to the Turf Wall.

Newbold, reporting on the pottery in Simpson’s paper of 1913, argued forcefully for a Hadrianic Stone Wall. Such conclusions were possible by this time because enough evidence for the accurate dating of Romano-British coarse pottery had been gathered and published. Of especial note were Flavian (and later) NEWSTEAD (by James Curle), Trajanic HALTWHISTLE BURN (F G Simpson), Antonine BALMULILDY (S N Miller) and late fourth century HUNTCLIFF (P Newbold).

J P Bushe-Fox’s study of the dating of early Roman North Britain has already been mentioned – also in this period R G Collingwood was able to date the Roman fort at HARDKNOTT from the pottery recovered in earlier excavations, a possibility not open to the archaeologists of the early 1890s.

A study of the annual reports on the 1906-1914 excavations at CORBRIDGE shows the development of the presentation of Roman pottery quite well. Initially there were brief and vague summaries, then more detailed finds reports by Haverfield from 1908 with special attention given to the samian. The first proper pottery report was that for the 1911 season, by Bushe-Fox. Several groups were described, illustrated and dated, with parallels drawn from Newstead, Gelligaer, Poltross Burn and German sites. Corbridge also provides an illustration of the problems thrown up by poor techniques of excavation and recording, with the discovery of the ‘Pottery Shop’. Haverfield saw the potential (from this deposit of mortaria, samian, colour-coated and coarse pottery) for cross-dating but while the pottery was second century most of the coins were fourth century and the excavators were unable to resolve this discrepancy in the absence of any stratigraphical information.

One of the advantages of military North Britain over the south was the ability of the sites to date the pottery found in them. Full advantage was taken of this by the clearly-focused scholars whose work has been surveyed above. A sad contrast is provided by the wasted potential of some southern sites for the study of later Roman pottery, eg the Saxon Short fort at PEVENSEY (dug 1906-1908). The excavator of that site, L F Salzman, does provide a welcome humorous aside arising from calculations of the volume of pottery that could be yielded by total excavation:

‘Unfortunately no classical writer has left any record of the average smashing capacity of the Roman servant, so that it is not possible to deduce from these figures the probable population of Anderida’. (Salzman 1909, 92)

Shortcomings

It would be false to pretend that there were no technical shortcomings in this period of advances. If the treatment of pottery was not all it should be, even less guidance was available on methods and aims in field archaeology. Ward’s book, for example, has nothing on excavation or finds analysis and the pottery chapter (reprinted unchanged in the second edition of 1920) eschews any mention of pottery dating. Recent re-excavation of one of Heywood Sumner’s New Forest kiln-sites has shown that the small-scale nature of his work could bring him to misleading conclusions (Swan 1971).

One related matter which was bound to have an impact on the quality of pottery studies (and much else) was the speed of publication. Very often the report on one season’s work would appear during the next year, an ideal which would significantly reduce the amount of time for research and drawing. Sometimes excavators had to publish further papers after the main publication, for example with KENCHESTER a ‘supplemental
report' came out in 1919 on finds not published in the 1916 report 'owing to an oversight'. The finds from the last season, 1910, at NEWSTEAD were not fully considered in Curle's 1911 report, as the final illustrations were by then far advanced, so that a substantial paper on them had to follow in 1913. Hartley (1972, 31) has noted that the published decorated samian from Newstead was primarily the mid-Antonine material and that the bulk of the Hadrianic-Antonine and late-Antonine samian did not get into the report, seriously diminishing the value of Newstead as a type-site.

Endpiece
In his autobiography, Mortimer Wheeler gave his view of the state of Romano-British archaeology in 1919:

I must here recapitulate some of the thoughts which were passing through my mind in that year of decision. First, it was clear to me that the next advance in our knowledge of human achievement outside the historical field was dependent upon fresh and methodical discovery, and that fresh discovery in great measure meant fresh digging. In Romano-British studies, which to me, as a classic, were the starting point, Haverfield had carried synthesis pretty nearly as far as it could be carried on the existing evidence. In other branches of insular archaeology, much more work of the kind awaited attention: work such as Lord Abercromby, for example, had already carried out on Bronze Age pottery. But those branches lay outside my immediate purview, and, in any case, it was sufficiently evident that there too the stimulus of controlled discovery was an urgent need. And as I look around me with these thoughts in my head, two other factors stuck out a mile. The first was the utter inadequacy of the pre-war techniques for the recovery and analysis of buried material. At Wroxeter under J P Bushe-Fox we had been groping towards something a little more adequate, inspired, as each generation fortunately is, by a filial appreciation of the carnage which marked its predecessor. It is a typical instance that, of five university students who worked together in the Wroxeter excavations of 1913, one only survived the war.

(Wheeler 1955a, 66)

Even making allowances for the fact that he wrote the above to set the scene for an account of his own later achievements, the picture is exaggerated by virtue of ignoring the great differences in expectations and results between north and south Britain.

For the south, Roman Britain remained stubbornly mono-period – only in the north, with an historical framework provided by the military activities of the emperors, did the three-hundred-odd years of Roman rule allow themselves to be broken up. Equally, because of the difficulties in dating Roman pottery in the south, even the provision of full published reports as a base for any future advances was not the norm, whereas in the north the benefits of a climate of optimism are apparent (above). It was in the north also that organised campaigns of fieldwork were strongest, a lot of them encouraged by Haverfield.

Prof Haverfield has been mentioned several times above, but for the systematic study of Romano-British coarse pottery the really major figure of this period was Joscelyn Plunkett Bushe-Fox (1880-1954). Before Corbridge and other sites he had worked for Flinders Petrie at Meydum in 1909-10, where he would have been made well aware of the potential of pottery as dating evidence (Drower 1985, 312). Here is one of the earliest students to do research on Roman pottery, celebrating with an affectionate anecdote the man he called 'a pioneer in the full sense of the term':

To Bushe-Fox I was sent, as your first Franks Student, by Sir Hercules Read in the summer before the First War and I well recall my arrival on a bicycle at rural Wroxeter and my first sight of a large-scale archaeological excavation. I was, however, almost immediately consigned by Bushe-Fox to a hut and a drawing-board where, in the midst of all this brave and exciting new world, I was condemned by my mission to sit as a prisoner and draw pottery. Bushe-Fox and I quickly came into conflict; more than once he found me absent from my desk without leave. Eventually he laboriously wired my legs to those of the drawing-table, and I subsequently had some difficulty, I remember, in breaking the shackles. Observing me yet again amongst the trenches, he resorted to a punishment of a more drastic kind; he had me lowered into a deep and very disgusting well and kept me there for many hours, indeed until I had cleared it out. I can only hope that I found truth in the loathsome sludge at the bottom of it. (Wheeler 1955b, 154)

Notes
1. A version of this paper was read to the Study Group's Glasgow Meeting in April 1988. Alert readers will note that I have not been brave enough to retain my opening lines.

2. The villas were: FRILFORD, Berks (Archaeol J 54); PETERSFIELD, Hants (Archaeol J 66); LIPPEN WOOD, Hants (Archaeol J 64); DARENTH, Kent (Archaeol Cantiana 22); BRISLINGTON, Somerset (TDBGAS 23); COMPTON, Surrey (Surrey A C 28); PULBOROUGH, Sussex (PSAL 2 ser 23); BOX, Wiltshire (Archaeol J 61) ALRESFORD LODGE, Essex (TEAS n ser 3); GRIMSTON, Norfolk (Norfolk Archaeol 16); HAMBLEDEN, Bucks (Archaeologia 71); PAINSWICK, Glos (TDBGAS 27); SUDELEY CASTLE, Glos (JBAAN Ser 1); TOCKINGSTON, Glos
BIBLIOGRAPHY

3. the kiln-sites were: RADLETT, Herts (T St Albans A & A S n ser 1); SILCHESTER, Hants (Archaeologia 52/May 1916); OARE, Wilts (Wils Archaeol Mag 36); BROOMSGROVE, Wilts (WAM 27); CHERRY HINTON, Cambs (P Cambridge AS 10); HORNINGSSEA, Cambs (PCAS 10/PCAS 17); SHOEBURYNESS, Essex (T Essex A S n ser 4/PSAL 2 ser 16/T Essex AS n ser 6); HARTSHILL, Warwick (PSAL 2 ser 16); BURTLE, Somerset (PSAL 2 ser 26); FARNHAM, Surrey (SURREY AC 20); STOCKTON HEATH, Lancs (The Reliquary 3 ser 6); WILDERSPOOL, Lancs (T H S Lancs Cheshire 52/55/56); NEW FOREST, Hants (Heywood Sumner 1919/1921/1927).  
4. too many sites to list here, the main ones are cited in the text.  
5. a recent study by Maxfield traces the major trends in the development of Wall chronology (1982, esp pp 72-74), updating Collingwood's paper in JRS XI.
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