



<http://kentarchaeology.org.uk/research/archaeologia-cantiana/>

Kent Archaeological Society is a registered charity number 223382

© 2017 Kent Archaeological Society

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE KILN POTTERY.

Since the compilation of the sherd register an attempt has been made to trace parallels of the horizontal barrel-shaped vessel No. 64. It appears that no example of this type has ever been found in Britain before. There are, however, a number of Continental vessels of a similar type but generally of inferior technique. Mr. M. R. Hull, the Curator of the Colchester and Essex Museum, has supplied the following references from F. Behn's *Römische Keramik*.

1. Horizontal barrel ; neck has two handles, no feet, red clay, dirty green glaze. Dunapentele, Hungary (where made). Third-fourth century. BEHN Type 399, H. 15, L. 14, W. 12 cm.
2. Horizontal barrel ; neck has two handles, four wart-like feet. BEHN Type 400 (with reference to Holder, *Formen der Römischen Thongefässe*, Pls. 10, 11).
3. Horizontal barrel ; neck has two handles, four small feet (=Lindenschmidt, *Röm-Germ. Cent.-Mus. Mainz*, Pl. XXV, 12), yellowish clay, dark red coating. BEHN Type 401, H. 17·5, L. 17·5, W. 12·5 cm. (Bingerbrück).
4. Horizontal barrel ; neck without handles. Near Kärlich (Bonn Mus.). Oelmann, *Niederbieber*, p. 49, No. 24. Brown-marbled ware. (Three other references given under this description.) (Presumably late third century.)
5. Horizontal askos or wine-skin with pointed ends, central neck with two handles, white clay, yellow-green glaze. Köln. BEHN Type 402, H. 9, L. 12, W. 7·5 cm.
6. As last, in glass. Kisa, *Das Glas im Altertume*, p. 116 ; Bonn Jahrb. 114-5, p. 376, Abb. 8d.
7. Yellow clay with rose-red painting, divided internally into three compartments each with separate spout.

Cordons in middle and at each end. Grooved foot-ring. Speyer, No. 1298. Cf. Harster, *Katal. d. Histor. Abt. Mus. Speyer*, p. 54. "Cult vessel?" Weisenau fabric (?). BEHN Type 403, H. 19·5, L. 27·5, D. 17 cm.

From these examples Mr. Hull deduces that the Canterbury vessel is of Cologne ware and of approximately the Constantinian age. But this does not agree with the date fixed by the associated pottery from the kiln. Indeed the evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of fixing it in the first half of the second century.

Further evidence inclines towards the earlier date when the vertical axis types are considered. Barrel-shaped vessels of this type are uncommon but not rare in this country. One has actually been found in Canterbury and is described and illustrated in *Arch. Cant.* IV, pp. 28ff. by Brent. The writer is giving an account of his excavations at St. Sepulchre's on the site of a Roman cemetery, and speaks of a vessel of black clay of extremely fragile texture and scarcely thicker than stiff cardboard and of a curious barrel shape. The vessels closely associated with this find are clearly of the late first or early second century.

Other examples are given by Grimes in *Y Cymmrodor*, Vol. XLI, p. 157, No. 118, in a description of the Holt potteries. The vessel illustrated here is very similar to that drawn by Brent. Grimes also mentions the same types "occurring at Chester, in undated deposits, in some cases in mica-coated ware, a technique generally regarded as not outlasting the early part of the second century".

Finally F. Oelmann in *Die Keramik des Kastells Niederbieber* illustrates a similar type and says, "This wooden barrel shape was made in glass in the first century (Niessen Coll. Nos. 93-4 and Loescheches, Introduction, s. XIV). The pottery has evolved from this shape and is found in a fine white shaded ware with orange-red paintings, probably made towards the end of the first century and beginning of the second at Köln. In their manifold shapes these vessels are closely connected with the glass and metal

models. The fine red marbled ware of Mainz which belongs to the same period apparently imitates the metal shape."

It should be noted that "the fine white shaded ware with orange-red paintings" is fairly descriptive of the Canterbury vessel.

From a close study of these types the dating evidence is not as conflicting as it first appears. The vertical axis types definitely belong to the late first and early second centuries while the horizontal axis types, given above, come at least a century later.

In style and technique the Canterbury vessel is far more closely allied to the former types. The Continental examples are, on the whole, tending towards the grotesque and degenerate in common with pottery in general at the later period. It can be held, therefore, that the presence of the vessel in question is not inconsistent with the rest of the kiln pottery. Until new evidence is brought to light, the Canterbury vessel must be regarded as an early example of a type made in the Rhineland and destined to a life of one to two hundred years.

The technique of the vessel is so far in advance of anything else found on the site that it is unlikely that it was made at this kiln, but was imported with several other pots and decorative reliefs such as the Jupiter Ammon head.

The exact purpose of this vessel on this site is a matter of conjecture. It is hardly the type a potter would be expected to use at his work or even at his meals. Had he used it as a model one would reasonably expect to find at least a trace of one of his unsuccessful attempts in the large dump of rejects. Perhaps it was a special order? The solution may be found when the rest of this interesting site is explored.

G.A.W.