

Dorchester. Dec. 5. 1892.

My dear Sir,

I am very sorry to find from your letter of Dec. 3 that owing to imperfect description I wholly failed to make myself understood about the fragment of pottery lately found at Fordington. I gather that you take me to have been referring to a tablet on a British vase. With these I am very familiar indeed, inasmuch as we have examples in the Dorset Museum, as also of the little boxes (no one

I shall never forget my visit to it - when less sensitive - on the occasion of the Dorset Field Club being guided over it by you.

By the bye, to return to that pottery fragment for a moment I may say that Mr. Lummington never saw anything like it in fashion.

Trusting that your health is now quite re-established,

I am
yours faithfully,
H. J. Moules.

L. Genl. Pitt Rivers. F.R.S.
to to to

vase large boxes) which seem to be a survival of the custom of making eyelets. But I have seen specimens, or engravings, of eyelets lower than the middle of a vessel - as here roughly depicted.



Little Piccola, Dorset
Cunnington Colln.
D.C. Museum

And never have I observed, either eyelets (apart from the "Purbeck handle") in any position on a vessel of black ware.



about
3 inches
in diam
Fordington
D.C. Museum
Black ware
Base

Now the Fordington fragment is black & has eyelets close to the base.

The find seems to be of the Roman

epoch - the find at large - for several grooves were accidentally struck. But I am puzzled by this fragment, as regards epoch. While its general contour is regular enough to suggest leather-burning, the deep grooving or fluting looks as if hand-produced, and the slight ornament on the ridges dividing the grooves "|||||"
I on our "|||||"
is different to any that I remember in my -
doubtless Roman-epoch "Whisker"
ware, so called.

I do not know of any youth who would be likely to suit you as sub. custodian at your Museum. It would be a capital opening in many respects. Your Museum, with the 2 additional wares, must be indeed interesting.