

'POST MEDIEVAL POTTERY IN
LINCOLNSHIRE 1450-1850'

by Andrew J. White, MA, FMA, FSA



Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
May, 1989



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

www.bl.uk

BEST COPY AVAILABLE.

VARIABLE PRINT QUALITY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE.

**TEXT IN ORIGINAL IS
CLOSE TO THE EDGE OF
THE PAGE**

CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Standard Abbreviations Used in the Text	iv
Chapter 1. Introduction and Methodology	1
Chapter 2. Pottery-making in Lincolnshire - Documentary Evidence	9
1. Introduction	9
2. Lincolnshire Potters, 1450-1850	13
3. Transcripts of Probate Inventories and Wills Relating to Lincolnshire Potters	30
Chapter 3. Pottery-making in Lincolnshire - Physical Evidence	63
1. The Nature of Physical Evidence	63
2. Gazetteer of Pottery-making Sites	68
Bolingbroke	68
Boston	80
Bourne	89
Coningsby	100
Hareby	105
East Keal	107
Kirkstead	109
Louth	113
Spalding	116
Toynton All Saints/St. Peter	117
Minor Sites	128
3. Pottery Production	130
4. Fabric Analysis	141
5. Pancheons with Name-Stamps	148
6. Dark glazed wares	155
Chapter 4. Pottery Imported from Outside Lincolnshire	180
1. Imports through the Port of Boston and elsewhere	180
2. Quantities, Values, Types and Sources	202
3. Imported Types: the Physical Evidence	215

Chapter 5.	Prices and Values of Pottery	226
Chapter 6.	Pottery Types and their Functions	247
Chapter 7.	Dated Groups of Pottery	267
	1. The Principles of Dating	267
	2. Pottery Associated with Coin-Hoards	273
	3. External Dating	276
	4. Gazetteer of Dated Groups	282
	5. A Note on Rubbish	295
Chapter 8.	Conclusion	305
Drawings of Pottery from Dated Groups and Kilns. Descriptions of Illustrated Pottery		315
Bibliography		342

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the manufacture and use of ceramics over four centuries in Lincolnshire, and considers the evidence for date and function of the pottery itself and for the social standing and economy of the potters, late survivors of the medieval peasant craftsman tradition. Documentary and physical evidence are both searched to produce the most comprehensive possible list of sites and potters names, and to highlight the areas of doubt where neither type of source can give sufficient proof. The methods of pottery production are also examined and two specific types of vessels are discussed in detail as examples of the search for origins. From this point the search widens to consider the importation principally by sea of pottery from other parts of the country and from Europe, and the prices of such wares are compared with prices of local products. This leads to certain conclusions about the economic pressures on local potters and their adjustments to deal with new problems and changing expectations.

Contemporary sources, depositional evidence and context are next used to study the names and function of pottery, and finally the principles of dating are discussed, and a series of pottery groups are analysed to test the reliability and transferability of dating. Throughout pottery making is compared with comparable trades and Lincolnshire's position with that of the wider ceramic world.

STANDARD ABBREVIATIONS IN THE TEXT

Arch.	Archaeologia
Ant.J.	Antiquaries Journal
AA ₄	Archaeologia Aeliana (4th Ser.)
Arch.J.	Archaeological Journal
AASRP/LAASRP	Associated Archaeological and Architectural Societies Reports and Papers/Lincolnshire Archaeological and Architectural Society Reports and Papers
Derbys.Arch.J.	Derbyshire Archaeological Journal
EDD	English Dialect Dictionary
EMAB	East Midlands Archaeological Bulletin
FNQ	Fenland Notes & Queries
Herts.Archaeol.	Hertfordshire Archaeology
JBAA	Journal of the British Archaeological Association
LAO	Lincolnshire Archives Office
LHA	Lincolnshire History and Archaeology
LNQ	Lincolnshire Notes and Queries
Med.Arch.	Medieval Archaeology
Num.Chron.	Numismatic Chronicle
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
Phil.Trans.	Philosophical Transactions
Post-Med.Arch.	Post-Medieval Archaeology
PCAS	Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society
PRO	Public Record Office

PSAL	Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London
PSAS	Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland
SGS	Spalding Gentlemen's Society
Trans.Ancient Mons.Soc.	Transactions of the Ancient Monuments Society
YAJ	Yorkshire Archaeological Journal

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

My subject - the pottery made and used in the historic county of Lincolnshire between 1450 and 1850 - is one which has until now attracted very little attention. Within the county no production sites are of any more than local importance either in scale or quality of manufacture nor yet in innovation of technique. Indeed Lincolnshire was probably one of the most backward areas of England in ceramic terms. The Coal Measures with their associated clays were outside its boundaries, denying the local potters any opportunity to rival Stoke on Trent or the manifold potteries of West Yorkshire with new wares while the shift in trading interests from east coast to west coast with the rise of the American and West Indian colonies, which gave such a fillip to the North Devon, Liverpool and Bristol potters, was a backward step for Lincolnshire. In the Middle Ages jugs from Toynton All Saints found their way to Norway: it is tolerably certain that no post-medieval Lincolnshire products were exported from the country. On the contrary the local potters were forced to compete in ports such as Boston with attractive and cheaper imports from Europe sent direct or via London. Fig.1

All these factors made for conservatism in style, a small and unstable local industry, and much poverty among the potters. Nonetheless it is instructive to see the

survival - perforce - of old fashioned styles and methods into a period when documentary evidence becomes really useful. The close dating of pottery itself becomes more difficult since for instance coarse earthenware with a green lead glaze continued to be made for some two hundred years after its general disappearance in other parts of the country, while the technique of producing a mottled or streaked effect by the addition of iron to a clear lead glaze, developed in Staffordshire before 1700, survived until the closure of the last pottery at Bolingbroke around 1800. Indeed some ceramic forms occurring on their own cannot be dated more closely than within a bracket of some two centuries. Luckily other forms were more inclined to change and to diagnostic detail. Experiments were clearly tried out: Blackware imitations were produced at Bolingbroke and Boston, while at the former and at Bourne a very few vessels with sgraffito decoration were made, under what influence it is not clear, but there is nothing to indicate that anything more than a tiny proportion of 'exotic' items were ever included in the quota.

In the period of my study - four centuries of vigorous social and political change - it is clear that the sources and range of information vary vastly. In terms of documentary evidence alone the quantity and quality of information in 1850 bears no relation to the few scraps of mid-15th century documentation. Trade Directories, Census Returns, Tithe Awards - all these provide evidence of a direct and

unequivocal kind quite unlike the passing references in Household Accounts and Court Rolls. The richness of post-medieval documentary evidence I have utilized to the full and I regard this part of my study to be of the greatest importance. The strictly archaeological account of dated groups and contexts will I believe become subject to considerable change in the course of time: how much post-medieval stratification has been simply brushed aside in past excavations the purpose of which was to locate a Roman rampart or to clear the debris from an Abbey ruin?

I believe furthermore that the quantity of recoverable post-medieval sherds, if finite, will be truly vast, so refrain from drawing over elaborate conclusions from the distribution patterns of distinctive or imported fabrics from the pitifully small proportions at present to hand. A single new excavation of a selected site in Boston could probably double the present totals for imported sherds in Lincolnshire. I hope that this study may provide a background against which further and more detailed work can be carried out. In particular a rigorous scientific analysis of pottery fabrics deserves to be undertaken. While it is possible at the moment to obtain analysis of thin sections from groups of known origin - eg. kiln waster groups - a great lacuna is the absence of any speedy and cheap method of processing large quantities of pottery without resorting to the, in the end, subjective use of eye and microscope.

The largest quantity of post-medieval pottery to be recovered comes from recent urban excavations in Lincoln and Stamford. However the contamination and residuality in pottery groups is usually very high in urban contexts and there is also often a lack of independent dating evidence (eg. clay pipes or coins) or insufficient quantity to satisfy statistical requirements for accuracy. Imported pottery may appear to provide a key to dating, but this method suffers from two simple pitfalls. The first is its relative rarity in 'inland' Lincolnshire, hence the possibility may arise of differential treatment of 'heirloom' pieces and the resultant delay in their entry into rubbish deposits. The second pitfall is that many imported pieces are regarded as 'type-fossils' of a particular period. There is often a strong element of truth behind this assumption, but when we consider the occurrence of the type in its homeland we find that it can have a much wider date range and occasionally a completely floating internal chronology between two widely spaced extreme dates. In other words we are often more confident of Continental dating than Continental archaeologists are.

My method of approach will be to build up a corpus of pottery groups, each being as free of contamination from earlier or later deposits as is possible, and to use them to establish an internal chronology based on the occurrence of the pots themselves, or on external evidence if the relationship is clear enough. Together with this I shall

draw together groups of wasters from kiln groups to show the available local sources, and use documentary evidence to demonstrate the social position and degree of capitalization enjoyed by the potters.

The potentially useful connections with imported pottery will be pursued from two angles: from that of European imports and also from the point of view of imports from the rest of England. Some imports from the rest of England are very distinctive. Such is the case with Staffordshire products. Other coarse wares from neighbouring counties depend for their recognition very much on the degree and depth of work carried out there. In the case of Lincolnshire the neighbouring county of Nottinghamshire (and especially the city of Nottingham) provides us with a more industrialized and technically more advanced industry, which is generally distinctive. Leicestershire, Cambridgeshire and Norfolk however, are less easy in general to separate in terms of fabric and finish from South Lincolnshire. Only when as much detailed work has been done in each of these counties as is currently available for the 10th-12th centuries will it be possible to isolate products with any degree of confidence.

Previous studies in post-medieval Lincolnshire ceramics have been very limited in scale. Pioneer work by the late Mrs Rudkin and Miss Hilary Healey was included in P. Brears, The English Country Pottery.¹ Miss Healey's own work on

the medieval pottery of Lincolnshire was summed up in an MPhil thesis for the University of Nottingham in 1975,² and in a continuing series of notes in Lincolnshire History and Archaeology. This journal has also carried many useful notes in an article, successively entitled 'Archaeological Notes, 19..', and 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 19..' which has run without a break since 1952.³ Other writers on relevant topics include Hurst⁴ and Coppack,⁵ who have both broken new ground in Lincolnshire medieval and post-medieval studies, the former with a European ceramic background, the latter from a detailed knowledge of East Midlands ceramics. Hurst, too, has produced a most useful resumé of the present state of medieval ceramic studies in Lincolnshire, up to 1984,⁶ which includes much on post-medieval ceramics as well.

It is unfortunate that as yet no detailed post-medieval groups have been published from the two most important urban centres, Stamford and Lincoln. I have, however, been given useful access to the Lincoln groups by Dr Lauren Adams, one-time medieval pottery researcher at the Lincoln Archaeological Trust. I would like to acknowledge in particular with grateful thanks the help of the late Mrs Ethel Rudkin, Miss Hilary Healey, and Dr Lauren Adams, as well as the late Antony Gunstone, formerly Director of Lincolnshire Museums, for his encouragement and advice, and my former colleague at the City and County Museum, Lincoln, Maggi Solly and my successor there, Anthony Page, for

continuing access to stored material.

Finally I should add that this thesis commenced in 1978, was largely researched before my move to Lancaster in late 1983, but has been updated to include relevant new information where possible. The subject does not stand still, however, and inevitably decisions have had to be taken deliberately to exclude some new evidence if it does not materially affect the main thrust of the argument. I have tried to summarize most of the relevant recent work and references will be found in the bibliography.

Notes

1. P.C.D. Brears, The English Country Pottery, Its History And Techniques, Newton Abbot, 1971, 193-5.
2. R.H. Healey, 'Medieval and Sub-Medieval Pottery in Lincolnshire', unpublished M.Phil. thesis, University of Nottingham, 1975.
3. A brief analysis of this series of articles to 1978 is printed in A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1978', LHA, 14, 1979, 65.
4. e.g. J.G. Hurst, 'Post-Medieval French Imports and English Copies at Lincoln', LHA, 1, 1966, 54-6, though Hurst's involvement with Lincolnshire pottery researchers as an expert and adviser is of very long standing.
5. e.g. G. Coppack, 'The Pottery', in Drewett, P., 'The Excavation of the Great Hall at Bolingbroke Castle, Lincolnshire, 1973', Post-Med. Arch. 10, 1976, 6-24.
6. J.G. Hurst, 'The Development of Medieval Pottery Research in Lincolnshire', in Field, N., and White, A., (eds), A Prospect of Lincolnshire, Lincoln, 1984, 64-8, which includes a very extensive bibliography.

CHAPTER 2

POTTERY MAKING IN LINCOLNSHIRE - DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

2.1 Introduction

The choice of any starting and finishing dates for this survey of pottery-making in Lincolnshire is bound to be artificial. Several sites mentioned here had been producing pottery for several centuries before 1450, while others continued after 1850.¹ This period of four centuries is, however, of a convenient length to study and it has two further merits. Firstly the latter half of the 15th century saw a major change in the pattern of imports into this country, so that deposits of this date offer a greater chance of cross-dating with foreign products.² Secondly the mid-19th century was a time in Lincolnshire when the local late-medieval survivals, such as the kilns of Bolingbroke, had ceased to exist, and their places were being taken by kilns attached to brickyards, producing wares in a different tradition and often run by potters with a training in other centres.³

The phrase 'late-medieval' may require some qualification. I do not imply that medieval styles remained completely fossilized in the local potters' repertoire. On the contrary there are indications of considerable experimentation, particularly in the 16th and 17th centuries,⁴ and there was also some conscious copying of techniques practised

elsewhere, such as slipping, sgraffito, and colouring of glazes. The real force for conservatism, noticed also in Yorkshire and the North of England generally at this period,⁵ was the retention of the cottage industry tradition, typified by the family unit plus a small number of apprentices and journeymen. The carving away of the wider markets by more distant factory potteries on the Coal Measures⁶ led inevitably to a decline in profitability, to part-time and seasonal production, and to a reduction in the capacity to experiment and innovate. The remoteness of east Lincolnshire no doubt helped the industry to survive there up to the end of the 18th century,⁷ but elsewhere, and notably in Lincoln the local industry had been defunct since the 15th century.⁸ The outward manifestation of the late-medieval survival was the retention of a basic range of forms such as pancheons, jugs, and ale-pots⁹ in an unrefined clay derived from local clay deposits, glazed with lead to provide a green or brown surface depending on whether the fabric was reduced or oxidized in the kiln. The result was usually an unpretentious but serviceable product well adapted to kitchen and dairy purposes, which gradually moved down the social scale as tablewares became cheaper and more readily available.

Canons of Evidence

Recognition of kiln sites in Lincolnshire comes from a variety of sources. In some cases eg. Boston a site is known from physical remains but there is virtually nothing

in the way of documentary evidence. At Hareby, however, though we know a good deal about the potter the location of his kiln remains unknown. Waster evidence at Fishtoft and Wildmore suggests in each case the presence of a kiln, but other factors point to the dumping of waste from elsewhere at both sites to strengthen the banks of the river Witham.

It has been noticed elsewhere that production sites may pre-date written evidence by a considerable space of time,¹⁰ and it is reasonable to assume that major centres such as Bolingbroke were in operation long before the first potters' names are recorded. The various kinds of written evidence, furthermore, have a tendency to change with time and to become more or less useful accordingly. This is especially true of Parish Registers which were only established in 1538, which do not in general quote occupations prior to c1600, and which become uniform and hence less informative from the introduction of printed forms in 1812. Bolingbroke is especially fortunate in its detailed registers.

Field evidence is also extremely variable, and depends on the degree of disturbance, from ploughing, via building work to full archaeological excavation, and to the interest or otherwise of field-workers.

Documentary Evidence

The main classes of document which I have found useful in this study are listed briefly below. It is not intended to examine exhaustively the nature of each. Manuscript sources are mainly to be found in either the Lincolnshire Archives Office (LAO) in Lincoln or in the Public Record Office (PRO) in Chancery Lane, London. The split between the two is in general between local, diocesan records and estate papers, and national records which include both those of the various royal functionaries and those of the Duchy of Lancaster. Extensive Duchy property including the Castle and Honour of Bolingbroke makes the latter a potentially useful source.

The following are the principal sources for information on potters.

1. Parish Registers and Bishop's Transcripts.
2. Other Parish papers (Churchwardens', Constables', and Overseers' Accounts, and Glebe Terriers.
3. Probate inventories.
4. Wills.
5. Court Rolls.
6. Leases and Indentures.
7. Household Accounts.
8. Rentals and Surveys (especially of the Duchy of Lancaster properties).
9. Maps.

10. Local newspapers.
11. Census Enumerators' Returns.
12. Published sources, including Trade Directories.

2.2 Lincolnshire Potters, 1450-1850

Only the merest handful of medieval Lincolnshire potters are known to us by name, and these mostly by chance. One Robert le Potter of Boston,¹¹ is known because he was away on a Pilgrimage in about 1200, while Siward le Potter of Glentworth¹² is recorded in 1172 as a tenant of Catley Priory. Similarly Hugh le Potter¹³ of St Botolph's parish in Lincoln appears in a Thurgarton charter of c1250. These can all be recognized by their distinctive surname or trade-name, but in the course of time such surnames either became fossilized or had no meaning; hence later potters must be described as potters for us to be even moderately certain of their trade.¹⁴ One such is Richard le Dyke,¹⁵ potter, of St Peter-at-Pleas parish in Lincoln, recorded in 1365, who may have been responsible for the wasters and moulds for face-masks on jugs found on the site of the Great Northern (now Central) Station in 1848.¹⁶ A few more names are known from the Court Rolls of Toynton All Saints, through the researches of Mrs le Patourel.¹⁷

With this short list should be compared the forty-odd names of potters working in the period 1450-1850, of whom we know in many cases a large amount of biographical detail, including age, family relationships, and property. It is not surprising that a much more rounded picture emerges, or that relatively much more attention should be paid to this side of the story than would be the case in earlier centuries. I propose to proceed alphabetically through the places where pottery was made and to give a resumé of what is known of each potter, including original sources and transcripts where these are substantially helpful.

1. Bolingbroke

By far the greatest number of potters' names in all Lincolnshire are recorded at Bolingbroke, where the pottery industry flourished for over two centuries. Not all the names are of master potters. Several appear to be paid workmen, journeymen, or even relatives employed in the potteries. Most potteries probably used cheap or free labour from within the family. Several potting dynasties such as the Stanneys and the Ousmans seem to have maintained the early traditions and may account for the conservatism in form and finish practised by the Bolingbroke potters.

1. The earliest named potter may be Arthur Ousman who died in 1609. His inventory¹⁸ does not call him a potter, nor has he any pots or equipment listed. On the other

hand he has no obvious source of income at all, and it is interesting to note that one of the appraisers of his property was Thomas Garrett, brother-in-law to Lebbens Walker of Hareby (see below), which may imply that Arthur was a potter. Given the other Ousman names connected with potting it is possible that Arthur worked for his father or an elder brother, in which case his work-place would not be his house, and he would not leave evidence of his trade in his inventory.

2. Thomas Owesman (Jnr),¹⁹ died in 1611, shortly after his daughter was christened. His father

3. Thomas Owesman (Snr)²⁰ died in 1615 and presumably had been potting at Bolingbroke since about the 1580s at least. It is likely that Arthur was his younger son.

4. Also working in the early years of the 17th century was John Burton (fl.1616) the burials of whose daughters are recorded in that year.²¹ Presumably related to him - perhaps his brother was

5. William Burton (fl.1618) whose son was christened in that year,²² while another potter,

6. Richard Stapleton, had his daughter christened in 1618.²³ One member of the Squire's family, Thomas Bryan, left in one of his rooms known as 'Dent Chamber': 'ii dozen of bools six dozen of earthen pans' worth 12s in 1616.²⁴

It is not very likely that the was a potter, and perhaps he was supplementing his income by wholesaling pots for the Bolingbroke potters, or even receiving them as payment in kind for rent.

After 1618 there is a gap until 1681 in our direct knowledge of working potters. It is most unlikely that the pottery industry disappeared but this period marks the transition from the Owsman to the Stanney dynasties, and lack of information is compounded by the failure of sources during Civil War and Commonwealth. William Burton, mentioned above, may be the same man as the William Burton recorded as a copyholder of the Duchy of Lancaster in a Parliamentary survey of 1650.²⁵ If William Burton the potter is the man recorded in the 1650 Survey he may bridge the gap which otherwise exists in the mid-17th century. Another source which does not unfortunately mention occupations is the Return of Hearth Tax Assessments, which survive in the PRO. That of 1662²⁶ includes the names of William Burton, Nicholas Burton, Richard Semper, John Stanney Snr. and Robert Stanney. That of 1670²⁷ includes Nicholas Burton, John Burton, Thomas Ousman and William Ousman, but is very defective and a number of names have been lost. All these names could belong to potters but in the absence of proof positive they cannot be claimed as such. However this evidence does perhaps cover the period between 1618 and 1681.

8. The next potter is Robert Stanney who died in 1692²⁸ leaving only £2 worth of 'Pootts', but a great deal in the way of cattle and sheep, and the 23 horses which suggests that he had access to valuable common in the Fen for grazing. Significantly 'fuel' ranks higher at £3 than his

stock of pots. It is very likely that it was in the form of a turf-stack, as with the Bourne potters. How far back Stanney's career runs we cannot tell, though he may be the individual named in 1662. There is no reason to suppose that he died young - his inventory totals the respectable sum of £113-03-00d - and in the absence of a will there is no check as to the age of children. In 1681²⁹ he was a Parish Constable and in 1683³⁰ he was elected Boon Master. In the former office his companion was

9. John Stanney, not recorded as a potter, but probably Robert's brother and one of the appraisers of his household goods in 1692.³¹ The 1662 Hearth Tax names John Stanney Snr. who was probably the father of both men. In 1692

10,11. John Langley and William Ousman were both in receipt of Parish Relief.³² The Parish Register record the burial of 'John Langley, Poor Potter' in 1734³³ so perhaps this is the same man. William Ousman is not named as a potter, but may be a link in the dynasty which ran from the late 16th to the mid-18th century.

12. John Semper, Potter, appears regularly in the Parish Registers with the christenings of a son and two daughters in 1701 and 1706, and the burials of daughters in 1703 and 1706. His own death in 1707 is indicated by an Administration Bond³⁴ granting administration to Ann Semper, widow, and two members of the wealthy Stapleton family. However, his widow Susanna, also deceased, is recorded in his brief probate inventory dated a few months earlier. Perhaps Ann was a surviving sister-in-law. The inventory makes no

mention of pottery or equipment and totals under £20, so perhaps Semper was an employee or journeyman working for another master, such as one of the Stanneys.

13. Thomas Ousman of that long-established family died in 1716,³⁶ leaving:

'Itm. Potts unburnt, and two potters wheels ... 01-05-00'

Two of the appraisers of his property were

14,15. John Hastings and Charles Slater, both illiterate and both separately recorded as potters, the former dying in 1764,³⁷ the latter in 1736.³⁸ A further appraiser, George Hastings, may have been related to John, but is described by the Administration Bond of Thomas Ousman as a Yeoman of East Keal. The Hastings family appear very frequently in the East Keal registers, but not as potters. Hastings and Slater were both probably journeymen working for Ousman prior to 1716 - whether they subsequently became their own masters we do not know.

16-19. William Stanney Snr,³⁹ and his three sons Robert, Thomas and William, born respectively in 1699, 1700 and 1704,⁴⁰ between them spanned the last century of pottery production at Bolingbroke. William Snr., perhaps born in 1665, died in 1726, and his two eldest sons Robert and Thomas Stanney followed soon after in a family tragedy recorded in the Parish Registers for 13th June 1733;

'Robert and Thos. Stanney Brothers and Potters dy'd both in one day wthn a few hours one of another & bury'd in one Grave'.

Their younger brother William survived until 1784, as one of the last potters of Bolingbroke. The Parish Registers report his burial thus:

'Wm. Stanney Potter ae 79 paup^r, 41

His wife Elizabeth, aged 66, outlived him by just one week.⁴² It may reasonably be doubted whether this William⁴³ can be identified with the man elected overseer of the poor in 1779, only five years before.

20. Thomas Bennett, potter, buried in April 1729,⁴⁴ seems to have left no other record behind. He may have been a journeyman.

21. Another Robert Stanney, perhaps brother to William Stanney Snr, died in 1736. It is hard to distinguish him in the Parish Registers from other individuals of the same name, but by using in combination his will⁴⁵ and the Parish Registers we can distinguish him as an individual born perhaps in the 1680s who married Elizabeth Page in 1711 and had by her ten children, five of whom died in infancy. The survivors shared the money raised from the sale of his land except his youngest son

22. William, aged six at his father's death, who was to inherit his house. He may have been the William Stanney, Potter, who was elected overseer of the poor in 1779. That his eldest son was not yet (if ever) a potter is borne out by a codicil to the Will, offering another acre of land to any of his sons who followed the trade of potting. Robert Stanney's property⁴⁶ was quite extensive, with a total value of over £161, including sheep, cattle and horses in

the fields and commons. Some of his sheep were in the Rout Yard, an earthwork just to the south of Bolingbroke Castle, perhaps originally a sort of Duchy of Lancaster pinfold,⁴⁷ and almost opposite the presumed site of Stanney's house.⁴⁸ The house itself consisted of nine rooms plus a Pothouse where his pottery and implements were, valued at £10 (much higher than the norm). It may have been this man, one of the few of the Stanney family that were literate, who made pancheons stamped with his name as an advertisement (see below).⁴⁹

We have already come across John Langley (10) who died in 1734 a pauper. The last known potter of Bolingbroke may have been his grandson.

23. Samuel Langley, born c.1732,⁵⁰ was widowed in 1768⁵¹ and died in 1793.⁵² The Parish Registers record his burial thus:

'Sam^l. Langley harmless Potter, paup^r ae 61'.

The rather odd adjective 'harmless' suggests that he was either subnormal or prematurely senile.

A question remains as to whether the pottery industry continued in Bolingbroke after 1793. If William Stanney the overseer of 1779 was the William born in 1730 it is possible that he could have been potting up to c.1800, but the poverty of the last two recorded potters suggests that the traditional markets were shrinking fast and that it is of little significance which year production actually ceased.

One more name remains to be considered, that of

24. Edward Ousman, who died in 1737 and was buried at Bolingbroke.⁵³ He was Overseer of the Poor⁵⁴ in 1719 and was probably the son of William Ousman (11) or of Thomas Ousman (13). The interest that attaches to him is mainly due to his connection with Hundle House in the parish of Coningsby. In his will dated 1736⁵⁵ he describes himself as 'of Hundle House' but leaves his wife his 'House onset and Premises' in Bolingbroke. Clearly he had property or interests in both places, so one wonders where his pottery was. Despite the reference to Coningsby parish it seems likely that Hundle House was an extra-parochial area in⁵⁶ Wildmore Fen, which was shared by several parishes as Fen Allotments. Ousman's burial at Bolingbroke suggests either that his major holdings were there or that Hundle House really belonged to Bolingbroke. Whatever the circumstances in 1736-7 this clearly gives a context for the earlier waste pottery found at Haven Bank⁵⁷ in what is now Coningsby parish created from newly drained fen in the early 19th century. It probably is to be connected with early members of the Ousman family either as waste from Bolingbroke dumped by them for agricultural reasons, or as the evidence for a pottery on the site.

2. Boston

1. The name of the mid-17th century potter, whose kiln was excavated in 1975 is unknown,⁵⁸ but a fragment of

a stamped pancheon found in Boston bears the letters [ANW]⁵⁹ and is almost certainly a local product. I have suggested elsewhere the name Anwick or Canwick as being a possible expansion, based on Lincolnshire place-names, but there are many other candidates. During the 19th century there were others recorded as potters, though it is possible that all were really potsellers.

2. Joseph Brown, 1818⁶⁰ and
3. Samuel Cottam, Church St., 1852.⁶¹
4. John Pearson, Jnr., Market Place, 1852.⁶²

3. Bourne

We know of at least five potters of Bourne by name. All presumably worked in Eastgate⁶³ or Potter Street which at that date was a somewhat isolated suburb enjoying elements of both town and countryside, as the surviving inventories tend to indicate.

1. The earliest potter for whom there is documentary evidence was Christopher Parker who died in 1552.⁶⁴ One of the appraisers of his goods was Bryes Manbie, who also appraised the goods of Robert Barton (see below). Perhaps Manbie was a neighbour of both men, or else another potter? Among Parker's possessions were

'all the potts and crosses'
valued at 30 shillings. 'Crosses' is an odd word in this context but may perhaps be read as a dialect form of 'cruses'.

2. The next earliest named potter is Robart Barton who died in 1555. His inventory,⁶⁵ does not refer to pots but records a 'workhouse' and 'ymplements' and also, perhaps significantly to 'all the torves and wood'. We cannot be sure that the turves (ie. peat) were used in firing the kiln, but Bourne is extremely well placed to obtain access to this fuel and the multiflue kiln excavated in Eastgate in 1973⁶⁶ would be best suited to a slow-burning and short-flame fuel such as this.

Barton owned oxen, cows and horses suggesting that he enjoyed 'right of Common' and practised a mixed economy. One of the appraisers of Barton's property was Stevyn Parker. The coincidence of his name with

3. Steven Parker, Potter, who died in 1615⁶⁷ may signify that he was his namesake's ancestor - perhaps father - and also a potter. Steven Parker the younger was himself a grandfather, according to his will, at the time of his death in 1615. Hence he was probably born in the 1550s or 1560s. If the names are significant we may have a case of at least three generations of the family being potters. Parker's inventory makes no reference to pots or to kiln or fuel; nor is there any indication of cattle etc. It is possible that Parker had effectively retired from business - his will dated 1613 indicates that he was already 'sicke in bodie' and perhaps had no great expectation of life. It should be recalled however that 'sicke in bodie but of good and p'fect remembrance' is a standard formula for

wills and is not always to be taken literally.

4. Another Parker, Christopher Parker, the son of Steven Parker, who died in 1624,⁶⁹ was classified as a 'yeoman' and left the very large sum of £309 in goods, including property at Holyoke and Tallington. However, his long inventory contains the following:

'In the pot house

Item all the potts and milke panns,

valued at x li '

So he too was a potter, or perhaps more likely the proprietor of a pottery, employing others to do the actual work.

5. The last named potter of Bourne is William Astin who in 1699 negotiated the purchase of a cottage at Pinchbeck.⁷⁰ The main interest here is that other sources suggest that the pottery industry in Bourne was defunct following the great fire in Eastgate in 1637⁷¹ - yet sixty two years later a Bourne man could still be called a potter. Either the seriousness of the fire was exaggerated, or perhaps a new phase of the industry began here some years later. We do not know whether Astin, for instance, had anything to do with Eastgate. Continuity cannot be assumed in the pottery industry as there do not seem to have been very substantial capital costs for equipment involved, while skilled journeymen could always be called in from elsewhere. At all events it would seem that Astin was not a practising potter in 1699.

So, once again in the case of Bourne the potters seem to have belonged to dynasties. Whether there were other Bartons is not at present clear, but there is abundant evidence for continuity within the Parker family, who perhaps were responsible for introducing the archaeologically-recognized Bourne 'D' ware (see below) in the early 16th century, and who in later generations moved socially upwards out of the pottery industry in the 1620s, if we accept the evidence of Christopher Parker Jnr.

4. East Keal

The slight evidence for a pottery here in the early 19th century, attached to a brickyard, will be outlined later. The name of the first proprietor here is unknown, though perhaps it was a relation of Miss Goodwin of Horncastle.⁷² Following the sale of the premises in 1811 the proprietor was probably

1. Joseph Parker, recorded frequently, in the Bishop's Transcripts in the 1820s and 1830s on⁷³ the christenings of children, as 'brickmaker'. Many of the names associated with pottery manufacture at Bolingbroke, such as Stanney, Hastings, Burton and Stapleton appear regularly in East Keal in the 17th and 18th centuries, but as occupations are hardly ever recorded there is no proof of such an early origin for the industry here, nor is there as yet any compelling archaeological reason to seek it.

5. Hareby

The tiny parish of Hareby adjoins Bolingbroke on the west side. One potter working here before 1611 is recorded by his probate inventory.⁷⁴

1. Lebbens Walker left much agricultural equipment together with:

'Item eight dosen of pottes --- vi^sviii^d,
in his kiln. His very detailed inventory gives a good indication of the possessions of a reasonably comfortable small farmer, to whom the business of potting may have been something of a sideline. Two interesting factors emerge from Walker's inventory and from his will.⁷⁵ Firstly he was probably quite young when he died: in his house was a cradle, and none of his five children mentioned in his will had yet reached the age of twenty-one. In fact we know of the birth of two of his children in 1607 and 1609 from the Parish Registers. Secondly he had pots in his kiln although he died in November.⁷⁶ This suggests that either he potted at a quiet time in the farming year, despite the dangers of frost and the difficulties in drying, or he worked at his trade all the year round.

We do not know where Lebbens Walker worked. Just possibly he worked at nearby Bolingbroke. Hareby is now reduced to a single large farm and a church, though this seems to be a late shrinkage⁷⁷. There may also have been a Fen Allotment.

None of Lebbens Walker's children were old enough to take up his trade, and in any case it appears that his widow married in 1612 a John Minting of Nether Toynton, labourer, and the family left the district.⁷⁸

Walker's floruit probably extends back into the last decade of the 16th century and makes him a contemporary of the first recorded potters of Bolingbroke.

6. Kirkstead (Kirkby on Bain)

Kirkstead is now a parish in its own right but was formerly an extra-parochial area in the parish of Kirkby-on-Bain - extra-parochial as it was the site of a great Cistercian Abbey. One potter is known here from

1. a probate inventory dated 1610;⁷⁹ Francis Moodie, who among his possessions left 'earthen vessels' and 'ii potter-wheelles'. It is unlikely that he worked alone if he had two wheels, and one of the appraisers, who could not sign his name, was John Potter. It would be extraordinary at this late date if such a surname signified a trade, unless it was actually a nickname, but the coincidence is most curious. The sites of what must be Moodie's waster-heaps are still to be seen at Kirkstead Abbey⁸⁰ (see below, chapter 3).

7. Louth

The following are recorded as potters:

1. Adam Dawson, 1818.⁸¹

2. 'Mr Harrison', d.1822.⁸²

3. Thomas Rose, brickmaker in James St. from 1835 and potter from 1841, d.1850.⁸³

4-9. The business was taken over by John Sugden whom the 1851 Census Returns⁸⁴ describe as 'born Marshchapel' (Lincs). Living with him were a daughter, Mary Ann,⁸⁵ aged 19, born in York, and a nephew, George,⁸⁶ aged 18, born in Leeds. The Yorkshire connection suggests that Sugden gained his training in Leeds or York, and this is further strengthened by the origins of one of his journeymen (they lived at 43 and 44 James St. presumably tied houses belonging to the pottery). This was William Lugdon,⁸⁷ aged 25, born in Leeds, journeyman pot-maker. Another journeyman was Edward Stone,⁸⁸ aged 24, born Louth. With the former was lodging at that date Richard Hardwick,⁸⁹ aged 18, born in Louth, also journeyman pot-maker. Sugden's daughter and nephew were described as 'potter's servant', presumably a technical term meaning that they served the potter either by turning the wheel or by preparing clay.

10. The 1861 Census Returns record John Mitchell⁹⁰ as 'Carrier, poulterer, and manufacturer of the Lincolnshire pottery', in James St. No journeymen potters are recorded, and we can probably conclude that the pottery was on the verge of extinction. 'The Lincolnshire pottery'

suggests that his wares were distinctive, and even perhaps the only wares being made in Lincolnshire at that date, though advertising claims need not be taken too seriously.

8. Spalding

1. James Smith, pot-maker, 1798.⁹¹ (In an advertisement for 'two journeymaen coarse or brown pot-makers'.)

9. Toynton All Saints

1. Despite the physical evidence of potteries in the 16th and early 17th centuries here (see below) the only potter known by name is Thomas Bucke, who in 1562⁹³ billed the Ancaster household for '11 dozen of milke pannes and for dyverse other greate and small potts' for 20s8d. Bucke was also a juror for Toynton Manor Court in 1562 for a Duchy of Lancaster survey of the Honour of Bolingbroke.⁹⁴

10. Toynton St. Peter

1. Like Toynton All Saints to which it joins on the south side Toynton St. Peter had a medieval and early post-medieval pottery industry.⁹⁵ Again only one post-medieval potter is known by name. His burial is recorded in March 1627,⁹⁶ but due to a particularly difficult hand in the Bishop's Transcripts two of the letters are uncertain. The name appears to be Thomas Haule.

2.3 Transcripts of Probate Inventories and Wills of Lincolnshire Potters

These documents which offer primary evidence are dealt with in the following manner. Probate inventories are transcribed in full, retaining dialect forms and spelling errors.

Square brackets mark lacunae in the originals. The reason for transcribing the full document is that this enables the significance of the tools and products of the pottery industry to be seen against the rest of the deceased's possessions. It also serves to point up quite neatly the almost universal dependency of the country dweller of the 16th-18th century upon agriculture in some form, whatever the professed occupation. This information also appears in the form of bar-graphs.

By contrast the wills are summarized, there being much standardized verbiage and legal padding. Wills show themselves to be useful in reconstructing family relationships and tensions, but rarely of any use in providing technical details of the deceased person's trade. Only aspirations sometimes appear eg. the Codicil to Robert Stanney's will of 1736.

A further point of interest is to be drawn from the manifest inability of many of the witnesses to sign their own names. As a hint at the level of literacy among potters and their social circles, it is of some use, but of course while non-signers can be deemed illiterate, the ability to

sign one's own name is not a guarantee of further literacy. Indeed, non-signers may include those too old, or with too poor eyesight, to sign properly.

A striking feature which emerges from the inventories and which is brought out more clearly by the graphs is the low value of the pottery and work tools both absolutely and also in relation to other items such as cattle and household goods. Pottery is almost always the least significant of the sources of wealth. Figs.2-

This conclusion should be examined with some care. If we suppose that the kiln and work tools seem to represent a relatively low capital investment we must also accept that in no case is the value of the house included in the inventory, which is concerned only with movables. The kiln and drying rooms etc. are almost certainly excluded either tacitly or expressly from the total.

Again, the pottery itself and the fuel stores made ready for firing it were both renewable. Compared with the livestock and crops, each representing perhaps a year's accumulation, or the household goods, which may represent a lifetime's acquisition, the pottery is the result of a single firing, or in the case of 'pots unburnt' the prepared but unfinished filling of a kiln. We have no evidence for how often a kiln was fired, but even allowing for a frequency of once a fortnight and excluding the Fig.2

coldest or wettest period of the year we may still have to multiply the value of one kiln load by thirty or so for a year. This would have a very significant effect on the relative value of the pottery taken over a period of time. The probate inventories give us a picture of a moment of time, artificially frozen, where capital items and stock-in-trade receive equal prominence. It is necessary to reconstruct this static picture in a dynamic fashion, where some goods are produced and sold quickly, while others move through the production cycle to a slower rhythm, even if the individual values are higher.

This chapter has drawn together the available documentary evidence for potters and pottery making in the country. In the next chapter we will examine the physical evidence and how it matches with the documentary material.

PROBATE INVENTORIES

Bolingbroke

Bourne

Grimsby

Hareby

Kirkstead

BOLINGBROKE

March ye 24th 1691

A true & present lunatrey of the Goodes and Chattells of
Robert Stanney of Bullingbrooke Latt Desessed

Fig.6

	£	s	d
Itm Purss & Apprell	5-	0-	0
Itm young beass & 3 young horses	6-	0-	0
Itm 25 Sheed or hodgs	6-	0-	0
It 30th youes	12-	0-	0
It 3 paire of Bullarkes	21-	0-	0
It 4 Cowes & 2 Steares	12-	0-	0
It 20 horeses	20-	0-	0
It wane & wayngeres plow & plowegeares	03-	0-	0
It ffuell	03-	0-	0
It ffor Pootts	02-	0-	0
It for hay	02-	0-	0
It for 12 Akers of Corne			
[] Grown	06-	0-	0
It for Corn in the [] & Barn	03-	0-	0
It 3 beds & Beding belong to them	07-	0-	0
It Lining	01-	0-	0
It one brass pot one Brase pane			
And 3 or 4 small peeces of puter	00-	13-	4
It one Cubbord & 2 Tables 6 Chares			
And other hushellment	01-	3-	4
It ffor Backon	01-	0-	0
It one sowe & peeggs	1-	6-	4

the hol sume is 113- 3-0

mark

John Stanney

Francis Wheatcroft

mark

William Wydayll

William Wright

BOLINGBROKE

A true and perfect Inventory of all ye Goods and Chattels of Thomas Ousman of Bolingbroke in the County of Lincoln Potter, Lately Deceased, Made and Appraised ye Fifteenth Day of May in the year of our Lord One Thousand Seven hundred and sixteen, by us whose names are hereunto subscribed.

Fig.7

	£	s	d
Imps Purse and Apparel	02:00:00		
Itm In the Little parlor, one Bedstead & its furniture, and three Chairs, and two old Boxes & one little Table	01:10:02		
Itm In the Great Parlor, Three Tables, Six Chairs, one seeing-glass and a Screen	01:00:00		
Itm In The Hall, one Pewter-case, Fourteen pewter Dishes Thirteen pewter Plates, three Chairs, two Tables, one Fire-Grate	02:10:00		
Itm In The Chamber over the Hall, two Bedsteads & Furneture, Three Chairs, and one Table	01:00:00		
Itm In The Chamber over the Parlor, one Bedstead and Beding, One Chest of Drawers, and one Chair	01:00:00		
Itm In The Kitchin one Hopper, one Soe, one Leven-tubb, Three Brass Kettles & Three Barrels	01:10:00		
Itm Potts unburnt, and two Potters Wheels	01:05:00		
Itm In the Yard, Wain and Wain-gears	01:00:00		
Itm One hundred of Furrs Kided	00:10:00		
Itm Fowr Oxen for the Draught	13:00:00		
Itm Fowr Cows, & two stear-calves, & one Heiffer & three Stake Calves	15:00:00		
Itm One Sorrel Mare & Fole, one three year old Fillie one old Gelding	05:00:00		
Itm Sheep	10:00:00		
Lastly One Acre of Beans	01:00:00		
	<hr/>		
Sum Total	57:05:02		
	<hr/>		

Apprais'd by Us

John Fletcher (

George Hastings (

John Hastings (

Charls Slater His marke (

BOLINGBROKE

July the 23, 1736

A True & P'fect Inventory of all & Singular the Goods & Chattels of Rbt. Stanney of Bolingbroke in the parts of Lindsey in the county of Lincoln, Potter, Deceased. Viewed & Appraised by us whose Names are hereunto subscribed.

Fig.7

	£	s	d
Imps. His Purss & Wearing Apparel	05	00	00
In the Parlour Three Bedds & other Furniture there	05	00	00
In the Chamber over the Parlour Two Bedds & other things	02	00	00
In the House Three Tables Six Chairs with other things	01	00	00
In the Passage, Pewter & Pewter case with other things	02	05	00
In the Hall Two Tables and some Chairs etc.	01	10	00
In the Hall Closset some od things there	00	10	00
In the Hall Chamber Two Beds with other furniture	06	10	00
In the Kitchen One Copper with other things there	04	00	00
In the Dairy some Milch Vessels there	01	00	00
In the Fox Graves Five Bease	07	10	00
In the same place Six Ews and Ten Lambs	04	12	00
In the same place Seven Horses & Mears	35	00	00
In the Hofelwel 14 Ews & 13 Lambs	09	05	00
In the Rout Yard 13 Ews 18 Lambs & one Ramm	13	12	00
In the same place three Cows & two Calves	12	00	00
In the Field 13 Shearings	04	11	00
In the Field 10 Acres of Corn	15	00	00
In the Yard two Swine	02	02	00
Waggon & Waggon Gears, Plow etc. with other Materials	12	00	00
In the Pothouse, Potts & other Materials belonging the Pottery	10	00	00
In the Yard Stocks & Blocks etc.	01	01	06
Wooll at Hagnaby	06	00	00
	161	18	06

Geo: Guniss
Tho: Johnson
Christopr: Witton
Christopr: Babington

BOURNE

This ys the inventory off all the goodds off Xpofer pkar
off Burne in the counte off Lyncollns made the xxii day
off May in the yere off our^e Lorde god one tho^o ccccc & lii
& presyd by Wyllm Sharpe y^e youngar Jys Pressgrane John Boy
& Bryes Manbe.

Fig.3

Itm primis ii steres	xlvis viiid
Itm vi Kye	iiiiil
Itm one hecforthe	xs
Itm ii callfes	vis viiid
Itm vii horrs & meyres	iiiiilvis viiid
Itm a shod cart wt. the geyres	xxxiiis iiiid
Itm all y ^e wodde & torroffs	xxvis viiid
Itm all the potts & crosses	xxxs
Itm all the hay	xiid
Itm all the bords	iis xd
Itm all the yarne	iiiis viiid
Itm all the corne	iis iid
Itm all the Leyds	xiid
Itm a bedde with other stoffe	iiis
Itm a payr of splynts & a pallet	iiiis iiiid
Itm iii flaxynshetes	viis
Itm vi hardynshetes	viiis
Itm iii pyllowberes	iis viiid
Itm iii towylls	iiiis
Itm iiii tabyll napkynns	iis
Itm all the lynnyng cloyth	xvis
Itm one matteres	iiiis
Itm one coverlyd	vis viiid
Itm a nother coverlyd & a bollster	iiis iiiid
Itm ii hollde bedde stocke	xvid
Itm ii hollde harkes wth other stoffe	vis viiid
Itm all the Rayment	xvis
Itm a copborde	vis viiid
Itm all the puter	vis viiid
Itm a bason a chaffyndyshe	
v candyllstycks	iiiis
Itm a mortar w th y ^e pestyll	iis
Itm iiii coffynhenges	iiiis iiiid
Itm a borde w th other stoffe in y ^e halle	vs
Itm all the brasse pannes	viis
Itm ii spyttis ii payr of cobberds	
and a brandyerthe	iis
Itm all the brewynvessells	iiiis
Itm a payr of mallte quernes	
w th other stoffe	vs
Itm all the pollyn	iis vid
Itm all the swyne	iis
Itm all the brasse potts	ixs

Sma xxiii li iiiisxd

BOURNE

This ys the Inventory of all the goods of Robart Barton
layt of Burn wythin the county of Lyncoln potter mayd
the xv day of the monythe of Septembre yn the yere of our
lord god one thousand five hondryth fyfthe fyve and
preysed by Roger Kelyngbek Brysse Manby Stevyn Parker
Wylly^m Sharpe wyth other men

Fig.3

Inprimis yn the hall an ould cobbarde and a tabyll with charis & formys	vi ^s viii ^d
Itm all the brasse	xiii ^s iiii ^d
Itm all the puter and lattyn	x ^s
Itm yn the parlar ii ould fetherbeds wyth on boulster	xx ^s
Itm all the lynyn	vi ^s viii ^d
Itm all the rament belonging to hym and to hys wyf	xx ^s
Itm iii ould arks wth other strayth	x ^s
Itm yn the kechyn on beyd wyth other trayth ther	x ^s
Itm on payr of querns	ii ^s
Itm all the ymplements belongyng to the Workhouse	x ^s
Itm yn the yarde ii oxyn	xlvi ^s viii ^d
Itm iiii Kye	liii ^s iiii ^d
Itm iiii mayrs wyth a foal	liii ^s iiii ^d
Itm all the toroves and wood	xl ^s
Itm on ould wayn wyth the gerys belongyng to the same	xxvi ^s viii ^d
Itm yn debts owyng to the sayd Robard be dyvers parsons	xiii ^{li} xvii ^s iiii ^d

Sm^a xxx^{li} vi^s

BOURNE

September 25th 1615

An Inventorye of the goods and chattells of Steven Parker
Potter disceased taken and praysed by these whose names are Fig.5
underwitten as followeth.

Imp^s in y^e hall

Ite on cubbord valued at
Ite one fframd table wth tow
wainscott furmes valued at

x^s
vi^s viii^d

Ite one Littell framd table two
chaires wth other implements
in the hall valued at

iii^s iiiv^d

In the Parlor

Imp^s one bedd stead wth one covering
and wth other furniture valued at

xiii^s iiiv^d

Ite one little Linesy cubbord wth
one Joynd furme valued at

v^s

One Counter table valued at

iii^s

Ite one trestle Bed wth a little Sta
bed and a trunke

x^s

In the Brise house

Ite one paire of quernes wth a
salting troughe and all other
implements valued at

x^s

In the Kitchin

Ite one peen? with other implements
valued at

iii^s

Ite tow brasse pannes valued at

viii^s

Ite one brasse pott wth a brasse possnet
valued at

v^s iiiv^d

Ite three pewter platters valued at

iii^s

Ite one spit with cobbiorns and
Jacks? firepan and Landiorns
valued at

vi^s viii^d

Ite one Lease valued at

iii^{li} vi^s vii^d

Ite his pursse and aparell
valued at

xxx^s

Sum tota ix^{li} iii^s o^d

praysers

Robert Leese

Thomas Parker

Thom: Collin
his mark

John White

LAO, INV.118/14

BOURNE

An Inventorie of the goods and chattells of Mgri Xopher Parker of Bourne in the county of Lincolneolia deceased: taken and praised the Twenty daye of November Ano. 1624 by Thomas Bourne gent, John Hotchkin, Edward Hareby Sen. and Thomas Parker the daye and yeare above sayd as followeth.

Fig.5

In the Hall

Impimis his purse and Apparrel Briches saddle bootes & spurrs valued at xivli vis viiid

Item two cubbords one longe table wth a frame one little table wth a frame: foure joynd furmes: two chares: foure buffitt stooles: two Binke boards valued at iili xiiis iiiid

Item viii Pewter platers three candle-sticks 5 salt sellers one mortar and a pestell one pewter cup valued at xvis

Item Rack iorns fire shovell Tonges and Aundiorns wth all other iorns belonging to the fire valued at vis viiid

Item x^{en} chashing two cubberd cloathes two carpits one window curtaine valued at xxs

Item one corslett wth a pike sword dagger and rapier wth all other utensailles valued at xxvis viiid

In the little parlor

Item one Trusse bed 2 ffetherbeds 2 coverings 2 blanketts 2 bedsheets one pillow valued at iili xiiis iiiid

Item one livery cubbord foure cheests one Trunk 2 little coffers 2 chushings one charger one warmeing pann with other implements valued at iili

Item 2 peeces of wollen cloth one beareing blanket 2 peeces of Stuffe valued at xxxs

Wayre

Item 7 pare of fflaxen sheets valued at iiili xs
Item sixe pare of hempe beare sheets
valued at iili
Item 7 pare of hempen sheets valued at xxxs
Item 2 dozen of Table napkins 7 holland
pillowbeares with seamings, vallances
for a bed 9 table clothes two towells wth
other wearing
Linings valued at iiili xs

In the Nether parlor

Item one trusse bed wth a tester over it,
one flocke bed one ffether bed, 2 boulsters
2 coverengs 5 curtaines wth vallance
valued at vili
Item one other bed 3 coverings one
pare of sheets one pillow wth beare and
vallance 4 pillowes valued at iili
Item 2 chaires 3 chistes one counter
table wth a cubberd in it one buffit
stoole one ? side saddle and all other
implements valued at iili

In the Chamber over the parler

Item one Trundell bed: one matrice
2 coverings one sheete one coffer one
wicker cradle valued xxs
Item three sto-- bedds wth furniture
belonging to them valued at iili

In the Chamber over the Halle

Item certaine wheate Rye Barley and
pease valued at iili
Item certaine yarne 3 wheelles flax
beare valued at xxxs
Item certaine Onnyans Shelbords Sacks
and all other implem^{ts} in the same roome xxxiis
valued at iiid

In the Battrie

Item xiii^{en} peeces of Pewter: barrells
butter potts and other implem^{ts} in the
same roome xiis iiiiid

In the Kitchin

Item one table wth a forme one moulding
table one dishe banke, one sooe & 3 payles
valued xs

Item 4or Brasse potts one brasse
posnet valued iili

Item 2 brasse panns 4 brasse vessells
3 little brasse panns 3 brass chaffing
dishes 3 candlesticks valued at iili

Item 2 Laundioms 2 dripping panns
fire iorns 2 brandriths 2 gridiorns:
2 spitts Cobiorns frying pann^s wth
other utensalls in the same Roome
valued at iili vis viiid

In the Brew house

Item one pare of quernes one Lead,
one moulding troughe one boulting
troughe 5 greate sooes one strike one
pick pott wth other implem^{ts} in the
same Roome valued iili

In the Malt Chamber

Item x^{xx} cheeses wth five quarter of
malt certain pease wth other shelves,
and all other implem^{ts} valued at xli

In the Milke house

Item 4or Barrells one churns & letherne
bottells, one wollen wheele, one pare
of scales xxiii li of butter, and all
other milke vessells valued at iili

In the Buttrie in the yarde

Item 2 barrells wth all other implem^{ts}
in the same Roome valued at iili

In the Chamber over the Buttrie

Item 3 strike of Oatemeale wth xxiii li of
butter and aples wth all other implem^{ts}
in the same Roome valued at iili

In the worke house

Item one plow 2 harrowes wth certaine
brick & boards, wth 2 Carte Roapes and
all other implem^{ts} in the same Rome
valued at xxviis viiid

In the Hovell

Item one Carte body wth 2 poles certaine
fuell as turffes kidds & ballow wood
and carte geares one harrow, wth other
implem^{ts} valued at iiili

In the pot house

Item all the potts & milke pannes
valued at xli

In the yarde

Item 2 long waynes wth shood wheeles 2
shorte waines one shorte carte 2 pare
of shood wheeles wth implem^{ts} belonginge
to them valued at viiili xs

Item one hovell of ould Beanes valued at viili

Item all the wheate, Rye Barly and pease
in the Barnes wth a cauche of pease xxxli

Item all the hay in the Barnes and
pastures and sacks about home valued at xxli

Item 13^{en} Kine, 1 Bull, 1 steare
valued at xxxiiili

Item two draught bullocks valued at vi li

Item 5 young bease and 17 yearling
calves valued at xviiili

Item 5 wainelinge calves valued at xxvs

Item 9 horse & 4 mares 2 foales valued
at xxiili

Item certaine thack & stuble wth
beasecribbs xxs

Item certaine Turffs valued at iiiili

Item timber wood and all the firewood
about the yard valued at xxxs

Item all the Swine hoggs valued at xxs

At Holyoke

Item 2 bed steads, shelves one sheete presse w th other implem ^{ts} valued at	xxs
Item forkes, lethers, shovells, spades, pipaxe window cloathes one beare leape w th other necessaryes valued at	xxs
Item all the poultry w th henns geese and Duckes valued at	xiili xiiis iiid

At Tallington

Item one frame hovell	xxvj ^s vii ^d
Item one bed stead valued att	x ^s
Item one steepe fatt valued att	xiiij ^s viij ^d
Item one lease for 2 yeares valued att	xiiij ^{li}
Item one Lease of Holyoke for 2 lives	xx ^{li}
Item one Lease of 12 acres of Land for one liffe valued at	vj ^{li} xiiij ^s vj ^d
Item wheate and rye sowne valued at	iiij ^{li}
Item one boate w th Rudders valued at	xiiij ^s viij ^d
Item one Lease for xx ^{ty} yeares valued at	ij ^{li} vj ^s viij ^d

Debts due to the testator

Item due by John Brown Esquire	ij ^{li}
Item due by Charles Baysham gent	xx ^s
Item due by []ashem Pratt for Rent & debt	ii ^{li} svii ^s
Item due by George Butt	xj ^s

Praisers Thomas Browne gent
John Hotchkin yeoman
Edward Harby Tanner
John (or Thom?) Parker yeoman

Sum totalis	li	s	d
huius Inventarie	309	4	4

GRIMSBY

An Inventory of the goods and chattells of Zachariah Godhelpe of Great Grimsby in the County of Lincolne Potter lately deceased Taken the second day of Aprill one Thousand six hundred eighty & five by us whose names are here under written Fig.6

	£ s d
Imprimis purse & apparrell	1-10-0
It. in the hall one Table seaven Chaires two old Cubberds and three little stooles	0- 8-0
It. two quart potts five small pewter dishes fowre fflagons fowre porringers one Bason three Pewter Candlesticks one chamber pott with other three little pieces of pewter	0-16-0
It. the Copper & Brewing Vessell with other small things	1-15-0
It. three brasse panns 2 Iron potts with a brass candlesticke	0- 5-0
It. in the parlour one draw Table	2-15-0
It. sixe Chaires three stooles one looking glasse	0- 7-0
It. one trunke livery Cubboards one warmeing pan	0-10-0
It. two searges one basket with other huslements	0- 2-0
It. fowre pairs of sheets half a dozen napkins	0-14-0
It. in the parlour Chamber one long Table with a forme	0-16-0
It. one little Table one Chaire one Chist a badd? bedd	0- 5-0
It. in the hall Chamber one pilion with a Cloth one linnen wheele with other huslements	0- 4-0
It. in the Brewhouse Chamber, trundle beddstead some Ash wood with other huslements	0- 2-0

	£	s	d
It. X parshell of Turffes a parshell of unburnt potts with some loads Ashes	2	10	0
It. in the yard one Cart with some fourniture with one saddle & a Bridle	1	10	0
It. in the workehouse, a parshell of deales and other Implements belonging to his trade	0	10	0
It. some firewood	0	5	0
It. three old horses with a badd? foale	3	0	0
It. one young meare	2	0	0
It. one Cow with a yeareing Calfe	2	10	0
It. three sheep & one young lambe	1	0	0
It. debts owing by the two Burgesses	9	5	0
It. two Bills of Thomas Gibsons	4	12	0
It. in doubtfull debts oweing from Saunder Cash Samuell Godhelp & Thomas Spencer	4	0	0
	<hr/>		
	£	s	d
The totall sume	39	11	0

William Toote
Tho: Stivenson
Harbert Knowles
Richard Maddisson

LAO, Admon. 1685/61

HAREBY

Hareby. A true Inventory of all the goodes, cattell, and Chattelles, of Lebbens Walker, late of Hareby in the County of Lincolne Potter, deceased: Apraysed the two and twentieth day of November Anno Domini 1611: by Edward Smith, George Shawe, Thomas Thorne, and John Greene, of Hareby aforesaid housbandmen. Fig.4

Inprimis money in his purse	vi ^s viii ^d
Item his apparell	xx ^s
<u>In the Hall</u>	
Item a long Table: and a frame	x ^s
Item one ioined foarme	iii ^s iiiv ^d
Item one great cupboard	xiii ^s iiiv ^d
Item two fourmes, and three chaires	ii ^s vi ^d
Item foure buffet stooles	iiii ^s
Item one bedstead, a fetherbed, two bouldsters, one covering, one blankett, one mattresse, and a quilt	xxx ^s
Item one trundlebed, a mattresse, a covering, & one quilt	v ^s
Item seven platters, three pewter dishes, one salt, one pewter candlestick and two tunnes	ix ^s
Item three brasse pottes	xx ^s
Item seven pannes, a bason, two frieng pans, a skimmer, one candlestick, a pestell, and a mortar	xx ^s
Item one dishe-benche, dishes, earthen pottes and some other husselmentes	ii ^s
Item a paire of cobirons, two spittes & two hookes	ii ^s
Item mattes, poules, and shelves	xvi ^d
Item a Bible	viii ^s
<u>In the great Parlour</u>	
Item one Standing bed, a fetherbed, one pillowe, a boulder, one covering, one blanket, & a mattresse	iii ^{li} vi ^s viii ^d
Item a stocked bed, a fetherbed, two bouldsters, two pillowes, a covering, a blankett, & a mattresse	xxvi ^s viii ^d
Item one letle cheste	xii ^d

In the litle Parlour

Item one cupbourd

vi^s viii^d

Item one great cheste

iii^s iv^d

Item a stocked bed, a mattresse, & other things belonging

iii^s iv^d

Item one old hutche

xii^d

Item a woollen wheele, and two linen wheelles

iii^s

Item foure pounds of hempe, & two pounds of flaxe

iii^s

Item one other greate cheste

iii^s iv^d

Item three lesser chestes

iiii^s

Item foure cushions

ii^s

Item a webbe of harden clothe, of fiftene yeardes

vii^s

Item two paires of linen sheetes, two paires of hempen sheetes, & an odde hempen sheete, two towelles, and three pillowbeares

xxxiii^s iiii^d

Item a chaire, and a cradle

ii^s

In the milkehouse

Item a salting trough, one kneading tub, & one soa

iii^s iiii^d

Item foure shelves, two standes, two kittes, & a dosen of kettle boules, with other husselmentes

iii^s iiii^d

In the Kilne

Item eight dosen of pottes

vi^s viii^d

Item in the lathe

Item in barley

iii^{li}

Item in oates, and pease

xx^s

In the Yeard

Item one waine, a cart, a plough, plankes and other instrumentes of housbandry

xx^s

Item wood in the yeard, and wood in Sr Henry Askewes wood

x^s

Item a sow, and foure houldinges

xx^s

Item ten geese and a hen

v^s

Item in the Closes

Item one Kow

xl^s

Item one Steere

xviii^s

Item one mare

lvi^s viii^d

Item one other mare, and a nag

Item two sheepe

Item which is owing unto her, by Mary
Blades of Whapeloade, widowe

praysed

Som

xxxiii^s iii^d
vi^s viii^d

v^{li}

xxxvi^{li} vi^s vi^d

Edward Smith
John Greene
George Shawe
Thomas Thorne

LAO, INV.111/295

KIRKSTEAD

An inventorie indented of the goods and chattells late Francis Moodie of Christead in the county of Lincoln Potter, deceased, taken & praised ye second day of March A^o dmi 1610, by Rob^t Lamb, William Swafield, Roger Ammond, John Potter.

Fig.4

In primis monie in his Pursse and his apparell	vis viiid
Item iii chairs, i trundle bed and furniture	iiis viiid
Item a wheele, a rack, a syve and a terras ?	xviid
Item a tub with wooll in it, and earthen vessels	iis vid
Item ii beds in the chamber, and the furniture	xd
Item one cubbord, i candlestick and other things on it	iiis
Item a brasse potte, ii spitts, one paire of racks, ii payre of tongs, a brandreth, a frieng panne, a paire of pinsers, i hammer, a posset, an yron wedge, ii hatchets, ii forks, a spade, ii trowels, a skimmer	vls
Item xii dishes, a bridle, a chaire and stoolles	xviid
Item a table, ii fourmes, ii potter-wheelles	vs
Item xx bordes, i laiden with firewood	iis vid
Item a wheelbarrowe	vid
Item a holden pigg	vis
Item ii geesse and one gander	vis
Item a painted cloth and a certon	vid
Summa totalis	xl ixv iid

Robert Lamb William Swafield Roger Ammond
(all illiterate, signed by marks)

WILLS

Bolingbroke

Bourne

Coningsby

Hareby

BOLINGBROKE

In the Name of God Amen, this 10th Day of July in y^e Year of our Lord 1736. I Robt. Stanney of Bolingbroke in the County of Lincoln Potter am very weak & sick in Body but of Perfect Mind & Memory thanks be given unto God

To Mr Jams Longstaffe Senior of Hagnaby and Samuel Hotchon Senior of Hairby

Close of Pasture called the four Acers, and Arrable Lands in the Low Field of Bolingbroke and in the High Field (purchased from Mr Norton Bryan) all to be sold and money paid as follows:

To my son Robt. Stanney £40

To my daughter Elizabeth Gosling £20

To my son John Stanney a Close of Pasture called the Stone Yard

To my daughter Mary Stanney £20 to be put out at interest until she arrive at 18 years of age

To my son William Stanney my House Onset and Premises in Bolingbroke

To my wife Elizabeth Stanney the remainder of goods and make her sole Executrix

To James Longstaffe & Samuel Hotchon full power to sell and act as trustees

(Witnesses)

Mary Taylor (illit.)

Ann Wright (illit.)

Christopher Babington

Elizabeth Clarke (illit.)

(Cod cil) One acre of land in the High Field to be shared among my sons, or to be given to them or him that follow the Trade of Potting.

BOURNE

In the name of God amen, the nineteenth day of Aprill in the eleaventh yeare of the raigne of our Sovereign Lord James by the grace of God of England, France and Ireland Kinge defender of the Faith pr. and of Scotland the sixth 1613. I Steven Parker of Bourne in the countye of Lincoln Potter beinge sicke in bodie but of good and pfect remembrance ...

To my son Christopher the lease of my land, for life, and afterwards to my son Richard Parker.

To Joane, Anne, John & Thomas, sons & daughters of Robert Common of Barrow, Rutland, Yeoman, my son-in-law, 20 shillings each at age 21.

To John, Roger & Elizabeth, sons & daughters of Hugh Sisson, my son-in-law of Oakham, Rutland, 20 shillings each at age 21.

To Anne & Alice Parker my neices 3s4d each on the day of their marriage.

To William Parker of Bourne tanner, son of William Parker, deceased, 20 shillings.

To Sibill and Jeane Woods my kinswomen 3s4d each.

To Grace Combe my maid, 3s4d.

To my son Richard Parker my best cloak.

To Robert Parker, son of Robert Parker deceased 10 shillings.

To my son Christopher the remainder, and to be sole executor.

To my second son Richard 12d for his paines to be supervisor.

(Witnesses)

James Hubbord
Robert Leese
Richard Parker

CONINGSBY

In the Name of God Amen, the six day of December 1736.
I Edward Ousman of Hundle House in the Parish of Cunsby in
the parts of Lindsey in the County of Lincoln Potter
being very sick & weak in Body, but of Perfect Mind &
Memory....

To my daughter Elizabeth West One Shilling.

To my daughter (maiden name) Mary Ousman One Shilling.

To Jenny Eveson £3.3s to be paid when she reaches age of 15.

To my wife Easter Ousman my House, Onset & Premises in
Bolingbrook, for her life.

To my daughter Eleanor Ousman my House etc. after the
death of her mother, and £15.

To my wife Easter Ousman all remaining goods etc. and to be
sole Executrix.

(Witnesses)

Faith Witton (illit.)

Margaret Maddison (illit.)

Christopher Babington

(Edward Ousman was himself illiterate)

HAREBY

In the name of God, Amen: I Lebbens Walker, of Hareby, in the County of Linolne Potter, sick in body but whole in minde, and sound, and perfect remembrance ...

To every one of my five children, Ruth, Sarah, Dorothy, John and Rebekah Walker, 10 shillings apeece, to be paid when they reach the age of 21.

To my wife Jane Walker everything else not otherwise given, and make her my sole executrix.

My loving Brother-in-Law Thomas Garrett of Bollingbrook to be Supervisor.

7th November 1611.

(Witnesses)

Robert Wight scriptor

- Smith (ilit.)
- Shawe (illit.)

William Scott

- Greene (illit.)
- Winsore (illit.)

LAO, LCC Wills 1611/i/184

Notes

1. Continuity around 1450 seems to be much greater than around 1850, however.
2. Raeren stoneware and Cistercian ware (the latter not imitated in Lincolnshire until much later) are the most satisfactory late 15th century type-fossils. For problems over Siegburg and Langerwehe stoneware imports see below.
3. eg. Leeds potters at Louth.
4. Especially at Bolingbroke and Bourne.
5. P.C.D. Brears, The English Country Pottery, Its History and Techniques, Newton Abbot, 1971, Chapter 1.
6. ibid, Chapter 2.
7. The last recorded potter at Bolingbroke died in 1793.
8. No potters are recorded in Lincoln after 1365. Edward Bowler, Potter, who died in 1601 and is referred to by Brears, op. cit., 193, was in fact a whitesmith, brazier, and bell-founder, see A.J. White, 'Two Newly Discovered Lincoln Bellfounders', The Ringing World, LXXIV, 1978, 21.
9. I use the local names which occur in contemporary documentary sources in preference to the terms used by ceramic historians.
10. Verbal comment by S. Moorhouse.
11. D. Owen, Church and Society in Medieval Lincolnshire, Lincoln, 1971, 124.
12. F. Stenton, Transcripts of Charters Relating to Gilbertine Houses, Lincoln Record Society, Lincoln, XVIII, 1922, 86.

13. Thurgaton Chartulary, 1075, (Transcript in LAO, Foster Library).
14. 'Potter' can also mean bellfounder, tinker, whitesmith, or potseller. A.J. White, 'Kiln Sites and Documentary Evidence in North Lancashire', in Davey, P.J., 'ed', Medieval Pottery from Excavations in the North West, Liverpool, 1977, 121.
15. LAO, Dii 80/3/70.
16. Anon., Memoirs Illustrative of the History and Antiquities of the County and City of Lincoln, London, 1850, xliii and Fig. facing. Many further finds were made on this site in 1987 by the Lincoln Archaeological Trust.
17. H.E.J. le Patourel, 'Documentary Evidence and the Medieval Pottery Industry', Med. Arch. XII, 1968, passim.
18. LAO, INV. 107B/54.
19. PRs.
20. PRs.
21. PRs.
22. PRs.
23. PRs.
24. LAO, LCC Admon. 1616/98.
25. PRO, E.317/10A f.13.
26. PRO, E.179/140/806.
27. PRO, E.179/251/14.
28. LAO, LCC Admon. 1692/109.
29. LAO, Bolingbroke Parish 10, Vestry Books, 1674-1782.
30. ibid.

31. loc. cit. in note 28.
32. loc. cit. in note 29.
33. PRs.
34. LAO, LCC Admon. 1707/98.
35. ibid. In the LAO Administrations are always kept with relevant probate inventory.
36. LAO, LCC Admon. 1716/80.
37. PRs.
38. PRs.
39. PRs.
40. PRs.
41. PRs.
42. PRs.
43. loc. cit. in note 29.
44. PRs.
45. LAO, LCC W. 1736/170.
46. LAO, LCC Admon. 1736/124.
47. So described in Elizabethan Duchy of Lancaster surveys, eg. PRO, DL. 44/604. (42 Eliz. 1).
48. A sherd from a pantheon stamped by Robert Stanney was found here by the late Mrs E.H. Rudkin, who pointed the site out to me.
49. A.J. White, 'Post-Medieval pantheons with name-stamps found in Lincolnshire', Post-Med. Arch., 1982, 29-38.
50. ie. 61 years before 1793.
51. PRs.
52. PRs.
53. PRs.

54. loc. cit. in note 29.
55. LAO, LCC W. 1737/155.
56. eg. W. White, History, Gazetteer, and Directory of Lincolnshire, Sheffield, 1856, 767. A large number of extra-parochial townships in this area of former Fen originate in the partition between Kirkstead and Revesby Abbeys of important granges and vaccaries here. See also D.J. Price, 'Medieval Land Surveying and Topographical Maps', Geographical Journal, CXXI, 1955, Pl. 1.
57. J.B. Whitwell, 'Archaeological Notes 1964', LHA, 1, 1966, 39.
58. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1975', LHA, 11, 1976, 57; 'Post-Medieval Britain in 1975', Post-Med. Arch. 10, 1976, 172-3.
59. op. cit. in note 49.
60. (Results of) Poll for the Election of Knights of the Shire, 1818, 144.
61. Information from Mr P. Wells.
62. ibid.
63. W. Marrat, History of Lincolnshire, Topographical, Historical, and Descriptive, vol. 3, 1816, 73n.
64. LAO, INV. 20/136.
65. LAO, INV. 25/6.
66. Duplicated Interim Report (nd) by N. Kerr in City and County Museum, Lincoln; N. Kerr, 'An Old Bourne Industry', Lincolnshire Life, March 1979, 38-9.
67. LAO, INV. 118/14; PRs. Aug. 17th, 1615.

68. LAO, LCC W.1616/106.
69. LAO, INV. 128/295; PRs. Nov. 5th, 1624.
70. LAO, Measure 1/4/8-10.
71. Marrat, op. cit.; C.W. Foster, The Parish Registers of Bourne, (1562-1650), Lincoln Record Society, 7, Lincoln, 1921, xiv.
72. Lincoln, Rutland, and Stamford Mercury, Sept. 13th, 1811, 1, c.5.
73. LAO, East Keal BTs. (late).
74. LAO, INV. 111/295.
75. LAO, LCC W. 1611/i/184.
76. PRs.
77. Armstrong's Map of Lincolnshire (1779) and the 1st edition OS 1 inch/mile Map of 1824 show a group of houses now apparently replaced by outbuildings of Hareby House Farm. In 1856 the population was 97, see W. White, op. cit., 780.
78. PRs.
79. LAO, LCC Admon. 1610/179.
80. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1977', LHA, 13, 1978, 78-9.
81. (Results of) Poll for the Election of Knights of the Shire, 1818, 82.
82. Brears, op. cit., 194.
83. Lincoln, Rutland, and Stamford Mercury, Mar. 19th, 1841, 2, c.3.
84. Census Enumerators' Returns, Louth, Lincs. 1851.
85. ibid.

86. ibid.
87. ibid.
88. ibid.
89. ibid.
90. Census Enumerators' Returns, Louth, Lincs. 1861.
91. Lincoln, Rutland and Stamford Mercury, May 18th,
1798, 2.
92. At least five potteries are indicated by waster-pits
and other evidence of this date.
93. LAO, Anc. VII/A/2f 109v.
94. PRO, DL 43/6/19.
95. Two sites only are so far recorded, but it seems
likely that many more remain to be found.
96. LAO, Toynton St. Peter, BTs (early).

CHAPTER 3

POTTERY MAKING IN LINCOLNSHIRE - PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

3.1 The Nature of Physical Evidence

Having examined some of the documentary sources for Lincolnshire potters we may now consider the physical evidence for the siting, distribution, and production methods of the potteries.

Physical evidence can take many forms, from the unequivocal testimony of a completely excavated kiln complex to a handful of very equivocal abraded waster sherds, whose ultimate origin could be far away. Physical and documentary evidence rarely coincide, and those sites well represented in one way are frequently poorly represented in another. Boston is a case in point: here a fully excavated kiln is extremely difficult to put into any meaningful context. Lincolnshire is not alone in this. Brears¹ and Lawrence² demonstrate many similar problems found elsewhere.

There are a number of criteria to be considered in deciding whether pottery really was produced in any particular place. These are listed below in order of quality:

1. Excavated kilns and detailed documentary evidence clearly relating in time and place to them and to no others.
2. Excavated kiln(s) or detailed documentary evidence indicating a clear siting for kilns.
3. Excavated waster pits or clay pits filled with wasters (preferably including fragments of kiln structure or furniture).
4. Non-specific references to potters or kilns within a given area.
5. Surface scatters of wasters and kiln fragments or furniture.
6. Suggestive field-names (eg. Potter's Hill).
7. Occurrence of what may be wasters on sites excavated for other reasons, where it is assumed that the wasters could not have travelled far from their point of origin.
8. Occurrence of possible wasters among field scatters, where there is no supplementary evidence of pottery production.

There may be other levels of evidence, but at the lowest levels of both documentary and physical evidence it is clear that there is an increasing subjectivity of interpretation. Hurst³ has demonstrated the dangers of reliance on incomplete evidence in the dating of medieval pottery, and the need to test more rigorously our evidence before laying down foundations which could profoundly affect future conclusions, if wrongly established.

Pottery studies in archaeology have long been bedevilled by intuitive judgements, however inspired these may prove to be, but in attempting to achieve objective results it is easy to fall into the trap of believing that pottery studies can become an exact science. I believe that with the exception of certain techniques, eg. TL dating, there is still more of an art than a science in the study of pottery.

There is no problem concerning some of the pottery production sites in question. At Bolingbroke there is a body of local lore concerning the potteries which only ceased to produce c.1800, and their existence has never been forgotten. On the other hand the industry at Toynton St. Peter and Toynton All Saints was only rediscovered, by excavation, some fifty years ago, despite the fact that All Saints was known as 'Potter Toynton' well into the Elizabethan period.⁴ Similarly at Bourne the discovery last century of large pottery vessels during the building of the town's gasworks struck no chord of memory. They were attributed to the Roman period.

At Hareby on the other hand we have the case of a potter named in 1611, but we still cannot be sure whether he worked in this parish, at nearby Bolingbroke, or in some Fen Allotment of his parish many miles away.

Before considering in a systematic fashion where and in what form the pottery was made it is useful to compare the quality of evidence with that of the Roman and medieval periods.

Roman period. Obviously there is no contemporary documentary evidence for potteries in Lincolnshire in this period, but Swann⁵ has recently gathered together the various forms of physical evidence and lists some 74 individual kilns or more concentrated areas of production in Lincolnshire and South Humberside. The quantity of sites provides an immense contrast to the post-medieval period, even though the factors at work are not quite comparable. There has been for instance a much longer period of interest in Roman archaeology and associated study of the pottery. Moreover the correlation of ancient and modern rural settlement and industrial sites is slight, hence many Roman pottery kilns lie outside modern built-up areas and are more prone to discovery either through the processes of agriculture or modern urban expansion. Once discovered there is generally greater ease in excavating whole pottery complexes such as those at Swanpool, Lincoln,⁶ than there is in understanding medieval and post-medieval complexes underlying houses and gardens on village streets as at Toynton and Bolingbroke.

Medieval Period. I have already indicated that the similarities are greater between the medieval and post-medieval periods. With a few exceptions, such as the medieval court-rolls of Toynton All Saints discussed by le Patourel,⁷ the documentary evidence in the Middle Ages is very slight and frequently entirely incidental; as an example we only know of Robert the potter of Boston because he left for a Pilgrimage in c.1200 (see above). The range of physical evidence, however, is not dissimilar, and the main difference may be the disappearance from the urban scene of the potter, especially in Lincoln. Elsewhere in the country the evidence suggests that potting gradually became a rural industry from about the 11th century.⁸ In the post-medieval period the evidence that will unfold will demonstrate a mixed economy: of villages with pottery industries such as Hareby and Toynton; of decaying towns, such as Bolingbroke; of industrial suburbs to towns, such as Eastgate in Bourne; of market towns, such as Louth; and of isolated places such as the site of Kirkstead Abbey. What unites these sites in their industry varies, as will be seen, with tradition, good clay-sources, and good transport - all important elements.

The complementary nature of the documentary and physical evidence renders it inevitable that there will be a degree of repetition between this chapter and the previous one, for which I make no apology.

3.2 Gazetteer of Pottery-Making Sites

Bolingbroke

Attention was first specifically focussed on Bolingbroke as a pottery, while the potteries were still working. The Spalding Gentlemens' Society, founded in 1710, kept records of items exhibited at its meetings in a series of Minute Books. In 1734 a slip-decorated or moulded earthenware vessel was found at Donington,⁹ not far from Spalding (or at Boston - the location varies). It was described in the Minute Books as being of 'Bolingbroke ware'.¹⁰ Whether this was a correct assessment cannot now be judged: the vessel does not survive, and so far slip-decorated and/or moulded wares do not seem to be very characteristic of the area, but it is extremely interesting to see these gentlemen discussing what must have been a near contemporary vessel and displaying knowledge of what was then a fairly humble country pottery.

A more technical interest is shown by a list produced by John Houghton in 1693. The list is 'A Table of Clays' and one of these is described as:

'Pure, that is, such as is soft like butter to the teeth, and has little or no greetiness in it. Greasy, to be reckoned among, the medicinal earth, or terrae sigillatae.'

Of these, no. 8 in the list is;

'The blue clay of Bullinbrooke pottery in Lincolnshire'.

The above is quoted most accessibly by Llewellyn Jewitt.¹¹ Other than this Jewitt had nothing to add except the negative; '... Nothing, however, is now known as to this manufactory'.¹²

Thomas Quincey, father of the more famous Thomas [de Quincey], carried out a tour of the Midlands in 1772.¹³ His particular interest in industry led him to comment:

'... Near this place is Bullingbroke; an inconsiderable town, in which there is nothing to be seen but a pottery for coarse earthenware'

Quincey was referring to East or West Keal when he said 'this place'. Perhaps he did not actually visit Bolingbroke, but if not at least its principal industry was well known in neighbouring villages.

Figs.8

Evidence certainly survived more locally. John Cragg, FSA of Threkingham produced a manuscript Topographical Notes of Lincolnshire in 1790-1820 which states;¹⁴

'... here is still at Old Bolingbroke a small trade carried on in Coarse-Earthen ware'

It cannot be ascertained exactly when this extract was written. As I note earlier the last pottery probably closed

in c.1800 or soon afterwards, and this seems to be confirmed by Cragg, although it has previously been believed that the last potter died a pauper in 1793. It may be, however, that Cragg was using an out-of-date source. If so this has not been discovered in any research. Cragg does confirm the small size of the trade in the late 18th century which parish register sources seem to indicate.

Traditions of the industry survived in the village despite the 19th century indifference: the late Mrs E. Rudkin's researches over about thirty years elicited oral evidence of the locations of several of the potteries, and even of some potters.¹⁵ This is not very surprising in a small and close-knit village community where families, if not surnames, show a formidable tenacity.

The pioneer work of Mrs Rudkin in recording memories and recovering surface pottery from various sites around the village led to the discovery of probable kilns in 1963 and subsequently to excavations in 1965¹⁶ at a point outside the built-up area, when two waster pits were located and excavated. In subsequent years the remains of a kiln was also excavated.¹⁷ This was of the circular multiflue type with probably five flues, but only about one third of the kiln survived, the rest having been cut away by a later ditch.

Fig.10

No further excavations of kilns have taken place. More recent work has concentrated on collecting and recording casual exposures of (mostly) waster sherds, which it must be admitted give an entirely random distribution to materials which are probably ubiquitous in the village. Excavations on the site of the medieval castle since 1965 have produced some stratified groups of pottery, especially from the Hall and Gatehouse.¹⁸ A very large proportion of the pottery is of local origin, but no stratified groups seem to predate 1600, and most are related to the regarrisoning during the Civil War and in its aftermath. The excavations by M.W. Thompson between 1965 and 1969 were mainly concerned with uncovering the curtain wall and towers and were an architectural rather than archaeological exercise. There is a total lack of published medieval pottery from the site, a state of affairs which is somewhat odd in view of the status of the castle as an important property of the Duchy of Lancaster, and birthplace of Henry IV, and in view of the light which might be thrown on the origins of the local pottery industry.

Huge quantities of wasters were found dumped in the castle moat, presumably after the Civil War when it was deliberate policy of Parliament to slight former Royalist strongholds. The value of such wasters is in the range of forms and finishes which can be expected in really large samples.¹⁹ The wasters cannot, however, be attributed to particular kilns or particular potters except in

the case of very distinctive items such as pancheons bearing name-stamps²⁰ (for further details of which see below). In Fig.30 all probability the dumping was carried out by all the contemporary potters in the village.

Origins of the industry

The first named potters at Bolingbroke are members of the Owesman or Ousman family, shortly after 1600.²¹ The working lives of the older members of the family undoubtedly stretch back into the late 16th century, and it is possible that the origins of the industry also stretch back well beyond the written evidence, as Stephen Moorhouse has suggested elsewhere. On the other hand there seem to be no good grounds for seeing the origins as early as the 15th century. The fabric of the various East Lincolnshire potteries are visually indistinguishable as we shall see, and even the 'distinctive' grid-stamped sherd stratified at the Bishop's Palace, Lincoln, in a group dated with perhaps excessive confidence to the mid-15th century²² could come from one of the potteries at Toynton All Saints, even though similar sherds were found in the waster pits excavated in 1965 at Bolingbroke. The sherds found in the kiln and waster-pits are perhaps no earlier than c.1550 and possibly later, since the chafing-dish found among them seems to typify that date. It is an attractive and economical hypothesis to view the kiln and waster-pits as part of a complex worked by the Owesmans, belonging to a

period c.1570-1650. Other kilns probably existed in the group, which was by no means totally excavated, though the area was closely investigated by proton gradiometer.

Fig.11

No further substantial anomalies showed.²³ It is not impossible that an industry which produced much nuisance in the form of smoke and fumes had to be introduced tactfully into the fringes of the village and had to demonstrate its economic advantage to landlords before potters were admitted as tenants within the village proper. This kiln and its associated waster pits do seem to represent the earliest phase, and also belong to a period when the Castle was in use and when perhaps manorial control, exercised by the Steward, was stronger.

Fig.12

Summary of pottery sites in Bolingbroke

Site 1 (TF 356648)

An area showing surface evidence for several kilns.

Two waster pits excavated in 1965. Part of a circular multiflue kiln excavated in 1967. Whole complex probably 16th century. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 83.76).

Figs.
49,50

Site 2 (TF 34806501)

Probable kiln site in garden. Surface finds include a fragment of a pancheon stamped by Robert Stanney. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 3.78).

Fig.52

Site 3 (TF 35226483)

Scatter of surface pottery including sherds glazed in a distinctive pale green/yellow. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 4.78).

Fig.51

Site 4 (TF 35056483)

Local tradition asserts that this rough paddock was the site of the last kiln and that an adjoining pig-sty was made from the remains of the kiln building. (Information from the late Mrs E. Rudkin.) No finds.

Site 5 (TF 34876522)

Scatter of surface pottery from garden and adjacent lane, including a complete pancheon. Much of the material appears to be of mid-18th century date, with a clear brown glaze. Some finds in CCM (Acc. no. 273.76).

Fig.52

Site 6 (TF 34956506)

Dump of c. $\frac{3}{4}$ ton of wasters in Castle moat. A proportion is stored in the Alnwick Tower of the Bishop's Palace, Lincoln (English Heritage).

Fig.53

Site 7 (TF 34836504)

Scatter of brown-glazed sherds from roadside verge. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 160.76).

Fig.52

Kiln Technology

Only one kiln has been excavated at Bolingbroke. Even this was considerably damaged, and its shape is reconstructed on the basis of assumed symmetry.

Further evidence can be gained from documentary sources, but most comes from the pottery itself, which shows clear differences between sites and marked progress in glazing and firing over a period of some two and a half centuries.

First of all let us consider the kiln, excavated in 1967 (site 1). It was represented by the remains of a circular base 2.54m in diameter, with two radiating flues, lined with brick. The kiln lay only 300 mm from the surface, and about the same depth of kiln floor survived. The eastern two-thirds of the floor had been cut away by a recent dyke, but symmetry requires that three further flues existed on that side. Whether one of these was larger than the others to permit access for loading (cf. Boston) cannot of course be determined, and as a result of this and the lack of kiln furniture it is not possible to comment on the degree of permanence and sophistication of the kiln. Fig.10

The products of this kiln, insofar as they can be judged from the contents of two adjacent waster-pits, do not argue for a very highly developed industry. Fabrics are very coarse and sandy, being positively harsh to the touch in many cases. It is possible that sand was deliberately

added to the clay as a filler to render it more resilient to rapid changes of heat, but the fact that the sandy fabric occurs in jugs and pancheons where subsequent heating was unlikely suggests that the sand was unintentional and a result of poor treatment of the clay. The clay occurs below sand and in digging clay-pits it would be very difficult to prevent the wind blowing sand into the exposed clay surface. It is in the subsequent washing, sieving, and weathering of the clay that distinctions between the coarse 16th century products and the relatively fine 18th century wares must come.

Products of the later kilns, none of which has yet been excavated, show increasing fineness of finish, more controlled glazing and smoother, less sandy, fabrics. The large quantities of material from Site 6 enable us to see the range of fabrics and glazes over a lengthy period. Other than by comparison of form with material from sealed groups elsewhere there are no checks to provide close dating within the finds from kiln sites, but the recent discovery of a rubbish deposit of c.1800 at Caistor suggests that Bolingbroke potters were producing both large coarse vessels and finer decorated pieces, very similar to 17th century products even at that date.

In general the coarse sub-medieval pottery seems to have been replaced by finer reduced greenwares and oxidized brown wares in the mid/late 17th century and by predomina-

antly oxidized wares in the 18th century, with a finish not unlike some modern French kitchenwares.

Fuel

Evidence is slight for the type of fuel used in the excavated kiln. The circular multiflue kiln, however, lent itself to two main fuels, peat and coal. In the 16th century peat, known locally as turf, would have been the most easily accessible fuel especially from Bolingbroke's fen allotments. Probate inventories of the Bourne and Grimsby potters give ample evidence for the use of this fuel, and even for the value of its ashes, but for none of the early Bolingbroke potters does this evidence survive.²⁴

It is highly likely that by the end of the 17th or beginning of the 18th century coal was passing into common use. Its use at Boston c.1640 must be regarded as exceptional and due to easy access by sea. The finer quality of later products may be due to the use of a more controllable fuel as well as to changes in kiln structure. Certainly coal ash seems to accompany wasters in unstratified circumstances around the village centre, though this can hardly be used as evidence.

Clay Sources

Attention has already been paid to Houghton's comments on the 'blue clay of Bullinbrooke' and there is no doubt that it was this clay which attracted potters to the village in the first instance. It had little else in the way of ready transport or large local markets to offer.

The clay is Kimmeridgian,²⁵ and underlies wind-blown sand of Quaternary origin. Two waster-pits excavated in 1965 were shown to have originated as clay pits, and were oval, with longest dimensions of approx. 13 feet and 10 feet respectively. They had been dug through the sand into clay, and were filled with first a mixture of clean clay and sand and then by waster pottery and soot. Whether the clean clay and sand mix was part of an unused supply of processed potting clay or was the result of natural weathering cannot now be established. The edge of a large feature adjacent to these pits, found by a proton gradiometer plot but not excavated, may perhaps have been part of a processing tank for washing and weathering clay. No other clay-pits have yet been identified, but undoubtedly exist in close proximity to other unexcavated kilns: some may well have been opened seasonally among the surrounding fields. It is unlikely that the potter's own crofts in the later period could have offered sufficient supplies of clay on their own.

Marketing

There is little that can be said of the marketing of Bolingbroke products, other than the conclusions to be drawn from a few scraps of physical or documentary evidence.

Products do seem to be quite widespread in Lincolnshire, but there is a strong chance of confusion with visually very similar sherds from Toynton All Saints/St. Peter, and Boston. Examples occur in Lincoln (eg. Vicars' Court c.1640) and among surface collections from village sites in north and east Lincolnshire, but in the south Bourne products seem to predominate, at least up to and during the 17th century. Lincoln, as the county town, probably enjoyed better contacts with a wider area than did other local towns and is perhaps a special case. The evidence of stamped pancheons (see below)²⁶ suggests a market radius of some 15 miles (24 km) but these items are very specialized and comparatively rare so that a few additional discoveries could quite change the apparent distribution.

There does not seem to be any direct evidence for packmen as suppliers, as there was at Ticknall in Derbyshire.²⁷ However, we do know of at least two potsellers in 18th century Lincolnshire, at Manthorpe near Grantham, and at Stamford.²⁸ Their numbers were to be greatly increased in the following century but the coarse pottery which they handled is not closely detailed. In the 17th century pottery was frequently sold by general dealers ranging from

fishmongers to haberdashers. The absence of slipware denies us the insights associated with inscriptional evidence from some West Yorkshire potters who clearly took orders for special pieces at fairs and markets, such as those of Halifax and Burton-in-Lonsdale.

One small clue to the marketing may be gained from the probate inventory of Thomas Bryan of Bolingbroke (d.1616).²⁹ He belonged to a local landed family whose members were considered to be squires of this divided parish. In one of his rooms, 'Dent Chamber', were:

'ii dozen of bools six dozen of earthen pans' valued at 12s. He was clearly not a potter, so perhaps he took some of his rent from potter tenants in kind and carried out a small trading venture himself. The quantities certainly seem of the right magnitude for a wholesaler.

Boston

There seems to be little or no tradition of a pottery industry in Boston and despite the discovery of a kiln here in 1975 documentary evidence has yet to be discovered. This is not for any lack of searching through the old corporation records, still held in Boston.

As a port Boston was in a very different position from other Lincolnshire sites: the potters had to compete with imported products from the Rhineland, via the Dutch ports

and also with the coastwise trade in earthenwares from London and King's Lynn. 17th century Boston products show a certain amount of Dutch influence; we cannot as yet identify the products of the recorded 19th century 'potters' or be certain whether there was any continuity in the industry - or even whether these names really represent potters, rather than dealers.

Thompson,³⁰ the historian of Boston, believed that there had once been an earthenware pottery there. He quotes as evidence a Satire of Bishop Hall,³¹ dated c.1599. The relevant lines are:

'What though he quaffe pure amber in his bowle
of March brewed wheat; yet slakes my thirsty
soule with palish oat frothing in Boston clay.'

This is obviously a very oblique reference and could be taken as referring equally well to imported pottery, but the antithesis of the drinks suggests that the containers were equally to be contrasted, ie. that 'Boston clay' represented a notably poor or crude vessel.

The same problems relate to the several references to 'Boston jugges' which occur in probate inventories.³² They may not have been earthenware at all, though the contexts suggest it. Alternatively in local minds 'Boston jugges' may have meant 'jugs obtained in Boston', hence of German stoneware, Dutch earthenware, or of Blackware from London

or Kings Lynn, as indicated by the Port Books³³ (for which see below).

Until 1975 the only physical evidence for local manufacture came from the discovery in the neighbouring parish of Fishtoft³⁴ of a deposit of pancheon sherds having glaze splashes over the fractures. This could indicate the presence of a kiln in the near vicinity, but might also be kiln waste dumped on the river bank as reinforcement, with origins in Boston itself or further afield. A similar question relates to the pottery found at Great Beats Fm. in Coningsby³⁵ which again is discussed more fully below.

Kiln Technology

In 1975 building work was in progress at Boston Grammar School in Rowley Road and when foundations were cut to the east of the existing buildings part of a stone-built kiln was uncovered.³⁶ The work was held up to allow excavation to take place, and the existing trenches were widened to reveal the whole of the slab-built floor of the kiln and its three flues. It was not possible to extend the search further in order to locate associated buildings, but later on several long shallow trenches were seen in a section to the north of the kiln. These may have been troughs for weathering clay, but their exact size and location were not recorded and their existence was not reported until after they had been destroyed.

Fig.13

The kiln and its flues were excavated to floor level and a limited area to the west of the northern flue (flue 3) was examined but the kiln structure was left in situ, to be bridged by a concrete lintel in the new building. As it could be preserved the kiln stonework was not removed, but one floor slab was lifted at the centre of the kiln and the deposit below was augered. This revealed a layer of stiff grey clay immediately below the floor and overlying an ash spread which in turn overlay an earlier baked clay floor, indicating that the stone-built kiln replaced an earlier more traditional kiln with a clay floor. The stone floor lay 850 mm above the base of the clay floor.

The later kiln had a stone-flagged floor 2.7m in diameter internally. Gaps between the flagstones were filled with tile and brick fragments and clay. Upon the floor stood stone walls standing to two courses in some places, forming a circular chamber with three flues evenly spaced around the circumference. Flues 2 and 3 (west and north-east respectively) had been robbed away and their presence was indicated by gaps in the kiln wall and heavy reddening of stonework in those areas, and by ash and sherds outside. It is probable that both were originally stone-lined. Flue 1 (south-east) appeared to be more substantial with a flagged floor and stone walls. It may have doubled as an entrance for loading and unloading the kiln, and it had a step down of c.100 mm from the kiln to the flue floor. The walls of the kiln and of flue 1 were composed mainly of

good ashlar blocks and included fragments of window tracery and blocks bearing masons' marks. These were almost certainly derived from the medieval Franciscan Friary, within the former precinct of which the kiln stood.

Over the whole of the kiln floor lay a mixture of ash, coal and waster sherds, and this extended into all the flues. Flue 2, however, exhibited two distinct layers of ash and debris. The lower of these (10) should perhaps be associated with the earlier clay-floored kiln.

Outside the north side, west of flue 3 lay a thick deposit of brown silty sand (6) abutting the kiln wall. This seemed to have been placed there to support the wall and perhaps to prevent leakage of the hot gases - there was no attempt elsewhere to seal the lower courses of the wall. The sand overlay a spread of stiff grey clay which was probably the sealing over the earlier kiln and acted as levelling-up for the stone floor.

In flue 1 the ash deposit (14) was partially covered by a dense mass of slaked lime. This appeared to post-date the last use of the kiln for pottery and suggests that one flue was used as a lime-kiln, perhaps to burn limestone blocks from the other flues and kiln walls.

Over the remains of the last firing and in the upper levels of all the flues were quantities of pottery including tin-

glazed earthenwares and tiles, part of a North Italian marbled slipware bowl, and German stonewares. These offer a terminus ante quem for the use of the kiln, which clearly served briefly as a rubbish tip. Clay tobacco pipes³⁷ were also found in contexts contemporary with the use of the kiln and in the subsequent rubbish deposit, and suggest a mid 17th-century date for last use and destruction, a date in agreement with that of the imported pottery.

There was no trace of superstructure but it is possible that some of the large number of 14th century roof-tiles found in destruction levels formed part of a dome. Others undoubtedly acted as 'shelves' separating stacks of pots in the kiln, as evidenced by the glaze-drips on them. No other internal structures or kiln-props were found, and it is likely that smaller items were fired inside larger, and that pottery was stacked directly on the kiln floor.

Fig.29

Products consisted of jugs, panchcons, chamber-pots, ale-jars, and many smaller and finer items particularly tripod pipkins with a dark green glaze externally and light brown internally. There were some cups, including imitations of Blackware types glazed in a very dark green, and a single Dutch oven³⁸ with thumb-decorated edges, one of the earliest examples so far found in this country.

No documentary evidence exists for kiln or potter, but it is known that the Greyfriars site was purchased by Boston

Corporation³⁹ soon after the Dissolution and that two of the tenants during the appropriate period were Mr Adlard of Torksey and Christopher Dennis.⁴⁰ Neither can as yet be associated with the pottery industry, though either may have let out land to potters as sub-tenants. No potters are recorded in the Parish Registers, either.

Summary of Pottery Sites, Boston Area

Site 1. Boston (TF 331437)

Stone-built circular multi-flue kiln with three flues. Products include jugs, pancheons, chamber-pots, ale-jars, tripod pipkins, cups and a Dutch oven, in lead-glazed oxidized and reduced fabrics. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 43.75).

Fig.14
Figs.
54,55

Site 2. Fishtoft (TF 346424)

Dump of pottery including pancheons with glaze covering breaks, found adjacent to river Witham. Location of finds unknown.

Clay Sources

The clay sources available to potters in Boston remain something of a mystery. Pottery from the 17th-century kiln exhibits a fabric closely similar to that of other East Lincolnshire kilns at Bolingbroke and the Toyntons, yet it lies in the heart of the Fens on the northern side of the Wash. Its geological history should then be quite different.⁴¹

It seems highly unlikely that a kiln would be established where there was no suitable clay or where deposits lay at a great depth. A more reasonable suggestion is that there were suitable local deposits of clays derived from the southern Wolds either in the penultimate glaciation or as alluvium brought down by rivers and streams.⁴²

The existence of earlier and later potters and more relevantly of brick-kilns as far back as the 15th century⁴³ tend to reinforce the case for availability of suitable clays.

Fuel

The excavated Boston kiln was undoubtedly fired with coal, which was found in abundance both burnt and unburnt. The mid-17th century is a very early date for such use outside Coal Measures but this was no doubt a result of the plentiful supply of coal which passed through the port of Boston. The Port Books⁴⁴ provide evidence for a massive trade in coal brought coastwise from Newcastle at this date, and this origin was confirmed by Mr A.H.V. Smith of the NCB Yorkshire Regional Laboratory, to whom samples were submitted. Microscopic analysis of the coal indicated an age and rank consistent with an origin in the Durham coalfield,⁴⁵ for which Newcastle and Sunderland were the principal ports. No doubt the use of this fuel was both cheap and more economical of storage space than the turf, used in many of the other kilns. It may also explain why

Boston seems to be the only really urban kiln of its date in the county (we do not know the location of the Grimsby kiln). A coal supply would relieve the potter of the need to build up trading contacts for turf in rural areas.

It is also of interest to consider that the use of coal, together with a stone-built kiln, may indicate a Pennine and Yorkshire origin for the potter, where both are known. It must be said, however, that the products do not seem to confirm this.

Marketing

As has been mentioned before, Boston fabrics are not readily distinguishable by eye from other East Lincolnshire types, except for one or two forms such as imitation Blackware cups and tripod pipkins. It is therefore difficult to identify the area over which they are distributed. They occur in local villages such as Leverton and Fishtoft, and the more recognizable types occur as far away as Lincoln.⁴⁶ There is no evidence for export or coastal trade in the Port Books - in this respect Boston seems to have been a net importer of pottery rather than an exporter - and it seems probable that distribution was principally within Boston itself and those villages for which Boston was the market town, a radius of perhaps 20 km. Lincoln, as the county town, enjoyed a special position in marketing, as we have seen earlier.

Bourne

Bourne, a small market town on the edge of the Fens in South Lincolnshire, once had a pottery industry which existed probably without a break from the late 13th to the mid-17th century. As such it paralleled Toynton All Saints/ St. Peter and clearly served the south of the county as Toynton served the east, but with rather less success. In the medieval period Toynton products penetrated Bourne's markets, but not vice versa.

No direct dating has been found for the earliest medieval pottery from Bourne. Three medieval fabrics have been distinguished,⁴⁷ and of these only examples of fabric 'A' cooking pots have been found in association with more readily datable vessels, at Stamford in a pit with a complete Saintonge polychrome jug,⁴⁸ and at Bicker Haven⁴⁹ (in Quadring parish) in levels associated with jugs made at Kiln 1 or 3, Toynton All Saints. In each case the acceptable date range spans the late 13th to the early 14th century. Fabrics 'A' and 'B' are fairly coarse, containing sand and larger grit as inclusions. Fabric 'C' is still fairly uncommon, and has a soft soapy texture containing small limestone grits, not unlike Lyveden products.⁵⁰ Only fabric 'A' was found in the two medieval kilns and waster pits excavated in Eastgate in 1973.

Fabric 'D', and the post-medieval kiln which produced it, show a complete break from the medieval tradition, though

the kiln and its workshops stood on ground which had been heavily pitted for clay and which was backfilled with 15th century wasters. There is therefore evidence for continuity of site and of industry, but also for very considerable changes at some point probably in the 16th century. These will be considered later.

In his History of Lincolnshire,⁵¹ Marrat refers to an entry in Bourne Parish Registers;

'... on 21st May 1637 a fire happened in the Eagate'.

Marrat further records that;

'This fire destroyed the greater part of Potter Street and did much damage to East Street (or Eagate) ... the cause ... through carelessness at the potteries which were destroyed with the street and never after rebuilt.'

As this work was published in 1816 we can only guess at the source of Marrat's information, which seems very detailed. Fires in towns at this date were common and very destructive, in the absence of solid party walls or an adequate fire brigade.⁵² The causes of fires were not infrequently put down to carelessness by bakers and others who had commercial hearths, so the stated cause of the Bourne incident may be no more than a reasonable conjecture. However, Marrat is very positive about the fire's effect

on the pottery industry, which is very difficult to accept in view of other evidence.⁵³

It is interesting to note the equation of Eagate and Eastgate. The former appears to be based on the word 'Ea' or 'Eau'⁵⁴ used in Lincolnshire for a stream or river, and in the case of Bourne such a derivation is topographically acceptable. This street and other lanes that lead off it lie to the east of Bourne market place and until quite a late date formed a separate entity.⁵⁵ No doubt the potters congregated there as the prevailing westerly winds would carry smoke and fumes away from the town.

In 1896 a group of pots was found in enlarging the gasworks in Eastgate.⁵⁶ These were published as 'Roman Pottery at Bourne', though one gentleman who had seen them thought they were of 'Early English' manufacture. Five ale-jars are illustrated, all substantially complete though cracked. One of these is now in the City and County Museum in Lincoln.⁵⁷ Other finds are also mentioned.

'The broken pottery consisted of a great many pieces, mostly of a yellow or green colour, but nothing perfect. They are very thin, and were clearly worked on a wheel. One red jar, about 6 inches in height, was nearly complete. There was also the base of a jar of a dark red colour, with some thumb marks on it'

This constitutes the earliest reference to finds from the pottery sites. All the pots illustrated are in Bourne 'D'

ware⁵⁸ and can be paralleled among finds from the post-medieval kiln excavated in 1973. Between 1966 and 1968⁵⁹ much pottery was seen on the surface in various parts of Eastgate, and in particular on the site of an electricity sub-station in Cherry Holt Lane.

Subsequently, in 1973, two medieval kilns (nos. II and III) were excavated by Nigel Kerr in advance of extensions to the Commercial Garage in Eastgate, and a post-medieval kiln (kiln I) with an associated house and workshops were excavated on the corner of Eastgate and Cherry Holt Lane in advance of road-widening.

Figs.
15,16

Since then no further excavation has taken place, though further fieldwork would doubtless amply repay the effort.

The post-medieval kiln may have been the property of successive members of the Parker family. The earliest named potters are Christopher Parker and Robert Barton,⁶⁰ (see above). The latter's inventory was witnessed by a Stevyn Parker, probably a potter, whose son Steven died in 1615.⁶¹ This man's son Christopher⁶² in his turn died in 1624 leaving £10 worth of 'potts and milke panns' in the pot house.

The Christopher Parker who died in 1624 was well-to-do, leaving over £309, and described himself as a yeoman. His ancestors, however, had been far less affluent. If

we wish to find a cause for the break in tradition in the forms and fabric of pottery we may have to look for outside capitalization. Steven Parker the younger certainly held his property on lease and it may well be that it was the owner of the kiln and workshops who controlled the business. This may explain the absence of any mention in Parker's inventory of the kiln, which, if we are correct in identifying with that excavated in 1973, was of new construction along with all the associated buildings.

Capitalization of the industry might well explain the change in pottery types, especially the more adventurous innovations, such as sgraffito wares.

That such a thing was possible is borne out by a grant under Letters Patent to a group of Lincolnshire gentlemen in 1570⁶³ of a licence for inter alia;

'baking earthen vessels and other earthen works with colours or 'purtraictes' after the manner of Turkey, Italy, Spain and Netherlond' and for bringing in 'stranger workmen' for the purpose.'

A contemporary letter⁶⁴ indicates that two Netherlanders; 'one a baker of fine earthen vessels' had been sent to Bourne 'which they mislike not' and then to Stamford. There is no evidence that tin-glazed earthenware was ever made at Bourne or Stamford, but clearly the quality of the clays was thought suitable and also Francis Harrington of

Bourne was aware of this.⁶⁵ Perhaps he was aware because he had a controlling interest in the existing Bourne potteries?

Summary of Post-Medieval Pottery Sites in Bourne

Site 1 (TF 101199)

Fig.17

Medieval and post-medieval sherds found in extending the Gasworks in 1895-7 included five almost complete 'D' ware ale-jars. One of these in CCM (Acc. no. 37.70)

Fig.57

Site 2 (TF 106200)

Reputed site of a kiln. No finds recorded.

Site 3 (TF 105199)

Large quantities of waster material found 1966 on west of Cherryholt Lane, in building a new electricity sub-station. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 16.70)

Site 4 (TF 107210)

Large quantities of smooth red wares found in field, 1966. Finds in CCM

Site 5 (TF 091198)

Pottery found in north-east part of field, 1966. Finds in CCM

Site 6 (TF 106199)

Clay-built pottery kiln with three flues and associated

Fig.56

house, workshop, and waster pits excavated in 1973. This kiln was producing Bourne 'D' ware. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 98.73).

Kiln Technology

The post-medieval kiln, excavated by Nigel Kerr in 1973,⁶⁶ was a circular multiflue with three flues disposed equidistantly around its circumference. The floor and flues were entirely of clay, the kiln floor having the unusually large diameter of 3.7m. It was surrounded by the remains of a clay wall c.200 mm in width which had been levelled by later ploughing except on the west side, where a boundary hedge had protected it.

Fig.15

The flues were short, only 1m long, and c.300mm wide, with walls c.100mm thick. There were no obvious stoke-pits and the flues contained no ash, but the bases were eroded as though by frequent cleaning.

Over the whole of the floor and extending into the flues was a secondary lining of clay with large sherds trodden into its upper surface. It was c.40mm thick and overlay a thin layer of ash (described by the excavator as wood charcoal, but see below), which represented the remains of the last firing. The superimposed floor had never been fired, and had obviously been abandoned before it had been used. The fire of 1637 might account for this, but there are many other factors which would explain it just as well,

such as the death of the potter, or a decision to move elsewhere. No kiln furniture was apparently found, nor traces of superstructure. A boundary ditch to the north of the kiln contained lumps of fired clay, but it could not be determined whether they were derived from a floor or from the kiln superstructure.

Adjacent to the western flue on the north side and again to the south were large waster heaps, only the eastern edges of which were located in the excavation.

The most interesting discovery in the long narrow area excavated which was to be covered by road-widening was a complete range of buildings and other industrial structures which provide the only Lincolnshire evidence for a complete post-medieval potter's croft.

Fig.16

The buildings fronted onto both Eastgate and Cherryholt Lane, south and west respectively. On the south side was a house with one room 6.2x5.2m containing a hearth and a trampled earth floor in which was mixed domestic rubbish. An adjacent passage and a second room to the west could perhaps be associated with the first room, the whole forming the domestic quarters with a lean-to-store on the corner of the two roads. A small gap separated the house end from the workshops to the north. The workshops consisted of two small rooms floored with 'green' (ie. unfired) refined clay. Fragments of two mortars, perhaps for grinding

ingredients for glaze, and an iron tool for shaping pot-rims, were found here. In the north-east corner was a hole, interpreted by the excavator as a post-hole. It is possible, however, that this was for the base of a potter's wheel. To the north of the workshop was a lean-to-shed in the floor of which was a pit 2m long, 1m wide and 1.3m deep which was partially filled with prepared potting clay.

The buildings were constructed of small limestone rubble bonded with clay and were c.800mm thick. Possibly the walls carried a mud and stud superstructure. Houses similar in construction to the potter's house survived to be recorded this century,⁶⁷ and comparable industrial structures could be seen in the brickyard hovels at Morton, just north of Bourne.⁶⁸

Part of the workshop may have burnt down, as a mass of part-fired clay, perhaps from the walls, sealed the floor of the building. Around the north and east of the building, the yard surface was hardened with limestone blocks, sherds, and domestic rubbish.

In this fairly complete picture of a potter's croft there seem to be two omissions. One is the apparent lack of cart-shed;⁶⁹ the second is the absence of any obvious heated rooms (other than the house) in which to dry the pottery before firing. Possibly this lay in an unexcavated part of the site. Less physical evidence might be

expected for a turf-stack,⁷⁰ but its absence too seems to require some explanation.

The kiln produced cooking-pots, jugs in three sizes, pancheons, pipkins, jars, ale-jars, dishes, chafing dishes, water bottles, lids, and watering-pots. Most were in a smooth pale-pink to red fabric containing occasional very large limestone grits, and partially covered with a thick cream-coloured slip before glazing. Some sgraffito wares were produced here, though not apparently on any great scale as none have yet been found away from the kiln-site. Among pottery with type 'D' fabric have been found sherds glazed with cuprous green specks. It is not known where these were made, but their origin must be another kiln in Bourne or in the same geological zone of southern Lincolnshire.

Fuel

Kerr describes the material from below the upper floor of the excavated kiln as 'wood-charcoal'. It seems unlikely that wood was used in a kiln of this type because of the length of flame which would result and the absence of baffles in the kiln. It is possible that wood was used to light the fires in the flues, or even to pre-bake clay linings, but on the whole the use of turf seems more probable. Bourne lies on the western edge of the Fens and peat could be dug from below the silts, or perhaps even from the surface at one time. Robart Barton's inventory⁷¹

records a store of 'torves and wood', and judging by the example of Zachariah Godhelpe of Grimsby⁷² even the ashes of turf had value, perhaps as potash or in soap-manufacture.

Clay Sources

Clay was dug from the proximity of the kilns in the medieval period, and the later kiln stood on ground which had formerly been pitted for clay. Where the clay for the later kiln itself came from is not clear as no contemporary clay pits were found on the site, but they probably lay nearby. The source was the Oxford Clays of the Upper Jurassic,⁷³ which was once extensively used in brickyards which followed it along a line west of the Fen Edge gravels and east of the limestone.

In the post-medieval period this was either extensively purified (or else the medieval potters had added refractory minerals to it) and it provides the smoothest fabric of any pottery in Lincolnshire except the much earlier Stamford ware, which derived from the Upper Estuarine Clays.⁷⁴

A puddling-pit was found on the site. It must have been worked manually as there was no trace of a blunger or any other mechanical contrivances. With a pottery of this size, perhaps with only one wheel in use, a staff of three or four could probably cope successfully if they successively dug, prepared, wedged, threw, and fired the raw material.

Marketing

There seems to be little evidence as to how the Bourne potters marketed their wares, other than from the scatter of distinctive pottery throughout South Lincolnshire, which Hilary Healey has mapped.

Fig.18

They had the advantage of living in a thriving market town, at this date increasing in population,⁷⁵ and they may have enjoyed the patronage of the Harrington family (see above) with its aristocratic connections. No doubt when the Berties were at Grimsthorpe the Bourne potters provided for their kitchen and dairy needs, but this market was neither very substantial nor very frequent. Excellent though the Bourne products were they could not compete with finer and more attractive foreign imports, and their clients must have been the farmers and cottagers of the Fen and its margins, and the townspeople of the nearby town of Stamford which had no post-medieval pottery industry of its own, as far as is known.⁷⁶

Coningsby

The pottery site at Coningsby is somewhat puzzling. It has been recorded under the names of Coningsby, 'Great Beats', and 'Haven Bank'. In fact it lies in the modern parish of Coningsby, in the hamlet or area known as Haven Bank, on Great Beats Farm.

The site was first discovered in 1964 by the late Mrs E.H. Rudkin,⁷⁷ just to the north of Great Beats Farm. Concentrations of pottery and sooty soil provided surface indications. A small trial hole was dug here in 1964 but no conclusive evidence was obtained as to whether this site was a pottery. Geophysical survey and a limited excavation could prove the point fairly readily, and this is a task which should be undertaken. When visited by the writer in 1982 the site lay under rough pasture, and little surface pottery was to be seen.

Wildmore, which lies adjacent to Coningsby, is now a civil parish, created in 1884 from an area of Fen and a number of extra-parochial hamlets drained and enclosed in the early years of the 19th century.⁷⁸ Until this date Wildmore Fen was an undrained waste, except where small enclosures had been taken in during the middle Ages, and it was common land shared by a number of villages including Coningsby, Revesby and Bolingbroke. The latter village in 1856 owned an allotment of 306 acres in this Fen,⁷⁹ the westernmost of the three Lindsey Fens. The pattern of settlement is complex. Post-drainage farms and cottages are scattered widely across its area, but medieval settlement consisted of a number of small nuclei, most of them originating in monastic granges and vaccaries belonging to the Cistercian houses of Kirkstead and Revesby. These monasteries resolved their differences in this area of competitive development by an agreement c.1257 recorded, rather oddly,

on a map in the Kirkstead Psalter.⁸⁰ Kirkstead in future developed its holdings in Wildmore Fen, Revesby in the West Fen.

After the Dissolution these settlements remained tithe-free and extra-parochial, but the occupiers gravitated towards one or other of the villages on the higher ground for religious purposes. Hence Haven Bank was considered to be part of Coningsby before Wildmore parish was created, while Hundle House looked towards Bolingbroke. How systematically this was practised it is hard to tell. Inhabitants of the Fen Allotments probably consisted of younger sons and their families who perhaps had part of their patrimony in the older villages. This perhaps explains the position of Edward Ousman of Hundle House,⁸¹ a potter who was buried at Bolingbroke, and who had property there (see above). A further complication is raised by Roberts⁸² who suggests that a Fen Statute of Bolingbroke Soke in the 16th century actually forbade permanent building in the Fen, and led to the use of impermanent, seasonal, or movable structures. This may in practice have been a dead letter but it raises questions as to whether any pottery could have been run on this basis.

Coningsby in the 17th century was a classic 'Open Village',¹⁸³ in which there were a number of small freeholders and a variety of crafts, including several 'dish-turners' or makers of treen.⁸⁴ A potter might well fit better into

this setting than that of Bolingbroke with its perhaps more restrictive arrangements. The people of the latter, though, as tenants of the Duchy of Lancaster land, may have enjoyed more freedom than we imagine, along with other tenants on Crown and quasi-Crown estates.⁸⁵ The evidence mentioned above, concerning Edward Ousman, must also be considered, and there are other pointers too. Robert Stanney of Bolingbroke who died in 1691,⁸⁶ left twenty horses among other stock which he may have been encouraged to keep by the availability of common grazing in the Fen. The importance of this will emerge later.⁸⁷

The site lies on low ground not far from the river Witham, but the course of the Witham has not always been as it is at present; in 1761 an Act⁸⁸ was obtained which inter alia allowed for the construction of a new cut linking Chapel Hill and Boston. This work, completed in 1766, left the old meandering river-course to silt up, but it can still be seen both as soil-marks on aerial photographs and as an influence on the line of the present minor road through Haven Bank.⁸⁹

Fig.19

The pottery site, then, lay on the river's edge until c.1764, and could therefore represent dumping of waste from a pottery kiln situated elsewhere to reinforce the bank. This may be also the case with the dump of pottery at Fishtoft which has a similar relationship to the riverbank. In favour of this idea we should note the great similarities

between the Haven Bank wasters and those from the 16th/17th century kilns at Toynton and Bolingbroke.

On the other hand it seems rather unlikely that potters could be prevailed upon to carry their waste up to 28km from their kilns. The time and cost involved would make the operation nonsensical without some financial inducement. Also we may recall that the potter of Kirkstead (see below) about whose existence and workplace there could be no doubt, made use of a similarly remote spot for his kiln, admittedly a little further from the river. This gives rise to another possibility: that Kirkstead, Coningsby and Fishtoft (and perhaps Boston) were all chosen deliberately by potters for their proximity to the river and hence to water transport.

Apart from the pottery, soot and ash the Coningsby site has produced evidence of tile used in the kiln to separate stacks, as well as parting-sherds. There is, in fact, as much evidence here for a pottery as there is on many of the sites in Toynton itself.

Fig.29

The range of pottery suggests a late 16th/early 17th century date, and includes costrels, chafing-dishes with battlemented rims, jars, chamber-pots, pancheons and tripod pipkins. It is too early to have been made by Edward Ousman, but could be the work of an ancestor.

Pottery site at Haven Bank, Coningsby

(TF 21965327). Possible kiln-site producing green-glazed earthenwares, found 1964. A small excavation (unpublished) took place here in 1964. Finds in CCM (187-8.76)

Fig.19
Fig.57

Hareby

Hareby lies on the Wolds one mile to the north-west of Bolingbroke and is a small parish now containing a mere handful of houses and a church. The village seems to represent a late shrinkage as earlier maps⁹⁰ show many more houses here. There is only one recorded potter here; Lebbens Walker, who died in November 1611.⁹¹ His inventory records:

'In the Kilne
Item Eight dosen of pottes'.

This seems to imply that the kiln was his, and on his property. Conceivably it could have been at Bolingbroke where Walker would have been a contemporary of the Ousman family, or even on a Fen allotment⁹² belonging to Hareby, but it seems more probable that the kiln was at Hareby itself as Walker was closely involved in village life here, being churchwarden in 1607.⁹³

The problem in locating the kiln lies in the shrinkage of the village since the 17th century.⁹⁴ Aerial photographs do

Fig.20

not provide the answer, as none seems to show earthworks, crop or soilmarks of the village street. In 1856⁹⁵ the population was 97, implying some twenty houses. The site is now dominated by the 19th century Hareby House and its farm buildings and no doubt part of the former village was swallowed up in the emparking of this house.

Two areas seem hopeful. One is a footpath leading to the church which lies on its own in the middle of a field. The footpath could be the relic of a village street. The other area is to the south of the church where the road drops rapidly down towards Bolingbroke. Houses are shown here in 1824.⁹⁶ Limited fieldwalking by the writer has produced sherds of medieval-17th century date⁹⁷ from the field immediately south of the church, but further work is needed to solve this problem.⁹⁸

Fig.58

Even in event of the discovery of wasters and other kiln material the products of Hareby would be indistinguishable from those of Bolingbroke, whose geology it shares. Clay sources and fuel sources were probably the same, while any potter at Hareby would be drawn towards the larger village with its better marketing facilities.

There is no indication that any later potters worked at Hareby. Lebbens Walker coincides with the first generation of potters to be recorded at Bolingbroke, and his working life probably commenced in the late 1580s or 1590s, unless he married late in life.

East Keal

East Keal lies on the southern edge of the Wolds halfway between the Toyntons and Bolingbroke. In this position we might reasonably expect a medieval or early post-medieval pottery industry to have sprung up,⁹⁹ but so far no evidence at all is forthcoming for its existence. The earliest references belong to the early 19th century, and appear in a local newspaper.¹⁰⁰ The most instructive of these is an advertisement published in 1811 and addressed 'to Brick and Tile Makers'.

It offers a brickyard containing 5 acres 1 rood and 9 perches (approx. 2.5ha) which produces clay 'of the first quality for making bricks, tiles and pots'. No mention is made of a separate pottery kiln. Perhaps the types of pottery made here could be fired in a brick-kiln though at Louth (see below) there were separate kilns for bricks and pots. There was also 'a new mill to grind clay'.

The brickyard is probably to be identified with that marked as 'Kiln' the 1824 Ordnance Survey map at TF 375645.¹⁰¹ Whether there was a predecessor to the site is uncertain. Several large burnt areas are to be seen after ploughing in a field to the east of the brickyard, which could be the bases of older brick clamps.

No products of the East Keal brickyard have yet been identified. Evidence from other brickyard potteries

suggests that the new markets available for them in the 19th century were in the provision of plant-pots, tree-pots, seed-trays and other such products¹⁰² to the gardens and conservatories of the new middle-class country-dwellers, and to the market-gardening trade. Evidence of the brickyard's operators is given above.

Site 1 (TF 375645)

Site of brickyard as marked on 1824 Ordnance Survey and subsequent maps.

Fig.21

Site 2 (TF 375638)

Medieval/post medieval pottery and a possible kiln-prop found here, but do not appear to survive. Possibly a predecessor to the brickyard site.

Clay Sources

East Keal shares with other southern wolds sites access to the Kimmeridge Clays, overlain by thin cover sands.¹⁰³

Fuel

At this date coal and coal-slack would have been readily available for firing the East Keal kiln.

Kirkstead

Kirkstead Abbey lies about 1 km east of the river Witham and the same distance south-west of the small town of Woodhall Spa. It was one of the richest and most powerful monastic houses in Lincolnshire and belonged to the Cistercian Order. Its precinct occupies some 7 ha. and is in the form of a rectangle minus its south-west corner, the long axis lying east-west. On the western side of the precinct there is a fishpond and area of amorphous earthworks which do not form part of the claustral buildings. One prominent mound has eroded and since 1972¹⁰⁴ has been known to consist entirely of waster sherds of pottery (Site 1). Two further areas have produced waster sherds. One (Site 2) lies close to the present entrance to the precinct on the north side, and is a series of low mounds. The other (Site 3) shows no mounds at all, but there is a scatter of wasters thrown up by mole activity over a wide area a little to the east of Site 1.¹⁰⁵

Fig.22

Fig.29

Visually all the sites produce sherds of similar type and fabric, and there can be little doubt that they are waste from the same pottery which could have been situated adjacent to Site 1 or 2. There is no obvious surface sign of structures here, of houses or workshops, but some of the out-lying buildings of the Abbey might have been utilized.¹⁰⁶ Alternatively the workshops etc. could have been situated just to the north-west of the present precinct entrance, where there is a range of disused farm-buildings. This theory has yet to be put to the test.

The forms of the pottery suggest a date in the late 16th or early 17th century,¹⁰⁷ and it seems unlikely that a pottery could have been working up-wind of the claustral buildings during the life of the Abbey. On these grounds alone the terminus post quem for this activity seems to be set by the dissolution of Kirkstead Abbey in 1537.¹⁰⁸

In the late 16th century the Abbey formed part of the great estates of the Clinton family, who also owned Sempringham Priory and Tattershall Castle. In 1643 Henry Fynes, Lord Clinton, was described as 'of Christed Abbey',¹⁰⁹ suggesting that he was at that date in residence. It has not been proved whether or not Stukeley¹¹⁰ was correct in identifying a house built upon the Abbey ruins in his plan of 1716, but either Kirkstead Hall or Kirkstead Old Hall ($\frac{1}{2}$ km north-east and north respectively) could have been named from the Abbey at that date. Probably a house at one of these points was used by cadet branches of the family throughout the late 16th and 17th centuries. Walter Clinton, yeoman, was a party to the Administration granted to the potter's widow in 1610 (see below).

The final piece of evidence is the inventory¹¹¹ of Francis Moodie 'of Christead ... Potter', who died in 1610. It includes both 'earthen vessels' and 'ii potter-wheeles', the latter being one of the only mentions of potters wheels anywhere in Lincolnshire.

Two wheels imply considerable output, and a work-force of perhaps up to ten.¹¹² There are no further references to potters at Kirkstead, nor any physical evidence to suggest that the industry went on beyond c.1610. Moodie's total property was valued at a little over £10, less than one-third of that of his contemporary at Hareby, Lebbens Walker. It is possible, then, that Moodie was capitalized in some way by Walter Clinton, as a small commercial venture and an economic use of the Abbey ruins.

Summary of Post-Medieval Kiln Sites at Kirkstead

Site 1 (TF 18726161)

Fig.22

A mound apparently composed entirely of waster sherds, on the north-west side of the Abbey precinct. Finds in CCM (Acc. nos. 46.72, 52.75, 9.73).

Site 2 (TF 18816176)

Fig.58

A scatter of wasters from a series of low mounds on the north side of the Abbey precinct, close to the modern entrance. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 43.76).

Site 3 (TF 18786159)

Fig.58

A loose scatter of wasters from a wide area of surface erosion on the south west side of the Abbey precinct. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 44.76).

The site of the workshop from which these wasters may have come is possibly at TF 18876183, where there are some

ruinous farm buildings (see above) which are themselves too late to form part of the pottery, but may well mark the spot.

Kiln Technology

In the absence of an excavated kiln little can be said about how it worked. The products give some clue, however, as there are a number of sherds stuck to tiles by glaze, and other fragments of kiln fabric. These suggest that like the four excavated examples in the county the Kirkstead kiln was a flat-floored circular multiflue with no internal structure, the pottery being stacked with tile shelves and dividers. The tiles appear to be medieval roof tiles, probably removed from the ruins. The pottery is both reduced and oxidized, though principally the former, and is filled with a very distinctive coarse white sand, which aids its identification on other sites.¹¹³

Clay Sources

The local clay is coarse boulder clay, with some surface sand cover.¹¹⁴ Like the potters of Boston and Coningsby (see above) the Kirkstead potters seem to have been using Quaternary deposits of clay (glacial or silty) and the site rather than its clays may have been the attraction.

Fuel

The Witham Valley is well supplied with peat deposits¹¹⁵ and these were no doubt utilized by the Kirkstead potters, though the point cannot be proved.

Louth

Louth is a medium-sized market town lying at the eastern foot of the Wolds, and acting as a centre for villages of the Wolds and of the coastal marshland. In the 19th century it had a thriving and wide-ranging industrial base including carpet-weaving, much of the industry being carried out at or near the Riverhead in the north-east corner of the town.¹¹⁶

From the early part of the century there was a pottery here and the names of a number of potters are recorded in the Parish Registers.¹¹⁷ One of the proprietors was probably James Harrison, who died in 1822.¹¹⁸

Later on Thomas Rose took over the business. He appears as a brickmaker in 1835¹¹⁹ but in 1841¹²⁰ the newspapers carried an interesting paragraph:

'Louth Pottery - the enterprizing Mr Thos. Rose is about establishing a glazed pot manufactory in Louth, having by dint of great perseverance brought his articles to a state of perfection equal to any of the Staffordshire ware.'

This suggests that Harrison's pottery was not on the same site as Rose's. A local tradition exists that there was once a pottery on the site of the Gas Works, run by a John Edwards.¹²¹

Rose must have died late in 1849 or early in 1850 for in the latter year an advertisement appeared in the Stamford Mercury¹²² for a brickyard by the river Lud, with access from James St. This brickyard contained both a brick-kiln and a pot-kiln and clay 'of an excellent quality, and well adapted for ... the common kinds of pottery, for which there is an active demand and a ready sale.' The clay was presumably dug from the northern part of the close, of which the brickyard occupied the southern end.

Fig.23

The purchaser of the property was John Sudgen¹²³ who must have brought a Yorkshire tradition to the pottery. Though he was Lincolnshire-born himself his children, both 'potter's servants', had been born in York and Leeds respectively. Perhaps their father had been a journeyman in some of the Yorkshire potteries. One of his own journey-men was Leeds man¹²⁴ while two others were born in Louth and had perhaps been Rose's apprentices.

By 1861 the pottery was in other hands¹²⁵ and probably in decline, as its proprietor was also a carrier and poulterer. A contemporary trade directory¹²⁶ refers to him, however, as 'manufacturer of the Lincolnshire Pottery', so it may have traded under this name earlier.

A few products only have been identified, and these, it should be added, on no very scientific basis.

Mrs E.H. Rudkin¹²⁷ noted the occurrence of vessels 'in deep

red fabric glazed black on upper half, the thick glaze being finished off in a clean line and not left to dribble down sides of vessel', rather like the products of the Midhope Pottery.¹²⁸ Two spirit jars with these characteristics are known,¹²⁹ while a rather cruder jar is in the Museum of the Louth Antiquarian and Naturalists Society.¹³⁰ It was found at Ludborough and contained a horse drench issued by a Louth veterinary surgeon.¹³¹ Mrs Rudkin's identification is probably correct, but a far wider range of products including pancheons and gardening requisites might be expected at this date, and even, considering Rose's boast to equal Staffordshire, some slipwares.

The area north of the pottery is now a public park and neither this nor the river bank have produced any trace of wasters, so a detailed analysis cannot yet be made. The site would obviously repay further local examination, as disused clay pits etc. may have been backfilled with pottery waste.

Clay Sources

Louth lies on Boulder Clay¹³² below the eastern edge of the Wolds. Clay was dug on an area adjacent to the brickyard, but was well refined before use.

Fuel

At this date the fuel for the kiln was undoubtedly coal, obtainable by sea via the Louth Canal or overland from the Nottinghamshire coalfields.

Marketing

Louth was a prosperous market-town and with its own population and that of the surrounding villages of Wold and Marshland could have provided sufficient sales locally. However the Louth Canal may have provided an outlet to a wider market.¹³³ By the same token of course it allowed an inlet for products from south and east Yorkshire.

A 'dealer in pots', John Ward, is recorded in the Parish Registers in 1834.¹³⁴ One of the men described as 'potter' in 1849, John Fanthorpe, seems to have become a Glass and China Dealer in Eastgate by 1856.¹³⁵ These men were presumably the middlemen in the retail inter alia of Louth products.

Spalding

Spalding lies in the heart of the Fens of South Lincolnshire. There is no evidence for any medieval pottery industry here, and Toynton All Saints and Bourne seem to have been the main suppliers, from what little evidence there is.¹³⁶

In the post-medieval period we know of the existence of a pottery from an advertisement in 1798 for 'two journeymen coarse or brown potmakers required to work for James Smith, Potmaker.'¹³⁷ Nothing more is known than that. Coarse pottery seems to have been known generically as 'brown pots'. This probably refers to the colour of the oxidized body with a clear glaze which formed the standard pottery of that age.

Possibly the pottery formed part of a brick-yard, as would be likely at this date. Clay would have been from the Fen silts, or from boulder clay occurring below the silts.¹³⁸ No products of this kiln have as yet been identified, but hardly any excavations have taken place here so samples are too small to be certain. Possibly the kiln was the source of coarsewares found at Harrington House.¹³⁹

Toynton All Saints/St. Peter

Le Patourel¹⁴⁰ has already surveyed the thriving medieval pottery industry at Toynton All Saints at least from the documentary side. The continuation of the industry into the post -medieval period has not been closely charted, and many of the sources which proved so helpful in the 14th century, such as the Court Rolls¹⁴¹ fail to help in the 15th and 16th centuries. Nonetheless there is plentiful physical evidence from kilns and waster pits. The neighbouring village of Toynton St.Peter also seems to have become an

important pottery centre towards the end of the industry. In both parishes this was probably in the first quarter of the 17th century, and there was no continuing tradition of the importance of the villages until the rediscovery of pottery items in the school gardens c.1910.¹⁴² As late as 1568 and even 1613, however, one of the Toyntons (it is not clear which) was still known as 'Potter Tointon'.¹⁴³

The origins of the industry go back to at least the last quarter of the 13th century,¹⁴⁴ and documentary evidence first emerges in 1311.¹⁴⁵ Throughout the Middle Ages the Toyntons formed part of the estates of the great Willoughby family, whose main seat was at Eresby,¹⁴⁶ near Spilsby, and only two miles from the Toyntons.

Some finds were made in 1910, 1911, 1928, 1930 and 1946, but almost all that has been achieved at the Toyntons is due either directly or indirectly to the indefatigable interest of the late Mrs E.H. Rudkin, who established the existence of the majority of sites and who excavated Kiln 1, a medieval kiln, in 1958-62.

Subsequently, Miss R.H. Healey excavated two further kilns, nos. 2 and 3, in 1967, of which 2 was of post-medieval date, and she later produced a synthesis of the state of knowledge of the medieval industry.¹⁴⁷ No complete kilns have been excavated since then, but a number of waster pits have been located during the building of new houses and one

Fig.24

probable kiln which was unfortunately largely destroyed before it could be properly examined. The potential for further work in Toynton is immense, especially on the medieval sites where documentary evidence is best. It should be observed that despite the large number of known sites no complete complex of potter's house /workshop/ claypits/processing works has yet been excavated.¹⁴⁸

Origins of the Industry

As has already been stated the earliest evidence for kilns at Toynton belongs to the end of the 13th century. At the other end of the scale there is no direct evidence for potters in Toynton All Saints after 1562 when Thomas Bucke supplied pots to the Willoughby d'Eresby family,¹⁴⁹ though an individual of the same name seems to have survived to the latter end of the century.¹⁵⁰ At Toynton St. Peter the one and only recorded potter, Thomas Haule, was buried in 1626/7.¹⁵¹ The name 'Potter Tointon' mentioned above may have been applied to St. Peter's. At all events the industry was probably defunct by the mid-17th century.

It has been suggested that potters migrated from the Toyntons to Bolingbroke,¹⁵² and the small overlap in production dates seems to add some strength to the argument. On the other hand there is so far no evidence of overlap in potter's names between the villages and the Owsman family seems to have no antecedents in Toynton.¹⁵³ With this in mind it may be safest to assume that there was competition

between the potters, and that those at Bolingbroke were better equipped to survive. It is clear that the 14th century Toynton potters did on some occasions at least obtain peat fuel for their kilns from Bolingbroke¹⁵⁴. If this supply were to have dried up, or rather been diverted, then we may have here one good reason for the collapse of the industry in the Toyntons.

Summary of Post-Medieval Pottery Sites in Toynton All Saints and Toynton St. Peter

(Site numbers used here are a sequence devised for convenience in identifying post-medieval sites only.) A different, and longer, numbered sequence is generally used in describing all the sites of all dates in the Toyntons.

Site 1 (TF 395631)

Fig.25
Fig.64

Kiln 2, excavated 1967. Brick-built, with five flues dated archaeo-magnetically to c.1475-1525. Finds in CCM (Acc. No. 56.75). Material collected from the surface in this and an adjacent area in 1966 includes pancheons, ale-jars, and jugs. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 230.77).

Site 2 (TF 393639)

Several areas within this field produced surface finds including an almost complete battlemented chafing-dish. Finds in CCM (Acc. nos. 140.70, 5.78 and 26.82).

Figs.
59-62

Site 3 (TF 39156375)

Kilns and possibly footings of an associated cottage were bulldozed in 1954 to provide a site for council houses. Pottery ranged from medieval to c.1560 (according to Mr J.G. Hurst). Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 229.77).

Site 4 (TF 393636)

Surface collection and a very small excavation in 1959. Finds include jugs and several very fine lobed cups. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 280.76 and 29-31.82).

Site 5 (TF 39296389)

Kiln site, 1979. Brick floor and at least two flues, with associated waster pit. Pottery of 16th century date. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 141.79).

Fig.61

Site 6 (TF 39386343)

A long waste-heap near the stream. Finds in 1961 and 1967 include kiln material, comb-decorated sherds and ale-jars. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 6.78).

Site 7 (TF 39256385)

A number of substantially complete waster vessels were found in 1981 in digging a septic tank for a new house, including large jugs and an ale-jar, probably of mid-15th century date. Finds in CCM

Fig.63

Site 8 (Toynton St. Peter) (TF 395633)

Surface pottery found in a garden includes a chafing-dish base. Finds in CCM

Site 9 (Toynton St. Peter) (TF 396632)

Surface pottery found in a field. Finds in CCM (Acc. no. 11.78).

Kiln Technology

Of the three excavated kilns at Toynton All Saints only one (Kiln 2) falls within the date-range under discussion. It was dated archaeo-magnetically to c.1475-1525. The other kilns, though earlier, form a sort of control against which technological advances and modifications can be judged.

Both the earlier kilns (kilns 1 and 3) were of circular multiflue type with five flues and an average diameter, being of slightly irregular shape, of 2.44m. Each was of baked clay construction with much evidence for patching and rebuilding.

Kiln 2¹⁵⁵ was represented on the surface by a small mound and after ploughing for the first time in 1966-7 by a marked concentration of burnt clay fragments. A quantity of brick rubble had also been removed from this site during levelling. Doubtless it had formed part of the kiln wall and superstructure. The kiln was excavated in 1967 by Miss R.H. Healey. It proved to be a circular brick structure

Fig.24

with five flues, having an internal diameter of 2.97m. Up to three courses of brickwork survived on the eastern side. Three floor levels were noted inside. The latest, floor A, was composed of clay and chopped grass laid on a bed of broken sherds. Floor B was of similar construction, but bedded on clean sand. It had been fired much harder towards the flues than in the centre. Floor C was of clay bedded also on clean sand, and showing similar variations in hardness.

The flues also showed signs of rebuilding. Four were c.300mm wide and c.1.4m long, being of brick in the floor and sides, originally clay-lined. The outer end of each was partly blocked with lumps of Spilsby sandstone. The brick floors overlay clay, perhaps associated with levelling up to floor A of the kiln. To the south-east lay the fifth flue, rather wider than the others at c.380mm. It was brick walled and clay floored and though containing ash etc it may have doubled as an entrance for loading and unloading the kiln.

Before floor A was laid a bank of sandy clay had been deposited all around the kiln save at the fifth flue, perhaps in order to rebuild the kiln walls. The new kiln had flues corresponding to the earlier ones. Three of the flues, south-east, west and north-west, were connected by their brick walls to floor B, the other two to floor A, and both had been repaired in what must be the last surviving phase.

It is not certain that the kiln in its earliest phase was of brick construction at all, as the earliest flues had no brick walls.

The bricks of which the kiln and flues were constructed were of an average size 254x127x51mm (10"x5"x2") and were laid in clean sand. Clay was only used to line the flues.

The pottery came from the fill of the kiln and its flues and stokeholes. It was not distinctively different in any part save in an early north-east flue, where there were sheds of an unglazed cooking-pot, a type otherwise unrepresented and therefore probably earlier.

The pottery consisted principally of pancheons, chafing-dishes, and ale-pots, and the independent dating evidence for the kiln provides a useful control for the date of emergence and currency of the latter forms.

What was almost certainly another pottery kiln was discovered during the cutting of foundation trenches for a new house in Peasegate Lane in July 1979.¹⁵⁶ The greater part of it was cut away or reburied under sand before it could be properly recorded, but a north-south flue was seen in section in one of the trenches. This was c.330mm wide, and contained burnt clay, carbon and ash.

The site had been visited earlier by Mr G. Britton and Mrs B. Kirkham and they described a brick floor having glaze trickles and some sherds fused to it, bedded on a thick layer of pancheon sherds. Two probable flues were noted at this time, so the kiln was probably another circular multiflue type, similar to kiln 2. The pottery associated with it, collected by Mr Britton, included large jugs, jars with pie-crust decoration beneath the rim, a fish-dish, tripod pipkins with solid rather than tubular handles, and pancheons with complex rims. On this basis a date somewhat later in the 16th century than kiln 2 seems most likely. A few metres further to the east a feature consisting of waster sherds lying on a base of ash and fired clay suggests an associated waster pit. Unfortunately pottery from the kiln, from beneath the kiln floor, and from the waster pit, was not kept separate, but there is no clearly visible distinction in form or fabric among the sherds collected and they probably represent a fairly short period in the history of the site.

Fuel

No fuel samples were taken from kiln 2 (Site 1) but it appears that no coal was found, so it is probable that the fuel was peat. It is known that in the 14th century Toynton potters were taking peat for fuel, some of it from Bolingbroke (see above). It seems likely that the tradition continued into the 16th century, especially since at this date coal was a very expensive fuel to transport to this remote spot.

The other possible kiln (Site 5) was certainly using peat,¹⁵⁷ on the evidence of the contents of the surviving flues and waster pit. The still unenclosed East Fen lying to the south of the Toyntons was no doubt a major source.

Clay Sources

The medieval potters of Toynton obtained their clay from pits dug among the open fields,¹⁵⁸ and the documentary evidence for this can be supplemented by physical evidence, showing that clay might be dug on the potter's own croft, the pit later being backfilled with wasters. Such a pit was located near the street frontage north of the Church in 1976.¹⁵⁹ Toynton has a varied geology and the immediate environs provide both Kimmeridge Clay and calcareous Boulder Clay derived from glaciation of the Wolds, together with sand and sandstone.

A medieval technique carried on late into the 15th century involved the use of two contrasting clays. Strips of iron-rich clay were laid in a variety of motifs over a purer, lighter-firing clay to create two-colour patterns. Both clays were presumably obtainable within the village area.

We know nothing of the processing of the clay as no sites of this kind have yet been found.

Marketing

Once again we know rather more of the medieval marketing methods at Toynton than we do for the later period.

Medieval products are ubiquitous in Lincolnshire, and pottery was sent by cart as far as Spalding and Whaplode (51 km),¹⁶⁰ well beyond the usual radius of medieval pottery sales. Vessels have even been found in Norway.¹⁶¹ Pottery perhaps lost on its way to market has been found at Bicker,¹⁶² and it even entered Lincoln against competition with local wares.

By contrast the later Toynton pottery probably suffered from lack of a local market-place, and the competition of Bolingbroke potters. A Toynton potter certainly supplied wares to his landlord in 1562 (see above) probably because the distance was so short to Eresby, but the 16th and 17th century lords of Eresby had ample choice of suppliers and were able to obtain more exotic European products (see above, note 146).

The greatest single difficulty must lie in the visual similarity of form and finish of late Toynton and early Bolingbroke products, so that no useful comparisons can readily be made between their distribution. Such evidence as there is, however, suggests that by the 17th century the latter had completely taken over the former's markets.

Minor Sites

The sites named above are the only ones in Lincolnshire known by physical or documentary evidence to have existed, but the list should be regarded as minimal. In the 19th century many brickyards probably had a small output of horticultural or sanitary wares. Some stonewares were certainly manufactured post-1850, among them small ink bottles for schools¹⁶³ and also water-filters,¹⁶⁴ which became a feature of most 19th century homes, especially after the typhoid epidemics.

A group of hand-made and most unusual rhubarb pots,¹⁶⁵ made for Hackthorn Hall gardens, may have originated in the now overgrown brickyard nearby,¹⁶⁶ which served purely local needs. Large sherds of earthenware have been found there by the writer. Such largely-undocumented brickyards built by and serving country estates are particularly hard to date.

Pottery production at Great Gonerby¹⁶⁷ near Grantham and at Waddington¹⁶⁸ near Lincoln, from c.1878 and c.1900 respectively, is only recorded in the memories of ex-employees or descendents. Consider then how easy it is for earlier potteries to be totally forgotten and unrecorded.

The clays of the southern Wolds seem to have attracted the 16th and 17th century potters. Parish Registers have been checked for most of the parishes in the Soke of

Bolingbroke, and no further potters' names recorded, but few Parish Registers list occupations regularly if at all. Without names it is well-nigh impossible to break into the vast reserves of information in wills and probate inventories, and without detailed estimates of date-range and size of industry there is no quick guide as to where to find the physical evidence. There is every likelihood of further pottery sites being discovered in this area, and comprehensive field-walking of key parishes would no doubt well repay the effort.

Certain towns, too, need to have their ceramic history (and hence sources of supply) examined. Stamford¹⁶⁹ provides many early contexts, but the reason for the apparently abrupt end to its fine potting tradition needs to be considered, as well as the possibility of continuity with different clays. Grantham, too, presents problems. It exhibits a high dependance on Nottingham in the Middle Ages,¹⁷⁰ but its post-medieval sources remain largely unknown.¹⁷¹ Spalding,¹⁷² too, deserves further work.

3.3 Pottery Production

Until recent times, with the availability of standardized supplies of prepared clays etc., the requirement of any location for a pottery was that it should have suitable clays and the right to dig them, a supply of water, fuel, the raw materials for glaze, and manpower. Of these the supplies of clay and fuel were the most important. Water was needed for working the clay and making slip and glaze, but vast supplies were not essential. Glaze materials and manpower were both transportable, but in fact the latter was readily available in Lincolnshire, where the industry was located in villages and towns. Lead for glazing was not locally available in Lincolnshire, the source being most probably the mines of Derbyshire, or old lead reused.

Clay

We have no documentary evidence at all for clay-working in the Lincolnshire potteries. However, some physical evidence comes from excavations at Bolingbroke, Toynton All Saints and Bourne.¹⁷³ At the first and second of these clay-pits were found, in both cases used as waster-pits when the clay had been extracted. The Bolingbroke pits were oval, having longest dimensions of 13 and 10 feet respectively. A pit filled with 15th century wasters, excavated by the writer at Toynton in 1976,¹⁷⁴ had served a similar function. It was of an irregular shape, with a diameter of some 20 feet, but with an extension of 8 feet to the south.

Clay, once dug, would have passed through the a number of processes. The first - 'blunging' to wash and soften the lumps was in later times carried out mechanically with horizontal paddles but manpower and a wooden plank may have been used up to the 18th century. The wet mixture was then run off into a flat tank, leaving behind the coarse residue, and left to weather - the area required would depend upon the demands of the throwers. Clay dug one year might need to stand weathering until the next. When weathered it was usually cut with a spade into rough blocks which could just be lifted. After a drying process the clay would be 'wedged' to remove air bubbles, by being cut apart and beaten together again. Then, in standardized balls, it was ready for the throwers. The timing of these processes would depend upon how many hands were employed. In a small pottery the potter could well dig and prepare his own clay. In larger ones the work might be spread among many hands, including children, apprentices and journey-men, so that the throwers could work more or less continuously.¹⁷⁵ The potters' complex at Bourne produced useful evidence for clay preparation on a small scale, but not for clay-digging.¹⁷⁶

Throwing

The throwers were the aristocrats of the pottery and usually included the proprietor. On them depended the speed and quality of work, and ultimately the saleability of the product. At Bolingbroke in 1716 Thomas Ousman had two

potters wheels,¹⁷⁷ and so did Francis Moodie at Kirkstead in 1610. These may have been kick-wheels operated by the thrower himself, or the slightly more sophisticated type turned remotely by an apprentice through a belt and handle or via an eccentrically mounted pole.¹⁷⁸ The proportion of other workers to throwers is shown by the 19th and early 20th century practice in Yorkshire at Littlethorpe and Burton in Lonsdale where up to nineteen employees served two throwers. This proportion perhaps relates to a more specialized and industrialized phase of the industry, but nonetheless for every working proprietor in the 17th and 18th centuries there may have been ten or a dozen others employed, including quite young children. At Bourne a hole was noted in the floor of the potter's complex which could be interpreted as the base for a potter's wheel. Also found was an iron tool 'used for shaping pot rims'.¹⁷⁹ The extremely long odds against recovering items such as this probably accounts for the lack of potters' tools from other kiln-sites. Again more recent evidence shows that the most makeshift equipment could be used to quite sophisticated ends. Three main types of tool are likely to have been used. First of all, in order to produce jugs and ale-pots which would look standardized and would also contain a reasonably standardized measure some sort of height and girth control was necessary. This could be provided by something as simple as a piece of wood or metal set in a lump of clay beside the wheel, so that the raising of the clay could be completed when it reached a set mark

laterally or vertically. The second sort of aid would be a template for producing a standard rim form, in vessels such as pancheons. The third performed a similar function with jug handles, where by pulling a strip of clay through a simple former handles could be quickly made to a style which not only looked right but also fired evenly. (Thick handles which had no grooving could expand or contract differentially and disastrously in the firing.)

To these aids we should add others concerned with decoration. Much decoration was clearly cut in freehand with a point or thumbed into strips of added clay. Such sgraffito as was practised at Bourne or in East Lincolnshire was clearly carried out freehand. However, the potters of Bolingbroke also used grid-stamps, probably of wood, to decorated applied strips on large ale-pots and later used roulettes for name-stamps on the rims of pancheons. These imply a very close control on the girth of pancheons to ensure that the name-stamp produced eight complete names per pancheon.¹⁸⁰ (See below.)

These potting aids were probably made by the potters and passed down from father to son, along with other secrets such as recipes for slip, potting clay, and glaze. If this was so we cannot altogether depend upon the name-stamp, style of rim, or decoration as an entirely satisfactory dating guide. Conservatism might well prolong the use of certain aids and techniques.

Many of the dimensions of pottery vessels, though produced by means of templates, appear to be based on human body measurements and recur constantly over the centuries. (We must of course allow 10-15% shrinkage rate in firing.) Hand-widths could determine the diameter of a jug neck, while panceons enjoyed an amazingly standardized diameter of c.340-360 mm, which is also an average length of arm from hand to elbow. At Boston a perforated wooden disc was found under the later kiln floor. This could be a 'bat' for the top of the potter's wheel, or part of the wheel itself. Its exact function remains a mystery. Handles were frequently applied in a distinctive manner - by the use of a hole in the jug side and a clay peg.¹⁸¹ Thumbing at the top joint on either side of the handle was also a distinctive feature which might be used as a means of distinguishing between various potteries. There is also the as yet untapped possibility of using a computer programme to store and analyse thumb-prints which must exist in very large numbers on jug handles. This might be developed to distinguish the work of individual potters and even perhaps establish family relationships.

Fig.29

Fuel and Firing

Both documentary and physical evidence seems to be against the use of wood as fuel in post-medieval Lincolnshire kilns. Instead it would appear that turf (peat) was in widespread use, occurring at Grimsby in the north and at Bourne in the south. At Boston coal was in use as early

as c.1640; the availability of supplies from the Durham coalfield¹⁸² via the coastal trade make this a special case. The kiln was also unusual in being stone-built. Kilns at Toynton were also using turf, as in all probability were the earlier kilns at Bolingbroke, obtaining it either from localized sources on the edge of the Fen, or possibly from Fen allotments in Wildmore Fen. These latter supplies may have dried up as drainage and enclosure took place, and it seems likely that the later kilns at Bolingbroke turned to coal fuel.¹⁸³ This might account for changing quality of the products - in particular the ability to control the firing process, which led to regular oxidisation of the products. At present none of the later kilns are available to test this hypothesis. Both coal and turf had the common property of producing short flams. This in turn accounts for the use of flat-floored circular multi-flue kilns. Firing with wood tends to produce long flames, and baffles or false floors are required in the kiln to avoid excessive concentrations of heat.¹⁸⁴

Excavated kilns show evidence of multiple firings, patching, and rebuilding. Kiln 2 at Toynton had a complex history, with repairs and relinings to certain parts. At Boston the stone-built kiln overlay an earlier clay-built one, and the stone walls had been protected by sand piled against one side, while the flues and floor contained broken and burnt sherds in layers of ash. Clearly the floor was not always cleaned up between firings.

Access to load such kilns where they were of a semi-permanent character was generally via one of the flues which was built somewhat wider than the rest.¹⁸⁵ The fires made in the mouths of these flues would have been gradually built up until the appropriate temperature was reached, then the firemouths would be blocked and the kiln allowed slowly to cool again.

Recorded methods of measuring correct temperatures before pyrometric cones or thermocouples were introduced to include the use of a metal tool to lift out a sample through a small hole in the kiln wall, or experience to judge the observed rise and fall of the stacked pots against a fixed mark to determine the point at which they matured.¹⁸⁶ We cannot now determine which if any of these methods were used in Lincolnshire.

Slip and Glaze

Slip and glaze were both used in post-medieval Lincolnshire. Slip was used frequently to produce an attractive ground colour for glazing and at Bourne a large number of jugs and ale-pots were given a bib of slip at the front or beneath the lip, usually glazed over. Indeed it is probable that a mixture of glazing material and slip was applied, perhaps with a brush. Pancheons were dipped in the mixture which was then swirled around inside, the excess being then tipped out.

At both Bourne and Bolingbroke sgraffito decoration was used, probably on a small minority of pieces. Fragments of sgraffito decoration occurred at the Bourne kiln site, while other sherds with east Lincolnshire fabrics have been found elsewhere. A thick layer of slip, of a cream, pink, or yellowish colour was scratched through in a pattern with a sharp point to expose the red or pink body colour underneath. No great skill was demonstrated in sgraffito work, and the Lincolnshire examples do not bear comparison with continental or North Devon products.

The east Lincolnshire kilns produced many vessels with little or no glaze, especially jugs. At Toynton and Bolingbroke a parchment-coloured surface emerged after firing, perhaps as a result of sulphur in the clay, which has the appearance of slip. These wares seem to disappear from the late 16th century.

Most pancheons and rarer vessels such as chafing-dishes were in contrast glazed all over, probably by dipping. Up to the 18th century these are usually in a reduced fabric, showing up as grey - or green under glaze. Later wares appear to have oxidized more generally, producing a red fabric, brown under glaze. Exceptions to this are items such as chamber-pots made at Bolingbroke, regularly oxidised from c.1640,¹⁸⁷ and the lidded pipkins made at Boston. These, like the distinctive Norfolk 'bichrome wares' have a rich olive green glaze - aided by copper

additives - on the outside and a clear oxidized interior. The effect appears to be deliberate and controlled.

Later wares in Lincolnshire, of which too little is still known, were oxidized with a clear lead glaze, or slightly stained with iron. Such would appear to be the 18th and 19th century wares of Boston and Spalding. Louth, and no doubt other centres, produced glossy black-glazed wares, the glaze being darkened with iron or manganese. Such items make up the bulk of coarse wares in such deposits as that found at Scothern.¹⁸⁸ Possibly wares from further afield, such as South Yorkshire and Staffordshire, are involved. Such distinctions are not very clear among coarser wares.

Some dark-glazed wares were used much earlier. Cistercian ware, 'transitional' and fully developed Blackwares¹⁸⁹ occur from the late 15th, early and mid 17th centuries respectively. Clearly many were obtained from outside the county via Kings Lynn (see below) or from the kilns of Wakefield, Potterspury or Ticknall. Some however were made in Lincolnshire. Blackware types with a dark green tinge to the glaze were made at the Boston kiln and occur at other sites such as Horncastle or Bolingbroke. It is not surprising that there should be some local copying of popular types.¹⁹⁰

Lead for glazing was one of the few things that could not be obtained from Lincolnshire itself. The only convenient source until the Industrial Revolution was Derbyshire,¹⁹¹ from which it must have travelled by pack-horse and cart. In the 17th century small quantities were being exported through Boston coastwise and direct to the continent. There were no recorded imports, nor any coastwise trade in lead into Boston. Whatever its ultimate source it is very probable that galena for glazing was also obtained by collecting scrap lead¹⁹² and grinding it dry or in water. It is thought that a lead pilgrim ampulla found with a 13th century kiln at Toynton All Saints had been brought for such reuse.

Extracted Evidence from Probate Inventories Listing Materials, Tools and Products

1. Rbt. Stanney, Bolingbroke 1736 LCC Admon. 1736/124.
In the Pothouse, Potts and other Materials belonging
to the Pottery. 10-00-00
2. Robt Stanney, Bolingbroke, 1691 LCC Admon. 1691/109
It ffuell 03-00-00
It ffor Poots 02-00-00
3. Thos Ousman, Bolingbroke 1716 LCC Admon. 1716/80
Itm Potts unburnt, and Two Potters Wheels 01-05-00
4. Lebbens Walker, Hareby 1611 Inv. 111/295
In the Kilne
Item eight dosen of pottes vis viid

5. Francis Moodie, Christead, 1610. LCC Admon. 1610/179
--- ii potter-wheelles vs
6. Zachariah Godhelpe, Gt Grimsby 1685, LCC Admon. 1685/61
It X parshell of Turffes a parshell of unburnt
potts with some loads Ashes 2-10-0
It in the workehouse --- and other Implements
belonging to his trade 0-10-0
7. Steven Parker, Bourne, 1616. Inv. 118/14
(no evidence other than trade).
8. Robart Barton, Bourne, 1555. Inv. 25/6
Itm all the ymplements belonging to the workhouse
xs
9. Christopher Parker, Bourne, 1552. Inv. 20/136
Itm all ye wodde & torroffs xvi^s viii^d
Itm all the potts & crosses [= cruses?] xxx^s
10. Christopher Parker, Bourne, 1624. Inv. 128/295
In the pot house
Item all the potts & milke pannes valued
at xli

3.4 Fabric Analysis

It is perhaps self-evident that the fabrics of Lincolnshire-made pottery were influenced by two things; the clay and naturally occurring coarser materials in it, and the deliberately added fillers. Nonetheless this needs to be stated. Then we must determine to what extent the clay was used in its natural state and to what extent impurities were added for beneficial purposes, to provide resilience against cracking, exploding, or laminating due to heat or cold stress.

The relationship between available clays and the finished pots (and their function) is an extremely complicated equation worked out pragmatically by most country potters through experiences both good and bad. In more recent times the very low profit margin allowed little time for experimentation and conversely tended towards extreme conservatism. In other words features such as control of the clay mix and the glaze formula, both of which go hand in hand, became fixed and any variation from them was regarded as potentially troublesome if not disastrous. The loss of a whole kiln load through 'dunting' or poor glaze adhesion could make the difference between survival and bankruptcy at this subsistence level.

Evidence drawn from the later country potteries at Burton-in-Lonsdale (N. Yorks) or Weatheriggs (Cumbria) suggest that

rapid change occurred at two opposed points; at times of prosperity and at times of extreme difficulty. In prosperity there might be leisure and capital to try new ideas, and equally when traditional markets were disappearing the potters were forced to abandon traditional products and try new fields such as 'art' wares with coloured glazes, garden wares with softer fabrics, or perhaps larger press-moulded wares.¹⁹³ It seems very probable that these same factors had their effect in earlier centuries, as the market clearly had cyclical phases.

The conservatism in clay preparation is no doubt but one factor to be considered. It was a conservatism based not on scientific analysis but on close observation and experience, and the clay structure must have depended on where it was dug, and varied with the local geology.

The economics of the situation determined that clay would not be dug far away from the kiln; indeed medieval and later evidence at Bourne, Toynton and Bolingbroke makes it clear that clay pits were frequently dug on the potter's croft, or for brief periods among the common fields, to be refilled with wasters when no longer in use. It must be presumed that the clay-pits among the common fields were only permitted at certain times in the farming year.¹⁹⁴ Their extent may then be determined by how much clay was required within that time. Elsewhere convenience of size or

the occurrence of limited rich deposits may have been the limiting factor.

Those centres of production in Lincolnshire from which any quantity of wasters survive (only wasters in situ can be used in assessing fabric range) fall into several distinct groups of fabrics. To distinguish between members of those groups is more difficult. First of all there is an 'east-Lincolnshire' group comprising the potteries of Toynton All Saints and Toynton St. Peter, Bolingbroke and Hareby, and Boston. The first four had deposits not only of Kimmeridge Clay underlying wind-blown sand, but also Boulder Clay sources near at hand. Boston presents more of a mystery, but the fabric is closely similar and may derive from Quaternary deposits of clay carried by glaciation or as silt from the southern edge of the Wolds.

Houghton describes the clay of Bolingbroke as:¹⁹⁵

'Pure, that is, such as is soft like butter to the teeth, and has little or no greetiness in it... .'

The finished products contain sand and other impurities which were either added to the native clay deliberately or may have been accidentally included as the clay was dug. The blown sand cover is very unstable and would tend to blow or slump into an open clay pit. Red and black inclusions of haematite and magnetite also occur.

At Kirkstead Boulder Clay must have been the source, already containing many accidental impurities, glacially derived. Its distinctive characteristic in pottery is the very sandy fabric, much sandier than the east Lincolnshire group.¹⁹⁶

Finally to the south occur the smooth wares of Bourne - Bourne 'D' ware - where the Oxford Clays of the Upper Jurassic provided the smoothest fabrics of post-medieval Lincolnshire, inviting comparison with the Upper Estuarine clay sources from which Stamford ware was made. Earlier Bourne wares included much coarser fabrics, and the introduction of 'D' ware signals the change of form and finish to the post-medieval.¹⁹⁷ It is possible that another - as yet unlocated - south Lincolnshire pottery produced a fabric within the Bourne group, as not all apparently Bourne products can as yet be matched there.¹⁹⁸ Oddly, in view of the very fine fabric at Bourne, there are often very large calcareous inclusions up to 4 or 5mm in length, occasionally larger. These seem to add nothing to the stability of the fabric and because they are so randomly placed, must be regarded as accidental inclusions.

A number of typical sherds from collections at Lincoln City & County Museum were examined visually under a 20x binocular microscope on freshly broken edges. The results are summarized below.

Toynton All Saints (acc. no. 5.78)

Coarse sand throughout. Occasionally larger opaque white chalk or limestone inclusions.

Toynton All Saints (acc. no. 140.70)

Coarse sand throughout. Large crystals of quartz, and occasional large white chalk, limestone, or shell inclusions.

Bolingbroke (acc. no. 3.78, 4.78 and 273.76)

Oxidized wares. Plentiful small quartz grains and tiny chips of flint. Other red and black inclusions mostly haematite and magnetite (iron). The red inclusions are usually granular and soft, the black inclusions are denser, producing a localized brown stain to clear lead glaze.

Reduced wares. As usual the inclusions are much harder to spot. Black or brown stains in the glaze are the main visual evidence.

Kirkstead Abbey (acc. no. 43.76, 9.73, and 46.72)

The samples differ slightly but it is felt that this is due to the smallness of the quantities and to normal variations overall.

The most distinctive characteristic is the 'harsh' feel of the sherds, due to the large quantity of angular white quartz grits filling the whole fabric and projecting through the glazed surfaces. There are also soft red and harder shiny black particles of haematite and magnetite.

Occasionally in addition to the quartz there are larger flat

white inclusions of chalk or limestone, probably derived glacially from the main geological formations of the county.

Coningsby (Haven Bank) (acc. no. 188.76)

The fabric and inclusions are visually indistinguishable from those at Bolingbroke. There is, however, a slightly greater incidence of flint inclusions, which may or may not be significant.

Boston (Grammar School) (acc. no. 43.75)

Fabrics are generally a good deal finer than others from east Lincolnshire. The sand/quartz is very much finer and more evenly distributed. There is less haematite than at Bolingbroke, but the fine inclusions are occasionally offset by very large flints.

Among the finer products such as the pipkins and the 'Blackware imitations' the fabric is even finer, the latter more so than the former. Better glaze marks the former, together with greater care in the firing. The 'Blackware imitations' are still not as fine in fabric or as hard fired as the Yorkshire Cisterican wares.

Bourne (acc. no. 98.73)

The 'D' ware contains no large grains of sand. There are very small amounts of haematite (red) and magnetite (brown) but visually the most important features are the occasional

large inclusions of chalk - up to 4-5mm long, sometimes breaking the surface - and the very large amount of tiny pieces of the same material spread evenly throughout.

Whether the fabric is oxidized or reduced these white inclusions and the smooth soft fabric, often very thinly potted, are the distinguishing feature. Sometimes a thin cream-coloured slip is applied to the outside.

3.5 Pancheons with Name-stamps

Pancheons are among the commonest types of medieval and later pottery in Lincolnshire and a continuous development in rim form can be traced from the 13th to the 19th century.¹⁹⁹ Amongst this vast number of pancheons a few stand out - these are the pancheons bearing advertisement name-stamps on the upper surface of the rims. Stamps of 'Robert Stanney' have been known for some time,²⁰⁰ but recently others have been discovered.²⁰¹

A total of twenty-two stamped sherds are so far known, representing some eighteen individual vessels. Of these thirteen are of 'Robert Stanney', while the remaining five are of three or more other names, none of which is complete, although a composite reading 'Nicholas Cas(---)' may be reconstructed, with some misgivings (see below) from nos. 14, 15, 17 and 18. During the course of the 17th and 18th centuries the characteristic local rim-form of pancheons became 'developed' or 'complex',²⁰² that is to say that the inner surface of the rim is usually curved and the outer surface bears one or more additional beadings. The stamped rims are varied in style, but all hark back to the simpler 'undeveloped' style of a century or more earlier, particularly in the possession of a flat, near-horizontal upper surface. This was almost certainly designed to enable the name-stamps to be applied evenly.

Fig.30

All the stamps with the exception of no. 16 are rouletted and moreover have a certain family resemblance caused at least in part by a reversed 'S' and by a pattern of square dots framing the name. Nos. 14 and 15 (Nicolas Cas[---]) are inverted - ie. are intended to be read from the outside of the rim. The two examples also differ in details, ie. the reversed 'S'. No. 16 is distinguished by apparently separately struck lettering and a complex pattern of dots between the letters. A separate and very local origin for this specimen found in Boston is quite probable.²⁰³

A feature of the 'Robert Stanney' stamps which cannot as yet be demonstrated for the other examples is their uniformity. Although the rouletting is frequently poorly impressed and sometimes runs sufficiently awry to slip over the edge of the pancheon, in no case is part of the lettering repeated or omitted, which suggests that the size of pancheons so stamped was very carefully controlled. All the 'Robert Stanney' stamps are from the same die, exhibiting the same reversed 'S' and gap between 'R' and 'O', so that a reconstruction based on the surviving fragments reveals that the name was stamped eight times around the rim of a pancheon whose diameter was a uniform 14 inches (355mm). This size was no doubt obtained by the use of a former or template. The roulette used to stamp the name once would need to be 42mm (1.65 ins) in circumference and was probably made by a specialist since the lettering is well formed and clear. Rbt Stanney who was constable of

Old Bolingbroke 1681-92 and c.1719 was illiterate as were many of his family.

Production Centres

It has been suggested above that no. 16 may be a local product of Boston²⁰⁴ and that resemblances between the others may indicate a common source; in the case of the 'Robert Staney' stamps (1-13) all the available evidence points to the kilns at Bolingbroke as being that source, and so in the absence of obvious alternatives no. 14, 15, 17 and 18 may be attributable to the same place.

The pottery industry of Bolingbroke began perhaps in the 16th century, the earliest kilns lying outside the village proper.²⁰⁵ Potters possibly migrated here from nearby Toynton All Saints and Toynton St. Peter where the industry had been established since at least the late 13th century²⁰⁶ though as yet no connection can be proved. In the 17th and 18th centuries the potters moved into the centre of Bolingbroke village where they flourished until an economic decline towards the end of the latter century closed down the last pottery.²⁰⁷ Until the middle of the 17th century the characteristic products were green-glazed, but by degrees a uniformly clear brown glaze seems to have been developed,²⁰⁸ perhaps due to technical advances in kiln construction and firing control.

Among the potters at Old Bolingbroke were several members of the Stanney family. Their house and kiln are thought to lie on the west side of the Castle, at TF 3480 6501, where a stamped sherd (no. 11) was found with remains of a kiln in the garden of a cottage. As the distribution map indicates, no stamped sherds have yet been found at more than a 15-mile radius from this source, a useful check perhaps on the distribution of other, none-stamped, articles from this kiln.

Listed below are the forms and findspots of all the known pantheon stamps.

Robert Stan(n)ey

- (1) Alford TF 4576
- (2) Boston TF 330449
- (3) Bratoft TF 490638
- (4) Burgh-le-Marsh TF 501639
- (5) Edlington TF 228713appr
- (6) Goltho
Goltho } TF 114774
Goltho }
- (7) Horncastle TF 259696
- (8) Langton-by-Spilsby TF 391702
- (9) Leverton
Leverton } TF 412478
Leverton }
Leverton }

Fig.26

(11) Old Bolingbroke TF 34806501

(12) Maltby TF 312840

(13) Panton TF 176793

Nicolas Cas (...)

(14) Burgh-le-Marsh TF 501639

(15) Burgh-le-Marsh TF 501639

)ANW(

(16) Boston TF 327440

Other unidentified marks

(17) Bratoft (Hall site) TF 472654

(18) Bratoft (Hall site) TF 472654

The full name of Nicolas Cas() and variants (nos. 14, 15, 17 and 18) is as yet unknown and no appropriate surnames have been found. However the letters are very poorly impressed and the transcription could be wrong. A suitable Nicolas, whose Christian name was also spelt in this idiosyncratic manner, was Nicolas Burton, recorded in Hearth Tax Returns for Bolingbroke (see above). This must remain a hypothesis until more complete examples of the stamp are found. Burton's dates would fit in quite well with the dating proposed below.

As yet no stamped pantheon sherds have been found in excavations, so there are no dated contexts. Three sherds (nos. 4, 14 and 15) were found among material from a single house site at Burgh-le-Marsh,²⁰⁹ other finds including pipes and imported pottery c. 1620-1700. As this was purely surface scatter too much weight should not be placed

on the associations, but clearly there is a reasonable case to be made here for the contemporaneity within the above limits of Robert Stanney and Nicolas Cas(---). Nos. 17 and 18 were found on the site of Bratoft Hall, dismantled in 1698, which offers a probable terminus ante quem.

As indicated above the suggested date range of the pancheons is somewhere in the late 17th or early 18th centuries, and this is confirmed by the existence of probate inventories of the effects of two potters bearing the name Robert Stanney, both working at Old Bolingbroke until their deaths in 1691 and 1736 respectively.²¹⁰ The two men were clearly related, perhaps as grandfather and grandson, and were members of one of the principal potting families in the village; if either date were to be preferred, the writer would tend to favour the former, perhaps indicating a floruit of c.1650-90 which would accord with the transitional nature of the glazing and firing.

Several conclusions can now be reached about the nature and variety of Lincolnshire stamped pancheons. Firstly distribution is limited to a radius of about 15 miles from the suggested centre of production. This might be taken as an indicator that the general run of Bolingbroke pottery travelled no further, but in fact recognizable types are found much further afield, eg. Lincoln,²¹¹ (but as the county town it may have been a special case). Little is known about the marketing of the pottery, but the limited distri-

bution of the stamped ware suggests either that certain potters sent their products further than others or that stamped pancheons were specifically sold to a local market.

Secondly it seems probable that the technique of name-stamping was developed by one potter and taken up by others. Similarities between three of the name-stamps suggest that Robert Stanney was the originator while the others copied him in some details. The single example from Boston (no. 16) is sufficiently different to indicate another source, which might well be in Boston itself (see above) where an industry beginning perhaps in the late 16th century is now known to have existed.²¹²

Finally, it seems clear that only a very small proportion of pancheons did carry a name stamp. In fact if a sherd bears a stamp it should indeed be more likely that it will be noticed and recorded. Clearly name-stamps would serve as advertisements, as on other classes of vessel,²¹³ but greater difficulty in manufacture would militate against extensive use. The problem is not unlike that of stamped clay tobacco-pipes, which in the 17th century formed a small proportion of the total production.²¹⁴ Perhaps the answer is simply that one stamped pancheon was put in with any sizable order of plain pancheons, as an advertisement for reorder.

3.6 Dark-glazed Wares

While the evidence for manufacture of dark-glazed wares in Lincolnshire is largely circumstantial there are indications that its supply was important and that its findspots are ubiquitous. Dark-glazed wares were, moreover, produced in the 15th-17th centuries in most of the neighbouring counties - eg. Norfolk, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Yorkshire, and we need not only to look to sources such as Ticknall or Wakefield for production. There is some evidence that both Bolingbroke and Boston potters were producing imitations of Blackware or Cistercian ware in a very dark green glaze.

First some definitions are in order. There are several types of dark-glazed wares which are traditionally separated by form and finish. The earliest is Midlands Purple Ware, a high-fired earthenware whose fabric frequently shows traces of fusion and whose overfired glazes, where present, often show as brown or black. A wide variety of forms from cooking-pots to salts are known, and the type was current certainly in the early 15th century,²¹⁵ and probably before. Next comes Cistercian ware, mainly used for small vessels such as cups and mugs, though also including figures, 'chalices', etc. in a hard fired fabric with a black or brown glaze achieved by the use of iron.²¹⁶ Dating is conventionally ascribed to a period from the late 15th to the early 17th century,

with use of slip or applied decoration mainly dating from pre-1540.²¹⁷

Finally we have the emergence of Blackwares towards the middle of the 17th century, concentrating on very tall narrow forms such as one and two-handled mugs,²¹⁸ but also including jugs. The final dates for Blackwares are rarely suggested, but similar types clearly run on through the 18th and 19th centuries and are only to be dated by context.²¹⁹

This apparently clear picture must be modified by observation. Firstly the distinction between 'early' Midland Purplewares and the other two fabrics cannot be upheld. For example several jugs exist, including the containers of Civil War coin-hoards from Grantham²²⁰ and Newark,²²¹ which clearly have much in common with Purplewares, yet belong to the 1640s. They have an overfired fabric and a rather poor quality brownish glaze and are in shape and finish somewhere between all three types. Equally a number of mugs are of an intermediate type, sharing various of the established criteria, and not belonging to such a clear-cut type-series as Brears indicates (see note 216).

It would be possible to describe several 'transitional' wares to bridge the gaps between the existing type-series, but there is now real doubt as to whether certain wares are transitional in position; whether there is a continuum of

development or whether varieties indicate different centres of production.

All the indications are that the situation is more likely to increase in complexity than to clarify. Recent work in south Lancashire at sites such as Rainford and Prescott indicate a bewilderingly wide variety of production on one site, encompassing nearly every variety of 17th century coarseware, both dark-glazed and of white fabric or 'Yellow ware' (no longer to be seen as exclusively a Midlands product.)²²²

In all this confusion certain landmarks survive and 'Cistercian ware' still conjures up an intelligible and clear picture; it should however be seen as a range of types within a much wider repertoire, the distinguishing characteristic being the potter's intention to provide a black or dark glazed item. I therefore suggest that the term 'dark-glazed ware' should be preferred for the generic article, with a sub-grouping as appropriate. I would also suggest that references in documents to 'Black Potts' cannot be tied down to a single type, but probably indicate that the same difficulty of making any distinction that we have today existed for contemporaries.

I have gathered together as many drawings of whole or substantially complete dark-glazed vessels from Lincolnshire as possible, as an aid to judging what types of ware were made or obtainable there, and for comparison with other areas.

It is precisely in the Midlands and East Anglia that the boundary between 'southern' and 'northern' wares, such as Tudor Greenware and Cistercian ware respectively, appears to occur.

Having surveyed in the last two chapters the evidence for pottery manufacture in post-medieval Lincolnshire we must move on to look at what competition from home and abroad the Lincolnshire potters were facing. With its long eastern sea coast it is inevitable that trade with northern Europe would play a large part in the historical development of the county. Wainfleet and Boston were the principal ports of medieval Lincolnshire, but by the 15th century Wainfleet was ceasing to be of much significance. Its total eclipse was rapid, but Boston continued to play a significant role.

Notes

1. P.C.D. Brears, The English Country Pottery, Its History and Techniques, Newton Abbot, 1971.
2. H. Lawrence, Yorkshire Potters and Potteries, 1974.
3. J.G. Hurst, 'White Castle and the Dating of Medieval Pottery', Med. Arch. 6, 1962, 135ff.
4. eg. LAO, LCC Admon. 1568/381 which refers to 'Potter Tointon'.
5. V.G. Swann, The Roman Pottery Kilns of Britain, RCHM Supplementary Series, no. 5, London, 1984, esp. 141-3.
6. G. Webster and N. Booth, 'A Romano-British pottery kiln at Swanpool, near Lincoln', Ant.J., XXVI, 1947, 61-79. J.B. Whitwell, Journal of Roman Studies, LIV, 1964, 159 and Pl.XII,1.
7. H.E.J. le Patourel, 'Documentary Evidence and the Medieval Pottery Industry', Med. Arch. XII, 1968, passim.
8. ibid.
9. Spalding Gentlemen's Society, Minute Book no. 2, 27th June 1734. Besides this vessel, which consists of two halves, an interlocking top and base, probably for storing cheese, there is a sketch of a mug or tankard. This looks more like a German product. The former is described as 'found in certain Ruins of an Antient Fabrick in the Borough of Boston, Lincolnshire'; the latter is given no provenance.

10. The items referred to also appear in R. Gough's edition of Camden's Britannia, vol. 2, 1806, 349 and Pl. VI, Fig. 3, opp. 314, where all are referred to 'Donnington'. Despite the ambiguity the important fact is that both were thought to be 'specimens of ancient Bolingbrook pottery, sent to a merchant there'.
11. L. Jewitt, The Ceramic Art of Great Britain, vol. II, London, 1878, 455. See also R. Bradley (ed), John Houghton's Husbandry & Trade Improv'd, rev. edn., 1, London, 1727, 168-9.
12. Jewitt, op. cit., vol. I, 438.
13. The Gentleman's Magazine, XLIV, 1774, 254.
14. LAO, Cragg 1/2, 'Topographical Notes of Lincolnshire, 1790-1820', f.29.
15. Much of this information is contained in a duplicated sheet produced for a local festival c.1965 by the late Mrs E.H. Rudkin and J.B. Whitwell; copy in files at the City and County Museum, Lincoln. Some of the information is quoted in Brears, op. cit., 194.
16. J.B. Whitwell, 'Archaeological Notes for 1963', LAASRP, 10, pt.2, 1964, 15, and J.B. Whitwell, 'Archaeological Notes for 1965', LHA, 1, 1966, 49 and Fig. 6. The same information also appears in EMAB, 8, 1965, 25.
17. J.B. Whitwell, 'Archaeological Notes for 1967', LHA, 3, 1968, 31 and J.B. Whitwell & K.F. Wood, 'Three pottery kilns in Lincolnshire located by proton gradiometer (Maxbleep) survey and confirmed by excavation', Prospezioni Archeologiche, 4, 1969, 127-8.

18. P. Drewett, 'The Excavation of the Great Hall at Bolingbroke Castle, Lincolnshire, 1973', Post-Med. Arch. 10, 1976, 1-33.
19. The pottery from the site is stored in the Alnwick Tower at the Bishop's Palace, Lincoln, but much of the unstratified pottery from the moat (said to have totalled some $\frac{3}{4}$ ton) seems to have been disposed of.
20. A.J. White, 'Post-Medieval pancheons with name-stamps found in Lincolnshire', Post-Med. Arch. 16, 1982, 29-38.
21. ibid., Appendix 2, 37-8.
22. H. Chapman, G. Coppack & P. Drewett, Excavations at the Bishop's Palace, Lincoln, 1968-72, Society for Lincolnshire History and Archaeology Occasional Papers no. 1, 1975, nos. 44 and 86. It is odd that no pottery between c.1450 and c.1730-40 is recorded, notwithstanding the historical evidence for damage during the Civil Wars.
23. Whitwell & Wood, op. cit.
24. White, loc. cit.
25. H.H. Swinnerton & P.E. Kent, The Geology of Lincolnshire, Lincoln, 1976, 54-6.
26. White, loc. cit.
27. '---earthen vessels, potts and pancions (were made) at Tychnull, and carried all East England through---', see P. Kinder, 'Collections towards a History of Derbyshire', c.1650, unpublished MS, Bodleian Library, Oxford, (quoted by Brears, op. cit.).

28. A.J. White, 'A Stamford Potseller's Stock in 1720',
Post-Med. Arch. 13, 1979, 290-2.
29. LAO, LCC Admon. 1616/98.
30. P. Thompson, The History and Antiquities of Boston,
Boston, 1856, 342.
31. Bishop J. Hall, 'Virgidemiarum', Lib. V, Satire ii,
117-9, in Hall, A., (ed.) Collected Poems of Joseph
Hall, Bishop of Exeter and Norwich, 1949, 82.
32. LAO, INV. 58/4, inventory of William Jackson of Welbourn,
Weaver, 1575/6, includes '3 Boston Jugs'. LAO, INV. 136B/
503, inventory of R. Clarke of Grantham, Mercer, 1630,
includes 'Boston jugs' among other apothecary stock.
33. PRO, E.190/387/1--401/18.
34. At TF 34624, found in 1966, see EMAB, 9, 1968, 21.
35. J.B. Whitwell, 'Archaeological Notes, 1964', LHA, 1, 1966, 39
36. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South
Humberside, 1975', LHA, 11, 1976, 57; J. Cherry,
'Post-Medieval Britain in 1975', Post-Med. Arch. 10,
1976, 172 and Fig. 4.
37. A.J. White, 'Clay pipes associated with a 17th century
pottery kiln at Boston, Lincs', in Davey, P.J. (ed),
The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe, vol. 1, BAR,
63, Oxford, 1979, 179-84.
38. cf. an example dated 1712 in the Yorkshire Museum, York.
39. Boston Corporation, TCD Records 1 and 31.
40. Boston Corporation, Survey, 4/B/4/2 f45.
41. Swinnerton & Kent, op. cit., 103-5.

42. ibid., 84-6; see also S.B.J. Skertchly, The Geology of the Fenland, Memoirs of the Geological Survey, 1877, 173-83.
43. W.D. Simpson, The Building Accounts of Tattershall Castle, 1434-1472, Lincoln Record Society, 55, Lincoln, 1960, 46, 60, 65; see also HMC, De L'isle and Dudley MSS, passim, s.d. 1431-52.
44. As note 33 above.
45. Report in the files of the City and County Museum, Lincoln.
46. Examples were found in excavations at St. Paul in the Bail and Vicars' Court, Lincoln, in mid-17th century contexts.
47. By Miss R.H. Healey in J.B. Whitwell and C.M. Wilson, 'Archaeological Notes 1968', LHA, 4, 1969, 108-9; see also R.H. Healey, 'Medieval and Sub-Medieval Pottery in Lincolnshire', unpublished MPhil thesis, University of Nottingham, 1975
48. C. Mahany, A. Burchard and G. Simpson, Excavations in Stamford, Lincolnshire, 1963-9, Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph Series, 9, London, 1982, 85 and Fig. 44.
49. Whitwell and Wilson, loc. cit.
50. G.F. Bryant and J.M. Steane, 'Excavations at the Deserted Medieval Settlement at Lyveden; A Second Interim Report', Northampton Museum and Art Gallery Journal, 5, 1969, 9ff.

51. W. Marratt, History of Lincolnshire..., 3, 1816, 73n;
a different version is given by C.W. Foster (ed),
Parish Registers of Bourne 1562-1650, Lincoln Record
Society, 7, Lincoln, 1921, 199.
52. eg. the Fire of London, or on a more local level,
the burning of Caistor in 1681. For a more general
study see E.L. Jones, 'The Reduction of Fire-Damage
in Southern England, 1650-1850', Post-Med. Arch., 2,
1968, 140-9.
53. The description of William Astin as 'of Bourne,
Potter', in 1699, see LAO, Measure 1/4/8.
54. E. Ekwall, The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English
Place-Names, 4th edn., Oxford, 1960, 155.
55. It is treated separately in Hearth Tax Returns, and
wills of several residents refer to bequests for the
repair of roads in 'Eagat Ward'.
56. FNQ, 3, 1895-7, 225, note 602.
57. Acc. no. 37.70.
58. Whitwell and Wilson, loc. cit.
59. J.B. Whitwell, 'Archaeological Notes 1966', LHA, 2,
1967, 45-6.
60. LAO, INV. 20/136 and INV. 25/6, dated 1552 and 1555
respectively.
61. LAO, INV. 118/14 and LCC Wills 1616/106.
62. LAO, INV. 128/295.
63. PRO, Cal. Pat. Rolls Eliz. 1, 5, (1569-72), 17,
no. 108.
64. C. Goff, A Woman of the Tudor Age, London, 1930, 288-9.

65. loc. cit. in note 63. Harrington was one of the co-grantees of the Patent. He was cousin to Lord Burghley, and later MP for Stamford. See G.A.J. Hodgett, Tudor Lincolnshire, Lincoln, 175, 106 and 138.
66. This excavation is as yet unpublished, and information given here is based on N.A. Kerr, 'An Old Bourne Industry', Lincolnshire Life, March 1979, 38-9; N.A. Kerr, 'A Medieval and Post-Medieval Pottery Industry; Excavations in Eastgate, Bourne, Lincs.', n.d., (a duplicated interim report, copy in the City & County Museum, Lincoln); and discussions with the excavator.
67. D.L. Roberts, 'The Vernacular Building of Lincolnshire', Arch.J. 131, 1975, 298-308.
68. D.L. Roberts, 'The Persistence of Archaic Framing Techniques in Lincolnshire; 2', Vernacular Architecture, 6, 1975, 38 and Fig. 3.
69. A requirement for any potter marketing his own wares; wagons are present in many such inventories, eg. that of Robart Barton, LAO, INV. 25/6.
70. A turf stack need not be under cover, but should leave evidence in the form of localized humus. This may of course be confused with topsoil, unless traces are specifically sought.
71. LAO, INV. 25/6.
72. LAO, Admon. 1685/61.
73. Swinnerton & Kent, op. cit., 53 and Fig. 1.
74. Mahany, Burchard & Simpson, op. cit., 173-4.

75. Hodgett, op. cit., 138.
76. Neither did Lincoln, but Stamford had excellent potting clays, and was judged suitable by one of the unnamed Dutchmen brought in by Bertie and Harrington in 1570 (see note 63 above). There is no evidence that he stayed on to produce tin-glazed wares, but such evidence should be actively sought.
77. J.B. Whitwell, 'Archaeological Notes 1964', LHA, 1, 1966, 39.
78. W. White, History, Gazetteer, and Directory of Lincolnshire, Sheffield, 1856, 767, 774-5.
79. ibid., 775.
80. D. Owen, Church and Society in Medieval Lincolnshire, Lincoln, 1971, 65; D.J. Price, 'Medieval Land-Surveying and Topographical Maps', Geographical Journal, CXXI, 1955, Pl.1.
81. LAO, LCC Wills 1737/155. Though the will is ambiguous it suggests that Ousman was a potter in Coningsby. Perhaps the Haven Bank site had long been in the family.
82. Roberts, op. cit., in note 68, 33.
83. cf. J.W.F. Hill, Victorian Lincoln, Cambridge, 1974, 93-4.
84. It is interesting to note the inventories of two Coningsby 'dishturners' as a comparison; Thomas Woods, 1667 (LAO, LCC Admon. 1667/236) and John Madder, 1683 (LAO, INV. 183/3). The most detailed inventory of a Dishturner comes from nearby Tattershall; William Shearman, d.1659, left:

'In the Chamber

4 hundred of dishes	8s h.	01-12-00
2 hundred of ladles	8s h.	00-16-00
4 dozen of Boles	5s h.	01-00-00
A grosse of Trenchers	6s.	00-06-00
3 grosse of spones and		
2 grosse of spoones	10s.	00-10-00

(LAO, INV. 161/192)

Such men were in direct competition with potters in some areas of production, though a mere remnant of a former industry. The comparison of prices is instructive.

85. eg. Charles I's loyal tenants at Crowland, who fought so hard on his behalf in the Civil War.
86. LAO, LCC Admon. 1691/109.
87. I owe this suggestion to the late Mrs E.H. Rudkin.
88. S.B.J. Skertchly, op. cit., 109-10.
89. Both lines can be seen on Capt. Andrew Armstrong's 1":1 mile map of Lincolnshire, 1778.
90. ibid., and OS 1st edn. 1":1 mile map, 1824.
91. LAO, Hareby PRs; LAO, INV. 111/295; and LAO, LCC Wills 1611/i/184.
92. As many villages in the Soke of Peterborough enjoyed, see J. Thirsk, English Peasant Farming, Cambridge, 1957, 118.
93. PRs.
94. In the 17th century it even seems to have had an ale-house, where Rev. William Underwood BA was wont to

while away his days, see C. Holmes, Seventeenth Century Lincolnshire, Lincoln, 1980, 55; J.W.F. Hill, 'The Royalist Clergy of Lincolnshire', LAASRP, 2, 1, 1938, 65-9.

95. W. White, op. cit., 780.
96. OS 1st edn. 1":1 mile, 1824.
97. In the City & County Museum, Lincoln, (Acc. no. 94.83).
98. Some useful evidence comes from a Terrier of 1596 (LAO, LMR 28/1), which records as boundaries of Richard Farror's lands in Hareby 'Church Layne', 'Towne Streete', and the 'Queenes hygh way'. The evidence would tend to suggest that considerable shrinkage took place here, perhaps late in the 17th century.
99. Brears, op. cit., 194. Medieval and post-medieval sherds and a possible kiln prop were found at TF 375638 in 1969, see C.M. Wilson, 'Archaeological Notes, 1969', LHA, 5, 1970, 12. This evidence does not seem to survive and remains inconclusive.
100. Lincoln, Rutland and Stamford Mercurcy, 13 Sept. 1811, 1 c.5.
101. OS 1st edn. 1":1 mile map, 1824.
102. See fuller discussion of the 19th century brickyard potteries below.
103. Swinnerton & Kent, op. cit., 54 and Fig. 1.
104. C.M. Wilson, 'Archaeological Notes, 1971', LHA, 7, 1972, 12.

105. J. Marjoram, 'Archaeological Notes, 1972', LHA, 8, 1973, 43; A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1977', LHA, 13, 1978, 78-9.
106. As at Tintern Abbey and Rievaulx Abbey, in the ruins of which brass and iron respectively were being worked soon after the Dissolution.
107. cf. the products of the kiln in Peasegate Lane, Toynton All Saints, found in 1979.
108. Dissolved by Act of Attainder, following the Lincolnshire Rising of 1536, see Hodgett, op. cit., 40.
109. LNQ, 1, 1888-9, 21-2.
110. W. Stukeley, Itinerarium Curiosum, London, 1776, Fig. 28.
111. LAO, LCC Admon. 1610/179.
112. Early this century the Littlethorpe Pottery near Ripon employed three wheels and nineteen men. Information from Mr Curtis of Littlethorpe.
113. Already Kirkstead ware has been recognized at Short Ferry, Fiskerton, and on several excavated sites in Lincoln.
114. Skertchly, op. cit., 197, 210, 288.
115. Swinnerton & Kent, op. cit., Fig. 1.
116. I. Beckwith (ed), The Louth Riverhead, Louth, 1976, passim.
117. LAO, BTs Louth (late); Adam Dawson, 1813; James Moor, 1840; Robert Harwood, 1848; Benjamin Moor, 1849; and John Fanthorpe, 1849.
118. LAO, BTs Louth (late), sub Burials 12/9/1822, aged 68.

119. Pigot & Co., Trade Directory of Lincolnshire, 1835.
120. Lincoln, Rutland and Stamford Mercury, 19 March, 1841,
2, c.3.
121. Information from Mrs E.M. Briggs of Louth.
122. Lincoln, Rutland and Stamford Mercury, 20 March 1850,
1, c.7.
123. Census Enumerators' Returns, Louth, 1851, sub 109,
Vicar's Lane.
124. ibid., sub 43-4 James St.
125. ibid., 1861. The proprietor was John Mitchell.
126. Post Office Directory of Lincolnshire, 1861.
127. Brears, op. cit., 194.
128. ibid., 227-8.
129. One is in the City & County Museum, Lincoln, (Acc. no.
37.64), the other, almost identical, is in the
possession of Mrs M. Boulton of Burgh-le-Marsh.
130. Information on its findspot and contents from
Mrs E.M. Briggs of Louth.
131. Gresswell & Son, White Horse, Gospelgate; see W. White,
op. cit., 266.
132. Swinnerton & Kent, op. cit., Fig. 1.
133. Beckwith, op. cit.
134. LAO, BTs Louth (late), Christenings, 2 April, 1834.
135. W. White, op. cit., 262.
136. J.B. Whitwell, 'Archaeological Notes 1968', LHA, 4,
1969, 113; le Patourel, op. cit., 119.
137. Lincoln, Rutland, and Stamford Mercury, 18 May 1798, 2.
138. Skertchly, op. cit., 280, 284, 288.

139. J.B. Whitwell, 'Archaeological Notes 1965', LHA, 1, 1966, 53. A typed list of the finds is in the City & County Museum, Lincoln. The date is in the first quarter of the 19th century. This deposit is further considered below.
140. le Patourel, op. cit., 101-26.
141. LAO, 1 Anc 3/18/1-102. The series concerned with the period 1451-1605 runs from 68-102.
142. Correspondence from the the Vicar, Rev. D. Carey, and the Headmaster, Mr W.H. Turner, in files at the City & County Museum, Lincoln, seems to constitute the earliest recorded evidence for the rediscovery. Several of the early finds are in the Museum, Acc. nos. 690.10 and 472-3.11.
143. LAO, INV. 1568/381/B.I., and LCC Wills 1613/282.
144. Archaeo-magnetic dating of Kiln 1 produced a date range of 1275-1350. (Oxford Laboratory for Archaeology). See M.J. Aitken & H.N. Hawley, 'Magnetic Dating 3; Further Archaeomagnetic Measurements in Britain', Archaeometry, 9, 1966, 190-1.
145. LAO, 1 Anc 3/18/1, the earliest surviving Court Roll for Toynton.
146. Finds from Eresby, all unfortunately unstratified, included local wares, as well as a typical 'seigneurial' range of imports, see J. Marjoram, 'Eresby Manor House, Spilsby', in Field, N. & White, A. (eds), A Prospect of Lincolnshire, Lincoln, 1984, 79-88.

147. R.H. Healey, 'Medieval and Sub-Medieval Pottery in Lincolnshire', unpublished MPhil thesis, University of Nottingham, 1975.
148. A cottage and associated kilns were located north of Mill Lane in 1954, but were demolished before they could be recorded.
149. LAO, Anc VII/A/2f 109v.
150. As a juror in the Manor Court, LAO, 1 Anc 3/18/68-102.
151. LAO, BTs, Toynton St. Peter.
152. Brears, op. cit., 194.
153. However, a George Stanye of Toynton All Saints was married in 1608, (LAO, BTs Toynton All Saints). If this man was indeed a member of the family later potting at Bolingbroke then his name is the only one so overlapping.
154. le Patourel, op. cit., 118; LAO, 1 Anc 3/18/50.
155. EMAB, 10, 1974 (for 1967), 36. Much of the detailed information quoted in the following paragraphs is drawn from a leaflet written by Miss R.H. Healey in 1978 and given a very limited circulation. For the archaeo-magnetic dating see M.J. Aitken and H.N. Hawley, 'Archaeomagnetic Measurements in Britain - IV', Archaeometry, 10, 1967, 130, 134.
156. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1979', LHA, 15, 1980, 79.
157. Analysis by Kate Foley, then Conservator at the Lincoln Archaeological Trust.
158. le Patourel, op. cit., 114.

159. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1976', LHA, 12, 1977, 78.
160. le Patourel, op. cit., 119.
161. G.C. Dunning, 'The Trade in Medieval Pottery around the North Sea' in Renaud, J.G. (ed), Rotterdam Papers, 1, Rotterdam, 1968, 35-58.
162. D.F. Petch, 'Archaeological Notes for 1961', LAASRP, 9, pt.2, 1962, 107. Some eleven or more complete jugs were found in 1933 during drainage work near Bicker church. The sole survivor is in the City & County Museum, Lincoln (Acc. no. 40.61).
163. Especially after the passing of the Education Act of 1870.
164. One type was designed by George Cheavin of Boston who later joined Doulton of Lambeth. See N.R. Wright, Lincolnshire Towns and Industry, 1700-1914, Lincoln, 1982, 207.
165. Now in the Museum of Lincolnshire Life, Lincoln.
166. At SK 994814.
167. The 'Moreton Pottery', 1878-1915; some examples of the ware are to be seen in Grantham Museum, together with a brief memoir by Mr J.F. Moreton dated 1936. The Moreton family had moved here from Balderton, Notts., when the clay ran out.
168. Run by the Gooding brothers, who came here from Dogsthorpe, see I. Beckwith (ed.), Waddington, 1977, 9.
169. Little post-medieval pottery from Stamford has yet been published, and none from closely dated contexts.

The best unpublished material is that from excavations at St. Leonard's Priory, excavated in 1969, including late pre-Dissolution contexts.

170. Judging by the range of material in Grantham Museum.
171. Finds from the Grantham Greyfriars, excavated in 1973, should go some way to redressing the balance, though there were few stratified groups even here. Publication is awaited. There are some indications that Nottingham and the Trent Valley continued to serve Grantham into the post-medieval period.
172. The only post-medieval group from Spalding comes from Harrington House (see below).
173. See above.
174. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1976', LHA, 12, 1977, 78.
175. The above is based on primitive country pottery techniques recorded at various potteries including Weatheriggs, Cumbria, and Burton-in-Lonsdale, North Yorkshire, in more recent times. It is likely that techniques such as these were used in the post-medieval pottery industry of Lincolnshire, though the extreme lack of both physical and documentary evidence cannot be over-stressed.
176. Kerr, op. cit. in note 66.
177. For convenience the extracted evidence from potter's wills and inventories is placed at the end of this section.

178. W.H. Pyne, Microcosm; or a Picturesque Delineation of the Arts, Agriculture, Manufactures etc. of Great Britain, 1808, (reprinted Luton, 1974), Pl. XVII, shows clearly the first and last of these methods.
179. See above, note 66.
180. A.J. White, 'Post-Medieval pancheons with name-stamps found in Lincolnshire', Post-Med. Arch. 16, 1982, 29-38.
181. R.H. Healey, A Glossary of Medieval Pottery Decoration, Bicker, 1976, 12.
182. Analysis was carried out by NCB Laboratories and indicated clearly a source in the Durham coalfield, as we might expect from the Port Book references to coal from Newcastle arriving in Boston. For the coal trade see also R. Finch, Coals from Newcastle, Lavenham, 1973.
183. Quantities of cinders mixed with waster sherds have been seen by the writer at various points around the village, used as a convenient local form of hardcore. One cannot as yet prove that these are industrial and not domestic, but the evidence points strongly to the former.
184. Brears, op. cit., 137-51; J. Musty, 'Medieval Pottery Kilns', in Evison, V.I., Hodges, H., and Hurst, J.G. (eds.), Medieval Pottery from Excavations, London, 1974, 41-65.
185. Musty, op. cit., 46.
186. Brears, loc. cit.

187. Examples from Bolingbroke Castle and Vicars' Court, Lincoln.
188. See below, under dated groups.
189. For the meaning of 'transitional' see below under 'Dark-glazed wares'.
190. Blackware copies in a poor greeny-black glaze have also been recognized in Norfolk and probably have a source at Fulmodeston, 29 kilometres to the north-west of Norwich. See S. Jennings et al., Eighteen Centuries of Pottery from Norwich, East Anglian Archaeology Report no. 13, Norwich, 1981, 150-2.
191. For early evidence see I.S.W. Blanchard, 'Derbyshire Lead Production, 1195-1505', Derbys. Arch. J. XCI, 1971, 119-140.
192. This was done up to c.1950 at Verwood in the New Forest. Musty, loc. cit., 55.
193. Brears, loc. cit., W.F. Holland, Fifty Years a Potter, Tring, 1958, passim.
194. Apart from those among the fallows most pits would have to be dug after the harvest and before the Spring ploughing. This was also a time when cattle and flocks were allowed to pasture on the stubble and aftermath. Such activities were rigorously controlled by the manor court, as at Toynton All Saints; cf. Court Rolls, (LAO, 1 Anc. 3/18).
195. R. Bradley (ed.), John Houghton's Husbandry & Trade Improv'd, rev. edn., 1727, vol. 1, 168-9.

196. This distinctive fabric has been identified among many surface collections from field-walking of medieval and post-medieval sites by Paul Everson in both East and West Lindsey. It is possible that Kirkstead is not the only source, given this wide distribution.
197. R.H. Healey, in Whitwell, J.B., and Wilson, C.M. (ed.), 'Archaeological Notes, 1968', LHA, 4, 1969, 108-9.
198. This smooth fabric, sparsely glazed with specks of cuprous green, occurs widely in south Lincolnshire. Nigel Kerr (pers. comm.) believes this to come from a source other than Bourne, perhaps Baston.
199. Early examples are known from the 13th and 14th century kilns at Toynton All Saints and Potterhanworth. For the latter see J. Marjoram, 'Archaeological Notes, 1973', LHA, 9, 1974, 30-1, and Fig. 11.
200. Brears, op. cit., 194; L.A.S. Butler, 'Church Close, Langton by Spilsby; a deserted medieval village', LAASRP, 9, 2, 1962, 133, and Fig. 3.5; J.B. Whitwell, 'Archaeological Notes, 1966', LHA, 2, 1967, 53.
201. Very few name-stamped coarsewares have been recorded elsewhere in Britain, but an example stamped 'PW' from King's Lynn invites comparison. See H. CLarke and A. Carter, Excavations in King's Lynn, 1963-70. Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph no. 7, London, 1977, 256, Fig. 115, no. 193.
202. Healey, op. cit. in note 181, 18-19.
203. Recently Hilary Healey (in litt.) has suggested that this may not represent a name, but may be merely a chance fragment of pattern. More sherds are required to prove or disprove this theory.

204. See above for details of the 17th century pottery kiln excavated at Boston Grammar School in 1975. Other kilns almost certainly remain to be found in Boston.
205. Of this group one kiln and two associated waster pits were excavated in 1963-7.
206. Kiln 1, final firing dated to c.1275-1350.
207. That of 'Samuel Langley, harmless potter' in 1793.
208. The early 'green' glaze is a lead glaze over a reduced body. Colour changes are almost entirely due to partial or full oxidation of the ware, an effect gradually achieved with increasing regularity as time went on.
209. J.B. Whitwell and C.M. Wilson, 'Archaeological Notes, 1968', LHA, 4, 1969, 116.
210. For transcripts of these see above.
211. Eg. in Lincoln, in groups from Flaxengate, for which see below.
212. See notes 31 and 204 above.
213. Cf. the large external advertisement stamps on some Central Gaulish samian ware by the Roman potters Cinnamus and Paternus.
214. cf. A. Oswald, Clay Pipes for the Archaeologist, BAR, Oxford, 14, 1975, esp. 62.
215. A coin hoard of c.1420 was found in a Midlands purple vessel at Attenborough, Notts.
216. Brears, op. cit., 18-23; J.P. Greene, 'Black Glazed Pottery and the Composition of its Glaze', Cheshire Archaeological Bulletin, 4, 1976, 15-20.

217. Bears, loc. cit. It is perhaps surprising that so little has been done to establish a tighter and more satisfactory chronology for Cistercian Ware, which is a great deal more varied in form and finish than Brears might seem to suggest.
218. cf. the examples from Roughton church (see below).
219. Fragmentary blackwares are exceedingly difficult to date within a period of a century or two, since it is usually the form which dictates the typology, the glaze and body being quite unchanging.
220. Grantham Museum, acc. no. M 68.
221. RCHM (E), Newark on Trent; The Civil War Siegeworks, London, 1964, 74.
222. Seen at a meeting of the Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology at Liverpool in November 1987.

CHAPTER 4

POTTERY IMPORTED FROM OUTSIDE LINCOLNSHIRE

4.1 Imports Through the Port of Boston and Elsewhere

It will be clear by now that considerable quantities of pottery were made in Lincolnshire during the period in question between 1450 and 1850 but that this was almost entirely in the form of coarse wares, suitable for use in kitchen and dairy, and in poorer households. Very little was made locally in the form of tableware.

Finer wares therefore had to be imported both from abroad and from other parts of Britain. In the earlier period it would appear from the evidence of the pottery itself that water transport played a large part in this process, and that Lincolnshire looked outwards to northern Europe and to coastal distribution via various east coast ports. Later on, and particularly from the mid 18th century, products from inland were more easily obtainable than before, probably because of improved land and canal transport.

The physical evidence, that of the pottery, will be examined later when contemporary groups of local and imported vessels are considered. Foreign imports have long been considered an important factor in dating the more traditional and conservative local products, but it is becoming increasingly clear that a great deal too much faith has

been placed in the 'close' dating available for continental material. Indeed there are wide discrepancies between the 'close' dating attributed to, for example, German stonewares found in this country and the very wide latitude in dating accorded to them in their areas of production.¹

In this section I will confine myself to the documentary evidence, and the way it can be used to analyse the distributive network and the dating of imports. The evidence is principally drawn from the Port Books of Boston, preserved in the Public Record Office.² Other Port Books, in particular those for Grimsby, have been examined but found to contain little or no evidence of value. The Boston Port Books like those for any other port, are divided into:

- 1) Overseas
- 2) Coastal.

They were produced in order to record cargoes passing into or out of the port in question and hence the custom duty payable. For our purposes their main use is in the analysis of cargoes containing pottery, and any reference to its origin.

Pottery arrived in Boston in one of four ways:

- 1) from overseas direct
- 2) from overseas but indirectly through another British port
- 3) coastally from other British ports
- 4) by land (ie. not recorded in Port Books).

The Overseas Books can be used to examine 1), but the Coastal Books record 2) and 3). By far the greatest quantity of evidence comes from Overseas Books. The principal coastwise trade was in coal from the Northumbrian coalfield via Tyne and Wear. A few ships brought in pottery as an incidental extra, while a slightly larger proportion, sailing from London or King's Lynn, brought pottery along with grocery goods and hardware, or with cargoes of household possessions.³

The system of customs bookkeeping was far from simple. When a ship arrived in port its cargo was removed over a period of days or weeks. Such subsequent removals were known as 'post entries'. More than one person was usually involved in the transaction, masters and crew members frequently having their own small 'adventure' as well as the larger ones belonging to groups of merchants, who tended to own shares in the ship in 'parts' ranging from 1/6 to 1/64, a system designed to equalise losses and to spread investment.⁴ Hence a number of entries may relate to one single cargo, while the Port Books themselves are frequently in very poor physical shape due to rough handling and poor damp storage in the Exchequer over a period of several centuries.

Methodology

There are very substantial numbers of Port Books for Boston, which are moreover as a rule duplicated or

triplicated by returns from the various officers of the customs, who were supposed to act as a check upon each other.⁵ The books run from 1565 to 1774. It was clearly impossible to read and transcribe all the books, and fortunately the Overseas books for the period 1601-40 have already been transcribed and published by Hinton.⁶ The approach therefore was to examine random but representative coastal books over the whole period, and a random range of overseas books for the periods before 1601 and after 1640. The published material was then looked at in closer detail. In addition, a random selection of books for Grimsby were also checked to see if any important evidence for importation into the north of the county was being missed. The absence of any useful references here suggest that in the north continental imports were obtained if anywhere via the port of Hull and redistributed by road or by water in small vessels. It is difficult to envisage any way of checking this theory in the absence of independent merchants' records. Physical evidence from excavations in Hull suggests that Hull and Boston had similar trading patterns, but much more Dutch earthenware, for example, occurs in Hull.

Coastal Trade

The following extracts from the Port Books (Coastal) serve to illustrate the range and quantity of pottery transmitted coastally and where possible, its original source. A few blank or uninformative entries are included lest it should seem that all the books contain relevant

information. Names of ships and places have been standardized, but other entries are verbatim.

PRO/ E190/387/1	1565. Lists only names of ships and dates of arrival.
E190/387/11	1570. 17 June. <u>Peter</u> from London. ... duo maunds pottes 10 Sept. <u>Greyhound</u> from London. ... xv doss. Bottells. 13 Sept. <u>Margaret</u> of Boston from Lynn. ... tria basketts potts.
E190/392/1	1594. Shipping mainly from Newcastle, with coal.
E190/392/15 'searcher'	1600-01. 1 Oct. <u>Trinitie</u> of Cambridge from Lynn. ... sex score doss. black potts. 7 April. <u>Grace of God</u> of Boston from London. ... unus basketts stone potts. (<u>recte Gyfte</u>), see below s.d. 4 July <u>Grace of God</u> of Boston from Lynn. ... ducenti dossens black potts 8 July. <u>Grace of God</u> of Boston from London. ... v basketts & unus chest drinkin glasses et stone potts.
E190/392/14 (surveyor)	[1600-01. 1 Oct. <u>Trinitie</u> of Cambridge from Lynn. ... sex score doss. black potts.]

23 Nov. Tryall of London from London
... quattuor basketts stone poots & drinking
glasses.

[4 July. Gyfte of God of Boston from Lynn
... ducent' dozens Earthen potts.]

[8 July. Grace of God of Boston from London.
... quinq' baskets & unus chest drinkinge
glasses & stone potts.]

E190/393/12

1604-5. 18 Oct. Robert of Boston from
London.

... 3 doz. 2 baskets potts et glassis.

9 Nov. Marie of Boston from London.

... duo chests et unum maund potts et glasses.

4 Dec. Robert of Boston from London.

... viii cases glasse iiii maunder' potts.

10 Feb. Matthew of Lynn (from Lynn?)

... unum basket stone potts.

22 Mar. Robert of Boston (from London?)

... one basket of potts.

E190/394/3

1611-2. 21 Feb. Robert of Boston from
London

... i baskett pottes and glasses.

21 Mar. Violet of Boston from London.

... and two barrells potts and glasses.

27 May. Robert of Boston from London.

... x barrells iiii basketts pottes and
glasses.

26 July. Robert of Boston from London.

... viii basketts two punchions three
barrells potts and glasses.

20 Sept. Thomas of Boston from Lynn.

... ix skeppes of blacke pottes.

6 Oct. Robert of Boston from London.

... three basketts two h'heades one
barrell one chest of potts and glasses.

18 Nov. Margaret of Newcastle from
Newcastle

... xxi chalders of coles and xxxvi bottells
of earthe covered with wicker.

18 Nov. Robert of Boston from London.

... two basketts potts and glasses.

E190/394/11

1616-17. 11 Feb. Christopher of Boston
from Lynn.

... three basketts of blacke pottes.

11 Feb. George of Boston from Lynn.

... fouer basketts Blacke pottes.

31 Mar. Erasmus of Boston from London.

... fouer basketts of pottes and glasses.

18 May. Susan of Boston from London.

... one baskettt pottes.

3 June. Erasmus of Boston from London.

... fouer basketts of pottes and glasses.

24 July. Susan of Boston from London.

... three basketts of potts.

14 Aug. Erasmus of Boston from London.

... three basketts potts and glasses.

30 Sept. Erasmus of Boston from London.

... six baskets and two barrells of potts
and glasses.

E190/395/1

1622-3 (extensively damaged).

23 May [--?--] of Boston from London.

... 4 basketts of potts and glasses.

4 [?] [--?--] of Boston from London.

... 2 basketts potts and glasses.

30 Sept. Xpofer (=Christopher) of Boston
from Lynn.

... 2 basketts blacke potts.

24 Nov. [--?--] of Boston from London.

... and one cheste of potts and glasses.

E190/395/2

1623-4. 17 April. Thomas of Boston from
London.

... fouer basketts one chest of potts and
glasses.

18 May. Mary Anne of Boston from London.

... Fowr basketts & fowre barrells of potts
and glasses.

27 Aug. Sara of Boston from London.

... sixe barells & foure basketts potts and
glasses.

18 Nov. Sara of Boston from London.

... fowre basketts two chests potts and
glasses.

E190/396/2

1632-3. 17 Feb. Unity of Boston from London.

... 3 basketts of potts.

7 Mar. Thomas & Mary of Lynn from Lynn.

... 3 basketts of potts.

11 April. Abigail of Boston from London.

... 2 basketts potts & glasses.

6 June [---] of Boston from London.

... 10 firkins of potts & glasses

22 July. Content of Boston from London.

... 6 basketts of potts & glasses.

1 Aug. Content of Boston from London.

... 4 basketts of potts & glases.

E190/397/6

1674. Out. 20 Feb. William of Spalding for Spalding.

... 3 basketts earthenware, ten doz. bottle jugs.

In. 19 Apr. Elizabeth & Mary [] from Lynn

... one baskettt potts

4 Dec. Samuel & John of Lynn from London.

... one baskettt galley potts.

19 Feb. Hopewell of Lynn from London.

... one baskettt earthenware.

E190/402/9

1705-6. 18 Feb. Thomas & Andrew of Boston from Lynn.

... ten bundles muggs & bottles.

27 Mar. Joshua & Mary from London

... a baskettt a box Earthenware & glasses.

10 Apr. Charles & Samuel from London.

... A hhd. three basketts. two boxes
Earthenwares & glasses.

19 Apr. Tim^y & Edward from London

... two hhds Earthenwares

20 Apr. Will^m from London.

... three hhds. Earthenwares.

20 June. Lecourt from London

... two hhds Earthenwares.

22 June. Thomas & Andrew from Lynn.

... Seven hhds. English Earthen ware.

E190/403/10

1710-11. 25 July (Out) Free Consent of
Spalding to Spalding.

... three basketts potts

1 July. Thomas & Andrew of Boston from Lynn

... six strings Holland muggs half a dozin
Holland pails.

14 July. Thomas & Robert of Boston from
London.

... one barrel Lynn plates.

14 July. Susanna from London

... three H'heads Earthenwares

23 Aug. Thomas & Andrew of Boston from
Lynn

... one string muggs.

25 Aug. Marshall from London.

... one h'head Earthenwares.

19 Sept. Timothy & Edward from London

(... in a cargo including one fire engine!)

... three barrels Lynn plates

eleaven H'heads two basketts Earthenwares.

23 Sept. Isaac from London.

... two basketts earthenwares.

19 Oct. Thomas & Andrew of Boston from Lynn

... one h'head potts.

20 Nov. Thomas & Andrew of Boston from Lynn.

... two string muggs.

E190/412/12

1740-1. In. 9 Apr. Friends Goodwill []

from London.

... 1 hhd earthenwares.

20 Apr. William & Ann [] from London.

... 3 hhds earthenware.

20 May. Dispatch of Boston from London.

... 1 crate earthenware.

23 June. Thomas & Ann of Boston from

London.

... 6 hhds earthenware

5 boxes china

Out. 2 Feb. Elizabeth of Lincoln for
Spalding

... a tonne of English Earthenware.

17 Feb. Good Intent of Boston for Spalding.

... 1 hhd earthenware.

E190/419/3

21 Mar. Lincoln 'Duddle'⁷ for Spalding.
... 4 tons earthen potts.

1760. In. 8 Feb. Concord [] from
London.

... 1 hhd earthenware.

21 Feb. Good Intent of Boston from London.

... 1 hhd earthenware

2 crates earthenware.

4 Mar. Susannah [] from London.

... 1 crate earthenware.

15 Mar. Mary [] from London.

... 4 hhds earthenware

2 crates earthenware.

22 Mar. Hope of Boston from Hull.

... 16 doz pieces earthenware.

22 Mar. Jno & Elizabeth [] from Hull.

... 36 doz pieces of earthenware

1 doz. stone bottles.

31 Mar. Martha [] from London.

... 4 hhds. 1 crate earthenware

1 box qty. 288 pieces China ware.

22 Apr. Concord [] from London.

... 1 hhd 4 crates earthenware

20 May. Mary of Boston from London.

... 1 hhd earthenware

2 June. Providence [] from London.

... 1 hhd earthenware.

In a few cases it will be seen that goods arriving in Boston by sea were redistributed again by water to places such as Spalding. It is only because of the transshipping that the Customs took any interest in the ultimate destiny of the goods. In the case of inland towns where redistribution was by road the Customs made no record. However it is very apparent that Boston was the main entrepot for Lincolnshire and that a high proportion of goods unloaded here were quickly dispatched by merchants or wholesalers to inland destinations.

Overseas Trade

E190/392/7 1595-6. Only trade with Scotland and the Baltic. No pottery mentioned.

Hinton loc. cit.

1601-18. No pottery imports recorded.

159 1618. 28 May. Fortune of Rotterdam from Rotterdam.

... 1 hd cast stone pots uncovered.

171 1628. 30 Jan. Hopewell of Boston from Rotterdam

... 22½ doz. earthen dishes

173 22 Feb. Violet of Boston from Holland.

... earthen dishes, £3.

175 19 Apr. Seaventure of Boston from Rotterdam.

... 2 chests earthen dishes £3.

1 hd. cast unwrought [sic] jugs.

- 187 1630. 6 Feb. John of Boston from
Rotterdam.
... 1 little basket with earthen jugs.
- 187 22 Feb. Hopewell of Boston from Rotterdam.
... 2 hd. cast uncovered stone jugs.
- 199 1633. 26 Mar. Friendship of Boston from
Rotterdam
... 3 hd. cast uncovered pots.
1 chest and a barrell with earthen dishes £2.
- 207 18 Sept. Rejoice of Boston from Rotterdam.
... 1 chest earthen dishes, value 20s.
150 cast uncovered pots.
- 209 31 Oct. Rejoice of Boston from Rotterdam.
... 50 cast uncovered pots.
- 225 1634. 21 Mar. Elizabeth of Boston from
Rotterdam
... 3 chests earthen dishes £3.
2 hd. cast uncovered pots.
- 227 4 Apr. Suzan of Boston from Rotterdam.
... 2 hd cast uncovered pots.
- 235 28 Aug. Seagreen of Lynn from Amsterdam.
... 3 chests earthen dishes £4.
1 chest earthen dishes £1.
- 237 30 Sept. Violet of Boston from Amsterdam.
... 2 chests earthen dishes £2.10s.
- 239 10 Oct. Post of Boston from Rotterdam.
... 50 cast uncovered pots.

- 239 3 Nov. Seagreen of Lynn from Rotterdam.
 ... 2 hd. cast uncovered pots.
- 243 20 Dec. Post of Boston from Rotterdam.
 .. 1 hd. cast uncovered pots
 1 chest earthen dishes £1.
- 257 1639. 11 Jan. Post of Boston from Rotterdam.
 ... 2 hd. cast uncovered pots
 30 doz. galley dishes.
- 257 11 Jan. Fortune of Boston from Rotterdam.
 ... 2 hd. cast uncovered pots.
- 259 7 Mar. Content of Boston from Rotterdam
 ... 15 doz. galley dishes.
- 259 7 Mar. Elizabeth of Boston from Rotterdam.
 ... 1 hd. cast uncovered pots.
- 265 29 Apr. Fortune of Boston from Rotterdam.
 ... 2 hd. cast uncovered pots.
- 269 16 July. Post of Boston from Rotterdam.
 ... 1 hd. uncovered pots
 15 dozen galley dishes.
- 273 6 Aug. Content of Boston from Amsterdam
 ... 20 dozen galley dishes.
- 275 1 Oct. Fortune of Boston from Rotterdam
 ... 50 cast stone jugs.
- 277 25 Nov. Post of Boston from Rotterdam.
 ... 2hd. cast uncovered pots
 20 dozen galley dishes

- 289 1640. 17 Jan. Fortune of Boston from
Rotterdam.
... $\frac{1}{2}$ hd. cast uncovered jugs.
10 dozen galley dishes.
10 dozen galley dishes.
- 291 [] Mar. Post of Boston from Rotterdam.
... 50 cast uncovered pots.
- 295 24 Apr. Fortune of Boston from Rotterdam
... 1 hd. cast uncovered pots.
50 cast uncovered pots.
- 301 7 July. Post of Boston from Rotterdam.
... 50 cast uncovered pots.
- 305 14 Sept. Post of Boston from Rotterdam.
... 75 cast uncovered jugs.
- 307 6 Oct. Rose Anne of Boston from Rotterdam.
... uncovered pots.
1 hd. cast uncovered jugs.
- 311 20 Nov. Trial of Newcastle from Rotterdam.
... 20 cast uncovered jugs.
- 313 11 Dec. Post of Boston from Rotterdam.
... 1 hd. cast uncovered pots.
 $\frac{1}{2}$ hd. cast uncovered jugs.
 $\frac{1}{2}$ hd. cast uncovered pots.
- 313 23 Dec. Violet of Lynn from Rotterdam.
... 40 cast uncovered jugs.
- E190/396/8 1660. 17 July. Elizabeth of [Boston] from
Rotterdam.
... 50 cast uncovered jugs.
50 cast uncovered jugs.

19 Sept. Swallow of [Boston] from []

... 25 cast of uncovered jugs

50 cast uncovered jugs

40 ffoot Gally tiles

1 gross red trenchers.

19 Sept. Elizabeth of Boston from Rotterdam

... 75 cast of uncovered jugs

50 casts uncoverd jugs.

26 Sept. Elizabeth of Boston from Rotterdam?

1 (hyndred) of white plates in a baskett.

1 Dec. Elizabeth of Boston from Rotterdam.

... 25 cast of uncovered jugs.

25 cast of uncovered jugs.

E190/396/9

1661. 6 Mar. Elizabeth of Boston from []

... 12 dozen of red trenchers.

5 June. Tabitha of Boston from Rotterdam.

... 2 (hundred) cast of uncovered jugs

1 (hundred) cast of uncovered jugs.

31 Jan. Swallow of Boston from Rotterdam.

... 75 cast of uncovered jugs.

17 Oct. Elizabeth of Boston from Rotterdam

... one (hundred) & a halfe of uncovered
jugs

5 basketts of 30 dozen of Gall. plates.

E190/396/17

1669. 20 Mar. Desire of Boston from
Rotterdam.

... 20 doz. bottle jugs.

30 Mar. Swallow of Boston from Rotterdam.

... 125 cast of uncovered potts

Earthenware valued at 6 li

10 doz. Bottle Juggs

Chest of earthenware valued at 5 li.

18 doz. bottle juggs

100 doz. uncovered potts

20 earthen potts covered

[post entry] 6 casks earthenware val. []

28 doz. bottle juggs

earthenware valued at 12 li

45 doz. bottle juggs

25 June. Providence of Spalding from
Rotterdam.

... 30 doz. stone bottle juggs

100 doz. stone bottle juggs

1 chest & a parcell. Earthenware val. 7 li.

31 May. Swallow of Boston from Rotterdam.

... 50 doz. bottle juggs

24 doz. bottle juggs

1 parcell earthenware 4 li

some blew juggs val. 2 li.

54 doz. stone bottles

1 chest earthenware val. 4 li.

11 doz. bottle juggs

6 doz. bottle juggs

10 doz. bottle juggs

200 galley tiles

22 doz. bottle juggs.

21 June. Adventure of Boston from Dort []

... 80 doz. bottle jugs [? Dordrecht]

22 Aug. Adventure of Boston from Rotterdam

... 18 doz. bottle jugs

20 cast earthenpotts uncovered

1 cask earthenware

1 cask earthenware.

15 Sept. Swallow of Boston from Rotterdam.

... 12 doz. blew jugs val. 36s.

One case earthenware val. at 4 li.

10 doz. uncovered potts 30 cast.

10 doz. jugs.

2 chests 1 basket earthenware val. 10 li

Blew Jugs 34 doz. val. v li

60 casts uncovered potts.

16 Sept. Speedwell of Boston from

Rotterdam.

... 6 doz. earthen plates

earthenware val. 3 li.

25 doz. bottle jugs

E190/397/15

1679. 20 Jan. Judeth of Boston from

Rotterdam.

... Eight doz. stone bottles

2 doz. bottle jugs.

[] July. Adventurer of Spalding from

Rotterdam.

... 30 doz. stone bottles

30 doz. stone bottles

40 doz. stone bottles

30 doz stone bottles

30 doz. stone bottles

two baskets galley tiles

4 Nov. Adventurer of Boston from []

... twenty doz. stone bottles

150 cast uncovered potts

100 cast uncovered potts

10 doz. stone bottles

42 doz. stone bottles

12 doz. stone bottles

E190/401/1 1697. [No pottery recorded]

E190/402/1 1702. [No pottery recorded]

E190/403/12 1710. [No pottery recorded]

E190/406/13 1720. 3 May. Thomas & Ann of Boston from
Rotterdam

... twelve doz. stone bottles

One hundred & forty one cast uncovered potts

[Most vessels from Norway/Sweden with
timber & masts or from Portugal with wine]

E190/414/9 1750. 4 June. Peacock of Boston from
Rotterdam.

... 120 casts uncovered potts

18 casts uncovered potts.

18 Sept. Debenham of Woodbridge from
Rotterdam.

... 192 casts uncovered Potts.

E190/424/8 1774. [No pottery recorded. All trade
with Scandinavia, Russia and Finland,
principally timber]

It is interesting to note the almost total lack of any overlap between vessels involved in coastal and overseas trade. Vessels seem to have specialized and also performed a regular series of voyages between certain ports, eg. the regular trips of the Robert of Boston to London in 1604-5. No doubt this permitted and even encouraged both merchants and masters to build up local contacts in their regular ports of call, thus speeding up the acquisition of full cargoes and reducing the turnaround time in port. Nonetheless a few odd vessels can be noted, such as the Debenham of Woodbridge which perhaps made a forced landfall in Boston, or was involved in an opportunistic visit.

Although such information is rare in the 17th century there is much evidence in the 18th and 19th centuries for handbills and newspapers advertising what amounted to a seaborne version of the carrier's cart, performing regular journeys to and from London and other major ports. This was of great service to wholesalers, but was also made use of for casual transport of items such as household furniture and belongings. It seems very clear that this evidence can be carried back into the previous century.

Other Port Books

Port Books for Grimsby were also examined. Those for 1601 (E190/311/6), 1612 (E190/313/6), 1624 (E190/315/9), 1669 (E190/320/12) and 1671 (E190/321/1) all failed to produce any evidence of pottery imports. Another source not examined because of its indirect relevance to the present study but probably a source of information for Staffordshire wares passing through if not into Lincolnshire is the Port Books for Gainsborough, like Grimsby a member of the port of Hull. In the 18th century earthenware from London and crated pottery from Staffordshire on its way to London are known to have passed through this Trent river-port.⁸ This would undoubtedly be a useful area for future research. As yet insufficient excavation has been carried out in Gainsborough to determine whether or not there is any significant archaeological evidence for high levels of Staffordshire wares.

4.2 Quantities, Values, Types and Sources

Much of the foregoing material, quarried from original sources, requires some digesting and evaluating before it can be translated into everyday terms of - how many? - what sort? - where from? The question of quantities also brings up that of value. In some cases values are given from which unfamiliar quantities can be assessed. In other cases quantities are matched by a subsidy⁹ at a known fixed percentage from which a total value may be ascertained. There is a danger here of falling into a circular argument, but there seem to be just sufficient external constants available to avoid that trap.

1. Quantities

Various forms of quantities are given. Some are straightforward numerical ones, based on dozens, eg. 'sex score doss black potts', or '20 doz. bottle jugs' or so many 'pieces'. Here we have no idea how the items were packed for shipment. Others take the form of containers such as baskets, chests, barrels, punchions, hogsheads, firkins, bundles, boxes, crates, 'tons' (for 'tuns'?), casks and parcels. These presumably were ordinary containers packed with straw or some such padding. Some containers are given in the form of a dialect word such as 'maund' (EDD gives 'a hamper or basket') or 'skeppes' (baskets).

Other quantities are much more difficult to explain. Three entries for instance relate to 'strings' of 'muggs'. Here we may be looking at mugs literally strung together by their handles, or alternatively a string may have been an absolute quantity. Another common quantity especially for stoneware vessels is so many 'cast'. The OED gives 'cast' as 'a certain quantity of clay made into (eg.) flower-pots', while Hinton¹⁰ interprets an entry of 1639 to indicate 'one cast = one pot or jug'. Casts, it will be noted, seem to be used exclusively for imported stoneware and do not occur in coastal records nor in dealing with earthenware.

Records of c.1750 use the plural 'casts', which may not be significant, but Hinton's example may be explained by a scribal error and it is possible from the values (see below) that a cast may ordinarily represent 2-3 vessels. On the other hand, if we take 15/9/1669 where 10 doz. seems to equate to 30 cast, this makes 1 cast = 4 pots.

Two entries record the contents of a basket. On 26/9/1660 there are 100 'white plates' (tin-glazed earthenware?) to a basket, while on 17/10/1661 five baskets seem to equate to 360 'galley plates', or 72 to a basket. Equally on 31/3/1760 one box contains 288 pieces 'China ware'. However it is likely that these smaller quantities were ad hoc contents of all-purpose containers and there may have been considerable variation in numbers due to size and shape of vessel.

2. Values

Values can be arrived at in two ways. First of all there are specific mentions in the text of certain entries, eg. 19/4/1628 where two chests of earthen dishes are worth £3, or 26/3/1633 where a chest and a barrel with earthen dishes are worth £2. Unfortunately as we do not independently know how many vessels a chest might hold we are not much wiser. However 15/9/1669 values 34 dozen 'Blew Juggs' at £5, or roughly four per shilling, and 12 doz. at 36s, or 3d each, which agree quite closely.

The other source is that of 'subsidies' on the duty payable. Entries such as 28/8/1634 show that £4 worth of earthen dishes attracted a 'subsidy' of four shillings while £1 worth paid one shilling. The rate of subsidy across a number of entries seems to work out at a standard 5% of value. Supposing that this rate applied to all pottery imports we can work back from the subsidy paid on items such as stoneware to an actual valuation. Again this seems to produce uniform results, as 50 cast pays a subsidy of 7½d, 100 cast 1s3d, 150 cast 1s10½d, and 200 cast 2s6d. This suggests that 'uncovered pots' were worth 3d per cast, that is to say perhaps ¾d each. 'Galley dishes' are susceptible to the same reasoning process. A consignment of 30 doz. on 11/1/1639 paid a subsidy of 1s6d, on 16/7/1639 1.5 doz. paid 9d, and on 25/11/1639 the subsidy on 20 doz. was 1s. This puts a value of 1d per dish on 'Galley dishes'.

The foregoing can be summarized as follows:

'Blew jugs' 3d each

'Uncovered pots' $\frac{3}{4}$ d each

'Galley dishes' 1d each

in each case based on value or subsidy.

What the names signified will be discussed below. However two important facts merge. Firstly the generality of imported goods were very cheap, which must have caused local producers many problems in either matching quality or price. Secondly, there were clearly large variations in individual values, suggesting that some items, eg. 'Blew jugs' were luxury items, or at any rate could fetch a price three times that of any 'ordinary' dish or pot.

It is important of course to note that valuations are whole-sale values placed on items by the importing merchants. It was in their interest to undervalue their stock, as it affected the duty payable, but equally the Customs had the right to challenge the valuation and to buy for the Crown at the price stated plus 10% for 'fair profit', which served as an occasional check on such malpractice.¹¹

3. Types

The above evidence also indicates a variety of types of pottery being imported into Lincolnshire. Some are easily identified with known imports, others are less easily categorized. The latter point is complicated by the fact

Figs.
32, 34, 3

that a number of ports served as entrepots where goods from a wide area were collected and then redistributed. We have no recorded imports from a German port but the stoneware imports from Dutch ports must include these as well as North German and Dutch earthenwares and tin-glazed wares.

Among the many categories of pottery mentioned the following must be singled out for special mention:

Black potts (1/10/1600, 20/9/1611, 11/2/1616, 30/9/1622), all from Lynn. Sarah Jennings¹² tells me that the sources of iron-glazed wares in Norfolk (the hinterland of Lynn) are at present unknown, but Wroxham and Fulmodeston are both possibilities. These black wares are known to have been fairly short-lived, and are a variety of GRE or glazed red earthenware, the basic Norfolk earthenware product of the early post-medieval period.¹³ That they were distinctive at the time we cannot doubt, but they may well be matched by local minority production at Boston and Bolingbroke, which will present problems of identification today. We will see below how 'black potts' were held in stock in considerable quantities by Lincolnshire shopkeepers, and valued between $\frac{1}{2}$ d and $\frac{3}{4}$ d each.

Stone potts (7/4/1600, 23/11/1600, 10/2/1604) from London and Lynn. The London pots are far too early for local production, and with the Lynn reference may relate to German imports redistributed coastally.

Bottells of earthe covered with wicker (18/11/1612), though fetched from Newcastle must relate to Martincamp type II flasks¹⁴ which were also being exported inter alia from Dieppe to Exeter. How they arrived in Newcastle is anybody's guess - perhaps as a return cargo on a collier in ballast from London? One example has been found in its original wicker at Nonsuch¹⁵ and they must have looked and travelled like Chianti bottles.

Bottles/Bottle Jugs (20/2/1674, 18/2/1705, 20/3/1669-3/5/1720 [many recorded]). These like the references to 'birded jugs' in probate inventories must refer to so-called 'Bellarmines',¹⁶ a relatively recent term. What is strange is the late appearance of the type in the records, though it must be added that dated examples cluster very much in the last quarter of the 17th century. The earlier types, made in Cologne,¹⁷ may have been subsumed under the title 'stone jugs', eg. 22/2/1630. These examples with short bodies and wide necks relate much more closely to the run of stoneware drinking vessels made at Raeren and Frechen, and were divided less categorically by use. In other words later 'Bellarmines' tended to narrow-necked bottle forms rather than mug forms.

Galley Pots/Galley Dishes (4/12/1674, 11/1/1639, 7/3/1639, 16/7/1639, 6/8/1639, 25/11/1639, 17/1/1640, 17/10/1661). Galley tiles are also mentioned several times. All must be references to tin-glazed earthenwares. 'Galley pots' were

named originally from the Dutch 'geleyerspotten', which seems to mean simply pots 'transported by water'.¹⁸

The physical evidence for contemporary Dutch tin-glazed wares in Boston includes both blue-and-white Ming imitations and colourful maiolica types, usually distinguished by a rather red fabric and a high-gloss glaze provided by the use of 'Kwaart' or lead additive. Most of the galley-wares came via Rotterdam.

Holland mugs (Holland pails?) (1/7/1710, ? 23/8/1710, ? 20/11/1710). The last two references are equivocal and are included here because the mugs are mentioned in similar quantities of 'strings'. The 'pails' may also be wooden or metal objects - only their association with mugs suggests that they too are pottery. With such a small sample more problems of identification are raised than solved.

There are at least three possibilities, in ascending order of probability; firstly some sort of as yet unidentified stoneware, eg. developed from the earlier products of Limburg; secondly a tin-glazed earthenware (but one would expect 'galley pots' or some such title); thirdly an earthenware such as Dutch redware or North Holland slipware. The great majority of recognized Dutch earthenware imports however, are not drinking vessels but flatwares or bowls, or fire-pots. Two pieces in the collections of the City & County Museum, Lincoln, and another from Lincoln in the British Museum are straight-sided handled mugs in a

characteristically Dutch fabric, with simple slip-trailed, girth lines which may represent the items in question.

Similar vessels were found in the Amsterdam of 1749.

Finally perhaps the references are inexact, indicating goods imported to Lynn via Holland, and redistributed from there.

Lynn plates (14/7/1710, 19/9/1710). These references are specific enough, but oddly both shipments come from London! Did the ships call in at Lynn on the way? The most common Norfolk products of appropriate date were in GRE (see above) and forms included a number of flatwares,¹⁹ which are rare products in Lincolnshire itself, and not very evident in archaeological assemblages.

China ware (23/6/1740, 31/3/1760). Both shipments are from London. The term 'china' may be generic or particular - there are several possible sources of porcelain, both Oriental and European,²⁰ by 1740. Alternatively this 'china' may be no more than white salt-glazed stoneware.

Stone pots/stone jugs. (Many references 1600-1750).

Frequently these are referred to as 'uncovered' and once, almost certainly in error, as 'unwrought'. These pots and jugs can be identified with some certainty as stoneware mugs from the Rhineland area, principally from Raeren near Aachen and Frechen, and Siegburg, near Cologne, though sources such as Langerwehe were in production much longer

than is usually appreciated, and Aachen was also producing wares very similar to those of nearby Raeren. Among these stoneware products the picture is rapidly changing as more sources are recognized and the old certainties over typological dating are overturned by excavation and publication in Germany itself.²¹ It is accepted that Siegburg ceased to export much after 1632 and Langerwehe pottery for instance is usually seen in this country as an indicator of 15th-16th century date, but some of these theories need to be modified in view of the tenacity of style and finish and the difficulty in distinguishing between some types and sources.

The 'uncovered' references seem to hint at the way which early stonewares were given hinged lids, often of silver or of pewter. These were added in this country, the products coming in without lids but sometimes with handles pierced to take a hinge. Lids were sometimes also added to earthenware or tin-glazed mugs, and are perhaps typical of imported drinking habits associated with the introduction of beer during the 16th century. Stoneware mugs were cheap and practical drinking vessels being impervious to liquids even when mishapen or blemished as they frequently were. They afford a striking example of successful market penetration since they can be found on almost any site of the appropriate period, however exalted or however humble, throughout Lincolnshire and of course throughout most of eastern England.

Earthen dishes (30/1/1628, 22/2/1628, 19/4/1628, 26/3/1633, 18/9/1633, 21/3/1634, 28/8/1634, 30/9/1634, 20/12/1634).

It is possible that further references are implied by 'earthenware' but the explicit references cover only a short period and seem to be supplanted by 'galley dishes'. All the shipments are from Rotterdam or Amsterdam, and the most likely sources lie on the river Weser in Germany, in the area of southern Lower Saxony.²² There are a number of known pieces of Weser slipware from Lincolnshire.²³ The terminal date of import is thought to be c.1650, which would fit reasonably well. Strangely, finds of Werra slipware - the other commonly imported German earthenware - seem to be almost unrecorded in Lincolnshire, but this is also a possible identification of the documentary references, and other examples may come to light.

White Plates (26/9/1660). This single reference seems to relate to a shipment from Rotterdam, and judging by the relative dates is a post-entry on a consignment which arrived 19/9/1660. It can only refer to plain white tin-glazed plates. Plain white²⁴ and blue-and-white was becoming more common by the mid-17th century, and gradually replacing the brighter palettes of the 'maiolica' period. Plates with verses and mottoes appear,²⁵ but plain wares are a great deal more common archaeologically than works devoted to tin glaze would lead us to believe. The answer is probably that decorated vessels were more prized and therefore more likely to survive to be collected than the everyday wares that

served their purpose and found their way into rubbish deposits, only to be recovered archaeologically.

Blew Juggs (31/5/1669, 15/9/1669). Shipped from Rotterdam and valued at 3d each wholesale, these 'juggs' are obviously something special. They are valued at three times the price of a 'galley-dish' or four times that of a plain stoneware mug from Raeren or Frechen. While tin-glazed vessels of an overall blue such as bleu Persan or bleu de Nevers are a possibility, such items do not seem to appear in the archaeological record of Lincolnshire. Again, the grès azurés de Beauvais, which were a luxury product of the 16th century²⁶ and which survived into the 17th century²⁷ may be meant, but French wares form a fairly insignificant proportion of Lincolnshire's post-medieval imports. The most likely candidates are the cobalt-decorated stonewares of the Westerwald region of Germany. From c.1580 the potters of Raeren were experimenting with cobalt and with impressed and moulded decoration on their stonewares and in the early 17th century, during the Thirty Years War, there seems to have been a substantial emigration of potters from Raeren and Siegburg to the villages of Höhr, Grenzau, and Grenzhausen in the Westerwald.²⁸ Here the industry still continues. Drinking-vessels of a variety of forms, together with a wide range of decorative and functional uses were made, manganese purple being added to the palette in the late 17th century. These wares are very commonly found in Lincolnshire,²⁹ and no doubt the quality of finish

and the decoration commanded a higher than average price.

Almost identical wares are now known to have been made in Fulham from the early 17th century, but it is likely that these would have been shipped direct from London, while German products were mostly shipped through Dutch ports, as we have seen.

The only significant imports not matched by documentary evidence are those from the south and west of Europe. How wares from these areas found their way into Lincolnshire is not at all clear. French pottery of the 16th century may have come direct to Boston, as the earlier pottery of the Saintonge did, but Italian and Spanish wares may have come via London or some other port, like the Martincamp flasks.

The principal imports involved were 16th century chafing-dishes from the Saintonge area of south-west France,³⁰ marbled slipware from northern Italy, probably Venice,³¹ and olive-jars from Spain.³² Other products came from another part of the Mediterranean, from a location as yet undetermined.³³

Summary

The Port Books of Boston are a very valuable source for information on pottery imports. They give an indication of the quantity, types, date-range and value of many of the most significant imports, as well as providing a useful

sidelight on the trading patterns of this relatively decaying port. The sources of supply clearly favour Germany and Holland rather than France or Spain, but the evidence of some southern European imports in Lincolnshire suggests that these arrived indirectly, being transhipped and transported coastally from London or by road from south coast ports. The relative abundance of stonewares, for example, and their low price, accounts for their ubiquitous occurrence on sites of all social levels, while Boston's own ceramic record, like that of many seaports, is truly cosmopolitan.

4.3 Imported Types: The Physical Evidence

Figs.
32, 34

We have seen examples of the documentary evidence for imports of pottery through Boston and also some identifications of the types mentioned in these sources. It is now time to turn our attention to the physical evidence from Lincolnshire.

German/Flemish stoneware. Most of the common types are well represented: Siegburg and Langerwehe in the early period, Raeren, Aachen, Cologne and Frechen from the late 15th/early 16th century onward - with Frechen types continuing into the 17th century, and Westerwald types emerging in the early years of the same century.³⁴

There seems so far to be no evidence of the elaborate moulded stoneware drinking vessels made at Siegburg in the 16th century, but some sherds exist of panelled jugs made at Raeren or in the Westerwald in the last quarter of the 16th century.³⁵ These stonewares, particularly those from Raeren and Frechen, are almost ubiquitous and occur on sites of a very great range of status throughout Lincolnshire. Often blemished and sometimes seriously distorted and cracked they must have been imported in vast quantities and probably also as 'seconds'. The Westerwald maintained its contacts; vessels ranging from the early 17th century to the mid-18th century occur in Lincolnshire. The earlier types are usually jugs (cf. example from Wyberton)³⁶ but

later tankards and chamber-pots occur in pit-groups in Boston. The later types were also copied in English salt-glazed stoneware with cobalt decoration (the later type of 'scratch blue') and occur in the Greestone House cellar group at Lincoln.³⁷

Other stoneware and near-stoneware types include the flasks made at Martincamp in Normandy, which have been found in Wainfleet, Tallington, Horncastle and Brackenborough, inter alia.³⁸

Of the earthenwares a number of types have been identified. Werra shipware is at present unaccountably rare, being known only from Lincoln,³⁹ but Weser slipware is much more common occurring on at least nine sites, principally in the Witham valley. Part of a rare Weser Brown Ware jug has recently been identified at Boston.⁴⁰

North Holland slipware is also at present unrecorded, though undecorated sherds may have been missed. Other Dutch wares are not much more common - Redwares occur at Horncastle and Goltho, while small mugs and handled bowls of presumably Dutch origin, with slipped interiors and trailed exterior decoration, are known from Washingborough and elsewhere. These may well be of early 18th century date.⁴¹

North Italian marbled slipware is recorded in the form of a bowl from Boston and a standing costrel from Maltby.

A large proportion of the TGE recovered from Boston appears to be of Dutch origin, witness its red body and shiny glaze, though such wares seem rarer inland. A sherd of a Montelupo maiolica dish has also been found in Boston.⁴² Spanish lustre-ware, bowls from Valencia, have been found in Lincoln and Boston, but it is otherwise unknown.⁴³ Similarly a single sherd of Italian faience of 14th-15th century date was recovered at Eresby.⁴⁴ Such single occurrences could be explained as individual gifts or items brought in the baggage of travellers. Spanish olive jars are also rare, though of course it is possible that some have been confused with Roman amphorae.

A few small sherds of Mediterranean Green and Red Ware have been found at Boston. At present its source is unknown.⁴⁵ Of the French wares other than Martincamp, Beauvais wares are virtually unrecorded (a few unprovenanced sherds only),⁴⁶ but a little more is seen of Saintonge wares.

Of these a number of greenware sherds are recorded, including a sweetmeatdish at Fiskerton, and two type Ia chafing-dishes from the same site and from Boston respectively. Most of a polychrome chafing-dish was found late last century in High Street, Lincoln, while a rosette from a type IV chafing-dish was found at Freiston.⁴⁷ Present evidence suggests that the Saintonge was not a significant source of pottery for post-medieval Lincolnshire.

It is clear from this chapter that prices of imports were a significant element in the pressure on local potters. The evidence for prices of locally produced pottery are considered in the next chapter.

Imported Wares in Lincolnshire

Type	Doc. Evidence	Physical Evidence
Siegburg stoneware	?	✓
Langerwehe stoneware	?	✓
Raeren stoneware	✓	✓
Cologne stoneware	✓	✓
Frechen stoneware	✓	✓
Westerwald stoneware	✓	✓
Martincamp flasks	✓	✓
Werra slipware	?	✓
Weser slipware	?	✓
N. Holland slipware	X	X
N. Italian marbled slipware	X	✓
Dutch slipware	?	✓
Saintonge (late polychrome)	X	✓
Dutch TGE	✓	✓
Spanish Lustre ware	X	✓
Montelupo TGE	X	✓
Spanish olive jars	X	✓
Dutch earthenware	?	✓
Mediterranean Green & Redware	X	✓

Notes

1. eg. B. Beckmann, 'The main types of the first four production periods of Siegburg pottery', in Evison, V.I., Hodges, H., & Hurst, J.G. (eds.), Medieval Pottery from Excavations, London, 1974, 183-220.
2. PRO Exchequer Records (class E.190). Individual references are given in the text. For Port Books in general see D. Woodward, 'The Port Books of England and Wales', Maritime History, 111, 1973, 147-65.
3. A useful context to this is given by T.S. Willan, The English Coasting Trade 1600-1750, Manchester, 1938 and 1967.
4. For examples of multiple involvement see R.W.K. Hinton (ed.), The Port Books of Boston 1601-1640, Lincoln Record Society, Lincoln, vol. 50, 1956, passim; while shared ownership of vessels can be seen from contemporary records elsewhere in the country, eg. J.D. Marshall, (ed.), The Autobiography of William Stout of Lancaster 1665-1752, Manchester, 1967, 122, and N. Vickers (ed.), A Yorkshire Town of the 18th Century, The Probate Inventories of Whitby, North Yorkshire, 1700-1800, Studley, 1986, 1-2, 60-1.
5. The organization of the Customs in general is well summarised in E.E. Hoon, The Organisation of the English Customs System 1696-1786, Newton Abbot, 1968, and in S. Prestidge, (ed.), The Call to Duty, London, 1983.

6. Hinton, loc. cit.; see also A.A. Garner, Boston, Politics and the Sea, History of Boston Series, no. 13, Boston, 1975.
7. This appears to be a type of small vessel rather than a name, as can be seen from other entries not quoted here.
8. I.S. Beckwith, 'The River Trade of Gainsborough, 1500-1850', LHA, 2, 1967, 6-7.
9. Subsidies: additional and particular duties imposed on the basic duties; see Hoon, op. cit., 27, 35.
10. Hinton, op. cit., ix; see also G. Sturt, William Smith, Potter and Farmer, 1790-1858, Firle, 1978, 85, for a much higher estimate of a 'cast'.
11. Hoon, op. cit.
12. in litt. John Hurst also suggests the Babylon kilns near Ely as a possible source.
13. See also S. Jennings et al., Eighteen Centuries of Pottery from Norwich, East Anglian Archaeology Report no. 13, Norwich, 1981, 150-4.
14. J. Hurst, 'The Pottery' in Neal, D.S., 'The Palace of King's Langley', Med. Arch. XXI, 1977, 156-7.
15. Hurst, in litt.
16. M.R. Holmes, 'The So-Called 'Bellarmine' Mask on Imported Rhenish Stoneware', Ant.J. XXXI, 1951, 173-9; A. Thwaite, 'The Chronology of the Bellarmine Jug', The Connoisseur, 182, 1973, 255-62; and F.H.W. Friederich, 'Bardamannen', Westerheem, XVI, 3, 1967, 96-113.

17. F.A. Dreier, 'Germany', in Charleston, R.J.,
World Ceramics, London, 1968, 130-131.
18. J. Bedford, Delftware, London, 1966, passim.
19. Jennings, op. cit., Fig. 65.
20. eg. Meissen.
21. The best and most up-to-date overall picture of
German stonewares can be gained from G. Reineking-
Von Bock, Steinzeug, (Kataloge des Kunstgewerbemuseums
Köln), Köln, 3rd edn., 1986. For Siegburg products
see Beckmann, loc. cit.; for Aachen, J.G. Hurst, 'Early
German Stonewares', (unpublished typescript of paper
read at Morley College, London, 1972); for Langerwehe
see P.V. Clarke, 'German Stoneware', in Schofield, J.
et al., 'Excavations South of Edinburgh High Street,
1973-4', PSAS, 107, 1975-6, 206-11.
22. C. Gaskell Brown, (ed.), Plymouth Excavations; Castle
Street; the Pottery, Plymouth, 1979, 40. Production
sites have been recognized at Coppengrave and Völksen,
near Hannover.
23. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South
Humberside, 1979', LHA, 15, 1980, 90.
24. eg. four plain white hollow-wares formerly in the
Lipski collection, The Lipski Collection of English
and Irish Delftware, Sotheby's Sale catalogue, part 1,
10/3/1981, nos. 10-13.
25. See M. Archer, English Delftware/Engels Delfts
Aardewerk, Amsterdam, nd., nos. 30-34.
26. Charleston, op. cit., 134.

27. J. Cartier, unpublished paper read at the Bristol Conference of the Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology, 1979.
28. Charleston, op. cit., 132-3.
29. See A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1978', LHA, 14, 1979, 83-4, no. 5, for an almost complete Westerwald mug found at Wyberton, Boston.
30. J.G. Hurst, 'Post-Medieval French Imports and English Copies at Lincoln', LHA, 1, 1966, 54-6; A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1975', LHA, 11, 1976, 64.
31. J.G. Hurst in Keen, J., 'Excavations at Old Wardour Castle, Wiltshire', Wilts. Arch. & Nat. Hist. Mag., 62, 1967, 75. Wares known from Lincolnshire are a bowl (Boston) and a standing costrel (Maltby).
32. J.M. Goggin, The Spanish Olive Jar, Yale University Publications in Anthropology, 62, Yale, 1960.
33. Earthenwares from Boston. Information from J.G. Hurst. See also ref. in note 45 below.
34. See refs. in note 21.
35. An example comes from the rubbish filling the disused pottery kiln at Boston, see Chapter 3.2.
36. See note 29 above.
37. See below, Chapter 7.4.
38. Wainfleet, City & County Museum, acc. no. 216.11; Tallington, no acc. no.; Horncastle, 1968 and 1978 excavations; Brackenborough, see Chapter 7.4 below.

39. J.G. Hurst, 'A Wanfried dish from Newcastle', AA.4, 1972, 259-62, esp. 261.
40. See note 23 above; Archaeology in Lincolnshire 1987-8, (4th Annual Report of the Trust for Lincolnshire Archaeology), 1988, 16.
41. cf. P. Marsden, The Wreck of the Amsterdam, London, 1985, 129, no. 71.
42. See note 40, second ref.
43. Archaeology in Lincoln 1981-82, (10th Annual Report of Lincoln Archaeological Trust), 1982, 31, Fig. 15 and cover; for Boston see note 46 below.
44. J.G. Hurst, 'Near Eastern and Mediterranean Medieval Pottery found in Western Europe', Archaeologia Lundensia, III, 200-201.
45. J.G. Hurst, D.S. Neal, H.J.E. Van Beuningen, Pottery Produced and traded in North West Europe 1350-1650, Rotterdam Papers VI, Rotterdam, 1986, 74-5.
46. A sherd is recorded from Boston, however, see S. Moorhouse, 'Finds from Excavations in the Refectory at the Dominican Friary, Boston', LHA, 7, 1972, 37. Various other significant imports were found in this excavation, including Dutch earthenwares and green-glazed Siegburg stoneware, although the nature of the excavation itself, and the contexts of the finds, were somewhat unsatisfactory.
47. For Saintonge imports in general in this period see J.G. Hurst, 'Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century imported pottery from the Saintonge', in Evison, V.I., Hodges, H.,

and Hurst, J.G., Medieval Pottery from Excavations,
London, 1974, 221-255. For other Lincolnshire finds
see refs. in note 30 above.

CHAPTER 5

PRICES, VALUES, AND THE SOCIAL POSITION OF POST-MEDIEVAL POTTERS

5.1 Prices and Values

Any discussion of prices and values of goods in previous centuries is hampered by the lack of a suitable yardstick by which to measure them. Prices and values are always relative, never absolute,¹ so what will serve as a means of comparison?

Money values are of course notoriously misleading: while a medieval nobleman's expenses might run into hundreds or thousands of pounds² a modest livelihood could be obtained from a tiny proportion of this, and whole sections of the community may have used money intermittently or not at all, relying on subsistence farming to provide food, and service to replace money rent to the landlord.³

The introduction, under Edward I, of a regular small denomination silver coinage, perhaps serves to illustrate the gradual changeover at even the lowest levels of society to a money economy, but even here there are pitfalls. Prices paid for goods might depend on their quality and durability as now, or even the social status of the buyer. As most of our documentary evidence comes from more well-to-do laymen, or from monastic account rolls (before 1536/9) we may be in fact be looking at unusually high ('saloon-bar')

prices. Alternatively the prices may be specially low, expressing the obligation felt by the potter to his landlord.

In the post-medieval period the potter was often in competition with the makers of treen and metal vessels, and here some comparisons may be sought. Pipe-makers also with their relatively low-value commodity were in a fairly similar position from c.1600-1800 and we may examine their production rate and profit-margin with some advantage.

Attempts have been made on many occasions to compare ancient prices with those of our own day, but to little avail, firstly because the current prices are no longer current by the time the book or article appears, and secondly because the relative value placed on various staple goods fluctuates considerably - hence the proportions of disposable income spent on particular items may vary from decade to decade, century to century. Even a staple item like wheat fluctuated greatly in price according to the harvest and other 'free market economy' reasons although it is perhaps the most satisfactory yardstick available.

What are the sources of documentary evidence for prices and values of pottery? Probably the three most important sources are monastic and household accounts and probate inventories. These can also give us the contemporary names (and hence uses) of the various vessels.

Looking first at the former categories of evidence we have an example in a passing reference in the Account Roll of the manor of Saleby in 1358/9⁴ to:

12 earthenware pots	12d
4 earthenware bowls for putting milk in	4½d

and in 1450 a single surviving Compotus Roll of Stainfield Priory⁵ accounts for:

2 Ale pots	9d
------------	----

A few years later the Tattershall Household⁶ Book for 1475-6 records:

3 doz white cups	15d
1 doz alepots	2s1d
1 doz spigots for the aforesaid alepots	2d
1 pot for the lord's cook	3d

Rev ask?

This raises several questions: are the white cups of the so-called 'Tudor Green', or are they of the white stoneware of Siegburg, or are they actually of ash-wood? We shall never know. Did the potter supply the spigots for the alepots or was there a separate supplier? If so, then were ale-pots provided with a standard sized spigot-hole for off-the-peg spigots? Finally, and this is a question of wider significance, what material was the lord's cook's pot made from? One might suspect iron rather than earthenware, but is the price appropriate?

From the Ancaster Household Accounts for 1562⁷ we obtain not only a price but also a supplier, one Thomas Bucke of Toynton:

11 doz of milk pannes and diverse other greate
and small potts 20s7d.

Unfortunately the diversity of goods accounted for renders it impossible to suggest a unit price, though it averages out about 1.8d per pot. The 'milk pannes' here as elsewhere are presumably pancheons.

In the same year the purchase of two chamber pots for 4d is recorded at Grimsthorpe.⁸ With probate inventories we are often in even greater difficulties. When the deceased's goods were appraised by a group of (usually) neighbours or associates it is reasonable to suspect that valuations will be exceedingly variable in their reliability. Round figures are common, mostly expressed in terms of marks or nobles even if actually written in pounds, shillings, and pence. Inventories are usually most interesting for the light they shed on the general social conditions, the quantity of subsistence equipment, the dialect names which are used to describe it, and occasionally the house plans which can be reconstructed from the room-by-room survey.⁹ References to pottery are usually unspecific, referring perhaps at best to vague numbers of 'earthen vessels'.¹⁰ There are many occasions on which it is impossible to tell

whether the appraisers were describing pottery or some other material - leather, wood, or metal. Even the inventories of working potters contain few, and low value, references to pottery as we have seen. There are two main groups of inventories which offer us more than these scattered and unsatisfactory references to pottery. These are (1) inventories of shopkeepers, particularly those classed as 'pot-sellers', and (2) inventories of apothecaries. The latter are perhaps of greatest interest where they name the vast range of types of medicinal vessel, and their values are likely to indicate their contents. However, given the immense interest at all levels of society in the 17th and 18th century in self-medication, any information on the availability of prepared drugs in containers is of value.

One pot-seller's inventory, that of William Becket of Manthorpe, near Grantham, dated 1722 refers merely to £2 worth of 'potts and glasses',¹¹ but that of Richard Hargrave of Stamford, dated 1720, is exceptionally detailed.¹² The accuracy of the valuation suggests that either the appraisers were extremely knowledgeable about prices (and descriptions) of pottery, or more likely, that the various items had prices marked on them in Hargrave's shop. Some items do not work out at a round figure price; it may be that these were in storage and their prices are wholesale - perhaps worked out from bills or invoices.

A true and perfect Inventory and Appraizmt. of the Goods and Chattells of Richard Hargrave late of Stamford in the County of Lincoln Potter dated taken and Appraized by us whose hands are hereunto sett and subscribed the 11th day of March Anno Dni 1720 as followeth.

	£	s	d
Imprimis - Purse and Apparell	00	10	=
Three Dozen of Flatt Ware in the Shopp	00	12	=
One hundred of course Ware	00	07	=
9: Dozen 11: peices course Ware	00	10	=
8: Dozen halfe pint Nottingham Muggs	00	09	11
One doz: and halfe pidgeon potts	00	03	=
3 doz 8: Venison potts	00	04	2
Two double quarts: 8 ^d : 2 doz: mustard potts 3 ^d	00	03	8
4: posset potts 1 ^s : fifteen porringers 1 ^s : 3 ^d	00	02	3
Eight peices of White Muggs and peices	00	00	8
Three Dozen of butter plates	00	06	=
Thirteen pound halfe Glass Decanthers	00	13	=
Seven punch bowles	00	07	=
Seven small fruit dishes	00	04	1
One large fruit dish	00	01	9
Five fine delph plates	00	01	8
Seven white Tea potts	00	02	4
Two large sugar dishes	00	01	6
Odd Cupps and Sausers	00	01	6
Eighteen pint muggs	00	01	9
Twenty peices coarse ware	00	01	8
17 peices Venison and pidgeon potts	01	01	9
3: dozen halfe butter plates	00	07	=
4: glass Decanthers 2 ^s . 8 ^d Seven Decanthers 2 ^s : 4 ^d	00	05	=
2: trimming Basons: 1 ^s : one Moutess? 8 ^d	00	01	8
Three punch bowles	00	03	=
One dozen halfe glass Salts	00	02	3
Four glass Canisters 2 ^s : 11 ^d fourteen tea potts 3 ^s : 10 ^d	00	06	9
Seven white Muggs 8 ^d : four white Juggs 4 ^d	00	01	=
One Beefe pott	00	01	=

Though the Trade Directories of the 19th century indicate that pot-and-glass sellers were not all uncommon there is little evidence from earlier dates that they existed. Both these 18th century inventories actually refer to the trade as 'potter'. Probably other dealers lurk under a variety of aliases - it is abundantly clear that inventories of a great many and diverse small general shopkeepers are calendared under 'Mercer' - perhaps a title to which many had aspirations. Here also may be found odd and variable references to pottery. Some examples may be seen in the following series of extracts from probate inventories of Lincolnshire shopkeepers of the 16th and 17th centuries. Among the 250,000 or so inventories in the Lincolnshire Archives Office there are a very considerable number relating to shopkeepers. There is no simple way of deducing in advance what items each may contain, and how relevant it may be without calling it up and studying it in detail, so these examples are drawn from those inventories partially described by L.B. and M. Barley in The Lincolnshire Historian.¹³

Inventories of Lincolnshire Shopkeepers who stocked Pottery

INV 79/237 Thomas Preestes of Spalding, 1590, Haberdasher

Item one dowzen of pots	vi d	($\frac{1}{2}$ d each)
Item one dowzen of little potes	vi d	(in the Further Shope) ($\frac{1}{2}$ d each)
Item halfe a dowzen of shovelles ii		
greate skepes iiii		
cartesaddles iii		
dowzen of trenchers and all the potes	iiii s	
with other implements		(in the Nether Shoppe)

INV 113/313 Thomas Cobbe of Sutton St. James, 1613, Chapman

Item halfe a grosse of Tobacco pipes	ii s	(3 per 1d)
Item blacke potts vii dozen	v s iii d	($\frac{3}{4}$ d each)

INV 136/503 Ralph Clarke of Grantham, 1630, Mercer

(In his own dwelling house are a large number of plates, dishes, etc. all valued at x d per pound, evidently of pewter)

In the Little Buttery ... divers earthen potts (inc. total
xxii s)

In the Shoppe. Item galley potts, glasses, searses
& Boston Jugges vii li.vi s. vi d

INV 139/21 James Smyth of Stamford, 1630, Tallowchandler

Goods in the Shoppe		
Item three score blacke juggs	x s	(2d each)
In the Matted Chamber		
Item fifteene Juggs	vi s	(4.8p each)
Itm thirteene grose of tobacco pipe	xxvi s	(6 per 1d)
In the High Garret Chamber		
Item blacke Potts & Juggs	xiii s iiii d	
In the Spadleman? Chamber		
Imprimis one hundred dozen of black potts	ii li x s iii d	($\frac{1}{2}$ d each)

INV 141/140 Thomas Walton of Grantham, 1634, Ironmonger

In the High Chamber		
a? dozen of birded Jugges	ii s vi d	(2½d each)
In the Beasome Chamber		
two? saltes ii hundreds of pottes	xi s	
In the Chamber over the Kitching		
(various items inc. black pottes --- total vii s)		
In the Chamber over the Shoppe (at Folkingham)		
(various items inc. foure dozen of black pottes --- total	vi li. iiii s (-)	

INV 96/202B John Rainton of Lincoln, 1602, Fishmonger

In the Shoppe	
Itm earthen potts, muggs, earthen pannes & wooden kans	xxvi s. viii d.

INV 180/206 William Dent of Horncastle, 1679, Ironmonger

Two Dozen of Blew Juggs vii s	3½d
Seaven dozen of Stone bottles att ii s iiii d	
a dozen	2½d
Eight dozen of Black potts att xi d y ^e dozen	11/12d
Twenty Gallie potts att iiii d y ^e peece	4d
Eleaven dozen of White Gallow pottes att v s vi d	½d
ffive dozen of Sweetmeat potts att xi s	2½d
Three dozen of plates and Basons att ii s vi d	2½d
Dozen ffoure large White candle stickes att v s vi d	4½d
One dozen of trencher Sallts att x s iii d	10¼d
Two dozen of plats more	
ffoure large Crachuals att iiii s	1s
ffoure middle Crachuals att xi d a peece	11d
ffive dozen of White smale potts att xi s	2/5d
One dozen of Large att iii s	3d
Three dozen of smale Nutmegg potts att xvi d a doz	1½d
ffoure flower potts att xi d a peece	11d
Eight smale flower potts att vi d a peece	6d
Eight smale Whit Basons att ii s	3d
a ?barrel of Whit Salts and potts att iii s vi d	-
Two large possett potts att iii s iv d	1s8d
Two middle possett potts att ii s vi d	1s3d
foure Whit chamber potts iii s	9d

It will be seen that appraisers were frequently unspecific in their descriptions and that the 'pots' and 'little pots' in INV 79/237 were given a similar price of $\frac{1}{2}$ d each, while in INV 136/503 the nature of the plates and dishes is only given away by their valuation at so much per pound, which would not apply to earthenware but only to pewter. In the case of Thomas Cobbe (INV 113/313) however the 'black potts' are clearly recognizable as the vessels brought into Boston by coasters from London and Lynn (see previous chapter). At this date they are almost certainly Blackware cups. At $\frac{3}{4}$ d each they represent a small fine item rather than a large coarse one and are thus slightly more expensive than the standard 'little pot'. However, the same items are valued at $\frac{1}{2}$ d each in INV 139/21. This dates from seventeen years later. Had prices gone down or does the new price represent the benefits of bulk buying? 1200 cups would require a considerable amount of storage space. The 'Juggs' in the same inventory are relatively expensive at nearly 5d each. Perhaps they are imported, as might be suspected of the 'Boston Jugges' of INV 136/503. The 'black jugs' in James Smyth's shop are likely to have been the apparently rare Blackware jugs, or if the 'black' is generic rather than descriptive, we may be looking at the contemporary names of jugs such as those that contained the Grantham and Newark Civil War coin-hoards (see above, Chapter 3).

Thomas Walton's inventory of 1634 provides one fascinating peice of information. The 'dozen of birded Jugges' at 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d each can hardly be anything but the so-called 'Bellarmine' jugs,¹⁴ which are still referred to on the Continent by their descriptive name Bartmänner or Bartmannkrüger, to which the English 'bearded jug' would well equate. The price does seem very cheap, however, and the primary use of many of these vessels as containers for spirits - mercury etc. - should be borne in mind. Very large imports of these items are recorded through the Port of Boston (see preceeding chapter).

The most detailed of all these inventories is undoubtedly that of William Dent of Horncastle. The whole inventory runs to many folios, and the pottery is contained in two short sections. The relatively high prices of individual items are partly accounted for by the later date, but also partly by the proportion of tin-glazed earthenwares which are implied at this date by the term 'white'. Indeed Dent seems to have had in stock little or nothing in the way of coarse earthenwares. The meaning of 'Crachuall' is not known; flower pots could be of local production but their relative costs suggest that they were large and ornamental, not utilitarian, and perhaps reflects interest in gardening. The cost of the posset pots may indicate that they were either of tin-glazed earthenware or slipware. Though the 'stone bottles' are not described as 'bearded' the prices accord well enough with those belonging to Thomas Walton,

and in any case by 1679 it would not be unusual for the bearded face to have either disappeared completely or at least to have lost its dominant size relative to the vessel. The 'Blew Juggs' are most probably of Westerwald stoneware, or conceivably English copies, though it is not an impossible description for tin-glazed jugs decorated in cobalt.¹⁵ At all events at 3½d each they do not represent much profit on the wholesale value of 3d each which is recorded in the Boston Port Books - only ten years earlier.

Looking over the other items one can clearly see the typical later 17th century spread of vessels: 'Gallie potts' and 'White smale potts' for medicaments; plates, basons, trencher salts, nutmeg pots, sweetmeat pots and possets for the table; and candlesticks and chamber pots for the bedroom. What is missing, and very obvious in the light of earlier records, is any stock for the kitchen, especially in coarse earthenware. William Dent and Richard Hargrave are united in selling principally the more expensive imported, or at least not locally made, items. This undoubtedly would have an effect on the local potters whose wares may now have been sold mainly in markets or by chapmen. This would certainly depress the prices they could expect to obtain, and may be one force which drove many potters to part-time or seasonal production. Traditional markets were beginning to disappear, and for townsfolk at least local earthenwares were becoming a

feature of the past, replaced by cheap and more attractive imports.

This effect has been noticed by Brears,¹⁶ and the growth of national centres of production such as Stoke at the expense of others has often been described. It may be put down to improvements in communications and advances in technique in potting centres as well as to increased expectations on the part of customers. In Lincolnshire's case the 'better communications' were more with northern Europe than with the rest of Britain.

What is perhaps surprising is that the local potters at such places as Bolingbroke managed to survive competition for so long. It is clear that prices for their products remained relatively stationary despite gradual increases in the cost of living, and tradition, together with a small residual market caused by the isolation of Lincolnshire, may have led to their persistence. The discussion of prices of pottery after the middle of the 18th century is hampered by lack of evidence. A moderate amount of research has been carried out by students of porcelain and finer wares but the evidence for coarse wares, if it exists, has yet to be published.¹⁷ Probate inventories are rare after 1750, and wills are rarely specific. Diarists such as Rev. James Woodforde¹⁸ provide much interesting information on small purchases and on the mechanics of trade in the later part of the century in

Fig.28

Norfolk but Lincolnshire has no Woodforde. There do not seem to be any satisfactory household accounts, either, for the Lincolnshire of this period. Among the splendid collection relating to the Monson family¹⁹ only one set of accounts, relating to purchases from Wedgwood, is of any real interest in this study. It may be that the lack of interest in such mundane matters by the august Historical Manuscripts Commission has denied us access to further information, but examination of calendars of papers of most of the principal families in the LAO does not induce much optimism. This gap is a large and important one, which students of economic history might well be encouraged to fill.

5.2 The Relative Position of Potters

We have seen that there was a quite remarkable degree of stability in pottery prices from c.1350-1720, with $\frac{1}{2}$ d for a small pot, 1d for an average one and 2d plus for larger or more elaborate types persisting throughout the whole period. Fig.28

The corresponding levels of prices for staple commodities show just how much the potters were being squeezed by rising costs and more or less stationary income from production. There were undoubtedly a number of responses to changing conditions, varying from going out of business, or diversification of interests, to accepting factory methods and a reduced standard of living.²⁰ Unfortunately these are difficult to demonstrate.

One of the best sources on comparative prices is J.E.T. Rogers. According to him it took a skilled artisan 64 weeks in 1591 to buy what in 1495 would have needed 10 weeks.²¹ As we have seen already the potters, who were just such skilled artisans, were quite unable to command even a fraction of this increase for individual wares. Volume production and the economies of scale do not seem to have been open to the poorly capitalized potters of Lincolnshire, so while the 17th and 18th centuries may have seen some improvements in production and perhaps a higher success rate in firing, these alone could not do more than slow the decline of the industry.

Apart from the general fall in the purchasing power of money items such as food prices weighed especially heavily on those with low or static incomes. The price of wheat varied dramatically according to the weather, quality of harvest, and demand. Food prices rose nearly seven times from the late 16th to 17th centuries,²² while average wages rose by a factor of only three. The price of wheat over the first two centuries of this study (1450-1650) are indicated by the annexed graph.

According to Thirsk²³ the evidence from College estates demonstrates that from 1500 to 1640 prices rose twice as steeply as wages, and of course as largely self-employed workers potters did not enjoy a statutory wage level. Land values also more than doubled in the period 1540-90,²⁴ and this may have been accompanied by a corresponding rise in the level of rents. Unfortunately we have no evidence of the levels of rent paid by post-medieval Lincolnshire potters. Some of them²⁵ were undoubtedly reasonably well-off, though not perhaps by the standards of some other places in the Midlands.²⁶ Those who left substantial amounts, according to their probate inventories, had high proportionate interests in agriculture. If they suffered from increasing rents they were also probably protected from fluctuating cereal prices, at least for their own consumption, by growing their own crops. Some, perhaps, as tenants or sub-tenants of the Duchy of Lancaster, may also have benefitted from the unrealistically low rentals and

Figs.27,28

slower rates of increases noted in some areas on Crown and Duchy properties.²⁷ However, despite any cushioning effects which agriculture may have provided for the potters there can be little doubt that the low returns on pottery production made it vulnerable to relatively minor problems. Low-cost fuel and clay made it a practicable proposition, but if either of these were threatened then there is little doubt that the potters could not afford to seek alternative sources. Again the fact that pottery as a trade tended to be a family concern meant that it tended to be passed on from father to son without the costs of a formal apprenticeship and no doubt the belief that the family trade should be preserved would tend to steer it through times of adversity and preserve it despite unpropitious and worsening economic conditions.

To sum up there is quite a considerable body of information from the later Middle Ages to the mid-18th century on prices and values of pottery, from which certain trends can be extrapolated, but in individual cases it is not easy to be certain of what sort of vessels are being discussed, of whether prices are being given by knowledgeable people, or of whether prices are wholesale or retail. We may compare this state of affairs with that relating to clay tobacco-pipes.²⁸ Here the product varies in size and elaboration but not fundamentally in kind, and evidence suggests that increases in price were rare over long periods of general inflation, with a consequent reduction in profits. We can

only suspect that potters were in much the same position. Prices of other commodities rose continually and steeply during the period of study, and there are the strongest indications that the status of potters, never high, was doomed to stagnation or a downward trend, despite attempts at better production methods. Why pottery products retained such a constant price level against a picture of rising commodity prices is far from clear. Undoubtedly more attractive or better-finished products imported from better-developed potteries in England or from the Continent robbed the local potters of the better end of their traditional market. However, even these items were relatively cheap as we have already seen. The depressing effect on overall pottery price levels must have been quite marked and public expectations of the right price for pottery products must have been heavily reduced, especially from the 17th century onwards.

In the next chapter we will consider what types of pottery were made and used in Lincolnshire, and the uses they were put to. This becomes significant in interpreting groups deposited as rubbish or by some chance accident.

Notes

1. M. St. Clare Byrne, Elizabethan Life in Town and Country, London, 1961, 307 ff.
2. M.M. Postan, The Medieval Economy and Society, Harmondsworth, 1975, 174 ff.
3. However most evidence points to the opposite; the replacement of service by cash payments and the buying in of supplies not available locally, even among the lower ranks of the free peasantry. The difficulty is still in understanding such an apparently simple question as how anyone could pay for a mug of ale when the smallest denomination coin represented perhaps between 1/10 and 1/6 of a day's pay?
4. R.C. Dudding, History of Saleby with Thoresthorpe, 1922, 149-50.
5. LAO, MCD 812.
6. E.M. Myatt-Price, 'The Tattershall Household Book', LAASRP, 7, pt.2, 1958, 153.
7. LAO, Anc. VII/A/2 f109v.
8. G.A.J. Hodgett, Tudor Lincolnshire, Lincoln, 1975, 156.
9. M.W. Barley, 'A Glossary of Names for Rooms in Houses of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in Foster, I.Ll., & Alcock, L. (eds.), Culture and Environment. Essays in Honour of Sir Cyril Fox, London, 1963, 479-501.
10. Occasionally we find useful details such as in LAO, INV 175/55, Robert Chamberlin of Gedney, 1672, who had in his dairy -

'Six pansions & two bowles & two earthen potts -- 0-6-8
Six earthen potts -- 0-1-6'

11. LAO, LCC Admon. 1722/17.
12. LAO, Wills O. 2019; A.J. White, 'A Stamford Potseller's Stock in 1720', Post-Med.Arch., 13, 1979, 290-2.
13. Two articles by L.B. and M.W. Barley, respectively 'Lincolnshire Craftsmen in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries' and 'Lincolnshire Shopkeepers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries' The Lincolnshire Historian, 2, no. 5, 1959, 7-22, and 2, no. 9, 1962, 7-22, are a most useful key to the vast quantities of partially calendared probate inventories in the LAO but carelessness in proof-reading renders many of the references infuriatingly inaccurate.
14. See references to preceding chapter, no. 16. 'Bearded Jug' is a much more appropriate and contemporary name for this type of vessel and the name begs no questions about the depth of northern European anti-Catholic feeling.
15. Conceivably of the type decorated with sponged mottling.
16. P.C.D. Brears, The English Country Pottery, Its History, and Techniques, Newton Abbot, 1971, esp. Chapter 2.
17. But see J. Draper, 'Inventory of Ann Shergold, ceramic dealer in Blandford, Dorset', Post-Med. Arch. 16, 1982, 85-91. The inventory dates from 1759, and is complementary to the Stamford inventory of 1720, see note 12 above.

18. J. Beresford, The Diaries of an English Country Parson; James Woodforde, 1758-1802, Oxford, 5 volumes, 1931, passim.
19. LAO, Monson Vouchers, 12, 1802. 2/5.
20. All these factors are recalled by Mr Richard Bateson who worked in various potteries at Burton in Lonsdale in the early 20th century, and whose forebears had operated them in a similar fashion for one and a half centuries.
21. J.E.T. Rogers, A History of Agriculture and Prices in England, Oxford, 1866-1900, vol. IV, 610-73.
22. ibid.
23. J. Thirsk (ed.), The Agrarian History of England and Wales, Cambridge, IV, 19, 435; V, pt. 1, 1984, 89-128; V, pt.2, 1985, 1-83.
24. ibid., IV, 336.
25. eg. Robert Stanney, Bolingbroke, 1736; Christopher Parker, Bourne, 1624.
26. L.M. Weatherill, 'The Growth of the Pottery Industry in England, 1660-1815', Post-Med. Arch. 17, 1983, 21n.
27. eg. in the Border Counties; see H.G. Ramm, R.W. McDowall, & E. Mercer, Shielings and Bastles, RCHM(E), London, 1970, 71.
28. A. Oswald, Clay Pipes for the Archaeologist, BAR, 14, Oxford, 1975.

CHAPTER 6

POTTERY TYPES AND THEIR FUNCTIONS

When archaeologists excavate deposits the fragments of ceramics that they find are not often classified by use, but more often by some convenient generic name, or form, or fabric.¹ This is very curious, since the potter clearly made the vessel for a specific purpose, and probably marketed it as such. The buyer and user would also have known from the shape and finish what its purpose was and would buy it because of a specific need. The purpose which the potter, buyer and user all had in mind determined its shape, size and finish, and for this purpose through perhaps centuries of experience had evolved the best solution that the technology of the period, and the purse of the buyer, could find.

Some work has been carried out on the continent into the use and breakage patterns of cooking-vessels,² and this is now being taken up in this country.³ The work on the medieval evidence tends to consist of plotting of the spread of sherds in eg., peasant houses, and of the examination of residual deposits from food etc. on the inner surfaces of the sherds, and carbon deposits on the outside. In the post-medieval period we have the advantage of possessing relatively plentiful documentary evidence for the names of vessels, and for their uses in some cases.⁴ The difficulty lies in connecting the two unequivocally with the excavated sherds.

In the absence or scarcity of materials such as glass or non-ferrous metals ceramic vessels were put to uses which would not suggest themselves immediately to a modern mind. Hence items such as explosive grenades might be made from spherical pots with a hole for the fuse.⁵ On sites attacked or defended in the Civil War period the finding of such as these may now be widely anticipated. Ceramic items connected with music may also be found from the medieval period onwards. Whistles, horns (such as the Pilgrims' Horns used at Aachen)⁶ and accoustic pots⁷ to aid choral singing were all widely made and used.

Of course there are also problems of identification. Some items were reused for a different purpose. Domestic vessels, when old and damaged, might spend a long time in barn or crew-yard as containers for veterinary treatments and salves. Other items, made for one purpose, might well lend themselves to another. Chamber-pots might well be bought by painters as ideal vessels for mixing paint in, while from the evidence of Roughton Church a job-lot of Blackware mugs might be used to contain raw pigments, having paper covers tied over their rims to keep the contents dry.⁸ Stoneware vessels frequently came to this country as containers for raw goods,⁹ but enjoyed a second career as storage or drinking vessels.

Fig. 3

The main uses for pottery vessels can be broken down into at least seven categories. These are:

1. Food storage and preparation.
2. Drinking.
3. Domestic/medicinal.
4. Garden and yard.
5. Kiln furniture.
6. Building materials.
7. Miscellaneous.

As might be expected the first two categories account for a high proportion of products. During the period in question (1450-1850) there were of course many changes, and one major change had already taken place, perhaps as early as the mid-14th century. This was the banishment of ceramics from the table to the kitchen and replacement by vessels of other materials. This took some time to progress down the social scale, and by the late 15th or early 16th century pottery cups, for which the English medieval counterpart is rare indeed had made their appearance.¹⁰ During the 17th century plates, in tin-glazed earthenware or slipware, were beginning to be commonplace. Their rise was at the expense of pewter and treen products,¹¹ though all may have been used side by side, or in a nice social grading in larger houses. Throughout the period however ale-pots and jugs must have been a commonplace sight in farmhouses and poorer houses, while jugs again and costrels too stood in the corner of the harvest-field filled with ale and small beer. An elaborate mammiform costrel is among wasters dumped in the ditch of Bolingbroke Castle. Ale-pots seem to

make their appearance in the late 15th or 16th century as do chafing-dishes.¹² The more elaborate of the latter must have been used at table, especially those imported from the Saintonge district of France¹³ though in wills of the period the only chafing-dishes mentioned seem to be of brass perhaps because of their high value. The use of such vessels probably marks the gradual retreat from the Great Hall to the private chamber, where cookery and the presentation of food was at a more intimate scale.

In the kitchen the medieval cooking-pot standing in the ashes had long been replaced by metal cauldrons but small individual vessels such as fish-dishes and dripping-pans continued to be made, as did Dutch ovens, used for frying bacon or baking apples in the radiant heat of the fire.¹⁴ In the kitchen and dairy there was much recourse to large open-mouthed pancheons, used at pig-killing times, and for rising dough and as convenient cream separators. We have already seen a 1562 reference to 'milk pannes' which almost certainly equates to pancheons. They are one of the most enduring types of pottery, ranging from the 13th to the 20th centuries in Lincolnshire, and only replaced latterly in the dairy by centrifugal separators.¹⁵ Mugs for drinking have already been mentioned. Again they tended to replace cups of horn or treen, and it is interesting to consider the possibility that German stoneware mugs were accompanied by continental drinking habits and perhaps by the introduction of beer, which gradually began

Fig.54

to replace ale.¹⁶ Another popular drink was posset.¹⁷ Here the mixture of milk and spices curdled with wine led to the introduction of a special vessel with twin side handles and a spout set low in the body so that the drink could be sucked from below the layer of froth on the surface. The third category, domestic and medicinal, is in some ways a disparate group. At one end of the spectrum we have chamber pots and urinals, at the other a wide range of pots associated with self-medication and with the emerging science of medicine. Nonetheless there is a coherence in this because many were associated with the sickroom and with changing personal habits.

Urinals tend to occur on pre-Dissolution monastic sites and sites where there were celibate clergy. For obvious reasons these closed-form vessels, usually with a hole in the upper side and with a lateral handle, tend to occur in male-only contexts, such as monasteries, eg. Humberston Abbey. However, there is also an implication of high status inherent in their use as monasteries had numbers of chambers devoted to different purposes and usually included separate dormitories and rere-dorters. Hygiene and night-time discipline are implied, together with a sufficiency of servants to empty the utensils. Urinals and jugs occur in a probably 16th century context at the Bishop's Palace in Lincoln,¹⁸ at the very end of their date range. Chamber-pots on the other hand seem to become common only in the late 16th and 17th century,¹⁹ again perhaps as a result of

Figs.
46,47

greater privacy and social complexity affecting new social groups and changes in house types. Chamber pots vary greatly in size and finish. Archaeologically they can sometimes be identified by the lime or ammoniac deposits on the interior, but at the smaller end of the scale they can be confused with handled bowls of perhaps quite different function.

'Perfume' or 'fuming' pots were used in the sickroom, partly to counter unpleasant smells and partly because it was thought that the smells themselves caused infection. Only three fragments have been found in Lincolnshire at Boston, Caistor and Hareby,²⁰ but others have probably been missed because only undiagnostic body sherds were found. In each case the vessel is of a jar-shaped form with perforations and openwork around its waist; the base should show the marks where the perfuming substance was burnt. Possibly examples of this form have been confused with chafing-dishes. At the medicinal end of the range are jars, pots and 'albarelli',²¹ for the storage of drugs and ointments. Some of these were made or imitated in semi-coarse fabrics such as yellow-ware or other light-firing clays. The majority of medicinal wares in the 17th and 18th centuries were made, however, in tin-glazed earthenware, no doubt because of its clean white appearance.²² Bulk containers for wet drugs do not seem to occur frequently in the archaeological record although there are very large numbers of complete examples in existence. They were tall,

Fig.53

with a pedestal base, and a tubular spout, and with the contents identified by Latin abbreviations and/or astrological symbols. Large containers for dry drugs and ointments, usually known as 'albarelli' from their Hispano-Moresque origins, are very common as archaeological finds, together with small hemispherical cups on footstands, with rims for paper covers to be fastened on. These latter, which must be regarded as both the stock-in-trade of doctors and quacks, and also the everyday contents of household medicine cupboards, occur in some profusion.²³

In a final and less obviously medicinal category are those small costrel-shaped vessels, which occur in both Cistercian ware and Blackware. These could be used for a variety of purposes, but the smallest could hardly have been useful containers for drink. The finding of a large number of such vessels in an apothecary's shop in York in 1885 suggests an alternative use, for 'draughts' of various sorts. The form of these miniature costrels, flattened back and front, would make them easy to pack for bulk transport, perhaps to be sold at fairs.²⁴

Fig.31

The pottery of garden and yard is somewhat more difficult to tie down. A number of superannuated kitchen vessels such as costrels and pipkins may have been used as containers for salves and other preparations for livestock. Pottery chicken feeders must have once been quite common. One was found at Vicar's Court, Lincoln. It has a series of

Fig.35

concentric dividers for water or feed and is in unglazed earthenware, as are so many of these outdoor wares.²⁵ We have documentary evidence from the 17th century for plant pots and nutmeg pots (presumably for growing or preserving nutmeg).²⁶ Much of the garden pottery tends by definition to lie outside the reach of archaeologists. Broken fragments occur no doubt on the sites of nurseries and on garden terraces, and in the absence of any excavated formal gardens in Lincolnshire, remain to be found. It is known that items such as tree pots of very large size were made for terraces. Other distinctive items survive only by chance. A set of very distinctive large rhubarb pots (pots with lids but no bottoms) made it would seem in the local brickyard, survive at Hackthorn Hall. One is now in the Museum of Lincolnshire Life. They are probably of 18th or early 19th century date.

Watering pots are a common late medieval survival. Some have a projecting spout terminating in a perforated rose, while others have a perforated base, the release of water being controlled by the covering of a small hole on the top by the thumb.²⁷ A fragment of such a pot decorated in sgraffito was found among wasters at Bourne. The small size and decoration of these pots suggests that they were used perhaps by ladies for watering flowers and herbs rather than by gardeners.

Fig.56

One of the oddest types of outdoor pot is the sparrow-pot. One in the City & County Museum at Lincoln came from a building in the city centre, while at Bolingbroke a cottage at the south-western end of the village still has two such pots set under the eaves. An introduction into the eastern counties from Holland in the late 16th century they had a long life-span. A hole in the rim held a twig for the bird to alight on while a keyhole shaped slot in the based helped to locate the pot firmly over a projecting peg in the eaves. The pot lay horizontally serving both as a nest and a trap. Farmers paid well for the killing of sparrows which were a nuisance to the crops, while in a hard winter the birds provided a useful source of protein to poor families.²⁸

In the circular multiflue kilns of Lincolnshire kiln furniture was of the simplest. Flat tiles, including at Boston and perhaps Kirkstead reused medieval roofers, were used as 'shelves' in the stacking process, while small pieces of waste pottery were used as 'parting sherds' to stop glazed pieces from sticking firmly together. The only specially made pieces of kiln furniture in use were unglazed clay cylinders with bases but no tops, which also seem to have been used in stacking. Even these may have had other functions, and the smaller ones could be inkpots, the larger butter-pots. However they do not seem to be found away from the kiln sites. They are believed to occur only at Toynton All Saints, and are perhaps late survivors of a

Fig.29

medieval technique which was going out of use in the 16th and 17th century.

Building materials may have been produced in local pottery kilns, but it is not until the 18th and 19th century that any close relationship developed between potters and brick-and-tile makers. Nonetheless from the 15th century onwards a number of elaborate roof finials and louvres appear, most of them having a closer connection with the plastic arts of the potter than of the brickmaker. Among these are the unique bifacial head on a ridge tile from Lincoln,²⁹ and the two miniature 'houses' still set on the ridges of houses in Tattershall and Horncastle.³⁰ More fragmentary pieces include the leg of an armoured figure from the site of Eresby House,³¹ or the tonsured monk riding a pony or mule, originally found in Stamford.³² At Toynton the occurrence of bricks in the kiln structures³³ may suggest a closer relationship between the two crafts than has hitherto been recognized, and this may be confirmed by the finding of spigot-jointed waterpipes at Toynton and Boston³⁴ in circumstances suggesting that they also were products of the pottery-kilns. Later the brickyard elements, as at Louth and East Keal, were to dominate, with the pottery as an adjunct to the making of unglazed plant pots, drain tiles, and large horticultural wares by moulding or slab-building.

A final category includes items such as models and toys. Even here we cannot be certain whether fragmentary finds fit into the categories of 'useful' or 'ornamental'. For example a piece found in excavations at Bolingbroke,³⁵

Fig.50

modelled in the form of horses joined at the hind quarters, might be merely ornamental, but a more complete find from Lincoln³⁶ suggests that it was part of a standing cup or even a table centre, with a dish carried on the backs of three horses, set at 120° to each other. A clearer 'model'

Fig.53

is the strange little figure, probably of late medieval date, made from a gently squeezed slab of clay, with punched dots for eyes, found at Toynton All Saints earlier this century.³⁷ Other human figures include a number of females in Tudor dress,³⁸ in either ordinary or reversed Cistercian ware. Some of the latter, clearly paralleled at Ticknall kilns in Derbyshire, appear to have no obvious function though the former seem usually to have a modelled clay basket at their waists, indicating that they may have been elaborate table salts.³⁹

Fig.53

A whistle in the form of a jester's head, found near Tattershall Castle, is an earthenware copy of a type known better in German stoneware.⁴⁰ The whistle is separately made from a small clay tube, and another example with a glazed mouthpiece but no jester is in the Hossack collection at Lincoln.⁴¹ It is very probable that items such as whistles and clay 'alleys' were judiciously distributed to children by travelling pot-hawkers as a sort

Fig.53

of ground-bait, to encourage further trade. Lighting plays a relatively minor part in Lincolnshire ceramics, and there is as yet no evidence of the making of ceramic lanterns.

However candlesticks are not uncommon, occurring at a number of Lincolnshire kiln-sites,⁴² while fragments of a Midlands yellow-ware candlestick were found at Vicars' Court, Lincoln.⁴³ It seems likely that in poorer households rushlights were in common use, candles being the preserve of the better off. Rushlights were usually fixed in holders of wood and metal.⁴⁴ Even users of candles did not always use a candlestick. There is manifest evidence from the west wing of Gainsborough Old Hall that candles were fixed to frames and partitions by nails driven through their bottoms, leaving the characteristic burn mark where they finally guttered out. Candlesticks of metal were also available from the 17th century and occur frequently in probate inventories. A number of rectangular ceramic dishes with side handles may have been used for steeping rushlights in mutton fat.

Fig.35

Dutch influence was probably stronger in East Anglia and Holderness than in Lincolnshire and there was less imitation or use of imported Dutch vessels compared with ports such as Hull. There is as yet no clear evidence for the square-topped vessels shaped like pipkins which Dutch genre paintings show as commonplace, used as holders for charcoal from which smokers lit their pipes.⁴⁵ However, some of the sherds found with irregular perforations in their sides

may be either fuming pots (see above) or that other characteristic Dutch vessel, the firepot. These, again filled with glowing charcoal, fitted into perforated boxes of ceramic or metal and women placed them under their feet or long skirts while engaged in static and cold tasks such as sewing and lacemaking.⁴⁶

This foregoing essay cannot do more than touch the surface of the subject. It must be remembered, however, that the vast preponderance of ceramic finds fit into a few well-defined types, eg. jugs or pancheons, and other, minority, uses may be indicated by the merest handful of more specialist types, often represented by a single sherd. Certain types of deposit, especially rubbish pits, are likely to show us a clearer cross-section of types in contemporary and common use. From the functions and names of pottery vessels we now move on to look at their uses for dating purposes and to a selection of substantial groups from Lincolnshire which can be analysed both by date and function.

Notes

1. eg. in Roman and later pottery we have names such as 'Castor Boxes', 'Poppy-Head Beakers', and 'E-ware'. Examples like these could be found for almost any period.
2. F. Piponnier, 'Une maison villageoise du XI^{ve} siècle: le mobilier', in Renaud, J.G.N., (ed.) Rotterdam Papers II. A Contribution to Medieval Archaeology, Rotterdam, 1975, esp. 163-7.
3. S. Moorhouse, 'The Site Distribution of Pottery as Evidence of Function: A Discussion of Some Case Studies', in Vynēr, B. & Wrathmell, S. (eds.) Studies in Medieval and Later Pottery in Wales Presented to J.M. Lewis, Cardiff, 1987, 161-87.
4. eg. From potsellers' lists such as those of Richard Hargrave of Stamford, 1720, (LAO, Wills. O.2019) or of William Dent of Horncastle, 1679, (LAO, INV. 180/206).
5. One was found in a Civil War deposit at Dudley Castle, see G. Egan, 'Post-Medieval Britain in 1984', Post-Med. Arch. 19, 1985, 162-3. See also examples from Leicester in L. Jewitt, The Ceramic Art of Great Britain, 1877, 81.
6. G. Reineking-Von Bock, Steinzeug, Cologne, 1986, 260; these would appear to be irrelevant, but a fragmentary example was found in Flaxengate, Lincoln. Its presence has yet to be explained. Another was found in Boston.

7. No examples of accoustic pots have yet been found in Lincolnshire but their existence might be anticipated from their occurrence in neighbouring Yorkshire (Fountains Abbey) and Norfolk (St. Peter Mancroft, Norwich). See K. Harrison, 'Vitruvius and Accoustic Jars in England During the Middle Ages', Trans. Ancient Mons. Soc., NS, 15, 1968, 49-58.
8. A.J. White, 'A Group of 17th Century Blackwares from Roughton Church Lincolnshire', Post-Med. Arch. 14, 1980, 200-203.
9. eg. mercury or spirits in stoneware bottles. The former has been recorded on a number of 17th century wreck sites such as that of the 'Vergulde Draeck', lost off Australia in 1655. See J.N. Green, The Loss of the V.O.C. Jacht Vergulde Draeck, Western Australia, 1656, B.A.R. Supplementary Series, 36, Oxford, 1977.
10. L.G. Matthews & H.J.M. Green, 'Post-Medieval Pottery of the Inns of Court', Post-Med. Arch., 3, 1969, 1-17.
11. Numerous 'dish-turners' are recorded around Tattershall and Coningsby. Examination of probate inventories shows them to have been makers of wooden bowls and dishes. Significantly they seem to disappear from the scene by the mid-17th century.
12. This seems to be true of Lincolnshire, but is not necessarily a nation-wide feature.
13. J.G. Hurst, 'Post Medieval French Imports and English Copies at Lincoln', LHA, 1, 1966, 54-6; A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1975', LHA, 11, 1976, 64.

14. One of these was found among wasters from the Boston kiln. Others were made at Yearsley, Yorks., see P.C.D. Brears, A Catalogue of English Country Pottery Housed in the Yorkshire Museum, York, York, 1968, 19, 31 Fig. 57/a. This type also occurs in Norfolk, see S. Jennings et. al., Eighteen Centuries of Pottery from Norwich, East Anglian Archaeology Report no. 13, Norwich, 1981, 178-80, nos. 1300-1301.
15. The varieties of medieval pancheon rims and forms in Lincolnshire are discussed in R.H. Healey, 'Medieval and Sub-Medieval Pottery in Lincolnshire', (unpublished M.Phil. thesis, University of Nottingham, 1975).
16. 'Greeke, Heresie, Turkey-cocks and Beer / Came into England all in a yeare' as the old rhyme said, according to John Aubrey; O.L. Dick, (ed.), Aubrey's Brief Lives, Harmondsworth, 1972, 52. However, le Patourel suggests a date as early as the 14th century for the change in drinking habits; see P.J. Davey & R. Hodges, Ceramics and Trade, The Production and Distribution of Later Medieval Pottery in North-West Europe, Sheffield, 1983, 33.
17. P.C.D. Brears, The Collector's Book of Country Pottery, Newton Abbot, 1974, 142-6. Posset pots appear in many forms and fabrics, mainly in the 17th and 18th centuries.
18. H. Chapman, G. Coppack & P. Drewett, Excavations at the Bishop's Palace, Lincoln, 1968-72, Occasional Papers in Lincolnshire History and Archaeology, Sleaford, 1975, 52-5.

19. L. Lambton, Chambers of Delight, London, 1983; J. Deetz, In Small Things Forgotten, The Archaeology of Early American Life, New York, 1977, 46-61.
20. For Boston see C.M. Wilson, 'Archaeological Notes, 1969', LHA, 5, 1970, 12 and Fig. II, 1; the Hareby and Caistor sherds are unpublished but are in the City & County Museum, Lincoln, Acc. No. 94.83 and 30.66 respectively. This type is discussed in L.G. Matthews, Antiques of Perfume, London, 1973, 56 and Pls. 33,34.
21. 'Albareello' is the traditional name for a dry-drug jar in the shape of a somewhat flattened baluster, having a barrel centre with footring and rim extending to the same girth. The name is derived from the Arabic, via Southern Spain.
22. Much evidence for medicinal jars comes from surgeon's chests on wrecked ships, such as the 'Mary Rose'. Interestingly enough a number of Siegburg stoneware jugs of 'seconds' quality were in use on this vessel. They were stoppered with wood and contained medicinal substances. See M. Rule, The Mary Rose; the Excavation and Raising of Henry VIII's Flagship, Leicester, 2nd edn., 1983, 186-92.
23. L.G. Matthews, Antiques of the Pharmacy, London, 1971, passim, covers very well the range of medicinal ceramics, as does J.K. Crellin, Medical Ceramics in the Wellcome Institute, Museum Catalogue vol. 1, English and Dutch, London, 1969. Other small hemi-spherical containers similar to these ointment pots

contained pomade. Many have Paris addresses in cobalt blue on the white tin-glazed surface. See Matthews, op. cit. in note 20, Pls. 61, 63.

24. Brears, op. cit. in note 14, 12-14.
25. Although it might seem an odd find for a clergyman's house in the Cathedral Close the probate inventory of John Crispe, 3 March 1645, who almost certainly lived at no. 3, Vicars' Court, includes 'Three henns --- js.vjd.'; see LNQ, vol. 7, 1896, 87-8. The original document is in the LAO, D1 37 3 C 140.
26. cf. the probate inventory of William Dent of Horncastle, Ironmonger, 1679. (LAO, INV 180/206).
27. A number can be seen in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. An alternative use sometimes suggested for these is that of watering the straw on house floors. Whether one accepts this depends upon whether the otherwise unsupported description of English houses by Erasmus, and subsequently much repeated, can be believed.
28. Brears, op. cit. in note 17, 103-4.
29. C.N. Moore, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire, 1974', LHA, 10, 1975, 65. This ridge tile was found before 1848, in which year it was exhibited at the Royal Archaeological Institute, see Memoirs Illustrative of the History and Antiquities of the City and County of Lincoln - 1848, London, 1850, xliii.
30. Both as yet unpublished, although a typescript description by the late Gerald Dunning is in the City & County Museum, Lincoln.

31. J. Marjoram, 'Eresby Manor House, Spilsby', in Field, N. & White, A., (eds.) A Prospect of Lincolnshire, Lincoln, 1984, 79-88, Fig. 6, no. 23.
32. R.H. Healey, 'A Fragment of an Earthenware Figure from Ewerby, Lincs.', South Lincolnshire Archaeology, 1, 1977, 23.
33. In Kiln 2 and in the disturbed kiln in Peasegate Lane (see above).
34. R.H. Healey, pers. comm.
35. In the City & County Museum, Lincoln, acc. no. 83.76.
36. From the site of 'The Monson Arms'; given to the City & County Museum, Lincoln in 1911.
37. In the City & County Museum, Lincoln, acc. no. 690.10.
38. eg. examples from Nettleham, acc. no. 9653.06, and Ruskington (Hossack Coll.), acc. no. 70.80. A further piece, from Stamford, is in the Stamford Museum.
39. Examples from Somerton Castle, acc. no. 86.76, and Addlethorpe, acc. no. 118.80. A complete example appears in J.M. Lewis, Medieval Pottery and Metalwork in Wales, Cardiff, 1978, 13.
40. C. Hayfield & J.G. Hurst, 'Pottery Fools Head Whistles from London and Tattershall, Lincs.', Ant. J. 63, 1983, 380-3.
41. For this collection see A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1980', LHA, 16, 1981, 81.

42. eg. Bolingbroke Castle (finds stored in the Alnwick Tower, Bishop's Palace, Lincoln) and Toynton All Saints (City & County Museum, Lincoln, acc. no. 140.77).
43. City & County Museum, Lincoln, acc. no. 67.73.
44. Several 15th century iron candlesticks were found in the River Witham at Kirkstead in 1787-8. These combine sockets, prickets, and rushlight holders. With them were found some rather later rushlight holders. All are at present on loan to the City & County Museum, Lincoln, from the Society of Antiquaries of London. See G. Pearson, 'Observations on some ancient metallic Arms and Utensils ...', Phil. Trans. LXXXVI, 1796, 395-451; and A.J. White, Antiquities from the River Witham; Pt. 3, Medieval, Lincolnshire Museums Information Sheet, Archaeology Series, 14, 1979, 3-4.
45. eg. Jan Miensz. Molenaer, 'Tavern of the Crescent Moon', and 'Peasants in the Tavern', Cornelius Bega (1632-64) 'Three Peasants Seated Together'; Adrien van Ostade (1610-85) 'Two Peasants Smoking'.
46. eg. Cornelis De Man, 'The Chess Players'; Jan Steen, 'A Welcome for the Visitor'; Cesar Boetius van Everdingen, 'Allegory of Winter' (after 1652); Jacob Ochtervelt (1632-82), 'The Doctor's Visit'.

CHAPTER 7

DATED GROUPS OF POTTERY

7.1 The Principles of Dating

Dated groups of pottery are perhaps the most useful tool available to the archaeologist in assessing dates for individual pieces and in transferring this evidence to sites where the evidence is less clear.

Taken at its most simple the technique can be stated thus:

- 1) examples of pottery types A, B, C and D are found together in close association and together with an item such as a coin, or below a wall known from other sources to date from, say, c.1600.
- 2) Pottery types A, B, C and D can all be seen to have been current in c.1600.
- 3) Found in association elsewhere with types E, F, G etc., the dates for which are as yet unknown, even one example of types A-D can suggest a date range which includes somewhere in it c.1600.
- 4) Now types E-G found elsewhere can carry with them some presumption of a date range which includes somewhere in it c.1600.
- 5) Ideally, we have now a situation in which a date on one site can be transferred across to any number of others, with of course a lesser degree of certainty.

6) By drawing on a number of closely associated pottery groups we should be able to improve the accuracy of dating on individual types; ie. we may be able to see type A is a new type, types B and C well-established and type D as definitely old-fashioned at the time, perhaps accidentally preserved.

7) We are now in a position to provide ranges of currency for each type, and establish relative dates for previously unknown types, so arriving at more sophisticated and less fallible dating systems, which are less likely to transfer a growing range of error as the connections become more remote.

This is an ideal system. Unfortunately reality is somewhat different. A whole range of uncertainties tend to arise in practice which increase the variables and muddy the apparent clarity of the picture. Some of these are summed up in a classic paper by Hurst.¹ We can now look at a whole series of questions which help us to establish how firmly our ideas are rooted in indisputable fact.

1) How reliable is the external dating method? Is the coin/document etc. absolutely explicit in its date or relationship with the group?

2) Is the group archaeologically 'sealed' or 'closed' - ie. not subject to later disturbance and contamination?

3) Is there any residual material in the group - ie. does the group contain sherds which have been disturbed from

earlier strata or which happened to be lying about when the deposit was made? (In Lincoln virtually all medieval and later groups have a high degree of residual Roman content.)

4) If we are relying on internal dating in the group - ie. a dated object - does this date actually apply to the group as a whole?

5) If we have no dated association but instead rely on a closely dated imported sherd or sherds, is the dating really as close as it is claimed to be?

6) Is there a substantial date-range within the group itself? Are we looking at for instance recently-made cheap cooking vessels associated with accidentally broken heirlooms of much earlier date?

7) What is the nature of the deposit? Is it rubbish, or site-clearance, or fill for an unwanted hole or hollow? Does the material come from several originally disparate and unrelated contexts?

8) How well was the group excavated?

9) Is all the group present, or has survival been influenced by selection of an unrepresentative range of vessels or types of sherd?

10) Is it a deposit at all, or does it consist of vessels drawn from a number of contexts which are believed to share a common date? (Such groups may be valid, but it is necessary to know whether they represent an intuitive selection or whether they are derived from strata related to a matrix firmly established from satisfactory external data. Otherwise the argument tends to become circular.)

All these considerations should lead us to establish a hierarchy of groups more or less firmly dated according to the above criteria, ranging perhaps from the isolated and rapidly-filled archaeological feature (eg. a rubbish pit) with undisturbed strata above it, and containing more than one closely datable object other than pottery, to the groups of vessels which appear to be from a uniform date and source, preserved in private hands or in a Museum.² Obviously more use and greater reliability can be expected from the former, but it will also be much less common. The selection of dated groups listed below includes a wide range of reliability.

It might be gathered from the foregoing section that the picture is totally gloomy as far as the possibility of identifying satisfactory dated groups is concerned. This would be a false impression. Hurst's strictures on dating relate strongly to medieval material, but post-medieval material, particularly that of the mid-16th century onwards is different in character. A number of benefits for the post-medieval archaeologist being to appear. Coins become more frequent finds, for instance, as a money economy becomes more or less universal, and from the time of Edward VI³ dates appear on coins, along with mintmarks which can be dated to a precise year. From the time of Charles II⁴ a regular copper coinage also appears and low-value coins such as these are more likely to be lost, and if lost, not to be searched for with quite the same vigour as silver.

Jettons of more easily datable types such as the ubiquitous Nuremberg issues,⁵ and trade tokens of various sorts also make their appearance.

From the 17th century metalwork frequently carries stamps, touch-marks, or even dates, and pewter plates, latten spoons, and small copper-alloy fittings such as buckles, datable by typology or by historical information, become widespread enough to figure in rubbish or foundation deposits. Even glassware⁶ can be used to provide cross-dating for pottery, given the rapidly changing fashions in drinking-glasses, and the well-documented dates of introduction. However, some care is needed, as glassware was prized and had therefore a high survival-rate. It can at least offer a terminus post quem for a deposit if not a close date.

The most widespread and useful external method for dating pottery by association is by the use of clay pipes. The typology and dating of these has been well established⁷ and with a few potential problems such as the continued use of old moulds we have from c.1600 an artifact which is both common and closely datable - that is, provided that there were tobacco smokers at the source of the deposits in question. Even where there are few diagnostic fragments, eg. bowls, surviving, there is a method of analysing suitably large quantities of stems, using the Binford formula⁸. The overriding advantage of clay pipes is that they were almost ubiquitous and tended because of their

fragile nature to have a short life. Diagnostic fragments can usually be placed within a twenty-year date bracket and quantity gives some measure of protection against being misled by a chance survival.

Finally pottery itself, or at least the finer or more decorative wares, begins to carry dates.⁹ Some pieces provide pictorial reference to known historical events,¹⁰ and hence again at least a terminus post quem for the first production of the piece. Even when the items themselves are not dated there are a number of 'milestones' in ceramic history,¹¹ where the date of introduction or currency of a type of ware is independently known. Hence we would not expect to find creamware in a deposit before 1761,¹² nor English tin-glazed earthenware much after 1800.¹³ It must be admitted however that such milestones are not completely reliable, and English stoneware, hitherto believed to begin with Dwight's patent of 1671, can now be seen to originate some years earlier.¹⁴ Indeed there is every chance of some of our most widely-accepted beliefs over dating and attribution being shattered by new evidence, although it is unlikely that dates will be revised by very much. It is well to keep an open mind on such matters.

7.2 Pottery Associated with Coin-hoards

Of the sixty or so coin-hoards¹⁵ of medieval and post-medieval data found in Lincolnshire a very few were contained in pottery vessels. These are listed below. This sort of association of coin and pot is so close that it offers excellent possibilities for dating of the pottery. Of course there is always the possibility of a very old pot being selected for use, as in the case of the famous Tealby find of coins of Henry II, in a Roman carinated bowl which had probably been found in disturbing a local pottery kiln, as it was a waster!¹⁶ There is reason to believe that this is a very unusual occurrence.

1) Alford, 1918. 170 gold coins deposited c.1828, in a jar covered by a piece of slate. The jar is not illustrated in the reports, and appears to have been lost.¹⁷

2) Freiston/Butterwick, 1886. 291 silver coins ranging from Edward VI to Charles I, deposited c.1643, in a jar which was broken by the horse in ploughing.¹⁸ No record survives of the jar.

3) Grantham, 1865. 180 silver coins up to Charles I found in the wall of Cheney House in Castlegate, in a jar.¹⁹ The jar, missing its top and handle, is now in Grantham Museum²⁰ and is a close parallel to the container of the Newark Civil War hoard.²¹

Fig.53

- 4) Holbeach, 1890. 29 silver coins ending with issues of Elizabeth I, found in a brown earthenware pot 'about 6 ins high without a lid and with a small handle'.²² This pot, almost certainly a Cistercian ware drinking vessel, seems to be lost.
- 5) Langrивille, 1830. A number of coins - worth £5-14s-6d - ranging from Charles II to George I, found in a small pot, now apparently lost.²³
- 6) Stamford, 1866. 3,000+ silver English and Scottish groats, deposited c.1465 in a broken coarse brown pot 8 ins high, at the E end of St. George's Church. The pot is lost.²⁴

Looking at the above list, it will be seen that there is only one surviving hoard container from among the six hoards contained in pottery vessels. This is not altogether surprising as the proportion of surviving Roman coin hoard containers is approximately equal. The coins attract the attention; survival of the container is entirely fortuitous. I have searched in vain for the missing pots in Museum collections and have to assume that they are now lost - however it is possible that they may survive in one of the larger regional or national collections, or - with provenances now lost - somewhere more locally in private hands. At all events we cannot gain much useful information from coin-hoard associated pots in Lincolnshire, though it

is to be hoped that other post-medieval hoards will be found, and that the containers will be better recorded than has been the case in the past.

7.3 External Dating

Dating a pottery deposit from some historically recorded event can be very misleading, as Hurst pointed out many years ago,²⁵ but it is very tempting. Recorded building history is one fruitful source of external dating, but must be very carefully considered. Is the deposit well sealed by a clear building phase? Is that phase the one recorded by document, and not a subsequent repair? Does 'building' mean building on an entirely virgin site with no earlier and easily disturbed deposit? Conversely, does destruction or abandonment mean total abandonment, or is there some subsequent squatter occupation or even deposition by robbers of stonework. One of the most extraordinary Lincolnshire deposits must be that of a chamber-pot, filling a hole in the great Roman mosaic at Winterton where the head of Orpheus had been removed in 1747.²⁶ The choice of utensil may be an example of sparkling early Georgian wit, but it also serves to demonstrate some of the other uses that clearly defined vessel-types could be put to! Even the dating of this pot depends on whether it was placed in position during the 1747 or 1797 uncovering of the mosaic, though the former is the preferred date.

Sites containing dated groups resulting from destruction and building work are exemplified by the former Bishop's Palace in Lincoln and the College of Vicars Choral, known as Vicars' Court, which stands next to it. The Bishop's

Palace was excavated in 1968-72 as part of a clearance operation in advance of consolidation and display by the then Department of the Environment. A number of actual or 'artificial' groups of pottery were analysed following the excavations. Some came from sealed stratigraphical positions, some from 'clearance' operations before building operations and some items did not very clearly form groups at all, but came from the same general areas. The latter are therefore somewhat suspect.

The publication of the finds²⁷ allowed for ten groups, each given a letter code. Groups A-F came from the area of the Kitchen Courtyard, while groups G-J were found in the Chapel Courtyard. In the report Coppack²⁸ suggests that little or no rubbish was dumped on site, given the high status nature of the establishment, but when levelling-up was needed on this awkward and sloping site earth fortuitously containing pottery sherds was dumped as part of the levelling. Groups A and B are 12th century in date, C and D mid-15th century, E undated but probably similar, and F from c.1730-40. From the Chapel Courtyard group G is late 12th century, H and I probably mid-15th century, and J is associated with deposition during the lease held on the site by Dr Edward Nelthorpe between 1726 and 1738.

Fig.40

Fig.41

A further group, without a prefix letter,²⁹ is entirely artificial, coming as it does from disturbed deposits removed without archaeological supervision during clearance

of the West Hall. Only heavy lime deposits on the sherds suggest any connection between them and is interpreted as evidence that they came originally from a garderobe pit.

There are of course other explanations for a lime deposit, and such selection from unstratified material tends to lead to circular arguments. This 'group' is given a 16th century date, but is in many ways unsatisfactory.

Another group also from the Bishop's Palace, but published separately,³⁰ was from a pit located in 1965. It is broadly contemporary with group J. With it was published another early 18th century Lincoln group from a pit cut into a yard just to the north of Guildhall and the Stonebow, the medieval south gate of the City. It is usually known as 'the Guildhall pit'.

Fig.44

Figs.
42,43

Numerous criticisms may be made of the Bishop's Palace report and some of the dating - or the rationale behind it - may be suspect. I believe that Group E is dated much too early - nos. 85 and 86 are more likely to be late 16th or early 17th century - while group C no. 44, typical of Toynton All Saints and Old Bolingbroke, may be over a century later than the stated date. Likewise the 1965 group contains items such as 14, 15 and 16 which all look like residual mid-17th century types. Emendations such as these might well fill the astonishing gap which otherwise exists between the building of the Alnwick Tower in the 15th century and the residence of Dr Nelthorpe, a period of

nearly three centuries. During this apparent 'gap' occurred the widespread destruction of Dean and Chapter property following the Parliamentary assault of May 1644, during the Civil War, and the more specific burning and occupation of the Bishop's Palace in 1648 during the Second Civil War. There was even damage during the Lincolnshire Rising of 1536.³¹ It is most unlikely that these events did not leave any archaeological deposits of destruction and rebuilding.

What must be the clearest possible evidence of the events of that May day in 1644 came to light in excavations by the writer at 3, Vicar's Court in 1977-8.³² At the rear of nos. 3 and 4 (the South range of the Court) are two massive garderobe towers rising from garden level which is a whole storey lower than ground floor level in the houses. The tower of no. 3 was and is divided into two by a lateral wall, each half having its own clearance door on the south side. Each half was again divided by an east-west wall, creating room for four garderobe shutes.³³ This would seem to have been the medieval arrangement, serving what were then a series of chambers occupied by individual Vicars.³⁴ By post-medieval times the College of Vicars was a much reduced body, each Vicar now occupying a whole house. Following the Parliamentary siege these Vicars were dispossessed and the houses handed over to 'needy persons'.³⁵ On May 6th 1644 at the fall of the Royalist garrison there was widespread destruction. The lead from the roofs of

Fig.35

Vicars' Court was removed and several of the houses so damaged as never again to be rebuilt.³⁶ At no. 3 the western inner garderobe shute, long disused, was filled with a substantial deposit of organic material including cinders, animal and fish bones, a mass of pottery and clay pipes, and most significantly broken stonework, broken painted window glass, and three identical latten spoons, part of a set. It appears that on or immediately after the capitulation there was a clearing up operation in the course of which the kitchen was tidied up by the expedient of bundling up all the damaged items and emptying them down the conveniently disused garderobe.³⁷ The pottery is closely dated by the associated clay pipes.

The events of 1664-7 were also manifest in the garderobe shute. At the instance of Dr Honeywood, the new Dean, instituted after the Restoration, the canons of the Cathedral were persuaded to donate money to the repair of Vicars' Court,³⁸ work which was quickly completed. At no. 3 slabs were laid on top of the 1644 deposit, and a new kitchen drain was made, using this deposit as a soakaway. Associated with this work was more building debris, clay pipes, pottery and drinking glasses of types current in the 1660s. Unfortunately there was some later contamination of the deposit.

A brief exploration, via a hole in the wall between western and eastern outer shutes demonstrated that both garderobe

shutes in the eastern half still contain similar deposits. The outer clearance door is blocked, but this deposit presents an opportunity for the future.

These two sites must stand as examples of the varied backgrounds from which dated groups of ceramics have been obtained and of the varying quality of the evidence, which in some cases carries a graphic and human story almost too rich and racy for the staid pen of the archaeologist!

7.4 Gazetteer of Dated Groups

A series of twenty-six stratified or sealed pottery groups can be identified for Lincolnshire spanning the period c.1500-1820. These are briefly discussed below, and the pottery types represented are listed while certain selected groups have been drawn in detail. Of these only the coarse pottery is illustrated, on the basis that finewares are more standardized. All the pottery however is analysed by a matrix. Due to the selectivity of excavations and to the number of sites which remain unpublished and the finds not easily accessible the distribution of these groups is very uneven, with the mid-17th and early 18th century relatively over-represented, and the 15th-16th centuries barely represented at all. A fruitful source of the latter groups would be from Dissolution-period deposits of monasteries. However very few such deposits have been excavated in controlled circumstances or in recent years.³⁹ The sites of three mid-15th century properties of Lord Ralph Cromwell; Tattershall Castle, Tattershall College and the nearby hunting-lodge of Tower-on-the-Moor, are all disappointing. Tattershall Castle was 'cleared' early in this century, and though a noble array of pottery comes from the site,⁴⁰ none of it is stratified. Tattershall College⁴¹ and Tower-on-the-Moor⁴² have both been excavated in recent times but neither published, nor is any site archive available to interpret the former. The latter, though promising at first view, is a heavily disturbed site on a blown-sand subsoil where robbing trenches have

Fig.48

slumped and there is contamination of deposits by rubbish from subsequent squatter-occupation or from later picnickers! This is sad, as otherwise the building was very short-lived and an apparently ideal subject for excavation. The Tower, under construction in the 1430s, was already being dismantled in 1472.⁴³ Coarse east Lincolnshire wares are present, and Cistercian ware, but no German stoneware. The absence of Raeren stoneware could confirm a date prior to c.1480, but one might expect some Siegburg stoneware to be present. Possibly the Tower was never used by the Cromwells themselves and the vessels found represent occupation by people of lower status.

With the exception of the Bishop's Palace in Lincoln there are few deposits from high status sites. The Willoughby family seat at Eresby has produced a wide range of wares,⁴⁴ rather similar to those from Tattershall Castle, but again no stratified groups were recovered, most deposits deriving from dredging of the moat.

Catalogue

1. West Bight (Mint Wall) Lincoln, 1980.⁴⁵ (Lincoln Archaeological Trust). A group of early 16th century wares from the fill of a barrel-lined industrial feature, north of the Roman Mint Wall, included Midlands Purple ware, Cistercian ware, and Cologne stoneware.

2. Bolingbroke Castle, 1966-73.⁴⁶ (Dept. of the Environment Inspectorate.) Group 1, the filling of a room below the gate house passage of the castle, sealed by road-metalling during its final development, contains fragments of 19 vessels deposited probably in the mid-16th century. A final issue groat of Henry VIII, lost in the early 1550s, occurred in the road-metalling. Fig.33
3. Grammar School Pottery Kiln, Boston, 1975.⁴⁷ (The writer, for Lincolnshire Museums.) The flues of the kiln, disused from c.1640, were used for dumping over a very short period, dated by a quantity of clay pipes. A very wide range of imported pottery occurred in this deposit. The kiln itself is discussed above (Chapter 3). Fig.34
4. Vicars' Court, Lincoln, 1977-8.⁴⁸ (The writer for Lincolnshire Museums.) A disused medieval garderobe shaft was part filled with a mid-17th century kitchen deposit, dated by clay pipes.⁴⁹ Among the deposit were pieces of roof lead and shattered painted glass fragments, suggesting that the deposit was laid down at or within a short time after the siege of Lincoln, which capitulated on 6th May 1644. Other small finds tend to confirm this dating. Fig.35
5. Eastgate, Lincoln, 1963-6.⁵⁰ (J.B. Whitwell, for Lincoln Archaeological Research Committee.) A small mid-17th century group was found in the fill of a disused well on the site of the Roman East Gate. The absence of Fig.36

clay pipes may signify the absence of a smoker, or possibly the deposit is dated a little too late and should be c.1620- clay pipes are very uncommon in Lincoln at that date. The presence of a sherd of a Blackware mug, however, would tend to suggest a date at least in the 1640s.

6. Flaxengate, Lincoln, 1972.⁵¹ (Lincoln Archaeological Trust.) The stratified deposit F72 (CY) from the multi-period site fronting Grantham street and Flaxengate probably dates from the earlier 17th century. It contains a Nuremberg jeton of Hanns Schultes (fl. 1550-74). These tokens have a wide currency and seem to survive for up to a century, so cannot be used except to provide a terminus post quem for associated artefacts.

7. Brackenborough, 1968.⁵² (Mrs Gibson, Brackenborough Hall Farm, in whose possession the finds remain). From a pit marked on the surface by a hollow among the earthworks of the former village came a group of pottery including east Lincolnshire wares, Weser slipware, North Italian marbled ware, German stoneware, and Martincamp flasks, associated with two Nuremberg jetons of Hanns Schultes (for comments on which see above). This group seems too cosmopolitan for a rural north Lincolnshire village house and may perhaps have originated from Brackenborough Hall after the desertion of the village. A mid-17th century date would be appropriate.

Fig.37

8. Dickinson's Mill, Brayford, Lincoln, 1972.⁵³ (Lincoln Archaeological Trust.) Group DM72 1 (AP) comes from this waterside site which at its lowest level produced evidence of Iron Age settlement. East Lincolnshire wares were associated with Blackware imitations, Cologne stoneware, 'Metropolitan' slipware, a waster sherd, and a polychrome tin-glazed tile of c.1600. A date of c.1630-50 is probable for the deposit.

9. Bolingbroke Castle 1966-73.⁵⁴ (Dept. of the Environment Inspectorate.) Group IV, from the filling of a well at the north-west end of the Hall range, contained fragments of 19 vessels associated with clay pipes of c.1640-60. Nearly all the pottery was of local origin, the exceptions being Cistercian ware and 'Metropolitan' slipware. Were it not for the clay pipes this deposit would be difficult to date, but no. 85, a chamber-pot, is matched exactly by one from Vicars' Court, Lincoln, for which see above, no. 4.

Fig.38

10. Roughton Church, nr. Horncastle 1909.⁵⁵ (Found during restoration.) A group of nine Blackware cups found under the pulpit had thick deposits of paint pigment in and on them, suggesting use by painters carrying out a delicate operation requiring only small quantities of paint. Documentary evidence suggests that the painters were working on a Royal Arms and Ten Commandments. As the emergence of Blackwares in Lincolnshire seems to date from

Fig.39

the 1640s it is likely that the occasion for painting a Royal Arms would be at or after the Restoration in 1660 rather than at the time of the Civil War. It is suggested that the deposit dates from c.1660 at the earliest.

11. St. Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln, 1979.⁵⁶ (Lincoln Archaeological Trust.) Groups DDH, DDG, DDF, CMF all came from low in the filling of a huge well of Roman origin. (The lowest fill was removed much later.) The fill was excavated in layers where such were apparent and in 'spits' where there was no distinct change of stratum, thus providing a number of artificially distinguished groups. These four groups appeared to be ceramically of one date, with deposition c.1670-80 judging by the latest vessel types, but containing much earlier material. Curiously the associated clay pipes throughout the deposit appeared to be consistently some ten to twenty years earlier. This cannot be readily explained.

12. Flaxengate, Lincoln, 1972.⁵⁷ (Lincoln Archaeological Trust.) Group F72 (DK) associated with a clay pipe bowl of 1670-1700, contained material typical of the whole 17th century. A tin-glazed sherd with a Wan Li border and a reversed Cistercian ware 'chalice' base ought to belong to the first half of the century, and it would appear that the group was redeposited or accumulated fairly slowly.

13. Flaxengate, Lincoln, 1972.⁵⁸ (Lincoln Archaeological Trust.) Group F72 (A1) associated with clay pipes of c. 1660-1700 contained a high proportion of east Lincolnshire wares. Accompanying these were slipware types of late 17th century date.
- 14-15. Bishop's Palace, Lincoln, 1968-72.⁵⁹ (Department of the Environment.) Groups F and J, from the Kitchen Courtyard and Chapel Courtyard respectively both date from c.1720-40, and are to be associated in historical terms with the restoration of the Palace by Dr Edward Nelthorpe. Figs. 40,41
16. Guildhall, Lincoln, 1970.⁶⁰ (City & County Museum, Lincoln.) The contents of a pit in a yard backing on to the Guildhall date probably to 1730-40 and in any case antedate the building of Battle's chemist shop (c.1750-1970). Figs. 42,43
17. Bishop's Palace, Lincoln, 1965.⁶¹ (Department of the Environment.) A pit located in the Chapel Courtyard while trenching for the footings of the northern boundary wall contained pottery datable to c.1725-50. Associated with it was a bottle seal marked 'Nelthorpe'. (For Dr Edward Nelthorpe and the Palace see above.) Such a bottle would not have been lost before 1726 at the earliest. Fig.44
18. St. Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln, 1979.⁶² (Lincoln Archaeological Trust.) Like the groups numbered 11 above,

group CMD came from the lower fill of the well. Clay pipes of c.1630-80 were associated, but Staffordshire white salt-glazed stoneware in the group must belong to post-1720, while a Nottingham stoneware mug carrying an AR excise stamp cannot be earlier than 1702, the date of Queen Anne's accession. A date of deposition of c.1720+ is probable.

19. Rowley Road, Boston, 1977.⁶³ (South Lincolnshire Archaeological Unit.) During the construction of the Ring Road through the eastern side of Boston several pits were found containing pottery. One pit in particular produced a coherent group including porcelain, white salt-glaze, and fragments of tin-glazed drug jars and ointment pots. Associated with these were a Westerwald mug with a 'GR' cipher and a wine bottle with a seal dated 1716. The group was notable for the number of complete vessels and the large proportion of 'medicinal' wares. A date of deposition in the 1730s or 1740s is probable.

20. St. Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln, 1979.⁶⁴ (Lincoln Archaeological Trust.) Two groups, CLX and CLW, from the fill of the well (see above) seem to be broadly contemporary. CLX contained white salt-glazed stoneware, 'Scratch Blue', Astbury and Whieldon type wares, for which a date no earlier than c.1750-60 is probable. This is confirmed by clay pipes of 1680-1750. CLW contained creamware and a Wedgwood green-glazed plate sherd of no earlier than the mid 1760s.

21. St. Paul-in the Bail, Lincoln, 1979.⁶⁵ (Lincoln Archaeological Trust.) Two further groups from the well, CLV and CLO, contained pottery of the period c.1760-85, deposited no earlier than c.1785. Both groups contained both creamware and pearlware, which offer a satisfactory terminus post quem of 1761 and 1782 respectively.
22. Greestone House, Greestone Place, Lincoln, 1978.⁶⁶ (The writer, for Lincolnshire Museums.) A massive pottery group was recovered from the fill of a cellar, exposed during building work. An outbuilding to the south of Greestone House, demolished at some unknown date, had a cellar which had been deliberately filled with a contemporary group of rubbish, coming presumably from Greestone House itself. 'Scratch blue' imitating Westerwald stoneware, creamware, pearlware, English and Chinese porcelain, put the earliest date of deposit in the period 1785-1800. The material had an internal coherence but was not archaeologically 'sealed' in the normal sense.
23. Pottergate, Lincoln, 1937.⁶⁷ (Dean & Chapter of Lincoln.) When the northern close wall adjacent to Pottergate Arch was removed in 1937 to allow the road known as Pottergate to be widened a group of pottery was recovered. It was retained by the Clerk of Works until 1979 when it was given to the City & County Museum, Lincoln. The data of recovery are not very satisfactory, but the group has an internal consistency suggesting that it came from a pit.

Westerwald and 'scratch blue' stoneware, porcelain and in particular black 'basaltes' ware suggest a date of deposition very late in the 18th century, which may be confirmed by clay pipes including one marked NAYLOR/BOSTON (fl. 1776-1818). This group, while appearing consistent, should be used with caution, and belongs to the lowest category of usable information.

24. Main Street, Scothern, Lincoln, 1977.⁶⁸ (The writer, Fig.45 for Lincolnshire Museums.) A linear feature, probably a robber trench for a brick wall, had been filled with domestic rubbish over a short period of time. Black glazed coarsewares of probably local origin were associated with creamware, both plain and printed (including a teapot and two chocolate mugs), Jackfield ware, Nottingham stoneware, English porcelain, and most importantly transfer-printed pearlware, giving a date of no earlier than c.1795-1805. Some earlier residual material appeared in the deposit, together with sherds of a mid-18th century tin-glazed plate. The adjacent house and ground on which the deposit was found probably represents a very modest farm in the 18th century.

25. McGuire's Yard, Caistor, 1983.⁶⁹ (The writer, for Lincolnshire Museums.) A pit disturbed during drainage work for a new development was found to contain the latest of Bolingbroke wares in association with tin-glazed earthenware, Nottingham stoneware, creamware and pearlware

as well as glass from garden cloches or acid carboys. Much of the pottery was broken up into small fragments, nor could all be recovered because of the nature of the site. A date of c.1800 would not be unreasonable, and this seems to mark the end of production at Bolingbroke.

26. Harrington House, Spalding, 1965.⁷⁰ (R.H. Healey.)

A pit on the site of Harrington House was found to contain a large group of pottery, ranging from local coarsewares to slipware, tin-glazed earthenware, printed pearlware, porcelain, black basaltes ware, and stonewares. The significant dating evidence came from three items; a jug with a printed scene of the execution of Louis VIth in 1793, the lid of a domino box of a type made by Napoleonic prisoners-of-war at Norman Cross, and a clay pipe by G. W(alter) of Peterborough, (fl. c.1820). One or two items of pottery probably belong to a period c.1810-20, which represents the earliest possible date of deposit.

To the foregoing twenty-six groups can perhaps be added another: that from the rere-dorter drain at Humberston Abbey, South Humberside.⁷¹ The status of the group, containing eleven vessels in Humberware and east Lincolnshire fabric, is somewhat obscure, but recently Colin Hayfield has made a case for its acceptance as a closed group of the second quarter of the 16th century (ie. from the Dissolution period of the Abbey). One may reasonably wonder why only substantial pieces were saved, and what the other sherds

Figs.
46,47

represented? At least two of the vessels are urinals, typical of a monastic site, but to what extent did urinals survive into the 16th century? In the absence of answers to these questions we should perhaps be careful not to place too much reliance in this group.

Composition of certain groups

	<u>Place</u>	<u>Minimum vessel numbers</u>				<u>Total</u>
		<u>Drinking</u>	<u>Flatwares</u>	<u>Medicinal</u>	<u>Other</u>	
1.	Mint Wall, Lincoln, c.1525	7	-	-	-	7
2.	Vicar's Court, Lincoln, c.1644	10	3	1	26	40
3.	Brackenborough c.1650	8	1	-	-	9
4.	Guildhall, Lincoln c.1730-40	8	10	2	11	31
5.	Bishop's Palace, Lincoln c.1750	4	1	-	9	14
6.	Scothern c.1800	10	8	-	12	30
7.	Pottergate, Lincoln c.1800	2	9	2	3	16

7.5 A Note on Rubbish

In searching for pottery groups of a relatively short span we come back again and again to rubbish deposits, either in pits or distributed in foundations, robbing trenches or generalized scatter in a sealed layer.

Considering our dependence on rubbish deposits for our information it is significant that we know so little of the mechanics of rubbish disposal.

In broad terms medieval urban sites tend to have rubbish pits at the rear of the plot, away from the street frontage, and associated with the 'laissez-faire' attitude of the urban authorities. At a time which varied from place to place these authorities seem to have awoken to their responsibilities. In Lincoln⁷² for instance the Tudor 'Mayor's Cry' included the following statute;

'28. That no Man or Woman lay or cast any dirt within the City, or without, but where it is assigned to be laid, that is to say at the Stamp, Badgerholm, and Besom Park, and in no other Place, in Nuisance of the People, on Pain to the Sheriffs, as often as committed ... 3s4d.'

We cannot of course be sure that this was the earliest statute (it almost certainly was not) or that it was obeyed or enforced. However, it is probably significant that from the mid-15th century rubbish pits cease to be a common feature in Lincoln, and consequently establishing a pottery sequence for that period is much harder.⁷³

As the three places named are likely to produce most of Lincoln's post-medieval rubbish we should look to them for information. The first two have not yet been excavated but the third, better known as The Park, was the site of excavations on the Roman Lower West Gate from 1968.⁷⁴ Sure enough, the upper levels produced much post-medieval rubbish, but the excavators' purpose did not lie in this area, but rather in the deposits beneath. Consequently there was much loss and inadequate recording of these upper levels, with their wealth of evidence for Lincoln's rubbish at this period.

The rural situation is quite unclear, but there seem to be strong indications that the individual remained responsible for his own rubbish until very recent times. On farms no doubt much rubbish was thrown onto dunghills or middens and subsequently scattered on fields. In lower-status houses there may not have been much solid rubbish to dispose of, but pits in the garden were probably common.

Much work needs to be done to clarify the picture and to establish how rubbish was deposited and over what typical period.⁷⁵ In particular some experimental work on deposit and redigging would be valuable.

Notes

1. J.G. Hurst, 'White Castle and the Dating of Medieval Pottery', Med. Arch., 6, 1962, 135-50.
2. eg. S. Moorhouse, 'A Late Medieval Domestic Rubbish Deposit from Broughton, Lincolnshire', LHA, 9, 1974, 3-16. A 'group' of Tudor Greenware and Raeren stone-ware vessels with the provenance of 'Sturton', in the City & County Museum, Lincoln, proved upon further examination to have come from a house sale there.
3. P. Seaby & P.F. Purvey, Coins of England and the United Kingdom, 18th edn., London, 1981, 144.
4. ie. the first official farthing coinage of 1672.
5. F.P. Barnard, The Casting-Counter and the Counting Board, Oxford, 1916.
6. G.H. Kenyon, The Glass Industry of the Weald, Leicester, 1967; H. Tait, The Golden Age of Venetian Glass, London, British Museum, 1979, esp. 24, Fig. 5; I. Noel Hume, A Guide to the Artifacts of Colonial America, New York, 1970; D. Crossley & A. Aberg, '16th Century Glass-Making in Yorkshire: Excavations at Hutton and Rosedale, North Riding, 1968-71', Post-Med. Arch., 6, 1972, 107-59.
7. A. Oswald, Clay Pipes for the Archaeologist, BAR, 14, Oxford, 1975; P. Davey (ed.), The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe, 1, BAR, 63, Oxford, 1979.
8. Quoted in Oswald, op. cit., 92-5; it must be added however, that the Binford Formula is by no means universally accepted, requires substantial samples to

be at all statistically valid, does not work with Dutch pipes, and becomes increasingly unreliable during the 18th century when stem-bores reach the minimal practicable diameter.

9. J.E. & E. Hodgkin, Examples of Early English Pottery, Named, Dated, and Inscribed, Menston, (reprint), 1973; J. Draper, Dated Post-Medieval Pottery in Northampton Museum, Northampton, 1975; F. Celoria, Dated Post-Medieval Pottery in the London Museum, London, 1966.
10. eg. Draper, op. cit., Pls. 4 & 10.
11. A. Noel Hume, 'Some Ceramic Milestones of Use to the Archaeologist', Post-Med. Arch. 2, 1968, 163-4.
12. G.W. Rhead, The Earthenware Collector, London, 1920, 136f; D.C. Towner, English Cream-Coloured Earthenware, London, 1957, 33.
13. As a late 18th century MS puts it,
'every merchant was concerned in a pot house made of delf until 1785. Then about it was dropped.'
This refers specifically to Liverpool, but probably represents a more general truth. See A. Ray, English Delftware Pottery in the Robert Hall Warren Collection, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, London, 1968, 76.
14. For Dwight's Patent see A.R. Mountford & F. Celoria, 'Some Examples of Sources in the History of 17th century Ceramics', Journal of Ceramic History, 1, 1968, 11-2; for earlier stoneware manufactory see S. Pryor & K. Blockley, 'A 17th-Century Kiln Site at Woolwich', Post-Med. Arch. 12, 1978, 30-5, (esp. 36-43).

15. A.J. White, 'A Gazetteer of Medieval & Later Coin-Hoards from Lincolnshire & South Humberside', (unpublished article, 1980, copy in the City & County Museum, Lincoln).
16. Now in the City & County Museum, Lincoln, acc. no. 36.46.
17. T. Shepherd, Transactions of the Yorkshire Numismatic Society, 1st ser., II, 1918, 50-2.
18. Num. Chron. 3rd ser., VI, 1886, 163-6.
19. Grantham Journal, 20 May, 1865.
20. Acc. no. M.68.
21. RCHM(E), Newark on Trent; The Civil War Siegeworks, London, 1964, 74.
22. FNQ, I, 1889-91, 254-5.
23. Lincoln, Rutland & Stamford Mercury, 2 April, 1830.
24. Num. Chron., 4th ser., XI, 1911, 153ff.
25. Hurst, op. cit. in note 1.
26. P.C.D. Brears, 'An 18th-Century Chamber-Pot from Winterton, Lincs.', Post-Med. Arch., 4, 1970, 166-7.
27. H. Chapman, G. Coppack & P. Drewett, Excavations at the Bishop's Palace, Lincoln, 1968-72, Occasional Papers in Lincolnshire History and Archaeology, Sleaford, 1975.
28. ibid., 15-29, 44-52.
29. ibid., 52-5.
30. G. Coppack, 'Two Eighteenth Century Pit-Groups from Lincoln', LHA, 8, 1973, 115-25.
31. T.M. Ambrose, The Bishop's Palace, Lincoln, Lincolnshire Museums Information Sheet, Archaeology Series, 18, 1980, passim.

32. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire & South Humberside, 1977', LHA, 13, 1978, 81; A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire & South Humberside, 1978', LHA, 14, 1979, 73.
33. M.E. Wood, 'Number 3 Vicar's Court, Lincoln', Lincolnshire Historian, 7, 1951, 281-6 and plan.
34. W.A. Pantin, 'Chantry Priest's Houses and other Medieval Lodgings', Med. Arch., 3, 1959, 247-8; M.E. Wood, The Medieval English House, London, 1965, 180ff, 380, 385.
35. Rev. E. Venables, 'The Vicars' Court, Lincoln, with the Architectural History of the College...', AASRP, 17, 1883-4, 247-50, quoting the Parliamentary Survey of 1650 (otherwise this document appears to have been lost).
36. ibid., 246.
37. A rather similar archaeological assemblage, in a latrine pit, and the documentary evidence suggested for it are discussed by P.J. Huggins, 'Excavations at Sewardstone Street, Waltham Abbey, Essex, 1966', Post-Med. Arch., 3, 1969, 87-94.
38. Two documents in the Honeywood Papers in the LAO provide evidence for this. LAO, D vii/3/2 is a petition of 1664 by the restored Vicars Choral which claims;

'That whereas of late goodly structures & habitations of y^e Pettitioners were by the Sones of Violence in these late times of devastation reduced into confused

heapes of rubbish ...'

This hyperbolic appeal had its effect judging by the list of subscribers which follows it. That over £400 was subsequently spent on repairs is shown by an undated but later document, LAO, D vii/1/3.

39. It appears that St. Leonard's Priory at Stamford produced pottery groups which might have usefully been analysed, but the site remains to be published.
40. Preserved in a small museum on the site.
41. Excavations were carried out by L. Keen. A brief note appears in J.B. Whitwell & C.M. Wilson, 'Archaeological Notes, 1968', LHA, 4, 1969, 110.
42. D.M. Wilson & D.G. Hurst, 'Medieval Britain in 1969', Med. Arch., XIV, 1970, 191.
43. W.D. Simpson, The Building Accounts of Tattershall Castle, 1434-1472, Lincoln Record Society, Lincoln, 55, 1960, 78.
44. J. Marjoram, 'Eresby Manor House, Spilsby', in Field, N. & White, A., (eds.) A Prospect of Lincolnshire, Lincoln, 1984, 79-88.
45. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire & South Humberside, 1980', LHA, 16, 1981, 72.
46. P. Drewett, 'The Excavation of the Great Hall at Bolingbroke Castle, Lincolnshire, 1973', Post-Med. Arch., 10, 1976, 1-33.
47. J. Cherry, 'Post-Medieval Britain in 1975', Post-Med. Arch. 10, 1976, 172.
48. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire & South Humberside, 1977', LHA, 13, 1978, 81; A.J. White,

- 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire & South Humberside, 1978',
LHA, 14, 1979, 73.
49. A.J. White, 'Clay Pipes from Vicars' Court, Lincoln',
in Davey, P.J., (ed.) The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco
Pipe, I, BAR, 63, Oxford, 1979, 171-8.
50. F.H. Thompson & J.B. Whitwell, 'The Gates of Roman
Lincoln', Arch. CIV, 1973, 172 and Fig. 18, nos. 19-29.
51. C. Colyer & M.J. Jones (eds.) 'Excavations at Lincoln,
2nd Interim Report', Ant.J. LIX, 1979, 50-91,
esp. 66-7. Material seen at the Lincoln Archaeological
Trust.
52. J.B. Whitwell & C.M. Wilson, 'Archaeological Notes,
1968', LHA, 4, 1969, 114. Finds preserved at
Brackenborough Hall Home Farm were examined by
courtesy of Mrs Gibson.
53. M.J. Jones (ed.) 'Excavations at Lincoln; 3rd Interim
Report', Ant.J., LXI, 1981, 83-114, esp. 88-90.
54. Drewett, loc. cit.
55. A.J. White, 'A Group of 17th-Century Blackwares from
Roughton Church, Lincolnshire', Post-Med. Arch. 14,
1980, 200-203. A Glebe Terrier of Roughton, 1822,
(LAO, Roughton Par., Terrier Bundle) refers to a
'King's Arms with the Ten Commandments'. Of these
there is now no trace.
56. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire & South
Humberside, 1979', LHA, 15, 1980, 75-6.
57. R.H. Jones, Medieval Houses at Flaxengate, Lincoln,
The Archaeology of Lincoln, Vol. XI-I, 1980, 45. The

single clay pipe bowl cannot provide sufficiently secure dating. For the pipe itself see J.E. Mann, Clay Tobacco Pipes from Excavations in Lincoln, 1970-4, The Archaeology of Lincoln, Vol. XV-I, 1977, no. 124.

58. R.H. Jones, loc. cit. For the clay pipes see Mann, op. cit., nos. 85, 115, 117.
59. Chapman, Coppack & Drewett, op. cit., 25-7, 48, 50-2.
60. Coppack, loc. cit. in note 30.
61. ibid.
62. White, loc. cit. in note 56.
63. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire & South Humberside, 1977', LHA, 13, 1978, 75.
64. White, loc. cit. in note 56.
65. ibid.
66. A.J. White, 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire & South Humberside, 1978', LHA, 14, 1979, 66.
67. Unpublished, City & County Museum, Lincoln, acc. no. 131.79.
68. White, loc. cit. in note 63.
69. Unpublished; City & County Museum, Lincoln, acc. no. 66.83.
70. J.B. Whitwell, 'Archaeological Notes, 1965', LHA, I, 1966, 53. A comprehensive list of the ceramics is given in an anonymous duplicated leaflet produced by Spalding High School in 1965. It is in fact written by Miss R.H. Healey.
71. C. Hayfield, 'A Late-Medieval Pottery Group from Humberston Abbey', S. Humberside', LHA, 19, 1984, 107-9.

72. J.W.F. Hill, Tudor and Stuart Lincoln, Cambridge, 1956, 218.
73. Pers. comm. from Dr Lauren Gilmour.
74. C. Colyer, 'Excavations at Lincoln 1970-1972: The Western Defences of the Lower Town; An Interim Report', Ant.J., LV, 1975, 228-46.
75. An interesting study of the subject, but not confined to 'rubbish' from the ground, is I. Noel Hume, All the Best Rubbish, London, 1974.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing chapters we have reviewed the very variable evidence available for the manufacture and use of ceramics in Lincolnshire over a period of four centuries from 1450 to 1850.

The documentary and physical evidence for pottery manufacture represents a fairly good 'fit', few sites being without documentary evidence of some sort, and few documentary references unsupported by finds of wasters etc. However, it is noticeable that clearly important villages such as the two Toyntons have very little post-medieval documentary evidence to match the quality and quantity of the finds and in the absence of strong medieval references we might be disposed to believe that they had little significance for pottery-making after c.1350.

Looking critically at the documentary evidence it becomes clear that a study such as this helped or hampered greatly according to the quality of the local archives office and its indexing. Lincolnshire is fortunate, in these respects, and more so that as the centre of a great medieval diocese Lincoln has been for centuries the natural place towards which records have gravitated. Furthermore there were few other alternative places for records to go. Only wills proved at the Prerogative Court of Canterbury (not a

fruitful source for a study of mainly poor artisans) and the papers of branches of government, such as the Exchequer, represent significant groups of records outside the county. To the latter should be added the Duchy of Lancaster which through its estates in Lincolnshire, during our period of study effectively run as an arm of government, bred a substantial archive including useful maps and surveys. It is plain that Lincolnshire benefits greatly from this concentration of records above the former constituent Ridings of Yorkshire, whose records are scattered far and wide, without much rationale behind the distribution.

The indexing of the records is also important, and one of the most striking discoveries during research was that, if one name was calendared as a potter a considerable number of others could be added, usually because of the family or clan nature of a potter's business. Without this calendared introduction, as it were, much more work would have been required to search out potters lurking under other occupational names in the archives. This is especially true of probate inventories where huge numbers of documents would have to be gone through to be certain that there was no evidence for pottery in the individual inventory. As it is, there are probably many more names to be found through unremitting search, although it is doubtful whether the process would add much to our knowledge. It is likely that the main pottery-making families have been found, if not in all their ramifications. An interesting point

emerges from the documentary search: potting was rarely a full-time occupation, and frequently seasonal. Unlike today it is improbable that many artisans could be clear in their own heads what was their principal work, or source of income (the two may not be the same). It is therefore likely that their appraisers were equally confused, when the property values indicated 90% agriculture and 10% pottery, though we should bear in mind the caveat about the use of probate inventory values expressed in Chapter 2.3. To an extent unguessable today agriculture must have formed a supplementary livelihood to the vast proportion of country-dwellers, whatever their avowed occupation. This is especially true for the occupants of the Fen-edge of Lincolnshire for whom shared rights in the unenclosed Fen continued to be available into the 16th and 17th centuries. Some of these Fen Allotments were at some distance from the mother-villages, so there was an unusual degree of poly-focal settlement compared with the nuclear settlement elsewhere in the county. We also have the practical cases of potters working in settlements later to become parishes in their own right, but owing services to their distant parish church.

Fig.2

The insular quality of the records is mirrored in the economic isolation of the potters whose products were markedly conservative and little affected by advances in neighbouring more industrialised counties to north and west. The tradition of green-glazed earthenware continued into the

late 17th if not the early 18th century, albeit in a more restricted range of forms. When the native tradition finally died at the very end of the 18th century it was replaced, as far as one can tell, by the brickyard pottery with industrialized techniques including controlled black glaze, a legacy of separate and faster development in other counties, itself by now under threat from factory production and the use of both cheap china and the more hygienic stoneware.

While it is possible to recognize individual Lincolnshire wares - especially those from the eastern part of the county - in the post-medieval period, it is a rare luxury anywhere to be able to plot distributions at this date. One of the few things that permits us to do this is the presence of name-stamps on pancheons. A tiny minority actually carry name-stamps, but those of Robert Stanney, for instance, are quite distinctive and indicate by their findspots the range of distribution. On present evidence such items are excessively rare in the country as a whole and the idea must therefore either have originated locally or else been copied from another medium.

The 'island' nature of Lincolnshire, which since at least Anglian times has determined the separate nature of its development, very effectively protected its ceramic industry and use pattern from more developed and industrialized producers, except for one important direction. This

was the North Sea. Even in this direction access seems largely to have been limited to Boston and Hull, with a possibility of some importation via Grimsby and Gainsborough. It was Boston in particular that allowed access to the limited Lincolnshire markets, and from the 13th century onward Boston became archaeologically distinctive, in the way which ports do, for a very heavy proportion of imported wares. The documentary evidence and finds agree very clearly over the importance of Rhenish and Low Countries wares, such as stoneware from Raeren, Cologne, and the Westerwald, or various sorts of earthenware dishes and tin-glazed earthenwares from the Weser area and Rotterdam respectively. The physical remains indicate that this was a very substantial trade indeed.

Where there is a disagreement in the records is how wares from France, Spain, Italy and the wider Mediterranean, got to Boston. These wares do not form a high proportion of archaeological assemblages numerically, but the means of import still needs to be explained.

The most probable means seems to be coastwise redistribution. We can see how one isolated vessel bearing coal from Newcastle could introduce to Boston a few dozen Martincamp flasks in their wicker baskets (see above, Chapter 4.1), and it was probably in such small ventures that most of the imports from outside northern Europe reached the port. Numerically coasters from London and

Lynn were the most important means of coastal redistribution, especially of items such as 'black pots' whose origins are discussed above, but without any definite source being proven.

As well as adding to the record of physical remains the documentary sources give us some tantalizing glimpses into absolute and relative prices and values. This enables us to contrast the cost of generally more attractive imports, which compare very favourably with the native article (where such evidence exists) and also to compare the prices over a period of time, which shows potters maintaining fixed prices for their wares against wildly fluctuating economic indicators with a generally upward underlying trend. Unfortunately the sources are too few and too scattered in place and date to do other than indicate parameters of comparison, but it certainly appears that to be a potter in 1650 required either greater productivity, greater economy, or cheaper production methods to obtain the equivalent return to a potter of two centuries earlier. In some cases we may be seeing what amounted to a sell-out to minor gentry of what had been a substantially peasant-based industry, in order to improve the capitalisation or to take advantages of a division between manufacture and marketing. It may be that these ideas are too fanciful and go beyond the meagre evidence. On the other hand it is perhaps not too difficult to read the ultimate signs of retreat in the face of increasing hardship, that of

Figs.
27,28

ceasing manufacture and taking up another trade. Robert Stanney of Bolingbroke certainly seemed to need to bribe his sons with land to take up the family occupation, in 1736.

The function of pottery, and hence what it has to tell us about human beliefs and customs, is all too rarely considered. Its use for dating purposes, and as a subject worthy of consideration for itself, has rather tended to blind archaeologists and historians of the decorative arts to such mundane aspects. However as we have seen, medical ceramics for example mirror the changing views on medical science, from fuming pots to drive away evil humours to tin-glazed jars for self-medication, a practice in the 18th century calling all too much for mercuric-based compounds to curb the ravages caused by excess. Similarly there is a very gripping story to be told of the origins and development of the chamber pot. The monkish use of pottery urinals has been remarked upon earlier, a practice whose apparent disappearance at the Dissolution has been overlooked by historians in their search for larger changes.

So far the study of how, and where, broken vessels lie within archaeological levels has been little studied, except in Europe. Much has yet to be learned about how vessels broke, how their sherds were spread, and what the average ceramic life expectancy was.

Secondary use of ceramics has likewise hardly been considered, though even the swiftest glance at Dutch genre paintings will show standard ceramic vessels in a variety of uses for which they were not intended. As we have seen, coarse vessels which survived breakage often suffered demotion from house to barn or farmyard. As with cooking and eating vessels generally an intensive study of residues would no doubt be very instructive.

Along with use patterns we should also consider disuse, and the manner of disposal. Rubbish is the stuff of archaeology, yet we rarely question how or why rubbish found its way into pits, or into disused features such as ditches. The example of Lincoln shows us how patterns of disposal changed, especially in the 15th century, from private to public, from rubbish pits on domestic premises to city-wide methods, dumping for instance into the former city ditch at Besom Park being organised in Tudor times.

The continuing use of pits for rubbish disposal elsewhere gives us some of our most useful contemporary groups for dating purposes, ceramic assemblages which in certain cases were used together and in others were disposed of together. The essential criterion for such groups, more difficult to achieve in practice than it might seem, is that they should be as complete as possible (without selection by archaeologists or others) and uncontaminated by earlier or later material. It is even harder in practice

to be certain that pottery groups thought to be associated with building works of known date actually are. There is much resort to intuition and circular argument in this field, so it is well to base our house-of-cards vision of ceramic inter-relationships on the best possible foundation, or else large parts of it may catastrophically collapse under further research.

Perhaps the ultimate in dating, by association with coins or coin-hoards, proves to be of limited use in Lincolnshire because so few such associations survive. In fact the records of those lost coin-hoard containers serve merely to tantalize.

These various elements combine to provide a view of the pottery made and used in Lincolnshire over four centuries. It is not the only view, and perhaps the documentary side has been emphasised at the expense of the scientific, and it is possible that a rigorous collation of the data culled from all the sherds themselves, seasoned with some mathematical processes, might lead to different conclusions. I do not personally believe that we have a sufficient percentage of all the pottery ever made in Lincolnshire to make such conclusions viable, nor do I believe that a huge unselective massing of drawings and descriptions is likely to serve a useful end. The methods of prehistoric study are illuminating and worthy of imitation, but are not as appropriate to the study of post-medieval artefacts,

for which we have another whole range of source material.

It is perhaps as well to remind ourselves continually of the lowly place of pottery, its fragility and cheapness. What has survived in enormous quantities from four centuries of Lincolnshire history hardly merited a comment at the time, but used carefully can now reveal more about its makers and users than ever they can have visualized.

UNABLE TO COPY AT THE REQUEST OF THE UNIVERSITY

Maps and graphs
and
Illustrations of pottery

DRAWINGS OF POTTERY FROM DATED GROUPS AND KILNS.
DESCRIPTIONS OF ILLUSTRATED POTTERY.

All drawings of pottery and related objects are reproduced at a scale of 1:4 unless otherwise stated. The majority are drawn by myself, and all exceptions are credited to the original draughtsmen. By and large only significant ornament is drawn, eg. on slipware, tin-glazed or moulded wares. In general decoration on creamware, pearlware etc. is not shown except where drawings have been copied from published examples and it would be counter-productive to omit such details.

In the interests of economy of space the descriptions which follow are standardized as much as possible in format and where there are no significant differences in fabric or ware, individual pieces are not itemised. Descriptions of the sites will be found in the main text.

Fig. 29. Kiln furniture

1. Coningsby. Pancheon base glazed to tile.
2. Kirkstead. Tile with rim marks.
3. Boston. Vessel base with rim marks.
4. Coningsby. Tile with rim marks.
5. Kirkstead. Tile with rim marks.
6. Toynton All Saints. 'Butter pot' or kiln furniture.
7. Boston. Wooden implement from kiln.

Fig. 30. Pancheon stamps

Numbers as in text. Reconstruction based on 'Robert Stanney' stamps.

Fig. 31. Dark-glazed wares

- 1-2. Short Ferry, Fiskerton, 1975.
- 3-6. Grantham Museum, unprovenanced.
- 7. Grantham, High St., 1965.
- 8. Lincoln, High St., CCM 103.77)
- 9. Lincoln, CCM 4896.14) applied strips
- 10-11. Lincoln, CCM 755.10
- 12. Stamford, CCM 1025.10.
- 13. Lincoln, CCM 9633.06.
- 14. CCM, unprovenanced.
- 15. Lincoln, Saltergate, CCM 470.11.
- 16. Lincoln, CCM 23.74.
- 17-27. Somerby DMV, CCM 141.74.
- 28. Lincoln, High St., CCM 103.77.
- 29. Lincoln, Monks' Rd., CCM 9632.06.
- 30-31. (Lincoln?) Jarvis Collection, Doddington Hall.

Fig. 32. Imports from Europe into Lincolnshire

- (1-4. Martincamp type III flasks; hard dark-red or orange red fabrics).
- 1. Tallington, CCM.
- 2. Wainfleet, CCm 216.11.
- 3. Horncastle, 1978.
- 4. Short Ferry, Fiskerton, 1975.
- (5-8. Saintonge, SW France; white/buff fine fabric, coloured glazes).
- 5. Short Ferry, Fiskerton, 1975; Sweetmeat dish? Green cuprous glaze.

6. Short Ferry, Fiskerton, 1975; chafing dish. Green and yellow glaze.
7. Boston, 1957; chafing dish. Green glaze.
8. Freiston Priory, CCM; chafing dish rosette. Green and yellow glaze.
9. Lincoln, The Park, CCM 97.70; imitation Saintonge cup with blundered religious inscription. Buff pink fabric, speckled green glaze.
- (10-12. Raeren stoneware, all drinking vessels)
10. Greetwell, CCM 111.70.
11. Lincoln, Mint Lane, CCM 9619.06.
12. CCM, unprovenanced.
- (13-16 Cologne stoneware).
13. Grainthorpe, CCM 225.78.
14. Boston, CCM 38.80.
15. West Rasen, CCM.
16. Sempringham, 1978; fragmentary inscription '(Des Heres w) art bleibt i(n ewickeit)'.
..
- (17. Frechen stoneware, bearded jug).
17. Nocton, CCM 78.57; imaginary coat of arms.
- (18. Westerwald stoneware, drinking vessel).
18. Wyberton, 1977; moulded decoration coloured with cobalt blue.
- (19-20. Weser slipware dishes, buff/orange fabric, white slip, red/brown and green glaze).
19. Lincoln, The Park, CCM 97.70.
20. Lincoln, Broadgate East, LAT.
- (21-23. Possibly 18th century Dutch earthenware; red/orange fabric, white slip, clear brown glaze, green on interior).

21. Washingborough, 1946. Mug.
22. Unprovenanced, CCM 21.82. Bowl/cup.
23. Washingborough, 1946. Bowl/cup.
- (24. Dutch earthenware pipkin; pinkish red fabric, splashed
orange glaze.)
24. Horncastle, 1978.
- (25. N. Italian marbled slipware costrel; dull red fabric, white
slip, clear glaze).
26. Maltby, CCM 286.76.
- (26. Spanish, Valencia, lustre ware bowl; buff/white fabric, tin
glaze, copper lustre).
26. Lincoln, St. Mary's Guildhall, LAT, 1981.

Fig. 33. Bolingbroke Castle, pottery from grp. 1.

1. Albarelo, TGE, Spanish (Malaga?).
- (2-14. Bolingbroke wares).
2. Large jug or cistern neck and handle.
3. Jug, rim.
4. Jug, rim.
5. Jug, rim.
- 6-12. Pancheons.
13. Bowl, rim.
14. Part of a basting, dripping or fish dish.
- 15-16,19. Rim, base and almost complete vessel in dark-glazed
(Cistercian type) ware.
17. Raeren stoneware mug base.
18. Langerwehe stoneware mug rim/neck.
20. Martincamp type 2 stoneware flask, body sherds

Fig. 34. Boston; imported wares etc. from disused kiln

1. N. Italian marbled slipware bowl; dull red fabric, marbled slip on interior, clear lead glaze.
2. Raeren/Westerwald stoneware 'panelled' jug, brown salt glaze.
3. Metropolitan type slipware cup; red fabric, white slip under clear lead glaze.
4. Dark-glazed ware jug/jar base.
5. TGE mug rim, burnt.
6. Midlands yellow ware bowl.
7. Dutch TGE bowl, buff fabric, Wan Li border, cobalt decoration, lead glazed back.
8. TGE bowl, hard fabric, cobalt decoration.
9. TGE bowl/dish base, two colour cobalt decoration, hole through footring.
10. Dutch TGE dish, cobalt and orange decoration.
11. TGE mug, purple manganese speckled.
12. As above, base.
- 13-14. TGE bottle/jug base, plain white.
15. TGE lid, plain white.
16. TGE base, cream fabric, cobalt, yellow and orange decoration.
17. TGE dish base, cobalt Chinoiserie decoration.
18. TGE dish base, red/buff fabric, cobalt decoration.
19. TGE bowl/chamber pot, plain white.
20. Dutch or Spanish TGE albarello, reddish fabric, cobalt decoration.
21. TGE albarello, cobalt decoration.

- 22. Dutch TGE dish, buff fabric, cobalt, green and orange decoration.
- 23-24. Mediterranean Red and Green Earthenware bowls, decorated with cream slip green and red/brown under lead glaze.
- 25. Bourne 'D' type pancheon, soft pink fabric but with splashed cuprous green glaze.

Fig. 35. Lincoln; Vicars' Court

- 1. Mug; cream/buff fabric, brown slip decoration, clear yellow glaze.
- 2. Mug/jug rim; Midlands yellow ware.
- 3. Jug handle; buff fabric, green glaze.
- 4. Candlestick base; Midlands yellow ware.
- 5. Dark-glazed ware; mug rim.
- 6. Jar base; red fabric glazed brown inside and dark green outside, Boston type.
- 7. Jar/pipkin; fabric and glaze as 6.
- 8. Metropolitan type slipware cup; red fabric, white slip under clear lead glaze.
- 9. Frechen stoneware bearded jug, mask.
- 10. Dark-glazed ware, cup handle.
- 11. TGE body sherd, cobalt decoration.
- 12. TGE mug rim, purple manganese speckled.
- 13. Dutch or Spanish TGE albarello base, brown fabric, pinkish glaze, cobalt decoration
- 14. TGE saucer, cobalt decoration.
- 15. TGE body sherd, cobalt decoration. Burnt.
- 16. Chicken feeder, smooth pink unglazed earthenware.

17. TGE mug/bottle base, cobalt decoration.
18. TGE rectangular figurine base, plain white (fired upside down).
19. TGE lid, plain white.
20. Bowl; pink fabric, orange glazed inside, dark green outside.
Boston or Bolingbroke.
- 21-22. Lids; smooth pink unglazed earthenware.
23. Dark-glazed ware bottle/costrel.
24. Jar base; orange fabric, brown glaze internally.
Bolingbroke type.
25. Pancheon handle; red sandy fabric, green glaze on handle,
brown on vessel. Bolingbroke type.
26. TGE bowl rim, plain white.
27. Norfolt bichrome type jug base; orange fabric, cuprous
green glaze externally, blistered brown internally.
28. Jug handle; orange fabric, traces of brown glaze.
29. Handled bowl; orange fabric, flaking surface, green/orange
glaze internally. Toynton/Bolingbroke type.
30. Metropolitan type dish; pink fabric, brown slip with
trailed design in white slip over, clear lead glazed.
- 31-35. Pancheons; orange fabric, pitted green/brown glaze.
Bolingbroke types.
36. Tripod pipkin base; orange fabric, brown glaze internally,
burnt externally.
37. Pipkin handle; orange fabric, green/brown glaze. Boston type.

Fig. 36. Lincoln; Eastgate

1. Jar; orange fabric, orange/brown glaze externally. Thumbed
strip decoration. Boston type.

2. Jar; orange fabric, orange/brown glaze externally.
3. Lid-seated jar or pipkin; orange fabric, green/brown glaze on both surfaces. Boston type.
4. Midlands purple ware jar; orange/purple fabric, burnt brown glaze.
5. Jug; reduced fabric, sparse green glaze.
6. Frechen stoneware mug.
7. Dutch? or Metropolitan type slipware dish rim; orange fabric, clear glaze over white slip decoration.
8. Midlands purple ware handled dish; fabric similar to 4.
9. Dark-glazed ware mug/beaker; brown fabric, dark brown glaze on both surfaces.
10. Norfolk bichrome type lid; cream fabric, cuprous speckled glaze on exterior, orange interior.
11. Tripod pipkin; orange fabric, brown glaze internally, burnt externally.

Fig. 37. Brackenborough; pottery group from DMV

1. Frechen stoneware mug.
2. Cologne stoneware mug; impressed prunts.
3. Frechen stoneware mug rim/neck.
4. Raeren or Siegburg stoneware mug neck; moulded decoration.
5. N. Italian marbled slipware costrel sherd; pink fabric, white slip, brown glaze.
6. Dark-glazed ware cup (Cistercian type).
- 7-10. Martincamp type III flasks; neck and body sherds of up to four vessels.

- 11-12. Weser slipware dish; buff fabric, white slip on interior, red/brown and green slipped decoration.
- 13. Basting, dripping or fish-dish; red fabric, green-glaze on interior.
- 14-15. Jar rims; reduced fabric, mottled green glaze. Bolingbroke/Toynton type.

Fig. 38. Bolingbroke Castle; pottery from grp. IV

(1-14. Bolingbroke type wares).

- 1. Body sherds of large cistern; sandy orange fabric, yellow green glaze. Applied strip decoration with rosette stamp.
- 2. Jug rim and handle; orange fabric, yellow green glaze.
- 3-4&9. Lid seated jars or pipkins; sandy red/orange fabric, olive green glaze.
- 5-7. Pancheons; orange/buff fabric, yellow/green glaze.
- 8. Lugged cooking-vessel; orange fabric, burnt outer surface.
- 10. Two-handled jar; red/orange fabric, olive green glaze.
- 11. Rim of small bowl; grey/brown fabric, patchy yellow/green glaze internally.
- 12. Large jar or cooking pot; orange fabric, unglazed.
- 13. Handled jar; fabric as 11, brown/green glaze on both surfaces.
- 14. Handled bowl or chamber pot; orange/buff fabric, yellow/green glaze internally.
- (15-18. Dark glazed wares, Cistercian type).
- 15. Cup; greenish glaze, applied white clay stamp.
- 16. Cup.
- 17. Cup; glaze bubbled and purple.

18. Cup.
19. Metropolitan type jug? sherd; orange fabric, white slip decoration, clear lead glaze.

Fig. 39. Roughton; paint pots from church.

(All dark-glazed drinking vessels)

1. Two handled mug/beaker.
- 2-9. Single handled mugs/beakers.

All held paint pigment traces - 1. Black, 2. Ochre, 3. Green,
4. White and red, 5. Orange/red, 6. White, 7. Pale blue, 8. Orange/red,
9. White.

Fig. 40. Lincoln; Bishop's Palace, grp. F.

1. Dark-glazed ware chamber pot; semi-vitrified purple fabric, clear lead glaze on both surfaces.
2. TGE chamber pot base, plain white.
3. White salt-glazed stoneware bowl rim.
4. Cup or porringer base; cream fabric, brown slip decoration, clear glaze.
5. ~~White~~ salt-glazed stoneware tea-cup.
6. Cooking-pot or jar; orange fabric, brown/green glaze on both surfaces.
7. Pancheon; orange fabric, clear glaze.
8. Jar rim; pale orange fabric.
9. Jar; pink/orange fabric, iron-stained (black) glaze.
- 10-11. Bowls; orange or orange/brown fabric, coarse inclusions, unglazed.

Fig. 41. Lincoln; Bishop's Palace, grp. J.

1. Fragment of a roof-louvre.
(2-6. White salt-glazed stoneware).
2. Small bowl.
3. Bowl or tea pot base.
4. Tankard rim with rouletted decoration.
5. Tankard base.
6. Tankard base with rouletted decoration.
7. English porcelain bowl with underglaze cobalt decoration.
8. Shallow bowl; pink fabric, white slip on interior, brown slip spots under clear lead glaze.
9. Posset pot, feathered slipware. Staffordshire.
10. Cup with similar decoration.
11. TGE plate rim; two tone cobalt decoration.
12. TGE punchbowl rim; cobalt decoration to exterior.
13. TGE chamber pot, plain white.
14. Nottingham salt-glazed stoneware porringer base.
15. Large cup or porringer; cream fabric, streaky light and dark brown glaze. (Sherds of eight other vessels of this kind in this group.)
16. Flat dish or plant-pot base; plain unglazed earthenware.
17. Large jar or pancheon; semi-vitrified purple fabric, applied clay cordon.
18. Chamber pot rim; hard red/purple fabric, clear lead glaze.
19. Flanged bowl; pale orange fabric, patchy pale green glaze on interior.
20. Pancheon; soft sandy orange fabric, brown/black glaze on interior.

- (21-24. Not illustrated. 21. Slip decorated moulded plate,
22-24. Slipware plates, all Staffordshire type).

Fig. 42. Lincoln; pottery from Guildhall pit

(1-3. White salt-glazed stoneware).

1. Mug.
2. Cup or porringer rim.
3. Cup or porringer base.

(4-6. Nottingham salt-glazed stoneware).

4. Tankard.
5. Tankard rim.
6. Bowl rim.
7. Porringer; cream fabric, iron-stained lead glaze.
8. TGE chamber pot, plain white with blue tinge.
9. TGE chamber pot, plain white.
10. Large jar; fabric and glaze as 7.
11. TGE bowl, plain white.
12. TGE chamber pot, plain white with blue tinge.
- 13-14. TGE barber's (bleeding) bowls, with pierced handles,
plain white.
15. TGE shallow dish, plain white with blue tinge.
16. TGE plate, as 13-14.
17. TGE plate, cobalt decoration.
18. TGE saucer, cobalt decoration.
19. TGE plate, dark cobalt decoration.
20. TGE bowl, cobalt decoration on interior.
21. TGE Plate rim, cobalt decoration.
22. TGE plate, cobalt decoration, pink tinge to glaze.

23. TGE teacup, cobalt decoration.
24. TGE plate, cobalt decoration.
25. TGE plate, cobalt, brown and green decoration. Pierced suspension hole in footring.
26. Bowl; orange/buff fabric, clear yellow glaze on interior.
- (27-31. Earthenware in red/orange fabric, black iron-stained glaze).
27. Bowl.
28. Large jar.
- 29-31. Pancheons.
- (32. Not illustrated; feathered Staffordshire slipware dish).

Fig. 44. Lincoln; Bishop's Palace, 1965

1. Bowl; semi-vitrified brown/purple fabric, black iron-stained glaze.
2. Chamber pot base; orange/white fabric, brown iron-stained glaze.
3. White salt-glazed stoneware bowl.
- 4-5. Staffordshire slipware cups.
6. Moulded Staffordshire slipware dish.
7. Shoulder of jar; grey/white fabric, copper green glaze on both surfaces.
8. Nottingham stoneware jug.
9. TGE chamber pot rim, plain white with blue tinge.
- 10-11. Tripod cooking pots; softish orange fabric, lead glaze brown inside and green on outside.
12. Jar; fabric and glaze similar to 10-11.
- 13-14. Jars or Jugs; fabric and glaze as 10-11.

Fig. 45. Scothern; pit group from Main St.

1. Leeds creamware teapot, painted red, black and yellow bird design.
2. Leeds creamware mug, brown decoration.
3. Leeds creamware mug, light brown decoration, black and white chequer at rim.
4. Leeds creamware mug, dark brown decoration.
5. Creamware jug base, plain white.
6. Creamware bowl, plain white.
7. Creamware lid, plain white.
8. Creamware plate, plain white.
9. Creamware bowl, plain white.
10. Creamware bowl, plain white.
11. Creamware plate, plain white.
12. Pearlware dish with transfer print.
13. Porcelain teacup, plain white.
14. White salt-glazed stoneware plate rim, moulded decoration.
15. Creamware bowl, plain white.
- (16-20. Nottingham stoneware).
16. Bowl base.
17. Handled bowl, cordon under rim.
- 18-19. Jar or jug bases.
20. Handled cup or bowl, reeded handle.
21. TGE plate, cobalt and manganese decoration on rim and interior.
22. Dark glazed ware jar base; red fabric, iron-stained glaze on inner surface.

23. Dark glazed ware jug or handled bowl; red fabric, iron-stained glaze on both surfaces.
24. Nottingham stoneware dish or bowl.
25. Dark glazed ware chamber pot; red/purple fabric, iron-stained glaze on both surfaces. White incrustation on interior.
26. Staffordshire slipware cup; off-white fabric, yellow slip on interior, brown glaze with yellow trailed slip on exterior.
27. Large salting-jar; coarse red fabric, iron-stained black glaze on interior only.
28. Pancheon; coarse red fabric, brown/green glaze on interior only.
29. Pancheon; coarse red fabric, iron-stained black glaze on interior only.

Fig. 46. Humberston Abbey; Toynton All Saints/Bolingbroke wares from drain

- (1-5. Toynton/Bolingbroke wares; pale orange/buff fabrics, glaze as individually described).
1. Small jug, orange/brown glaze.
2. Large jug, green/orange glaze.
3. Urinal, purple/yellow-brown glaze.
4. Small jug or urinal?, unglazed.
5. Cistern/ale-jar, olive green glaze, applied thumbled strip decoration.

Fig. 47. Humberston Abbey; Toynton All Saints/Bolingbroke/Humber wares from drain.

- (6. Toynton/Bolingbroke ware; see above for description).
6. Cistern/Ale-jar, olive green glaze, applied thumbled strip decoration.
- (7-11. Humber wares; hard orange/red fabrics, olive/brownish green suspension glazes).
7. Jug.
8. Jug.
9. Squat jug with thumbled 'feet' on base.
10. Jug base.
11. Urinal.

Fig. 49. Bolingbroke; pottery from site 1.

(Types, reconstructed from a number of sherds. These are also wasters, so only generalized descriptions are given).

1. Cistern/Ale-jar; orange/brown fabric.
2. Jug? with frilled base; light orange/brown fabric, cream slip surface.
3. Jug; orange/brown fabric, bit of green glaze.
4. Handled bowl; orange/brown fabric, unglazed.
5. Pancheon; orange/brown or reduced grey fabric, green glazed interior.
6. Chafing dish; orange/brown to grey fabric, green/brown glazed inside and out, made in two pieces.

Fig. 50. Bolingbroke; pottery from site 1

1. Cistern/Ale-jar; purple fabric, mottled green glaze.
- 2-4. Jar/cistern sherds; buff fabric, green glaze. Various stamped/impressed applied strip decorations.
5. Jar/cooking pot; orange/pink fabric, unglazed. Thumbled strip decoration under rim.
6. Cistern/Ale-jar base; buff/orange fabric, green glaze. Thumbled base.
7. Chafing dish; white/buff fabric, wasted green glaze.
8. Chafing dish; orange fabric, patchy brown green glaze. Perforations below rim.
9. Small bottle neck; buff fabric, unglazed.
10. Pipkin handle; buff/orange fabric, unglazed.
11. Jug handle; buff/orange fabric, unglazed.
12. Basting/dripping pan, side handle; buff orange fabric, patchy brown glaze.
13. Chafing dish? side handle; buff fabric, dull green glaze on both surfaces.
14. Large bowl/pancheon with pulled feet; orange fabric, patchy brown glaze on interior. Dutch influence?
15. Modelled horse; orange fabric, reduced at core, green glaze. Probably from an elaborate dish base or table centre.

Fig. 51. Bolingbroke; pottery from site 3.

(All fabrics orange/red; glazes described below, almost always smooth and glossy)

1. Bowl rim; clear brown glaze internally.
2. Jar; brown glaze internally.

3. Lid-seated jar; glaze as 1.
4. Jar; glaze as 2.
5. Bowl/jar; smooth green/brown glaze.
6. Bowl; clear brown glaze on both surfaces.
7. Bowl; glaze as 1.
8. Bowl/pancheon; glaze as 1.
9. Bowl/pancheon; glaze as 1.
10. Flanged bowl; clear brown/green glaze on both surfaces.
11. Lid-seated jar; glaze as 10.
12. Handle; overfired with brown/purple glaze, as Cistercian types.
13. Jar/bowl; glaze as 1.
14. Pancheon; dark brown glaze internally.
15. Plate/bowl rim; glaze as 1.
16. Flanged bowl; glaze as 1.
17. Jug lip and spout; dark green glaze on both surfaces.
18. Handle; glaze and finish as 12.

Fig. 52. Bolingbroke; pottery from site 2 (1-7), site 7 (8-11), and site 5 (12-15)

1. Jar; reduced fabric, unglazed.
2. Jar; reduced fabric, dark green glaze on both surfaces.
3. Jar; orange fabric, dark green glaze on interior, green/brown on exterior.
4. Flanged bowl; orange fabric, clear brown glaze on both surfaces.
5. Pancheon; hard grey overfired fabric, wasted glaze.
6. Pancheon; orange fabric, dark green glaze on interior.

7. Pipkin/skillet handle; orange fabric, clear brown glaze.
8. Small jar; orange fabric, dark green/brown glaze on interior.
9. Bowl (diam. unknown); orange fabric, green/brown glaze on interior.
10. Shallow bowl; orange fabric, clear brown glaze on interior.
11. Bowl; orange fabric, clear brown wasted glaze on interior.
12. Saucer or dish; red fabric, glossy brown/orange glaze with black specks.
13. Dripping pan handle; fabric and glaze as 12.
14. Jug/jar base; fabric and glaze as 12.
15. Bowl with thickened rim; fabric and glaze as 12.

Fig. 53. Bolingbroke; pottery from site 6 (1-10), Grantham (11), miscellaneous sites (12-23).

(1-10 from fill of Castle ditch, of more than one period or maker)

1. Mammiform costrel; orange fabric, mottled brown glaze on exterior.
2. Cup; red fabric, dark green glaze on both surfaces. A local version of a Cistercian ware type?
3. Cup or costrel base; as 2. A waster with a hole in its base, filled with a lump of glaze.
4. Bottle/flask neck; orange fabric, green glazed on exterior.
5. Bowl; orange fabric, brown glaze on interior. Rim decorated with impressed concentric rings.
6. Shallow bowl; orange fabric, green/brown glaze on interior.
7. Bowl/pancheon; orange fabric, green glaze on interior.

8. Bowl?; buff fabric, light green glaze on both surfaces, finger impressions inside.
9. Candlestick stem; orange/buff fabric, green glaze on outside and in top recess.
10. Jar or pipkin; orange fabric, green glaze on both surfaces.
11. Grantham coin hoard container (jar or jug); brown/purple fabric and glaze.
- (12-13. Midland Yellow ware handled bowls)
12. CCM 9606.06.
13. CCM 9605.06.
14. Staffordshire slipware cup or handled bowl. Lincoln, Post Office, CCM 136.08.
15. Spanish oil/olive jar. Morton, Gainsborough, CCM Trollope Coll.
16. Whistle (from jester's head model?) Dorrington; buff fabric, clear yellow/green glaze. CCM 70.80.
17. Human figure/toy, Toynton All Saints; buff/orange fabric, dull green glaze on upper surface. CCM 690.10.
18. E. Lincs. sgraffito sherd, Barrowby; sandy orange fabric, yellow glaze over slip, cut through to show fabric. CCM 175.77.
19. Fuming pot, Caistor; reduced fabric, dull green glaze on both surfaces. CCM 30.66.
- (20-23. Figurines or salts in 'reversed Cistercian ware'; cream fabric, yellow glaze, brown clay details (20-21) or conventional Cistercian ware (22-23)).
20. Female head, Ruskington, CCM 70.80.
21. Female head, Nettleham, CCM 9653.06.
22. Female figure with basket, Somerton Castle. CCM 86.76
23. Female figure with basket, Addlethorpe. CCM 118.80.

Fig. 54. Boston; pottery from site 1.

(Fabrics reduced or orange/red, glazes brown or green over reduced fabric, often pitted. Exceptions noted below.)

- 1-2. Jars, thumbled decoration below rim.
3. Handled jar or cooking pot.
4. Jar with heavy rilling.
- 5-6. Cordoned bowls.
7. Part of a dutch oven? Fragmentary scratched initials like a merchant's mark.
8. Lower part of dutch oven on three feet.
- 9-12. Lids, all unglazed.
- 13-14. Storage jars/pipkins; orange fabric, glossy green glaze on exterior, brown on interior.
15. Mug base; orange fabric, dark green glaze on both surfaces.
A local imitation of Dark glazed wares?
16. Base of unidentified vessel, description as 15.
17. Cup/bowl base, description as 15.
18. Large handled bowl.

Fig. 55. Boston; pottery from site 1.

(Fabric and glaze descriptions as in Fig. 54.)

- 19-23. Pancheons. 19 has a flanged rim and 20 thumbled decoration on upper edge.
24. Large handled bowl with thumbled strip below rim.

Fig. 56. Bourne; pottery from site 6

(Fabrics usually oxidized, pink or orange, sometimes with cream slip, patchy glaze, clear or green.)

1. Jug; bib of slip below spout, covered with patchy green glaze.
2. Large jug; as 1.
3. Watering pot neck; sgraffito on top and side through white slip.
- 4,8,9. Pancheons, slipped and part clear glazed internally.
5. Jar with thumbbed/sgraffito band below rim; description as 3, but glazed.
6. Bowl/pancheon with sgraffito on rim; as 5.
7. Jug neck with sgraffito leaf pattern; as 5.

Fig. 57. Coningsby; pottery from Great Beats Fm. (1-12). Bourne; pot from Site 1 (13).

1. Costrel; pink fabric, dark green mottled glaze.
2. Chafing dish; pink fabric, mottled brown/green glaze.
3. Handle, octagonal section; pink fabric, shiny green glaze overall.
4. Jar; reduced fabric, mottled brown/green glaze.
5. Skillet handle; pink fabric, dark green wasted glaze on upper surface.
6. Tripod pipkin base; hard purple fabric, overfired glaze.
7. Handled bowl; reduced fabric, mottled green glaze.
8. Stacking tile, glazed on both surfaces with rim marks.
9. Lid-seated jar; pink fabric, green glaze.
10. Jar; reduced fabric, mottled green glaze.

- 11-12. Pancheons; pink fabric, mottled green glaze internally.
12 has stacking marks from other vessels under rim.
13. (Bourne). Cistern/Ale-jar; pink fabric, bib of slip covered in clear glaze above spigot hole. Knife-trimmed base.

Fig. 58. Hareby; pottery from DMV site (1-7). Kirkstead; pottery from site 2 (8-19) and site 3 (20-29). ..

1. Flanged bowl; orange fabric, brown glaze.
2. Fuming pot; orange fabric, dark green glaze. Holes and cut-out crosses in body, sgraffito mark on exterior.
- 3-6. Pancheons; orange fabric, glossy green glaze on interior.
7. Plate or dish; orange fabric, clear glossy brown glaze on interior.
8. Bowl/pancheon; red sandy fabric, brown/green glaze.
9. Jar; buff fabric, wasted green glaze on exterior.
10. Jar; reduced fabric, dark green patchy glaze.
11. Pancheon; reduced fabric, mottled dark green glaze.
12. Pancheon; orange fabric, orange/green glaze.
13. Jar; reduced fabric, brown/green glaze.
14. Pancheon; reduced fabric, patchy green glaze.
15. Bowl; orange fabric, wasted green glaze.
16. Jar; brown/grey fabric, unglazed.
17. Bowl; reduced fabric, brown/green glaze on interior.
- 18-19. Pancheons; reduced fabrics, dark green glaze on interior.
20. Pancheon; reduced fabric, green glaze on interior.
21. Pancheon; orange fabric, wasted glaze on interior.
22. Handle; reduced fabric, unglazed.

23. Handle; reduced fabric, dark green patchy glaze.
24. Pancheon; orange fabric, green glaze on interior.
25. Stacking tile; marks of at least two successive rims in glaze.
26. Pancheon; orange fabric, orange/green speckled glaze.
27. Pancheon rim; orange fabric, patchy green glaze.
28. Pancheon rim; reduced fabric, dark green patchy glaze.
29. Jar; reduced fabric, patchy green glaze on exterior.

Fig. 59. Toynton All Saints; pottery from site 2

(Fabrics coarse and red, patchy green glaze. These are wasters, so only generalized descriptions are given.)

1. Jug; overfired and distorted, the handle of another stuck to its base.
2. Jar.
3. Cistern/Ale-jar; handles fixed at top by plugs of clay into vessel.
4. Jar.
5. Large jug.
6. Handle of skillet or pipkin; fastened by clay plug as 3.

Fig. 60. Toynton All Saints; pottery from Site 2.

(General description as Fig. 59)

7. Jar; thumbled strip below rim.
8. Chafing dish.
- 9-11. Fragments of dripping/basting/fish dishes of slab construction.
- 12-13. Deep dishes/pancheons.

14. Pancheon; overfired, cracked and distorted.
- 15-16. Feet from tripod vessels or more probably props for separating stacks in the kiln. (Many such were found on this site.)

Fig. 61. Toynton All Saints; pottery from Site 2 (1-11) and Site 5 (12-23).

1. Bowl; orange fabric, green glaze on interior.
2. Jar; orange fabric, green glaze on exterior. Thumbled strip below rim.
3. Jar; orange fabric, pitted green/orange glaze. Thumbled strip below rim.
4. Foot from tripod vessel; red/orange fabric, unglazed. Clay plug to strengthen join.
5. Spigot hole from cistern/ale-jar; red/purple fabric, unglazed.
6. Pancheon; orange fabric, green glaze on both surfaces.
7. Pancheon/bowl; orange fabric, green glaze on interior.
8. Jug; orange fabric, patchy green glaze on exterior.
9. Costrel; orange fabric, green glaze on exterior.
10. Candlestick, hollow, with multangular cut base; orange fabric, green glaze on exterior.
11. Pancheon; orange fabric, green glaze on interior.
12. Pancheon; orange fabric, orange/green glaze.
13. Pancheon; orange fabric, green glaze on interior.
14. Jug (more complete example of same profile/size as 21).
15. Foot from tripod vessel; red fabric, unglazed.
16. Rim and handle of cistern/ale-jar or bowl; orange fabric, green glaze on exterior.

17. Jug rim; orange fabric, green glaze.
- 18-19. Pipkin handles; orange/red fabric, unglazed.
20. Dripping/basting/fish dish; orange fabric, patchy green glaze.
21. Jug; distorted ~~waster~~ (see 14).
22. Spigot hole from cistern/ale-jar; orange fabric, patchy green glaze.

Fig. 62. Toynton All Saints; pottery from site n. of church (1-7), and site 2 (8-15).

(1-7. Fabric orange with buff surfaces, unglazed except as indicated).

1. Jug, green glaze on shoulder.
2. Jug.
3. Kiln prop (marks of jug rims on base).
4. Small jug.
5. Bottle neck.
6. Jug base, frilled decoration.
7. Curfew or dish-cover (no air-holes); 8-pointed star sgraffito through green glaze and slip? surface.
8. Cistern/Ale-jar neck and handles; orange fabric, green glaze on exterior. Plugged handle joint.
9. Skillet handle; orange fabric, unglazed.
10. Handled bowl; orange fabric, green glaze on interior and part of exterior.
11. Jug; overfired and distorted, wasted glaze.
12. Pancheon; orange fabric, wasted glaze on interior.
13. Bowl; orange fabric, patchy green glaze on interior.

14. Lid-seated jar; orange/buff fabric, green glaze on exterior.
15. Jar; orange fabric, green glaze on exterior. Thumbled strip below rim.

Fig. 63. Toynton All Saints; pottery from Site 7

(Fabrics orange with parchment exterior surface, green glaze on front/shoulder only. Reeded handles.)

1. Jug; distorted waster with rim of another jug pushed up into base by incorrect stacking.
2. Jug; crack in base.
3. Jug.
4. Jug; prominent girth grooves.

Fig. 64. Toynton All Saints; pottery from Site 1

(Fabrics orange with occasional parchment exterior surface, patchy green glaze)

1. Cistern/Ale-jar, partial glaze. Knife trimmed base.
2. Pancheon; green glaze on interior.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aitken, M.J. & Hawley, H.N., 'Magnetic Dating 3; Further Archaeomagnetic Measurements in Britain', Archaeometry, 9, 1966, 190-1.
- Anon., (Results of) Poll for the Election of Knights of the Shire, Lincoln, 1818.
- Anon., Memoirs Illustrative of the History and Antiquities of the County and City of Lincoln, Royal Archaeological Institute, London, 1850.
- Anon., Potiers de Saintonge, huit siècles d'artisanat rural, Paris, 1975.
- Archaeology in Lincoln, Annual Reports of the Lincoln Archaeological Trust, 10-12, Lincoln, 1982-4.
- Archaeology in Lincolnshire, Annual Reports of the Trust for Lincolnshire Archaeology, Lincoln, 1- , 1985-date.
- Archer, M., English Delftware/Engels Delfts Aardewerk, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, n.d.
- Ashdown, J.H., 'The Pottery and Other Finds' in 'Finds from a Well at Potter's Bar', Herts. Archaeol., 2, 1970, 92-104.
- Barley, L.B. & M., 'Lincolnshire Craftsmen in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', The Lincolnshire Historian, 2, 6, 1959, 7-22.
- Barley, L.B. & M.W., 'Lincolnshire Shopkeepers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', The Lincolnshire Historian, 2, 9, 1962, 7-22.

- Barley, M.W., 'A Glossary of Names for Rooms in Houses of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in Foster, I.H. & Alcock, L. (eds.), Culture and Environment. Essays in Honour of Sir Cyril Fox, London, 1963, 479-501.
- Barnard, F.P., The Casting-Counter and the Counting Board, Oxford, 1916.
- Barton, K.J., 'The Post-Medieval Pottery' in 'Excavations at St. Nicholas's Almshouses, Bristol', Med. Arch. VIII, 1964, 193-212.
- Beckwith, I.S., 'The River Trade of Gainsborough, 1500-1850', LHA, 2, 1967, 6-7.
- Beckwith, I.S., The Louth Riverhead, Louth, 1976.
- Beresford, J., The Diaries of an English Country Parson; James Woodforde, 1758-1802, 5 vols., Oxford, OUP, 1931.
- Blanchard, I.S.W., 'Derbyshire Lead Production, 1195-1505', Derbys Arch. J., XCI, 1971, 119-140.
- Bradley, R. (ed.), John Houghton's Husbandry and Trade Improv'd, Vol. 1, London, 1727.
- Brears, P.C.D., A Catalogue of English Country Pottery Housed in the Yorkshire Museum, York, York, Yorkshire Phil. Soc., 1968.
- Brears, P.C.D., 'An 18th-Century Chamber-Pot from Winterton, Lincs', Post-Med. Arch. 4, 1970, 166-7.

- Brears, P.C.D., The English Country Pottery - Its History and Techniques, David & Charles, Newton Abbot, 1971.
- Brears, P.C.D., The Collector's Book of English Country Pottery, David & Charles, Newton Abbot, 1974.
- Brears, P.C.D., The Long Collection of Delft & Creamware, Castle Museum, York, 1977.
- Bryant, G.F. & Steane, J.M., 'Excavations at the Deserted Medieval Settlement at Lyveden; A Second Interim Report', Northampton Museum & Art Gallery Journal, 5, 1969.
- Bryant, G.E., 'Experimental Kiln Firings at Barton-on-Humber, S. Humberside, 1975', Med. Arch., XXI, 1977, 106-23.
- Butler, L.A.S., 'Church Close, Langton by Spilsby; a deserted medieval village', LAASRP, 9, 2, 1962.
- Caiger-Smith, A., Tin-Glaze Pottery in Europe and the Islamic World, Faber, London, 1973.
- Celoria, F., Dated Post-Medieval Pottery in the London Museum, HMSO, London, 1966.
- Chapman, H., Coppack, G. & Drewett, P., Excavations at the Bishop's Palace, Lincoln, 1968-72, Soc. for Lincs. Hist. & Arch. Occ. Papers, 1, Sleaford, 1975.
- Charleston, R.J., World Ceramics, Hamlyn, London, 1968.

- Charleston, R.J. & Towner, D., English Ceramics 1580-1830, Sotheby Parke Bernet, London, 1977.
- Clarke, H. & Carter, A., Excavations in King's Lynn, 1963-70, Soc. for Med. Arch. Monograph Series No. 7, London, 1977.
- Clarke, P.V. & Hurst, J.G., in Schofield, J. et al., 'Excavations South of Edinburgh High Street 1973-4', PSAS, 107, 1975-6, 206-11.
- Colyer, C., 'Excavations at Lincoln 1970-1972: The Western Defences of the Lower Town. An Interim Report'. Ant.J. LV, pt. 2, 1975, 227-266.
- Colyer, C. & Jones, M.J. (eds.) 'Excavations at Lincoln. Second Interim Report: Excavations in the Lower Town 1972-8', Ant. J. LIX, pt. 1, 1979, 50-91.
- Cooper, R.G., English Slipware Dishes 1650-1850, Tiranti, London, 1968.
- Coppack, G., 'Two Eighteenth Century Pit-Groups from Lincoln', LHA, 8, 1973, 115-25.
- Coppack, G., 'The Pottery' in Drewett, P., 'The Excavation of the Great Hall at Bolingbroke Castle, Lincolnshire, 1973', Post-Med. Arch. 10, 1976, 6-24.
- Crellin, J.K., Medical Ceramics in the Wellcome Institute, Museum Catalogue vol. 1., English and Dutch, London, 1969.

- Crossley, D. & Aberg, A., '16th Century Glass-Making in Yorkshire: Excavations at Hutton and Rosedale, North Riding, 1968-71', Post-Med. Arch. 6, 1972, 107-59.
- Davey, P.J. & Rutter, J.A., 'Medieval and Early Post-Medieval Finewares from France and Spain', Cheshire Archaeological Bulletin, 3, 1975, 15-21.
- Davey, P.J. (ed.), Medieval Pottery from Excavations in the North West, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, 1977.
- Davey, P.J. & Rutter, J.A., 'Imported Pottery in the North West, c.800-1700 AD', Cheshire Archaeological Bulletin, 6, 1978-9, 19-36.
- Davey, P.J. & Hodges, R. (eds.), Ceramics and Trade - The Production and Distribution of Later Medieval Pottery in North West Europe, Sheffield, 1983.
- Deetz, J., In Small Things Forgotten: The Archaeology of Early American Life, Anchor Books, New York, 1977.
- Dick, O.L., Aubrey's Brief Lives, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1972.
- Draper, J., Dated Post-Medieval Pottery in Northampton Museum, Museums & Art Gallery, Northampton, 1975.
- Draper, J. 'Inventory of Ann Shergold, ceramic dealer in Blandford, Dorset', Post-Med. Arch., 16, 1982, 85-91.
- Draper, J., Post-Medieval Pottery, 1650-1800, Shire, Aylesbury, 1984.

- Dudding, R.C., History of Saleby with Thoresthorpe, 1922.
- Dunning, G.C., 'The Trade in Medieval Pottery around the North Sea', in Renaud, J.G., (ed.), Rotterdam Papers, 1, Rotterdam, 1968, 35-58.
- Ekwall, E., The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names, OUP, Oxford, 4th edn. 1960.
- Evison, V.I., Hodges, H. & Hurst, J.G., Medieval Pottery from Excavations - Studies Presented to Gerald Clough Dunning, with a Bibliography of his works, John Baker, London, 1974.
- Fairclough, G.J. Plymouth Excavations: St. Andrews Street 1976, Plymouth Museum Archaeological Series, 2, Plymouth, 1979.
- Fanning, T. & Hurst, J.G., 'A Mid Seventeenth-Century Pottery Group and other Objects from Ballyhack Castle, Co. Wexford', Proc. of the Royal Irish Academy 75, C, 6, 1975, 103-118.
- Field, N. & White, A., A Prospect of Lincolnshire, Lincoln, 1984.
- Finch, R., Coals from Newcastle, Terence Dalton, Lavenham, 1973.
- Fishley Holland, W., Fifty Years a Potter, Tring, 1958.

Foster, C.W., The Parish Registers of Bourne (1562-1650),
Lincoln Record Society, 7, Lincoln, 1921.

Friederich, F.H.W., 'Baardmannen', Westerheem, XVI, 3,
1967, 96-113.

Frothingham, A.W., Lustreware of Spain, Hisp. Soc. of
America, New York, 1951.

Garner, A.A., Boston, Politics, and the Sea, History of
Boston Ser., 13, Kay, Boston, 1975.

Garner, F.H. & Archer, M., English Delftware, Faber & Faber,
London, 2nd edn., 1972.

Gaskell Brown, C., Plymouth Excavations: Castle Street:
The Pottery, Plymouth Museum Archaeological Series,
1, Plymouth, 1979.

Goff, C., A Woman of the Tudor Age, London, 1930.

Goggin, J.M., The Spanish Olive Jar, Yale UP, Yale, 1960.

Gough, R., William Camden's Britannia, Vol. 2, London, 1806.

Grant, A., North Devon Pottery: The Seventeenth Century,
University of Exeter, Exeter, 1983.

Green, J.N. et al., The Loss of the Verenigde Oostindische
Compagnie Jacht Vergulde Draeck, Western Australia, 1656,
BAR Supplementary Series 36i and ii, Oxford, 1977.

- Greene, J.P., 'Black Glazed Pottery and the Composition of its Glaze', Cheshire Archaeological Bulletin, 4, 1976, 15-20.
- Hall, A. (ed.), Collected Poems of Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter and Norwich, London, 1949.
- Harrison, K., 'Vitruvius and Accoustic Jars in England During the Middle Ages', Trans. Ancient Mons. Soc., NS., 15, 1968, 49-58.
- Haslam, J., Medieval Pottery, Shire, Aylesbury, 1978.
- Haward, W.I., 'The Trade of Boston in the Fifteenth Century', AASRP, XLI, 1933.
- Hayfield, C. & Hurst, J.G., 'Pottery Fools' Head Whistles from London and Tattershall, Lincs.', Ant. J. 63, 1983, 380-3.
- Hayfield, C., 'A Late-Medieval Pottery Group from Humberston Abbey, S. Humberside', LHA, 19, 1984, 107-110.
- Hayfield, C., Humberside Medieval Pottery, BAR, 140, Oxford, 1985.
- Healey, R.H., 'Bourne Ware', LHA, 4, 1969, 108-9.
- Healey, R.H., 'Medieval and Sub-Medieval Pottery in Lincolnshire', Unpublished MPhil thesis, University of Nottingham, 1975.

Healey, R.H., A Glossary of Medieval Pottery Decoration,
Car Dyke Research Group, Bicker, 1976.

Healey, R.H., 'A Fragment of an Earthenware Figure from
Ewerby, Lincs.', South Lincs. Archaeology, 1, 1977, 23.

Hill, J.W.F., 'The Royalist Clergy of Lincolnshire',
LAASRP, 2, 1, 1938, 65-9.

Hill, J.W.F., Medieval Lincoln, CUP, Cambridge, 1948.

Hill, J.W.F., Tudor and Stuart Lincoln, CUP, Cambridge, 1956.

Hill, J.W.F., Georgian Lincoln, CUP, Cambridge, 1966.

Hill, J.W.F., Victorian Lincoln, CUP, Cambridge, 1974.

Hill, J.W.F., A Short History of Lincoln, Lincoln Civic
Trust, Lincoln, 1979.

Hinton, R.W.K. (ed.), The Port Books of Boston 1601-1640,
Lincoln Record Society, 50, Lincoln, 1956.

Hodgett, G.A.J., Tudor Lincolnshire, Hist. of Lincs.
Committee, Lincoln, 1975.

Hodgkin, J.E. & Hodgkin, E., Early English Pottery, Named,
Dated & Inscribed, EP (reprint) Wakefield, 1973.

Holdsworth, J., Selected Pottery Groups AD650-1780,
Archaeology of York, 16/1, CBA, London, 1978.

Holmes, C., Seventeenth Century Lincolnshire, Hist. of
Lincs. Committee, Lincoln, 1980.

- Holmes, M.R., 'The So-Called 'Bellarmine' Mask on Imported Rhenish Stoneware', Ant. J. XXXI, 1951, 173-9.
- Honey, W.B., Wedgwood Ware, Faber, London, 1948.
- Honey, W.B., European Ceramic Art from the end of the Middle Ages to about 1815, Faber, London, 1949.
- Hoon, E.E., The Organisation of the English Customs System, 1696-1786, David & Charles, Newton Abbot, 1968.
- Hurst, J.G., 'White Castle and the Dating of Medieval Pottery', Med. Arch., VI, 1962, 135-50.
- Hurst, J.G., 'Post Medieval French Imports and English Copies at Lincoln', LHA, 1, 1966, 54-6.
- Hurst, J.G., 'The Pottery', in 'Excavations at Old Wardour Castle', Wilts. Arch. & Nat. Hist. Mag., 62, 1967, 74-8.
- Hurst, J.G., 'A Wanfried dish from Newcastle' AA4 1972, 259-62.
- Hurst, J.G. & Moorhouse, S., 'Imported pottery from the Boulevard and other sites in the Bridlington district', in 'A Medieval Post-Mill and Prehistoric Site at Bridlington', YAJ, 45, 1973, 26-9.
- Hurst, J.G., in Neal, D.S., 'The Palace of King's Langley', Med. Arch. XXI, 1977, 156-7.

Hurst, J.G., 'Langerwehe stoneware of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries', in Apted, M.R., Gilyard-Beer, R., and Saunders, A.D., (eds.), Ancient Monuments and their Interpretation; Essays Presented to A.J. Taylor, 1977, 219-38.

Hurst, J.G., Neal, D.S. & Van Beuningen, H.J.E. Pottery produced and traded in North West Europe 1350-1650, (Rotterdam Papers VI), Rotterdam, 1986.

Jarrett, M.J. & Edwards, B.J.N., 'Medieval Pottery from Finchale Priory', AA4, XXXIX, 1961, 253-78.

Jarrett, M.G., Edwards, B.J.N., 'Medieval pottery in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle Upon Tyne', AA4, XLI, 1963, 85-106.

Jennings, S. with Karshner, M.M., Milligan, W.F. & Williams, S.V., Eighteen Centuries of Pottery from Norwich, East Anglian Archaeology Report no. 13, Norwich, 1981.

Jewitt, L., The Ceramic Art of Great Britain, 2 vols. London, 1878.

Jones, E.L., 'The Reduction of Fire-Damage in Southern England, 1650-1850', Post-Med. Arch. 2, 1968, 140-9.

Jones, M.J. (ed.), 'Excavations at Lincoln. Third Interim Report: Sites Outside the Walled City 1972-1977', Ant. J., LXI, pt. 1., 1981, 83-114.

- Jones, R.H., Medieval Houses at Flaxengate, Lincoln, The Archaeology of Lincoln, XI-1, CBA, London, 1980.
- Kenyon, G.H., The Glass Industry of the Weald, Leicester UP, Leicester, 1967.
- Kerr, N., 'An Old Bourne Industry', Lincolnshire Life, March 1979, 38-9.
- Lambton, L., Chambers of Delight, Gordon Fraser, London, 1983.
- Lawrence, H., Yorkshire Potters and Potteries, David & Charles, Newton Abbot, 1974.
- Le Patourel, H.E.J., 'Documentary Evidence and the Medieval Pottery Industry', Med. Arch. XII, 1968, 101-126.
- Lewis, J.M., Medieval Pottery and Metalwork in Wales, Nat. Mus. of Wales, Cardiff, 1978.
- Lincoln Archaeological Trust, Annual Reports, Lincoln, 1-9, 1973-1981.
- Llubiá, L.M., Cerámia Medieval Española, Labor, Barcelona, 1973.
- Mahany, C., Burchard, A. and Simpson, G., Excavations in Stamford, Lincolnshire, 1963-9, Society for Med. Arch. Monograph Series, 9, London, 1982.
- Mann, J.E., Clay Tobacco Pipes from Excavations in Lincoln, 1970-4, The Archaeology of Lincoln, XV-1, CBA, London, 1977.

- Marrat, W., History of Lincolnshire, Topographical, Historical and Descriptive, Boston, 3 Vols, 1814-1816.
- Marsden, P., The Wreck of the Amsterdam, 2nd edn. Hutchinson, London, 1985.
- Marshall, J.D., The Autobiography of William Stout of Lancaster 1665-1752, MUP, Manchester, 1967.
- Matthews, L.G. & Green, H.J.M., 'Post-Medieval Pottery of the Inns of Court', Post-Med. Arch., 3, 1969, 1-17.
- Matthews, L.G., The Antiques of the Pharmacy, G. Bell & Sons, London, 1971.
- Matthews, L.G., The Antiques of Perfume, G. Bell & Sons, London, 1973.
- May, J. et al. 'Report of the Summer Meeting at Lincoln 1974', Arch. J., 131, 1974, 268-382.
- McCarthy, M.R., 'An Early Seventeenth-Century Pit Group from Benet Street, Cambridge', PCAS, LXV, 1974, 79-92.
- McCarthy, M.R. & Brooks, C.M., Medieval Pottery in Britain AD900-1600, Leicester University Press, 1988.
- Moorhouse, S., 'Finds from Basing House, Hampshire, c.1540-1645', Pt. 1., Post-Med. Arch., 4, 1970, 31-91.
- Moorhouse, S., 'Finds from Excavations in the Refectory at the Dominican Friary, Boston', LHA, 7, 1972, 21-53.

Moorhouse, S., 'A Late Medieval Domestic Rubbish Deposit from Broughton, Lincolnshire', LHA, 9, 1974, 3-16.

Moorhouse, S., 'Non-Dating Uses of Medieval Pottery', Medieval Ceramics, 10, 1986, 85-123.

Moorhouse, S., 'The Site Distribution of Pottery as Evidence of Function; A Discussion of Some Case Studies', in Vyner, B. & Wrathmell, S. (eds.), Studies in Medieval and Later Pottery in Wales Presented to J.M. Lewis, Cardiff, 1987, 161-187.

Mountford, A.R. & Celoria, F., 'Some Examples of Sources in the History of 17th Century Ceramics', Journal of Ceramic History, 1, 1968, 11-12.

Myatt-Price, E.M., 'The Tattershall Household Book', LAASRP, 7, 2, 1958.

Mynard, D.C., 'Excavations at Somerby, Lincs., 1957', LHA, 4, 1969, 63-91.

Nauman, J. (ed.), Meisterwerke hessischer Töpferkunst-Wanfrieder Irdenware um 1600, Erich Röth-Verlag, Kassel, 1974.

Noel Hume, A., 'Some Ceramic Milestones of Use to the Archaeologist', Post-Med. Arch., 2, 1968, 163-4.

Noel Hume, I., A Guide to the Artifacts of Colonial America, Knopf, New York, 1970.

Noel Hume, I., All the Best Rubbish, Gollancz, London, 1974.

Noel Hume, I., Early English Delftware from London and Virginia, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, 1977.

Noel Hume, I., Martin's Hundred, Gollancz, London, 1982.

Oswald, A., Clay Pipes for the Archaeologist, BAR, 14, Oxford, 1975.

Owen, D., Church and Society in Medieval Lincolnshire, Hist. of Lincs. Committee, Lincoln, 1971.

Pantin, W.A., 'Chantry Priests' Houses and other Medieval Lodgings', Med. Arch., III, 1959, 247-8.

Peacock, D.P.S. (ed.), Pottery and Early Commerce, Characterization & Trade in Roman and Later Ceramics, Academic Press, London, 1977. (Renfrew, C., Introduction: Production and Exchange in Early State Societies, the Evidence of Pottery', 7 ff in above).

Pearson, G., 'Observations on some ancient metallic Arms and Utensils ...', Phil. Trans. LXXXVI, 1976, 395-451.

Piponnier, F., 'Une maison villageoise du XI^{Ve} siècle: le mobilier', in Renaud, J.G.N. (ed.), Rotterdam Papers, II, Rotterdam, 1975, 163-7.

Platt, C. & Coleman-Smith, R., 'The Pottery', in Excavations in Medieval Southampton 1953-69, Vol. 2, Leicester, Leicester U.P., 1975, 16-183.

Porter, S., 'The Making of Probate Inventories', Local Historian, 12, 1, 1976.

Poston, M.M., The Medieval Economy and Society, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1975.

Prestidge, S. (ed.), The Call to Duty, London, 1983.

Price, D.J., 'Medieval Land Surveying and Topographical Maps', Geographical Journal, CXXI, 1955, Pl. I.

Pyne, W.H., Microcosm; or a Picturesque Delineation of the Arts, Agriculture, Manufactures etc. of Great Britain, 1808, reprinted Luton Museum, Luton, 1974.

Quincey, T., 'A Tour in the Midland Counties of England, performed in the Summer of 1772', Gentleman's Magazine, XLIV, 19774.

Rackham, B., Medieval English Pottery, 2nd edn. Faber & Faber, London, 1972.

Rackham, B. & Read, H., English Pottery, (reprint), EP, Menston, 1972.

Raistrick, A., Old Yorkshire Dales, David & Charles, Newton Abbot, 1967.

Ramm, H.G., McDowall, R.W. & Mercer, E., Shielings and Bastles, HMSO, London, 1970.

Ray, A., English Delftware Pottery in the Robert Hall Warren Collection, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, Faber, London, 1968.

RCHM(E), Newark on Trent. The Civil War Siegeworks, HMSO, London, 1964.

Rhead, G.W., The Earthenware Collector, Herbert Jenkins, London, 1920.

Reineking von Bock, G., Steinzeug, Kunstgewerbemuseum der Stadt Köln, 3 edn. Köln, 1986.

Roberts, D.L., 'The Vernacular Building of Lincolnshire', Arch. J., 131, 1975, 298-308.

Roberts, D.L., 'The Persistence of Archaic Framing Techniques in Lincolnshire; 2', Vernacular Architecture, 6, 1975.

Rogers, A., A History of Lincolnshire with Maps and Pictures, Darwen Finlayson, Henley, 1970.

Rogers, J.E.T., A History of Agriculture and Prices in England, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 7 vols., 1866-1900.

Royal Commission on Historical MSS, De L'isle and Dudley MSS, no. 77, London, 1925.

Rule, M., The Mary Rose; the Excavation and Raising of Henry VIII's Flagship, Leicester, 2nd edn. 1983.

Russell, V. & Moorhouse, S., 'Excavation near the Bishop's Palace at Nettleham, 1959', LHA, 6, 1971, 19-27.

St. Clare Byrne, M., Elizabethan Life in Town and Country, Methuen, London, 1961.

Seaby, P. & Purvey, P.F., Coins of England and the United Kingdom, Seaby, 18th edn., London, 1981.

Simpson, W.D., The Building Accounts of Tattershall Castle 1434-1472, Lincoln Record Society, 55, Lincoln, 1960.

Skertchly, S.B.J., The Geology of the Fenland, Memoirs of the Geological Survey, London, 1977.

Stenton, F., Transcripts of Charters Relating to Gilbertine Houses, Lincoln Record Society, 18, Lincoln, 1922.

Stukeley, W., Itinerarium Curiosum, London, 1776.

Sturt, G., William Smith, Potter and Farmer: 1790-1858,
Caliban, Firle, 1978.

Swann, V.G., The Roman Pottery Kilns of Britain, RCHM
(Suppl. Ser. 5), London, 1984.

Swinnerton, H.H. & Kent, P.E., The Geology of Lincolnshire,
(2nd ed.), Lincoln, LNU, 1976.

Tait, H., The Golden Age of Venetian Glass, British Museum,
London, 1979.

Tate, W.E., The Parish Chest, CUP, Cambridge, 3rd edn. 1969.

Thirsk, J., English Peasant Farming: the Agrarian History
of Lincolnshire from Tudor to Recent Times, Routledge,
London, 1957.

Thirsk, J., (ed.), The Agrarian History of England and Wales,
Cambridge, CUP, Vols. IV and V, 1967-1985.

Thompson, F.H. & Whitwell, J.B., 'The Gates of Roman
Lincoln', Archaeologia, CIV, 1973, 129-207.

Thompson, P., The History and Antiquities of Boston, Boston,
1856.

Thwaite, A., 'The Chronology of the Bellarmine Jug',
The Connoisseur, 182, 1973, 255-62.

Towner, D.C., English Cream-Coloured Earthenware, Faber &
Faber, London, 1957.

Venables, E., 'The Vicars' Court, Lincoln, with the Architectural History of the College ..', AASRP, 17, 1883-4, 247-50.

Vickers, N. (ed.), A Yorkshire Town of the 18th Century; the Probate Inventories of Whitby, North Yorkshire, 1700-1800, Studley, 1986.

Weatherill, L., 'Technical change and potters' probate inventories 1660-1760', Journal of Ceramic History, 3, 1970, 3-12.

Weatherill, L.M., 'The Growth of the Pottery Industry in England, 1660-1815', Post-Med. Arch. 17, 1983, 15-46.

Webster, G. & Booth, N., 'A Romano-British pottery kiln at Swanpool, near Lincoln', Ant.J., XXVI, 1947.

West, S.E., 'The Deserted Medieval Village of Snarford, Lincs.', LHA, 4, 1969, 93-7.

Wheeler, W.H., A History of the Fens of South Lincolnshire, Boston, 1896.

White, A.J., 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1975', LHA, 11, 1976, 55-64.

White, A.J., 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1978', LHA, 14, 1979, 65-85.

White, A.J., 'A Stamford Potseller's Stock in 1720', Post-Med. Arch., 13, 1979, 290-2.

- White, A.J., 'Clay pipes associated with a 17th century pottery kiln at Boston, Lincs.', in Davey, P.J. (ed.), The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe; Vol. 1, BAR, 63, Oxford, 1979, 179-84.
- White, A.J., 'Archaeology in Lincolnshire and South Humberside, 1979', LHA, 15, 1980, 67-91.
- White, A.J., 'A Group of 17th century Blackwares from Roughton Church, Lincolnshire', Post-Med. Arch., 14, 1980, 200-203.
- White, A.J., 'Post-Medieval pancheons with name-stamps found in Lincolnshire', Post-Med. Arch., 16, 1982, 29-38.
- White, W., History, Gazetteer and Directory of Lincolnshire, Sheffield, 1856. Reprint David & Charles, Newton Abbot, 1969.
- Whitwell, J.B. & Wood, K.F., 'Three pottery kilns in Lincolnshire located by proton gradiometer (Maxbleep) survey and confirmed by excavation', Prospezioni Archeologiche, 4, 1969, 127-8.
- Willan, T.S., The English Coasting Trade 1600-1750, MUP, Manchester, 1938 and 1967.
- Wilson, V., British Regional Geology East Yorkshire and Lincolnshire, London, HMSO, 1948.
- Witt, C., Delftware, City Art Gallery, Bristol, n.d.

Wood, M.E., 'Number 3 Vicars' Court, Lincoln', Lincolnshire Historian, 7, 1951, 281-6.

Wood, M.E., The Medieval English House, Dent, London, 1965.

Wood, P., 'Made at Nottm., An Introduction to Nottingham Salt-Glazed Stoneware', Castle Museum, Nottingham, 1980.

Woodward, D., 'The Port Books of England and Wales', Maritime History, III, 1973, 147-65.

Wright, N.R., Lincolnshire Towns and Industry, 1700-1914, Hist. of Lincs. Committee, Lincoln, 1982.

Documentary Sources

Detailed references to primary material in libraries and archive offices are given in the notes accompanying each chapter. However the following is a list of the principal repositories and sources which were found to be of use.

LAO (Lincolnshire Archives Office, Lincoln).

Parish Registers

Bishop's Transcripts (BTs)

Wills (esp. Mormon micro-fiche copies)

Probate Inventories

Court Rolls (esp. Toynton All Saints)

Dean & Chapter deposits

Cragg MS History of Lincolnshire.

PRO (Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, London)

E.190 (Exchequer Records, Port Books)

DL (Duchy of Lancaster papers esp. relating to the Honour
of Bolingbroke)

E.179 (Exchequer Records, Hearth Tax Returns).

Lincoln Central Library

Lincoln, Rutland & Stamford Mercury newspaper files.

Ross MSS (Parish by parish survey of Lincolnshire, 19th
cent.)

Census Enumerators' Returns (microfilm).

City & County Museum, Lincoln

Parish files and accumulated excavation archives.

Spalding Gentlemen's Society

Various MSS, including Minute Books.

Boston District Council

Town books and property papers.

