Scottish East Coast Transfer Printed Wares
George R. Haggarty

Overview
There were many potteries situated along the Firth of Forth littoral, however only a few used white firing clays, see location map. In this paper I will use both extant examples and shards recovered archaeologically to highlight what evidence we have, for production of transfer printed wares, by the potteries situated between Portobello and Prestonpans. I have omitted the potteries of Bo’ness and Kirkcaldy, as their wares have been researched and illustrations of Bo’ness transfers can be accessioned online at [www.bonesspottery.co.uk](http://www.bonesspottery.co.uk). The histories of the Kirkcaldy potteries have also been published with some images and transfer pattern lists (Bell 2006, 147-150). Other illustrated examples can be found in (Kelly 1999).

The numbers given in some of my references given below are not pages, but word files from CD’s which were distributed along with journals of the Northern Ceramic Society. Most of the small shards have been quickly photographed in a museum store on a centimetre square background. I have gone overboard with the figure numbers, in case other researchers would like more information. It must be said that any ceramic expertise I have is not on transfer printed wares. Nevertheless, as an archaeologist and ceramic historian and having excavated

---
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many of Scotland’s industrial kiln sites, I feel obligated to make sure my work is disseminated and would also welcome constructive feedback. At present none of the wares produced by the Cousland pottery have been identified.

Although in my opinion many examples of later Scottish transfer printed pottery are extremely poor, some of the early examples are as good as much of the ware produced in Staffordshire. All shard image are the authors and they can be used with an acknowledgment, as are most images of extant vessels. I can be contacted at haggartyg@aol.com.

Little remains above ground testifying to the importance of Scotland’s east coast pottery industry, except for two partly restored bottle kilns at Portobello. The archaeological potential however is enormous, but not without its problems. When many of the potteries closed the sites became dumping grounds not just for other potteries, but also domestic waste. I have therefore been extremely careful in choosing what shards I have illustrated.

For example, I have seen blue and white transfer printed shards of a women spinning flax from an archaeological excavation in Cromarty and garden in Portobello, and although it has lots of Scottish elements such as the child playing with a one handled luggie its production site is not known.
Introduction

Potteries & transfer printed wares etc. covered in this paper.

Portobello Pottery .................................................. page 04
Newbigging Pottery ............................................. page 45
Musselburgh Pottery ............................... page 60
West Pans Pottery ................................. page 62
Cadell’s or Watsons Potteries .............. page 72
Morrison Haven, Bankfoot & Cuttle Potteries page 85
R&G Gordon v John Jenkins engraver........... page 87
Excavations at Morrisons Haven & Cuttle.... page 93
Sanitary Ware........................................................ page 101
APPENDIX A & B - Gondola ......................... page 105
APPENDIX C - Flora....................................... page 107
APPENDIX D - Claremont....................... page 108
APPENDIX E - Free Gardeners Society Jugs.. page 109
APPENDIX F - Rathbone Childs Plates ....... page 110
APPENDIX G - Duke of Wellington Mark.... page 111
APPENDIX H - Newbigging Childs Plate..... page 112
APPENDIX I - WP & Crown Mark............. page 112
APPENDIX J - Possible Prestonpans Jug...... page 113
APPENDIX K - Brougham & Grey Jug....... page 114
Acknowledgments ................................. page 115
Bibliography.................................................... page 116

As well as potted histories of the potteries, I have illustrated impressed marks and backstamps. Some of the excavated transfer prints I have given temporary names but would be delighted if TCC members could inform me of any marked pieces. It’s the same with the shard material, I would be delighted to get feedback.
**Portobello**

On the 12th of July 1765 William Jamieson an Edinburgh architect and speculative builder feued from Baron William Muir of Caldwell a plot of 3 acres at Portobello. Jamieson’s quickly enlarged this to just over 10 acres, and this land lay to the east and adjacent to the Frigate burn and was bounded to the north by the sea and to the south by the Kings highway. There are several other feu-contracts which show how William Jamison quickly built up his holding in Portobello, to 52 acres.

Allowing a year for construction this suggests that the earliest possible date he could have produce bricks and tiles in the area was 1766. Jamieson’s also constructed a pottery to manufactured coarse red earthenware and more importantly he also built a white ware pottery, almost certainly for the manufacture of creamware as no shards of white salt glazed stoneware have been recovered. Its production dates are not known, but evidence from a surviving letter confirms that it was in operation by 1784. We also know that by 1795 Jamieson had leased his white ware pottery to Cookston & Jardine, Edinburgh china retailers, but no marked pieces have been recorded.

By 1805 Jamieson redware pottery was in the hands of a Thomas Yool and it was his daughter Grisel, later changed to Grace, who married, Thomas Rathbone a potter originally from Staffordshire, but who had come to Scotland to manage a pottery in Glasgow and who, in 1809, in partnership set up a whiteware pottery adjacent to his father in law’s old redware establishment. Rathbone’s sons were involved after his death in 1826, and often unsuccessfully until the 1850s.

The history of this major ceramic producing area and all its potteries is extremely complicated and elements are not yet fully understood, but presently only Jamieson and Rathbone are
known to have produced transfer printed wares. In (fig 1)² one arrow points down to the site of Jamison’s late 18th century pottery and one horizontally to Rathbone’s later 19th century one.

‘Jamieson’s Pottery & Salt Glazed Stoneware Pottery’
By 1774. William Jamieson; erected a whiteware pottery run at first by the Scott Brothers oral tradition. Cream Coloured for sale Caledonian Mercury in Jan 1790; advert placed by W. Jamieson.
c. 1795-6. Cookson & Jardin; ceramic retailers in Edinburgh.
1811. George Morrison; purchased part of the site from Jamieson’s estate and converted into a soap works; an adjacent derelict kiln is mentioned in the document.
1826. James Tuohy; soap maker;
1827. William Creelman; purchases the soap works; he had a small adjacent pottery, Jamieson’s, where he had been producing stoneware since c. 1812-14.
1838.- Milne, Cornwell & Co; stoneware potters.
1842. Messrs. Milne & Co – Visited by the Children’s Employment Commission
1846. Milne Smith; stoneware potters.
1840. Thomas Tough; stoneware potter purchases Creelman old pottery.
1867. Murray & Buchan; produced mainly stoneware.

Red highlights what I now think was a separate small salt glazed stoneware pottery

The meagre evidence for 18th century transfer printing at Portobello comes from a large archaeological excavation which produced a sizeable creamware assemblage. Although there was an abundance of dipped wares etc. there were only three small glazed and bisque transfer printed shards, from either the c. 1795-6 Cookson & Jardin or earlier Jamieson period (fig’s 2, 2a 3, 3a & 4).

² Thanks to the Scottish pottery society for the use of this image
‘Rathbones’ Pottery’
c.1766. William Jamieson; erected a redware brick and tile works.
by1805. Thomas Yool was running the redware pottery.
  1809. Thomas Rathbone, Thomas Yool & John Thom; whiteware pottery leased first then purchased in 1815; trading as T. Rathbone & Co. Thom a stoneware Merchant sold out to Rathbone in 1825.
  1832. Samuel & Robert Rathbone; company sequestrated.
  1838. John Rathbone; pottery leased from his mother; offered for let in March.
1840-44. James Anderson; trading as Anderson & Co.
1844-50. Samuel and James Rathbone; trading as Rathbone Brothers
by1856. William Affleck Grey & Co; stoneware.
by1896. William & Alexander Grey; stoneware producers.

Between 1809 and c.1850 the Rathbone pottery was a large producer of transfer printed wares and a range of marked examples have been recorded. There is also a body of evidence from archaeological excavations, and many of the transfers seen on shards, have been given, temporary names, by the author. There is also a group of glazed shards which may or may not be from Rathbone products and they are dealt with separately.

Marks used by Thomas Rathbone on his transfer printed wares includes an impressed R below a crown (fig 5), a wheel (fig 5a), T R & Co Stone China around a crown (fig 5b), and which I suggest dates from c. 1830. SEMI CHINA, (fig’s 5c & 5d). don’t know what’s above the impressed (TR & Co). (fig 5e). Later family marks include, for Samuel and Robert Rathbone, c. 1832, (S & R R) below a crown (fig 5f), and c. 1844-50 a blue and white, R. Brs. / NON PAREIL, Rathbone Brothers, backstamp (fig 5g).
‘Free Gardners’, ‘Masonic Paraphernalia’

‘God Speed the Plough’ & ‘Mariners Arms’

Four Rathbones prints, all extremely rare, have recently been identified on the same large jug, which bizarrely, has a blue and white ‘Font’ backstamp. The prints include one for the society of ‘Free Gardners’ (fig 6) (Haggarty 2019, 59-60), ‘Masonic Paraphernalia’ (fig 6a), a version of ‘God Speed the Plough’ (fig 6b), and ‘Mariners Arms’ (fig 6c).

‘Talking Farmers’

A range of wares decorated with transfer prints first identified from the excavations on the Rathbone’s kiln site and named by me as ‘Talking Farmers’ Haggarty 2008, 25). Not the mug in the authors collection (fig 7), but all the other items so far identified, such as this bidet, and large bowl, both previously in author collection and now in the National Museums Scotland, also have the ‘Mega
*Flower Border*’ my name (figs 7a & 7b). **Note:** recently brought to my attention is a similar bidet in a private collection and which has on its base an impressed ‘Thomas Rathbone ‘R’ and crown mark, see (fig 5).
‘Woman with Child’

Decorated with the ‘Mega Flower Border’ is a large bowl, now in the collection of the National Museum Scotland and whose central transfer has been identified from excavated shards and named by the author ‘Woman with Child’ (fig 8).

‘Octagonal Vermicelli (Church)’

Also decorated with the ‘Mega Flower Border’ is another large bowl previously in the authors collection and is now in the National Museum Scotland. Again, the central transfer has been identified from excavated shards and named by the author ‘Octagonal Vermicelli (church)’

(fig 9). The shard (fig 9a) is from the base of a cup.
‘Octagonal Vermicelli (Flowers)’

Also identified from excavated shards is another vermicelli transfer print ‘Octagonal Vermicelli (Flowers)’ my name (Haggarty 2008, 21). The small illustrated saucer (fig 10), was purchased by the author in London and there is a small teapot with the same design in a Scottish TCC members collection and which has been illustrated by (Berthoud & Maskell 2006, 35 Plate 207). (fig 10a) is a bisque excavated example, and (fig 10b) shows the distinctive leaf border seen on saucers and small plates etc. (Haggarty 2008, 29 & 20).

Note; Rathbone produced at least one other transfer with this vermicelli surround as in the past I have handled a teapot which had both a horse, and cow beside a river within the octagon.

The Font’

Probably the most seen Rathbone transfer is the ‘The Font’ (fig 11), which is always backstamped (fig 11a). This print which has been recorded on a large range of Rathbone forms was first produced by Spode in the 1820s as ‘Girl at the Well’ (Drakard and Holdaway 1983, 136). Later used by Heath, Harvey, and Edward Challinor of Staffordshire (Coysh and Henrywood
1982, Vol 1-144 & Vol 2 – 84). Rathbone’s examples are often found with an added impressed mark, generally an impressed crown, but very occasionally, an impressed crown within a double circle within which is ‘T R & CO. STONE CHINA’. A few examples like the plate (fig 11), have the later (1844-50), impressed ‘S&RR’, the Samuel & Robert Rathbone mark.

‘Resting Camel’

A transfer print which I have named ‘Resting Camel’ (Haggarty 2008, 21), can be seen complete on a saucer in a Scottish private collection (fig 12). It was first identified as a Rathbone product from excavated bisque and glazed shards. An unmarked teapot a variant of the London shape, the property of Libra Antiques was illustrated by (Miller & Berthoud 1985, p.280 Pl 1679). A glazed basal angle cup shard with the resting camel print on its exterior also has part of a small domed building on its interior (Haggarty 2008, 22). A recently identified teabowl confirms this (fig’s 12a & 12b).
‘Canton’

A bisque shard with ‘Canton’ within a wreath backstamp (fig 13) shows that Rathbone produced an earlier version than the Scottish Link pottery of Robert Herron & Sons of Kirkcaldy (Bell undated, 135), and Jamieson of Bo’ness (Kelly 1999, 24). Later versions were also produced by the Glasgow potteries of J & M P. Bell, Britannia & Caledonian, and the Clyde Pottery in Greenock (Jones & Leishman 2012, 45).

The interior of the cup has a small transfer print of a boat with a sail and two figures (fig 13a) (Haggarty 2008, 5). On the cup’s exterior is a pot containing a flowering plant above what might be a fence.

‘Indian Figure’

A backstamp on an excavated saucer shard (fig 14), almost certainly is ‘INDIAN FIGURE’ above a smudged ‘--kin China’ backstamp. There are many shards from the Portobello
excavation, (Haggarty 2008, 17), but as, yet I have not seen a complete vessel.
That said I am informed that a bowl has been through the hands of the TCC member Robbie Conn. Several shards conjoin from the body of teapot, decorated with rococo scrolls and an eastern figure with what looks like a long pipe (fig 14a). Other glazed and bisque shards show the main rococo elements of the design (fig 14b) and a vignette of 3 figures, one smoking (fig 14c).

‘Bosphorus’
Shards both bisque and glazed, with elements of the ‘Bosphorus’ pattern (fig 15 & 15b), were recovered during archaeological excavation on the Portobello kiln site (Haggarty 2008, 2). A common and well-known pattern in Scotland, Bosphorus is normally found with the backstamp of J. Jamieson & Co., or J. Marshall & Co., of Bo’ness, while several English manufactures also produced patterns of that name (Coysh & Henrywood 1982, 48). Unfortunately, the fragment of a blue underglaze ‘BOSPHORUS’ backstamp (fig 15b), is lacking the manufacturer’s name, but what survives is like a mark used at Bo’ness, only in reverse.

‘Girl Musician II’
It is reasonable to assume that the pattern which I have named ‘Girl Musician II’ (Haggarty 2008, 15), was copied from the John and Richard Riley pattern, known as ‘The Girl Musician’ (Coysh
1979 58-9 fig 76). Another version was discussed by Henrywood in the (FOB 10, p 6), but not illustrated. Unlike the Riley version with three figures on the right of the transfer, the Rathbone bisque shards show the pattern reversed, and has only two figures, a kneeling shepherd with a crook, and a girl musician (fig 16). The print on the Rathbone bisque cup shards seems to show a country house, somewhat similar to Riley’s but, again, reversed. The Rathbone version has a distinctive floral border and I have not seen an extant example.

‘Boy with Parrot, Dog, and Cage’

A few of the bisque and glazed Rathbone cup shards recovered had blue and transfers of a boy kneeling (fig 17). Behind him is a large birdcage with parrot and a vase of flowers on a plinth. To his left is a dog with his head on his lap, my name ‘Boy with Parrot, Dog, and Cage’, (Haggarty 2008, 3). The bodies of the cups have a double carination and their exteriors are decorated with a transfer print of trellis and flowers (fig 17a), while the interiors have a somewhat similar but narrower border (fig 17b). I have not seen an extant example.

‘Castle and Tree’ & ‘Ruins in Landscape’

Among the Portobello shards recovered was the base of a cup decorated with a transfer print of a castle behind a stretch of water, tree and rocks (Haggarty 2008, 6), and which I named ‘Castle and Tree’ (fig 18). Also recovered, was a small group of bisque and glazed shards, which I named ‘Ruins in Landscape’ (Haggarty 2008, 23). Later work on the site by Alder
Archaeology, recovered the base of a brown transfer printed teabowl (fig 18a). This had the same castle and tree print on its interior and figures in a small boat on its exterior. This suggested that the glazed and bisque shards which I had named ‘Castle and Tree’ and ‘Ruins in Landscape’ were linked. This was confirmed when a teapot (fig 18b & fig 18c), with a distinctive knop and impressed Rathbone mark (fig 18d), was acquired by the author and is now in the National Museums Scotland.

‘Chinese Raftman & Ruins’

The name I have given to this group of line and stipple engraved transfer printed shards (fig 19), is ‘Chinese Raftman & Ruins’, (Haggarty 2008, 7). It may derive from ‘Chinese Raft’, a pattern named by Coysh (1979, 106-7 illus 160), and given a probable Herculaneum attribution. It was later suggested by Jones that the same pattern, this time in reverse, may have been a Clews product (FOB 66, 7...
illus 2). A teapot was later illustrated by Holdaway (FOB 86, 7 illus 2), and possibly in reverse, by Jones (FOB 123, 7). A saucer decorated with a transfer print named ‘Raftman and Ruins’ with the addition of a horseman, with dog on his left, riding uphill towards ruins, my ‘Chinese Raftman & Ruins, was illustrated by Jones in the (FOB 41, 6). It has many of the elements found on the Rathbone shards, although in reverse something seen on one Portobello shard (fig 19a). There are variations in the transfers used on the Portobello shards and a bowl interior shows a castle gate and towers (fig 19b), as does the interior rim of a cup (fig 19c). A glazed body shard (fig 19d), shows part of a tree and structure not that unlike the one on Tom Jones (FOB saucer which suggests it may also be a version of Rathbone’s ‘Chinese Raftman & Ruins’. See also Loren Zeller (FOB 139, 10 & 12).

‘Cottage with Tall Chimney’

Both bisque and glazed shards from several different vessels, decorated with transfer prints of a ‘Cottage with tall chimney’ my name, behind a wall were recovered. The two shards (fig’s 20 & 20a) are from the interiors of small bowls (Haggarty 2008, 9). The large bowl shards interior has a scroll border and a small fragment can be seen on a glazed plate and bisque cover (fig 20b). The cup shard left is London shaped and the top centre shard shows a small part of a female figure.
‘*Twa Coos*’

Two small bisque base shards, from small bowls (*fig 21*). They are decorated with small fairly crude transfer prints of ‘*Twa Coos*’ my name in the Scottish vernacular, (Haggarty 2008, 27).

‘*Bird, Butterfly and Flowers*’

The bisque shards (*fig 22*), are all decorated with the Bird, Butterfly and Flowers’ transfer print my name. the shards are all from well thrown London shaped bowls with splayed rims (Haggarty 2008, 1). Shards have bits of ‘*Birds, Butterflies and Flowers*’, and it looks as if there is at least two less fussy versions of the same pattern on the interiors.

‘*Wild Dog Roses*’

Two bisque rim shards from large moulded jugs with a pronounced, beaded, rim, and vertically ribbed neck panels, (*fig 23*). They have been decorated with transfer prints on both surfaces (Haggarty 2008, 28) and the design on its exterior looks to be composed of wild dog roses with buds, hence my name. The interior print has different flowers.
‘Milkmaid’

I have personally not recovered, from any of my excavations at Portobello, shards of the Milkmaid pattern. I am however reliably informed that illegal scavengers have recovered examples and trusted friends have seen them and say that the outer transfer seen on the saucer (fig 24), is my ‘Mega Flower Border’. Doreen Otto published a jug decorated with Milkmaid in the (FOB No 39, p.14). It was later identified from Portobello shards as a Rathbone product, by Irene Macdonald (FOB No 40 p7). This led to a number of other examples subsequently being illustrated, including a teabowl and sucrier (FOB No 41 p.11), and jug (FOB 50 p.5). Milkmaid was originally a Spode design, thought to have been introduced c.1814 or 1815 (Drakard & Holdaway 1983, 136 PL 701).

Numerous other English potteries subsequently produced variations including Davenport, Bell Vue, Don. In Scotland, William Reid of Newbigging Musselburgh produced a variation (fig 104), and recently the author and Robbie Conn identified a version produced by the Verrieville pottery in Glasgow, A forthcoming note in the TCC Bulletin.

Note; It is likely that a teapot illustrated by (Berthoud & Maskell 2006, 198 Pl 1185), is a Rathbone example.

‘Rathbone Jug’ Unnamed

Among the papers given by her son to the author from the effects of the late Scottish pottery researcher and collector, Kay Dickson, is a photograph of a blue and white transfer printed jug (fig 25), on which has been pasted a note ‘Rathbone’s Jug (c.f. shards)’. According to a short article by Kay along with a poor photograph in the (Scottish Pottery Historical Review 1988, No 12 p54 fig 4), the jug was
identified from shards which I have not seen. I am happy with the attribution and the present whereabouts of the jug is not known to the author.

‘Deer and Cottages’

Bisque and glazed pearlware shards (fig 26), recovered during excavations on the Portobello kiln site, (Haggarty 2008, 11), have on them a central transfer and a border with ‘Deer and Cottages’, my name which resembles Fallow Deer, first produced by Rogers later Wedgwood and possibly Minton (Priestman 2001, 142 pl 6.66). Irene McDonald published two photographs of a small beaker, (FOB 68, p.10), previously in author collection and now in the National Museums Scotland, (fig 26a & 26b), and which she noted matched my shards and
suggested a Rathbone product, but with minor differences, see also a cup illustrated by (Priestman 2001, 142 pl 6.67).

Also, previously the authors collection and now in the National Museums Scotland is a blue and white transfer printed bowl, which is almost certainly related (fig’s 26c, 26d & 26e).

‘Bridge and Swans’

Bisque and glazed shards with what I have called the Bridge and Swans transfer prints were recovered during excavations on the Portobello kiln site (Haggarty 2008, 4). One of the bisque shards (fig 27), was impressed with the Rathbone R and crown mark (fig 27a). The bases of two other bisque and glazed shards from London a shaped cup (fig 27b), and bowl (fig 27c) are decorated on their interiors with a transfer print of a swan. Both bases are impressed ‘SEMI CHINA’. Previously the authors collection and now in the National Museums Scotland is a London shaped tea bowl, decorated with a version of the ‘Swan and Bridge’ pattern (fig 27d) with bisque shard from a London shaped bowl (fig 27e).
‘Bruce & Wallace’

A note in the papers of the late Kay Dixon informs us that she had seen shards with King Robert Bruce and William Wallace transfer prints, which had been recovered from the Portobello kiln site. I have not seen these shards and cannot confirm a Portobello provenance, for the two canister shaped mugs (figs 28 & 28a). They are decorated with an all over blue and white transfer-print and clobbered highlights and which are like the poor photographs in her archive. The pattern of flowers and foliage has two circular vignettes depicting William Wallace with ‘Scots wae hae wi Wallace Bled’ and King Robert Bruce with ‘Scots wham Bruce has often led’. Taken from the poem ‘Scots wae hae’ by Robert Burns. Rim highlighted in vivid pink. The print of Wallace was almost certainly taken from a line engraving by Walker produced in (1757). A source print for Bruce is difficult and it just may be loosely based on an image of him in Crabbs Historical Dictionary, published in (1825).

Fleming (1923, 148 Pl xxx), illustrates an oval red clobbered jug, with the same Bruce and Wallace figures but with a different background transfer and handle, now in the collection of Stirling museum, and a low-resolution image can be seen at smithartgalleryandmuseum.co.uk. A Scottish pottery collector has also informed me that a version was produced by the Glasgow Caledonian pottery in 1830, to commemorate the 500th anniversary of Wallace’s death in 1829. A pair of Riley mugs also have portraits of Bruce and Wallace and these are superimposed on views of Langley Park Bucks and Gogerddan Cardiganshire.
‘Chinese Boat’

Of the six excavated bisque shards, (fig 29), two are probably from slip-cast vessels, possibly tureens (Haggarty 2008, 16). I gave the shards the temporary name ‘Gondola’ and flowers as the transfer shows a boat being punt by a man, with, another figure sitting under a canopy. There is also a range of buildings behind the boat along with rococo scrolls and flowers (fig’s 29a, 29b). Thanks to a Scottish collector who recently sent me an image of a jug in his collection, I now know the shards are from an unrecorded Rathbone pattern ‘Chinese Boat’. The backstamp (fig 29c), may also be like (fig 53a). The ‘Chinese Boat’, jug rim also has what I have named Rathbone’s ‘star and dagger’ border

‘Florentine’

A single bisque shard (fig 30), from the Portobello kiln site excavations (Haggarty 2008, 16), may have come from a tureen cover and the transfer was probably copied from Minton’s ‘Florentine. It certainly seems to have an entwining serpent, and a vase, but it also has a strange, large, leaf, to the left. Gordon’s of Morrison Haven and Bankfoot also produced a Florentine variant. See APPENDIX C
‘Claremont’

There are only glazed shards of this transfer pattern from the excavation (fig 31), and I am not sure if the glazed cup shards illustrated are Minton or a Rathbone copy. Minton’s wares were usually marked, and unfortunately on the excavated shards most of the base is missing. However, on comparing the shards to published Minton examples, (Priestman 2001, 224 pl 8.65), there are certain differences. The Claremont floral pattern was introduced by Minton c. 1830 (ibid 224). The name also used in Scotland by both the Clyde and Bo’ness potteries. I now think this may be a Rathbone variant, see APPENDIX D.

‘Flowers Birds and Insects’

The Don Pottery in Yorkshire (Griffin 2001, 118) used the same transfer print on a similar jug with the same ‘GENUINE OPAQUE CHINA’ backstamps. I have examined the marks and transfer on the Rathbone shards (figs 32 & 32a), at and have illustrated what I think is a complete printed jug with overpainted enamels, and which was purchased in Edinburgh (fig 32b & 32c). A very similar but much larger transfer can be seen on the interior of bowls and jugs produced by William Reid of Musselburgh; see (fig’s 98).
‘Thomas Attwood’

A bisque shard from a moulded plate with part of a very rare transfer print; a portrait thought to be the Chartist, Thomas Attwood (fig 33). Only, one extant example has been recorded (May 1983, 115, fig 157), and this may date from 1839 (Haggarty 2018a, 9 fig 240).

‘Look Mummy’

I worked on the Portobello kiln site until 10 o’clock one evening to empty a stone lined well prior to it being destroyed by the developers. Amongst the shards recovered, and possibly not a Rathbone product were four from a cup with a developed foot and everted rim. The interior is decorated with a black transfer print of a large architectural vase in an Italianate landscape (fig 34). The exterior has another Italianate architectural vase being viewed by two women and a pointing child ‘Look Mummy’ my name.

‘Unknown’ Glazed

A number of glazed shards, from different vessels, decorated with different transfer prints were recovered during the excavations and these are illustrated below. The recovery of glazed shards is not necessarily evidence for it being produced on the site. However, when two or more different vessels are represented with the same transfer, statistically, the evidence is much stronger.
Four glazed, conjoining, white earthenware shards from a saucer decorated with a red transfer print of flowers and a bird around a landscape (fig 35). On the obverse of one shard there is an impressed stylised flower with eight petals (fig 35a).

Three glazed white earthenware shards from a saucer (fig 36), decorated with a transfer printed black border of flowers, and perhaps a similar central panel.

Two glazed white earthenware shards from a saucer and slop bowl (fig’s 37 & 37a). Both are decorated with a broad transfer printed border of tiny stylised flowers, one in blue, and one in green. The blue and white bowl shard is decorated on the exterior with the same transfer. There is evidence for a central transfer print on the green saucer and I suggest that they are probably Rathbone products.
One rim shard (fig 38), from a moulded bone china saucer decorated with a purple transfer print of what may be seashells, coral, and seaweed, within a small reserve. There is also a narrow transfer printed border. Shard evidence from the site suggests that at some time the Rathbones were producing bone china but the evidenced from this shard needs to be treated with caution.

One exceedingly small, flat, glazed white earthenware shard (fig’s 39 & 39a), transfer printed, line and stippled in red on both faces. There is a small yacht is on its upper surface.

One glazed white earthenware rim shard from a cup, (fig’s 40 & 40a), decorated on both surfaces with blue and white transfer prints of rococo scrolls and flowers. Probably ‘Claremont’. See APPENDIX D.

One glazed white earthenware shard from a bowl (fig’s 41 & 41a). It is decorated on its exterior with a black transfer print of woods, and on the interior possibly a border showing the figure of a ploughman, with his plough.
‘Unnamed Pattern’

From the Rathbone site are two, conjoining, glazed white earthenware rim shards from a large jug with a section of the handle still attached (fig 42). The shards are decorated on both surfaces with somewhat smudged border prints of mixed flowers with white tipped leaves. A few similar bisque shards were also recovered (fig’s 42a).

Only by examining them closely was I able to match a mug with the excavated shards (fig 42b). The mug which has a Rathbone handle, has also been decorated with a previously unrecorded transfer print which looks a bit like if it’s been cobbled together (fig’s 42d, e & f), but I can’t see any obvious joins.
‘Unknown’ Bisque

A group of small bisque shards; with unknown Rathbone transfers.

Bisque wavy rim cup shard whose exterior is decorated with a transfer print of a figure and flowers in front of a stylized tower (fig 43). The interior border has rococo scrolls surrounding a vignette of an island and leaves (fig 43a).

Bisque cup rim shard exterior and interior both decorated with border transfer prints of an architectural character (fig’s 44 & 44a).

Bisque body shard decorated with what look like part of a broad and distinctive border transfer print (fig 45).
Bisque rim shard with badly smudged red border transfer print (fig 46).

Bisque shard with a transfer print which may show a lion and his tamer? (fig 47). This shard was recovered during a recent excavation at Portobello by a local group, supervised by AOC Archaeology.

Bisque handle shard from a jug decorated with a transfer print of entwined foliage (fig 48).
Two moulded, white earthenware, bisque shards from two jugs decorated with a sheet transfer prints made up with tiny dots, fine twig like lines, and spaced larger dots (fig 49).

Three bisque shard all of which derive from different transfer printed child’s mugs (fig’s 50, 50a & 50b). I have not identified any mugs with these small transfer printed surroundings, and (fig 50) is probably ‘A Present for A Good Boy or Girl’.

Bisque white earthenware bisque rim shard from what is possibly a small plate decorated with a border transfer print of flowers (fig 51).
Bisque shard from a bowl with an everted rim, decorated on the interior with a transfer print of what just may be a ruined tower on rocks (fig 52). There is a slight trace of a transfer print of a tree on the exterior.

Bisque white earthenware bisque shard from what is probably a plate, decorated with a transfer print of flowers (fig 53). On its reverse there is part of a printed backstamp (fig 53a).

See (fig 29c)

Bisque white earthenware bisque shard from what may be a plate, decorated with a transfer print (fig 54); towers.

Bisque white earthenware shard from a small saucer, decorated on the interior with a transfer print of a rococo scroll and flowers, and what could be an island with trees and bushes (fig 55).
Two, moulded, bisque cup handles shards decorated with different transfer prints of stylised tendrils (fig 56). I have included an image to get an idea of form (fig 56a).

Bisque cup rim shard decorated with the transfer which shows a window, and branches (fig 57). It also has a flower border on the interior (fig 57a)

‘Chinoiserie’

A large percentage of the bisque transfer printed shards recovered from the Portobello excavations were decorated with different Chinoiserie transfer prints including common ‘Standard Willow’, which I have catalogued separately. As I have no familiarity of Chinoiserie transfers, especially ‘Broseley’ and ‘Two Temples’ and their variants. I decided that I was not competent to sort then out, despite it being patently obvious that there are a few differences and, on some shards, elements of the design, have been reversed. I have however tried to match the shards using features such as everted, or wavy, rims. As always, we can’t be a hundred percent sure that glazed examples are Rathbone products.
‘CUPS’

Two, conjoining, white earthenware bisque shards from a cup decorated on its exterior with a transfer print (fig 58), and on its interior with a border (fig 58a). The cup has a slightly flared rim and a break in the profile is 30 mm below the rim.

Three white earthenware bisque shards, two conjoining, from a London shaped cup or cups, decorated on its exterior with a transfer print (fig 59), and interior borders (fig 59a).

Bisque shard from a London shaped cup decorated on its exterior with a transfer print (fig 60), and on its interior with a border (fig 60a). The break in its profile is 50 mm below its rim.
Three white earthenware bisque shards with two illustrated from a cup, or cups, decorated on its exterior with a transfer print (fig 61), and on its interior with a border (fig 61a). The large shard is London shaped and has the break 45 mm below the scalloped rim.

Six white earthenware bisque shards, two illustrated from cups decorated on their exteriors with a transfer print (fig 62), and on their interiors with a border. This cup has a flared rim.

Four white earthenware bisque shards from a London shaped cup decorated on its interior only, with a transfer printed border (fig’s 63 & 63a). The break on this cup is 43 mm below its rim.
Four glazed white earthenware bisque shards from two London shaped cups with only two conjoining shards illustrated. The cups are decorated with a transfer print on their exterior (fig 64). The other shards have a transfer border on the interior. Combining the shards, the break of slope is 45 mm below the rim. The well of the illustrated cup is decorated with a version of the island and rocks pattern (fig 64a).

Three white earthenware bisque base shards from cups (fig 65). All decorated with transfer prints of the common ‘Island and Rocks’ pattern. Nothing survives to give us a clue to the cup shapes.

One white bisque rim shard decorated on the exterior with a transfer print (fig 66), and on the interior with a border print (fig 66a). The cup may be bell shaped.
Bisque white earthenware shard decorated on its exterior with a transfer print (fig 67) and with a border on its interior (fig 67a). This shard has a waist break in its profile exactly 30mm below its rim.

Two bisque white earthenware shards from a cup decorated on its exterior with a transfer print (fig 68). The largest shard has a break in the profile 28mm from its footrim.

Bisque white earthenware shard from the body of a cup decorated on its exterior with a transfer print (fig 69), and on its interior with a border. The cup has a slight break in the profile, just above the rocks.

‘SAUCERS’

One white earthenware bisque shard from a saucer or small plate, decorated with a transfer print (fig 70). The reverse has part of a Rathbone impressed wheel shaped stamp c.11mm in diameter (fig 70a).
Six bisque white earthenware shards, with two conjoining, from a minimum of two saucers, one illustrated and both decorated with the same transfer prints (fig 71). The bases of the saucers have a very distinctive profile (fig 71a).

Bisque white earthenware shard from a saucer or small plate, decorated with a transfer print (fig 72). The reverse has Rathbones impressed wheel shaped stamp c.11mm in diameter (fig 72a).

Three, conjoining, white earthenware bisque shards from a footed saucer decorated with a transfer print (fig 73).
Fourteen white earthenware bisque shards of which three, and three, conjoin from a minimum of three footed saucers, one illustrated (fig 74). All the shards are decorated with the same transfer print and the illustrated saucer has a Rathbone crown above an ‘R’ impressed.

‘BOWLS’

Two, conjoining, white earthenware bisque shards from the base of a large bowl decorated with a ‘Two Temples’ transfer print (fig 75). Both the interior and exterior have traces surviving of Rathbones ‘Mega Border’ transfer print.

Glazed body shard from a pearlware London shaped bowl, decorated on the exterior with a blue and white transfer print (fig 76).
Bisque shard from a London shaped bowl with traces of transfer printing on its exterior, and a variation of the ‘Three Islands’ pattern on the interior (fig 77).

Bisque rim shard from a small bowl decorated on the exterior with a transfer print (fig 78), and on its interior with a border transfer (78a).

Two, conjoining, glazed shards from a pearlware London shaped bowl, decorated on the exterior with a blue and white transfer print (fig 79). The interior has a transfer printed border (fig 79a).
‘JUGS’

Two, conjoining, shads from the rim and neck of a jug (including evidence of a pouring spout) decorated with a blue and white transfer print (fig 80).

Three shards, one bisque, and two glazed, from the rims of three different jugs, all with a blue and white transfer print. This has what looks like a stylized butterfly in the border (fig 81).

A Rathbone jug now in the National Museums Scotland has the same border transfer along with James Young Wright and it is dated 1827 (fig 81a).
‘PLATES’

Three glazed white earthenware shards, two conjoining, from a small plate decorated with blue and white transfer prints (fig 82).

‘MUGS’

Bisque body shard with a handle scar from a mug, decorated on the exterior with a transfer print (fig 83).

Six glazed white earthenware shards with four, and two, conjoining, from a minimum of two vessels (fig 84), which, with some misgivings, I refer to as mugs. They are decorated with transfer prints on their exterior and the ‘Island and Rocks’ pattern internally.
‘Standard Willow’

Two, conjoining, glazed white earthenware shards from a small plate with dished border, and decorated with a blue and white transfer print, a variant of ‘Standard Willow’, (fig 85). On the base of the plate is part of an impressed mark and the letters ‘RR’. can be made out. These are part of ‘S&RR’ i.e. Samuel and Robert Rathbone c. 1832.

Two, conjoining, pearlware shards from a plate decorated with a blue and white transfer printed version of ‘Standard Willow’ (fig 86).

Three glazed white earthenware shards, two conjoining, from two similar plates, decorated with a transfer printed blue and white version of the ‘Standard Willow’ (fig 87).
Fifty-seven bisque shards from plates all decorated with a transfer printed version of the ‘Standard Willow’. I have combined several the shards in a bid to produce something of a composite print (fig 88).

Large bisque shard from a plate decorated with a transfer printed version of ‘Standard Willow’ (fig 89). This plate shard is extremely heavy.
Two shards from tureens bases, decorated with transfer prints of ‘Standard Willow’, and on their reverse, there are fragments of Rathbone brothers’ blue and white Britannia backstamps ‘NON PAREIL / R Brs’ (fig 90). I have illustrated a complete c.1844-50, ‘Standard Willow’, Rathbone brothers marked plate and its backstamp (fig’s 90a & 90b).

After the potteries closure, in the late 1920s, most of its buildings were demolished and the site was converted into a builder's yard after which the area degenerated into waste ground. In 1987 a development, prompted a small archaeological investigation, mainly confined to one multi-phase kiln (fig 91).

The first owner of the Pottery was William Reid who was born in Prestonpans on 10th May 1765 and who was married in the parish of Edinburgh on 5th May 1784 to Clementina Bagnall, daughter of the potter Robert Bagnall. A document states that Reid had acquired for two hundred- and sixty-pounds sterling, 'the malt barn, kiln, steep stone and corn barn with garden ground, behind the kiln, in Musselburgh.

William Reid was still potting at West Pans in 1800, but by November 1801 he had built a pottery on his land at Newbigging. After this he was referred to as a potter in Musselburgh. Reid mortgaged the Newbigging land for £200 in July 1800 and again for another £150 in November 1801 and it was this money he used to construct his Pottery. The property was added to in 1807 when William Reid potter at Newbigging and Clementina Bagnall purchase [d] a mansion house, offices, court, garden and park and small dwelling house adjoining. Reid raised the money for this purchase by mortgaging some of his property. Reid's factory is depicted on Hay's map of 1824, where its ground plan is shown to be considerably larger than those of adjacent buildings. An image on a surviving billhead is shows four kilns and it seems to be accurate (fig 92).
William Reid died on 13th October 1835 at the age of 70. During his lifetime at least two of his sons, Robert, and George, joined him in the business and the pottery traded under the name of William Reid and Sons. The business encountered problems after William's death and by January 1838 the Pottery, complete with its flint mill, was advertised to let, first in the *Scotsman*, and then in the *Staffordshire Advertiser*. Apparently, the works continued in production with the help of Jonathan J. Forster as Pottery manager. The *Staffordshire Advertiser* (23 February 1856) carried another advertisement for the sale or let of the Pottery stating, 'as lately occupied by M Reid and Son', indicating that the works had already closed. This date is confirmed by the Post Office Directory of 1856-57 which carried no entry for the Pottery. When the pottery reopened, it produced only Stoneware.

The excavated ceramic assemblage has led to the identification of a number of extant items, mostly moulded plates, and a few of these have been decorated with transfer prints (fig’s 93, 94, 95 & 96). I have never handled plate (fig 96). Fig 94 central transfer, see APPENDIX H.
‘Gleaners’

Now in East Lothian Museum are a number of signed and dated ceramic items which includes a pair of matching lidded earthenware bowls, with large painted moulded lions. knops and lion head with ring handles (fig 97). The bowls which were rediscovered in a town council cupboard and photographed by the author along with (fig 98), are decorated with blue and white transfer prints and hand painted vignettes; arms of Musselburgh. Exteriors with a variant of standard willow (fig 97a) and covers with broad floral scroll border surrounding a scene of three figures collecting corn within a landscape (fig 97b). The interior lid seating and outer rim with narrow transfer printed Chinoiserie borders (fig 97c). Both the main print and border were probably copied from Charles James Mason & Co. (1826-48), ‘Gleaners’.
‘Jugs & Basins’

Presently on display in the National Museums Scotland, Edinburgh is a large, moulded, signed, and dated, *Wm Reid May 14th, 1822*, bone china jug.

Now in East Lothian museum and matching it, are two similarly marked and decorated bone china bowls, one illustrated (fig 98).

I have suggested that these may all have been produced to honour the visit to Scotland of George IV in 1822. They all have the arms of Musselburgh highlighted on their exteriors in Pratt colours, within the common moulded basket weave design. It was New Hall who almost certainly first introduced this design, later copied by several other manufacturers. The interior of both bowls is decorated with transfer prints of flowers, birds, and butterflies, decorated with a range of coloured enamels (fig 99). This transfer has much in common with Rathbone’s ‘*Flowers Birds and Insects*’ (fig 32).
Bridge of Lucano’
A short note by Robert Copland in the (FOB 46, P10), describes a c. 5 inches high mug as having a view of the ‘Bridge of Lucano’ in an oval cartouche with an all-over print design (fig 100). He also noted a narrow border on the top of its interior (fig 100a), and ‘W REID’ on a ribbon backstamp (fig 100b). He then went on to suggests that the ribbon bears a strong resemblance to that of the rare Spode mark (Copland 1993 55, fig 37), c. 1805-18 and which is rarely found on blue printed wares. In the past I have handled three similarly decorated mugs, one unmarked, one with ‘W. REID’ on a ribbon, and one with ‘W. REID’ with a blue and white backstamp; a flag with winged supporter (Haggarty 1996, 32 fig 47a) (fig 100c) which is an example produced by the Don Pottery.
Robbie Conn, a TCC member very kindly drew my attention to an extremely rare and possibly unique, 2-piece Scottish Stilton pan, originating in Canada and now in the collection of William Allardyce (fig 100d). It has almost certainly been copied from a c. 1820 Spode example and has two previously unrecorded impressed (REID & SON) marks (fig 100e).

We don’t know when William made his son a partner, but the Stilton Pan probably dates from around 1830 and interestingly the top is decorated with the same Gleaners’ and border transfer print (fig 100f), as on the covers of the two bowls in East Lothian museum (fig 97).

William and Clementina’s eldest son, Robert, was aged twelve, when he entered the Potters’ Box Society as an apprentice potter in June 1799 and would have finished his 7-year apprenticeship in 1806. Prior to his death aged 70 on the 13th October 1835, William Reid drew up in November 1828 a document in headed ‘Settlement, William Reid in favor of his wife and children’ in which he sought to secure the future of the pottery and in which he notes the ‘Pottery business, presently carried on by me and my son, Robert Reid, Potter’.
‘Standard Willow’

Large blue ashet transfer printed with a version of ‘Standard Willow’ (fig 101). The backstamp consists of three fouled anchors and three scallops shells the arms of Musselburgh (fig 101a). Purchased by the author from a prominent local Musselburgh family who said it had been handed down and originally came from the pottery of William Reid. Next to the blurred backstamp is a drawing of Musselburgh’s arms (fig 101b). Another backstamp with thistles (fig 101c) is sometimes seen on Newbiggin ‘Standard Willow’ decorated plates and which was illustrated by Coysh & Henrywood 1982, 299).

‘Chinoiserie’

Attributed to the Newbigging pottery with confidence as this puzzle jug matches exactly a named, dated, and painted example now in a Scottish private collection, (Haggarty 2018, 46). The jug is decorated with a hand painted verse, blue and white Chinoiserie prints and borders (fig 102 & 102a).
‘Excavated Shards’

‘JACKO’S - PENCE – TABLE’

Six bisque shards from a white earthenware child’s plate (fig 103). The moulded decoration consists of a shell-like edge and border composed of two different large stylized flowers, against a stippled background. The centre has been decorated with a transfer print showing an early passenger train crossing an aqueduct. What survives of the printed motto is in black and I have completed it in red. ‘JACKO’S - PENCE – TABLE’ Friends now oft greet each other’s smiles / By railways speedy aid / And fifty pence clear fifty miles / Of four and two pence paid. This print is taken from JACKO’S MERRY METHOD OF LEARNING THE PENCE TABLE. Published by Dean & Co. Threadneedle St London by 1846. Grandpapa Easy’s Series.

Note: a different plate with the title JACKO’S PENCE TABLE was illustrated in an article by Dickson on Scottish child’s plates (2002, 39, fig 15). It was given a possible attribution to Musselburgh, but this attribution is more than highly speculative.

‘Milkmaid’

Four conjoining bisque white earthenware shards (fig 104), from what is either a small plate or saucer decorated with a transfer-printed unrecorded version of ‘Milkmaid’ (Haggarty & Haggarty 1988, 12 PL 4; Haggarty 1996, 18 & 19 fig 10).

Milkmaid was originally a Spode design and is thought to have been introduced c.1814 or 15 (Drakard & Holdaway 1983, 136 PL 701). See above Rathbone (fig 24).
‘A present for Mayse’

Two conjoining bisque white earthenware shards from a bowl (fig 105), decorated with a transfer printed cartouche containing, ‘A present for Mayse’ (Haggarty 1996, 18 & 19 Fig 14). I have looked in (Riley 2002,) book on Children’s mugs and plates, but this transfer surround has not been illustrated.

‘Geranium’

Bisque white earthenware saucer shard, (fig 106), decorated with faded transfer-print, a variation of ‘Spode’s ‘Geranium’ Pattern and border (Haggarty & Haggarty 1988, 11-12; Haggarty 1996, 18 & 19 Fig 9). This border is often used in conjunction with the Geranium pattern and especially on Spode plates and dishes with coats of arms (Coysh & Henrywood 40, Pl 2 & Drakard & Holdaway 1983, 168, PL 952). Spode designed the geranium pattern in 1821 (ibid 1983, 146-7 Pl’s 821-1 & 2). The base of this shard has a small trace of an impressed mark. Plates with this border are also known with a printed Edge Malkin mark, (FOB 1999, 104, 4-5).

‘Chinoiserie’

Bisque white earthenware plate shard decorated with what may be a variant of ‘Standard Willow’ (fig 107). However, this small bisque shard does not seem to match several marked examples known to be from the Reid Newbigging pottery (Haggarty 1996, 32 fig 48).
Bisque body shard from a white earthenware plate, decorated with a transfer-print (fig 108). Pagodas of this size can be found on ‘Two Temples’ of which innumerable variations occur from potteries all over Britain, and which may have originated at the Spode factory. Copeland has discussed at some length, Spode’s contribution to the development of this pattern (Copeland 1980).

Five thin white bisque earthenware shards of which two conjoin from a London shaped wavy edged cup (fig 109) decorated with two Chinoiserie transfer prints.

Three conjoining shards from the base of a white earthenware bowl which has an almost straight footrim (fig 110). The bowl is decorated in the centre with a transfer print of an island composed of rocks, trees and two buildings. This design has been discussed and a number of variations illustrated by a number of authors including (Copeland 1980, 53-66) and Drakard & Holdaway 1983).
‘Unknown’ Bisque

One large, white, bisque, earthenware rim shard (fig 111), covered with a floral transfer print, which has been used on many recovered shards from smaller moulded jugs.

Four conjoining bisque white earthenware shards from what is probably a saucer decorated around the edge with a transfer-print (fig 112).

Two conjoining bisque white earthenware shards from what is probably a small plate or saucer decorated in the centre with a transfer print of what may be part of a dragon, and possibly copying something like C. M. Mason’s Chinese Dragon (fig 113). This shard also has a fragment of a backstamp (fig 22a).
Three glazed white earthenware shards from a small bowl (fig 114), decorated underglaze on both surfaces with blue and white transfer-print including ferns. From the excavation there are also nine bisque shards of this pattern.

Three conjoining bisque white earthenware shards from what is probably a cup decorated on both the interior and exterior with a band of transfer printing (fig 115). The interior band is 37mm broad while the exterior would be at least 50mm. A glazed cup with this transfer was recovered by archaeologists in Glasgow.

Two conjoining bisque white earthenware shards from what is probably the shoulder of a teapot decorated with a band of transfer printing (fig 116). On the right is part of a vignette containing a tree and a cottage.
Two conjoining bisque white earthenware rim shards from a bowl, decorated on the interior with a broad band of transfer printing (fig 117).

Small bisque body shard decorated with a transfer-print of a sheep (fig 118).

Two small conjoining bisque white earthenware shards from the rim of a bowl and decorated on the interior with an indistinct band of cross hatched transfer printing (fig 119).

Two bisque white earthenware rim shards from a shallow wavy cover c. 13mm high and probably square (fig 120). It is decorated with a rococo transfer print.

Small bisque saucer body shard with traces of a transfer print (fig 121).
Small bisque saucer rim shard decorated with a transfer-print of what looks like a scale background and a floral filled reserve (fig 122).

Three white bisque shards of which two conjoin from the rim of a deep saucer (fig 123). Decorated with a transfer-print of a scroll around the rim and what looks like flowers in the centre.

Small bisque saucer rim shard decorated with a transfer-print of a simple border (fig 124).

Two thick bisque body shards from a deep plate decorated on the interior with a transfer print of a meadow and small tree (fig 125). The border has the look of snakeskin.
Group of ten glazed white earthenware shards decorated with several different blue and white transfer prints (fig 126).
All unstratified.

Glazed white earthenware rim shard from a saucer decorated with a blue and white rococo style transfer printed pattern, which includes a non-specific animal against hills (fig 127).
Not well stratified.

One small white earthenware rim shard decorated on both surfaces with blue and white transfer prints (fig's 128 & 128a).
Not well stratified.
Published research, (Forbes & Haggarty 2007), confirms that there was a second small pottery in Musselburgh and proof of this lies in the Musselburgh Valuation Roll which records both Reid’s Newbigging Pottery at West Vennel and James Forster’s Pottery at ‘23, Newbigging’. Although he may have set up business at some time in the preceding four years, it shows that by 1855 James Forster had established his own venture in Newbigging as tenant of a pottery rented from the Kedzlie family, probably with his father’s advice and support. It is highly likely that this pottery had once been operated by the John and Thomas Tough, father and son, who later moved to larger premises in Portobello, trading there as ‘Tough & Coy and who went on to became significant players in the history of Portobello stoneware potteries.

The Kedzlie family owned more than one tract of land in Newbigging, and had acquired this Newbigging holding in 1739, when John Kedzlie, brewer in Newbigging, bought it for £197.18 Scots from Thomas Horries, Shoemaker in Musselburgh. This property came through the family to Miss Catherine Kedzlie, who, somewhat late in life, married Thomas Tough, designated ‘Stoneware Manufacturer in Portobello’ in their marriage contract. In May 1899 she sold it for two hundred- and fifty-pounds sterling to William C. Maxwell, a Musselburgh Joiner. This Sasine gives the exact location of the property as ‘on the East side of Newbigging, with Alexander Vernor’s property on the South, John Wilson’s property on the North, the Common lane on the East, and the High Street of Newbigging on the West’.

N.B. confirmation lies in Hay’s map of 1824 which pinpoints both the Kedzlie property, small yellow oval and the Reid property, large red oval (fig 129).

The Valuation Roll consistently records James Forster’s occupancy of the Kedzlie pottery premises until 1884 – 85, when his son, Jonathan, James Forster, took over the tenancy of both the dwelling house and the pottery. The rent was due to ‘Miss Kedzie, living at 2, James Street, Portobello,’ heir to the property, and now owner. In 1890 Jonathan James Forster was still tenant of the dwelling house, but no reference was made to ‘Pottery premises. And by
1892, instead of the pottery we have the following entry, ‘Mason’s yard – Tenant, Ramsay Banks & Son, Builders’. There is no archaeological evidence for what wares were produced by the Musselburgh pottery but (Paterson 1857, 65), notes that ‘At Newbigging there is a small pottery belonging to Mr Foster who manufactures dishes of all kind’.

‘Ching’

Very few examples from the Musselburgh pottery have been identified and only one piece of transfer printed ware. This is a large named and dated jug (fig 129a).

The jug has ‘J. R. HOOD / Dec 21st, 1846’. painted on its front (fig 129c), and an oval ‘Ching’ backstamp along with ‘Musselburgh / Pottery / J.F’, on its base (fig 129c). J.F. is almost certainly the initials of James Foster.

Two other Scottish potteries J. & M. P. Bell and Robert Herron & Sons Kirkaldy also produced a Ching pattern.
West Pans Pottery

Thanks to William Littler’s thirteen years of 18th century soft paste porcelain production, 1764-77, and later white earthenware potteries at the small seaside hamlet of West Pans, dark shaded area (fig 130), more has been published on its history and wares, than any other Scottish east coast ceramic producing site. This research can be found in (Forbes & Haggarty 2005; Haggarty 2006; Forbes & Haggarty 2006; Haggarty 2008a; Haggarty, G 2010 & Lewis J 2010), with a full bibliography in (Haggarty 2008a p. 57-8). After Littler’s departure production of pottery using white firing clay only began again in 1784 with Robert Bagnell’s occupation of the site. Bagnell originally from Staffordshire, was a Catholic who’s previous creamware pottery in Glasgow had been destroyed by a mob during the Gordon Riots. Probably short of money Bagnell took on a partner Anthony de la Chapelle a teacher of French in Edinburgh and who claimed to have contacts in France who would purchase their wares. The pottery prospered until the beginning of the French Revolutionary wars of 1792-1802, when trade fell away and when both of their estates were Sequestrated. A William Webster took over the pottery with Bagnell as manager and trading as ‘The West Pans Stoneware Company’ although the archaeological evidence suggest they were producing creamware. This enterprise was short lived, and the partnership dissolved in 1793. Pottery production carried on under J. Read & Company and in 1794 he initiated a Summons against Bagnell, but later in 1796 his estate was also Sequestrated. By 1804 a William Smith was running the pottery but four years later in 1808 he was also Sequestrated. Excavations on the site suggests they were all basically producing the same types of wares. In 1815 David Wilson potter and James Gibson took over the empty pottery from Nicol and James Watson, landowners and salters, by then its owners. Soon in need of funds Wilson & Gibson took on a new partner John Smils merchant which soon led to several more problems and the closure of the pottery in 1817. Next is the Roger and Davidson period which despite more legal wrangles probably lasted until c. 1832.

---

3 Sequestration - the process of bankruptcy
Excavations at West Pans produced a very large ceramic assemblage but extraordinarily little transfer printed wares. After the abandonment of the site by William Littler in 1777, a number of drainage ditches were cut into the ground, almost certainly due to the build-up of clay and waterlogging probably due in part to a number of c. 1750 redware potteries on the site (fig 131). All the pottery stratified above these levels was creamware and pearlwares in the form of industrial slip decorated wares dating from c.1800. Two trial trenches put in on another part of the site produced a collection of bisque teapot shards dating from the c. 1825. For a possible West Pans mark see APENDIX I.

‘Bisque & Glazed Shards with Underglaze painting’

‘Peace of Amiens’

From the excavation several pearlglazed shards transferred-printed in light brown and then painted underglaze in red, orange, green, yellow, and blue were recovered (fig 132, 132a & 132b). The central transfer, part of which can be seen on the bisque

---

4 The base of an earlier small c 1750 redware kiln can be seen to the left of (fig 131), and it has been cut by the later ditches. Another redware kiln was excavated by the author on the adjoining property; area lightly shaded in the shape of a cross (fig 130).
shard (fig 132e), can be found with various borders but it always has the Goddess of Peace, left, holding in her arms a frond, while centre is Britannia with her shield. The seated figure on the right is the French republican symbol of Marianne with her spear on which is a Phrygian cap. Below the figures are cannons and shot, as seen on a saucer belonging to the author (fig 132d).

This transfer celebrates the Peace of Amiens which was signed between Britain and France on the 27th March 1802. It is a common pattern almost certainly produced by several different British potteries (Tomlinson 2008, 33-37). One of whom painted Roman numerals on the bases of its vessel’s (Haggarty 2012, 68-69). Other excavated bisque shard showing the flowers not illustrated.

Also, from the West Pans excavation are two pearlware rim shards from either the opposite sides or two different tea bowls decorated with brown transfer prints and underglaze painting; brown-ochre, blue and green. They show a man fishing while a lady and gentleman looks on (fig 133). There is also a trace of a thin brown-ochre band on the rim while the interior is decorated, with a border print (fig 133a). A pearlware fluted teabowl, with very minor differences to the West Pans shards is known (fig 133b).

Note: a larger pearlware bowl with a similar border as on excavated shards, was sold at an Edinburgh auction in 2004 and another badly stained example catalogued as Prestonpans is in the collection of the National Museums Scotland. Its exterior is decorated with crude transfer prints and comparable
underglaze painting. One side has Admiral Duncan and Admiral Neilson (fig 133c), obviously, the latter being a misspelling of Nelson and on the other side are two chickens facing each other above which is ‘The thickest holds too to one’ (fig 133d). At that time an ‘f’ was used for an ‘s’. Its probable that this bowl is a West Pans product but its far from proven.
‘Bisque shards’

‘Feeding Chickens’
One white bisque earthenware shard from the base, near the centre of a small plate or saucer (fig 134). It shows a woman with a basket hanging from her left arm, a climbing plant to her left and a fragment of a lattice window. To date, the only published references to this rare pattern that I have found are in the bulletins of the ‘FOB’. Five transfer-printed shards in blue of a woman throwing seed to chickens were illustrated in (FOB Vol 88). These were noted as having come from an archaeological excavation carried out on the site of a shop in Exeter, which had sold earthenware. Illustrating the shards brought a response in the next edition (Vol 89), along with a photograph showing the pattern in full on a tea bowl and saucer. The pattern has tentatively been called ‘Feeding Chickens’ and may have been copied from a Job Ridgway 1802-1808 or Job Ridgeway and Sons 1808-1814, (FOB Vol 144 7). The author subsequently purchased a saucer in this design (fig 134a).

Two small white conjoining bisque earthenware shards from the rim of a saucer decorated on its interior with a transfer print of leaves (fig 135).
Bisque shard from what may be a bowl decorated on its exterior with a fuzzy transfer print of what may be a landscape (fig 136).

Small bisque shard from an unknown vessel decorated on its exterior with a transfer print of what may be waves (fig 137).

One small bisque shard from what may be a plate decorated on its flat interior with a band of what is possibly shells (fig 138).

One bisque white earthenware knop decorated on its upper surface with part of a transfer print (fig 139)
'Glazed Shards’ See also APENDIX I.

Note; I have omitted many glazed shards as they are two late in date to be products of West Pans and come from excavations carried out on the associated cottages.

Ten pearlware shards of which seven and three conjoin to form fragments, with a complete profile of a wavy rimed tea bowl rim painted with a brown band. The fluting is shanked from left to right and the deep blue transfer print is a variation of the Rock pattern (fig 140). The Rock is a Spode pattern, originally pre 1800 in date, and a covered sugar bowl with a remarkably similar engraving has been illustrated by Copland (1980, 51, Pl 18). The inside border (fig 140a) is also a Spode design called forest landscape and it has been illustrated by Drakard and Holdway (1983, 128, Pl 607-3).

One basal angle shard from a teabowl (fig 141), decorated on the exterior with a blue transferred printed zebra and, in the interior, with a tree springing from a small clump of foliage (fig 141a).
Two conjoining glazed shards from a pearlware blue transferred printed tea bowl (fig 142). The design incorporates a horse pulling what might be a gypsy caravan or covered wagon going left with a driver with a whip, while a dejected dog walks alongside a wheel.

Fifteen glazed shards, of which seven, three, two and two conjoin to from fragments from a bowl (fig 143). The transfer print shows two figures facing left in a garden with one holding a parasol over the other and two birds flying above. There is a temple and to the right and another figure standing in a doorway. The interior of the bowl has two and a half rows of a honeycomb effect, interspersed with vignettes filled with flowers just below the rim. This pattern may be linked to parasol and birds, a transfer print produced by Samuel Rainford who had a pottery in Leeds c.1800-12. I am indebted to Frank Davenport for this suggestion. Almost certainly taken from a design by the Dutch artist, Cornelis Pronk (1691-1759) and which was commissioned by the (VOC) c. 1735. (FOB 127, 9).
Six glaze pearlware shards of which five conjoin to form a large rim and body fragment from a blue transfer printed tea bowl decorated on the exterior with a floral sheet pattern ([fig 144]). There is also an internal transfer printed border ([fig 144a]).

One glazed pearlware rim shard from a saucer decorated with a black border transfer print. The glaze has not attached to the back of the saucer ([fig 145]).

Two glazed pearlware waster shards from a saucer decorated below the rim with a black border transfer print 23mm broad ([fig 146]). See (FOB 2009. 144 p.11) for an illustration of a jug with the ‘Warrior and Lady’ print.

Two glazed pearlware waster shards from a small bowl decorated below the interior rim with a black transfer border print ([fig 147]).
Two conjoining glazed shards from a pearlware blue transfer printed saucer 140 mm in diameter and with a wavy border (fig 148)

Not well stratified

‘Bridge and Swans’

Three conjoining pearlware shards from the base of a saucer decorated in a blue underglaze transfer-printed design which incorporates two swans swimming in front of an arched stone bridge and a landscape ‘Bridge and Swans’ (fig 149).
Also, from the West Pans excavation is the base of a bowl with part of a transfer printed swan (fig 149a).

It would be interesting to know what date experts on transfer printed would give to this saucer is are as it’s conceivable they are West Pans products. It’s also possible that Rathbone purchased the engraved plates after one of the many West Pans Sequestrations.
See Rathbone’s ‘Bridge and Swans’ (fig 27).
Cadell’s or Watsons - Pottery

Although experiments had previously been undertaken to produce a refined porcelain body (Haggarty & Forbes 2004), the mass production of white ceramics in the Forth littoral begun in 1750 when the merchant William Cadell, and Samuel Garbet⁵ built a pottery, situated just below the old kirk at the east end of Prestonpans, which can be seen on a recently discovered map showing the underground coal seams (fig 150). Initially, the pottery was managed by Cadells nephew, also called William, who had been given a quarter share of the enterprise by his uncle. Cadell senior kept a half share for himself, leaving Roebuck with the final quarter. It has been asserted, by other authors including (McVeigh 1979, 7) and (Kelly 1992, 300), that the pottery manufactured creamware from the time of inception and did not commence the production of white salt glazed stoneware until c. 1755. However, in May 1754 the Scots Magazine published Dr. James Lind’s paper on lead poisoning due to the action of lemon juice on lead-glazed vessels. Lind, famous for his work on scurvy, was also knowledgeable on ceramics and in his search for suitable containers, had visited the Cadell and Roebucks pottery in Prestonpans and wrote of ‘a manufactory lately set up at Prestonpans’ where ‘stoneware is made to as great perfection as many seen in England’ (Haggarty & Forbes 2004, 3). We can therefore be fairly certain that both McVeigh and Kelly were wrong and that it was white salt glazed Stoneware not creamware which was produced at its onset (Haggarty 2007, 218-230).⁶ As there has been no archaeological investigation of this site, presently

---

⁵ Garbet had moved from Birmingham to Scotland, where with his friend the brilliant chemist Dr, Roebuck he had established a manufactory for producing oil of vitriol on a large scale,

⁶ An 18th century ceramic assemblage recovered from a nearby workman’s trench by the author and George Dalgleish was composed entirely of white saltglazed stoneware shards and associated kiln furniture.
only one exceptionally large white salt glazed stoneware bowl from its early years can be identified.

A date for the commencement of creamware production at the Auld Kirk pottery so far eludes us as, prior to c. 1770, the Customs books refer only to the export of stoneware. Later there are references to both stoneware and cream coloured, but there are indications in shipping lists that these terms were often used interchangeably and indiscriminately (Gibb 1978, 5-9). The only identifiable creamware items from this period come from a ‘Royal’ pattern dinner service.

Two plates are presently on display in the City of Edinburgh Museum (fig 151), one is in an English private collection and the remainder is in Historic Deerfield. The service was by repute presented by William Cadell to his ward Anne Mocket on her marriage in Aberlady, to one James Cunningham, on the 3rd August 1792. Several the plates have a tiny impressed mark which looks like it was produced by a small animal’s paw (fig 151a). Both the painting and central transfer are extremely poor quality.

By 1762 William and his son John, who had now taken over as manager had insured their pottery equipment and stock for £100 and by 1774 the pottery was employing 40 workers. Later the 1790 Statistical Account notes that the Auld Kirk Pottery was employing 40 adults and around 30 children.

Thanks to a lengthy Prestonpans Pottery Inventory of 1801-2, (Quail 1979, 58-62), we have a window into its production at the end of the 18th century. It is significant that the inventory lists 11 old copper plates and one new at £5.10s along with 64 quair of printing paper, which along with 14lbs Zapher £3. 3s. and 6lbs Blue Calz in Carriage at £14. 17s. confirms that the pottery under Caddell was involved in ceramic printing. A quire of paper was formally 24 sheets.
In February 1796 William and John leased the pottery for 19 years to John Fowler, William Anderson and David Thomson who traded as William Anderson & Co. 1796-1811. Anderson retired and the remaining partners trade as David Thomson & Co. 1811-1817. Later, in 1817, a John Fowler stated that he had entered into a partnership with Thomson but having lost confidence in him asked the court to inventory the stock and dissolve the company. The stock was valued at £2,164 11s 9d and this, along with the pottery lease (expiring in 1818), was sold.

Later when Hamilton Watson, estate was sequestered in 1838, by the Trustees of William Caddell of Tranent for non-payment of his 1837-38 rent. He was leasing both the whiteware and redware potteries for £150 per annum. The inventory of goods, materials, and utensils etc. includes engravings for printing on pottery valued at £150 sterling. Most of the extant identifiable examples, including some particularly good blue and white printed ware, derive from this period of the pottery’s life. Watson passed away before the sequestration was discharged in 1840. The purchasers of the engravings etc. was, Gardner & Co., (Alloa) £8. 3s, Belfield & Co., (Prestonpans) £4. & Anderson & Co., (Glasgow) £9. An inventory of the goods at the Pottery drawn up by Jonathan Foster, includes details of their copper plates and quantities. Extant examples with many of these transfers, have not identified.

Pattern names and number of plates. See APPENDIX C for Flora

Filigree Pattern 5; Flora 14; Gondola 20; Roslyn Castle 14; Dark Bird and Fly 6; Broseley 14; Light Bird and Fly 9; Poisson Font 4 (Persian Font); Juvenile Sports 7; Japan 3; Oriental Tablature 6; Edinburgh Views 5; No 7 - 5; Hebe 4; Jug Plates 20; Bouquet 4; Lace Border 3; New France 5; No 8 – 4; Filling up Patterns 9; Odd plates 87.

Note; Edinburgh Views almost certainly include the Union Canal; Road to Colinton’ and ‘Port Hopetoun’ and Jug plates almost certainly include those for ‘The Gentle Shephard.

---

7 The pottery had been possessed by Hislop and Watson and then by Hamilton Watson. Hislop was John Fowler’s nephew and had inherited his share.
8 See the chapter on George Gordon for a note on how it was the engraver John Jenkins who engraved many of Watson’s copper plates.
One exceptionally large white earthenware blue and white transfer printed, baluster shape jug, with three moulded bands around its body (fig 152). Large C-scroll handle with applied front handling lug, simple spout. Base and rim with broad band of floral transfer-print. Main body transfer printed with ‘The Road to Colinton’ along the bank of the Union Canal’ Edinburgh. Marks on base: impressed ‘WATSON & Co’ and transfer-print ‘WATSON & Co’. (fig 152a)

Source prints; John Wilson Ewbank’s (1799 - 1847), fifty-one drawings engraved by W. H. Lizars for James Browne’s Picturesque Views of Edinburgh (1825).
Blue and white transfer printed pearlware bowl. Central pattern showing Port Hopton which was the end of the Union Canal in Edinburgh (fig 153).

Watson & Co Backstamp’

Source prints; John Wilson Ewbank’s (1799 - 1847), fifty-one drawings engraved by W. H. Lizars for James Browne’s Picturesque Views of Edinburgh (1825), (fig 153a).

A blue and white transfer printed outer border which is sometimes seen on Port Hopton bowls (fig 154). This is a copy of Minton’s Floral Vase (Priestman 2001, 179-181).
‘The Gentle Shepherd’

Source prints are Aquatints of David Allan (1744 – 1796). These were printed by A. Foulis and published in Glasgow in 1788 along with the extremely popular poem and pastoral comedy ‘The Gentle Shepherd’. The text from the poem on the necks of jugs is in old Scots tongue.

Blue and white jug (fig 155)

Text on jug neck (*Mause… let gang your grips fly, Madge howt Bauldy leen I wadna wish this tulzie haed been seen, it’s sae daft like ‘*).

This quotation is from the ‘The Gentle Shepherd’ by Allan Ramsay. The transfer-print illustrates a scene between the characters ‘Madge’ and ‘Bauldy’. Madge is beating Bauldy and another character called Mause tries to intervene and tells Madge to ‘Let gang your grips’.

Source Print (fig 155a).

David Allan; Plate 8; aquatint; 1788.
Blue and white jug (fig 156)

Text on jug neck;

*Bauldy. ‘And yonder's Mause: ay. ay. She kens fu weil. When ane like me comes rinnin to the Deil. She and her cat sit beokin in her yaird; To speak my errand, faith, amaist I'm feared’.*

This quotation is from the ‘The Gentle Shepherd’ written by Allan Ramsay. The transfer-print shows Mause sitting spinning with her sleeping cat in front of a cottage while Bauldy stands behind a two-bar fence.

Source Print (fig 156a)

David Allan; plate 4; Aquatint; 1788.
Blue and white jug (fig 157)

Text on jug neck

Patie-- My Peggie why in tears smile as ye wont allow nae room for tears The im nae mare a shepherd yet I'm here.

This quotation is from the ‘The Gentle Shepherd’ written by Allan Ramsay. The transfer-print shows Patie standing beside a sitting and weeping Peggie. He is wrapped in a plaid and there is a dog to his left and cows in a field to their right.

Source Print (fig 157a)

David Allan; plate 9; aquatint; 1788.
Blue and white jug (fig 158).

Text on jug neck; ‘Jenny ‘And what would Roger say gif he coud speak Am I obliged to guess what ye’re to Seek’.

This is a quotation from The Gentle Shepherd by Allan Ramsay. The transfer print shows two figures Roger and Jenny in a landscape and with a dog to their right. Rodger has his tartan plaid around his shoulders.

Source Print; (fig 158a).

David Allan; plate 7; aquatint; 1788.
Blue and white mug (fig 159).

This transfer print shows a scene from the Gentle Shephard, and it shows Jenny and Peggy sitting beneath a tree. There is a waterfall to the left above a pot and a wooden staved luggie in the bottom right corner. Along the bottom is a flowing burn. It has a blue and white Watson & Co backstamp (fig 159a).

Source Print; (fig 159b).
David Allan; plate 2; aquatint; 1788.
Blue and white mug (fig 159c)

This transfer print is from the Gentle Shephard, and it shows Patie and Rodger both with plaids around their shoulders.

In the background is an extremely high waterfall, there is a ruin on left and sheep and collie dog on right.

Source print (fig 159d)

David Allan; plate 1; aquatint; 1788.
Irene MacDonald (1997, 9 figs 7-10), illustrates three moulded jugs, all decorated with Watsons transfer printed borders and David Allan Gentle Shephard Aquatints (fig’s 160 & 160a). Irene went on to state that these jugs matched shapes known from the Bo’ness pottery, Jamieson period (1827-1854). I am not convinced as there is a similar pair of marriage jugs recorded and these are dated 1832, long before the sale of Watsons copper plates.

‘Camel Bridge and Tent’
A small deep plate with a strange blue and white transfer print of a man leading a camel away from what looks like a long bridge. To the right of this is a tree and large open Berber type tent, (fig 161). On its rear is a backstamp which includes ‘WATSON’ above a ‘4’. (fig 161a) The transfer-printed border is composed of various flowers.
‘Bird and Fly’

Cup and saucer decorated with the bird and Fly transfers in red (fig 162). This is the ‘Light Bird and fly’ and 9 Gordon plates are listed. I am informed that this pattern can occurs with its name and ‘SEMI CHINA’. Within a diamond as illustrated by Fleming (1923, 160). Robert Herron & Sons Links pottery in Kirkcaldy also had a pattern with this name.

‘Chinoiserie’

A Bourdalou of traditional form with single loop handle (fig 163). Its body decorated on both faces with the same light blue and white chinoiserie transfer prints. Typical chinoiserie borders and its handle with transfer of continuous simple flowers (fig 163a). Base impressed ‘WATSON’ (fig 163b).
Morrison Haven & Bankfoot & Cuttle, Potteries

About 1750, originally from Newcastle, a potter called Anthony Hilcote, who had been potting at West Pans, moved to lease a redware pottery at Morrison’s Haven Harbour (fig 164), situated at the western extremity of Prestonpans from Janet Grant, Countess Hyndford (1729–1818). Later in 1772, after Hilcote moved again this time to Portobello, George Gordon, clerk at the Leith Glass House Company, was granted by the Countess, a 19-year lease on the site. The following year Gordon formed a partnership on a 19-year basis with Rowland Bagnall and it was their intention to make ‘cream coloured ware, black, tortoise shell, white, and every other kind of pottery ware’ and at its inception it they employed 6 workers. Bagnall died on the 22 February 1773 leaving his wife Elizabeth with no hereditary entitlements, so she was removed. In 1774, Gordon moved into the pottery with his sons, George, and Robert, both working potters.

In 1795 Gordon also took over the Bankfoot pottery from William Cadell and Margaret Inglis. Bankfoot was situated to the west of Prestonpans on the landward side of the main road, which ran along the coast to Edinburgh. To the east lay a small promontory known as the Cuttle.

In 1818, Sir James Grant-Suttie, 4th Baron of Balgone and Prestongrange (1759–1836) had inherited the land at Prestongrange and his relationship with Gordon got off to a bad start and he took him to court over the disrepair of the housing and the Sea Mill at Morrison’s Haven. It got worse as Grant-Suttie refused to renew their soon to expire lease and began litigation banning Gordons’ from digging for red clay at Morrison’s Haven.

In the mid-nineteenth century the pottery industry was in decline, throughout the area, and as one contemporary observed; ‘Of late [1831], all operations of potting, with the exception of two small works for brownware (what we call redware), have been suspended, to the serious disadvantage of numerous and manifold interests. Robert Gordon moved to a small

---

No examples of whiteware from the Cadell period has been recorded.
brownware pottery at Rope Walk, Prestonpans to be succeeded, in 1839, by his brother George Gordon (3rd). George Gordon (2nd) took over management of the pottery at Bankfoot but was soon struggling financially and was ultimately sequestrated, in 1828. George Gordon (2nd) may have moved to the Cuttle as he already owned the site and the existence of two beehive kilns, suggests it may have been producing brick and tile and he may have begun to produce whiteware. In 1840, he took on a five-year lease of Watsons old pottery at Prestonpans. By this time, this pottery had ‘three kilns and adjacent building along with the two dwelling houses on the main street and small hill garden behind’. By the end of his first year, Gordon had to relinquish the lease because he could not afford the rent arrears of £17 10s. Subsequently, all the stock was sold and, in 1841, George Gordon (2nd) was ordered out of the pottery, just a year before his death in 1842.

Many marked Gordon pieces are known, most moulded and painted wares, but marked willow patterned items are not rare. We are lucky that two archaeological excavations one at Morrison Haven, which truthfully is more important for the study of slipware, and one on the Cuttle site, (fig 165), red oval, which has given us an important window into their production. Marks include, a single crown, ‘GORDON’, ‘GEO GORDON’, ‘G. Gordon’, & ‘R & G Gordon’, all impressed and the last two often above a crown. Rare is ‘R. Gordon impressed’. Other marks have been put forward (Jones & Leishman 2012, 27), including G. G impressed; I still need to be convinced, and R & G Gordon raised, which was just a mistake. Thanks to the glaze, the names above the small crown even enlarged are often almost impossible to decipher (fig 165a).
R. & G. Gordon v John Jenkins

An 1831 court case between R & G Gordon potters at Bankfoot and Morrison’s Haven and John Jenkins engraver is an important source of information into how the engraving of copper plates for Scottish pottery industry was carried out in the 1820s. The case revolved around a claim by the Gordon’s that they had been overcharged for repair work on the ‘Lady of the Lake’ pattern which had been smoothed down leaving merely the outline and recut.

In evidence Jenkins stated that ‘pottery copper-plate engraving is a peculiar branch of engraving art… almost exclusively confined to England near the potteries such as in Staffordshire’. He had served ‘a long apprenticeship, practised as a journeyman with the artists in the line’ at Messer’s Bentley and Wear¹⁰ of Shelton, near Newcastle under Lyne¹¹. On coming to Scotland in 1820, ‘he was employed by Messer’s Watson and Co. of Prestonpans and executed the entire work of the Pottery in the engraving line’. With insufficient work to employ him full time with the approval of Hamilton Watson he worked for any potter who might need him. This includes the Gordons, the previous (Thomas), and current Mr Rathbone (Samuel), of Portobello, Mr Reid at Newbigging, some of the Glasgow potters and others.

Jenkins stated that he was the only individual of any standing in the line who was then or had been in Scotland for the previous 10 or 11 years, although Gordons occasionally employed an itinerant pottery engraver by the name of Downing. He also claimed that Gordons might have beaten down Downing’s prices below the regular rate. Rates were governed by those established in Staffordshire where there were many master engravers. Messrs Bentley & Wear had no less than 21 Journeyman besides apprentices. Rates for new plate (full price) – slight repairs (half price) – full repair two (thirds price), and these were the rates paid by all the Scottish potters for whom he worked. Gordons however claimed that Jenkins had overcharged him for some repair work and had taken him to court.

Among Jenkins witnesses were from Watson & Co. Jonathan Foster Manager, Thomas Fairley, Painter, James Nicol, Journeyman Printer, and Samuel Gardner, Modeller Manager.

Foster stated that he had been in the pottery at Prestonpans for 45 years and had been foreman for 25 or 26 and employed for, 14 or 15 years by Watson & Co. He therefore had good

---

¹⁰ In the document wrongly spelt as Bentley & Ware
¹¹ Bentley Wear & Bourne engravers and printers Vine Street Shelton 1815-23 subsequently became Bentley & Wear 1823-33. Thanks to Pat halfpenny who sent me lots of information on them.
knowledge of repair prices for copper plates. He also stated that Jenkins was the only pottery engraver in Scotland and was a good workman. He remembered seeing Gordons ‘Lady of the Lake’ pattern when it had a thorough repair being smoothed down leaving merely the outline. It was a large one sometimes in 3 or 5 pieces\(^\text{12}\). Rathbone also stated that it was a heavy pattern and estimated that it would consist of 5 plates. Gordons suggested that Mr. W. H. Ainsworth, engraver at Birdsnest, Newcastle on Tyne was a proper person to judge copper plate engraving as there were no engravers in Edinburgh cutting for potters. However, if Jenkins objected, they were pleased to leave the matter in the hands of Rathbone of Portobello and William Reid of Musselburgh.

Jenkins won the case and the Gordons had to pay.\(^{13}\)

1. In the document there are also other interesting bits pertaining to other Scottish east coast potteries; Jenkins engraved for 2 guineas a ‘Broseley’ saucer for Watsons.

2. There is mention of a new engraving for a table plate in the ‘Willow’ pattern for Gordon

3. Samuel Gardner had been a modeller at Watsons for 8 years but had been in the pottery business for 40. He had previously worked in Staffordshire, Newcastle or Shields, Bristol and in Scotland for Samuel Rathbone of Portobello.

4. Samuel Rathbone stated that he had been in the trade for 14 years and he did not employ English artists if he could get Jenkins to do his work

**Note:** The only other engraver I know with a connection to the east of Scotland is a David Scott from Edinburgh, who along with a Hugh Adamson a potter skilled at printing where hanged in 1805, at Glasgow Cross, for forging banknotes.

\(^{12}\) This might suggest that Watsons allowed Jenkins to bring other potters engravings back to be worked on.

\(^{13}\) I am grateful to Jean Shirlaw who put me on to these papers over afternoon tea at Irene MacDonald.
‘Chinese Crane’

A large transfer printed platter with a moulded border which are common on Gordon’s wares (fig 166). Impressed GORDON along with a Chinese Crane backstamp (fig 166a).

Ten pearlware shards, from a plate were recovered during excavations on the Morrison Haven kiln site and conjoin to form two fragments of a different transfer print showing the crane facing in the opposite direction, and what appears to be a chick within a romantic floral and Chinese inspired landscape (fig 166b). It also has the Chinese Crane backstamp and (fig 166c).
‘Lady of the Lake’

Jug and basin set decorated and sink all decorated with the Lady of the Lake, a pattern-based on the poem ‘The Lady of the Lake’ by Sir Walter Scott (fig’s `167, 167a & 167b). The poem was tremendously influential in the nineteenth century, and partly inspired the Scottish Highland Revival. The design is based on two different engravings after a painting by Richard Westall R. A. whose illustrations were in the Scott’s first edition, published in 1810, by John Sharp of Piccadilly, London (Coysh & Henrywood 1982, 208). Other makers who used this design was Thomas and John Carey, c. 1823 to 1842 Lane Rd, Staffordshire, (ibid 209) and Dixon, Austin & Co. Garrison Pottery c. 1820-40, (Coysh & Henrywood 1989, 122). It is not known when the Gordon’s version was introduced but c. 1830, it was totally recut by the engraver John Jenkins.
'Florentine’ see APPENDIX C
In Arnold Fleming book on Scottish pottery, there is a poor illustration of a plate with the same central transfer as seen on (fig 168), but with a different border, and which he calls Prestonpans ware (1923, 176 Pl xxxix).
This led to it being classed as a Gordons product by some Scottish collectors. Examples are known with a Florentine Opaque China backstamp which is now attributed to Minton (Priestman 2001, 43 pl3.71), but it may have been copied. Shards recovered from my archaeological excavations, don’t validate this version of Florentine, as a Gordon’s product, and (fig 168b & 168c), shows that different variants of Florentine was used by Gordon on both plates and sinks.

‘British Lakes’
Presently I don’t have an image, but shards with the typical Gordons moulded border and including one with part of a backstamp were recovered from both the Morrison Haven and Cuttle excavations (fig’s 169 & 169a). There is a terrible image of Gordon’s ‘British Lakes’ platter with GEO. GORDON impressed and the tree backstamp, on
the front of the Scottish Pottery Society Bulletin NO 37, Nov. 2003. This shows that it was taken from a Stevenson’s design of the same name, British Lakes 6. 3 on the TCC data base.

‘Willow’

Many plates and platters decorated with Standard Willow have been recorded with marks relating to the Gordon family; I have only illustrated three, all with different marks.

Base impressed; **R & G Gordon**

(fig 170).

Base impressed; **G Gordon**

(fig 171).

Base impressed; **Geo Gordon** with crown

(fig 172).
‘Excavations at the Cuttle Site; Belfield’s and Morrisons Haven’

Excavations carried out on the site of the later Charles Belfield’s & Co. pottery, (founded in the 1830s), at the hamlet of Seacliff an area, traditionally known as Cuthill (or Cuttle), uncovered a large ceramic assemblage. Around 1839, a sea wall had been moved outwards and a void, later under the floor of the Belfield’s pottery was filled with ceramic and kiln waste (fig 173). It’s likely that this material had been dumped from the nearby Bankfoot pottery of George Gordon the second, prior to him moving and taking over Watsons pottery in 1840. Included in the dump was a large collection of plaster of Paris and ceramic moulds along with shards both bisque and glazed (Haggarty 2010a). Crucially part of transfer printed plate recovered had the impressed mark of a crown above ‘Geo Gordon and other shards are known Gordon’s patterns. Unfortunatly prior to the archaeologists getting access to the site it had been run over by heavy machinery, which did no good for a layer of wet plaster moulds (fig 174).

Another archaeological excavation carried out at the Morrison Haven the Gordons first pottery site, recovered a large and extremely important assemblage of Scottish late 18th century slipware. This had been dumped by the potter Anthony Hilcot, onto the remains of an even earlier 17th century glassworks (Haggarty 2009). A small group of later glazed shards recovered from the Gordons period, are in the main, not that well stratified. However, what evidence there is from the transfer-printed wares, suggest some of the pottery is acceptable, and I will highlight the more problematic shards.
‘Cupid amongst the Roses’ associated transfer prints

Shards both bisque and glazed, from plates moulded with Cupid amongst the Roses were recovered from the Belfield site (Haggarty 2010a 4). Most of these shards were hand painted, but one had part of a green transfer print of a shell and flowers (fig 176). See APPENDIX A. The only extant plate which I have identified, has two different prints within its small reserves, and four small prints of flowers (fig 176a).

‘Queen Victoria & Prince Albert’

Excavation on the Belfield’s site uncovered many bisque and glazed shards from moulded plates, some of which were decorated with transfers of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert (Haggarty 2010a, 3) (fig 177). Subsequently a plate with a complete red transfer print of Prince Albert on his horse has been identified (fig 177a). The transfer is placed within a moulded border consisting of three: cartouches with incuse mottoes ‘THE QUEEN AND / THE CONSTITUTION’, ‘THE QUEEN AND / REFORM’, ‘THE QUEEN AND
‘Bo - - -’

From the Morrison Haven excavations were recovered three pearlware shards, of which two conjoin, from a small plate decorated with a blue transfer print of birds and flowers (fig 178). On its reverse is part of an oval backstamp with the letters ‘BO… (fig 178a).

‘LIBERTY’, These are between two crowns and three vignettes of thistles, roses, and shamrocks. There is also a tower and flag in background of the print and below his horse is ‘PRINCE ALBERT’ (Haggarty 2018a 6 & 7 fig’s 16 & 18).
‘Lord Brougham’
Several pieces and complete ceramic plate moulds were recovered from the Belfield site (fig 179), and an extant example has since surfaced (fig 179a). On this is an exceedingly rare red transfer print of Lord Brougham, (Haggarty 2018a, 9 fig 25). From the excavations on the site of Rathbones Pottery in Portobello a bisque shard with similar moulding was also recovered which might suggest that the master mould changed hands. See APPENDIX K

‘Canova?’
From the Morrison Haven excavation were recovered four shards which conjoin to form a fragment from the rim of a small plate decorated with red transfers. The border has a small sailboat and urn in a reserve and flowers in others (fig 180). From the same excavation, is a cup base printed in black (fig 180a), and a moulded jug body shard with a similar transfer in green (fig
180b). It looks like Gordon’s with minor differences, and like John Dawson & Co of Sunderland (1799-1837), copied a common Thomas Mayer (1836-38) design ‘Canova’. The Links pottery of Robert Herron & Sons in Kirkcaldy also produced a pattern in this name.

Six, well stratified, glazed shards, were recovered from the Belfield’s site. They conjoin to form a fragment of white earthenware, bell-shaped cup. It is decorated on both surfaces, and handle with different red transfer prints (fig’s 188, 188a & 188b).

Well stratified and from the Belfield’s site and probably a Gordons product are two conjoining pearlglazed rim shards, from a saucer decorated with a section of a transfer printed blue floral border (fig 189).

Well stratified and from the Belfield’s site, one white earthenware waster shard, almost certainly from the centre of a child’s plate, decorated with part of a transfer print with a religious motto (fig 190). ‘SERVE THE LO [RD] / AND SURE [?]’
Well stratified, from the Belfield’s site, were recovered three pearlglazed, shards which conjoin to form a fragment from a child’s plate. Decorated in the centre with part of a blue transfer print of a religious motto surrounded by a floral wreath (fig 191). ‘MY SO[?] / SINNER-[?] / THE[?] / [?]’

Well stratified from the Belfield’s site are two, conjoining, pearlglazed shards from a small plate decorated with blue transfer printing. The border has traces of an open floral design; the centre decoration is a strange bush, or tree (fig 192).

Well stratified from the Belfield’s site are two pearlglazed rim shards from a cup decorated with part of a blue border on the interior and larger version of the same pattern on the exterior (fig 193). Similar border transfer on plate (fig 194), from the Morrison’s Haven site, so almost certainly a Gordons product.
Well stratified from the Belfield site is a small plate shard decorated with blue and white transfer prints (fig 194). The interior shows a romantic Chinoiserie inspired design, while the border is of spaced flowers filled with small dots with ears: there is a very slight trace of a blue backstamp, and impressed mark on the base. Is this possibly yet another variation of the common Gondola pattern.

Well stratified from the Belfield site are three pearlware everted rim shards (one with a handle scar), from a cup, or cups, with a wavy borders; decorated on both surfaces with blue transfer printing (fig 195 & fig 195a). It is possible that the basal angled shard (fig 196), is from the same cup?

One pearlglazed basal angled shard from a cup which has been decorated on the exterior and interior with a blue transfer print (fig 196). See (fig 195).

From the Belfield site, one white earthenware rim shard with a small section of a blue transfer print on each surface (fig 197).’

*Gondola* See APPENDIX B
From Morrison Haven excavation, but not well stratified is base shard from a cup, or small bowl, with a developed footrim, decorated on the interior with a blue and white transfer print of what appears to be a woman servant serving tea on a small square topped table to a seated couple (fig 198).

From Morrison Haven and not well stratified are two pearlware rim shards which conjoin to form a fragment of a red transfer printed cup of London shape. The exterior transfer printed sheet print consists of small open dots and flowers, while the interior is decorated with a broad border in similar style (fig 199).

From Morrison Haven and not well stratified are two conjoining shards from the base of a small carinated bowl with a developed footrim and traces of an exterior and interior blue transfer printed borders, similar to the surviving fragment on its interior (fig 200).

From Morrisons Haven and not well stratified are several shards which conjoin to form a large fragment of a dipped and lath trimmed black transfer printed child’s mug; possibly with ‘A Present / to Charles’ (fig 201). It also has a hand painted brown band below its rim.
From the Belfield’s site, one, glazed, shard from a plate decorated with a brown transfer print showing what appears to be three Mediterranean fishermen sorting their catch (fig 202). Not well stratified.

‘Sanitary Ware’
Several thick shards from sinks both plain and transfer printed were recovered during the excavations on the Belfield site, as were a large number of plaster moulds fragments,
from both sinks and toilets. In the image above (fig 203), the front two shards are from a sink decorated with a blue and white star sheet pattern. The thirty-seven, glazed, earthenware shards behind are decorated with a broad rococo border transfer which is smudged. I have enlarged the two scenes (figs 203a & 203b). Gordons pre 1840.

Also, from the Belfield site are two thick bisque white earthenware shards with fragments of another transfer print which has a somewhat strange building. Shards are almost certainly from a sink (fig 204).

From the Belfield site two, thick glazed, white earthenware shards from the rim of a sink or toilet decorated with an all-over blue and white floral transfer print (fig 206). Gordons pre 1840.

Note: a version of the Florentine pattern which was also used on Gordons sanitary ware; see (fig 168b).
The excavations at Portobello uncovered a large group of glazed and bisque shards from various design of sinks, toilets, and various sanitary fittings etc (fig 207). The toilets were decorated with transfer prints and despite some effort, it was not possible to show complete patterns.

The transfer used on the toilets consists of garden urns filled with mixed flowers (fig 207a & 207b).

A few sinks and toilet rims were decorated with a band of vine leaves and bunches of grapes (fig 207c & 207d)

Some sink shards both bisque and glazed were decorated with a cracked ice like pattern (fig 207e).
APPENDIX A

‘Gondola’

The small glazed Gordon’s shard (fig 76) shows part of a small green transfer print of a shell and flowers. It has been cut from a larger Gordon’s of Morrison Haven and Bankfoot transfer, and this can be seen on a moulded tazza (fig 208), which has a Gondola backstamp (fig 208a).
APPENDIX B

‘Gondola’

The two well stratified blue and white rim shards (fig 179), excavated on the Belfield site on close inspection match a plate illustrated by Fleming (1923, 176, pl XXXIX), which he called Prestonpans Ware (fig 209). This is yet another version of Gordons Gondola confirmand by a plate shown at a meeting in Kirkcaldy and illustrated below (fig 209a & 209b). My thanks to Gus.

Previously wrongly attributed to Watson’s of Prestonpans (Jones 2013, 43 fig 37), is another plate and additional example of Gordon’s ‘Gondola’, with a different but somewhat analogous central ship and landscape transfer (fig 209 c), and similar backstamp (fig 209d).
APPENDIX C
(Flora)

We know that Watsons of Prestonpans produced a pattern called ‘Flora’ and from excavated shards evidence, we also know that both Rathbones of Portobello (fig 30), and Gordons of Morrison Haven and Bankfoot (fig 168), were producing variants of Minton’s Florentine but we do not know the name being used.

An archaeological excavation at the nearby port of Leith, from which most of the pottery was exported, uncovered shards from two plates decorated with blue and white transfers, a variant of Florentine (fig 210). On the reverse of two shards are fragments of backstamps containing the pattern name (Flora) along with an impressed (20) (fig 210a).
APPENDIX D

'Claremont'

From an archaeological excavation at the Port of Leith along with the shards noted in APPENDIX C, were uncovered six shards from a small plate, decorated with blue and white transfer prints of rococo scrolls and flowers (fig 211). The reverse has a blue and white cartouche backstamp within which is the pattern name (Claremont / Stone / China), over which is impressed a small star (fig 211a); see (fig 35) for a somewhat similar example. The border on this saucer matches that on Rathbone cup shards (fig 40).

Just for interest; shards from the centre of a small plate with a green transfer and an impressed star have been recovered from yet another local excavation (fig 211b). It may also have a Claremont Stone China backstamp? (fig 211c).
APPENDIX E

Thanks to a surviving minute book, we know that The Fraternity of Gardeners of East Lothian, (Lodge Haddington), an important Scottish Society was in existence as early as the 16th of August 1676 (Cooper 2000). When legally terminated by its last 23 members on the 22nd Feb 1953, amongst the property dispersed were transfer-printed jugs. In four sizes, ‘I have only seen three’, and these are well known amongst Scottish ceramic collectors. They are pearlware and decorated with two or three, depending on size, examples of the same two brown transfer-prints. The main one shows a gardener standing with his left foot resting on his spade in the foreground of a formal garden the second is of flowers and leaves. The rim's and necks are painted with brown lines and below the transfer are the words: 'GARDNER'S Society HADDINGTON' (fig 212 & 212a).

In a short note on the Jugs, Irene MacDonald concluded, that the Free Gardner’s jugs of Haddington were products of Thomas Rathbone pottery in Portobello (MacDonald 1988, 69). On present evidence I think that this is correct.

While carrying out research in the Scottish Record Office Sheila Forbes discovered an invoice for 64 transfer printed jugs in 4 different sizes, made out to the Gardening Society Haddington.


- 6-quart jugs at 1/10 ½ £ 11. 3.
- 10-pt ditto at 1/3 £ 15. 0.
- 36-chopin at 7 ½ £ 1. 2. 6.
- 12-mutchkin at 4 ½ £ 4. 6.
- 1-Copper plate engraved £ 15. 0.
- Carriage of jugs £ 2. 6.

£ 3. 10. 9.

Andrew Pringle Master …… Signed by John Vort as “settled”

John Vort may have been a Haddington merchant.
APPENDIX F

‘Child’s Plates’ Rathbones

Childs plates with the dog, monkey and fox border are common and many of the published examples are decorated with transfer prints. A number of potteries are known to have produced these and Rathbone can be added to the list, as a large number of both bisque and glazed shards from child’s plates, in different sizes were recovered (fig 213). Some had painting on the border animals (fig 214) and stylized flowers. A few also have slight traces of transfer printing.

One bisque shard from a distinctive moulded child’ plate with traces of a central transfer print and a flower within its border (fig 215).

One bisque shard from a moulded child’ plate, which has just the slightest trace of a transfer print (fig 216).
A number of bisque shards from a few distinctive child’s plates. A few of which have traces of transfer printing, mainly flowers (fig 217 & 217b).

APPENDIX G

‘Duke of Wellington’

Wares with a transfer print called ‘Duke of Wellington’ (fig 218), are often sold as Rathbone of Portobello products, based as far as I can tell on a few glazed shards recovered from the pottery site. This is the problem of people scavenging on the developers spoil heaps, as none of the shards are bisque, were stratified, and may derive from the town dumped midden material. I have seen several large ‘Duke of Wellington’ ashets and plates with a Glasgow, Rowley Retailers mark, and if they are Scottish, this is much more likely to tie them to the Caledonian Pottery in Glasgow. Despite being given a certain Portobello attribution (Connell 2007. 64), I am extremely reluctant until more evidence is forthcoming to classify this pattern as a Rathbone product. Rowley originally from Staffordshire was manager of the Caledonian Pottery from at least 1802 until 1809 or 1811
the year it was acquired by the Delftfield Co. and when he may have opened his Glasgow Wilson Street retail premises (Neil 1812). Rowley is also thought to have acted as a Caledonian pottery selling agent. Interestingly Irene McDonald illustrates a printed pearlware teapot in the Spode version of ‘Two Temples or Broseley’ pattern; marked ‘ROWLEY. WILLISON STREET / GLASGOW. STONE CHINA, which she suggests may have been produced by the Caledonian pottery (McDonald 1993, 77-8 fig 1 & 2). In the same paper is noted a marked Rowley plate in her own collection decorated with the Spode ‘Lucano Bridge’ pattern while Neil in his 1812 paper suggests that Rowley marked ashets decorated with transfers of Glasgow Cathedral were also products of the Caledonian Pottery.

APPENDIX H

The Reid’s of Newbigging pottery transfer print which can be seen on the moulded plate (fig 94), is a cut down version of the one illustrated on this child’s plate from a Scottish private collection (fig 219).

APPENDIX I

‘WP & Crown Mark’

A few items with an impressed ‘W. P. below a Crown’ mark, have been put forward as West Pans products, and this includes a plate, at onetime in the authors collection, and which is decorated with printed Masonic and Orange Order symbols (McVeigh 1979, 63 figs 29).

What may be the same W. P. mark not ‘W. B’ as given on the TCC data base number 47760, and which is on the reverse of a transfer printed plate ‘Deer Pattern’ also illustrated on the TCC database, number 1675. Although it’s indeed possible that this mark (fig 220), was used at West Pans, it is yet unconfirmed.
APPENDIX j

Now in a Scottish private collection is a large pearlware jug; shouldered body, with straight neck, pointed fluted spout, simple ‘C’-scroll moulded handle; neck, rim handle and foot lined in brown, To front is a stylised off centre wreath in brown. Sides decorated with transfer-printed scenes surrounded by painted wreaths. Left (fig 221) a bagpiper is playing while a man and woman dance while on the right side (fig 221a) are two pipe smoking men seated at a table with glasses and bottle. Both clobbered in red, yellow, blue, brown and green.

This jug was purchased from Mrs Ingles an old lady who lived in Prestonpans and had a large collection of marked Prestonpans pottery and a West Pans porcelain teapot which is now in the collection of the National Museums Scotland. Mrs Ingles said that her Grandfather had a shop in the area and had taken pieces from customers. Height 200mm; Length 230mm; Base Diameter 115mm; Rim Diameter 120mm
APPENDIX K

A Rathbone of Portobello or George Gordon of Prestonpans moulded jug, commemorating the 1832 Reform Act, with the same ‘Lord Brougham’ transfer as (fig 179), but in grey (fig 222) has recently been offered for sale. It also has a transfer print of ‘Lord Grey’ (fig 222a),

and a much larger section of the same border print in its interior (fig 222b) as used on the plate (fig 179). Finally, it also has two small flower transfers in neck reserves (fig 222c).

This good-looking moulded jug (fig 222d), was taken from a Minton original, first produced c. 1830 and marked examples are known with both prints of William IV (Atterbury & Batkin 1945, 110) and sprigs of Wiliam IV and Queen Adelaide (May & May 1972, 55 fig 83).
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