Introduction

A distinct type of English filled-in transfer on pearlware appeared for a brief period in the 1820s, during the reign of George IV, made by some 17 small factories. Predominately jugs and mugs, they stand out with their brightly enamelled colouring on deep blue backgrounds, with transfer patterns that reflect the popular taste for Chinoiserie at the time. Of this filled-in transfer type on pearlware, the most common and widely copied pattern is ‘Boy in the door’, but a dozen or so other patterns have been found in this genre.

This research project, kindly funded by the Transferware Collectors Club (TCC), aimed to examine the evidence supporting current attributions and to separate out some of the regional differences. A detailed study of ‘Boy in the door’ wares revealed separate engraving styles. At first, I noticed four distinct engraving types but towards the end of this project while checking all known examples, I was surprised to find a fifth. This rare variation is used by Mayer & Newbold and the unattributed ‘R&H’ (both of which factories I had already assigned to another type).

Showing how these five engraving types differ, aids attribution of unmarked examples of ‘Boy in the door’ to a specific region and/or factory, and my findings also help with attribution of other patterns.

Principal findings

Although factory marks are commonly found on these wares, previously attribution relied on initials, and in only one case on a surname (Johnson, Hanley). Two dated examples are known, both 1823, and the initials from the marks on these two pieces have been matched with two Staffordshire partnerships in business at this time; Baggerley & Ball of Longton (1822–1836) and Lockett & Hulme of Lane End (1819–1826). Other, scarcer factory marks are occasionally seen, such as ‘P&A/B’ attributed to Pountney & Allies of Bristol (1816–1835). However all these wares remain relatively under-researched and there has been no irrefutable proof for any of these attributions, or attempts to describe regional differences.

Over the course of more than 10 years researching these wares and corresponding with collectors in the UK and the US, I have accumulated a reference source of examples, patterns, factory marks and related evidence, which I believe now covers all known varieties and manufacturers of this genre. An exploratory article in NCS Newsletter 153 (March 2009) led to some gaps being filled by reports of other types, eg mugs as well as jugs found with the ‘JC’ Mark 15, but generally confirmed my confidence that I was dealing with a comprehensive set of all known patterns of wares in this class.
One of the aims for this research project had been to see if there was any indisputable evidence to support existing attributions. These had previously been based on finding partnerships in contemporary trade directories and other documents, where the names matched the initials on the factory marks. In some cases, the probability was already high that they were correct where there were few, if any, other candidates in the right period that matched those initials, eg Lockett & Hulme for ‘L&H’, or Mayer & Newbold for ‘M&N’. ‘L&H’ marked wares had offered the best hope here, because their factory marks included the pattern number 10 for ‘Boy in the door’, and 18 for ‘Elephant and Camel’. Sadly there appears to be little product-related documentation left from any of these relatively small, obscure manufacturers, such as pattern books or product lists with recognisable descriptions. Nor does there seem to be reliable anecdotal evidence from any living descendants, despite exhaustive enquiries including interviews on local Staffordshire radio appealing for any living descendants of manufacturers such as Baggerley & Ball, or Lockett & Hulme. However it was at least reassuring to find nothing that contradicted the earlier assumptions.

With the lack of anything tangible to link the assumed manufacturers with their products, I decided to examine more closely the transfers on examples whose origin was at least backed up by other clues or supporting evidence. I observed clear regional differences which (by a process of elimination) lend weight to other, less supported attributions; and other features that provide pointers for attributing unmarked wares. I have found compelling support for the Bristol and Sunderland attributions, and I am

Table 1. Opaque china factory marks, attributions and products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Patterns known</th>
<th>Types found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baggerley &amp; Ball, Longton</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>Jugs, mugs, bowls, Unmarked vases Unmarked jugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longton 1822-1830</td>
<td>Elephant &amp; Camel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baggerley &amp; Ball, Longton</td>
<td>Mongol Huntsman</td>
<td>Jugs, mugs, spil vases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longton 1822-1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B &amp; Co, unattributed, Staffs</td>
<td>Ladies Picking Fruit</td>
<td>Jugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1820s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bill, Simpson &amp; Co</td>
<td>Mongol Huntsman</td>
<td>Jugs, mugs, Very scarce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1822-1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bill, Simpson &amp; Co</td>
<td>Mongol Huntsman</td>
<td>Jugs, mugs, Very scarce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1822-1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C &amp; B, unattributed</td>
<td>Lady on 6-legged chair</td>
<td>Just one spill vase with lustre bands and one jug known Rare pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>? John Carey</td>
<td>Unattributed, originally thought to be Cambian</td>
<td>Lady with Bird and Cage - “Seated man” variant</td>
<td>Mask jugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1815-1829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lockett &amp; Hulme, Lane End</td>
<td>Boy in the door ('No 10')</td>
<td>Jugs, mugs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1818-1829</td>
<td>Elephant &amp; Camel ('No 18')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mayer &amp; Newbold, Lane End</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>Jugs, many types/sizes including mask jugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1817-1832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B.J.Myatt &amp; Co, Lane End</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>Just one mug known Very scarce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1818-1827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pountney &amp; Alls, Bristol</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>Jugs, mugs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1819-1829</td>
<td>Lady with Lyre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>R &amp; H, unattributed</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>Jugs, mugs, Very scarce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>R &amp; H, unattributed</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Chinese of Rank</td>
<td>Just one jug known Extremely rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Unattributed,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lady with Bird and Cage - “Seated man” variant</td>
<td>Mask jugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lockett &amp; Hulme, Lane End</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>Jugs, mugs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1818-1829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lockett &amp; Hulme, Lane End</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>Jugs, mugs, Very scarce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1818-1829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consequently more confident in separating out the other wares mainly to Staffordshire and (in one pattern only, ‘Lady with Bird and Cage’) to Swansea. I therefore believe it is possible to view these wares in the context of their likely region of manufacture (see Index on page 18).

Because of the widespread copying of ‘Boy in the door’ by many different factories, I compared all the transfers used for this pattern and identified 5 distinct engraving types. Three of these can be associated with Staffordshire manufacturers, the fourth mainly with Sunderland (Dixon/North Hylton), and the remaining one with Bristol (Pountney & Allies). This has led me to some tentative guesses as to the progression and sequence of copying of this pattern by the different regions and factories.

As part of this research project, I have supplied a comprehensive set of photographs, descriptions and attributions to the TCC database of known patterns. Examples of the patterns described can be viewed on that database collectively, under the generic name ‘blue ground filled-in transfer enameled overglaze’, which may be helpful when reading this report. During this exercise of providing images and descriptions for the TCC database, Michael Sack was able to identify the source print for a pattern I had previously named ‘Pipe smoker with two attendants’. Michael identified the source print as A Chinese of Rank, a hand-coloured aquatint by William Daniell, published in London in 1810. This new information supports the previously held view that wares of this type were made around the 1820s, a few years after this illustration was published.

Table 1 lists known factory marks, current attributions, patterns and types known - and the Mark numbers quoted in this article. This table includes updates and additions of further types found since a previous version appeared in my article in NCS Newsletter 153 (March 2009).

**Historical context**

These wares are very distinctive, decorated with blue transfer patterns, displaying a characteristic range of brightly coloured enamels (brick-red, plum, yellow and green) on a cobalt blue background. The patterns are mostly chinoiseries, reflecting the fashion of the day, popularized by King George IV - albeit a few years after it first came to prominence. They are known in the following forms.

a) Jugs (sometimes described as ‘Ale’ or ‘Cider’ jugs). Various shapes and sizes known; most are ‘Dutch’ type but mask jugs were also made by Reuben Johnson and Mayer & Newbold.

b) Mugs. These are generally sturdy and sometimes quite large.

c) Spill vases. These are scarce and known mainly in two patterns, ‘Mongol Huntsman’ and (very rare on vases) ‘Boy in the door’ pattern. Spill vases were used for holding tapers or rolled paper, for transferring a flame from fireplace to candle.

d) Punch bowls. These are very rarely found. Of just two known in ‘Boy in the door’ pattern (see ‘Thistle, Rose and Shamrock’ on the TCC database), one is marked ‘B&B/L’.

e) Toast water jugs. I am aware of only one of these, in ‘Mongol Huntsman’ pattern.

The notable thing about the above list is that tea-wares and table wares are completely absent; ie no tea or coffee cups, saucers, teapots, sucriers, plates or platters. Instead the wares seem to have had a less-refined function. I believe they are mostly associated with ale or cider drinking in the early 19th century, either in public houses or for domestic use. This fits with their relatively simple forms, the use of earthenware rather than porcelain, and
the fact that the quality of potting and
decoration in some cases is poor. This
variable quality is perhaps to be expected,
as some of the workforce employed were
relatively unskilled – including children as
young as 10 years old.

One of the dated examples, a jug
attributed to Baggerley & Ball, has the
inscription ‘John Hustwit/Windsor Castle/
1823’. I have checked the employee
records of Windsor Castle of this period,
and they have no record of the name
‘Hustwit’. It is actually more likely that
‘Windsor Castle’ refers to a public house of
this name, and John Hustwit may well have
been the proprietor. In this period there
were many public houses named ‘Windsor
Castle’, all over England.

A porcelain jug in a similar filled-in transfer
design, attributed to Rathbone, is known
with the inscription ‘I Millerd Dolphins/Inn
Neapat Pagnell/Buclis 1823’. This probably
refers to the proprietor of the Dolphin Inn,
known to be trading at the address of High
Street, Newport Pagnell in Bucks
(Buckinghamshire) in the early 19th
century. The idiosyncratic spelling on the
jug is probably the result of being
transcribed by a poorly educated worker.

The association of these wares with ale or
cider drinking perhaps explains why they
have not, until now, been paid the same
amount of research and collector attention
as higher quality wares. However, beauty
is in the eye of the beholder and I
personally find these wares attractive and
colourful, exciting to collect because of the
scarcity of factories and patterns, and very
much worth a closer look.

The regions currently assumed to have
produced these wares are Staffordshire,
Bristol, Sunderland and Swansea. In line
with the general trend of pearlware output
of the early 19th century, the majority
would have come from Staffordshire -
predominately the Longton/Lane End
locality.

Boy in the door:
The five pattern types

One of the earliest versions of ‘Boy in the
door’ was produced by Miles Mason c.1800,
which I believe was copied by the
manufacturers covered in this report.
These later engravers made changes
including reversing the original image and
splitting it to create two different panels -
the lake with buildings in the distance has
been moved and incorporated into the
second panel (side 2). Miles Mason’s
version (on a teapot with impressed mark
‘O.M. Mason’ in Norwich Castle Museum
collection) shows the seated figure as a
lady with left arm raised, another lady who
is missing in our later copies, and a second
boy who grows taller by the time he
appears in wares by Baggerley & Ball etc.

Checking the engraving on known
examples, both from my collection and
those seen in other collections or for sale
on the internet, has resulted in five distinct
pattern types being found for ‘Boy in the
door’. These show regional differences in
the transfers used by Staffordshire,
Sunderland and Bristol manufacturers. The
key feature distinguishing the specific
pattern type is the thistle on the front
‘union symbol’ section, but there are other
differences, shown in Table 2 (opposite)
and described below.

Miles Mason ‘Boy in the Door’ teapot
### Table 2. Boy in the door engraving type characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern type</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factories using each pattern type:</td>
<td>Baggerley &amp; Ball JC (John Carey?)</td>
<td>Mayer &amp; Newbold R&amp;H Lockett &amp; Hulme Opaque China</td>
<td>Mayer &amp; Newbold R&amp;H</td>
<td>Sunderland (unmarked) Myatt &amp; Co</td>
<td>Pountney &amp; Allies, Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side 1</td>
<td>Seated figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side 2</td>
<td>Bushes (top left)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roof (top right)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Motif each side of union symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thistle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Type I**

Type I engraving is the most convincing in terms of style. The oriental figures have flowing movement, similar to those on the Miles Mason design. The thistle is distinctive, being the most botanically accurate.

This is known on wares marked ‘B&B/L’ (Mark 1) attributed to Baggerley & Ball, and on wares marked ‘JC’ (probably John Carey, see Mark 15).

This unmarked, un-enamelled example is interesting as it appears to have been intended to be left un-enamelled. Does this represent one of the earliest examples of ‘Boy in the door’? Baggerley & Ball wares are the most often found of this type; they are also the most common of this genre.

**Baggerley & Ball, Longton, Staffs (1822–1836)**

Jugs from this factory in Boy in the door pattern are quite common. Less frequently other wares are found. Unmarked spill vases in ‘Boy in the door’ are attributable to Baggerley & Ball by their engraving and enamelling, as are rare punch bowls in this pattern; one of which (in the Nancy Pogue collection) has the factory Mark 1 on the base.

A ‘Boy in the door’ jug with Mark 1 and dated 1823 is known; the ‘John Hustwit/Windsor Castle’ example illustrated in Godden’s *Illustrated Encyclopedia of British Pottery and Porcelain*, page 14.

Other patterns: Mongol Huntsman (‘B&B/L’ mark 2, also often unmarked) and Elephant & Camel (only unmarked examples known, attributable by handle and spout shape). Page 13 shows a comparison with an ‘L&H’ marked example in this pattern.

**‘JC’ marked wares – John Carey? Longton, Staffs (1818–1828)**

There are a couple of other contenders for the ‘JC’ initials (Mark 15) in this 1820s period, but John Carey is, I believe, the most likely. As the engraving type is that used by Baggerley & Ball, I am confident with the Staffordshire attribution. No other patterns are known with this mark.

**Type II**

The oriental figures are relatively naively and stiffly drawn, and may therefore have been copied from Type I by a subsequent engraver. The distinguishing feature of the Type II engraving is the flower-like motif either side of the union symbol with five circles surrounding a central circle (see fourth row on Table 2). On the other engraving types, there are only four surrounding circles arranged in a cruciform shape. In addition, the base of the thistle flower head is smooth rather than spiky as in Type I.

**Lockett & Hulme, Lane End, Staffs (1819–1826)**

This engraving type is the only one seen on wares marked ‘L&H/LE’ (Mark 8, with pattern number ‘10’), attributed to Lockett & Hulme. A ‘Boy in the door’ jug with Mark 8 and dated 1823 is illustrated in Rodney Hampson’s *Longton Potters 1700-1865*, page 190. Other patterns: Elephant & Camel (‘L&H/LE’ Mark 8 with Pattern ‘No 18’).

**Mayer & Newbold, Lane End, Staffs (1817–1832)**

This is the most frequent type on wares attributed to Mayer & Newbold (Mark 9), although they also used engraving Type III. Others patterns are known, but without the chinoiserie style and with a much smaller enamel colour range.
R&H, unknown factory with Mark 12

These scarce wares are probably the output of an unidentified Staffordshire manufacturer, so far un-attributed. See also Type III. Other patterns: A Chinese of Rank (‘R&H’ in beaded oval, Mark 13).

Unknown factory, ‘Opaque China’ with no initials (Mark 16)

I believe the maker of wares with this scarce mark, with the same engraving type as used by Lockett & Hulme, Mayer & Newbold and ‘R&H’, is probably another unidentified Staffs manufacturer. No other patterns are known with this factory mark.

Type III

This type has stiffly drawn figures, similar to Type II. It has the cruciform motif rather than the 5 surrounding circles seen only on Type II. In addition, the base of the thistle flower head is different, with an inner circle.

I discovered this scarce variation at a relatively late stage in my research, and I only know of a few examples using it. This group of transfers is very similar to Type II and may be by the same engraver. It was only used by Mayer & Newbold and the un-attributed R&H (Marks 9 and 12, as for Type II). Unlike Type II, it is not known on Lockett & Hulme wares. We can only speculate why both factories used both types of engraving. Presumably having shared the same engraver, they then both replaced their copper plates with updated versions from, again, a shared source.

A Type III Boy in the door mug with ‘R&H’ factory Mark 12 is in the Reserve Collection of the Potteries Museum at Hanley.

Type IV ‘Sunderland’

Wares attributed to Sunderland have this engraving type, examples of which are very rare. This type has two main characteristics. The first is in the thistle, which has a stylised flower, two-dimensional in appearance with distinctive horizontal lines, and an inner circle on its base. Secondly, the roof of the small building towards the right of Side 2 has a different treatment, as shown in Table 2.

Sunderland - North Hylton or Dawson potteries, possibly Dixon, Austin & Co (1820–1826)

Over the course of several visits spanning a number of years, Norman Lowe has found pottery shards on a spoil heap by the River Wear in Sunderland. On the site of the old North Hylton pottery, this heap was possibly also used by the Dawson pottery, which stood on the opposite bank of the Wear. These shards can be positively identified as the output of these two potteries, from the early 19th century. Of specific interest to us, several are ‘Boy in the door’ pattern. The latter are all glazed but not enamelled and they share several distinct features that set them apart from all other ‘Boy in the door’ types. The shard (below) shows this Type IV pattern. It is part of the ‘union symbol’ front section from ‘Boy in the door’. The Irish shamrock is seen towards the lower right. Note the very shallow lobes of the shamrock leaf. The English rose further left almost disappears into the edge of the reserve. Finally, there is a scallop shell motif at the top right of the shard which has a rather triangular appearance. These features are enough to set this shard apart from all other examples of ‘Boy in the door’ pattern.
I recently acquired a very unusual mug (Index 24) in ‘Boy in the door’ pattern, un-enamelled and matching the shard on page 7, ie Type IV. As is common with wares from the North East at this time, the mug is unmarked. Its regional attribution was confirmed by Norman Lowe as the style, handle shape and fixing are characteristic of Sunderland. I can therefore conclude that this mug can be attributed to the same origin as the shard illustrated, ie North Hylton or Dawson potteries.

I also have an enamelled unmarked ‘Boy in the door’ mug (Index 25) with this Type IV pattern. Its loop handle with wide central ridge matches an unglazed handle section recovered from the spoil heap mentioned above. Because this mug is colour-enamelled and the ‘Boy in the door’ shards collected have only been blue and white, an attribution to Sunderland has to be more tentative. However, the mug is closer in style and feel to the Sunderland-attributed un-enamelled mug, than to any other examples known from other regions, and its background colour is a ‘truer’ blue, with a less purplish tinge than seen in the output from all other regions. Taken together, the evidence would seem to suggest a Sunderland attribution for both of these mugs.

The author is not aware of other patterns in this genre attributable to Sunderland.

**B.J. Myatt & Co, Lane End, Staffs (1818-1827)**

An anomaly within Type IV is a single mug (Index 23) marked ‘M&Co/L’ (Mark 10), attributed to B.J.Myatt & Co of Lane End, Staffs. The engraving suggests Sunderland, but the mark points to a Staffordshire attribution, as does the style of the base and overall feel of the mug. Perhaps both manufacturers used the same engraver, as was common during this period, or the copper plates were transferred from one factory to another? It may have been a trial run, as it is crudely made with the transfer applied incorrectly and missing the usual ‘Side 1’, an upside-down application of the transfer to the handle, and poorly applied enamelling. Perhaps it’s not surprising not more of these were made!

**Type V ‘Bristol’**

**Pountney & Allies, Bristol (1816–1835)**

Type V is only known on wares marked ‘P&A/B’ (Mark 11) attributed to Pountney & Allies of Bristol. They are also sometimes unmarked. The distinctive feature of the Type V engraving is in the seated figure on Side 1. On all other versions of this pattern, this seated figure (clearly a woman on the Miles Mason version) has their right arm raised, holding what appears to be a spray of flowers towards the boy in the doorway. On Type V versions, this arm is positioned downwards. I originally thought this feature was simply an error in the enamelling, but a close examination of the example in Bristol Museum shows a clear line on the engraving, defining the edge of the arm and the side of the building. Amusingly, the disembodied raised arm can still be seen on the engraving, against the building to the left. This suggests that the engraver, used only by Pountney & Allies, copied one of the other four types. Looking at the treatment of the bushes towards the top left of Side 2, he probably copied an example of Type I. As explained below, an apparently unique numbering system seen on jug handles also confirms a Bristol attribution for the Type V engraving.

Enamelled jugs and mugs in ‘Boy in the door’ pattern are occasionally found with the scarce factory mark ‘Opaque China/P&A/B’ (Mark 11). This mark has traditionally been attributed to Pountney & Allies of Bristol, operating from their
Temple Back factory, and there is a jug of this description on display at Bristol Museum & Art Gallery. The ‘B’ initial underneath fits with Bristol and there are no contemporary partnerships elsewhere with the initials ‘P&A’.

I have a ‘Boy in the door’ jug (Index 27) with the ‘P&A’ mark and an incised number ‘12’ on the base of the handle. The rather angular style of the handle is not particularly unusual for this period, but the numbering on the handle certainly is. Judie Siddall reported a similar incised ‘6’ on the handle of an unmarked jug in ‘Lady with Lyre’ pattern, attributed to Pountney & Allies. Karin Walton at Bristol Museum kindly showed me several contemporary examples in the Museum’s collection attributed to Bristol. Among these was a large jug with the same handle shape as my ‘Boy in the door’ jug (Index 27), an incised ‘4’ on the base of the handle and (most significantly) a ‘Bristol Pottery’ mark in red script on the base. This jug is inscribed and dated 1829, which sits within the Pountney & Allies period of ownership.

The above two examples of incised numbers are on very similar-shaped handles. The Bristol Museum collection has other locally made jugs with incised numbers on the handles, in varying handle shapes. The numbers found are in the range 4, 6, 12, 24, and they apparently relate to ‘by dozen’ numbers, being a common practice at the time for determining wages according to size of the jug (the larger the number, the smaller the size of jug). Although this numbering system itself is known elsewhere, eg associated with Spode, I believe (after various checks) that having these numbers incised on handles is specific to Bristol. This confirms the Bristol attribution for the ‘Boy in the door’ Opaque China mark ‘P&A/B’, Mark 11. It also supports a Bristol attribution for the unmarked ‘Lady with Lyre’ wares with this handle shape and numbering system.

**Boy in the door conclusions**

The distinct characteristics, particularly of the Bristol wares but also to some extent that of Sunderland discussed above, give me more confidence in separating out, by a process of elimination, the other ‘Boy in the door’ examples and factory marks (of which there are many) to the prolific Staffordshire region. This is particularly helpful for placing the un-attributed ‘R&H’ Types II and III, Mark 12) and un-initialled ‘Opaque China’ examples (Type II, Mark 16), which I now believe are both Staffordshire manufacturers. These wares bear a strong resemblance to those of other Staffordshire partnerships. Frustratingly, the ‘R&H’ mark remains un-attributed, with no known Staffordshire manufacturer (or anywhere else, for that matter) definitely matching those initials and in the right timeframe. There is just a remote possibility that it was a mark used by an early and brief partnership of James Riddle and John Hartshorne (see Rodney Hampson’s *Longton Potters 1700-1865*, p.138), but no trade directories in existence list such a partnership.

Baggerley & Ball wares remain the most commonly found, and I believe it is still reasonable to trust this attribution for ‘B&B’ (Marks 1 and 2), together with Lockett & Hulme for ‘L&H’, Mayer & Newbold for ‘M&N’, and (although of ‘Sunderland’ engraving type IV), B.J.Myatt & Co for ‘M&Co’. Where it becomes less certain is in some of the other matching of names with initials, where other candidates are available having the same initials; eg ‘JC’ is probably John Carey but could also be John Chatfield (Lane End, 1822).

Incidentally, I have found nothing tangible to explain why the two dated examples in this pattern bear the date 1823. I can only assume that this year may represent the approximate peak of their popularity.
Type I

B&B/L  
JC

L&H / LE  
M&N  
R&H  
Opaque china

Type II

Type III

M&N  
R&H

Type IV

Both Unmarked, Sunderland  
M&Co/L

Type V

P&A/B (Bristol)
**Boy in the door**

**Sides**

- **Type I**
- **Type II**
- **Type III**
- **Type IV**
- **Type V**

Labels:
- JC
- L&H
- M&N
- Unmarked Sunderland
- P&A/B (Bristol)

City:
- Sunderland
- Bristol
**Handle shapes**

As well as similarities in engravings, this research also found some consistency in handle shapes within factories, which helps with attribution of ‘Boy in the door’ and other patterns. Exceptions are known, e.g. the 1823 ‘John Hustwit’ B&B jug, which has an L&H-shaped handle. Generally though each factory seems to have a favoured handle shape. This, taken with other factors, can increase the probability of an accurate attribution for unmarked wares.

Examples of favoured jug handle shapes for known marks and/or patterns are shown below, grouped to aid comparison.
Other patterns

Mongol Huntsman

This pattern was named by Howard Davis in his *Chinoiserie; Polychrome Decoration on Staffordshire Porcelain 1790-1850*. On page 144, he attributes an unmarked jug in this pattern, to Rathbone of Tunstall. Jugs in this pattern and with this handle shape have been found with the Baggerley & Ball Mark 2, and the jug he illustrates is more likely to be made by this partnership.

Two other factory marks are associated with this pattern, and I believe both marks relate to the partnership of Bill, Simpson & Co, Longton, Staffs (1825–1830), Marks 4 and 5. Examples with either mark for this factory are very scarce, and are only found in this pattern. A jug with Mark 4 is in the Cambridge Fitzwilliam Museum.

In addition, unmarked jugs are known with a handle shape that differs from Baggerley & Ball, as shown for example in Index 18. Although the handle shape has some similarities, it is thinner and does not have the shallow ‘feathering’ on the upper section of the handle as on Baggerley & Ball examples. I assume this is another, unknown Staffs manufacturer.

Elephant and Camel

This colourful and detailed pattern moves away from the Chinese theme. It is known on unmarked jugs by Baggerley & Ball (see below) attributable by identical handle and spout mouldings as marked ‘Boy in the door’ and ‘Mongol Huntsman’ examples. It is also found on Lockett & Hulme marked jugs and mugs (Mark 8 with the pattern number 18 on the base), and on mask jugs with Mark 7, attributed to Reuben Johnson, Hanley (1816–1823).

The Duenna

Unlike many of the other designs, this is more English Regency in style than chinoiserie. It appears to have been based on the 1775 Sheridan comic opera ‘The Duenna’. This is one of two patterns appearing on mask jugs with Mark 7, attributed to Reuben Johnson, Hanley (1816–1823). Jugs by this manufacturer are more often unmarked. Godden extends the date range for these Johnson mask jugs to end slightly later, around the mid-1830s; noting that Phoebe Johnson continued in business following Reuben.
Ladies Picking Fruit

Jugs in this pattern are known with the mark ‘B&Co/SP’ (Mark 3). The ‘SP’ initials presumably refer to Staffordshire Potteries, but there are many manufacturers that would fit this mark, which therefore has to remain un-attributed. However, even without the ‘SP’ for Staffordshire Potteries, the wares have a distinctly Staffordshire feel about them (right).

A Chinese of Rank

A very rare pattern, associated with Spode. I had previously named this pattern ‘Pipe Smoker with two attendants’ before Michael Sack identified the source engraving with the title as given.

Lady on Eight-legged Chair

This rare pattern is known on a spill vase (below) and one jug only, with the ‘C&B’ Mark 6, which remains un-attributed. No manufacturer with these initials in the right timeframe (and presumably Staffordshire) has been found matching these initials. The colour palette on these wares is rather unusual with strong enamel tones, but the general shape and style again suggests a likely Staffordshire attribution.
Lady with Tasselled Hat

A very rare pattern, known on jugs and one mug also found, unmarked and un-attributed. The shape and style, including the handle shape (see p.12 & Index 20), suggest a Staffordshire manufacturer.

![Lady with Tasselled Hat (Unmarked)](image)

Lady with Bird and Cage

When researching the origins of these filled-in transfers on pearlware, Swansea Cambrian is slightly problematic for three reasons. No marked wares of this filled-in transfer style have been found that are irrefutably attributable to Swansea Cambrian; only un-enamelled ‘Lady with Bird and Cage’ wares marked ‘Dillwyn & Co’ from a more recent date (1831-1850) than our 1820s period. The only other factory mark associated with this pattern (Mark 14) has no initials and cannot be attributed with absolute certainty. To date, there are no other patterns in this distinctive blue ground filled-in transfer on pearlware style that can definitely be associated with Swansea production.

Nevertheless, the fact that un-enamelled and marked wares in this pattern were produced at Swansea in the Dillwyn period, lends support to a Swansea Cambrian attribution for some of the earlier filled-in transfer ‘Lady with Bird and Cage’ examples. In addition, there is in existence a copper plate engraved on one side with ‘Lady with Bird and Cage’, and on the other side with a later Swansea pattern bearing the more recent (1850s) Swansea proprietor’s name of D.J. Evans. For the moment, I believe it is reasonable to conclude that any enamelled examples in ‘Lady with Bird and Cage’ are probably, but not certainly, Swansea Cambrian in origin.

There is also a ‘Seated Man’ variant of this ‘Lady with Bird and Cage’ pattern. It has been seen on jugs with an ‘Opaque China’ mark, no initials, Mark 14. Morton Nance originally attributed this mark to Swansea Cambrian and this has been perpetuated by other, more recent authors. But, again, there can be no certainty about this attribution and the shapes of the examples found are not generally associated with the Cambrian factory.

![Seated Man variant (Opaque China)](image)

![Lady with Bird and Cage (Unmarked)](image)
Arcade
This has been found on a mug of a shape and feel similar to those from the North-East. Jugs are also known in this pattern, sometimes with copper lustre banding and raised beading around the top rim, with a handle similar to L&H-type but thicker.

Man Offering Small Cage
This extremely rare pattern is illustrated and incorrectly attributed to Rathbone in Howard Davis’ book *Chinoiserie; Polychrome Decoration on Staffordshire Porcelain 1790–1850* (page 143 plate 193). I had not seen an example until I found the jug below just a short time ago. The shape and feel of this jug suggest a Staffordshire potter. Note the engraving similarity to the L&H ‘Elephant & Camel’ jug alongside.

Lady with Lyre
This pattern is also produced in porcelain, eg wares by Hilditch. So far, all of the ‘Lady with Lyre’ examples in blue ground filled in transfers on pearlware have been unmarked, but they are attributable to Pountney & Allies, Bristol.

Some years ago Peter Scott sold me an unmarked pearlware mug in ‘Lady with Lyre’ pattern, which he described as ‘by Pountney’. This mug is similar in style to the other filled-in transfers except the background remains undecorated, without transfer or the characteristic blue ground. However, the colour palette of the enamelling is quite similar and it is only a subtle difference in style. The mug has a similar feel and handle shape to a ‘P&A/B’ marked ‘Boy in the door’ mug in my collection (Index 26), and the bases are remarkably alike. More recently, unmarked ‘Lady with Lyre’ jugs have been found with the Bristol numbering system on the handles, which are also of a Bristol shape.
**Conclusion**

The above represents my current views on attributing this specific genre of blue ground filled-in transfer on pearlware. Luckily, many of the ‘Boy in the door’ examples are marked and can be placed with a degree of confidence with specific manufacturers. Variations in engraving style lend further support to the existing attributions and highlight some of the regional differences. Knowing how to spot these characteristics, as well as the usual handle shapes for each factory, should also help in identifying the likely manufacturer of unmarked wares. One can also, over time, get a feel for which examples are Staffordshire in origin and which may have been produced in other regions such as Bristol and Sunderland.

My hope is that people will start to give this genre a closer look. For a short time in the early part of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century these wares had their own significant niche in the history of British ceramics. They provide a fascinating insight into the workings of relatively minor pottery manufacturers and their practice of copying each other’s transferware designs.

© Report Copyright Pete Christmas 2010

**Acknowledgements**

I have been helped by numerous people particularly within the TCC, and my special thanks go to Judie Siddall, Dick Henrywood, Connie Rogers, Michael Sack and Loren Zeller.

I am also grateful for useful and friendly advice over the years from Elaine Chetham, Jessica Davies, Geoffrey Godden, Helen Hallesey, Rodney Hampson, Norman Lowe, Philip Mernick and Karin Walton.

Finally I am grateful to Great-Aunt Audrey, from whom I inherited the Baggerley & Ball jug (Number 5 in the index), and for the late Howard Davis for his reference book. They have no idea what they started!

**Contact details**

I would be interested to hear of other patterns, or views relating to my comments on attribution, handle shapes etc. Any suggestions for a snappier title for this genre, rather than ‘blue ground filled-in transfer enamelled overglaze on pearlware’, would also be gratefully received! If anyone should want to use material from this report in any other publication, I am happy for you to do so but would appreciate you letting me know in advance and acknowledging both me and the TCC. Contact me through the TCC or email: petechristmas@idnet.com
Table 3. Index of the Christmas Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Wares</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B&amp;B / L</td>
<td>Spill vase</td>
<td>Mongol Huntsman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baggerley &amp; Ball</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Large vase</td>
<td>Mongol Huntsman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baggerley &amp; Ball</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Elephant &amp; Camel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baggerley &amp; Ball</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Spill vase</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Baggerley &amp; Ball</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B&amp;B / L</td>
<td>Large jug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Baggerley &amp; Ball</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No initials, Opaque China</td>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Unknown factory</td>
<td>Staffs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>Small mug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>John Carey?</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>John Carey?</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>John Carey?</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>L&amp;H / LE / No 10</td>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Lockett &amp; Hulme</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>L&amp;H / LE / No 10</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Lockett &amp; Hulme</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>L&amp;H / LE / No 18</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Lockett &amp; Hulme</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>R&amp;H</td>
<td>Small jug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>R&amp;H, Unknown factory</td>
<td>Staffs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>R&amp;H</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>R&amp;H, Unknown factory</td>
<td>Staffs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>R&amp;H beaded border</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>A Chinese of Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td>R&amp;H, Unknown factory</td>
<td>Staffs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M&amp;N</td>
<td>Large jug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Mayer &amp; Newbold</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M&amp;N</td>
<td>Small jug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Mayer &amp; Newbold</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Wares</td>
<td>Pattern</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Mongol Huntsman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown factory</td>
<td>Staffs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Arcade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown factory</td>
<td>North East?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Lady with Tasselled Hat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown factory</td>
<td>Staffs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Lady with Bird and Cage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swansea Cambrian?</td>
<td>Swansea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>B&amp;Co / S P</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Ladies Picking Fruit</td>
<td></td>
<td>B &amp; Co, Unknown factory</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M&amp;Co / L</td>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Myatt &amp; Co</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Boy in the door un-enamelled</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>North Hylton</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>North Hylton</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>P&amp;A / B</td>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Pountney &amp; Allies</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>P&amp;A / B</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Boy in the door</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Pountney &amp; Allies</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Lady with Lyre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pountney &amp; Allies</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Lady with Lyre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pountney &amp; Allies</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>