Introduction

The publication of the first books and articles on H&R Daniel by Michael Berthoud and Geoffrey Godden drew attention to the company and resulted in more of their wares being identified. The same thing happened when Identifying Daniel Porcelain Tablewares was published: the database of information about the company rapidly increased, and continues to increase.

We are pleased to say that H&R Daniel Earthenwares has already achieved a similar result and a good deal of new data has come to light since its publication in 2015. There is now sufficient additional information to warrant the production of this supplement.

It is initially being issued to DCC members with the Spring 2018 Journal but, as the Journal is now in loose leaf format, members may wish to keep this supplement with their copy of H&R Daniel Earthenwares.

Our priority in the book was to differentiate between the earthenwares of Daniel and those of their contemporaries and we included a large amount of detail on the products of Thomas Dimmock & Co and associated companies. Their marks often included the initial D rather than the name in full with the result that several Daniel patterns were wrongly attributed to Dimmock in the past.

This supplement therefore includes new information about earthenware by Thomas Dimmock as well as updates on certain of the Daniel wares. We hope it will assist all who have an interest in earthenwares, or in the development of the Daniel manufactories.

The Authors

NOTE: Unless indicated otherwise all references to page numbers in this supplement relate to the relevant pages in H&R Daniel Earthenwares, and the supplement should be read in conjunction with that work.

New pattern entries since the publication of H & R Daniel Earthenwares are in Bold
Updates to pattern entries in H&R Daniel Earthenwares are underlined
Dimmock & Smith

On page 26 we referred to the rate book entries for Thomas Dimmock’s Hanley premises appearing under the name Dimmock & Smith. At the time we had not recorded any pieces with marks which might be attributed to this manufactory. Godden believed that the style of the wares he had seen with the D & S Mark suggested a date between 1842-1859, which is probably appropriate for the first pattern shown below. However we have also obtained some items marked D & S (Jovialis and Quadrupeds patterns) which appear to be of an earlier date.

Corean Temple pattern. This example is a 27 cm polychrome plate with slightly scalloped edges and small ribs extending from the edge for about an inch towards the centre. The quality of the printing and decoration is extremely high. The spelling ‘Corean’ it is simply an earlier version of the word ‘Korean’ but is here used to give a generic oriental impression. This pattern is recorded in the Transferware Collectors Club database as #16771.

Jovialis Pattern (No. 44). This 10 cm tall ale mug is printed in green with a suitably jolly scene. The word ‘Jovialis’ means appertaining to Jove or Jupiter and refers to the influence of Jupiter on those who are born under the sign of this planet being happy and having a jolly attitude.

Quadrupeds pattern. The 25 cm bowl pictured below is printed in under glaze blue with a ‘Lion’ pattern from the Quadrupeds series. The pattern is identical in every respect to that produced by John Hall around 1825-1830. Hall’s printed mark contained the word “Quadrupeds” in the lower half of the cartouche and the name J HALL in the upper section.

The bowl shown below has a printed cartouche of the same form but the upper section has been painted out. The series title appears in the same place and the script initials D & S have been added below the cartouche. This suggests that the copper plates were acquired by Dimmock & Smith when the Hall factory closed in 1832. The TCC database records Hall’s version of this pattern as #2951 and D & S as #9043.
The four vignettes around the border are as large as the central design and show deer, goats and a very strange looking zebra with an ostrich. The designs, taken from *A Cabinet of Quadrupeds*, a book of prints by John Church produced in 1805, were extremely popular. They were used in various ways by several manufacturers (including Enoch Wood & Sons) but none of them were identical to the designs of J Hall. The TCC database also has the ‘Stag’ pattern from this series, with the J Hall version as #3544 and D & S as #16320.

**Normandy pattern.** The TCC database also records a pattern entitled ‘Normandy’ by Dimmock and Smith as #7288. The example shown is a large well and tree platter (meat dish) printed in dark brown or black in this pattern The centre view shows a formal garden scene of vaguely classical nature but bearing no resemblance to the region of France. The mark is a floral cartouche with the word NORMANDY in the upper part and the initials D & S in script below it.

**Thomas Dimmock & Co**

**Argyll pattern.** (Page 36) This pattern is recorded in the TCC database as #13542. That example is marked with a scroll cartouche containing the pattern name and monogram and also bears the Pearl Ware and monogram impressed mark. There is a painted fractional number 1/1501. We have now recorded two further examples.

This 27 cm plate has the same printed mark but with the addition of what appears to be a letter T in script at the right. It has a painter’s mark and a different fractional number which we read as 1/2444 although the last three digits could be sixes.
The second example has the same scroll but without the script letter, and the printed mark is close to the edge of the plate. The impressed pearl ware mark and number (which in this case is 1/1604) are in the centre.

**Aurora pattern.** (New pattern – not recorded in the TCC database.) This design was initially found printed in blue and then a polychrome version was also recorded. The printed KAOLIN WARE mark confirms the attribution to Thomas Dimmock.

**Bohemia pattern.** On page 30 of the book we referred to this mark but at the time had no photograph to illustrate the pattern. Since then we have acquired several items in variations of this Kaolin Ware pattern. The first illustrated below, bearing the same mark described in the book, is a 27 cm soup bowl printed simply in blue. However the next item is a 7 inch side plate printed in a basic brown and with the flowers painted in a muted but reasonably naturalistic palette. There are touches of gilding around the edge and inside the border pattern, although most of it has rubbed away leaving a greyish residue which might give more knowledgeable folk a clue to the gilding technique used. As well as the printed mark and registration mark for 1844 it bears a hand painted number, 1/104, and a small painters mark.

However the most impressive item in the Bohemia pattern is the rectangular low comport with handles shown below. It is 27 cm across the handles and printed in dark blue, picked out in a similar palette of colours to the small plate. The edge and the moulded features of the handles are picked out in gilt and it is even decorated on all four sides under the lip. It has the same registration mark (for 1844) as the other items in this pattern and bears a hand painted number (in this case 1/2914), as well as an impressed Pearl Ware mark.
The quality of this piece and the craftsmanship required to create it, make it particularly upsetting that, like most earthenware, it is held in such low esteem in the UK today. While we appreciate a bargain as much as anyone, it was positively distressing to find that this beautiful piece could be won on eBay with a maiden bid of 99p.

Chinese Tree pattern. On page 38 of the book we quoted Godden’s reference to this mark but at the time had not seen the pattern at that time. Since then, two examples have come to light. The first is a very thickly potted and heavy 23 cm plate bearing an impressed Pearl Ware mark, the printed mark enclosing the TD monogram as described by Godden and also a hand painted number which is badly worn but appears to be 1/3555, along with a painter’s mark. It is skilfully decorated, with subtle colours under a thick glaze giving the appearance of gilt. (A platter with identical decoration has also been recorded but in that case the painted number was 1/3583.)

The second plate, also quite a heavy item, is a standard 27 cm plate and with small moulded ribs as in the Corean Temple example. It may be that the slight extra thickness provided by these ribs helped prevent the rim of the plate sagging while it was being made. This plate bears the identical Chinese Tree printed mark enclosing the TD monogram but in this case there is a very clear impressed mark JD, for John Dimmock, indicating that this pattern was popular enough to be continued into his occupation of the factory. His version uses a much less subtle palette with a lot of dark blue and the painting is less precise. It has a hand painted number 1/3544.

Finally we have this beautiful little tureen or sauce bowl, with stand. The stand measures just under 23 cm across the handles The item sat in the display cabinet for some considerable time, identified as Thomas Dimmock because of the impressed Pearl Ware logo incorporating the entwined TD monogram, but there were no other marks to indicate the pattern. It was only when collating the material for this supplement that we realised we were looking at another variant of the Chinese tree pattern. It is printed in a delicate blue and the moulded features are picked out in gold.
**Clematis pattern.** This pattern, only very recently recorded, has been seen on an even smaller tureen or sauce bowl – the stand is just over 15 cm in diameter and the whole thing, to the top of the finial, is a mere 11 cm tall. The tureen has only the impressed Pearl Ware/TD mark, but the stand has both the printed mark including the pattern name and an initial D, together with the same impressed mark. Although the tilted flower finial is reminiscent of a feature frequently seen on Daniel wares, the marks provide a firm attribution to Thomas Dimmock.

![Image of Clematis pattern](image1.png)

**Coral Border pattern.** On page 36 of the book we referred to this pattern being seen in the TCC database and at the time thought that the attribution to Dimmock was probably correct. We have since obtained an example, the rectangular 28 cm dish illustrated below, and have seen two other examples of plates. All are printed in blue, with the mark shown below. As yet, we have not seen anything in this pattern which bears either the Dimmock TD impressed mark or the Pearl Ware mark. In fact the type of decoration is not unlike some Daniel printed wares and the mark could be said to have some resemblance to the RD Seaweed mark later used by Richard Daniel. In the circumstances we feel we should keep an open mind about the attribution of this pattern, as there remains a possibility that it could be a Daniel design.

![Image of Coral Border pattern](image2.png)

**Japonica pattern.** This pattern is yet another take on the vaguely Asian look which was very much in vogue in the early part of the 19th century. We were able to obtain a 23 cm plate which, like other Dimmock wares, is quite thickly potted and very heavy for its size. The sturdy construction pays off because such pieces generally survive in good condition but they must have been very heavy in use. The plate is transfer printed in blue and the design picked out with various shades of pink, green and orange. The rim of the plate retains traces of gilding which has largely rubbed off.
The printed mark contains name of the pattern in a decorative cartouche with the entwined TD monogram below it. However there is also a distinct letter V at the left of this mark which does not appear to be part of the design. Perhaps this may relate to the size or have some other in-house significance. There is an impressed Pearl Ware mark and also a hand painted number 1/3511 and a painter’s mark. We subsequently came across a low comport identically decorated and with the same printed and impressed marks, although the painted number is 1/351. At this stage we do not know enough about Dimmock’s numbering system to be able to suggest whether this is an omission or a deliberate change in the number to indicate something different about the pattern or shape.

Morea pattern. A low comport in this pattern was shown on page 34, printed in blue. We have subsequently seen plates printed in green.

We include here this image of a delightful small tureen (18 cm high, 20 cm across the handles) to illustrate the distinctive shape. It has the same printed Morea mark as the comport but there is no impressed mark.
**Pearl Ware botanical pattern.** On page 35 we illustrated two plates decorated with botanical specimens and numbered 1/510 and 1/514. We speculated that the hand-painted fractional numbers were applied very specifically to individual decorations. We subsequently came across a similar plate, with a slightly darker green border and a different flower but which also bore the number 1/1514 (illustrated below left). In addition we have recorded a low comport (below right) which bears the number 1/2664. Whereas the comport seems to confirm our theory, the plate raises some doubt. Perhaps when we have recorded more numbers and patterns the situation may become clearer.

**Persian pattern.** The name does not appear in the list of patterns attributed by Kowalsky to Thomas Dimmock (pages 38-39). The example is a 23 cm plate printed in black and green with intricate geometric devices, parts of which have been picked out with gilding. The rim of the plate also bears traces of gilding. The nature and position of the gilding in the border of the plate means that it would have required very precise laborious work and must have been one of the more expensive designs. It is also quite thick and heavy and has survived in very good condition, apart from some rubbing to the gilding, primarily around the edge. The printed mark bears the name of the pattern in a scroll above which is a stylised rising sun and below it is the TD entwined monogram. There is an impressed Pearl Ware mark and a hand-painted number, 1/3695.

A rectangular low comport, identical in shape to that illustrated earlier with the Bohemia pattern, has also been recorded. The decoration is identical to the plate shown here and the pedestal, and underside of the comport were also finally decorated. Although the comport had the same printed and impressed marks, there was no hand-painted number.
Rhine pattern. We now have a photograph of this pattern to illustrate the record on page 30, found on a 27 cm plate.

Rose Wreath pattern. This pattern was described, but not illustrated, on page 38, where four versions of the pattern in different colour schemes were described. At the time three of the database entries were described as ‘Maker Unknown’. All these entries have now been attributed to Dimmock on the basis of the fourth entry #13359, which had a mark which appeared to be the monogram of Thomas Dimmock.

We have been able to obtain a 25 cm plate which is apparently identical to that fourth entry in the TCC database. The body is the characteristic heavy style of Dimmock wares. The back of the plate has treble stilt marks (see page 19), similar to those found on some Daniel wares and the printing is quite delicate and nicely done, which might also suggest a Daniel origin.

Arguing against this is the fact that there is no D in the printed mark, and impressed marks are associated more with Dimmock than with Daniel. The impressed mark overlaps the printed mark and is difficult to discern, but the photograph taken under cross lighting below shows that it is very similar to the application and positioning of the impressed mark on a Dimmock example illustrated as figure 22 on page 27 of H & R Daniel Earthenwares.

The balance of evidence therefore supports the attribution to Thomas Dimmock.

Scroll pattern. On page 39 we reported that Kowalsky records a pattern with the name ‘Windsor Scroll’ which he attributed to Thomas Dimmock, but the large (31 cm diameter) low comport we have found simply has the pattern name ‘Scroll’. Although the Daniel factory papers list a pattern by this name, the example we found has the name within a printed ‘Crown’ mark, of the type used by Thomas Dimmock – several versions are shown on pages 27 – 28.
The comport is thickly potted in Dimmock’s sturdy stone ware and has survived in excellent condition. It is printed in blue with a red/brown colour thickly applied to create the pattern and then individual details picked out in gold. The central motif is reminiscent of the geometric Persian pattern. Apart from the printed ‘Crown’ mark there is a hand-painted number. Unusually, this is painted in gilt rather than the usual red and was presumably applied by the same person who applied the gilding to the pattern. The overall effect is impressive, although close study of the painting reveals that it is much cruder than the Persian pattern. The applied number is the lowest we have seen, being 1/11. If these numbers were used in sequence, this would be an early production piece, and that would support our view that the ‘Crown’ mark was one of the first used by Dimmock.

Tripod pattern. This pattern is reported on page 39 as being one of the additional patterns attributed by Kowalsky to Dimmock. We have been fortunate to obtain a square serving dish with handles which, had it been a piece of Daniel porcelain, we would have called a bread-and-butter plate. Until we see other pieces in this pattern it is difficult to suggest to what kind of service this piece might have belonged.

The dish, which is 25 cm across the handles, is in Dimmock’s sturdy Kaolin Ware body, and has moulded detail on the handles. It is printed in black with the details picked out in red, yellow and green. It has a printed mark in black with the caption KAOLIN WARE above the name of the pattern, which is enclosed within a cartouche, and below it a single capital D. It has a hand-painted red number 1/438.

A jug has also been seen, with this pattern printed in black and the whole of the ground between the motifs being painted in blue. There is no mark other than a number hand-painted on the base, 1/1356 in red. If the numbers were used in sequence, there would seem to be a considerable interval between the dish and the jug and the workmanship of the latter is inferior to that of the dish.
Vienna pattern. This pattern is also listed on page 39 among the additional pattern names recorded by Kowalsky. The example we found is a plate, about 23 cm in size, in the heavy Kaolin Ware body. It is simply but attractively decorated with the floral sprays picked out in fairly naturalistic colours using a palette of pink, orange, yellow and green.

Between the central well and the green ground of the border there is a single gilded line. Along the edge of the plate the outer border is in a yellow-brown colour which we refer to as faux gilding, as it gives the impression of gilt from a distance but is of course cheaper to produce. This plate having both versions places it in the middle cost range.

Just above the words KAOLIN WARE in the printed mark, there is an impressed Pearl Ware mark, done so lightly that it is barely visible. In addition there is a hand-painted number, 1/402 and what appear to be two painter’s marks.

From the information in this supplement we can now extend the range of painted numbers found on some items which can be attributed to Thomas Dimmock. Although we now have more data available we are still far from perceiving any kind of consistent system in the use of these numbers.

| 1/11 Scroll | 1/3572 Rose Border |
| 1/104 Bohemia | 1/3583 Chinese Tree |
| 1/351 (error?) Japonica | 1/3687 Tasmania with green and light blue leaves |
| 1/402 Vienna | 1/3695 Persian |
| 1/438 Tripod | 1/3805 Japonica |
| 1/711 Green Florentine | 1/3878, or 1/3978 Tasmania as 1/3687 but with some dark blue leaves |
| 1/748 Blue Florentine | 1/3899 Indian |
| 1/1501 Argyll | 1/4198 Eglinton |
| 1/1510 Pearl Ware botanical v1 | |
| 1/1514 Pearl Ware botanical v2 | |
| 1/1604 Argyll | |
| 1/2076 KW Bamboo plate | |
| 1/2444, or 1/2666 Argyll | |
| 1/2664 Pearl Ware botanical | |
| 1/2914 Bohemia | |
| 1/2917 Green/blue moulded leaf plate and comport both have same number | |
| 1/1356 Tripod | |
| 1/3511 Japonica | |
| 1/3544 Chinese Tree – John Dimmock | |
| 1/3555 Chinese Tree | |
H & R Daniel

Daniel’s Real Ironstone

Vase. Pages 49-51 describe miscellaneous wares with this mark, and they have been associated with the period when Richard Daniel occupied the former Mason’s works at Fenton, using Mason’s moulds and copper plates. Even so, we were surprised to receive the photograph of the vase (below left) which looked like nothing we have ever seen associated with the Daniel name.

However it bore the impressed mark for Daniel’s Real Ironstone and when we checked with the Mason’s Collectors Club, the Chairman, Malcolm Lewin, kindly sent us the photograph below on the right. This shows the same body being used by Richard Daniel although the handles are different. Malcolm confirmed that it was common practice at the Mason’s works to mix and match elements from different moulds, much in the same way that Richard Daniel created new porcelain shapes by combining elements from different designs.

![Vase](image1)

![Vase](image2)

Lion and Pennant Group

Corinth Stone Ware. On page 84 we gave a brief description of this pattern, recorded in the TCC database as #9051, and then shown as Maker Unknown. The mark indicated that it belonged to Daniel’s Lion and Pennant group and the attribution in the TCC database was subsequently changed to H & R Daniel.

We were delighted recently to find an example of the pattern, and even more so because it was on a tea bowl and saucer. Received wisdom had told us that the Daniels never produced tea bowls. While this may have been the case for porcelain, the Tea Ware List in the factory papers (page 126) showed quite clearly that ‘unhandled Teas’, or ‘Bowls with Saucers’, were made in earthenware.

The fact that the body shape of the bowl is clearly different from the standard Dimmock cup shape (illustrated on page 31, figure 34) provides further support to the Daniel attribution.

![Tea Bowl](image3)

The bowl (front, top and back views above) is 6 cm tall and 10 cm diameter, and is unmarked. The saucer (below) is 15 cm diameter and bears a clear printed mark. An illustration of the bowl and saucer appears on the first page of this supplement.
It should be noted that the names ‘Corinth’ or ‘Corinthian’ were used by other manufacturers. However they can be easily distinguished because they bear the manufacturer’s name as part of the mark: JAS EDWARDS, E CHALLINOR, W.E. & Co (William Emberton & Co).

**Japan Groups**

**Japan Groups 1906** This pattern, which is described in the factory papers as “Blue outline blue Scalloped border Gold fibres”, had previously been seen only as a 25 cm platter, shown by Michael Berthoud at one of his seminars and illustrated in figure 77 on page 56.

In 2017 we were privileged to be given access to a dinner service in pattern 1906 which had been preserved almost intact through generations of one family. Its particular value was that it showed us shapes such as pickle dishes and gravy boats which are listed in the factory papers but have never been recorded as made examples. The photograph below shows part of the service prior to auction but we have included in this supplement photographs of all the major pieces which are new to Daniel earthenware studies.
Below is an inventory of the surviving items of the service which gives an understanding of the number and variety of shapes which would have been included. We believe that it would originally have been intended to provide 24 place settings, which suggests that it was originally bought for a well-to-do family in a house with a large dining room to accommodate so many dinner guests.

While the wealthiest might have actually used their porcelain services, it appears that the practice in most families was to put the porcelain on the table as an initial display but to replace it with earthenware for the actual business of eating. Earthenware items were generally sturdier and would stand up better to continued use; they were also cheaper to replace, or more likely discard, when the inevitable damage occurred.

**Composition of service in Japan Groups 1906 pattern**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 Dinner plates</td>
<td>27 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Entree plates</td>
<td>23 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Side plates</td>
<td>20 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Large Soup Bowls</td>
<td>27 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oblong serving dishes</td>
<td>25 x 20 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Flat Serving Dishes</td>
<td>28 x 23 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Flat Serving Dishes</td>
<td>33 x 27 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Flat Serving Dishes</td>
<td>38 x 30 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Flat Serving Dish</td>
<td>25 x 20 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Deep Serving Dishes</td>
<td>30 x 25 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Vegetable Dishes</td>
<td>25 x 20 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lids for above</td>
<td>23 x 23 x 10 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Meat Dish</td>
<td>48 x 40 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Meat drainer size</td>
<td>25 x 17 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Serving dishes with handles</td>
<td>33 x 27 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Soup Tureen &amp; Stand</td>
<td>40 x 33 x 20 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 small tureens, lid and stand</td>
<td>23 x 20 x 19 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Lid and stand only for small tureen</td>
<td>23 x 20 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 gravy boats</td>
<td>17 x 9 x 10 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pickle dishes</td>
<td>17 x 16 cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of existing pieces 136

So there were likely to have been around 170 individual items in the service when bought. The number would vary because some customers would, for example, use silver ladles rather than the earthenware ones designed to accompany the service.

We knew from the factory papers that the Daniels manufactured drainers but we had never previously seen a made example. There are those who collect these individual items and as a result they frequently become separated from the service for which they were intended.

The drainer would normally be placed on top of a larger serving dish to catch the residue. However there was no surviving dish on which this drainer would comfortably sit, and we have to surmise that there must originally have been another large dish in this service.
The meat dish is a massive, heavy item which would have been a challenge to manipulate in the kiln and fire successfully. The A4 book may help to give an impression of its bulk although not its weight: 2.75 kg! The side view shows where the edge has sagged slightly when the huge slab of clay was still wet, but this would not have detracted from the functionality of the piece, which still inspires admiration at the skill of the workers who could achieve such a feat.

These plates were often referred to as ‘well and tree’ from the depression (on the left in the photographs) which collected the meat juices and the layout of the channels which led into it. Feet extend along three sides to keep the dish level.

The picture above is only roughly to scale but attempts to convey the relative size of the massive soup tureen (40 cm across the handles) and one of the small sauce tureens (23 cm). The shapes are similar and the soup tureen would probably have had a large version of the lid on the small tureen. The handles and finials in this service are similar to those used for Chinese Scenery services (Page58).
The next illustration shows two of the smallest shapes in the service but each very important. The factory papers show that the Daniels manufactured pickle dishes and gravy boats but these are the first made examples to be discovered.

On a previous occasion when we discovered a fairly complete porcelain dinner service in the Mary Talbot shape we found that it included a large open bowl, which Geoffrey Godden informed us was a salad bowl. He explained that large dinner services usually included one, as well as covered dishes for vegetables. In this case, the salad bowl has helped to solve an earlier puzzle.

Prior to publishing the book we had obtained a very large platter in Japan Groups pattern 1902 which initially puzzled us because it had a distinct hexagonal raised well. Having determined that it was in fact a tureen stand, we wondered what the tureen itself would look like. This service has answered that question.

The large and small tureens have round bowls but their base is hexagonal. The salad bowl shown below similarly has a round interior but the base and the lip are hexagonal shaped.
We have seen covered vegetable dishes in porcelain, and we found an earthenware version in the Chinese Scenery pattern, illustrated in the book. However we have included a photograph of the vegetable dish from this service because of the unusually shaped lid.

The simple dome with finial, finished off with the gadrooning at the rim, is in this case extended up by a border with slight ribbing, perhaps to strengthen it.

We would like to record our gratitude to Mark Lee-Barber for sharing some of his excellent photographs with us and for giving us access to this service which has added greatly to our knowledge of Daniel earthenware shapes.

Chusan pattern This pattern, attributed to Richard Daniel, is described on page 90. We said there that it was a complicated situation; since then the new evidence which has come to light has given us even more problems to wrestle with but at least some answers are starting to emerge. One example of the pattern had been found with the mark S & H and we speculated which company might have used that mark. We now know that all of our suggestions were wrong.

The mark in fact refers to Sneyd & Hill, a short lived company which operated from Miles Bank around 1845. In 1846 it was continued by Thomas Sneyd alone but apparently only lasted for one more year. Geoffrey Godden records a printed mark for Sneyd & Hill (3610) and an impressed mark for Thomas Sneyd (3609) T SNEYD HANLEY. Godden refutes suggestions by other authorities who attribute the mark to an earlier period, producing evidence from the Stoke rate books to prove his case. He also reported finding a vase with this mark.

Kowalsky records the same marks as Godden, but also writes that a printed initial mark S & H, often including the pattern name, has been found on items dating from around 1845 (B2164). Usefully, he considers eight other potteries which might be candidates for these initials but rejects four as being too early and the other four because they are not recorded as earthenware manufacturers. Interestingly he mentions a pattern called ‘Windsor Scrolls’ with these initials. Elsewhere he has recorded a pattern by that name attributed to Thomas Dimmock. This may be a case of copper plates being bought up following the liquidation of a manufactory and we believe that the same may have applied in Richard Daniel’s case.

Our initial assumption, with Richard’s chequered career at the forefront of our minds, was that the Chusan copper plates belonged to him and were bought by S & H in 1847. However by the time of Richard’s bankruptcy it seems that Thomas Sneyd, late Sneyd and Hill, had already ceased trading. Our revised hypothesis therefore is that when Richard resumed trading after his bankruptcy he may have bought the plates from S & H in order to get started more quickly. This is underlined by a sighting in the USA of a plate bearing Sneyd’s mark which was decorated with a Pekin pattern identical to that used by Richard Daniel (page 88) However, our alternative hypothesis that the copper pattern plates might have been produced by a professional engraver who sold them to several manufacturers, also remains a possibility.

The connection of Sneyd & Hill with the Chusan pattern is further reinforced by the discovery of a plate, printed with this pattern in flow blue with added gilding. The plate which measures 29 x 23 cm, bears the impressed mark described by Godden. The impression is quite light and the image below has been computer enhanced to make it visible.
The plate is in a most intriguing shape. The handles are very similar to those of Daniel’s Rococo Scroll shape in porcelain wares, thought to have been produced 1838-1845. Another plate marked for Thomas Sneyd has been seen in a pattern called Chinoiserie – it, too, has the same handles. Is it possible that there was some previous connection between Thomas Sneyd and the Daniels? Or was this simply a case of Sneyd plagiarising the shape? As is always the situation with Daniel research, when one question is answered, two more present themselves!

![Chusan dish with T Sneyd mark (above right); handle of this dish compared with Rococo Scroll (below right)](image)
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We were initially shocked when a friend told us that he routinely used antique ceramics on a day-to-day basis and we would still hesitate to use any of our Daniel wares in this way. However, as mentioned in the text of this supplement, Dimmock’s Kaolin Ware and Pearl Ware are very robust, so we bring them out when entertaining. The large plates and comports are a very attractive way to serve sandwiches, biscuits etc and this demonstrates the beauty and practicality of earthenware in a way which displays behind glass cannot do.

If our efforts, both in these publications and elsewhere, help to bring about a greater appreciation of earthenwares then we shall feel amply rewarded.

*The Editors*