

existed. The dating evidence is at present inconclusive, but quantities of early 19th century stoneware sherds are everywhere evident.

Further work in the Burlington Road range will involve investigation of the sites of the two kilns which are known to have flanked the surviving example until the 1930s. As soon as conditions permit the excavations will also be extended to other areas of the Pottery. The final stage will be observation during the demolition of buildings and making of new foundations. Meanwhile, the above initial impressions, based on work up to the third week of April, are necessarily tentative, and further progress must be awaited.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that the project and its circumstances raised a number of problems basic to present day thinking about priorities. In the first place there have been the considerations for and against the permanent preservation of the surviving buildings, apart from the remaining kiln. Secondly, it had to be decided how far effort should be devoted to recording the surviving buildings and to research into the Pottery's

activities in more recent times, compared with problems which are already of great historical and artistic interest. The decision, rightly or wrongly, has been that the 300 years of existence of the Fulham Pottery and its fortunes are significant as a whole, and that all phases of the Pottery's history, from the achievements of its distinguished founder to its activities and final demise as a working pottery during the present century, have an equal claim to rescue from oblivion. This decision led, in turn, to a decision on the objectives and method of excavation. The history of the Pottery might well suggest that priority should be given to urgent search for and recovery of "Museum" pieces, of which admittedly there are all too few of certain Fulham provenance. However, the most important opportunity and priority on a site such as this is to gain knowledge, which is largely lacking, on the developments and changes in techniques and methods of work during all phases of the Pottery's existence from Dwight's time onwards. To this end the work must be as meticulous as it would be for any other archaeological site.



## New Director at Guildhall Museum

MAX HEBDITCH, at 33, is the new Director of the Guildhall Museum. He was a contemporary of Barry Cunliffe and Martin Biddle at Cambridge, where he read Archaeology and Anthropology. He spent three and a half years as Field Officer at Leicester Museum, an experience which will undoubtedly stand him in good stead as he grapples with the problems of rescue work in the City.

In 1965 he took up the post of Assistant Curator in Archaeology at Bristol Museum and four years later he became Curator in Agricultural and Social History. Having been Secretary of the Bristol Archaeological Research Group, he is able to appreciate fully the assistance which amateurs are able to give.

Max Hebditch is daunted neither by the untidy sprawl of the museum's current accommodation nor by the prospect in three and a half years time of a gradual disappearance of exhibits as the new Museum of London takes shape. He feels that the Guildhall Museum can provide a valuable contribution to the City by making people aware of their past environment. As a means of arousing further interest he hopes shortly to be able to clear a space in the museum where temporary exhibitions can be held.