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This article outlines the results of two phases of excavation at 12–18 Albert Embankment, Lambeth. The site was partially excavated in 1988 by the Museum of London’s Department of Greater London Archaeology. However, areas around the edge and north of the site were not examined and excavation of the remainder of the site was undertaken in 2000 by the Museum of London Archaeology Service. The excavations demonstrated the rapid and relentless pattern of change that took place in Thameside Lambeth from the mid-18th to the mid-19th centuries. An area of market gardens and semi-rural settlement became a densely occupied urban slum. The archaeological sequence and the associated finds showed how these changes had actually occurred. Period 1 represented the geological horizon; subsequently the site was cultivated (period 2). This activity ceased c. 1745 and in period 3 the site became built up. Associated with the construction of Buildings 1 and 2 was Open Area 3 that contained a substantial dump of pothouse waste. Dated to 1745–70, this assemblage included tin-glazed ware, stoneware and London area post-medieval redware. Both kiln furniture and vessels (including wasters) were found. The kiln furniture included forms used for both tin-glazed and redware, suggesting that both wares may have been manufactured at the same pothouse. Furthermore, the assemblage included the first examples of 18th century redware kiln furniture. It is suggested that this assemblage derived from either the pothouse at Norfolk House or that at Vauxhall, the only local potters known to be making both stoneware and tin-glazed ware between 1745 and 1770. The excavation suggests that London area post-medieval redwares may also have been manufactured at either of these Lambeth potters. This is the first evidence for the manufacture of 18th century redwares in Lambeth. From the early 19th century the use of the site intensified (period 4): sixteen cesspits were recorded. In period 5 these cesspits were backfilled as one event, during the period 1851–60, as a result of the arrival of piped sewage disposal in the area. The large backfill assemblages are discussed here, giving an insight into the status and lifestyle of mid-Victorian Lambeth’s residents.

(Note: the tables referred to in the text are available on the Archaeology Data Service website: see Endnote)

Circumstances of the fieldwork

The site was located at 12–18 Albert Embankment, London SE1 in the London Borough of Lambeth, and was bounded to the north by Salamanca Street, to the south by a property boundary to an adjacent office building and on the east by a railway viaduct to Waterloo Station (fig 1). The railway viaduct is shown on figure 2. The excavation area covered approximately 1550m² and was situated to the east (rear) of the now-demolished Queensborough House (a multi-storey and basemented office building not subject to investigation as its basement had truncated all archaeological deposits). The OS National Grid Reference for the site is 530530 178610.

A planning application was approved in 1999 for the demolition of Queensborough House and the redevelopment of the site to form a hotel. The planning permission included a condition which required an archaeological investigation prior to development, since the site was within an Archaeological Priority Area (the North Lambeth Riverside Zone), as defined by the local planning authority. Consequently, the Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) conducted an excavation during July and August 2000.
In 1988 the site was the subject of archaeological investigation by the Department of Greater London Archaeology (DGLA) of the Museum of London (the DGLA was a precursor to MoLAS), under the site code ALA88 and supervised by Patricia Price; the trenches are shown in grey on figure 3. They were separated by deep modern foundations. No full analysis of the records from the 1988 field work was undertaken and only an interim summary was compiled, noted in the bibliography (Museum of London 1988).

The 1988 excavations were treated as an evaluation for the complete archaeological excavation of the remainder of the site in 2000, beyond the limits of the ALA88 trenches (fig 3). Some areas could not be excavated owing to engineering constraints. Furthermore, other areas at the north and south of the site had deep basements which removed all archaeological material. The 2000 work was undertaken using the site code ABK00. MoLAS was commissioned by CgMs Consulting on behalf of their client Bankside Hotels Ltd and their architects RHWL Partnership, to conduct an excavation of the areas of the site beyond the limits of the ALA88 trenches.

This report describes the results of this most recent archaeological work and integrates them with the findings of the 1988 excavation, giving an overview of the developmental sequence at the site. The post-excavation assessment of the site details the exact breakdown of the site sequence (Tyler 2001, 10–16).

The archaeological sequence is expressed here in terms of a period-based sequence of land use. Land-use entities are unique to the site and based upon a combination of stratigraphic development of the site with artefactual and documentary dating. The analysis resulted in a series of specialist research archives under the site code ALA88 and ABK00. These are lodged with the Museum of London’s London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre (LAARC, Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED) and may be consulted by prior arrangement.
Topographic and historical summary

This summary gives the archaeological results of the excavation, their topographic and historical context, focusing on periods and events relevant to the site’s chronology. The chronological summary is supplemented by a section on Lambeth’s post-medieval pottery industries, providing background on an important aspect of the excavation.

TOPOGRAPHY

Topographically, the site lies on fairly flat ground at approximately 4.5m OD. The underlying geology of the site consists of First Terrace Gravels over London Clay (BGS 1981).

West of the excavation, the edge of the gravel terrace passed through the basemented area of the now-dismantled Queensborough House. Beyond the edge were fluvial and alluvial deposits relating to the river Thames, which were not investigated as they were beyond the limit of excavation.

BACKGROUND: PREHISTORIC TO MEDIEVAL

There is little evidence for pre-medieval activity in the area. Finds mainly come from the river Thames and as such cannot be used to suggest cultural activity specific to the site area.
Local prehistoric finds from the river include three flint axes, a bronze spearhead and part of an iron sword. Another sword, dated to the 10th or 11th centuries, was recovered from the river. The one land-based find is a flint core found c. 600m south of the site, adjacent to the current Vauxhall Station (Greater London Sites and Monuments Record (GLSMR) refs 090147, 091261, 091382, 091383, 092279, 092353, 114002, 114016, 114017; Imber 1979, 10–12, 25).

Firmer evidence for prehistoric activity in the general vicinity comes in the form of a Bronze Age timber pile structure recorded along the eastern Thames foreshore, to the south of Vauxhall Bridge, c. 700m south-west of the site. This has been interpreted as the remains of posts which supported a bridge, elevated trackway or jetty-type structure (Haughey 1999, 18–19). At this distance from 12–18 Albert Embankment, the structure has little bearing on the understanding of the site, but is an important indicator for a Bronze Age presence in the area.

Although Roman pottery has been found opposite Lambeth Palace at 113–127 and 129 Lambeth Road, c. 450m to the north of the site, there is little supporting evidence for any Roman presence in the area (GLSMR 091325, 09003901). Nevertheless, these few finds have been associated with a river crossing suggested for the Lambeth area. Indeed, a feature interpreted as a Roman road excavated in the grounds of Lambeth Palace in 1935 was associated with this apparent river crossing (Survey of London 1951, 1). But no actual, physical evidence for the river crossing has been found. More pertinently, no Roman material has been found close to the site.

A settlement known as Water Lambeth, centred some 400m north of the site, is thought to be of Late Saxon origin. The site itself was located in the Manor of Kennington in which the Domesday Book of 1086 describes Lambeth as agricultural and sparsely populated: ‘The land is for 2-and-a-half. In the demesne there is one plough and 4 villeins and 3 bordars with
2 ploughs. There is 1 serf and 4 acres of meadow.’ In 1337 Edward III granted the manor to Edward, Earl of Chester and Duke of Cornwall, commonly known as the Black Prince. This grant has remained operative, meaning that the Manor of Kennington is still administered by the Duchy of Cornwall (Survey of London 1951, 5; 1956, 57–60).

Settlement thereafter spread south from Water Lambeth along the riverside road Fore Street (replaced in the 1860s by Albert Embankment) and a parallel road, to the east, known as Back Lane which defined the western limit of the whole site. Both roads are seen on figure 4 to the west of the site. Back Lane was renamed Princes Street by the 1790s.

THE POST-MEDIEVAL USE OF THE SITE

The 600 years following the Domesday Book saw the site remain undeveloped, set within mainly open land – although strip development had taken place along the Thames frontage and main roads.

Located behind the buildings ranged along Back Lane, the site was probably not subject to development until the later 18th century. Subsequent events led to a denser pattern of occupation in the area and directly affected the nature and scale of development at the site.

In 1746 the core of the site, including the excavation area, was cultivated as market gardens (fig 4). The proximity of Lambeth to London meant the economy of the area focused on market gardening and dairy farming, with little housing development occurring during the 18th century away from the main roads. A sign that redevelopment was soon to arrive in the area came in 1750 with the opening of Westminster Bridge, which provided ready access to north Lambeth. This trend continued with the completion of Vauxhall Bridge in 1816 (Survey of London 1956, 9).

Horwood’s map of 1792–9 shows that development had begun to stretch back from the street frontage onto the former open ground (fig 5). The site is partially occupied by rows of tenements, fronting on to Great Lemon Court and Little Lemon Court. The Hodkinson & Middleton survey of 1785 describes eighteen ‘small new brick dwelling houses on the east side of Prince’s Street, whereof three are in Prince’s Street, nine are in Lemon Court, and four are in Little Lemon Court, with yards sheds and a field’.

From the mid-19th century the character of the area surrounding the site changed swiftly and irrevocably. Four major events impacted on the site to varying degrees:

1 The completion, between 1845 and 1848, of the brick railway viaduct for the London and South Western Railway. Located immediately east of the site, this extended from Nine Elms (south of Vauxhall Bridge) to a new terminus at Waterloo (Roebuck 1979, 120; Survey of London 1956, 9).
2 The imposition of a new piped sewage system, begun in 1856, leading to the infilling of communal, open cesspits (Roebuck 1979, 51–4).
3 The opening of Lambeth Bridge in 1862, allowing further ready access to north Lambeth (after the opening of Vauxhall Bridge) from the west bank of the Thames (Survey of London 1951, 120).
4 The creation of the Albert Embankment between 1866 and 1870 (Survey of London 1951, 1).

The new railway viaduct meant that as well as streets and buildings being ‘cut up or dismembered’, the properties adjacent to the railway line were subjected to constant noise and filth from the trains themselves (Survey of London 1951, 1). Lambeth Bridge brought more people into and through the area, while the construction of the Albert Embankment entailed more demolition. Stranded, the site was left sandwiched between the viaduct and the embankment.

The most significant of these events for its potential impact on the archaeology of the site was the arrival of piped sewage disposal. Following the Metropolis Management Act of 1855,
Fig 4 12–18 Albert Embankment: extract from Rocque’s map, 1746, with the site superimposed (site outline at 1:2000).

Fig 5 12–18 Albert Embankment: extract from Horwood’s map of 1792–9, with the site superimposed (site outline at 1:2000).
Lambeth Vestry appointed a surveyor of sewers to prepare plans, supervise and manage works for the borough. As an immediate consequence of the act local authorities were charged with the cleaning and emptying of all cesspools and privies by scavengers, under the supervision of Inspectors of Nuisances. In 1856 two inspectors were appointed in Lambeth and a contract awarded for scavenging. More significantly, between 1856 and 1888 the Lambeth Vestry constructed 53 miles, 261 yards of sewers, with the greatest amount of construction undertaken in 1865 (Roebuck 1979, 51–4, 62, 93, 98). The new network of pipes meant that cesspits went out of use and were infilled, leaving small external plots of land available for encroachment from buildings, leading to an increase in population density.

By the time of the 1868 1:2500 OS map the site was virtually covered with tenements (fig 6). In addition to Lemon Court, Salamanca Court, a side road off Salamanca Street, had been constructed. Salamanca Court—barely 35m long—had eleven dwellings packed along its west side, making each frontage just over 3m wide (c. 8 feet). Booth’s poverty survey of 1889 describes the residents of the properties on the site as ‘very poor, casual, [with] chronic want’ (Booth 1889). In a hardly untypical evolution for London, the site’s setting had changed from 18th century pastoral to 19th century slum.

LOCAL POTTERY INDUSTRIES

A major focus of archaeological interest in the area centres on the evidence for post-medieval pottery industries, which flourished in Lambeth from the 17th century, and possibly from the 16th century. Dumps of waste material disposed by the pothouses have been found close to the site.

The site is located immediately south of Lambeth High Street, along which a pothouse manufactured tin-glazed ware—known colloquially as delftware—from c. 1732–4 to 1786.
and 1789 to c 1793 (the pothouse was unoccupied from 1786 to 1789). The site of this manufactory is now occupied by the headquarters of the London Fire Brigade, 150m north of the site. Further north, along Lambeth Bridge Road, at the far end of Lambeth High Street opposite Lambeth Palace, was another, earlier, tin-glaze manufactory at Norfolk House, operating from 1680–1772/9. Other pothouses in the area manufacturing tin-glazed wares included Vauxhall, immediately north of the Vauxhall Bridge (operating 1683–1802); Glasshouse Street (operating 1743–1846) and Copthall, along the river frontage between Tinworth Street and Glasshouse Walk (operating 1676–1730) (Britton 1987, 52–67).

Waste from the tin-glaze pothouses was dumped locally and has been found close to the site. During the 1930s Professor F H Garner recovered fragments of pottery from five building sites both to the west and east of Lambeth High Street (Bloice & Thorn 1969; Garner 1937). One of Garner’s finds groups was on the site of the Lambeth High Street pothouse itself (Bloice & Thorn 1969, 59). Garner found sherds of saggars with triangular peg holes as well as biscuit-ware basins, bottles, chargers, drug jars, plates (small), porringers, posset pots, punch bowls and tile. Glazed wares included bowls, chargers and plates decorated in blue, purple and polychrome designs including geometric and Chinese-style patterns (Garner 1937, 50–5). Biscuit ware is the unglazed result of the first firing of tin-glazed vessels. A second firing takes place once the vessel has been coated in glaze.

While there has to be some ambiguity as to where Garner’s finds were manufactured – another of his building sites was as close to the Norfolk House pothouse as Lambeth High Street – some of these vessels must have been manufactured at Lambeth High Street. Although Garner deposited his finds with the Victoria and Albert Museum, he died before advising the institution which finds came from which sites.

Tin-glazed ware is not the only type of pottery to have been recovered in the immediate vicinity of the site. Dumps of waste from the manufacture of London area post-medieval redwares have been found 90m to the north-east at Bruce House, Black Prince Road in 1963, when John Ashdown discovered a group of coarse earthenware wasters, including industrial vessels, jugs, large storage vessels, milk pans and pipkins (TBAOG 1964, 21–2). These finds have been named the Salamanca Place Group and are held by the Victoria and Albert Museum. Many of these pots were glazed, either dark brown or green, and others have a coat of yellow slip. These wasters indicate that the group probably represents a dump (in open land) from a nearby pottery producing post-medieval redware, perhaps in the last quarter of the 16th century. Edwards has suggested that these wares may be associated with potters working in Lambeth, at locations unknown, from c 1590 to 1610 (Edwards 1974, 4). These finds have not been associated with any known pothouse. The earliest known manufacturer of post-medieval redwares in Lambeth was the pothouse just south of Glasshouse Street, which made the ware from 1784 to 1823, between two stages of tin-glaze production (Britton 1987, 61–2; Oswald et al 1982, 52).

Stoneware was also produced in the area during the 17th and 18th centuries. It was made alongside tin-glazed ware at the pothouses at Copthall (1693–1700), Vauxhall (1712–1865), Norfolk House (c 1760s) and Glasshouse Street (1784–1823) (Britton 1987, 52–67; Edwards 1981, 133–4).

During the 19th century the most significant pothouse in the area belonged to Doulton. It was established after the tin-glaze pothouse along the west side of Lambeth High Street was taken over by Doulton & Watts in 1826. Between 1829 and 1830 two new kilns were built, for red terracotta wares, including chimney pots, ridge tiles and garden vases. Doulton began trading as The Lambeth Pottery during the 1830s. After John’s son, Henry, joined the company in 1835 expansion was rapid: a new kiln was built for terracotta sculpture in 1840; properties to the north were acquired in 1843 and 1854, extending the pottery down the full length of Lambeth High Street. A pothouse dedicated to the manufacture of drain pipes was established at the north end of Lambeth High Street in 1846. Stoneware vessels, including bottles and jars, were also produced in great quantity. By 1890 there were 70 kilns in Lambeth where in 1840 there had been just sixteen (Eyles 2002, 22, 27–8, 30).
The site sequence

This summary of the developmental sequence presents a single, chronological synthesis of the two phases of excavation for the whole site, based on the work undertaken during the post excavation analysis (Tyler 2001, 10–16). The graphical conventions used on the figures below are detailed on figure 7.

PERIOD 1: THE GEOLOGICAL HORIZON (OPEN AREA 1)

Period 1 was represented by Open Area 1, the Thames terrace gravels (not illustrated). As the earliest phase of the site, period 1 represents the horizon above which all cultural activity took place. Surface levels of between 2.81m and 3.13m OD were recorded for the gravels, dependent on the degree of truncation from subsequent activities, mainly the ploughing noted in period 2. No features cut directly into the alluvial gravels.

PERIOD 2: EARLY CULTURAL ACTIVITY (OPEN AREA 2; STRUCTURE 1), 1550–1700, DISUSE BY 1745–1800

Period 2 consisted of Open Area 2, an external subsoil seen across the whole site, which sealed Open Area 1. The Open Area 2 subsoil was evidence for the site as open, worked ground. The soil survived to between 3.06m and 3.58m OD. Dating evidence for the working of this soil came from pottery dated to 1550–1700 and tobacco pipe with a date range of 1690–1710.

The soil was a uniform light-brown sandy silt that had been mixed through working, most probably ploughing. Although finds included material up to the beginning of the 18th century, no date can be suggested for the commencement of the plough activity and the soil had been reworked too much to definitively establish the mode of formation, although, in view of the history of the site, ploughing is the most likely. No plough furrows or bedding trenches were observed.

Features cutting into this soil were limited to a series of cuts and a well (Structure 1). Of the seventeen cuts, twelve were recorded in plan and are illustrated here (fig 8). The remainder were recorded in section only during the 1988 excavation. The lack of bone or other domestic debris from the backfills of these truncated features showed that the cuts probably were not rubbish pits. As such, they signify little more than excavation into the open area, probably for quarrying the underlying gravels.

Pottery from the backfills of eight of the cuts was dated to the 17th and 18th centuries: 1690–1710, 1680–1800, 1630–1700, 1630–1700, 1690–1710, 1580–1700, 1630–50, 1690–1710 – indicating that the backfilling took place no earlier than 1690 and probably after 1710.

---

Fig 7 12–18 Albert Embankment: graphical conventions used in this report.
Redeposited material in the backfills included 29 pieces of worked and thirteen pieces of burnt, heavily calcined, unworked flint that ranged in colour from red to white to grey. The assemblage is dominated by débitage (flakes and cores), with the flakes generally hard-hammer struck with minimal evidence for preparation. Two carefully worked small multi-platform flake cores were recovered. Two retouched forms were recovered: a scraper and a serrated flake. Although these are relatively long-lived forms, their general appearance, together with technological characteristics, suggests a broad Neolithic–Early Bronze Age date for the material.

One feature cutting into Open Area 2 was indicative of more than simple excavation of the soil. This was Structure 1, a well lined by a timber cask. The backfill was dated to 1745–1800 by pottery, specifically English porcelain, manufactured from c 1745. Open Area 2, therefore, fell out of use by the date of this backfilling. Structure 1 was probably associated with buildings shown west of the excavation area on Rocque’s map of 1746 (fig 4).

**PERIOD 3: THE FIRST DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE (OPEN AREA 3; BUILDINGS 1 AND 2; OPEN AREA 4), c 1745–70**

In period 3 Buildings 1 and 2, the earliest on the site, were constructed on a new open area (OA3). The Open Area 3 deposit was placed upon Open Area 2 to consolidate the open ground in advance of the construction of Buildings 1 and 2. The open space behind Buildings 1 and 2 was represented by Open Area 4.

**Open Area 3, 1745–70**

Open Area 3 was an external deposit characterized by the inclusion of a high proportion of finds that were pothouse waste (fig 9). This included material from the manufacture of tin-
Fig 9  12–18 Albert Embankment. Plan of features from period 3: the Open Area 3 dumps, Buildings 1 and 2, and Open Area 4. Scale 1:400.

Fig 10  12–18 Albert Embankment: view of pottery dump with complete saggar from period 2, also showing part of the foundation of Building 1. Scale 2 x 100mm.
glazed ware (kiln furniture, biscuit ware and glazed vessels), stoneware (kiln furniture) and redwares (kiln furniture and waster vessels). The material had been dumped as hardcore or ballast in preparation for the construction of Buildings 1 and 2 (figs 10 and 11). Overall, Open Area 3 was dated to 1745–70 by the forms and decorative style of the tin-glazed vessels. This pottery assemblage is discussed in detail below.

**Buildings 1 and 2, c 1745–70**

The evidence for Building 1 was limited to a stretch of east–west foundation at the north-west of the site (fig 9). Dumps laid against the base of the foundation included tin-glaze waste dated to 1735–70 (fig 10). The foundation itself was constructed from bricks of a type dated to 1700–1900.

Building 2 was represented by a north–south stretch of foundation close to the western limit of excavation constructed upon the Open Area 3 dump layers (fig 9). It was therefore constructed after c 1745–70. Although bricks in Building 2 were dated to 1700–1900, the tighter dating evidence from Open Area 3 takes precedence.

Buildings 1 and 2 do not appear on Rocque’s map of 1746 (fig 4), but are present by the date of the compilation of Horwood’s map of 1792–9 (fig 5). The archaeological dating evidence for the two foundations is consistent with this. Although there is nothing to link them archaeologically, Horwood’s map appears to show that these two, unconnected, foundations may have been part of the same building.
Open Area 4: external area to the east of Buildings 1 and 2, 1740–1800

Open Area 4 was an external deposit of mixed soils to the east of Buildings 1 and 2 (fig 9). Open Area 4 was dated to 1670–1800 from pottery, a date range which includes the period during which Buildings 1 and 2 were constructed on the preceding open ground, Open Area 3.

Firmer dating evidence for Open Area 4 came from the backfill of a series of sixteen cuts made into this open ground. All were truncated, irregularly shaped and unlined. The lack of finds in the group overall suggests that these were not rubbish pits. Where rubbish pits would have contained debris, only six of these pits contained finds, with the clearest dating evidence from a fill with pottery dated to 1740–1800. In this case, it is clear that these cuts were simply evidence for the working of Open Area 4. This places the activity within the period when Buildings 1 and 2 were standing.

Open Area 4 is seen on Horwood’s map of 1792–9 (fig 5), west of and behind the buildings recorded as Buildings 1 and 2.

PERIOD 4: INTENSIVE BUILD-UP OF THE SITE (OPEN AREA 5; BUILDINGS 3–7; STRUCTURES 2–17), 1807–50

In period 4 the site became more intensively built up with the demolition of Buildings 1 and 2, their replacement with at least five new buildings (Buildings 3–7) and the construction of at least sixteen brick-lined cesspits (Structures 2–17) (fig 12). These activities took place upon Open Area 5, a constantly re-worked external soil (fig 12).

Fig 12  12–18 Albert Embankment: plan of features from period 4: cuts made into Open Area 5; Buildings 3–7; Structures 2–17. Scale 1:400.
Open Area 5

Open Area 5 was represented by a dark, mixed, ashy soil. Although some redeposited medieval pottery, dated to 1270–1350, was present, finds from the deposit were dated to the 19th century: tobacco pipe dated to 1820–40 and 1830–60; pottery dated to 1807–50 and 1830–60.

A series of cuts had been made into Open Area 5. Eight were recorded and are seen on figure 12 as a single group because of their similarity. Of these, at least five had mixed finds and were most probably rubbish pits. One contained building material and pottery dated to 1830–50; a second tobacco pipe and pottery dated to 1830–40; a third building material and pottery dated to 1807–80; a fourth pottery and building material dated to 1807–1900; and a fifth building material, tobacco pipe and pottery dated to 1780–1820.

A sixth pit, the most north-easterly (fig 12), had been cut through two backfilled period 5 cuts, each dated respectively to 1800–1900 and 1800–60. The backfill of this pit included a mixture of redeposited finds: medieval pottery dated to 1270–1500, building material dated to 1680–1800, and tobacco pipe dated to 1730–60. There was also a large assemblage of tin-glazed pottery (with biscuit ware and kiln furniture) dated to 1745–70. It is clear that the backfill material dates to the 18th century. This seeming reversal of the dated archaeological sequence is the result of the material in the pit backfill being redeposited after excavation elsewhere, on or near the site.

Buildings 3–7

A group of five brick-built buildings constructed on Open Area 5 were represented by a series of truncated foundations (fig 12). Building 3 was an east–west foundation close to the western limit of the site, constructed across the plot of Building 1. Bricks were of a 19th century type. Building 4 was located at the north-west of the site and was represented by a foundation using a brick pier base, dated to after 1800 by its bricks. Building 5 was represented by a linear, north–south aligned foundation close to the west of the site, to the south of Building 3. Pottery from the backfill of the construction cut was dated to 1830–50. Building 6 was located at the north of the site. It consisted of a series of four linked north–south and east–west foundations, constructed from bricks dated 1800–1950. Building 7 was constructed in the eastern part of the site and was represented by two abutting foundations, one aligned north–south, the other aligned east–west, the pair being L-shaped. Once again, the bricks were dated to after 1800.

Cesspits: Structures 2–17

Period 4 also saw the construction a series of sixteen brick-lined cesspits which cut into Open Area 5 (figs 12–14). Their details are summarized in table 1. All had been cleaned out before backfilling, so no primary fills were present, just backfill (fig 14). Truncation meant that their original cappings had been removed.

Discussion

Buildings 3, 4, 5 and 6 represented the remains of the small domestic holdings seen on the OS map of 1868 (fig 6). It is likely that each property had access to a cesspit, constructed at the same time as the buildings. Building 7, at the south-east of the site, appears to be part of the wedge-shaped building seen abutting the railway viaduct on the 1868 map (fig 6).

The 1868 map shows that the cesspits on the western side of the site were located within small properties along the east side of Salamanca Court (fig 6). The regular spacing of the cesspits (Structures 15, 14, 17) implies that one cesspit served each property. Structures 3, 4 and 5 also appear to serve properties on the east side of Salamanca Court. Structures 2 and 13 may have served buildings at the southern end of Salamanca Court.
Fig 13 12–18 Albert Embankment: view of the Structure 2 cesspit under excavation, showing that primary fills had been removed before the deposition of the backfill.

Fig 14 12–18 Albert Embankment: view of the backfill of the Structure 11 cesspit. Each scale 10 x 100mm.
Structures 6, 9–12 and 16 appear to be located in the back gardens of buildings along Salamanca Street, distributed one per property.

PERIOD 5: CONSOLIDATION OF THE SITE, STRUCTURE 18 AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF BUILDING 7, 1851–c. 1880/1900

Buildings 3–7 were retained in period 5, when all the period 4 cesspits were backfilled (fig 15). Overall this activity has been dated to 1851–60 by tightly datable assemblages of pottery. The nature of the backfill material is discussed below. Before backfilling, the cesspits had been cleaned out; no primary fills were present on the site. No evidence for associated building development was found at the time of cesspit filling and the related consolidation of the ground surface.

A further development in period 5 was the construction of Structure 18 within Building 5 (fig 15). This furnace had a concave base, rounded western end and was constructed from refractory brick. It was backfilled with, and based upon, layers of fine dark grey ash. Because of truncation all that survived was the base of the structure. Pottery from the base of the structure was dated to 1880–1900.

The finds

THE 18TH CENTURY CERAMICS FROM THE OPEN AREA 3 DUMP IN PERIOD 3, by Kieron Tyler with Lucy Whittingham

Introduction

Thirty-one external dump contexts were identified in this period, all associated with Open Area 3. Each context included similar material, so they are treated as one assemblage in this report. The composition of the dump is summarized in table 2.
Extensive truncation from later foundations and pits meant that the original extent of this dump was unknown. Furthermore, dumps of this type only represent an unspecifiable proportion of the product produced by the p工商ouse(s) from which it was sourced. As a representation of what failed, not what went to market, it is impossible to suggest whether the forms represented in the dump were mainstay products or items produced in small runs. With these points in mind, detailed quantification of the make up of the dump would result in compromised statistics that would reveal nothing about the manufactory’s products. The importance of this assemblage is centred on the different wares it contains.

Consequently, a sampling strategy was adopted where only diagnostic vessels were kept. This was in line with standard current practice for archaeological sites where dumps of pottery were present (eg Miller & Stephenson 1999, 17).

The primary components of the retained assemblage were four wares, discussed individually below: biscuit-fired earthenware (38%); London-area post-medieval redware (22%); tin-glazed wares (17%); kiln furniture: for tin-glazed ware, London area post-medieval redware and stoneware (14%). The presence of biscuit-fired earthenware, tin-glaze and redware waster vessels, and kiln furniture shows that these external dumps contain redepsoited waste from p工商ouses in the vicinity. In addition to these major components were smaller quantities of other 17th and 18th century English and imported wares (including some stoneware vessels), discussed briefly below (see also table 2).

**Biscuit-fired earthenware**

Biscuit waste, the result of the first firing of tin-glazed ware, comprises 38% of the assemblage. The range of forms represented by this assemblage is typical of London’s tin-glazed production of the mid–late 18th century (table 2).

The wide range of vessels primarily included rounded bowls/punch bowls, chamber pots, plates and jars with smaller quantities of chargers, cups, mugs, ointment pots, spouted wet drug jars, rounded dishes, porringer and stool pans (table 2).

Floor and wall tile blanks were also found. The presence of wall tiles has some bearing on the dating of the assemblage. In 1677 Dr Johnson found the tin-glaze manufacturers of Lambeth unable to make wall tiles, as the correct blend of clay and method of firing had not been perfected (Tyler et al in prep). Although wall tiles were stacked at Southwark’s Pickleherring p工商ouse in 1699, none have yet been identified as products of the manufactory from excavation (ibid).

Any problems with making wall tiles in Lambeth were overcome at the Norfolk House p工商ouse some time before 1765. Therefore, from the biscuit tile evidence it is unlikely the biscuit assemblage can date to much earlier than the end of the 17th century and is in all probability later.

The vessel forms are all typical of finds made elsewhere in Lambeth. For example, the rounded bowls have convex flanged rims and footing bases, similar to those recorded at Norfolk House (Bloice 1971, 22, fig 53: nos 48 and 50).

**London-area post-medieval redware**

London-area post-medieval redware constitutes 22% of the assemblage. This fabric provides the majority of the coarse utilitarian vessels which are associated with household functions.

Forms include bowls (concave, handled, round and straight-sided) dishes, flanged dishes, jars, larger storage jars, jugs, lids, pipkins and porringers (table 2). The larger handled bowls are often decorated with an incised wavy pattern. Some of the straight-sided bowls have an internal glaze and may have been used for industrial purposes.

As well as utilitarian vessels there are a number of horticultural vessels, flowerpots and urns, and industrial vessel types such as sugar moulds. Many of the horticultural vessels are flower pots of varying sizes, usually unglazed, and fired either to a reduced grey colour or oxidized red. The urns are found in a range of coarse, unglazed vessels, with convex rims and slightly sagging bases that are fired a reduced grey colour. They are characterized by two small apertures: one cut into the centre of the base and another into the lower body, just above the base itself. A few vessels are glazed but this appears to be accidental.

Also found were a number of small waster sherds with clear glaze, often over the fracture of the sherd. Although most are undiagnostic, one handle was recovered (fig 16).

**Tin-glazed earthenware**

The tin-glazed earthenware forms the fourth largest component of these external dump assemblages (17%). Most of these wares are highly fragmented and difficult to attribute to specific decorative typologies. However, where decoration was apparent, the classification system developed by Orton (1988) has been used: type A decoration (TGW A), type C decoration (TGW C), type D decoration (TGW D), type F decoration (TGW F), type I decoration (TGW I), type J decoration (TGW J), plain pale blue-glaze (TGW BLUE), late tin-glazed ware (TGW LATE) (table 2).

The earliest product found is a rim fragment of a 17th century TGW A charger, which was residual. Otherwise, the most common vessels are bowls, pharmaceutical jars/albarelli, ointment pots and
Figs 16–22 12–18 Albert Embankment. Fig 16: London-area post-medieval redware waster: handle with glaze over break. Fig 17: tin-glazed waster sherds – fused plates. Fig 18: saggars for tin-glazed ware – right, six-peg hole saggar; left, base of saggar with U-shaped cutaway. Fig 19: external view of six-peg hole saggar with pegs inserted. Fig 20: tin-glazed kiln shelf with redware scar. Fig 21: stoneware kiln furniture – spacer for placing between stoneware saggars. Fig 22: stoneware kiln furniture: stoneware saggar with pedestal fused to inside of base. Scale all 1:2 except fig 18 1:4.
plates with the occasional punch bowl, chamber pot, charger, mug, porringer and teapot lid. Chamber pots and jars are a common form in plain white glazed TGW C and TGW BLUE. Jars, mugs, plates and bowls all occur in TGW D, F, I and J. All these forms were produced during the 18th century, during the period 1735/45–70. The TGW J bowl and plate, and TGW 1 plate date from this period (table 2). Therefore, this assemblage is dated to c 1745–70.

As well as the finished tin-glazed products there is also evidence of manufacturing waste in the form of fused vessels, including two examples of plates (fig 17).

Kiln furniture for tin-glazed ware, stoneware and London-area post-medieval redware

Vessels used for manufacturing tin-glazed ware account for the largest group of kiln furniture from the site. Much of this furniture is lightly dusted with a white batt wash, which is the original slip applied to the kiln furniture to prevent vessels from sticking to the furniture once firing has begun.

The finds included a wide variety of trivets, discs, girders, pegs, shelves/batts, setters and two types of saggars as defined by Bloice (1971, 118–20): type 1 with U-shaped cutaways and type 2, an open cylindrical sleeve with triangular peg holes (fig 18). Although type 1 saggars were associated with a period earlier than 1737 at the Norfolk House pothouse, the finds from that site were not ‘a complete representation of the products of the kiln at any one time’ (Bloice 1971, 144, 147). Consequently, type 1 saggars continued in use after 1737, into, and probably beyond, the c 1745–70 period suggested for this dump.

Although whole saggars rarely survive, a complete type 2 saggars was found in these external dumps (fig 10). This has twelve peg holes with spurs, showing that twelve plates were fired in this size saggars. Some of these saggars and girders had become glazed during firing. Other saggars had six peg holes (figs 18 and 19).

A small number of tin-glazed kiln shelves bore the scars of red earthenware vessels and lead glaze on their surfaces (fig 20). These scars are significant to the understanding of the manufacturing techniques associated with the production of London-area post-medieval redwares and tin-glazed earthenware, as they demonstrate that either the two wares were fired at the same pothouse, perhaps together in the same kiln, or that tin-glaze kiln furniture was re-used by a redware pothouse.

Stoneware kiln furniture was less common but examples included spacers (fig 21) and saggars with U-shaped cutaways (fig 22). These were coated with green salt glaze. The spacers were wads of clay, placed in the kiln during firing between each saggars to ensure the circulation of air. Square pedestals, to support the vessels being fired, were fused to the inside base of the saggars.

The least common form of kiln furniture was for firing London-area post-medieval redware. Two forms of saggars were recovered (figs 23 and 24). Splashes of colourless glaze adhered to both the inside and outside of the saggars. There was no grit or sand present. Although in redware, these saggars are paralleled by forms employed during the manufacture of stoneware. The first, with teardrop-shaped side apertures, was similar in form to saggars dated to c 1740–1800 used in firing stoneware tankards at the Fulham pothouse (Green 1999, 192–4) (fig 23). The second was similar to an earlier type of multi-perforated saggars used at Fulham to fire finewares, dated to c 1685 and later (Green 1999, 186–7).

Other 17th and early 18th century English and Continental wares

Other than these four main categories of wares discussed above a number of other 17th and early 18th century English and Continental wares also occurred in the Open Area 3 external dump assemblages (table 2).

Some of the earlier, residual, 16th–17th century products include a Surrey/Hampshire border white-ware chamber pot and dish, and an early slipped
redware sherd. Early post-medieval Continental imports include examples of 16th–17th century Montelupo tin-glazed ware and Portuguese faience. Eighteenth century products dating from the period of the dumps deposition include English stoneware bottles and storage jars. There was no evidence for any stoneware wasters. Other 18th century English stoneware products include small quantities of Nottingham/Crich stoneware and Staffordshire-type white stoneware jars and a tankard. Early 18th century English earthenwares include Staffordshire mottled brown glazed ware mugs and Staffordshire slipware dishes. Continental stonewares include 18th century Rhenish imports such as Frechen stoneware and Westerwald stoneware.

Discussion

The period 3 external dumps consisted of a large collection of fragmented and redeposited domestic material which included kiln waste from various production sites, perhaps in the vicinity.

The earliest product found is a rim fragment of a 17th century tin-glazed charger with a Wan Li-type decoration dated to no later than 1650. The only other 17th century vessels recovered were a tin-glazed jar and mug with a decorative style dated to 1670–90. These objects must be considered residual. Otherwise, the remaining dumps included tin-glazed, stoneware and redware vessel forms and types which fall within the date range of c 1745–70 provided by the decorated tin-glazed vessels.

A minor component of the dumps was wares that could not have been local products, including border wares and imported wares (table 2). These tended to have cut-off dates of no later than 1700, suggesting that their source was domestic rather than industrial. It is possible that the 17th century tin-glazed wares noted above were also from a non-industrial, also domestic, source.

With a date range of c 1745–70 for its deposition, the dump assemblage represents the period during which the tin-glazed industry was in decline, while the Staffordshire industry was in the ascendant. Indeed, Wedgwood’s first London warehouse/showroom was opened in 1765. By displaying his wares set as services for a meal and using other innovative display techniques, such as limiting the amount of vessels of types such as Jasper on display, to make them seem rare but not outrageously expensive, Wedgwood quickly captured a market. Moreover, he was selling the pottery himself, rather than through distributors or guilds (McKendrick 1982, 103–4, 118).

The combination of aggressive marketing and the durability of the Staffordshire wares had a swift impact on the tin-glazed industry. In 1750 there were nine tin-glaze pothouses in London, in 1775 there were six. In 1800 there were three left and by 1846 there was one, the last in London – and possibly the country – at Glasshouse Street in Lambeth (Britton 1987, 31–80). In the case of the tin-glazed and biscuit wares from the site, vessels associated with the escalating habits of tea, coffee and chocolate consumption – all popular from the late 1650s – are under-represented. Presumably the more durable heat-proof wares manufactured in Staffordshire dominated this portion of the market.

The lack of cross-joins in the assemblage suggests that the material was redeposited some distance from its original source, as a mix of fragmented industrial waste and lesser proportion of domestic material. In this case, the external dumps appear to be levelling material introduced onto this site as make-up for building foundations, rather than pothouse waste that had been immediately dumped.

Defining the source of the industrial waste is, therefore, problematic. This production waste may be derived from either one of a number of nearby factories working during the relevant period. The site is located close to Lambeth High Street, along which a pothouse manufactured tin-glazed ware from 1732/4–1786 and 1789–c 1793 (the pothouse was unoccupied from 1786–9). Stoneware, rather than tin-glazed ware, was manufactured there from 1793. Further north, along Lambeth Bridge Road, at other end of Lambeth High Street was the Norfolk House tin-glaze manufactory, operating from 1680–1772/9.
Stoneware was also produced elsewhere in the area during the 17th and 18th centuries. As noted above, it was made with tin-glazed ware at the pothouses at Copthall (1693–1700), Vauxhall (1712–1865), Norfolk House (c 1760s) and Glasshouse Street (1784–1823) (Britton 1987, 52–67; Edwards 1981, 133–6).

With both Vauxhall and Norfolk House manufacturing both tin-glazed and stonewares in the 1760s, it seems as though either of these pothouses may be the source of the dumps. However, the discovery of kiln furniture, wasters and biscuit-ware kiln shelves demonstrate that a pothouse making London-area post-medieval redware was also operating nearby during the 18th century – yet no evidence for redware manufacture at Vauxhall or Norfolk House exists. Previously, as noted above, evidence for the production of London-area post-medieval redware in Lambeth was confined to the 16th or early 17th century and at the Glasshouse Street pothouse, between 1784 and 1823.

Nevertheless, the site has shown that tin-glazed and redwares were manufactured locally around the c 1745–70 period. The most likely candidates are Vauxhall and Norfolk House.

THE 19TH CENTURY CERAMICS FROM THE PERIOD 5 CESSPIT BACKFILLS, by Lucy Whittingham

Introduction

In period 5, 4962 sherds of pottery were recovered from the backfills of twelve cesspits (Structures 2, 4, 6–8, 10–16).

Examination of the pottery reveals multiple cross-joins between sherds in Structures 2, 4, 6 and 8, and also between Structures 2 and 11, Structures 11 and 12, Structures 11 and 14, and between Structures 10 and 12. This demonstrates that the backfilling of Structures 2, 4, 6, 8 10–12 and 14 was undertaken as one event.

Although there were no cross-joins with the remaining four cesspits (Structures 7, 13, 15 and 16), overall there was no difference in the date or composition of the pottery from the various backfills. Consequently the period 6 cesspit backfills are considered here as one assemblage.

This large quantity of domestic pottery is primarily of late 18th to mid-19th century date and can be divided into the following broad categories: 58% finewares (creamware, pearlware, yellow ware and other fine whitewares), 14% English stonewares, 13% coarse earthenwares (London-area post-medieval redware, Surrey/Hampshire red border wares), 5% English porcelain and less than 1% tin-glazed wares. These are discussed in turn below.

Creamware

Creamware was a fine whiteware, made in Staffordshire from the 1750s. It was lighter and cheaper than porcelain and finer than tin-glazed ware, and superseded both wares in the marketplace. By the end of the 18th century it was the most successful ware in England, produced beyond Staffordshire in Leeds, Derbyshire, Newcastle, Bristol and Liverpool. Its smooth surface was suitable for decoration, both painted and printed.

The creamware vessels from the period 5 backfills are usually plain and undecorated but some examples were decorated. Some of these styles can be dated to between 1760 and 1800.

The plain, undecorated creamware vessels were for hygiene and sanitary purposes, food storage, serving and consumption. Large quantities of dinner and dessert plates were found together with rectangular meat dishes, many of which bore heavy scoring from utensils. A range of complete (or profiles of) cylindrical preserve jars and ointment pots served as storage or pharmaceutical wares. The sanitary vessels consist of well-preserved stool pans and chamber pots in plain white-toned refined whiteware and creamware.

The decorated vessels included a complete green-glazed plate with applied floral sprigs from Structure 11 (fig 25, front centre). Marbled and banded forms were limited to small to medium-sized, often complete, rounded drinking bowls.

Pearlware

Pearlware is a blue-glazed type of creamware, produced from 1779. Popular in the 19th century, it was typically decorated with underglaze blue prints (imitating porcelain) or marbled or banded slip.

The pearlware was plain, painted or transfer-printed. The painted pearlware is decorated in the under-glaze blue-painted ‘tree post fence post house’ pattern, common between 1780 and 1820.
Forms included scallop-edged plates, typologically dated to either the late 18th-century Rococo style and the mid 19th-century unscalloped shell-edge with impressed pattern style dating from the 1840s and 1850s. The factory stamp consistently found on pearlware in this assemblage is ‘ROGERS’, a potter operating in Longport, Staffordshire, between 1780 and 1830.

Yellow ware

Yellow ware is a refined earthenware with a buff to dark-yellow fabric, coated with a clear lead glaze, giving the vessel a yellow appearance. This type of pottery is broadly dated to between 1800 and c.1900. The yellow ware vessels are slip-decorated in mocha or banded patterns on a buff-bodied fabric. Yellow ware constitutes 8% of the assemblage in utilitarian vessels such as chamber pots, shallow rounded bowls, jugs and cylindrical jars (fig 25, front left and back right).

The remainder of the fine whitewares

Other than the creamware, pearlware and yellow ware, the fine whitewares included transfer-printed wares (which represent the bulk of the vessels used for food serving/consumption), tea wares and hand-painted wares. Food serving/consumption vessels include meat dishes, dinner, tea and dessert plates, tureens and egg cups (fig 25, egg cup at centre).

The patterns are blue and white Chinese landscape transfer-printed designs, notably willow pattern (fig 25, willow pattern plate at back, centre), blue and white European designs (such as wild rose) or Far Eastern landscape designs with floral borders. Many of the back-stamps reflect the exotic locations the designs are meant to portray such as ‘ARCADIA’, ‘JAVA’ and ‘WHOMPOA’. Willow pattern decoration only occurs on food consumption/serving wares: ie gravy boats, tureens, plates of varying sizes and meat dishes. The coloured transfer-printed wares are usually green, black or pink and represent Far-Eastern and Chinese designs. These particular coloured prints are, however, found on only one or two vessels apiece and do not form distinct decorative sets.

Transfer-printed tea wares form 10% of the period 5 assemblage by functional category. These include slop bowls, teacups, saucers, and a few cream jugs. Up to three different groups of tea sets have been identified. The first set belongs to the two temple or Brossley style of blue-and-white Chinese-inspired print which was common up until c.1820. The second type is the flow blue pattern, applied to later pearlware and refined white earthenware from c.1830. The third pattern is ‘fern’, another common blue-and-white transfer-print used on a small group of tea wares (fig 25, fern-pattern teacup, centre, right). Additionally, a teacup from the backfill of Structure 10 bore transfer-printed decoration celebrating the Great Exhibition of 1851.

Many of the refined white earthenware slop bowls, saucers and teacups are hand painted with a purple or green floral polychrome pattern or sponge decorated in blue, purple or green, a technique which was employed after c.1830. Also found were a small number of nursery plates or children’s toys with decoration such as the painted ‘pet dog’ pattern.

English stonewares

English stoneware vessels constitute 14% of the period 5 assemblage. Substantial groups of stoneware were
recovered from a number of large cesspit groups (Structures 2, 4, 8, 10–12 and 16), and were probably manufactured at Lambeth’s many stoneware pothouses. Some vessels are applied with the later Bristol-type glaze which dates them as post-1830.

The variety of forms included drinking, serving/consumption and storage items, many of which are impressed with either the retailer’s or manufacturer’s stamp. The most common vessels are bottles, for black leading (fig 26), furniture polish, ginger beer or porter beer. Ointment pots were also recovered (fig 27).

Ginger beer bottles are the most common and many have their manufacturer or retailer stamped toward the bottom of the vessel. A bottle stamped with ‘STEPHEN GREENS GLASS LINED INSIDE, LAMBETH’ refers to Stephen Green’s Imperial Pottery factory that was operating in Lambeth at 54 Prince’s Street between 1831 and 1858 (Oswald et al 1982, 74–5). Some of the bottles are probably seconds, having fused together during the firing and subsequently been prised apart, leaving heavy scarring on the outer surfaces.

Globular flasks and spirit flasks are also well represented, and include three near-complete spirit flasks (one illustrated on fig 28: spirit flask back, right). Other alcohol consumption and serving vessels include a range of jugs (one illustrated on fig 28, left) and mugs decorated with sprig relief-moulded design depicting hunting scenes (one illustrated on fig 28, front).

The assemblage also includes three near-complete stoneware measures from cesspit Structure 11. These, together with the range of hunting/cylindrical mugs, tankards and jugs, show that waste from a tavern was included in the assemblage. The jug most worthy of note among this group is a Lord Nelson face jug from Structure 8, a popular figure used on London stoneware jugs to celebrate the Reform Bill of 1832 (fig 29) (Oswald et al 1982, 65).

Large quantities of shouldered and cylindrical stoneware storage jars were also found. Recovered from the backfill of Structure 2 was a complete shouldered storage jar stamped with ‘C. WAUD, PURVEYOR OF TURTLE TO THE QUEEN 86 NEW BOND STREET LONDON’, which may once have held turtle soup. This vessel was probably manufactured locally at the Vauxhall pothouse, c 1835–51 (Edwards 1981, 102)

A variety of conical and dwarf ink bottles were also found, mainly from Structure 11. Ink became more widely used after the introduction of the penny post in 1839 (Oswald et al 1982, 62). Structure 2 yielded two complete saucer-type candlesticks, which represent the only evidence of ceramic lighting vessels in this assemblage. A rectangular, straight-sided dish found in Structure 2 with a rouletted bead pattern around the
rim may have been used as a butter pot. Other vessels include a complete soap dish found in Structure 14.

A number of stoneware industrial vessels were also found. These include a variety of well-used crucibles (fig 30). Most are conical, with the exception of one complete example which is small, shallow and globular.

Smaller quantities (usually less than 1%) of other types of 18th-century English stoneware were also found and include Black Basalt ware, Drab stoneware, Nottingham/Critch stoneware and Staffordshire-type white stoneware.

Coarse earthenwares (London-area post-medieval redware, Surrey/Hampshire border redware)

Most of the utilitarian, coarse earthenwares, are either London-area post-medieval redware (nearly 13% of the total assemblage) or the later products of the Surrey/Hampshire border redware industry (less than 2%).

The coarse redware forms are similar to those associated found in period 3 and served a variety of utilitarian functions in the household. Forms included bowls (handled, concave, rounded or straight-sided), chamber pots and stool pans, colanders, dishes (small, divided or rounded), jars, pancheons, money boxes, pipkins, and horticultural vessels such as urns and flower pots. Several of the bases on the large pancheons were sooted on the exterior surface suggesting that they were placed in the oven and perhaps used as baking dishes. Other horticultural vessels include unglazed shallow rounded dishes, which appear to have served as draining vessels for flowerpots or urns to sit in. These vessels are mostly found in the backfill of Structure 11.

Redware vessels that may have had industrial uses include coarse, internally-glazed, straight-sided bowls, fired grey within a reduced atmosphere.

A small quantity of Surrey/Hampshire border redware vessels include pipkins, cauldrons, rounded bowls, and small dishes but are dominated by sanitary wares such as stool pans and chamber pots, some of which have been re-used as paint pots, from the backfills of Structures 6, 8 and 15. These wares were conceivably still produced in the early 19th century and, therefore, were contemporary with the period 6 cesspit assemblages.
English porcelain

English porcelain forms a very small proportion of the period 5 assemblage (5%), found in the backfills of Structures 11, 12, 14 and 15.

The porcelain was decorated, generally either in blue and white or painted in polychrome. A few saucers and teacups are painted with similar over-glaze brown and green floral designs, or with the ‘Chelsea sprig’ design.

Vessels worthy of note include a plate that is finely painted in the Chinese-style blue and white willow pattern design, and a near-complete Worcester porcelain blue-and-white gravy boat, with the half-crescent moon factory stamp on the underside of the base.

The remaining vessels include a finely painted teapot decorated with an under-glaze blue background surrounding enamelled and gilded floral motifs and a relief-moulded decorated vase with a crudely painted purple and applied gilded decoration. Much of the remaining porcelain is in a fragmented state.

Tin-glazed wares

In period 5 tin-glazed earthenware vessels are represented by 19th-century style ointment pots. All three plain white and one plain pale blue-glazed ointment pots came from the backfill of Structure 11.

One is stencilled in black paint with the inscription ‘No 3 Gervais R-Martin Pres la R-aux Ours a Paris’) (fig 27, third from left). Gervais was a perfumer in Rue St Martin, Paris and has been identified in the earliest Parisian Directory of 1841. Ointment pots with similar applied stencil marking have been interpreted as French tin-glazed ware or, more likely, late Glasshouse Street products that were marked with their retailer stamp during manufacture (Britton 1987, 169, fig 174).

A further two ointment pots are stencilled with black paint anchor mark on the underside of the base (fig 27, left). It is thought that the anchor is imitating the manufacturing marks used on Bow porcelain (R Stephenson, pers comm). This anchor appears on jars made at the Mortlake tin-glaze pothouse, a concern which moved to Glasshouse Street, Lambeth in 1823. It is probable the anchor-marked ointment pots are Glasshouse Street products. This pothouse closed in 1846 (Britton 1987, 61–2, 75–6; Sloane & Hoad 2003, 72–5).

Discussion

These cesspit groups are characterized by large quantities of joining sherds from substantially complete vessels and profiles that are closely datable to within 10 and 20 years, with no evidence of intrusive or residual material.

The backfill of cesspits Structures 2, 4, 8 and 6 are dated as 1845 to 1850/1860 by the presence of the Minton & Co. manufacturing stamp of 1845, found in association with pearlware – the end date of which lies between 1850 and 1860 – in Structure 8.

The deposition in other cesspits, such as Structures 10 and 12, must have taken place later than c 1851, based on a Great Exhibition transfer-printed cup found in the backfill of Structure 10. As some of the pottery from Structure 10 cross-joins with Structure 12, the same date might apply to the backfill of Structure 12.
As noted above, the numerous cross-joins between these cesspits imply that the backfilling took place as one event, occurring between 1851 and 1860. These dates are supported by the types of tobacco pipe and building material also found in these features.

The quality of the wares in all the cesspits is not particularly high. For example, there are very few matching sets of dinner services or tea wares, implying that these wares were purchased or acquired as individual items, rather than as sets. This suggests that these pits are filled with the clearance material from low-status tenements in the vicinity. This is also reflected in the relatively out-of-date composition of the finewares and porcelain. For example, Willow pattern, commonly applied to many of the industrial finewares found, was gradually superseded by later European designs throughout the second quarter of the 19th century. Other forms of decoration, such as the painted polychrome wares and sponged wares, were up to twenty years old when discarded and by the mid-19th century represented the cheapest end of the ceramic market (Miller 1991, 6–8).

The quantities of stonewares and redwares suggest the owners were using a range of mundane and utilitarian vessels for sanitary, storage and tablewares. Only a few pieces appear to have been well looked after, such as the Worcester porcelain gravy boat, perhaps representing an heirloom piece, as this porcelain was more expensive. The tin-glaze ointment pots were probably products of the local Glasshouse Street pothouse, which closed in 1846, and may have been kept as household ornaments until their deposition on the site.

These backfills, therefore, represent the discard of a large amount of poor quality domestic pottery at one moment in time, spread between several different features as the result of a major land redevelopment.

**THE REGISTERED FINDS FROM THE PERIOD 5 CESSPIT BACKFILLS, by Alison Nailer**

As the pottery from the period 5 cesspits demonstrated that their backfilling took place as one event, the registered finds from these features are discussed here as a single assemblage.

**Glass**

The glass objects from the cesspit backfills were mainly utilitarian. For example the backfill of Structure 2 included bottles, phials, and a few fragments of window glass. The bottles include a cylindrical wine bottle with sloping shoulders, possibly for sparkling wine, an ink bottle, and two small moulded bottles, one of which had dosage marks embossed on the side.

Recovered from Structure 4 were a miniature glass jar and fragments of at least five stemmed glass cups. The glass from Structure 8 was equally mundane, and included a large beaker or small jar in colourless, glass bottles, a large jar, a few phials, and several window glass fragments. The bottles from Structure 8 included a cylindrical wine bottle, fragments of two large square bottles (possibly for gin), and several moulded bottles including a ‘Hamilton’ bottle embossed with the legend ‘... PE&Co ... RS STREET ... GENUINE SUPERIOR AERATED WATERS’.

Structure 11 contained a large quantity of glass tableware, predominantly fragments of eight stemmed cups in a range of styles. Several are plain and simple in style, one has a faceted stem, two have bucket-shaped fluted or faceted bowls, one has a bowl decorated with etched flowers and cut leaves. One cup has misshapen folds at the top of the stem, suggesting that it was possibly a second.

There were also a number of phials and bottles of more utilitarian function recovered from the backfill of Structure 11. The bottles were primarily fragments of a number of moulded, probably medicinal, bottles and at least four cylindrical wine bottles. The smaller vessels included one moulded cylindrical bottle, embossed on the base with the mark RI (two dots beneath the R). A fragment of a small bottle with an oval section is embossed on the side ‘...W HENRY ... MATIC ... RIT OF ... LGRAPH’, obviously a reference to an aromatic spirit of some kind.

Of the eight phials recovered from Structure 11, four were very similar: long, very narrow, cylinders with no necks and everted rims, the bases are without kicks (fig 31, right, lying flat). There are also two larger cylinders, one of which is distorted on one side (fig 31, centre, standing). A very small moulded bottle with flat raised panels on the front and back, probably for paper labels was also recovered (fig 31, back). The small size suggests it was for smelling salts or possibly perfume. Cylindrical phials were also recovered from Structures 14 and 15.

The most unusual glass object came from Structure 2: an enigmatic hollow globe-shaped object in white glass, possibly part of a light fitting.

**Table items**

A selection of objects associated with the setting and use of the table were also recovered. A teaspoon came from Structure 4. Found in the backfill of Structure 8 was a handle formed by a ring on the end of a long
shaft, with a screw thread at the other end of the shaft, probably from a table item such as a cake stand. Table items from Structure 11 included knife handles in antler, bone, and possibly ivory. Most were simple in style, with only one shaped into a simple pistol-grip style. Two teaspoons appear to be of rattail design.

Play/children

Playthings and objects associated with leisure were found in the cesspit backfills. Alleys, or marbles, were recovered. Structure 4 contained two ceramic alleys, one with blue and green tartan decoration. Structure 8 contained a ceramic alley, decorated with red and yellow concentric circles. Structure 11 contained a ceramic alley with floral decoration, and four ceramic alleys which may have been either toys or from the necks of bottles (fig 32).

A substantial number of gaming items or toys were present in Structure 11, including four bone dominoes (fig 33), each with a differing arrangement of dots. There were also ten gaming counters: seven cut from pieces of pottery (three stoneware, three redware, one tin-glaze ware) and three cut from roof tiles.

A slate tablet from Structure 4 had carefully etched lines on one side and a roughly scratched grid on the other may be an example of the re-use of an item, possibly for a board game or child’s work board. Not necessarily related, but certainly complementary, was a slate pencil, probably a child’s, recovered from Structure 11 (fig 32, right).

Display items

A number of fragments of display items were also recovered from Structure 11. These vessels were mostly made of moulded or pressed glass, either colourless or with a slight green tinge. Some of the fragments were too small to determine the type of vessel, but identifiable vessels include a small jar with deeply moulded ribs surmounted by narrow bands, the pedestal base of a very large jar or vase, and part of a stopper, probably from a decanter, with extensive cut decoration. The most unusual item was a piece of novelty ware, a small dish or tray pressed in the form of a scallop shell with additional cut decoration of circles and lines.

The display items from Structure 11 were not limited to glassware; fragments of a vessel, or possibly a pair of vessels, made from rock crystal, probably Blue John, were discovered (fig 31, left). The vessel(s) had been cut and possibly lathe-turned, the outside polished and the rim ground flat. This appears to be
part of a larger item but is not possible to determine what.

Utilitarian household objects
Utilitarian household items recovered from Structure 11 included part of a flat-backed double-ended brush, probably a scrubbing brush, along with a toothbrush (fig 34). A copper-alloy pendant handle, probably from a piece of furniture, also indicates a domestic origin.

Industrial waste
A quantity of other material was recovered from Structure 11. Two fragments of glassmaking waste were found although these were probably redeposited. Several indeterminate iron fragments may be of either structural or industrial function, but a number of slag fragments are probably also redeposited general rubbish from elsewhere on the site. Three small ceramic crucibles suggest some metalworking activity in the area, although their origin is also uncertain.

Redeposited objects
Structures 8 and 11 included redeposited finds, indicating that the backfills did not all originate in the nearest houses. These items may well have been gathered up in general rubbish from around the vicinity of the site during the clearance and levelling operations. Fragments of two glass items dating from the 16th century were recovered from two of the contexts in Structure 8. The first, a bowl in cobalt blue glass, has an optic blown diamond pattern and was probably imported from the Continent. The second, a colourless flask with optic blown wrythen decoration, may have been imported but could be of English manufacture. The backfill of Structure 8 included a glass jar/flask with optic-blown diamond decoration in a style generally associated with late 15th to early 16th century façon de Venise, although this piece was probably imported from northern Europe.

Discussion
The presence of redeposited objects in Structures 4, 8 and 11 indicates that the backfills were not exclusively sourced from the residential properties which were probably associated with the cesspits. The inclusion of industrial finds in the backfill of Structure 11 further demonstrates that these backfills were not exclusively domestic.

However, where domestic objects were present (Structures 2, 4, 8, 11 and 14), their nature suggested that they derived from households that, although a long way from wealthy, were not living on the bread line either and had some disposable income.

The nature of the domestic rubbish in the cesspits is homogeneous: items associated with kitchen-type usage do not predominate and most of the items are a range of toys, personal, grooming/toilet and table items. This suggests that the debris was collected from throughout multiple properties, and was not restricted to the clearance of one room.

THE CLAY TOBACCO PIPE FROM THE PERIOD 5 CESSPIT BACKFILLS, by Alison Nailer

The pipe bowls have been dated and classified according to the chronology of bowl types (Atkinson & Oswald 1969, 171–227) or (for some of the 18th century pipes) the simplified general typology (Oswald 1975, 37–41). A Dutch pipe has been classified according to Atkinson’s typology (Atkinson & Oswald, 1972, 175–182). The prefixes AO (Atkinson &
Oswald 1969), OS (Oswald 1975) and AD (Atkinson & Oswald, 1972) are used to indicate which typology has been applied. No attempt has been made to date undiagnostic stem fragments.

As with the registered finds from the period 5 cesspits, the tobacco pipe is discussed here as a single assemblage. The tobacco pipe is quantified in table 3.

The backfills of Structures 2 and 8 contained a mixed group of pipes that included bowl types AO28 (c 1820–40) and AO29 (c 1840–80). A date range of 1840–80 has therefore been assigned to these deposits on the evidence of the latest bowl type present. However, the inclusion of greater numbers of the earlier bowl type AO28, and the absence of type AO30 bowls (commencing c 1850) again suggests that the dating can be refined to 1840–50. The pipes are quite fragmented, of poor quality and broken close to the bowl/stem junction.

Most of the clay pipes were recovered from the backfill of Structure 11, which produced 33 pipe bowls, of which 23 have makers’ marks. The large group of pipes is of similar composition to the groups from the backfills of Structures 2 and 8, but includes two pipes of type AO30, dating from c 1850.

Among the pipes from Structure 2 is a portrait pipe probably representing the Duke of Wellington and probably made c 1860. The eyes and eyebrows are painted black.

Structure 4 produced a total of eight pipe bowls with a date range of 1840–50. Decoration is limited to the common forms of relief-decorated seams. One of the pipes carries the mark of James Swinyard who was recorded at Hooper Street, Westminster Road during the period 1828–54; other examples of his pipes were recovered elsewhere on the site including cesspit Structure 11.

A large percentage of the 19th century pipes from Structure 11 were decorated, mostly with common designs such as leaf- or wheat-moulded seams, floral motifs and ribbing. There is a late example of an armorial pipe. On the back of its bowl are large Prince of Wales Feathers flanked by ribbons bearing the usual motto ICH DIEN. On the front of the bowl is a large, stylized ostrich feather. The pipe bears the mark of George Benson (II), who was listed in Pentonville and other addresses in the period 1802–20. Benson’s pipes were also recovered from the backfills of Structures 4, 8 and 15.

There was also an unusual faceted bowl pipe from Structure 11, with four shield-shaped panels on either side of the bowl: the stem has the mark of Arthur Gordon, who was listed in directories at Golden Square during the period 1823–57, moulded in relief on the stem. The other identifiable makers from this context are Edward Jackson who was recorded at George’s Row, Lockfields in 1839 and New Street, Lambeth (and elsewhere) 1857–99; James Swinyard (also found in Structure 4); and John Higgins, recorded in Aldersgate Street and elsewhere during the period 1862–91.

Only three pipe bowls were recovered from Structure 14. One is decorated with a leaf seam, and all three are marked, although it is not possible to identify the maker.

Discussion

The pipes from Structures 2, 8 and 11 were quite fragmented, with many broken close to the bowl/stem junction, suggesting that it is unlikely the pipes were thrown into the cesspits immediately after use. Instead the pipes were probably deposited as part of a general clearance programme rather than as a result of casual loss.

The pipes from Structures 2, 8, 11 and 14 were generally of poor quality, suggesting a relatively low status for their owners. Many were made in old and worn moulds, so that their decorative features were poorly reproduced. In some cases the pipes were not trimmed properly or were deformed during firing. It seems likely that this reflects the impoverished nature of this part of London in the 19th century.
Conclusion

Although the excavations at 12–18 Albert Embankment primarily resulted in material from the 18th and 19th centuries, there were some earlier, redeposited finds, notably an assemblage of Neolithic–Early Bronze Age flint artefacts. These were found in the early 18th century backfills of a series of pits cut into Open Area 2. The pits were probably quarry pits, suggesting that some of the backfill may have been local, perhaps even deriving from the site itself. However, the lack of certainty about the original source of this prehistoric material means that no definitive statement can be made about whether this assemblage represents cultural activity exclusive to this part of Lambeth.

Otherwise, the site was firmly representative of 18th and 19th century activity. The most significant feature from the 18th century was Open Area 3, a substantial dump of waste pottery dated to 1745–70. Three types of ware were present: tin-glazed ware, stoneware and London area post-medieval redware. Kiln furniture was recovered for all three wares, while waster vessels were limited to tin-glazed ware and London area post-medieval redware.

The mix of the three wares does not necessarily indicate that the dump derived from a single pothouse, but with documentary evidence for the concurrent production of tin-glazed ware and stoneware at Lambeth’s Vauxhall and Norfolk House pothouses in the relevant period (from 1712 at Vauxhall and during the 1760s at Norfolk House), these two pothouses are prime candidates for the source of the waste. The assemblage included London area post-medieval redware kiln furniture and tin-glaze kiln furniture that had been used for manufacturing London area post-medieval redware, suggesting that Vauxhall or Norfolk House may also have manufactured this ware.

The assemblage is dated to the period during which London’s tin-glaze industry was in decline, shrinking as a result of the competition presented by Staffordshire’s increasingly successful pothouses. Faced with competition from Staffordshire, Lambeth’s tin-glaze pothouses must have broadened their range of products in an attempt to court new markets. This was doomed to failure as the coarse stonewares and redwares in this assemblage were never going to appeal to customers favouring the new, fine Staffordshire wares. The Norfolk House pothouse had closed by 1779. Changes in the market led to the Vauxhall pothouse reducing the level of tin-glaze production in the late 18th century in favour of stoneware.

The dump of pothouse waste was laid in preparation for the construction of buildings on the former open ground in period 3, c 1745–70. This initial development of the site was followed by period 4, when the site became intensively built up. By 1868 the site was completely covered by small tenements. These were served by a series of cesspits, sixteen of which were recorded during the excavation.

In period 5 the cesspits were cleaned out and backfilled, as a result of the arrival of piped sewage disposal in the area. The backfilling, dated to 1851–60, took place as one event and was not accompanied by clearance of the buildings themselves, indicating that the material in the cesspits did not derive from any particular building on the site. In effect, the contents of one cesspit did not necessarily come solely from the building with which it is presumed to be associated.

The significance of this backfill material is that the finds assemblage provides a snapshot of the cultural debris of a mid-19th century lower class urban lifestyle. Children’s playthings were mixed with tobacco pipes; combs, spectacles and brushes were found alongside vessels associated with taverns. The fine tablewares of the day were dumped together with mundane stoneware bottles and older, 18th century, vessels which must have been cherished heirlooms or ornaments. The material cast indiscriminately into these cesspits represented all aspects of household life, from the indoor and domestic to the wider, community perspective.

Endnote

The tables listed below are available on the Archaeology Data Service website (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/library/surreyac/v91.cfm). Copies of this material will also
be deposited with: the Society’s library, Guildford; Surrey History Centre, Woking, and the Surrey Sites and Monuments Record, Kingston. Photocopies can also be supplied by post – enquiries should be addressed to the Hon Editors, Surrey Archaeological Society, Castle Arch, Guildford GU1 3SX.
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1 Details of cesspits in period 5
2 The composition of the ceramics in the Open Area 3 dump in period 3
3 Quantification and dating of clay tobacco pipe by feature
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