

implications of the term 'Romano-Saxon ware' are now omitted, and so on. But these are minor points compared with the CBA's total neglect of the local kilns which did after all produce the majority of R-B pottery. A reader new to the subject might come away with the impression that the *Report's* list of wares is exhaustive. Far from it. Also, the CBA's authors may wish to ask themselves whether there is much point on providing such descriptions without illustration of specific products, especially as three blank pages and the cover were crying out for use, and the present illustrations serve little purpose at all.

Alas, things are no better where general method is discussed. The *Students' Guide* implies that the main purpose of pottery study is to date archaeological deposits, and is rather too sanguine about the possibilities in this direction. (Note that Saxon deposits in the City of London generally contain 99-100% Roman pottery!). Pottery is in fact a pretty crude dating tool and should be used only in the absence of better ones such as good coin groups. On the other hand, the real possibilities opened up by studies of the distribution and trade of pottery go unmentioned. Very little is said about that all important means of identification, the components of the pottery fabric itself, and while information

of petrological examination is promised for a fourth edition, the example of a suitable fabric description is still given as "sandy buff paste with cream slip." This won't do in the 1970's: was the sand coarse or fine? sharp or rounded? what was the colour of the quartz grains? And *don't*, please, try to "temper your subjective judgment" with the CBA's colour chart until they produce something a little more subtle, or take too much notice of the methods recommended for pottery drawing (I've never understood what you were supposed to do with the engineers' square and the plasticine . . .)

It is a pity to have to slate the CBA's *Students' Guide*, but far more trouble should have been taken with this edition. The bibliography is still worth having, but in all other respects the *Guide* has been superseded by *Pottery in Roman Britain*, and the CBA should have the grace a) to mention Vivien Swan's book in the *Students' Guide*, and b) not to only list it as suitable for the under-16 age group (!) in their recent bibliography³—a trick which might backfire on the CBA. After all, the young do have intellectual ability too, not to mention a capacity to learn new tricks. And who is going to be writing reports on pottery in 5, 10 or 20 years time?

3. **British Archaeology: an introductory booklist.** Council for British Archaeology, 1976. 16pp., 75p.

Letters

GALLIPOTS (1)

WHEN I was at school in the 1920's the term "gallipots" (pronounced with a silent t) was the name given to the mugs we used to "brew up" cocoa. These were, in those days, of enamelled metal.

My wife tells me that when she was a student nurse at the Middlesex Hospital in the 1950's, gallipots made of enamel or stainless steel were regularly used as containers for lotions and antiseptics when doing dressings: about 2in. high and 2½in. diameter, with an outcurving lip and rounded corner edges at the bottom. By the 1960's these had been replaced by disposable ware.

As a matter of curiosity, there is near Chipping Norton a Galleypot Farm.

D. G. CORBLE

82 Winchester Court,
Vicarage Gate,
London, W8 4AF

GALLIPOTS (2)

I WAS very interested in Mr Iain Walker's letter in your winter number about gallipots, which took my memory straight back to my grandmother's kitchen about 1898-1900.

I was born at Lee, Kent, in 1889, but in 1898 my parents moved to live with my mother's widowed mother, then living at Bexleyheath, Kent, and it was in the latter's kitchen that gallipots were always prominent. They consisted of the white-glazed cylindrical earthenware and wide mouthed jam pots in which Keiller's Marmalade came, and a few other pots of different sizes but of the same colour,

shape and material. When emptied of their original contents, they went into general kitchen use as "gallipots." I cannot remember any other vessel being so used under this name—certainly not the shallow pots used for ointment. Nevertheless, because of their glazed insides and wide mouths, gallipots were often used for the storage of fats.

My grandmother was born in Somerset but in 1857 she married a young Londoner who worked in a carpenter's shop in the Clerkenwell area of East London, in Milton Street and later Red Lion Street (now Britton Street). He later changed his work from wood to leather and became a currier and prospered.

Undoubtedly he lived and worked for nearly 50 years in the East London working class environment (1833-1882) as mentioned by Mr. Walker.

With regard to Arthur Morrison, I share Mr Walker's high opinion of him and shall treasure a copy of his "*Hole in the Wall*."

DONALD McDONALD

79 Scotts Lane,
Bromley,
Kent.

GALLIPOTS (3)

REFERENCE Iain Walker's enquiry about gallipots — my mother who was brought up in Gospel Oak and Islington, said without hesitation that this was a pot for dripping (i.e. fat from the joint). She had never heard of the moneypot use but perhaps that was a regional difference, or a temporal one (she was born in 1892).

CHERRY LAVELL

Council for British Archaeology,
7 Marylebone Road,
London NW1.