

## REVIEW

C. M. Cunningham and P. J. Drury, Post-medieval sites and their pottery: Moulsham Street, Chelmsford (Chelmsford Archaeological Trust Report 5) CBA Research Report 54, 1985. 96 pp; 52 figs., 7 plates, 1 microfiche. Price £11.75.

The contents of this volume belie the slightly misleading title. Apart from the pottery, it includes the excavation reports on the three Moulsham Street sites, together with those on the small finds and clay pipes, and the Chelmsford Archaeological Trust has taken the opportunity to publish an outline of their post-Roman pottery typology and a summary of some kiln waster material from Stock.

The layout of the volume makes it difficult to use the pottery sections to their full advantage, as the pottery typology is separated from the site pottery, on which it is based, by the other elements of the excavation reports. The volume begins with the full fabric list, ranging from Saxon to the 18th century, and detailed descriptions of two local and two white ware fabrics. The other fabrics are not dealt with until after the excavation and small finds texts. It is stated that only the fabrics and forms printed in bold type are considered further in this report. This can cause some confusion as Fabric 50 (in light type), Staffordshire-type slipware, is both illustrated (Fig. 2.4 and Fig. 41.24) and has a section in the text on page 67; North Italian marbled slipwares and Staffordshire-type salt-glazed wares suffer a similar fate. Figure 1 illustrates the range of rim forms together with their identifying codes, A1, B1 etc. The same codes but with different meanings are used for the vessel forms; A1 rim forms are plain and upright, A1 vessel forms are plates. The vessel form typology for Essex is amply illustrated in ten figures, mostly with examples from the Moulsham Street excavations augmented by more complete examples from other sites. It is stated in the summary that the typology 'is based on, and illustrated by' the excavated material; however, some vessels in the typology are not mentioned again, for example Fig. 10.69, a North Italian costrel. After careful scrutiny the provenance of other vessels not from the site can be found under the vessel forms section on pages 67-72, but not this one. Also, for instance, if one is interested in the cups, Form E, on page 12, the information both on fabric and the site date is not given until page 71, and it is not possible to ascertain what other pottery was associated with them. The detailed discussion on the forms is in the section dealing with the site pottery, while the discussion in the typology section deals with function. This compares the ceramic vessels to the rarely surviving equivalent forms in other materials and mentions the metal vessels listed in the inventories relating to the site and how these may have affected the ceramic assemblages. The evidence of use on the Moulsham Street vessels is used to interpret their function.

The pottery section after the excavation text contains the summaries on the remaining wares and the detailed work on the vessel forms. Under each form is a list of the fabrics that form has been found in, and cross-references to the form typology figures published in the beginning of the volume are given. This more detailed discussion gives the date ranges of the different forms and occasionally their relationship to the site. It is difficult to see why this section was not included with the form typology and it is perhaps unfortunate that the first entry relating

form and rim codes is incorrect. The pottery drawings in this section, apart from two pages of pottery marks and imported wares, are from pit groups.

Part III of this volume is a valuable discussion of the 17th and 18th century waster dump material found over a number of years at Stock, the source for the local material found on Moulsham Street. The documentary evidence for the potters there highlights the seasonal nature of the industry and the economic status of the craftsmen. Some of the vessels are illustrated and the numbers of sherds in each vessel form listed. The Braintree 'ringers' jar is also published in this section but it is difficult to distinguish from the drawing the 'spigot of glazed body-clay still in situ' mentioned on page 15.

The other sections of the report have not been dealt with in this review. Apart from the excavation text, they include a useful small finds report on a varied range of post-medieval objects, which might be in danger of being overlooked because of the volume title, and an interesting section on a group of pottery stamps and ?culinary moulds.

This is an important report, although its usefulness is diminished by the problems of relating the two pottery sections. It is difficult to provide both a typology and a site report using the same material without duplicating drawings and identifications. If the limitation of space prevented this being done, it would have been more helpful if the pottery sections had not been separated by forty-seven pages.

Sarah Jennings  
Trust for Lincolnshire Archaeology

#### REVIEW

L. T. Alexander, 'North Devon Pottery and Other Finds c. a. d. 1660-1700', in The Bulletin and Journal of Archaeology for New York State Number 88, Spring 1984, 15-32.

This is an account of the excavation of a rubbish pit located by fieldwalking on the Buck Site, Kent County, Maryland, closely datable to after 1663 (probably 1679) and before 1770. Coins and clay pipes of Lluellin and William Evans of Bristol confirm this. Gravel-tempered ware bowls, pipkins, pancheons and shallow tripod pipkins formed the majority of the pottery assemblage, with a certain amount of sgraffitto and plain coated slipware. Some London Delft and part of a Westerwald bottle were also recovered. The group is important as it provides additional evidence for the dating of a wide range of specific forms. The photographs are good, but the line drawings are rather stylised and complete quantification is lacking.

P. J. Davey