

by **Jan Thijssen** whose article sets a standard for the investigation of this material in the Netherlands. It outlines the collapse of the Delftware industries and the rise of industrial production in England. The techniques and tastes of the period are described and the English ceramic hegemony from the mid-18th to the mid-19th century in the Netherlands is discussed. The Dutch response to this was slow; only after 1850 were the Maastricht potteries technically able to compete with England. The finds from Bourtange are systematically described and illustrated with figures and cross-sections of all noteworthy objects, together with significant features such as decoration and marks.

Christiaan Jörg investigated the Oriental porcelain. This occurs everywhere in the Netherlands as a result of the extensive Dutch trade with China. It was traded in the Groningen province through small shops in the provincial towns of Winschoten and Appingedam, at fairs and through chandlers. Seventeenth-century porcelain is rare; the majority dates from the 18th century. At Bourtange the forms mainly consist of cups and saucers and some plates. The absence of more elaborate forms and complex decoration may indicate that the army personnel were not wealthy, which is borne out by the English ceramics. Nineteenth-century Chinese pottery such as ginger jars and hand-painted copies of European transfer-printed dishes are completely absent, and European porcelain was rare. Finds are recorded by the same method that Jan Thijssen uses.

The article on redwares by **van Gangelen** and **Lenting** is remarkable in giving the exact provenance of lesser known German products. Pottery characteristic of the German production centres of Dwoberg and Wildeshausen was identified in Bourtange. Van Gangelen has studied Groningen redwares in depth; these also were identified, a rare occurrence in the Netherlands.

Only three groups of closed finds were quantified. The absence of a conclusion is disappointing precisely because this site offers a perfect opportunity to examine the consumption of a specific isolated and well-documented social group. Evidence for the socio-economic and historical context of the assemblages and the material culture are available, but a scientific discussion based on this information is lacking. Are we awaiting a second volume? The site of Bourtange is well worth a visit and this book will make it even more appealing.

Michiel Bartels

Marie-Cornélie Roodenburg *'De Delftse pottenbakkersnering in de Gouden eeuw (1575-1675). De produktie van rood pottengoed*. Hilversum 1993. 178 pp including plates and figures with an English summary; 240 x 158 mm. ISBN 90-6550-372-2. Publisher: Verloren, Larenseweg 123, 1221 CL Utrecht, Holland. Dfl 45.- (exc. p&p)

This profound study of the production of redwares in the Golden Age is marked by an integrated approach. Roodenburg selected the famous ceramic town of Delft since the archives for this period are useful sources. Delft is one of the few Dutch towns where work on probate inventories has been carried out. It is a central and representative centre in Holland where it is possible to set redware production against Delftware (*plateel*) production. Fortunately, the author shuns the art-historical approach and concentrates on the organisation of the industry, production, the

consumer market, the artisans and the socio-economic position of the potter.

In the late 16th century, brewing and linen production were the main industries in Delft. The redware potteries were the third largest. The continuing war with Spain ended the export of beer and consequently of large-scale brewing. The war also forced Flemish weavers to leave their country and some of those who settled in Delft boosted the production of luxury cloth. From 1600 onwards, Delftware production, first majolica, and from the late 1630s faience, gave work to those who had lost their jobs in the brewing industry. In the year 1600 only two *plateel*-potteries are known; in 1660, 21 potteries and by 1695, 31 were productive. Around 6% of the working population was employed in Delftware production. Redware potters were, however, always a minor group. In 1570 there were only two redware potteries; in 1600, 4; in 1630, 7; in 1670, 2; and in 1710, 1. From these figures it can be concluded that redwares were produced mainly for the local market.

Roodenburg gives an account from historical sources of all potters known in Delft, their kilns, wealth and social position. Some specialised in making kiln furniture for the Delftware potters, others had sidelines, while most simply made everyday ceramics.

The redware potters belonged to the guild of St. Michael, a guild for handworkers such as broommakers, thatchers and ballmakers. The Delftware potters were organized in the higher ranking guild of St. Luke, in which other artist-craftsmen such as silversmiths and pewterers were represented. The contribution for the St. Michael's guild was equal to or a little higher than that of the St. Luke guild. The benefits for disability or a pension after 16 years of contribution were fl.2 and 5st. a week for the redware potters. The Delftware potters had the same benefit for ordinary illness. It is not certain whether the redware pottermasters had to prove their mastery by making particular pieces like their colleagues in Bergen op Zoom or Gouda. The guild obliged potters to make quality products, and masters were limited to three apprentices, a measure to avoid monopolies.

The potters imported their clay directly from the Delfland. Sometimes they used white-firing clay from Frisia for making slip-decoration. The kilns were fired on peat from West-Brabant and Holland. The lead for the glazing of the pots was imported from Cologne, the market for lead of the Eifel-region, or from Scotland. The redware ovens were subject to inspection from the town-council and the guild. All pots were fired only once, unlike Delftware which needed at least two firings. The main forms are tripod pipkins, frying pans, braziers, colanders and flowerpots. Strawberry-pots and sugar-pots were also made on special request from growers and refiners. A comparison is made between the forms that appear in the potters' archives, the probate inventories from Delft and archaeological cesspit-finds from Leiden. Roodenburg also compares certain forms with illustrations from historical sources and the household waste from the same period.

Production capacity is analysed, showing common breakage and loss of production through very cold winters in the Golden Age. Commercially, the difference between Delftware potters and redware potters was great. In early capitalist Holland, Delftware and loans or shares were regarded as equally sensible investments making Delftware a flourishing and wealthy industry. By comparison, common redwares were of little commercial interest. Since they required different techniques, and because of high investment and guild-regulations, redware potters could not switch to making Delftware. This does not mean that the kiln owners were poor; on the contrary, they were among

the highest-rate tax-payers. The end of redware production in Delft was due to heavy competition from quality redwares imported from West-Brabant, Oosterhout and Bergen op Zoom, and the poor home market for cooking pots. People preferred eating from a Delftware plate rather than a communal pot.

Mrs. Roodenburg's work is a perfect inter-disciplinary study of industrial history and ceramic research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Wijsenbeek-Olthuis, T.** 1987, 'Achter de gevels van Delft. Bezit en bestaan van rijk en arm in een periode van achteruitgang (1700-1800)' *Amsterdamse historische reeks. Grote serie deel 3*. Hilversum.
- Roodenburg, M-C.** 1984, 'Delftse pottenbakkerijen in de zeventiende eeuw; een archivalisch onderzoek naar pottenbakkers en hun nering in de periode 1575 tot 1700' *Jaarboek voor de geschiedenis van bedrijf en techniek* 1, 105-122.
- Roodenburg, M-C.** 1986, 'Produktiewijze en produktie-omvang van grof aardewerk voor huishoudelijk gebruikgedurende de zeventiende eeuw in Delft' *ibid.* 3, 63-75.

Michiel Bartels

L. Blackmore and A. Vince, *Medieval Pottery from South-East England found in the Bryggen Excavations 1955-68*, The Bryggen Papers Supplementary Series, No. 5, 1994. 320 pp. ISBN 82 00 21670 5. University of Bergen, Scandinavian University Press.

The report on the imported wares from south-east England found in the excavations at Bryggen, Bergen, accounts for well over 50% of this particular volume (pp. 1-159, 4 pls., 2 diags., 30 figs.); the remaining papers are reports on French medieval ceramics, dog bones, and the 'cellar' buildings and privies at Bryggen.

It is the intention of this review to concentrate on the study of the London area pottery, but first I wish to comment briefly on the Bryggen Papers as the means of publishing the results of the excavations carried out at Bryggen, Bergen, between 1955 and 1968. These papers are not as well known or well publicised as they ought to be. As a subscriber to the Supplementary Series (signed up many years ago!), I am sent the volumes as they are published, but otherwise I have seen very little advertising their existence. They are available, however, from Oxbow Books, Oxford.

Given the duration and size of the excavations at Bryggen and the incredible amount of information and material they have yielded, it was decided to publish the results in a series of scholarly papers - a Main Series and a Supplementary Series. The Main Series carries the longer excavation reports, the many building details, and particular aspects of the material culture to which an entire volume has been devoted. The Supplementary Series covers shorter studies on central subjects, preliminary results and to some extent also, studies on related themes. This approach is not wholly consistent. For example, Volume 4 of the Main Series is a study of the footwear from the Gullskoen area of Bryggen, while Lüdtkke's report on Pingsdorf Ware appears in the Supplementary Series, where it is titled 'The Bryggen

Pottery 1'. This might indicate that the London-type wares should have appeared in a single volume as 'The Bryggen Pottery 2', which they have not.

In dealing with the south-east English material, Blackmore and Vince set out their paper under four main headings: the background to the study, the analysis of the material, the Bryggen pottery in the wider context and the conclusions drawn from the study.

In their introduction, the complexities of the site stratigraphy are dealt with clearly and succinctly, providing a very useful account of the Bryggen excavations in the context of the development of urban archaeology in Norway, including the recording systems used and the site chronology which was developed. The complexities of the background can best be understood if one remembers that the excavation began in 1955 when recording systems were in a relatively early stage of development. The site chronology is further complicated by its dependence on dating both by a mixture of dendrochronology and radiocarbon dating, and by relating fire layers to historically documented fires.

In general terms, the study of the pottery from Bryggen is an important exercise for a number of reasons. Firstly, we are dealing solely with imported pottery - there being no indigenous contemporaneous ceramic production. Secondly, there is the possibility of a reliable chronology; and thirdly, as Lüdtkke (1989) states in his study of the Pingsdorf ware, 'captured in the fire layers is the complete household inventory at the moment of catastrophe'.

Important though this report on the London-area pottery is, it must be seen in the context of the medieval ceramics from the site as a whole. The Bryggen excavations yielded between 150,000 and 160,000 sherds of pottery ranging in date from the 11th to the 20th centuries. The quantitative distribution of the various wares is highlighted by the number of storage trays (45 x 100cm) they take up. Of some 865 trays, identified English pottery takes up 241 trays, almost equal to the total amount of German pottery, which fills 243 trays. The largest group of English pottery is Grimston ware - 115 trays, Scarborough ware fills 48 trays and Humber-type wares, 22 trays. Shelly-Sandy ware and London-type wares occupy only 16 and 12 trays respectively. Why, then, as quantitatively they account for such a small percentage of the English wares present, were the London-area wares published first? It was decided to do this as the pottery from a number of sites in the City of London had recently been examined in detail and a ceramic sequence formed which it was hoped would help refine the Bryggen chronology. Blackmore and Vince maintain that their study of the London-area pottery confirms the chronology of the fire levels originally proposed for the site and the pottery has been remarkably useful for elucidating the early development of the site. It has also been valuable for testing the absolute dating of the sequence of development. This is surely good news for future studies of the other classes of ware and for those of us dealing with the same wares on our own sites.

Lifting the study above a mere descriptive process of London-type ware occurring in Bryggen, Part 3 of the report examines the pottery in the wider context of Bergen and Norway generally and intelligently examines its role as an indicator of trade.

So far, with the publication of this report and the earlier work on the Pingsdorf ware, the site is living up to expectations, although the evidence is not as clear-cut as might have been hoped. There is a long way to go, however, as what has been published to date accounts for a mere 6% of the total amount of pottery yielded. I eagerly await publication of the remaining pottery, but meantime congratulate Blackmore and Vince for this excellent report.