

Section F: Artefact Analysis

By Eleanor Conlin Casella and Specialist Authors (as indicated)

F.1: Artefact Management

As part of the Alderley Sandhills Project, three types of laboratory processing were conducted on artefactual materials recovered during excavations. All artefactual materials underwent field management procedures during the excavation seasons. After being transported to the large object stores at the Manchester Museum, artefacts were processed through the from the archaeological laboratory facility at the University of Manchester. From October 2003 through June 2004, the ASP Collection was cleaned, identified and catalogued by fabric. Finally, a sample of the Collection underwent specialized identification and analysis through ARCUS at the University of Sheffield. This section will now outline the methods and procedures developed for non-specialist artefact management and laboratory processing. Detailed reports of the specialist analysis and interpretation of assemblages from the ASP Collection are also presented within this report.

F.1.1: On-Site Field Management

During the excavation season, field crews conducted primary cleaning, identification and stabilization of artefacts through an on-site Field Laboratory. Cultural materials and soil samples were identified by excavation area, trench number, and context number. For the vast majority of recovered artefacts, depositional circumstances suggested that a Lot Provenience was the most appropriate scale of spatial location information to be collected. As discussed in previous sections, the oral history and material evidence of site formation processes indicated that the primary occupation related deposits had been heavily disturbed and intermixed with structural debris during the demolition and recycling activities that occurred after 1950. The specific 3-dimensional location of each artefact was therefore not immediately related to social use of the site; that microscale spatial information had been obscured by later demolition activities. Thus, artefacts were spatially provenienced as a group, and linked to their stratigraphic context. Each lot was assigned a unique Lot Number, which corresponded to the Trench, Context and Unit of origin. Three-dimensional point provenience data was also taken for "Special Finds," or those objects determined to be diagnostic, photogenic, valuable, particularly fragile, or otherwise unusual. These objects were issued a unique Special Find number and boxed separately for ease of identification during post-excavation specialist analysis. The artefacts from fully excavated (or "closed") Lots were washed on site, and bagged by fabric type. By the end of the excavation season in September 2003, approximately 30% of the Collection had been washed and sorted.

F.1.2: Identification and Cataloguing of Finds

The 70% of recovered artefacts which had not been processed on site were subsequently washed and sorted at the Archaeology Laboratory at the University of Manchester between October 2003 and January 2004. The collection was then sorted by fabric types: ceramic (subdivided into earthenware, stoneware, porcelain, and terracotta), glass (subdivided by colour), metals (subdivided into aluminium, copper-alloy, ferrous, lead, silver, and composite), bone and shell, seed, wood, building materials, coal and charcoal, leather and rubber, and plastic.

Originally consisting of 1385 bags of Lot provenienced finds, and 370 Special Finds, the Alderley Sandhills Project Collection proved similar to other Industrial Era sites in terms of the amount of cultural materials recovered. The sheer quantity of these materials prevented analysis of the entire Collection within the timeline required by the Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund. Thus, a sampling strategy was developed in consultation with the ARCUS specialists and the English Heritage Project Officer to ensure that the materials chosen for post-excavation analysis would provide representative results.

All Special Finds (SF), regardless of stratigraphic context, were selected for specialist analysis. In addition, Lot provenienced artefacts within the Collection were sampled for specialist analysis, and delivered to ARCUS at the University of Sheffield. The sampling strategy developed for each Area reflected the primary research questions under examination:

Area A: The Lot provenienced artefacts from Area A which were not sent for specialist analysis included artefacts from topsoil deposits ([1000] – [1003] & [1005]). Artefacts from these layers were not from their original cultural depositions and had been deposited in these layers through rabbit activity, erosion and other natural factors. The first stratigraphic deposit was context [1004], the large second demolition layer. As noted previously in Section E, [1004] lay across all units of Area A, and contained an impressive quantity of household-related materials abandoned before demolition of the cottage. Because of the quantities of artefacts recovered from this large deposit, [1004] was sampled for post-excavation analysis. Unit 1 of Area A was selected as a representative sample because this specific trench unit had exposed the greatest extent of the cottage interior. Additionally, preliminary processing of the collection during excavation had documented an unusually large assemblage of decorative ceramic figurines recovered from this Unit, determined by the ARCUS specialists to be worthy of more detailed identification and analysis. All artefacts from the other (smaller) Area A depositional contexts ([1012], [1013], [1035]) were also sent for specialist analysis.

Area B: Topsoil layers from Area B ([2000] – [2003], [2016], [2017], [2051], [2052], [2055] – [2057]) were not sent for specialist analysis. Because the most important research question for this Area was to date the structure and determine the functions of the rooms, the Lot provenienced artefacts from all other depositional layers were sent for specialist analysis.

Area C: The nature and date of cultural activities in Area C was unclear, and the limited amount of artefacts recovered suggested the area had not been used for dumping of household rubbish. To enable a better interpretation of this trench, all artefacts from Area C were sent off for specialist analysis.

Area D: In contrast to Area C, this Area was easily identified as a dump during excavations. However the nature, associations and date of this dumping event remained unclear. Therefore, artefacts from the dumping contexts ([4002] & [4003]) were identified as particularly worthy of specialist analysis. The large quantity of artefacts from these two contexts necessitated the adoption of a sampling strategy. The northern half of the trench had been disturbed by vandals during excavation. Therefore, Unit 3 was chosen as the most representative sample of contexts [4002] and [4003] because it had been least contaminated by the illegal disturbance. Lot

provenienced artefacts from all other depositional contexts ([4004], [4006], [4007] and [4008]) were sent for specialist analysis in order to aid in dating and characterising the dump.

Those remaining Lot provenienced materials not selected for specialist analysis were catalogued and sorted for discard. Diagnostic and representative artefacts from this unanalyzed sample were retained, packed, and transported to the Manchester Museum for permanent curation. Laboratory processing took place between January and June 2004.

F.3: Specialist Analysis

The artefacts chosen for specialist analysis were divided in to eleven artefact types: ceramics, glass, metals, building materials, tobacco pipes, coins, animal bone, plastics and rubber, textiles and leather, fuel and floor coverings. These were transported to ARCUS (University of Sheffield) for analysis in December 2003 and January 2004. The following sections constitute the reports on the specialist analyses for each fabric type.

F.3.1: Ceramics

By Chris Cumberpatch, ARCUS, University of Sheffield

Introduction

The pottery assemblage was sorted and recorded by area and context and the results tabulated using MS-EXCEL. Appendix F.1 and F.2 (Tables 1 to 14) are a core element of the report and should be read in conjunction with it. The assemblage examined consisted of a total of 6,695 pottery sherds and fragments of other ceramic material (excluding ceramic building material) from the four excavated areas. This represented a sample of the total assemblage, selected according to the criteria set out in the excavation report (see Section F.2). Material not selected for full examination was briefly examined at Manchester Museum and a small number of individual items were extracted on the basis of their intrinsic interest. Details of these have been included in the report.

The pottery assemblage included domestic vessels (table wares and utilitarian wares) and ceramic objects (dolls, figurines, ornaments, ceramic components, bottle stoppers etc) but excluded ceramic building materials (including wall tiles and sewer pipes) and clay tobacco pipes which are the subject of separate reports (internal references). Appendix F.2: Table 1 summarises the total numbers of vessel sherds from the four excavated areas. The data pertaining to pottery vessels are summarised in detail in Appendix F.2: Tables 2 – 5 and 10 to 13 while ornaments, personal items and other objects are summarised in Appendix F.2: Tables 6 - 9. Wall tiles and sewer pipes have been included in the report on the ceramic building materials with summary tables pertaining to items found amongst the pottery are included in Appendix F.2: Table 11 and Table 12.

Type series

The pottery was classified in accordance with the generally accepted scheme of wares and types developed by collectors and archaeologists. The following notes

are not intended to be an exhaustive account of each type but rather to present salient details relevant to the case of the Alderley Sandhills site.

Brown Glazed Coarseware, Brown Glazed Fineware and other glazed coarsewares

Brown Glazed Coarseware, generally the commonest utilitarian earthenware found on sites dating to between the later 17th and early 20th century, was relatively rare at Alderley Sandhills, occurring in moderate quantities only in Area B. The product of a large number of 'country potteries', Brown Glazed Coarsewares occur in a wide variety of red and orange fabrics which presumably indicate differences between potteries and changes in patterns of raw material procurement over time. To date little archaeological attention has been focussed on these wares and no fabric series or typological scheme exists for the Alderley area. Observable variations in the fabrics have been noted where appropriate in the tables, but, in the absence of a body of comparable material, no attempt has been made to devise a comprehensive fabric series. Generally the ware has an orange to red fabric, the latter sometimes with pale streaks in cross-section. Inclusions are sparse and any programme to investigate the production and circulation of these wares would depend heavily upon chemical analysis. The range of vessels types from Alderley Sandhills is, as might be expected, limited with pancheons and jars predominating although it is clear from excavations on industrial sites in Sheffield that a variety of special purpose vessels were also manufactured in the ware (e.g. Cumberpatch 2002) and there may be some overlap with the production of horticultural wares (Cumberpatch 2003c).

The term Brown Glazed Fineware has been used to refer to vessels which, while they have similar fabrics and glazed finishes to those of the coarsewares, appear in forms which more closely resemble tablewares (plates, small jugs and jars) than they do the larger pancheons and storage jars which are the more typical products of this industry.

Related to Brown Glazed Coarseware are the very similar Black Glazed Coarseware which has a black glaze on a similar oxidised red body and Redware which has a clear glaze on an orange or red body giving a distinctive bright red finish. Redwares often formed the basis for slipwares and when decorated with trailed white slip they are classified as Type 1 slipware (Cumberpatch in prep. 1), although this was rare at Alderley Sandhills. The Brown Glazed Coarseware tradition continues into the 20th century (Late Redware), the later wares being characterised by much finer, harder and denser fabrics and hard, thin glaze.

A common counterpart to Brown Glazed Coarseware is Yellow Glazed Coarseware which is generally found in a more restricted range of vessels (principally pancheons) and in slightly smaller quantities. The fabrics and manufacturing techniques are similar to those employed in the manufacture of the Brown Glazed wares, although a coat of slip internally is normally required to produce the distinctive yellow internal surface (underneath clear glaze). The quantities of Yellow Glazed Coarseware from Alderley Sandhills were unusually small and it was present in Area B only.

Late Blackware

Late Blackware represents an 18th century development of the better known 17th century Blackware type which itself is a typological variant on the earlier Cistercian wares (Cumberpatch 2003a). The relationship to the earlier types is somewhat remote, vessel forms having undergone considerable change, but the hard, fine dark red fabric is very similar to that of the earlier wares and the black glaze remains a

prominent characteristic. The 18th century vessels are generally characterised by being completely glazed internally, but with an unglazed area on the base and immediately above. The vessels are normally hollow wares and flatwares are rare although a small number of wheel-thrown plates were present at Alderley Sandhills (e.g. Area B/3, context [2088]). The term Late Coarse Blackware has been used to refer to a small number of vessels with a similar pattern of glazing on a coarser body.

Manganese Mottled ware

Manganese Mottled wares (also known as Mottled wares) constitute an important component of the majority of 18th century ceramic assemblages. They are characterised by their distinctive honey-coloured glaze with darker streaking, normally on a pale buff body containing fine inclusions. Vessel forms typically include mugs and other kitchen and tablewares. Relatively small amounts of this ware were present at Alderley Sandhills, possibly because production was in decline by the later 18th century, but perhaps also because the role of tablewares was taken by the Creamwares and Pearlwares.

Slipware

Combed and trailed slipwares of later 17th and 18th century type were, like the Mottled wares, relatively rare and many of the sherds were small in size and showed signs of having been subject to considerable mechanical abrasion. This having been said, slipwares, notably press-moulded plates and a small number of pancheons as well as hollow wares, were present in the earlier phases of the site and would seem to have been in use at the same time as the more formal tablewares. They appear to have been less significant as tablewares than the more fashionable Creamwares and Pearlwares, an observation which also applies to the Mottled wares and finer Brown Salt Glazed Stonewares.

The term Slipware has also been applied to a distinctive type of pottery which is characterised by having a buff body covered with a dark red slip (usually internally) and a transparent glaze, sometimes streaky and resembling a dark version of Mottled ware. This distinctive ware, which is probably of local origin, was often used for wheel-thrown plates which are unglazed externally (sometimes with irregular patches of glaze) and with the dark slip and glaze applied internally. The date range of this type is uncertain, but on the technological and stylistic grounds it probably belongs to the 18th and early 19th centuries. Similar wheel-thrown plates were certainly being manufactured at Silkstone in South Yorkshire between 1754 and 1802, although here the mottled glaze was applied directly onto the body without a layer of slip (Cumberpatch, in press).

Later types of slip decorated wares (Factory Produced Slipwares) are discussed below.

Brown Salt Glazed Stoneware

While White Salt Glazed Stonewares (described below) were produced principally for the table, Brown Salt Glazed Stonewares occur in a wider range of forms which include cooking, storage and transport vessels as well as various types of tableware. Mugs and tankards are a common component of 18th century groups, together with large and small jugs (Ford, unpublished; Jennings 1981). The range of such vessels is similar to that seen in the Manganese Mottled wares, the distinction from the White Salt Glazed Stonewares being that the latter were made in forms (and services) more suitable for formal table settings.

The brown colour comes from an iron wash into which the leather hard vessels were dipped at the leather hard stage, prior to firing. Brown Salt Glazed Stonewares were manufactured widely across the Midlands from Staffordshire to the Chesterfield, Derby, Nottingham area, as well as in London. Production appears to have begun in Staffordshire in the latter years of the 17th century and continued alongside White Salt Glazed Stoneware during the 18th century. From the later 18th century and throughout the 19th century production of domestic tablewares and drinking vessels appears to have ceased in favour of utilitarian, storage and transport vessels (Ford, unpublished), a characteristic which can be seen in the Alderley Sandhills assemblage where tankards and mugs are relatively rare in comparison with larger bowls and jars. Amongst the utilitarian vessels a notable (although not particularly rare) find was a stoneware bottle stamped with the manufacturer's name, identifying the vessel as a product of the Bourne Pottery, Derbyshire (described in detail below).

Tin Glazed Earthenware

Often known as 'Delft ware', Tin Glazed Earthenware represents an attempt to reproduce white porcelain using traditional European earthenware technology with the addition of a glaze containing tin, an opacifying agent giving the characteristic white or blue-white finish. Produced in both England and the Netherlands in the 17th and 18th centuries, Tin Glazed Earthenware occurs in a wide variety of forms (including plates, bottles, jars and ointment pots) and is often decorated with hand painted designs, typically in blue. A very small number of sherds (all from flatwares, so far as could be determined) were recovered from Alderley Sandhills (e.g. contexts [2088] and [2114]) and it seems likely that this reflects the later 18th century date of the earliest deposits excavated.

White Salt Glazed Stoneware

White Salt Glazed Stoneware was the most significant home-produced refined earthenware manufactured between c.1730 and c.1770 and rapidly supplanted Tin Glazed Earthenware as the dominant ceramic tableware (Barker, unpublished 1). The use of ball clay, combined with calcined flint allowed firing to a temperature of c.1260 degrees centigrade during which process salt was introduced into the firing chamber. At a high temperature salt volatilizes and the chemical reaction between the sodium and the silica in the clay body results in a hard, thin vitreous coating and waste hydrochloric acid gas, the latter released from the kiln through the chimney (Barker, unpublished 1).

White Salt Glazed Stoneware was ideal for the manufacture of tablewares as it was suitable for both moulding and throwing and extremely fine forms could be produced. It was thus considerably lighter in form than the Tin Glazed Earthenwares, extremely resistant to staining and discolouration and highly durable (although brittle). It was also cheaper and simpler to produce than porcelain and thus far more widely available to the emergent middle class of the 18th century who sought such sophisticated wares as part of the pursuit of civilized behaviour (Kowaleski-Wallace 1997, Richards 1999).

The popularity of White Salt Glazed Stoneware appears to have begun to wane in the 1760s as competition with lead glazed Creamwares intensified, but production appears to have continued in Staffordshire until the 1780s and probably the 1790s (Barker unpublished 1). Production at the Swinton pottery in South Yorkshire seems to have ceased around 1775, to be replaced by the manufacture of Creamwares

(Cox and Cox 2001: 31) and the small quantities of the ware amongst the Alderley Sandhills assemblage is one of the indicators of a later 18th century date for the assemblage from Area B (discussed below).

Creamware

Creamware, a twice-fired earthenware made from ball clay with flint, also known as Queensware, was manufactured from the 1740s and became increasingly common during the 1760s to 1780s although it remained in production into the first decades of the 19th century (Barker, unpublished 2). Production was extremely widespread and the attribution of individual items to specific potteries is virtually impossible, especially when dealing with assemblages as shattered and fragmented as that from Area B at Alderley Sandhills. The range of vessel forms was extremely wide and included not only cream coloured tablewares (the commonest type recovered from Alderley Sandhills), but also a variety of moulded decorative wares and underglaze painted wares. A number of such vessels were recovered from Area B (Figures F.63, F.72 & F.73). Creamware were also includes a range of moulded wares decorated with coloured glazes and ascribed descriptive names such as 'cauliflower ware', 'pineapple ware' and similar, depending upon the form produced (Barker, unpublished 2). A number of small fragments of such vessels were noted, although in no case could the exact form be determined (e.g. contexts [2073], [2086], [2114] and [2134]; Figure F.16). It may be important to note that all of these contexts appeared to the rear southern exterior of the southern Hagg Cottage, in the area that contained remains of the modified brick entrance feature.

Pearlware

Pearlwares have been described by Barker (unpublished 3) as lead glaze, twice-fired earthenwares made of a mixture of ball clay, Cornish china clay and flint. They are distinguished by the blue-grey tint in the glaze, produced by the addition of small quantities of cobalt and copper. Production was well established in Staffordshire by the time of the first dated pieces (1775) and they became the dominant type during the 1790s until they were superseded by Whitewares during the 1830s. The term covers a wide variety of decorated wares which include the majority of the Edged wares (distinguished by their moulded 'feather' edges and blue or pale green paint) noted from Alderley Sandhills and a considerable proportion of the transfer printed wares. The latter have been distinguished in the tables as 'Transfer Printed Pearlware'. A small number of sherds of Pearlware decorated with underglaze paint were also identified (Figures F.64, F.65, F.70 & F.71).

Whiteware

Whiteware is a rather broad term used in this report to cover all refined earthenwares of 19th and early 20th century date (Barker, unpublished 4). The distinction between early Whitewares and later Pearlwares can be difficult to determine as the latter became whiter in the later years of production and Whitewares may sometimes have a bluish tint to the glaze as a result of the leaching of colour from the transfer printed designs. This ambiguity is reflected in the cases in which a question mark in the tables indicates uncertainty about the precise attribution. The range of vessel types and forms is extremely wide and includes both tablewares and utilitarian wares, including kitchenwares. Decorated wares are mainly transfer printed (Transfer Printed Whiteware) but some later (20th century) examples bear silver and gold overglaze decoration similar to that seen on the porcelain / bone china sherds. A slightly earlier decorated variant of Whiteware, Sponged ware, occurs across the site but in

very small quantities (contexts [2044], [2076] and [2040]), probably an effect of the general absence of material dating to the middle part of the 19th century.

Transfer Printed wares

Both Pearlwares and Whitewares bear underglaze transfer printed designs, typically in blue, but also occasionally in black and sepia. Where possible the design has been identified by name in the tables, but the degree of fragmentation of the assemblage was so great that in many cases only a small part of the design was present and the design was unidentifiable. Where this is the case, no name has been ascribed, but a description of the fragment has been provided.

The range of designs identified amongst the assemblage was not wide and the majority are those which were generally the commonest and most popular, specifically Willow, Asiatic Pheasants and Two Temples. These designs enjoyed long periods of popularity and are unreliable as indicators of the date of individual pieces. They were also shared widely amongst potteries throughout Britain and attempts to attribute particular details to specific potteries have not generally been successful (Copeland 1999, Coysh and Henrywood 1982, 1989). Later designs are harder to identify, being mainly variations on floral and vegetation motifs.

Mocha ware

Mocha ware, a common find on sites of 19th century date, was unusually rare at Alderley Sandhills. The distinctive design consists of tree-like designs produced by touching a brush loaded with an acidic solution onto a band of wet, coloured slip, producing a highly distinctive dendritic fan on a coloured background (Rickard 1993, Sussman 1997). Although distinctive, the type has a broad chronological range (c.1790 – 1895) and was produced at potteries throughout Britain, as well as on the continent. Its presence at Alderley Sandhills is thus unsurprising and its relative rarity probably relates to the apparent lack of material from the middle decades of the 19th century, in contrast with the principal periods of deposition in the later 18th to early 19th and the early 20th centuries (as discussed below). Examples include the sherd from context [2027] which appears to be an early example (on a Creamware type body) and later sherds from contexts [1035] and [2163].

Factory produced slipware, Slip Banded ware and other Banded wares

A variety of types of factory-produced slip decorated wares were identified amongst the assemblage. These included inlaid slipware and slip banded wares in various colours, blue being the commonest. According to Barker (unpublished 5), slip decoration first appears on refined earthenwares (Creamware and Pearlware) around 1775 and later (1830 – 1840) on Yellow (or Cane Coloured) wares and on Whitewares. Cheap and relatively easy to produce, Slipwares were amongst the cheapest decorated wares and are common on a wide variety of sites, both urban and rural. As indicated in the tables, dating is somewhat difficult although the characteristic carinated or 'London shaped' bowls (e.g. contexts [1035], and [3002]) date to post-1815, the globular bowls being somewhat earlier.

The commonest form of slip decoration, simple lines and bands of varying thickness and colour, is of little use for dating, being found from c.1797 to 1890 and on into the 20th century (Barker unpublished 5). Such decoration occurs on sherds from Areas A, B and C (e.g. contexts [1004], [2024] and [3002]) but was absent from Area D.

Inlaid slip decoration, made by cutting a pattern into the leather-hard body of the vessel, applying a slip coating and removing the slip with a lathe, leaving the hollow pattern filled with coloured slip, dates to between the 1790s and the 1830s – 1840s (Barker, unpublished 5). Examples were not uncommon at Alderley Sandhills, although only in Area B and are a further indication of the later 18th to early 19th century date of this group of material. Patterns were generally simple and include curving lines and checkerboard motifs (e.g. contexts [2006], [2010] and [2024]). These patterns are sometimes found combined with broader applied bands (e.g. context [2076]).

Marbled slipware consists of variously coloured slips applied on a slipped body and then disturbed with a stylus or comb to produce a marbled effect. Only a small number of sherds were identified with this type of decoration (contexts [1035], [2010] and [2073]) and at least two of these appeared to be from teapots.

Cane Coloured ware

The term Cane Coloured ware has been applied to sherds with a yellowish-buff body and clear glaze, the latter emphasising the distinctive colour. Although sometimes known as Yellow ware (Barker, unpublished 7), this term has been avoided to distinguish the type from the 16th and 17th century Yellow wares. As Barker has noted, these wares are best known for having been manufactured at Thomas Sharpe's factory at Swadlincote in Derbyshire, but they were also made far more widely and by the 19th century were a common kitchen ware with forms including bowls of various sizes, dishes, jugs and jars. Decoration included slipped lines and bands in blue, brown and white. Mocha decoration is also found on Cane Coloured wares as, for example on the sherd from context [2020]. Quantities of this type of ware were relatively sparse at Alderley Sandhills, but it would seem that this was largely a result of the absence of a mid to late 19th century phase within the ceramic assemblage rather than a genuine absence of this widespread and popular ware.

Stoneware

The unqualified term 'Stoneware' has been used to refer to later 19th and 20th century stoneware vessels, including flagons, bottles, plain jars and jam jars (many of which were represented by body sherds which cannot be assigned to specific vessel types). Such sherds are a common find on sites of this date. Details of individual vessels have been included in the appropriate tables.

Horticultural wares (unglazed red earthenwares)

A small number of flowerpots were noted in Areas A, B and D. All of these appeared to be standard flowerpots with none of the variation recorded by Currie (1993). There was no indication of the origin of these vessels and with the exception of one which appeared to have been coated with red slip and a second with an internal flange and a hole pierced in the wall (context [2044]), all appeared to be standard plain flowerpots.

Porcelain

The term 'porcelain' has been used somewhat loosely in this report to describe bodies with a vitrified translucent, 'crystalline' appearance and includes sherds of bone china (notably two sherds which bear marks indicating that they were 'Guaranteed Bone China'). No sherds of imported Chinese porcelain were identified and there were no examples of early English or European hard or soft paste porcelains. The wares referred to by the term in this report are generally of a very

late date (early to mid-20th century) and often bear over-glaze gold and silver lustre designs (normally thin parallel lines and bands). Cups, saucers, plates and mugs are the commonest vessel forms and it is clear that this was the preferred type of tableware in the latter stages of the occupation of the site.

Other wares

A wide variety of other wares occurred in small quantities across the site and it is appropriate to give brief details of these.

Only one sherd of Yellow ware was noted (context [2125]), the base of a small jar, most probably of later 17th or early 18th century date. This was probably contemporary with the sherds of Blackware type from context [2114].

Sherds from two or three teapots in Black Basalt or Basaltes ware were present in contexts [2024], [2027], [2027] and [2028], the latter consisting of joining sherds from the two contexts indicated. Black Basalt ware was developed by Josiah Wedgwood around 1767 from an earlier type of black ware known as Egyptian Black (Mankowitz 1966, Godden 1966). Traditionally iron oxide had been used to obtain the black colour, but Wedgwood improved the colour and texture by adding manganese and employing a finer clay body to produce a ware of superior quality. Initially used for busts and intaglios, the black body was later used to manufacture black tablewares, including teapots of the type found at Alderley. Like many such innovations, Wedgwood's distinctive ware was copied by other manufacturers and it is not possible to attribute the teapots from Alderley to any particular manufacturer.

The only vessel definitely attributable to the Wedgwood factory is the Jasper ware lidded jar from context [1004], described below and shown in Figure F.25. Although the origins of Jasper ware lie in the 18th century (Godden 1966: xx), this example dates to the early 20th century, as indicated by the stamped makers mark on the base.

The term Colour Glazed ware has been applied to wares with buff or similarly light coloured body and dark coloured glaze, often very shiny. Similarly coloured wares in which a coloured body has been used to achieve a similar effect have been classified as Blue and Brown Bodied wares. These wares appear to be late in date and include a number of vessels which are clearly associated with the latest phases of activity on the site. Teapots are a particularly common form.

The term Encrusted ware has been applied to items, which have been decorated by applying crumbs of dried clay to a slip-coated surface. Although known to have been applied to vessels (Barker, unpublished 6) the examples from Alderley Sandhills are all ornaments (Appendix F.2: Table 6, Figures F.32 & F.48) of early to mid 20th century date.

The term Lustre ware has been applied to a small number of vessels from Areas A and B. In the case of Area A (context [1004]) a teapot of later 19th or early 20th century date with a brown, metallic lustre finish was the only vessel identified although a many of the later tablewares bore single or multiple over-glaze lustre lines and thin bands as a decorative motif and on one elaborately decorated jug lustre decoration was used in combination with other colours (Figure F.56). In Area B (context [2076]) two small sherds with a lustre finish were noted, also from a late context.

A number of sherds are recorded in the tables as Unidentified. These sherds were generally heavily burnt and discoloured. In a number of cases it was possible to distinguish between tablewares and other types (Area B) and these are indicated as Unidentified Tableware in the tables.

Stamped and marked vessels

The problems of attributing 18th century and later pottery to specific manufacturers on the basis of the style of the vessels or their decorative designs and motifs are well known and the only reliable method is to use the manufacturers marks applied to the underside of vessels. A number of such marks were found on sherds from Alderley Sandhills and these are discussed in this section. The marks have been divided into two groups; maker's marks and stamps and decorative marks and stamps. The former are more numerous and informative for the purposes of dating but the latter are perhaps more informative when aspects of consumption are considered.

1) *Maker's marks and stamps*

Context [1001] A/2:

Brown Salt Glazed Stoneware bottle from the Bourne Pottery, Derbyshire (Fig F.40). The text is as follows (* = missing or illegible letter):

NDY AND CODNO ???* POTTERY
DERBY****E
VITREOUS STONE BOTTLE
J. BOURNE
PATENTEE
GUARANTEED NOT TO ABSORB

According to Godden (1991), the Bourne pottery of Denby in Derbyshire was established in 1809 and employed a variety of marks in subsequent years. Joseph Bourne ran the pottery between 1833 and 1860 and stamps including the place name 'Codnor Park' relate to the period between 1833 and 1861, but from 1850 ' & Son' was added to the Bourne name. It would seem, therefore, that the bottle dates to between 1833 and 1850. These bottles are widespread and examples are known from sites in Durham and Newcastle (Cumberpatch 2003d, 2003e).

Context [1001] A/ and [1004] A/1:

Two Whiteware servers or tureens with moulded ring foot bases decorated with dark blue transfer printed designs showing butterflies and leaf and flower designs. Both have transfer printed marks on the underside which, although relating to the same retailer and maker, differ in their details (Figures F.19 and F.44). The vessel shown in Figure F.19 bears the following words, associated with a symbol apparently based on the rod of Aesculapius:

Mortlock
Oxford Street
AD 1746
WORCESTER

ENGLAND

The second vessel (Fig. F.44) has a similar mark, but without the attribution to Worcester. This vessel also bears two stamped numbers '10' and '03'

John Mortlock was one of the leading later 18th and 19th century pottery retailers, the firm being founded in 1746 and closing in 1930. The firm were associated with a number of manufacturers, some of whom were named on certain marks. In this case the manufacturer cannot be identified with any certainty. The identification of England as the origin of the vessels indicates that the vessels date to after 1891.

Context [1001] A/4:

A plate with a recessed base bearing the Asiatic Pheasants design internally and part of the makers mark on the underside (not illustrated). The mark follows the conventional pattern with a floral scroll surround, but only part of the manufacturers name survives; 'T.C. ...' or 'T.G. ...'. If the latter reading is correct, then the mark suggests that the manufacturer was T.G. Booth of Tunstall, Staffordshire, a firm known to have used the design prior to 1880 (Coysh and Henrywood 1982:29). The Asiatic Pheasant design, of which a number of examples were amongst the tablewares from Alderley Sandhills, was one of the most popular transfer printed designs of the latter half of the 19th century and continued to be manufactured into the Edwardian period. This long-lived popularity makes the dating of individual pieces difficult, particularly where the maker's mark is fragmentary or absent. Figure F.7 shows part of a makers mark from a second plate (context [2001] B/5) with the name 'Booth' surviving which may have come from the same factory (although Booth appears to have been a common name in the Staffordshire potteries).

Context [1004] A/1:

A Jasper ware lidded jar with a series of classical tableaux around the body, separated by individual trees and wreaths. The tableaux consist of groups of two and three female figures with small winged cherubs at their feet (Figure F.25). The underside of the jar is stamped 'WEDGEWOOD / MADE IN ENGLAND'. Jasper ware originates in the later years of the 18th century, but the addition of the 'Made in England' stamp would appear to date the vessel to the early 20th century.

Context [1004] A/1:

Porcelain type whiteware cup with a printed mark on the underside of the base consisting of a sheaf of wheat symbol and the words: 'CWS WINDSOR CHINA' (Figure F.29).

The Co-operative Wholesale Society (established in Manchester in 1863) appears to have employed the Windsor Pottery, Longton as a supplier from 1911 (Godden 1991:170) and a variety of marks included the Windsor name, although the precise date of the sheaf of wheat motif remains to be established.

Context [1004] A/1:

A large bowl, part of a jug and basin washing set (Figures F.36a & F.36b), with a red transfer printed design of roses internally and the words 'IVORY' and '...BODLEY' on the foot. The jug has a moulded profile with broad pink bands and bands of gold over over-glaze printed flowers. A number of firms with the name Bodley are known to have been active in Staffordshire in the middle and later 19th century (Godden 1991: 82-84) and without initials it is impossible to distinguish one from the others. Although the style of the set appears to be relatively late, the use of a stamped mark

in combination with the name of the pattern suggests that it dates to the final three decades of the 19th century. Other sherds from the jug and bowl set were noted in the material not examined as part of the project.

Context [1004] A/1:

The base of a small utilitarian Whiteware mixing bowl or pudding basin (not illustrated) stamped with the number '5' and the words 'BRITISH MADE' on the underside. Such bowls were available in shops until recent times.

Context [1004] A/1:

The base of an undecorated cup bearing a printed mark on the underside of the base consisting of a Royal coat of arms and the name of the maker: 'CAULDON POTTERIES Ltd. ENGLAND' with a number : 'Reg. No. 704006/7'. Cauldon Potteries Ltd was the successor to the earlier Cauldon Ltd., the name having been changed in 1920. Production under the Cauldon name continued until 1962 when the firm was taken over by Pounteney and Co. Ltd. of Bristol (Godden 1991: 133-4).

Context [1004] A/1:

A porcelain or Whiteware plate with a makers stamp on the underside (Figures F.22 & F.45) with a recumbent lion and an intertwined 'TM' logo and the words: 'ATHENS' / Made in England'.

The significance of the word 'Athens' is not clear, although it may refer to the dark blue leaf and tendril design on the inside of the plate. The maker was Thomas Morris of the Regent Works, Longton in Staffordshire, a factory that was in production from 1892 to 1941. The 'Made in England' phrase indicates that the plate is of 20th century date. The plate is one of a number of vessels which bear very similar transfer printed designs (see also Figure F.23) and were probably purchased as parts of a set of tablewares.

Context [1004] A/1:

An overglaze transfer printed Whiteware cake plate with a central vertical rod-handle (see Unwin, internal reference). The plate is highly decorated (Figure F.27) and bears a Globe symbol and the words 'OSAKA FENTON ENGLAND' and 'Made in England' on the underside. Alfred Fenton and Sons were based in Brook Street, Hanley and operated from 1887 to 1901. If this firm was the origin of this vessel, then it must have been a very late product as the phrase 'Made in England' denotes a 20th century date. This association cannot be taken as unequivocal as the globe symbol is not recorded as one associated with the Fenton pottery by Godden (1991: 245).

Context [1004] A/1:

Two vases of Whiteware type with elaborate painted and gilded decoration externally (Figures F.77a & b; F.78a & b). Both have batch numbers painted on the underside (Figure F.77: 4444 / 4642 / 150; Figure F.78: 1591 / 2233 / 153) and transfer printed crests and marks. The vessel shown in Figure F.77 has the words 'Royal', 'Bonn' and 'Germany' with a crest while Figure F.78 has the word 'Bonn' with the crest and two stamped numbers; 268 and 2. A third vase in a similar style was represented by a moulded but unmarked base. The vases are discussed in a following context focused on the ornaments and related items from the site.

Context [1012] A/2:

A transfer printed Whiteware vessel with a diamond printed mark on the underside bearing the words 'Semi China' (not illustrated). Many companies used the term or similar terms (Stone China, Semi-Porcelain) between 1810 and 1830 and a further range of similar terms, many of them vague or misleading, were in use between 1830 and 1880.

Context [2001] B/5:

A transfer printed plate with a Chinese landscape style design and part of a mark on the underside in a floral scroll cartouche (Figure F.7):

'... WARE'
'...BOOTH'

It is probable that this denotes manufacture by one of the number of potters named Booth active in Staffordshire in the 19th century (Godden 191: 85-86).

Context [2001] B/5:

A stoneware marmalade jar with a printed label 'Keiller's Dundee Marmalade' and stamped 'MALING / MADE IN ENGLAND' on the underside. The name of Maling is linked with a number of potteries in the Newcastle and Sunderland area between 1762 and 1963 (Godden 1991: 408-410) as discussed below (Context [4003] D/2).

Context [2116] B/4:

Parts of a plate with the transfer printed Asiatic Pheasants design internally and a printed makers mark on the underside in the normal floral scroll cartouche naming Adams and Co. of Tunstall as the makers (Figure F.17). The name Adams was a common one in the Staffordshire potteries (Godden 1991:19-23, Coysh and Henrywood 1982:16), but it seems likely that this mark refers to William Adams and Sons of Tunstall, a company established in 1769 and still in production in the 20th century.

Context [4002] D/3:

Whiteware plate base with a maker's mark on the underside with a rampant unicorn between the two written elements:

Made in England
[Unicorn]
H & K
TUNSTALL

The phrase made in England denotes a 20th century date and the maker was Hollinshead and Kirkham Ltd who operated the Unicorn Pottery in Burslem from c. 1870 to 1956. The mark in question dates to between 1900 and 1924 (Godden 1991: 332).

Context [4002] D/3:

Whiteware plate base with a maker's mark on the underside consisting of a rising sun motif over a partially preserved name: ... MEAKIN / ... ENGLAND. The combination of the rising sun and the name indicates that the plate was made by J & G Meakin of Hanley sometime after 1912, the date at which the rising sun was registered as a trade mark (Godden 1991:427).

Context [4003] D/2:

A small porcelain type jug marked with a crown symbol on the underside and the words: SUTHERLAND ART CHINA ENGLAND (Figure F.51b).

The origin of this mark has not been traced with any certainty, although the use of 'ENGLAND' dates it to after 1891. A Daniel Sutherland and Sons operated in Park Hall Street, Longton, Staffordshire between 1865 and 1875 and subsequently under the name Hugh Sutherland, but in neither case does Godden (1991: 604) mention marks of the type described here.

Context [4003] D/2:

Profile of a cup with a rather crudely printed Willow pattern design externally and 'MADE IN ENGLAND' on the underside (Figure F.54b). This would indicate a 20th century date for the item, but there is no indication of the maker.

Context [4003] D/2:

The base of a Whiteware plate printed on the underside: BRIDGWOOD ENGLAND (Figure F.3). The firm of Sampson Bridgwood and Son Ltd was established in Longton, Staffordshire in 1805 at the Anchor Pottery. A wide variety of marks were employed, but the name England was only added after 1891 and 'Ltd' was added after 1933, so the sherd can reasonably be suggested to originate between these two dates.

Context [4003] D/2:

The base of a Whiteware plate with a badly damaged printed mark: 'MADE ... / M.F. ... / ENGLAND'. Little can be said of this mark other than it dates to after 1891.

Context [4003] D/2:

A Whiteware plate base with part of a printed mark: '...AKIN / ...ND' and the number 391413, presumably a batch number or similar. The words most probably form part of 'Meakin / Made in England'. The name of Meakin is one shared by a number of Staffordshire pottery firms, the earliest of which was J and G Meakin of Hanley, established in 1851. In this case, the inclusion of the word 'England' indicates a post-1891 date, by which time three other Meakin potteries were in production (Alfred Meakin, Charles Meakin and Henry Meakin).

Context [4003] D/2:

Two stoneware marmalade jars with printed labels identifying the contents as Frank Cooper's Oxford Marmalade with stamped makers names on the underside 'MALING ENGLAND' (Figures F.1 & F.2). The Maling family ran a number of highly productive potteries in the north-east of England (Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Sunderland) between the mid 18th and mid 20th centuries (Godden 1991: 408-410) and their stoneware jars were used by both the Keiller and Cooper companies as containers for jam and marmalade (see also context [2001] B/5). These jars are a common find on sites of 19th and early 20th century date throughout Britain.

Context [4004] D/2:

A recessed base from a plate with a maker's mark on the underside:

WOOD & SONS
BURSLEM
ENGLAND

The mark appears to date from c. 1907 or later at which time the former ' & Son' changed to ' & Sons'.

The inside of the plate bears an unusual heraldic motif, only part of which is preserved (Figure F.82). This consists of a shield with a stylised sun rising out of the sea (indicated by wavy lines) and surmounted by a square rigged sailing ship and supported by a lion and a kangaroo. The significance of this mark has yet to be traced.

2) Decorative and other marks and stamps, including souvenirs and children's plates

A smaller number of vessels bore words and texts as part of the design. In the case of souvenir and commemorative vessels these were limited to the names of individuals or places and these are described in the following section but others bore sections of text or names identifying scenes shown on the vessel. The best example of this is the Robinson Crusoe plate from context 2044 48 & 235 B/3 (Figure F.9) but others were also present, although most were too fragmentary to be comprehensible.

Context [1001] A/1:

A plain Whiteware sherd bearing an unintelligible part of a piece of text (Figure F.50b):

'...et
... legs
... the
... ..nder
...rt'

Context [1001] A/2:

A foot ring base from a Whiteware plate or similar flatware item, with part of an unintelligible text, printed in green (Figure F.46):

'...G GOBS A
... SS THAN RIS...'

The same context ([1001] A/2) produced a second small sherd, also with a green printed text reading:

SORROWING
...E IN DEBT

The sherds would appear to be parts of the same plate (or two very similar plates) with a message that, given the reference to debt, was probably a morally uplifting one or one with a warning regarding the perils of debt.

Context [1004] A/3:

The ceramic lid of a container bearing the words: 'FREE FROM ANTHRAX / STERILIZED / BRITISH MADE'. It is unclear what the container once held, although

a veterinary product is perhaps the most likely. For safety reasons the object was not closely examined.

Context [1035] A/2:

A transfer printed body sherd (Figure F.51a) with parts of two words printed in blue: ‘...(A)VOI... / Co...’. It is unclear whether these relate to a maker or to some specific phrase, although the latter is perhaps more plausible.

Context [2006] B/2:

Two non-joining Creamware sherds with parts of a text of at least two lines: ‘...ecaus...’ and ‘...s me...’. The full text is irrecoverable and it is not even clear whether the two sherds were from the same vessel (not illustrated).

Context [2044] B/3:

A Whiteware plate with a moulded rim with a design of daisies and a transfer printed design in the centre with additional hand colouring (Figure F.9). The design shows Robinson Crusoe, identified by the name printed as part of the design. There is nothing to identify the maker of the plate, but designs, often intended for the use of children, based upon books and nursery rhymes were not uncommon in the later 18th and 19th centuries.

Ornaments, souvenirs, figurines, personal items and toys

In addition to the normal day-to-day ceramics and tablewares described above, a number of ceramic objects fell into the categories of ornamental items, toys, souvenirs and personal items. Oral history evidence from former residents of the houses and of other houses in the locality is of some considerable significance in understanding the material from Area A and this is presented and discussed elsewhere in the report (internal reference).

Souvenirs fell into two categories; those relating to national events and personalities, particularly royalty and those relating to holidays and excursions.

1) Souvenirs

Context [2001] B/4:

Part of a commemorative vessel with a moulded plaque depicting a head of Queen Victoria and the letters ‘V R’ picked out in blue (Figure F.14). The vessel was also decorated with a rilled line, emphasised by the use of blue paint (a design element often found on carinated jars and bowls) with hand painted blue loops and possible sponged decoration on the body. A later 19th century date is probable but no exact parallel has been traced.

Context [2001] B/4:

The base and body of a commemorative Whiteware mug with an overglaze transfer depicting Queen Mary and George V, although the only surviving element of the design names Mary and credits ‘W & D Downey’. The latter were successful society photographers active in the later 19th and early 20th centuries who were commissioned on a number of occasions to take studio portraits of members of the royal family. These pictures were the source for the transfer prints used to decorate commemorative mugs and other objects, the credit attached to the image

presumably indicating that the use was sanctioned by the photographers. Commemorative pottery depicting King George and Queen Mary was issued on a number of occasions including the coronation and the Silver Jubilee. It is not clear which occasion this mug commemorates, but given the period during which the Downey's were active, the coronation seems probable.

Context [1004] A/1:

Sherds from two small, matching, porcelain souvenir vessels with overglaze transfer designs depicting a seaside resort and gold detailing on the rims and handles (Figure F.62). The exact wording is unclear but includes the following elements:

'DO...GLAS',
'...MEN...'

It is possible that the first relates to the name of the town 'Douglas' on the Isle of Man, a connection which is also indicated by the find of a trivet bearing the three legs symbol of the island (see Section F.3.3 below). The significance of the second fragment is unclear although given that the two vessels seem to form a matching pair it might be expected to relate to another town, tourist attraction or site close to the first.

Contexts [2001], [2040], [2041] and [2044] B/4:

A small souvenir plate from Blackpool showing the Tower and other attractions; overglaze transfer printed on porcelain (Figure F.13). There is nothing to indicate the manufacturer, but such souvenir items were widely produced. This particular piece should be seen as essentially similar to the two small souvenir vessels shown in Figure F.62.

2) *Figurines, ornaments and personal items*

The category of figurines, ornaments and personal items overlaps with the souvenirs described above, the difference being that the items described here do not appear to relate to a particular place or event as the souvenirs do (although it is probable that, in the eyes of the former owners, they had associations over and above those which are recoverable archaeologically). The details of the figurines and ornaments and personal items are summarised in Appendix F.2: Tables 6 - 9.

Figurines, personal items and ornaments (although not dolls and toys which are described below) were found almost exclusively in Areas A and B, with some significant distinctions discernable between the two areas. The only exceptions to this rule were the figure of a bird from Area D (Figure F.55b) and part of an unidentified figurine from Area C. The bird was anomalous in every sense in that it appeared to be garden ornament rather than a household ornament and was far more crudely modelled than the remaining figurines.

The items from Area A were linked through the oral history evidence with a particular occupant of the cottage, Mrs. Lena Perrin and their survival in quantity is related to the removal of Mrs. Perrin from the site and her incarceration in an asylum (see Section C) at the end of her life. The less regular survival of such items from other parts of the site resembles the more normal archaeological situation and is presumably a result of chance breakage and disposal or casual loss.

The history of ceramic figurines is a considerable subject in its own right and one which cannot be discussed in detail here. The ornamental figurines (as opposed to toys) recovered from Alderley Sandhills are part of a tradition which appears to emerge in the later 17th and 18th centuries and is connected, technically at least, with the development of refined earthenware bodies of the type used for Creamwares, Pearlwares and related wares. The best known type is perhaps Pratt ware (Lewis and Lewis 1993) which dates to between 1780 and 1840 and the figurines from Alderley Sandhills can be linked with these wares in style and form, if not necessarily technically. Such figurines were manufactured widely and there is no indication as to the origin of the examples from Alderley Sandhills. The figurines are typical of their type in depicting archetypal figures in vaguely 18th or early 19th century dress (cf. Lewis and Lewis 1993: Chapter 16). They are shown in Figures F.47, F.48, F.69, F.74, F.75 & F.76 and listed in Appendix F.2: Table 6.

Two figurines depict groups of figures, one of which appears to be part of a matching pair. The first, from context [1004] consists of three female figures in later 18th or 19th century dress supporting a shallow receptacle painted orange inside (Figure F.76). The glazed white earthenware body appears to have been moulded in two halves (back and front) and reinforced internally with strips and rods of clay prior to the joining of the two halves. The details of the faces, hair and dress of the figures is picked out in underglaze paint and the style is that of a 'flatback' a type of ornament manufactured in extremely large numbers during the 19th century and designed for display on a shelf or mantelpiece (Hughes 1981). A small hole in the back of the piece may be to allow it to be attached to a hook on the wall. Such figures were produced very widely by numerous potteries and attribution to a particular manufacturer is impossible.

The second figurine (context [1004]) depicts two children and the trunk of a tree with the upper part elaborated to form a small dish-like receptacle (Figure F.75). Like the first figurine, this was also produced in a two-piece (front and back) mould in white earthenware. The style of painting is somewhat different with paler, pastel colours used in place of the darker, bolder colours on the first. Again, this would appear to be a cheap, mass-produced item and there is no indication of the manufacturer. Part of a third figurine, represented only by the upper part of the tree was recovered from context [1001] A/1, suggesting that the two formed a matching pair.

Parts of a fourth figurine were also recovered from contexts [1001], [1004] and [1005]. At first sight this appears to be the head of a horse (Figure F.74) and parts of the body (non-joining black and white striped sherds), but the black stripes betray it as a zebra, although with the mane of a horse. Oliver (1981) has illustrated a close parallel to this item (Oliver 1981: Figure 81) and has noted that figurines depicting exotic animals appeared in the early to mid-19th century in connection with fairs, circuses and touring wild beast shows. Potters were swift to pick up on a new source of images and, where possible, adapted existing moulded figures to show new species of animal. In the case of horse figures (a popular existing line), the simple addition of black stripes was sufficient to create a zebra, even though the long mane and harness details were, strictly speaking, incorrect. The example illustrated by Oliver dates to 1845, which is somewhat earlier than might have been expected for the context in which the Alderley Sandhills example was recovered and it is possible that this piece was inherited by Mrs Perrin, rather than having been bought by her. The same may be true of the first figurine, described above, which, stylistically, seems somewhat earlier than the domestic pottery from the same context.

Context [4002] D/1 produced a figurine in the shape of a swan (lacking a head and neck) together with parts of an unidentified decorative vessel. The swan figurine had a very faint maker's mark on the underside consisting of a Staffordshire knot containing the three initials 'A B J' within the segments with the words '& Sons' and 'England' beneath it with 'GRA ***N' above, this word being interrupted by a small hole in the flat bottom of the swan. These elements are contained within a shield surmounted by a rising sun. The mark is that of the company A.B. Jones and Sons of Longton in Staffordshire. A parallel has been published by Godden (1991: 357; 2192) and it appears to date to between 1900 and 1913.

In addition to the large earthenware figurines, a number of fragments from smaller porcelain figurines were also recovered and these appeared to be of a higher quality than were the earthenware objects.

Figure F.12 shows part of the head of a woman wearing a bonnet (context [2027] B/2), cast in a two piece (left and right sided) mould in pale grey porcelain. There was no indication that the object was ever painted.

Figure F.47 shows the head and right arm of a woman or boy wearing a bicorn hat in pale grey porcelain with long hair and cravat (context [1001] A/2). The hat appears to sit unusually high on the top of the head, possibly because the figure is depicted in the act of removing it; the hand holds the right hand point of the hat. The figurine seems to have been made in a mould, but the mould line has been removed with some care. There is no indication that the finely moulded piece was ever painted. Other fragments which may belong to figurines appear in Appendix F.2: Table 6.

In addition to the figurines a number of other decorative objects were recovered. These included two items in 'Encrusted ware' a distinctive decorative technique involving the application of crumbs of dried clay to a slipped surface prior to firing. The first object is a moulded hand holding an egg or egg-like object (part of which was missing) with the egg and the wrist encrusted with clay chips and also decorated with applied flowers (Figure F.48a). A stamped plaque on the underside of the object appears to indicate the date (Figure F.48b) according to one of two schemes used between 1842 and 1883 and, although the plaque is difficult to decipher, the following reading is suggested to be correct. The IV in the top loop indicates the class of ware. The number 10 in the top corner indicates the day of the month on which the object was manufactured and suggests that the stamp belongs to the second of the two schemes, used between 1868 and 1883. If this is the case, then the letter in the right hand corner should indicate the year of manufacture. Unfortunately this is difficult to read, but C is possible and this would indicate 1870 as the year of manufacture.

The second object (or objects as the sherds do not join to form a single item) is the lower part of a small vase or vases, the body encrusted with clay chips and with applied flowers (Figure F.32). A small fragment appears to be from a third Encrusted ware vessel, but the sherd is too small for more details to be deduced.

The line between ornaments, objects with no practical utility beyond their own existence as objects of regard (such as the figurines), and decorative utilitarian objects, which can be said to have a potential function in addition to their own form and colour is a difficult one to define precisely, given the highly decorated nature of many tablewares (notably jugs and teapots) and the fact that objects of utilitarian

form can be intended primarily as objects of display and regard (as in the case of the souvenir plates). The distinctions made in the tables should therefore be regarded as intended principally as a means of breaking the material down into descriptive categories, rather than as a set of taxonomic principles with any wider significance.

Personal items are defined as items that have a utilitarian function (unlike figurines which are considered as decorative) but which might have been used by a single member of the household rather than shared by the entire family. Very few items fell into this category (Appendix F.2: Table 8), possibly because such objects are more likely to have been removed when the houses were vacated by the occupants (either by the owner or by a close relative) and one must question why these particular items were left behind; possibly they were considered to have had no particular sentimental or personal value and may even have been actively disliked by their owners. Three items in particular fall into this category; the ring tree (Figure F.31), a small, flat lidded jar (Figure F.35) and the base of an unidentified object decorated with overglaze transfers (Figure F.38). Although all of the items were broken, all the pieces from the first two were recovered which might suggest that they were intact when abandoned. Also included in the group is the Jasper ware lidded bowl (Figure F.25). It seems more likely that this was broken before discard as the fragments were found scattered between two contexts and the lid was missing. In addition, it seems likely to have been a more expensive item than either the ring tree or the lidded jar.

The vases form a heterogeneous group which are not united by any particular style or form, with the exception of the group of at least three gold coloured vases with elaborate floral decoration (Figures F.77, F.78 & F.79). The makers mark on the underside indicates that these vessels were of German origin although they were presumably purchased locally.

Other vases included a slip decorated vessel of very distinctive form and style (Figure F.21) with an appearance bordering on the grotesque and which is quite unlike any other item in the assemblage. Of somewhat higher quality, at least in terms of its manufacture, is a red stoneware vase or similar vessel (or undetermined form as only the upper part survives) decorated with figures and heads in a combination of classical and ancient Egyptian designs (Figure F.20). The object was cast in a dark red body and was coated with a darker red slip, partly removed by abrasion. The classical figures are arranged in two tableaux one depicting three women the other (less complete) seeming to show a male figure with a staff or spear and two unidentifiable figures. A number of face masks or heads set around the circumference of the vessel are in an Egyptian style rather than Classical. No parallels for this object have been found and its date remains in doubt. Classical motifs and tableaux were popular from the 18th century onwards (Richards 1999: 204) but precisely when Egyptian motifs became popular is less clear; enormous popular interest was sparked by the discovery of the tomb of Tutankhamun in 1922 (Hillier 1999), but there is also evidence of Egyptian themes as an element in popular culture prior to this (Cumberpatch 2003b) and the date cannot be determined on the basis of the style of the object alone. Other items were too fragmentary to allow their forms to be accurately reconstructed (e.g. Figures F.68 and F.69), but all are listed and described in Appendix F.2: Table 6.

Toys

Dolls and small figurines were the single commonest type of child's toy found on the site (Appendix F.2: Table 7), but a small porcelain plate from context [2076] B/5

appeared to be a toy and it is probable that the Robinson Crusoe plate described above should be included in the category of child-related wares, but as it cannot be classed as a toy it has been included in Appendix F.2: Table 3.

Toys, like figurines, ornaments and personal items were found differentially distributed within the excavated areas. In contrast to these categories, they were recovered only from Areas B (excluding Quadrant B/1) and D (Quadrants D/1 and D/2 only). With the exception of the toy plate, all the toys were either dolls or small figurines, the latter distinguished from ornamental figurines by their relatively cruder moulding and finish.

Doll's heads were the commonest type of toy recovered (Figures F.5, F.6, F.15, F.80 & F.81) and are represented in most cases by the heads alone (although these generally included the neck and part of the upper back and shoulders). Complete bodies with moveable arms (attached by cord) were represented by only one example, although the fragmentary condition of the remainder meant that similar dolls might be represented by undiagnostic fragments. The details of the fragments are given in Appendix F.2: Table 7. Two of the heads bore stamped marks across the neck and shoulders. One of these was indecipherable but appeared to be in European (German) style lettering. The other (Figure F.81) bore the following words and numbers:

Germany
275.19/0.
oppers

although the final 's' was difficult to decipher and may be another letter. Toys from Germany were not uncommon in Britain in the 19th and early 20th centuries, a connection also indicated by the presence of the three German vases. The presence of a German coin from unstratified deposits within the site raises the possibility that one or more members of the household had visited Germany and this might be linked with the occupation of the Rhineland after the end of the First World War, but whether this was also the source of the dolls and vases (brought back as gifts) is conjectural and requires independent verification.

Aside from the dolls, toys were represented by the toy plate and, possibly by two small figurines, one with a painted blue coat (Figure F.10) and the other a rather crude white porcelain figure (Figure F.11a), although at least one of these, the figure in the blue coat, might have been part of an ornamental figurine rather than a toy. Context [2001] B/2 produced the solid porcelain body of an animal (possibly a dog) lacking a head and with holes to allow the attachment of movable legs.

3) Other ceramic items

Very few ceramic items other than those described above were recovered from the site. Those items which fall into this category are listed in Appendix F.2: Table 9 and all are (or appear to be) component parts of other objects. The bottle top (The Lively 'O'; Figure F.33) probably came from a bottle containing a carbonated beverage. In contrast the object marked 'Free from Anthrax' appeared to be the top of a container for a veterinary product. Given the potential toxicity of certain veterinary products, this was not examined closely and has not been illustrated.

Vessel types and forms

The greater part of the pottery assemblage from Alderley Sandhills consisted of tablewares and wares related to the transport and preparation of food. In this section the nature of these wares will be considered in detail. The basic data is presented in Appendix F.2: Tables 2 – 5 with the representation of vessel type by ware type given in Appendix F.2: Tables 10 - 13. Smaller groups of vessels have been classified as 'Horticultural wares' and 'Other wares' and these will be considered separately. As noted in the description and dating of the material from the different contexts (see below), two principal periods are represented in the assemblage, the earlier dating from the latter part of the 18th century and the early 19th century (Area B) and the later dating to the later 19th and first half of the 20th century (all areas but particularly Area A).

Tablewares, ornaments and souvenirs

Tablewares formed the largest single category of identifiable vessels and the category includes those types of vessels which are related to the serving and consumption of food. Teapots, which in some senses can be considered as a transitional item (in that the vessel is used to both prepare and serve the beverage), are included amongst the tablewares.

Tablewares were well represented in all phases of the site although those from the earlier phases were in a considerably more fragmented condition than those from the final phases and few examples suitable for illustration were recovered.

The presence of significant quantities of Creamware and Pearlware (and smaller quantities of contemporary tablewares such as the Black Basalt wares) suggests that the inhabitants of the cottages were able to afford to follow contemporary fashions in tableware and the small quantity of White Salt Glazed Stoneware and Tin Glazed Earthenware may indicate that this ability extended further back into the 18th century. Social historians (e.g. Kowaleski-Wallace 1997, Richards 1999) have emphasised the degree to which the availability and acquisition of formal tablewares was bound up with the creation and definition of the emerging middle class during the 18th century. Economic historians have documented the efforts of entrepreneurs to market wares which allowed the reinforcement of a sense of class identity through participation in everyday practices which contrasted sharply with those of the 17th century. Roy Porter has written of the 'great pressures upon people to mimic their betters' (1991: 222) and the extent to which observant and innovative manufacturers were able to employ increasing literacy and access to newspapers and magazines to exploit this in the marketing of their products. In spite of the ranting of clergymen and moralists who saw imminent catastrophe in all social change, particularly in patterns of consumption amongst the working and middle classes (a wearisome tradition extending back at least as far as the Classical and medieval periods and equally manifest today; Cumberpatch, in prep. 2) Porter has noted that

Georgian society took pride in the increasing range of material objects which were now [in the 18th century] falling within the pockets of a wider cross-section of society. (Porter 1991: 225)

But he has also pointed out that

Nor was there the dwarfing of people by possessions which set in with that clutter of furniture and domestic bric-a-brac ushered in by Victorian mass production and sentimentality about home. ... Objects certainly fascinated the Georgians ... yet they were also mobile, valuing the freedom money gave for activity and enjoying being out of doors and on the move. 'Home sweet home' is basically a nineteenth-century sentiment (1991: 225).

Although it is, of course, unwise to try to identify particular aspects of national trends from individual archaeological assemblages, something of the picture given by Porter, Richards and other social and economic historians is discernable in the pottery assemblages from the Hagg Cottages. The site inhabitants were able, in the later 18th century (and probably also earlier in the century) to acquire and use tablewares of fashionable type and (presumably) to discard these when the fashion moved on from the off-white Cream and Pearlwares to the brighter Whitewares of the 19th century. The absence of deposits dating to the middle years of the century is unfortunate as it obscures the growth of distinctive characteristics of Victorian consumption as summarised by Porter (above) and documented in detail by Briggs (1990: Chapter 6), but something of the changes described by these authors can perhaps be seen in the 19th century figurines owned by Mrs Perrin and in her continued acquisition of decorative souvenirs and similar items, as described above.

In addition to the white and cream tablewares there is an additional category of vessels which, while forming a significant part of most 18th century assemblages, have attracted somewhat less attention from historians than have the former category. These are the tableware forms (mugs, tankards, plates, press-moulded dishes) which were manufactured in various types of earthenware and decorated with dark glaze or dark glaze and contrasting light slip (Mottled ware, Slipware) and in Brown Salt Glazed Stoneware during the 18th century but which generally disappear in the early years of the 19th century.

It would seem that on the basis of colour and function the brown stoneware and mottled earthenware mugs and tankards are a development, conceptually although not technically, of the Blackware types and other drinking vessels of the 17th century. In this regard it would seem that the tendency towards individualisation which is seen in terms of the formal white and cream tablewares is also reflected in the brown and mottled wares which, it might be supposed, were used in less formal contexts than those in which the Creamwares and Pearlwares were used. Alongside the drinking vessels there are the Slipware and Mottled ware plates and dishes, also in dark colours but with yellow and red-brown decoration in the case of press-moulded slipwares and a mottled finish in the case of the wheel-thrown plates. It would appear that there was a strong tradition of dark-coloured tablewares which ran in parallel to that of the white and cream tablewares throughout the 18th century and which involved a simpler range of vessel types, without the elaborate diversification into many specialised vessel forms that we see in the formal Creamware and Pearlware tableware sets. Although found widely in excavated assemblages of 18th century date, the role and relative position of these wares is hardly mentioned by historians (e.g. Richards 1999) in contrast to the emphasis placed upon the introduction and widespread acceptance of lighter coloured wares.

These wares were present at the Hagg Cottages in relatively small numbers; a larger proportion of such wares has been documented from other sites of a similar date and this may be further evidence that the inhabitants of the cottages were both able to

afford the more fashionable wares which were available and were also aware of the social advantages which its possession conferred. Little is known of relative prices of the two classes of pottery; the earthenwares were manufactured widely in 'country potteries' (Cumberpatch in press) but the Brown Salt Glazed Stonewares would have required somewhat more sophisticated facilities similar to those used for the production of the contemporary White Salt Glazed Stonewares. Such technological considerations are not, however, a reliable guide to relative price.

If the presence of later 18th and 19th century refined earthenware tablewares are indicative of the participation of the inhabitants of the cottages in a wider quest for civility and civilised living then what do the early and mid 20th century wares indicate about the later inhabitants of the cottages? Clearly the tradition of whitewares established in the 18th century and still dominant today was maintained; bone china, porcelain and white earthenware dominate the table ware component of the assemblage with cups (Figures F.28, F.29, F.39, F.41, F.53, F.60, F.61 & F.54b), saucers (Figures F.37 & F.53), plates (Figures F.17, F.28, F.42, F.50a, F.55a, F.22 & F.45), dishes and bowls (F.70, F.71, F.72, F.73 & F.57), serving vessels (F.11, F.18, F.19, F.27, F.28 & F.44) and jugs, both plain and highly decorated (Figures F.23, F.24, F.56, F.36b & F.51b) well represented alongside rarer items such as the cake plate (Figure F.27) and the later teapots.

The impression is, however, one of less material prosperity and access only to the lower end of the market. Without detailed price lists (and in the absence of the time necessary to prepare and present full analyses of such lists) or comparative indicators of income, it is difficult to present more than impressionistic data relating to this issue. While the Creamwares and Pearlwares represent a part of the material culture repertoire of the time which would have been sought out by anyone wishing to establish their social position and membership of the emergent polite society, this is not the case with the later 19th and early 20th century wares. The absence of high quality wares and the preponderance of cheap, mass produced items with a limited range of standard (and undistinguished) decorative motifs seem to mark this particular group out as representing the lower end of the wares available to the consumer. Particular items stand out as representative of this; the saucer from the Co-operative Society (context [1004] A/1) for example suggests participation in a movement started by and for the working class and which contributed considerably to their ability to obtain goods of decent quality at reasonable prices but which would have had no pretensions to sophistication or a position at the leading edge of fashion.

Other items are similar; the Asiatic Pheasant and Willow designs were produced in vast quantities and were the commonest of the transfer printed designs that survived the imposition of copyright laws in 1842. Between 1860 and 1880 the fashion in white dinner services shifted in favour of plates with decorative printed borders and plain centres (Coysh and Henrywood 1997: 11), with the more traditional designs presumably relegated to the cheaper end of the market. The 20th century wares are hardly decorated at all – silver and gold lustre lines around rims and on bodies, while perhaps imitative of more sophisticated wares, hardly equal the hand painted decoration on the under-glaze painted Creamwares and Pearlwares. This is not to say that the inhabitants of the Hagg Cottages were in any sense destitute; the evidence of the souvenirs (one from each cottage) indicates that they were able, like thousands of working people, to take day trips and longer breaks at seaside resorts, notably Blackpool (Benson 1994: 102-3). The evidence of a visit to the Isle of Man is

perhaps a little more surprising, but is perhaps indicative of the relative sophistication the population of the north-west in terms of holiday activity; as Benson has noted (1994: 84-5) the tradition of taking a weeks holiday rather than a day trip was established in the north-west a generation before it became common elsewhere.

The value seemingly placed by Mrs Perrin and her contemporaries on ornaments (see Sections C and J) may be reflected in her retention of the mid 19th century examples alongside her more recent acquisitions and while the widely varying styles appears to the modern eye to reflect a lack of a sophisticated aesthetic sense (or at least an aesthetic sense which values consistency and harmony in style and design) it may be that an explanation for this should be sought in an alternative source of valuation which ascribes a higher priority to notions of memory and continuity. Thus the souvenirs probably spoke of past (and possibly infrequent) holidays at the seaside while the older figurines were perhaps the property of her mother or grandmother and as such enjoyed a value which is virtually irrecoverable in detailed terms from archaeological data alone. The same may be true of the repaired tureen lid from context [2044] (Figure F.11). There is nothing to indicate that repairs to tablewares were necessitated by poverty (none of the more frequently used types, cups, mugs or plates, are repaired even though they were inherently more likely to be broken) and it is perhaps more likely that the repair was necessitated because the vessel was of a value which is beyond economic calculation; it may, for example, have been a wedding present, a gift from a member of the family or an heirloom.

Utilitarian earthenwares, kitchen wares and washing sets

The category of utilitarian earthenwares and kitchen wares is a broad one and might well be sub-divided if it were possible to distinguish between vessels used for the storage of food and purposes such as the making of butter and cheese, the pickling of eggs, onions and seasonal fruit and vegetables and those used for the preparation of individual meals. In practice however it seems unlikely that such fine distinctions can be drawn, particularly as vessels may have served more than one purpose. This category therefore includes the Brown and Yellow Glazed Coarsewares, Redwares and similar types as well as Cane Coloured and Whiteware vessels such as mixing and pudding bowls and the jelly mould (Figure F.57).

The tradition of Brown and Yellow Glazed Coarsewares, Redwares and their variants is derived directly from that of post-medieval wares (Cumberpatch 2003a) and forms the utilitarian counterpart of the Brown Salt Glazed Stonewares, Mottled wares and Slipwares discussed above. Unlike these wares, the utilitarian component survived the shift in fashion away from dark coloured wares towards whitewares which took place during the 18th century and Brown Glazed Coarsewares in particular are a regular component of 19th century ceramic assemblages. The tradition remains discernable today in the form of brown and red earthenware style vessels designed for use in the kitchen. Although comparable statistics are difficult to obtain (because of different excavation and publication strategies, patterns of waste disposal and site formation processes) it seems that the quantity of utilitarian ware from the Hagg Cottages was relatively low, particularly in comparison with urban sites.

Rather different from either the utilitarian wares or the kitchen wares was the washing set consisting of a jug and large bowl (context [1004] A/1). As noted above, this was decorated with a red transfer printed design of roses internally. The jug had a moulded profile with broad pink bands and bands of gold over over-glaze printed flowers (Figures F.36a & F.36b).

Storage wares and containers

Storage wares and containers includes all those vessels which have, or appear to have, functions related to food storage and transport and includes the jam and marmalade jars, stoneware bottles and flagons and other kinds of jars. In terms of their place in the household, they should perhaps be considered alongside the kitchen wares and the glass ware from the site (see Section F.3.2 below).

The most distinctive containers were those with printed labels identifying them as containing marmalade (Figures F.1 & F.2). The two companies represented, Cooper's and Keiller's both used the same manufacturer for their jars (Maling; also used by Hartley's, a company not represented at Alderley Sandhills) and unlabelled examples are impossible to ascribe to a specific company. Such jars are found widely throughout Britain both on archaeological sites and on rubbish dumps excavated by collectors.

Bottles and flagons, normally a common find in later 19th and early 20th century sites were rare at Alderley Sandhills with only one example of a stoneware bottle (manufactured at the Bourne Pottery in Derbyshire; Figure F.40) amongst the assemblage. It is possible that the larger variety of stoneware flagon (used for a wide variety of beverages) was returnable to the vendor for a fee (a number of types have a printed value on the shoulder) and that few found their way into the archaeological record because of this.

Other storage vessels were unmarked and unlabelled, including the substantially complete example shown in Figure F.43 (context [1013] A/2).

Horticultural wares and other items

Horticultural vessels were represented by a relatively small number of flowerpots of conventional design. These were present in Areas A, B and D but absent from Area C. Only one other object appeared to be related to the gardens of the houses and this was the bird figurine from Area D (Figure F.55b). It is probable that the numbers of flowerpots is not truly representative of the numbers in use as garden waste may have been disposed of in a different manner to the household waste and many broken flowerpots may have been reused as 'crops' to line the bottoms of new pots prior to their use.

An additional utilitarian vessel of undetermined purpose is the crucible shaped vessel from Area A. It is possible that this vessel was in some way connected with the individual who worked in a chemists shop after the First World War.

Discussion

Area A

Later 19th and 20th century tablewares (Porcelain / bone china, Transfer Printed Whiteware and Whiteware) form a major component of the assemblage from Area A with teapots in other, more colourful, wares (Appendix F.2: Table 2). The figures in the table (maximum number of vessels) probably over-estimate the numbers of vessels involved, but the relative proportions would appear to be indicative of a real situation, given the inevitable problems caused by sampling strategy and the vagaries of the survival and recovery processes. The emphasis appears to be on

cups, saucers, plates and mugs. The bowl category is a broad and perhaps less than satisfactory one, given that the term can be used to describe vessels with slightly different functions (soup bowls and dessert bowls for example) and these differences were not always apparent when considering the smaller sherds. It is clear however that the bowls were tablewares and not kitchenwares (mixing bowls etc).

The small quantity of 18th to early 19th century ware (Creamware, Pearlware, White Salt Glazed Stoneware) generally follows the pattern of the later wares in terms of vessel forms, although whether the presence of these wares is chance (related to residuality) or an indication of the presence of heirlooms is unclear; given the evidence for the importance of display in the later period (the figurines and other ornamental items), it is possible that heirlooms were involved, although residuality may be a simpler explanation.

Horticultural wares were present in some numbers but other utilitarian earthenwares were notable by their absence. This is striking when considered in relation to the evidence from other areas of the site (see below) and also when compared with data from sites of a comparable date elsewhere. Those utilitarian wares which are present are generally stonewares of different types and include a bottle, jars and bowls. The latter are distinctively larger than the whiteware bowls and presumably intended for kitchen rather than table use.

Area B

The greater chronological range represented in the assemblage from Area B is responsible for the far greater diversity in the range of ware types present in the assemblage and it is possible that the greater range of vessel types is also in part linked to changes in vessel form over time. This having been said, there is also a greater range of both wares and types when compared to the assemblage from Area A and this may result from a real situation in which a greater variety of vessel types were in use at any one time.

The later types, broadly contemporary with those from Area A (Porcelain, Whiteware) represented a similar range of types (mug, plate, cup, saucer, bowl, dish) and a similar pattern can be seen in the earlier tablewares (White Salt Glazed Stoneware, Creamware, Edged ware, Pearlware and transfer printed variants). Teapots were once again present in a variety of wares, including Black Basalt ware, Colour Glazed ware and Slip Banded ware. The differences between the two assemblages lie in the relative proportions of utilitarian and coarsewares and perhaps also in the relative values of the tablewares in question.

The utilitarian wares form a diverse group, from the colourful slipwares to the simpler Redwares and Brown Glazed Coarsewares. Vessel forms in the latter are dominated by large open vessels (pancheons and less securely identified 'Open Vessels') together with jars and jar-like forms. The precise functions of such vessels are difficult to determine, given that they could have been used for a number of purposes connected with the processing of food and its processing and preparation for storage. The numbers of vessels involved (significant, even when the unreliability of the ENV figure is allowed for) certainly suggest that such activities were of some importance on the site. The character of the vessels makes dating difficult, but the impression was that the majority are of 18th to 19th century type rather than of 19th to 20th

century type and so contemporary with the earlier tablewares. The scarcity of Yellow Glazed Coarseware is somewhat unexpected and while this may relate to the appropriateness of different types of vessels for different functions, the fact that we do not understand the difference between Brown and Yellow Glazed coarsewares precludes any definite conclusion in this point.

Utilitarian stonewares, a category which can be split into vessels used for the sale and transport of commodities (jam jars, bottles, flagons) and those used in the kitchen (large bowls, jars) were represented amongst the Area B material, although, with the exception of large bowls in Brown Salt Glazed Stoneware, they were not present in large numbers.

Area C

The pottery assemblage from area C was the smallest from the site as a whole and the numbers of identifiable vessels are correspondingly small. The general pattern was similar to that from Area A, but, as noted above the range of tablewares was somewhat smaller, with Porcelain / bone china wares rare in comparison to Area A. Other than this, the general impression was of an assemblage with similar characteristics to that from Area A, including the presence of small quantities of residual material of 18th and early 19th century date. Given that the deposit is poorly understood and its relationship to the major deposits is less than clear, it can scarcely be considered as a reliable source of data for the interpretation of the assemblage as a whole.

Area D

On the basis of the excavated evidence it was originally suggested that the material from Area D may have related to landfill activity unconnected with the cottages. However, while this cannot be determined on the basis of the pottery data, it is clear that the general chronological range represented by the material is very similar to that of the assemblages from Areas A and B, specifically that of Area A. Eighteenth and early 19th century material is present in small quantities but the principal element appears to be contemporary with the material from the later phases of Area A and also to resemble it closely in terms of the range of vessel types present. Tablewares in Porcelain / bone china and Whiteware were common and cups, plates, saucers and unidentified flatwares were the commonest forms. The assemblage is also characterised by a greater than normal number of storage and kitchen wares, notably stoneware jam jars, pudding bowls and similar vessels. A jelly mould was also recovered. The evidence thus suggests a very similar ceramic profile (and consequently a history and character) to that of Area A.

F.3.2: Glass

By Hugh Willmott, ARCUS, University of Sheffield

Introduction

A large assemblage of glass was recovered from the excavations, and this can be broadly divided into two categories; window and vessel. The majority of the glass is relatively recent in date and the sheer quantity of often industrially mass-produced material makes traditional methods of reporting post-medieval assemblages, where each piece of vessel is individually catalogued (Willmott 2002: 7-8), impossible.

Consequently this report represents a new way of reporting and interpreting more recent glass assemblages.

Window glass

Post-medieval window glass is notoriously difficult to date stylistically and in the absence of decorative features there is little information that can be gained from individual fragments. Furthermore, unlike earlier windows made-up from small leaded quarries, more recent panes are larger and usually impossible to reconstruct when found broken archaeologically. Consequently, it has not been possible to measure the size of any of the panes from Alderley Edge.

<i>Area</i>	<i>Context</i>	<i>Weight</i>
Area A	1004	6,300g
	1012	222g
	1013	292
Area B	2027	60g
	2057	1,538g
	2073	115g
	2086	22g
	2088	122g
	2173	64g
	2114	312g

Table F.1: Summary of the window glass (by weight)

All the window glass found appears, from the quality of its metal and the relative lack of weathering, to be late 19th or 20th century in date. This is not at all surprising given the age and nature of the cottages. However, the only meaningful method of quantification that can be undertaken on the window glass is to measure it by weight (Table F.1), although this in itself is still only provides a limited level of information. Although at first sight there does appear to be a large quantity, particularly from Area A, this is in fact not the case. It must be borne in mind that the nearly 7kg of glass from Area A would account, if put together for only a single average-sized window.

Given this the assemblage must actually be viewed as quite small given the number of windows originally present in the cottages in Areas A and B. There might be two explanations for this. The first is that much of the window glass was removed prior to the demolition of the cottages, having a certain value attached. Certainly, this an interpretation often used for the absence of earlier window glass on some sites, but whether it would hold true for the 1950s is less certain. The other alternative is explained by the location of the windows themselves. By their very nature, most windows in domestic dwellings are in elevated positions. Consequently on the decay and demolition of a building it is possible that much of the window glass was spread widely around the building and would not fall immediately in the area that was subsequently excavated.

However, what is noticeable is that window glass was only found in Areas A and B. While this might seem to be an obvious association with the structures in these areas, it is informative. It clearly suggests that all the windows were probably broken and deposited as part of the clearing and demolition of the site during the 1950s. Had there been widespread earlier breakage and replacement of windows it would seem

likely that they would have been dumped (as much of the vessel glass) in other areas of the site, and Area D in particular.

Vessel glass

Whilst the quantity of window glass is less than might be expected, the number of vessels is substantial. Consequently, only those fragments diagnostic enough to provide positive identification, and a possible indication of minimum vessel counts, are considered. However, it must be emphasised that any quantification through minimum vessel counts will underestimate the true number originally deposited. Data relevant to the following discussion is presented in Appendix F.3.

In this report the vessel glass is examined broadly by area. Unlike the window glass which is more generic and adds little to the narrative of those living on the site, the vessels do reflect the stylistic and dietary preferences of the inhabitants. Three broad categories of vessel glass can be identified. The first two, (which are often interchangeable) are tablewares and items intended for display. By their very nature these categories contain the most elaborate and varied vessel forms, and usually the most expensive. Far more numerous are containers, and bottles in particular. These had a much wider range of functions, such as containing alcohol, foodstuffs and medicines. Attempts in the past have been made to classify the relative longevity of bottles, (e.g. Hill 1982), and although these are largely inaccurate, they do emphasise that compared with display items or tablewares that they had relatively short life spans. Given this rapid turn over, the large numbers originally used, and their often more robust nature, it is no surprise that they are the category to survive in the greatest numbers. However, what is more interesting are the relative proportions of each type of bottle and what they say about the consumption patterns taking place in the various areas.

Area A

Area A, which overlay the east cottage, contained by far the largest group of glass in all three categories. These included at least seven tablewares. The first is the fragments making up the body from a bell-shaped 'Newcastle' decanter, decorated with thick vertical running ribs. This vessel is slightly earlier than all the other tablewares and the more expensive, being free blown and dating to around 1830-50, this piece was originally intended to hold wine at the table. However, whether it was ever used for such in this context is less certain. Interestingly it is missing its stopper, normally the most durable element. Given that it was found in a later demolition layer it would seem that this piece of glass had been curated for nearly a century before deposition, and it is possible that the stopper was lost some time before.

The other tablewares are, on the whole, rather more functional and cheaper. Perhaps an exception is a complete facet-cut pepper pot with an electro-plated nickel silver top. Made in Birmingham between 1920-1940, this pepper pot is more expensive than some of the other items, but still not a costly piece. All the others are common utilitarian press-moulded wares and 20th-century in date. These include a matching small salt and pepper pot (Figure F.83), an egg cup, an oval bowl and the stem from a cake stand.

The most distinctive element of the assemblage from Area A is the varied group of non-functional display items. These clearly 'compliment' similar items found amongst the ceramic assemblage, and can be associated with Mrs Perrin's own specific

tastes. Some of the items are fairly ordinary, such as two 20th century press-moulded vases, very cheap items suited for floral displays (Figure F.84). Other items are slightly more unusual, such as fragments from two opaque white vases, unfortunately too fragmented to reconstruct, but painted and similar to some of the commemorative ceramics. The final vessel that is purely for display is more interesting. This is a highly fragmented, but reconstructable, pedestal bowled 'lustre' (Figure F.85). Made in an opaque blue glass it is decorated with a worn banded gilding and has the remains of seven, out of an original eight, cut and faceted drops which would have hung from small holes drilled into it. Lustres were a popular Victorian sitting room decoration, designed to sit on the mantelpiece in pairs. This particular example is probably quite an early one, dating to around 1860-80, and given its context must then have been a curated object, and between seventy and ninety years old when discarded. What also points to Mrs Perrin's curation of this object is that despite its fragmented state, it is clear she only possessed the one, and not the matching pair. Whether she only ever had one, or broke one earlier in her life is unclear.

The final items relating to display all point to a single piece of furniture, for which the glass elements are the only surviving parts. There are three cheap moulded handles with screw threads, which would originally have belonged to wooden cabinet doors. Also present are some pieces of narrow bevelled mirror glass (Figure F.86). Being around 6cm in width these are too narrow to have been portions of a looking glass, and instead they resemble decorative mirrors sometimes found on cheap cabinets of the first half of the twentieth century. Combined with the handles they point to the display cabinet used by Mrs Perrin to show off her curiosities.

As already noted the largest group of material takes the form of bottles and jars, there being a minimum of one hundred and forty-one in total. Where these can be positively identified they fall into six broad groups (Table F.2).

<i>Type</i>	<i>% of total</i>
Alcohol bottles	16%
Sauce bottles	22%
Other bottles	24%
Food jars	13%
Medicine bottle	14%
Cosmetic phials & jars	11%

Table F.2: Containers from Area A

The proportions of bottles are quite interesting from this area. There are perhaps slightly fewer alcohol bottles than might be expected, as in most late 19th and early 20th century assemblages these form a significant core. Beer bottles present mainly come from Groves and Whitnall's Stockport brewery, although there are also Boddingtons and John Grundy bottles. Interestingly the second largest category of bottles from this area are sauce bottles, with 22% falling into this group. From this evidence it is clear that the Barber household (associated with Area A/3) were big table sauce consumers, with a particular appetite for Fletchers Sauce from Selby, Masons OK Sauce and other brands such as Hazelwood & Co. The final category of comestible container are food jars, which formed 13% of the total. Not unexpectedly these included well-known 20th century brands such as Horlick's, Bovril and Shippam's, as well as Ye Olde Farm Pickles (Figure F.87).

The last category of containers are those for holding medicines and cosmetics, a quarter of the whole assemblage. This is a very significant number indeed. With the medicinal bottles a clear trend emerges. There are a significant number of unidentifiable pill bottles, but interestingly when contents can be identified, they are associated with a particular disorder. The two brands concerned are Milton's milk of magnesia bottles and jars of MacLean Brand Stomach Powder. Although it is not possible to identify individual may have used these, from their distribution they would appear to have been from the Barber household, and it seems likely that at least one 20th century resident had a stomach-related complaint. The final containers of notes are all for cosmetics. These include ribbed perfume bottles, white cream jars and two facet-cut stopper tops from slightly more expensive scent bottles. The date of these, as well as their distribution, would suggest that they belonged to Mrs Perrin.

Area B

Area B, located over the southern cottages, also produced a significant assemblage of glass, although smaller and less diverse than that from Area A. Only five tablewares can be identified and one of these, a folded-out rim from a bowl is 17th century in date so must be an intrusive find. The remainder belong to late 19th and 20th century, and interestingly include the only two drinking vessels from all the areas excavated. They are both portions of wine glasses, the first being a free-blown and facet-cut vessel, whilst the second is a cheaper press-moulded one (Figure F.88). Other low quality press-moulded wares are a sugar caster and the top from a cake or patisserie stand. Interestingly this latter piece was clearly broken at the stem, and the break ground flat so that it could still serve as a dish. Given the cheapness of this object, this is surprising, and does suggest that the Barrow household was far from affluent.

Only two display items were recovered as well. It is difficult to reconstruct the first, as it is a tapering pedestal shape, ground at the top to take a metal fitting. However, it is decorated with numerous marvered coloured blobs, suggesting it was more for visual display than any other purpose. The other display item is a portion of rim, from a clear late 19th century vase that has been cased on the outside with a swirled red glass. Unfortunately it is not possible to reconstruct its form further.

As with Area A, the majority of vessels here are containers, these being a minimum number of thirty-six, although in rather different proportions. The largest significant category (Table F.3) are alcohol related bottles. Importantly all but two are wine bottles, and this compliments the find of two wine glasses.

<i>Type</i>	<i>% of total</i>
Alcohol bottles	31%
Sauce bottles	3%
Other bottles	44%
Food jars	14%
Medicine bottle	5%
Cosmetic phials & jars	3%

Table F.3: Containers from Area B

Also in contrast with Area A are the numbers of sauce bottles, here there is only one (making up 3% of the total assemblage). Clearly on this evidence the dietary preferences between these two sets of cottages are clear. Other food jars and bottles are also present in reasonable proportions in the assemblage, but what is also

striking when compared with Area A are the very low numbers of either medicine or cosmetic containers. Given this, and the higher proportion of alcohol bottles, it is tempting to suggest that this assemblage is more 'masculine' than that from Area A, although such attributions are probably simplistic given that Edna Barrow was living here at the time.

Area C

This area only produced one fragment of glass worthy of note. It is a portion of light yellow pinched arm, probably from a decorative ornament, although further identification is not possible.

Area D

Area D also produced a significant assemblage of glass, although these are mainly containers (Table F.4). Two tablewares were found. The first is a portion of bowl from a port or sherry glass, and is probably late 19th century in date. The second at first looks like an ordinary bottle. However, it is in fact a double-ended banana-shaped baby feeding bottle, made this shape to facilitate cleaning and embossed "The Hygienic Feeder" (Figure F.89). Only a single fragment from any display items was found. This is part of a opaque white pedestal base, flashed in light blue, possibly from an item such as a lamp (Figure F.90). The type of glass suggests that it is early 20th century in date.

The remaining twenty-seven vessels are all containers.

<i>Type</i>	<i>% of total</i>
Alcohol bottles	22%
Sauce bottles	7%
Other bottles	26%
Food jars	7%
Medicine bottle	31%
Cosmetic phials & jars	7%

Table F.4; Containers from Area D

A range of alcohol bottles are presented, including beer bottles of Frederick Robinson, Groves & Whitnall and Bell & Co. Other comestibles present include Lea & Perrins sauce and Bovril. There are also further milk of magnesia bottles, a bottle of corn solvent manufactured by James Wolley of Manchester and an Alkia Saltrates cosmetic bottle. Interestingly these proportions of various container categories seem to lie some way between those for Areas A and B. This might be a coincidence, but also might suggest that both sets of cottages were using this dump as a repository for their rubbish.

Conclusions

The assemblages of glass from Alderley Sandhills are interesting for a number of reasons. Logistically the sheer quantity of material, and containers in particular, calls for a different approach to be taken. Not every piece can be counted and catalogued, and inevitably only the diagnostic fragments can be considered. Consequently, any accurate quantification is difficult, and the minimum vessel counts produced will significantly under estimate the real numbers. Conversely though, with such large assemblages of containers, it is possible to compare and contrast the relative types represent between the areas and identify significant differences.

Despite the large assemblage, the most surprising aspect is the relative paucity of tablewares. In total only fourteen were found in all the areas. This might, on one hand, suggest that glass use was limited in all the cottages. However, given that by the mid-19th century mass-produced glass was available very cheaply, this is perhaps unlikely. It is perhaps more likely then, that on breakage most glass was discarded in areas not excavated. If this is true, it would indicate that the number of containers found was in fact far fewer than originally use, a possibility supported by the clear evidence of dumping in Area D. Although the number tablewares are few, it is interesting to note the almost absence of any more expensive items. The single exception is the free-blown 'Newcastle' decanter from Area A, but this is probably a curated heirloom belonging to Mrs Perrin. Otherwise all the other tablewares were inexpensive items.

The number of display items, although limited compared with similar ceramic examples, are perhaps more than might be expected. Area A, in particular, contains several items which are not normally found archaeologically and it is interesting to be able identify an item of furniture too. The connexions between this glass and Mrs Perrin are clear in Area A, but this also explains its survival. Due to their relative completeness it is possible to suggest that items such as the lustre (and also the decanter) were whole and deliberately smashed and their pieces left untied up just prior to, or as part of, the clearance of the cottages.

On an individual level, each of the utilitarian containers found are less informative. However, when considering the assemblages as a group more interesting patterns emerge. Area A contained a range of beer bottles connected with the Perrins, whilst in Area B wine was clearly the drink of choice with the Barrows. Certain anomalies can be seen, such as the obvious liking of table sauce displayed in the eastern cottages by the Barber family. Likewise the high concentration of medicinal containers, and stomach remedies in particular, in the area of the Barber household suggests that at least one of the family might have suffered a particular complaint.

F.3.3: Metalwork

By Joan Unwin, ARCUS, University of Sheffield

Approximately 75% of the metal finds were identifiable, the rest being corroded, totally encased in a sandy deposit or an unrecognisable part of a larger object. It is probable that a few more items would be identified if the concretions around the finds were removed. The items were simply identified, some measured and three items were x-rayed for any possible manufacturer's mark, which might have provided dating evidence. This report describes the finds according to Areas and Units and the finds identified in each unit are listed together with a brief summary. All the identified objects are listed in Unit order in Appendix F.4 with a brief description, together with their context and bag numbers. Once this had been done, the artefacts were grouped according to their function. The quantitative finds are listed in Appendix F.5. The majority of the metal finds were ferrous – wrought iron, cast iron and steel of which a very few items were of stainless steel (post 1920s). There were a few items, principally kitchen items, which were of aluminium. Even fewer items were of brass and copper. Several items have been identified as being made of silver or nickel silver and one item was part-made of 9ct. gold.

The excavation of two cottages (four dwellings) has yielded a quantity of small metal objects from which to try to reconstruct the lifestyles of the occupants.

The finds have been divided into six groupings:

- 1. structural** – these are items which may have been incorporated into the buildings or their fittings. Small items include nails, screws and spikes, plus larger objects such as drain pipes, gutter and shelf supports, door furniture and window frames.
- 2. furniture** – there are very few metal items which can be definitely identified as coming from objects such as cupboards, drawers or beds.
- 3. domestic** – these objects make up the largest grouping and include items related to cooking and eating.
- 4. personal items** – these constitute the second largest group and are possibly the most interesting. This group includes safety razors, handbag frames, buttons and some jewellery.
- 5. miscellaneous** – there are a few items, some of which are quite interesting, but which do not come into the above groups. They include the very few tools found on the site.
- 6. unidentifiable** – there are many items such as metal rods, bars and sheets whose functions are unknown, plus others which are corroded, encased in a sandy deposit or have no clues as to their function.

Dating

The dating of objects has been based on their design and the materials used. The evidence for these conclusions comes from comparable material in the Hawley Collection, trade catalogues and hardware buyers' guides from the early 20th century. The general impression is that, apart from any structural objects, the artefacts come from the first half of the 20th century. There seems to be no evidence from the metal finds relating to any occupation of the cottages before then. The earliest datable find is a handsaw, which was probably manufactured in the first half of the 19th century, but as a valuable tool, was likely to have been used into the 20th century. Most of the structural objects, spikes, nails, etc, were made of wrought iron, and by the second half of the 19th century, such things were generally made from bulk cast steel. However, the use of wrought iron in rural areas, by blacksmiths, may have continued.

Contexts and locations

From the information provided about the location of finds, the metal objects do not seem to point to any specific period in time, other than the early 20th century, or any focus of activity. The units, especially in Area A, overlap different rooms and as no specific locations were given, it will be necessary to refer to the oral evidence as to where, for instance, cooking and eating were carried out. However, there seems to be no distinct difference between the contexts and the 'severity' of demolition and subsequent probable vandalising of the site, make it almost impossible to pinpoint the original location of small metal objects.

- Area A was the homes of the Barber and Perrin families. This area produced the most identifiable finds, but the types of finds are not restricted to any specific context, except that the first demolition phase (the removal of the roof) has a higher proportion of structural metalwork.

- Area B was the homes of the Ellam and Barrow families. It produced fewer objects, more unidentifiable objects but proportionally more structural items.
- Area C was thought to have been a midden and produced hardly any identifiable finds.
- Area D was a dump, likely related to the Hagg cottages. It produced few objects; the identifiable ones were for domestic or personal use and none was related to structural features. The items may or may not be related to the residents of the four cottages.

Summary

The cottages were built of stone and wood and the excavated finds have yielded some structural ironwork. Wrought iron nails, screws and spikes were used presumably in the fabric of the building, but some of these finds may relate to internal fixtures, such as shelves or cupboards. A small number of later wire nails and copper roofing nails were also found. At least one cottage had wrought iron casement windows, with leaded lights. There is evidence of iron guttering, drains or fall pipe. But because these cottages were deliberately demolished and almost certainly vandalised, any metal having scrap value would have been removed. Therefore, none of the identifiable finds relates to fire grates or cooking ranges.

The overall impression gained from the personal and domestic artefacts is that families occupied the cottages, as male, female and children's artefacts were found. The finds are not of the highest quality and suggest that the occupants had a limited income, though with desires for refinement. However, since the families would have taken most of their belongings with them, whatever was left was probably considered of no consequence (or a chance item might have been lost or overlooked). In addition, because the cottages were left empty for some time, no doubt they were scavenged for any metal which might have been remotely valuable, to use or as scrap.

F.3.4: Building Materials

By John Tibbles, ARCUS, University of Sheffield

The Brick

Introduction

An assemblage of 103 fragments of brick, with a combined weight of 51,565g was submitted. The majority bore evidence characteristic of their method of manufacture. The hand-made material included straw impressions, moulding lips, moulding sand, rain pitting and strike marks. Less than 16% of the hand-made assemblage showed residual moulding sand indicating that the remainder were likely to have been manufactured by the slop-moulded method, without sand. The machine-made examples exhibited stamped impressions and extrusion marks. The assemblage has been categorised into 11 different site types.

The assemblage

Pre-machine manufactured bricks were made by the insertion of a wad of prepared clay into bottomless moulds, moistened and often covered in sand to facilitate the removal of the formed clay. The excess clay would be struck off, the form tipped out onto a palette board and removed to a prepared area of ground until partially dried,

ready for firing. Early machine manufactured bricks were formed by a hand presses which were eventually superseded by steam powered machinery.

Bricks were manufactured to the required shape as per their intended use within construction. The standard rectangular brick was for common usage, the more specialised shapes to form architectural features around arches, doors, windows and vaults.

The dimensions of bricks have been subject to periods of legislation. At York in 1505, bricks were standardised at 10" x 5" x 2 ½". Parliament decreed in 1571, that the size of a brick should be 9"x 4 ½" x 2¼", in 1725 the size should be 9" x 4 ½" x 2" and by 1777 8 ½" x 4" x 2 ½". By 1850 the size of bricks was generally 9 x 4 ½ x 3" (Dobson 1850:33) although by the turn of the 20th century this size varied slightly throughout the country (Rivington 1919:113). Eleven broad types of bricks were identified (Table F.5), including firebricks:

Type	Size (metric)	Size (Imperial)	No.
A	240mm x 115mm x 75mm	9½" x 4½" x 3"	2
B	240mm x 115mm x 65mm	9½" x 4½" x 2½"	1
C	240mm x 115mm x 70mm	9½" x 4½" x 2¾"	6
D	240mm x 110mm x 68-70mm	9½" x 4¼" x 2¾"	2
E	235mm x 110mm x 65-70mm	9¼" x 4¼" x 2½"-2¾"	2
F	230mm x 110mm x 65-70mm	9" x 4¼" x 2½"-2¾"	3
G	230mm x 110mm x 75mm	9¼" x 4¼" x 3"	1
H	230mm x 112-115mm x 60-70mm	9¼" x 4¼"-4½" x 2"-2¾"	3
I	230mm x 115mm x 75mm	9¼" x 4½" x 3"	1
J	230mm x 115mm x 50mm	9¼" x 4½" x 2"	1
K	222-230mm x 105-115mm x 65-75mm	8¾"-9¼" x 4"-4½" x 2½"-3"	4
Total			26

Table F.5: Complete Brick Sizes

Part bricks are more difficult to allocate a category due to the width and thickness corresponding to more than one type. The majority of the brick assemblage falls within the above categories based upon a best-fit policy. Identification of a small proportion of examples from the assemblage was not possible due to abraded surfaces and size.

Standard Bricks

The twenty-six complete bricks within the assemblage were all comparable with bricks manufactured within the late 18th - mid-late 19th century (Dobson 1850, Lloyd 1925). The part bricks were classified adopting a best-fit policy based on surviving dimensions, fabrics and general characteristics. Although incomplete, they are consistent with the fabrics and measurable dimensions of the complete examples within the assemblage.

Fire-Bricks

Firebricks were bricks specially manufactured for use within a fire or hearth and could withstand degrees of intense heat. Several fragments of *'fire-bricks'* were tentatively identified from contexts [1013], [2044], and [4003]. The complete example displayed dimensions of 230mm x 115mm x 50mm, whilst the diagnostic fragments displayed a

thickness range of 17-35mm^{3/4}"). Heat exposure was evident on the diagnostic assemblage. The firebricks were manufactured in a coarse white/grey fabric (Fire clay?).

Industrial Bricks

Five incomplete machine-made industrial bricks of a dense grey/white fabric were recorded. The width and thickness dimensions ranged from 107mm - 110mm and 65mm-70mm respectively. Complete length dimensions were not obtainable. Each brick displayed the mark 'SHRIGLE' or part thereof impressed into one stretcher surface. The majority of fragments have been subjected to heat stress.

Two further complete machine-made foundry bricks (230mm x 110mm x 65mm) of a coarse grey/pale brown (10YR 7/4) fabric were also recorded. All displayed the mark 'ARNLY IRON CO WORTLEY' impressed into one surface.

Voussiours

A single fragment of a voussiour brick of probable 19th century date was also recorded. The exceptionally smooth surfaces were obtained by '*rubbing*' to the desired thickness. Such bricks are a common feature within the window lintels of late 18th and 19th century buildings.

Discussion of the bricks

Dating of bricks is highly contentious due to their re-use nature as a valuable building commodity. The standardisation of bricks by Parliament over the centuries helped to create a more uniform brick and better architecture. However it should be noted that although these statutes were binding with severe finds for those contravening, it would be naive to believe that all pre-mechanical brickmakers adhered strictly to these sizes at all times.

The majority of the brick assemblage (50%) was recovered from Phase 5 contexts within Area B (see Section E.3.2).

Complete and part bricks were identified as '*hard stocks*' or '*stocks*' (over burnt bricks, sound, but considerably blemished both in form and colour). Generally these are used for footings, within the body of thick walls and in positions where the work is subject to great compressional stress (Mitchell 1919b:130). The complete bricks of these types recorded displayed a general size of 225-240mm x 105-116mm x 65-70mm (9-9 1/2" x 4-4 3/4" x 2 1/2-2 3/4"). London Stocks during the late 19th to early 20th century displayed dimensions of *circa*. 9" x 4 1/2" x 3" (Dobson 1850:38). Based upon a '*best fit*' policy the brick samples would tend to fit within the parameters of this brick classification.

Examples of brick with bevelled arrises along one stretcher or header were recorded from contexts [1012] (Area A) and [2078] (Area B). This effect would have been formed by the constant wear of animals/carts passage and originated from within a yard surface or roadway.

Several bricks displayed adhesions in the form of copper staining, industrial residue, Fe concretions/adhesions and pitch, plaster, lime-wash and paint. This evidence suggests that the bricks were associated with contexts of an industrial nature rather than domestic. However, the fragments bearing evidence of surface treatments such

as plaster, limewash and paint are likely to have originated from the domestic building.

A single complete brick (230mm x 112mm x 60mm) displaying dark reddish (5R/3/1) lead glaze runs on one surface. The glaze is not typical of 19th century brick glaze and may represent the residual elements of a pottery kiln floor of 16th-17th century date. Similar examples were recorded within 16th-17th century contexts at Beverley, East Yorkshire (Tibbles 2002:29) and Barton, North Lincolnshire (Tibbles, forthcoming). This example is likely to have been imported into the area as opposed to pertaining to manufacturing activity occurring on site.

Catalogue of Bricks per Area

Area A

Phase 2

A single fragment of brick was recorded from within this Phase and is likely to be residual or disturbed from the Phase 3 demolition deposits (see Section E.3.1). The machine-made brick bears the stamp of 'SHRIGLE'.

Phase 3

The majority of the brick assemblage from this phase displays the characteristics of industrial usage (industrial residues, heat affects and dense bricks) and although classed as demolition material, it would appear to have been imported to the site from the nearby mine.

Phase 4

This assemblage represents residual elements of the Phase 3 demolition material (Section E.3.1), including *firebricks*. Elements of earlier bricks were also evident, possibly from the domestic building. The presence of bevelled bricks suggests a yard or exterior surface. Substantial plaster or render adhesions (11mm thick) adhering to one sample is indicative of wall surfacing, particularly of cellars or exterior walls to assist against damp or inclement weather.

Again, the presence of *firebricks* within the assemblage tends to suggest dumping from the mine, however, the bricks may have been '*salvaged*' for secondary usage and incorporated within the domestic building (see Section E.3.1). The presence of two different mortars and blue paint adhesions tends to support this.

Area B

Phase 1

Presence of machine-made fragments and heavily distorted 'stock' bricks (see Section E.3.2). Occasional recycled example of probable late 18th-early 19th century bricks (context [2044]).

Phase 5

Multiple fragments bearing iron and copper adhesions. Single fragment displaying pitch adhesion. Heavily distorted stocks. Single burnt fragment from possible hearth. Fragment displaying bevelled header from yard or roadway. The majority of the assemblage is probably imported as dumping from the mine complex.

Phase 6

Several fragments display Fe adhesions, possible result of lying within contact of iron objects whilst within the dump. Presence of distorted stocks and firebricks. Paint adhesions and limewash are indicative of domestic internal wall decoration. Fragments of non-diagnostic brick also recovered.

Phase 7

Fragment of brick. Possibly late 18th early 19th century.

Area C

Phase 1

The two joining fragments (forming a complete brick) were post 1850 in manufacture. They are likely to represent casual deposition (see Section E.3.3.).

Phase 4

The single complete brick was of a post 1850 date and is likely to be the result of casual deposition.

Area D

Phase 4

The brick assemblage; including firebrick fabric, was conducive with dumping. All were post 1850s in date (see Section E.3.4).

The Ceramic Tile

Introduction

An assemblage of sixty-three fragments of ceramic tile, with a weight of 16,210g was recovered. Of the assemblage, five forms were identified. The remainder was unidentifiable by form.

The assemblage

Positions of the nibs and peg holes are usually described from the nib side of the tile, i.e. the underside as hung, not necessarily as made. Demand normally dictated the size and quality of flat roof tile which often varied until a statute was instigated in 1477 (17 Edward IV, c iv) that dictated the size. A flat tile was fixed at 10 inches by 6 inches by 5/8 inch (255 mm x 153 mm x 16mm), a ridge tile 13 inches long by 1/2 inch thick and a hip tile 10 inches in length with a convenient width and thickness (Celoria et al 1967:218). Early flat roof-tiles were suspended by projecting nibs or by peg/nails Alternately flat tiles were often secured by iron nails, as were ridge and hip tiles. Each layer of tiles overlapped the layer below and to make them weatherproof were bedded on moss. The lowest layers, and sometimes all the layers, were often pointed or rendered with mortar (Salzman 1952:233).

Flat Roof Tile

Twenty-two fragments of flat roof tile were identified. None of the examples displayed means of suspension such as peg/nail holes or nibs. All the fragments were of 15mm thickness.

Ridge Tiles

Ridge tiles are specifically made for covering a roof ridge and according to Scott's description (1964), vary in shape between half-round (a semicircle of 7 ¾" diameter), hogback (half-round tiles with a raised centre), segmental (flattened half-round tiles) and angle (sharp angle bend with flat surfaces). Ceramic ridge tiles are generally either half-round or hogback in shape. They would be held in place by mortar and/or nails and overlap the adjacent tile, although in some cases may be butted up end to end.

Four fragments of possible ridge tile were identified within the assemblage form contexts [2004], [3004], and [2184]. Their thickness varied between 14mm-20mm and none displayed mortar adhesions. The examples were probably hogback type.

Floor Tile

Context [2004] contained a single fragment of paviour or floor tile, displaying a thickness of 38mm and mortar adhesions.

Miscellaneous Tile

Context [4004] contained a single fragment of machine-made ducting in a dense stoneware fabric, 20mm thick. The tile was probably associated with the lining of chimney flues.

Land Drain

Within the ceramic tile assemblage, twenty-two fragments were identified as ceramic land drain, the majority of the fragments from contexts [2152] and [2184]. Their manufacture and characteristics are similar to those of ridge tiles and therefore identification from small fragments must be taken with caution.

Unidentifiable

Of the assemblage, thirteen fragments were unidentifiable by form. The fabric indicates a post-medieval date.

Ceramic Tile Discussion

The majority (86%) of the ceramic tile assemblage was recovered from Phase 5 contexts within Area B (see Section E.3.2).

The dearth of material within the ceramic tile assemblage is of limited interpretative value, although it does reflect a variety of forms and their use within construction. The material provides evidence for the architecture of the building such as flat-tiled roofs capped with ridge tiles. The presence of the flat roof tile may be residual elements of the earlier buildings known to have existed on site. However, although the manufacturing characteristics of the tile within the assemblage tend to suggest flat roof tiles, the sole plates to late 18th century land drains are of similar form.

The land drains possibly represent dumping or elements of field drainage prior to the construction of the buildings.

Catalogue of Ceramic Tiles Per Area

Area B

Phase 3

One fragment of a pavement or floor tile representing an element of the paved areas associated with the domestic building. The two joining fragments of a hogback ridge tile, most likely a result casual deposition (see Section E.3.2).

Phase 5

The majority of the flat roof tile (99%) and land drain (68%) within the tile assemblage was recovered from this phase. This material may have been an aspect of dumping and/or possibly used for levelling. One fragment of a hogback ridge tile was also recovered.

Phase 7

This assemblage consisted of land drains, possible residual elements of agricultural activity or dumping.

Area C

Phase 1

A single fragment of flat roof tile, a likely result of casual deposition (see Section E.3.3).

Area D

Phase 4

Eight fragments of tile, unidentifiable by form. This most likely can be attributed to dumping (see Section E.3.4).

Phase 3

One fragment of a hogback ridge tile and a single fragment of land drain. Probable result of dumping.

The Stone Building Materials

One hundred and thirty-three fragments of stone building material (weight 49,165g) and 527 examples of slate building material (weight 11,017g) were recorded.

Roofing Slate

Slate tiles have been found to vary considerably in colour and uniformity. It is generally found in Wales, the south-west of England and the Lake District. Within areas of quarrying, slate has not only been utilised for roofing but paving, steps, stairs, window sills and surrounds, copings, chimney pieces shelves, water tanks, gravestones and later damp proof courses (Clifton Taylor 1987:158)

The fissile character of Welsh slate enabled it to be split into finer laminae than sandstone or limestone slates (6mm compared to 13-26mm) therefore significantly reducing the total roof weight and subsequently reducing the roof timber size. Welsh slate was exported to other parts of England by sea, canal and railway.

Slates were often preferred roofing material to ceramic tile as they were generally 33% lighter over the same area permitting smaller timber scantlings and required a less steeply pitched roof

It is debatable whether the colour of a slate can determine quality. Mitchell states that a good roofing slate should be uniform in colour and free from patches, compact, hard and rough to touch. Those which are found to be greasy and purple in colour being usually inferior for roofing purposes (Mitchell 1919b:89). However, others argue that the colour of slate is not much of a guide to quality (Rivington 1919:25)

General Warburton of Penryhn Quarry in 1750 devised the naming of the different slate sizes after female aristocratic ladies, the largest slate was the Queen 762mm in length but the most popular size was the Countess at 508mm x 254mm. Countesses were generally used for roofs with $\frac{1}{4}$ pitch, ladies $\frac{1}{8}$ pitch. The practice usually denotes that the steeper the pitch the smaller the slate. On roofs were mixed sizes are incorporated the smaller slates were generally along the ridge and the largest along the eaves (Tables F.6 and F.7).

Type	Size	Quantity
<i>Smalls</i>	12" x 6"	4
<i>Doubles</i>	13" x 7"	3
<i>Ladies</i>	16" x 8"	1
<i>Countesses</i>	20" x 10"	2
Not identified		417
Total		517 fragments

Table F.6: Slate types

Thickness	Frag
20mm	1
15mm	1
13mm	1
12mm	8
11 mm	2
10mm	24
9mm	1
8mm	67
7mm	54
6mm	14
5mm	32
<5mm	284
Total	526

Table F.7: Slate thickness

The majority of the slates; 192 fragments = 39.25%, were of a thickness that fell within the 5-10mm range ($\frac{1}{4}$ " - $\frac{3}{8}$ "). Twelve fragments were categorised within the 11mm-15mm range 2.50% and a single tile was of 20mm thickness. The remainder of the assemblage (58.5%) displayed a thickness of <5mm and represented thin laminae of broken slate.

Thirteen fragments displayed part or complete suspension nail holes ranging in diameter between 5mm-7mm. Fewer slates were needed to cover equal areas of roofing when nailing close to the middle rather than the head of the slate. Slating nails generally were manufactured from iron, zinc, copper, or lead. The iron nails

were usually cast or malleable, the latter only used for cheap work. Iron nails were seldom used after 1919 (Mitchell 1919a:408). The ferrous adhesions evident on seventeen slates can be attributed to the residual elements of the iron suspension nails.

Slate Discussion

All the assemblage was of Welsh slate and the nearest source of the material was probably the Foel Fahn Quarry at Llangollan, Denbighshire. Phase 3 contexts within Area A produced the majority of the material (37%) and only 0.1% was recovered from Area D, within Phase 1 contexts (see Sections E.3.1 and E.3.4).

Forty-seven fragments of slate bore residual mortar adhesions/stains suggesting use within the roof of the buildings; however, several fragments displayed mortar adhesions either over one or all of the broken edges. These fragments may represent either *filling* pieces within the roof construction or damp coursing from within the lower brick wall courses. Approximately 15% of the assemblage bore evidence of hand dressing along one or more edges. One example from context [2116] B/4 displayed a distinct row of bored holes, 4mm in diameter that suggests a post-quarry attempt at reducing the slate, probably for repairs.

Based upon thickness, the tiles do not appear to represent other aspects within a building such as sills, thresholds, floors etc, but are the residual elements of roofing material although a few fragments may have possibly originated from damp-courses. The overall quality of the slate was poor and several fragments displayed evidence of laminating suggesting that the life span as a roofing material was on the wane and new roofing material was needed.

Building Stone

The Assemblage and Discussion

Of the 133 fragments of stone recorded, 15% can be dismissed as geological pebbles. The majority of the assemblage is of sandstone and of the identifiable fragments (11%) display a single smooth surface indicative of wear suggesting that these are the flagstones forming the floor to the building. Five irregular limestone fragments with a single flat surface from contexts [2024], [2027], and [2008] may represent repairs to this floor. A single fragment of unidentified stone from context [2004] displayed a smooth surface and its characteristics tend to suggest that it may have been incorporated within the structure as a threshold.

Three fragments of sandstone display suspension holes ranging between 15mm-25mm indicative of roof tiles. The fragments range between 20-25mm in thickness and only one fragment displayed mortar adhesions. A further possible three fragments may represent roof tiles based upon their ferrous adhesions, possibly representing roofing nails.

Seventy-nine fragments (60%) display a thickness of <8mm and are therefore classed as laminae fragments and cannot be categorised. The majority of the assemblage (48%) was recovered from Phase 4 contexts within Area B. Area C produced the least with 2.25% of the assemblage evenly distributed between Phases 4 and 5 (see Sections E.3.2 and E.3.3).

Other Building Materials

The Mortar

Scotts dictionary of building describes "*mortar*" as a mixture of Portland cement, lime putty and sand in the proportions of 1:1:6 or 1:2:9 for the laying of bricks and stones. Until the manufacture of cement became general, lime-sand mortars were universal. The natural limes and cements that are used to build structures are produced by the natural calcination of limestone or other calcareous minerals. Materials such as limestone from which the production of limes and cements is extracted differ greatly within their composition which range from carbonate of lime (calcium carbonate) such as chalk, to stones that can contain between 10-30% clay (Rivington 1919).

Early mortars were composed of 1 part lime to 2 or 3 parts sand within which the Romans often mixed pounded tile in an attempt to render exterior walls impervious to rain. (Rivington 1919:149.). By the medieval period lime could be purchased ready burnt or burned in kilns especially constructed in the neighbourhood. If sea or shore sand was to be mixed with the lime it was preferred to have been extracted in the winter months when rains washed out some of the salt which made it unsatisfactory for building purposes (Salzman 1952:152). Ideally mortar should not contain dirt, silt or vegetable matter (Brunskill 1990:59-60) although within the 19th century attempts were made at matching mortar with brick colours. A black mortar was obtained by mixing 1 of lime to 3 of ash, ground clinker or black moulding sand from the foundry or blacksmiths shop. In the belief of obtaining greater strength iron filings and foundry scale was mixed with the lime. (Brunskill 1990:60).

No scientific analysis of the material has been undertaken, however all the mortar samples have been visibly examined using a 10x-magnification lens and described accordingly: grey/white 2.5YR 8/1 with occasional lithic/stone inclusions to <10mm. The majority (75%) was recovered from Area B, evenly distributed between Phases 3 and 4 (see Section E.3.2).

Of the seven fragments within the assemblage, four were identified as demolition mortar from wall construction, a fifth fragment still retaining its trowel pointed surface. The material varied in colour from white to light grey and all were subjected to testing with dilute hydrochloric acid. The results showed that all the samples were more likely to be composed of Portland cement and quarried sand rather than slaked lime and sand.

Putty

Glaziers or painters putty is generally described as a plastic material used for bedding glass. It is made from whiting mixed with linseed oil and occasionally white lead is added. Plasterers putty is made of pure chalk lime, slaked and allowed to '*mellow*' for an extensive period of time before use (Mitchell 1919b:62). The seven examples recorded from contexts [2025], [1012] and [1013] were all from window glazing and displayed the characteristic flat surfaces with sharp edges. Phase 4 contexts within Area B produced four of the seven fragments (see Section E.3.2).

Plaster

Plaster is the term more often given to calcareous compounds the base of which is calcium sulphate (Mitchell 1919b:64). It is often used in both external and internal plastering and is applied to ceilings and walls whilst plastic which later hardens.

Sixty-three fragments of wall plaster were identified within the assemblage ranging in thickness between 6mm-30mm. Many of the fragments were abraded due to the soft nature of the material. Several fragments retained painted surfaces including fragments from context [2073] displaying at least three separate coats. Colours recorded were light blue, dark green, brown, cream and white. The white paint was of gloss whilst the remainder of water-based emulsion. A single fragment from context [1012] A/1 was the thickest recorded (30mm) and also displayed two flat surfaces and two distinct (water?) pipe impressions on the underside. Plaster was most predominant within phase 5 contexts, of Area B (65% of the assemblage).

F.3.5: Tobacco Pipes

By Susie White, ARCUS, University of Sheffield

Introduction

The ASP excavations produced a total of 185 clay tobacco pipe fragments, comprising 49 bowls, 132 stems and 4 mouthpieces, together with the remains of one briar pipe and nine vulcanite mouthpieces, and one unidentified pipe-lay object, from a total of 31 different pipe bearing contexts.

Methodology and treatment of the material

The pipe fragments from Alderley Edge have been individually examined and details of each fragment logged on an Excel spreadsheet. The layout of the spreadsheet has been based on the draft pipe recording system that has been developed at the University of Liverpool (Higgins & Davey 1994). Copies of the spreadsheet and the draft recording system have been deposited as part of the site archive. A context summary is presented as Appendix F.7 of this report. Appendix F.8 presents a graph to show the overall date range for each context together with the date ranges of the more diagnostic and marked fragments. Stem-bores for the bowl fragments and marked stems have been measured to the nearest 64th of an inch using a ruler. In the case of the plain stems, only the surface treatment and a count have been given, ie the bores of plain stems have not been measured. Plaster casts have been made of all the stamped marks and entered into the National Clay Tobacco Pipe Stamp Catalogue, a copy of which is held by the National Clay Tobacco Pipe Archive at the University of Liverpool.

The Tobacco Pipes in Context

Clay tobacco pipes are probably the most useful dating tool for archaeological deposits of post-medieval date. They are found almost everywhere, were short-lived and were subject to rapid change in both size and shape. They can often be tied to a specific production site or, at the very least, to a regional centre. Subtle differences in their style and quality enable them to be used as indicators of social status as well as a means by which trade patterns can be studied.

A context summary listing all the fragments recovered is provided in Appendix F.7. The graph in Appendix F.8 has plotted the overall date range for each context group (shaded grey) together with the date range for the more diagnostic and marked fragments (red crosses).

Of the 31 different pipe bearing contexts from the excavations at Alderley Edge, 24 produced less than ten fragments. With the majority of the contexts contain a number of very small bowl fragments and plain stems, which are difficult to date closely.

Area A

Area A produced a total of 47 pipe fragments comprising six bowls, 29 stems and 12 mouthpieces. This includes a briar pipe bowl and nine vulcanite mouthpieces, all post dating 1850. By looking at the date ranges plotted on the chart in Appendix F.8, it is clear that the overall date range for Area A is c.1700-1950. The more diagnostic and marked fragments however all cluster within a much tighter date range of c.1820-1950. There is not evidence of 17th century activity in this area but a number of plain stems suggest that there was some activity from the mid 18th century onwards. This would tie in well with the documentary evidence that suggests the cottage in Area A was built during the 1740s.

Area B

Area B produced the largest group of pipe fragments from the site, comprising 43 bowls, 96 stems and a single mouthpiece, and was the only area to produce any 17th century material. The overall date range for Area B is c.1610-1950+ which is much wider than that from either Area A or Area C, as the graph in Appendix B clearly shows. There are two distinct peaks in activity, the first in the 17th century, c.1640-1710, and the second from the mid 18th century through to the 20th century, c.1740-1950+. This ties in well with the documentary evidence that suggests there was a 17th-century cottage in Area B and that occupation of this area continued through to the early 1950s.

Area C

Area C produced the smallest group of finds from the site with a total of just nine fragments comprising two bowls and seven stems. It is difficult to say very much about this group given how small and fragmentary it is, but an overall date range of c.1700-1860 is suggested. The earliest fragments from Area C are two plain 18th century stems. The most diagnostic fragment from Area C was a part of a bowl with a ring and dot motif on the side of the spur, recovered from context [3002]. This would almost certainly have come from a long-stemmed spur pipe dating from c.1810-1860.

Summary

A small number of pipes dating from the 17th century are represented on the site, but interestingly, only from Area B. In spite of the fact that fragments have been recovered from the 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th centuries, it is interesting to note that there are no early 17th century pipes. There is also a “dip” in the early part of the 18th century. This may in part be due to the fact that bowls of this period had particularly thin walls, which do not survive well in the ground. There is also evidence from other parts of the country to suggest that fewer pipes were being smoked due to the increased popularity in snuff taking.

The latest period of occupation on the site is marked by an interesting group of vulcanite mouthpieces, and a single briar pipe, which represent the changing smoking habits in the 20th century.

The Tobacco Pipes Themselves

Having considered the tobacco pipes in context, the following sections go on to look at the tobacco pipes themselves.

Bowls

A total of 51 bowl fragments were recovered from the excavations at Alderley Edge, the most diagnostic of which are discussed under the three following headings; Plain Bowls; Mould Decorated Bowls and Briar Bowls.

1) Plain Bowls

The excavations at Alderley Edge produced a total of 25 plain bowl fragments. The majority of these are just small fragments, which has resulted in them being given quite broad date ranges.

The only 17th-century bowl fragments to be recovered from the site came from Area B. The most complete of these was recovered from Area B/4, context [2124] and dates from c.1650-1670 (Appendix F.9: Fig 1). This particular bowl is a typical local product of the period and it has a milled and bottered rim. Of slightly later date, c.1660-1710, is a spur fragment from Area B/5, context [2076]. (Appendix F.9: Fig 2). Although only fragmentary this particular fragment appears to date to the end of the 17th century, or just into the first decade of the 18th century. The remaining early bowl fragments recovered from the site would appear to date from the mid 17th through to the first decade of the 18th century, ie c.1650-1710.

The plain 18th century bowls recovered from the site are also very fragmentary. Bowls of this period had much thinner walls than those of the 17th century, which meant that they were much more fragile. As a result large fragments do not survive well in the ground and bowls of this period are often under represented in the archaeological record. The presence of so many small bowl fragments, and a number of plain stems, however, suggests that 18th century material was present on the site although their fragmentary nature makes it impossible to identify specific bowl types.

From Area B/2, context [2006] came a small 19th-century bowl fragment with distinctive roughing up scars on the interior of the bowl, together with traces of what appears to be an internal bowl cross. These are features that are seen regularly in 19th and 20th century pipes and are caused by marks on the stopper that was used to create the bowl cavity. In his description of the manufacture of clay pipes in 1946, Gordon Pollock states that these “roughing up” scars were made by a “sharp firm taps by a crisp heavy steel file” and that they “helped to prevent the walls of the moulded pipe from being sucked inwards when the stopper was raised from the mould” (Jung 2003:11).

The latest plain bowl and one of the most complete, to be recovered from the site, dates from c.1850-1920 (Appendix F.9: Fig 9) and was recovered from Area B/3, context [2044]. It is most likely to have been a spur type bowl, but the spur is now missing.

2) Mould Decorated and Marked Bowls

The excavations at Alderley Edge produced a total of 24 mould decorated or marked bowl fragments, all of these fragments date from the 19th or early 20th century.

The earliest decorated pipes from the site were recovered from Area B/2, context [2006], and date from c.1810-1840. A total of five fragments were recovered, three of which came from the same bowl with the fourth from an identical bowl that appears to have been made from the same mould (Appendix F.9: Fig 7). These bowls have

leaf-decorated seams and moulded milling. On the lower part of both are a series of enclosed flutes. The upper part of the bowl on the smoker's left has panel bearing a floral motif, whilst the panel on the smoker's right is decorated with Masonic motifs. The fifth fragment is also a spur and would appear to be from a similar bowl, although it has not been possible to make an exact match. It is, however, possible that this final fragment is simply part of a bowl decorated with fine flutes. Flutes were one of the most common forms of decoration on bowls of the late 18th and 19th century. Wide flutes were common at the end of the 18th century with narrow flutes becoming more common towards the mid 19th century.

Part of another bowl decorated with Masonic motifs was recovered from Area B/5 context [2114] dating from c1830-1860 (not illustrated). This particular fragment, from a different mould, is very poorly moulded but parts of the square and compass can still be seen.

The largest group of mould decorated bowls date from the period 1810-1860 and comprises nine essentially plain bowls, all of which have leaf decorated seams. Two of these have been illustrated (Appendix F.9: Figs 3 and 4). The example from Area B/2, context [2006], Special Find (SF) <234> has a moulded dot on either side of the spur as well as leaf-decorated seams (Appendix F.9: Fig 4). Also from Area B/2, context [2006] came a small spur fragment dating from c.1800-1900 (Appendix F.9: Fig 5). This also has dots on the spur, but in this particular example there are three dots on each side rather than just one. Unfortunately the seams are damaged on this example so it is not possible to say if they also had leaf-decoration originally.

Three other bowls from the site had leaf-decorated seams but this time in conjunction with other decorative motifs. The first, and most fragmentary, was recovered from Area B/2, context [2085] and dates from c.1800-1900 (not illustrated). This particular bowl fragment is very small and although the leaf-decoration on the seam can clearly be seen, not enough of the bowl survives to identify the nature of the other decorative motifs that area also visible.

The second bowl came from Area B/2, context [2027] and comprises four joining fragments dating from c.1810-1850 (Appendix F.9: Fig 6). This particular example has a very tall elegant bowl with raised bands or 'ribs' on the lower part of the bowl. Both seams are decorated with a panel of leaves that are rather unusual in that the leaves point downwards. Although now missing, it is most likely that this bowl originally had a spur.

The third bowl was recovered from Area A/2, context [1035] and dates from c.1840-1870 (Appendix F.9: Fig 8). In addition to the main decorative scheme, comprising a series of narrow flutes on the lower part of the bowl with a series of broad panels above, this bowl also has leaf-decorated seams together with a ring and dot motif on either side of the spur. Another spur fragment dating from c.1810-1860 with a ring and dot motif was recovered from Area C/1, context [3002] (not illustrated). This was almost certainly from a long-stemmed pipe but not enough of the bowl survives to be able to say if it was plain or decorated.

3) *Briar Bowl*

One of the more interesting finds from the excavations at Alderley Edge is the briar pipe bowl recovered from Area A/3, context [2003], SF <352>. Briar pipes are made from the root burl of the white heather tree (*Erica arborea*), which only appears to

grow in those countries bordering the western Mediterranean, such as France, Italy, Corsica, Morocco and Algeria (Linney 1924:107). The root burl grows very slowly, often being 30-50 years old before it is harvested, and is noted for its hardness and fine grain. Some of the earliest, and finest, briar roots were harvested in Corsica (*ibid*) and roots from here supplied the small workshops in a number of villages in the Jura Mountains of France, most notably that of St Claude.

Henri Comoy and his brothers established the first briar pipe factory in England in 1879 (Linney 1924:106). Comoy's were very quickly followed by a number of other firms, as briar pipes grew in popularity, and a number of them continue to the present day. By the early 1900s manufacturers were offering a wide range of pipe styles with pattern names such as *Billiard*, *Dublin*, *Apple*, *Bulldog* and *Rhodesian*. The briar pipe recovered from the excavations at Alderley Edge is poorly preserved and most of its original surface finish has now decayed away (Appendix F.9: Fig 23), but it is possible to identify the basic bowl form as a Billiard type.

By the 1920s many of clay tobacco pipe manufacturers both in this county and on the continent had gone out of business. The larger firms that were left struggled on, but were increasingly under pressure to diversify in order to counter the changing smoking habits of their customers and in particular the increasing popularity of the briar pipe.

Stems

The dating of the stems has been given in broad date ranges. Stem dates should be used with caution since they are much more general and less reliable than dates that can be determined from bowl fragments or from stems that are decorated or marked by known makers.

The excavations at Alderley Edge produced a total of 132 stem fragments, 127 (96%) of which were completely plain. One of these plain stem fragments, from Area B/2, context [2027], dating from c.1750-1850, has faint traces of a green glaze and clearly came from towards the mouthpiece end of a long stemmed pipe. The use of a green lead-glaze to coat mouthpieces did not appear until c.1800 but had gone out of fashion by c.1910. The remaining six stems are marked or have been modified in some way and are discussed below.

One stem, dating from c.1750-1850, was recovered from Area B/5, context [2114], (Appendix F.9: Fig 11). This has a rather curious spiral mark around the stem that is less than 1mm wide. In places this appears to be a continuous groove, but in others it has the appearance of very fine milling. It is unclear if this is an accidental or deliberate mark nor is it clear whether it was produced before or after firing.

Three of the stems from Alderley Edge have traces of either a moulded design or moulded lettering on them, both recovered from Area A/2, context [1035]. The first has crudely moulded leaves long the seams and dates from c.1810-1850 (Appendix F.9: Fig 10). The second fragment is a stem made of red clay and has the incuse moulded lettering W.WHITE/GLASGOW along its sides (Appendix F.9: Fig 13). This particular fragment can be attributed to William White and Son of Glasgow who were working from c.1846-1955 and who often used red clay for their pipes. The third, and final, fragment is from Area A/1, context [1012] and comprises a plain spur and stem marked with the incuse moulded lettering COGHILL/GLASGOW (Appendix F.9: Fig

12). The Coghills were a successful family of pipemakers from Glasgow working from c.1826-1904. It is interesting to note that in this particular example the makers name appears on the smoker's right although the more usual position for it was on the smokers left.

The two remaining stems both have ground ends, and both date from c.1750-1850. The first was recovered from Area B/2, context [2028] (Appendix F.9: Fig 14) and the second from Area B/5, context [2076] (not illustrated). In both cases the grinding appears to be slightly faceted suggesting that these fragments were used in much the same way as a piece of chalk to write graffiti. Stems that have been used in this way have been found throughout Yorkshire and other parts of the country from as early as the 17th century onwards.

Mouthpieces

A total of 13 mouthpieces were recovered from the excavations at Alderley Edge comprising four made of clay and nine made of Vulcanite.

1) Clay Mouthpieces

Only four clay mouthpieces were recovered from the excavations, two dating from c.1750-1850 and two dating from c.1850 or later. The earliest two mouthpieces both had simply cut ends with no obvious coating or finish. One was recovered from Area A/2, context [1004], and the other from Area B/5, context [2076].

The remaining two mouthpieces, both from Area A/2, context [1035], date from c.1850 or later and are of a 'nipple' type. These would have come from the short-stemmed, cutty pipes that were popular from the mid 19th century.

2) Vulcanite Mouthpieces

In addition to the clay mouthpieces discussed above, the excavations at Alderley Edge produced an interesting group of vulcanite mouthpieces. Vulcanite is a relatively recent invention and mouthpieces made of this new material rarely appear in archaeological contexts. Only two published vulcanite mouthpieces are known from the British Isles. These were recovered during excavations at Castle Rushen Stores, in Castletown on the Isle of Man in 1992 (Higgins 1996: Figs 55.29-30).

Vulcanite is a hard rubber created by the vulcanisation of natural rubber with sulphur and was discovered by Charles Goodyear in the USA c.1839, although from the 1930s a variety of synthetic rubbers were used rather than natural rubber. Vulcanite was patented in England by a man called Hancock in May 1843 and in the USA by Nelson Goodyear, Charles' brother, in 1851 (*ibid*). Both Hancock and Goodyear exhibited a number of mouldings in this new material at the Great Exhibition in 1851. Mouthpieces made of vulcanite appear in England from c.1878 onwards (Dunhill 1977:197).

Mouthpieces as well as cigar and cigarette holders appear in a catalogue for George Zorn & Co, Philadelphia dated 1892 (Jung 1989) and were advertised by a number of briar pipe makers right through to the present day. For example, L. Orlik Ltd., London from c.1899; Charatan Pipes Ltd., London c.1951; B. Barling & Sons Ltd., London c.1962; Duncans Briars Ltd., Leigh, Lancashire c.1974 and Oppenheimer Pipes, Hockley, Essex c.1980.

A total of nine vulcanite mouthpieces were recovered from the excavations at Alderley Edge suggesting that at least nine briar pipes in a variety of styles must have been used on the site. Seven of these mouthpieces were recovered from Area A/1, context [1004] with the remaining two from Area A/3, context [1004], SF <190>. A selection of these have been illustrated in Appendix F.9: Figures 15 to 21.

Although very little has been published on the range of vulcanite mouthpiece types it is possible to identify some of them from the trade catalogues produced by a number of the briar pipe manufactures at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries. From Area A/3, context [1004], SF <190> came two mouthpieces that are described as a 'saddle' type (Appendix F.9: Figs 20 and 21). One of these is of a more common type, which is circular in section (Appendix F.9: Fig 20) and could have been used with a wide range of briar pipe forms. The second is a little more unusual in that it is square in section (Appendix F.9: Fig 21) and is most likely to have come from one of two main briar pipe forms, a Bulldog or a Rhodesian.

With the mouthpieces from Area A/1, context [1004], it is less easy to identify them as being associated with a specific briar pipe form. Three of the mouthpieces appear to be a 'taper' type (Appendix F.9: Figs 15, 16 and 19). Figure 19 is interesting in that it is the only mouthpiece to be marked and can therefore be more closely dated. On the smokers left is the lettering AERO in an oval and on the smokers right is the lettering PROV.PAT above the number 31128/30. PROV.PAT means *provisional patent* and suggests that the patent for this particular mouthpiece had not been fully registered at the time of manufacture. The number 31128 is the actual patent number and the suffix /30 denotes the year, in this case 1930 (P Hammond *pers com*). Two of the mouthpieces are of a 'fantail' type, only the most complete of which has been illustrated (Appendix F.9: Fig 17). Both the taper and fantail types were used with a wide range of briar pipe forms.

The two remaining vulcanite mouthpieces, only one of which is substantially complete (Appendix F.9: Fig 18) are rather different. Mouthpieces with a gentle curve seem to have been referred to as a 'quarter bend' but the examples that appear in the trade catalogues appear to be much flatter in section than the Alderley Edge examples. These two fragments are very round, or cylindrical in section and the part of the mouthpiece that would have been put in the mouth appears to be missing in both examples. The end that would have attached to the pipe bowl is not the same as the other vulcanite mouthpieces from Alderley Edge and it has not been possible to match it to any of the examples in the existing trade catalogues.

Seven of the nine vulcanite mouthpieces recovered from the excavations at Alderley Edge have evidence of tooth-wear, particularly the AERO stem, and were clearly heavily used. It is most likely that the vulcanite stems and the single briar pipe represent the collection of a single pipe smoker. It is unfortunate that only one of the briar bowls that would have gone with these mouthpieces has survived. Although vulcanite was being used as early as the 1850s, it is most likely that this particular group dates from c.1930+.

Pipe-Clay Object

In addition to the tobacco pipes recovered from the site at Alderley Edge there was a single unidentified object made from pipe clay. This is a small cone shaped object with a dished base and was recovered from Area B/4, context [2073], SF <89>

(Appendix F.9: Fig 22). The object may well have been mass produced by pressing the clay into a one-piece mould. The dished base is covered in a light green glaze that has bubbled and cracked. It is most likely that this object dates from the 19th or early 20th century.

Conclusions

The assemblage from the excavations at Alderley Edge is rather small but provides examples of a range of tobacco pipes from the 17th century through to the mid 20th. One of the most interesting aspects of the assemblage from Alderley Edge is the presence of a group of vulcanite mouthpieces and the remains of a briar pipe. Objects of this type are rarely encountered in archaeological contexts and they present a unique opportunity to study the changing habits in smoking at the end of the 20th century.

F.3.6: Coins

By Hugh Willmott, ARCUS, University of Sheffield

A total of sixteen coins were recovered from the excavations, and all but one came from Area A (catalogued below). The majority are 20th century in date and include standard bronze, nickel brass and cupro-nickel issues from the reigns of Edward VII to George VI (1901-1952). However, two 19th century coins were also found. The first, C14, is a 1807 half penny of George II. Relatively few copper coins were issued in the late 18th century, but quite a large number of halfpennies were minted in the fourth issue of 1806-7. The other earlier coin, C16, is an 1840 Type A³ silver shilling of Victoria, with a second head and no initials on truncation.

The coins are in themselves of relatively little archaeological interest, although they are representative of the period that the site was occupied. Why the majority were found in Area A is less clear, but they do help provide *terminus ante quem* dates for the contexts in which they were found.

C1 Farthing of George VI (1936-52). R. Wren. Nickel brass, first issue 1942.
[1001] A/1 <51>

C2 Farthing of George V (1910-36). R. Britannia. Bronze, 1918.
[1001] A/3 <3>

C3 Farthing of George VI (1936-52). R. Wren. Nickel brass, first issue 1940.
[1001] A/4 <32>

C4 Shilling of George V (1910-36). R. Lion on crown inner circles. Silver, second coinage, 1920-6. [1004] A/1 <5>

C5 Sixpence of George V (1910-36). R. Three oak sprigs with six acorns. Silver, fourth coinage, 1930. [1004] A/1 <5>

C6 Penny of Edward VII (1901-10). R. Britannia. Bronze, 1908.
[1004] A/1 <365>

C7 Shilling of George VI (1937-52). R. 'English' type, lion on large crown. Cupro-nickel, second coinage, 1948. [1004] A/1 <5>

C8 Farthing of George VI (1937-52). R. Wren. Nickel brass, first issue 1939.
[1004] A/1 <5>

C9 Farthing of George VI (1937-52). R. Wren. Nickel brass, first issue 1942.
[1004] A/1 <5>

C10 Halfpenny of George VI (1937-52). R. Ship. Nickel brass, first issue 1940.
[1004] A/3 <196>

C11 Farthing of George V (1910-36). R. Britannia. Bronze, 1924.
[1004] A/3 <168>

C12 Threepence of George VI (1937-52). R. Thrift. Nickel brass, first issue 1944.
[1004] A/3 <288>

C13 Sixpence of George VI (1937-52). R. GRI crowned. Cupro-nickel, second
coinage 1947
[1004] A/3 <176>

C14 Halfpenny of George III (1760-1820). R. Britannia. Copper, fourth issue-Soho
1807.
[1005] A/4 <273>

C15 Farthing of George VI (1936-52). R. Wren. Nickel brass, first issue 1942.
[1028] A/3 <353>

C16 Shilling of Victoria (1837-1901). Silver Type A³. Second head 1840.
[2001] B/5 <112>

F.3.7: Animal Bone

By Sean Bell, ARCUS, University of Sheffield

A total of 241 fragments of animal bone were recovered from Areas A (149 fragments), B (91 fragments) and D (1 fragment), although none were recovered from Area C (Appendix F.10). Within Area A, contexts [1012], [1013] and [1035], 95 fragments represented intrusive elements from single individuals of rodent or rabbit. These have been excluded from the analysis. Due to the small size and fragmentary nature of the assemblage, a detailed analysis of the 'population' is impractical.

All the animal bone identified in Area A was recovered from contexts relating to the two demolition phases, or the intervening phase. The fragments recovered from Area A were generally less fragmentary than those recovered from Area B. A number of elements clearly represented joints of meat consumed on or near the site. These were generally cow and sheep, with a single fragment of rabbit rib bearing cut marks. No fragments were identified as pig, though the possibility remains that pig is represented by a number of the indeterminate fragments.

Four fragments recovered from Area A were identified as being worked. Two examples, from contexts [1004] and [1013], were cut in to rectangular shapes of less than 0.1cm in thickness. These were undecorated and their possible use could not

be determined, though they appeared unfinished. A third example from context [1012] was a button. The final example was a fragment of red deer antler tine which had been used as a knife handle, with the broken tang still present within the handle itself. It was unclear if the slightly polished sheen to the antler exterior was the original finish or as the result of extensive use.

The deposits underlying the structures in Area B contained four fragments of bone, three of which had been chopped, and as such probably represented joints of meat, and may have dated from the 17th century occupation.

The earlier structural phases, represented by contexts [2063], [2073], [2127] and [2161], also contain a high proportion of fragments showing evidence for consumption related activities. There are a number of burnt/calced fragments and cow-sized ribs which have been butchered. In contrast to those fragments in Area A, however, these appear to have been sawn rather than chopped.

The overlying demolition layer, contexts [2027] and [2028], contains only a few, small fragments along with a piece of finished bone, shaped as a disk with a central, circular puncture.

Over half of the fragments recovered were from contexts dated to Structural Phase 5. This group contained a sizeable proportion of small, indeterminate fragments. The majority of the larger fragments again showed evidence for being prepared for consumption. Context [2025] contained a bone handle. This appeared to be manufactured using a cow metapodial. An iron rivet was visible, and one surface had been incised with two series of parallel, diagonal lines as decoration.

The overlying demolition, post-demolition and topsoil layers contained a similar assemblage. Context [2001] contained a worked, sub-rectangular fragment similar to those recovered from contexts [1004] and [1013]. The example from context [2001], however, was highly polished, giving a wood-like appearance, with one face decorated with a single series of incised, longitudinal, parallel lines. As with those in Area A, the use for these items could not be determined.

Only one fragment of bone was recovered from Area D. This was a small, burnt indeterminate fragment.

F.3.8: Plastics

By Joan Unwin, ARCUS, University of Sheffield

The plastic finds were all clear to see, though some were not recognisable, being small parts of larger items. The items were identified and simply described. The report describes the finds according to Areas and Units and the finds identified in each unit are listed together with a brief summary. All the identified objects are listed in Unit order in Appendix F.11 with a brief description, together with their context and bag numbers.

The excavation of these plastic finds provides an opportunity to assess the types of items found in these households. The items appear to date (on stylistic grounds) from the 1930s onwards. This is a time when more and more consumer items were being made of one or other of the new plastics. Increasing numbers of objects were

being made from cheaper plastics, replacing the more costly natural materials, such as bone, ivory and tortoiseshell.

Early Plastics

It is not possible to give a clear identification of many plastics without some testing procedures. Destructive testing such as applying heat, will identify some types, but non-destructive testing, using Fourier Transform infrared spectroscopy, is much more reliable, as well as not damaging the object. However, some indication can be given here, based on the probable use of a particular plastic for specific products.

The value of 'plastics' lies in their properties allowing them to be moulded and to carry colours. Once machinery had been developed to capitalise on these properties, manufacturers could use semi-skilled labour to produce items similar to those made from natural materials, but at a fraction of the cost. From the 17th century, people have exploited the properties of such natural material as horn to make moulded objects such as knife handles and buttons. By the 19th century, an increasing number of objects were being marketed for the homes of the rising middle classes. Rubber and bitumen were other examples of natural 'plastics'.

The chemical treatment of some of these natural materials resulted in a more useful product. Rubber can be vulcanised (treated) with varying amounts of sulphur and can produce a hard, black, semi-synthetic plastic called 'vulcanite' used for such items as tobacco pipe stems and fountain pens. Later, a semi-synthetic plastic 'celluloid' was developed in the 1860 and marketed as Xylonite and Ivorine. These items were extensively used in the cutlery trades to imitate ivory knife handles. They were also used to make combs, hair slides and toys. Useful as these products were, they were highly flammable.

The major synthetic plastic was 'Bakelite' developed during the early years of the 20th century. Made from phenol and formaldehyde, it is extremely brittle. This can be modified by including fabric, paper, or cotton into the plastic, which give it both strength and an attractive finish. The colours tend to be dark and this plastic was used for larger items, such as telephones or radio cases.

The finds from Sandhills include some items which are likely to be Xylonite and Bakelite and possibly Vulcanite. Some natural materials have been included with these plastics – bone crochet hooks and a bone mouthpiece for a tobacco pipe.

The finds have been divided into the following groupings:

- 1. furniture** – there are very few items which can be definitely identified as being part of some item of furniture
- 2. domestic items** – a few items, notably the tops from mineral water bottles, have been found
- 3. personal items** – these constitute the largest group of finds, including beads, buttons and combs.
- 4. miscellaneous** – there are a few items, such as parts of toys, included in this section.
- 5. unidentifiable** – there are some items which are part of larger objects and cannot be identified.

Description of the finds from each area – units and contexts

Using the information that has been given relating to the contexts and unit areas, there seems to be no clearly identifiable locations for or periods of activity. The impression is that artefacts, most of which are quite small, have been thoroughly mixed up through the layers. Most finds were in the topsoil or in the post demolition layer, suggesting that some had been dropped there after the residents left, and therefore may have no connection with the families.

1) Area A

Area A – Unit 1

context	bag	description
domestic		
a) cutlery		
1004	15	Xylonite square handle for a through tang table knife, blade broken
c) other		
<i>1004</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>blue painted metal seal from a Gin bottle, Groves and Whitnal</i>
1004	15	mineral water bottle stopper, elliptical, marked Salford
1004	15	mineral water bottle stopper, Groves and Whitnall, Salford
personal		
1004	15	quantity of purple, red and glass beads
<i>1004</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>bone mouth piece of a tobacco pipe</i>
1004	15	comb; brown bakelite comb, men's type 120mm.
1004	15	ten buttons as - two green buttons, gilded, with shanks 20mm diameter; trouser button; two square black and gilded buttons blouse? with shanks; black button with broken shank; child's black shoe button, with shank; pearl button; two white buttons
1004	15	'pearl' earring, no fastener
furniture		
1004	15	Bakelite knurled knob - from a radio ?
miscellaneous		
1004	15	Vulcanite ?broken pointed end of a black knitting needle
<i>1004</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>2 bone crochet hook handle, metal tip missing; bone crochet hook</i>
1004	15	tiddly-wink, cream
1004	15	2 grey balls; 2 squashed balls
1004	15	bicycle brake pad, vulcanised rubber

Table F.8: Area A, Unit One finds, listed in the grouping described above. Items in italic are not plastic.

Unit One encompassed the front room and part of the kitchen of the Perrin household, plus the entrance hall and part of the cellar steps belonging to the Barber household. This Unit produced the largest number of finds. The majority are of a personal nature, mainly buttons from female clothing. Several of the other finds relate to children – a tiddly wink and a small brake pad from a bike. Of interest is the number of mineral water bottle tops scattered around the site, being found in most Units. They are mostly from Manchester or Salford suppliers.

Area A – Unit 2

context	lot	description
domestic		
c)other		
1004	133	two mineral water bottle tops, Groves and Whithall, one has the number 23 and one 25
furniture		
1012	319	cream stud, 25mm diameter – from furniture?
personal		
1035	133	two pieces of a large plain comb, brown Bakelite
miscellaneous		
1035	133	tennis ball

Table F.9: Area A, Unit Two finds, listed in the grouping described above

Unit Two covered the rear part of the Perrin's kitchen, part of Barber's cellar steps and outside the cottages to the rear. Again, there are two mineral water bottle tops.

Area A - Unit 3

context	lot	description
personal		
<i>1004</i>	<i>219</i>	<i>brush, bone, no bristles, for ringlets or doll?</i>
miscellaneous		
1004	288	golf ball
unidentifiable		
1004	226	blue tubes, brittle and ridged, ferrous wire inside

Table F.10: Area A, Unit Three finds, listed in the grouping described above. Items in italic are note plastic

This unit covered the Barber's front room, part of the kitchen and an additional room.

Area A - Unit 4

context	lot	description
domestic		
1005	237	mineral water bottle top, Groves and Whithall, Ltd., 2 Salford, GB, number 24

Table F.11: Area A, Unit Four finds, listed in the grouping described above.

Unit Four covers the rear of the Barber's kitchen and the area outside the house.

Area A Conclusions

There were few finds which could add information about the lives of the families in these two houses. They drank mineral water, seeming to prefer that from the Groves and Whithall Brewery, which dated from the 1880s. The majority of the plastic finds relate to female clothing in the form of a variety of buttons. There is a trouser button and two white buttons which may also be from men's clothing. The other group of items of interest are those linked to recreational activity, but perhaps the items were

lost here when children and youths visited the cottage area after they were demolished.

The items made from plastics are small and there is only slight evidence that the families had any of the larger items, such as a radio. There is no evidence that any domestic items such as plastic plates and cups had been used.

2) Area B

The two households in the building at the end of their occupation were the Misses Ellams and a Mr Knight, who replaced the Barrow family.

Area B – Unit 2

context	lot	description
miscellaneous		
2001	34	rubber, red, connector for a pipe ?

Table F.12: Area B, Unit Two finds, listed in the grouping described above.

This Unit covers the front of the house belonging to the Barrow household – the entrance, part of the front room, the kitchen and stairs.

Area B – Unit 3

context	lot	description
personal		
2044	48	part white button
miscellaneous		
2001	101	two rectangles of Bakelite 90mm square, c.1930s-40s, with a copper coil woven round a series of graphite rods, possibly a tuning device, short wave, may be an aerial. Possibly for outside, on top of a portable radio.
2044	48	cream tiddly wink, black fragment, white fragment

Table F.13: Area B, Unit Three finds, listed in the grouping described above.

This Unit covers the rear of the Ellam house, with a substantial part of the Unit being outside the building. One extremely intriguing item is possibly from a radio, acting as an aerial.

Area B – Unit 4

context	lot	description
domestic		
2044	268	mineral water bottle top, Groves and Whithall, Ltd., Ltd. 2 Salford, GB
2044	349	mineral water bottle top, Sumner fulwood
miscellaneous		
2024	35	plastic figure of a man, made in Germany
2040	75	fragment of green plastic ?

Table F.14: Area B, Unit Four finds, listed in the grouping described above.

Unit Four covers the rear extensions of the Barrow household and the pathway beyond the back wall.

Area B – Unit 5

context	lot	description
domestic		
2001	100	mineral water bottle top, chequered pattern, no name
2001	109	two mineral water bottle top, Spardal Mineral Water Co Ltd., Manchester
personal		
2001	102	black sunglasses, right hand lens and arm only, made in Italy
miscellaneous		
2001	151	Bakelite disc, screw thread on back, screw inner thread on front

Table F.15: Area B, Unit Five finds, listed in the grouping described above.

This Unit covers a path and a privy at the rear of the Barrow house.

Area B Conclusions

The notable results of the finds here are the mineral water bottle tops. As in the cottages of Area A, there is no indication that these finds were related to any specific area of activity within the cottages. Since the majority were found in the topsoil, some items may result from the activities of children, etc after the cottages were demolished.

3) Area D

The area was a rubbish dump and only Unit 2 yielded a few fragments of plastic.

Area D – Unit 2

context	bag	description
personal		
4002	80	pink/red fragment - part of slide see also 4003/90
4002	233	comb, brown Bakelite, simulating tortoiseshell
4003	90	part of red hair slide ? black colour on front, pierced pattern

Table F.16: Area D, Unit Two finds, listed in the grouping described above.

General Conclusions for Plastic Analysis

The excavations of these two sets of dwellings dating from at least the mid 18th century has provided a small number of plastic finds, almost all dating from the first half of the 20th century. The condition of the finds was reasonable; they had been cleaned and were not coated in any encrustations. The majority of the finds seem to be celluloid and are mostly personal objects. The objects, as a group, are interesting in that they show the types of plastic items which would have been common, during

the 1930s and 1940s. The objects, especially those related to personal possessions, confirm the images seen in newspapers, magazines and catalogues of the time.

The finding of plastic material in an archaeological context provides an interesting dilemma. The problems for society caused by the non-degradable characteristic of plastics, which was one of its prime attractions, make plastics an almost ideal find, since it will have suffered little. However, plastics do degrade, even if this is almost imperceptible. If any of these finds are required for long-term care, then it would be essential to determine the exact type of plastic. Many of the early plastics give off corrosive gases and chemicals can migrate to adjacent materials.

F.3.9: Organic Materials

By Antonia Thomas, ARCUS, University of Sheffield

The Assemblage

Items of textiles, leather and wood were recovered from Areas A, B and D although none were found in Area C (Appendix F.12).

The textiles and leather recovered from the site can be split into three broad categories of artefact; namely footwear, textiles and leather with buckles or other fixtures attached, and other, undiagnostic fabric pieces.

Leather pieces identifiable as elements of footwear were recovered from seven locations on site: Area A/1, context [1004]; Area B/3, context [2043]; Area B/3, context [2044]; Area B/4, context [2044]; Area D/2, context [4003]; Area D/3, context [4006]; and Area D/4, context [4007]. Many of the miscellaneous scraps of leather recovered from other contexts on the site may have originally come from footwear items as well, although this is conjectural, as they lack the identifiable characteristics of lacing or cut vamps that were seen in the other items. The sturdiness of the leather used in the footwear, and the size of the uppers, suggests that these were predominantly boots rather than shoes. This is not surprising, as 19th and early-20th century footwear style, for both men and women, is characterised by the predominance of boots. Moreover, given the employment of the residents of the cottages in the mining industry, it is likely that these were work boots.

Composite items, consisting of leather and/or textile with fixtures attached, were recovered from context [1004] in both Areas A/1 and A/3. The oval metal item from Area A/1 is belt or shoe buckle and retained some fragments of attached textile. The five composite items from Area A/3 consist of metal rivets, buckles and clips, and appear to be part of a bag, possibly a rucksack.

The two rectangular strips of 'leather-look' coloured textured vinyl from Area A/1, context [1004] have a cotton-bonded backing and most probably derive from either clothing and associated accessories or from household furniture. However, such imitation leather fabrics were also commonly used during the early 20th century for covering radio sets and other household items. Leatherette was manufactured under a variety of trade names from the early 20th century and was particularly popular in the post-war period.

Amongst the other items, there were two cork bottle stoppers from Area B/4, context [2173] and Area D/2, context [4002], two fragments of pencils from Area B/2, context

[2006] and Area D/2, context [4003], three scraps of cardboard from Area D/2, context [4003], part of a paint-brush from Area A/2, context [1013], and several pieces of undiagnostic textile from throughout Areas A, B and C of the site (Appendix F.12).

The final category of organic artefact were those structural elements of the cottages constructed from wood. A large number of contexts in both Area A and B contained samples of wood, which was usually undiagnostic and is therefore not considered in this report. A few context did include more identifiable elements. In Area A four different balusters from the same staircase rail survived, these being made from pine and 19th century in date. Fragments of window frame were also found in Areas A (context [1004]) and B (context [2073]). These presumably had formed part of the cottages. Otherwise all the other structural wood was less recognisable, but probably related to beams, floorboards and the like in the department.

Conclusion

Unfortunately the organic artefacts are largely uninformative in illuminating the transformations of domestic life and consumer culture over the period of occupation on the site. Furthermore, it has to be noted that there is considerable unreliability when relating the above objects to the occupation of the cottages; shoes, garments, bags and pencils are all items that are commonly lost in such areas, these items may therefore be residual and relate to casual deposition unrelated to the activity on the site. It is possible that given the phasing for the contexts from which these items derive, that many of these objects relate to the dumping and backfilling that occurred after the site had largely gone out of use, rather than being connected with specific identifiable occupants.

F.3.10: Fuel and Clinker

By Roderick Mackenzie, ARCUS, University of Sheffield

A large quantity of fuel and slag were recovered from the excavations (see Appendix F.13 for presentation of analysis data). In total this weighed in excess of 47 kilograms, and the vast majority came from Area B and the south cottage. On close examination the samples could be seen to consist of three basic elements, coal, charcoal and clinker (or more accurately a burnt fuel ash slag).

Rather than being indicative of any industrial process, these residues are entirely consistent with the fuel and raking-out from domestic hearths and oven ranges. However the reasons for the greater quantity found in associate with the southern cottage is less clear, as presumably similar amounts would originally have been generated in the eastern cottage, and its absence might indicate a difference in disposal practices.