

## FOUR GROUPINGS OF ENGLISH PORCELAIN STILL AWAITING ATTRIBUTION

By Geoffrey A. Godden  
Collector, author and lecturer

During the last few years great strides have been made in the re-attribution of important but unmarked classes of English 18th century porcelain, yet some interesting groupings still remain to tease us!

The recent re-attributions have concerned the early (mainly blue and white) porcelains, formerly believed to have been produced at Liverpool by William Reid<sup>1</sup>. Later, some examples were tentatively attributed to the so-called *Pomona* pottery at Newcastle-under-Lyme, in Staffordshire<sup>2</sup>. All this was cast aside when a team of specialists, from the Museum of London, carried out excavations on the Limehouse site in 1990, before a new road was driven through the area backing on to the River Thames.

The important finds at Limehouse included not only a kiln-base but an interesting selection of factory “wasters” showing fire-damaged key shapes and styles of decoration, painted in under-glaze blue. These finds were published<sup>3</sup> and it was soon generally accepted that the former William Reid Liverpool porcelains had really been made at Limehouse in London during the short but very early period c.1746-8. A representative selection of such wares with historical background are included in my *Godden's Guide to English Blue and White Porcelain* (Antique Collectors' Club, 2004).

A later and very different class of porcelain had been attributed to William Ball, of Liverpool, of the late 1750s and early 1760s<sup>4</sup>. These attractive pieces were characterised by a bright tone of cobalt blue, under a glossy almost oil-like glaze. This grouping was shown to have originated at Vauxhall on the south side of the Thames when some (admittedly only a few), matching wasters were found on this London site. The Vauxhall factory, originally producing earthenwares was worked by John Sanders. This potter enjoyed the assistance of a well-placed backer and partner, Nicholas Crisp of Bow Church Yard. Sanders and Crisp sought to produce porcelain as early as June 1751, for they then took out a licence to mine Cornish soap-rock and by November 1752 had paid for an initial supply.

In May 1753 an important announcement appeared



Figure 1, A superb quality Baddeley-Littler mug, painted by the leading flower painter who was responsible for the best early specimens. Note the ornate handle form.  
Height: 4 ¼ inches (10.8 cm) c.1777-80

in the *Public Advertiser*<sup>5</sup>, stating that “At Mr Sander's near the Plate Glass House, Vauxhall, is now to be sold a strong and useful Manufacture of Porcelaine Ware, made there of English Materials .....”. The manufactory continued until at least 1764 when Crisp's financial problems seemingly forced the closure of this smallish porcelain works. The porcelains can be quite beautiful<sup>6</sup> under whichever name William Ball – Liverpool or Vauxhall they are grouped. The most recent grouping to be identified was produced by Joseph Shore (Co.) from circa 1760 onwards at Isleworth, by the Thames near Kew Gardens. Indeed, the first finds of factory wasters<sup>7</sup> were found in the river-mud. The newly discovered, or rather re-discovered, Isleworth porcelains were drawn from a number of earlier classes – mainly some of our Derby, Bow and Lowestoft blue and white porcelains which were re-classified and attributed to Isleworth.

Good information on these important re-attributions and illustrations of typical examples are contained

in my new work *Godden's Guide to English Blue and White Porcelain* (Antique Collectors' Club 2004). It will be noted that all these attributions were based on the discovery of key factory wasters. That is the spoilt, discarded, fragments found on, or near, the original factory sites. Such wasters may evidence characteristic shapes or added patterns and so fix the place of manufacture.

Alas, no such informative wasters have been discovered to help us identify the rather later groupings which have intrigued me for many years and which are my subject today. These problem pieces are obviously unmarked (or rather they do not display clear or helpful markings) nor do they link with as yet discovered factory wasters. We cannot, therefore, even be sure where in the British Isles they were produced.

The first of my remaining problems is the earliest, being of the probable period c.1777-1785, and therefore is much the same period as the main group of re-discovered Isleworth porcelains. However, they are quite different. The Isleworth porcelains are seemingly all decorated in under-glaze blue, as we have not as yet identified, with certainty, any over-glaze enamelled specimens. In contrast this other grouping concentrated on over-glaze coloured patterns producing very-little-glaze blue patterns. I show typical specimens in Figs. 1 – 4.

I have been collecting these porcelains, as have other “students” such as the late Dr Bernard Watney, for many years and have previously written and lectured on them. I even gave them a tentative “name of convenience” – the *Baddeley-Littler* group. This designation has been widely accepted and used, although it is entirely made-up! An alternative name – the *Caddy Class* - has also been used by earlier researchers, such as the late John Murray.<sup>8</sup>

*Baddeley-Littler* suggests the possible linkage between Ralph (or John) Baddeley of Shelton (now Hanley) in the Staffordshire Potteries and William Littler, who had previously produced porcelains at Longton Hall in Staffordshire (c.1749-1760) and later at West Pans in Scotland.

John Baddeley had produced some porcelains in partnership with William Fletcher prior to August 1775, after which Ralph Baddeley (John's son) continued the Shelton pottery.<sup>9</sup> The Baddeley-Fletcher porcelains still await discovery but they would pre-date my present grouping.

William Littler, having closed the Longton Hall works and held a closing auction sale of stock at Salis-



Figure 2, A typical Baddeley-Littler moulded mark-head cabbage-leaf jug. Broadly but brightly painted with a popular Oriental figure design. Note the leaf between the two heads, which has been added to hide a fault in the porcelain.  
Height: 8 ½ inches (21.8cm) c.1780

bury in September 1760, moved to West Pans, near Musselburgh, in Scotland. He had certainly settled there by October 1764, when he was made Honorary Burgess of Musselburgh. He remained at West Pans, producing both Longton Hall-type porcelain and some earthenware until at least 1777.

He made a rather pathetic appeal for financial help in the *Caledonian Mercury* (June 1777). This read in part: “Wanted. A partner into the china manufactory at West Pans, who will advance a sum of money ... as this manufactory has not succeeded, it will, no doubt ... Prevent many from giving attention to this advertisement. Please to inquire at the said manufactory and the proprietor will show the proposals and as this is the reason for trade, he begs they will not lose time”.

Not surprisingly, it would appear that no new backers came to William Littler's rescue. It is believed that he very soon returned to Staffordshire where he died in 1784.

Simeon Shaw, writing in his *History of the Staffordshire Potteries*, published privately in 1829, wrote: “Littler at a subsequent period was manager of a porcelain manufactory in Shelton, for Messrs. Baddeley & Fletcher. But this was discontinued for reasons already mentioned and became



Figure 3, A rare Baddeley-Littler covered tureen. The twig handle and applied flowers and leaves are typical of this class. Height: 6 inches (15.3 cm) c. 1780-5

expensive. They fired with wood because the body would not bear coals. Some specimens of this ware, are very close imitations of the oriental porcelain ...”

Shaw was probably wrong in one respect, in that this partnership had been dissolved in August 1775, while Littler was still in Scotland but the former Baddeley-Fletcher pottery was still in being and was continued by John’s son Ralph Baddeley. It is not clear what Simeon Shaw had in mind in writing that the porcelain enterprise was discontinued “for reasons already mentioned”. But under Littler’s earlier venture at Longton Hall, Shaw stated “there not being much demand for this kind of ware ...”. He also stated “its defect was inability to bear sudden or excessive change of temperature” and “there are many specks, and the whole has a greyish hue ...”. Clearly, the earlier Littler porcelain made in Staffordshire in the 1750-60 period were not considered perfect. This applies equally to the later Baddeley-Littler porcelains.

Indeed, the earlier Littler porcelains made at

Longton Hall in Staffordshire and at West Pans in Scotland are very similar in appearance and in chemical make-up, with a high percentage of lead, nearly ten percent, and no bone ash or soap stone. A joint report on finds at West Pans includes the telling statement<sup>10</sup> that the tested wasters:-

“have a high lead content and are chemically and mineralogically indistinguishable from Longton porcelain.” This I believe applied equally to the class now under discussion in my *Baddeley-Littler* porcelains.

Before discussing or looking at a grouping of these post-1777 Staffordshire porcelains (which were once attributed to Thomas Wolfe & Co. of Liverpool with a late 1790s dating) I need to establish that Baddeley was indeed producing porcelain. This was provided by Josiah Wedgwood when giving evidence to a committee of the House of Commons at Whitehall in February 1786. He then stated that he had come to speak on behalf of the Staffordshire earthenware potters and, additionally, on behalf of the partners in the New Hall porcelain company and “also in the names of Messrs Baddeley Booth and Company China Manufacturers”. The clerk writing up Wedgwood’s statement did not include punctuation in this vital line. It is therefore, not

possible to determine if Wedgwood said and meant – Baddeley and Booth in 1786. Certainly we have proof that Baddeley and Booth – single or together, were producing porcelain in Staffordshire at the same period as the New Hall partnership, which dates from c.1781. Bailey’s *Director* of 1784 includes Hugh Booth of Stoke as a manufacturer of “china” as well as earthenwares. Wedgwood did not mention Littler, as he had died four years previously and had reputedly only acted as a manager or adviser to Baddeley on porcelain manufacture. He was not a partner, probably having no funds to invest. I added Littler’s name to underline his part in the making of this class of porcelain and its similarity to Littler’s earlier Longton Hall and West Pans porcelain.

This class of porcelain is quite a large one, particularly in regard to the number of different shapes it introduced. I currently (in 2003) have amassed over one hundred specimens. Within the probable eight or nine year period, c.1777–1785, it might have been more prolific than most Liverpool factories, Lowestoft, or even Caughley, in relation to enamelled specimens. If the Staffordshire origin is agreed then, in the 1777–1781 period, it represents the only porcelain in production in The Potteries. The formation of the much larger, so-called New Hall company in the early 1780s with its superior body, using Champion’s patent for the use of Cornish china stone and China Clay, may well have led to the decline and closure of the Baddeley china enterprise in the mid-1780s, after William Littler’s death.

It is time we looked at a few, representative examples of this *Baddeley-Littler* class of English soft-paste porcelain. Most pieces comprise teawares, but some imposing moulded jugs and mugs were produced, as were a few dessert wares.

The earliest, main type of enamelled decoration comprises well-painted naturalistic floral groupings or small sprays. Some groupings were so popular that they seem almost to be stock patterns<sup>11</sup>. Fig. 1, a single mug, must serve here to represent this early and very attractive class, which I would date to approximately 1777–1780. Another, mainly early, class comprises Oriental-style figures in landscapes. In general terms such designs ape the mass of Chinese hard-paste porcelain being imported by the English East India Company. This was extremely popular and was copied by most of the English 18th century porcelain manufacturers, particularly at this period. The *Baddeley-Littler* examples vary to some degree and might be compressed or expanded according to the shape of the

article. Various simple border designs were also used with these figure designs. Fig.2 illustrates one of these almost standard patterns which are usually broadly but attractively painted in a bright palette.

This illustration depicts a popular shape of moulded jug. Such mask-spouted, so-called cabbage-leaf jugs were produced by most of our late 18th century porcelain manufacturers. The Baddeley examples have a rather large face-spout and were made in at least four



Figure 4, A group of Baddeley-Littler porcelains, all decorated with versions of a popular simple floral pattern, modelled on Chinese Export market porcelains. Tea canister (of a characteristic shape). Height: 5 inches (12.7 cm) c.1780-85

sizes. At least two different types of moulded border occur and the handle form can also vary<sup>12</sup>.

Fig.3 shows a small tureen, probably from a dessert service – a similar shape occurs as part of New Hall dessert services. The swag decoration is unusual for our grouping, being more typical of Bristol or Chelsea–Derby porcelains. However, I wish to feature my group’s love of raised flower work, relief-moulded leaves and twigs – all brightly coloured. These were obviously not added to standard tea wares, but can occur on stands, lids and tureens. The flower finials on teapots and sugar bowl covers are also characteristic. An unusual, if rare, feature is the use of slightly coloured flowers or even handles.

By far the larger proportion of the enamelled patterns comprise formal patterns. These emulate in general type the imported Chinese porcelains of the 1770s and 1780s. Such English copies are certainly not unique to this grouping but Baddeley excelled in this then popular style. Fig.4 shows various typical shapes,



Figure 5, A Baddeley-Littler bowl, decorated with three different bat-printed scenes in puce. The inside border, a typical one, is hand-painted. Diameter: 6¼ inches (16 cm) c. 1780-5

all adorned with rather cramped floral groupings within a pink cartouche or frame.

Other Chinese export market type floral patterns often with ornate border designs were also popular and occur on a good range of teawares and other small objects, such as leaf-shape dishes. My jug illustrates an interesting feature – one also associated with Longton Hall and West Pans porcelains – where body faults are covered with a large, painted leaf.

Perhaps one reason why this class of unmarked porcelain was originally attributed to Liverpool, was the number of examples which bear over-glaze prints, which can occur in various colours. They do not, however, in my experience, directly link with similar Worcester or Liverpool over-glaze printing. I show as a single example one side of a bowl (Fig.5). This also shows the hand-painted feather like border that often accompanies these prints, seemingly of the 1780 period. They appear to have been produced by the cold-process using glue bats to transfer oil – which later held in place the dusted-on finely ground colour.

Several of these prints also occur with the same border design on unmarked contemporary creamware. It is recorded by Wedgwood that Baddeley and his son were leading manufacturers of cream coloured earthenwares. These prints could provide further weight to our Baddeley attribution for the local Simeon Shaw recorded in 1829<sup>13</sup> :-

*“Mr William Smith, an engraver of considerable ability,*

*resident in Liverpool was engaged to engrave new [copper] plates in a superior style for Mr R Baddeley of Shelton and the excellence of the pottery, with the elegance of the embellishments from plates of finer execution rendered him unrivalled for some time ... Mr Smith engaged Thomas Davis, of Worcester to print for Mr Baddeley, and he introduced other improvements in the operations”. Elsewhere Simeon Shaw wrote “The method of printing with glue bats was also practised by Harry Baker, for Mr Baddeley, of Shelton; about 1777”.*

Returning, to William Smith, Mrs Mollie Hoskins discovered his Will made in January 1801. He was then living in Stoke-on-Trent and was described as an engraver. He left all his tools to his three sons and interestingly his first executor was named as James Ross of Worcester, “engraver”. This suggests his early training under Ross at Worcester His local executors were Thomas Fletcher and Sampson Bagnall, potters at Shelton. The Fletcher family had earlier connections with the Baddeleys. Thomas Fletcher and Sampson Bagnall had been in partnership and Fletcher, seemingly also produced porcelains for a period (c.1794) in partnership with William Tittensor<sup>14</sup> William Smith's Will was proved in June 1802.

As a class these *Baddeley-Littler* porcelains have a good family likeness. The soft body was rather thickly potted. The covering glaze has an almost wax-like appearance. It can form (similar to Longton-Hall) scum-like lines at the edges. Some discolouration and sanding is often apparent on the underside of objects. Indeed, I used to refer to these porcelains as the “dirty bottom class”. But many pieces were cleanly potted and can

even be superb. However, I have not noted any gilding.

My next mini-collection of unmarked problem porcelain is here illustrated by the group shown in Fig 6. The probable period of these porcelains is c.1780-85 (perhaps 1790), making them contemporary with early New Hall or indeed with the later *Baddeley-Littler* porcelains, already discussed.

They, however, appear quite different. They are very trimly potted, neatly painted on a good, almost-silky glaze quite unlike any other class. They were probably produced by a small concern over a short period. Examples are rare and those in my own collection are limited to a few shapes and all pieces are enamelled over the glaze with well-painted floral groupings. The characteristic simple loop handle, with generous room for the hand, are noteworthy and unique to this class.

These scarce porcelains are, in a word beautiful. But who made them and why did the concern fail? In trimness of potting and neatness and restraint of decoration, one is tempted to suggest that a leading Staffordshire potter, such as Turner or Neale turned

his attention to porcelain but soon found his earthenwares were less trouble and sold well to his established markets<sup>15</sup>. Yet, somehow the pieces do not seem Staffordshire and the shapes do not have any links with known Staffordshire earthenwares. If we must concern ourselves with name hunting I think we have to look outside the Potteries, perhaps to Derbyshire.

My next group of problem pieces is associated with a mysterious impressed mark – the clear “W” followed by three stars or asterisks, within brackets. This mark is to be found on porcelains as well as on a range of different earthenwares – creamwares, green-glazed pottery and black basalt-type wares. The probable period is c.1800–1810. The porcelains typically comprise tea and coffee wares, ornamental objects such as bulb pots (Fig. 7) and vases. Even figures were made in the Staffordshire style, on square plinths. The body is a dense, compact one of the type we call hybrid-hard paste porcelain.

Some of the porcelains were seemingly decorated by William Billingsley, after he had left Derby and Pinxton and while he was acting as an independent decorator at Mansfield from 1799–1801. One well-decorated bulb pot of the shape shown in Fig 7 is marked “*Billingsley, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire*” incised through the brown

Figure 6, A grouping of unmarked porcelains characterised by this high quality flower painting, trim potting and simple loop handle. Height of coffee pot: 9¼ inches (23.7 cm) c.1780-90





Figure 7, A hybrid-hard-paste porcelain bulb pot of a characteristic form. Wall painted scenic panel and typical rather ornate gilt side panels. Impressed W(XXX) mark. Height: 6 inches (15.3 cm) c.1800-5 Formerly Godden collection. Present ownership unknown

enamel covering the bottom of the pot. This added enamel covers the impressed "W" mark, thus suggesting that this device did not relate to Billingsley or to his Mansfield establishment. It related to the manufacturer from whom he purchased the undecorated, blank porcelain.

A complete tea service, some pieces of which bear this mystery mark, the decoration of which is widely attributed to William Billingsley is spread between several collections. Fig.8 (right) shows the scenic milk jug, which is a typical form. Note the angular handle (the ball-like knob on the teapot is pierced). Like most specimens these two milk jugs are unmarked but they come from tea services of typical shapes and body.

This interesting group of porcelains has engendered much thought and writing. The basic details and a representative display of pieces are featured in Appendix VI of *Staffordshire Porcelains* (Granada Publishing, 1983). The early writers attributed this impressed mark to the well-known potter Enoch Wood but I seriously questioned this theory – for reasons given in the above publication. It has also been thought possible that the mark does not relate to the manufacturer but to a wholesaler or middle-man. I think this unlikely but the idea surmounts several problems.

Whilst some of the pieces may be associated with William Billingsley at Mansfield, or perhaps slightly later at Brampton in Lincolnshire (c.1802-8), many other pieces must have been decorated at the place of

manufacture which I believe to have been in Staffordshire. It is, however, quite possible that if the potter sold undecorated blanks to Billingsley he also sold some to other independent decorators. During this same period, John Rose of Coalport, for example, did a large business in selling undecorated white porcelain.

The existence of a relatively large number of decorative bulb-pots, which were originally sold in matching pairs or even in sets, suggests that the concern was aiming at a wealthy market. The pieces are well-gilt and are generally of an expensive nature.

The teaware (and other forms) are not mere copies of standard porcelain shapes of the period. Indeed, a study of the favoured forms suggests an individualist rather than a copyist. An interesting feature of this rare group of porcelains is the use of a silver-like lustre rather a grey colour. Various firms in The Potteries and also at Coalport were experimenting with lustre decoration in the early 1800s. Simeon Shaw writing in or rather before 1829, stated:-

*"The first maker of silver lustre properly so called was John Gardner (now employed by J Spode Esq) when employed by the late Mr Wolfe of Stoke ..."*

Here we have a surname with the right initial to fit our marks. Unfortunately, this group does not easily link with the porcelains tentatively associated with Thomas Wolfe at Stoke and we cannot be sure that the lustre can be attributed to this potter, its use was spreading.

It is possible that the answer to our problem will come from the related earthenwares rather than from the rarer porcelains. Already, several matchings have been made between "W"... marked undecorated creamwares and shapes drawn and then engraved in the design books or catalogue issued by James and Charles Whitehead of Hanley in 1798. Alas, this catalogue slightly pre-dates our porcelains but the Whiteheads produced a "great variety" of wares "both useful and ornamental as well as printed, painted and enamelled [creamwares] as likewise dry bodies, such as Egyptian Black, Jasper etc., etc.," they were clearly large manufacturers progressing into the period of our "W" marked pieces. Yet not one name marked "Whitehead" ceramic object is known. Like many other potters they choose not to use a clear mark – the better to assist inter-trading. I have always thought that this coded mark related to the Whiteheads. I am still awaiting the final element of proof – one way or the other. In the meantime, I enjoy the pieces and the puzzle.

My next problem group is the first to bear pattern



Figure 8, Two milk-jugs of a form typical of the W(XXX) marked porcelains. The scenic patterned example is from a part service attributed to William Billingsley's decorating studio at Mansfield. Some pieces from this set bore the impressed initial mark. Height: 4 1/2 inches (11.7cm) c.1800

numbers. Yet these are so far proving unhelpful. I show typical examples in Fig. 9. These pieces seemingly date to the approximate period c.1785-95. the porcelains are very neatly potted and are decorated with pleasing restraint. They were angled at a discriminating high class market. At first sight they are very similar to New Hall porcelains of the mid-1780s. Such Staffordshire porcelains could well have been the inspiration behind this perhaps related group. Are they Staffordshire? I fancy so. Are they New Hall blanks decorated elsewhere? I think not. Which potter, could have produced such high-quality items? Perhaps Neale. Two early partners in the first Tunstal partnership, which had acquired Champion's Patent rights, left after a few years. These were Anthony Keeling and John Turner. Could these pieces have been produced by one of these two earthenware potters? We have within recent years identified with fair certainty the later, mainstream porcelains produced by these potters. But could they be early Keeling, or perhaps not Staffordshire at all! What questions these porcelains pose.

The attractive teawares represented here by Fig.9, bear the pattern number "11". This number occurs on most pieces including the cups and saucers. In this

regard the set is different from New Hall as this factory did not paint pattern numbers on smaller items such as cups and saucers. The mode of painting the pattern numbers in a neat, careful manner is also unusual. The numbers have a dot before and after the number "11" or the number is inside brackets "(11)". To further confuse matters I have another tea service, possibly made by Keeling, which bears the same pattern number but is of a different design. Yet one of the pattern numbers is written within brackets. I have a further set, of pattern "46" which also has bracketed neatly rendered pattern numbers. These low (early) pattern numbers suggest the early days of a factory's existence and this mode of rendering in the pattern numbers may well have been changed after a year or so. On the other hand these patterns may have been added by an outside (independent) decorator or studio. The four classes discussed in my 2003 lecture and briefly reported here are but few amongst many remaining problems. Obviously, none of these ceramic puzzles bear a maker's mark, nor do any of the known specimens link with such key-pieces. We are groping, very much in the dark.

Well into the 19th century clear name marks on our porcelains are the exception rather than the rule. This suited the retailers (who probably dictated the practise) as it made it difficult for the buyers to purchase replacements or additional pieces direct from the (unknown) manufacturers. It also made it easier for



the potters to sell blanks to independent decorators who would sell on the goods under their own name. Unmarked goods might also enable the retailer to sell the porcelains under an upmarket name and so ask an enhanced price. After all, very few manufacturers' names would have been known to the average buyer.

For any of these reasons, it is clear that much English porcelain was unmarked, as were all the Chinese porcelains that were so popular. A mark was not as important to the original buyer as it is to the collector today. While many collectors seek and worship a factory mark there are those of us (myself included) who welcome the puzzles presented by the mystery classes. We welcome the challenge. We merely worship the porcelains for their own sake – their quality and charm over and above a mere mark.

All illustrations are from the (past or present) *Godden Reference Collection*

#### NOTES

1. *Four Groups of Porcelain, possibly Liverpool, Part 1*, by Dr Bernard Watney. (*Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, Vol 4, Part 5 1959)
2. *The Pomona Potworks, Newcastle, Staffs* by Paul Bemrose. (*Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, Vol 9, part 1. 1973)
- 3A *Recent Excavations on London Porcelain Sites*, by Dr Bernard Watney. (*Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, Vol 14, part 1. 1990)
- 3B *The Search for the Limehouse Pottery*, by John Potter. (*Morley College Ceramic Circle Bulletin*, Second series, No. 1, 1992)
- 3C *Limehouse Ware Revealed*, a multi-author publication. (*English Ceramic Circle and Museum of London*, 1993)
- 3D *The Limehouse Porcelain Manufactory ... A multi-author publication*. (*Museum of London and English Heritage*, 2000).

Figure 9, Neatly potted and finely decorated teawares bearing the early pattern number 11 either within brackets or with a dot before and after the number – .11. Attractive problems of the 1790's. Height of teapot: 6½ inches (16.4 cm)

- See *Four Groups of Porcelain Possibly Liverpool*, by Dr Bernard Watney. (*Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, Vol 5, part 1, 1960). See *Extracts from Eighteenth Century London Newspapers*, by Mrs Nancy Valpy. (*Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, Vol 11, part 2, 1982)
6. A good selection of prices and further details of the Vauxhall venture are given in *Godden's Guide to English Blue and White Porcelains*. (*Antique Collectors' Club*, 2004)
  7. See *Isleworth Pottery, Recognition at last?* By Ray Howards. (*Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, Vol 16, part 3, 1998).
  8. See "Storm in a Tea Caddy", by John J Murray, (*The Northern Ceramic Society Newsletter*, No 35, September 1979).
  9. See "John Baddeley of Shelton, an Early Staffordshire Maker of Pottery and Porcelain" Parts I and II, by John Mallet. (*Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, Vol 6, parts 2 and 3, 1966 and 1967).
  10. See "West Pans Story, the Scotland Manufactory" by Mavis Bimson (then of the British Museum) John Ainslie and Dr Watney. (*Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, Vol 6, part 2 1966).
  11. I was able to show several slides of different objects being painted with identical floral arrangements
  12. A good selection of jug shapes and indeed of other forms and styles of decoration are illustrated in *Staffordshire Porcelain* (a multi-authored work) published by Granada Publishing in 1983. See Chapter 3
  13. *History of the Staffordshire Potteries*, by Simeon Shaw (privately published 1829)
  14. See *Encyclopaedia of British Porcelain Manufacturers* by Geoffrey Godden (Barrie & Jenkins, 1988)
  15. These porcelains do not seem to link to later known or marked types of Turner or Neale porcelain