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Dedication

This work is dedicated to the memory of Robin Greeves.

This project is the result of a six year friendship with a truly lovely man known, especially in collecting circles in England, as “The Pickle Dish Man”. Through our work as specialist antique dealers, we have known him for about twenty years. However, in the last six years since moving nearer to him, we became extremely good friends. In fact, I would call him one of, if not my best friend in the world. He started off as a customer who bought pickle dishes from us and then became a huge part of our lives. We spoke to him almost daily on the telephone telling him all our news. We would take him to sales, view days, antique shops and centres, go to quizzes with him and he introduced me to the theatre; I jokingly referred to him as my 'cultural attaché'. Tragically, he died in December, 2009 having a massive heart attack whilst out delivering Christmas cards around his village.

Some two or three years ago, he and I had discussed writing a book together, or at the very least, producing a catalogue or record of his collections. This is something that I was very keen to do, but as so often is the case, it never really happened. However, as we were in possession of both of his collections, temporarily as it might be, I feel that this was an opportunity too good to miss.

This is something that I felt very strongly about; this was a man’s life’s work putting these two collections together. Think of all the love, care and attention that has been put into them; all the many hours, miles, days, years and associated stories that these collections are made of. For them to be just sold on and dispersed with no record would, in my opinion, be an absolute tragedy. These types of collection dispersals always make me feel very sad – a collector has died and their wares are then sold on the open market; it just somehow removes the human element from it all.

Finally, I believe that this would be a fitting tribute to a man who had an enormous passion and knowledge for transferware, but in particular, for pickle dishes and milseys.

Robin Greeves 1936—2009
INTRODUCTION

The term “Pickle Dish” is a generic term which covers a vessel, in many forms, that was a multi-purpose article used for serving a variety of foods. Pickle dishes were an integral part of a dinner service and as such were an important article for serving a variety of spices, pickles, relishes and condiments. While many people assume that a pickle dish may only be used for a presentation of various types of pickles this is not the case. Actually, it is perfectly acceptable to include any type of pickled food or condiment on the dish. Therefore, a pickle dish could also be used to serve pickled fruits and nuts during the dessert course of a meal. It may sound silly to refer to the pickle dish as the original Swiss Army knife, but the reality is, it was such a versatile serving receptacle.

Pickle dishes were made from pottery, pearlware, creamware, ironstone, porcelain, delft, silver, glass and many other materials. For the purposes of this work, I will only be describing and referring to blue transferware pottery examples. As you will see from reading this work, blue-printed pickle dishes took many forms and guises, but were all carefully designed to be practical as well as to look good in a table setting.

In short, a pickle dish was intended to provide easy and practical access to food items during a meal.
History of Pickles

The first question we must answer is; what are pickles? Modern-day terminology and thinking suggests that pickles are gherkins or cucumbers, but the broader and more specifically, the historical term, differs from this greatly. Historically, the term pickles did refer to an item that had been pickled or preserved, but also the term encompasses sauces and relishes that were designed to accompany a meal. As such, pickles as an item generally consists of discernible vegetable or fruit pieces in a sauce, although the sauce is subordinate in character to the vegetable or fruit pieces. It might consist of a single type of vegetable or fruit, or a combination of these. These fruits or vegetables might be coarsely or finely chopped, but generally a relish is not as smooth as a sauce-type condiment, such as ketchup. The overall taste sensation might be sweet or savory, hot or mild, but it is always a strong flavour that complements or adds to the primary food item with which it is served. Relish probably came about from the need to preserve vegetables in the winter. Chutney might be considered a type of relish. Indian pickles and relishes, where the preparation originated from, generally includes either vegetables, herbs or fruits.
Historical Background of Pickles
It seems that pickles have always been a part of our cuisine and historical references date back to more than 4400 years ago when pickled cucumbers became popular in Mesopotamia. The origin of pickles is not very clear exactly, but in India, pickles were well known in the Vedic period (c.1700—320 BCE). The Vedic scriptural writings indicate quite relevant knowledge of pickles. The oldest pickle known to human beings are pickled cucumbers and Aristotle also praised their taste and healing effects. This clearly points out that the pickles were also known to the ancient Greeks. Romans also showcase a brief history of pickling as pickled and brined cucumbers were eaten by Julius Caesar's soldiers. Highly nutritious and vitamin-rich pickles were consumed to maintain sound health as the cucumbers healed their wounds fast. Not only cucumbers, but other vegetables were also brine soaked and preserved for longer term usage. The traditions have continued until present day. In the United States for example, pickled cucumbers were introduced by the European immigrants and rapidly became an integral part of the everyday cuisine. In fact, pickles were as much a tabletop feature as salt and pepper are today. It was also a way of eliminating waste as people simply pickled their bulk fruits and vegetables to be used at a later date or in conjunction with a specific meal.

Varieties of pickles
A huge variety of vegetables are processed into pickles of all kinds. These vegetables also include the indigenous or endemic vegetables of certain regions in the world. The most prominent vegetables to be used in pickles are radish, Chinese cabbage, cucumber, turnip, ginger, carrot, onion, ground dates, mustard, ground pepper, garlic, tomato, eggplant, beet, mushroom, lemon and peaches.

Need of pickles and relishes
The need to use pickles, relishes and chutneys in the cuisine of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was varied.

Firstly, this was a period where refrigeration, which we take for granted today, was largely not available and as such, food would go off much quicker. In order to disguise this and to make food more appealing, pickles and relishes were often added in both the preparation and consumption stage of eating a meal. Indeed pickles were such a popular food item and supplement of the period that in 1820, Frenchman Nicholas Appert, became the first person to commercially sell them in jars.
Secondly, this was a great period of discovery, exploration and adventure. People were exploring the world and bringing back their finds. These included a great many things, but amongst them were much in the way of herbs, spices, relishes and other foodstuffs. Bigger, faster ships and better and safer navigation techniques meant that this was all possible; it was indeed becoming a small world. It was also a time of showing off one’s wealth and social awareness; serving the latest imported spice or pickle was all part of being a fashionable Georgian or Victorian.
Collecting Pickle Dishes

Collecting pickle dishes is a great way to further and expand your collection and your knowledge of Transferware. There is a wealth of information on the subject of transferware available, both in terms of books and reference works as well as online data such as the excellent Transferware Collectors Club’s pattern and source database. www.transcollectorsclug.org

You can collect by shape, by style, by pattern or by factory. They are quite small pieces of pottery, so won’t take up too much room. They are also relatively un-common, so collecting them will be a challenge and I’m sure that is a large part of the collecting drive.

The best part though is that they are generally relatively inexpensive, so collecting them won’t break the bank!

One doesn’t need to go to extreme lengths though!
Shapes and Forms (including pickle sets)

Pickle dishes come in a wide variety of shapes, sizes and designs, but the main five shapes are: ‘Leaf’, ‘Shell’, ‘Handled’, ‘Flounder’ and ‘Pickle Sets’. Some were factory specific and others were generically copied. The sizes of pickles within these forms varied very little and as such there seems to be a standard ‘pickle dish size’. This size seems to be about five and a half inches at the longest point.

‘Leaf’ shape:

The leaf shape was by far the most popular design for a pickle dish. There are many variations on the theme however and these varied by potter and by date of production. This shape was produced in transferware from 1780 to present times. The leaf dish was sometimes a ‘flat leaf’ as shown in the example below and sometimes a much deeper dish, but the theme remained the same where the dish resembled a leaf. Some potters went to great lengths to copy or imitate nature; on the reverse (or very occasionally on the face), they would mould very fine ‘veins’ to really suggest to the eye that this was indeed a leaf and not a piece of pottery.
Veins on face:

Veins to underside:
‘Shell’ shape:

The shell shape is generally a much rarer form than the leaf and tends to be an early form being pre-1835 in date. As with the leaf shape, the shell style varies tremendously. Some examples merely suggest the shell shape as with the “Pinwheel” example below.

However, some potters produced dishes that really looked like blue-printed actual shells. This can be seen in the next image of an early Leeds pottery example. It is so thinly potted and is of such high quality potting and moulding that it actually looks and feels like a real clam shell!
‘Handled’ shape:

The handled or more specifically, the two-handled shape is much more a trait of the period 1820 to 1830. Many potters used this shape or theme and some have argued that this shape is not a true pickle dish. However, the truth of the matter is that even the standard leaf-shaped dish was a truly multi-purpose vessel.
‘Flounder’ shape:

The flounder shape is another example of the potters taking inspiration from nature. I think that this shape is a very elegant form and is my personal favourite shape of pickle dish. This shape, as with the two previously covered, tends to be from the period 1820—1840. Below the pottery example is an image of a flounder and you can clearly see that they copied quite closely the outline of the fish.
‘Pickle Sets’:

In addition to the singular pickle dish, sets that included several self-contained and removable dishes were also produced. These are known as ‘Pickle Sets’. They generally consisted of four dishes, but some had five or six. Some had small lug handles which made removing them from the larger tray easier. Below are some examples:

A Carey Domestic Cattle series pickle set.  
A British Views series pickle set.  
A Spode Greek series pickle set.
Two pictures of a Spode Indian Sporting series pickle set; one with the dishes in place and one with them removed.
Two pictures of a Spode Castle pattern pickle set.
Two views of a rare Spode Flower Cross pattern footed pickle set. Even the central, footed dish is removable.
A Joseph Clementson Pekin Sketches pattern footed pickle set.

A Riley Eastern Street Scene pickle set in contemporary wooden tray.
**Dimensions & Pattern Positioning**

The dimensions provided in this work will be taken across the longest or tallest point of the dish as illustrated below:

All dimensions will be measured, recorded and noted in inches.
The pattern positioning varies from manufacturer to manufacturer and from pattern to pattern and they will be referred to as being in either ‘Landscape’ or ‘Portrait’ format as shown below:

Therefore, in ‘landscape’ format, dimension will be measured and recorded at the longest point and in ‘portrait’ format they will be measured and recorded at the tallest point.
A observation worthy of inclusion is to point out how the handle, with the print in landscape, is almost always to the right; this is almost certainly to accommodate the right-handed user. Interestingly though, within this work there are some examples where the handle is to the left in the landscape format – was this made for a left-handed person? It was most probably made and printed by a left-handed printer where they will have instinctively printed they way that felt most comfortable to them.

This ‘Willow’ pattern dish has very interesting printing; you will notice that it is mirror transferred. Therefore, if you hold it left or right-handed, one portion of the pattern will be in the correct aspect. Is this an ambidextrous dish? Probably not, but it’s an interesting observation.
Something else that is interesting to note is the difference in positioning of the pattern (landscape or portrait) within the scenic dishes and the Chinioserie dishes.

The greater majority of this sample group of the chinioserie dishes are printed in the portrait position. However, the greater majority of the scenic dishes are in the landscape format. Maybe this is down to the certain patterns suiting one format rather than the other, or maybe this was a date-related fact. Given that the chinioserie dishes are earlier than the scenic dishes being typically 1790 – 1815 rather than 1815 – 1840, perhaps this was the trend at the time. I suspect that the chinioserie patterns positioning was a direct copy of Chinese original’s position, or at the very least, a copy of the early English porcelain, that was copying the Chinese originals.

Possibly after years of use and with the wider scenic-type patterns, it was discovered that it was more comfortable to hold the dish in the landscape format where the pattern could be seen at its best.

This is born out in the statistics: 51% of the chinioserie dishes are in portrait whereas in the rest of the dishes (animals, floral, scenic & other), only 9% are in the portrait position. This is a ratio of approximately 5:1 and I feel that there must be something in that.

Here we see a ‘portrait’ positioned ‘Fisherman & Castle’ chinioserie dish and a ‘landscape’ positioned Wedgwood, ‘Blue Rose border’ series dish to illustrate this point.
About this Collection

Included in this work are dishes that have repeated patterns. This has been done for several reasons.

Firstly, this amongst other things, this is a catalogue of someone’s collection, therefore, it seems only right to share exactly what the collection consisted of.

Secondly, although there are a number of repeated patterns, the examples show very well how different pieces of a larger pattern were often used to cover a dish. This is not only interesting, but poses questions about the wealth of the potter and a desire not to waste (see conclusion for an expanded explanation).

Thirdly, some patterns were repeated, but on different shapes, so it is important to share all the different shapes associated with certain patterns and makers.

A Beemaster pattern shell-shaped pickle dish, c.1820.
Patterns – Animals & Birds Scenic, Chinoiserie, Floral & Other

For the ease of cataloguing, the patterns will be broken down into categories. These will be: Animals & Birds, Scenic, Chinoiserie, Floral and Other. Within these categories, the dishes will be grouped by design or factory if known. Although this categorization seems fairly self-explanatory, some patterns are quite difficult to decide where they belong. Therefore, here is an explanation:

**Animals & Birds** – the category will include patterns where an animal or bird is the main focus of the pattern name or indeed is the pattern name itself. These will include some series that are not animal series, but where animals are the main topic. For example, Ridgway’s Rural Scenery series.

**Scenic** – these will include patterns that are a scene, are part of a landscape series or are of a known place.

**Floral** – This will have patterns that are of flowers, floral series and those that are just border prints. The pieces that are just border prints will also be included elsewhere where their specific pattern belongs despite it not being printed in full. For example, Rogers Zebra pattern pickle dish with border print only, will be included here and in the Animals & Birds category.

**Chinoiserie** – this will include all the chinioserie patterns, even if they have an animal, bird or flowers as their main focus point. This is because some patterns are stylistically Chinioserie in theme despite the subject matter not being of Chinese origin.

**Other** – this final category will be made up of all the other patterns that don’t fit into the above categories such as Armorials, etc.
ANIMALS & BIRDS

ADAMS:

Adams ‘Cattle Scenery’ series pickle set segment, c.1880. It is 5.5” long. Note the small ‘lug handle’ to the left. Often pickle set dishes had this type of handle to aid in removing them from the larger fitted tray.

Adams ‘Cattle Scenery’ series, leaf-shaped dish, c.1880. It is 5.5” long.

Adams ‘Cattle Scenery’ series handled-dish, c.1880. It is 6” handle to handle.
Adams ‘Lions’ pattern leaf-dish, c.1820. 6.5” tall. It is unmarked. This scene was taken from a print of a painting by S. Edwards, entitled; “Felix Leo, Lion, Lioness and Young”. This is the first example in this work where the print is in the ‘portrait’ format with the handle being at the ‘bottom’.

Adams ‘Lions’ pattern leaf-dish, c.1820. 6.5” tall. It is unmarked. This scene was taken from a print of a painting by S. Edwards, entitled; “Felix Leo, Lion, Lioness and Young”. Note how, in this example and the one above, the printer has used the two distinct elements of the pattern twice, but on two different dishes. They make a wonderful pair.
BRAMELD:

Brameld ‘Parroquet’ pattern (border print only) leaf-dish, c.1825. It is 6” long and is unmarked, but is a known Brameld shape.

CAREY:

Carey ‘Domestic Cattle’ series one-handled dish, c.1825. 6” long.

CLEWS:

Clews ‘Oriental Sports’ series leaf dish, c.1820. It is printed with the “Common Wolf Trap” scene. It is 5.5” long.
DAVENPORT:

Davenport ‘Exotic Birds’ pattern handled pickle dish, c.1825. 6” long. Blue-printed ‘Davenport, Stone China’ mark to the underside.

FELL:

Thomas Fell pickle dish printed with a single Deer, c.1825. 5.5” long. It has an impressed mark of ‘FELL & CO’ to the underside.

HERCULANEUM:

Herculaneum ‘Cattle’ series dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” in length. Unmarked.
POUNTEY & ALLIES:

Pountney and Allies Dromedary pattern leaf-shape pickle dish, c.1830. It is unmarked, but is attributed to the factory on shape—see ‘Gothic Ruins’ dish by Pountney & Allies in the “Scenic” section.

RIDGWAY:

‘Cowman’ pattern leaf shaped pickle dish, attributed to Ridgway, c.1825. Note how, in this version, there is no cow, but only the Cowman. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.

‘Cowman’ pattern leaf dish, attributed to Ridgway, c.1825. It is unmarked and is 5.25” long. This example has a smaller print and the handle is missing due to restoration.
Ridgway ‘Exotic Birds’ pattern leaf-shaped pickle dish, c.1830. It is 5” long and is unmarked.

Ridgway ‘Exotic Birds’ pattern leaf-shaped pickle dish, c.1830. It is 5” long and is unmarked. This example has a very slightly different print placement form the dish above.

Ridgway ‘Mythical Bird’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 6” long and is unmarked. This is a common Ridgway shape and it seems to have been unique to them. Note the circular moulding in the handle and their typical use of a cobalt blue colouring to all of the handle.
Ridgway ‘Rural Scenery’ series leaf shaped dish, c.1825. The example is probably printed with a piece of a larger scene. It contains two goats in front of a cottage. The dish is 5” long and is unmarked.

Ridgway ‘Rural Scenery’ series leaf shaped dish, c.1825. As with the dish above, this example is printed with a piece of a larger scene. It contains a cottage and a tree. The dish is 5” long and is unmarked.

Ridgway ‘Rural Scenery’ series leaf shaped dish, c.1825. The example is probably printed with a piece of a larger scene. It contains two goats in front of a cottage. The dish is 5” long and is unmarked.
Ridgway ‘Rural Scenery’ series leaf shaped dish, c.1825. The example is probably printed with a piece of a larger scene. It contains two men digging with spades. The dish is 5” long and is unmarked.

ROGERS:

Rogers ‘Elephant’ pattern shell dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is impressed ROGERS to the underside.

Rogers ‘Elephant’ pattern (border print only) leaf dish, c.1825. It is impressed ROGERS to the underside.
Rogers ‘Elephant’ pattern (border print only) leaf dish, c.1825. It is impressed ROGERS to the underside.

Rogers ‘Zebra’ pattern (border print only) leaf dish, c.1825. It is unmarked except for a workman’s mark.

**SPODE:**

Spode ‘Indian Sporting’ series leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5” long and is printed with part of the scene; “The Dead Hog”. Printed SPODE in blue and a Spode workman’s mark.
Spode ‘Indian Sporting’ series leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5” long and is printed with part of the scene; “Common Wolf Trap”. Printed SPODE in blue and a Spode workman’s mark.

**SWANSEA:**

A leaf shaped dish, c.1810, possibly Swansea. It is 6” in length and has a blue-printed mark to the underside of an eight-petalled flower head.

**WEDGWOOD:**

Wedgwood ‘Bird Cage’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 6” long and is impressed WEDGWOOD to the underside. Note Wedgwood’s very distinctive shape.
ENOCH WOOD:

An Enoch Wood Sporting series leaf dish, c.1825. It is printed with a Setter and Hunter. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked. Note this distinctive Wood shape having three bun feet and a naturalistic leaf shape.

An Enoch Wood Sporting series leaf dish, c.1825. It is printed with a Setter and Hunter. It is 6.25” long and is unmarked. Note how on this slightly larger dish, more white can be seen around the edge of the dish.

WOOD & CHALLINOR:

A Wood and Challinor ‘Pheasant’ pattern dish with loop handle, c.1830. It is unmarked.
UNKNOWN MAKER DISHES:

An ‘Angry Lion’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long an is unmarked. You will note that only part of the whole scene has been used, in this case, just the Lion.

An ‘Angry Lion’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long an is unmarked. You will note that only part of the whole scene has been used, in this case, the two men running away from the Lion.

A ‘Blue Pheasant’ (partial print) pattern leaf dish, c.1830. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked. This pattern was made by Masons, so this could be tentatively attributed to them.
A ‘Blue Pheasant’ (partial print) pattern leaf dish, c.1830. It is 5.5” long and is un-marked. This pattern was made by Masons, so this could be tentatively attributed to them.

A ‘Exotic Bird’ pattern handled dish, c.1830. It is 5.5” long and is impressed; REAL IRONSTONE CHINA. This pattern was made by Hicks, Meigh & Johnson, so this could be tentatively attributed to them.

An unknown scene of a cow in a stylised chinioserie landscape printed on a handled dish, c.1820. It is 6” long and is unmarked. This piece is also listed in the Chinioserie section because of its obvious influences.
A ‘Durham Ox’ series leaf dish, c.1815. It is 6” long and is printed with a scene of a cow and calf. This is actually part of a larger scene which includes a cowman tending a group of three cows. It is unmarked.

A ‘Durham Ox’ series leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5” long and is printed with a scene of a milkmaid milking a cow and whilst a seated man and other cows look on. It is unmarked.

A ‘Durham Ox’ series leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5” tall and is printed with a slightly different section of the milkmaid scene (see above). It is unmarked.
A ‘Fallow Deer’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked. This version of Fallow Deer is quite different and more stylised than the Rogers’ pattern. Therefore, this one will be listed as maker unknown.

A ‘Fallow Deer’ pattern flounder shaped dish, c.1820. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked. The pattern on this dish is a closer match to the Rogers’ pattern, so it was quite probably made by them.

A ‘Family and Mule’ pattern handled dish, c.1815. It is 5.75” long and is unmarked. This dish is a very distinctive and an identically shaped dish listed in the scenic category under Lakin. Assuming that the attribution of that dish (‘Classical Ruins’) is correct, then maybe this one is Lakin too.
A ‘Gamekeeper’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is unmarked. This dish is printed with part of the whole Gamekeeper pattern and here, only includes two dogs and the two birds they are searching for (to the left of the log).

A ‘Piping Shepard’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 6” long and is unmarked. There has been a piece of this pattern marked “Philips”, but here it will remain as maker unknown.

A ‘Resting Farm Boy’ pattern miniature leaf dish, c.1825. It is 3” long and is unmarked. It shows a boy sleeping under a tree with his dog. The small size of this dish raises an interesting point; was it a pickle dish or maybe it was a toy piece?
A ‘Swan Centre’ pattern flounder dish, c.1825. It is 6” long and is unmarked.
SCENIC

ADAMS:

An Adams Native pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 4.5” wide and is unmarked. This dish is only printed with one element of the whole scene; the bridge. The following two dishes are each printed with the remaining two pieces of the pattern; the cottage and the horses. Note also how Adams seemed to often use the technique of printing two identical pieces of the same pattern on one dish, especially when used in the ‘portrait' format. See the Lions pattern dishes in the “Animals & Birds” section for further examples of this technique.

An Adams Native pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 4.5” wide and is unmarked. This dish is double-printed with the cottage section of the larger print. This scene is sometimes thought to be a view of Llangollen in North Wales, but will remain unidentified here.
An Adams Native pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 4.5” wide and is unmarked. It is printed with the bridge section, but also the horses can been seen on the right too.

A William Adams ‘Cyrene’ pattern flounder dish, c.1840. It is 6” long and is unmarked.

**BATHWELL & GOODFELLOW:**

A ‘Palladian Porch’ pattern shell dish, c.1820. It is 5” tall and is unmarked. This pattern is often attributed to Bathwell & Goodfellow, so it remains here as being tentatively attributed to them.
A Zachariah Boyle ‘Antique Scenery’ series handled dish, c.1830. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked although, most wares in this pattern often bear a titled series mark to the underside. This example is printed with part of a larger scene.

A Zachariah Boyle ‘Antique Scenery’ series leaf dish, c.1830. It is 5” long and is unmarked although, most wares in this pattern often bear a titled series mark to the underside. This example is printed with part of a larger scene.
A Zachariah Boyle ‘Antique Scenery’ series leaf dish, c. 1830. It is 5” long and is un-marked although, most wares in this pattern often bear a titled series mark to the underside. This example is printed with part of a larger scene.

BRAMELD:

A Brameld ‘Castle of Rochefort’ pattern leaf dish, c. 1825. It is 5.75” long and although it is unmarked, this is a known Rockingham shape. Rochefort is a French seaport on the Bay of Biscay.

A Brameld ‘Castle of Rochefort’ pattern leaf dish, c. 1825. It is 6.25” long and although it is unmarked, this is a known Rockingham shape. Rochefort is a French seaport on the Bay of Biscay.
CAREY:

A Carey and Sons ‘Ancient Rome’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.

DAVENPORT:

A Davenport ‘Tudor Mansion’ or ‘Bisham Abbey’ pattern flat leaf shape dish, c.1815. It is 7” long and is unmarked. Note the blue-black colour printing. Bisham Abbey is in Hertfordshire near Henley-on-Thames.
A Davenport ‘Fisherman’ series flat leaf dish, c.1815. It is 7” long and is unmarked. This series consists of a multitude of different scene, all showing either a river, lake or other fishing scene.

A Davenport ‘Rhenish Views’ series shell-type shaped dish, c.1835. It is 5.5” tall and is both impressed and printed DAVENPORT to the underside.

Davenport ‘Rhenish Views’ series shell-type shaped dish, c.1835. It is 5.5” tall and is both impressed and printed DAVENPORT to the underside.
JOHN DENTON-BAGSTER:

A John Denton Bagster ‘Vignette’ series pickle set segment, c.1825. This lug-handled dish is printed with part of a scene known as ‘The Woodcutters’ Lunch’. This dish is unmarked and is 4.75” wide.

A John Denton Bagster ‘Vignette’ series pickle set segment, c.1825. This lug-handled dish is printed with part of a scene that includes two cowmen and their cattle. This dish is unmarked and is 4.75” wide.

A John Denton Bagster ‘Vignette’ series leaf dish, c.1825. It is printed with part of a scene known as ‘The Woodcutters’ Lunch’. Note the veins to the interior of the dish.
DON POTTERY:

A Don Pottery ‘Italian Views’ series leaf dish, c.1820 and is 5.25” wide. It is probably printed with a section of a larger scene. It is unmarked.
A Don Pottery ‘Italian Views’ series leaf dish, c.1820 and is 6.25” wide. It is probably printed with a section of a larger scene. It is unmarked bar the blue-printed name ‘BLACK SWAN’ which was a Coaching Inn in Hemsley, Yorkshire.

**ELKIN, KNIGHT & BRIDGWOOD:**

An Elkin, Knight and Bridgwood ‘Irish Scenery’ series leaf dish, c.1825. It is 4.75” wide and it is printed with cows before a large house. It is unmarked.

An Elkin, Knight and Bridgwood ‘Irish Scenery’ series leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” wide and it is printed with cows before a large house. It is unmarked. Note the Variation in the pattern to the example above.
An Elkin, Knight and Bridgwood ‘Rock Cartouche’ series leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” wide and it is printed with part of a much larger scene. It is unmarked.

GOODWINS & HARRIS:

A Goodwins & Harris ‘Metropolitan Scenery’ series leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” wide and is unmarked. The print is taken from a larger scene.

HALL:

A Hall leaf shaped dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” wide and is impressed HALL to the underside. The pattern and view are both unknown.
HAMILTON:

A Robert Hamilton ‘Fisherman with nets’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 6.5” long and is unmarked. Note the very distinctive Hamilton shape.

A Robert Hamilton ‘Gothic Ruins’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 6.5” long and is unmarked. Note the very distinctive Hamilton shape.

A Robert Hamilton ‘Philosopher’ pattern handled dish, c.1820. It is 4.5” tall and is unmarked. This pattern is usually found with a Wild Rose pattern border, but is not printed on this particular example.
HENSHALL:

A Henshall ‘Castle & Bridge’ or ‘St. Albans Abbey’ pattern flounder dish, c.1815. It is 6” wide and is unmarked. Note the moulded lines to the interior.

A Henshall ‘Castle & Bridge’ or ‘St. Albans Abbey’ pickle set segment, c.1815. It is 3.75” wide and is printed with pieces of the border print. It is unmarked.

A Henshall ‘Castle & Bridge’ or ‘St. Albans Abbey’ pickle set segment, c.1815. It is 3.75” wide and is printed with pieces of the border print. It is impressed HENSHALL & CO to the underside.
A Henshall ‘Castle & Bridge’ or ‘St. Albans Abbey’ pickle set segment, c.1815. It is 5” wide and is printed with pieces of the border print. It is unmarked.

HICKS & MEIGH:

A ‘British Views’ series shell-type dish, c.1825, attributed to Hicks and Meigh. It is 6.25” long and is printed with an unknown view.

KEELING:

A ‘Lakeside Meeting’ pattern flounder dish printed in the portrait format. It is 5.5” tall and is attributed to James Keeling.
LAKIN:

A ‘Classical Ruins’ pattern handled dish, c.1815. It is 5.75” long and his pattern is attributed to Thomas Lakin. See the ‘Family & Mule’ pattern dish in the “Animals” section for an identical shape.

LOCKETT & HULME:

A Lockett & Hulme ‘Ponte Rotto’ pattern flounder dish, c.1825. It is 6” long and is unmarked. “Ponte Rotto” means “Broken Bridge” in Italian.

A Lockett & Hulme ‘Ponte Rotto’ pattern flounder dish, c.1825. It is 6” long and is unmarked. “Ponte Rotto” means “Broken Bridge” in Italian.
MASONS:

A C.J. Mason & Co. ‘Trentham Hall’ pattern shell dish, c.1820. It is 6” long and is unmarked.

MAY:

A Robert May ‘Bird Fountain’ pattern flounder dish, c.1830. It is 5.75” long and is unmarked. Note that this example is printed with a different part of the larger pattern.
A Minton ‘English Scenery’ series flounder dish, c.1825. It is 6” tall and is unmarked. It is printed with an unknown view.

A Minton ‘Italian Ruins’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.
A Minton ‘Monks Rock’ series leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.75” long and is unmarked. It is printed with an unknown view.

A Minton ‘Monks Rock’ series leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked. It is printed with an unknown view.

PETTY’S, LEEDS:

A ‘Wiseton Hall, Nottinghamshire’ pattern leaf dish, c.1830. It is 6” tall and is attributed to Petty’s, Leeds. This is part of a larger scene; see the next dish for details.
A ‘Wiseton Hall, Nottinghamshire’ pattern handled dish, c.1830. It is 6” tall and is attributed to Petty’s, Leeds. This is part of a larger scene; see the previous dish.

**POUNTNEY & ALLIES:**

A Pountney & Allies ‘Gothic Ruins’ leaf dish, c.1830. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked. See Pountney ‘Dromedary’ in the “Animals” section for an identical shape.

A Pountney & Allies shell dish, c.1830. It is 6” long and is unmarked. It is printed with a view of “Park Place, Henley” from the ‘River Thames’ series.
RIDGWAY:

‘An Ancient Hindoo Temple in the Fort of Rotas, Bahar’ leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.75” long and is attributed to Ridgway by shape.

‘An Ancient Hindoo Temple in the Fort of Rotas, Bahar’ leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.75” long and is attributed to Ridgway by shape. Note the fill on the handle.

A Ridgway ‘College’ series leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.75” long and is printed with a view of “Christ’s College, Cambridge”. It is unmarked.
A Ridgway ‘Angus Seats’ seats leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and is printed with an unknown view. Note the fill on the handle and compare it to the fill on the handle at the start of the Ridgway section on the previous page.

A Ridgway ‘Angus Seats’ seats leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and is printed with an unknown view.

A Ridgway ‘British Scenery’ series leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is printed with an unknown view, possibly taken from a larger pattern.
A Ridgway ‘British Scenery’ series leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is printed with an unknown view, possibly taken from a larger pattern.

An ‘Eastern Port’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 4.75” tall and is attributed to Ridgway.

An ‘Eastern Port’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 4.5” tall. It is attributed to Ridgway.
An ‘Eastern Port’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.5” tall and is attributed to Ridgway.

A William Ridgway & Co. “Marmora” pattern shell dish, c.1835. It is 6” long.

An ‘Osterley Park’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.25” long and is attributed to Ridgway.
An ‘Osterley Park’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.75” long and is attributed to Ridgway.

An ‘Osterley Park’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 4.5” long and is attributed to Ridgway.

An ‘Osterley Park’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is attributed to Ridgway.
An ‘Osterley Park’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is attributed to Ridgway.

A Ridgway ‘Ottoman Empire’ series leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and is printed with a view of “Eski Stamboul”.

A Ridgway ‘Ottoman Empire’ series leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and is printed with a view of “Eski Stamboul”.
A ‘Picnic’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 4.5” long and is attributed to Ridgway.

RILEY:

A Riley ‘Eastern Street Scene’ leaf dish, c.1820. It is 6.5” long and is unmarked.

A Riley ‘Eastern Street Scene’ leaf dish, c.1820. It is 6.25” long and printed with Riley’s “Semi China” mark to the underside.
A Riley ‘Eastern Street Scene’ leaf dish, c.1820. It is 6.5” long and printed with Riley’s “Semi China” mark to the underside.

A Riley ‘Eastern Street Scene’ leaf dish, c.1820. It is 6.25” long and printed with Riley’s “Semi China” mark to the underside.

A Riley ‘Scene after Claude Lorraine’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 6.25” long and printed with Riley’s “Semi China” mark to the underside.
ROGERS:

A Rogers ‘Monopteros’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.5” long and is impressed ROGERS to the underside.

A Rogers ‘Tivoli’ pattern two-handled dish, c.1820. It is 6” and is unmarked.

SPODE:

A Spode ‘Caramanian’ series leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5” long and is printed with ‘Three figures and a Sarcophagus’.
A Spode ‘Castle’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and is printed with a view of the “Gate of Sebastian at Capena”.

A Spode ‘Castle’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and is printed with a view of the “Gate of Sebastian at Capena”.

A Spode ‘Girl at the Well’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and is printed SPODE to the underside along with a workman’s mark.
A Spode ‘Italian’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and has a Spode workman’s mark printed to the underside.

A Spode ‘Bridge of Lucarno’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is printed SPODE to the underside along with a workman’s mark. It is 5” long. Lucarno is near Tivoli in the East of Italy.

A Spode ‘Bridge of Lucarno’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is printed SPODE to the underside along with a workman’s mark. It is 5” long.
A Spode ‘Bridge of Lucarno’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is printed SPODE to the underside along with a workman’s mark. It is 5” long. This scene is used as a supplementary print to the main scene.

A Spode ‘Bridge of Lucarno’ pattern shell dish, c.1820. It is printed with a workman’s mark. It is 5.25 ” long. This scene is used as a supplementary print to the main scene.

A Spode ‘Tiber’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.5” long and is printed with a view of ‘The Castle and Bridge of St. Angelo”.
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A Spode ‘Tiber’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.5” long and is printed with a view of ‘The Castle and Bridge of St. Angelo’.

A Spode ‘Tower’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and is printed SPODE to the underside along with a workman’s mark. The view is “The Bridge of Salaro near Porta Salaro” in Italy.

A Spode ‘Tower’ pattern shell dish, c.1820. It is 5.25” long and is impressed Spode to the underside along with a workman’s mark. The view is “The Bridge of Salaro near Porta Salaro” in Italy.
STEVENSON:

A Stevenson 'Ancient Greece' pattern shell-type dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and has the Ancient Greece title mark to the underside.

A Stevenson ‘Rose Border’ series leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is printed with a titled view of “Halstead, Essex”.

TURNER:

A ‘Villagers’ pattern flounder dish, c.1820. It is 5.5” long and is attributed to Turner.
A Wedgwood ‘Blue Claude’ pattern shell dish, c.1820. It is 5.25” tall and the print was taken from Claude Lorraine. It is impressed WEDGWOOD.

A Wedgwood ‘Blue Rose Border’ series leaf dish, c.1820. It is printed with an unknown view, but is impressed WEDGWOOD. Note the distinctive Wedgwood handle. It is 5.75” long.

A Wedgwood ‘Blue Rose Border’ series leaf dish, c.1820. It is printed with an unknown view, but is impressed WEDGWOOD. It is 5.75” long.
A Wedgwood ‘Blue Rose Border’ series shell dish, c.1820. It is printed with a view of Vesuvius erupting. It is impressed WEDGWOOD and is 6” long.

A Wedgwood ‘Blue Rose Border’ series leaf dish, c.1820. It is printed with an unknown view, but is impressed WEDGWOOD. It is 5.75” long.

**ENOCH WOOD:**

An Enoch Wood ‘Grapevine Border’ series leaf dish, c.1825. It is 6.25” long and is printed with a view of “Esholt House, Yorkshire”. Note the Enoch Wood shape.
An Enoch Wood ‘Italian Scenery’ series leaf dish, c.1825. It is 6.25” long and is printed with a view of “Naples”.

An Enoch Wood leaf dish, c.1825. It is 6.25” long and is printed with a view of “Lanercost Priory, Cumberland”.

UNKNOWN MAKER DISHES:

A ‘Boy Piping’ pattern flounder dish, c.1820. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Boy Piping’ pattern flounder dish, c.1820 It is 5.25” long and is unmarked.

An ‘Etruscan & Greek Vase’ pattern shell dish, c.1830. It is 6” long and has the pattern title mark to the underside.

A ‘Girl ant the Well’ or ‘Font’ pattern shell dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked. Several potters did this pattern including Rathbone and Wood & Challinor.
An unknown pattern of gothic ruins in a landscape. It is rather similar in style to Ridgway’s ‘Angus Seats’ series. This leaf dish is 5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Passion Flower Border’ series shell dish, c.1825. It is 5.25” long and is printed with a titled view of “Gubbins Hall”.

A ‘Hop Pickers’ pattern flounder dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is printed with the right-hand section of the main scene including a cottage which is often not included on other wares.
A Beemaster pattern shell-shaped pickle dish, c.1820. It is 6” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Hospitality’ or ‘Benevolent Cottagers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.75” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Hospitality’ or ‘Benevolent Cottagers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.75” long and is unmarked.
A non-Spode ‘Italian’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 6” long and is unmarked.

A non-Spode ‘Italian’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.

A non-Spode ‘Italian’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked.
A non-Spode ‘Italian’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Bridge of Lucarno’ pattern shell dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and is impressed with an ‘S’ to the underside. Lucarno is near Tivoli in the East of Italy.

An ‘Oriental Scenery’ series shell dish, c.1825. It is printed with a titled view of an ‘Ancient Temple at Boglipore’. It is 5.25” long.
An ‘Oriental Scenery’ series shell dish, c.1825. It is printed with a titled view of an ‘Ancient Temple at Boglipore’. It is 6.25” long.

A ‘Parrot Border’ series shell dish, c.1825. It is 6.25” long and is printed with a view of “The Fakeer’s Rock at Janguria, near Sultangunj”.

A flounder dish printed with a view of ‘Pashkov House, Moscow’. It is 5.5” tall and is unmarked.
A ‘Piping Shepard’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 6” long and is unmarked. There has been a piece of this pattern marked “Philips”, but here it will remain as maker unknown.

A shell dish with loop handle printed with an unknown pattern of a vase before a river landscape. It is 6.5” long and is unmarked. Note the unusual use of gilding to the handle.

A shell dish printed with an unknown view of a picnic scene on a riverbank. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.
A leaf dish printed with an unknown scene. See Williams & Weber, page 728 for pattern details. It is 6” long and is unmarked. Note how this dish is printed in a left-handed landscape format.

A loop-handled shell dish printed with an unknown scene. See Williams & Weber, page 728 for pattern details. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked.

A loop-handled shell dish printed with an unknown scene. See Williams & Weber, page 728 for pattern details. It is 6” long and is unmarked.
A ‘shipping’ series leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.75” long and is printed with the “Dingy” pattern.

A ‘shipping’ series leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.25” long and is printed with the “Dingy” pattern.

A ‘Sundial’ pattern shell dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Villagers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked. This pattern was made by Turner, Heathcote and Marsh, but will remain maker unknown here. See Turner in the ‘Scenic’ section for pattern variations.

A ‘Village Church’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Village Church’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Village Church’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Village Church’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long. This shape and workman’s mark can be seen under Riley in the “Floral” section.

A ‘Wild Rose’ or ‘Nuneham Courtenay, Oxfordshire’ pattern handled dish, c.1825. It is 6.5” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Wild Rose’ or ‘Nuneham Courtenay, Oxfordshire’ pattern flounder dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Wild Rose’ or ‘Nuneham Courtenay, Oxfordshire’ pattern flounder dish, c.1825. It is 6” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Wild Rose’ or ‘Nuneham Courtenay, Oxfordshire’ pattern leaf dish, c.1845. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Wild Rose’ or ‘Nuneham Courtenay, Oxfordshire’ pattern dish, c.1825. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked. Although it is a modified leaf dish, it is a very unusual shape and is unique in this work.

A ‘Wild Rose’ or ‘Nuneham Courtenay, Oxfordshire’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 6.25” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Wild Rose’ or ‘Nuneham Courtenay, Oxfordshire’ pattern flounder dish, c.1825. It is 6” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Winding Road’ pattern (variation) handled shell dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is unmarked.
OTHER

RILEY:

A Riley ‘Drapers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 6” long and has the Riley “Semi China” mark to the underside. This dish was made as part of a service Commissioned by the Worshipful Company of Drapers.
FLORAL

ADAMS:

A floral pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.75” long and is unmarked. This is attributed tentatively to Adams because of the distinctive treatment of the handle.

An Adams ‘Tendrill’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 4.75” long. As above, note the handle and see other examples of Adams’ handles elsewhere in this work.

BOothS:

A Booths floral leaf dish, c.1880. It is 5.5” long.
BRAMELED:

Brameld ‘Parroquet’ pattern (border print only) leaf-dish, c.1825. It is 6” long and is unmarked, but is a known Brameld shape.

BURTON:

A Samuel & John Burton ‘Lovick’ pattern leaf dish, c.1835. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked. Samuel Lovick was a china and glass retailer in Norwich, Norfolk in the 1830s.

A Samuel & John Burton ‘Lovick’ pattern leaf dish, c.1835. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.
COPELAND:

A Copeland leaf dish, c.1895. It is printed with a vase of flowers and is 5” long.

DAVENPORT:

A Davenport ‘Bamboo & Peony’ shell dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is impressed DAVENPORT to the underside.

HENSHALL:

A Henshall ‘Flower & Leaves’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 6.5” long and is unmarked.
A Henshall ‘Flower & Leaves’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.75” long and is unmarked.

A Henshall ‘Flower & Leaves’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked.

A Henshall ‘Flower & Leaves’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 6.25” long and is unmarked. This example is a slight variation having a small stringing-type border around the edge of the dish—maybe the copper plate was engraved specifically for a pickle dish which would be a rarity indeed.
LEEDS POTTERY:

A Leeds Pottery shell dish, c.1815. It is 5” long and is printed with floral sprays. It is impressed LEEDS POTTERY twice to the underside.

MINTON:

A Minton ‘Bamboo & Flowers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 4.75” long and is unmarked.

A Minton ‘Bamboo & Flowers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 6” long and is unmarked.
A Minton ‘Bamboo & Flowers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.

A Minton ‘Bamboo & Flowers’ pattern flounder dish, c.1825. It is 5.75” tall and is Printed with Minton’s “Semi China” mark.

A Minton ‘Basket of Flowers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.25” long and has a Minton workman’s mark to the underside.
A Minton ‘Basket of Flowers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 4.75” long and is unmarked.

A Minton ‘Basket of Flowers’ pattern shell dish, c.1825. It is 5.25” long and has a Minton workman’s mark to the underside.

A Minton ‘Pinwheel’ pattern shell dish, c.1825. It is 5.25” long and has a Minton workman’s mark to the underside.
A Ridgway ‘Bandana’ pattern shell dish with loop handle, c.1830. It is 5.75” long.

A Ridgway ‘Dresden Opaque China’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.75” long and is unmarked.

A Ridgway ‘Dresden Opaque China’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.
A Ridgway floral pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and has a blue printed mark; “IRONSTONE CHINA” to the underside.

A Ridgway floral pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.

A Ridgway floral pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked. The floral design looks very much like a water lily.
RILEY:

A Riley ‘Flower Arrangement 2’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 6.5” long and is Unmarked.

A Riley ‘Floral’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It has a very distinctive workman’s mark that can also be seen on one of the ‘Village Church’ pattern dishes in the “Scenic” category. It is 4.75” long.

A Riley ‘Floral’ pattern handled dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.
A Rogers ‘Elephant’ pattern (border print only) leaf dish, c.1825. It is 4.75” long and is impressed ROGERS to the underside.

A Rogers ‘Elephant’ pattern (border print only) leaf dish, c.1825. It is 4.75” long and is impressed ROGERS to the underside.

A Rogers ‘Zebra’ pattern (border print only) leaf dish, c.1825. It is 4.75” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Myrtle’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.5” long and is attributed to Rogers.

**SPODE:**

A Spode ‘Filigree’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is printed SPODE along with a workman’s mark to the underside.

A Spode ‘Geranium’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is printed with a workman’s mark to the underside.
SWANSEA:

A leaf dish printed with a floral spray within a typical Swansea border, c.1815. It is 4.5” tall and is tentatively attributed to Swansea.

WEDGWOOD:

A Wedgwood ‘Floral’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.75” long and is impressed WEDGWOOD to the underside.
A Wedgwood ‘Floral’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 6” tall and is impressed WEDGWOOD to the underside. Note the Wedgwood shape having a vine around the underside.

UNKNOWN MAKER DISHES:

A ‘Pinwheel’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 6” long and is unmarked.

A floral pattern leaf dish printed within a ‘Long bridge’ border, c.1810. It is 4.75” long and was possibly made by Swansea.
A ‘Tendrill’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.75” long and was possibly made by Adams.

A ‘Tendrill’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.25” long and was possibly made by Adams.

A ‘Tendrill’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 4.5” long and was possibly made by Adams.
A ‘Tendrill’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 4.5” long and was possibly made by Adams. Note the very distinctive shape and moulding of this and the previous dish; maybe made by a potter other than Adams?

A ‘Tendrill’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.5” long and was possibly made by Adams, although it is a typical Minton shape.

A ‘Tendrill’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.25” long and was possibly made by Adams.
A leaf dish printed with various floral sprays within a ‘Willow’ pattern border, c.1815. It is 5.5” long.
CHINOSERIE

ADAMS:

An Adams leaf dish, c.1900. It is printed with part of the ‘Chinese Bird’ pattern that was originally produced by Adams in the early nineteenth century. It is 5.5” long.

An Adams leaf dish, c.1900. It is printed with part of the ‘Chinese Bird’ pattern that was originally produced by Adams in the early nineteenth century. It is 5.5” long.

An Adams ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.25” long and is impressed ADAMS, TUNSTALL to the underside.
An Adams ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is impressed ADAMS to the underside. Note the distinctive Adams shape of handle and double-printing. It is 6.5” tall.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is unmarked, but was probably made by Adams due to their distinctive handle moulding. It is 5.75” tall.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is unmarked, but was probably made by Adams due to their distinctive handle moulding. It is 6.25” tall. Note the very unusual jagged edge; it looks like you could use it as a saw!
BRAMELD:

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820 It is 5” long and was probably made by Brameld due to the distinctive Brameld shape.

DAVENPORT:

A ‘Two Boat Willow’ pattern flat leaf shaped dish, c.1810. It is 7” tall and was possibly made by Davenport due to the shape. It is unmarked.
A Davenport ‘Chinoiserie High Bridge’ pattern shell dish, c.1815. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Chinoiserie Ruins’ pattern flat leaf dish, c.1815. It was possibly made by Davenport. It is 7” long.

A ‘Willow’ pattern flat leaf dish, c.1815. It is 6.75” long and was possibly made by Davenport based on shape, although there is a foot rim on this example.
ELKIN, KNIGHT & CO:

An Elkin, Knight & Co. ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 4.75” long and is impressed ELKIN KNIGHT & CO to the underside.

HAMILTON:

A Robert Hamilton ‘Canton River’ pattern pickle set segment, c.1820. It is 5” tall and is unmarked.

MINTON:

A Minton ‘Oriental family’ pattern flounder dish, c.1820. It is 5.5” long and has a blue printed Minton workman’s mark to the underside.
A Minton ‘Queen of Sheba’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 4.75” tall and is unmarked.

A Minton ‘Willow’ pattern shell dish, c.1820. It is 5.25” long and has a blue printed Minton workman’s mark to the underside.

RIDGWAY:

A ‘Curling Palm’ pattern shell dish, c.1810. It is 4.5” long and is Unmarked and was possibly made by Job Ridgway.
A Ridgway ‘Emerging Boat’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and is unmarked.

**SPODE:**

A ‘Forest Landscape II’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 4.75” long and is unmarked. It was probably made by Spode.
A Spode ‘Gothic Castle’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5.5” long and has a Spode workman’s mark to the underside.

A Spode ‘Gothic Castle’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5.5” long and has a Spode workman’s mark to the underside. Note how this example is printed in the left-handed landscape format.

A Spode ‘Grasshopper’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.5” long and has the SPODE STONE CHINA mark to the underside.
A Spode ‘Temple Landscape II’ leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.5” long and has the SPODE STONE CHINA mark to the underside.

A Spode ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5” long and is printed SPODE to the underside along with a workman’s mark.

STEVENSON:

A Stevenson ‘Chinese Traders’ pattern leaf ish, c.1815. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.
SWANSEA:

A Swansea leaf dish, c.1810. It is printed with part of the ‘Boy on a Buffalo’ pattern to the centre within the ‘Floral Bouquet’ border. It is 6” tall.

A ‘Fitzhugh’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 7.25” tall and was possibly made by Hollins or Swansea. Note the printing to the underside and how is closely mirrors the printing to the interior.

WEDGWOOD:

A Wedgwood ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1895. It is 5.5” long.
A Wedgwood ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1895. It is 5.5” long.

ENOCH WOOD:

An Enoch Wood ‘Eastern Scenery’ pickle set segment, c.1825. It is 4.5” long and is unmarked.

An Enoch Wood ‘Eastern Scenery’ pickle set segment, c.1825. It is 4.5” long and is unmarked.
RICHARD WOOLLEY:

An ‘Ornate Pagodas’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5.5” tall and is unmarked. It was possibly made by Richard Woolley.

UNKNOWN MARKER DISHES:

A ‘Boy on a Buffalo’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 4.75” tall and is unmarked. It was possibly made in Swansea.
A ‘Boy on a Buffalo’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5.5” tall and is unmarked. It was possibly made in Swansea.

A ‘Boy on a Buffalo’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 3.5” tall and is unmarked. It was possibly made in Swansea.

A ‘Buddleia, Twisted and Intertwined Tree variation’ leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.25” tall and is unmarked.
An unknown pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.25” long and is printed with stylised flowers.

A ‘Chinoiserie Bridgeless’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Chinoiserie Bridgeless’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Chinoiserie Bridgeless’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5” tall and is unmarked.

A ‘Chinoiserie Bridgeless’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 6” tall and is unmarked.
A ‘Chinoiserie Bridgeless’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 4.5” long and is unmarked.

A stylised chinioserie shell dish, c.1815. It is 5” tall and is printed with a rural scene including a cow. It is unmarked.

A unknown pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5” tall and is unmarked.
A chinioserie pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.25” long and was possibly made in Swansea.

An unknown shell dish with loop handle, c.1830. It is 6” long and has a vase in the Chinese landscape.

A ‘Chinese Flag Bearers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.75” tall and has an impressed star to the underside.
A ‘Chinese Flag Bearers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 4.5” tall and is unmarked.

A ‘Chinese Flag Bearers’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.75” tall and has an impressed star to the underside.

A ‘Chinese Gardeners’ pattern pickle set segment, c.1820 It is 4” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Chinese Market Stall’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.25” tall and is unmarked.

A ‘Dagger Landscape First’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 6” tall and is unmarked.

A ‘Fisherman & Castle’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.5” tall and is unmarked.
A pearlware ‘Fisherman & Cormorant’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5” tall and has an impressed ‘I’ to the underside.

A ‘Fitzhugh’ pattern shell dish, c.1810. It is 5.25” tall and is unmarked.

A ‘Flying Pennant II’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 6.25” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Long Bridge’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 4.75” tall. See “Floral” section, “Unknown Makers” for an identical shape with a ‘Long Bridge’ border.

A ‘Long Bridge’ pattern leaf dish, c.1810. It is 5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Net’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 4.5” long and has a blue printed mark which is possibly a ‘C’.
An ‘Ornate Summer House’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 6” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Parasol, Bridge & Pagoda’ pattern leaf dish, c.1805. It is 6.5” tall and was probably made by Sowters & Co., Mexborough.

A ‘Spotted Deer’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5” tall and is unmarked.
A ‘Two Temples II, Variation Broseley’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Two Temples II, Variation Broseley’ pattern flounder dish, c.1815. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked.

An unknown pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.5” long and is printed with what appears to be a Church within a ‘Willow’ pattern border. This is probably a small part of a much larger pattern.
A ‘Willow’ pattern two-handled dish, c.1820. It is 6” long and most unusually for a pickle dish, it is printed to the underside too.

A ‘Willow’ pattern two-handled shell dish, c.1830. It is 4.5” long and is unmarked. Note the moulded lines within the dish.

A ‘Willow’ pattern flounder dish, c.1820. It is 5” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Willow’ pattern dish, c.1815. It is 6” long and is a very unusual shape being unique within this work. It is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern shell dish, c.1825. It is 5.75” long and has a very feint and un-readable impressed mark. This shape has been noted marked ‘Twigg’, so was possibly made by them.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 4.5” tall and is unmarked.
A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5” tall and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 6.5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.5” tall and is unmarked.
A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1835. It is 4.5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.25” tall and is unmarked. Usually for pickle dishes, this one is printed on the underside with the border print.
A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5” tall and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1830. It is 6.25” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.5” tall and is unmarked. It was possibly made by Adams. See other examples of the Adams’ handle elsewhere in this work.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5.75” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1840. It is 5” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1830. It is 6” long and is unmarked. Note the left-handed landscape printing format.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 5.75” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1830. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 4.75” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1840. It is 6” long and is unmarked. Again, this is a very unusual shape for a pickle dish.
A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1830. It is 6” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1825. It is 5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1840. It is 5.5” long and is unmarked. Talk about using minimal pattern to the centre!
A ‘Willow’ pattern leaf dish, c.1840. It is 5.25” long and is unmarked. Note how the pattern is ‘mirror’ printed.

UNKNOWN PATTERNS:

An unknown pattern leaf dish, c.1815. It is 3.25” tall and is unmarked.

An unknown pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 4.5” tall and is unmarked.
An unknown pattern leaf dish, c.1820. It is 4.5” tall and is unmarked.

An unknown pattern shell dish, c.1810. It is 5.5” tall and is unmarked. Note the beautiful feet on this dish.
CONCLUSION:

Pickle dishes add greatly to our knowledge of Transferware. This is true for a variety of reasons. Firstly, the intended use of pickle dishes within a functional dinner service adds to our understanding of the social and historical context of these wares. Secondly, within this work you will appreciate the vast variety of shapes and forms that were produced. Also, you can see that some shapes were factory-specific and that pattern attributions (some slightly tentative) can be made. This is particularly exciting when patterns are previously un-attributed. Thirdly, the shape and fineness of potting on some of these dishes reminds us of the skill and ingenuity that the potters possessed. Finally, for people who don’t have many pickle dishes within their collections, it shows that they are a superb addition to a collection, a great source of learning and research, but also a thing of beauty!

There are a few further points that need to be mentioned in the conclusion that are evident from viewing the pickle dish section of this work.

There are a several instances of a ‘strange’ choice of print used.

This can be seen illustrated above. On the left, you have a lovely Village Church pattern dish that shows a beautiful pattern of the church, cottage, man, fence and sheep. However, the Village Church dish to the right is just printed with the fence which is to the left-hand side of the pattern as a whole. On the face of it, this seems quite odd. However, I believe this is the printer being resourceful rather than being deliberately obtuse. I think it is fairly safe to assume that
copper plates were not engraved especially for pickle dishes. Therefore, copper plates were simply borrowed from another ‘shape’ of the approximate size of the pickle dish and then used to print them. This would often lead to a wastage of the print. So, the printer would often cut a print in half and use one half on one dish and the other half or section on another pickle dish. This is almost certainly what has happened on the aforementioned Village Church pattern dishes. Another example of this type of pattern cutting and re-using rather than wasting is illustrated below on two Spode Castle pattern dishes.

The Spode Castle pattern tureen stand shows where the approximate cut in the transfer was made to create the above two pickle dishes.
A question of size of the a dish is an interesting point too. As mentioned earlier, pickle dishes seem to be roughly a standard size, being about 6” in length. However, it is noticeable from this collection that some potters produced dishes that were about 1/4” difference in size. For example, Riley made ‘Eastern Street Scene’ in sizes 5.75”, 6”, 6.25”, and 6.5”. Were these just four different sizes that you could order or were they meant to be graduated so that they could be stacked easily and safely rather like a nest of tables?

There is one example in the collection of a tiny pickle dish as shown below.

This ‘Resting Farm Boy’ pattern dish is much smaller than the average dish being only 3” long. This is 50% of the size of the standard dish. This begs the question; what was it’s use? Maybe it was designed for a rarer spice or pickle that was smaller in volume or more probably, was it a toy piece or from a child’s set? I suspect the later is nearer the truth, but one thing is for sure, it really is a super little item!
Overall, these dishes are of great relevance and importance as we strive to understand and research transferware. Hopefully, this work will have gone some way to proving this point and will have stimulated interest, ideas and thought into your own collecting and researching alike.

A flat-leaf ‘Castle’ pattern dish, c.1825.
MILSEYS

Introduction:

It is probably true to say that never before has an object’s use caused so much discussion and intrigue. I think that almost every conceivable use has been suggested over the years.

The word ‘Milsey’ is said to be a Scottish corruption of the two words, “milk” and “sieve”. If you say these two words quickly, you can quite easily arrive at “milsey”. If this origin is true, then obviously, it would suggest that this device or strainer was used for sieving milk. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, refrigeration of milk was largely not possible. Therefore, before milk could be added to tea, or similar beverage, it was boiled to stop it tasting very sour. As a result of the boiling process, a skin would form on the milk. Thus, one theory regarding the use of these ingenious strainers would be placed on top of a teabowl and the milk would be poured through them and thus the milk’s skin would be strained from that entering the teabowl. Given that tea was quite an expensive commodity at the time, none should be wasted, especially by making it go sour with pre-boiled milk.

The above explanation seems very plausible, but I would like to explore other possibilities. There are a number of important points to note here that might shed some light on the milsey’s true use:

1. Milseys were produced on ‘non-teaware’ patterns.
2. No American Historical patterns were produced.
3. The hole size, shape and number variations that were produced.
4. Milsey shape and size variations that were made.
5. Handle variations that were potted.

I will now look at these points in turn.
1. **Milseys were produced on ‘non-teaware’ patterns.**

If this strainer is for sieving milk, then it would be natural to assume that it belongs as part of a tea service’s wares. There is evidence to suggest this is to the contrary. If we take Spode for this example, we can see several interesting things that contradict the idea of the strainer being part of a tea service. Taking the ‘Greek’ pattern as an example; shown below is a Spode ‘Greek’ pattern milsey. Spode ONLY produced this pattern on dinner wares and toilet wares and never on tea wares.

![Spode 'Greek' pattern milsey](image1)

So, on this evidence, we can say that this Greek pattern strainer was not made for use in a tea service.

Shown below, is a Spode ‘Queen Charlotte’ milsey.

![Spode 'Queen Charlotte' milsey](image2)

Spode did produce this pattern on tea wares, so it could be assumed that the above milsey was produced and intended to be used as part of a fully functioning tea service.
The really interesting thing to note about the above two examples, is the number of holes, hole size and the hole positioning. Given that these two patterns were both produced at about the same time, c.1810, I believe they were possibly made to do completely separate jobs.

The Greek pattern example has twenty-one holes, which in relation to the Queen Charlotte milsey, are relatively large holes. They are all centred around the middle section of the milsey’s bowl.

The Queen Charlotte milsey has fifty three holes which are smaller in diameter and cover much more of the bowl’s surface. So, this example has more than twice the holes that the Greek pattern has. I truly believe that a company like Spode, who made an item for absolutely every possible use, made milseys or strainers for more than one usage.

This evidence is seen elsewhere in this collection where you see strainers made by other companies other than Spode who used patterns on their strainers which were non-tea ware patterns. See the following two examples:

Davenport ‘Rustic Scenery’ series milsey—This pattern was not produced tea wares.
This evidence suggests that milseys were made for use at both the tea table and the dinner table. With all the above said, what could these non-tea ware strainers be used for? I will look at usage later on in this work.

2. No American Historical patterns were produced.

It seems from my own experience and from this collection, that milseys that were printed with ‘American Historical’ patterns are extremely rare or simply weren’t produced. I have spoken to a leading dealer from America who has dealt in American Historical wares for many years and he has never heard of or seen an American Historical milsey. Now, this raises several interesting points; Firstly, were Milseys ONLY produced by potters that were not known to be great exporters? A lot of this collection is made up of Minton and Spode milseys and these two companies didn’t make wares for the American export market. So, to contradict this, there are some examples in this collection that were made by potters who did make pieces for the export market, these being Rogers and Davenport. Arguably, some of the biggest exporters were Enoch Wood, Clews and Stevenson and I have no examples in this collection produced by these companies, so cannot say for sure that milseys were not produced by these potters. However, I suspect that these three potters did produce milseys, but I have no evidence to support this. So, the second thing to note is if exporting potters such as Rogers and Davenport did make milseys, why do we not find American Historical printed milseys? Maybe milseys were market-specific and the American Market had no need for them as part of either dinner ware or tea ware? I will cover this later in the usage part of this work.

Minton ‘Monk’s Rock’ series milsey—another non-teaware pattern.
3. The hole size, shape and number variations that were produced.

As mentioned before, hole sizes and number almost certainly varied by use, but potters also had their own signature take on hole design. Some had very simple geometric patterns made up of small, circular holes, but other were much more intricate being made up of a variety of hole sizes, shapes and designs. This can clearly be seen by the following examples:

This ‘Chinese Flag Bearer’ example has a really beautiful pattern of holes and I think the printer has purposefully not transferred over them in order to show them off.

This ‘Net’ pattern example has leaf-shapes interspersed with circular holes.
This Turner ‘Elephant’ pattern milsey has leaves, circles and heart-shaped cut-outs.

The holes in these strainers were punched out by hand and were not moulded as part of the manufacturing process. I’m sure that some potters had quite large punches that included the majority of the holes in one punch, or at least quite large sections of the overall pattern that could easily be reproduced. This can seen in a number of examples how symmetrical and crisply the intricate hole pattern is produced.
So, I believe that milseys were made for different uses and this can be supported by the ‘tea ware versus dinner ware’ point noted earlier and the following milseys that have very different hole sizes:

You will notice that the top milsey in the example above has holes that are three times the size of the example below it. This surely can’t be down to a potter’s style of holes and must relate to intended use. If we look at the example with small holes, you could imagine these holes becoming easily blocked in certain situations and with certain media being used. I will examine this point later in the usage section of this work.

4. Milsey shape and size variations that were made.

The milsey or strainer shape did not really change much over the period being examined (1790 – 1850). They usually consist of a dished bowl, a series of holes
in the bowl and a handle of sorts. However, there were variations on this theme. Although most only had one handle, some had two which must be considered quite rare. Out of this quite large sample group in this work, only three examples shown have two handles. Two are chinioserie and the other is scenic and is shown below:

Minton ‘Verona’ pattern which has two handles.

Spode ‘Tower’ pattern strainer. This is an example of the more usual single-handled type. Note the Spode shape which has a simple loop handle to the interior of the bowl.
The following two examples are of the more usual variety that have only one handle which is attached to the outside of the bowl.

‘Net pattern strainer. Note the rather ornately moulded handle.

Herculaneum ‘Greek’ series strainer with simple loop handle.

There are other differences to note. The following example has the addition of three small feet on the underside. These are such a rare addition especially within this sample group of over a hundred pieces where only three examples have feet. I am, therefore, sure that these feet were designed to enable the strainer to stand in a larger receptacle while something was being drained.
Rogers ‘Zebra’ pattern (border print only). Note also the beautiful hole pattern and the heart-shape cut-outs.

It could be argued that as these milseys with feet were all made by the same manufacturer, they were simply a design that this potter used. However, I still think that these feet enabled the strainer to work in a very specific way.

5. **Handle variations that were potted.**

It seems that quite a few milseys either had loop handles or holes in their handle.
This would indicate that they may have been stored by hanging them up. This
could either have been done by placing the milsey directly onto a nail or similar
device or with the addition of a short piece of string.

The three examples above are all by different manufacturers and all have
pierced holes in their handles.

The three examples above were all made by different manufacturers and have
loop handles.

It would make sense to store these very delicate pieces of fine pottery in such a
way that they would not easily get damaged and handles as shown above would
allow this.
What follows is a practical examination of the potential uses of these milseys or small strainers.

If we take their use within a tea service as our first line of investigation, we need to be assured that the milsey will work successfully. Again, taking Spode as our example, you will notice that the Spode’s shape of milsey had the handle on the inside of the bowl. It would therefore be impractical to hold the milsey during use.

Therefore, the milsey would have to rested on the rim of a tea bowl. So, the first question must be; does a Spode milsey sit safely on the rim of a Spode tea bowl?

A Spode ‘Waterloo’ or ‘Italian Church’ pattern teabowl and saucer, c.1820.
The below images reassure us that a Spode milsey doe sit safely and securely enough during its potential intended use.

These three images show a Spode Forest Landscape pattern milsey resting on the rim of a Waterloo pattern teabowl. Although they are not the same pattern (unfortunately, I didn’t have the luxury of matching patterns), I’m sure they would have been the same design originally, it does demonstrate that this small size of Spode milsey does sit perfectly safely on the rim without the risk of falling into the teabowl.

These three images show the larger size of Spode milsey, in this case a Gothic Castle example, sitting on the rim of the Waterloo teabowl. Although it looks far more awkward in these images, it too was very safely positioned without fear of it either falling off or into the teabowl.

Maybe this slightly larger size of milsey was intended to be used with a larger cup or teabowl, or maybe it was intended to be used for an entirely different use to the smaller milsey. It is also important to note the hole differences in these two milseys; one has the larger, but fewer number of holes and the other more holes, but are smaller.

So, for these experiments, I will use both of these milseys to try and determine which works best for each given purpose.
The next question must be related to the name ‘milsey’. If the name indeed comes from a corruption of the two words, ‘milk sieve’, then we must try this out and see how successful it is at doing this job. The below images illustrate this in use. The milk was boiled before being strained just as it would have been done two-hundred years ago when it was done to prevent it tasting sour in the pre-refrigeration days.

As can be seen from the above images of both the small and large-holed milsey, they both work extremely effectively at removing the milk skin from what drains through. Of all the possible uses, this one works by far the best and most successfully. You will notice that the milk in the teabowl in both sets of results is completely free from the unwanted skin. The only other thing to mention is that the milsey with the smaller holes require slight agitation to get the required results.
Another possible use within a tea service would be to strain tea leaves from tea before it enters the tea bowl. We now know that a milsey will sit successfully on the tea bowl and especially with the Spode example, one wouldn’t have to hold the handle and risk getting burnt fingers when the hot tea was poured. We also know that this is a plausible use as tea was still very expensive at the time and as it was in a loose state (being before the introduction of tea bags), tea leaves could be strained from the tea solution and re-used at least once more. The following images show just this point:

A Spode Girl at the well pattern teapot, c.1825. It also has an integrated strainer to the interior of the pot where liquid enters the spout.

The following experiments were firstly performed using loose tea leaves. However, I feel that this was not satisfactory as the leaves or leaf pieces had been slightly ground or crushed and I’m sure that tea leaves in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries would have been larger. As such, I have tried using slightly larger herb pieces as a substitute to get the desired results.
Tea leaves through the larger-holed milsey. Most of the leaves went through into the bowl.

Tea leaves through the smaller-holed Milsey. Slightly more successful, but much went through.

Herb pieces through the larger-holed milsey. Much better, but still quite a lot of pieces got through.

Herb pieces through the smaller-holed milsey. Again, more successful and not many pieces got into the teabowl.
Another possible usage could have been aiding in the creation of the highly fashionable citrus teas. It is debatable just at what stage the citrus was added, but so that an individual could add their own required citrus amount, then a milsey that was placed over the tea bowl would stop any pips or flesh from the fruit from entering the tea.

All in of the above experiments, Lemon, Lime and Orange, the strainer performed very well catching all of the flesh and unwanted pieces and only let through the pure juice.
Another widely-used name for a milsey is an ‘egg drainer’. As this name sounds fairly self-explanatory, let’s examine how it might be used.

The consumption of poached eggs was a widespread and common practice at this time. An egg would be broken and placed into a pan of nearly boiling water. It would remain in the water for a couple in minutes until poached at which point the now poached egg would be removed. I doubt very much that the egg drainer would be used to remove the poached egg from the water as the risk of burning one’s fingers would be too high. It is much more likely that the egg would be fished out using a spoon or similar utensil and then placed in the egg drainer to drain the water prior to serving.

As can be seen from the above images, this works very well indeed. In only a short amount of time, most of the water has drained away from the poached egg so that it is now ready to enjoy. However, in order for this process to work properly, the drainer must sit in either a teabowl, saucer or similar vessel to allow the water to drain somewhere and be collected.

If these egg drainers were used at the table to serve poached eggs on their own, then the egg would have to be perfectly dry so that the table or table cloth would not get wet. Because of this and the fact that there is not an accompanying vessel for the drainer to sit and aid serving the eggs satisfactorily, I find this explanation and usage as being fairly unlikely.
While we are on the subject of eggs, let’s also look at how the milsey could be used as an aid to cooking.

The separating of eggs is a widely used practice in many branches of cooking and while it can be done in a variety of ways, a draining or separating vessel would certainly be useful.

The left-hand image is of an egg broken into the milsey with small holes. The right-hand image is after thirty seconds of agitating.

The left-hand image is of an egg broken into the milsey with larger holes. The right-hand image is after thirty seconds of agitating. This proved to be quite an unsuccessful experiment as almost nothing drained through the holes of either milsey, largely because the egg white is far too viscous. I would therefore conclude that this is not a plausible use for this vessel.
Other examples of milseys

A Flight Royal Lily pattern porcelain milsey, c.1810.

A pearlware milsey, c.1815.

A creamware milsey, c.1800.
Conclusion

From the experimental usage section, I would say that some conclusions can definitely be drawn.

Their use as a egg separator was unlikely and proved to be quite unsuccessful. The white of the egg was far too thick and viscous and as such almost none was able to pass through the relatively small holes of either milsey used.

The use as an egg drainer seems quite plausible as it certainly worked well. If it were done using the Rogers’ examples discussed earlier in this work, which have feet to lift it further off a receptacle to aid draining, it would be a possibility. The only doubt I have about this use is that to be used at the table with the poached egg in, it would have to stand in another saucer-like vessel, otherwise the table or table cloth would get wet from the still draining egg.

The citrus tea straining device also seem plausible and worked well in the practical experiments. It allowed you to really squeeze the fruit to get out the desired amount of juice without fear of getting flesh or pips in the tea.

The milsey also worked quite well in preventing larger pieces of tea from entering the teabowl especially in conjunction with the straining piece on the inside of the spout. I am not entirely happy with this experiment as it is difficult to fully ascertain the actual size and shape of the period tea leaves, although I suspect that they were much bigger than we are used to today. As such, the later experiment showed that with the slightly larger pieces used, the milsey work quite effectively. I guess it stands to reason that the larger the pieces you are trying to sieve, then the more successful these pieces are going to be.

By far the most successful and indeed plausible use seems to be their use as a milk sieve. They really worked well and let absolutely none of the milk skin or thick milk through. The only caveat is that the milsey with the smaller holes seemed to get blocked, but with slight agitation, the milk passed through well enough.

While there may be evidence to suggest that at least some of the milseys produced were intended to be used with tea wares, other examples’ usage is less clear. I believe that their use is rather similar to the pickle dish in a way; they are truly multi-purpose items that could be used in a variety of ways and for a variety of uses.
Patterns – Animals & Birds, Scenic, Other, Floral & Chinoiserie

As with the pickle dishes earlier in this work, the patterns on the milseys will be broken down into categories. These will be; Animals & Birds, Scenic, Other, Floral and Chinoiserie. Within these categories, the dishes will be grouped by design or factory, if known. Although this categorisation seems fairly self-explanatory, some patterns are quite difficult to decide where they belong. Therefore, here is an explanation:

**Animals & Birds** – The category will include patterns where an animal or bird is the main focus of the pattern or, indeed, the pattern name. Also included here will be examples that are of this series by pattern name or design, but only have the border print. For example, the Rogers Zebra pattern milsey is only printed with flowers from the border print.

**Scenic** – These will include patterns that are a scene, are part of a landscape series or are of a known place.

**Floral** – This will have patterns that are of flowers, floral series and those that are just border prints. The pieces that are just border prints will also be included elsewhere where their specific pattern belongs despite not being printed in full. For example, Rogers Zebra pattern milsey with border print only will be included here as well as the Animals & Birds category.

**Chinoiserie** – This will include all the Chinoiserie patterns, even if they have an animal, bird or flowers as their main focus point. This is because some patterns are stylistically Chinoiserie in theme despite the subject matter not being of Chinese origin.

**Other** – This final category will be made up of all the other patterns that don’t fit into the above categories.
Sizes in this work, as with the pickle dishes, will be in inches. They will be measured, recorded and noted at the longest point of the milsey. This will include the handle or handles as shown below.
ANIMALS & BIRDS

ROGERS:

A Rogers ‘Elephant’ pattern (border print only) milsey, c.1825. It is 4” long. Note the feet on this example.

A Rogers ‘Zebra’ pattern (border print only) milsey, c.1825. It is 4” long. Note the feet on this example.
DAVENPORT:

A Davenport ‘Rustic Scenery’ series milsey, c.1820. It is 4” long and is unmarked.

MINTON:

A Minton ‘Monk’s Rock’ (border print only) series milsey, c.1820. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked.

A Minton ‘Verona’ pattern milsey, c.1830. It is 4.25” long and is unmarked. Note the very small holes on this example.
A Minton ‘Verona’ pattern milsey, c.1830. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked.

A Minton ‘Verona’ pattern milsey, c.1830. It is 4.25” long and is unmarked.

A Minton ‘Verona’ pattern milsey, c.1830. It is 4.75” long and is unmarked. Note the two handles.

A Minton ‘Verona’ pattern milsey, c.1830. It is 4.75” long and is unmarked. Note the two handles.
MINTON & BOYLE:

A Minton & Boyle ‘Devon’ pattern milsey, c.1836. It is 4.25” long and is unmarked.

ROGERS:

A Rogers ‘Monopteros’ pattern milsey, c.1825. It is 4” long and is unmarked.

SPODE:

A Spode ‘Castle’ pattern milsey, c.1825. It is 3.5” long and marked SPODE.
A Spode ‘Tower’ pattern milsey, c.1825. It is 3.5” long and marked SPODE.

**UNKNOWN MAKER MILSEY:**

A ‘Girl at the Well’ or ‘Font’ pattern milsey, c.1830. It is 4” long and is unmarked. This pattern was produced by a number of potters.
HERCULANEUM:

A ‘Greek’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 4” long and is attributed to Herculaneum.

SPODE:

A Spode ‘Greek’ pattern milsey, c.1825. It is 3.5” long and has a Spode workman’s mark to the underside.

A Spode ‘Greek’ pattern milsey, c.1825. It is 3.5” long and has a Spode workman’s mark to the underside.
COPELAND:

A Copeland ‘British Flowers’ series milsey, c.1850. It is 3.5” long and is printed Copeland to the underside.

MINTON:

A Minton ‘Bamboo & Flowers’ pattern milsey, c.1825. It is 4.25” long and is unmarked.

A Minton ‘Basket of Flowers’ pattern milsey, c.1825. It is 3.75” long.
A Spode ‘Flower Cross’ pattern milsey, c.1825. It is 3.5” long and is unmarked.

A Spode ‘Group’ pattern milsey, c.1825. It is 3.5” long and has a blue printed workman’s mark to the underside.

A Spode ‘India’ pattern milsey, c.1825. It is 3.5” long and has a blue printed workman’s mark to the underside.
A Spode ‘Lattice Scroll’ pattern milsey, c.1825. It is 3.5” long and is printed SPODE to the underside.

**BORDER PRINTS:**

**MINTON:**

A Minton ‘Monk’s Rock’ series milsey, c.1820. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked.

**ROGERS:**

A Rogers ‘Elephant’ pattern (border print only) milsey, c.1825. It is 4” long. Note the feet on this example.
A Rogers ‘Zebra’ pattern (border print only) milsey, c.1825. It is 4” long. Note the feet on this example.

**MAKERS UNKNOWN:**

A floral printed milsey, c.1835. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked.

A floral printed milsey, c.1835. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked.
A floral pattern milsey with a chinioserie style border, c.1815. It is 3.5” long and was possibly made in Swansea.

A floral pattern milsey with a chinioserie style border, c.1815. It is 3.5” long and was possibly made in Swansea.

A ‘Tendril’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked. It is of the same shape and has the same type of handle as seen on the possible Swansea milseys seen above
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A floral pattern milsey with a chinioserie style border, c.1815. It is 3.5” long and was possibly made in Swansea.

A ‘Tendrill’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked. It is of the same shape and has the same type of handle as seen on the possible Swansea milseys seen in the above four examples.

A ‘Tendrill’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked. It is of the same shape and has the same type of handle as seen on the possible Swansea milseys seen above.
A ‘Tendrill’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked. It is of the same shape and has the same type of handle as seen on the possible Swansea milseys seen above.
CHINOISERIE

BRAMELD:

A Brameld ‘Willow’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.5” long and the handle is decorated with a known Brameld ‘fill’.

DAVENPORT:

A Davenport two-handled ‘Chinese men in a Garden’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long.

A Davenport ‘Chinese men in a Garden’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long.
MEXBOROUGH:

A ‘Parasol, Bridge & Pagoda’ pattern milsey, c.1805. It is 3.75” long and was probably made by Sowters’s Pottery, Mexborough.

MINTON:

A Minton ‘Chinese Marine’ pattern milsey, c.1830. It is 4.25” long and is unmarked.

SPODE:

A Spode ‘Forest Landscape’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.5” long.
A Spode ‘Forest Landscape’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.5” long.

A Spode ‘Gothic Castle’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.5” long.

A Spode ‘Queen Charlotte’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.5” long.
A Spode ‘Willow’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.5” long.

**TURNER:**

A Turner ‘Elephant’ pattern milsey, c.1800. It is 3.25” long and is unmarked. Note the distinctive hole pattern used by Turner.

A Turner ‘Stag’ pattern milsey, c.1800. It is 3.25” long and is unmarked.
A Turner ‘Stag’ pattern milksey, c.1800. It is 3.25” long and is unmarked.
A Turner ‘Stag’ pattern milsey, c.1800. It is 3.25” long and is unmarked.

UNKNOWN MAKER MILSEYS:

A ‘Two Temples II, Variation Broseley’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Two Temples II, Variation Broseley’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 4.5” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Chinoiserie Bridgeless’ pattern milsey, c.1810. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Chinoiserie Bridgeless’ pattern milsey, c.1810. It is 3.25” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Chinoiserie Bridgeless’ pattern milsey, c.1810. It is 3.75” tall and is unmarked.
A ‘Chinese Flag Bearers’ pattern (border print only) milsey, c.1810. It is 4” long.

A ‘Flying Pennant’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Nankin’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Net’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.5” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Net’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked. Note the unusual moulded handle.

A ‘Swan & Peacock’ pattern milsey, c.1810. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked. It was possibly made by Swansea and note the beautiful rope-twist handles.
A ‘Two Temples II, Variation Broseley’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Two Temples II, Variation Broseley’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked.

An unknown pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.5” long and has a beautiful, crisply moulded handle with a hole in it.
An unknown pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.25” long and is unmarked. It has a handle very like the previous example. The piercing of ‘clubs’ and ‘diamonds’ was often done by Swansea, so has a tentative attribution to that factory.

An unknown pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 3.5” long and is unmarked. Note the unusual pair of strap handles.

A milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked. This pattern is part of a larger scene that has been noted on jugs and mgs attributed to the Ferrybridge pottery.
A milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked. This pattern is part of a larger scene that has been noted on jugs and mgs attributed to the Ferrybridge pottery.

A milsey, c.1815. It is 3.75” long and is unmarked. This pattern is part of a larger scene that has been noted on jugs and mgs attributed to the Ferrybridge pottery.

A ‘Willow’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 4” long and is unmarked.
A ‘Willow’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 4” long and is unmarked.

A ‘Willow’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 4” long and is unmarked. Note the beautiful and rather elegant handle.

A ‘Willow’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 4” long and is unmarked. This is very similar to the ‘Spode shape’, but the handle is slightly longer in the bowl.
A ‘Willow’ pattern milsey, c.1815. It is 4” long and is unmarked. Note the unusual ‘crown-shaped’ holes.
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