



Figures 5.1 and 5.2: clay tobacco pipe bowl, left and right sides¹

Among the artefacts excavated at Hungate were two clay tobacco pipe bowls marked on one side with the City of York coat of arms and on the other side, the motto: ‘MASON / YORK / 1828’. They are illustrated in Figures 5.1 and 5.2.² This was the mark of George Mason Senior, who operated in Monkgate, on the periphery of the city centre, between 1800 and 1839.³ Mason had three apprentices over his 39 years of production. He himself had started his trade as apprentice to one of York’s most

¹ York Archaeological Trust (hereafter YAT), Project 5000 (Hungate), SF157, ‘Tobacco pipe’ (1828-1839). This pipe was excavated from Hungate Block E: see Appendix 9 for a map of the Hungate excavation site.

² The other similarly marked pipe bowl can be found at: YAT, Project 5000, SF1078, ‘Clay tobacco pipe’ (1828-1839).

³ Pigot & Co, *Directory of Cheshire, Cumberland... 1828-9* (Part II: Notts-Yorks & N Wales), p.1138.

prolific pipe makers, Mark Hesp, in 1792. At his death, Mason's business was taken over by his son, George Mason Junior, who continued the business until his death in 1866.⁴ Interestingly, all three men used very similar marks in their business. Mason Sr's proprietary mark closely resembled his former master's device in which proprietary details were depicted inside a shield.⁵ Likewise, Mason Jr's symbol continued this tradition. His mark comprised a shield and contained the words 'MASON / YORK / 1848', with a 'malformed' City of York coat of arms on its opposing side.⁶

This repetition of a particular element of a mark is intriguing. Certainly, the progression between Mason Sr and Mason Jr could be interpreted in a fairly straightforward manner that suggested a pragmatic re-use of moulds between makers. Yet once Mason Sr had acquired his freedom, he and Hesp operated in York in the same period. The link between marks then was not simply a bequest or recycling of equipment, but a deliberate gesture towards the pipemaking heritage within which Mason Sr positioned himself. Through his evocation of his former master's mark, Mason Sr communicated messages to his customers, and, perhaps, to himself, about the way in which he made pipes – and presumably, the quality of his produce – which were deliberately designed to associate his pipes with those made by Hesp.

⁴ John Andrews, *Pipemakers of the City of York 1643-1921* (Shrewsbury, 1989), pp.4-5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p.11.

⁶ S.D. White, 'Clay tobacco pipes from excavations at Hungate, York: Block D (YORYM:2006.5201)' York Archaeological Trust Report (October 2007)', p.3; Andrews, *Pipemakers of the City of York*, p.10.

Despite the semiotic value presented by these marks, they have been little studied by historians – indeed, as artefacts of study, clay tobacco pipes have been virtually entirely overlooked. The associated material culture of smoking, however, such as tobacco jars, wrappers and pouches, stoppers, lighters and cleaning materials, have all been considered by historians in order to draw conclusions about broad issues of gender and class.⁷ In part, the neglect of the study of the clay pipe is linked to its ubiquity. As archaeologist Matthew Johnson has remarked, clay pipes are found ‘in their thousands’; fragments look very similar and at first, ‘do not seem to be promising for theoretical excursus’.⁸ Isolated studies have begun to highlight the importance of pipes as part of a wider story. Johnson has shown how the presence of large pipe deposits can allow us to hypothesise about the activities and behaviours associated with drinking practices. More recently, Natascha Mehler has traced mercantile and commercial networks across early modern Bavaria through pipe deposits.⁹ Craig Cessford has also urged historical archaeologists to consider the broad range of other potential uses for the clay pipe beyond smoking, and their implications for our understanding of social and cultural histories. So too has Jacquie Pearce.¹⁰ The primary use of pipes has been as a dating tool in order to identify the

⁷ Maurice Rickards, *Encyclopedia of Ephemera. A Guide to the Fragmentary Documents of Everyday Life for the Collector, Curator and Historian* (London, 2000); Catherine Molineux, ‘Pleasures of the smoke: “Black Virginians” in Georgian London’s tobacco shops’, *William and Mary Quarterly* 64:2 (2007), 327-376. Much work simply describes smoking-related material culture, for example: Ben Rapaport, ‘How do we smoke? : accessories and utensils’ in Sander L, and Xun, Zhou (Eds.), *Smoke. A Global History of Smoking* (London, 2004), 100-107; Jordan Goodman, *Tobacco in History, The Cultures of Dependence* (London, 1993), p.6, briefly mentions tobacco boxes.

⁸ Matthew Johnson, *An Archaeology of Capitalism* (Oxford, 1996), pp.183-4.

⁹ Natascha Mehler, ‘The archaeology of mercantilism: clay tobacco pipes in Bavaria and their contribution to an economic system’, *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 43:2 (2009), 261-281.

¹⁰ Craig Cessford, ‘The archaeology of the clay pipe and the study of smoking’, *Assemblage* 6 (2001), http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/adsdata/assemblage/html/6/Cessford_text_web.html (accessed June 2010); Jacqueline Pearce, ‘Clay tobacco pipes and smoking in London’, Museum of London (MOLA) Datasets | Locating London’s Past, <http://www.locatinglondon.org/static/MolaArchaeology.html#toc2> (accessed February 2012).

period of the context from which they are recovered.¹¹ This is often achieved through linking makers' marks upon pipes with textual sources such as trade directories, although the shape and size of pipe bowls and stems are also useful indicators of the period from which they originate. Important interdisciplinary work by pipe specialists and enthusiasts has been carried out in order to identify specific pipemakers from their marks.¹²

Such an analysis of the marks upon pipes, however, overlooks their semiotic significance: it does not explore the communication intended by the symbols that were branded on pipes, nor does it tackle the broader question of *why* some pipes were marked when the vast majority were bare. This chapter develops a wider interpretation of these marking practices, one that integrates the sign value of these marks into its analysis. Although it uses York-excavated pipes as a starting point, it combines these with a data set of pipes recovered from across the UK, and occasionally, abroad, in order to strength its claims about marking practices, much as the analyses of the previous two products in the thesis have done. In so doing, it demonstrates that marks found upon pipes were a form of marking that, like others studied in this thesis, can be shown to have had wider significance. In turn, the historiography of branding is made more complex. As discussed at length in the thesis

¹¹ Mehler states in 'The archaeology of mercantilism' that her original intention was the creation of a local pipe typography to assist with site-dating, p.276. See also: Seth Mallios, 'Back to the bowl: using English tobacco pipebowls to calculate mean site-occupation dates', *Historical Archaeology* 39:2 (2005), 89-104; Christine Williamson, 'Dating the domestic ceramics and pipe smoking related artifacts from Casselden Place, Melbourne, Australia', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 10:4 (2006), 329-341.

¹² For the UK much of this work has been compiled by users of the National Clay Pipe Archive, housed in the University of Liverpool. Articles on this subject in their affiliated publication, the *Society for Clay Pipe Research Newsletter* are too numerous to mention. For Yorkshire specifically, see S.D. White, *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe 18. The Dynamics of Regionalisation and Trade: Yorkshire Clay Tobacco Pipes c.1600-1800*, Edited by P.J. Davey and D.A. Higgins (British Archaeological Report [hereafter BAR] British Series, 374, 2004).

introduction, ‘branding’ has usually been presented as a twentieth-century process, one which stemmed from the introduction of standardised, mass-produced commodities. In this reading, the primary purpose of branding was for product differentiation. Implicit within the discussions of these marks is an assumption that ‘branding’ is synonymous with logos or symbols that represented proprietary identities.¹³ The marks found upon clay tobacco pipes commonly were such symbols: Mason Sr’s bowl, depicted in figures one and two, showcased exactly this kind of mark. Other pipes featured marks of pipe retailers, such as hotels or pubs, or the names of tobacconists or merchants.

Yet as this thesis has demonstrated throughout, ‘branding’ was a more complex practice performed by not only those with proprietary interests, but also by the state for two broad purposes: the creation and perpetuation of a national identity and as a means of control. As chapter two has discussed, medicines were required to bear the stamp duty label between 1783 and 1941, and as chapter four has ascertained, stonewares were subject to a variety of marking practices from different government departments that included the Excise and the Board of Trade. Apart from a short-lived excise duty in the late seventeenth century, however, the government did not become directly involved with the production and retail of clay tobacco pipes, although duties were levied upon tobacco.¹⁴ It was not until the introduction of Registered Designs

¹³ Nancy F. Koehn, *Brand New: How Entrepreneurs Earned Consumers’ Trust from Wedgwood to Dell* (Boston, MA, 2001); Liz Moor, *The Rise of Brands* (Oxford, 2007); Naomi Klein, *No Logo. No Space. No Choice. No Jobs* (London, 2010). See also Table 1 in the introduction.

¹⁴ The excise duty that was levied upon stonewares 1695-1697 was also levied upon clay tobacco pipes: An Act for continuing to his Majesty certain Duties upon Salt, Glass Wares, Stone and Earthen Wares, and for granting several Duties upon Tobacco Pipes, and other Earthen Wares, for carrying on the War against *France*, and for establishing a national Land Bank, and for taking off the Duties upon Tunnage of Ships, and upon Coals (1696); An Act for taking away half the Duties imposed on Glass, and the whole Duties lately laid on Stone and Earthen Wares, and Tobacco Pipes, and for granting (in

late in the nineteenth century that pipemakers were required to place a state mark upon their products, and then only if they were a design that had been entered in the Books of Registration kept by the Board of Trade.¹⁵ As such, there were no requirements to mark pipes in any specific manner. George Mason Sr's use of the City of York coat of arms alongside his proprietary mark, however, reveals that clay tobacco pipemakers marked their products with semiotic values of authority: these included symbols of civic culture and the language of heraldry.

Some of these marks have been identified as decoration rather than as branding and as such have been considered as an aesthetic rather than a functional element of the pipe.¹⁶ The pipe fragments excavated by YAT reveal that many pipes were ornately decorated with leaves, stars, hearts and other symbols, and it is sometimes difficult to determine the difference between a decorated pipe fragment and a branded one, particularly when some pipes – such as the Hesp and both Masons – utilised designs that could be considered as both marking and decoration (a shield symbol and their name). Analyses of pipes by clay pipe specialists have differentiated between decorated and marked fragments through the classification of any piece that contained letters or initials as a 'marked' fragment. By contrast, 'decorated' pipes is the term for those with ribbing or ornate seams and more detailed and potentially significant

lieu thereof) new Duties upon Whale Fins and *Scotch* Linen (1698). Excise duties on tobacco were numerous throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and include: An Act for continuing several Duties granted by former Acts upon Wine and Vinegar, and upon Tobacco, and *East-India* Goods, and other Merchandize imported, for carrying on the War *against* France (1695); An Act for the more effectual securing the Duties on Tobacco (1750); An Act for the better securing the Duties payable on Tobacco (1785); An Act to grant to His Majesty certain Duties of Excise on Tobacco to be manufactured in *Ireland*; and to allow certain Drawbacks in respect thereof, in lieu of former Duties of Excise and Drawback; and to provide for the regulating and securing the Collection of the said Duties (1812); An Act for better securing the Duties of Excise on Tobacco (1821).

¹⁵ These are held at The National Archives (hereafter TNA), BT 43, Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Office and predecessor: Ornamental Design Act 1842 Representations (432 volumes).

¹⁶ Craig Cessford, 'The archaeology of the clay tobacco pipe'.

imagery such as oak leaves or acorns.¹⁷ This distinction is muddled in instances where a symbol represents a name – such as the Prince of Wales feathers produced for use in a pub with the same name – but in the main a ‘marked’ pipe included initials or letters. However, this distinction overlooks the semiotic value of the ‘decorative’ imagery. As this chapter will demonstrate, many of these ‘decorative’ marks utilised the symbolic language of heraldry and civic culture, such as the Yorkshire rose, and in so doing, complicated what has been categorised purely as decoration. As such, when this chapter refers to ‘marked’ pipes, these types of decorative branding are included.¹⁸

Clay pipes did not move very far from their source of manufacture: their fragility meant they did not travel well and this, combined with their cheapness and the ease of their production, meant that they became throwaway items. While particularly in the nineteenth century pipes with symbols of national political relevance began to be produced en masse, pipes tended to reflect more local identities: not only of their maker but also in the symbols of authority. Both versions of the Mason mark, with its imitation of the arms of the City of York, represented this preoccupation with civic, rather than state, affiliation on the part of pipemakers. Clay pipes, then, offer an opportunity to complicate further the way in which we think about branding between 1650 and 1900, in which the diverse marking practices that constitute ‘branding’ – state and proprietary – are merged to transmit civic, rather than state, values.

Furthermore, although they can be understood as both marks of production and

¹⁷ This is standard in most assessments of clay pipes. For example, see: Jacqui Pearce, ‘Living in Victorian London: The Clay Pipe Evidence’, <http://www.geog.qmul.ac.uk/victorianlondon/pdf/ClayPipe.pdf> (accessed January 2012), p.9.

¹⁸ Seam decoration, however, has been ignored, as it appears to be far more aesthetic than semiotic in intention by covering up the join between two sides of a pipe bowl.

commerce, they also represented something outside of the transactions that pipes passed through. Makers appear to have personalised and amended their marks to reflect specific affiliations and beliefs: not necessarily just of their customers, but also of themselves. They also used their work to commemorate significant personal events or rites of passage, such as marriages. While these were marks of production – they identified a specific individual’s output – their significance was not only commercial. As we will see, we can place them in a wider social context, and see them as one example of how people construct their self-identity through their craft. Marks of production on pipes can be understood as part of much broader social processes than traditional readings of these marks have placed them within.

1. The marking practices of clay pipe makers and retailers

Unlike the other industries discussed in the thesis, pipemakers did not adopt any radical new technologies, beyond new or bigger kilns, nor did they harness innovative working practices in order to mass-produce their goods. They were handmade until into the late twentieth century.¹⁹ While the methods of production did not vary a great deal, as we will see, pipes were marked in various ways and places. This variety allowed branding to be added at different stages, and occasionally, by people other than the pipemaker.

¹⁹ S. Paul Jung Jr, *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe 17. Pollocks of Manchester: Three Generations of Clay Tobacco Pipemakers*, Edited by David Higgins (BAR British Series 352, 2003), pp.47-54.

1.1 How pipes were marked

Although methods for marking clay pipes diversified, by the mid-nineteenth century, no one method dominated. The nature of the clay pipe meant that, as with stone bottles, any branding had to be placed upon the object prior to its firing. Clay was transported from various regional centres to the pipemaker and when needed, soaked in water in order to restore its malleability. Once the requisite elasticity and consistency had been achieved after a few days, makers hand-rolled hundreds of pieces of clay into the generic pipe shape. This was a long thin piece with a bulb at the end to form the bowl. These were dried upon ‘dozening boards’ that held sixteen proto-pipes at a time – each board accounted for four that might be spoiled – and, after they had reached the appropriate level of moisture, were pierced with a rod through the ‘stem’ down to the bowl end.²⁰ The pipes were then placed into a two-piece mould that, from the eighteenth century, was tightened in the newly-invented ‘gin-press’ affixed to the worktop.²¹ Although at first the moulds were made from brass, by 1750 these moulds were created in iron, which lasted longer.²² A lever attached to the press pushed a stopper down into the bulbous end of the pipe and thus formed the hollow bowl and simultaneously pushed the rest of the clay into the mould and formed the requisite shape. A basic, unmarked clay pipe was formed and it was at this point that branding was placed upon the pipe, although the methods of doing so varied, depending on maker and geographical traditions.

²⁰ Peter Brears, *The Pipemaker*, (Leeds, 1991), pp.4-5.

²¹ The ‘gin-press’ was short for the ‘engine press’: see: Jacqui Pearce, ‘Clay tobacco pipes and smoking in London’, <http://www.locatinglondon.org/static/MolaArchaeology.html#toc2> (accessed February 2012). See also: Adrian Oswald, *Clay Pipes for the Archaeologist* (BAR British Series, 14, 1975), pp.16-17.

²² Eric G. Ayto, *Clay Tobacco Pipes* (Princes Riseborough, 1979), p.19.

Moulded marks, such as George Mason's device pictured in Figures 5.1 and 5.2, were formed whilst they were pressed into shape, with the mould being customised in order to do so. Mould marks originated in the late seventeenth century. They lasted, on average, around thirty years.²³ The biggest problem with re-using pipe moulds was the abrasive nature of clay, however, which eventually led to degradation in the quality of the mould and thus in the clarity of any detail on the pipe.²⁴ As George Mason Sr and Jr's marks demonstrate, moulds could be altered. Clay pipe specialist Adrian Oswald has suggested that evidence of this is rare, although this may have been due to the fact that amendments were 'so well done as not to be visible on pipes'. Alternatively, makers that inherited moulds with proprietary marks upon them sometimes left the original intact and added their own stamp. The early eighteenth-century maker Henry Hoar inherited the moulds of his master and added his own initials, 'HH' to his pipes made in moulds that were marked 'R. Teppot'.²⁵ Branding by moulds then, did not create an identical, standardised mark and they could be altered.

Once the pipe was removed from the mould and press, the piercing rod was removed and the pipe was placed on another drying rack. At this stage, impressed marks could be placed upon the pipe. These could be either in relief, in which marks would be set so that they raised above the surface of the pipe, or incuse, in which the mark was sunken into the pipe. Ayto has suggested that this branding was made with a signet

²³ Adrian Oswald, 'On the life of clay pipe moulds', in Peter Davey (Ed.), *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe. 9. More Pipes from the Midlands and Southern England* (BAR, 146i, 1985), p.5.

²⁴ Ayto, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, p.19.

²⁵ Oswald, 'On the life of clay pipe moulds', p.10, p.12.

ring.²⁶ This is entirely possible, but evidence from London has indicated that a stamp made from wood was used to impress these marks upon pipes.²⁷ Whether stamped or moulded, after the pipes had been branded, they were loaded into kilns and fired. Their diminutive size meant that hundreds were fired at any one time. Indeed, despite the lack of industrialised techniques for pipemaking, a skilled maker was able to produce 500 pipes per day.²⁸ The requisite temperature of 900°C had to be reached gradually to dry the pipe out slowly: to rush this process could result in the pipe exploding if there was any errant moisture within the clay. It would also take at least a day for the kiln to cool enough for one to be able to remove the pipes, so the firing process lasted around three days in total.²⁹ Once fired, the mark was permanent. In the nineteenth century, pipes were sometimes marked with a rubber stamp after they had been fired, as depicted in Figure 5.5.³⁰

²⁶ Ayto, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, p.27.

²⁷ Richard Le Cheminant, 'A London pipemaker's stamper', in Peter Davey (Ed.), *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe 6, Pipes and Kilns in the London Region* (BAR British Series 97, 1981), 90-91.

²⁸ Denis Gojack and Iain Stuart, 'The potential for the archaeological study of clay tobacco pipes from Australian sites', *Australasian Historical Archaeology* 17 (1999), 38-49.

²⁹ Ayto, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, pp.19-24; Brears, *The Pipemaker*, p.6; Oswald, *Clay Pipes for the Archaeologist*, pp.19-20.

³⁰ Brears, *The Pipemaker*, p.8.



Fig. 5.3, clay tobacco pipe heel base mark, stamped in relief³¹; Fig. 5.4, clay tobacco pipe heel base mark, stamped incuse³²



Fig. 5.5, clay tobacco pipe with ink stamp³³

³¹ Museum of London, Clay Tobacco Pipe Makers' Marks from London Database (hereafter MoL CTPMMLD), UPT90 <118> AO10, 'clay tobacco pipe fragment' (1640-1660).

³² MoL, CTPMMLD, GM160 <11> AO2, 'clay tobacco pipe fragment' (1580-1610).

³³ Shrewsbury Museums Service, (hereafter SMS), SY14900, 'clay tobacco pipe with smooth bowl' (late C19).

Overall, by the nineteenth century, there were three main methods of branding pipes. Various factors – including pipemaker’s preference and geographic tradition – affected which of these was used, whether in isolation or in conjunction with another method. Similarly, these factors affected the location of marks upon pipes.

1.2 Where pipes were marked

Although clay pipes varied in size and although there was a trend in the eighteenth century for longer stemmed ‘churchwarden’ style pipes, they were, in the main, relatively small objects. Despite this, pipemakers certainly knew how to make the most of the available surface area of a pipe and they were marked in a variety of places on the pipe: the stem, the bowl or the heel, and sometimes a combination of all three.³⁴ It is hard to ascertain whether there was any preference for any of these locations because of the significant differences in survival rate of each part of a pipe. Stems survive more frequently due to their sturdiness; intact bowls, on the other hand, are found less often. In particular, the fashion for thin pipe bowls in the eighteenth century has resulted in a dearth of archaeologically recovered surviving marked fragments.³⁵ It is difficult therefore to accurately gauge how frequent branding upon eighteenth-century pipe bowls was in comparison to stems. The length of pipe stems also meant that upon disposal, one stem might have broken into multiple fragments. Although part of the stem may have carried a mark, once broken, most likely into several pieces, the number of ‘unmarked’ fragments increases disproportionately in

³⁴ See Appendix 10 for the anatomy of a clay tobacco pipe.

³⁵ S.D. White, ‘Clay Tobacco Pipes from St Leonard’s, York (YORM:2001.10746’, (March 2010), p.7.

relation to the marked pieces.³⁶ Analysis of an assemblage of nineteenth-century pipes made in or around Glasgow has revealed a high number of marked stem fragments.³⁷ Despite the differences in survival rate in pieces of pipe, however, analysis of the York pipes has shown that pipe bowls were more commonly branded than stems. In York's St Leonard's dig, six marked stems and ten branded bowls were excavated. However, these six were two per cent of all stems, whereas the ten were fourteen per cent of all bowls.³⁸ The Hungate excavations have revealed a similar predominance of marked bowls over stems: taken together, 33 per cent of all bowls carried a mark compared with under one per cent of stem fragments. The only marked pipe fragment from Swinegate was also a bowl.³⁹

In her analysis of marks upon pipes in London, Jacqui Pearce states that marks were more commonly found under the heel of the bowl in the seventeenth century.⁴⁰ By the eighteenth century, as heels became thinner, there was less room for pipemakers to put their stamp upon the base.⁴¹ Instead, the marks were placed upon the side of the heel or spur. Marks on the sides of bowls became more common over the nineteenth century, but it was not until the twentieth century that proprietary details appeared

³⁶ More discussion on how many fragments the average stem broke into can be found in Lauren J. Jagielski, 'Consumerism in the late eighteenth century: the treatment of disposed tobacco pipes from the Mount Pleasant site (46JF215) Jefferson County, West Virginia', *UW-L Journal of Undergraduate Research*, XII (2009), 1-39, <http://uwlax.edu/urc/JUR-online/PDF/2009/jagielski-laurenARC.pdf> (accessed February 2012).

³⁷ Dennis Gallagher, 'Morlaggan: Clay Tobacco Pipes', http://highmorlaggan.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/High-Morlaggan-pipes-report_Dennis-Gallagher.pdf (accessed February 2012).

³⁸ See Appendix 14, 'Clay pipes from St Leonard's and Swinegate, 1650-1900'.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ Pearce, *Clay tobacco pipes and smoking in London*.

⁴¹ Iain C. Walker, *Clay Tobacco Pipes, with Particular Reference to the Bristol Industry* Vol. 1 (Ottawa, 1977), p.12.

upon pipe stems.⁴² The York evidence certainly corroborates this pattern. The seventeenth-century marked pipes were characterised by devices upon the heel, whereas by the nineteenth century branding by York pipemakers was concentrated upon the sides of the bowl. In his analysis of the Yorkshire pipemakers Peter Hammond has reiterated the strong local influence in the marking of pipes. Where there was an existing tradition of marking in a particular manner, makers appeared to conform to this.⁴³

Clay pipe bowls and their heels changed in size over the period, which reflected changes in the price and availability of tobacco as well as fashion.⁴⁴ This meant that the amount of space a mark occupied on a bowl varied. The seventeenth-century heel marks depicted on the Museum of London database indicate that these marks covered the heel completely, although this was a small percentage compared to the surface area of the bowl as a whole. The Mason pipe designs depicted in Figures 5.1 and 5.2, however, covered around two-thirds of the outside of the bowl. Another nineteenth-century pipe from Hungate with an Irish harp and heart on the sides of the bowl and the initials 'T.W.' in the seam directly opposite the smoker, occupied a similar amount of the bowl's external sides.

⁴² Pearce, 'Clay tobacco pipes and smoking in London'. Pearce does not refer to any marked stems in her study of pipes from Limehouse, Sydenham or Westminster, see: 'Living in Victorian London: the clay pipe evidence'.

⁴³ Peter Hammond, 'Nineteenth-Century York Pipemakers', paper given at *Society for Clay Pipe Research Conference*, 10 September 2011.

⁴⁴ Jung Jr, *Pollocks of Manchester: Three Generations of Clay Tobacco Pipemakers*, p.1; Alfred Dunhill, *The Pipe Book* (London, 1975), p.165.



*Fig. 5.6, Clay tobacco pipe (left side); Fig. 5.7, Clay tobacco pipe (right side)*⁴⁵

The position and size of marks upon pipes therefore varied and depended upon not only pipe fashion as a whole but also the period and the geographic traditions in which pipemakers operated. The marks could be extremely prominent to smokers or observers during the tobacco consumption process, or, in the case of those upon the base of heels, obscured from view. As a result, this complicates the way in which we interpret marks. Were these marks intended to be seen? If so, who was the target audience? And how did this change between 1650 and 1900?

⁴⁵ YAT, Project 5000, SF83, 'Tobacco pipe' (C19).

1.3 Marking frequency and unmarked pipes

The other key factor that requires consideration in an analysis of marked pipes is the frequency of marking. Excavations find pipe fragments in large quantities, but marked pieces, as opposed to purely decorated pieces, are relatively rare. Despite the disparity in survival rates of certain periods – particularly the eighteenth century – a gradual shift can be identified in the frequency of specific types of mark. While in the seventeenth century, marks comprised of names, letters or initials were common, by the nineteenth century makers tended to favour symbols or motifs that have been previously been classed as decorative. As we will see, however, these marks were not just aesthetically pleasing – their significance could be far greater. They might represent a pub name or they might reflect a personal allegiance of the pipemaker. An understanding of the frequency of each of these types of marks will help us understand the way in which they were intended, comprehended and used.

Hungate's Block E produced 479 pipe fragments.⁴⁶ Of these, only 24 pieces were branded. This includes those marked with initials and letters as well as those with motifs (that have previously been classed as decorative).⁴⁷ The vast majority of marked fragments were bowls or their heels: 25 per cent of all bowls were branded, compared to only one per cent of stem fragments. Of these bowls, thirty per cent were covered with letters, names or initials. However, many pipes displayed motifs such as the City of York coat of arms, Prince of Wales feathers, ships and masonic emblems: the vast majority of branded pipes from this block (75 per cent) were covered with

⁴⁶ Susie White, 'Hungate York: Assessment of the Clay Tobacco Pipes, Block E (YORYM:2006:5201)', York Archaeological Trust Report (April 2007).

⁴⁷ See Appendix 13, 'Clay pipes from Hungate Block E, 1650-1900'.

these types of motif. The eighteenth-century pipes had a fairly equal balance between the two types of branding and included three lettered pipes and two fragments with other motifs. The nineteenth-century pipes comprised mainly non-lettered branding. This assemblage indicated a shift in bowl marking practices from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries in favour of symbols, rather than letters.

Conversely, the branded stems from Block E were few in number. Only four stem fragments of a total 381 recovered were branded and three of these were marked with names, letter or initials. In two instances these were the name of the manufacturer, William Southorn of Broseley and Henry Dudman of Plumstead; the other referred to the Manchester Ship Canal. All three of the pipe stems marked with names were produced in the nineteenth century. The other marked stem bore the Chester roll-stamp mark and dated from the late seventeenth century. The evidence from Block E suggests a possible shift in stem marking practices between periods, although such a small sample means the evidence from other areas needs to be taken into account.

The other excavations in Hungate complement the evidence presented by Block E.⁴⁸ Of 991 total fragments, there were 150 bowls, of which 56 were branded. 56 per cent of these were marked with names or initials, and the remainder with other motifs. Again, the nineteenth-century pipes were more likely to be characterised by symbolic motifs such as a heart, Irish harp or rose and thistle emblem. The majority of the seventeenth-century pipes, however, were branded with initials such as 'AB' that

⁴⁸ See Appendix 11, 'Clay pipes from Hungate Blocks F and H'; S.D. White, 'Assessment of the clay tobacco pipes from Hungate, York (YORYM:2006.5201)', York Archaeological Trust Report (October 2008).

represented specific individuals such as Abraham Boyes, York pipemaker at the end of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century.

Other YAT excavations in York's Swinegate and St Leonard's neighbourhoods revealed a similar pattern of marking. In Swinegate, 368 fragments were uncovered, of which 60 were bowls, 303 were stems and five were mouthpieces. Only one branded fragment survived, a bowl from the mid seventeenth century with the three-letter stamp of an unidentified maker.⁴⁹ The St Leonard's excavations uncovered 437 pipe fragments: 69 bowls, 363 stems and five mouthpieces.⁵⁰ Within this assemblage, fourteen per cent of all bowls and just two per cent of stem fragments were branded. There were no seventeenth-century bowls in this collection. All the eighteenth-century bowls were marked with initials and all but one of the nineteenth century examples with non-name motifs. The named bowl bore the mark of a fictitious Irish pipemaker, O'Brien of Mayo Street, Dublin. This quantitative examination of York's pipes suggests that York makers' marking practices changed over time: pipe branding became more focused upon symbols than names in the nineteenth century.

As multiple parts of the pipe could be marked, working with fragments, rather than intact pipes, hinders any exact assessment of the extent to which pipes were marked. However, analysis across the broad time period covered by this thesis reveals that while shape and dimensions varied, the degree to which York pipe makers marked their pipes did not vary a great deal over the period. Less than four per cent of pipe

⁴⁹ S.D. White, 'Clay Tobacco Pipes from Swinegate, York, (1989.28 / 1990.01 / 1990.25)' (March 2010), p.4. See Appendix 14, 'Clay pipes from St Leonard's and Swinegate'.

⁵⁰ White, 'Clay Tobacco Pipes from St Leonard's, York', p.9.

assemblages in York were marked fragments. On a recent excavation in London's Paternoster Square, between just two per cent and eighteen per cent of bowls (the piece of a pipe most likely to bear a mark) carried any device.⁵¹ Paul E. Reckner's work on Five Points, New York, has presented a similar case for the rarity of marked pipe fragments.⁵² In terms of frequency, then, the York pipes correlate with those excavated in other areas and countries.

Unmarked pipes, then, were the norm. Considering the life expectancy of most clay pipes in the period, it was understandable that most makers did not go to the trouble of marking all their pipes. Penny-pinching Charles Wharton of Nottinghamshire insisted that his servants cleaned his pipes in order to reduce expenditure on new ones, and the nineteenth-century writer, Thomas Carlyle, described by his contemporaries as a 'vehement smoker', recycled and cleaned the type of pipe he favoured due to the difficulty of obtaining them elsewhere.⁵³ Yet these men have been portrayed as the exception, rather than the norm. Taverns or pubs that sold tobacco ready to smoke in pipes apparently re-used and cleaned their pipes each night, much as they would with glasses or tankards, but as with drinking vessels, it was expected that pipes would not survive for long term use.⁵⁴ By contrast, Tennyson allegedly only

⁵¹ Sadie Watson and Jacqueline Peace, with Anne Davis, Geoff Egan; and Alan Pipe, 'Taverns and other entertainments in the City of London? Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century finds from excavations at Paternoster Square', *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 44:1 (2010), p.182, p.193, p.201.

⁵² Paul E. Reckner, 'Negotiating patriotism at the Five Points: clay tobacco pipes and patriotic imagery among trade unionists and nativists in a nineteenth-century New York neighborhood' *Historical Archaeology* 35:3 (2001), 103-114.

⁵³ Walker, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, Vol. 1, p.414; Carlyle Letters Online (hereafter CLO), Thomas Carlyle to John A. Carlyle, 5 August 1851; Thomas Carlyle to Jane Welsh Carlyle, 27 July 1857 (accessed October 2010); James Anthony Froude, *Thomas Carlyle. A History of the First Forty Years of His Life, 1795-1835*, Vol. 2 (London, 1882: reprinted Farnborough, 1969), p.433.

⁵⁴ Walker, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, Vol. 1, p.3.

smoked once from each pipe and smashed each one in his fire after he had finished.⁵⁵ Prior to the development of technology that enabled marks to be positioned quickly and easily, the addition of these marks was an extra stage to the production process, which increased cost and time spent in the creation of marked pipes. Marking pipes was not a cost-effective use of the pipemaker's time.

Yet as this thesis has shown, the producers of many mundane, throwaway items went to the trouble of marking some or many of their products. Branding differentiated products from similar articles and acted as an avatar for the producer, which allowed consumers to form expectations about a product's quality. Both purposes were required due to the fact that these products often travelled considerable distances from their point of origin. As outlined, however, pipes rarely travelled significant distances from their production centre. The employment of proprietary marks for these purposes was therefore less important in the market for pipes. This may hint at why many fewer pipes contained proprietary marking, compared with medicines or stone bottles. The fact that hundreds of pipes were baked in one kiln load meant that makers might only have marked a proportion of their product. Nineteenth-century makers packed their unfired pipes in saggars to protect their pipes from burning during the firing process. Pipes were stacked in layers inside these containers.⁵⁶ If marks were stamped, rather than moulded into the pipe, this stacking method may have had some influence on the numbers of pipes that were marked, with only one layer marked out of each saggur. This makes marked pipes all the more intriguing. The next section

⁵⁵ Bain (1896), quoted in Walker, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, Vol. 1, p.3.

⁵⁶ Ayto, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, p.21.

undertakes a systematic analysis of the different types of marks found upon pipes in order to ascertain their purpose.

2. Branding on pipes

As we have seen, clay tobacco pipes were branded in a variety of different methods and locations. Makers also displayed considerable diversity in the marks they placed upon their pipes. As with other marks discussed in this thesis, they can be split into two broad categories: marks that communicated proprietary meaning such as marks of production or retailership; and marks that represented semiotics of authority and control, whether on a civic or national level. Clay pipe makers complicated this division through the appropriation of these symbols of authority for their personal proprietary marks, or through the production of pipes marked with Prince of Wales feathers for a pub with the same name.

As the introduction to this chapter outlined, however, until the introduction of registered designs in the late nineteenth century there were no government-required marks upon clay pipes: rather, it was a heritage of artisan guild tradition and control that prompted makers to use these symbols in their work. Pipemakers across Britain were incorporated at different times. The first London Company of Tobacco Pipe Makers existed between 1619-1643, the second between 1663-1868 and the third from 1954.⁵⁷ The York pipemakers were first incorporated in the 1650s.⁵⁸ As we will

⁵⁷ 'Tobacco Pipe Makers and Tobacco Blenders: Our History', <http://www.tobaccolivery.co.uk/about-us/our-history.html> (accessed March 2012).

see, workers from similarly incorporated industries such as pewterers, goldsmiths and silversmiths drew upon a language of heraldic devices and marking practices in their production. Indeed, guild marks that followed this same heraldic vocabulary appeared on a diverse range of products across Europe.⁵⁹ Unlike many of these other industries, however, London pipemakers were not required to mark their pipes in any specific manner according to the Company's regulations. Indeed, the Company's influence waned throughout the eighteenth century and it disbanded in the mid-nineteenth century. Each city's Company regulated itself and its jurisdiction did not spread nation wide. Regardless, the use of these types of proprietary marks on pipes continued. Guild marks were intended to identify specific producers in order to discourage production of poor quality products. Their location – often on the underside of the pipe in the early period of pipe making – suggested that their intended audience was inspectors of pipes, rather than their consumers. As Fanselow and Akerlof have described, marks of proprietorship encouraged the standardisation of production.⁶⁰ As with other products, the mark became an avatar for a maker that reflected consistency of quality.

As with stone bottles, the proprietary branding upon pipes reflected not only makers but other people that had a proprietary interest in their consumption: tobacconists,

⁵⁸ Allan Peacey, 'The development of the tobacco pipe kiln in the British isles', *Internet Archaeology* 1 (1996), <http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue1/peacey/intro.html> (accessed March 2012).

⁵⁹ In addition to the above discussed trades, Friedemann Hellwig, 'Makers' marks on plucked instruments of the 16th and 17th centuries', *Galpin Society Journal* 24 (1971), 22-32, discusses marks from Italy and Jørgen Wadum, 'The Antwerp brand on paintings on panel', in Erma Hermens, Annemiek Ouwerkerk and Nicola Costaras (Eds.), *Looking Through Paintings. The Study of Painting Techniques and Materials in Support of Art Historical Research* (Baarn, 1998), 179-198, examines joiner's marks on painting panels in Antwerp.

⁶⁰ Frank S. Fanselow, 'The bazaar economy or how bizarre is the bazaar really?' *Man* 25:2 (1990), p.253; George A. Akerlof, 'The market for "lemons": quality uncertainty and the market mechanism', *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 84:3 (1970), pp.499-500.

publicans and ships' merchants. To these people, as with the blacking merchants discussed in chapter three, pipes were essentially a container for their product, tobacco. Pipes, like other containers, therefore bore marks that represented not only the producer, but also sellers or distributors. As we have seen with many of the forms of branding used by the other trades discussed in the thesis, it was the maker of the container – in this case pipes – who made the marks. Unlike blacking makers, however, who used the stamp as an additional layer of security in protecting themselves against counterfeiters, this type of mark upon a pipe was more of an advertising technique for the individual or company it represented. As with the marks found upon stone bottles and medicines between 1650 and 1900, those found upon clay pipes also complicate the relationship of producer and final consumer intended in most historical discussions of 'branding'. Instead, the marks on pipes revealed a diversity of identities layered upon one commodity. Branding as a process was far more complex than has been portrayed.

2.1 Makers' marks

Pipemakers' marks comprised a rich array of different symbols over the period 1650 to 1900. In Yorkshire, early seventeenth-century pipes were characterised by abstract motifs or symbols. In her analysis of Yorkshire marks, Susan D. White has found that initials or words were less common in the very earliest years of pipemaking, on both heels and bowls.⁶¹ Most makers used motifs alone to represent their production. Symbols such as stars or suns, roses, and wheels were common across the country. While some were apparently somewhat abstract, others used canting or word play on

⁶¹ White, *The Dynamics of Regionalisation and Trade*, pp.100-101.

their family or place name: makers working near Pontefract Castle used a tower symbol on their pipes, and the Gauntlet family of Amesbury, well-known in the seventeenth century for their high quality pipes, bought by nobility such as the Marquis of Hertford, used a glove symbol on their pipe heels, as depicted in Figure 5.8.⁶²



Fig. 5.8, clay tobacco pipe fragment with gauntlet stamp in relief⁶³

Extensive work by the curators of the National Clay Pipe Archive has revealed the diversity of different makers' marks on heels, spurs and bowls. However, unless personalised with initials, many of these marks repeatedly deployed very similar

⁶² *Ibid.*, p.87. Thanks to Susie White and David Higgins for the reference to the Gauntlet family.

⁶³ MoL CTPMMD, MGS96 <240> AO16, 'clay tobacco pipe fragment', stamped mark in relief (c.1580-1910). It is not known whether this is a pipe made by the Gauntlet family of Amesbury but is shown for illustrative purposes.

symbols: flowers, anchors and fleur de lys, which would make it difficult to discern from one another on a national scale. The highly localised nature of the pipe industry however meant that the same motif such as a heart, a crown or a crossbow, could be used by different makers across the country but would still be representative of their work, as other pipe makers in the vicinity would adopt different marks for their own. Instead, makers employed subtle variations upon these themes. In Yorkshire, the most common motif was the wheel, of which White has identified eighteen different types. These variations were often slight: a wheel split into anything between four and sixteen segments, with the addition of dots, spokes or chevrons.⁶⁴ As White has gone on to show, in the late seventeenth century, ‘pure symbol marks appear to have gone out of fashion’.⁶⁵ Instead, common motifs, which included tobacco plants or leaves and stars, featured alongside makers’ initials in order to differentiate between individuals. Some makers managed to fit their entire name into their mark. Figures 5.9 and 5.10 illustrate named and initialled pipes. Figure 5.10, which included three initials into its design, is attributed to a pipemaker and his wife, with ‘R’ representing the male partner, ‘T’ his wife and the ‘S’ their surname. White notes that three-letter marks were relatively sparse in England in comparison to Scotland, where they were more popular. They sometimes also reflected a place name rather than surname.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ White, *The Dynamics of Regionalisation and Trade*, pp.85-86.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p.86.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p.87.



Fig. 5.9, clay tobacco pipe bowl fragment⁶⁷; Fig. 5.10, clay tobacco pipe bowl fragment⁶⁸

White states that this integration of initials into makers' marks in Yorkshire came to dominate their design and pattern into the eighteenth century. This is certainly borne out by the evidence from St Leonard's, in which 60 per cent of marked fragments contained initials rather than symbols. This assemblage was marked by an concentration, unusually, of eighteenth- as well as nineteenth-century pipes and demonstrated this development in makers' mark pattern well.⁶⁹ By contrast, Block E of Hungate contained a far higher proportion of pipes marked with motifs: 75 per cent of this predominantly nineteenth-century assemblage revealed pipes marked with Masonic designs or the abstract motifs used since the seventeenth century.⁷⁰ The balance between motif and initial-marked pipe fragments from the rest of Hungate,

⁶⁷ Portable Antiquities Scheme Database, (hereafter PASD), HESH-F7B694, 'clay tobacco pipe bowl fragment' (c.1660-1680).

⁶⁸ MoL, CTPMMD, GM169 <6> AO18, 'clay tobacco pipe bowl' (1660-1680).

⁶⁹ See Appendix 14, 'Clay pipes from St Leonard's and Swinegate'.

⁷⁰ See Appendix 13, 'Clay pipes from Hungate Block E'.

however, was split fairly evenly.⁷¹ This is likely due to the fact that this assemblage reflected a more balanced composition of pipes in terms of chronology, split almost equally between the late-seventeenth and nineteenth century. The York fragments provide detail beyond the period focused upon by White's regional study, whose analysis stops at pipes made after 1800, and are indicative of changes in branding designs into the nineteenth century. Two of the three nineteenth-century branded stem fragments from Hungate's Block E revealed that this was a common location for makers' marks, with the stamps of both William Southorn and Henry Dudman placed on this area.⁷² Walker has noted that both Edwin and William Southorn, who worked from the 1830s in the Broseley area, stamped their pipes with their mark upon the stem, as depicted in Figure 5.11.⁷³



*Fig. 5.11, clay tobacco pipe*⁷⁴

⁷¹ See Appendix 11, 'Clay pipes from Hungate Blocks F and H'.

⁷² See Appendix 13, 'Clay pipes from Hungate Block E'.

⁷³ Iain C. Walker, 'Churchwarden clay tobacco-pipes and the Southorn pipemaking family of Broseley, Shropshire', *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 10 (1976), p.147.

⁷⁴ SMS, SY14904, 'clay tobacco pipe' (late C19).

The pipe shown in Figure 5.11 also contained an ink stamp for a pub, the Bull's Head, which was positioned on the bowl's exterior and faced the smoker (illustrated in Figure 5.5). This pipe's marks revealed that the layering process of branding used in the patent medicine and stone bottle industries, which aggregated identities throughout a product's lifecycle, was used by pipemakers as well. The 'Bull's Head' mark represented not only the proprietary identity of one pipe outlet but was also a form of advertising if the pipe was taken from the premises. Clay pipe branding, then, performed multiple roles.

2.2 Advertising marks

Analysis of the York pipes has revealed that the nineteenth century witnessed a continuation in the use of symbols or motifs in pipe branding. While some of these were likely to be makers' marks, others represented other proprietary identities and as such were used as an advertisement technique. As outlined, pipemakers were commissioned to put their customers' marks upon their pipes, in a similar fashion to how potters were commissioned to place the proprietary details of their clients upon their stone bottles. Many of these clients included drinking establishments, inns and hostelrys: venues in which pipes were provided with another commodity, tobacco, similar to the way in which beer would be sold in a tankard.⁷⁵ As an anonymous petition to Parliament stated, 'Publick houses' were 'considerable Dealers' in pipes, so considerable that they requested that the excise duty of the 1690s on clay pipes was

⁷⁵ Walker, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, Vol.1, p.403; White, *The Dynamics of Regionalisation and Trade*, p.143; Matthew Hilton, 'Smoking and sociability', in Gilman, Sander L, and Xun, Zhou (Eds.), *Smoke. A Global History of Smoking* (London, 2004), p.130.

instead transferred to publicans and tavern-keepers.⁷⁶ Walker has noted two bowls in Bristol City Museum's collections with the legend 'WILLIAMS / ROYAL ALBERT HOTEL / MORICE TOWN / DEVONPORT' and another with 'W EVANS / WHITE SWAN HOTEL / SWANSEA' upon them. He has also drawn attention to another fragment with 'THE WHITE HART // OPPOSITE ST PANCRAS STATION' upon it.⁷⁷ These marks, then, referred to outlets for pipes.

Study of other pipes has revealed that other distributors, such as retailers were also represented through branding on pipes. The 'WH' heel mark uncovered at Pontefract Castle was attributed to a tobacconist rather than pipemaker through the comparison of a surviving tobacconist's token from the area.⁷⁸ Furthermore, Walker has suggested that the stamp 'HBW Russell of Liverpool' found upon pipes excavated in Ghana was the name of a ship's agent, which helped 'facilitate reordering'.⁷⁹

Many examples of this type of mark on pipes can be read in a fairly straightforward manner as advertising. Names in particular are easily distinguished between maker and retailer. Yet pipes intended for distribution by pubs and taverns complicate this distinction between makers' marks and advertising marks. Often these drinking establishments had common names such as the Wheatsheaf, the Prince of Wales, the King's Head or the Cross Keys. Accordingly, they were represented by the slightly

⁷⁶ Anonymous, *A Proposal with Reasons Humbly Offered to the Honourable House of Commons, for Transferring the Duty Now Paid by the Manufacturers of Glass, and Earthen-Wares, and Tobacco-Pipes, to Publick Houses* (n.p., 1699).

⁷⁷ Walker, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, Vol. 1, p.158.

⁷⁸ P.J. Davey and S.D. White, 'The clay tobacco pipes', in *Pontefract Castle Excavations 1982-86. Yorkshire Archaeology* 8 (Exeter, 2002), p.238.

⁷⁹ Walker, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, Vol. 1, p.160.

more abstract symbols: Prince of Wales feathers, the royal coat of arms or by the more obvious sheaves of wheat or crossed keys. While some such branded pipes were likely intended for pubs, others may have been part of the makers' mark. The Greyhound Inn in Abergavenny distributed pipes to its clientele with greyhounds upon them.⁸⁰ In his analysis of the nineteenth-century pipes excavated near Glasgow, however, Dennis Gallagher has asserted that while some pipes that bore these marks were intended for pubs, 'it is more likely that both [maker and publican] were making use of the same popular motif.'⁸¹

The use of such motifs by makers, distributors and retailers of pipes reveal that this semiotic language was not restricted to the pipe industry, but was used in a variety of areas of society: sites of popular sociability such as pubs, and in the coats of arms of incorporated crafts and industries. These symbols, then, had an underlying significance to contemporaries.

2.3 Political emblems

As discussed briefly in the opening section of chapter four, as a result of developments in the legal definition and interpretation of intellectual property, in the mid nineteenth century the Design Copyright Act (1839) and Ornamental Design Act (1842) were passed. This provided a means for craftsmen and companies from a

⁸⁰ Ibid., p.158.

⁸¹ Dennis Gallagher, 'Morlaggan: Clay Tobacco Pipes' (accessed February 2012).

variety of industries to register designs and obtain protection for their work.⁸² A copy of all of these was kept by the Board of Trade along with details of the person who had registered the design. The common themes in designs by clay pipe makers kept in these registers demonstrated a preoccupation with emblems of national political relevance. Nationalistic language such as coats of arms or mottos of non-British countries was particularly prevalent. One design featured the Australian coat of arms complete with an emu and kangaroo upon the bowl.⁸³ Irish themes were particularly well represented, as depicted in Edward Keevil's registered design for a pipe with a bowl covered in an Irish harp and marked on the stem with the motto 'ERIN GO BRAGH' ['Ireland Forever'], reproduced in Figure 5.12.



Fig. 5.12, registered design for 'ERIN GO BRAGH' clay tobacco pipe⁸⁴

⁸² See: P.J. Hammond, 'Registered and patented clay tobacco pipes', in *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe. 9. More Pipes from the Midlands and Southern England* (BAR British Series, 146i, 1985), 29-156, for a detailed overview of the Registered Designs legislation in relation to clay pipe makers.

⁸³ TNA BT 43/67 Registered Design No. 139315 and No.140223.

⁸⁴ TNA BT 43/67, Registered Design No.149291.

The Hungate-excavated pipe depicted in Figures 5.6 and 5.7 also incorporated traditional Irish imagery: a harp with ‘Erin’ underneath it. Pro-Irish slogans commonly featured upon nineteenth-century clay pipes. Alexandra Hartnett has demonstrated how the people of Galway used their consumption habits to engage in political discourse and pipes were no exception, as evidenced by the excavation of pipes across the country marked with ‘HOME RULE’, ‘REPEAL’ and ‘ERIN’ motifs.⁸⁵ As Hartnett has outlined, other popular ‘Irish’ motifs included ‘round towers, Irish wolfhounds, and shamrocks as well as busts of prominent political figures’.⁸⁶ Another commonly found Irish motif was the pseudo-makers’ mark, ‘O’BRIEN / MAYO ST / DUBLIN’. Two examples of bowls that bore this mark were excavated in York, one in Block E of Hungate and one from St Leonard’s.⁸⁷ An example from Cheshire is depicted in Figure 5.13. This was a fictitious maker and address, found upon pipes made by north-western manufacturers such as the Pollocks of Manchester.⁸⁸ Such branding was an example of how people perceived makers’ marks to be a representation of their origin.

⁸⁵ Alexandra Hartnett, ‘The politics of the pipe: clay pipes and tobacco consumption in Galway, Ireland’, *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 8:2 (2004), p.140.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p.141.

⁸⁷ See Appendices 13 and 14.

⁸⁸ See record for PASD, LVPL-B1A3F6, ‘clay pipe (smoking)’.



*Fig. 5.13, clay pipe bowl fragment*⁸⁹

Research on the political imagery of clay tobacco pipes excavated elsewhere has highlighted the use of a plethora of symbols: trade union marks, depictions of United States presidential candidates and nationalistic symbols such as American eagles.⁹⁰ British makers sought to maximise their share of this market through the production of US-themed designs: a design registered by Charles Crop appears to celebrate the centenary of the Declaration of Independence, complete with a soldier standing next to a cannon, holding a 'liberty' pennant.⁹¹ Work on pipes recovered from Britain has revealed politically minded designs from around the passage of the first Reform Act

⁸⁹ PASD, LVPL-B1A3F6, 'clay pipe (smoking)', (c.1880-1920).

⁹⁰ Sudbury, 'Additional notes on alternative uses for clay tobacco pipes and tobacco pipe fragments', p. 106; Reckner, 'Negotiating patriotism at the Five Points'.

⁹¹ TNA, BT 43/67 Registered Design No.137568.

in 1832 that featured the Magna Carta.⁹² Others showed allegiance to the Birmingham Political Union and bore 'UNION' and 'REFORM' on each side of its bowl. Another Chartist design had a 'chamfered lip' and 'LIBERTY' in relief on its reverse to portray the overall effect of a liberty cap. These types of designs have been compared with these types of marks on pipes and earthen wares, such as reform flasks that featured Lord Brougham, the Lord Chancellor who carried the 1832 Reform Bill through the House of Lords.⁹³ One pipe design, registered in the 1850s, was titled 'the British National Pipe'. It portrayed the British coat of arms on the bowl and the legend, 'our good old English clay' upon the stem.⁹⁴ Placed within the context of its creation – the Crimean Wars – the design very overtly evoked a sense of nationhood.

Throughout the nineteenth century, pipemakers capitalised on the opportunities provided by the raised political awareness amongst all levels of society, in order to incorporate political emblems upon their products. The literature on pipe marks has shown that Irish-themed pipes comprised the majority of emblem-marked pieces, and of the York-excavated pipes, the only emblem-marked fragments featured Irish symbols.⁹⁵ Common slogans included 'CAN'T BEAT / HOME RULE', 'REPEAL' and 'THE / PARNELL / MP / PIPE'.⁹⁶ Analysis of the production of one Bristol pipe-making family has shown a 'REPEAL' stamped bowl amongst their output.⁹⁷ Other

⁹² Richard Le Cheminant, 'Socio-political clay tobacco pipes of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-centuries', *Society of Clay Pipe Research Newsletter* 49 (1996), pp.6-8; White, *The Dynamics of Regionalisation and Trade*, p.111; Richard Le Cheminant, 'Clay tobacco pipes from London and the south east', in P. Davey (Ed.), *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe 6. Pipes and Kilns in the London Region* (BAR British Series 97, 1981), pp.145-147.

⁹³ Le Cheminant, 'Socio-political clay tobacco pipes', pp.11-15.

⁹⁴ TNA, BT 43/66 Registered Design No. 118810.

⁹⁵ YAT, Project 5000, SF83, 'clay tobacco pipe', see Figs. 5.6 and 5.7.

⁹⁶ Le Cheminant, 'Clay tobacco pipes from London and the south east', p.154-155.

⁹⁷ Roger Price; Reg Jackson; Philomena Jackson; Paul, Harper; and Oliver Kent, 'The Ring family of Bristol, clay tobacco pipe manufacturers', *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 18 (1984), pp.297-298.

commonly found marks included those of the masonic Royal Antediluvian Order of Buffalos (RAOB).⁹⁸ Two ‘UNITY IS STRENGTH’ bowls excavated in London indicated designs that marked affiliation to other unions, in this case interwoven with corn or wheat symbols and thus believed to be linked to Joseph Arch’s nineteenth-century agricultural union.⁹⁹ Although Irish-marked pipes form the majority of this type of marked pipes, they reveal the way in which makers recognised the power of some nationalistic symbols and used them in order to increase their sales.

3. Readings of clay pipe branding

The rich variety of images and symbols found upon clay pipes demonstrates the multifunctional role of branding. Clay pipe marks performed economic purposes: they acted as a maker’s avatar and, much like proprietary marks found upon medicines and stone bottles, they implied standardisation in terms of quality. The appropriation of the Gauntlet family mark in the seventeenth century demonstrated that some people interpreted branding in this manner, as the Gauntlets were compelled to instigate a law suit to protect their mark. Their pipes, which were retailed to the nobility, were perceived to be of excellent quality and cost two and a half times more than the average pipe. In his *Worthies of England*, Fuller described them as ‘Gauntlet-pipes, which have that mark on their heel, are the best’.¹⁰⁰ This reputation meant that the family’s mark was counterfeited. However, when taken to court, the defendant

⁹⁸ PASD, LANCUM-0F70C2, ‘clay pipe (smoking)’, (c.1880-1920); also see White, *The Dynamics of Regionalisation and Trade*, p.417 and p.466, for images of these masonic-themed pipes excavated at Wood Hall Moated Manor and Pontefract, West Yorkshire.

⁹⁹ Le Cheminant, ‘Clay tobacco pipes from London and the south east’, pp.154-157.

¹⁰⁰ Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England. Who For Parts and Learning Have Been Eminent in the Several Counties. Together with an Historical Narrative of the Native Commodities and Rarities in Each County* (London, 1662), p.144. A similar heel mark can be seen at http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/claypipes/pages/mark.asp?mark_name=Gauntlet (accessed March 2011), although this is not the mark of the Amesbury family.

claimed that his gauntlet's thumb faced a different way to the original, which would constitute a difference in heraldry. As Fuller pointed out, this difference was incredibly slight: 'surely such, who bought his pipes, never took notice of that Criticisms, or consulted which way the Thumb of his Gauntlet respected.'¹⁰¹ The problem of counterfeiting never went away for pipemakers. Despite the introduction of the Registered Designs legislation, makers still faced imitations of designs that included their proprietary details. In 1877 Bethnal Green pipemaker William Hinchler copied Ebenezer Church's 'Danube Bramble' design. Hinchler attempted to claim difference between his and Church's design: 'the ornamentation thorns on [his] pipe being much larger than in the other', but it was not considered enough of a difference to 'constitute an originality'. Hinchler was unable to pay the £5 fine and £2 4s. costs and so was imprisoned in lieu of his debt.¹⁰² London-based maker Charles Crop also faced threats to his registered designs in the late nineteenth century.¹⁰³ The marks and decoration found upon pipes clearly held significant value in terms of the representation of quality standards and advertising purposes.

As with the other products discussed in the thesis, marks on clay pipes also contributed towards the formation of national and civic identity, through the repetition of particular motifs and the use of the visual culture of heraldry on mundane, everyday products. The appropriation by makers of this language in their makers' marks represented a blurring of the boundaries between these two types of marking practices, much as the stamp duty on medicines was used by proprietors to boost the

¹⁰¹ Fuller, *Worthies of England*, p.144.

¹⁰² *The Times*, 5 October 1877, issue 29065.

¹⁰³ *Crop & Sons v Baker* (1888). I owe these legal references to Hammond, 'Registered and patented clay tobacco pipes'.

credibility of their product. Yet many early makers' marks on pipes differed from the proprietary marks already discussed in the thesis that aimed to reassure customers about the authenticity of their products and protect against counterfeits. The location of many of these marks, on the underside of the heel, meant that consumers did not immediately see them. It is apparent that marks on clay pipes, then, had a different intended audience and thus a different purpose, to other, perhaps more straightforward, forms of proprietary branding discussed in the thesis. The proliferation of advertising and political marks over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries reflected wider changes in consumption and marketing. Commodity branding was used by other manufacturers in order to evoke a specific response in consumers, be it trust or political allegiances. Pipe marks were not just aimed at the consumer. The remaining section of this chapter will discuss the multiple roles that each type of clay pipe mark played and their implications for our understanding and interpretation of a definition of 'branding'.

3.1 Makers' marks

The increased historical interest in material culture studies has in part been born out of an acceptance that possessions both reflected and helped people construct their identity, a phenomenon highlighted by anthropologists. The work of Mary Douglas, who emphasised the potential for social communication that objects possess, was further developed by Russell Belk, who emphasised the ways in which people attached meaning to the items that they consume.¹⁰⁴ Similar work by historians has

¹⁰⁴ Mary Douglas, *The World of Goods. Towards an Anthropology of Consumption. With a New Introduction by Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood* (London, 1996); Russell Belk, 'Possessions and the extended self', *Journal of Consumer Research* 15 (1988), 139-168.

explored this theme.¹⁰⁵ The popularity of political designs on pipes such as ‘Home Rule’ or ‘No Excise’, and other similarly politically advertised products such as the radical MP Henry Hunt’s brand of liquid blacking, can be explained in this way. Masonic pipes too such as the ROAB, were most likely aimed at smokers who identified as part of this group. As Hartnett has demonstrated, consumers identified with the semiotic values transmitted by these marks and therefore consumed them.¹⁰⁶ Marcos Martín-Torres agrees that ‘branded commodities foster[ed] loyalty and mutual recognition among consumers’.¹⁰⁷ This interpretation provides a convincing explanation for many of the marks found upon nineteenth-century pipes. It does not, however, explain the initialled marks that dominated seventeenth- and eighteenth-century assemblages. While these can be interpreted as marks that represented standardisation, their location on the underside of the pipe suggests that they were not messages for consumers. Two explanations for these marks emerge, one of which shares similarities with other marks discussed in the thesis. Firstly, they resembled the role of similar marks in similar industries in which they were used for inspection purposes. In this sense, they were marks of control. Secondly, they acted as an avatar for the producer, but in a different manner to that already discussed. Rather than transmit information about reputation and credibility, these marks were a far more

¹⁰⁵ For example: Paul A. Pickering, ‘Chartism and the “Trade of Agitation”’, *History* 76:347 (1991), 221-237; Peter Burke, ‘*Res et verba*: conspicuous consumption in the early modern world’, John Brewer and Roy Porter (Eds.), *Consumption and the World of Goods* (London, 1993), 148-161; James A. Epstein, *Radical Expression. Political Language, Ritual, and Symbol in England, 1790-1850* (Oxford, 1994); Elizabeth Kowaleski-Wallace, *Consuming Subjects. Women, Shopping and Business in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1997), pp.19-69; the contributions in Matthew Hilton and Martin Daunt (Eds.), *The Politics of Consumption. Material Culture and Citizenship in Europe and America* (Oxford, 2001); the contributions in Frank Trentmann (Eds.), *The Making of the Consumer. Knowledge, Power and Identity in the Modern World* (Oxford, 2006).

¹⁰⁶ Hartnett, ‘The politics of the pipe’.

¹⁰⁷ Marcos Martín-Torres, ‘Of marks, prints, pots and Becherova: freemasons’ branding in early modern Europe?’, in Andrew Bevan and David Wengrow (Eds.), *Cultures of Commodity Branding* (Walnut Creek, CA, 2010), p.213.

personal representation of the pipemaker's identity as constructed and expressed through their work.

3.1.1 Marks of inspection: control and credibility

The pipemakers of Westminster became incorporated in 1619, with 36 members, over half of the 62 recorded pipemakers based in London at this time. When the Charter was granted anew in 1634, it was signed by 22 makers.¹⁰⁸ In addition to setting price levels for pipes, the Company sought to protect its members' production through the inspection of pipemakers' premises, as well as the property of non-members it suspected of illegal pipemaking.¹⁰⁹ This level of power and control over the production of a particular industry was not peculiar to the pipemaking trade: metalworkers, such as gold- and silversmiths and pewterers faced similar levels of inspection.

At their incorporation in 1504, all London pewterers were required to mark all their products with their stamp or 'touch'. Registers were kept at Pewterers' Hall in London for comparison.¹¹⁰ However, this was a formalisation of a process that had been carried out since at least the fourteenth century. The intention of the Company was to ascertain the makers of poor quality hollowware pewter, as traced through their touch. John Hatcher and T.C. Barker have suggested that the Company's

¹⁰⁸ Museum of London, 'Clay pipes in London', <http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/claypipes/pages/claypipesinLondon.asp> (accessed February 2012).

¹⁰⁹ Ayto, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, p.13; Walker, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, Vol.1, p.20.

¹¹⁰ A reproduction of one of the touchplates from the Worshipful Company of Pewterers can be seen in Peter R.G. Hornsby; Rosemary Weinstein; and Ronald F. Homer, *Pewter. A Celebration of the Craft 1200-1700* (London, 1989), p.i.

preoccupation with these types of objects in particular was likely borne out of other concerns about capacity and collusion with untrustworthy retailers of alcohol who short-measured their customers. As punishment these pewterers had their touches taken from them and amended to reflect their untrustworthiness with an 'F' added to the stamp. As a result these makers would have been unable to practice independently.¹¹¹

As with the other products discussed throughout the thesis, pewter makers saw the benefits of marking their product and promoted their touch as a signifier of superior, rather than poor, quality. Hatcher and Barker have asserted that makers' touches on pewter contravened the attempt by the Company to create the 'anonymous uniformity of wares' as pewterers used them as a means of advertisement that signified high quality pewter. As a result in 1564 the London Company implemented a new mark, a rose and crown, to be stamped only on those objects of the highest standard. Scottish pewterers had an equivalent symbol, a thistle and deacon. As with other official marks that represented the credibility of an institution or other respected body, it was soon appropriated by makers and used in conjunction with their proprietary marks. An attempt to control the use of a 'London' stamp to imply superior quality also failed, as did the addition of an 'X' mark to reflect 'extraordinary' standard.¹¹²

¹¹¹ John Hatcher and T.C. Barker, *A History of British Pewter* (London, 1974), p.143, pp.170-172. As mentioned in chapter four, ale measure marks upon drinking vessels were not required by law until the passage of An Act for Ascertainning the Measures for Retailing Ale and Beer (1700).

¹¹² *Ibid.*, pp.183-184.

Pewterers were allowed to mark their products at their own premises, unlike other similar incorporated industries. Gold and silversmiths were required to take their goods to Company's Hall and have them stamped after inspection for quality, hence the origin of the term 'hallmark' for this type of branding. However, pewterers were subject to inspection at their premises at all times, much as pipemakers were.¹¹³ The gold- and silversmiths were also fiercely protective of their marks of quality, particularly when imitated by pewterers in order to pass off pewter as silver. At its inception, then, the Company of Pipemakers operated from within an industry context of supervision, monitoring and control, which was realised through officially recognised marks. The London Pipemakers set out rules about the way in which pipes were retailed – by the early nineteenth century they forbade the hawking of pipes – and also about the price.¹¹⁴ The Bristol Company of Pipemakers set standards for styles and lengths of pipe, with 'long pipes' classed as those with stems of 16 inches, 'Dutch pipes' of 14 inches and 'Jamayca pipes' 13 inches. A fine of one shilling per gross was imposed upon pipes that did not conform to this standard, and Walker has cited the example of a pipemaker who infringed these standards through production of a 24 inch-long pipe.¹¹⁵

Despite this context of intense supervision, however, the Pipemakers did not require the imposition of makers' marks upon clay pipes, unlike with the pewterers, gold- and silversmiths. Instead, marking pipes appeared to be a voluntary process for pipemakers across the country. Why, then, did they choose to put makers' marks on

¹¹³ Malcolm Bell, *Old Pewter* (London, 1905), p.128; Hornsby et al, *Pewter. A Celebration of the Craft*, pp.12-13.

¹¹⁴ Walker, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, Vol. 1, p.403.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.15.

their products? While pewterers were admonished for the manipulation of their touch into an advertising mark, the majority of seventeenth-century pipemakers who marked their pipes opted to place these on the underside of their pipes. A consumer would only see it when the pipe was empty: if they turned it over to look at the mark in use, the tobacco would have fallen out. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, retailers of pipes may have shown these marks when they displayed pipes in their shop windows, as depicted by George Scharf.¹¹⁶ Trade card evidence suggests that pipes were packaged upside down in straw and sawdust-lined boxes.¹¹⁷ If purchased by the box the marks would have been very prominent. But in the use of the pipe, marks on the heel of the pipe remained hidden. The location of these marks on the base of the pipe suggested these were signals not for consumers, but rather for other pipemakers or perhaps inspectors. As they were founded in the seventeenth century, the Companies of Pipemakers of York, Westminster and Bristol were part of a 'young' industry. The adoption of the marking process of other industries hints at the emulation of the bureaucratic procedures of other incorporated crafts. By doing so, the Companies assumed the authority and credibility for their members that the marks for other crafts were intended to provide. As pipemakers did not have to register their marks unlike with metalworkers, they were able to alter them as they saw fit. This in conjunction with the fact that they were voluntary suggests that pipemakers' marks were a far more personal representation of the individual who used them, than in many other trades.

¹¹⁶ British Museum (hereafter BM), British Roy Scharf Vol.4 PV, 1900,0725.90, 'drawing' (1828); BM, British Roy Scharf, Vol.4 PV, 1862,0614.14, 'drawing' (1828); These are reproduced in Peter Jackson, *George Scharf's London. Sketches and Watercolours of a Changing City, 1820-50* (London, 1987), p.67 and p.61.

¹¹⁷ BM, Heal, 117.5 'Trade card for W. Bacon, Tobacconist' (C18).

3.1.2 Trade and craft as a means of construction of personal identity

As the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century branding of Mark Hesp and the Mason family demonstrated, pipemakers sometimes emulated elements of their masters' marks in their own stamp. While to some extent this can be attributed to the structure of the industry as an incorporated trade, it also revealed the heritage of the newly freed pipemaker. In his decision to repeat a significant aspect of his master's mark in the creation of his own, Mason Sr made a deliberate choice to share his history and roots in the industry. To an extent, this was a savvy business move: Hesp was a popular and prolific pipemaker and York customers that purchased his pipes would have recognised the repetition of his mark in Mason's. There was the distinct possibility that consumers would have linked the two together in terms of quality, and chosen to purchase pipes from Mason instead of, or as well as, Hesp. The significance of marks in terms of this type of link has been demonstrated through the counterfeit situations discussed earlier in the chapter. Makers' marks performed a similar function to that of shop signs in the eighteenth century, of which David Garrioch has described as 'a poor person's heraldry at work, a combining of elements which, to the connoisseur, would indicate the identity or the professional ancestry of the tradesman.'¹¹⁸ The echo of Hesp in Mason's mark, however, also spoke volumes about Mason's personal identity and affiliation to specific individuals.

While George Mason Sr emulated elements of his master's mark in his own stamp, and Mason Jr behaved similarly, George Mason Sr's stepson Charles Peirs, did not utilise his father's mark. Nor did he position his mark in the fashion adopted by his

¹¹⁸ David Garrioch, 'House names, shop signs and social organisation in Western European cities, 1500-1900', *Urban History* 21:1 (1994), p.32.

stepfather. Peirs moved from York to Nottingham under somewhat dubious circumstances in 1824 and married into a well-established pipemaking family based there. Rather than emphasising his heritage and continuity with his predecessors in York, Peirs styled his mark in the Midlands style in which the maker's name and place name were created in relief around the rim of the bowl.¹¹⁹ Peirs, then, used his makers' mark to construct an identity in which traces of his past were not visible.

The diversity of different marks explored in the literature on clay pipes has demonstrated the creativity of pipemakers from the seventeenth to late nineteenth centuries. Word play, such as the glove symbol used by the Gauntlet family or the star commonly found upon Stirling-based makers' pipes, was one such method.¹²⁰ Some markers found a particular affinity with a particular motif or symbol and integrated this into their mark: the eighteenth-century Brentford maker, William Heath, occasionally marked his pipes with a crown and his initials beneath.¹²¹ Other makers found room to incorporate their location into their mark, whether it was the whole word as with the nineteenth-century mark of E. Southorn shown in Figure 5.11, or whether makers expanded their standard two-letter mark through the integration of the first letter of their location, as seen with pipes recovered in West Yorkshire with the maker's initials, 'ON' headed by a 'P', which represented Pontefract.¹²² Other

¹¹⁹ Peter Hammond, 'Nineteenth-century York pipemakers', paper given at Society for Clay Pipe Research Conference, 10 September 2011; John Andrews, *Pipemakers of the City of York*, p.4.

¹²⁰ Dennis Gallagher, *Special Report. Study of the Tobacco Pipes from Biggar Archaeology Group's Projects 1981-2010* (n.p., 2011), p.7, http://www.biggararchaeology.org.uk/pdf_reports/BAG_CLAYPIPES_REPORT2010_f.pdf (accessed February 2012).

¹²¹ Alison Laws and Adrian Oswald, 'The kiln of William Heath, eighteenth-century Brentford pipemaker', in Peter Davey (Ed.), *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe 6 Pipes and Kilns in the London Region*, (BAR British Series 97, 1981), p.34.

¹²² White, *The Dynamics of Regionalisation and Trade*, p.87; Walker, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, Vol. 1, p.17.

products such as the Cumberland Bituminous Fluid discussed in chapter one, utilised place name in their name and branding upon the product, whether it was intended to reassure customers about the origin of the product or was an attempt to affiliate oneself with a particular region renowned for quality. Yet in the first two centuries of pipemaking in particular, when pipes were very much a locally-produced and consumed commodity, the inclusion of the place name in a makers' mark did not perform this function. Instead, it pointed to a maker's self-identification with a region, city or town, as seen with the Mason family's incorporation of their marks with York's coat of arms. An English pipemaker based in Gouda in 1617 used a traditional symbol of England, a Tudor rose with a crown over it, as his makers' mark reflected his nationality.¹²³

The three-letter mark did not always reflect location. It was also used to represent the marriage of a pipemaker. The sole marked fragment from the Swinegate excavations was a seventeenth-century bowl stamped with an 'S' above the initials 'BC'.¹²⁴

Elsewhere in Yorkshire, White has recorded one other similarly branded pipe believed to represent a maker's marriage, marked 'H' over 'IM'.¹²⁵ In the London excavations at Paternoster Square, one fragment of only two marked pieces from one building's assemblage, was marked 'TAM'. This, like the Pontefract example, has been classed as a marriage mark.¹²⁶ The relative scarcity of these three-letter stamps is demonstrated in the Museum of London's catalogue of marks, which lists only one

¹²³ Walker, *Clay Tobacco Pipes*, Vol.1, p.20.

¹²⁴ Appendix 14, 'Clay pipes from St Leonard's and Swinegate'.

¹²⁵ White, *The Dynamics of Regionalisation and Trade*, p.87; Davey and White, 'The clay tobacco pipes', p.238.

¹²⁶ Watson and Pearce, 'Taverns and other entertainments in the City of London?', p.193.

somewhat ambiguous three-letter mark.¹²⁷ It is possible that marks like these that represented a marriage, also reflected a new partner not only in life but also in the family business, hence the integration of the spouse's identity into the mark. The use of such a pattern was not the exclusive preserve of pipemakers but was used on buildings in marriage stones, trade tokens and stone and glass tavern bottles.¹²⁸ This was a firmly established practice by the 1650s: Henry VIII and Jane Seymour's initials, 'joined by a truelover's knot', were inscribed throughout Hampton Court Palace over a hundred years previous; but this was a practice performed not only by royalty but to those lower in the social hierarchy as seen on more ordinary buildings.¹²⁹ The commemorative royal marriage ceramics of the noted seventeenth-century potter, Thomas Toft, performed a similar function.¹³⁰ Patterns in stained glass windows also reflected these events.¹³¹

These variations in makers' marks represented different facets of a pipemaker's beliefs or changes in their life such as a move to a different area or their marriage. Taken as a whole they reflected a personal need to utilise their work to represent not only pride in their work but also as a representation of them as a whole. The motifs or

¹²⁷ MoL CTPMMD, KWS94 <989> AO15, 'clay tobacco pipe' (1660-1680).

¹²⁸ White, *The Dynamics of Regionalisation and Trade*, p.87; George C. Williamson, *Trade Tokens in the Seventeenth Century in England, Wales, and Ireland, by Corporations, Merchants, Tradesmen, etc.* Vol. 1 (London, 1889), p.xxxiii; Askey, *Stoneware Bottles*, p.87; Fay Banks, *Wine Drinking in Oxford 1640-1850. A Story Revealed by Tavern, Inn, College and Other Bottles. With a Catalogue of Bottles and Seals from the Collection in the Ashmolean Museum* (BAR British Series 257, 1997), pp.33-96.

¹²⁹ J. Norris Brewer, *London and Middlesex; or, an Historical, Commercial and Descriptive Survey of the Metropolis of Great Britain...* Vol. IV, (London, 1816), p.464, p.466.

¹³⁰ Thanks to Mark Jenner for this reference. For an example, see: Ashmolean Museum, AN1949.343, 'Thomas Toft dish' (c.1670), <http://www.ashmolean.org/ash/britarch/highlights/toft-dish.html> (accessed April 2012). See also the documentary series directed by David Vincent, *Ceramics. A Fragile History* (London, 2011).

¹³¹ For example, the 'Pricke of Conscience' window in All Saints Church, North Street, York, is believed to depict the Henryson and Hessle families, united by marriage, who donated the necessary funds for the piece. See: 'All Saints, North Street', <http://allsaints-northstreet.org.uk/stainedglass.html> (accessed March 2012). Thanks to Lisa Liddy for this reference.

initials they selected to use in these marks were a physical construction of a persons' identity. Unlike the late medieval guild seals discussed by Elizabeth New, these were neither marks of 'communal endeavour', nor representations of an exclusive group of people.¹³² Instead, they were marks of the individual: they were not required for Company purposes.

Similar marks in other industries, such as masons' banker or carpenters' marks, had multiple functions. As Jennifer Alexander has demonstrated of masons' marks, sometimes they could be assembly devices, used to aid the construction of buildings where the stone was cut away from the site. By contrast, banker marks can be interpreted as marks of ownership by masons. As Alexander has shown, they were site specific, with the same mark being repeated on stone across the country. They were not intended to represent a mason from great distances, instead their purpose was to identify a mason's work on a particular building, when they were paid per task, rather than by a regular wage.¹³³ Masons' marks, then, were true marks of production. They were placed out of view or were so faint that one would have had to search for them. While pipe marks were not difficult to locate, their placement underneath pipe bowls further supports the idea that as with bankers marks, the intended audience for the symbols found on pipes was not the smoker or retailer, but the pipemaker himself.

¹³² Elizabeth New, 'Signs of community or marks of the exclusive? Parish and guild seals in later Medieval England', in Clive Burgess and Eamon Duffy (Eds.), *The Parish in Late Medieval England* (Donington, 2004), pp.112-113.

¹³³ Jennifer S. Alexander, 'The introduction and use of mason's marks in Romanesque buildings in England', *Medieval Archaeology* 51 (2007), pp.64-65. See also: Blake Tyson, 'Identifying and classifying mason's marks', *Vernacular Architecture* 25 (1994), 4-15 and Colum Hourihane, *The Mason and His Mark. Masons' Marks in the Medieval Irish Archbishopsrics of Cashel and Dublin* (BAR British Series 294, 2000).

This interpretation of marks upon commodities, which complements Henry Glassie's assertion that objects must be considered as both commodities and as productive processes, also furthers Belk's interpretation of objects as reflections of the 'extended self', in which purchases are read as a construction of the consumers' identity.¹³⁴ Makers' marks offer a complementary approach in which producers' identities are integrated into this reading of possessions. Martín-Torres has noted that some makers produced items with branding that they did not necessarily understand.¹³⁵ Yet makers' marks represented a type of branding that communicated messages about the maker that the *consumer* may not have understood or taken any notice of, particularly given their common location on the underside of the pipe. Instead, they were a way for the producer to 'create themselves'.¹³⁶ The sculptor's marks found on fifth century BC statues recovered in Iberia bore a close resemblance: they were not found in prominent places, and they looked like scratches, rather than deliberate marks.¹³⁷ If they were hidden to all but the maker of the mark, then the function they fulfilled was for the maker. In contrast to most readings of 'branding', the semiotic values transmitted by this type of mark were not intended for the consumer: it was a deeply personal representation of a maker's identity as constructed through his work.

¹³⁴ Henry Glassie, *Material Culture* (Bloomington, 1999), p.77; Belk, 'Possessions and the extended self'.

¹³⁵ Martín-Torres, 'Of marks, prints, pots and Becherova', pp.226-227.

¹³⁶ Cathy Lynne Costin, 'Introduction: craft and social identity', *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 8:1 (1998), p.6.

¹³⁷ Teresa Chapa; María Belén; M. Isabel Martínez-Navarrete; Alicia Rodero; Bautista Ceprián; Juan Pereira, 'Sculptor's signatures on Iberian stone statues from *Ipolca-Obulco* (Porcuna, Jaén, Spain)', *Antiquity* 83:321 (2009), 723-737.

3.2 Advertising marks

As the chapter has demonstrated, the marks upon pipes were rich and varied in nature and as such offer multiple ways of reading ‘branding’. Although it is difficult to say for certain as makers may have opted to use symbols and motifs as their proprietary mark, it appears that the gradual decline in initialled marks in favour of motifs over the eighteenth and into the nineteenth century represented a decline in marks of production in favour of other proprietary identities such as retailers or distributors. There was a shift, then, in branding aimed at appealing to consumers (whether the consumer of the pipemaker or the consumer of the tobacconist or publican). As such, an interpretation of these marks needs to consider the semiotic value communicated to the consumer.

While political emblems or motifs on pipes might have been representative of the maker’s sympathies, in order to sell them and make a living, it was likely that they were representative of potential customers’ views as well. The fictitious makers’ mark of O’Brien of Dublin, stamped upon pipes made in northwest England, reflected the way in which marks were made with the consumer in mind: makers knew this was a fake identity, whereas consumers may not have realised. This was a strategy that had been used in earlier periods, as shown by T.H. Breen’s work on identity in revolutionary America.¹³⁸ The plethora of designs lodged with the Board of Trade for pipes demonstrated that the amount of goods marked in such a manner increased over the nineteenth century. Pipemakers were particularly keen to produce pipes that

¹³⁸ T.H. Breen, ‘An empire of goods: the Anglicization of colonial America, 1690-1776’, *Journal of British Studies* 25:4 (1986), 467-499; T.H. Breen, “‘Baubles of Britain’: the American and consumer revolutions of the eighteenth century’, *Past & Present* 119 (1988), 73-104.

reflected peoples' political interests in particular. Branding was targeted at consumers and was used to encourage consumption through repeat purchases, rather than impart that measure of security used in other industries such as the medicine and liquid blacking trades. As Reckner has emphasised in his work on Five Points, material culture studies offers an opportunity to assess 'the process through which national identities and ideologies are constructed, communicated, and transformed through the use of material symbols and rhetoric'. Reckner's analysis of the pipes at Five Points has focused on the very overt histories presented by Irish or trade union symbols on pipes.¹³⁹ A 'British pipe' design created in the height of the Crimean War was a similar attempt to perpetuate a specific nationalist story.¹⁴⁰ Many of these marks, however, have invited research through their uniqueness. By contrast, many of the symbols used in the branding of clay pipes – lions, shields and Prince of Wales feathers – have not been interpreted as a representation of nationhood: overlooked due to their sheer volume of numbers.

3.3 A semiotic vocabulary of authority

Underpinning all of these readings of the branding found upon clay pipes was a tacit contemporary understanding and appropriation of a specific vocabulary of symbols. Marks such as crowns, Prince of Wales' feathers, fleur de lys, roses, lions and thistles, used by not only pipemakers but also drinking establishments and most incorporated trades, appeared virtually everywhere in the daily lives of most people, yet passed unnoticed. These symbols were derived from the language of heraldry and their adoption by family dynasties had granted an authority to them that had become a

¹³⁹ Reckner, 'Negotiating patriotism at the Five Points', p.103.

¹⁴⁰ TNA, BT 43/66 Registered Design No. 118810.

common understanding. The rose, for example, represented the Tudors, as well as the Houses of Lancaster and York. The fact that they appeared on mundane, throwaway commodities such as pipes made them even more powerful. Their constant repetition on such a short-lived commodity meant that people did not challenge these marks or their meaning. The fact that they were disposable implied that they had little or no meaning: this was deceptive.

As previous chapters have demonstrated, commodity branding encompassed a far more broad range of marks than has previously been acknowledged in the historiography. Proprietary branding has been preferenced over marks of the state such as stamp duty labels or excise stamps, which, as have been established, acted as unnoticed marks of government control and authority. While clay pipes were never subject to any similar compulsory marking practices, they too contributed towards the proliferation in everyday life of symbols adopted by the state as signifiers of authority, control and power. These marks were deeply engrained in the everyday life of most individuals, to the extent that people became ‘blind’ to them. They rarely invited comment by contemporaries, except perhaps by those who were especially attuned to them through their own beliefs. For instance, Thomas Carlyle wrote to his family: ‘The Pipes I have at present have no “royal arms” on them; mere simple rib-work instead; they are extremely welcome to drop the royal arms.’¹⁴¹ The stealth-like passage through daily life of their consumers has meant that these marks have continued to be unremarked upon by historians. Through their focus on branding as a

¹⁴¹ CLO, Thomas Carlyle to Jean Carlyle Aitken, 1 January 1840 (accessed October 2010).

proprietary device, historians have not yet explored fully the way in which state authority was reinforced through the material culture of consumption.

By contrast, the high volume of pipes marked with the Prince of Wales' feathers or armorial pipes have frequently been explained by pipe specialists as advertising marks for pubs or taverns that bore these names.¹⁴² Symbols of 'royal and lordly authority', they have been found in greater numbers in North America rather than Britain.¹⁴³ It appears that coats of arms evoked commentary only in the negative; otherwise they went unnoticed, indications of their stealth-like presence in the daily interactions of most individuals. Audrey Noel Hume, analysing the deposits of colonial Williamsburg, found 76 pipes with variants of the Hanoverian arms on the bowls, featuring the crown, flanked by the lion and unicorn and the motto 'DIEU ET MON DROT' beneath them, as well as makers' marks on the heel or spur of the pipe. Others included the Prince of Wales feathers and the motto 'ICH DIEN' ('I serve'), or the Hanoverian arms with 'JE MAINTIENDRAY' ('I will maintain', coat of arms of the Netherlands). Only four of those examined by Noel Hume came from non-tavern sites.¹⁴⁴

While this was certainly the case for some pipes, this overlooks the wider significance of the names of the drinking establishment itself: the King's Arms, the Prince of Wales, or the Cross Keys. All of these titles drew upon the either the monarchy itself

¹⁴² Le Cheminant, 'Clay pipes bearing the Prince of Wales' feathers', p.93.

¹⁴³ Johnson, *An Archaeology of Capitalism*, p.186.

¹⁴⁴ Audrey Noel Hume, 'English clay tobacco pipes bearing the royal arms from Williamsburg, Virginia', *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 4 (1971), p.146; see plates IV-VIII. See also Le Cheminant, 'Clay pipes bearing the Prince of Wales' Feathers', pp.92-101.

or a core element of a city's civic identity, as represented in their coat of arms. All of these drew upon heraldic imagery, devices and styles, which were repeated across a broad spectrum of commodities and non-textual material cultures. Apothecaries used a considerable degree of heraldic language in the decorations for their blue and white delftware drug jars and pill tiles. These decorations have not gone unnoticed by specialists in these objects. Medical ceramics specialist William Jackson has asked: 'how do we account for the presence of peacocks, songbirds, baskets of fruit, antlers, fleur-de-lys, unicorns, wyverns and dolphins [on these objects]?'¹⁴⁵ In his study of London street sellers, Henry Mayhew described the packaging of liquid blacking and lead as 'heraldic' in design.¹⁴⁶

Considered in isolation these marks may be considered as simply aesthetically pleasing. When placed into a wider context with other commodities and institutions that utilised these symbols, however, a greater significance emerges. Collectively these symbols comprised an alphabet that came pre-loaded with significance through use over the centuries by institutions of authority such as guilds and incorporated industries or powerful families.

When people opted to use these devices they often did so for the credibility they imparted, which had been aggregated through years of use. Much like some excise stamps, the crowned leopard motif used by the Goldsmiths was known simply as the

¹⁴⁵ W. Jackson, 'English delftware drug jars', in Bryony Hudson (Ed.), *English Delftware Drug Jars. The Collection of the Museum of the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain* (London, 2006), p.43.

¹⁴⁶ Henry Mayhew, *London Labour and the London Poor. The Condition and Earnings of those that will work, cannot work, and will not work*, Vol.1 (London, 1861), p.474.

‘King’s Mark’. This institution fiercely guarded their use of royal lion symbols for fears about misappropriation and its repercussions to their own reputation.¹⁴⁷ The Company of Sheffield Cutlers, by their own admission, had ‘ransacked’ books of heraldry since 1628 for ideas for new makers’ marks for their registration process.¹⁴⁸ As Garrioch goes on to note of shop signs, many pipemakers’ marks ‘came directly from medieval heraldry: the castle and portcullis; the arms of towns...; the fleur-de-lys itself; and the many heraldic animals.’¹⁴⁹ There is no doubt that they were also used for decorative purposes: sometimes they depicted exotic and extraordinary creatures such as lions, griffins and eagles. Unthinking repetition of these images for aesthetic reasons was similarly powerful: the meaning of these symbols had become so engrained into the collective cultural consciousness that there was a high likelihood that some people may not have recognised the dual semiotic value of the motif they stamped onto a pipe stem or bowl for decorative purposes.

Social scientist Michael Billig has described the way in which nationhoods are created, reiterated and eventually established through the repetition of specific symbols such as flags in everyday situations.¹⁵⁰ Much like the marks of government that passed unnoticed throughout daily life on other commodities such as proprietary medicines, through their repetition on goods and buildings these motifs also transmitted values about authority and power throughout society. The crowns that appeared throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries on coinage, bank notes

¹⁴⁷ Jan Gadd, ‘Hallmarks – fake and pseudo silver marks on pewter in 1636 and later’, *Journal of the Pewter Society*, 11:3 (1998), [http://www.pewterbank.com/HALLMARKS by Jan Gadd...Makers and Marks... 8.pdf](http://www.pewterbank.com/HALLMARKS%20by%20Jan%20Gadd...Makers%20and%20Marks...%208.pdf) (accessed March 2011).

¹⁴⁸ Great Britain. Parliament. House of Commons, *Report from Select Committee on Merchandise Marks* (London, 1862), p.85. The Cutlers were not allowed to repeat an earlier registered design.

¹⁴⁹ Garrioch, ‘House names, shop signs, and social organisation’, p.32.

¹⁵⁰ Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (London, 1995), p.41.

and the stamp duty labels discussed in chapter two pervaded the consciousness of the consumer and contributed to the construction of a national identity and thus modern nation state. The uniquely local nature of pipes meant that they communicated not only nationalistic sentiments or stories, but also those of civic culture. The transmission of such symbols was part of a process of increasingly established civic culture and urbanisation that Phil Withington has situated in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in which he argues that towns promoted a ‘democratic’ ideal in which their inhabitants were invited to participate in order to instigate a community.¹⁵¹ Traditional historiographies of urbanisation and associated civic culture have situated this development as a phenomenon of the long eighteenth century.¹⁵² The increase in the use of civic marks by pipemakers in the later seventeenth century onwards suggests that the pipemaking industry was slower to adopt these emblems. Surviving pipe evidence for the eighteenth century is, as already discussed, somewhat problematic, but by the nineteenth century a greater proportion of marked pipe bowls bore these civic symbols.

Towns expressed a particular civic identity through various methods, including its trade directories and the money it circulated.¹⁵³ This was adopted by manufacturers and shopkeepers in these towns. The Mason family’s use of the arms of the City of York on their pipes did not just demonstrate their affinity for York: through the repetition of this mark on their product they perpetuated a civic identity that smokers

¹⁵¹ Phil Withington, *The Politics of Commonwealth. Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2005).

¹⁵² For example, Peter Borsay, *The English Urban Renaissance. Culture and Society in the Provincial Town 1660-1770* (Oxford, 1989).

¹⁵³ Victoria Morgan, ‘Beyond the boundary of the shop: retail advertising spaces in eighteenth-century provincial England’, in John Benson and Laura Ugolini (Eds.), *Cultures of Selling. Perspectives on Consumption and Society Since 1700* (Aldershot, 2006), p.59.

held in their hand and carried with them all day. It was present at work, in social situations and taken into the consumers' private domestic space. Ultimately, this small representation of a civic symbol permeated most stages of smokers' daily lives to the extent that they ceased to notice it. By the later part of our period, pipe branding performed not only economic functions, but also contributed towards the construction of national and civic identities through their repetition and use of these symbols. It may be that as national, state marks increased, so too did the marks of civic entities in response: a local reluctance to surrender entirely to the increasing dominance and influence of the nation state.

Such loaded symbols were overt examples of a process that has been overlooked by historians. Unlike with the revenue stamp duty labels found on medicines and other products from the late eighteenth century onwards, it was not considered a criminal act to use the royal coat of arms in a registered design. It is possible that this oversight relied on the fact that there was no monetary loss at stake for the crown, unlike with fraudulent revenue stamps. Yet the use of the coat of arms in unauthorised locations was, if not actively encouraged, then not actively *discouraged* either. For the authorities, so long as royal or civic marks were not misappropriated or misused, it was not considered a problem in the way in which forgery of these marks (in the locations in which they were required to be present) was. Instead, the use of these marks by producers of all commodities contributed towards an 'invisible' unthinking cult of nationhood and civic culture.

4. Conclusion

The varied marking practices expressed on clay tobacco pipes complicate the historiographies of ‘branding’. As with the other products examined in the thesis, the marks found upon clay pipes represented a diverse range of interests and influences, both proprietary and institutional. Marks on pipes were made by one identity – the maker – but were intended for, and read by, multiple groups in society. Much of the literature on pipe marking has been focused upon the relationship between the maker and the final consumer that smoked the pipe in a similar fashion to the way that historians have considered the branding of other products, for example many marks on pipes contributed towards an overall material culture of political consumption. Advertising marks such as names of pubs or tobacconists, have been identified but it has not been made explicitly clear that these revealed another stage in the ‘branding’ process: these marks represented a ‘middle’ consumer. Similarly, producers of stone bottles sold their bottles to ‘middle’ consumers such as liquid blacking manufacturers or drinks merchants, who passed the object onto the final consumer, usually considered the only consumer in most analyses of branding. Unlike shoe polish makers or porter merchants however, advertising marks on pipes did not seek to provide assurances about the expected quality standard of the pipe in quite the same way that the marks on containers of medicines and blacking did.

This focus upon the end consumer by historians has resulted in part from the powerful histories of an eighteenth-century ‘consumer revolution’ that are now considered a

standard part of the historiography of the period.¹⁵⁴ Much work on branding by historians has preferenced the consumer over the producer and as such, analysis of the marks upon clay pipes has overlooked alternative interpretations of the other marks upon pipes. Russell Belk's assertion that possessions represented the 'extended self' further compounded this. Yet makers' marks were powerful communications about producers, not just in terms of economic value, but also of the social and cultural messages that they portrayed about the craftsman. The manner in which makers selected their marks to represent an affinity with a specific place, represented the way in which people identified with a region, town, or even country. Similarly, the integration of spousal initials into their makers' mark was not necessarily the result of a new partner in the business: it represented a new stage in the maker's life and, again, a way in which people identified themselves, as a partner and member of a family. This was not the same as the producers of the Concentrated Essence of Jamaica Ginger, Samuel and Susanna Oxley, who announced to her customers that she had taken over the business upon Samuel's death, in order to assure them that she would continue to produce the medicine. Pipemakers did not advertise in this manner and the positioning of their marks – usually on the underside of the heel or on the spur, beneath any decoration – suggested that their marks were not intended for their consumers, but themselves. Fundamentally, makers' marks represented the identity of that person. To an extent, they performed the same functions as marks of production on other products in terms of implying a standard of quality, but their role as a construction of the self through their craft was a far larger part of this.

¹⁵⁴ Neil McKendrick, John Brewer and J.H. Plumb, *The Birth of a Consumer Society. The Commercialisation of Eighteenth-Century England* (London, 1982).

The self-identification of a maker with specific motifs and symbols such as roses, coats of arms and heraldic devices, alluded to a common semiotic language shared by a nation. Makers' marks represented an intersection of 'all cultural domains: economic, social, political, and ritual.'¹⁵⁵ The repetition of these symbols perpetuated a national rhetoric and authority much as the excise marks and stamp duty labels on other products did. The integration of heraldically important symbols of civic culture too demonstrated the way in which pipemakers not only contributed towards stories of national power but also local authority and control. These marks formed part of an overall backdrop of increasing numbers of state marked material surfaces outlined in the thesis introduction – commodities, buildings, coins – virtually every available surface. In so doing, local and national government both imparted credibility and authority, and simultaneously drew their power and legitimacy from the repetition of these symbols by their citizens in all elements of their daily lives. Ultimately, the power of these marks lay in their invisibility.

¹⁵⁵ Costin, 'Introduction: craft and social identity', p.3.