


Name: 1598741896147 pages | File size: 16.Mb

DOWNLOAD 

Book online 

Erica Gibson

ePub | *DOC | audiobook | ebooks | Download PDF



(Free and download) Ceramic Makers' Marks (Guides to Historical Artifacts)

Ceramic Makers' Marks (Guides to Historical Artifacts)

Erica Gibson : Ceramic Makers' Marks (Guides to Historical Artifacts) before purchasing it in order to gage whether or not it would be worth my time, and all praised Ceramic Makers' Marks (Guides to Historical Artifacts):

8 of 8 people found the following review helpful. Some British Backstamps I Have KnownBy James L. MurphyThis volume is a tremendous disappointment and the publisher's blurb borders on false advertising. It is by no stretch of the imagination "comprehensive" and might better be titled "Some British Backstamps I Have Known." The photographs and drawings of some 350 marks apparently derive solely from the collections of the Sonoma State University's Anthropological Studies Center, gathered "from the length and breadth of California," which one submits is a much smaller universe than the technically correct but highly misleading "found in North American archaeological sites" advertised in the back cover's claim for comprehensiveness. One might therefore expect something in the way of archaeological context but there is none--not even site provenience--other than the aforementioned "length and breadth of California." Seeking "to offer a more comprehensive identification guide," following such predecessors as Gates and Ormerod's work on ceramic marks of the East Liverpool, Ohio, region, Gibson's effort is a poor simulacrum. It could more accurately be described as a photographic footnote or postscript to the Kowalskys' (1999) and Godden's

(1991) catalogs of British marks, illustrating for the most part previously described marks or variants thereof. This in itself is not without value but scarcely rises to the level of being a comprehensive identification guide. North American marks are restricted to two previously described California stoneware manufacturers' marks (D. Brannan and Garden City) and a San Francisco importer's mark. European marks are limited to four Haviland backstamps previously recorded by the Kovels (1986), an unrecorded mark for a Bordeaux company (J. Viellard), and a Berlin KPM mark (referencing the Kovels rather than Roentgen!), for a total of nine non-British marks. Finally, a minor correction should be noted, which does underscore the value of Gibson's emphasis on photographic illustration: The Thomas Shirley Co. partial mark illustrated on p. 127 as "rdina" is surely (no pun intended) "edina" and no doubt represents a popular Moresque "Medina" pattern. If there is a place for this kind of thing-- and I do not dispute that there is-- it would be on a website, hopefully with some indication of the individual provenience for these sherds and clearly indicating which are "well-known examples" and which are "variations of previously known marks," or "formerly unidentified marks." In sum, the publishers not only vastly exaggerate the comprehensiveness of this compendium but overestimate its audience ("...historical archaeologists, material culture specialists, collectors and antiques dealers, museum professionals, students, art historians, and others interested in ceramics." I am left with the perhaps subjective notion that the author may have been led astray by an over-eager publisher, an under-diligent editor, and/or an out-of-control advertising writer. 3 of 3 people found the following review helpful. Original research would be nice ...By Great Lakes Research Given the number of published sources that are currently available covering the identification and chronology of ceramic makers' marks, either new or readily accessible on the used market, the most obvious question relative to this particular work is what new information does it bring to the research shelf? The most obvious attraction of this work is the series of excellent makers' mark photographs and descriptions. Unfortunately, most of the illustrated marks are either identical to those published in earlier reference works, or are at best simply minor variants of more common marks by previously well documented firms. New marks are limited to a handful of American manufacturers, importers, and retailers. More interesting, although only sporadically present within the text, are descriptions of associations between various printed and impressed makers' marks, vessel shapes, decorative types, etc. According to the publisher, "... the catalog provides full information on both the history of the mark and its variants, as well as details about the manufacture," and that appears to generally be the case, although the minimal thumbnail sketches provided in this small volume appear to be almost entirely derived from readily accessible standard sources and give little indication for either original or new research. It should be further noted that although these examples were drawn from archaeological contexts, there is no information contained in this volume relative to association, context, or even the sites from which they were drawn, adding little if anything to the chronological utility of these particular marks. While many of the makers' mark descriptions reference corresponding marks in Praetzellis et al. (1983), that report is long out-of-print and is not readily available. Again, according to the publisher, "... a set of indexes allow for searches by manufacturer, location, mark elements, and common words used." The reviewer assumes that the publisher is referring to searches of the book predicated on the recovery of archaeological specimens with partial makers' marks. While indexing such a work is laudable, the results are highly variable. For example, while indexing by "city" of manufacture, such as Burslem, Cobridge, or Liverpool, may have some utility, searching for marks corresponding to their "country" of manufacture, such as England, is certainly more problematic. Similarly, while searching for makers' mark design "elements" such as a Garter or an Anchor may produce useful results, searching for marks that include the Royal Coat of Arms is unlikely to significantly aid the researcher. It should be noted that one of those Royal Coat of Arms marks is likely misidentified as the product of the Staffordshire firm of Thomas Booth Co., rather than the more likely Tempest, Brockmann Co. of Cincinnati. Altogether, this small volume represents a modest addition to the archaeological literature and may be of some utility in the identification of partial makers' marks on archaeological specimens. However, the fact that only 112 manufacturers and 336 makers' marks are referenced is the book's ultimate weakness. The work is so limited in scope that it will never be a primary source - rather, one that is only consulted after working over the usual suspects, and if something is in fact discovered within this volume, it will require a return trip to the primary sources for clarification and citation. Ultimately, there are probably a dozen or so primary ceramic reference books that any archaeologist dealing with Euro-American sites of the nineteenth or early twentieth century must have on their bookshelf. Given that the currently reviewed volume is largely culled from those publications and presents so little new or unique information, the work certainly does not fall into the "must have" category. 1 of 3 people found the following review helpful. Helpful marks on British Export Ceramics By Connie Rogers Ceramic Makers' Marks By Erica Gibson Volume 3 in "Guides to Historical Artifacts" series 147 pages, 336 marks from 112 different manufacturers Erica Gibson, a member of the Transferware Collectors Club, has studied the field of archaeology, specializing in the identification and analysis of 19th-century and early 20th-century material culture. She received her MA from the University of Pittsburgh in 1990 and moved to California in 1993. She is the Archaeological Lab Director for the Anthropological Studies Center (ASC) Sonoma State University, where she has developed and now oversees the operation of ASC's artifact processing and cataloging system, SHARD (Sonoma Historic Artifact Research Database). The development of this book, originally intended as a reference tool for archaeologists, is helpful to ceramic researchers as well, especially for those of us working to identify patterns, makers

and dates. It seems that we gain a lot from sharing information back and forth between the two disciplines. The marks identified are a reflection of the contexts of the archaeological deposits in which they were recovered (more than 250 collections from the state of California). During the mid to late 19th century American potters faced a domestic market that not only preferred British wares but considered them to be superior to those made in the United States. Large quantities of relatively inexpensive British wares were produced exclusively for the American market, and the predominance of this market is reflected in archaeological deposits. The marks used by British manufacturers for export are not the same as marks on domestic ware; therefore this collection of marks contains many not seen before in standard references. The marks identified in this volume are primarily of British origin, though there are a few French and German marks. A few importers marks are included. With few exceptions United States firms are excluded, as they are well documented in other sources. The book is organized alphabetically by manufacturer, and within manufacturer by mark. Information includes manufacturer name, pottery name, pottery location, dates of operation, previous and subsequent pottery operators, wares produced, additional information about the firm, and references. Mark information includes the mark description, dates of mark use, additional comments and references. If known, the printed pattern found with the mark is noted. A mark description that I appreciate is the distinction between two kinds of Royal Arms marks: standing Royal Arms mark and seated Royal Arms mark. An occasional photo of a mark reassembled from shards, serves as a reminder that this book is based on archaeological finds. At times the complete mark was not recovered, but the missing part(s) have been surmised. Rather than try and photograph the impressed marks, the author chose to have drawings made of these marks. As a result, these marks are very clear to read. The wealth of Royal Arms marks indicates that a lot of the shards found were ironstone (perhaps white ironstone, which was a very popular export from Britain). It is also good to see sets of initials for lesser known potters such as: S. F. J. for Smith, Ford, Jones, Lincoln Pottery, Burslem, Staffordshire. This volume has become another reference to use to attribute unknown initials. The book has very helpful indexes as an aid to finding information. I commend Erica Gibson for her work and highly recommend the book. Connie Rogers

Erica Gibsons comprehensive guide provides a much-needed catalogue of ceramic makers' marks of British, French, German, and American origin found in North American archaeological sites. Consisting of nearly 350 marks from 112 different manufacturers from the mid-19th through early 20th century, this catalog provides full information on both the history of the mark and its variants, as well as details about the manufacturer. A set of indexes allow for searches by manufacturer, location, mark elements, and common words used. This guide will be of interest not only to historical archaeologists, but material culture specialists, collectors, museum professionals, students, art historians, and others interested in ceramics.

About the Author Erica Gibson is archaeology lab manager at the Anthropological Studies Center, Sonoma State University. She has an MA in archaeology from University of Pittsburgh and is a member of the Register of Professional Archaeologists.