

THE LIVERPOOL PORCELAINS OF JOHN AND SETH PENNINGTON

Maurice Hillis

ALTHOUGH THERE WERE THREE PENNINGTON brothers who operated porcelain factories in Liverpool in the eighteenth century, only the name of Seth Pennington is at all widely known to collectors of English porcelain. Seth was, in fact, the youngest of the three brothers and the last to establish his own porcelain factory, which he did in September 1778.¹ It is a curious historical quirk that today he should be relatively well known and have identified wares ascribed to him, whilst his elder brothers, James and John, should still remain in relative obscurity.

James, the eldest of the three Pennington brothers, established his porcelain factory at Brownlow Hill, Liverpool in 1763.² About 1767 he moved his porcelain production to Park Lane and continued there until 1773. In that year James left Liverpool to work at the newly established porcelain factory at Wirksworth in Derbyshire.³ The porcelain made by James Pennington has not, as yet (June 1993), been identified and in this lecture I wish to concentrate on the later porcelains made by John and by Seth. Although these two porcelains are very alike in paste, glaze and potting and display similar shapes and decoration, there are, I believe, sufficient differences to enable a separation to be achieved in many instances.

Firstly, I shall set out the documentary evidence relating to the locations and durations of the porcelain factories of John and Seth Pennington and demonstrate that John, like his younger brother Seth, was indeed a porcelain manufacturer; a fact that has, in the past, sometimes been questioned.

John Pennington was born on the 19th April 1733 and his younger brother Seth on the 7th July 1744.⁴ James Pennington was born on the 26th December 1728 and was therefore more than four years older than his brother John and about fifteen and a half years older than Seth. James could therefore have taken his brother Seth as an apprentice and it is probable that he did in fact do so.

The father of the three Pennington brothers was John Pennington, a Liverpool maltster. Their father was a freeman of Liverpool and in due course the three sons also became freemen but as potters not as maltsters. Because they became freemen by inheritance it is not known to whom they were appren-



Figure 1. Mask spouts as used by John Pennington, on the left, and by Seth Pennington, on the right. Courtesy of the Williamson Art Gallery and Museum, Birkenhead.

ticed to learn the pottery trade. The Liverpool freedom books seldom record information about apprenticeships in those cases where a petitioner's father was already a freeman. To obtain information about the masters of the Pennington brothers it will be necessary to find records of their original indentures. As yet, these have not been located.

John became a Freeman of Liverpool on the 28th January 1761 in company with his elder brother James.⁵ This was in preparation for the parliamentary election to be held later that year in which only freemen could vote.⁶ Seth was too young at that time to become a freeman and did not do so until 1767.⁵

JOHN PENNINGTON'S TWO PORCELAIN FACTORIES

The actual date that John Pennington became the proprietor of a porcelain factory is not known but it could have been as early as 1768 or 1769. A very strange advertisement was published by John in the Liverpool General Advertiser in December 1775 and this gives some tantalising clues about his earlier career.

WHEREAS some evil-minded person or persons have, at different times, secretly entered a Wind Mill situated near the road leading from this town to Low Hill, belonging to John Pennington, China Manufacturer, and have made a practise of intermixing some hurtful ingredients with the materials grinding in the said mill, in such a

manner as to render them unfit for use, to the great detriment of the said proprietor, and if not prevented, will entirely put a stop to his business: he does therefore give this public notice, that whoever will give him information of any person or persons who have been aiding or assisting, or any way concerned in the affair, so that they may be brought to Justice shall be entitled to a reward



Figure 2. Comma terminal handles as used by John Pennington, on the left, and by Seth Pennington, on the right. Courtesy of the Williamson Art Gallery and Museum, Birkenhead.

of SIXTY GUINEAS. This villainous affair was practised six or seven years ago, but the offenders as yet could never be discovered.

Counting back seven years from the publication of this advertisement would indicate that John Pennington was operating his own windmill in late 1768. It can be presumed that his mill was for grinding ceramic materials and this possibly indicates that John was by then a master potter.

Evidence of the location of John's first recorded porcelain factory is given by a fire insurance policy taken out on 13th September 1774.⁷ This refers to his pothouse and warehouse 'situate at Copperhouse Hill' which is a clerk's error for Copperas Hill. The site was long and narrow, being about 155 yards long and eight or nine yards wide. As well as the

china works it contained a lamp black works and four small dwelling houses.⁸ However, the porcelain works is likely to have been in operation earlier, as John had been living at Copperas Hill from at least 1773.⁹

At this point it is worth discussing some documentary evidence relating to the Copperas Hill China Works, which I believe to be misleading. This relates to an entry in Gore's Liverpool Directory for 1774 which lists James Pennington as at the China Works, Copperas Hill. The 1769, 1772 and 1773 editions of the directory had previously listed James as at the China Works, Park Lane. I believe that the listing of James at Copperas Hill in 1774 is in error for John. I consider that the Park Lane China Works closed in 1773 (it is not listed in the 1774 directory) and that James then went to Wirksworth where he was resident from at least December 1773.³ He thus could not have been at Copperas Hill in 1774, where John is shown as the sole proprietor of the china works by the 1774 insurance record.

John took his first apprentice no later than September 1773.¹⁰ He subsequently took at least six further apprentices including his own son James. In June 1776 John advertised in the Liverpool General Advertiser for a more experienced craftsman:

WANTED

A JOURNEYMAN TURNER in the
CHINA BUSINESS,
who is accustomed to turn upon the Leath,
such a one may meet with
proper encouragement, by applying to
John Pennington,
at the China Manufactury on Copperas Hill,
Liverpool.

Three years later John moved his porcelain factory from the rather cramped Copperas Hill site to a more spacious works at Folly Lane. The advertisements that he inserted in the Liverpool and Chester newspapers in June 1779 give interesting information about the decoration of the chinaware.

JOHN PENNINGTON, CHINA MANUFACTURER

Begs leave to inform his FRIENDS and the PUBLIC, That he has removed from his late factory, at Copperas Hill, to one perfectly commodious, Situate in that part of FOLLY LANE called CHELSEA, Where he now carries on business, in the most extensive manner, and makes elegant, cheap, and serviceable
CHINA WARE.

Which are, for brilliancy of colour, equal to any made in Great-Britain. Gentlemen who desire to

have any particular device, coat of arms, crest, cypher, &c. may have them neatly done, according to direction. Also, drafts, or the likeness of vessels taken, and painted in the most correct and masterly manner.

Those persons who please to favour him with their commands, may depend upon being served with the strictest attention and dispatch. Merchants, Captains of Ships, and Shopkeepers, who purchase wholesale, will have large and profitable allowances made them.

He also takes this opportunity of returning his most grateful thanks for former favours, and wishes to continue the public's much obliged humble servant.

John Pennington.

Again, there is some confusing documentary evidence bearing on John's move from his first factory at Copperas Hill to his new factory at Folly Lane. This originates in the record of an insurance policy taken out on the 15 January 1783 by Wm. Marsh Mears, the owner of the Copperas Hill Works.¹¹ This reads: 'on his china works adjoining and communicating at Mears Hill near Liverpool in the tenure of John Pennington, China Manufacturer.' The clerk has in error described the works as being at Mears Hill, which doesn't exist, and has also recorded that it was in the tenure of John Pennington in 1783, which is also incorrect.

I believe that John Pennington had no interest in the Copperas Hill works after his move to Folly Lane in June 1779. This is demonstrated by an advertisement that Wm. Marsh Mears placed in the Liverpool papers in June 1780: 'To be let and entered upon immediately the China Manufactory and Premises adjoining on Copperas Hill late in the possession of John Pennington'. A similar advertisement was again placed in the newspapers in August 1783 and it appears that Copperas Hill was never again used as a porcelain factory after John Pennington left.

John died on the 19 October 1786 but the Folly Lane porcelain factory was continued by his widow Jane Pennington until 1794. The factory was then advertised for sale.

To be SOLD by AUCTION

At the house of Mr. Henry Forshaw, the Globe Tavern, in John-street, Liverpool, on Tuesday next the 1st day of April, at 6 o'clock in the evening. A PIECE OF LAND or GROUND, on the north side of Folly-lane, or Derby-road, in Liverpool, with the Kilns, workshops, warehouses, and other buildings thereon erected, now used as a manufactory of china ware, together with a



Figure 3. High Chelsea Ewers: that on the left is by Seth Pennington; that on the right can be attributed to John Pennington. Private Collection.

convenient and well finished dwelling house and garden adjacent thereto, containing in the whole to the front of said road 78 yards or thereabouts, running in depth upwards of 42 yards, now in the occupation of Mrs. Jane Pennington.

No sale, however, resulted from this advertisement and the factory was again offered for sale in September 1794. As this latter advertisement speaks of the factory as 'lately used as a manufactory of China Ware,' it would appear that Mrs. Pennington had by then ceased porcelain production.

SETH PENNINGTON'S PORCELAIN FACTORY

Turning now to Seth Pennington: when he became a porcelain manufacturer in September 1778 he did so in partnership with John Part. They commenced production by taking over the existing porcelain factory on Shaw's Brow that had previously been operated by Richard Chaffers and by Philip Christian. On the 11 November 1778 Pennington and Part took their first apprentice and subsequently took at least four others.

The partners initially leased the porcelain factory for seven years but subsequently purchased it, probably in April 1785 when they insured the property.¹² In 1788 they mortgaged the china works for £500¹³ and in 1799 the factory was advertised to be sold.

CHINA WORKS

To be SOLD by AUCTION

At Forshaw's the Globe Tavern, in John-street, TO-MORROW the 3d of September inst. at six o'clock in the evening.

THE INHERITANCE of the extensive CHINA WORKS, on the north side of Shaw's brow, in

Liverpool, being in front about 30 yards, and extending in depth 50 yards, or thereabouts, now in the occupation of Pennington and Part.

There are 3 spacious Hovels or Outbuildings, containing Kilns, well adapted for the manufactory of China, or any kind of Earthenware, and there is also a spring of excellent water on the premises.

The buildings may easily be adapted to any kind of business, where room is required.

Also, to be sold along with the works, an old established Publichouse, (land of inheritance) adjoining to them, and now in the occupation of — Huson.

For further particulars enquire of Mr. Ellames, or said Pennington and Part.

The statement that the buildings could be adapted for any kind of use can probably be taken to indicate that the china manufactory was not flourishing at that time. In the event no buyer seems to have been found. It appears that the Pennington and Part partnership was subsequently dissolved. Seth Pennington continued to make porcelain at Shaw's Brow until about 1805, probably on a rather small scale, first in partnership with John Edmundson and later with John Edwards. He died in 1827.

IDENTIFYING THE PORCELAINS OF JOHN AND SETH PENNINGTON

Having established that John and Seth Pennington



Figure 4. John Pennington jug with biting serpent and satyr mask terminal handle. Private Collection.

were involved in making porcelain at separate factories in Liverpool in the later eighteenth century, the next task is to attempt to establish what porcelain was made by each brother.

Traditionally, a group of bone ash porcelain¹⁴ had been attributed to Seth Pennington and it is from this large and diverse group that I will draw the wares that I now propose to attribute to John Pennington. However, I believe that others in the traditional Seth Pennington group are indeed Seth's and I will seek to establish guidelines by which these may be recognised and differentiated from wares made by John.

I have been unable to find any documentary evidence to show that Seth was the proprietor of a porcelain factory before 1778, when he was 34. It is quite likely that his earlier potting career had been spent in the employ of his brothers James and John. Therefore, I believe that dated pieces of the traditional Seth Pennington group that bear dates prior to 1778 cannot have been made by Seth.

Mask Spout Shapes

In the Knowles Boney, collection housed at the Williamson Museum and Art Gallery, Birkenhead, are two mask jugs dated 1772¹⁵ and 1773.¹⁶ These jugs are in a bone ash porcelain and cannot, therefore, have been made by Philip Christian, who was operating the Shaw's Brow China Factory at that time but who made a soapstone porcelain.¹⁷ Moreover, the shape of the mask spout on the 1772 and 1773 jugs is quite different to that found on Christian's porcelain.

In 1772 and 1773 James Pennington was operating the Park Lane China Works and so he is also a possible maker of these dated mask jugs. However, I think it is more probable that they were made by John Pennington at Copperas Hill. This is because the same mask is found on a dated jug inscribed 'Fine Ale. Luke Lunt. 1790' housed in Liverpool Museum.¹⁸

The use of this moulded spout from 1772 to 1790 fits in well with the presumed period of John Pennington's porcelain production and its continuation, after his death, by his widow Jane until 1794. She would have been running the Folly Lane porcelain works when the 1790 mask jug was made. However, the possibility that the 1772 and 1773 jugs were made by James Pennington at the Park Lane Chinaworks cannot be completely dismissed. The 1773 jug would, in such circumstances, have to have been made in the closing months of the Park Lane works. The re-appearance of this mask spout on the 1790 jugs (and on other undated pieces that appear to be later than 1773) would presumably indicate that the mould was subsequently transferred to John Pennington.

When Seth Pennington took over the Shaw's Brow factory from Philip Christian in 1778 it appears that he did not continue production of the soapstone body that Christian had used but rather switched to a composition based on bone ash. This can be seen by the occurrence of many shapes previously used by Philip Christian but in a bone ash body.

In certain cases these shapes are distinctive enough to permit separation of the porcelains made by John and Seth. In *figure 1* we see two mask spouts that exemplify this. On the left is the type of mask which is found on the 1772, 1773 and 1790 dated jugs and which I attribute to John Pennington. On the right is the type of mask used on Philip Christian's soapstone porcelain. In this case the jug is of bone ash porcelain and I therefore attribute it to Seth Pennington. These distinctively shaped mask spouts can thus be used to differentiate jugs made by John from those made by Seth.

Comma Terminal Handle Shapes

Another shape that occurs in two versions is the comma terminal handle (*figure 2*). On the right is a bone ash version that follows the type previously made in soapstone by Philip Christian. This bone ash version I attribute to Seth Pennington. It can be distinguished from the version on the left by the comma terminal being vertical rather than splayed outwards and by the handle taking a form closer to the body of the piece than in the other version.

The version on the left only occurs on bone ash porcelain and I attribute it to John Pennington. This attribution is based on two factors. Firstly, this handle form is found on jugs with the John Pennington version of the mask spout.¹⁹ Secondly, when the site of the Folly Lane porcelain factory was excavated by Professor Alan Smith in 1968²⁰ an unglazed bone ash porcelain waster was recovered that precisely matches this handle form.²¹

High Chelsea Ewers

The High Chelsea Ewer is a form of creamer made at most eighteenth century English porcelain factories. In *figure 3* we see two versions from Liverpool. The shape on the left is found in both a soapstone porcelain and a bone ash porcelain. When in a soapstone body this version can be attributed to Philip Christian and when in a bone ash body to Seth Pennington. The differently shaped High Chelsea Ewer on the right can probably be attributed to John Pennington.

The situation is rather more complicated, however, than with the mask spouts or the comma terminal handles. In the case of the High Chelsea Ewers two further versions, which appear to be of Liverpool origin, are found in addition to those shown in *figure 2*. Nevertheless, on the basis of



Figure 5. Seth Pennington coffee pot. Courtesy of Geoffrey Godden.

certain printed patterns that are sometimes found on the shape shown on the right of *figure 2* I am reasonably confident that this version can be attributed to John Pennington.

Other Distinctive Shapes

Another handle shape that I believe has attributional value is shown in *figure 4*. This very elaborate handle, showing a biting serpent and with a satyr mask terminal, I believe to be indicative of a John Pennington origin, when found on porcelain dating from the 1770s to 1790s. It does, however, occur on other porcelains outside this date range. It is found on nineteenth century porcelain, some of which is of Coalport origin, and it also occurs on earlier Liverpool porcelain.²² However, within the period mentioned, I believe the use of this handle indicates a John Pennington origin. It does not seem to occur on Seth Pennington's porcelain.

The jug in *figure 4* is further shown to be of John's porcelain by the use of his distinctive mask spout. This combination of John's version of the mask spout and the biting serpent and satyr mask terminal handle is to be found on a number of other large jugs such as an example in Liverpool Museum.²³

A scroll type handle that I believe to be indicative of a Seth Pennington origin is found on many jugs and coffee pots such as the mask jug inscribed 'Richard Bridge. Elton' at Birkenhead²⁴ and the



Figure 6. John Pennington punch pot. Courtesy of Simon Spero.

coffee pot in *figure 5*. This Seth Pennington handle also occurs in a slight variation in which the return scroll at the top attachment to the body is missing.

Mask jugs with this type of handle invariably bear the Seth Pennington type of mask spout. Coffee pots sometimes have a leaf moulded and fluted spout as in *figure 5*. This spout shape was previously used by Philip Christian and its use on bone ash porcelain appears to be confined to Seth Pennington.

One final handle shape that is worth discussing is a strap handle with two grooves running along it, near either edge. This double groove strap handle occurs on many jugs, mugs and coffee pots. When these jugs have mask spouts they are always of the John Pennington type. In addition some of these pieces are decorated with underglaze prints that I believe are also indicative of a John Pennington origin. This leads me to believe that this double groove strap handle can be associated with John Pennington but not with Seth.

There is one caveat. It is possible that some pieces on which this handle occurs predate John's period of porcelain production and are more properly to be attributed to his brother James. This could be a difficult matter to resolve if, as seems possible, John was closely associated with James's porcelain making activities and may even have acquired moulds and other materials from him prior to James's departure to Wirksworth.

Printed Decoration

It is usually very hazardous to attribute porcelain on the basis of painted decoration whether enamelled or in underglaze blue. Such decoration can, of course, be freely copied. This would particularly be the case in a close-knit potting community, such as Liverpool, where workmen could have changed factories very easily and where a number of

factory proprietors were closely related. Thus we find that very many of the painted patterns used by John Pennington were also used by Seth, often in indistinguishable form. Nevertheless, in a few instances a tentative attribution can be made because of the rarity of the painted pattern.

If we consider the fine bone ash porcelain punch pot shown in *figure 6*, we can attribute it to John Pennington on the basis of its date of 1775. The other side is painted in underglaze blue with a rather sinister European landscape. The rarity of this design and the fact that it occurs on pieces, such as the mug in *figure 7* and a coffee pot,²⁵ that have a double groove strap handle suggest that the use of this pattern may be confined to John Pennington's porcelain.

Printed Decoration

Printed decoration, when applied over the glaze, is not a reliable method for identifying ceramics. Undecorated earthenwares and porcelains from a variety of sources could be decorated by specialist ceramic printing firms. Indeed, in the eighteenth century Liverpool was an important centre of this trade, which was carried on there by John Sadler and continued later by his partner Guy Green.

On the other hand, underglaze blue printed decoration, which was carried out at the factory of production, has the potential to be used as a means of identifying the origin of the pot. This is not without its pitfalls as the copper plates from which such prints were taken could pass from factory to factory, particularly on the closing down of a works.

Nevertheless, if certain printed patterns can be linked to distinctive shapes of one factory and are not found on distinctive shapes of another factory then these patterns provide good evidence on which to base the attribution of pieces that do not have such distinctive shapes. It is, of course, most important to ensure that the printed pattern being used to provide such an attribution is precisely linked to that on key pieces.

A popular design was often used by more than one porcelain factory. It is thus most important to make careful comparisons of the printed decoration. This is most readily done by comparing the decoration found on similar forms i.e. a teapot with a teapot, a coffee cup with a coffee cup etc.

In Liverpool virtually identical versions of certain underglaze blue prints are found on porcelains that considerations of shape show were made both by John and by Seth Pennington. For example, 'The Fisherman' or 'Pleasure Boat' pattern, well known on Worcester and Caughley porcelains, is found on the Liverpool porcelains of John and Seth. However, unlike the situation with Worcester and Caughley, where distinctive versions of this pattern are associ-

ated with each factory, in the case of the two Liverpool factories the prints do not display features that would permit their separation. The same is true of a rather busy floral print often found on both John²⁶ and Seth's (figure 3, left) porcelains.

In other cases, however, distinctive versions of the same printed design exist which are an aid to attribution. In figure 8 for example we see two versions of the 'Rural Lovers' print. That on the plate was used by Seth Pennington whilst that on the teapot was used by John Pennington.

The prints are different: on the John Pennington version there is much more space around the man's head and two birds perch in the tree. On the Seth Pennington example the background crowds much closer around the man's head. He wears a hat with a lower crown and there are no birds in the tree. The Seth Pennington version also occurs in a mirror-image version. This has no attributional significance, however. Indeed, both variations of the Seth Pennington version have been found as wasters not far from Seth's Shaw's Brow factory.

Another print with attributional value is the 'Two Quails'. This occurs in two versions. Seth's version is more crudely engraved and the quails have more pointed heads than they do in John's version.²⁷

Two closely related prints of 'The Lady with Bird in a Cartouche' occur on the wares of our two factories. In figure 5 we see the Seth Pennington version. The John Pennington version is most easily distinguished by variations in the design of the cartouche.²⁸

A related print of a 'Lady with Bird and Child' is known (figure 4). In this the bird perches on the lady's other wrist, she is accompanied by a child and there is no cartouche framing the design. This design is more usually found on teawares, sometimes with a simple line border. On other occasions it has a heavy cell type border and the design is sometimes washed over. In my experience this print was only used by John Pennington.

Quite a number of printed designs previously used by Philip Christian were continued by Seth Pennington on his bone ash porcelain. Among these are 'The Mother and Child and Man Fishing' and 'The Three Ladies' as used at Worcester. Again wasters of these patterns were found not far from Shaw's Brow.²⁹ These patterns do not seem to have been used by John Pennington and thus provide a useful method of separating the porcelains of John and Seth.

CONCLUSION

It has been shown that the brothers John and Seth Pennington operated independent porcelain manufacturing businesses in Liverpool in the later part of



Figure 7. John Pennington mug. Courtesy of Simon Spero.

the eighteenth century. The porcelains are in many respects very alike and both brothers used a similar bone ash formula to make their porcelain.

Despite the similarities certain features can be used to separate these two groups of porcelain. For example, distinctive shapes, such as mask spouts, comma terminal handles and High Chelsea Ewers were used in different versions by the two brothers. Other shapes appear to have been used by one brother but not the other. Thus John used the biting serpent and satyr mask handle and the double groove strap handle, while Seth used the 'Richard Bridge' handle.

Painted decoration is, in general, not a helpful means of separating these porcelains but certain underglaze blue printed patterns have attributional significance. Some patterns appear to be exclusive to one factory while others were used by both factories but in differing versions. Yet other underglaze prints were used by both factories but do not have distinctive features that permit an easy identification. It appears that certain wares of these closely related factories will always be difficult or impossible to separate.

However, I believe, that with continued study, a substantial body of wares will be confidently attributed to each factory, thus giving to John the rightful

rightful recognition he deserves for his many years of potting.

NOTES

- 1 Lyn and Maurice Hillis, *Northern Ceramic Society Journal* 5, 29-35, (1984).
- 2 Maurice Hillis, *The Liverpool Porcelains*, Northern Ceramic Society, Occasional Paper No 1, (1985).
- 3 Maurice Hillis, *Northern Ceramic Society Journal*, 6, 223-224, 1987.
- 4 J.J. Murray, *Northern Ceramic Society Journal*, 4, 69-108, 1981.
- 5 Liverpool Freedom Records, Liverpool Public Library.
- 6 Lyn and Maurice Hillis, *Northern Ceramic Society Journal*, 5, 23-28, (1984).
- 7 Sun Insurance Policy No 343981, discovered by Mrs. Elizabeth Adams.
- 8 Liverpool Corporation Leases, Liverpool Public Library. See the baptismal record of his son John, 15 June 1773.
- 10 William Wright was enrolled as a freeman of Liverpool on 11 September 1780: his apprenticeship to John Pennington would have started at least seven years earlier.
- 11 Sun Insurance Policy No 470146, discovered by Harold Blakey.
- 12 Sun Insurance Policy No 503897, discovered by Harold Blakey.
- 13 Charles T. Gatty, *Trans. Hist. Soc. Lanc. Ches.*, 33, 123-168, (1881).
- 14 The use of calcined animal bones in the manufacture of artificial or soft paste porcelain was first introduced at Bow at some time prior to 1750. The use of this material later spread to other English porcelain factories.
- 15 Made in Liverpool: Liverpool Pottery and Porcelain 1700-1850, catalogue of the 7th Exhibition of the Northern Ceramic Society, Walker Art Gallery Liverpool., plate 139.
- 16 Knowles Boney, *Liverpool Porcelain of the Eighteenth Century and its Makers*, plate 41a.
- 17 The use of soapstone, a clay found near the Lizard in Cornwall, was first employed in the manufacture of soft paste porcelain at Bristol about 1749. Its use later spread to Worcester and other English porcelain factories.
- 18 Maurice Hillis, *Northern Ceramic Society Journal*, 6, 1-21, (1987) : plate 12.
- 19 See reference 18 plates 9 and 13.
- 20 Alan Smith, *Eng. Ceramic Circle Trans.*, 8 2, 199-202, 1972.
- 21 See reference 18 plate 1.
- 22 *Eng. Ceramic Circle Trans.*, 7 3, plate 216b, 1970.
- 23 See reference 18 plate 8.
- 24 See reference 15 plate 131.
- 25 See reference 18 plate 18.
- 26 See reference 18 plate 13.
- 27 See reference 18 plate 14 for an example of the John Pennington version of this pattern.
- 28 See Alan Smith, *Liverpool Herculaneum Pottery*, 1970, plate 8 for the John Pennington version of this pattern.
- 29 See reference 15 plate 133 for a mug and wasters of the 'Three Ladies' pattern.

Figure 8. 'Rural Lovers' prints: on the left, as used by Seth Pennington, and on the right, as used by John Pennington. Courtesy of the Williamson Art Gallery and Museum, Birkenhead.

