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**Purpose** This paper explores the advertising strategy of crockery importers and dealers in relationship to their origins and backgrounds. This is a departure from earlier ceramic-history literature which tended to focus on the Staffordshire producers, with limited awareness of how the identity of importers and dealers influenced what products were sold, and their individual approaches to marketing.

**Methodology** Within a context of historical marketing research, this paper analyses newspaper advertising and commentary. It combines an examination of marketing practices with a wider consideration of the cultural identities of ceramic importers and dealers. The digitalization of historical records, combined with sophisticated search engines, makes it more feasible to examine a broader range of sources. Thus, modern research methods can enhance our understanding of production and demand, and reveal how marketing strategy was diverse.

**Findings** Awareness of how advertising was influenced by the backgrounds and socio-political views of importers and dealers demonstrates ways in which Anglo-American ceramic trade could be far more market-led. More significantly, marketing approaches were not necessarily responding to American demand, but rather that importers could engage in commissioning goods which reflected their own views on politics, religion or slavery.

**Originality/value** Examining the advertising of importers demonstrates the complex relationship between production and ceramic demand. Thus, this paper opens up debates as to how far the advertising of other merchandise in the United States shows evidence of taking a more individual approach by the nineteenth-century.
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**Introduction**  
In 1952, Ernest S. Turner’s assessment of American advertising was that, ‘In content, the American advertisements were not vastly different from those in English newspapers’, except ‘the British upper classes had almost ceased to advertise their black boys for sale. American advertisers still trafficked in human flesh’ (1952: reprint 1968, p.116). Using the case-study of imported English ceramics, the purpose of this paper is to show how American advertising in the early nineteenth-century evolved in far more diverse ways.

The contention of this paper is that American ceramic advertising became more complex than simply providing information about stock and competitive prices. When comparing the backgrounds of crockery importers and dealers with their actual advertising, it becomes apparent how cultural origins, a motivation for migration, and on occasion, political sympathies and religious affiliations were reflected in marketing strategy. The marketing practices of crockery importers and dealers in the United States show evidence of being individualistic in nature, and viewed in this way, there arose an interesting interplay between cultural identity and the approaches displayed in advertising. Thus, appreciating that importers and dealers marketed goods that adhered to their backgrounds and viewpoints, has implications on how we understand the relationship between production and demand. The last part of this paper speculates as to reasons why American ceramic marketing developed in these unusual ways.

**Production**  
The United States relied particularly on England for its supply of ordinary ceramic tableware
(Weatherill, 1971, p.87-8). In an article entitled ‘On the Trade of France with the United States’, published in a New York newspaper, *The Time Piece*, in 1797, it was already recognised how, ‘EARTHEN WARE… On scrutiny, it will be found, that notwithstanding their home manufactures of this kind, the greater part made use of in the United States is English’ (*The Time Piece*, November 13, 1797). This serialised report was published by H. Caritat, who also ran a circulating library on Pearl Street, New York. Approximately thirty years later, when an English traveller visited the ‘humble habitations’ of the Seneca Indians near Buffalo, he unexpectedly found amongst their furniture a, ‘…display of Birmingham teas-trays, and blue and white Staffordshire crockery’, causing him to record how this was, ‘such an opposite picture of rural life’ (Boardman, 1833, p.160-1).

English earthenware, was no longer the preserve of white settlers, and ceramic export figures from the main port of Liverpool to the United States confirm gradual increases, subject to wars and fluctuations in economy (Ewins, 1997, p.5-6).

Even though a broad range of Staffordshire ceramics was exported to the United States, it was the printed earthenwares, specifically produced to appeal to the tastes of the American market, which initially received the most attention from early ceramic historians. William C. Prime’s *Pottery and Porcelain of all Times and Nations* of 1877, is an example of a vast publication that included references to creamwares and earthenwares printed with political themes or American scenery.

Of the Staffordshire wares, Prime, observed how the ‘American decorations’ in dark blue were ‘common enough… forty years ago’, but were now ‘becoming scarce’, and as a consequence, ‘collectors will do well to secure good specimens’ (1877: 3rd edition, 1879, p.346). (See Figure 1). Large collections were formed, including one belonging to William Randolph Hearst, although his was sold-off at auction during the Great Depression (Parke-Bernet Galleries, 1938). Even so, the collecting trend led to more publications, such as *The China Hunters Club* of 1878, by Annie Trumbull Slosson (William Prime’s sister-in-law), and Alice Morse Earle’s *China Collecting in America* of 1892, that discussed, along with other imported ceramics, Staffordshire wares produced for the American market. However, the perplexing issue of motivation for producing printed designs aimed at the American market, was only briefly considered by these early writers. For instance, Alice Morse Earle proposed:

‘It seems odd that English potters should have made so many pitchers bearing testimony to the victories of their late enemies, unless they were ordered by American dealers specially for the American market; but I have never seen anything to prove that such orders were given’ (1892, p.142).

While there was some speculation that American crockery dealers could have impacted on Staffordshire production, as Earle indicates, she had failed to find evidence to support this theory. Also, it is interesting that Earle described the dealers as ‘American’, which requires more scrutiny. The question of identity and whether those involved in the trade were American, or of more recent English or European origins in America, was not considered relevant in that period. This paper argues that identity does have a relevance in helping to understand distribution, and even approaches to ceramic advertising.

In short, early ceramic-history literature typically focused on the producers, and often assumed that designs for the American market were producer-led. For instance, Mable Smith’s *Anglo-American Historical China* interpreted these ceramics as ‘used to appeal to our patriotism, a feeling which was then running very strong, and assured a ready sale’ (1924, p.iv). Ellouise Larsen’s *American Historical Views on Staffordshire China* of 1939, repeated a view that the wares simply appealed to American patriotism (1939: revised 1950, p.2). Larsen’s publication (revised and enlarged in 1950) remains the most extensive catalogue of all the underglaze American-themed printed wares that were produced and the visual sources used for these transfer wares. Emphasising the role of manufacturers in cultivating this market has continued, and as late as 1995, Jeffrey Snyder’s *Historical Staffordshire: American Patriots and Views* interprets these wares as manufacturers attempting to recapture trade after the Anglo-American War of 1812-14, by ‘plucking the patriotic heartstrings of the new nation’ (p.5-6).

**Marketing**

Thus, the theoretical framework of this inquiry needs to be located within the context of research focused far more on the role of marketing. Research papers by Neil McKendrick’s in the *Economic
History Review in 1960, and in the Royal Historical Transactions in 1964, systematically addressed the business strategy of Josiah Wedgwood. This area of research culminated in McKendrick, Brewer and Plumb’s The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-century England of 1982. McKendrick approached the subject of Wedgwood’s marketing strategy from the perspective of an historian, rather than as a collector who had hitherto dominated ceramic-history research, as outlined above. McKendrick, Brewer and Plumb explored the ways in which marketing impacted on the growing consumption of commodities from the end of the eighteenth century (1982, p.40). One of McKendrick’s chapters focuses on ‘Josiah Wedgwood and the Commercialization of the Potteries’, and on how he made use of distribution warehouses, showrooms, the exhibiting of new products combined with a consideration of display, travelling salesmen, as well as utilising ‘straight-forward’ advertising (1982, p.118). McKendrick’s analysis usefully begins to bridge the gap between production and consumption. Wedgwood advertised widely, promoting outlets in Dublin and Bath, and advertisements placed in a Bath newspaper also referred to the showroom on Soho street, London (Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette, October 10, 1776). Certainly, Josiah Wedgwood was a dominant manufacturer, who produced prestigious goods, though in the case of the American market, he viewed it as a useful destination to off-load unwanted stock (Wedgwood Museum, 1973, p.127). Thomas Bentley, his Liverpool partner, also believed that the American market was not ready for expensive products (McKendrick, 1964, p.19). There remains scope to build on our understanding of how the advertising of ceramics evolved in the United States.

The purpose of Neil Ewin’s ‘Supplying the Present Wants of Our Yankee Cousins...’: Staffordshire Ceramics and the American Market 1775-1880 of 1997, was to examine what was more widely exported, and how the growing trade for English ceramics in the United States, was actually organised. Paralleling the work of economic historians who have previously examined the organisation of the Anglo-American trade, ‘Supplying the Present Wants...’ also found a tendency of Staffordshire manufacturers to deal more directly with the United States in the post-1815 era. More precisely, Norman Buck’s The Development of the Organisation of Anglo-American Trade 1800-1850 argued that in a period of rising exports, ushered in by the end of the Anglo-American War of 1812-14, British manufacturers, as opposed to merchants, became more dominant as marketing agents in the United States (1925: reprint 1969, p.98-9, 121).

The examination of the methods which facilitated the flow of merchandise into the United States has not been ignored by researchers (Miller, 1984a; Miller, 1984b). For example, Alice Cooney Frelinghuysen’s ‘Empire City Entrepreneurs: Ceramics and Glass in New York City’ outlines how, in the context of rising imports and increasing demand, English ceramic manufacturers had family members in the United States helping to develop and coordinate their trade (2000, p.330). However, merchants continued to deal with the smaller Staffordshire manufacturers, and crockery importers and dealers in America still remained important for sales and distribution. In “Supplying the Present Wants...” many American importers and dealers, who advertised ceramics are referred to, but the backgrounds and cultural identities of these crockery importers and dealers often remains unclear.

A view expressed in John Brewer and Roy Porter’s Consumption and the World of Goods of 1993 that The Birth of a Consumer Society...of 1982, was a seminal text, creating a surge of research into marketing and consumption (1993, p.2). Brewer and Porter’s Consumption and the World of Goods brings together the varied results, including a chapter entitled, ‘Manufacturing, consumption and design in eighteenth-century England’ by John Styles, a design historian. Styles argued that, ‘specifications were set predominately by the merchants and manufacturers who controlled the various trades, in accordance with their assessment of changes in fashion and in the other influences on demand’ (1993, p.528). Thus, Styles’ argument is emphasising that merchants, or manufacturers, responded to consumer fashion and demand. Styles’ chapter speculates how this also applied to international markets, when he states:

‘The production and supply of a wide range of eighteenth-century manufactured goods was organized along these lines. The processes at work are especially clear in the case of the American market, because of its size and appetite, the distances involved and the relative weakness of manufacturing in eighteenth-century North America, but the production and supply of similar goods in eighteenth-England was not very different’ (1993, p.528).
Obviously, understanding how manufacturers produced goods for different markets becomes even harder when there was a geographical gap between the producer and the market, and this was certainly the case with the Anglo-American ceramic trade. The growing appetite for commodities suggested by Norman Buck or John Styles can be supported by other primary evidence. When the Staffordshire manufacturer, John Ridgway, visited New York city in 1822, he was astonished by the amount of, ‘imports & exports: the busy shops & bustling streets’. His diary entries also record how New York was ‘a sort of emporium to all Nations’. Such scenes of mercantile activity impressed Ridgway to the extent that he noted that if he lived anywhere else than England, it would be in New York (Archival, Ridgway diary, 1822). But, the question remains, should it be assumed that manufacturers produced different goods anticipated to appeal to this growing market, or did importers and dealers, who were closer to consumers, ever influence production?

Referring to the 1920s to 1940s, it is interesting how Roland Marchand’s Advertising the American Dream..., raises a similar question concerning the role of advertisers, when he wrote:

‘Did the content of advertisements mirror the consumers’ actual conditions and behavior – or their fantasies and aspirations? Or did the ads reflect, even more faithfully, the particular values and preoccupations of advertisers, advertising agents and copywriters?’

Marchand continues, ‘…even a plausible explanation of the content of a group of advertisements, as intended by their creators, would prove nothing about the impact of the messages in those ads on consumers’ (1985, p.xvi). In other words, Marchand did not pursue this line of enquiry. But, this paper examines whether, in the nineteenth century, importers and dealers advertised goods that adhered to their backgrounds and viewpoints, which then has implications on our understanding of the relationship between production and demand. So whilst this paper is not unique in raising a similar question of whether the values of sellers could influence their marketing, it still needs to be thoroughly documented if this actually occurred in the crockery trade.

Although research has been undertaken into the marketing of ceramics in England in the mid-eighteenth century, do these investigations provide an adequate model of how the ceramic advertising evolved in the United States? For example, Hilary Young’s English Porcelain 1745-95: its Makers, Design, Marketing and Consumption of 1999, discussed how porcelain manufacturers began to use outlets and warehouses in London. Young even suggests that there was an opportunity for customers to request adaptations to be made to products through contact with the London outlets - the hub of the English ceramic trade (1999, p.163). Young also points out how newspaper advertising was used by both English porcelain manufacturers and ceramic merchants, but his research concludes that it was merely a ‘conduit for basic sales information’ (1999, p.171). The English approach to advertising ceramics in the nineteenth century seems to have remained focused on sales information.

In terms of the United States, Benjamin Franklin, as editor of the Pennsylvania Gazette, has been credited as a pioneer of early newspaper advertising because he gave consideration to typographic layout, the use of basic illustrated imagery, and the actual number of advertisements in each edition (Applegate, 2012, pp.8-12). Gradually newspapers, such as the New York Daily Advertiser, became more focused on advertising commodities, rather than providing news (Applegate, 2012, pp.18-19). Unlike England, by this period, there was no tax on American newspapers or advertisements (Presbrey, 1929: reprint 1968, p.75). It has been pointed out that by the 1830s, advertising could subsidise the newspapers (Sivulka, 2012, pp.13-9), but beyond these rudimentary observations the actual content of advertisements has been considered to be similar to English newspaper advertising. Certainly, in terms of American crockery importers and dealers, just like their English counterparts, their advertising in the late eighteenth century drew attention to the wide range of ceramic stock available, the new arrivals, and the sellers’ competitive prices (Smith, 1974). However, moving into the nineteenth-century the backgrounds of importers and dealers, and their marketing strategies became surprisingly intertwined, and this is examined below.

**Family connections**

Specialist crockery importers and dealers tended to cluster on certain streets in the major east coast ports. For instance, in New York in the early part of the nineteenth century crockery importers and dealers were normally located on Maiden-lane, Pearl and Water Streets, near to the docks and to the
East River. From a broader, business-history perspective it has been argued that family connections were a vital part of the development of Anglo-American trade, since they helped reduce business uncertainty and risk (Rose, 2000, p.60). In addition, Sheryllynne Haggerty, a business and trade historian, has argued that the ‘kinship nexus’ persists as a positive feature of networks in historical research because it is assumed to have reduced ‘moral hazard’ (2012, p.165). In the case of crockery importers and dealers, there is ample evidence to show that the same principles applied. The brothers, Gilman and Horace Collamore, from Scituate, Massachusetts, became crockery importers in Boston from the 1810s, forming various business partnerships (See Pedigree 1). Col. John Collamore of Scituate (a brother of Gilman and Horace) had a number of sons who also became involved in the crockery trade. These were Ebenezer, Davis and Gilman Collamore, dealers in New York, and John Jr., George E., and Andrew F. Collamore, crockery dealers in Boston. When the Boston partnership between Horace Collamore and William Churchill (another crockery dealer), was dissolved in 1824, Horace was immediately replaced by his nephew, John Collamore Jr, illustrating the importance of family connections (Columbian Centinel, Boston, March 3, 1824).

Just as Peter Mathias observed in The Early Modern Atlantic Economy, that kinship could allow access to credit, he also points out how ‘marriage often cemented alliances between families with close business interests’ (2000, p.19), and crockery importers and dealers followed the same pattern. This is shown in the case of Thomas and William Hewitt who were originally from Staffordshire, and who became crockery importers in New York, from the early part of the nineteenth century. Thomas and William Hewitt ran stores at 263, Broadway and 16, Chamber Street, advertised as follows in 1805:

RECEIVED by the Ship Mars,
from Liverpool, 72 crates of Earthenware,
by THOS. & WM. HEWITT, importers of
China, Glass and Earthenware, respectfully beg
leave to inform their friends and the public in ge-
neral, that they have opened two stores of the a-
bove goods, at no. 263 Broadway, and no. 16
Chamber-street, wholesale and retail, where coun-
try customers may be supplied on the most rea-
sonable terms:
New-York Gazette, May 6, 1805.

In 1806, at New York, ‘Wm Hewitt, son of Mr. Hewitt, Lane End, Staffordshire’ was married to ‘Miss Sarah Cauldwell, eldest daughter of Mr. John Cauldwell, merchant of New York, formerly at Birmingham [England]’ (Staffordshire Advertiser, July 14, 1806). It also transpires that the Cauldwell family were involved in the crockery trade. John Cauldwell advertised metal buttons, stockings, and 40 crates of ‘assorted earthenware’ available from his 323, Pearl Street store in 1797 (Daily Advertiser, New York, June 3), and his brother Cornelius Cauldwell Jr, who arrived in New York in 1806 with his son, Ebenezer, proceeded to focus on the crockery trade. The genealogy of the Cauldwell family is well recorded because Jane Cauldwell, a daughter of Cornelius Cauldwell, married George Colgate in 1824, and thus became linked to the famous Colgate family of New York (Abbe and Howson, 1941, pp.365-70) (See Pedigree 2). The reason for the Cauldwells involvement in the crockery trade is interesting. Prior to arriving in New York, city directories show that a Cornelius Cauldwell was a dealer in earthenware and glass at 35, Dale end, Birmingham, England in 1800 and 1801 (Chapman, 1800-1). In addition, a ‘Staffordshire warehouse’ business called Lea and Cauldwell existed in Birmingham during the 1790s (Pye, 1791; Ward, 1798). This consisted of Jacob Lea of Longport, Staffordshire, a potter, with another member of the Cauldwell family, called Joseph (London Gazette, April 29, 1791). Perhaps not coincidentally, Joseph Cauldwell had married a Maria Lea in Birmingham in 1787.

In the manner of early English migrant potters who impacted on the development of the American ceramic industry (Hudgins, 2007, pp.203-8), some crockery importers and dealers had Staffordshire roots. For example, William W. Shirley was baptized in Hanley in 1797, and came from a family background of manufacturing in Hanley and Shelton, Staffordshire. He arrived in New York in 1818, aged 21 (Scott, 1981, p.280), and became a crockery importer (See Pedigree 3). In August 1820, William W. Shirley advertised a ‘New & Cheap China, Earthenware & Glass Store’ at 55, Maiden-
lane, and in 1821, a wholesale and retail ceramic and glass warehouse at ‘No.43 Maiden-lane, sign of the large Blue Pitcher’:

\[
\text{WHOLESALE & RETAIL} \\
\text{CHINA, EARTHEN & GLASS WAREHOUSE,} \\
\text{No.43 Maiden-lane, sign of the large} \\
\text{Blue Pitcher.} \\
\text{W. M. W. SHIRLEY has received by late} \\
\text{arrivals, and now opened, a general assort-} \\
\text{ment of the above articles, consisting of rich} \\
\text{blue Dinner, Tea and Coffee Services;} \\
\text{Pitchers of various sizes and colors; cut and} \\
\text{plain glass Tumblers, Wines, Decanters, &c.} \\
of numerous patterns…’
\]

New York Gazette, June 20, 1821.

The use of a shop-sign outside the establishment was a practice already adopted by English crockery dealers in London by the eighteenth century (Young, 1999, p.171). By 1824, Shirley’s business had expanded enough to warrant running what was called a ‘Wholesale Earthen Ware and Glass Store’ at 6, Fletcher, and the ‘Retail Store’, at 43, Maiden-lane. William Shirley was able to deal in crockery and glass from more than one New York store because he was in a co-partnership with a brother called Cephas Shirley, who arrived in New York in 1825, aged 31 (Scott, 1981, p. 281). Prior to his arrival in the United States, Cephas was involved in decorating and manufacturing ceramics (Pigot, 1818; Staffordshire Advertiser, June 24, 1820). A notice in The London Gazette concerning ‘Petitions of Insolvent Debtors’ also links Cephas Shirley to selling ceramics in London, England, with a Benjamin Shirley (September 23, 1823). The Shirley family established a number of ceramic and glass-related businesses, supporting Sheryllynne Haggerty’s notion of the ‘family nexus’. Jesse Shirley (who seems to be another brother of Cephas and William W. Shirley) was running a ‘fancy store’ in Philadelphia by the 1830s, and a nephew (also called William Shirley), became a ceramic importer in Baltimore from the 1840s (see Pedigree 3). As a result of these family ties, they were in a position to promote one another’s different businesses.

In 1844, William Shirley of Baltimore offered ‘100 crates printed and common ware’ from his South Calvert Street store, suggesting that he had become a prominent crockery dealer. His obituary draws attention to ties to Staffordshire and to other members of the family-network, some of whom had connections to the crockery trade:

‘He [William Shirley] was descended from the old Staffordshire family of Shirleys, one of the most ancient and respect families of England. He is survived by two sons – Messrs. Henry C. and W. W. Shirley – one daughter – Miss Hannah Shirley – and two grandsons– Capt. Joseph W. Shirley of Troop A. Maryland National Guard, and Mr. Harry Shirley. A brother, Mr. John Shirley, of San Francisco, also survives him’ (The Sun, Baltimore, December 20, 1900).

William’s son, Henry C. Shirley, joined the Baltimore crockery business, and an obituary of John Shirley of San Francisco, shows that he was involved with William Shirley’s Baltimore business, but was based in California from 1849, allegedly establishing the ‘first’ crockery house on the west coast (San Francisco Chronicle, February 12, 1911). The Shirley family, alone, created an elaborate network of ceramic importing businesses, branching from the east coast to pioneering western markets, and their involvement in the ceramics trade continued into the early twentieth century.

Thus far, coinciding with what trade and business historians have already determined, crockery importers and dealers in the United States where interconnected. Where, the crockery trade tends to differ from the views of other historians is the attitudes towards businesses being long-term family dynasties. For instance, a view expressed in Thomas Cochran’s Frontiers of Change: Early Industrialism in America, was that:

‘Few sons felt the obligation, common in continental Europe, to perpetuate the farm or firm as a family enterprise. Money, or ‘economic rationality’ rather than land and family
ties, was the common measuring rod of society. New opportunities drew away the ablest young men, and partnerships continually changed’ (1981, p.12-3).

This assessment of American businesses is not satisfactory when applied to the ceramic importers and dealers. One explanation could relate to what Frank Thistlewaite established when analysing the contribution of English migrant potters to the development of the American ceramics industry. Thistlewaite points how these families remained in control of manufacturing in the United States, relating this phenomenon to the ‘unusually high degree of craft skill’ that was involved in the trade (1958, p.277). One wonders if the same principle applies to crockery importers and sellers who had either family connections to those manufacturers remaining in the Staffordshire Potteries, or who had developed an intimate understanding of the business — both of the networks and the products that suited the market. For example, one crockery seller from St.Louis, Missouri, advertised how his stock, direct from the Potteries and suited to the country trade, was also ‘carefully selected and put up by experienced English packers’ (Illinois Weekly State Journal, August 7, 1845).

In 1860, when aged 68, Ebenezer Cauldwell of New York (the crockery dealer who originally came with his father from Birmingham, England) had a personal estate worth $25,000, and real estate worth $14,000 (1860 Census, New York). Ebenezer’s sons, Thomas G. and William A. Cauldwell, both became involved in crockery importing (See Pedigree 2). In 1860, when aged 42, William Shirley, the crockery dealer of Baltimore (and nephew of William W. Shirley of New York) had real estate worth $5,000 and a personal estate worth $3,000. After approximately 50 years of dealing in china and glass he amassed an estate worth $300,000 (1860 Baltimore Census; The Sun, Baltimore, December 27, 1900). His son also became a crockery dealer (See Pedigree 3). John Collamore jr. of Boston was described as a millionaire, due to involvement in the crockery trade (Boston Herald, August 17, 1887). Based on obituaries, the Collamore brothers of Boston and New York remained in the crockery business for decades. (See Pedigree 1). Henry Winkley of Philadelphia, was described as another millionaire crockery dealer, and in this position was able to make a significant contribution to the development of New England education, bequeathing sums such as $100,000 to Harvard, $50,000 to Williams College, and $30,000 to Amherst College, in Massachusetts, and $20,000 to Dartmouth College, in New Hampshire (Boston Daily Advertiser, August 11, 1888). Regardless of whether crockery dealers were from England, or were born in the United States, the most compelling reason for dynastic tendencies was profit.

The important question remains, however, whether the tightly-knit communities that were formed between crockery dealers, often with shared backgrounds and origins, ever impacted on ceramic marketing. Cephas Shirley advertised his ‘China Commission Warehouse’ on the basis of having a broad knowledge of the ‘crockery business’, initially derived from being a native of the Staffordshire Potteries and having spent twelve years in the United States. Cephas had previously assisted his brother William W. Shirley in New York in the 1820s, and then established his own crockery importing business in Philadelphia in the 1830s. Even his acquaintance with French goods, was accounted for because of his time spent in Paris:

‘CHINA COMMISSION WAREHOUSE, No.42 and 43 PHILADELPHIA ARCADE – C. SHIRLEY offers his services to Merchants and others who have consignments of LIVERPOOL CROCKERY or GLASS WARES and will attend to the sale or purchase of those articles for a small commission. The knowledge he possesses of the CROCKERY BUSINESS, being a native of the Staffordshire Potteries, England, and having resided in this country for twelve years, will doubtless enable him to be of service to those who may have such articles to dispose of. C. S. has also devoted his attention to the article of FRENCH CHINA. He has resided in Paris, France, and is acquainted with the French importers who reside in this country…’

Public Ledger, Philadelphia, June 29, 1836.
Cephas Shirley’s advertisement at least provides evidence of how this Englishman acquired more awareness of French ceramics and suppliers, since French porcelain was important to the upper end of the American market (Ewins, 1997, pp.46-50). Nevertheless, it is significant that Cephas Shirley’s advertisement declared how ‘the knowledge’ of the trade had stemmed from his own background.

**Politics and migration**

The relationship between backgrounds and the marketing of ceramics becomes more intriguing when one appreciates the variety of reasons for migration. R. jr. & J. Eddowes, advertised ceramics with political themes. Their father, Ralph Eddowes senior was described as a merchant originally from Chester, England, arriving in the United States in 1794 (*National Gazette*, Philadelphia, April 4, 1833). The following astonishing notice appeared in a variety of English newspapers, such as the *Derby Mercury* and the *Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette*, claiming that the Eddowes family left England in 1794 with property valued at £26,000:

**EMIGRATIONS TO AMERICA.**

...Ralph Eddowes, Esq. of Chester, with his wife and five children, accompanied by four other of the principal families of that city, sailed from Liverpool, about a fortnight ago, in the Hope, Captain Johnson. Mr. Eddowes has taken with him a property of twenty-six thousand pounds."

*Derby Mercury*, England, September 4, 1794.

After Ralph Eddowes arrived in Philadelphia he wrote letters to William Roscoe, the Liverpool lawyer, expressing fears that as a newcomer he could not afford to have a poor credit reputation (Haggerty, 2012, p.112). In spite of his concerns, Eddowes senior imported a variety of goods from Liverpool to Philadelphia, including some earthenware, from the mid-1790s (*Philadelphia Gazette*, July 25, 1796). The sons, Ralph jr. and John Eddowes, then advertised ceramics with a political theme in 1805, following a tendency of importers to begin to specialise in selling a limited range of merchandise:

**‘R. jun. & J. Eddowes’**

*Earthen-Ware and Glass-Store,*

No. 27, north and Third street.

H ave received by the Charlotte, and other late arrivals from Liverpool, a handsome assortment of articles in this line; among which are. Brown Line Dinner Sets; Jugs, with an elegant print of the President of the U. States, done by an eminent London artist.

They also offer to the notice of the public and of the ladies in particular. a few sets of English (burnished) China (the first imported here) of superior taste..."

Poulsom’s American Daily Advertiser, Philadelphia, November 6, 1805.

As established at the beginning of this paper, a tremendous amount has been written about Staffordshire wares depicting American subject-matter, since these wares were acquiring collectable status from the mid-1860s (Laidacker, 1939, p.125). However, the *R. & J. Eddowes’* advertisement referring to jugs printed with the American president has not apparently been identified by writers researching creamwares that depicted these American themes (McCaulay, 1942; Hyland, 2005, pp.55-65; Teitelman et al., 2010). The advertising of ceramics, in that period, tended only to use generic ware-type terminology. Presumably, given the date of the advertisement, the jugs would have depicted a portrait of Thomas Jefferson, and certainly creamware jugs incorporating portraits of Jefferson are recorded in collections and publications, and some of these have been, and can be, attributed to the Herculaneum Pottery, Liverpool (Teitelman et al. 2010, p.90). (See Figure 2).
Obviously, the more up-to-date interpretation of the wares adapted to suit American tastes is that they only represented a small proportion of wares that were manufactured in Liverpool, or Staffordshire. In one instance, an invoice of two hundred crates of Herculaneum Pottery, Liverpool, shipped to New York in 1802, describes only three percent of the total as being printed wares. The bulk of this invoice was for plain, or edged creamware, and even the printed wares were only identified with vague phrases, such as ‘Jugs copperplate’. As Robin Emmerson has succinctly argued when considering this Herculaneum invoice of 1802, ‘It is important for museums and collectors to realize that the relative proportions of the different types of wares that have survived intact are virtually in inverse proportion to their original share of the market’ (2010, p.250). While collecting may contribute to problems of understanding actual demand, ironically, R. & J. Eddowes’ advertisement (referring to jugs with a print of the United States President), grows in importance. These types of ceramics were a small amount of the market share, and were rarely advertised.

At this point, awareness of the actual identity and background of the Eddowes family acquires significance. Ralph Eddowes senior died in Philadelphia in 1833, aged 82. His obituary declared that his motivation for migrating to the United States was his ‘enthusiastic love of liberty’. Ralph Eddowes’ obituary explains how he associated with William Roscoe (the Liverpool lawyer and abolitionist), and Dr. James Currie (member of the Liverpool Literary Society). The obituary explains how ‘he instituted’ a legal suit which was taken to the House of Lords. The suit, which was won by the Eddowes’ party, was concerned with the rights of the citizens and freemen of Chester, England, to annually elect the mayor, the alderman, and their council (Chester Chronicle, April 23 and 30, 1790). However, the obituary indicates that as ‘an intolerant spirit succeeded the French Revolution’, the Eddowes family felt ‘threatened with persecution’, and they left England. In the United States, Ralph Eddowes formed a Christian Society following Unitarian views. He associated with Dr. Joseph Priestley, who also arrived in the United States in 1794, as the acclaimed advocate of the ‘rights of man’ (National Gazette, Philadelphia, April 4, 1833). Ralph Eddowes was taught by Dr. Joseph Priestley when he attended Nantwich school, Cheshire, in the late 1750s (Fox, 1833, pp.215-9). Ralph Eddowes jr., (who advertised the jugs with the image of the American President) was about twelve when the family emigrated.

As indicated at the beginning of this paper, early ceramic historians have focused on certain wares and their producers, with far less consideration of the role of crockery importers and dealers, unless assuming that they were ‘American dealers’ (Earle, 1892, p.142). In this instance, the background of the Eddowes shows that they were a disaffected English family who, interestingly, marketed politically orientated ceramics once in America. Due to their unusual backgrounds, could it not be suggested that this played a part in the motivation to market jugs depicting Thomas Jefferson? Certainly, Ralph Eddowes senior, wrote to Thomas Jefferson in 1807, enclosing two pamphlets concerning translations of the New Testament, and in his letter he explains how he was a pupil of Dr. Priestley, but had left England due to a civil matter, adding:

‘My attachment to the principles on which the Constitution of the U.S. is founded has gathered additional strength since the administration of it has been in your hands, and I consider it as an [sic] high honour & happiness that I can subscribe myself

            Your fellow Citizen
            Ra. Eddowes.’

(Thomas Jefferson Papers, November 14, 1807).

There appears to have been a deep admiration for Thomas Jefferson, and it transpires that Ralph Eddowes Jr., called one of his sons, Thomas Jefferson Eddowes (See Pedigree 4). In such circumstances, when examining the marketing approaches of crockery dealers in the United States, the discussion needs to be widened; not simply examining what the dealers were selling, or how the dealers were selling it, but why, crockery dealers were advertising it in the first place.

The possibility that the backgrounds and cultural identities of importers and dealers could influence what was sold and marketed, then goes further when it is recognised how crockery dealers actually commissioned designs that coincided with their views. In an article by Barbara Magid entitled, ‘Robert H. Miller, Importer: Alexandria and St.Louis’, it is mentioned how this dealer advertised ceramics aimed at the American market. Magid establishes that Robert H. Miller of Alexandria D.C. was a member of an established American, Quaker family (2008, pp.143-161), who
advertised ceramics depicting La Fayette and the surrender of Cornwallis (see Figure 3). His advertisement of July 1825, used the phrase, ‘Executed expressly for him, from a drawing sent out’. If this were the case, it would rather reinforce an interpretation of the more specialized ceramics being significant, though never more than just a small portion of the ceramic trade:

![Advertisement](image)

*Alexandria Gazette*, Virginia, July 4, 1825.

Figure 3 illustrates lustre jugs that relate to what was described in Robert Miller’s advertisement.

Later, in 1840, Robert Miller marketed, ‘supplies of ware with Harrison and Log Cabin engravings, from designs sent to the Potteries by himself’. (The image of a log cabin was used in General William Harrison’s presidential campaign, to stress his down-to-earth values). The link between Robert Miller’s own views, and what he marketed, is indicated by an 1840 advertisement which stipulated that ‘Whig Merchants’ would be, ‘supplied upon the “Credit System” at reasonable prices, in time to celebrate the approaching triumph of correct principles’ (*Alexandria Gazette*, Virginia, October 1840). In other words, Miller marketed politically-related ceramics which reflected his own political views, and this also impacted on his willingness to grant credit to other Whig merchants. Thus, examining marketing strategy of the actual political interests of importers reveals other interpretations of why ceramic designs were produced for the American market.

**Growth**

In another instance, a crockery dealer named Thomas F. Field, advertised ceramics ‘expressly to his order’, that reflected his own business opportunities. Based on Field’s obituary of 1877, he had been ‘engaged in the crockery business when a mere lad, at Utica, N.Y.’, and had died at his Brooklyn residence, aged 84 (*New York Tribune*, September 15, 1877). Ceramics impressed with ‘Field & Clark, Utica’ (referring to a partner called Theodore Clark) exist in collections, and in the case of the ceramic sugar (see Figure 4 and 5), it demonstrates a broader demand for blue printed rural scenes, apart from American scenery.

Initially, Field & Clark advertised ceramic designs relating to how advances in transportation were presenting new opportunities for economic progress. In 1824, it was announced that pitchers and plates, had been ‘ordered by’ them, and were now available. These celebrated the opening of the Erie Canal, enthusiastically described by Field & Clark as creating an ‘unbroken water conveyance…between this [Utica] and Liverpool’ (*Statesman*, New York, June 15, 1824). Pitchers and plates exist that mention De Witt Clinton, the ‘Late Governor’ of New York, who had been a significant driving force behind the construction of the Erie Canal (See Figure 6). Field’s obituary also refers to how in 1824, ‘he made the first transportation of crockery ever carried on the Erie Canal.’ (*New York Tribune*, September 15, 1877). By 1829, the partnership of Field & Clark was dissolved, and in 1832, Thomas Field moved his crockery business to New York, where he remained (McCaulley, 1944, p.297). While there has been growing awareness of how the Erie Canal ceramic design was orchestrated by Field & Clark of Utica (*Patriotic America*, 2011), Thomas Field’s wider religious views and socio-political interests become relevant at this point.
Religion and Orthodox Crockery

When Thomas F. Field, ‘merchant of Utica’ married ‘Miss Mary Ann, eldest daughter of David Roberts of this city’, the ceremony was officiated by the Rev. John Williams at the Baptist Church, Oliver Street, New York (National Advocate, New York, April 9, 1823). Members of the Hewitt and Cauldwell families (other crockery dealers in New York) were also married by the same Baptist minister. At a meeting held at the Methodist Chapel, Utica on 18th February 1828, Thomas Field was appointed as one of the commissioners resolved to prevent violation of the Sabbath (Connecticut Observer, Hartford, March 3, 1828). Field became President of the Baptist Central Tract Society of Utica, founded in April 1828, and secretary of the Oneida Bible Society of New York (New-York Baptist Register, Utica, November 28, 1828; Philadelphian, May 23, 1829). The Baptist Central Tract Society claimed to have distributed 150,000 tracts in 1830, and Field was still active as the President in 1831 (Christian Watchman, Boston, February 12, 1830).

Understanding Thomas Field’s religious convictions helps to account for his evolving marketing strategy. In May 1833, it was commented on in an article entitled ‘Orthodox Crockery’ in the Trumpet and Universalist Magazine, of Boston, that Thomas Field was launching a ceramic design referring to the Scripture. In this article, Field was reported as stating that ‘he has contracted for the manufacture of plates of all sizes’, and that the ‘manufacturers are highly delighted with the pattern’. The orthodox crockery referred to was actually a pattern entitled ‘Millennium’ and was advertised by Thomas F. Field from June 1833 (see Figure 7). His advertising reinforces how this pattern was ‘made from designs prepared by himself’:

‘MILLENNIUM EARTHENWARE ARRIVED – The Subscriber takes the liberty to solicit public patronage for a new and beautiful pattern of Earthenware Plates, of all sizes, made from designs prepared by himself principally from Scripture illustrations. The pattern is received from Staffordshire by the Spring’s arrival and far exceeds his expectations.

The following is a brief description if it. On the top of the plate is the All-seeing Eye, shedding rays of light down upon the world. Beneath, is the Bible opened to Isaiah, 11th Chapter, 6th Verse: next in order, is a Dove descending with an Olive Branch, and the words “Peace on Earth,” the centre is filled up with a landscape, and a group of figures spoken of in the verse representing the Millennium, or all nature harmonized and returned to its native innocence in which the Creator left it previous to the fall of man; in the Garden of Eden, at the foot, is the figure of a supplicant, with the petition “Give us this day our daily bread.” The whole surrounded with a border of wheat sheaves, fruits, and flowers. Although a considerable extra expense has been incurred in getting up the pattern, it will be sold at the same prices as ordinary patterns of blue printed ware.

The above can be obtained only at the China, Glass, and Earthen Ware Store, No. 200 Greenwich St. between Barclay and Vesey Sts, New York, where it will be sent for merchants to any other store...

Orders by letter faithfully executed...THOMAS F. FIELD.’

New York Observer, June 8, 1833.

Field’s designs received mixed reviews. The Trumpet and Universalist Magazine was far from enthusiastic, cynically declaring that, whilst ‘There will be much money made on this new importation’, whether it was appropriate, was another matter. Their reticence was made clear in the final part of article, reinforced with a quote from Revelations, as follows:

‘Merchants may make themselves rich at first in the traffic of modern Babylon, but if the light of truth continues to spread as it has done, they shall “stand afar off for the fear of her torment, saying alas! alas! that great city Babylon, that mighty city! for in one hour is thy judgment come. And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for no man bugeth their merchandize any more.” ’ Rev. xviii, 10,11.’ (Trumpet and Universalist Magazine, Boston, May 11, 1833).
One writer in the *Liberator*, Boston, pointed out how Jehovah’s command was, ‘thou shall not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness, of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath…’. The article, entitled ‘Moral’, continued as:

‘I do not know, Mr. Editor, that the same effect would be produced on every one, as there was produced on me the other day, in receiving a Sabbath-noon refreshment on a millennium plate. I was pleased with those striking emblems of divine promise…but the presentment of the EYE appeared as exception. I could but reflect, this is just like such creatures as we are. We can advance but one step at a time; and that step very often needs mending…’  
- *Western Recorder* (*Liberator*, Boston, September 21, 1833).

This writer was not entirely convinced by all of the imagery incorporated into the design. Alternatively, an article entitled ‘The Millennium Ware’ appeared in the *Christian Watchman*, Boston in 1833, argued how ‘at one time it was falsely represented by certain editors.’ The article included a lengthy description of the imagery, but concluded that the design was the result of ‘a worthy and enterprising importer’, and that a quantity of this ware was available for purchase from James S. Barbour’s store on Commercial Street, Boston (*Christian Watchman*, Boston, August 23, 1833). James S. Barbour’s own advertising for his crockery store does not draw attention to selling the so-called ‘Millennium’ plate. However, when James S. Barbour married Miss Louisa Harrod in Boston, during July 1835, it was officiated by the Rev. William Hague, pastor of the First Baptist Church and Society of Boston, who had previously been the pastor of the Baptist Church of Utica (*Columbian Centinel*, Boston, July 11, 1835). Thomas F. Field’s Millennium plate was sold through a crockery dealer who was a Baptist, and one wonders if the link between Field of New York and Barbour of Boston came about because the Rev. William Hague had links to Utica, where Thomas Field had previously operated as a crockery dealer in the 1820s. In this respect, the distribution of the Field’s ‘Millennium’ plate mirrors Stanley Chapman’s structural analysis of the transatlantic economy where he argued:

‘…so long as communication between trading centres continued to be slow and uncertain, the only way in which merchants could repose confidence in their correspondents’ decision making was to employ members of their own families, or, failing that, the ‘extended family’ of co-religionists’ (1992, p.93).

The advertising of Ezra Chamberlin & Son of Boston referred to the ‘Millennium crockery ware’ as a ‘celebrated’ design (*Christian Watchman*, Boston, September 6, 1833). When Ezra Chamberlin died in 1854 aged 76, his obituary establishes that he had, not only been active in business, but also a deacon of the Second Baptist Church of Boston (*Manufacturers’ and Farmers’ Journal*, Providence, RI, December 28, 1854). Without examining the wider backgrounds of the importers, the reason why certain patterns of distribution emerged is not fully appreciated.

The sellers who chose to market the ‘Millennium’ design had connections to the Baptist faith, and interestingly, when a notice appeared in a New Jersey newspaper entitled ‘What Next?’ it mentions how Field’s design had been advertised in ‘the religious papers’:

‘What Next?-A pious trader in N.Y. advertises in the religious papers, “Millennium Earthed Ware dinner Plates! of all sizes, made from designs prepared by himself, from scripture”’.  
*Jerseyman*, Morristown, New Jersey, June 19, 1833.

One advertisement placed by Edward E. Huggins of New Haven, Connecticut, emphasised that he had ‘Millennium Crockery’ available. Huggins does not appear to have any obvious connections to the Baptists, but one possible explanation is that his store, and the Baptist Church, were both on Chapel Street:
Thus, the Millennium design was commissioned by a Baptist, sold by other Baptists, and even sold in locations were it would be easily accessible to a Baptist congregation.

**Slavery**

It is well known that Baptists in northern America were traditionally strong campaigners against slavery, and, once again, it may be suggested that Field’s own views impacted on his marketing (Lindman, 2008, p.142). In 1838, Field advertised ‘Blue Printed Earthenware, made expressly to his order’ available from his New York outlet and which drew attention to the American Constitution:

‘... The subscriber, at 87 Water street, has just received and for sale, Blue Printed Earthenware, made expressly to his order, of a new pattern, containing suitable devices, with the following article from the Constitution of the United States: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, of abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.” THOMAS F FIELD...’

The Emancipator, New York, October 11, 1838.

The above advertisement uses the phrase ‘Congress shall make no law...’ and this actually appears on blue printed wares commemorating the death of Rev. Elijah Lovejoy, the proprietor of an abolitionist newspaper at Alton, Illinois, who was murdered by a pro-slavery mob in 1837 (see Figure 8). This design may be contrasted with what was also described as ‘Constitutional Ware’ in The Emancipator, New York, on 11th October, 1838. The Emancipator included a more detailed description of the design, and poignantly mentions a slave kneeling at the figure of liberty pointing to a printing press (see Figure 9).
Here, it is apparent how Baptist values impacted on the behaviour of this importer, just as Max Weber’s *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* suggested that the attitudes of Calvinism, Methodism and the Baptists influenced the rise of capitalism, and even, attitudes towards consumption (1930: reprint 2010, p.115). In the nineteenth century, the evolution of the advertising of ceramics in the United States could be more elaborate than simply providing product information concerning an ever increasing plethora of imported merchandise. In 1841, Thomas Field was described as President of the Baptist Anti-Slavery Society of New York (Christian Reflector, June 16, 1841), emphasising how his socio-political and religious views mirror what he promoted.

Early American ceramic historians developed various unsubstantiated theories as to why this anti-slavery design was produced, which invariably ignored the actual role of the importer and dealer in the process of design-development. For instance, in 1892, Alice Morse Earle stated:

‘It is asserted that the pieces bearing this design were the gift of the English Anti-Slavery Society to the American Abolitionists, shortly after the death of Lovejoy; that they were sold at auction in New York, and the proceeds devoted to the objects of the Society of Abolitionists. If this account is true, these plates are certainly among the most interesting relics of those interesting days’ (1892, p.333).

In 1903, N. Hudson Moore, another early American ceramic historian, also argued that this ceramic design was a gift from English anti-slavery supporters to the American Abolitionists, and even indicated that these plates had been targeted for forgery (Hudson Moore, 1903, p.79). Ellouise Larsen (the author who produced the most comprehensive survey of printed wares destined for the American market) believed that the design was certainly manufactured in Staffordshire, and used to raise money for freeing slaves in the United States (1939: revised 1950, p.242).

But, there is nothing in Field’s advertisements that indicate that any profits were syphoned-off in this way. Nor, is there evidence to support the theory that it was a gift from the English Anti-Slavery Society to be sold at auction, although this interpretation still persists in the publications of more modern, American ceramic and cultural historians (Klamkin, 1973, p.102-4; Heneghan, 2003, p.14). Sam Margolin’s ‘And Freedom to the Slave: Antislavery Ceramics, 1787-1865’ of 2002, repeated the idea of the wares being donated by British abolitionists to raise money for the anti-slavery cause, and also points out how these were faked in the late nineteenth century. The narrative expressed by Margolin is that the Rev. Elijah Lovejoy was a Presbyterian minister and editor, whose murder created a wave of indignation that led to his becoming a martyr who the ‘Staffordshire potters memorialized’ in their wares (2002, p.95-7).
However, the contemporaneous interpretation, pieced together from newspaper notices and advertisements, is rather different. In an article in Utica’s abolitionist newspaper, *The Friend of Man*, it was reported that specimens of Field’s plates had been discovered at the Anti-Slavery Office, New York, in October 1838. The newspaper article (presumably written by the editor), explained how he had proceeded to Field’s New York store at 87, Water Street to purchase a dozen plates for his own use. The writer also believed that, ‘The pattern was made to his [Thomas Field] own order, and, so far as we know, he is the only man in his business who has dared to put his finger upon the “peculiar institution”.’ (*The Friend of Man*, Utica, October 17, 1838). One comment, which appeared under the heading of ‘Scraps’, in a Hartford, Connecticut newspaper mentions how Messrs. Field & Co., were advertising ‘anti-slavery earthenware’, but then asked, ‘What sort of an animal is that?’ (*Times*, September 21, 1839). Based on these comments, it is unclear if there was sufficient demand for the design to benefit slaves. Thus, it is important to recognise how the design was at that time considered to be touching on an issue of acute socio-political tension, rather than Field (or the Staffordshire manufacturer) identifying some marketing opportunity. The production of fakes of the Lovejoy plate was probably due to how the collecting of Staffordshire wares resulted in a demand for copies, or fakes, of these rarer items.

Awareness of how the socio-political views of this crockery importer influenced what Thomas Field commissioned, and what was marketed, complicates John Styles argument that ‘specifications were set predominately by the merchants and manufacturers’ in response to ‘changes in fashion...’ (1993, p.528). The anti-slavery plate may not have been in enormous demand, but the importance to contemporaries was, according to *The Friend of Man*, that dining tables were furnished with this crockery, and the plates could at least silently preach abolitionism to guests and children ‘on sound principles’ (October 17, 1838). Clearly, it was envisaged that the Lovejoy design was for use and not merely for display, and one is reminded of Max Weber’s observation that the justification of consumption within a Protestant ethic was often practicality, rather than for mere pleasure (1930: reprint 2010, pp.115-6). Field continued to advertise his ‘Anti-Slavery Earthenware’ plates and pitchers in the New York *Spectator* from March to June 1839:

‘ANTI - SLAVERY EARTHENWARE –
Plates and pitchers, and a general assortment of China, glass and earthenware, of the latest and best patterns for sale. Country merchants who regard the quality of ware will find it to their interest to call and examine my stock at 87 Water street. THOMAS F. FIELD...’

*Spectator*, New York, March 18, 1839.

**Shocking work among the crockery**

An actual analysis of Thomas F. Field’s advertisements for the anti-slavery design makes it doubtful that he was responding to American demand. Importers and dealers were socially and culturally complex individuals, adding weight to Sherylynnne Haggerty’s suggestion that merchants ‘were not pure “economic men”.’ (2012, p.236). Field had his views, and it was even observed in a Boston newspaper of 1834, that he courageously marketed his New York business as an ‘Abolition China Store’, long before the death of Rev. Elijah Lovejoy in 1837. The reference to an advertisement in the *Liberator*, Boston, August 30, 1834, to what the mob might do to Field’s crockery store, is a poignant reminder of how the views of merchants was not necessarily in unison with attitudes of the consumers:

‘Thomas F. Field, of New York, “offers for sale
an amalgamation of colors and qualities of French,
English, and India China Tea...” and styles his
store an “Abolition China Store.” If the mob scent
out this amalgamation, there may be shocking work
among the crockery.’

*Liberator*, Boston, August 30, 1834.

In fact, apart from being described as the ‘oldest crockery merchant or dealer in this State’, Thomas F. Field’s obituary indicates that he ‘was at one time prominent in municipal politics, first as
a Whig, then as an Abolitionist, and finally, as a Republican’ (*New York Tribune*, September 15, 1877). When Thomas Field stood as an Abolition candidate for Mayor of New York in 1842, he received only 136 votes, whereas the Democrat candidate received over 20,000 votes, and the Whig, over 18,000 (*Albany Argus*, Albany, April 22, 1842). As indicated above, some crockery importers accumulated significant fortunes because of involvement in the trade, but Thomas Field’s personal estate was valued at only $500 in 1860 and $1,500, in 1870 (1860 and 1870 Census, Brooklyn, New York).

If the advertising of importers and dealers in America could reflect the individual concerns of the sellers, it then becomes necessary to theorise why this became the case. Was it because, with the inevitable geographical divide between the Staffordshire manufacturers and the American market, producers were obliged to respond to requests from importers and dealers, and therefore, American marketing began to evolve in ways that reflected this situation? Did the entrepreneurial nature of the United States encourage marketing to become more individualised? Could it be argued that the varied and unusual qualities of ceramic advertising in the United States reflect the diversity of cultures, sharing or occupying varied points of view? Crockery dealers might be Americans, and pro-American, or from England, but keen to assimilate, or as outsiders, perhaps wishing to comment on issues, such as the continuation of slavery. A provisional theory might be that the marketing examined above became a reflection of different cultural identities and, more significantly perhaps, it was possible to express these different ideologies within American society. It is interesting how advertisements for ‘Free Labor’ stores (often owned by Quakers) have also been identified in a Philadelphian abolitionist newspaper in the 1830s (Glickman, 2004).

**Summary**

Whilst there is evidence that Staffordshire manufacturers could initiate the production of designs for the American market (*Archival, Ridgway diary, 1822*), surveying actual advertising provides a deeper understanding of the relationship between production and demand. New layers of complexity are added to ceramic research that has previously been weighted only towards the role of producers, or to Neil McKendrick’s analysis of Wedgwood’s skilful marketing, or even John Styles’ suggestion that manufacturers and merchants were more engaged in a process of responding to consumer-demand. Importers and dealers could also initiate production, and more importantly, this was not necessarily responding to demand. Thus, this paper highlights the importance of examining consumption from the sales’ perspective. American newspapers advertisements can provide significant insights into the backgrounds and beliefs of the ceramic importers.

References to the advertising of ceramics specifically aimed at the American market were rare, even though these ware-types have been hugely collected. However, the Eddowes family’s advertising of jugs with an image of the US President, is of interest when it is realized that this family migrated for political reasons. In this instance, perhaps the promotion of American subjects was not wholly motivated by a business opportunity, but reflects their own attempts at assimilation. Families involved in the crockery business might be migrants, but some clearly saw themselves as American. One member of the Cauldwell family (crockery importers of New York, who were natives of Birmingham, England), fought in the Anglo-American War. John Cauldwell Jr., whose birth was recorded at the Baptist Meeting House, Cannon Street, Birmingham in 1791, became an Officer in United States’ Army, but died at Fort George, Niagara, in 1813 (*Commercial Advertiser*, New York, September 1, 1813). (See Pedigree 2). However, when Cephas Shirley promoted his crockery business in Philadelphia it was on the basis that his own business abilities were enhanced by being a native of the Potteries. The reason why Robert H. Miller of Alexandria D.C. promoted ceramics referring to President Harrison was because he had Whig sympathies.

Overall, this type of research has to be undertaken to redress the misreading of what certain ceramic objects may signify. Even from a 21st century perspective, David Fischer has interpreted the Lovejoy ceramic design (now shown to be commissioned by Thomas F. Field) as one example of the ‘outpouring’ of imagery concerned with abolition and civil liberties after Elijah Lovejoy’s murder in 1837 (2005, p.280), assuming that the production of the physical object was an automatic reflection of attitudes. In reality, the comments of contemporaries infer that the subject was a controversial one, and when it is appreciated that the Lovejoy design was actually orchestrated by an importer originally from England, it is perhaps more akin to an outsider making a comment about slavery in the United States (1870 Census, Brooklyn, New York). Therefore, considering the origins, backgrounds and
identities of crockery importers and dealers begins to grow in significance, since what was advertised did not simply emanate from the Staffordshire manufacturer, or was responding to the perceived demands of the consumer.
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Figure 3: Jugs, earthenware, lustre with printed and enamel decoration depicting front and back portrait of General ‘La Fayette’, and the surrender of Cornwallis at York Town. Unmarked, Staffordshire, c1825. Courtesy of, Private collection.
Figure 4: Sugar, earthenware, blue printed, depicting two fishermen beside a ruin. This printed pattern occurs on wares manufactured by Enoch Wood & Sons, Burslem, Staffordshire, c1820s. Impressed mark ‘Field & Clark’. See Figure 5. Courtesy of, Private collection.

Figure 5: Backstamp of Figure 4. Impressed ‘Field and Clark, Importers of Earthenware, Utica’. (Impressed mark distorted). The Field & Clark partnership existed from c.1822-1829. Courtesy of, Private collection.
Figure 6: Plate, earthenware, blue printed, ‘The Grand Erie Canal, A Splendid monument…’.
Wares with this inscription were advertised by Field & Clark of Utica, Statesman, New York, June

Figure 7: Two plates, earthenware, brown and pink printed, ‘Peace on Earth’.
Printed mark on back, ‘Millenium’[sic]. Advertised by Thomas F. Field of
Figure 8: Detail of Figure 8, depicting a printing press, a slave, and marked ‘LOVEJOY, The First Martyr to American LIBERTY, ALTON NOV.7. 1837.’ Courtesy of, Private collection.

Figure 9: Plate, earthenware, blue printed, ‘Lovejoy… Congress shall make no law…’. Advertised by Thomas F. Field of New York, in 1838. Unmarked, Staffordshire, c1838. Courtesy of, Private collection.
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Pedigree 1: The Collamore family of Boston and New York.

John Collamar [sic] of Scituate, Massachusetts. = Margret ...

John Collamore  
b. 1742, Scituate.  
Capt. Enoch Collamore = Hannah ...
b. 1745, Scituate.  
d. 1824.

Col. John Collamore = 1. Michal  
b. 1775, Scituate.  
d. 1859, aged 83,  
Scituate.  
2. Polly  
2. Polly

Enoch Collamore  
b. 1782, Scituate.  
Anthony Collamore  
b. 1787, Scituate.

Gilman Collamore  
b. 1789, Scituate.  
d. 1823.  
Formed a co-partnership  
with Joseph S. Hastings, 1810.  
Dissolved 1813.

Horace Collamore  
b. 1791, Scituate.  
Collamore & Churchill.

John Collamore jr  
b. 1802  
d. April 1884.

Ebenezer Collamore  
b. 1809  
d. March 1884.

Andrew Collamore  
b. 1817, Scituate.  
d. 1846.

Davis Collamore  
b. 1820, Scituate.  
d. 1887.

George Collamore  
b. 1828, Scituate.  
d. 1881.

William Collamore  
b. 1830, Scituate.  
Gilman Collamore  
b. 1834, Scituate.  
d. 1888.

Gilman Collamore  
b. 1817, Boston.

Churchill & Collamore from 1824, Boston.

Key: Names in bold, had connections to dealing in ceramics in the USA.

Cornelius Cauldwell, = Jane Edwardley of Wednesbury, Staffordshire.
Linen-draaper. m. 1760, Birmingham, England.

John Cauldwell = Deborah Low
b. c1763, Birmingham. m. April 1787, Birmingham.
d. 1822, New York.

Joseph Cauldwell = Maria Lea
b. 1766, Birmingham. m. October 1787, Birmingham.

Cornelius Cauldwell jr. = Elizabeth Thompson
b. 1770, Birmingham. m. 1789, Birmingham.
d. 1818, New York.

Sarah = 1. William Hewitt, m. 1806, New York, son of Mr. Hewitt, Lane Cauldwell, End, Staffordshire.
b. 1788, Birmingham.

Jane = Charles L. Caucalwell Roberts
b. 1791, Birmingham. m. 1825, Fort George, Niagara.
d. 1843, New York.

John Cauldwell = Cornelius J. Cauldwell
b. 1791, Birmingham. d. 1875, New York.


2. Maria Alburris.


Cornelius J. Cauldwell
b. 1824, New York.

Ebenezer Cauldwell = William Alburtus Cauldwell
b. 1822-1858.

(b. 1827-1893, New York).

Key: Names in italics, dealt in ceramics in England. Names in bold-italics, dealt in ceramics in England and then in USA. Names in bold, dealt in ceramics in USA.

1 Deborah Lea, sister of Maria Lea according to Abbe and Howson’s Robert Colgate: The Immigrant: A Genealogy of the New York Colgates and Some Associated Lines, 1941. However, according to Birmingham parish records, the name appears as ‘Deborah Law’. 

William Shirley = Hannah ...

of Shelton.

Jesse Shirley = Eliza Cephas Shirley*
bapt. 1786, Hanley... bap. 1793, Hanley. d. 1839, Philadelphia.

Benjamin Shirley = Eliza Garrick
d. 1865, New York.

William Wright Shirley = Eliza Garrick Coddington,
bapt. 1797, Hanley. m. 1818, New York.
d. 1865, New York.

William Shirley = Ellen G. Davis
b. 1816, London. m. 1840, Baltimore.
d. 1900, Baltimore.

Shirley & Robert Cook,
Calvert St., Baltimore.

John Shirley
m. 1840, Baltimore. d. 1911, San Francisco.

William Faircio Shirley
d. 1903, New York.

William W. Shirley
d. 1917, Baltimore.

Henry C. Shirley
Baltimore.

no children

* Cephas Shirley was initially in New York, followed by Philadelphia in c1836, and then resided on Calvert St., Baltimore.

Key: Name in italics, had connections to ceramic manufacturing. Names in bold-italics, had connections to manufacturing in Staffordshire, and then dealing in ceramics when in the USA. Names in bold, dealt in ceramics in the USA.

---

Pedigree 4: The Eddowes family of Cheshire and Philadelphia.

John Eddowes, grocer/tobacconist.

John Kenrick esq. of Wynn Hall, Denbighshire, Wales.

Ralph Eddowes, merchant.
b. Chester, 1751.
Educated at Nantwich by Dr. Priestley.
Moved to America in 1794, d. Phil., 1833.
A founding member of the First Unitarian Church of Philadelphia.

Sarah Kenrick
m. 1777.

Rev. Timothy Kenrick

Ralph Eddowes Jr
b. 1784, Chester, Eng. d. 1841, Phil. m. 1820, Phil.

Louisa
Thornton

John Eddowes
b. 1785, bpt 1786, Chester. 1850 Census, described as a 'notary public'.
d. 1871, Geneva, Illinois.

Lydia Naudain
m. 1816, Delaware.

Roger Eddowes
b. Chester, 1792.
Farmer, Moorland Township, Pennsylvania.
d. 1856.

Ralph Eddowes III
Thomas Jefferson Eddowes
(1821-98) (1825-1893)
Wheelwright, Phil., Bookbinder, Phil., in 1850.
in 1850.

Timothy Eddowes, preacher, Geneva, Illinois.

(thirteen children, in total).

Key: Names in bold, involved in dealing in ceramics in the USA.