

Southampton French Quarter 1382

Specialist Report Download F2: Clay tobacco pipes

By David A. Higgins

Introduction

This report deals with the clay tobacco pipes recovered by Oxford Archaeology (OA) during excavations at Southampton French Quarter that were commissioned CgMs Consulting, acting on behalf of Linden Homes, in advance of redevelopment. The site covered approximately 0.5 ha and was bounded to the west and east by the historic frontages of French St and the High St (formerly English St). The site code used for these excavations was SOU 1382. An assessment report on the pipes was submitted by the author on 20.3.07. The pipes were re-examined and this final report prepared between November 2008 and March 2009.

Material recovered

A total of 1,095 fragments of clay tobacco pipe were recovered from the excavations, comprising 235 bowl fragments, 809 stem fragments and 51 mouthpieces. The assemblage includes a total of 67 marked pipes, comprising 34 stamped and 33 moulded examples. There are six stamped heel marks dating from the seventeenth century but most of the other examples are early eighteenth-century stem stamps. These later stamped marks include five Dutch examples (two heel stamps and three stem stamps). The 33 moulded marks are of eighteenth century or later date. There are also 36 fragments with moulded decoration, which date from the later eighteenth century onwards.

The pipe fragments from the site as a whole range from the early seventeenth century through to the early twentieth century and were recovered from a total of 100 different contexts. Most of the groups (88 contexts) were relatively small, comprising 20 fragments or less. The 12 larger groups were almost all from the fills of pits or other features. There were 10 groups with between 20 and 72 fragments and two larger groups containing 127 and 277 fragments (contexts 6438 and 3641 respectively). These pit groups provide important reference points for a study of the pipes from Southampton and the most significant of them are discussed in more detail below. All of the fragments from this site have been examined and details of each context group logged onto an Excel table, a copy of which is included here as Appendix 1.

The pipes in relation to the site

Clay tobacco pipes provide one of the most accurate and sensitive means of dating Post-Medieval deposits, particularly if they are present in some numbers. The most significant deposits/features are discussed below. Each entry starts with the context number(s), followed by brackets giving the numbers of bowl, stem and mouthpiece from each context, together with the total. For example, (3/6/0 = 9) shows that a total of nine fragments of pipe, comprising three fragments of bowl and six stems, is present. This allows the size and nature of each group to be easily seen before it is discussed. Context groups are discussed together where they come from a common feature, such as a pit fill. The nature of the feature and its respective number are given after the brackets containing the numbers of pipe fragments.

60 & 139 (3/1/0 = 4) Fills of Cess Pit (166). Although this cess pit only produced four fragments of pipe, three of these are bowls and all were produced by George Harding, who was operating in Southampton from c1843-71. All of the bowl forms are different (Figs 47, 48 & 51) and they provide a good date for the group. See also contexts 133 and 141 below.

133 & 141 (11/24/4 = 37) Fills of Cess Pit (169). The fills of this cess pit produced 11 bowl fragments including seven spurs, all of which were marked GH for George Harding of Southampton, who operated from c1843-71. At least three different styles of Harding's pipes are represented (Figs 48, 52, 53) while the fact that all the identifiable pipes were made by him shows his dominant position in supplying the mid nineteenth century market. A cross-join was found between contexts 133 and 141. This group is contemporary with 60 / 139 above and includes a pipe that had been reused in a broken and shortened form (Fig 48). This may well suggest a poorer household, while the two cess pits (166 & 169) represent a mid-nineteenth century phase of activity on the site. They also provide an important reference group for Harding's products.

3413 (2/3/0 = 5) Demolition Layer. This context includes a bowl with a gauntlet mark (Fig 3) as well as what may be part of a seventeenth century export style bowl. Just a thick stem survives with part of the bowl cavity, but not enough to be absolutely certain whether it was a spurless export style or not.

3640 (7/29/2 = 39) Fill of Tank (3549). Although there are one or two residual pieces, this is basically an excellent early eighteenth-century group with several complete bowls and stem fragments of up to 175mm in length. There are five marked stems representing four different makers, all of whom were working between about 1690 and 1750 (CAR/TER, THO/MAS/DOD, RICH/ARD.S/AYER (2 examples) and RVB/SYD/NEY; Figs 13, 14, 17 & 22 respectively). The marks fit best with a general 1700-1740 deposition, with 1710-30 being the most likely date for this group. It is interesting to contrast the relatively elegant and burnished pipes made by Sayer in East Woodhay with the thicker unburnished stems made by Dod and Sydney. There is also a relatively poor quality unmarked and unburnished spur pipe that was probably made locally (Fig 32). One unusual find is an unmarked heel bowl that is not of a local style (Fig 30). Although just possibly a Wiltshire form, this example is best matched in Somerset and Devon and it might reflect coastal trade coming into Southampton.

3641 (61/202/14 = 277) Fill of Tank (3549). A large and very consistent group including large fragments of up to 135mm in length. There are a few residual bowl forms ranging from c1610-60 (e.g., Fig 2) but the majority all fall within the c1660-80 range (e.g., Figs 6-7), providing a close and reliable date for this deposit. About 40 recognisable bowl forms are present, most of which are of typical styles for the period as illustrated by Atkinson (1975, Figs 276-7). The excavated pipes are almost all heel forms with just four spur types being represented (10%). There are, however, a significant number of west-country style bowls with a pronounced 'chinned' form (e.g., Figs 26-29). There are some eight to ten examples of this style, some of which have the rim cut back towards the stem, like an example from 3640 (Fig 30). These bowls represent just over 20% of the group as a whole, and so form a significant element of it. This style of bowl is much more typical of Wiltshire, Somerset and Devon than it is of Hampshire. The Wiltshire examples are usually marked, whereas these are all plain, which is more characteristic of the pipes produced in Devon. The examples from this pit seem most likely to either coastal trade from the west or the hitherto unrecorded local production of this style in the Southampton area itself. Only three stamped marks are present in this context (about 7.5%); a running fox (Fig 2), a gauntlet (Fig 6) and part of a heart-shaped with stars above the (damaged) lettering, which seems to comprise a large letter W (Fig 7). An example of this W mark from Bridge St, Christchurch, occurs on a chinned 'west-country' style bowl of c1660-80 with a possible place of manufacture being given as Salisbury (Markell notes, National Pipe Archive), although this author has been unable to find parallels for this mark from there. The fox pipe is also likely to have been produced in Salisbury, while the gauntlet marks appear to have been produced in a number of centres, which probably

include places such as Salisbury and Winchester. The range and nature of the pipes in this context are similar to those from 3642.

3642 (17/54/1 = 72) Fill of Tank (3549). A large, fresh looking group, with pieces of up to 150mm in length before being recently broken. There are one or two bowl forms of c1640-60 including two West Country forms (e.g., Fig 25), one of which has a substantially complete stem (bowl chipped but similar to the illustrated example). The majority of the bowls, however, date from c1660-80, suggesting a good, contemporary deposit of this date. There is one pipe with a gauntlet stamp (Fig 5) and the overall range of forms is very similar to those from 3641.

3647 (15/3/0 = 18) Pit Fill (3635). An odd group in that a range of large, fresh looking bowl fragment was recovered, often with long surviving stem sections, suggesting a little disturbed deposit. The earliest pipe dates from c1640-70 and has an incuse IEF/FRY.H/VNT stamp on its heel (Fig 1). There is also a crudely made spur pipe of c1660-80 with 164mm of surviving stem. The majority of the bowls, however, date from around 1680-1740, so that about a century of pipes is represented overall (seven heel and seven spur forms are present in total). It is unfortunate that virtually no stems were collected from this deposit, since the maker's marks that are likely to have been on them would have helped date the final closing of this deposit. The two marks recovered were made by Richard Hoar of Portsmouth (Fig 15), who is recorded in parish register entries from 1705-37 (Fox & Hall 1979, 16-17), and one of the Browne's of Southampton (Fig 11), who were working during the first half of the eighteenth century. The closing date for this fill is likely to be around 1700-40, but it is unclear why such fresh looking pipe fragments span such a wide date range (c1650-1750).

4148 (7/10/1 = 18) Pit Fill (4146). An interesting group containing large, fresh looking pieces of pipe, several of which have been recently broken. There are two complete spur bowls, one with a Will Sidney stem stamp (Fig 24) and the other unmarked but with 170mm of surviving stem (Fig 33). This second piece looks rather later than most of the other spur bowls from the site, being more of a mid-eighteenth century form, while its substantially complete stem suggests it was a fresh discard into the pit fill. The first William Sidney died in 1741 and the second does not appear to have worked after about 1750, suggesting that the pit should not be any later than this in date. The stem stamp is a square variety and so can possibly be placed later than the round variety and attributed to William II. Of particular interest, however, are the remains of at least two identical Dutch pipes in this pit. There are two bowls, both with crowned L marks on the base of the heel (Fig 8), and two stems that almost certainly came from these bowls, both of which are decorated with identical roll-stamps comprising milled lines with 'ring of pearls' borders (Fig 9). The crowned L mark was used in Gouda from at least 1726-1925 but these examples date from around the middle of the eighteenth century when the mark was used by three manufacturers; Cornelis de Licht (1730-45), Jacob de Licht (1745-53) and Frans Verzijl (1753-74). Verzijl was one of the best known Gouda manufacturers and he exported huge numbers of pipes, with crowned L mark being used on his medium quality pipes. Although it is possible that the Southampton finds are early examples of his production, the Sidney pipe should be no later than c1750 and so the crowned L pipes may have been made by one of the de Lichts. The bowl form is based on English styles and was produced mainly for export. Dutch pipes are always rare in English contexts, although they tend to be more common in ports with international shipping where they may well have arrived as personal possessions or as small packets being traded by individuals, rather than as part of any large-scale trade.

4179 (21/40/2 = 63) Pit Fill (4167). This appears to have been an outstanding pit group but, unfortunately a lot of damage appears to have occurred during excavation and not all of the pieces were recovered so that valuable information on stem lengths has been lost. In particular, six pieces that all appear to have come from the same pipe are present. These make up an almost complete pipe and the fresh breaks suggest that this was probably intact in the ground but two crucial pieces are now missing, so that the complete length cannot be determined. Surviving stems of at least 165mm are present and this appears to have been a fresh and little

disturbed deposit. Bowl forms range from c1660-1740 but with the latest forms suggesting final deposition around 1700-40. Most of the forms are typical of the period, including an unusually shaped spur type (similar to Atkinson 1975, Fig 276.11). There is also a late seventeenth-century form with a small heel that has not been previously noted from Southampton (Fig 31). Four pipes with Sidney stem stamps are present and these represent at least two different mould types and two different die types (Figs 20-21).

6273 (0/6/0 = 6) Pit Fill (6278). A group of thin stems, some slightly curved, one of which is decorated on both sides of the stem with a tendril design flanked by leaves and what appear to be acorns (Fig 39). A stem of this type attached to a spur with the initials RB is illustrated by Arnold (1977, Fig 8.6) who attributes it to Roger Browne (born 1710, died 1765). This date seems extremely early for such a thin stem and for this type of moulded decoration. There are, however, parallels for this style of decoration amongst a tightly dated group waste from the Lumley kiln in Doncaster, which was operating from 1768-82 (White 2004, 33). Furthermore, Oswald (1975, 171) lists a Roger Browne at Southampton from 1753-75, and both of these dates are different to those mentioned by Arnold. If there was a later Roger Browne working in Southampton during the 1770s or later, then this would provide a good candidate for the manufacturer of these unusual decorated stems. An exact match for this particular decorated stem is provided by fragments from context 6438. In this instance, it is almost certain that the stems would have come from an Armorial bowl of c1770-1790, decorated with the Royal Arms and GR for George Rex, but with the initials WB on the spur (Fig 38). This pipe must be a product of the William Brown (II) who is last recorded by Arnold in 1749, when he took a 40 year lease on property in French Street. It seems that William (II) must have worked until at least the 1770s and that the stem from context 6273 was produced by him. It is interesting that both Roger and William Browne were producing these decorated stems at the end of the eighteenth century – a very early date for this style of decoration from anywhere in the country.

6438 (15/105/7 = 127) Pit Fill (6435). An outstanding group containing a large and extremely consistent group of pipes in very fresh condition, which suggests that they were all used and discarded within a very short period of time. The dating of this group can be pinned down quite closely by considering the marks and bowl forms present. One of the pipes is marked AC (Fig 44) and can be attributed to Arthur Coster (I) of Fareham, who was born in 1752 and died in 1816 (Fox & Hall, 1979, 20). Coster is unlikely to have been in business on his own before c1770, when he would have been just 18, and it is more likely that he would have been in his early 20s, around 1775, before he would have been in a position to start his own workshop. This provides a very useful *terminus post quem* for the group. Although Coster continued to work until his death in 1816, the bowl forms from the pit are not of the types that would be expected from the 1810s and so must date from before this. Quite a number of commemorative pipes were made in the area around 1805 to commemorate the battle of Trafalgar (e.g., Fox & Hall 1979, Figs 40-42) and these are also of later bowl styles, so the pit group most likely dates from at least a few years earlier, i.e., at least before c1800. One unusual feature of the pipes is the early use of stem decoration (Fig 38) using a style that can be paralleled amongst material from the Lumley kiln from Doncaster, which probably dates from no later than 1782 (White 2004, 31 & Fig 5.1.7). The general style of the Southampton bowl forms can also be matched by the finds from the Doncaster kiln as well as a pipe found under the floor of a building constructed in 1791/2 (White 2004, Fig 167). These constraints firmly place the pit group within the last quarter of the eighteenth century with a date in the 1780s perhaps being most likely.

Eleven of the surviving 14 spurs or heels in this group are marked WB, presumably for William Browne (II), last recorded leasing a property in French Street for 40 years in 1749 (Arnold 1977, 329). These show that Browne was producing at least four different types of Armorial pipe, each of which is decorated with the Royal Arms and the initials GR for George Rex (Figs 36-38 & 40). One of these has his initials moulded upright on the spur (Fig 40) as opposed to the usual horizontal orientation. Arnold (1977, Fig 8.3) illustrates an Armorial marked WB, but without the initials GR flanking the crown, showing that Browne had at least a fifth mould of this type. One of the mould types represented in this pit has its stem decorated with a relief-moulded foliage design, which is very early for this style of decoration (Fig 38). Arnold (1977, Fig 8.6)

illustrated a similar stem but with the initials RB, which he attributes to Roger Browne (II), who died in 1765 (see also context 6273 above). This date, however, seems too early for this style of decoration, suggesting that there may have been a later maker with these initials, perhaps a Richard Browne (III).

The WB pipes from the pit also include three examples with a fluted bowl (Fig 42) and a heel bowl with a Masonic design, most of which is missing (Fig 41). The heel of the Masonic pipe has not been trimmed, an early example of this economy measure. The bases of only three of the 13 spur pipes have been trimmed, so it is clear that trimming of the heel or spur had largely been abandoned by the time this pit was filled. The Masonic fragment joins a further two pieces of stem to give a surviving length of 182mm, which is long enough to show that this pipe has a straight stem. In contrast, some of the other surviving stem fragments appear to have been curved (e.g., Fig 40) so that both straight and curved forms appear to have been in use. Curved stems were only introduced towards the end of the eighteenth century and so this pit group represents a transitional period when both forms were in contemporary production.

Although Arnold (1977, 328) has previously recorded plain and Armorial bowls for William Browne, this pit group not only shows that he made several different patterns of Armorial pipe but also that he was making fluted and Masonic pipes as well, thus extending his known range. Arnold also had a gap during the last quarter of the eighteenth century when no Southampton pipemakers were known (1977, 325). This group fills this gap and suggests that at least two makers (RB and WB) were working locally, perhaps at the French Street site, which had previously been leased for 40 years until 1789.

There are also two other designs of fluted pipe in the pit group, one unmarked (two examples, both very fragmentary; Fig 43) and the other marked AC, being the Arthur Coster pipe referred to above (Fig 44). The stem fragments in the pit are all very consistent and show that all these designs probably had very long thin stems, ending with simple cut mouthpieces. The slender nature of the stems can be seen from their widths where they join the bowl drawings and show that these thin forms were already well established by the late eighteenth century.

The final point of note is that three of the pipe fragments were recovered with some sort of non-ferrous metal blocking their stem bores. One piece is the WB Armorial with the initials moulded upright on the spur (Fig 40) and the other two are stem fragments, both of which have been fractured by the force of the metal corroding and expanding within the stem. One of these fits onto the bowl, showing that metal is present over a distance of at least 5.5cm of the stem. While the metal could have been the remains of thin wires or metal rods pushed into the stem bore to try and clean them, the metal protruding from the bowl fragment appears to be soft, like lead. Furthermore, one of the stems has fractured so as to reveal the metal, which seems to completely fill the stem bore but ends with a rounded end, as if molten metal had cooled within the stem. Although no metal can be seen in the base of the Armorial bowl, it is known that pipes were occasionally used as ladles for pouring molten metal, sometimes during 'coining', i.e., producing counterfeit coins. It is extremely unusual to find metal within the stem bore of pipes and these three examples add to only a handful of examples that are known nationally. They also show that at least some of these pipes were being used in an unusual way before being discarded.

The pipes themselves

There have been quite a number of papers published on pipes from different parts of Hampshire but only a few that relate specifically to Southampton itself, the most significant papers of which are Atkinson's 1975 study of the pipes from excavations in Southampton (1966-69) and Arnold's 1977 economic study of the Southampton pipemaking industry. These two papers illustrate quite a number of local bowl forms and marks, although Arnold's illustrations are all slightly reduced, making them hard to use, and Atkinson does not include any nineteenth-century material in his study. This lack of later material has led to problems in that researchers in other areas are unable to identify Southampton products, for example, whether the large

numbers of GH pipes recovered from Poole can be attributed to George Harding of Southampton or not (Markell 1992, 173). The corpus of illustrated material available for Southampton is not as extensive as that from neighbouring south coast ports, such as Portsmouth (Fox & Hall 1979; Fox & Barton 1986) or Poole (Markell 1992; Markell 1994).

Although there has been some study of the pipes found at Southampton, it was only the pipe finds from the 1966-9 excavations that were examined for the 1953-69 excavations volume and the systematic survey of the pipes from the town as a whole that was envisaged at that time never materialised (Atkinson 1975, 344). Despite the early pioneering pipe research carried out in Southampton during the 1970s, there does not appear to have been any significant work in the area for more than 30 years. This substantial assemblage offers the potential to redress this balance and some of the key areas are discussed in the following sections.

The marked pipes

One of the strengths of an assemblage of this size is the range and number of marked pipes that have been recovered. These span the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries in date and allow the sources of the pipes that were being used and consumed in Southampton over this period to be examined. The identification of these marks, however, relies on the availability of previously published finds and the accuracy and completeness makers' lists. One of the problems encountered with this study is the fact that the available lists of Hampshire and Wiltshire pipemakers are almost certainly incomplete and that the lists that have been published often contain conflicting dates and details, making attribution and accurate dating difficult. The evidence for pipemakers and pipe production in the region as a whole clearly needs to be reviewed and this limitation needs to be borne in mind in the following discussion.

The excavations produced a total of 67 different marks, comprising 34 stamped examples and 33 moulded examples (Table 1). Almost all of the stamped marks date from the seventeenth or early eighteenth century while the moulded marks are all of eighteenth century or later date. These two different styles of mark are considered separately in the following sections.

Mark	Pos	Type	No	Suggested Maker	Place	Date	Figs	Comments
BRO/WN	SX	IS	1	Brown	Southampton	c1700-1740	11	Probably made by either Roger or William Brown, both active in the early eighteenth century.
R/BRO/WN	SX	IS	1	Roger Brown	Southampton	c1700-1740	12	Made by one of the Roger Browns' during the early eighteenth century.
CAR/TER	SX	IS	1	C. Carter	Southampton?	c1710-1730	13	Oswald (1975, 171) notes C. Carter marks of c1720-50 from Southampton.
THO/MAS/DOD	SX	IS	1	Thomas Dod	Boldre	c1700-1730	14	Oswald (1981, 172) notes marriages for Thomas Dod of Boldre in 1695 and 1723.
RIC/HARD/HOAR	SX	IS	1	Richard Hoar	Portsmouth	1705-1737	15	Richard Hoar of Portsmouth is recorded in parish register entries from 1705-37 (Fox & Hall 1979, 16-17).
IEF/FRY.H/VNT	H	IS	1	Jeffrey Hunt	Norton St Philip	c1640-1670	1	Either Jeffrey Hunt I (1599-1690) or II (born 1623/4; Lewcun 1985) of Norton St./Philip, Somerset.

Mark	Pos	Type	No	Suggested Maker	Place	Date	Figs	Comments
RICH/MAN	SX	IS	3	John Richman	Southampton	c1690-1730	16	John Richman moved from East Woodhay to Southampton in 1687 and was still there in 1697. The style of the mark is more likely to be early C18th.
RICH/ARD.S/AYER	SX	IS	2	Richard Sayer	East Woodhay	c1700-1730	17	There appear to have been at least two makers of this name working at East Woodhay in Hampshire from at least 1685-1716 (Cannon 1991, 25).
THO/SHAR/P	SX	IS	3	Thomas Sharp	Romsey?	c1700-1740	18	Presumed to be the son of pipe maker Thomas Sharpe of Romsey, who died in either 1689 or 1698 (ambiguous transcript in Winchester Museum files; Inventory 098/1-2). Individuals named Thomas Sharp were married at Romsey in 1682 and 1728 (occupations unknown). See also a relief mark used by this maker.
THO/SHARP	SX	RS	1	Thomas Sharp	Romsey?	c1700-1740	19	Presumed to be the son of pipe maker Thomas Sharpe of Romsey, who died in either 1689 or 1698 (ambiguous transcript in Winchester Museum files; Inventory 098/1-2). Individuals named Thomas Sharp were married at Romsey in 1682 and 1728 (occupations unknown). See also an incuse mark used by this maker.
SID/NEY	SX	IS	4	Sidney	Southampton	c1710-1740	20, 21	At least two different mould and die types represented by these examples, which were made by one of the Sidney family of Southampton (see Arnold 1977, 329-31 for details).
RVB/SYD/NEY	SX	IS	1	Ruben Sidney	Southampton	c1700-1730	22	Probably made by Ruben Sidney (I) of Southampton, born 1673, apprenticed 1687, married 1696 and died 1750 (Arnold 1977, 331).
WILL/SID/NEY	SX	IS	3	William Sidney	Southampton	c1710-1750	23, 24	Two round marks (Fig 23) were most likely made by William (I), working by 1719 and buried in 1741. His son William (II), was recorded as sick and on poor relief in 1747 and he may have made the square mark (Fig 24). See Arnold 1977, 329-31 for full family details.

Mark	Pos	Type	No	Suggested Maker	Place	Date	Figs	Comments
L crowned	H	RS	2	One of the de Lichts (1730-53) or Frans Verzijl (1753-74)	Gouda	c1720-1750	8	Dutch marks from Gouda, associated with roll-stamped stems and probably made by either one of the de Lichts (1730-53) or Frans Verzijl (1753-74).
W	H	RS	1		Salisbury?	c1660-1680	7	Damaged mark, possibly form Salisbury (but this is rather uncertain).
Running Fox	H	RS	1		Salisbury?	c1640-1670	2	Presumably made by a pipemaker named Fox, most likely working in Salisbury.
Gauntlet	H	IS	4		Wiltshire?	c1630-1680	3-6	Occurs on West-Country bowl forms with more than one die type represented. Originally used by the Gauntlet family of Amesbury, this mark was widely copied by other manufacturers in the region.
roll-stamped stem	SX	RS	3		Netherlands	c1720-1750 and c1770-1840	9, 10	Three Dutch stems, two of which are identical (Fig 9) and associated with crowned L marks of c1720-50 from the same context (see above and Fig 8). The third stem is later and dates from c1770-1840 (Fig 10).
Sub-Tot (stamped)			34					
RB	HS	RM	1	Roger Brown	Southampton	c1700-1740	34	Either Roger Brown (I), buried 1737, or his son, Roger (II), buried 1765.
WB	HS	RM	13	William Brown	Southampton	c1730-1800	35-38, 40, 41, 43	The WB marks can be divided into two types. There are two examples on plain bowls that date from c1730-60 and can be attributed to one of the William Brown's, who worked in French Street. There are 11 later examples dating from c1770-1800 that occur with highly decorated bowls (mainly Armorial and fluted). Possibly made by a William Brown, working later than is currently documented.
AC	HS	RM	2	Arthur Coster	Fareham	c1770-1816	44, 45	Arthur Coster (I) was born in 1752 and died in 1816.
HARDING	SL	RM	1	George or Edward Harding	Southampton	1843-1871	50	Made by either George Harding (working c1843-71) or his son Edward (working c1858-66). George was the senior and more established pipemaker of the two and most likely to have made this stem.
GH	HS	RM	12	George Harding	Southampton	1843-1871	47-9, 51-4	George Harding ran his business from c1843-71, during which time he was probably the principal pipemaker in Southampton.

Mark	Pos	Type	No	Suggested Maker	Place	Date	Figs	Comments
JM	HS	RM	1	John Munday?	Carisbrooke?	1810-1850	55	Perhaps John Munday, who was working at Carisbrooke from at least 1841-51, although this maker is more likely to have been a journeyman rather than a master pipemaker.
IS	HS	RM	1	?	?	1740-1800	46	Armorial bowl with the initials IS moulded on the spur. Unidentified maker.
JS	HS	RM	1	John Skain / Skeans	Southampton	1830-1860	56	Probably John Skeams or Skeanes, recorded in Southampton from 1839-44. Alternatively, a James Skeaines was working in Salisbury from at least 1852-75.
??	HS	RM	1	?	?	1840-1880		Illegible mark on a spur bowl with leaf decorated seams.
Sub-Tot (moulded)			33					
GRAND TOTAL			67					

Table 1 – Marked pipes from the excavations, including details of the position (POS: SX = across the stem; H = on the base of the heel; HS = on the sides of the heel; SL along the stem), type of mark (IS = incuse stamped; RS = relief stamped; RM = relief moulded) and number of examples recovered (No). The stamped marks are given first, followed by the moulded marks.

Stamped marks

The 34 stamped marks recovered from the excavations can be divided into two broad classes, comprising nine heel stamps and 25 stem marks. These are described in the following two sections: -

Heel Stamps

IEF/FRY.H/VNT (Fig 1) One example of this incuse heel stamp was found. This was made at Norton St Philip in Somerset around 1640-1670 by either Jeffrey Hunt I (1599-1690) or Jeffrey Hunt II (born 1623/4; Lewcun 1985).

Running Fox (Fig 2) One example of this relief stamped heel mark was found. This was made c1640-1670 and is marked with one of a number of different running fox dies used by this maker, who is presumed to have been named Fox himself. The Wiltshire VCH gives a pipemaker named Edmund Fox at Amesbury from 1600-50 (Brown 1959, 244), while Oswald (1975, 198) gives the same dates but the name as Edward and with pipes recorded from Amesbury, Devizes and Salisbury. Atkinson (1970, 177-9), on the other hand, notes this mark in some numbers from Salisbury and says that he has been unable to substantiate any evidence for a maker of this name at Amesbury. There were certainly pipemakers named Fox working at Trowbridge from c1650-1725 (Norgate 1984, 128-9), but they used full name marks and are not necessarily the users of the fox symbol – they merely demonstrate that members of the Fox family was certainly connected with the pipemaking trade. By the time of his 1980 study, Atkinson had become sure that these symbol marks were produced in Salisbury, where they most frequently date from c1630-70 and must represent one or possibly two different makers (Atkinson 1980, 67). Further documentary and

distributional studies are still needed, but the most recent thinking is to attribute this piece to a Salisbury maker.

Gauntlet (Figs 3-6) Four examples of this incuse stamped heel mark ranging from c1630-1680 were found. These occur on West-Country bowl forms with each is marked with a different die type. Although this mark was originally used by the Gauntlet family of Amesbury, it appears to have been extensively copied and examples may well have been produced in places such as Salisbury and Winchester. A detailed analysis of the individual die types is needed to establish where each is likely to have been produced but, in broad terms, all of these bowl forms suggest a Wiltshire origin, rather than production in Southampton itself.

W (Fig 7) One example of this relief stamped heel mark dating from c1660-1680 was found. The mark is only partially surviving but appears to have been heart-shaped with stars above the lettering, which seems to comprise a single large letter W (Fig 7). An example of this mark from Bridge St, Christchurch, occurs on a chinned 'west-country' style bowl of c1660-80 with a possible place of manufacture being given as Salisbury (Markell notes, National Pipe Archive), but this author has been unable to find any other examples from there, despite large numbers of marks having been recorded.

L crowned (Fig 8) Two identical Dutch pipes, both of which have crowned L marks on the base of the heel and the stems of which were decorated with roll-stamps comprising milled lines with 'ring of pearls' borders (Fig 9). The crowned L mark was used in Gouda from at least 1726-1925 but these examples date from around the middle of the eighteenth century when the mark was used by three manufacturers; Cornelis de Licht (1730-45), Jacob de Licht (1745-53) and Frans Verzijl (1753-74). The bowl form is based on English styles and was produced mainly for export.

Stem Stamps

Roll-stamped stems (Figs 9-10) Three stems decorated with roll-stamped borders were found, all of which are Dutch. Two are identical (Fig 9) and are almost certainly from the two Gouda bowls dating from c1720-50 with crowned L marks that were found in the same context (Fig 8). The third (Fig 10) is later in date and probably dates from around 1770-1840.

BRO/WN (Fig 11) One example of this incuse stamped stem mark was found. This was made by a member of the Brown Southampton c1700-1740 (probably either Roger or William, both of whom were active in the early eighteenth century).

R/BRO/WN (Fig 12) One example of this incuse stamped stem mark was found. The lettering of this mark is not very well executed and the mark is poorly formed, making it very hard to read, but it can be identified from similar marks found elsewhere in the city (Arnold 1977, Fig 9.11). These were made by Roger Brown of Southampton, who was working c1700-1740.

CAR/TER (Fig 13) One example of this previously unrecorded incuse stamped stem mark was found. Oswald (1975, 171) notes C. Carter marks of c1720-50 from Southampton, which is where this maker may well have worked.

THO/MAS/DOD (Fig 14) One example of this incuse stamped stem mark was found. This was made by Thomas Dod of Boldre, which is situated about 10 miles SSW of Southampton, near Lymington, and dates from c1700-1730. Oswald (1981, 172) notes marriages for Thomas Dod of Boldre in 1695 and 1723. Atkinson (1972, 153) notes examples of this mark from Marlborough and Salisbury in Wiltshire and Hook in Hampshire.

RIC/HARD/HOAR (Fig 15) One example of this incuse stamped stem mark was found. This was made by Richard Hoar Portsmouth, who is recorded in parish register entries from 1705-37 (Fox & Hall 1979, 16-17).

RICH/MAN (Fig 16) Three examples of this incuse stamped stem mark were found. These were made by John Richman from East Woodhay, near Newbury, who moved to Southampton in 1687, when he too took a lease of a property next to the Theatre Tavern in French Street, and he was still there in 1697 (Arnold 1977, 329). The style of the mark is likely to date from c1690-1730 (and, most likely, after c1700), suggesting that Richman worked later than the surviving documents would suggest. A probable example of an earlier style of heel stamp that also appears to have just read RICH/MAN has been found at Castle Cornet on Guernsey (David 2003, Fig 394). Cannon (1991, 24) notes two types of mark for this maker, IOHN/RICH/MAN on the heel and RICH/MAN across the stem, with a distribution including the Channel Islands, Littlecote, Newbury, Portsmouth, Poulton and Southampton.

RICH/ARD.S/AYER (Fig 17) Two examples of this incuse stamped stem mark was found. These were made by one of the Richard Sayer's (alias Lawrence), who worked at East Woodhay in the north-west of Hampshire, near Newbury. There appear to have been two makers of this name, who appear in the records from at least 1685-1716 (Cannon 1991, 25). The Southampton examples are typical of the Sayer pipes produced at East Woodhay, which were widely marketed. Cannon (1991, 25) notes examples of these pipes from Basing, Chilton Foliat, Coleshill, Littlecote, London, Marlborough, Newbury, Oxford, Poulton, Salisbury, Swindon, Wanborough, Winchester and Virginia, USA. The author has also recorded an example from Reading (Higgins, forthcoming) and it is clear that the Sayer's were not only very prolific makers but also that they were able to find a market for their wares over a wide area. One reason for this may have been the superior quality of their products. The two examples from this site both came from the same context (3640) where they stand out in the assemblage as being better quality products. Both examples were almost certainly made in the same mould, which was of good quality with neat, clean lines and an elegant style. These two pipes have much thinner stems than most of the others in the group and, in contrast with most of the locally produced pipes, they are neatly burnished on both the bowl and stem. It is probably this better quality that enabled the Sayers to market their pipes so widely, despite the additional transportation costs. It is interesting that Sayer pipes have now been found in Southampton since some were clearly exported to America and they must have been shipped via an English port. Southampton is geographically the closest port to East Woodhay and so these pieces may complete the missing link in their distribution route to America. It is not known how long the second Richard Sayer worked in East Woodhay, although the style of the pipes would suggest it was as late as c1730. It is interesting to note that a maker named Sayer, perhaps a member of the same family, worked at Fareham at some point during the early eighteenth century, as evidenced by pipes of this date stamped SAY/ER.FA/REHA/M on the stem (Fox & Hall, 1979, Fig 15.102). Examples of the Fareham marks have been found on the Channel Islands, as have those of W Sayer, who worked at West Wellow in Hampshire from c1728-69 (David 2003, 242 & Figs 420-1).

THO/SHAR/P (Figs 18) Three examples of this incuse stamped stem mark was found, dating from c1700-1740. There is known to have been a pipemaker called Thomas Sharp of Romsey, who died in either 1689 or 1698 (Winchester Museum files; transcript from Inventory 098/1-2, with ambiguous dates given). Whichever date is correct, these marks seem a little too late in style to have been made by this maker. There are, however, marriages of individuals named Thomas Sharp at Romsey in both 1682 and 1728 (Internet IGI; to Anne Briant on 8 October 1682 and to Mary Stork on 19 August 1728). No occupations are given in the internet listings, but it is possible that these references represent two generations of the same family and that one or both of these individuals were pipemakers (although it should be noted that the surname Sharp is quite common in the area generally). The Southampton examples represent a previously unrecorded mark type, although Atkinson (1972, 151) notes a THO/SHAR/AP mark that has been found in both Salisbury and Southampton and there is also a relief

THO/SHARP mark from these excavations (see below). What is clear is that one or more makers of this name were operating in the Southampton area (almost certainly at Romsey) during the early eighteenth century.

THO/SHARP (Figs 19) One example of this incuse stamped stem mark was found, dating from c1700-1740. This is another previously unrecorded mark for this maker (see above entry for details).

SID/NEY (Figs 20-21) Four examples of this incuse stamped stem mark were found. These were made by one of the members of the Sidney family, who appear to have been one of the two principal pipemaking families in Southampton from the late seventeenth century through to mid-eighteenth century. Details of the family are given by Arnold (1977, 329-30), who notes that the family was based in St. Michael's parish and that they were at least partly responsible for a peak in exports from the port during this period (1977, 327). Nathaniel appears to have founded the family business and must have lived to a very considerable age if he is the same person who was apprenticed in 1644 and who died in 1711. Nathaniel had two sons, Ruben (I) and William, both of whom went on to become pipemakers, as did Ruben's son, Ruben (II) and, possibly, William's son William (II). The family appear to have increasingly struggled to maintain the pipemaking business during the eighteenth century and they had probably all either died or given up the trade by 1750. Examples of SID/NEY marks have been found at Castle Cornet on Guernsey (David 2003, Figs 403-4), but none have been found amongst the numerous publications on finds from Wiltshire. This suggests that the Sidneys' were supplying the local and export trade, rather than the inland trade from Southampton.

RVB/SYD/NEY (Fig 22) One example of this incuse stamped stem mark was found. This was made by one of the Ruben Sidney's (father and son) who were working in Southampton. Ruben (I) was born in 1673 and apprenticed to his father, Nathaniel, in 1687. He would probably have been working on his own account by the time he married in 1696. His son, Ruben (II), was married in 1736 but appears to have given up the trade to become a jailor during the 1740s. Ruben (I) died in 1750 (see Arnold 1977, 329-31 for full family details). The stamped stem mark probably dates from c1700-30 and can most likely be attributed to Ruben (I). Pipes made by this maker have also been found at Castle Cornet in Guernsey (David 2003, Figs 402 A & B).

WILL/SID/NEY (Figs 23-24) Three examples of incuse stamped stem mark was found, which were made by one of the William Sidney's of Southampton. William (I) was the son of Nathaniel Sidney and originally apprenticed as a baker in 1692. He must have reverted to being a pipemaker, however, being listed as such in 1719. He died in 1741 and his son, also William, was recorded as being sick and on poor relief in 1747 (Arnold 1977, 329-31). Arnold does not specifically state any occupation for William (II) but he may well have followed in the family trade and Oswald (1975, 173) lists a William (II) as a pipemaker in Hythe, c1740. Oswald's source, however, is given as 'pipes' and so may not be reliable unless they specifically include the place name on them. The marks recovered from these excavations fall into two forms, a circular mark (Fig 23) and a square one (Fig 24). The square mark occurs on a bowl from of slightly later date and it is tempting to attribute this to the second William – although this may well be too neat a scenario. Either way, both marks were clearly in use and circulating in Southampton during the first half of the eighteenth century.

Moulded marks

The 33 moulded marks recovered from the excavations are as follows. With the exception of one moulded stem mark, these are all relief-moulded initials placed on the sides of a heel or spur. They are described and discussed alphabetically below: -

RB (Fig 34) One example of this mark was found in context 3646, where it was associated with a local style spur bowl, dating from *c*1700-1740. This RB pipe is of a similar date but it is a London style heel bowl with large and rather crudely executed initials relief moulded on the sides of the heel. This pipe can be attributed to either Roger Brown (I) of Southampton, buried 1737, or his son, Roger (II), buried 1765 (Arnold 1977, 329).

WB (Figs 35-42) Thirteen examples of this mark was found, ranging in date from *c*1730-1800. These WB marks can be divided into two types. There are two examples on plain spur bowls that date from *c*1730-60 and which were almost certainly made in the same mould (Fig 35). These two pipes have an unusual and distinctive form with a forward pointing spur and a very upright bowl, the top of which dips back towards the smoker. This form does not appear to have been previously recorded from Southampton but a large number of very similar examples have been found at Poole, in particular a group marked BV that are likely to have been made there (Markell 1992, Fig 97.109). The Southampton examples can be attributed to one of the William Brown's, who appear to have worked from *c*1700 onwards and who took out a 40 year lease of a property in French Street in 1749 (Arnold 1977, 329).

There are 11 later examples of WB marks dating from *c*1770-1800, all of which were found together in pit fill. Ten of these are spur types and one is a heel type and all are highly decorated with large, thin-walled bowls and thin stems, some of which appear to have been curved (e.g., Fig 40). There are seven examples of Armorial pipes, representing four different mould types (Figs 36-40), each of which is decorated with the Hanoverian Royal Arms and the initials GR for George Rex. One of these moulds types (Fig 40) is unusual in that the initials have been placed upright rather than in the more usual orientation on the spur. This particular piece also has some faint marks, perhaps from lettering, around the bowl rim and there is an internal bowl cross. Another of the Armorial mould types is unusual in that it has foliage decoration on the stem – a particularly early example of this style (Figs 38-39). There are three examples of a fluted design, all of which were made in the same mould and all of which also have an internal bowl cross (Fig 42). This design has very narrow and quite complex flutes with six slightly thicker flutes on each side of the bowl, each of which is generally flanked by two much finer flutes and then with a medium thickness flute between each of these groups of three. The only heel pipe is very fragmentary, but has traces of Masonic emblems decorating the bowl, a popular motif at this time (Fig 41). The Masonic pipe also has part of an internal bowl cross surviving. These WB pipes all came from a pit fill that can probably be tightly dated to *c*1775-90 (see 6438 above) and are presumed to be late products of the William Brown last documented as a pipemaker in 1749. They not only greatly extend the likely working period for this maker, but also provide an excellent sample of the various late eighteenth century styles of decorated pipe that were being produced in Southampton.

AC (Figs 44-45) Two examples of this mark was found, both on bowls dating from around 1770-1810. These can be attributed to Arthur Coster Fareham, who was born in 1752 and recorded as a pipemaker from at least 1784 until his death in 1816 (Fox & Hall, 1979, 20). Both of the pipes are fluted and both appear to be previously unrecorded types for this maker. One is a spur bowl with neatly engraved lines of dots between the flutes (Fig 44), which was recovered from a pit fill likely to date from *c*1775-90 (see 6438 above). The other is a heel bowl with alternating thick and thin flutes - the base of the heel is not trimmed (Fig 45). Both bowls have large, thin-walled bowls and thin stems with bores of 5/64”.

HARDING (Fig 50) One example of a stem was found with the faint, relief moulded lettering HARDING on left hand side – the right hand side is blank (Fig 50). A trimming mark has obscured any Christian name initial that there may have been, but there may well have been a ‘G’ in this position, as seen on other known examples from Southampton (Arnold 1977, Fig 11.34). The small sections of surviving bowl suggest that this was a spurless form with raised rib decoration and leaves on the mould seams, a style dating from after *c*1850 and with this example is most likely to date from the 1860s. It was probably made by George Harding, who worked from *c*1842-70 although it could alternatively have been

made by his son, Edward, who operated on his own for a brief period from about 1858-66 (see GH below for details of both Hardings).

GH (Figs 47-49, 51-54) Twelve heels or spurs with the relief moulded initials GM were found, which can be attributed to George Harding Southampton. George Harding is an interesting manufacturer since he clearly made a wide range of pipes and yet he only appears to have worked for a fairly limited period, thus providing an accurate date for these pipes. The 1841 and 1851 Census returns for this maker have been located and they provide the following information: -

1841 – King Street	M	F	Occupation	Born
George Harding	38		Labourer	Hampshire
Hannah Harding		40		Hampshire
Ann Harding		16		Hampshire
George Harding	14		Apprentice	Hampshire
Melsy(?) Harding	10			Hampshire
Edward Harding	9			Hampshire
Alfred Harding	7			Hampshire
Ellen Harding		6		Hampshire

1851 – 16 Bell Street	M	F	Occupation	Born
George Harding	48		Pipe Manufacturer	Eling, Hampshire
Hannah Harding		50		Eling, Hampshire
Alfred Harding	20		Apprentice	Southampton
Ellen Harding		16		Southampton

From these reference is it clear that George was born in about 1803 and that, by 1841, he was living with his six children in King Street. His occupation at this date is only given as that of a labourer, and so he is unlikely to have been making pipes on his own account by this date. The first known reference to him as a pipemaker is in 1843, when his address is given in a directory as 16 Bell Street (Arnold 1977, 333). What is significant is that 16 Bell Street was where Thomas Frost, a member of a well known local pipemaking family, had been working until at least 1839. Harding clearly took over this works in about 1842 and so any marked pipes of his must have been produced after this date.

George appears to have had a successful business since, by 1848, he is recorded as having at least one apprentice. Unfortunately this reference relates to the apprentice, John Hodges, neglecting his work, for which he was sentenced to one month (Hampshire Telegraph No 2545; 15 July 1848). Hodges appears to have resumed his apprenticeship, being listed as a 20 year old pipemaker in the 1851 Census and perhaps still working for Harding – although no record of him has been found after this date. Trade directories list George's business as Harding & Son from 1855-7 and George must have continued pipemaking until at least 1870, by which time he is listed in a trade directory at Wellington Road in Freemantle, Southampton (Arnold 1977, 333). It has not been possible to find Census entries for George in either 1861 or 1871, but he is not likely to have been working much after 1870, when he would have already been aged 67 (although it is possible that the George Harding, widower, born at Minstead (about 8 miles from Eling) and working as a general servant at Eling in 1871 is the same person). He certainly seems to have either given up the trade or died by 1875, since he is not listed in the P.O. Directory for Southampton of that year.

The son alluded to in the 1855-7 directory entries was Edward, born in about 1831 or 1832. He must have set up on his own after this brief partnership, being listed at nearby 28 Mount Street, Orchard Lane

from 1859-61 and at 16 Winchester Street from 1863-5 (Arnold 1977, 333). He presumably died soon after 1865 since, by the time of the 1871 Census, the Winchester Street address was occupied by his former wife, Ann, and their three children, but she was now married to a Bill Russell, by whom she had had two further children, the eldest of whom was already aged three. In 1871 Bill Russell was a labourer at a gas works and Edward's eldest son, Frederick, was an apprentice shoemaker. It seems that pipemaking at 16 Winchester Street had ended by this date and that none of Edward's family continued in the trade.

From the above, it can be seen that George Harding was the principal pipemaker in this family and that he was working from about 1842-70. His son, Edward, followed him into the trade and worked at the family business until about 1858, after which he set up on his own. Edward must have died young in about 1866 and no marked pipes attributable to him are known. For about 30 years from 1842-70 George was probably the principal pipe maker in Southampton, a fact reflected by the dominance of his pipes in the deposits of this date (in particular, cess pits 166 & 169).

From the excavated evidence, it is possible to get an indication of the range of pipe styles that were produced by George Harding, the majority of which were decorated. Some of these were quite ornate with decoration covering the entire bowl, for example, the fluted (Fig 47), bottle and glass (Fig 48) or rose and thistle (Fig 49) designs. Although all of these styles are known to have been produced by other makers in the south of England, they show that Harding was offering a range of products to compete with them. In particular, these designs were popular amongst other makers operating in the Portsmouth Harbour area, for example, James Goodall of Fareham and Richard Goodall of Gosport both made rose and thistle designs, while Henry Leigh, amongst others, made a bottle and glass design (Fox & Hall, 1979, 33 and 40-42).

In keeping with contemporary fashions, most of Harding's pipes just had the bowl seams decorated, either with leaves and acorns (Fig 51) or simply with leaves (Figs 52-53). The excavated finds include seven examples of GH pipes types with leaf decorated seams, representing at least four or five different mould types – and possibly more. This style clearly formed the staple of Harding's production, with both large and small bowl forms being represented (Figs 52-53). There is just one example with a completely plain bowl (Fig 54). This is of a slightly later style to those with leaf decorated seams and is unlikely to have been introduced to his range until the 1850s or, more likely, 1860s.

All of the styles described above are likely to have had long stems with simple cut tips. There may well have been some variation in length according to price and style, but both the range of forms and the decorative motifs that he employed are typical of the period. The excavated examples not only extend the known range of products being made by Harding but also show that he was making a typical assortment of designs with which to compete with other manufacturers in the region. His products are only of average quality but they were sufficient for him to become one of the principal manufacturers in Southampton for nearly 30 years, with examples of his work having been found from as far away as Alderney (Arnold 1977, 333). The finds from these excavations not only show how his products dominated the mid nineteenth-century assemblages in Southampton but will also provide a useful reference point for the future identification of his products. This is particularly important since there were pipemakers in neighbouring Dorset with the same initials, i.e., George Hallet, working in Beaminster from at least 1840-44, and George Holland of Weymouth, recorded in 1823/4 (directories). A pipe marked GH has been found at Poole (Markell 1992, Fig 99.155), where it is likely to have been traded rather than made. The origin of this piece is uncertain, since it could have come from either Southampton or from one of the Dorset makers. Building up a record of the patterns that each of these pipemakers produced will allow finds such as this to be identified in the future, which in turn will allow the trade patterns of each production centre to be explored.

JM (Fig 55) One example of this mark was found, dating from c1810-1850. The only known Hampshire maker with these initials is a John Munday, who was working at Carisbrooke on the Isle of Wight in 1851, aged 45 (Oswald 1975, 172). On checking this reference, however, it was found that Munday was given as a 'Pipe Manufacturer J' in 1851, i.e., he was a journeyman working for someone else. He was born c1806 and also appears in the 1841 census for Newport, when he was in Orchard Street, described simply as a pipe maker. In that year, however, he was living next door to John Jones, an 80 year old pipemaker for whom marked pipes are known and for whom he may well have been working. Munday has not been found in any trade directories or in the later census returns. Given that Munday seems more likely to have been an employee rather than a master pipemaker, this pipe is unlikely to have been made by him, although it remains a possibility. Alternative possibilities include the JM pipe arriving with coastal shipping from Brighton, where a Joseph Maynard is recorded from 1832-4 (Oswald 1975, 196), or that it belongs to an as yet undocumented maker from the Southampton area. The pipe itself narrow flutes on both sides of the bowl, stopping at a straight line about 8mm below the rim (Fig 55). The bowl has a rather oval bowl opening and relatively thin walls. The initials are unusually small and the stem bore measures 5/64".

IS (Fig 46) One example of this mark was found on an Armorial spur bowl dating c1740-1780. This has a fairly good rendition of the Hanoverian Arms on the bowl with the motto HONI SOIT QVI MAY Y PENSE around the outside and SEMPER EADEM (always the same) on the ribbon beneath. This pipe is quite unusual in including the motto SEMPER EADEM, which was the motto of Elizabeth I and is not usually found on these later armorial designs. This particular motto is not recorded in either Noël Hume (1971) or Atkinson & Oswald's (1980) studies of armorial pipes, although Le Cheminant (1981, 105) does include two examples from London on a bowl with the maker's initials HP. The new Southampton example is quite a large and relatively thin-walled bowl with a fine spur and a stem bore of 6/64". Although otherwise typical of the Armorial bowls produced locally, this set of initials does not appear to have been recorded before and the maker has not been identified.

JS (Fig 56) One example of this mark was found, dating from c1830-60. A possible maker for this pipe is John Skain or Skeans of Southampton, who is recorded working from around 1839-44. There is, however, some confusion in the records over this maker, who has proved very difficult to pin down in original sources because of his unusual surname and the numerous ways in which it was spelt (or could be spelt). Oswald (1960, 93) first recorded this maker as James (not John) Skeams of Southampton, working in 1839, and cited Nelson's Directory as his source. Arnold (1977, 333) was unable to relocate Nelson's Directory to check this reference, but gives James Skeams' dates in Southampton as 1839-67, although he also noted that Skeams later worked at Salisbury, presumably towards the latter end of the date range given by him. Oswald's later list (1975, 173 & 198) only records James Skeanes / Skain at Southampton in 1839 and 1841, while he lists a John (not James) Skeanes at Salisbury from 1858-75. Neither the Christian name nor dates for the Salisbury maker match with those given by Arnold. In contrast, the VCH for Wiltshire notes a James Skeines at Salt Lane, Salisbury, from at least 1850-9 (Brown 1959, 244). The final confusion is that Arnold (1977, 333) says that kiln waste belonging to Skeams was found at 58 French Street associated with pipes made by John Russell, who is recorded working 1794-1802. This seems too early for the Skeanes recorded by Oswald from 1839-41 and it may be that Arnold had seen earlier IS pipes, like the armorial example described above, which were probably made by an as yet unidentified maker.

In order to try and resolve some of the confusion surrounding Skeanes, a limited internet search of census records and trade directories has been carried out by the author, but this has only added to the confusion. The 1841 census records for Southampton list a John Skain, pipe maker, age 30, living in Winchester Street with his wife, Sarah, and five children, aged between 6 months and 7 years of age. This clearly shows that the Southampton pipemaker's name should be John, not James as given by Oswald and Arnold. It also shows that Skain was not old enough to have been making pipes on his own account much

before about 1830, which is well after the recorded dates for Russell. Nelson's Directory could not be found online, but Pigot's Directory of 1844 (SW England and Wales) still lists a John Skeans, tobacco pipe maker, in Winchester Street, Southampton. Slater's 1852-3 Directory of SW England and South Wales does not list Skeans in Southampton, although it does list a James Skeines working in Salt Lane, Salisbury. A James Skeaines (*sic*) is also listed in Salt Street, Salisbury in both the 1859 PO Directory and Kelly's 1867 Directory, thus confirming the Salisbury maker's Christian name, which is different from that given by Oswald, but matches that given in the VCH. There no pipemakers at all listed in the 1875 PO Directory for Wiltshire, but Oswald may have had another source for his 1875 date. So, according to the records seem by the author, it was consistently a John Skain or Skeans who was working in Southampton from at least 1841-44 (and, presumably, from 1839 if the earlier directory could be checked), while it was a James Skeines or Skeaines who was working in Salisbury from at least 1850-67 (and possibly as late as 1875). This suggests that two separate makers with different Christian names are represented, not just one, as stated by Arnold.

There is, however, still a slight remaining uncertainty as a result of the fact that there is no Skeines listed in Salisbury in the 1844 Directory and none in Southampton in the 1852 Directory. This means that all these references could still be to one person who moved between the two places if the Christian name was as confused in the nineteenth century as they became in the twentieth century references. Unfortunately, no entries could be found in the 1851 or later census returns for either place to check whether one or two families were represented, probably because the surname spelling had been transcribed differently yet again. If these entries could be found, it should resolve whether all these references are to the same pipemaker or not. Either way, the present evidence suggests that John Skain or Skeans was only working in Southampton from about 1839-44 and that he is unlikely to have been pipemaking on his own account before *c*1830. He appears to have either stopped pipemaking or left Southampton by the time of the 1852 directory and so any pipes produced by him in the town can be accurately dated to the period *c*1830-50 and, most likely, this range can be narrowed to just a few years during the late 1830s and early 1840s. The JS pipe recovered from the excavations would fit within this date range and so can most likely be attributed to John Skain or Skeans of Southampton, with James Skeaines of Salisbury, *c*1850-75, being the next most likely candidate.

One bowl dating from *c*1840-1880 was found with illegible marks on the sides of its spur. This bowl has leaf decorated seams (not illustrated).

Trade and marketing

Although sources such as Port Books can provide a great deal of information about the principal commodities being traded in and out of Southampton by way of coastal or overseas trade, they do not provide much information about inland trade or the myriad of small scale transactions and movements of goods that were undertaken by individuals. Pipes are useful in this respect in that they can be used to shed light on the inland areas from which goods were being drawn and the individual movements of pipes from further a field, some of which may well have been carried as personal possessions.

The first point to note is that Southampton itself never seems to have developed a very significant pipemaking industry of its own. Although pipemakers are recorded in the town from the early seventeenth century onwards (Arnold 1977, 325), they were never particularly numerous, with only five or six documented makers at any one time for most of the late seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries. This level of activity is comparable with other south coast ports such as Portsmouth (Fox & Hall 1979, 45) or Exeter (Arnold & Allan 1980, 307) but far fewer than places such as Chester or Liverpool/Rainford where substantial pipemaking industries emerged, with as many as 40-50 pipemakers working in each of these centres during the early eighteenth century (Higgins 2008, 139).

While there is no doubt that some of the pipes made in Southampton were exported, the industry there must have been as much for local consumption in the town itself as for trade and the Southampton industry was not even vigorous enough to prevent pipes from other centres from circulating in the town. The marked pipes from the excavations include examples from Portsmouth, Fareham and the Netherlands, all of which can be accounted for by shipping trade. In addition, however, there are examples from Boldre, about 10 miles to the SSW; East Woodhay about 30 miles to the N; Norton St Philip, about 45 miles to the NW; Romsey, about 7 miles to the NW and Salisbury, about 20 miles to the NW. Some of these inland goods have travelled significant distances to reach Southampton but there is no real evidence of trade in the other direction, since the numerous publications on Wiltshire pipes (see references) do not record Southampton marks. Indeed, pipes from East Woodhay have also been recovered from the New World (Cannon 1991, 25), most likely having been shipped through Southampton. This suggests that not only were these inland manufacturers able to find a market in Southampton but also that they may even have been competing with the town's manufacturers for a share of the export trade.

Pipes were not generally traded very long distances overland because of their fragile nature and a possible explanation of this phenomenon can be found from an examination of the pipes themselves. Two Richard Sayer pipes from East Woodhay were found amongst a group from the fill of a tank (3640). Both of these are finely burnished on the bowl and stem while the bowl forms themselves are elegant, thin-walled and well finished (Fig 17). The stems are also noticeably thinner than other examples in this context and they have fine spurs. In contrast, the locally produced pipes have relatively thick stems and they are not always burnished. There is one unmarked spur bowl in particular that, by comparison, has a poor, uneven surface and a thick, poorly formed spur (Fig 32). In short, the pipes from East Woodhay are a much finer quality and better looking product. Differences such as these cannot be seen from the documentary evidence alone and this is where an examination of the artefactual evidence can provide insights into the trade networks and social status of the goods that were being brought to and consumed within Southampton.

The same context group (3640) also produced an unmarked heel bowl of unusual form that clearly marks it out as being an import to the town (Fig 30). The style of this piece suggests that it was made well to the west of Southampton, most likely in Devon. Shipments of pipes from Southampton to Exeter are recorded during the early eighteenth century (Arnold & Allan 1980, 314) but not of pipes in the other direction. While this isolated example could just have been a personal possession carried by a sailor it still demonstrates a coastal movement of goods that would not have otherwise have been detected from the documentary sources alone.

The eighteenth century Dutch pipes recovered from the excavations provide another example of this type of 'unofficial' trade (Figs 8-10). Dutch pipes were always rare in England, despite the size and scale of the Dutch pipe industry and its substantial export trade. This is largely as a result of the various wars and trade sanctions that existed between the two countries. When Dutch pipes are found in England, they are frequently in ports and then often close to the quaysides, suggesting that the pipes found are personal possessions that were discarded by sailors rather than the result of formal trade.

From an examination of the available evidence it would appear that, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Southampton had its own pipemaking industry, which supplied most of the town's needs as well a modest export trade. The quality of the pipes, however, was fairly average and the industry was not vigorous enough to prevent other production centres, some of which were some distance inland, from capturing a share of both the home and export markets. One of the key factors in this may have been the better quality of the pipes that were produced in 'specialist' centres, such as East Woodhay, as opposed to Southampton itself.

Social status

As noted above, the Sayer pipes from East Woodhay were of a much finer quality than the Southampton products, and this quality is likely to have been reflected in their price. One of the most obvious features associated with quality was a burnished surface, which is known to have increased the cost of a pipe since it was an additional task to perform in the production process. The use of burnishing was not confined to the East Woodhay makers and it can also be seen on some of the other pipes found in Southampton, for example the Thomas Dod pipe from Boldre and the Richard Hoar pipe from Portsmouth (Figs 14-15). These pipes were fully burnished while Thomas Sharp from Romsey seems to have just burnished the bowls of his pipes (Figs 18-19). In contrast, none of the locally made pipes produced by the Brown, Richman or Sidney families in Southampton is burnished (Figs 11-12, 16 & 20-24). Despite the use of burnishing in the neighbouring production centres of Boldre, Portsmouth and Romsey, the Southampton makers seem not to have attempted to compete with these better quality products. This is particularly notable in the case of Richman who had moved from East Woodhay, where burnishing was almost universal, to work in Southampton, where his pipes were unburnished. It would seem that the early eighteenth century Southampton makers were content to cater for the cheaper end of the market and that they did not attempt to compete with the better quality pipes that were produced in neighbouring centres.

This excavation is interesting in that it included the site of Polymond Hall, a large building that can be considered to have been a 'high status' residence from the medieval period onwards (Plot 237 in the excavations). Almost exactly a half of the excavated pipes, 495 out of 1095 fragments, were recovered from the plot associated with this building. Although it is a somewhat crude means of comparison because it does not take into account the chronological range of pipes from the different areas, it is still noteworthy that 23 of the 34 stamped marks were recovered from this plot (68%). The stamped marks almost all date from between c1640 and 1750 and are likely to represent slightly better quality pipes, in that the makers took the trouble to identify them. Furthermore, the majority of the more 'exotic' pieces, imported from further a field, came from Plot 237. These include all four of the gauntlet marks; the fox and W pipes, possibly from Salisbury; both Richard Sayer pipes from East Woodhay and four of the five Dutch marks from the excavations. Even allowing for the nineteenth century groups of pipes found elsewhere on the site (but not present in any numbers from Plot 237), it seems that there is a still a bias towards marked, burnished and imported (i.e., better quality) pipes from the site of Polymond Hall.

Hair curler

Context 487 produced half of a hair curler (Fig 58). This is of a neat, symmetrical form and has simple cut ends without any maker's mark. This style of curler is typical of the eighteenth century.

Summary and conclusions

As well as providing good dating evidence for the excavated contexts and features, the pipes also contribute to a broader understanding of production and consumption patterns within the wider catchment area of the site. Overall the excavations produced a wide range of pipes dating from the early seventeenth century through to about 1900, including some important pit groups of seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth century date. These groups not only extend the range of known bowl forms and decorative motifs used in Southampton, but also provide evidence for pipe production in the town during the second half of the eighteenth century, a period when none had been previously documented. Context 6438 deserves special mention as a key group most likely dating from c1775-90, which not only provides evidence for pipe production in Southampton at this period but also a closely dated reference point for the introduction of a number of other technological features including the production of long, thin, parallel-sided stems; the end of heel/spur trimming; the frequent use of internal bowl crosses and the introduction

of curved stems. This group is also particularly unusual for the evidence of metal having been melted within some of the pipes. From the mid-nineteenth century there are good groups representing the products of George Harding, who was probably the principal maker in Southampton at this time. The finds have allowed the first reasonably comprehensive assessment and definition of this maker's products to be made, which will be of importance is distinguishing his products from those of other makers with the same initials who were working elsewhere on the south coast.

Although pipemaking is documented in the town from 1618/19 onwards, the lists of known makers tend to contain rather brief and often contradictory references (Arnold 1977, 327-335; Oswald 1975, 171-4). While a review of the documentary evidence is clearly needed, the general pattern seems clear in that the town had a consistent but never particularly large pipemaking industry, which can now be seen to have probably been continuous from before 1618 through to about 1914. The excavations took place in the French Quarter of Southampton, an area where many of the pipemakers are known to have worked (e.g., John Richman who took a lease of a property next to the Theatre Tavern in French Street in 1687, or William Browne who rented a property in next to the entry to St John's Hospital in French Street in 1749; Arnold 1977, 329). Several of the manufacturers who worked in this area marked their products and a good range of these have been recovered from the excavations. The excavated material allows the pipe production that was taking place on or near the site to be characterised and shows that, during the seventeenth century from c1660-80, some 20% of the pipes are of west-country forms. These are unmarked, generally unburnished and without rim milling (e.g., Figs 25-9). This style has not previously been particularly noted from Southampton but the numbers present suggest that they must have formed part of the range produced in the town. During the first half of the eighteenth century the local makers typically produced spur pipes with stem stamps, but these tended to be of average quality and did not match the finer quality pipes produced in neighbouring centres.

The archaeological evidence suggests that the Southampton industry was sufficient to provide for the majority of the town's needs, and a small export trade, but that the production was generally of standard regional types and mediocre quality. This allowed pipemakers from as much as 40-50 miles inland to take a small share of the town's domestic and export markets, particularly where these pipes came from specialist centres producing good quality pipes. There are a small number of imported pipes that must have been carried by coastal or overseas shipping, but never in sufficient quantity to suggest a substantial and organised trade as opposed to small scale cargoes and/or personal possessions. Just one possible fragment of a specific export style pipe was recovered from context 3413 but, even if this is an export piece, it is insufficient evidence by itself to suggest that they were actually being made in Southampton. The better quality and/or imported pipes appear to be particularly associated with the occupation of Polymond Hall, a high status household in this part of the town. The Southampton industry appears to have declined towards the middle of the eighteenth century but the excavations have produced new evidence that there was a resurgence towards the end of the century, and that this revival continued into the nineteenth century.

Acknowledgements

The author is particularly grateful to Jan van Oostveen in the Netherlands for his help with identifying the Dutch mark and to Dr Susie White for producing all the pipe illustrations for this paper. The die details were drawn by the author.

List of illustrations

The most diagnostic fragments from this site have been illustrated at 1:1 and the following list gives a suggested date for each example, together with details of its appearance and attributes. Each entry ends with the site code, area code, context number and object reference number (respectively). Burnished surfaces are indicated with broken lines. Incuse lettering for the marks is shown solid and relief lettering in outline. The bowl forms have been illustrated at life size with the mark details at twice life size (twice the size of the scale bar).

Fig 1 - West-Country style bowl of c1640-1670 with an incuse stamped mark on the heel reading IEF/FRY.H/VNT. This can be attributed to either Jeffrey Hunt I (1599-1690) or II (born 1623/4) of Norton St./ Philip, Somerset. The bowl has a bottered and fully milled rim and has been finished with a very good burnish. Stem bore 8/64". SOU 1382 3647.

Fig 2 - West-Country style bowl of c1640-1670 with a relief stamped mark on the heel depicting a running fox. Presumably made by a pipemaker named Fox, most likely working in Salisbury. The bowl has a bottered and fully milled rim. Stem bore 6/64". SOU 1382 3641.

Fig 3 - West-Country style bowl of c1630-1650 with an incuse stamped gauntlet mark on the heel. Originally used by the Gauntlet family of Amesbury, this mark was widely copied by other manufacturers in the region. The bowl has a rather square cut rim, which may not have been bottered. The bowl is fully milled rim and has been finished with an average burnish. Stem bore 8/64". SOU 1382 3413.

Fig 4 - West-Country style bowl of c1630-1650 with an incuse stamped gauntlet mark on the heel. Originally used by the Gauntlet family of Amesbury, this mark was widely copied by other manufacturers in the region. The bowl has a rather square cut rim, which may not have been bottered. The bowl is fully milled rim and has not been burnished. Stem bore 8/64". SOU 1382 3070.

Fig 5 - West-Country style bowl of c1660-1680 with an incuse stamped gauntlet mark on the heel. Originally used by the Gauntlet family of Amesbury, this mark was widely copied by other manufacturers in the region. The bowl has a rather square cut rim, which may not have been bottered and which has not been milled. The bowl has a good burnish and the stem bore probably measured 8/64" (mostly broken away). SOU 1382 3642.

Fig 6 - West-Country style bowl of c1660-1680 with an incuse stamped gauntlet mark on the heel. Originally used by the Gauntlet family of Amesbury, this mark was widely copied by other manufacturers in the region. The bowl has a lightly bottered and fully milled rim – it has not been burnish. Stem bore 7/64". SOU 1382 3641.

Fig 7 - Fragment of c1660-1680 with a relief stamped mark on the heel containing a single letter W. Damaged mark, possibly form Salisbury, although this is rather uncertain. The bowl has a rather square cut rim, which does not appear to have been bottered. The bowl is fully milled rim and has quite a glossy surface that may have been rubbed in some way to help polish it although it does not appear to have been actually burnished. Stem bore unmeasurable. SOU 1382 3641.

Fig 8 - Dutch bowl of c1720-1750 with a relief stamped mark on the heel comprising a crowned L. This can be attributed to one of the de Lichts (1730-53) or Frans Verzijl (1753-74) of Gouda. The rim has been bottered and all the surviving section is milled. The bowl surface has an average burnish and the stem bore measures 5/64". This is one of two identical bowls from this context, which also produced two identical roll-stamped stems that would have origianlly been connected to them. One of these is shown in Fig 9. SOU 1382 4148.

Fig 9 - Stem fragment of *c*1720-1750 with a Dutch roll-stamped border comprising a series of milled lines with 'ring of pearls' edges. This stem and roll-stamp is one of two identical examples recovered from the same context, which also produced two identical Dutch bowls with crowned L marks (see Fig 8 above), with which they must have originally connected. The stem has a light, average quality burnish and a stem bore of 5/64". SOU 1382 4148.

Fig 10 - A thin Dutch stem fragment of *c*1770-1840 with a faintly impressed 'ring of pearls' roll stamp and traces of diagonally milled lines. The stem is not burnished and has a stem bore of 5/64". SOU 1382 7651.

Fig 11 - Bowl dating from *c*1700-1740 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading BRO/WN. The last letter looks like a ligatured NL but was perhaps intended to be NE. This mark can be attributed to one of the Roger or William Brown's of Southampton, who were active in the early eighteenth century. The rim has been cut and lightly bottered and the stem bore is 5/64". SOU 1382 3647.

Fig 12 - Stem fragment of *c*1700-1740 with a poorly impressed incuse stamped mark across the stem that would probably have read R/BRO/WN. This was made by one of the Roger Brown's of Southampton during the early eighteenth century. The stem is not burnished and has a bore of 6/64". SOU 1382 6430.

Fig 13 - Stem fragment of *c*1710-1730 with a previously unrecorded relief stamped mark across the stem reading CAR/TER. Oswald (1975, 171) has previously noted marks of *c*1720-50 reading C. Carter, which he attributes to a Southampton maker. The stem is unburnished and has a bore of 6/64". SOU 1382 3640.

Fig 14 - Stem fragment of *c*1700-1730 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading THO/MAS/DOD. This can be attributed to Thomas Dod of Boldre. Oswald (1981, 172) notes marriages for Thomas Dod of Boldre in 1695 and 1723. The stem has a good burnish and a bore of 7/64". SOU 1382 3640.

Fig 15 - Bowl of *c*1705-1737 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading RIC/HARD/HOAR. This can be attributed to Richard Hoar of Portsmouth who is recorded in parish register entries from 1705-37 (Fox & Hall 1979, 16-17). The rim is cut and the bowl has been finely burnished. Stem bore 6/64". SOU 1382 3647.

Fig 16 - Bowl of *c*1690-1730 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading RICH/MAN. This can be attributed to John Richman of who moved from East Woodhay to Southampton in 1687 and was still there in 1697. The style of the mark is most likely to date from the early eighteenth century. The rim has been bottered but not milled and the pipe is not burnished. Stem bore 7/64". SOU 1382 5010.

Fig 17 - Bowl dating from *c*1700-1730 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading RICH/ARD.S/AYER. This can be attributed to Richard Sayer of East Woodhay. There appear to have been at least two makers of this name working at East Woodhay in Hampshire from at least 1685-1716 (Cannon 1991, 25). The rim has been cut and the bowl given a good quality burnish. Stem bore is 6/64" (but nearly 7/64"). SOU 1382 3640.

Fig 18 - Fragment of *c*1700-1740 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading THO/SHAR/P. This is presumed to be the son of the pipemaker Thomas Sharpe of Romsey, who died in either 1689 or 1698 (ambiguous dates from transcripts in the Winchester Museum files taken from Inventory 098/1-2). Individuals named Thomas Sharp were married at Romsey in 1682 and 1728 (occupations unknown). The very rim of this pipe seems to have been lightly bottered but it is not milled. The bowl has a good burnish on it but not the stem. Stem bore 7/64". These finishing characteristics are all the same as

another bowl from 5010 and a stem from 5073, and so seem to be typical for this maker. SOU 1382 3876.

Fig 19 - Fragment of *c*1700-1740 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading THO/SHARP. This is presumed to be the son of the pipemaker Thomas Sharpe of Romsey, who died in either 1689 or 1698 (ambiguous dates from transcripts in the Winchester Museum files taken from Inventory 098/1-2). Individuals named Thomas Sharp were married at Romsey in 1682 and 1728 (occupations unknown). This pipe has a very light, poor burnish on the bowl (only) and a stem bore of 7/64". SOU 1382 5073.

Fig 20 – Pipe of *c*1710-1740 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading SID/NEY. This can be attributed to one of the Sidney family of Southampton (see Arnold 1977, 329-31 for details). The rim has been very lightly bottered and wiped but the pipe is not milled or burnished. Stem bore 7/64". SOU 1382 4179.

Fig 21 - Fragment of *c*1710-1740 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading SID/NEY. This can be attributed to one of the Sidney family of Southampton (see Arnold 1977, 329-31 for details). The rim has been very lightly bottered but the pipe is not milled or burnished. Stem bore 6/64". SOU 1382 4179.

Fig 22 – Stem fragment of *c*1700-1730 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading RVB/SYD/NEY. This was probably made by Ruben Sidney (I) of Southampton, born 1673, apprenticed 1687, married 1696 and died 1750 (Arnold 1977, 331). The stem is not burnished and has a bore of 7/64". SOU 1382 3640.

Fig 23 - Bowl of *c*1710-1750 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading WILL/SID/NEY. This was most likely made by William (I), working by 1719 and buried in 1741 as opposed to his son, William (II), who was recorded as sick and on poor relief in 1747 (see Arnold 1977, 329-31 for full family details). The bowl is unburnished and has a simple cut rim. Stem bore 6/64". SOU 1382 3639.

Fig 24 – Bowl of *c*1710-1750 with an incuse stamped mark across the stem reading WILL/SID/NEY. This was either made by William (I), working by 1719 and buried in 1741 or his son, William (II), who was recorded as sick and on poor relief in 1747 (see Arnold 1977, 329-31 for full family details). This bowl has thinner walls and a slightly later feel than Fig 23. The rim has been cut and wiped but not burnished. Stem bore 6/64". SOU 1382 4148.

Fig 25 - West-Country style bowl of *c*1640-70 with a bottered but not milled rim. Stem bore 7/64". SOU 1382 3642.

Fig 26 - West-Country style bowl of *c*1650-80. Rim has been wiped (and possibly bottered) but is not milled. Stem bore 6/64". SOU 1382 3641.

Fig 27 - West-Country style bowl of *c*1660-80 with a bottered but not milled rim. Stem bore 7/64". SOU 1382 3641.

Fig 28 - West-Country style bowl of *c*1660-80. Rim has been wiped (and possibly bottered) but is not milled. Stem bore 8/64". SOU 1382 3641.

Fig 29 - West-Country style bowl of *c*1660-80. Rim has been wiped but does not appear to have been bottered; it is not milled. Stem bore 8/64". SOU 1382 3641.

Fig 30 - West-Country style bowl of c1700-30. Rim has been wiped but does not appear to have been bottered; it is not milled. Stem bore 8/64". SOU 1382 3640.

Fig 31 – Transitional style bowl of c1680-1710. Rim bottered but not milled. Stem bore 7/64". SOU 1382 4179.

Fig 32 – Spur pipe of c1700-40, probably produced locally. The rim has probably been lightly bottered and wiped. Stem bore 6/64". SOU 1382 3640.

Fig 33 – Pipe of c1720-50 with a cut rim. Stem bore 6/64". SOU 1382 4148.

Fig 34 – Pipe of c1700-1740 with a relief moulded mark on the sides of the heel reading RB. This can be attributed to either Roger Brown (I) of Southampton, buried 1737, or his son, Roger (II), buried 1765. The bowl has very thick walls and the rim has been cut and wiped. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 3640.

Fig 35 – Spur bowl of c1730-1760 with a relief moulded mark on the sides of the heel reading WB. This can be attributed to William Brown of French Street, Southampton. An identical example was recovered from context 667. The pipe has a cut rim and a stem bore of 5/64". SOU 1382 6382.

Fig 36 – Armorial bowl from a pit group of c1770-1800 (and most likely c1775-90) with the maker's initials WB. These initials can almost certainly be attributed to the William Brown who took out a 40 year lease of a property in French Street in 1749 (Arnold 1977, 329). This is one of four different Armorial designs from the pit made by Brown, this example being characterised by quite large, clearly separated leaves on the seam facing away from the smoker in conjunction with the medium sized initials GR flanking the arms and touching the rim line. The initials WB are also relatively large and the design is not very crisply executed on the bowl. The design is a slightly inaccurate version of the Hanoverian Arms and the lettering of the mottoes is almost illegible, but appears to have been intended as HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE around the arms with DIEU ET MON DROIT in the ribbon below. Only one example of this style was recovered, with a stem bore of 6/64". SOU 1382 6438.

Fig 37 - Armorial bowl from a pit group of c1770-1800 (and most likely c1775-90) with the maker's initials WB. These initials can almost certainly be attributed to the William Brown who took out a 40 year lease of a property in French Street in 1749 (Arnold 1977, 329). This is one of four different Armorial designs from the pit made by Brown, this example being characterised by rather confused leaves on the seam facing away from the smoker from which spring a single rose on the left hand side of the bowl and a single thistle on the right. The rose is also distinctive in that it has a serrated stem. The initials GR flanking the arms are rather small while the maker's initials on the spur are relatively large. The design is a slightly inaccurate version of the Hanoverian Arms and the lettering of the mottoes is almost illegible, but appears to have been intended as HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE around the arms with DIEU ET MON DROIT in the ribbon below. Four examples of this design were recovered from the pit – three with stem bores of 6/64" and one with a bore of 5/64". SOU 1382 6438.

Fig 38 - Armorial bowl from a pit group of c1770-1800 (and most likely c1775-90) with the maker's initials WB. These initials can almost certainly be attributed to the William Brown who took out a 40 year lease of a property in French Street in 1749 (Arnold 1977, 329). This is one of four different Armorial designs from the pit made by Brown, this example being characterised by rather confused leaves on the seam facing away from the smoker from which spring both a rose and a thistle on each side of the bowl. The initials GR flanking the arms are rather small and the initials WB are smaller than the version shown in Fig 37. Most notably, this design also has tendril decoration on the stem. The bowl design depicts a slightly inaccurate version of the Hanoverian Arms and the lettering of the mottoes is almost illegible, but appears to have been intended as HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE around the arms

with DIEU ET MON DROIT in the ribbon below. Only one example was recovered, with a stem bore of 5/64". SOU 1382 6438.

Fig 39 – Stem fragment of c1770-1800 with relief moulded tendril decoration on the sides, with leaves and acorns from the tendril. This fragment matches pieces from pit group 6438, which probably dates from c1775-90, and so it almost certainly comes from an Armorial WB pipe, as shown in Figure 38. It was not possible to establish a certain overlap with this mould type to show the full extent of the decorative stem scheme. Similar decorative stems are also known on Armorial pipes marked RB (Arnold 1977, Fig 8.6). Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 6273.

Fig 40 - Armorial bowl from a pit group of c1770-1800 (and most likely c1775-90) with the maker's initials WB. These initials can almost certainly be attributed to the William Brown who took out a 40 year lease of a property in French Street in 1749 (Arnold 1977, 329). This is one of four different Armorial designs from the pit made by Brown, this example being characterised by quite large, clearly separated leaves on the seam facing away from the smoker in conjunction with the large initials GR flanking the arms and set well down from the rim line. The initials WB are also distinctive and unusual in that they have been set upright on the sides of the spur. There are some faint marks just below the rim on the right hand side of the bowl that have been partially blurred by wiping. These could be lettering, although this would be very unusual on this style of pipe. The other side of the bowl is missing, so it cannot be seen if this was mirrored. At the interior base of the bowl is a relief moulded cross, arranged as a '+' in relation to the long axis of the pipe. The design is a slightly inaccurate version of the Hanoverian Arms and the lettering of the mottoes is not all legible (although better than the others in this group), but appears to have been intended as HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE around the arms with DIEU ET MON DROIT in the ribbon below. Only one example of this style was recovered, with a stem bore of 5/64". This particular example is also extremely unusual in that it has a soft grey metal, probably lead, intermittently blocking the stem bore for at least 5.5cm from the bowl. There is no trace of metal within the bowl base itself. SOU 1382 6438.

Fig 41 - Fragment of a Masonic bowl from a pit group of c1770-1800 (and most likely c1775-90) with the maker's initials WB. These initials can almost certainly be attributed to the William Brown who took out a 40 year lease of a property in French Street in 1749 (Arnold 1977, 329). A joining fragment gives 183mm of surviving stem. This appears to have been straight (not curved) and it shows very little taper over the surviving length, suggesting that this was a very long stemmed design. The base of the heel has not been trimmed and there is part of an internal bowl cross surviving, arranged as a '+' in relation to the long axis of the pipe. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 6438.

Fig 42 - Fluted bowl from a pit group of c1770-1800 (and most likely c1775-90) with the maker's initials WB. These initials can almost certainly be attributed to the William Brown who took out a 40 year lease of a property in French Street in 1749 (Arnold 1977, 329). This is a very large, full bodied bowl with thin walls. The unusually thin and closely spaced flutes comprise six thicker flutes on each side of the bowl between each pair of which is a central medium sized flute flanked by two thin ones. Fragments of three of these pipes were found in the pit but only two had measurable bores, both of which were 6/64". SOU 1382 6438.

Fig 43 - Fragment of a fluted bowl from a pit group of c1770-1800 (and most likely c1775-90). One of two fragmentary examples from the same mould in this context, one of which has a stem bore of 5/64" and the other 4/64". SOU 1382 6438.

Fig 44 – Fluted spur bowl from a pit group of c1770-1800 (and most likely c1775-90), with a relief moulded mark on the sides of the heel reading AC. This can be attributed to Arthur Coster of Fareham, who was born in 1752 and died in 1816. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 6438.

Fig 45 – Fluted heel bowl dating from c1770-1816 with a relief moulded mark on the sides of the heel reading AC. This can be attributed to Arthur Coster of Fareham, who was born in 1752 and died in 1816. The base of the heel has not been trimmed. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 6898.

Fig 46 - Armorial bowl of c1740-1800 with the relief moulded initials IS on the sides of the spur. This maker has not been identified. Stem bore 6/64". The design is a slightly inaccurate version of the Hanoverian Arms but they have been neatly engraved and the quality is much better than that of the WB Armorialia above (Figs 36-40). The lettering around the arms reads HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE with SEMPER EADEM in the ribbon below. This was the motto of Elizabeth I and the author has only been able to find one design where it has been used on a pipe (Le Cheminant 1981, 105). The bowl form is also more refined than the WB examples, with the upper part of the bowl flaring out slightly towards the rim when viewed along the stem of the pipe. Stem bore just over 6/64". SOU 1382 218.

Fig 47 – Fluted bowl fragment with the relief moulded initials GH on the sides of the heel. This pipe can be attributed to George Harding of Southampton, who ran his business from c1843-71, during which time he was probably the principal pipemaker in Southampton. This design had leaf decorated seams and seven quite thick flutes on each side of the bowl. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 139.

Fig 48 - Bowl decorated with a bottle and glass motif with the relief moulded initials GH on the sides of the heel. This pipe can be attributed to George Harding of Southampton, who ran his business from c1843-71, during which time he was probably the principal pipemaker in Southampton. This particular example has been broken with 86mm of surviving stem but then reused, as is shown by the clear tooth wear marks on the stem. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 139.

Fig 49 – Bowl decorated with a rose and thistle design with the relief moulded initials GH on the sides of the heel. This pipe can be attributed to George Harding of Southampton, who ran his business from c1843-71, during which time he was probably the principal pipemaker in Southampton. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 487.

Fig 50 – Stem fragment relief moulded mark on the left hand side of the stem reading HARDING. A trimming mark has removed any surname initial and the right hand side of the stem is blank. This fragment can be attributed to either George Harding (working c1843-71) or his son Edward (working c1858-66). George was the senior and more established pipemaker of the two and most likely to have made this pipe. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 8064.

Fig 51 – Bowl fragment with a relief moulded mark on the sides of the heel reading GH. This can be attributed to George Harding of Southampton. George Harding ran his business from c1843-71, during which time he was probably the principal pipemaker in Southampton. The bowl seams are decorated with oak leaves and acorns. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 60.

Fig 52 – Small bowl with leaf decorated seams and relief moulded initials on the sides of the heel reading GH. This pipe can be attributed to George Harding of Southampton, who ran his business from c1843-71, during which time he was probably the principal pipemaker in Southampton. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 133.

Fig 53 – Large bowl with leaf-decorated seams and the relief moulded initials GH on the sides of the heel. This pipe can be attributed to George Harding of Southampton, who ran his business from c1843-71, during which time he was probably the principal pipemaker in Southampton. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 141.

Fig 54 – Plain bowl with the relief moulded initials GH on the sides of the heel. This pipe can be attributed to George Harding of Southampton, who ran his business from c1843-71, during which time he was probably the principal pipemaker in Southampton. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 8301.

Fig 55 – Fluted bowl of c1810-1850 with the relief moulded initials JM on the sides of the heel reading. This is perhaps John Munday, who was working at Carisbrooke from at least 1841-51, although this maker is more likely to have been a journeyman rather than a master pipemaker. Stem bore 5/64". SOU 1382 4757.

Fig 56 – Bowl of c1830-1860 with leaf decorated seams and a relief moulded mark on the sides of the heel reading JS. This can probably be attributed to John Skain / Skeans of Southampton, who is recorded working from 1839-44. Alternatively, there was a James Skeaines was working in Salisbury from at least 1852-75. Stem bore 4/64". SOU 1382 8301.

Fig 57 - Bowl fragment dating from c1840-70 with large, curled leaves on the seams. Stem bore 4/64". SOU 1382 133.

Fig 58 – Half of a hair-curler dating from c1700-1800. The curler has been neatly rolled, probably using a former, and has a simple cut end. The curler measures 9.6mm at its narrowest point and 14.6mm at its maximum swelling. SOU 1382 487.

References

Arnold C J, 1977, 'The Clay Tobacco-Pipe Industry: An Economic Study' in D P S Peacock (ed.) *Pottery and Early Commerce*, Academic Press, London, 313-336 (340pp).

Arnold C J, & Allan J P, 1980, 'Exeter: It's Clay-Tobacco Pipe Industry and Commercial Relations' in P Davey (ed.) *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe*, **III**, British Archaeological Reports, Oxford, British Series 78, 305-24.

Atkinson D R, 1970, 'Clay Tobacco Pipes and Pipemakers of Salisbury, Wiltshire', *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, **65**, 177-89 & Plate XI.

Atkinson D R, 1972, 'Further Notes on Clay Tobacco Pipes and Pipemakers from the Marlborough and Salisbury Districts', *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, **67**, 149-56.

Atkinson, D R, 1975, 'The Clay Tobacco-Pipes' in C Platt and R Coleman-Smith, *Excavations in Medieval Southampton 1953-69*, Vol 2, Leicester University Press, 343-9.

Atkinson, D R & Oswald A, 1980, 'The Dating and Typology of Clay Pipes Bearing the Royal Arms' in P Davey (ed.) *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe*, **III**, British Archaeological Reports, Oxford, British Series 78, 363-91.

Brown W E, 1959, 'Tobacco and Clay Pipes' in *The Victoria County History of Wiltshire*, **4**, 240-4.

Cannon P, 1991, 'Evidence of Tobacco Pipe Making in East Woodhay & District', *Transactions of Newbury and District Field Club*, **14.1**, 16-27.

David N, 2003, 'Appendix 4: Clay Tobacco Pipes' in K J Barton (ed.), *The Archaeology of Castle Cornet, St Peter Port, Guernsey*, Guernsey Museum and Art Gallery, 231-78.

Fox, R and Barton, K J, 1986, 'Excavations at Oyster Street, Portsmouth, Hampshire, 1968-71', *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, **20**, 31-255 ('The Clay Pipes' 185-223).

Fox, R T and Hall, R B, 1979, *The Clay Tobacco Pipes of the Portsmouth Harbour Region 1680-1932*, no publisher listed, 56pp.

Higgins, D A, 2008, 'Merseyside Clay Tobacco Pipes, c1600-1750', *Journal of the Merseyside Archaeological Society*, **12**, 125-60.

Higgins, D A, forthcoming, 'Clay Tobacco Pipes from Excavations at the Oracle Site, Reading', Oxford Archaeology.

Le Cheminant, R, 1981, 'Armorial from St Paul's Wharf', in P Davey (ed.) *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe*, **VI**, British Archaeological Reports, Oxford, British Series 97, 102-26.

Lewcun, M, 1985, 'The Hunt Family Identified', *Society for Clay Pipe Research Newsletter*, **8**, 14-21.

Markell, D J, 1992, 'The Clay Tobacco Pipes' in I. P. Horsey, *Excavations in Poole 1973-1983*, Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society, Monograph 10, 159-175 (210pp).

Markell, D J, 1994, 'The Clay Tobacco Pipes' in D. R. Watkins, *The Foundry Excavations on Poole Waterfront 1986/7*, Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society, Monograph 14, 56-9 (96pp).

Noël Hume, A, 1971, 'English Clay Tobacco Pipes Bearing the Royal Arms from Williamsburg, Virginia', *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, **4**, 141-6.

Norgate, M, 1984, Edward and James Fox, Pipemakers of Trowbridge, *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, **78**, 128-9.

Oswald, A, 1975, *Clay Pipes for the Archaeologist*, British Archaeological Reports, British Series 14, Oxford, 207pp.

White, S D, 2004, *The Dynamics of Regionalisation and Trade: Yorkshire Clay Tobacco Pipes c1600-1800*, British Archaeological Reports, British Series 374, Oxford, 567pp.

Appendix 1 – Context Summary:

Summary of the clay tobacco pipes recovered from the Southampton French Quarter excavations (SOU 1382) by context, showing the numbers of bowl (B), stem (S) and mouthpiece (M) fragments recovered from each group. The overall date range represented within each group is listed (range) as well as the likely deposition date based on the latest pipe fragments recovered (deposit). Pipe fragments from sieved samples are highlighted in yellow.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
39	39	Layer	demolition fill	172	EMOD	1	3		4	1660-1770	1680-1770				
60	166	Fill	cess pit fill	172	EMOD	1	1		2	1800-1900	1840-1870	GH	Leaf & acorn seams	51	Includes a partial bowl of c1840-70 with leaf and acorn seams and a moulded GH mark on the spur. George Harding of Southampton is recorded working 1843-71.
76	76	Layer	Overburden	N/A	EMOD		8	1	9	1640-1900	1800-1900				One residual C17th/18th stem but all the rest probably C19th. Mouthpiece has cut end.
131	80	Fill	Service trench fill	172	EMOD		2		2	1780-1880	1780-1880				One piece certainly curved.
133	169	Fill	cess pit fill	172	EMOD	10	9	3	22	1800-1900	1840-1870	GH x 6	Leaf seams x 8 plus bottle & glass	48, 52, 57	Good group with all bowls fitting a date range of c1840-70. All the surviving spurs are marked GH for George Harding of Southampton, who is recorded working 1843-71. All bowls where enough survives to tell have leaf decorated seams. One of these has very wide, stylised leaves and another has the addition of a bottle on the LHS and a glass on the RHS, surrounded by a wreath. This last piece fits a stem (fresh break) to give 87mm surviving with wear marks at the end, showing it was used in this state (Fig 48). A mouthpiece from this context fits with a stem from 141, another fill from the same cess pit.
139	166	Fill	cess pit fill	172	EMOD	2			2	1840-1870	1840-1870	GH x 2	Flutes x 1, Bottle, Glass, etc x 1	47, 48	Two bowl fragments, both marked GH for George Harding of Southampton, who is recorded working 1843-71. One is a complete bottle and glass design with 88mm of surviving stem and the other a fragmentary fluted bowl with leaf decorated seams.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
141	169	Fill	cess pit fill	172	EMOD	1	13	1	15	1610-1900	1840-1870	GH x 1	Leaf seams x 1	53	One residual C17th stem but all the rest probably C19th and a good date provided by a complete George Harding bowl of c1840-70 with leaf seams. The mouthpiece has a cut end. A stem from this context fits with a mouthpiece from 133, another fill from the same cess pit.
153	149	Fill	Pit fill	172	EMOD		2	1	3	1800-1900	1800-1900		Red tip		Three C19th stems, all likely to be mid century in date. The tip has a cut end and 38mm of red coating on it - some sort of degraded wax or paint.
195	195	Masonry	Concrete slab	172	EMOD		2		2	1760-1880	1760-1880				Most likely to be C19th stems.
215	215	Layer	Layer	172	EMOD		3		3	1760-1880	1800-1880				
218	228	Fill	Pit fill	172	EMOD	1	22	2	25	1740-1880	1740-1800	IS x 1	Armorial	46	Quite a large group but only one bowl, which is a complete Armorial of c1740-80 marked IS on the spur - maker unknown. This is a neatly executed bowl. The stems are hard to place, being of late C18th or C19th types. Latest date for this group uncertain.
267	257	Fill	Pit fill	173	HMED			1	1	1610-1710	1610-1710				Cut mouthpiece of C17th type with a stem bore of 8/64".
355	311	Fill	Pit fill	172	HMED		1		1	1750-1900	1750-1900				Undiagnostic stem fragment with a bore of 5/64".
417	416	Fill	fill of service trench	General	EMOD		2		2	1660-1900	1750-1900				

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
487	487	Layer	levelling layer	173	EMOD	1	5	1	7	1610-1900	1840-1870	GH x 1	Rose & Thistle; foliage stem	49, 58	Mixed stem fragments but a decorated stem and complete GH bowl both suggest a latest date of c1840-70 (George Harding of Southampton is recorded working 1843-71). The complete GH bowl has leaf seams and a rose on the LHS, thistle on the RHS. There is a stem fragment with leaf and tendril design on the sides. The context bag also includes half of a neatly made C18th hair curler, unmarked.
591	590	Fill	Fill of drain	172	HMED		3		3	1740-1840	1740-1840				Two of the pieces join (fresh break) and all could be from the same pipe. Hard to date accurately but perhaps most likely to be later C18th.
610	610	Layer	Floor surface	172	EMOD		6	1	7	1700-1840	1750-1840				Mouthpiece has a cut tip.
667	855	Fill	fill of cess pit	173	PMED	1	1		2	1610-1760	1730-1760	WB x 1			A residual fragment of C17th stem and part of a plain bowl with a forward pointing spur marked WB dating from c1730-60. The initials are upright on the spur, an unusual orientation. This pipe can be attributed to one of the two William Browne's who were working in the first half of the C18th (a burial is recorded 1751).
668	854	Fill	Modern fill	173	PMED		1		1	1660-1730	1660-1730				
669	854	Fill	Fill of stone and brick lined feature	173	PMED	1	4		5	1610-1730	1680-1730				Plain heel (only) of around 1660-90 plus some mixed stems, the latest of which are probably c1680-1730.
768	767	Fill	fill of square feature	172	HMED		1		1	1710-1800	1710-1800				
769	240	Fill	fill of drain	172	EMOD		2		2	1720-1850	1720-1850				
794	793	Fill	Post hole fill	172	PMED		1		1	1710-1750	1710-1750	WILL / SID / NEY x 1			Fairly thick stem with the mark of William Sidney. William (I) was buried in 1741 and his son, William (II) was sick and on poor relief in 1747.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
886	885	Fill	fill of barrel pit	173	EMOD		4		4	1760-1880	1760-1880				Some long and slightly curved fragments, most likely late C18th or early C19th.
919	919	Layer	Rubble layer	173	EMOD	1	1		2	1660-1710	1660-1710				A late C17th heel fragment and a stem of late C17th or early C18th date.
921	921	Layer	floor layer	173	PMED		1		1	1610-1710	1610-1710				Small stem fragment with a large bore (9/64").
980	980	Layer	lens	173	LMED	1	5		6	1610-1680	1640-1660				Four of the stem fragments join (fresh breaks) and all of the fragments from this context are burnished - most of them finely. There is a heart-shaped heel fragment of c1640-60, also finely burnished, which provides a likely date for this group of good quality pipe fragments.
1028	1027	Fill	pit or posthole fill	173	PMED		1		1	1650-1710	1650-1710				A markedly oval stem fragment with a large bore. Could be anywhere from c1650-1710 but most likely c1660-1700.
1120 (sample 32)	1033	Fill	Pottery vessel fill	173	PMED		1		1	1750-1900	1750-1900				Small piece of cylindrical stem. Hard to date accurately but perhaps most likely late C18th to early C19th.
1281	1280	Fill	Pit fill	174	PMED	1	1		2	1640-1720	1670-1700				Group comprises a very abraded (looks water-rolled) stem of C17th or early C18th date and a complete, fresh looking heel bowl of local style dating from c1670-1700.
1283	1289	Fill	Pit fill	174	LMED		1		1	1610-1710	1610-1710				Abraded stem fragment.
1396	1401	Fill	Pit fill	174	PMED		1		1	1720-1840	1720-1840				Small stem fragment - quite thick but with a relatively small bore of 5/64".
1397	1401	Fill	Pit fill	174	PMED		2		2	1610-1850	1750-1850				Two stems, the later of which dates from c1750-1850.
3030	3029	Fill	Construction cut Fill	237	PMED		1		1	1610-1730	1610-1730				Most likely to be later C17th or early C18th.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
3070	3169	Layer	Floor surface	237	PMED	1		1	2	1610-1710	1630-1650	Gauntlet x 1		4	One quite thick but sharply tapered and burnished C17th piece leading to a cut mouthpiece and a complete bowl of c1630-50 with a gauntlet stamp on the heel. The bowl is of a distinctive West Country form and the mark is very similar to [3413] but a different die.
3182	3182	Masonry	Wall	237	PMED	1	4		5	1660-1750	1690-1730	RICH / MAN x 1			Mixed stems of late C17th or early C18th date plus a spur bowl fragment associated with a RICH/MAN stem stamp. John Richman moved to Southampton from East Woodhay around 1687 and is recorded until at least 1697. The style of the pipe and mark could date from as late as c1730.
3189	3188	Fill	Pit fill	237	PMED	3	15	2	20	1610-1730	1680-1710				The stems in this context are of C17th or early C18th types, but generally rather coarse and crudely made. The three bowl fragments (two heels and one spur) would all fit with a date of c1680-1710, which seems the likely date for this group as a whole. The one complete bowl has an unusually large bore for this period of 9/64".
3189 (sample 107)	3188	Fill	Pit fill	237	PMED	2	3		5	1610-1740	1690-1740				Mainly residual C17th pipes, including a complete heel bowl of c1660-80. The latest piece, however, is an almost complete bowl, probably spur, of c1690-1740 (and most likely c1700-30).
3323	3322	Fill	Pit fill	237	PMED	2	8		10	1610-1730	1690-1720	RICH / MAN x 1			Generally rather coarse, crude stems with large bores - probably late C17th. Group includes a spur bowl fragment associated with a RICH/MAN stem stamp. John Richman moved to Southampton from East Woodhay around 1687 and is recorded until at least 1697. The style of the pipe and mark could date from as late as c1730 but most likely c1690-1720 in this group.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
3397	3397	Layer	Modern fill	237	PMED		1		1	1660-1720	1660-1720				
3413	3413	Layer	Demolition layer	237	EMOD	2	3		5	1610-1700	1610-1700	Gauntlet x 1		3	Group includes a complete bowl of c1630-50 with a gauntlet stamp on the heel (very similar to [3070] but a different die). The bowl is of a distinctive West Country form. There is also a thick stem opening into a bowl that is possibly a heelless export type. The other stems have thick bores and all of these pieces are of C17th date.
3421	3421	Masonry	Wall	237	PMED		1		1	1680-1750	1680-1750				
3511	3511	Layer	Cleaning layer	237	-		1		1	1750-1850	1750-1850				
3553	3549	Fill	tank fill	237	PMED		1		1	1660-1720	1660-1720				
3554	3549	Fill	tank fill	237	PMED		1		1	1610-1750	1610-1750				
3639	3549	Fill	tank fill	237	PMED	2			2	1710-1750	1710-1750	WILL / SID / NEY x 1		23	Two complete early C18th spur bowls, one of which has 111mm of surviving stem with the mark of William Sidney. William (I) was buried in 1741 and his son, William (II) was sick and on poor relief in 1747.
3640 (sample 108)	3549	Fill	tank fill	237	PMED		4		4	1610-1740	1700-1740				

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
3640	3549	Fill	tank fill	237	PMED	7	25	2	34	1610-1740	1700-1740	CAR / TER x 1; THO / MAS / DOD x 1; RICH / ARD.S / AYER x 2; RVB / SID / NEY x 1		13, 14, 17, 22, 30, 32	Although there are one or two residual pieces, this is basically an excellent early C18th group with several complete bowls and stem fragments of up to 175mm in length. There are five marked stems representing four different makers, all of whom were working between about 1690 and 1750. The marks fit best with a 1700-1740 deposition, with 1710-30 being most probable within this period.
3641 (sample 109)	3549	Fill	Pit fill	237	PMED	8	17	2	27	1610-1680	1660-1680				Original count 23 and 4 pieces probably broken since then. Same range of material as main context group.
3641	3549	Fill	Pit fill	237	PMED	53	185	12	250	1610-1680	1660-1680	Running fox x 1; Gauntlet x 1; ?W x 1	milled stem	2, 6, 7, 26, 27, 28, 29	A large and very consistent group including large fragments of up to 135mm in length. There are a few residual bowl forms ranging from c1610-60 but the majority all fall within the c1660-80 range, providing a close and reliable date for this deposit. Forms are predominantly heel with just occasional spur types. Three heel marks present, one is heart-shaped with stars above the (damaged) lettering, which seems to comprise a single large W. An example of this mark from Bridge St, Christchurch, occurs on a chinned 'west-country' style bowl of c1660-80 with a possible place of manufacture being given as Salisbury (Markell notes, NPA).
3642 (sample 110)	3549	Fill	tank fill	237	PMED	4	14	1	19	1610-1710	1660-1680				Includes two complete bowls of c1660-80 and a burnished bowl fragment - unusual for this context.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
3642	3549	Fill	tank fill	237	PMED	13	40		53	1640-1680	1660-1680	Gauntlet x 1		5, 25	Large, fresh looking group, with pieces of up to 150mm in length before being recently broken. There are one or two bowl forms of c1640-60 but the majority are all c1660-80, suggesting a good, contemporary deposit of this date.
3645	3635	Fill	Pit fill	176	PMED	6	7		13	1610-1730	1690-1730				Rather mixed group but with the latest piece a substantial (120mm overall) early C18th style spur pipe fragment. Group includes a finely burnished complete heel bowl of c1640-70.
3646	3635	Fill	Pit fill	176	PMED	2	2		4	1610-1740	1700-1740	RB x 1		34	One piece of residual C17th stem but both bowls and the other stem consistent with a deposit of c1700-40. Bowls comprise a complete early C18th West Country style spur form and a London style bowl with the crudely executed initials RB on the sides of the heel for Roger Brown. Roger (I) baptised 1676 and buried 1737 and his son, Roger (II) baptised 10 and buried 1765.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
3647	3635	Fill	Pit fill	176	PMED	15	3		18	1650-1740	1700-1740	BRO / WN x 1; RIC / HARD / HOAR x 1; IEF / FRY.H / VNT x 1		1, 11, 15	An odd group in that a range of large, fresh looking bowl fragment was recovered, often with long surviving stem sections, suggesting a little disturbed deposit. The earliest pipe is a Jeffry Hunt pipe of c1640-70 and there is a crudely made spur pipe of c1660-80 with 164mm of surviving stem. The majority of the bowls, however, date from around 1680-1740, so that nearly a century of pipes is represented overall. It is unfortunate that virtually no stems were collected from this deposit, since the maker's marks that are likely to have been on them would have helped date the final closing of this deposit. The two stem marks recovered were made by Richard Hoar of Portsmouth, who is recorded in parish register entries from 1705-37 (Fox & Hall 1979, 16-17), and one of the Brownes of Southampton, who were working during the first half of the C18th.
3648	3697	Fill	cellar fill	237	PMED		1		1	1610-1710	1610-1710				
3656 (sample 111)	3549	Fill	tank fill	237	PMED		3		3	1610-1710	1610-1710				
3656	3549	Fill	tank fill	237	PMED	3	17	1	21	1610-1710	1660-1680				The three bowls in this group range from c1640-1680 in date with the latest being c1660-80. This provides a likely final date for the whole group.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
3657	3582	Fill	Pit fill	237	LMED	4	1		5	1680-1710	1680-1710				Three of the bowl fragments join (fresh breaks) to make up the larger part of a c1680-1710 bowl with 196mm of surviving stem. The other bowl is of similar date and complete with 158mm of surviving stem. The substantially complete nature of these two pipes suggests that they came from a fresh deposit that has not been subsequently disturbed. The only other stem has a freshly broken end. It is unfortunate that more pieces were not recovered from this well-dated deposit, which may well have contained reconstruct able pipes.
3874	3874	Layer	consolidation layer	174	PMED		3		3	1640-1720	1640-1720				One of the stems has a good burnish on its surface.
3876	3877	Fill	Backfill	174	PMED	1			1	1700-1740	1700-1740	THO / SHAR / P x 1		18	A nice burnished West Country style spur bowl (good burnish) with a stem mark for Thomas Sharp - who seems to be a previously unrecorded maker.
4030	4029	Fill	fill	237	EMOD		1		1	1660-1720	1660-1720				
4057	4056	Fill	Pit fill	237	EMOD		5		5	1610-1750	1610-1750				Stems of mixed C17th or C18th types. Could possibly all be C17th.
4148	4146	Fill	Pit fill	237	EMOD	7	10	1	18	1680-1740	1720-1750	WILL / SID / NEY x 1; L Crowned x 2	Dutch stem borders x 2	8, 9, 24, 33	An interesting group containing large, fresh looking pieces of pipe, several of which have been recently broken. There are two complete spur bowls, one with a Will Sidney mark of c1700-40 and the other with 170mm of surviving stem (Figs 24, 33). The main interest, however, are the remains of at least two identical Dutch pipes. These both have crowned l marks on the base of the heel and the stems are decorated with roll-stamps comprising a zone of milled lines flanked by 'ring of pearls' borders

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
															(Figs 8-9).
4178	4167	Fill	Pit fill	238	PMED	1	11	1	13	1610-1740	1700-1740				Group includes a complete early C18th spur bowl of local form.
4179	4167	Fill	Pit fill	238	PMED	21	40	2	63	1660-1750	1710-1750	SID / NEY x 4		20, 21, 31	This appears to have been an outstanding pit group but, unfortunately a lot of damage appears to have occurred during excavation and not all of the pieces were recovered so that valuable information on stem lengths has been lost. In particular, six pieces that all appear to have come from the same pipe are present. These make up an almost complete pipe and the fresh breaks suggest that this was probably intact in the ground but two crucial pieces are now missing. Surviving stems of at least 165mm are present and this appears to have been a fresh and little disturbed deposit. Bowl forms range from c1660-1750 but with the latest forms suggesting final deposition around 1710-50. Four pipes with Sidney stem stamps are present and these represent at least two different mould types and two different die types.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
4757	4756	Fill	Fill of Pit	238	EMOD	1	1		2	1780-1900	1810-1850	JM x 1	Flutes	55	One piece of late C18th or C19th stem and a complete fluted bowl dating from c1810-40. This has the small moulded initials JM on the heel, perhaps for John Munday, who was working at Carisbrooke in 1851, aged 45 (Oswald 1975, 172).
5010	5180	Fill	Pit fill	180	PMED	13	57	1	71	1610-1740	1700-1740	RICH / MAN x 1; THO / SHAR / P x 1		16	One or two pieces of stem could be earlier and residual but all of the bowl forms range from c1650-1740 with the majority being late C17th to early C18th. The latest forms are c1700-1740. Two pipe have marked stems. One is for John Richman, recorded working in Southampton from 1687 until at least 1697 and the other a Thomas Sharpe mark - previously unrecorded maker. This could be quite an early C18th deposit. Includes some quite large fragments (stems up to 108mm).
5062	5069	Fill	Pit	177	PMED		1		1	1640-1720	1640-1720				
5071	5072	Fill	rubbish pit fill	180	EMED		5		5	1610-1740	1680-1740				
5073	5180	Fill	levelling layer	180	PMED	1	3		4	1640-1740	1700-1740	THO / SHARP x 1; THO / SHAR / P x 1		19	Latest pieces are two joining fragments (freshly broken) of a spur pipe stamped THO / SHARP - a second die type for this previously unrecorded maker - plus another example of a THO/SHAR/P mark as found elsewhere on this site.
5077	5180	Fill	rubbish pit fill	180	PMED		2		2	1610-1720	1640-1720				
5200	5200	Layer	Make-up	177	EMOD		1		1	1680-1750	1680-1750				
5220	5192	Fill	Pit fill	176	AN		1		1	1750-1900	1750-1900				
5283	5284	Fill	Pit fill	176	HMED		1		1	1610-1740	1610-1740				

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
6000	6000	Layer	machine layer	General	EMOD		5	1	6	1610-1780	1680-1780				Mouthpiece has cut end and joins a stem (fresh break).
6006	6006	Layer	Burnt layer	169	EMOD			1	1	1750-1900	1750-1900				Mouthpiece with a cut end.
6070	6070	Layer	surface layer	168	EMOD	3	24	2	29	1610-1720	1660-1690				Although all of the fragments are relatively small, they are all of C17th or very early C18th types and the 3 bowl fragments all date from c1660-90, suggesting the likely date for this group.
6143	6142	Fill	Robber cut fill	170	EMOD	2	3		5	1640-1850	1750-1850				One complete heel bowl of c1680-1710 and a spur fragment of early C18th date. Two of the other stems are of similar date (C17th or early C18th) and there is just one stem that is of later C18th or early C19th date.
6215	6214	Fill	Pit fill	170	EMOD		3		3	1700-1780	1700-1780				Three quite large, fresh looking stem fragments.
6271	6278	Fill	Pit fill	170	EMOD		1		1	1700-1780	1700-1780				Quite a large, fresh looking stem fragment.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
6273	6278	Fill	Pit fill	170	EMOD		6		6	1770-1800	1770-1800	(WB x 1)	Foliage stem	39	A group of thin stems, some slightly curved, one of which is decorated on both sides of the stem with a tendril design flanked by leaves and what appear to be acorns. A stem of this type attached to a spur with the initials RB is illustrated by Arnold (1977, Fig 8.6) who attributes it to Roger Browne (born 1710, died 1765). This date seems extremely early for both such a thin stem and for this type of moulded decoration. There are, however, parallels for this style of decoration amongst a tightly dated group waste from the Lumley kiln in Doncaster, which was operating from 1768-82 (White 2004, 33). Furthermore, Oswald (1975, 171) lists a Roger Browne at Southampton from 1753-75, both of which are different dates to those mentioned by Arnold. If there was a later Roger Browne working in Southampton during the 1770s or later, then this would provide a good candidate for the manufacturer of these unusual decorated stems. An exact match for this particular decorated stem is provided by fragments from [6438]. In this instance, it is almost certain that the stem belongs to an Armorial bowl, decorated with the Royal Arms and GR for George Rex, but with the initials WB on the spur. This pipe must be a product of the William Brown (II) who is last recorded by Arnold in 1749, when he took a 40 year lease on property in French Street. It seems that William (II) must have worked until at least the 1770s and that the stem from [6273] was produced by him.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
6365		Void		General	VOID	1	1		2	1720-1850	1750-1850				A neat West Country style spur bowl, complete, dating from c1720-60, and a curved stem of later C18th or early C19th date.
6369	6369	Layer	Layer	240	PMED		2		2	1660-1720	1660-1720				
6382		Void		General	VOID	1			1	1730-1760	1730-1760	WB x 1		35	A good example of a mid-C18th style spur bowl with the initials WB moulded upright on the spur for one of the William Browne's of Southampton, at least one of whom worked in French Street. Fresh example with 95mm of surviving stem.
6406	7364	Fill	Pit fill	170	PMED		1		1	1610-1710	1610-1710				Most likely a later C17th piece.
6419	7291	Fill	Pit fill	170	EMOD		1		1	1660-1720	1660-1720				
6430	6430	Layer	Layer	170	PMED		4		4	1700-1740	1700-1740	R / BRO / WN x 1		12	Group of early C18th stems, one or which is stamped with the mark of Roger Browne (I), who was baptised in 1676 and buried in 1737. The marked piece fits another piece of stem in the same context (appears to be a fresh break).

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
6438	6435	Fill	Pit fill	170	EMOD	15	105	7	127	1770-1800	1775-1790	WB x 11; AC x 1	Armorial x 7; Masonic x 1; Fluted x 7	36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44	An outstanding group containing a large and extremely consistent group of pipes in very fresh condition. Eleven of the surviving 14 spurs or heels are marked WB, presumably for William Browne (II), last recorded leasing a property in French Street for 40 years in 1749 (Arnold 1977, 329). Browne was producing at least four different types of Armorial pipe, decorated with the Royal Arms and the initials GR for George Rex. He also produced a fluted pipe and a Masonic design. The Masonic pipe is of a style introduced c1780, and all the bowls would fit with a c1770-90 range, with c1775-1790 being the most likely date of deposition. There are also two other designs of fluted pipe in the group, one unmarked and the other marked AC. The AC pipe can be attributed to Arthur Coster (I) of Fareham, who was born in 1752 and died in 1816 (Fox & Hall, 1979, 20). Three of the pipes have metal in their stems, a very unusual feature. All the pipes have thin stems, providing an important benchmark for this change, and some appear to have been curved. The mouthpieces are all cut.
6483	6483	Masonry	Wall	240	PMED	1	2		3	1640-1720	1680-1710				Two stems of later C17th or early C18th date and a bowl fragment of c1680-1710, which probably provides a good date for all these pieces.
6504	6682	Layer	Pit fill	240	PMED	1	1		2	1640-1710	1660-1710				Just a very small part of a heel survives. Latest stem is a very thick, chunky piece of late C17th type.
6510	6510	Layer	Sealing layer	171	EMOD		1		1	1640-1700	1640-1700				
6870	6869	Fill	rubble infill	172	PMED	1			1	1670-1710	1670-1710				Late C17th style heel fragment (only).

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
6898	6777	Fill	Drain fill	170	EMOD	1	2		3	1770-1810	1770-1810	AC x 1	Flutes	45	A complete bowl of late C18th style with fluted decoration and joining stem (fresh break). This can be attributed to Arthur Coster (I) of Fareham, who was born in 1752 and died in 1816 (Fox & Hall, 1979, 20). The other stem in the group is of a contemporary style.
7043	7043	Layer	floor layer	240	PMED		1		1	1610-1730	1610-1730				Most likely late C17th or early C18th.
7115	7106	Fill	Pit fill	168	EMOD	1	1		2	1660-1740	1690-1740				Includes what would have been a complete West Country style spur bowl of c1690-1740.
7161	7163	Fill	Pit fill	241	PMED	7	15	2	24	1610-1690	1660-1690		reworked stem x 1		This group appears to contain two separate elements. There are three early bowls of c1620-40, one of which joins two of the stems to make up a substantially complete pipe with 170mm of surviving stem (estimated c250mm originally). The other bowls seem to range from c1660-90 and clearly indicate later deposition in the same context. One of the stem fragments has had a long, slightly dished area ground or cut out of it after firing.
7599	7595	Fill	rubbish pit fill	166	HMED		4		4	1680-1750	1680-1750				
7651	7734	Fill	Backfill	167	EMOD		5		5	1770-1840	1770-1840		roll-stamped border	10	All of the stems appear to be of later C18th or earlier C19th types. There is one very narrow piece with a faintly impressed stem border, which includes the 'ring of pearls' motif. This is a northern European import, almost certainly from the Netherlands.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
7732	7730	Fill	Pit fill	167	EMOD	2	5	1	8	1610-1700	1670-1700				Group of large, fresh looking fragments, all of which are of C17th type. One of the two complete bowls dates from c1660-80 and the other c1670-1700. Most of the stems look to be late C17th and this looks like a good late C17th group.
8040	8039	Fill	Pit fill	242	EMOD		1		1	1660-1720	1660-1720				
8055	8055	Layer	Floor	242	EMOD		1		1	1750-1900	1750-1900				
8064	8063	Fill	Posthole Fill	242	EMOD	1			1	1860-1880	1860-1880	HARDING x 1		50	Part of a spurless bowl with rib seams, which dates from c1860-1880. The barely legible surname HARDING is relief moulded in serif script on the left hand side of the stem and there may have been an initial before this, obliterated by a trimming mark. There does not appear to be any lettering on the RHS of the stem. George Harding and his son Edward are recorded working from 1843-71 and stems marked G HARDING have been previously recorded (Arnold 1977, 333-4).
8081	8081	Layer	Burnt layer	243	LMED		1		1	1750-1850	1750-1850				Neatly finished, cylindrical stem, most likely to be later C18th.

Cxt	Fill of	Type	Interpretation	Area	Phase	B	S	M	Tot	Range	Latest	Marks	Dec, etc	Figs	Comments
8301	8295	Fill	Pit fill	241	EMOD	3	3		6	1780-1880	1840-1880	GH x 1; JS x 1; ?? x 1	Leaf seams x2	54, 56	Three stems of late C18th or C19th type (2 join - old break) and three complete bowls, all of which probably date from c1840-80 and all of which have moulded maker's initials on them. Two are spur forms with leaf seams. One maker's mark is illegible but the other reads JS for James Skeams or Skeanes, recorded in 1839 (Arnold 1977, 333; Oswald 1975, 173). The other bowl is a plain type with a small heel marked GH for George Harding, recorded working from 1843-71 (Arnold 1977, 333).
Total						235	809	51	1095						









