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ABSTRACT

This study examines the methods and problems of attributing utilitarian, salt-glazed stoneware vessels to the Morgan, Morgan-VanWickle, and Warne & Letts potteries. The three potteries were located in Middlesex County, New Jersey and operated around the turn of the nineteenth century. The opening section addresses the history and material possessions of the Morgan family who owned the three potteries and the best source of stoneware clay in North America. Also included are sections on the Morgan clay bank and the history of the potteries.

Previous attributions to the potteries have been made on the basis of poorly recorded amateur archeological excavations conducted in the 1930s to 1940s. New archeological evidence from each of the potteries came to light in 1995. Through a synthesis of documentary, archeological, and extant object research the author assesses and adjusts past attributions. Of particular interest are the potteries' decorative motifs and methods of applying decoration.

Based on the recently excavated shards, it is evident that all three of the potteries made extensive use of cobalt oxide. The Warne & Letts and Morgan-VanWickle potteries made occasional use of iron oxide and copper oxide. The preferred method of decoration varied from pottery to pottery. The Morgan pottery made the most extensive use of linear, slip-trailed designs, incised pots rarely, and used coggle wheels very rarely, if ever. The Warne & Letts pottery brushed on oxides; rarely incised decoration; and made extensive use of stamps and coggle wheels. The Morgan-VanWickle pottery engaged in the least
freehand application of oxides; produced the most incised decorations; and made extensive use of stamps and coggle wheels.

Using data provided from the shards and extant marked pots, the author examines the attributions of extant, unmarked pots located in five public collections. Of the ten pots attributed to the Warne & Letts pottery, six are strongly associated with the pottery while the association of four others cannot be confirmed at this time. Of the twenty-eight pots attributed to or related to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery, six are strongly attributable, seventeen are moderately attributable, and five have very little association to the pottery. Of the twenty-three pots attributed or related to the Morgan pottery, five are strongly associated, twelve can be moderately associated, and six others cannot be associated with the pottery.

Overall, the attribution of stoneware pottery on the basis of surface decoration is challenging. It is especially difficult to make attributions to potteries working in the same stylistic tradition and in close proximity of space and time. Surface decoration should be used as one of many tools with which to attribute pots to manufactories. Other important considerations are form, construction, materials, workmanship, marked dates, and provenances.

At times the most accurate attributions are broad. When the state of knowledge at a particular time does not allow for a specific label, a broad attribution is more responsible. Attributions should be made by degrees based on the amount and quality of information from which the attribution is made. Above all, solid attributions take time to research and verify. Stoneware pots should be attributed to a region or pottery only with concrete physical or documentary evidence after an adequate amount of research has been undertaken.
INTRODUCTION

The following study focuses on three New Jersey stoneware potteries; the Morgan, Morgan-VanWickle, and Warne & Letts potteries. These manufactories existed in Middlesex County around the turn of the nineteenth century. The Morgan and Warne & Letts potteries were located in the village of Cheesequake. James Morgan Sr. managed the Morgan pottery from before 1775 to his death in 1784.1 His son James Morgan Jr. ran the pottery until before 1800.2 From as early as the 1790s, Thomas Warne operated a pottery about a quarter of a mile from the Morgan pottery.3 In 1805, Joshua Letts became his partner in the Warne & Letts pottery.4 After Warne died in 1813, his widow sold the pottery to James Morgan Jr.5 Letts continued to make wares there until as late as 1818.6 James Morgan Jr. began a potting venture with Jacob VanWickle and Branch Green in or before 1805. The Morgan-VanWickle pottery continued operation until 1827 at the latest.7 The Morgan-VanWickle pottery was located about six miles from Cheesequake in the village of Old Bridge. During the operating periods of the potteries, both the villages of Cheesequake and Old Bridge were parts of South Amboy Township.8

To begin a discussion of New Jersey stoneware, the previous contributions to the subject must be addressed. Historiographically, the subject has been studied in two ways. The first relies primarily on extant pots and excavated shards to tell the story of early potteries in terms of their products and methods of production. The second relies on documentary sources to recount details of the people and events surrounding early pottery production.
The first archeological excavations of New Jersey stoneware were undertaken by Robert J. Sim. Sim was a trained entomologist working for the New Jersey Department of Agriculture in the 1930s to 1950s. His avocation was the excavation of early New Jersey pottery sites. He was joined by fellow pottery enthusiasts Arthur W. Clement and James S. Brown. They collected fragments and reassembled them to determine the forms made by and the decorations used by early potters. The three men shared their findings in articles and booklets. The article most significant to the current study was written by Sim and Clement for the March 1944 issue of *The Magazine Antiques*.

In their article "The Cheesequake Potteries," Sim and Clement describe the excavation sites and the characteristics of the excavated shards. Through documentary research and comparisons with extant pots, the men determined the identities of the potteries that worked on the sites. The article focuses on their findings at the Morgan and Warne & Letts potteries. Sim's excavations are important because they were early and he collected the shards. Much of the scholarship on New Jersey stoneware is based on Sim's writings and shards.

One article based on Sim's findings was "The Potters of Cheesequake, New Jersey" written in 1973 by James R. Mitchell, the then curator of Americana at the New Jersey State Museum. The article focuses on the Morgan and Warne & Letts potteries. His evidence base is the genealogy of the Morgan family, other documentary sources, and pots and shards from the Sim collection. Mitchell discusses the Morgan family and describes in greater detail the decorations attributed to the Morgan and Warne & Letts potteries.

In the mid-1980s, a former Winterthur fellow, Kathryn Jo Davis, studied the Warne & Letts pottery. Her thesis focuses on extant pots marked by or attributed to the pottery. She carefully measured, drew, and weighed pots to prove that efficient shop practices produced vessels very similar in size, weight, and appearance. Therefore, pots falling within narrow parameters of size and appearance could be attributed to the Warne &
Letts pottery. The strength of Davis' study is her examination of several essential and non-essential characteristics of marked and unmarked pots.

The earliest documentary study of New Jersey potters appears in Alvia Disbrow Martin's *At the Headwaters of Cheesequake Creek*. Martin is the curator of the Thomas Warne Historical Museum & Library. In her chapter on New Jersey's first settlers, Martin includes histories of the Morgan, Warne, and Letts families. She discusses their places of origin, land holdings, and occupations. In terms of potteries, she discusses locations and access to supplies. Her evidence is a wide variety of primary and secondary sources. The strength of this study is Martin's knowledge of the area and its history.

The most recent writing on New Jersey potters is that of M. Lelyn Branin, a retired professor from the New Jersey Institute of Technology. Unlike Martin's more general history, Branin's *The Early Makers of Handcrafted Earthenware and Stoneware in Central and Southern New Jersey* discusses potters specifically. The major strength of Branin's work is his reliance upon primary documents. For each pottery, he undertakes a careful study of genealogy and land ownership. As expected from documentary studies, Branin and Martin provide short descriptions of the potters' wares, but do not offer new interpretations of them.

The previous object-centered studies of New Jersey stoneware were hampered by early archeological practices. Sim was a pioneer without a large body of archeological scholarship upon which to draw. Without models for the systematic preservation of information and shards, he did not make plans for the fragments and data he collected. Because of this lack of planning, the significance of Sim's collection has diminished over the years. After Sim's death in 1956, his collection of pots, shards, and notes was distributed to different institutions in New Jersey.10 These institutions have preserved the materials, but not necessarily their meanings.
The current study benefits not from greater knowledge or skill on the part of the writer, but from the luxury of hindsight and the discovery of new archeological materials. In 1995, under the auspices of the New Jersey Department of Transportation, two cultural resource research companies, Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. of East Orange and Hunter Research, Inc. of Trenton, completed two separate archeological investigations. Louis Berger & Associates excavated the remains of the Morgan-VanWickle pottery site. Hunter Research excavated the site of the Morgan pottery and conducted a systematic surface collection at the Warne & Letts site.

The advantage of these recent investigations is that the shards were collected systematically from finite locations, the labeled shards from the different sites are separate, and there are extensive written reports. Although the new archeological findings can be used to confirm past theories, they also have their limitations. Because each site was previously disturbed by amateur archeological excavations and construction projects, the current evidence is not complete.

One intent of this study is to demonstrate the usefulness of archeological material to the decorative arts historian. The science of archeology makes available objects and information which can enhance current understandings of decorative arts. The historian must understand the types of information that can be derived from and the limits of archeological material. Also, archeological material should be considered one tool among many in understanding objects.

In the interest of time and space, this study is limited to decorated shards. Decorated shards are important to the study of ceramics because they are helpful in attributing extant, unmarked pots to a particular pottery. Often shards are not large enough or cannot be mended to represent a form. Therefore, scholars rely on the belief that decorations are unique to specific areas or potteries. With potteries as closely situated and related as the Cheesequake and Old Bridge potteries, however, such an assumption is
dangerous. Therefore, this study incorporates a three-pronged approach of documentary research, archeological research, and extant object research in order to make correct attributions.

Another intent of this study is to explore aspects of New Jersey potteries not discussed in detail in prior studies. The following section on the Morgan family attempts to draw together previous research and lesser known documentary materials to broaden the understanding of the family integral to the study of North American stoneware. Also included is a section exclusively on the Morgan clay bank. Another important contribution is an examination of the Morgan-VanWickle pottery in conjunction with the Morgan and Warne & Letts potteries. Because of early confusion regarding the pottery, no extensive survey of Morgan-VanWickle products currently exists.

THE MORGAN FAMILY

The Morgan family was wealthy and powerful. They owned a great deal of land and were involved in wide-ranging, power-based activities including government-, military-, legal-, and business-related enterprises. The Morgans are important to the study of late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century stoneware because they controlled a major source of stoneware clay and owned at different times three New Jersey stoneware potteries. Their clay and pottery-related activities will be addressed separately outside this section. The following explores how the Morgan family's wealth was derived from and symbolized by its possessions and activities.

This branch of the Morgan family migrated from England to New York and then to New Jersey. According to an existing land deed, in 1710 Charles Morgan (1649 or 50-1719/20) of West Chester, New York bought 500 acres "'on ye So. side of Raritan River,
commonly called and known by ye name Cheesequakes beginning at ye mouth of ye Creek towards ye Bay." The early acquisition of this land located on the ocean and between two waterways ensured the Morgans of wealth and power.\textsuperscript{12}

Charles Morgan Jr. died in 1719/20 leaving his estate to Charles III, Thomas, and James Morgan.\textsuperscript{13} In 1730, Charles Morgan III (1683-1749/50) added to the Morgans' holdings by buying a second parcel of land "Lying on the West side of the Road or Path that Leads from where Yose Soey formerly Lived to the Landing on Cheesequakes Creek."\textsuperscript{14} Charles Morgan III served as a member of the New Jersey Colonial Assembly at Perth Amboy in 1716. To be a member of this body, one was required to be a freeholder of 1,000 acres of land in the Colony of New Jersey.\textsuperscript{15} This stipulation illustrates the link between land and power which favored people like the Morgans.

In Charles Morgan III 's 1749/50 will, his youngest three sons; William, Daniel, and James; received about a third of the Morgan family lands.\textsuperscript{16} In 1764, this property was deeded from William Morgan and Daniel Morgan to James Morgan Sr.\textsuperscript{17} This significant portion of land (in the 1778 Perth Amboy tax records he is listed as owning 300 acres)\textsuperscript{18} allowed James Morgan Sr. (1734-1784) to farm and exploit the lucrative commodity of high quality stoneware clay.\textsuperscript{19} He is the first member of the Morgan family known to have mined and sold clay.

Through tax recordings one can trace the transfer of land and power from James Morgan Sr. to his eldest son James Morgan Jr. In the 1782 tax ratables, most likely coinciding with his marriage to Catherine VanBrackle, James Morgan Jr. (1757-1822) is listed as owning 100 acres of improved land while his father retained 200 acres.\textsuperscript{20} In the August 1784 tax ratables, after James Morgan Sr.'s February 1784 death, James Morgan and "Widdow" Morgan are listed with 150 acres of improved land each.\textsuperscript{21} By the making of the 1785 tax list, Widow Morgan was not listed and James Morgan Jr. owned 300 acres of improved land. Presumably his mother was living with him at this time.\textsuperscript{22}
James Morgan Jr.'s land holdings fluctuate over the years probably due to grants of land to family members and real estate speculation. Morgan's recorded improved acreage reached its height in 1794 when he owned 500 acres.23 The least improved property he owned after 1794 was 361 acres the year before his death.24 In the 1797 tax ratables, Morgan owned 400 acres of land. In comparison to other members of the South Amboy community, Morgan was the eighth largest improved landholder and within the top one-and-a-half percent of improved landholders.25 From this vantage point, James Morgan Jr. enjoyed a great deal of respect and power.

James Morgan Sr. and James Morgan Jr. are the first known members of the Morgan family to be involved in the stoneware pottery business. For a better understanding of their involvement in the Morgan pottery enterprises it is necessary to examine their lives outside the pottery industry. James Morgan Sr. was a younger son of Charles Morgan III. In 1754, probably in South Amboy, he married Margrit Roeters Evertson (1731-1827).26 James Morgan Sr. was a captain in the military, a farmer, an inn owner, a clay bank owner, and the manager of the Morgan pottery.

James Morgan Jr. was the first son of James Morgan Sr. James Morgan Jr. had two wives and fourteen children during his lifetime. He married Catherine VanBrackle (1764-1802) in 1782 and she bore him ten children. Three years after Catherine's death, he married Ann VanWickle (1784-1869) who bore him five children.27 Like his father, James Morgan Jr. involved himself in military activities, farming, inn keeping, clay mining, and pottery manufacture. He was also involved in politics and real estate speculation.28

There are no known records of the Morgans' religious affiliation. Family members intermarried with those of the Dutch Reformed and Episcopalian faiths. James Morgan Sr.'s wife, Margrit Roeters Evertson, was baptized in a Dutch Reformed Church.29 His daughter Mary married Thomas Warne in the Freehold Dutch Reformed Church.30 His
daughter Sarah and her husband Jacob VanWickle are buried in the St. Peter's Episcopal Church Cemetery in Spotswood.31 James Morgan Jr. may have been a Baptist, however. Item number thirteen of his 1822 will requests that his executors "appropriate sixty dollars to the repairs of the Baptist meeting house and for them or some of them to see that it is done and done to advantage."32 This money was paid out of the residue of Morgan's estate on 20 October 1825.33 Morgan's donation indicates that he had disposable income not required by his family after his death. It is also apparent that he wished to make a noticeable contribution to the community.

In their immediate community, the Morgans were active in their neighbors' legal activities. James Morgan Sr. and his sons William, Daniel, and James Jr. served as executors, witnesses, administrators, fellowbondsmen, and inventory takers for the estates of numerous neighbors and family members.34 These activities indicate the trust and respect the Morgans commanded in this tight-knit, face-to-face community.

The Morgans also held positions of importance in greater New Jersey. Captain James Morgan Sr. and General James Morgan Jr. received their titles through military service during the American Revolution. James Morgan Sr. served from pre-1776 to as late as 1781. He held several commanding positions during the Revolutionary War in the New Jersey towns of Newark, Elizabethtown, Cranbury, South Amboy, and Spotswood.35

The first line of James Morgan Jr.'s 1822 inventory lists "Military accoutrements" indicating his former military involvement.36 He rose through the ranks from Sergeant to Ensign to Captain.37 In 1793, he received the commission of Lieutenant Colonel from Governor Richard Howell. In 1811, he received a sword and the commission of Major General from Governor Joseph Bloomfield.38 The Morgans' military careers are obvious examples of the power they wielded in New Jersey. As a wealthy landholder during the
Revolution, James Morgan Sr. was a logical choice for a leader of troops. His son rose quickly through the ranks and later received higher commissions from the state governor.

In addition to military service, James Morgan Jr. also served his country in the political arena. He was a representative at the General Assembly in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania from 1794 to 1799. Morgan later was elected as a Federalist to the Twelfth Congress from 1811 to 1813. His tombstone in the Morgan Cemetery in South Amboy makes a lasting record of his service to the country with the passage "An old and reputable officer of the Revolution/ and late member of Congress/ Ah stranger pass not by this stone/ But stop and leave a tear/ The friend of all, a foe to none/ In peace lies slumbering here." Morgan's political career expanded his sphere of power beyond the state to the national level. James Morgan Jr.'s political and military activities indicate a significant amount of disposable time. Although he derived a living from farming and potting enterprises, he was not plowing the fields and turning wares. He was an owner, investor, and manager with hirings to execute the day-to-day tasks necessary to move his interests forward.

One of the Morgans' lesser known activities was the running of an inn or tavern. James Morgan Sr. is listed in the South Amboy tax ratables as owning a tavern in 1779 and 1780. In 1789, the tavern reappears under the ownership of James Morgan Jr. This tavern, dating to 1660, was the earliest in the area. The Morgans did not own it at this early date. An inn in this location is logical because it was located next to a ferry landing. Supposedly the tavern was called the "Cheesequake Hotel" or "Morgan House." It served as "the site of most functions of the day, official and social." The tavern was a meeting place for the local militia and the Second Regiment of Middlesex County. This is not surprising in light of the Morgans' involvement in the military. Owning the inn closest to the ferry landing added to the Morgans' income and afforded them control of a public meeting place.
The Morgans' material possessions also indicate their wealth and range of business enterprises. The most informative surviving document of Morgan family possessions is James Morgan Jr.'s 1822 probate inventory. The examination of this inventory presents an image of the family's material circumstances at its height.

The house in which James Morgan Jr. lived was called Sandcombe. It was located on a bluff "on the north side of the mouth of Cheesequake Creek off [present day] highway 35." On the first floor were a parlor, hall, dining room, "back East Bed room," and "West Bed Room." On the second floor were the "NW Bed Room," "S.E. Bed room," and "Small Bed[room]." Above was a garret and below was a cellar containing the kitchen and kitchen chamber. Outside were a cow shed, barn, and hen house. The "manor house which was of large extent, stood until 1874, when it was burned, with all its stores of pictures and plate." Presumably the loss of this house accounts for the lack of surviving records and artifacts related to this important early New Jersey family. The size of the house and the number of dependent structures indicate the extent of Morgan's wealth. The dependencies also suggest the working nature of Morgan's property.

Morgan's wealth also can be measured in movable possessions. Despite a lack of physical evidence, the recorded contents of Morgan's house indicate the family was living well beyond necessity. The house contained a good quantity of furniture in each room and such luxuries as looking glasses, a piano forte, window curtains, oil cloths on the floors, silver tea spoons, many books, extra tablecloths, bed linens, and window curtains. Outside were a carriage, sulky, pleasure wagon, and pleasure sled.

James Morgan Jr.'s interests and activities can be confirmed or inferred from his possessions. Morgan's fecundity of children is evidenced by three cradles and one crib in the garret. His use of his cow herd for leather is indicated by listings of "Six and a half sides of upper leather & two Calf skins" and "Sole Leather" in the garret. Morgan's harvesting of wood from his woodlands is evidenced by "Plank and Old Boards" under the
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cow shed, plank in front of the barn, a "lot of boards at the Clay bank," twelve cords of wood at the meadow, and ten cords of wood sold for Morgan in New York. In addition to the sale of wood, boards were useful in the pottery industry. After wares were formed and decorated they were placed on boards for transport to a drying area or to the kiln.

James Morgan Jr. was educated in public schools.48 His father and grandfather were able to sign their wills, but the extent of their education is unknown.49 James Morgan Jr.'s interest in reading and writing are apparent from the contents of his house. He seems to have been particularly interested in reading on history, geography, and law. In the parlor were "Five Volums Washington life (by Marshal)" and "Four Volums Leo the Tenth." It appears that Morgan resided in the "back East Bed room." In this room were a desk and bookcase, "a portable Writing Desk," "Six volums of the Journals of the house of Congress," "three volums of the laws of the US," "Two volums of Paynes Geography," and "Two Volums of Voyages with Maps." In addition to the books specified, Morgan also owned many magazines and "forty bound books."50 The ownership of this type and number of reading materials indicates Morgan's wealth, level of education, and interest in leadership.

Morgan's wealth of possessions naturally extended to animals and animal-related equipment. At the time of his death he owned five horses, two mules, thirty head of cattle, three calves, six oxen, seventeen shoats (young hogs), five hogs, and three hives of bees. In the 1797 tax ratables, Morgan owned six horses, more than anyone else in South Amboy. He owned the seventh most head of cattle with eighteen. This placed him in the top one-and-a-third percent of cattle owners.51 Accessories included harnesses, saddles, gear and traces, wagons, and sleds. In the 1819 tax ratables, Morgan was taxed for a coach and a chair or "gigg." In 1821, he was taxed for a chair, gig or sulky, and a "4 horse stage wagon." It is significant that Morgan owned these modes of transportation which were considered substantial luxury items on which taxes were levied.52
Morgan's living assets also included three slaves. Two, "An Old negro Slave named Kate no Value" and "A Negro Slave for life named Hannah/ $75.00," were listed in the 1822 inventory as appearing in the kitchen chamber. In front of the barn, the men taking inventory encountered "One black man & slave for life named Ben." In the past, the greatest number of slaves Morgan had owned was two in 1784. On every other tax list Morgan or his father owned only one slave. On the 1797 tax list Morgan owned one slave. At that time, in South Amboy, one person owned three slaves, four owned two slaves, and twenty-six owned one slave like Morgan. Owning at least one slave placed Morgan in the top six percent of slave owners in the community. Since laws and attitudes about slave-owning in New Jersey were becoming increasingly negative, it seems that Morgan's ownership of three slaves in 1822 was high. In the 1784 tax ratables, the only year black, non-slave inhabitants were counted, James Morgan Jr. housed seven blacks on his property. Morgan's ownership of slaves and the residence of free or indentured blacks on his property is not surprising considering the many laborious aspects of clay mining.

In addition to owning slaves, the Morgan family was also involved in the illegal trade of slaves to the South. James Morgan Jr.'s brother, Charles Morgan, moved to Louisiana by about 1800 and owned a cotton plantation called Morganza on the Mississippi River. Charles Morgan and Judge Jacob VanWickle, both well respected in their communities, were responsible for illegally moving blacks from New Jersey to Louisiana. In 1807, when Congress outlawed the African slave trade, the kidnapping and interstate trade of slaves became a very lucrative business. Charles Morgan was not allowed to buy slaves in New Jersey because he was not a resident. Instead, VanWickle bought slaves under the names of various friends and family members. He also provided the certificates of consent necessary to transport them out of state.

In 1818, several members of the Morgan-VanWickle slave ring were apprehended including James Morgan Jr. and his daughter Elsey Morgan. Through cash transactions,
the offenders were able to cut deals with prosecutors. James Morgan Jr. was found innocent and Elsey Morgan's case was thrown out of court on account of insufficient evidence. Jacob VanWickle was never indicted.62

Some New Jerseyans were outraged by the lack of punishment the slave ring received. They felt that the Morgans and VanWickles were able to elude justice because they could afford the best lawyers; had extensive legal privileges; and had the power to bribe or intimidate potential witnesses.63 The Morgans and VanWickles did not stop trading slaves despite the passage of the 1818 New Jersey law "prohibiting the export of blacks except under the most stringent conditions."64 The slave ring was successful before and after this law because Morgan had money and VanWickle had legal connections.65

The VanWickle family possesses much the same pattern of inhabitation in the New World as the Morgans.66 Perhaps for this reason the Morgans and VanWickles formed business and marriage bonds. Evert Janse VanWickelen (dates unknown) probably came from Holland to New Amsterdam. By 1700 he bought 800 acres of land on the Raritan River in New Jersey.67 His son Simon VanWickle (d. 1754) moved to New Jersey by 1726.68 Simon VanWickle's second son, Nicholas (d. 1801), was probably born in Raritan, New Jersey after 1726.69 He moved to Middlesex County by 1764.70

Nicholas' first son was Jacob Charles VanWickle (1770-1854), later Judge Jacob VanWickle of the Morgan-VanWickle slave ring. He was a judge in the Court of Common Pleas from 1808 to 1853 and was an Old Bridge freeholder from 1812 to 1827.71 In 1792, Jacob VanWickle married Sarah Morgan (1772-1835) forming an important bond between the two families. In 1805, he became partners with James Morgan Jr. and Branch Green in the Morgan-VanWickle pottery. Jacob VanWickle's son Stephen moved to Louisiana near Charles Morgan and married Charles Morgan's daughter, Adele (1810-1839).72

Nicholas VanWickle's son Simon (1752-1825) also had ties with the Morgan family.73 For a time, he was the commandant of James Morgan Jr.'s military regiment.74
In 1805, James Morgan Jr. married Simon VanWickle's daughter Ann (1784-1869). In 1811, Simon's son, Nicholas (1786-1837), married James Morgan Jr.'s daughter Ida (1791-1862). Nicholas Morgan was involved with the Morgan-VanWickle pottery after James Morgan Jr.'s death.

Like the Morgans, the VanWickles came from Europe, settled in New York, and then moved to New Jersey. Both families were wealthy enough to buy a lot of land early and then pass it on to later generations. Their land, family connections, and longevity in the area allowed them to participate in local government, the military, and various lucrative business enterprises. Due to these similarities, the families operated in the same circles and knew one another well. When it was time to make alliances through marriage and business affairs it was natural that two families of nearly equal footing would choose to bond with one another.

The Morgans also occasionally intermarried and conducted business with those of lower status when it was to their benefit. The alliance between the Morgans who had capital and raw materials and a family with potting skills was beneficial to both parties. The first evidence of such a connection was in 1785 or 1786 when James Morgan Sr.'s daughter, Mary (d. 1838), married Thomas Wame (1763-1813), a potter and descendent of the founder of New Jersey. In 1805, their oldest child, Meleny (b. 1787 or circa 1789), married the potter Joshua Letts (no dates) who soon thereafter became Thomas Wame's partner at the Wame & Letts pottery. In 1806, their daughter, Margret (b. circa 1794), married potter Benjamin Lent whose marked shards appear on the Wame & Letts pottery site. These unions make apparent the importance of the marriage bond to the transfer of skills and tools to the next generation. The union of skills and raw materials is a more rare circumstance.
The Morgan family was a wealthy and powerful force in New Jersey. Upon first arrival in New Jersey, the family controlled a large portion of well-located land. Through various land-supported endeavors like farming, inn keeping, clay mining, and pottery manufacture they were able to earn a substantial income. With this wealth the Morgans were able to surround themselves with evidence of their high economic status. This status led to trust and respect within South Amboy as evidenced by their involvement in many legal affairs. To strengthen their position in the community, the Morgans formed advantageous partnerships with other families. With the base of power they derived in the South Amboy area, the Morgans were able to expand their influence into the New Jersey military and the national government. With so many interests, it is improbable that James Morgan Sr. and James Morgan Jr. were involved in the day-to-day running of any of them. They were owners, managers, and investors who hired people to farm, keep the tavern, mine clay, and turn pots.

THE CLAY BANK

Possibly the most lucrative Morgan family enterprise was the mining and selling of stoneware clay. The valuable deposits of clay were located one mile south of South Amboy Village along the Raritan Bay and Cheesequake Creek. The Morgan clay bank was part of the Raritan formation of stoneware clay which extends below Staten Island, Long Island, Manhattan, the Amboys, and Woodbridge, New Jersey. The Morgan clay bank was located above sea level so it drained well, was located on shore for easy shipping, and yielded a variety of clays suitable for different purposes.

The Morgans exploited the clay resources on their property at least as early as the operation of the Morgan pottery. The Hunter Research report suggests that the Morgans
may have been mining and exporting clay in the first half of the eighteenth century. Charles Morgan Jr. bought the land containing the Morgan clay bank in 1710 and then Charles Morgan III bought more clay-bearing land in 1730. It is unclear whether Charles Morgan III intentionally added to the family's clay holdings or not.  

Potters from Maine to Georgia desired clay from the Morgan clay bank because it could be used to make stoneware vessels more durable and higher-priced than coarse earthenware vessels. "Morgan clay' and 'clay as good as Morgan's' became well-known terms in the pottery industry." In an existing early-nineteenth-century document, Athens, New York potter, Nathan Clark, remarks that he sent "300 loads of Morgan's best" from one pottery to another.

At least two potteries owed James Morgan Jr. money at the time of his death. In his 1822 inventory under "Bonds and Notes considered as doubtfull" appear the entries "Judgement against E. Price . . . 69.99" and "Bal of Clay against Armstrong and Wentworth . . . 59.38." Ebenezer Price, a Cheesequake potter, may have owed Morgan money for clay. Peleg Armstrong and Erastus Wentworth ran a pottery in Norwich, Connecticut. From these two transactions, it is apparent that Morgan was selling clay to local potters and potters beyond his immediate area.

In 1878, geologists George Cook and John Smock examined the New Jersey clay deposits. They found that the Morgan clay bank deposits ranged from twenty-five to forty feet deep. The thickest deposits lay under laminated sand which kept the clay from being carried away by water. Cook and Smock felt the clay of the Morgan clay bank probably existed in pockets rather than in a layer.  

The clay bank consisted of roughly six strata of varying thicknesses. From the surface, forty feet of laminated clay and sandy clay lay above another eight feet of sandy clay. Below this was three feet of blue stoneware clay, six feet of red clay, and five feet of stoneware clay which became sandy at the bottom. Under the stoneware clay was a layer
of sand. According to Cook and Smock, the sandy clay, blue stoneware clay, red clay, and stoneware clay layers were not always distinct, but were all considered part of the stoneware bed. "The stoneware clay, proper, is a white to greyish white clay, marked by numerous small spots or specks of ferric oxide and hence, sometimes, termed 'fly-specked.'" Clay miners in Woodbridge and Perth Amboy stripped apart the different qualities of clay and stored them separately.

Methods of mining clay varied. Often the top layer of dirt and sand was removed. Then workers using picks and shovels sunk large pits into the clay. As the mining of clay progressed, the refuse from successive pits was shoveled into previous pits. Sometimes "drifts," or short horizontal shafts, were cut from a pit along the clay bed. The tops of the "drifts" were left to fall and fill the pit. Likely the Morgans employed slaves, indentured servants, and poor white laborers to remove clay from the ground and transport it in carts overland to the dock for shipment by water. Water transportation was preferred because clay was heavy and bulky.

James Morgan Jr.'s 1822 inventory indicates his shipping of clay via water. He owned an old skiff and the schooner Susanna. The schooner Susanna also is named in an October 1818 shipping order which reads "South Amboy October 27 1818/ Put on Board the Schooner Susanna Daniel Petty Master 50 Loads of Clay at one Dollar per/ [signed] James Morgan." The clay was shipped from New Jersey north and south along the Atlantic coast. From ports it was carried by cart or wagon to urban and rural potteries. Potters living at a distance from ports would certainly pay more for transportation of clay to their sites. This higher price for obtaining clay was likely reflected in higher-priced finished goods.

Although not mentioned in the wills of James Morgan Sr. or Jr., the clay banks were clearly one of the Morgans' most important assets. They were careful to ensure the clay banks remained on one parcel of land and proceeded only in the male line.
the transaction of James Morgan Sr.'s will, James Morgan Jr. received his father's lands including the clay banks. In his will, James Morgan Jr. gave the clay rich lands to the eldest son from his second marriage, Charles, instead of his to his wife who lived there at the time.

Charles Morgan's July 1849 will indicates more clearly the importance of the clay bank. Morgan states that "It is my will and I order that my children be educated and supported from the income of my clay banks and out of my estate until my son Charles Morgan arrives to the age of twenty-one." He then orders that his land be divided equally among his children who would choose parcels in order of sex and age. However, his daughters were excluded from choosing land with clay banks on it: "my daughters . . . excepting therefrom all clay banks and all clay banks that may be found in or on my said lands, which I give and devise equally to my sons." It is significant that Charles Morgan mentions the income from the clay banks before his estate in discussing the support of his children. Perhaps the clay banks were richer than his estate. Also significant is his exclusion of his daughters from owning clay banks. He clearly wished to keep the clay banks within the male Morgan line so as not to dilute the wealth available from them.

The Morgan estate stayed intact until 1893 when it was sold by the chancery court "to settle the claims of the heirs." Presumably, the increasingly industrial nature of pottery production, introduction of alternative materials to stoneware clay, and the increasing demands of a growing family on decreasingly profitable lands led to the dispersal of the Morgan property and clay banks. The resources of "The Famous Old Morgan Estate" were still prized at this time as the auction advertisement touted the "3500 feet of ocean beach," "valuable clay lands," "valuable moulding sand," and "wood land." The advertisement claimed, "The first clay mines ever worked in New Jersey are on this land and fortunes have been made out of clay-mining here, although the workings have only covered a few acres of the land and the bulk of the deposit is untouched."
acre clay farm "contains large deposits of stone ware, terra cotta, and fire clay of the first quality, and easily accessible." Although this auction announcement heralded the end of the Morgan dynasty in New Jersey, it illuminates the amount, variety, and quality of resources available to the Morgans when they controlled this land.

**THE POTTERIES**

James Morgan Sr. is credited with founding the earliest known stoneware pottery in New Jersey. The Morgan pottery was located at the intersection of present-day Cotrell Road and New Jersey Route 34. Different starting dates are cited for this potting enterprise. The New Jersey State Museum publication *New Jersey Pottery to 1840* dates the beginning to as early as 1754. There is no material or documentary evidence to substantiate this date. A more likely date for the start of the pottery is James Morgan Sr.'s November 1768 mortgage loan from Thomas Walton, a New York merchant. Morgan mortgaged a 280-acre parcel of land and a 23.81-acre parcel of land for £393. The smaller parcel is the site on which shards belonging to the Morgan pottery have recently been found.

During their excavations in the 1930s to 1940s Sim and Clement found shards on the Morgan site dated 1775 and 1776 proving that Morgan produced pottery during the Revolutionary War. Corroborating this evidence is Morgan's 1782 claim to the British government for damages to various household items and "'1 kiln of Stone Ware not burnt." The pottery continued production under the supervision of James Morgan Jr. after James Morgan Sr.'s death in 1784, but probably ceased operation by 1800. The following year, James Morgan Jr. sold the land upon which the pottery stood.
James Morgan Sr. and Jr. are not generally thought to have been potters themselves. They were, as detailed above, wealthy men with wide-ranging interests. In order to exploit the clay on his property, it is possible that James Morgan Sr. learned to pot in New York at the Crolius or Remmey potteries. It is more likely that Morgan hired German potters from New York or Europe.

During their excavations, Sim and Clement found that the most commonly manufactured products at the Morgan pottery were various sizes of jugs, jars, chamber pots, and mugs. They found lesser quantities of curved-sided bowls, spouted field jugs, handled cups, plates, and colanders. They did not find shards recognizable as jar lids, pitchers, or tankards. All items were made of salt-glazed stoneware and most were decorated with slip-trailed cobalt oxide.

As production at the Morgan enterprise neared an end, the Warne & Letts pottery began operation. At present it is impossible to prove any link between the Morgan and Warne potteries beyond Thomas Warne's marriage to Mary Morgan in 1786. Even if his marriage did not provide him with training or equipment, it provided an advantageous link to the raw materials necessary for his trade.

Joshua Letts became Warne's partner around the time of Letts' 1805 marriage to Meleny Warne. It is likely that he was an apprentice in Warne's shop before this time. Sim and Clement recorded pots marked with the potters' names and dates from the years 1804, 1806, and 1807. The pottery also produced many marked, undated pots. As is evidenced from extant, marked wares, the production of Warne & Letts closely paralleled that of the Morgan pottery. They produced many jars and smaller numbers of jugs, butter crocks, and pitchers.

The exact date of Thomas Warne's death is unknown, but his estate inventory was taken in October 1813 or 1814. Portions of his estate were sold at public vendue in order to satisfy his debts. In 1814, Warne's wife, Mary Morgan Warne, bought the
property on which the pottery stood. In 1815, she sold the property to her brother, James Morgan Jr. Letts continued to operate the pottery for another four years, possibly renting it from Morgan. By 1819 Letts had either died or left the area.114

James Morgan Jr. retained ownership of the Wame & Letts pottery site until his death in 1822. Unlike the other two Morgan-related potteries, Morgan mentions this pottery in his will. He bequeathed the pottery and the land on which it stood to his granddaughter, Catharine Bowne. Because Bowne was underage, her property was managed by Morgan's executors until her 1831 marriage. Morgan ordered his executors to keep her estate at use, so the pottery was probably occupied until she gained control of it in 1831.115 Bowne mortgaged the property and did not keep up the payments. The mortgage fell to her uncle, Charles Morgan, who, unable to collect money from Bowne, sued her in chancery court. The sheriff seized the property and sold it to Charles Morgan in 1835 or 1839.116 There is no evidence that pottery manufacture took place during Charles Morgan's ownership of the property.

The third, but not necessarily chronologically the last, pottery with which James Morgan Jr. was involved was the Morgan and Co. or Morgan-VanWickle pottery. The Morgan-VanWickle pottery was located in Old Bridge, New Jersey on present-day New Jersey Route 18 near the South River Bridge.117 The pottery began as a partnership between, James Morgan Jr., Jacob VanWickle, and Branch Green. As mentioned above, James Morgan Jr. and Jacob VanWickle were wealthy men with many business interests. They probably provided the land, capital, and marketing of the products while Branch Green, a potter, oversaw the creation of pots.

James Morgan Jr. and Branch Green had been involved in a previous pottery-related partnership in Troy, New York. Branch Green was potting in Troy as early as 7 May 1799 when he placed an advertisement seeking journeymen potters in the Troy  

Northern Budget.118 Green and Morgan were partners by 11 February 1801 when they
advertised in the Troy Northern Budget requesting "Two hundred cords of Pine Wood to be delivered at Morgan & Smiths Stone Ware Factory" and "two or three Journeyman Potters that can come well recommended as workmen at the Stone-ware manufactory." Perhaps the shortage of wood and the necessary transportation of clay to Green's Troy location prompted his move to New Jersey. Green was in Old Bridge by 1803 when he witnessed the transfer of property from Jacob VanWickle to John and Obadiah Herbert.

A series of advertisements for the pottery at South River Bridge appeared in the Trenton newspaper, The True American, in 1805. On 3 June 1805, Green placed an advertisement reading "Two Journeyman Potters That are workmen, at turning, may have steady employ and the biggest wages going, by applying to BRANCH GREEN at South River Bridge." From July through September The True American ran an advertisement for the wares of James Morgan & Co. announcing "WHEREAS James Morgan, Jacob/ VanWickle, & Branch Green,/ have established a Manufactory of Stone/ Ware, at South River Bridge, under the Firm of JAMES MORGAN & CO./ They now offer for sale the following Arti-/cles at the following Prices." James Morgan & Co. offered for sale jars and jugs from one-sixteenth to three gallons in capacity, chamber pots, and two sizes of mug. The advertisement claimed the company's wares to be "ten or twelve/ per cent lower than can be bought in the City of New York, and the Ware not inferi-/or to any made in America. In 1809, Branch Green left the Morgan-VanWickle pottery to establish his own in Philadelphia.

James Morgan Jr. does not mention the Morgan-VanWickle pottery in his 1822 will. Morgan had probably either disposed of his share of the pottery or had a previous understanding that the pottery would go to a surviving partner. After Morgan's death, Jacob VanWickle's twenty-six-year-old son, Nicholas, joined him in the Morgan-VanWickle potting venture. In 1824 or 1826, Nicholas VanWickle left Old Bridge to establish another pottery in Manasquan, Monmouth County, New Jersey. Perhaps
Nicholas VanWickle established a stoneware factory in yet another location because of a lack of wood.

The Morgan-VanWickle pottery probably continued production until 1827 when Jacob VanWickle's son-in-law, Leonard Appleby, placed an advertisement in The True American reading "Stone Ware/ At reduced Prices/ The subscriber being desirous of quitting the business, and having a large/ assortment of first rate ware, will deliver it within forty miles from his Factory,/ to order, for ten per cent less than has been sold by any Factory in the state." Leonard Appleby was likely working as an agent for Jacob VanWickle in the closing and liquidation of the stoneware manufactory.

In comparison to the products of other stoneware potteries of the time, the vessels of the Morgan-related enterprises were typical of their region. These potteries were part of the larger northern-mid-Atlantic, German-influenced tradition centered on the clay-producing areas of Raritan Bay, Long Island, and Manhattan. The northern mid-Atlantic wares are characterized by their gray, salt-glazed bodies decorated with incised lines and cobalt oxide. Often cobalt or iron oxide appears around handle bases. Common forms are mugs, jugs, jars, chamber pots, and other utilitarian wares.

The northern-mid-Atlantic wares are similar to those produced in the towns of Grenzau, Hohr, and Grenzausen in the German Westerwald region. Potters of this region produced stonewares fashioned of gray clay and covered with "heavy," "brilliant" salt glazes. These potters decorated their wares with a range of incised, molded, slip-trailed, and brushed-on designs. They used cobalt, manganese, and iron oxides as colorants. Potters from this area rarely marked their wares. Typical products produced in the Westerwald region were mugs, jugs, vases, ewers, ring bottles, and flagons.

It is important to acknowledge that the wares of the Morgan, Warne & Letts, and Morgan-VanWickle potteries are part of a larger tradition. In the next several sections as the individual features of the potteries' decorative motifs and techniques are examined, it is
helpful to recall their place in the larger context of Western pottery. The wares of each pottery were at once individual and typical in their region and abroad.

The above documentary information regarding the Morgan, Warne & Letts, and Morgan-VanWickle potteries is essential to the firm attribution of unmarked wares. A pottery's working period, location, potting tradition, and characteristic object forms are critical factors when weighing the veracity of a current attribution. These pieces of information when linked with data provided by archaeological material and extant, marked wares form the foundation for a sound attribution.

THE SHARDS

As Donald Blake Webster states, "In studying early pottery one sooner or later turns to archeology to establish a reasonable and accurate connection between surviving objects whose provenance is not known."129 For the decorative arts historian, this is the link to archeology; archeological shards are tools for studying, attributing, and understanding the products of early potters. Archeological reports provide the decorative arts historian with a base of research with which to begin a study. A detailed report puts the excavated materials into a physical and historical context. Archeologists evaluate and research pottery traditions, technology, and histories related to the site.

This study examines the remains of waster dumps collected by archeologists at the Morgan, Warne & Letts, and Morgan-VanWickle pottery sites. On the Warne & Letts site shards were surface collected; no excavation took place.130 Excavations of the other two pottery sites yielded shards, kiln furniture, and kiln bricks.131

Waster dumps are filled with pots rejected after firing. They allow for a technical analysis and a survey of the types of forms made by a pottery. Not ascertainable are the
working dates, total production, and percentages of different objects made, fired, and sold by a pottery.\textsuperscript{132} The decorative motifs that appear in a pottery's waster dump can be assigned to that pottery, yet, may not be exclusive to that site.

Because the shards found at the three pottery sites were small, only a brief survey of forms is possible. At the Morgan site, Hunter Research found twice as many vessels with wide mouths than with small mouths.\textsuperscript{133} Shards on the site came from jars, jugs, footed and flat-footed bases, and four types of handles. No shards came from lids.\textsuperscript{134} Forms represented by the Warne & Letts pottery shards were similar to those of the Morgan pottery.\textsuperscript{135} At the Morgan-VanWickle site, Louis Berger & Associates found parts of jugs, jars, bottles, flasks, inkwells, milk pans, and a very few lids. The majority of shards were from wide-mouthed jars.\textsuperscript{136}

Decorated shards found on the pottery sites were ornamented in a variety of ways including trailed slip, incised lines, stamped shapes, and coggled shapes. Some shards display a combination of techniques. Each method of decoration will be explored in relationship to the three pottery sites.

To varying degrees, the Morgan, Warne & Letts, and Morgan-VanWickle potteries decorated their wares with colored oxides. The most prevalent was blue cobalt oxide. The present group of shards indicates the Morgan pottery used cobalt oxide exclusively. The Morgan-VanWickle and Warne & Letts potteries made rare use of a brown, possibly iron, oxide. One shard at the Warne & Letts site displays green copper oxide.

Potters could apply oxides with a slip cup or a paint brush. The slip cup was a small fired clay container with a large hole in the top for filling and one or more smaller holes in the side. The smaller holes were equipped with feather quills that drained the cup. The potter mixed the oxide with liquid clay, or slip, of a flowing consistency. To decorate, he tilted the cup so the colored slip flowed through the quills onto the unfired ware. Paint brushes of various sizes were used to apply thin or thick coats of slip.
The Morgan pottery used freehand decorations alone more than the other two potteries. A majority of the freehand decorations appear to be slip-trailed. Less distinct, flatter lines may have been brushed on. The use of a brush is unlikely in most cases, however, because the lines are of consistent width and lack a painterly quality. Because the shards are small, there are none that represent a whole example of any of the Morgan pottery designs.

The freehand application of decoration at the Morgan pottery allowed potters to create designs of any size or style. Despite this capability, they chose to use the same small repertoire of designs over and over. The simplest use of slip-trailed color was as stripes applied between turned lines around pot rims or shoulders.

The most frequent design to appear among the Morgan shards is the spiral (see fig. 1). In some cases, at the junction of two spirals are three lines resembling the tripartite leaves of a fleur-de-lis. These curved, robust spiral forms would have been complementary to contemporary Baroque interior decoration. The spiral motif also was an easily executed decoration that quickly added value to the Morgan pottery's wares.

The shards from the Morgan pottery site suggest other slip-trailed decorative motifs. Like the spiral motif, these are linear and use the contrast between light clay and dark slip to create an effect. There are but a few shards with these motifs, so it is difficult to understand the intent of the decorator. One shard displays loops that may have continued around in a circle to create a stylized flower. Another shard has loops that may have been part of a bow. These few shards representing different motifs emphasize the common use of the spiral at the Morgan pottery.

According to Sim and Clement, the Morgan pottery had a greater repertoire of slip-trailed designs than that suggested by the recent excavation. Brown describes these designs found by Sim as "triangles of dots, . . . 3-2-1 'fish scale' designs and series of long wavy lines, one over the other, with or without dots over the high points on each
Like the above-mentioned looped designs, these more complicated slip-trailed designs were probably not as common as the spiral.

The Wame & Letts pottery applied oxides with a slip cup or brush, but favored the brush. Many of Wame & Letts' lines are inconsistent in width (see fig. 2). Their character describes the more nervous movement of a brush rather than a steady stream of slip from a slip cup. Like the Morgan designs, none of the freehand motifs of Wame & Letts are entirely represented on the small shards. Unlike the Morgan pottery, the remains of the Wame & Letts brushed and slip-trailed designs reveal no commonly used motifs; all designs are indistinct.

A few of the Wame & Letts shards display motifs composed of curved lines. One shard displays part of a tight spiral, but it is not the nest of concentric lines used by the Morgan pottery. One sloppily rendered curved line seems to describe an open circle. Another shard displays a solid circle surrounded by a broad line. On this shard, the space between the elements is closer in character to the Morgan spirals than the others. While the Morgan pottery spirals were quickly applied, the lines never overlapped. The Wame & Letts designs are rendered in a freer, more painterly, fashion in which lines meet and overlap to describe a variety of indistinct forms.

The assemblage of Wame & Letts shards suggests other decorative schemes. Some designs incorporate loops like the indeterminate Morgan pottery motifs described above. One shard displays three-quarters of a figure-eight. Two others have double curved lines and suggestions of interior negative spaces. These may have been parts of stylized ribbons, swags, or flowers. One Warne & Letts shard displays waves. Another may display waves or perhaps a capital letter J. Two shards coated with large quantities of iron oxide indicate that some pots were quickly decorated by dipping in a contrasting color of slip.
The Morgan-VanWickle pottery did not use slip-trailed and brushed-on oxides as often as the Morgan or Warne & Letts potteries. The Morgan-VanWickle pottery used oxides more in conjunction with incised or stamped decorations. The shards with purely slip-trailed or brushed-on oxides may have been parts of larger designs that incorporated incising or stamping. There is no evidence of distinct designs like those of the Morgan pottery. Some shards indicate that the Morgan-VanWickle potters thinly applied oxides over wide areas. One shard decorated with brown iron oxide suggests the dipping of vessels in slip as practiced at the Warne & Letts pottery.

There are only two Morgan-VanWickle motifs than can be described. The first is a thinly applied stripe of iron oxide around the top, exterior rim of a wide-mouthed jar. This is unlike the application of stripes between tooled lines at the Morgan pottery. The second is a wave motif. One shard displays lightly applied waved lines with swells about one inch apart. A second shard displays thicker lines that may also represent a wave. Like the waves on the Warne & Letts shard, these were quickly rendered with a brush. They may have been parts of larger nautical scenes.

The use of slip at the Warne & Letts and Morgan-VanWickle potteries was more liberal and less precise than at the Morgan pottery. At the Warne & Letts pottery, lines were inconsistent, lines overlapped, and pots were occasionally dipped into slip. The Morgan-VanWickle pottery combined oxides with incised or stamped decoration. It used expansive areas of thin washes more than linear designs. Neither pottery was strongly committed to a single, distinct, slip-trailed motif like the Morgan pottery was to the spiral.

In addition to applying oxides, potters decorated vessels with incised lines. Like the freehand slip-trailed and brushed-on designs, the incised designs were too large to be captured on the small shards left on the sites. From the evidence supplied by the recently excavated shards, this method was least used by the Morgan pottery. However, Sim and Clement noted designs not found by Hunter Research. Sim and Clement found shards
incised with geometric shapes, plants, flowers, fowl, animals, and human figures filled with blue.¹³⁸

Hunter Research found a few shards with minimal incising. One shard displays an incised "bean-shaped" area filled with heavy cobalt oxide. A second incised motif, filled sloppily with cobalt oxide, is composed of two curved lines that may describe a wave or a swag. The incising and filling of shapes with cobalt oxide is a departure from the Morgan pottery's more common freehand application of oxides. When there are no incised lines, oxides describe, not fill, lines.

Warne & Letts also used incised lines rarely. One shard displays a range of horizontal and diagonal lines that may have described a calm sea. These lines were washed over with a light coat of cobalt oxide. This expansive, light coating is reminiscent of the Morgan-VanWickle pottery's use of cobalt oxide. A second shard displays three incised, curved lines which divide areas of blue cobalt oxide, green copper oxide, and gray clay. Shards and marked pots indicate that the Warne & Letts pottery rarely used incised lines and copper oxide. Therefore, this shard may have been part of a special pot.

The Morgan-VanWickle pottery used incised decoration far more than the Morgan and Warne & Letts potteries. One shard displays two curved, incised lines that may have been a crescent-shaped swag like that at the Morgan pottery. Another shard displays a combination of slightly curved and irregular horizontal lines lightly brushed over with cobalt oxide. Like the Warne & Letts shard above, this may have been part of a nautical scene. One shard is deeply incised with straight lines describing triangles and rectangles. This juxtaposition of shapes may have described a figure or structure. The lines are covered with a dark coat of cobalt oxide.

The majority of the Morgan-VanWickle pottery's decorated shards display floral or foliate motifs (see fig. 3). These motifs were rapidly applied in a formulaic fashion. Stalks and leaves are described with slashing, curving lines. Most elements are textured with
rapidly incised diagonal lines. In all but one case the lines are filled with cobalt oxide. Like the spiral of the Morgan pottery, the Morgan-Vanwickle pottery's incised floral motifs are formulaic and quickly rendered. The designs were intended to add interest and value to the pots, but were not necessarily unique artistic expressions in themselves.

One design found at the Morgan-VanWickle site departs from the incising described above. This motif was impressed by a tool with several blunt projections which left shallow, fluid impressions in the wet clay. This "wave" motif appeared on rim shards and on a curved shoulder shard. The tool used on the rim shards (possibly from the same jar) had four to five projections while that used on the shoulder shard had three wider projections. It is difficult to discern what tool was used to create the design. The irregular width and depth of the waves on the rim shards imply the use of a makeshift tool. Nearly any scalloped-edged object or piece of heavy paper could have left these impressions. The more even pattern on the shoulder shard suggests the use of a regularly-shaped object such as a blunt wooden fork.

The Morgan-VanWickle and the Warne & Letts potteries used stamps to decorate wares. The Warne & Letts pottery also used stamps to mark wares with its name and location. (For discussion of marked shards refer to section entitled "Marked Pots.") The Warne & Letts pottery's stamped decorative motifs were limited to scalloped shapes and curved lines. The shards decorated with scalloped shapes suggest there were at least two different stamps, one having more scallops around the edge than the other. The shard with curved lines may display part of a swag or a crescent shape. A larger shard displays parts of three crescent-shaped stamped motifs and a stamped tassel.

The Morgan-VanWickle pottery used more sophisticated stamps than the Warne & Letts pottery. In keeping with the pottery's incised floral designs, one of its stamped motifs displays four elongated-ovoid petals that extend in opposite directions like compass points (see fig. 4). Between the petals are dashed lines. The petals and dashed lines are
not uniformly impressed or perfectly aligned with one another. These inconsistencies suggest that the elements of the design were separately impressed or that the stamp was hand-carved and imperfect as a result.

Another stamp used by the Morgan-VanWickle pottery is also divided into four parts. This motif displays four hearts, separated by diagonal lines, arranged opposite one another with their points facing inward (see fig. 5). Surrounding the hearts is a scalloped border. The scallops do not meet at logical places with the diagonal lines or correspond to the hearts in a meaningful way. If the motif was created with one stamp, the stamp may have been crafted by hand without attention to relating the parts. Or, perhaps, the lines were incised with the aid of a stencil. The Louis Berger & Associates report states that the lines of the motif were created by removing clay rather than impressing it. It also suggests the design may have been stamped and the lines then cut deeper. Because the motif appears on extant pots, it would seem that it was created with a stamp which was the fastest, most economical way to repeat this type of design.

Sim found evidence of a wider repertoire of stamped motifs at the Morgan-VanWickle pottery site. Brown describes "a wide variety of designs in round or oval stamps, some with 'rope' borders. Flowers, fish, hearts, eagles and the man-in-the-moon were favorites." He also states that these stamped decorations precede the incised decorations of the Morgan-VanWickle pottery. If this is the case, the Morgan-VanWickle pottery moved in the opposite direction from industrialization by changing from specialized tools to freehand methods.

Both the Warne & Letts and the Morgan-VanWickle potteries used coggle wheels to decorate their wares. The patterned coggle wheel, created from clay or wood, rotated within a forked handle. When applied to a damp clay surface it left a decorative impression. Coggled decoration was often rapidly applied leaving uneven or sloppy overlaps at the meeting of the patterned band. Unlike other methods of decoration, coggled
designs are easily understood from their remains on shards because they are small and mechanically repeated. Generally, a line of coggling runs horizontally around the rim or shoulder of a vessel. It is, however, difficult to determine the pattern of repeat with only a small sample of coggled decoration. Also difficult is comparing small samples of coggled decoration to determine if they were created with the same tool.

Hunter Research did not find evidence of coggled designs on the Morgan site, but, according to Brown, the Morgan pottery used two coggled designs. "Only two fragments of coggle[d] decoration were found in the dig. One was a band about a half-inch wide made up of alternately long and two short lines. This ran vertically up the side of what apparently was a small jug. The other was a rope-like band which twined around a piece from top to bottom." This is an unusual use of coggling. Instead of a coggle wheel, the rope design may have been created by wrapping a piece of rope around the form.

Cogged designs are important when considering the usefulness of archeological finds in attributing pots to a particular pottery. When a coggled design is found at a site, it is tempting to attribute all unmarked pots with the same design to that pottery. However, tools are portable. As George Miller suggests, "the coggle wheels were owned by potters rather than by the owners of stoneware manufactories; the potters or specialized decorators moved between potteries taking their tools with them." Unlike the individual hand of an artist, a coggle wheel can produce the same results in anyone's hand. When a coggled design is found at one site, it definitely was used on that site. Yet, it may not be exclusive to that site. Also, many coggled designs are variations on lines and simple geometric shapes. If not treated cautiously, this limited repertoire of designs can lead to misattributions.

In comparing the coggled decorations found on the Wame & Letts and Morgan-VanWickle sites, it is clear how similar some coggled designs are. Both potteries had coggle wheels that produced long, vertical lines. The vertical lines of the Warne & Letts
pottery are thinner, shallower, closer, and more smoothly applied than the Morgan-VanWickle lines. Those of Morgan-VanWickle are thicker and more irregular. Despite these differences in quality, without the shards present or a good mental image of the designs, one could easily misattribute a pot with vertical lines to one pottery or the other. The existence of similar coggle wheels at two potteries implies that there were probably more potteries that employed this simple design, thus complicating the issue further.

Another simple linear motif used by the Morgan-VanWickle pottery is rows of short vertical lines. Some of these lines are deeply impressed and shaped like the letter I. Others are squat and rectangular. Several shards are marked with more than one row of short vertical lines, but it is difficult to know whether the I-shaped and the squat lines were used together or not. Also difficult to determine is whether the double rows of lines were created simultaneously with one tool or by several passes of a tool.

Both potteries used coggle wheels that created vertical pointed ovals (see figs. 6-7). Wame & Letts used two types of vertical pointed oval. The one used early by Wame and during his partnership with Letts is wider than the extremely thin, pointed ovals used later by Letts. The Morgan-VanWickle pottery's pointed ovals are wide like the early Wame & Letts design. Since the shards at the two potteries are small, and at times the impressions are smeared, it is impossible to state whether the ovals were produced by the same coggle wheel. I do not believe they were. The Morgan-VanWickle ovals seem thinner and less regularly shaped than those of Wame & Letts.

One motif shared by the two potteries alternates ovals and circles composed of tiny inward-pointing triangles (see fig. 8). This design may have been created at the two potteries with the same coggle wheel. The small examples available make it difficult to prove this. Branin states that one of the Morgan-VanWickle pottery's coggled designs was "made with the exact same tool [that decorated] sherds from Wame & Letts." The Louis Berger & Associates report suggests that the oval-and-circle motif is that alleged to be
I will tentatively state that the two impressions were created with the same tool. There is not a significant degree of difference in style and quality between the two designs. Also, the individual triangular impressions in specific locations on the shapes are very similar. Although these observations are slim evidence to prove the point, the similarities do exist and put into question any attributions made on the basis of this design.

The Morgan-VanWickle pottery created other designs with "dashed" lines. One such motif is a horizontal row of ovals composed of dashed lines connected with short, solid lines. The horizontality of this motif is emphasized by thin, deep lines above and below the shapes. A close variation on this design, is one with paired, dashed circles connected with short lines. A third horizontal, dashed design gives the impression of basket-weave. Although the intricacy of the basket-weave design could have been impressive, the inconsistent impressions make the image sloppy instead.

Two designs used at the Warne & Letts and Morgan-VanWickle shops are easily distinguishable, but strikingly similar in concept. Warne & Letts' design is more intricate and better executed suggesting that this pottery may have started using the design first. The Warne & Letts design consists of a horizontal row of diamonds with alternating patterns inside (see fig. 9). Every second diamond contains nested diamonds while circular rosettes or pinwheels appear in the others. Above and below the junctions of the diamonds appear smaller nested diamonds.

The Morgan-VanWickle diamond-based motif is much simpler and less refined (see fig. 10). The crudeness of the lines led archeologists to believe it was an incised copy of the Warne & Letts motif. On an extant pot, the band overlaps and runs under the handles, therefore, it cannot be an incised decoration. This motif consists of a horizontal band of nested diamonds. At the junctions of the diamonds are vertical figure-eights. It is
possible that both potteries designed their diamond-based motifs separately, but it is more likely that one pottery appropriated the design from the other.

Less sophisticated, but more cleanly executed are the sawtooth-related designs of Warne & Letts. One design is a wide, horizontal sawtooth band. Another motif incorporates wide, alternating recessed and raised rectangles bordered above and below by small triangles arranged in a sawtooth pattern (see fig. 11). There is no proportionate one-to-one or two-to-one relationship between the triangles and rectangles.

From the evidence at the sites, it seems the Morgan-VanWickle coggle wheel designs were less complex and not as well-executed as those of Warne & Letts. There was nothing as intricate as the diamond-in-diamond-and-rosette design at the Morgan-VanWickle site. Nor were there any designs as finely executed as the wide-rectangles-bordered-with-sawtooth-triangles. The Morgan-VanWickle coggled designs such as the wide vertical lines could be considered crude. Also, the pottery's geometric shapes composed of dashed lines are sloppy. The better quality of the Warne & Letts coggled designs may indicate that they were the coggle wheel design innovators. Although the Warne & Letts pottery is well-known for its coggled designs on marked wares, fewer coggled designs were found at that site than at the Morgan-VanWickle site. Seven coggle wheel designs were found at the Warne & Letts site while eight were found at the Morgan-VanWickle site.

From the shards recently collected from the sites of the Morgan, Warne & Letts, and Morgan-VanWickle potteries, it is possible to make several conclusions. All of the potteries made extensive use of cobalt oxide. The Warne & Letts and Morgan-VanWickle potteries made occasional use of iron oxide and copper oxide.

The preferred method of decoration varied from pottery to pottery. The Morgan pottery made the most extensive use of linear, slip-trailed designs, incised pots rarely, and used coggle wheels very rarely, if ever. The Warne & Letts pottery brushed on oxides;
rarely incised decoration; and made extensive use of stamps and coggle wheels. The Morgan-VanWickle pottery engaged in the least freehand application of oxides; produced the most incised decorations; and made extensive use of stamps and coggle wheels. The potteries' preferred decorative motifs and methods of decoration aid in, and at times hinder, the attribution of unmarked wares to a particular pottery.

Do these preferences for different methods of decorative application indicate any relationships between the potteries? It is possible to state, as Davis does, that the continuation of freehand applied oxides at the Warne & Letts pottery indicates a link to the earlier Morgan pottery. But this perceived link is only superficial. If Thomas Warne were trained at the Morgan pottery, he would have learned to apply the slip-trailed spiral motif so often used at that pottery. Why did Warne not continue to use it at his pottery? Perhaps he wished to make new designs in order to distinguish his work from the older pottery. If so, why did he choose to render his designs with a brush instead of a slip cup? Thomas Warne could have learned freehand techniques from any New Jersey or New York potter. At this time it is impossible to link the Morgan and Warne & Letts potteries on the basis of decorative techniques.

There is not even a superficial link between the decorations of the Morgan pottery and the Morgan-VanWickle pottery. The Morgan-VanWickle pottery never favored the slip-trailing method. The Morgan-VanWickle pottery used coggle wheels like the Warne & Letts pottery. Because the coggled designs of the Warne & Letts pottery are more complex and refined, this pottery likely first used and popularized coggle wheels in the area. Beyond this influence, there is no apparent relationship between the two enterprises.
MARKED POTS

In addition to excavated shards and documentary research, extant marked pots are the other piece of evidence helpful to the successful attribution of unmarked wares. I visited six museum collections to study the decorations on extant examples marked by the Morgan, Morgan-VanWickle, and Warne & Letts potteries. Because so few marked objects from the Morgan and Morgan-VanWickle potteries exist, they will be discussed first. Then the many marked wares of the Warne & Letts pottery will be addressed.

The Morgan pottery produced at least one marked pot, shards of which were found by Sim on the Morgan pottery site. This pot was incised, not stamped, "Danniel Holmes/ . . . September 23, 1775/ . . . mboy James Morgan." This pot was certainly a special order because Holmes' name appears on it, the Morgan pottery rarely incised pots, and this is the only surviving example of a marked pot from the Morgan pottery. It may have been a gift commemorating an event in September of 1775.

There are no extant Morgan-VanWickle marked pots. Shards from the Sim collection at the New Jersey State Museum suggest that the pottery did occasionally inscribe its name on wares. The three shards indicate that incised vertical and horizontal lines framed two rows of upper case block letters with serifs. The letters on the shards suggest the incised mark read VANWICKLE & MORGAN. Cobalt oxide was liberally spread over the border and letters for emphasis. It is significant that this inscription does not read Morgan & VanWickle or Morgan & Co. Perhaps VanWickle was the leading partner in the firm. This could explain the pottery's absence from James Morgan Jr.'s 1822 will. The fact that the Morgan and Morgan-VanWickle potteries incised their names on pots implies that marking was a rare practice at these manufactories.
Of the three potteries under study, only the Warne & Letts pottery consistently marked its products. This pottery used a range of name stamps including WARNE, T. WARNE C., T.W.J.L, WARNE & LETTS, and MADE.BY.J.LETTS. It seems logical that the marks WARNE and T. WARNE C. are of the earliest date before Warne's partnership with Letts while the MADE.BY.J.LETTS stamp is the latest after Warne's death. In order to observe patterns, I first will examine pots marked with the different name stamps separately and then draw conclusions from the patterns.

I examined four jars on which the name Warne appeared. Three of them (MCHA 79.528.50, NJSM 352.27, and NMAH 300894.84) were marked with the WARNE name stamp while the fourth (NMAH 77.803.215) was incised freehand with the name Melinay Warne. The letters in each of the stamped WARNE impressions are identical suggesting that the maker used the same stamp to mark these pots (see fig. 12). In each case, the characters are upper case block letters with serifs. Because the letters are in a line and are impressed for the most part to a uniform depth, they were likely created with a single stamp. On jar MCHA 79.528.50, about half of the W is lightly impressed indicating the quickness with which the stamp was applied.

Two of the WARNE jars (MCHA 79.528.50 and NJSM 352.27) were marked also with location stamps. Jar MCHA 79.528.50 is marked AMBOY.N.JERSY and jar NJSM 352.27 is marked upside-down S.AMBOY.N.JFRSY. As with the WARNE name stamp, the location stamps were more lightly impressed on the left causing the S and part of the E in the respective impressions to be omitted. It appears that these impressions were created with one, identical stamp.

The typeface of the location stamp is in the same style as that of the WARNE stamp. The A, R, and N have the same characteristics, but the letters of the location stamp are less defined than those of the name stamp. Perhaps the location stamp was more worn.
than or an imitation of the more distinct name stamp. The typeface used by the Warne &
Letts pottery does not appear to have been commonly used by other potteries at the time.

All three jars stamped WARNE were also stamped with a pair of scallop-shaped
forms that have been referred to previously as "holly leaves" or "swags" (see fig. 12). Each impressed shape displays four upper scallops in a straight line and five lower scallops in a semi-circle. Shards bearing this motif were recently collected from the site. Each form was impressed separately because on jar MCHA 79.528.50 they overlap slightly. The alignment of the shapes also varies. This variation of proximity and alignment attests to the rapidity with which the stamps were applied.

Besides stamped decoration, two of the WARNE pots display brushed-on oxides. On jar MCHA 79.528.50 a decorator brushed dark brown oxide within the scalloped shapes and around the bases of the handles. On the reverse of jar NMAH 300894.84 is a greenish-brown, brushed-on decoration. As with the application of stamps, the application of oxides on the WARNE pots was done quickly. They were applied in or around strong shapes. When rendered freehand, they form nebulous shapes.

The rarest mark used by Warne is T.WARNE C. The one pot I examined with this stamp was wide-mouthed jar NJSM 69.1. The letters of the T.WARNE C. stamp are more squat than those of the WARNE stamp. The serifs are straight, not triangular. Below the name stamp appears, in the same squat style, the location stamp SOUTHAMBOY followed by a horizontal diamond. Two rows of coggled pointed ovals like those recently found on the site surround the neck and shoulder of the pot (see fig. 6). Coggled decoration is used in conjunction with this stamp and not the WARNE name stamp suggesting that the pots marked T.WARNE C. were produced after those marked WARNE.

The Warne & Letts partnership produced more marked examples than Thomas Warne did alone. The partnership marked its wares with the stamps T.W.J.L and WARNE.
& LETTS (see figs. 13-16). These name stamps may have been used simultaneously. In this discussion, the T.W.J.L stamp will be addressed first. Of the group of pots I examined, seven bore these initials (MCHA 79.5115 and 79.528.25, NJSM 69.17.2 and 82.50.1, NM 47.10, and NMAH 77.803.210 and 77.803.211). At the Thomas Warne Historical Museum & Library, one rim shard (TWM 612) displays this stamp. Three recently collected shards also display parts of this mark.

The letters in the T.W.J.L initials are similar but not identical to the letters used in the WARNE and S.AMBOY.N.JERSY stamps. The letters in the initial stamp are separated by diamonds. The diamonds contain either lines that extend from side to side like an X or lines that extend from corner to corner like a cross. Invariably, the first and third diamonds contain an X while the middle diamond contains a cross. The consistency of the letters and the diamonds suggest that all of the initialed impressions were created with the same stamp.

None of the initialed vessels are dated or marked with the location of the pottery. Six of the seven pots display new variations on the above-mentioned scalloped shape used by Warne. Three pots and one of the collected shards display shapes that are described by six upper and six lower scallops (MCHA 79.528.25, NM 47.10, and NMAH 77.803.211) (see fig. 13). Three other pots (NJSM 69.17.2 and 82.50.1 and NMAH 77.803.210) display a different variation on the scalloped shape (see fig. 14). In this case, the top row of scallops faces upward rather than recessing into the shape. Instead of a scalloped semi-circle below, there is a curved line. These variations were stamped singly or in pairs. When in pairs, the shapes are aligned straight unlike the often-angled Warne designs.

The three pots and one shard decorated with the six-over-six scalloped shape all display brushed cobalt oxide inside the shapes and over the letters. All three of the pots with the softer scalloped shape are decorated in the same manner with dark brown oxide.
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The two pots with handles have oxide brushed around the handle bases. Three shards stamped with the initials T.W.J.L were decorated in the same way with cobalt oxide.

In this study, the only extant, marked vessels displaying coggled designs are those of Warne and Warne & Letts. Not until his partnership with Letts, did Warne use more than the coggled pointed oval motif. Two of the pots with the six-over-six scalloped motif, NMAH 77.803.211 and 79.528.25, have coggled designs. Jug NMAH 79.528.25 displays coggled long, vertical lines around the shoulder. Jar NMAH 77.803.211 has two rows of shorter, vertical lines around the shoulder. Two of the pots with the softer scalloped shapes, NMAH 77.803.210 and NJSM 69.17.2, also have coggled decoration. Both are decorated around the rim with a series of very thin, vertical rectangles that are bordered above and below by a sawtooth pattern of triangles. This coggled design is similar, but not identical to the wide-rectangles-bordered-with-sawtooth-triangles motif found recently on collected shards. Jar NJSM 69.17.2 displays a second coggled design of five unevenly-spaced rows of tiny triangles on the shoulder just above, and overlapping, the stamped initials (see fig. 14). None of the shards, not even a rim shard, exhibit a coggled design in combination with the T.W.J.L stamp.

The last jar marked T.W.J.L (MCHA 79.5115) is not closely related to the others. Its main decorative feature is a coggled row of horizontal diamonds and pointed ovals connected by long horizontal lines. Every other shape is filled with dark brown oxide. Dark brown oxide also surrounds the bases of the handles.

The only other recorded name stamp used by the partnership of Warne & Letts is WARNE & LETTS plus a date (see figs. 15-16). Of the examples I examined, ten were marked with this stamp and dated 1806 or 1807 (MCHA 79.508.31 and 79.512.5; NJSM 336.5, 352.29, and 77.23; NM 30.551; NMAH 77.803.216 and 79.577.17; TWM 2745; and WM 59.1780). This stamp was not used on undated pots. Portions of this stamp appear on shards collected by Hunter Research. The type used in the WARNE & LETTS
stamp is similar in style to that used in the WARNE and S.AMBOY.N.JERSY stamps. The s in Letts and the last three digits of the date seem incised, but, due to their repeated, consistent appearance, are more crudely carved parts of the name stamp.

In addition to the WARNE & LETTS stamp, all ten pots also display the S.AMBOY.N.JERSY location stamp. It seems that Warne & Letts may have owned two different S.AMBOY.N.JERSY stamps. Although the two stamps are identical in every other way, the stamp used by Warne before the partnership and used by Warne & Letts in 1807, had a flaw. The second point of the letter M in AMBOY is truncated. The stamp used in 1806 does not show this flaw (see figs. 12, 15-16).

Of the group of ten pots, six are dated 1806 (MCHA 79.508.31, NJSM 336.5 and 352.29, NM 30.551, TWM 2745, and WM 59.1780). Four jars marked 1806 are adorned with single or paired four-over-five scalloped shapes; the six-over-six scalloped shape and the soft scalloped shape do not appear on these jars. Perhaps these vessels date to before the creation of the other two variations of scalloped shape seen on examples marked T.W.J.L.

Five of the six jars dated 1806 are decorated with oxides. Three display cobalt oxide (NJSM 336.5, TWM 2745, and WM 59.1780) and the other two (MCHA 79.508.31 and NM 30.551) dark brown oxide. The oxides were brushed inside scalloped shapes, lightly over stamped letters, and around bases of handles. Jar TWM 2745 also displays brushed-on waves under the handles and, on the reverse, a lozenge with two curved wing-like projections. Jars MCHA 79.508.31, NM 30.551, TWM 2745, and WM 59.1780 have coggled around the rim the wide-rectangles-bordered-with-sawtooth-triangles design like that on recently collected shards. Jar NM 30.551 displays around the shoulder a coggled wide sawtooth band unlike that on recently collected shards (see fig. 15).

The most ornate vessel of the group dated 1806 is jug NJSM 352.29. Three rows of coggling encircle the shoulder of the jug. The wide-rectangles-bordered-with-sawtooth-
triangles motif appears above two rows of tiny squares that may or may not have been created simultaneously with one tool. Below the name and location stamps is a motif likely created with one large stamp. The main element is a horizontal figure-eight. Above and below the center of the figure-eight are small, vertical pointed ovals. To the right and left are tassels composed of three pointed ovals. Brushed-on cobalt oxide appears inside the elements of this motif. This is a far more ambitious use of stamped decoration than the earlier scalloped shapes used by Warne.

Of the group of ten pots marked with the WARNE & LETTS stamp, four (MCHA 79.512.5, NJSN 77.23, and NMAH 77.803.216 and 79.557.17) are dated 1807. All of these pots display an additional impression not seen on those dated 1806. The stamp reads LIBERTY.FOR.EV in the same style of typeface as the other Warne & Letts stamps (see fig. 16). This mark was created with a single, large stamp and always appears above the name stamp. Like the initial stamp, T.W.J.L, the elements of this stamp are divided by diamonds. In this case, both diamonds contain cross shapes. To the left of the stamped letters is what appears to be an abstract human hand with two fingers extended toward the letters. Surrounding the "hand" and letters is a jagged, rectangular outline with eleven spikes on the top.

Only two vessels dated 1807 display pairs of four-over-five scalloped shapes. Jar MCHA 79.512.5 has a pair of cobalt-filled, overlapping scalloped shapes beneath the name and date stamps. Butter crock NMAH 77.803.216 displays the same motif below the location stamp on its reverse side. Three of the 1807 examples display coggled decoration. Jar MCHA 79.512.5 and butter crock NMAH 77.803.216 are adorned around the rim with coggled wide-rectangles-bordered-with-sawtooth-triangles. Coggled rows of pointed ovals appear around the rim and shoulder of pitcher NJSN 77.23.

In addition to name, location, and LIBERTY.FOR.EV stamps, small-mouthed jar NMAH 79.577.17 has the same figure-eight-with-pointed-oval-and-tassel motif that
appears on jug NJSM 352.29. This example confirms that the whole motif was applied simultaneously with a single stamp because the entire left side fades to nothing. Like the rapidly impressed name and location stamps, this decorative stamp was quickly applied leaving a lighter impression on the left side. The decorator used cobalt oxide to fill in the hand of the \textit{LIBERTY.FOR.EV} stamp and the figure-eight.

Presumably after the death of Thomas Warne, Joshua Letts began marking pots with the stamp \textit{MADE.BY.J.LETTS}. Of the pots I examined, four (NJSM 336.6, NM 47.11, NMAH 300.894.85, and TWM #HCR) bore the \textit{MADE.BY.J.LETTS} stamp (see figs. 17-18). The letters of this stamp are different in style and scale than the other Warne & Letts stamps. They are in the same squat, straight-serifed style as the \textit{T.WARNE C.} stamp. Like the initial and \textit{LIBERTY.FOR.EV} stamps, the elements of the \textit{MADE.BY.J.LETTS} stamp are separated by diamonds. The first and third contain an $X$ while the middle diamond contains a cross.

Small-mouthed jar NM 47.11 displays, in addition to the name and location stamps, a variation of the \textit{LIBERTY.FOR.EV} stamp (see fig. 17). The text and the "hand" are identical to those on the Warne & Letts vessels dated 1807, but the jagged border is missing. Because it is identical in every other way, it is possible that Letts altered the old stamp. Besides his continued use of the altered \textit{LIBERTY.FOR.EV} stamp, Letts did not continue to use any other Warne & Letts decorating tools. Below the \textit{LIBERTY.FOR.EV} stamp is a carefully incised foliate and floral motif not seen on earlier Warne & Letts wares. Dark brown oxide fills each shape. A coggled double row of diagonal lines encircles the shoulder. These precise, close rows were probably created simultaneously with one tool.

Small-mouthed jar NMAH 300894.85 displays the name stamp, the location stamp, and a coggled double row of short diagonal lines around its shoulder. Between this row of coggling and the maker's mark appears a row of attached, coggled horizontal pointed ovals. Letts filled every second oval with dark brown oxide.
Large-mouthed jar TWM #HCR displays the name stamp, location stamp, and a variation on the coggled ovals formerly used by Warne & Letts. Around the rim of the jar is a row of small pointed ovals which are narrower than those used earlier. Above the maker's mark appears a row of large, detached, horizontal, pointed ovals (see fig. 18). These ovals are connected by dashed lines and contain horizontal, pointed figure-eights. At random, Letts filled the large ovals with cobalt oxide.

Jug NJSM 336.6 is the only Letts vessel marked with a location. The location stamp is not the common S.AMBOY.N.JERSY stamp, but rather the SOUTHAMBOY and diamond stamp earlier used in conjunction with the T.WARNE C. stamp. One shard excavated by Sim displays portions of the MADE.BY.J.LETTS and the SOUTHAMBOY stamps used together (see fig. 19). Jug NJSM 336.6 displays around the shoulder the coggled oval-and-circle motif like that found on shards at the Warne & Letts and Morgan-VanWickle sites (see fig. 8).

In examining all the marked products of the Warne & Letts pottery, one sees decorating trends emerge. Warne decorated his wares with freehand, stamped, and coggled designs. He used the four-over-five scalloped-shaped stamp and the coggled small pointed ovals. These techniques persisted and were expanded upon when Letts joined the business. Two new variations on the scalloped shape appeared, yet the old shape was still used. The potters developed larger, more elaborate stamps such as the figure-eight-and-pointed-ovals-and-tassels and LIBERTY.FOR.EV stamps. Coggled decorations moved from pointed ovals to more elaborate linear and geometric patterns. Freehand decoration receded and played a secondary role to stamped and coggled designs. Brushed-on oxides became accents in and around shapes instead of main decorative elements. All of the Warne & Letts pottery's decorations, while adding monetary value to the wares, were applied quickly to speed production.
After Warne's death, Letts' pots still displayed stamped and coggled designs, yet few were the same as those used by the partners. The only patterns Letts continued to use were the coggled pointed ovals and the \textit{LIBERTY.FOR.EV} stamp. However, Letts' coggled pointed ovals were not the same as those used before and the \textit{LIBERTY.FOR.EV} had been altered. It is possible that Letts did not continue to use any of the original Warne & Letts tools. Letts' new coggled and incised designs are bolder and larger than the earlier patterns. Most were large shapes that could be filled with oxides.

What do these changes in decorative application indicate about the Warne & Letts pottery? Because the pottery's decorations became more elaborate when Letts joined the business, Letts has been given credit for creating the new decorative tools. If Letts was the creator of the new tools, it is curious that he did not continue to use his full repertoire of designs after Warne's death. If Warne was the creator, it is strange that he did not decorate his wares more elaborately before the partnership. Perhaps the partnership with Letts allowed Warne more time, money, and freedom to decorate pots as he could not before.

The profusion of stamps and coggle wheels represents an investment of time and possibly money as much as it does creative ability. The new Warne & Letts decorations were likely a function of pooled resources more than evidence of one man's talent. It is also possible that Warne and Letts employed a third party who owned these coggle wheels. If this nameless man was the source of the Warne & Letts coggle wheel designs, he may have left with his tools upon Warne's death. Being accustomed to decorating with coggle wheels, Letts may have designed new ones for himself.

The Warne & Letts pottery used a larger number of coggle wheel patterns than they have been given credit for in the past. Davis credits the pottery with nine designs, two of which they did not actually use.\textsuperscript{152} Mitchell states that the pottery owned at least six different coggle wheels.\textsuperscript{153} Missing from these authors' lists are the double row of tiny squares used by \textit{WARNE & LETTS} (NJSM 352.29), the wide sawtooth pattern used by
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WARNE & LETTS (NM 30.551), the large-ovals-containing-pointed-figure-eights-connected-by-dashed-lines used by Letts (TWM #HCR), and the attached, horizontal pointed ovals of Letts (NMAH 300894.95).

Does the Warne & Letts pottery's extensive use of tools indicate a move toward a more industrialized mode of stoneware production in New Jersey? According to the Hunter Research report, "The Warne & Letts methods of applying decoration to their wares using fabricated stamps, dies and wheels would appear to represent a shift in stoneware manufacturing practice away from the small-scale cottage industry mode of production towards faster, large-scale and more standardized operation." On the surface this statement seems accurate, but may not hold true when measured with other potteries and the history of tool usage.

Although the Morgan pottery did not employ many tools, it was able to quickly decorate its wares with the slip-trailed spiral. These spirals were not standardized, but they could be applied quickly to enable large-scale production. People could learn to effectively execute this simple decoration easily. Not as simple to learn or apply are the incised floral/foliate motifs of the Morgan-VanWickle pottery. Yet, the quick rendering and the repeated use of these designs indicate that they were produced with large-scale production in mind.

Stamps and coggle wheels are time-saving devices, but they were not a new development in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century. As early as the Bronze Age, potters were decorating vessels with repetitious designs created with notched rocker tools, stamps, and possibly coggle wheels. The scale of tool usage at the Warne & Letts and the Morgan-VanWickle potteries does not represent a change in technology or scale of production, but instead a shift in the allocation of resources. Rather than spending time training freehand decorators, the potteries spent time and money on the initial
development of time-saving tools. This is not a shift from small- to large-scale industry, but a shift in attitudes towards handcraft.

The coggle wheel may also have been chosen for aesthetic reasons. It produced light, linear motifs while the slip cup was better-suited for bold decorations. The robust, slip-trailed spirals of the Morgan pottery were well-suited to the eighteenth-century Baroque style. The small scale linear and geometric motifs produced by coggle wheels were better suited to the Federal style of interior decoration of the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century. Despite the utilitarian nature of stoneware vessels, they may have reflected the more apparent stylistic changes that took place in higher style goods.

What is the significance of Wame & Letts marking their wares? The Morgan pottery and the Morgan-VanWickle pottery left behind only the slightest trace that they incised but did not consistently mark pots. Did Warne & Letts mark pots because they were the second pottery in the South Amboy area? Perhaps the Morgans had no competition and did not need to mark wares. Warne may have felt the need to indicate that he was a new maker of stoneware in South Amboy. Or, maybe Warne was trained in a pottery that consistently marked its wares. It is possible that Warne & Letts were shipping their wares farther afield than the Morgans had been previously. Instead of local patrons knowing the potters and their wares, Warne & Letts may have needed to advertise to a larger, more impersonal market. This seems implausible, however, because the Morgans were selling clay and likely pots up and down the east coast. Also, they were businessmen manufacturing wares for a profit. Why would they not advertise? While the Morgans likely hired potters to create wares at their manufactories, Warne and Letts were potters themselves. Perhaps the pride of authorship prompted them to mark their products.
ATTRIBUTED POTS

Attributing unmarked pots to a particular pottery is a difficult task that should be undertaken with caution. It is helpful, when making an attribution, to state in writing the reasons behind it. This information allows future curators and scholars to better understand the motivation for it and assess its validity. Unannotated attributions can weaken over time when their bases are unclear. Attributions can also be unduly strengthened over time as pots are so often associated with a pottery that the two become closely linked. These attributed pots begin to serve as bases for further, more attenuated attributions.

Wares should be attributed to potteries less aggressively. Although museums and collectors desire the ability to associate their vessels with names and places, it is more important that attributions reflect the true amount of information known about an object. A seeming lack of information can at times lead to extrapolations and assumptions that may not hold true over time. A better policy is to attach broad attributions to vessels until more information is available. A broader attribution puts the vessel into a wider pool of examples with which to study and compare it. A narrow attribution can isolate a pot so that it is never correctly attributed or studied.

There are several types of information upon which curators and scholars rely when making attributions. Often unattributed vessels are compared to extant pots marked by a pottery. Similarities between the vessels in matters of form, construction, materials, workmanship, decorative motifs, and application of decoration can lead to the attribution of unmarked pots. Unmarked vessels also can be compared to archeological findings from pottery sites. Archeological shards can yield varying amounts of information about
construction, materials, workmanship, and decorations. Marked pots and excavated shards offer standards to which unattributed pots can be compared.

If limited information is available about a particular pottery, a practice of attributing pots by degrees may be in order. If several of the characteristics between the standard and the unattributed pot are similar or the same, one can make an attribution with a strong to very strong degree of certainty. When there is one strong similarity, it is possible to make an attribution with a moderate degree of certainty. A vague similarity between the standard and the unattributed pot leads to a weak attribution. When there is only a vague similarity combined with questionable or incorrect elements, the attribution is very weak if applicable at all.

Provenances are helpful, but at times problematic, in making attributions. Object histories can be forgotten, distorted, reinvented, or enhanced over time. Yet, provenances should always be recorded and, if necessary, commented upon for the benefit of future curators and scholars.

Discussed below are the many pots attributed to the Morgan, Morgan-VanWickle, and Warne & Letts potteries. The current attributions are examined using information available from recent archeological investigations, past archeological excavations and scholarship, and documentary sources. A number of pots are attributed to each pottery. With the information provided by new findings, some of the attributions can be confirmed while others still await confirmation. Attributions to the Warne & Letts pottery are discussed first because the issues are clearer than those of the other two potteries. Generally, within the sections, the strongest attributions are presented first. However, when pots raise questions or display similar motifs, they are included with the examples with which they are most closely related despite differences in strength of attribution. See Appendices A-C for charts outlining the attributions discussed in this study.
Because the Wame & Letts pottery left behind a large number of marked pots and easily distinguishable stamped and coggled motifs on their pottery site, it is relatively easy to prove or disprove attributions to the pottery. Of the vessels I examined, ten were attributed to, but not marked by, the Wame & Letts pottery. Based on their stamped motifs, four jars are very strongly associated with the pottery. Small-mouthed jar NMAH 300894.83 displays *LIBERTY.FOR.EV, S.AMBOY.N.JERSY*, and a pair of scalloped shaped stamps. All three of these stamps are identical to those on a variety of marked Wame & Letts pots and on recently collected shards (see figs. 15-16). Jars NMAH 65.L[?].108, 77.98.23.912, and 77.803.214 each display a *S.AMBOY.N.JERSY* location stamp and single scalloped shapes identical to marked and collected examples. Wide-mouthed jars NMAH 77.803.219 and NM 56.91 are strongly attributable to the Wame & Letts pottery on the basis of the distinctive diamond-in-diamond-and-rosette coggled design recently found on shards at the pottery site (see fig. 9). This group of pots satisfies all the criteria for strong to very strong attributions.

Wide-mouthed jar NJSM 352.28 and jug NJSM 352.35 have attributions to the Wame & Letts pottery that cannot be substantiated with any degree of certainty. The coggled oval-and-circle-composed-of-inward-pointing-triangles decoration on jar NJSM 352.35 is like that found on extant Wame & Letts pots and collected shards, but the motif was also found on fragments from the Morgan-VanWickle site (see fig. 8). The appearance of this motif on both sites compromises any attributions made solely on its basis. The coggled wide-zigzag decoration on jug NJSM 352.28 was not found on any marked pots or collected shards. The Wame & Letts pottery may have manufactured these objects, but further evidence is required before realistic attributions can be made.

Two jars with weak and very weak attributions to the Wame & Letts pottery are small-mouthed jar NJSM 69.138.1 and wide-mouthed jar NMAH 77.803.217. Jar NJSM 69.138.1 exhibits a vague, freehand cobalt oxide motif that does not relate strongly to any
other Warne & Letts decorations. Also, the jar has extruded handles that are atypical of other Warne & Letts products. Davis attributed jar NMAH 77.803.217 to Warne & Letts based upon its form and shape. Yet, the crude coggled decoration and the color of the cobalt oxide do not match that on extant, marked pots or collected shards.

I had anticipated finding a greater number of attributions to the Warne & Letts pottery because of their penchant for marking and their variety of known coggled designs. I expected that many pots with coggled decorations would have been automatically attributed to Warne & Letts. Instead, the attributions made to Warne & Letts were, with four exceptions, well-founded. This degree of accuracy can be ascribed to the number of marked examples, the distinct motifs used, and the previous scholarship of Davis and others.

Attributions to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery are a far more messy affair. I had expected that the lack of previous scholarship on and marked pots produced by the pottery would have decreased the number of attributions to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery. Instead, of the pots I examined, there were twenty attributed and eight others related to the pottery. Presumably previous attributions to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery were made on the basis of the shards excavated by Sim.

This evidence is problematic for several reasons. The current records of the Sim excavation are poor. The proveniences, or locations of the shards within the Sim dig, were not preserved. Therefore, when the information provided by the recent excavation confirms the pottery's use of one decorative motif, it is impossible to extend this confirmation to adjacent shards in the Sim excavation.

Information about the Sim excavation is contained in two brief, illustrated sets of notes in the Monmouth County Historical Association's Cheesequake pottery files. It is unclear whether the notes are by Sim, a colleague, or an unrelated scholar. These notes provide scant information with which to understand the work of Sim and subsequent
attributions based on his work. At times, they present conflicting information and 
compromise attributions based on Sim's findings.¹⁵⁹

The problem is exacerbated in the Old Bridge area because of early confusion 
regarding the location of the Morgan-VanWinkle and Bissett potteries.¹⁶⁰ Sim states in 
*Pages from the Past,* "There is still some confusion in our knowledge of stoneware 
factories at Old Bridge." When excavating in Old Bridge, Sim thought he had found the 
Bissett pottery site. He stated "If Morgan and VanWickle had another factory somewhere 
in Old Bridge, the site has not been found."¹⁶¹ In fact, Sim probably had found the 
Morgan-VanWinkle site, not the Bissett pottery. Unfortunately, existing notes do not 
indicate the site from which objects were removed, but instead reflect uncertain attempts at 
attributions.

A striking example of conflicting information confusing attributions to the Morgan-
VanWickle pottery is small-mouthed jar MCHA 79.528.51 decorated with small coggled 
ovals and large coggled fish. The small coggled ovals resemble those of the Warne & Letts 
and the Morgan-VanWinkle potteries (see figs. 6-7). The large coggled fish do not appear 
on shards found recently on either site. The large fish design is attributed to "VanWickle" 
in the Cheesequake pottery files.¹⁶² Yet, the attribution is confused by the appearance of 
this motif on a pot attributed to Joshua Letts in Sim and Clement's article "The 
Cheesequake Potteries."¹⁶³ Due to the conflicting evidence surrounding this pot, a better 
attribute would be to New Jersey or to Old Bridge or South Amboy, New Jersey.

The evidence of coggled and stamped decorations found on the Morgan-VanWickle 
pottery site by Louis Berger & Associates assists in the attribution of wide-mouthed jars 
NJSN 352.41 and NMAH 300894.86. These jars display coggled ovals and the coggled 
diamond-in-diamond motif (see fig. 20). The coggled diamond-in-diamond motif is as yet 
exclusive to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery. Jar NMAH 300894.86 is currently attributed
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to the New Jersey area. Both objects should be attributed strongly to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery.

Two stamped motifs exclusive to the Morgan-VanWickle site are the four-petaled-flower-in-circle and four-hearts-in-scalloped-surround motifs. Jugs NJSM 352.24 and NJSM 361 display the four-petaled-flower-in-circle stamp and, therefore, are strongly attributed to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery (see fig. 4). Jar NJSM 361 also displays the date 1807 which falls within the working period of the Morgan-VanWickle pottery.

The Morgan-VanWickle pottery produced wide-mouthed jar NJSM 352.34 because it displays the four-hearts-in-scalloped-surround motif (see fig. 5). On the reverse is a stamped motif depicting a human profile in a circle (see fig. 21). The human-profile-in-circle, or "man-in-the-moon," motif has long been associated with the Morgan-VanWickle pottery on the basis of Sim's excavated shards. "This 'man-in-the-moon' mark was often excavated at the VanWickle and Morgan [Morgan-VanWickle] refuse heap in Old Bridge and has been employed to attribute surviving objects to VanWickle and Morgan's pottery."¹⁶⁴ No recently excavated shards bear this motif. However, the pairing of the known four-hearts-in-scalloped-surround motif with the human-profile-in-circle supports its attribution to the pottery.

The attribution of the human-profile-in-circle motif to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery also links a group of vessels bearing this image to it. Small-mouthed jar NMAH 322631.24 has a strong attribution to the pottery because it bears the human-profile-in-circle motif and the coggled diamond-in-diamond design. Small-mouthed jar MCHA 79.528.19 and inkwell NMAH 77.803.220 are attributed moderately to the pottery because they bear the human-profile-in-circle motif. These attributions are weaker than those above because these vessels do not display a second motif found during the recent excavation.

Small-mouthed jar NMAH 77.803.221 and wide-mouthed jar NMAH 77.80.3 display stamped human-profile-in-circle motifs surrounded by series of curved and pointed
lobes. It is unclear whether these lobes are part of the stamped image or incised around the image. In either case, the difference in design from that on pot NJSM 352.34 lessens their attributions to the level of moderate to weak.

Jug NMAH 77.803.222 bears a stamp depicting a small, shaded circle surrounded by a larger circle which is in turn surrounded by nine curved lobes. These lobes are similar to those surrounding the human-profile-in-circle motif on jar NMAH 77.803.221. However, this motif does not appear among the excavated shards or in conjunction with an attributable motif on another vessel. Therefore, based upon decorative evidence, the attribution of this jug to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery is very weak if not baseless.

Confirming attributions based on motifs excavated by Sim but not found by Louis Berger & Associates is difficult. Wide-mouthed jars MCHA 79.528.40 and NMAH 77.803.218 bear small coggled ovals and large coggled ovals containing fish or flowers. The small coggled ovals resemble those of Warne & Letts and the Morgan-VanWickle pottery. The large-ovals-containing-fish-or-flowers design appears in the Cheesequake pottery files. The note maker attributed the image exclusively to VanWickle (probably meaning Morgan-VanWickle).165 Because the design is only attributable on the basis of scant, possibly erroneous, notes, the attribution to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery is moderate to weak. A stronger attribution would be to Old Bridge, New Jersey.

Four vessels (MCHA 79.528.55, NJSM 82.16.3, and NMAH 77.803.225 and 82.423.45) bear the coggled design of a bird holding a leaf in its beak. Three of the four are attributed to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery while the fourth (NMAH 77.803.225) is attributed to New Jersey. This motif does not appear on shards recently excavated on the Morgan-VanWickle site. In the Cheesequake pottery files, this coggled motif, entitled "Leaf and Dove," is noted as "one fragment found at Old Bridge."166 Because it is not specified that this coggled design came from the Morgan-VanWickle pottery site, the
attributio to that pottery is moderate to weak. A more accurate attribution for all four vessels is Old Bridge, New Jersey.

Another coggled design with the same problems is the coggled-fish-with-small-leaves motif on jug NMAH 79.577.9. In the Cheesequake pottery files, this "Fish and Berry" motif appears together with the bird-with-leaf motif. Unfortunately, it is not specified on which Old Bridge site the motif was found.\textsuperscript{167} The jug's current attribution to Old Bridge, New Jersey is strong.

Jug MCHA 79.528.43 displays two motifs not found on shards from the recent excavation. Around the shoulder are two rows of short coggled lines punctuated regularly with Xs. On the belly of the jug is a stamped, horizontal figure-eight flanked by rounded, heart-shaped projections. Cobalt oxide fills the stamped design. The stamped figure-eight design does not appear among the notes on Sim's shards or on other attributable pots. The coggled vertical lines punctuated with Xs is attributed to "VanWickle" in the Cheesequake pottery files.\textsuperscript{168} Without corroborative evidence, this vessel is linked to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery only with a moderate to weak degree of certainty.

Five jars (MCHA 79.528.48, NJSM 82.50.2 and 352.37, and NM 56.99 and 77.338) with incised foliate motifs are attributed to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery or to Nicholas VanWickle (see fig. 22). The incised foliate motifs are very closely related. A central stalk, flanked by large leaves, supports a cluster of five berries or small leaves. On four of the jars, the stalk and berries stand vertically from the horizontal leaves. On jar NM 56.99 the image is turned ninety degrees so that the leaves are vertical and the berries hang. The images were incised freehand; they are not identical, so could not have been produced with a stencil. In each case the incised motif is filled with a light wash of cobalt oxide. Jar NJSM 352.37 displays a foliate motif brushed in cobalt oxide on the reverse. Jars NJSM 82.50.2, NM 56.99, and NM 77.338 have the date 1823 brushed in cobalt oxide on the
reverse. This date places the manufacture of these jars within the working period of the Morgan-VanWickle pottery.

Although many shards from the Morgan-VanWickle pottery site display incised floral and foliate motifs, none match this distinctive pattern. It appears that Sim excavated shards that can tie this group of jars to that pottery. Brown describes "the 'leaf and berry' design" as, "often dated" and "[o]ccasionally . . . used in combination with a brushed motif." The style of the incised decorations, use of cobalt oxide, and shape of the jars are characteristic of the Morgan-VanWickle pottery, but there is no physical or strong documentary evidence to support the attribution. Therefore, although the group of pots was likely created at the Morgan-VanWickle pottery, at this time they can be attributed to the pottery only with a moderate to weak degree of certainty.

Jars NM 77.338 and NM 56.99 are currently attributed to Nicholas VanWickle. These attributions are misleading. Nicholas VanWickle, a potter, helped his father, Jacob VanWickle, with the Morgan-VanWickle pottery after the death of James Morgan Jr. in 1822. Therefore, Nicholas VanWickle could have made the jars bearing the date 1823 at the Morgan-VanWickle pottery. In 1824 or 1826, Nicholas VanWickle began his own pottery south of Old Bridge in Manasquan, New Jersey. Attributions made to Nicholas VanWickle usually refer to this later phase of his career when he was a master potter. Since these pots are dated 1823, they could not have been made by Nicholas VanWickle in Manasquan. If they were made by Nicholas at the Morgan-VanWickle pottery, they can be attributed accurately to that pottery.

Another vessel misleadingly attributed to Nicholas VanWickle is wide-mouthed jar NM 56.90. This jar is decorated with two rows of the coggled oval-and-circle-composed-of-inward-pointing-triangles motif. It is reasonable to suppose that Nicholas VanWickle was using this coggled decoration in Manasquan. More concrete evidence from the shards at the Morgan-VanWickle and Warne & Letts sites suggest that this jar may have been made
at one of those two potteries (see ill. 8). Again, Nicholas may have been the creator of the jar at the Morgan-VanWickle pottery.

Two last jars attributed to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery have very little basis for such an attribution. Small-mouthed jar NMAH 77.803.148 is labeled on the base "VanWinkle/NJ/Old Bridge." This label was probably placed there by collectors Sim or John Paul Remensnyder who previously owned the jar. In the National Museum of American History's object files, the jar is attributed to New York or New Jersey. The jar exhibits an elaborate incised bird and flower. The slashing diagonal lines texturing the bird and flower are like those on shards excavated from the Morgan-VanWinkle site. However, there is no concrete evidence that such elaborate designs were executed at that pottery. The broad attribution of this jar to New York or New Jersey is more appropriate when compared to the very weak grounds upon which the attribution to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery is based.

Wide-mouthed jar TWM 312 displays several slip-trailed, cobalt oxide spirals. This jar, attributed to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery, was probably intended to be attributed to the Morgan pottery because the spiral is its most common decoration. There is no evidence that the Morgan-VanWinkle pottery made use of slip-trailed spiral motifs. Because there are questions about attributing objects to the Morgan pottery solely on the basis of slip-trailed spirals, a more general attribution to the state of New Jersey would be the most accurate label for this jar.

Overall, attributions to the Morgan-VanWinkle pottery are complicated by the lack of information and contradictory information regarding Sim's excavations in Old Bridge. Of the twenty-eight pots attributed or related to the Morgan-VanWinkle pottery, six are strongly attributable, seventeen are moderately attributable, and five have very little association to the pottery. The new information provided by the Louis Berger & Associates excavation helps clarify the situation. Yet, the continued lack of information
about some Old Bridge stamped, coggled, and incised motifs is troubling. An excavation of and further research into the Bissett pottery site would likely answer several of the questions regarding the use of motifs in Old Bridge.

While attributions to the Morgan-VanWickle pottery are complicated, making strong attributions to the Morgan pottery is even more difficult. Warne & Letts and Morgan-VanWickle used tools that produced the same decorative effect each time. Although these tools could be transported or copied, they can be accurately identified on shards and compared easily to designs on unmarked pots. Because the Morgan pottery only made extensive use of slip-trailed motifs, particularly the spiral, it is nearly impossible to strongly attribute an object to the Morgan pottery. Of the pots I examined, twenty-three were attributed to the Morgan pottery.

Pots displaying slip-trailed spirals cannot automatically be attributed to the Morgan pottery because the motif may have been used by other New Jersey potters. For example, two jars with slip-trailed spirals at the Monmouth County Historical Association are attributed to the Kempell pottery.\textsuperscript{171} Jar MCHA 79.508.50 is attributed exclusively to the Kempell pottery while jar MCHA 79.528.54 is attributed to either the Morgan pottery or the Kempell pottery. The basis for these attributions is unclear. Both potteries may have used the blue spiral motif. Jar MCHA 79.508.50 is probably not a Morgan pot because the configuration of spirals and the spikes extending from them is not found on the shards excavated from the Morgan pottery site. On jug MCHA 79.528.54, the stripe around the neck and the pair of spirals with three lines extending below are motifs that were found on the Morgan site.\textsuperscript{172} In either case, the possible use of the slip-trailed blue spiral by another New Jersey potter puts into question attributions solely based on this motif.

Sim excavated three mugs (NJS M 352.40, NM 47.40 and 47.41) from the Morgan site.\textsuperscript{173} These mugs are decorated with incised lines filled with cobalt oxide. Mug NJS M 352.40 is decorated with abstract, spiked foliate motifs and crude human faces. Mug NM
47.40 is decorated with deeply incised, abstract floral or foliate motifs. Mug NM 47.41 is decorated with spirals and dots grouped to form diamonds. Because all three mugs came from the Sim collection, two of the three were illustrated in Sim and Clement's article, and the mug not illustrated displays the spirals found often among excavated shards, this group of mugs can be very strongly attributed to the Morgan pottery.

A fourth reconstructed mug does not possess such a strong provenance. Mug NM 76.392 has a tentative current attribution to the Morgan pottery because it was found during a 1970-71 excavation in New York City alongside a chamber pot attributed to the Morgan pottery (discussed below). This mug is quite different from the mugs described above. Its central panel is incised with large waves, horizontal figure-eights, and teardrop shapes. Between the peaks of the waves are stamped, stylized flowers. Most areas of the design are filled with dark cobalt oxide. Because there is no evidence of these decorative motifs among excavated shards and the mug was found in New York City, it is impossible to attribute it to the Morgan pottery with any degree of certainty.

Pots from the Sim collection which display decorative motifs like those on recently excavated shards are attributed strongly to the Morgan pottery. Two chamber pots (both MCHA #Morgan) were excavated and reconstructed by Sim (see figs. 23-24). Both reconstructed chamber pots display slip-trailed spirals. One displays "triangles of dots" described by Brown as characteristic of Morgan pottery decoration. Around the handle base of the second chamber pot is a series of scallops punctuated in the center with dots.

A third reconstructed chamber pot from the Sim collection (also MCHA #Morgan) is less strongly attributable to the Morgan pottery. The pot's provenance is strong, yet the decorations are not characteristic of other shards excavated at the Morgan pottery site. The pot exhibits spirals, but the inner curves of the spirals terminate in leaves. There are additional abstract and naturalistic designs above and below the junction of the two spirals. The decorations are mostly incised lines filled with cobalt oxide. This pot displays a
strange combination of motifs rendered in a technique rarely used by the Morgan pottery. Due to these conflicting pieces of evidence and the lack of good records regarding Sim's excavations, the chamber pot is only moderately attributable to the Morgan pottery.

Wide-mouthed jar NMAH 77.803.197 is moderate to strongly associated with the Morgan pottery. This jar displays the well-known slip-trailed spiral motif. It also exhibits two motifs on the strongly attributed reconstructed chamber pots MCHA #Morgan. Above the junction between two of the spirals is a grouping of dots arranged in a triangular shape. Below two of the junctions between spirals are scalloped shapes punctuated with dots.

Jug NJSM 352.33 has the same series of scalloped shapes punctuated by dots under the handle. This jug can be attributed with a lesser degree of certainty than the above jar, however, because its provenance is unknown. The scallop-and-dot motif matches shards excavated by Sim, but none recovered recently. For these reasons, jug NJSM 352.33 is moderately attributed to the Morgan pottery.

Another object in a similar position is jar MCHA 79.528.24. This jar is decorated with a closely grouped series of waves or scallops punctuated above by dots. The basis for attributing this jar to the Morgan pottery is an image in the Monmouth County Historical Association Cheesequake pottery files. This black and white image displays a series of large shards of which two are almost identical to the decoration on jar MCHA 79.528.24. A label photographed with the shards reads "JAMES MORGAN POTTERY/ Cheesequake/ Brushed on and slipcup designs." Presumably, Sim excavated and photographed these shards. However, since the documentation is scant and the design does not appear among the recently excavated shards, the jar is attributed to the Morgan pottery with only a moderate degree of certainty.

Slip-trailed spiral decorations have led to several past attributions to the Morgan pottery. As discussed above, the spiral motif was not necessarily exclusive to the Morgan pottery. Five jugs (NJSM 71.326; NMAH 77.803.202, 77.803.204, 77.803.205, and
77.803.206) display slip-trailed spirals in conjunction with waves or tripartite linear
projections. The form, manufacture, and decoration of the pots are typical of the Morgan
pottery, but may be also typical of other New Jersey potteries of the same period. On the
sole basis of the slip-trailed spiral motif, these jugs are moderately associated with the
Morgan pottery.

Other pots with spirals have features that detract from their possible attribution to
the Morgan pottery. Reconstructed chamber pot NM 76.391 A,B displays spirals and a
stripe around the neck typical of the Morgan pottery. The chamber pot could be attributed
to the pottery with a moderate to strong degree of certainty if it had not been excavated in
New York City. It is highly likely that the chamber pot was created at the Morgan pottery,
shipped to New York City, sold, used, and buried there. While this provenance strongly
suggests that the Morgan pottery was selling wares outside of New Jersey, it does not help
to strengthen the pot's attribution to the Morgan pottery. Therefore, chamber pot NM
76.391 is moderately attributable to the Morgan pottery.

Wide-mouthed jar NJSM 82.3.2 and small-mouthed jar NMAH 77.803.198 are
decorated with spirals but are departures from the typical Morgan pottery products. Jar
NJSM 82.3.2 displays a series of slip-trailed spirals. Woven among these spirals is a
spiked, curved line. Beneath the jar's handles are slip-trailed number twos which probably
indicate capacity. The decoration of the jar is in the same style as that found on excavated
shards, yet the slip-trailed numbers and spikes do not appear on excavated shards or on
moderate to strongly attributable objects. Therefore, an attribution to the Morgan pottery
cannot be confirmed at this time.

Jar NMAH 77.803.198 has a pair of brushed-on spirals from which three rounded
projections extend. A brushed-on stripe encircles the neck of the jar. The use of a brush to
execute the decoration is a departure from the Morgan pottery's usual slip-trailed technique.
The cobalt oxide stripe around the collar is atypical because it covers the tooled lines,
instead of following between them. This departure from the pottery's usual application of
decoration makes it impossible to attribute this jar to the Morgan pottery.

Small-mouthed jar NMAH 77.803.199 and teapot NMAH 77.803.208 depart from
the usual Morgan pottery products in terms of decorative motif and object form. Slip-
trailed (although those on the teapot may have been brushed on) variations on the spiral
motif adorn both vessels. These images are composed of two curved lines surrounding a
dot resembling half to three-quarters of a bull's eye target. On the jar at the junctions of the
spirals appear sloppily executed scalloped shapes punctuated with dots. These motifs are
similar to, but not the same as, those found on excavated shards. The forms of these pots
are also peculiar. Among the excavated shards, there is no evidence of the heavily tooled
shoulder found on jar NMAH 77.803.199. There is also no concrete evidence that the
Morgan pottery created teapots. On the grounds of unattributable decorations and
uncharacteristic forms, jar NMAH 77.803.199 and teapot 77.803.208 cannot be associated
with the Morgan pottery.

Wide-mouthed jar NMAH 77.803.200 is almost a complete departure from the
usual decorative schemes of the Morgan pottery. The central decorative motif is unique.
Trailing, "spiky" vines with stylized bell-shaped flowers meander across the belly of the
pot. Below the handles are slip-trailed spirals and number twos. Despite the small, slip-
trailed spirals, there is little concrete proof with which to attribute this jar to the Morgan
pottery.

One last object, water cooler NM 23.2214, is currently attributed to the Morgan
pottery on the basis of its date and provenance in a New Jersey family. The water cooler
was a gift from the Disbrow family to the Newark Museum in 1923. The large, dated,
initialed vessel was undoubtedly a special order. The water cooler was tooled at top,
bottom, and middle. Each tooled section is decorated with cobalt oxide stripes trailed
between tooled lines. Bordering the top and bottom bands of tooling is a slip-trailed wave
motif. A large hole appears in the widest, central section of the water cooler. To the left of the hole are the combined initials AK and a four-leaf clover. To the right of the hole is the date 1788 and a Maltese cross. These decorations are incised and filled with cobalt oxide.

When the water cooler was given to the Newark Museum it was attributed through family tradition to the Morgan pottery. Because of its special nature, there is little to prove or disprove this traditional attribution. The date of manufacture suggests that it was made at the Morgan pottery, but other New Jersey and New York potters also were producing stoneware in 1788. The application of slip-trailed cobalt oxide stripes between tooled lines also suggests the work of the Morgan pottery. Although the Morgan pottery did not commonly use incised lines, the special nature of this vessel may explain this departure from the norm. Because the attribution to the Morgan pottery cannot be strengthened by physical evidence from other Morgan pots or from excavated shards, the water cooler is moderate to weakly attributed to the Morgan pottery.

The difficulty in attributing pots to the Morgan pottery is obvious when the strengths of the attributions are examined in terms of numbers. Of the twenty-two objects currently attributed solely to the Morgan pottery, only five are strongly attributed to the pottery because they were excavated by Sim. One pot is moderate to strongly attributed to the Morgan pottery because of its likeness to an example excavated by Sim. Eight objects have moderate attributions based on their slip-trailed motifs. Two pots have moderate to weak attributions based on, in one case, a comparison with a moderately attributed example, and, in the other, on a provenance that cannot be substantiated stylistically. The other six examples have weak or very weak attributions based on anomalous forms and/or decorations.

As evidenced above, the attribution of pots to the Morgan pottery must be undertaken carefully and tentatively. Freehand, slip-trailed decorations are difficult to ascribe to a particular pottery with a strong degree of certainty. Strong attributions to the
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Morgan pottery are possible when objects have strong provenances and decorations match those excavated from the site. Future, in-depth studies of other New Jersey and New York potteries that decorated with slip-trailed motifs may aid in attributing vessels to the Morgan pottery.

Overall, the attribution of stoneware vessels on the basis of surface decoration is challenging. It is especially difficult to make attributions to potteries working in the same stylistic tradition and in close proximity of space and time. Surface decoration should be used as one of many tools with which to attribute pots to potteries. Other vital considerations are form, construction, materials, workmanship, marked dates, and provenances. Information regarding these and decorative features can be garnered through close study of extant, marked pottery and excavated shards.

In addition to physical characteristics, documentary information about a pottery is essential to the firm attribution of pots. One should know about a pottery its working period(s), location, pottery tradition, characteristic wares, and characteristic decorating techniques. Invaluable is knowledge of previous scholarship and archeological excavations related to the pottery. Also important is knowledge of other potteries working in the same region and stylistic tradition. Such information places the pottery into a larger context from which an attribution of greater accuracy can be made.

At times the most accurate attributions are broad. When the state of knowledge at a particular time does not allow for a specific label, a broad attribution is more responsible. Attributions should be made by degrees based on the amount and quality of information from which the attribution is made. Above all, solid attributions take time to research and verify. Stoneware pots should be attributed to a region or pottery only with concrete physical or documentary evidence after an adequate amount of research has been undertaken.
CONCLUSION

What does the preceding study contribute to the understanding of the Morgan, Morgan-VanWickle, and Warne & Letts potteries? Documentary research into the Morgan family and the Morgan clay bank affords a new synthesis of information. Although the Morgan family and their rich source of clay are extraordinary in the study of American decorative arts, their examination is a beginning to the understanding of the people and raw materials behind the extant stoneware products and archeological shards.

The recent archeological investigations and the resulting artifacts provide hard evidence upon which current and future studies may be based. This tangible proof confirms previous attributions lacking extant supporting evidence. It also allows for an objective assessment of past attributions which cannot be substantiated at this time. The objective assessment of these attributions creates a firm basis for future study by removing subjective opinions from the practice. When archaeological material is considered together with extant, marked wares and documentary evidence, the three types of information lead to sound attributions.

The archeological shards provide useful information regarding the decorative techniques and motifs used by the potteries. Decorative motifs found exclusively on a pottery site confirm the attribution of unmarked wares also bearing those motifs. When these motifs appear on extant wares with other designs not found on the pottery site, they confirm the use of those designs and indicate a larger repertoire of motifs that may be assigned to that pottery. Also enlightening are the preferences for the different methods of decorating held by the potteries. Each pottery, despite their close proximity of time and space, decorated its wares with a different combination of techniques and motifs.
The recently excavated shards from the Morgan-VanWickle site provide a greater understanding of a pottery that before had been little researched or appreciated. No previous survey or analysis of its wares exists. Now, several coggled and stamped motifs are known to have been used at the pottery and an assessment of extant, attributed wares has been undertaken. A greater understanding of this pottery provides a new perspective from which to view the Warne & Letts pottery. Warne & Letts marked and decorated many wares, but it was not the only pottery using several decorating tools. Examining the two potteries within the context of one another provides a more nuanced picture of Middlesex County, New Jersey pottery production.

This study was a fruitful union between the disciplines of decorative art history and archeology. For me, the combination of the two disciplines was a rich experience that led to my greater understanding of and appreciation for the science of archeology. I was able to apply the information and materials provided by archeologists to a practical problem in the field of American decorative arts. Hopefully, more future intersections between these fields of study and other disciplines will create a better understanding of historic objects and lifeways.

At times, this study moves backward in order to move forward. Former theories are confirmed, denied, or deferred to the future as evidence allows. The information provided above is not intended to be a final conclusion regarding the Morgan, Morgan-VanWickle, and Warne & Letts potteries. It is, instead, a basis constructed from solid information upon which future scholars may build.
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FIGURES

Figure 1: Shards excavated from the Morgan pottery site with the prevalent spiral motif. Hunter Research, Inc., all site 28-Mi-105A, Excavation Unit 3/3. (Photo: Patricia A. Halfpenny)
Figure 2: Shards surface collected from the Warne & Letts pottery site with freehand, brushed-on motifs. Hunter Research, Inc., all site 28-Mi-85, surface collected. (Photo: Patricia A. Halfpenny)
Figure 3: Shard excavated from the Morgan-VanWickle pottery site with incised foliate motif brushed over with cobalt oxide. Notice the quickly incised outlines filled with slashing diagonal lines. Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., site 28-Mi-190, 526. (Photo: Patricia A. Halfpenny)
Figure 4: Shard excavated from the Morgan-VanWickle pottery site with stamped four-petaled-flower-in-circle decoration brushed over with cobalt oxide. Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., site 28-Mi-192, 535. (Photo: Patricia A. Halfpenny)
Figure 5: Shards excavated from the Morgan-VanWickle pottery site with stamped four-hearts-in-scalloped-surround motif brushed over with cobalt oxide. Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., site 28-Mi-189, 735. (Photo: Patricia A. Halfpenny)
Figure 6: Shards surface collected from the Warne & Letts pottery site displaying two varieties of coggled, pointed-oval motifs. The wider ovals on the larger shards appear on extant pots marked WARNE and WARNE & LETTS. The narrower ovals appear on pots marked solely by Letts. Hunter Research, Inc., both site 28-Mi-85, surface collected. (Photo: Patricia A. Halfpenny)
Figure 7: Shards excavated from the Morgan-VanWickle pottery site displaying coggled, pointed-oval motif. This motif is similar to that found on wares marked WARNE and WARNE & LETTS and on shards from the Warne & Letts pottery site. It is unclear whether the motifs at the two potteries were created with the same tool. Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., site 28-Mi-189, 826. (Photo: Patricia A. Halfpenny)
Figure 8: Shards surface collected from the Warne & Letts pottery site displaying coggled oval-and-circle-composed-of-inward-pointing-triangles motif. Shards with a nearly identical motif were excavated at the Morgan-VanWickle pottery site. It is possible that the motifs at the two potteries were created with the same tool. Hunter Research, Inc., both site 28-Mi-85, surface collected. (Photo: Patricia A. Halfpenny)
Figure 9: Shards surface collected from the Warne & Letts pottery site displaying coggled diamond-in-diamond-and-rosette motif. Hunter Research, Inc., both site 28-Mi-85, surface collected. (Photo: Patricia A. Halfpenny)
Figure 10: Shard excavated from the Morgan-VanWickle pottery site with coggled diamond-in-diamond motif. This motif is reminiscent of that found on marked Warne & Letts wares and on shards from the Warne & Letts pottery site. This cruder, simpler design may have been based on the cleaner, more complex Warne & Letts decoration. Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., site 28-Mi-192, shovel test s4f, stratum A. (Photo: Courtesy of Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. and the New Jersey Department of Transportation.)
Figure 11: Shards surface collected from the Warne & Letts pottery site displaying coggled motifs with sawtooth profile. Hunter Research, Inc., all site 28-Mi-85, surface collected. (Photo: Patricia A. Halfpenny)
Figure 12: Thomas Warne. Wide-mouthed jar displaying WARNE name stamp, part of S.AMBOY.N.JERSY location stamp, paired four-over-five scalloped-shaped stamps, and brushed-on iron oxide. Notice the characteristics of the typeface in the name and location stamps. The W is composed of two overlapping Vs. The A is composed of a wide inverted V and a downward-pointing, v-shaped crossbar. In the letter R, the diagonal stem intersects with the vertical element. The N has serifs only on the lower left and upper right. The upper and lower crossbars of the E extend left past the vertical element and swell to serifs at their free ends. The center crossbar is narrow and swells into a wedge-shaped serif at its free end. Monmouth County Historical Association, 79.528.50.
Figure 13: Warne & Letts pottery. Wide-mouthed jar displaying *T.W.J.L* name stamp, single six-over-six scalloped-shaped stamp, and brushed-on cobalt oxide. Between the letters, notice the diamonds with X- or cross-shaped interiors. Newark Museum, 47.10.
Figure 14: Warne & Letts pottery. Wide-mouthed jar displaying T.W.J.L stamp, paired soft-scalloped-shaped stamps, coggled tiny triangles, and brushed-on iron oxide. New Jersey State Museum, 69.17.2.
Figure 15: Warne & Letts pottery. Wide-mouthed jar displaying WARNE & LETTS 1806 stamp, S.AMBOY.N.JERSEY stamp, single four-over-five scalloped-shaped stamp, coggled wide sawtooth band, and brushed-on iron oxide. Newark Museum, 30.551.
Figure 16: Warne & Letts pottery. Wide-mouthed jar displaying **WARNE & LETTS 1807** stamp, **S.AMBOY.N.JERSEY** stamp, paired four-over-five scalloped-shaped stamps, **LIBERTY.FOR.EV** stamp, coggled wide-rectangles-bordered-with-sawtooth-triangles design, and brushed-on cobalt oxide. Notice the abstract human hand to the left of the letters in the **LIBERTY.FOR.EV** stamp. Pointing hands were popular in advertisements and broadsides of the period. (Davis, p. 92) Monmouth County Historical Association, 79.512.5.
Figure 17: Joshua Letts. Small-mouthed jar displaying *MADE.BY.J.LETTS* stamp, *LIBERTY.FOR.EV* stamp, incised floral and foliate design, and brushed-on iron oxide. Notice the squat, straight-serifed typeface of this stamp. The *LIBERTY.FOR.EV* stamp is identical to that used by the Warne & Letts partnership with the exception of the missing jagged border. Newark Museum, 47.11.
Figure 18: Joshua Letts. Wide-mouthed jar displaying *MADE.BY.J.LETTS* stamp, coggled large ovals containing pointed figure-eights, and brushed-on cobalt oxide. Thomas Warne Historical Museum & Library, #HCR.
Figure 19: Shard displaying portions of *MADE.BY.J.LETT* stamp and SOUTHAMBOY stamp. Monmouth County Historical Association, no accession number.
Figure 20: Attributed to Morgan-VanWickle pottery. Wide-mouthed jar decorated with coggled pointed ovals, coggled diamond-in-diamond motif, and brushed-on cobalt oxide. New Jersey State Museum, 352.41.
Figure 21: Attributed to Morgan-VanWickle pottery. Wide-mouthed jar decorated with stamped four-hearts-in-scalloped-surround (on reverse), human-profile-in-circle (shown), and brushed-on cobalt oxide. New Jersey State Museum, 352.41.
Figure 22: Attributed to Morgan-VanWickle pottery. Small-mouthed jar displaying incised foliate motif and brushed-on cobalt oxide. New Jersey State Museum, 352.37.
Figure 23: Reconstructed chamber pot excavated on the Morgan pottery site by Sim. Decorations include slip-trailed spirals and series of dots grouped to form triangles. Monmouth County Historical Association, #Morgan.
Figure 24: Reconstructed chamber pot excavated on the Morgan pottery site by Sim. Decorations surrounding handle include slip-trailed spirals and scallops punctuated with dots. Monmouth County Historical Association, #Morgan.
## APPENDIX A: VESSELS ATTRIBUTED TO THE WARNE & LETTS POTTERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession Number Object Form</th>
<th>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</th>
<th>Motif(s)</th>
<th>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</th>
<th>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 300894.83 Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Warne &amp; Letts</td>
<td>stamped <em>LIBERTY. FOR.EV, S.AMBOY.N.JER SY</em>, paired scalloped shapes</td>
<td>very strong</td>
<td>three stamped motifs found recently on site and on marked pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 65.L[?]108 Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Warne &amp; Letts</td>
<td>stamped <em>S.AMBOY.N.JER SY</em>, single scalloped shape</td>
<td>very strong</td>
<td>two stamped motifs found recently on site and on marked pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.98.23.912 Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Warne &amp; Letts</td>
<td>stamped <em>S.AMBOY.N.JER SY</em>, single scalloped shape</td>
<td>very strong</td>
<td>two stamped motifs found recently on site and on marked pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.214 Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Warne &amp; Letts</td>
<td>stamped <em>S.AMBOY.N.JER SY</em>, single scalloped shape</td>
<td>very strong</td>
<td>two stamped motifs found recently on site and on marked pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession Number</td>
<td>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</td>
<td>Motif(s)</td>
<td>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</td>
<td>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.219</td>
<td>Warne &amp; Letts</td>
<td>coggled diamond-in-diamond-and-rosette</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>coggled motif found exclusively on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 56.91</td>
<td>Warne &amp; Letts</td>
<td>coggled diamond-in-diamond-and-rosette</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>coggled motif found exclusively on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 352.35</td>
<td>Warne &amp; Letts</td>
<td>coggled oval-and-circle</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>motif on shards at Warne &amp; Letts site; identical motif also found on Morgan-VanWickle site; jug could be from either pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 352.28</td>
<td>Warne &amp; Letts</td>
<td>coggled wide zigzag</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>coggled design is similar but not identical to that on marked pot; exact design not found on marked pot or excavated shards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 69.138.1</td>
<td>Warne &amp; Letts</td>
<td>brushed abstract foliate</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>motif not identical to any on marked pots or excavated shards; extruded handles unusual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.217</td>
<td>Warne &amp; Letts</td>
<td>coggled zigzag</td>
<td>very weak</td>
<td>coggling is crude; motif not found on any marked pots or excavated shards; heavy cobalt applied over coggled decoration atypical; cobalt uncharacteristically bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B: VESSELS ATTRIBUTED OR RELATED TO THE MORGAN-VANWICKLE POTTERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</th>
<th>Motif(s)</th>
<th>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</th>
<th>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 352.41</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>coggled ovals, diamond-in-diamond</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>two motifs (diamond-in-diamond exclusive) recently found on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 352.24</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>stamped four-petaled-flower-in-circle</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>stamped motif found exclusively on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 361</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>stamped four-petaled-flower-in-circle, inscribed initials, date 1807, and foliate motif</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>stamped four-hearts-in-scalloped-surround motif found exclusively on site; date is within pottery's working period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 352.34</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>stamped four-hearts-in-scalloped-surround, human-profile-in-circle</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>stamped four-hearts-in-scalloped-surround motif found exclusively on site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#### APPENDIX B: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Form</th>
<th>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</th>
<th>Motif(s)</th>
<th>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</th>
<th>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 322631.24</td>
<td>Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Old Bridge, New Jersey</td>
<td>stamped human-profile-in-circle, coggled diamond-in-diamond</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>diamond-in-diamond motif found exclusively on site; weaker evidence is the human-profile-in-circle that appears with the four-hearts-inscalloped-surround on jar NJSM 352.34; attribution could be narrowed to Morgan-VanWickle pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHA 79.528.19</td>
<td>Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>stamped human-profile-in-circle, scales</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>human-profile-in-circle basis of attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.220</td>
<td>Inkwell</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>stamped human-profile-in-circle</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>human-profile-in-circle basis of attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.221</td>
<td>Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>stamped human-profile-in-circle surrounded by curved lobes</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>human-profile-in-circle basis of attribution; attribution is weaker because lobes are not present on jar NJSM 352.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 77.80.3</td>
<td>Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>stamped human-profile-in-circle surrounded by curved and pointed lobes</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>human-profile-in-circle basis of attribution; attribution is weaker because lobes are not present on jar NJSM 352.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession Number Object Form</td>
<td>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</td>
<td>Motif(s)</td>
<td>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</td>
<td>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.222 Jug</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>stamped small circle surrounded by larger circle and lobes</td>
<td>very weak</td>
<td>motif not found among excavated shards or on a strongly attributable pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHA 79.528.40 Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>coggled ovals, large ovals-containing-fish-or-flowers</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>large ovals-containing-fish-or-flowers motif attributed to &quot;VanWickle&quot; in Cheesequake pottery files, MCHA; no shards bearing motif found during recent excavation; a better attribution would be Old Bridge, NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.218 Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td>South Amboy, New Jersey</td>
<td>coggled ovals, large ovals-containing-fish-or-flowers</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>large ovals-containing-fish-or-flowers motif attributed to &quot;VanWickle&quot; in Cheesequake pottery files, MCHA; no shards bearing motif found during recent excavation; a better attribution would be Old Bridge, NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHA 79.528.51 Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>coggled ovals, large fish</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>coggled large fish attributed to &quot;VanWickle&quot; in Cheesequake pottery files, MCHA; attributed to Joshua Letts in &quot;The Cheesequake Potteries&quot;; no shards bearing motif found during recent excavation; a better attribution would be to New Jersey or Old Bridge or South Amboy, NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession Number Object Form</th>
<th>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</th>
<th>Motif(s)</th>
<th>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</th>
<th>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCHA 79.528.55 Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>coggled bird-with-leaf</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>Sim found one fragment bearing this motif at Old Bridge; it is not specified that it came from the Morgan-VanWickle site; a better attribution would be Old Bridge, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 82.16.3 Jug</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>coggled bird-with-leaf</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>Sim found one fragment bearing this motif at Old Bridge; it is not specified that it came from the Morgan-VanWickle site; a better attribution would be Old Bridge, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.225 Jug</td>
<td>possibly New Jersey</td>
<td>coggled bird-with-leaf</td>
<td>moderate-strong</td>
<td>Sim found one fragment bearing this motif at Old Bridge; it is not specified that it came from the Morgan-VanWickle site; a more precise attribution would be Old Bridge, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 82.423.45 Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>coggled bird-with-leaf</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>Sim found one fragment bearing this motif at Old Bridge; it is not specified that it came from the Morgan-VanWickle site; a better attribution would be Old Bridge, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 79.577.9 Jug</td>
<td>Old Bridge, New Jersey</td>
<td>coggled fish-with-small-leaves</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>Sim found fragments bearing this motif at Old Bridge; it is not specified that they came from the Morgan-VanWickle site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Object Form</th>
<th>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</th>
<th>Motif(s)</th>
<th>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</th>
<th>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCHA 79.528.43</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>coggled vertical lines punctuated with Xs, stamped horizontal figure-eight with curved projections</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>the vertical-lines-punctuated-with-Xs design is attributed to the &quot;VanWinkle&quot; pottery in Cheesequake pottery files, MCHA; no shards bearing either motif were found during recent excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHA 79.528.48</td>
<td>Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>incised and brushed foliate</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>motif attributed to Morgan-VanWickle pottery by Brown; it is not identical to any on recently excavated shards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 82.50.2</td>
<td>Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>incised and brushed foliate, brushed date</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>motif attributed to Morgan-VanWinkle pottery by Brown; it is not identical to any on recently excavated shards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 352.37</td>
<td>Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWinkle</td>
<td>incised and brushed foliate</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>motif attributed to Morgan-VanWinkle pottery by Brown; it is not identical to any on recently excavated shards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX B: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</th>
<th>Motif(s)</th>
<th>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</th>
<th>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM 56.99 Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Jacob or Nicholas VanWickle</td>
<td>incised and brushed foliate, brushed date</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>motif attributed to Morgan-VanWickle pottery by Brown; it is not identical to any on recently excavated shards; misleading attribution, probably intended to attribute jar to Morgan-VanWickle; Nicholas may have created the jar there, he was not working in Manasquan until 1824 at the earliest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 77.338 Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Nicholas VanWickle</td>
<td>incised and brushed foliate, brushed date</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>motif attributed to Morgan-VanWickle pottery by Brown; it is not identical to any on recently excavated shards; misleading attribution, probably intended to attribute jar to Morgan-VanWickle; Nicholas may have created the jar there, he was not working in Manasquan until 1824 at the earliest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 56.90 Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Nicholas VanWickle</td>
<td>coggled oval-and-circle</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>motif on shards at Morgan-VanWickle site; identical motif also found on Warne &amp; Letts site; jug could be from either pottery; misleading attribution, probably intended to attribute jar to Morgan-VanWickle; Nicholas may have created the jar there, he was not working in Manasquan until 1824 at the earliest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession Number</td>
<td>Object Form</td>
<td>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</td>
<td>Motif(s)</td>
<td>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.148</td>
<td>Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle, New Jersey or New York</td>
<td>incised and brushed bird and floral</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle - very weak, New Jersey or New York - strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWM 312</td>
<td>Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan-VanWickle</td>
<td>slip-trailed spirals</td>
<td>very weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C: VESSELS ATTRIBUTED OR RELATED TO THE MORGAN POTTERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</th>
<th>Motif(s)</th>
<th>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</th>
<th>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 352.40</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>brushed, incised, impressed abstract foliate, crude face</td>
<td>very strong</td>
<td>excavated and reconstructed by Sim; illustrated in &quot;The Cheesequake Potteries&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 47.40</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>brushed and incised abstract floral and foliate</td>
<td>very strong</td>
<td>excavated and reconstructed by Sim; illustrated in &quot;The Cheesequake Potteries&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 47.41</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed stripes, spirals, dots</td>
<td>very strong</td>
<td>excavated and reconstructed by Sim; slip-trailed spirals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHA #Morgan</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed spirals, dots, curved lines, horizontal lines</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>excavated and reconstructed by Sim; it is uncertain that the shards came from the Morgan site; likeness to the dot and spiral motifs found on very strongly attributable mugs and on recently excavated shards leads to strong attribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</th>
<th>Motif(s)</th>
<th>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</th>
<th>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCHA #Morgan</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed spirals, foliate, dots in scalloped shapes</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>excavated and reconstructed by Sim; it is uncertain that the shards came from the Morgan site; likeness to the dot and spiral motifs found on very strongly attributable mugs and on recently excavated shards leads to strong attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstructed chamber pot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHA #Morgan</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed and incised spirals, curved lines, dots, abstract naturalistic</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>excavated and reconstructed by Sim; it is uncertain that shards came from the Morgan site; decorative motifs are unlike others found by Sim or found in recent excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstructed chamber pot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.197</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed spirals, curved lines, dots</td>
<td>moderate-strong</td>
<td>dot motif excavated by Sim and spiral motif basis for attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 352.33</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed dots in scalloped shapes</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>basis for attribution is chamber pot MCHA #Morgan excavated and reconstructed by Sim; no similar motifs found in recent excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHA 79.528.24</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed dots and waves</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>basis for attribution is photo of shards dug by Sim; motif not identical to any on recently excavated shards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJSM 71.326</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed spirals and wavy lines</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>spiral motif basis for attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession Number Object Form</th>
<th>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</th>
<th>Motif(s)</th>
<th>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</th>
<th>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.202 Jug</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed spirals and wavy lines</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>spiral motif basis for attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.204 Jug</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed spirals and wavy lines</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>spiral motif basis for attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.205 Jug</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed spirals with lines</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>spiral motif basis for attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.206 Jug</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed spirals with curved lines</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>spiral motif basis for attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 76.391 A,B Reconstructed chamber pot</td>
<td>possibly Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed stripe, spirals</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>spiral motif and stripe indicate possible attribution to Morgan pottery; object was excavated in New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHA 79.528.54 Jug</td>
<td>Morgan or Kempell</td>
<td>slip-trailed stripe, spirals with straight lines</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>stripe and spiral motifs typical of Morgan pottery, but could also have been used at Kempell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 23.2214 Water cooler</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed and incised waves and letters</td>
<td>moderate-weak</td>
<td>basis of attribution is date of 1788 and provenance in Disbrow family; attribution cannot be strengthened because object and decorative motifs are unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession Number</td>
<td>Object Form</td>
<td>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</td>
<td>Motif(s)</td>
<td>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHA 79.508.50</td>
<td>Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Kempell</td>
<td>slip-trailed spirals with curved lines</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISM 82.3.2</td>
<td>Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed spirals with &quot;spiked&quot; lines</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.198</td>
<td>Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>brushed stripe and spirals with curved projections</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.199</td>
<td>Small-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed partial spirals, whole spirals, and dots in scalloped shapes</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.208</td>
<td>Teapot</td>
<td>possibly Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed or brushed partial spirals with curved and straight lines</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession Number Object Form</td>
<td>Current Attribution as Supplied by Institution</td>
<td>Motif(s)</td>
<td>Strength of Attribution in Opinion of Author</td>
<td>Reasons for Strength/Weakness of Attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAH 77.803.200 Wide-mouthed jar</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>slip-trailed abstract floral motif with spikes and bell-shaped flowers, spirals</td>
<td>very weak</td>
<td>spirals under handles only basis for attribution; floral motif and number 2 under handle not found among excavated shards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 76.392 Reconstructed mug</td>
<td>possibly Morgan</td>
<td>brushed, incised, and stamped flowers, waves, and teardrops</td>
<td>very weak</td>
<td>shards excavated in New York; motifs not found among excavated shards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>