

Bow porcelain:

New primary source documents and evidence pertaining to the early years of the manufactory between 1730–1747, and John Campbell's letter to Arthur Dobbs

Pat Daniels, Oxfordshire, UK

W. Ross H. Ramsay, Southern Institute of Technology, NZ

Published by the *Southern Institute of Technology Journal of Applied Research* (SITJAR), NZ. (June 2009)

Abstract:

This contribution relates to the early years of the Bow Porcelain Manufactory, its paste types used, and in particular to a letter written by John Campbell to Arthur Dobbs in which is mentioned white clay seen at Bow for their china ware. The date of the letter is deduced as early 1745 and the writer is corroborated as being John Campbell of Lazy Hill, Bertie County, North Carolina. Historical research on both sides of the Atlantic has established that the latest John Campbell could have been on site at Bow was during mid 1742, although there are compelling grounds for suggesting an even earlier date. Therefore Campbell's visit to Bow represents the earliest extant eye-witness account of this famous porcelain concern. As a result, this personal correspondence should be recognised as one of the most important primary source documents relating to the English porcelain industry. It specifically names Bow as a business enterprise and mentions the use of white clay for its china ware, established here as most likely Cherokee china clay. Combined with other evidence as presented, it would seem that the chronology of some early Bow porcelains requires reassessment.

Origin and Early History of the Bow Factory:

The Bow porcelain manufactory (New Canton) is generally regarded as having commenced production of phosphatic (bone-ash), soft-paste porcelains in the vicinity of Bow village, east London around 1747 or 1748. The concern reached its zenith in the mid 1750s and then slid into a slow decline, finally closing around 1774. The use of bone-ash in porcelain survived the demise of Bow and has now evolved into what we refer today as English bone-china. Although some early writers, without any substantiation, have reported that initial ceramic experiments may have been undertaken by the Bow proprietors as far back as the 1730s (Chaffers, 1863; Solon, 1903), possibly associated with a glasshouse owned by Edward Heylyn (Burton, 1921), more recent writers have tended to discount a 1730s inception for the Bow concern, preferring a founding date from the late 1740s (Tait, 1965; Watney, 1963, 1973; Adams and Redstone, 1981; Gabszewicz, 2000). Consequently it has been assumed that Bow made only phosphatic porcelains being dated no earlier than *c.* 1747. Moreover a state of denial has generally attended any possibility that

products derived from the Heylyn and Frye (two of the Bow proprietors) ceramic patent of 1744, using *uneka*¹ (*unaker*) clay imported from the Carolinas, were made.

One of the major problems hindering the unravelling of the origin and development of the English porcelain industry has been the perceived lack of evidence relative to its formative phase. Although over the last 250 years pertinent documents have come to light, some have been misread, misinterpreted, underestimated or simply ignored. Such is the case with the Heylyn and Frye ceramic patent (Bow 1st patent), granted on the 6th December, 1744, and the subsequent specification, enrolled on the 5th April, 1745. The recipe detailed therein specifies the use of white refractory clay called *uneka* by the Cherokee Indians in whose lands in the Carolinas it was located. For over 100 years this landmark document has been variously declared as not worth the paper it is written on, uncertain, hesitant, nothing but a sea of troubles, and experimental, as documented by Ramsay et al. (2004b, 2006). Burton (1902) declared *that patent is not worth the paper on which it was written*, a conclusion that has been reiterated in the literature ever since and which has had a deleterious effect on the advancement of English ceramic research.

Ramsay et al. (2006) finally put these misleading notions to rest by successfully firing analogue porcelains following the 1744 patent specification, thus proving that the document represents a land-mark recipe in Anglo-American ceramic history. Moreover, we consider it to be a hard-paste formula predating William Cookworthy's by a quarter of a century as argued by Ramsay and Ramsay (2008). Chemical analyses of samples taken from members of the mysterious 'A'-marked porcelain have moreover demonstrated that whoever was firing these brilliant wares was replicating the specification contained in the 1744 Bow patent. Undoubtedly, this ceramic group, usually identifiable by an incised or blue painted capital A, represents the 'long-lost' products of the 1744 patent awarded to two of the Bow proprietors, Edward Heylyn and Thomas Frye (Ramsay et al., 2001, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2006; Ramsay and Ramsay, 2007a,b, 2008; Daniels, 2007; see also Charleston and Mallet, 1971 and Freestone, 1996 who drew comparisons between the 1744 patent specification and the composition of 'A'-marked porcelains without making a clear attribution to Bow). Whilst Heylyn and Frye's names are attached to the patent application it is almost certain that neither contributed to the experimentation of these iconic wares.

A not dissimilar situation has attended a letter written by John Campbell to Arthur Dobbs of Carrickfergus, Northern Ireland. This highly important document not only mentions Bow and the white clay for their china ware, but records the author's opinion, gained from his on-site visit, that the venture was "only a bubble" with the undertakers. The importance of Campbell's observation has been overlooked since an extract from his letter was read by Aubrey Toppin to the English Ceramic Circle in 1959, although no transcript of what was said has so far been located. It is questionable whether anyone prior to Daniels (2007) has read this correspondence in its entirety.

The identification of the 1744 patent wares by 2003, based on chemistry, materials science, and historical documents, necessitated a major change in thinking with the realisation that the Bow concern must have been operating by the early 1740's. More recently Daniels (2007) has argued that the driving force behind the establishment of an English porcelain industry was the Royal Society of London, which was at the forefront of an immense plan to establish Britain's dominance in world trade, to expand its interests in the Americas, and to develop London into the scientific and cultural capital of the world. The

¹ The accepted spelling for this Cherokee word meaning 'white.'

strategy was stirred by analogous French designs expressed in an *Encyclopaedia*. The scheme commenced with the accession of George II in 1727 and the opening up of business opportunities in the Carolinas by their restoration to the Crown, including the establishment of the new Colony of Georgia. Of the various committees concerned with the organisation of the Georgia project, one-third were Fellows of the Royal Society, headed by its president Sir Hans Sloane.

The Society's promotion of English lead glass and English porcelain occurred by its inauguration in the early 1660s. Both of the promoted industries appear to have utilised new techniques included in John Rupert Glauber's book *A Description of new Philosophical Furnaces* published in 1651 and both were contracted to sell their products through the Glass Sellers' Company. The Society's interest in ceramics continued through Fellows such as Dr. Pope, who in 1667 presented a sample of the soapy rock for testing by Mr. Boyle, or Nehemiah Grew who, in 1681, included "soap-stone, steatites" in his *Catalogue and Description of the Natural and Artificial Rarities belonging to the Royal Society*. Observations were made by Hooke and Houghton (John Dwight's porcelain), Plot (general), and Lister (French soft paste porcelain). In the early 18th century Dr. Sherrard presented samples of natural Chinese kaolin and petuntse, together with prepared samples. In 1729 Dr. Woodward's *An Attempt Towards a Natural History of the Fossils of England* was presented posthumously to the Society. In this work he claimed that successful experiments on the soaprock of Cornwall had been carried out and these proved soaprock (steatite) to be suitable for the manufacture of porcelain. Between 1719 and 1724 Dr. Cromwell Mortimer attended Boerhaave's lectures in Latin at Leyden and would have become familiar with the Professor's theory on "virgin earth" (bone-ash). Therefore, by the time the Society became involved in the plans to establish a porcelain industry in England it had available details of the materials and methods of manufacture of Oriental hard-paste porcelain, English steatitic porcelain, English phosphatic (bone-ash) porcelain, and the glassy type of porcelain favoured in France. This stored knowledge was essential to the development of early English porcelain at Bow, the subject of this present paper. The chronology of events leading to the establishment of the East London porcelain manufactory is as follows:

1. Sponsorship by the Society of a journey to Carolina in late 1729 by one of its Fellows, Sir Alexander Cuming (elected 1720), who visited the clay pits near Estatoway in the Lower Cherokee settlement on Ladyday March 25th 1730. He then proceeded on an historic journey through the whole of the Cherokee lands. Having seduced the Indians to the British cause and obtained their declaration of allegiance to George II, he was crowned Chief of the Cherokee Nation before returning to England with seven Cherokee chiefs, six of whom he presented to George II and with whom he signed a peace (trade) treaty on behalf of the British nation in his lodgings in the Spring (Vauxhall) gardens.
2. In 1729, the engagement of William Stephens, later Secretary to the Trustees in Georgia and afterwards Governor of the Colony, to work in a large iron foundry in Scotland where charcoal was being produced for use in the furnaces and for export. This concern was managed by Benjamin Lund, (colleague of Edward Heylyn of Bow), who later became the proprietor of a soft paste porcelain works in Bristol, which utilised soaprock mined under licence in Cornwall. Charcoal was an essential fuel in 18th century foundries and was in extremely short supply.

3. In 1729, following the death of Woodward, Dr. Cromwell Mortimer was appointed Secretary of the Society and moved to Bloomsbury to assist Sir Hans Sloane. He developed a sophisticated metalline thermometer for measuring high temperatures, together with a wind-furnace and athanor that he stated in a letter to Boerhaave at Leyden he had perfected by June 1736. This self-feeding furnace was dependent on charcoal for its fuel and, according to Mortimer, it could be regulated and was able to reach the high temperatures required for vitrifying china clay. Of note William Cookworthy in a letter to Thomas Pitt, his financial backer, mentioned the use of a wind-furnace to achieve the high temperatures required for his Cornish china clay recipe. With a suitable kiln in place, Mortimer would have required small quantities of clay in order to experiment on the porcelain recipe and it is significant that Andrew Duchè moved from Charleston, South Carolina to Savannah, Georgia in 1736. The clay pits were in Georgia and the benefits from all mines in the Colony had previously been officially awarded to the Trustees. The progress of Mortimer's experiments can be measured by the crude sample shown by Duchè in Savannah in May 1738, as recorded in Stephens' Journal, followed by a more sophisticated translucent cup shown to Stephens in June 1741. Stephens described the sample as, *a little Piece in Form of a Tea-Cup, with its Bottom broke out, which he said he had passed through one Baking, and was yet rough, but upon holding it to the Light, as it was, without any Colouring on it, I thought it was as transparent as our ordinary strong China Cups commonly are.* Daniels (2007) maintains that the samples shown in Savannah were sent from London in which case an announcement in the *Daily Gazetteer (London Edition)* June 17, 1738, Issue 922 is auspicious:

Bristol, June 14. Yesterday arrived the *Heyland (Heylyn)*, Alexander Dick, in 5 Weeks and odd Days from South Carolina; **left all well at Georgia.** (our emphasis).

The *Heylyn of Bristol* was owned by Edward Heylyn and Dick was the captain for many years. The ship must have arrived in Georgia mid to late April in order to turn around from Charleston about 10th May.

4. Thomas Bryand's appearance at a Royal Society meeting on 10th February 1742/3 when he presented samples of porcelain. The present authors believe these wares replicated the 1744 patent specification, classified today as the 'A'-marked group. The porcelain appears to have met with the full approval of the Fellows, the minutes stipulating that, *it appear'd to be in all respects as good as any of the finest Porcelane or China ware.* Bryand, together with two Americans from Boston, John Still Winthrop and Sam Auchmuty, attended as guests of Cromwell Mortimer. Other members present, as well as other guests, also had strong links with America (Daniels, 2007). This event links Cromwell Mortimer and Thomas Bryand, with high-fired, refractory 'A'-marked porcelains, and the Bow porcelain manufactory. We find no evidence to link Bryand with Chelsea as has been repeatedly claimed in the literature since Sir Arthur Church.

Many other appointments connected with the establishment of the Colony of Georgia were made in the second half of 1732. Two of these were essential to the development of

the porcelain industry at Bow. Firstly, there was the granting of a licence to Roger Lacey and associates to manufacture potash and there is evidence that large quantities were being shipped to London by late 1734. James, Roger's brother, obtained a Licence to stay at home to manage the consortium's business at the London end. As there was no distinction between potash and bone-ash until late in the eighteenth century, it is thought that much of this could have been bone-ash made from the enormous quantity of bones available in the Colony. The second, vitally important appointment was of Andrew Duchè, the Philadelphian potter, as Agent in Georgia for the export of *uneka* clay (Daniels, 2007).

The approximate period of production of 'A' marked wares at Bow was from the appearance of Bryand at the Royal Society in February 1742/3 to the departure of Andrew Duchè from Savannah in September, 1746 when Cherokee clay was apparently no longer required. This period of production can be verified by a number of primary source documents:

1. Daniel Defoe's *Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain*, 4th edition, edited by Samuel Richardson, which mentions Bow Village, where a "large manufactory" has lately been set up and is already producing "large quantities". Although published in June 1748, Daniels (2007) has shown that the copy must have been handed to the printer by about March 1746/7. Allowing for the editor's time in assembling the material and for the time it took the Bow factory to reach the stage of manufacturing "large quantities," February 1742/3 seems a reasonable time for commercial production to have commenced, although not necessarily confined to the hard-paste recipe.
2. The Vincennes Privilege signed by Louis XV in July 1745. This Privilege gave The Royal Factory the exclusive right to manufacture hard-paste porcelain in France and it referred to an English factory making porcelain finer than Meissen because of its composition. Daniels (2007) maintains that this refers to the Bow Factory and the manufacture of its hard-paste 1744 patent wares.
3. Daniels (2007) suggests that William Cookworthy, the chemist who manufactured hard paste porcelain from Cornish materials in the late 1760's, visited Duchè in London sometime before July 1745 and was shown samples of Bow's 'A'-marked porcelain. Cookworthy considered the porcelain, *equal to the asiatick* (sic).
4. John Campbell's letter to Arthur Dobbs, an important piece of evidence discussed later in the text.
5. A letter dated 14th December 1744 written by William Tomlinson Jnr. to his friend Richard Howe II of Aspley Guise mentioning the passing of a ceramic patent and the use of fine clay from the Carolinas (Bridge and Thornton, 2006).

Since only about 40 extant examples of 'A' marked porcelain have been recorded, it seems unlikely that this expensive hard-paste output could ever have encompassed the "large quantities of teacups, saucers etc" mentioned in Defoe and we conclude that a significant component of this production would have been phosphatic.

Consequently the authors suggest that phosphatic (bone-ash) porcelain may have been manufactured either before, or concurrently, with 1st patent wares. A handle form thought unique to the 'A' mark group does appear on some of the earliest phosphatic porcelains, as do various decorative features. A figure alluding to Vice-admiral Vernon's capture of Porto Bello on 22nd November, 1739 would suggest an early commencement for this phosphatic group. A pair of figures of Turks resembles Thomas Lacey and George Anne Bellamy as they appeared in *Tamerlane* during the winter season in Dublin in 1745/6. Likewise there is some very primitive Commedia del 'Arte figures, which on appearance must pre-date the Vernon and Turks models. As mentioned above Cromwell Mortimer attended Boerhaave's original lectures in Leyden where the Professor's theories on "virgin earth" were expounded. There was no need to rely on the publication of Boerhaave's work by Shaw and Chambers in London in 1727.

The authors suspect that a distinctive corpus of steatitic porcelain, generally referred to as the George II bust group, may also have been produced at Bow over the same period. In a paper read to the English Ceramic Circle, Dudley Delevigne (1963) high-lighted the on-going confusion surrounding the George II busts themselves and listed the range of attributions provided these busts as hard-paste Plymouth, Chelsea, Bow, Longton Hall, Derby, and perhaps Worcester. Current scholarship has accepted Bernard Watney's opinion that because the busts are steatitic, but alien to the Worcester output, they must have been made by Richard Chaffers at his Liverpool factory in the late 1750's. Taking into account the date of Chaffers' soaprock licence and the initial delivery in late 1756, to the authors this seems technically impossible. The house style and marketability in Liverpool also appear doubtful. The authors commenced work on the problem in 2003 and the results from a chemical testing programme on a number of George II busts and associated socles, demonstrate that in all cases the paste for both items is magnesian (steatitic) and is clearly related. Moreover compositional data obtained for body and glaze do not allow for a definitive attribution based on known compositions currently accepted for first period Worcester, Chaffers Liverpool and Vauxhall low-Ca body porcelains. The close compositional correspondence between each of these bodies suggests a common parent – most likely of London origin.

Historically the busts allude to the King's victory at the Battle of Dettingen, when, for the last time, an English monarch fought at the head of the cavalry. He is seen wearing the cuirass, a form of armour consisting of leather breastplate and backplate that covered the trunk but not the arms. It was worn by cavalry officers. Some of the busts were provided with a bracket, examples of which are in the British Museum, the Victoria and Albert Museum, and the National Museum of Ireland, Dublin. The political allegory behind the design of these rare brackets is particularly illuminating.

The bracket incorporates two winged putti, both with attributes that indicate the relevance with the associated bust. The first, representing Fame, holds a laurel leaf, the emblem of victory, and points upwards to the King wearing the cuirass as in the battle of Dettingen. The second figure, in crested helmet and holding a shield bearing the Union flag, depicts Britannia, with trophies of war, trampling on a winged dragon representing the rebellious Scottish Catholic Jacobites. These attributes explicitly declare the King's success in defending the Union and the Protestant Church by finally defeating the Scottish Catholics and their French promoters, backed by the Vatican, at the Battle of Culloden in April 1746 as discussed by Daniels (2007). The celebrations in London and in Edinburgh were euphoric and there were cut-out illustrations of "Victory trampling Rebellion underfoot."

The mystery surrounding the early subject matter of this series of busts has caused them to be associated with the Seven Years' War (1756-1763), but of all the transfer prints on porcelain connected with these conflicts not one depicts the King in any sort of armour, let alone the cuirass. This was a political war fought abroad and of much less interest to the English with little to do with rebellion – especially a Jacobite rebellion. It was a difficult time for the King. Pitt refused to serve in the ministry with Fox on any account. Cumberland refused, while Pitt was in power, to take up his command in Germany. Eventually the King's hand was forced by Pitt's popularity and Pitt formed a fragile ministry with Newcastle. Fox was forced to accept the subordinate post of paymaster. Pitt was determined to conduct open Government. He presided over the passing of the Militia Bill by which mercenaries, *were dismissed and Englishmen were enabled to defend their own country.*

Among the new regiments Pitt raised for the regular army he included two to be drawn from Highland clans, who had been in revolt against the King eleven years before. Basil Williams (1962) quotes Pitt's own explanation:

I sought for merit wherever it was to be found...I found it in the mountains of the North. Called it forth...an hardy and intrepid race of men....who had gone nigh to have overturned the State...they served with fidelity as they fought with valour, and conquered for you in every part of the world; hardly the political climate in which to present or market the George II busts!

As this series of busts is numbered they were most likely commissioned for presentation rather than for sale. In either case, taking into account that the King was, in normal times, most unpopular, they were only appropriate to the second half of 1746 at the latest. Richard Chaffers, a Roman Catholic, is unlikely to have produced these busts and brackets. In contrast there is strong evidence of active support for the King during the Jacobite uprising from at least one member of the Bow proprietors and his merchant colleagues.

The following report appeared in the *London Gazette*, issue 8305:

“At St. James's, February 27 (1743/4)

to the King's most Excellent Majesty,

The humble Address of the Merchants of the City of London.

*We your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal Subjects, the Merchants of your City of London, having observed, by your Majesty's most gracious Message to your Parliament, that Designs are carrying on by your Majesty's Enemies, **in Favour of a Popish Pretender**, to disturb the Peace and Quiet of these your Majesty's Kingdoms; think it our indispensable Duty, not to omit this Opportunity of expressing our just Resentment and Indignation at so rash an Attempt.*

We have too lively a Sense of the Happiness we enjoy in our Religion and Liberties under your Majesty's mild and auspicious Reign, and of the flourishing Condition of our Trade and Commerce, even in the midst of War, under your paternal Care and Vigilance, not to give your Majesty the strongest Assurances of our highest Gratitude for such invaluable Blessings; nor can we doubt, but by the Blessing of God upon your Majesty's Arms, and the unanimous Support of your faithful Subjects, the Attempts of your Enemies will recoil upon themselves, and end in their own Confusion.

We therefore humbly beg Leave to declare to your Majesty, our unshaken Resolution, that we will, on this critical Conjuncture, exert our utmost Endeavours, for the Support of publick Credit, and at all Times hazard our Lives and Fortunes, in Defence of your Majesty's sacred Person and Government, and for the Security of the Protestant Succession in your Royal Family (our emphasises).

Among the large number of merchants named in the address are Edward Heylyn, Alexander Dick, (captain of the *Heylyn of Bristol*), John Norris, and James Theobald. Other names connected with early ceramic history are Thomas Allen (mentioned in Campbell's letter to Dobbs), Stephen Theodore Janssen, Samuel Martin, Samuel Baker (a recipient of *uneka*), Moses Mendes da Costa, John Hanbury and Samuel Smith (Dobbs's papers include a copy of a letter from Hanbury to Smith). Also Andrew Pringle, whose brother Robert sent him a barrel of clay from Carolina.

In the *Daily Gazetteer* of 17th September 1737 it was reported that *Heylyns*, Alexander Dick was at Hamburg on 20th September, up the Elbe from Carolina. Could the ship have been collecting German migrants? *The London Gazette* of 13/8/45 reported that Alexander Dick had been declared bankrupt, which information was repeated in the *St. James's Evening Post* on 19th August 1745 and in *The Daily Advertiser* of 30th September 1745 the bankrupt was named as Alexander Dick, Merchant, at his house Hand-Court facing the Steel Yard in Thames St.; repeated on 9th October 1745.

In a talk given to the English Porcelain Circle published in Transactions III, 1931 entitled *A NOTE ON THE LIMEHOUSE CHINA FACTORY* Aubrey J. Toppin writes of a search made at the Public Record Office among the Bankruptcy Order Books and the naming there of Alexander Dick, Merchant of London, for whom a Bankruptcy Order was made exactly one week after the Limehouse creditors' meeting of June 3rd, 1748. It seems that Toppin misread the date of this bankruptcy as the following notice appeared in the *Daily Advertiser* of September 30, 1745, Issue 4607:

To be sold by Auction without Addition,

By Order of the Assignees, on Wednesday the 9th of October next, and the following days,

The Genuine Household Furniture, Linnen, China, and Books, of MR. ALEXANDER DICK, Merchant, at his House in Hand-Court facing the steel-yard, in Thames-Street, consisting of Needlework, Silk and Worsted, Cotton, and other Furniture, a fine ton'd Harpsichord by Barton, a Chariot and Harness, with good Kitchen Furniture.

Note, The Goods are very clean and fashionable, not having been long in use.

There can be no doubt then that Heylyn was an active supporter of the Protestant succession and is more likely to have been connected with the manufacture of the George II bust than Richard Chaffers. All of the associated figures suggest suitability for the London market; indeed Watney proposes that the coloured examples were decorated in London and that the nun figure, another member of this group, was cast from a larger Bow model.

A further item from this so-called George II group is an octagonal plaque moulded with a biblical scene depicting Susannah and the Elders. This relates to a scandal involving the actress Peg Woffington after she signed for Drury Lane in September 1741.

Swarms of gallants had vied for the beautiful young actresses attention the moment she appeared in London, and they would besiege her for the rest of her career. Among the others was a curious pair often seen together, Colley Cibber and Owen Swiney. Cibber – comedian, playwright and professional fop – was 70 years old Cibber's croney Swiney was 61.

The comic rivalry between the two old men for Peg's regard of course set off jokes about "Susannah and the Elders." Consequently the most promising time for selling the plaque would be 1742/3.

Other evidence to support the manufacture of steatitic porcelain at Bow is to be found in a number of chemical analyses of porcelains that can be attributed to Bow (Ramsay and Ramsay, 2005, 2007a,b). The most striking is the tea canister held in the collections of the National Gallery of Victoria. Ramsay and Ramsay (2005) present an analysis of the body of this canister and they conclude that the high-clay body contains a distinct level of magnesium (2.3 – 6.3 with an average of 4.6 wt% MgO). Two sources for the magnesium were suggested namely a magnesian glass cullet and steatite. Subsequent discussions with Professor Ian Freestone have now favoured a steatitic source for the magnesium. Ramsay and Ramsay (2007b) sum up the current situation in stating that this canister does not so much conform to what we currently regard as Bow 1744 patent porcelains ('A'-marked group) but rather it is the first credible example attributable to Bow in which steatite (~15 wt% steatite) is inferred to have been added. A detailed discussion is provided as to why this canister is an important link piece between Bow first and second patent porcelain wares both compositionally and decoratively (Ramsay and Ramsay, 2007b).

From early in the year 1748 a series of letters was exchanged between the Cornish scientist William Borlase and Emanuel Mendes da Costa, a naturalist and mineralogist elected Fellow of the Royal Society in 1747. On the pretext of preparing a paper on the properties of soaprock for the Society's Transactions, Mendes wrote several times to Borlase pressing for information on soaprock, possibly knowing that the Cornishman had been involved in sending samples to several scientists between 1735 and 1738. Following a letter from Mendes dated 22nd February 1748/9, Borlase endeavoured to rid himself of future enquiries by making the following intriguing reference to Thomas Frye of Bow (Hobbs, 1995),

.....as to its properties you must have assistances at hand and have all sorts of it you can desire to acquaint yourself in the most ample manner with the true nature of it. Has Mr. Fry the Painter who makes the London China ware ever seen it? Probably, he may give you many usefull hints, and I am informed he is a very good natured communicative man (our emphasis),

thus suggesting that knowledge as to the properties of steatite for making porcelain was available in London and that Thomas Frye may have dealt previously with soaprock.

Two unusual potting features may point to a connection between steatitic and phosphatic porcelain and the Royal Society. Several models attached to the George II bust group of steatitic porcelain have finger and thumb prints impressed into the paste on their glaze free bases. This feature is replicated on some of the earliest Bow phosphatic shell salts. Finger and thumb prints also occur on a Bow figure of David Garrick in the guise of an Abbess, datable to 1745/6, which is marked with the chemical sign for regulus of antimony (Daniels, 2007). The rarity of these impressions suggests that they emanate from a single

workshop or repairer and certainly all of them appear to date from about the same time, which is mid 1740's. There are a considerable number of alchemical signs incised on the bases of earliest Bow figures and wares and all of them appear on the dial plate of Mortimer's thermometer. There is no chemical sign for rapeseed, which is indicated by a capital R on the dial and which also appears on the bases of Bow products known generically as the 'scratch R' group.

Finally in the Nicholas Blundell inventory of 1737 mention is made of two Cornish bowls. We suggest that this refers to Cornish steatite and hence we propose that by at least 1737 steatitic wares were available to the public, either on a commercial or semi-commercial basis.

John Campbell's Letter to Arthur Dobbs:

The significance of this letter to English ceramic history was first recognised by Daniels (2007), who discusses the importance of this correspondence, dates it to around April 1745, and in addition supplies a complete transcript of the letter. Daniels (2007) points out that the use of the phrase *only a bubble with the undertakers* by Campbell in his letter implied, according to early Georgian terminology, an emotive word used in the 18th century to describe an unsubstantial, visionary project likely to fail, a crackpot scheme exploited by Jonathon Swift in *An Essay on English Bubbles* and published in 1719, hardly a description which would apply to Bow in or around 1749. By that time the very large Bow Factory called New Canton was nearing completion and a high level of production had been achieved. Bow porcelain was already being offered for sale independent of the factory's outlets, for instance at Mr. Mitchell's Toyshop.

Aubrey Toppin appears to have introduced an extract from the Campbell letter in an address to the English Ceramic Circle on 9th May, 1959, but no transcript of what was said has so far been located. Hugh Tait referred to the Toppin discovery in 1959 (Tait, 1959) and stated that the letter was dated 24th June, 1749 although in a subsequent publication (Tait, 1965) he correctly noted that the letter was in fact undated, inexplicably adding,

The continued use of American supplies of china-clay at Bow seems to be implied in the brief reference made by John Campbell to Arthur Dobbs in an undated letter, but probably written in the 'forties, in which he states that clay on Dobbs's lands in the Cherokee territory in North Carolina 'resembles what I saw at Bow for their China ware which I believe is only a bubble.....'

Since then the paragraph mentioning white clay seen at Bow has appeared in various publications devoted to English ceramic history (Watney, 1963, 1973). Such texts invariably state that the letter was written about 24th June, 1749 and the author has been named repeatedly as John Campbell LLD, a prolific London literati and expert on the American colonies who later became agent for Georgia. Surprisingly, as early as 1968, Graham Hood (Hood, 1968) correctly named John Campbell of Lazy Hill Plantation, Bertie County, North Carolina as the correspondent. Later writers have overlooked Hood's identification, perhaps because he made no attempt to elaborate on Campbell's possible connection with the Bow porcelain manufactory, its proprietors, or to question the date of the Campbell letter. A transcript of that letter is provided by Daniels (2007) and is reproduced below by courtesy of the Public Records Office of Northern Ireland.

My friends here have advised me to embark immediately for England on this occasion but my private affairs are liable to suffer exceedingly by a precipitate departure, must rely on my Friends good offices & troubling them by letter to crave their endeavours which may effect as much as my presence could. I shall write my Brother on this subject and he I hope will assist me as my dependence for security will be on him for any undertakings my friend can procure or Engage me in. My small fortune is intirely in this province and in such Stuff as is not very mutable, lands, Houses, Negroes & outstanding Debts etc. This present affair is the only agreeable prospect to me ever since in this country, if I don't succeed must jogg on through life at the old rate of great fatigues & many inconveniences incident to doing business in this place. I have not yet been at Leisure to make a journey thro the back country as I proposed but collected what information I could & am told the whole Lands Mr. McCulloh took up will be seated in very few years. The old Planters are moving outwards from ye Northward & Virginia great numbers resort to these Lands & set down on any place they fancy, plant away they expect some owner will claim & they then intend to purchase. The Lands on Black River & heads of Cape Fear are now in great esteem, as they abound with swampy reedy places & are exceeding good ranges for Cattle. Our people drive two hundred miles to these places, a few people kept great stocks without show or noise for some years before they drove any for sale. The people of the back Country are going on Indigo, Hemp, Flax & Deary's all growing much in esteem amongst us. The War and necessity put people on Industry and has shown them how easy they can supply their wants within themselves.

I send you in a small Box a sample of White Clay & the Oar (sic) intermixed with the vein which has been traced above a mile in Edgecombe County the clay resembles what I saw at Bow for their China ware (which I believe is only a bubble with the undertakers) This Clay is near water carriage & if worth any thing enough might be had. The land is vacant & it's communicated to me as a secret by some persons who pretend to be judges of these fossils, but desire your opinion. I have shipped some Birds & things for the Earl Granville & wish they may get safe to him. I have put on board for you a Box of Mirtell Candles which I have mention'd to your Cousin Thos. Allen to get on shore as he lives convenient to the Vessells for they are not worth yr trouble.

When any other opportunity (arises I) shall procure & send you some few Trifles as our best produce can't be estimated any thing else to what your City affords, I shall ever have the most Gratefull sense of your particular favours to me in London & shall be exceeding glad when any opportunity to make manifest that regard & esteem which I cant now, only by wishing you happiness & prosperity being Sir Yrs etc.

What is strange about the paragraph mentioning the shipment of a Box of White Clay and Oar, Birds and things and a Box of Mirtell Candles, is that Campbell does not name the ship or the captain, which would have been unheard of at the time. Also, he is sending the Box of Clay for Dobbs to collect, but the Mirtell Candles, also on board for Dobbs, he has, mentioned to your Cousin Thos. Allen to get on shore as he lives convenient to the Vessells for they are not worth yr trouble. If Dobbs has to collect the box of white clay from the vessel why not the candles as well? According to Major Andrew Dobbs, the present incumbent of Castle Dobbs, Carrickfergus, Dobbs could not have had a Cousin called Thomas Allen, as no ancestor of his married into an Allen family. This raises the question in our mind as to whether the Campbell letter was obfuscating with regard to the identity of Allen. According to Kent's Directory of 1740, Thomas Allen was a Turkey Merchant of Broad-Street

Buildings. His ship, the *King George*, was caught in the embargo in the Thames and had to provide 1 seaman. It must have been of small size, as the *Hannah*, less than a month previously, had been forced to provide 3 seamen. Allen was also a signatory to the Address of the Merchants of the City of London in support of the King and the Protestant cause against the impending Jacobite invasion.

The earliest possible date of the Campbell correspondence was easily established as Campbell mentions the Earl Granville, a title John Lord Carteret inherited on the death of his mother on 10th October, 1744. The latest date of writing could be determined only by carefully studying Campbell's observations on the prevailing conditions in the colony and his references to the massive land grants involving Henry McCulloch, Arthur Dobbs, Murray Crymble, James Huey and their Associates. It turned out that the 'Associates' included some surprisingly relevant and interesting names and enabled a connection to be made between John Campbell, Arthur Dobbs, and the Bow proprietors. For instance the name of the factory's financier George Arnold, a London alderman, appears with that of Arthur Dobbs and James Huey among the Grantees of a parcel of 60,000 acres listed alphabetically in the North Carolina Journal covering Patents for Grants of Land under the dates 14th January, 1735/6 (Table 1) This particular petition was first mentioned by Governor Gabriel Johnston at an Executive Council Meeting held at Edenton, North Carolina on 29th November, 1735. Johnston had earlier been in London and had been party to a number of meetings arranged by the Board of Trade and the many merchants involved in the land speculation. Significantly, Dobbs departed Carrickfergus and crossed to England on the 26th April, 1732 (Clarke, 1959: p.39).

In 1736, Campbell and Dobbs are connected with a further petition for 1,200,000 acres made by James Huey, Murray Crymble and 'Associates' on behalf of Henry McCulloch, later known as 'the great land grabber' (Table 2). The lands were surveyed in 1744 and 96 patents of title were issued in the amount of 12,500 acres to each of 15 patentees as recorded in Land Grant Book 19 in the office of the Provincial Secretary of North Carolina. However a protracted dispute between McCulloch and surveyor Matthew Rowan over the validity of the survey caused long delays. In the opinion of Rowan this was deliberately concocted to facilitate a further extension of the quit rents. It eventuated that McCulloch was successful and the Official patents were not issued until early in 1746 (new style).

Campbell's "present affair" must refer to McCulloch's visit to London early in 1745 (new style) following the 1744 survey and Campbell is hoping that his grant will be confirmed. He needed security from his brother, James living in Coleraine, Ireland, to guarantee the payment of the quit rents. A parcel of 12,500 acres would have added considerably both to his real estate and possible future income. It appears that Campbell's letter was written before McCulloch returned to North Carolina; otherwise he would have known the outcome of the London meetings with the Board of Trade. As it turned out, Arthur Dobbs was the only speculator who successfully fulfilled the demands of settlement attached to the grants, (1 white person for each 400 acres) having placed 500 white immigrants on his 200,000 acre grant.

This means that Campbell wrote the letter to Dobbs circa April 1745 whilst McCulloch was in London. Both authors of this present contribution realised by 2004 that this document represented the earliest, extant, eyewitness account of any English porcelain

concern and as a consequence a concerted attempt has been made over the last 5 years to trace the movements of John Campbell prior to April 1745 in an endeavour to pinpoint the date Campbell was in London with time to spare to visit the Bow site.

The career of John Campbell:

The Dictionary of North Carolina Biography (Powell, 1979) contains an entry for John Campbell, Merchant of Edenton and Lazy Hill Plantation, Bertie County, and confirms that he was, *one of the distinguished Gentleman of Ireland and wealthy London merchants*, who got together in the early 1730's to promote protestant settlement in the Carolinas. Campbell's will, drawn up on the 19th April, 1777, shows him to have amassed a considerable fortune and large estate, from which he left *the sum of £100 sterling to Henry Newton of Coleraine, Northern Ireland, to pay unto my brother James Campbell if alive and my sisters Mary and Elizabeth and their heirs in equal proportion*. The will also establishes that Campbell had two children, a son James and a daughter Sarah, both by his first wife Mary, nee Hill. Judging by the large number of books mentioned in his will he was well educated and came from a well-to-do family. He had several grandchildren, including John, son of James.

Apparently John Campbell was born around 1702 in the town of Coleraine, and he died in North Carolina in 1780 or early 1781. Coleraine was the name given by Campbell to the town he established in North Carolina after his Irish birthplace. The plan of the Irish town of Coleraine was amongst those contemplated for Savannah by James Oglethorpe before his departure for the new colony of Georgia. As yet we have been unable to discover where Campbell was educated and whether he attended university. Neither have we been able to ascertain when he first moved to London, although there is circumstantial evidence that he may have been resident in the capital before 1729. The exact time he migrated to North Carolina is also uncertain although we know he was in the Province and a landowner by late 1733 (Table 3). In the November 1733 term in the Bertie County Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, a jury of landowners headed by Campbell was appointed to, *lay out a road from the landing (Gum Point) to Cashie road where it now strikes off to sd. George Pollock's.....* Likewise in the May term of the Bertie County Court, 1734, Campbell was appointed overseer of adjoining landowners for clearance and maintenance of a road from Maules Haven to Hicks Mill and also a road from Cashie Road to Gum Point at John Campbell's. In 1736 Campbell recorded his cattle mark in the Bertie County records ².

Primary source evidence through shipping records has shown that Campbell was an active trader between North Carolina and Britain and that there were a number of occasions prior to his letter of 1745 when he was in London. These and other records also establish his presence at Edenton. By studying his known whereabouts on both sides of the Atlantic it has been possible to determine the number of occasions and dates he could have been in London (Table 3). It seems he introduced tobacco from North Carolina into Britain during the mid 1730s and his trading route encompassed London, Liverpool, and Whitehaven. It appears that on his return voyages to North Carolina he carried both trade goods and Protestant settlers.

² Bertie County, NC, Deeds cattle markings, (1722-1741).
<<http://ftp.rootsweb.com/pub/usgenweb/nc/bertie/deeds/cattle.txt>>

Likewise numerous records testify that he was an active member of society in both Bertie and Chowan counties (Table 3).

On August 18th, 1737 Campbell was in London as master of the *Burrington*, when he paid sixpenny money to Greenwich Hospital and again he was back on 17th January, 1738/39 as master of the *Mary and Margt.* departing London for Roanoke when he paid £1.6.8 sixpenny money³. These payments were a compulsory contribution to a welfare scheme for sailors introduced to Parliament in 1729 by James Oglethorpe by which 6d for each seaman carried during the year had to be paid to the Greenwich Hospital. This replaced an earlier scheme that failed.

If Campbell was embarking emigrants on this occasion, as recorded on a later journey hereunder, he would have remained in port for some time, perhaps three to four weeks. He was in London again at the end of 1739 when a petition or memorial arrived with the Privy Council on 25th February, 1739/40 from the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty as a result of the Government embargo on all shipping following the declaration of war with Spain on 19th October, 1739 (Privy Council Register Office, 1738-1740)⁴. An Order of Council and Warr (sic) was signed on 27th February, 1739/40, *for discharging from the Embargo the Snow Mary and Mariane John Campbell Burthen 100 Tons or thereabouts Navigated wth. five men now in the River of Thames bound for North Carolina laden with Sundry Merchandise in a perishing condition as also a Quantity of Arms and Ammunition for the Inhabitants of that province, and having on board 50 poor foreign protestants and Servts whom he has maintained on board ever since 23.^d Dec.^r last.* (PRO, 1734-1740)⁵.

This Order confirms that Campbell was involved in carrying migrants from London to North Carolina. Since his passengers had been maintained on board since 23rd December he must have anchored in the Thames around the end of November because on 29th November, 1739 he paid Greenwich Hospital sixpenny money for the ship on 8 seamen for a total of 79.9 months (= £1.16.10)⁶ and did not depart until after 27th February, 1739/40, a period of three months. Three months lingering in the Thames would have provided plenty of time to visit the Bow factory especially as he was well connected and being from North Carolina would have attracted the interest of the proprietors, one of whom, George Arnold, has been shown to have been involved in land speculation in the Carolinas from the mid 1730's⁷ as was Campbell. The lifting of this embargo is perhaps one of the favours Campbell mentions in his letter, as Dobbs was a close friend of Admiral Wager, one of the signatories on the petition to the Privy Council, and a regular confidant of Prime Minister Walpole.

Another possible favour which may have stemmed from Dobbs's influence at the Admiralty concerns a Charter Party Agreement signed by Campbell at Edenton on 4th September, 1740, not long after he returned from London around April 1740. This agreement

³ PRO Kew, London, Admiralty, Greenwich Hospital accounts, 1738-1744m ADM 68/197, folio 75.

⁴ Privy Council, Office Register, 1st October 1738 – 27th March 1740 (PC. 2/95).

⁵ PRO Kew, London. Treasury. Out Letters – Customs and Excises. Customs, 1734-1740. (T, 11/21) p. 419, OIC 27 Feb 1739/40.

⁶ PRO Kew, London. Treasury. Out Letters – Customs and Excises. Customs, 1734-1740. (T, 11/21) p. 419, OIC 27 Feb 1739/40.

⁷ PRO, Kew, London. C05/319

was between himself “as part owner of the good Snow called the *Mary and Mariane* of London of the Burthern of two hundred and ten tons as admeasured, and now lying in the Bay of Edenton on behalf of the joint owners” and Gabriel Johnston on behalf of His Majesty (Cain, 1988: p. 371-373). By this agreement Campbell was held responsible for the maintenance and refurbishment of the vessel whilst in His Majesty’s service. The Charter continued until the 30th December, 1741, so Campbell’s presence in Edenton would have been essential during the intervening period. He was definitely there in March 1740/41 as on the 18th he petitioned for 404 acres in Bertie County (Cain, 1988: p. 117).

Shortly after the charter ended, Campbell suffered a misfortune when next crossing to London. Campbell’s Snow is listed under “ships taken by the Spanish” in the Gentleman’s Magazine of 1742:

29th April 1742

“*Mary and Mary-Ann*, Campbell, Carolina to England, St. Sebastian.”

It has not been investigated whether the ship was retained by the Spanish, destroyed, or ransomed. It is also not known how or when John Campbell was able to return to North Carolina following this capture, but we have established that he was back by 10th September, 1742 when he witnessed a deed in Bertie County (Table 3). During the intervening three months from May to July he may have visited the Bow site, had he been in London, although this seems unlikely in view of the problems he faced. Certainly Dobbs could not have done him any favours in London at that time because he remained in Ireland from June 1741 until April 1743.

Campbell’s continued presence in Bertie, NC is confirmed by his signature as witness to the will of Owen MacDaniel (MacDaniell) on 7th February, 1742/43 and this will was proved at the May 1743 term of Bertie County Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions by oath of John Campbell (Table 3). From early 1743 Campbell became involved in local politics and in purchasing and developing his plantation at Lazy Hill. In Edenton on 27th July, 1743 he was granted 600 acres in Chowan and admitted to the Meeting to prove his right to take up land by settling 12 whites and 5 blacks (Cain, 1988: p. 144). Shortly afterwards, on 23rd August, 1743 he witnessed the signing of a bill of sale between Benjamin Hill (his father-in-law) and Daniel Hough⁸ whilst on 17th November, 1743 at a meeting in Edenton he petitioned for a further 300 acres in Chowan and on the following day he took on John Rowan, with the consent of Mathew Rowan, as an articulated apprentice mariner⁹. In January 1743/44 he stood surety for Peter Payne as guardian of Elizabeth Slaughter¹⁰.

Letters of Attorney sworn at Grocers Hall in London on 16th February, 1743/44 demanded John Campbell’s residency in Edenton for some time, as he was appointed attorney for William Doley (Dolley), ironmonger, and George Low, packer (Cain, 1988: pp. 404-407), both in the estate of Henry Wensley, formerly a London mariner, late of Pasquotank River in North Carolina in America, planter. Wensley was heavily in debt to both Doley and Low at the time of his decease. Also in the year 1744 Campbell was elected to the Lower House of Assembly, which required his presence in North Carolina. Likewise Court

⁸ Bertie County Deed Book F p. 528

⁹ Chowan County Deed Book, A-1, p. 316

¹⁰ Chowan County Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, January 1743/44 term

records from North Carolina prove that he was resident there continually through 1743, 1744, and much of 1745 (Table 3).

From March/April 1744/45 there was the additional problem of war with France, which would have made the sea voyage even more hazardous than it had been in 1742. Taking all of the above documented facts into account it is concluded that the earliest date John Campbell could have visited the Bow site was prior to his initial departure for North Carolina, where he was well ensconced by late 1733. The latest he could have visited Bow was during the period May to July 1742, that is assuming he returned to North Carolina via London. Allowing for delays and sailing time from St. Sebastian to London and thence to North Carolina he must have left London by the end of July in order to witness the deed dated 10th September, 1742 in Bertie County (Table 3). However, by mid 1742 commercial production on the east London site must have been imminent, if not already in progress, and the authors consider the word “bubble” would have been inappropriate. It is more likely Campbell saw the clay at Bow during the time he was delayed by the embargo in December 1739 to February 1739/40 or prior to that date. One of the authors (WRHR) leans towards a mid-late 1730s date while the senior author (PD) favours a late 1732 to 1733 date supposing that the ‘undertakers’ wanted to familiarise Campbell with the white clay prior to his initial departure for North Carolina hoping that he might discover more accessible deposits in North Carolina than those in the far west located in Cherokee country. The visit must have occurred well before February 1742/3 when the site was obviously fully equipped and ready to go into production. As Mortimer’s wind-furnace and athanor were finished by June 1736 and Duchè moved to Savannah at that time to organise regular shipments of clay one cannot see the word ‘bubble’ being appropriate and can therefore assume that Campbell’s viewing of the clay must have taken place sometime between late 1732 and 1735, but no later.

Additional supporting documents:

Several other supporting documents have come to light that, although of later date, none-the-less affect events presented in this account. These include two letters from papers relating to Lord Granville’s Proprietary in North Carolina in the Longleat House Archives¹¹. These are published for the first time by kind permission of Lord Bath (Appendices 1, 2). The original spelling has been preserved.

The memorandum of “fowls, Birds and Walnut plank” mentioned in the opening paragraph of the letter from Campbell to Granville (Appendix 1) dated 13th May, 1749 may be in part responsible for the confusion over the date of Campbell’s earlier letter to Dobbs in which he mentions sending “birds and things” to the Earl. It may have been assumed by previous writers that these two Campbell letters relate to the same shipment, however the tone of both of Campbell’s letters suggests such shipments were a regular occurrence; the second paragraph already anticipates a future shipment. The possible assumption by some that the two letters were contemporary demonstrates yet again the danger of publishing extracts taken out of context. Possibly the person who typed the transcript of the Dobbs Papers was aware of the later letter and therefore commenced Campbell’s earlier letter to

¹¹ Carteret Papers: (Earl Granville Papers) – 175 8/5/1749 and 175 13/5/1749.

Dobbs on the same sheet as a letter dated 24th June, 1749 endorsed in Dobbs's writing "A copy to Hanbury from Smith." Dickson (1966) comments that as this letter (Campbell to Dobbs) is copied on the same sheet of paper as D.162, no. 47a, it probably belongs to 1749.

The concurrent letter to Granville from Governor Johnston (Appendix 2) dated 8th May, 1749, verifies that Campbell had constant "Access" to the Earl and must have been on intimate terms with him for a private letter from his agent in North Carolina to have been shown during a personal visit. We also learn from the letter that John Campbell traded to Liverpool. Campbell himself elaborates on this trading by informing His Lordship that he was the first to export tobacco to London and had built up a considerable export of it to Liverpool and Whitehaven (Appendix 1). Also on 13th May, 1749 Campbell writes that he had recently returned from London and that whilst he was there, *Legeslature repealed the Navigation Act, whereby the buoys & directions for our Channels are all gone*. This reference is to a clause repealing the 1723 Act for buoys and beaconing the channels, which clause is the 20th section of, *An Act for granting unto his Majesty the Sum of Twenty One Thousand Three Hundred and Fifty Pounds....* passed at the session of the General Assembly that sat at New Bern from 18th March to 6th April, 1748.

This means that Campbell visited England in the spring of 1748; another confirmation that the letter to Granville cannot relate chronologically to the letter to Dobbs in which Campbell states that he was unable to visit London even though his friends advised him to do so. In addition there is no doubt that had the two letters been contemporary Campbell would also have informed Dobbs of the repeal of the Navigation Act because it would badly have affected his proposed migration programme. Carteret (later Earl Granville on October 10th, 1744), Dobbs, and Campbell appear to have been associated from the period of Carteret's term as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. It is probable that Campbell and Dobbs were related through the Stewart family of Ballintoy, County Antrim (now County Londonderry), by which means Dobbs and surveyor Mathew Rowan were cousins. For further details and background to the extensive land grants in North Carolina involving Dobbs, Campbell, Roan, George Arnold, and Earl Granville see Daniels (2007). It may be worth remembering that John Carteret signed the King's recommendation for further consideration of the Bow 1st Patent Application of 8th October, 1744.

It seems that "birds and things" were sent to Granville on a regular basis giving John constant "Access" to his Lordship. The sending of live and stuffed birds to the nobility as gifts was common practice. George Edwards had four patrons during the publication period of his *History of Birds*, namely The Duke of Richmond, Sir Hans Sloane, Richard Meade MD and Martin Folkes, all Fellows of the Royal Society. According to Edwards, black and white Chinese Cock Pheasants were kept by Sloane at his home in London where they hatched young ones and brought them to maturity. Regarding the Touraco (Edwards, Plate 7) he writes, *This bird is now living at Colonel Lowther's house in St. James's Park*. The Quan or Guan (Plate 13) he saw, *.....one of these birds at Captain Chandler's (commander of the Bow ship the Antelope) at Stepney, who brought it with him from one of the Sugar Islands*. In 1753, Harriet Pinckney left a card for the Princess of Wales, *Miss Harriet Pinckney, daughter of Charles Pinckney Esqr., one of His Majesty's Council of South Carolina pays her duty to her Highness and humbly begs leave to present her with an Indigo bird, a Nonpareil, and a yellow bird, which she has brought from Carolina for Her Highness*.

Other background evidence:

There are several other pieces of evidence which possibly connect John Campbell with the various groups that were responsible for the creation of Georgia and the opening up of the Carolinas, which the senior author has suggested was part of a massive scheme to improve British industry and commerce, to increase trade and navigation, to revitalise the arts and sciences, and to expand her interests abroad (Daniels, 2007). This was in response to analogous French plans stemming from their Academy of Science. The Royal Society of London, Members of both Houses of Parliament, Aldermen of the City of London, hierarchy of the Church of England, military and naval leaders, a large number of wealthy merchants, and many of the leading artists and actors of the day became involved. All groups were represented on the various committees set up to manage the scheme. Where necessary The Royal Society sought advice from leading authorities and in some cases privately sponsored experts from its own ranks to reconnoitre a region. Such was the case with Sir Alexander Cuming and William Houston the botanist; William Miller of the Chelsea Physic Garden followed in his stead when Houston died prematurely in 1733.

Amongst the persons seconded to the extended committee of the Bray Associates¹² was John Campbell of St. George in the Fields, Middlesex. Also serving were James Oglethorpe and John Percival, later 1st Earl of Egmont, who are considered to be the founders of Georgia, as well as James Lowther of Whitehaven, and Major (later Colonel) John Selwyn. It was this John Selwyn who shared 400,000 acres with his friend Arthur Dobbs in the great McCulloch land grant in the Carolinas, in which John Campbell of North Carolina was also involved.

The same John Campbell was named by the Reverend Samuel Wesley¹³, brother of John and Charles, as one of the 26 active members of the Committee appointed by the House of Commons “to enquire into the state of the Gaols of the Kingdom” on 25th February, 1728/29. Included with those named by Wesley were James Oglethorpe, John Percival, Sir Thomas Lowther, John Selwyn, Mr. Alderman Parsons, Edward Vernon, and John Norris. A Sir John Norris was a member of the Privy Council which met on 11th February, 1739/40 to hear the petition on behalf of John Campbell and again on 25th February, 1739/40 when the embargo was lifted. Likewise John Norris and Edward Heylyn (presumably the Bow proprietor) attended a meeting of The Royal Society in 1738 as the guests of James Theobald FRS, a London merchant and later president of the Bank of England from 1744-1755. One of the subjects discussed that day was “stones that will easily vitrify.” Edward Vernon’s name appears on a Bow inkwell. The idea came from Oglethorpe, ostensibly to rescue innocent persons from debtor’s prison and transport them to Carolina. The Gaols Committee was captured for posterity in a painting executed in 1729 by William Hogarth, who was also involved in the refurbishment of the Vauxhall gardens and the revitalisation of the St. Martin’s Lane Academy.

John Campbell Esquire of St. George’s Fields was also a governor of St. Thomas’s Hospital (Golding, 1819), as was George Arnold of Bow fame from 1731. Several other Campbells were on the Board but these were all titled, including John 2nd Duke of Argyle and his heir, Archibald, Earl of Islay, later the 3rd Duke a regular client of Bow.

¹² An earlier charity concerned with prison reform from which the Trustees of Georgia received a large legacy toward the settlement of the new colony. *Creating Georgia: Bray Minutes and Supplementary Documents*.

¹³ In the dedication to his poem *The Prisons Open’d*.

It is hoped that future research will confirm that John Campbell Esquire of Saint George in the Fields is one and the same as John Campbell of Lazy Hill Plantation, NC. What we do know is that the Campbell of Lazy Hill Plantation was transporting migrants to North Carolina in 1739/40 and in addition he was exporting tobacco to Britain and Barbados. The Treasurer's and Comptroller's Records for the Port of Roanoke¹⁴ show that as master of the Brigantine *Mary & Marg^t* he paid duty for three casks of tobacco shipped to Barbados on 4th March, 1738/39. By his own account he was also exporting large quantities of tobacco to London, Whitehaven, and Liverpool. The question arises as to whether he was exporting to Henry Slingsby in Barbados (fellow grantee in Tract 6 of the Crymble-Huey 1737 petition) and to James Lowther in Whitehaven (fellow committee member of the Bray Associates)?

Discussion:

In this account based on primary source documents, we accept that the author of the letter to Arthur Dobbs was John Campbell of the Lazy Hill plantation, Bertie County, North Carolina. We also accept that this letter was not written in the late 1740s but rather around April 1745. Although the initial idea of pinpointing the date John Campbell saw clay at Bow has been nullified by the several occasions he visited London we have been able to track his whereabouts between 1733 and 1745 and it has been resolved that the latest possible date for the on-site Bow viewing was between May and July 1742. Apart from the Heylyn and Frye ceramic patent and its specification, John Campbell's letter to Arthur Dobbs must now rank as one of the most significant, extant primary source documents relating both to the very early years of the Bow porcelain manufactory and to the formative years of the English porcelain industry. This letter specifically mentions Bow as a business enterprise undertaking the manufacture of 'china ware' from clay compared visually with white clay from Edgecombe County, NC. The 1744 Bow 1st patent specification states that the white clay used was sourced from the Cherokee nation in the Carolinas. The connection between Heylyn and Frye, Bow, and Cherokee china clay is enhanced by William Tomlinson Jnr's letter of 14th December, 1744 to Richard Howe II of Aspley Guise, which does not mention Bow but records that a patent "is granted" (the Heylyn and Frye patent of 6th December, 1744) for the manufacture of "china ware" made with fine earth which comes from Carolina (Bridge and Thornton, 2006). Moreover the mention of aldermen being involved is strongly suggestive of the Bow manufactory, which from Poor Law Overseer's Accounts Books for the Parish of West Ham for the period of Ladyday 1749 to Michaelmas 1749 and then again from Michaelmas 1749 to Ladyday 1750 was referred to as *Ald. Arnold & Comp.*

Although some early writers (Chaffers, 1863; Solon, 1903) have written that Bow was operating in the 1730s, these claims were unsubstantiated, vague, and have largely been ignored by subsequent writers. Based on our research it appears that there is now some basis for these early claims as it can be stated that Bow was recognised as Bow and operating considerably earlier than has been accepted to date. This in turn raises a number of questions about Bow and its output during the earlier period from the 1730's – mid 1742. Moreover a number of Bow porcelain items typically dated to 1748 - early 1750s and thought to be phosphatic, may now need their assumed dates of manufacture and their compositions reassessed. If Bow was operating in the 1730s utilising a range of paste types as demonstrated

¹⁴ Treasurer's and Comptroller's Records, Port Roanoke, Collector's Accounts, 1732-1742, State Archives, Raleigh, NC, pp. 82-83.

by Ramsay and Ramsay (2007a, b) (phosphatic, magnesian, and possibly glassy) in addition to the high-firing Si-Al-Ca body, then we deduce that there must be a body of wares in existence dating from these very early years of the Bow output, which have been incorrectly attributed to other later factories.

Lastly we comment briefly on the notion recently advanced in the literature that because of the perceived discordance in form and decoration between Bow first patent porcelains ('A'-marked wares) and Bow phosphatic wares relating to the Bow second patent of 1749 it is misleading to think of the earlier wares and their associated 1744 patent specification as pertaining to Bow. Instead it has been proposed (Manners, 2007) that both the 1744 patent and its wares should be regarded as relating to a short-lived predecessor (precursor-Bow), rather than Bow itself. Based on our research we comment as follows:

1. The Campbell correspondence, which refers to white clay, china ware, and the Bow factory itself, was written at the deduced height of ceramic output of the Si-Al-Ca body based on the specification in the Bow first patent of 1744. Moreover the on-site visit could have been no later than mid 1742 and most likely considerably earlier. By referring to Bow, Campbell obviously accepted that the recipient of his letter also understood what was referred to and it can be assumed by 1742, at the very latest, a porcelain concern located in the vicinity of Bow village was being referred to as Bow in everyday conversation and correspondence;
2. the problem with attempting to ascribe a factory attribution based purely on form and decoration has caused considerable problems through the history of English ceramics. It was essentially because of these criteria that Lane (1958) and Bimson (1958) sought a Continental attribution for these iconic English Bow first patent porcelains. Likewise, based on form, potting, and decoration a Bow attribution was denied (Charleston and Mallet, 1971) and an attribution was sought in Scotland (Valpy, 1987; Rock, 1999). This notion of the primacy of the artistic pursuit (Fisher, 1947) has dominated English ceramic thinking for well over half a century and in part explains why such attempts to derive an attribution for these Bow first patent wares have been unsuccessful for some 80 years. In contrast Ramsay, Ramsay, and co-workers sought to explore contemporary documents (Ramsay et al., 2001, 2006), chemical composition (Ramsay et al., 2003, 2004a), and kiln-firing of analogue porcelain wares (Ramsay et al., 2004b) to arrive at a credible attribution without recourse to obscure if not fictitious potworks. We suggest that attributions based essentially on form and decoration alone without consideration of other legitimate methods of attribution, be they contemporary documents, composition derived from science, or archaeology, are likely to prove, in many instances, too limiting and narrowly based. For a similar discussion relating to the Bow multiple potworks model based on potting, glazing, tone of underglaze blue, and decoration without consideration of composition, contemporary documents, or archaeology (Spero, 1989, 2001, 2006, 2008) see Ramsay and Ramsay (2007b);
3. what is emerging from current research into Bow (Daniels, 2007; Ramsay et al., 2001, 2003; Ramsay and Ramsay, 2007a, b) is the recognition that we are not yet fully appreciating the full Bow ceramic output and on this basis it may

be premature to claim that there is a discordance in form and decoration. A case in point is the tea canister (Ramsay and Ramsay (2005, 2007b) which exhibits transitional features between Bow first and second patent wares; and

4. based on compositional studies it is becoming clear that for the last 250 years the full range of ceramic compositions manufactured at Bow has not been fully understood. Research to date (Ramsay and Ramsay, 2007b) has identified a variety of compositions including Si-Al-Ca bodies with variable Si:Al ratios, MgO-SiO₂-Al₂O₃ +/- PbO +/- S types, and a multiplicity of compositions in the system P₂O₅-10xSO₄-10xPbO having P₂O₅ > 5wt% which can be attributed to Bow. The question arises that if one adopts a two-fold grouping of output (precursor-Bow and Bow) then which of the above compositional types recognised to date belong to the former and which to the latter? Moreover the debate has as yet not even touched on glaze chemistries and their compositional range.

We conclude that based on contemporary documents the concepts advanced by Daniels (2007) regarding the Campbell letter are further substantiated, the Bow porcelain manufactory was most likely operating in the 1730s, the 1744 patent of Heylyn and Frye can now be regarded as the Bow first patent, the products of that specification may be seen as Bow porcelains, the chronology of some early Bow phosphatic porcelains coupled with some magnesian wares attributed to other later factories, may require revision, and that ceramic connoisseurship predicated on the notion of the primacy of the artistic pursuit may possibly be too narrowly based to sustain ceramic scholarship through the 21st century.

Acknowledgements:

Special acknowledgment is made to the Marquise of Bath for permission to publish two private letters to the Earl Granville and to Dr Kate Harris, archivist at Longleat House for her help and advice. One of the authors acknowledges the receipt of the Robert Lee Gill scholarship for 2004 - 2005 to Winterthur Museum, Library, and Garden where a number of important documents were found. He also acknowledges support by the Cumming Ceramic Research Foundation through its scholarship programme. Special mention and gratitude is extended to George Stevenson, former Private Manuscripts Archivist, North Carolina State Archives for his remarkable knowledge and patient support in helping to trace the whereabouts of John Campbell during the 1730s and early 1740s. Table 3 benefited from additional dates relating to John Campbell's whereabouts obtained from Sally Koestler, a descendant of Campbell. We join to thank the late Roger Daniels who discovered the notice of capture of the "Mary and Mary-Ann" with its captain, John Campbell, in April 1742 as recorded in "The Gentleman's Magazine."

References

- Adams, E., & Redstone, D. (1981). *Bow Porcelain*. Faber and Faber, London.
- Bimson, M. (1958). In A. Lane, Unidentified Italian or English porcelains: The 'A'-marked group. *Keramik-Freunde der Schweiz, Mitterlungsblatt*, 43, 15-18.

- Bridge, A., & Thornton D. (2006). Some new light on the early history of the Bow porcelain factory from primary sources. *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, 19 (2), 403-412.
- Burton, W. (1902). *A History and Description of English Porcelain*. Cassell and Company Ltd. 1st edition reprinted by Wakefield E. P. Publishing Ltd., London.
- Burton, W. (1921). *A General History of Porcelain*. Vol. 2. Cassell and Company Ltd., London.
- Cain, R. J. (Ed). (1988). *Records of the Executive Council 1735-1754*. The Colonial Records of North Carolina (Second Series), Raleigh, NC, VIII.
- Cain, R. J. (Ed). (1994). *Records of the Executive Council 1755-1775*. The Colonial Records of North Carolina (Second Series), Raleigh, NC, IX.
- Chaffers, W. (1863). *Marks and Monograms on European and Oriental Pottery and Porcelain*. J. Davy and Sons.
- Charleston, R. J., & Mallet, J. V. G. (1971). A problematical group of 18th century porcelains. *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle* 8, 80-121.
- Clarke, D. (1958). *Arthur Dobbs Esquire 1689-1765*. Bodley Head, London.
- Daniels, P. (2007). *The Origin & Development of Bow Porcelain 1730-1747 including the participation of the Royal Society Andrew Duchè and the American contribution*. Oxford: Resurgat Publishers.
- Delevigne, D. (1963). The bust of George II. *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle* 5 (4).
- Dickson, R. J. (1966). *Ulster Emigration to Colonial America 1718-1775*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Dossie, R. (1758). *The Handmaid of the Arts*, 2. London: J. Nourse at the Lamb opposite Katherine Street in the Strand.
- Fisher, S. W. (1947). *English Blue and White Porcelain of the 18th Century*. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd.

- Freestone, I. C. (1996). A-marked porcelain: some recent scientific work. *Transactions English Ceramic Circle 16*, 76-84.
- Gabszewicz, A. (2000). *Made at New Canton Bow Porcelain from the Collection of the London Borough of Newham*. London Sealprint Ltd.
- Gabszewicz, A. & Freeman, G. (1982). *Bow Porcelain, the Collection Formed by Geoffrey Freeman*. Lund Humphries, London.
- Golding, B. (1819). *An Historical Account of St. Thomas's Hospital Southwark*. London.
- Her Majesty's Stationery Office. (1856). *A.D. 1744: Manufacture of earthenware, Heylyn and Frye's specification, patent No. 610*.
- Hobbs, B. K. (1995). New perspectives on soapstone. *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle 15*, 368-392.
- Hood, G. (1968). The career of Andrew Duché. *Art Quarterly. 31*. (footnote 31).
- Hurlbutt, F. (1926). *Bow Porcelain*. London: G. Bell and Sons.
- Lane, A. (1958). Unidentified Italian or English porcelains: The 'A'-marked group. *Keramik-Freunde der Schweiz, Mitterlungsblatt. 43*, 15-18.
- Manners, E. (2007). 'A'-marked porcelain and Chelsea; a connection. *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle 19 (3)*, 471-475.
- Mountford, A. (1969). Thomas Briand – a stranger. *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle 7 (2)*, 87-99.
- Powell, W. S. (Ed). (1979). *Dictionary of North Carolina Biography*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Ramsay, E. G., & Ramsay, W. R. H. (2007a). *Bow: Britain's Pioneering Porcelain Manufactory of the 18th Century*. International Ceramics Fair, Park Lane Hotel, London, June 2007, 16p.

- Ramsay, W. R. H., Gabszewicz, A., & Ramsay, E. G. (2001). *Unaker* or Cherokee clay and its relationship to the 'Bow' porcelain manufactory. *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle* 17, 474-499.
- Ramsay, W. R. H., Gabszewicz, A., & Ramsay, E. G. (2003). The chemistry of 'A'-marked porcelain and its relation to the Edward Heylyn and Thomas Frye patent of 1744. *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, 18, 264-283.
- Ramsay, W. R. H., Hansen, J., & Ramsay, E. G. (2004a). An 'A'-marked covered porcelain bowl, Cherokee clay, and colonial America's contribution to the English porcelain industry. In R. Hunter (Ed.), *Ceramics in America*. Milwaukee, USA: Chipstone Foundation.
- Ramsay W. R. H., Hill, G., & Ramsay, E. G. (2004b). Re-creation of the 1744 Heylyn and Frye ceramic patent wares using Cherokee clay: Implications for raw materials, kiln conditions, and the earliest English porcelain production. *Geoarchaeology* 19, 635-655.
- Ramsay, E. G. & Ramsay, W. R. H. (2005). An 'A' marked porcelain tea canister: Implications for early English porcelain production. *World of Antiques and Art*, August 2005-January 2006, Australia: André Jaku, 76-79.
- Ramsay, W. R. H., Davenport, F. A., & Ramsay, E. G. (2006). The 1744 ceramic patent of Heylyn and Frye: 'Unworkable *unaker* formula' or landmark document in the history of English ceramics? *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Victoria* 118 (1), 11-34.
- Ramsay, W. R. H., & Ramsay, E. G. (2007b). A classification of Bow porcelain from first patent to closure: c. 1743-1774. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Victoria* 119 (1), 1-68.
- Ramsay, W. R. H., & Ramsay, E. G. (2008). A case for the production of the earliest commercial hard-paste porcelains in the English-speaking world by Edward Heylyn and Thomas Frye in about 1743. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Victoria* 120 (1), 236-256.
- Rock, J. (1999). The 'A' marked porcelain: Further evidence for the Scottish option. *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle* 17 (1), 69-78.
- Solon, M. L. (1903). *A Brief History of Old English Porcelain and its Manufactories*. Bemrose and Sons Ltd., London.

- Spero, S. (1989). Early blue and white Bow. *Antique Collecting, The Journal of the Antique Collectors' Club* 24, 62-67.
- Spero, S. (2001). *Simon Spero Exhibition 2001: English porcelain and enamels 1745-1791*. London: Privately published.
- Spero, S. (2005). *Simon Spero Exhibition 2005: English and French porcelain and enamels 1740-1785*. Ringwood, Hampshire, UK: Pardy and Sons Ltd.
- Spero, S. (2006). What we do not know about 18th century English porcelain. *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle* 19 (2), 315-342.
- Spero, S. (2008). *Simon Spero Exhibition 2008: The Faith and Dewayne Perry collection of early English porcelain*. Ringwood, Hampshire, UK: Pardy and Sons Ltd.
- Tait, H. (1959). Bow Porcelain 1744-1749: *A special exhibition of documentary material to commemorate the bi-centennial of the retirement of Thomas Frye, manager of the factory and 'inventor and first manufacturer of porcelain in England.'* London: Trustees of the British Museum.
- Tait, H. (1960). Some consequences of the Bow Special Porcelain Exhibition. *Apollo Magazine, Parts I-IV*.
- Tait, H. (1965). Bow. In R. J. Charleston (Ed.), *In English Porcelain 1745-1850*. London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 42-43.
- Valpy, N. (1987). A-marked porcelain: 'A' for Argyll? *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle* 13, 96-107.
- Watney, B. (1963). *English Blue and White Porcelain of the Eighteenth Century*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Watney, B. (1972). Liverpool porcelain of the Eighteenth Century. *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle* 8 (2).
- Watney, B. (1973). *English Blue and White Porcelain of the Eighteenth Century*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Williams, B. (1962). *The Wig Supremacy 1714-1760*. 2nd edition, Oxford.

Appendix 1. Letter from John Campbell to the Earl Granville (with permission of Lord Bath)

North Carolina May 13th 1749

My Lord,

The inclosed memorandam of fowls Birds and Walnut plank Craves your Lordship's Acceptance.

Mr. Halton intended a Wild cherry tree which (I) shall procure & send with some Earths, Minerals, Stones, and other things from the back Country, that may have something usefull in them. I wrote a few lines to advise of Col^o. Halton's death. I apprehend it of Consequence to your Lordship's Estate in this Country.

Permitt me to trouble your Lordship on the state of Commerce in your part of this Province as I have found it at my return from England.

Ocorocock is the only Inlett for Vessels of burthen to Albemarle, and is distant from Edenton fifty Leagues, the Channell's shoals permit but Eight feet water in many places. Before an Act of Assembly for Bouying and Staking the Channells, few Vessells from England, or Strangers unacquaint^d, durst Venture to this Country. I was the first who promoted the Tobacco Trade to London and by my Example have introduced a Considerable Concern from & to Whitehaven & Liverpool in that Branch. This can't be carryed on to advantage but in ships of Burthen. we are Oblidged to have Small Vessells to Carry part of the Ships Cargoes thro. the Shoals down to the Barr, before the Ships can compleat their Lading. When in England the Legeslature repealed the Navigation Act, whereby the bouys & directions for our Channells are all gone. The smallest Vessell Can't pass without a Pilot and Hazard of runing on shoals which occasions great delays & renders it impractable to give Vessells dispatch or gett them up the rivers as usuall.

An Act for Circulating paper called Proclamation Mony (of which I send a Bill) According to Act of Assembly – I have applyed for A Copy of that Act the Secretary refused it, and gave for answer, the Governour gave his orders not to lett any Copy be given to any person. I am informed this Paper is to be a lawfull Tender in all payments and Debts at Law.

Without enumerating any more discouragements or inconveniencys these have put a stop to Credit, and occasioned me to write my freinds to prevent any further advances in Trade to this Country. I have Setled a Trade and was to have some Slaves imedeatly from Africa, which would have been particularly serviceable and promoted Produce in this Country and prevented the purchase of Slaves in Virginia which Carryes away most part the Cash, our Beef, Pork, skins, & Tobacco sell in that Province for. New Bills will not purchase any of our Commoditys to make returns to our Correspondents. where they are a tender I expect little other money would be paid. I have seen by experience of the old Currency when it was plenty, noe Gold nor Silver was to be seen. as it became Scarce Cash introduced itself, and in some Countys no bills were received or Passed. For some years money was plenty in these counties, and in general in your Lordships Estate the people have Commodities will sell for money either at Home or in their Neighboring Country. Severall Northern Vessells this season have brought summs of Sliver & Gold to purchase provisions. In all the Plantations where Paper Money is Current, Gold & Silver is a Commodity & continually Exported none choose to give Bills of Exchange for Paper money as I have yett mett it was for Cash I could purchase as we must depend on Virginia for Bills of Exchange it is better to carry the Cash than to invest New in Bills into Commoditys to Carry thither as is not always to be done, and as much danger this Currency may depreciate as the former from four for one, to ten for one.

The people to the North in your Estate have not yett taken nor are willing to let this money become Current. they have paid allmost the whole Tax imposed for Sinking the old Bills & expect the same Calculation in their favour now, as they must pay in Commoditys for these Bills at an under value, those to the South at treble their Value. it's visible where the loss falls. if they doe pass we shall be as much at a loss at their expiration for Cash as now, and I am afraid your Lordship would find a great inconveny in the Consequence of this Money in a very short time. it will discourage Setlers from the northern Colonys to Move among us (the former Currency did I am assured), and Bills of Exchange not very readily be gott to Send you from Virginia nor Elsewhere, and why your Agents have been fond to promote the Circulation of these Bills is to me a Matter of speculation.

With great Concern I have acquainted with many Publick Proceedings in this Province. the design has been long formed to deprive your Tennants of any share in the Legislature, and all the Artifices, ingenious men are Capable of, have been employed this ten years past to render them Ojjects to bear the Blame of the misconduct of other Gentlemen. I was present in the Assemblies. no Law they have passed but were rejected when proposed by a full representation of the whole Country. now Calumny assists them to Cast the Blame on the very people who proposed the good Acts wanted in the Country but their view is to Confirm what they have done, as if out of good design, and when proper oppertunitys, slack the reins of Justice and give a loose to their premeditated schemes, Change your Lordships Tennants Pistoles as often as wanted & feed us on paper. Your Lordships Tennants seem very well disposed to pay their Rents, and would be exceeding glad to find Your Agents their friends that had the Interest of the Country in View – and acted with Candour between Your Lordship & the Tennants. their Satisfaction will be great to procure the friendship and Patronage of so great Personage, to Whom I Crave The Honour to be with greatest Submission and Respect,

My Lord,

Your Most Devoted

& Most Hum. Svt,

Jn^o. Campbell

[Endorsed:] R [received] 10th July

Appendix 2. Letter from Gabriel Johnston to the Earl Granville (with permission of Lord Bath)

Edenton

May 8, 1749

My Lord,

After the many protestations I have made of my sincere attachments to your Lordships service I look upon it as my Duty, to send you such private Hints as may promote your Interest in this province. In consequence of this I must inform you that Mr. Campbel who trades between this place and Liverpool makes a very bad use of the Access he has to your Lordship. Since he came in last he talks of a Letter you shewed him from Mr, Moseley and which he has represented in such a light, as has incensed Your Tennants to the Highest Degree against Him, so that I was once afraid, He would Have been Mobbed, and I am sure It will have a very bad effect on the Collection this Spring¹.

Mr. Halton Dyed at Edenton on the 15th of Last month. I appointed a proper person to administer upon his Estate, and charged Him before Mr. Moseley to begin by seperating the Cash, bills, and Every thing Else belonging to Your Lordship from Mr. Haltons private Estate and Deliver the same to Mr. Moseley and take His receipt for them, and left them to manage this affair together².

1 Collection of the rents. Edward Moseley and Col. Robert Halton were Earl Granville's agents in North Carolina.

2 The letter appears to be unfinished.

Table 1. List of Grantees and their Acreages in North Carolina, Registered on 14th January, 1735/36

Name	Details	Acreage
George Arnold	New Hanover on a branch of the Black River to westward of A. Hamilton's land	12,000
William Allison	ditto below James Huey's land	12,000
Arthur Dobbs	ditto	6,000
James Huey	ditto	12,000
Alexander Hamilton	ditto	6,000
Alex. Stewart	ditto	6,000

Table 2. List of 15 Grantees with their Respective Acreages in each of the 12 Tracts, North Carolina

Tract	Grantee	Acreage
1	John Selwyn of Matson, Gloucestershire & of Cleveland Court St. James's, London (an influential person who had the ear of the King and a close friend of Dobbs)	100,000
2	Arthur Dobbs	100,000
3	John Selwyn	100,000
4	Ambrose Harding of Dublin, counsellor	12,500
	Patrick Smith of Dublin, Ireland	12,500
	Jeremiah Joy	12,500
	John Campbell of Lazy Hill Plantation, Bertie County	12,500
	James McCulloch of Sarecta	25,000
	Mrs. Penelope McCulloch Jr. of Sarecta	12,500
	Henry Eustace McCulloch of Sarecta	12,500
5	Arthur Dobbs	100,000
6	Dr. William Houston of New Hanover County	12,500
	James Huey, merchant of London	50,000
	Henry Howson, merchant of London	12,500
	Alexander and Henry McCulloch (of Elk Marsh, Halifax Co.)	12,500
	Henry Slingsby, merchant of Barbados	12,500
7	Henry McCulloch of Sarecta	100,000
8	Henry McCulloch of Sarecta	75,000
	Dr. William Houston of New Hanover County	25,000
9,10,11, & 12	Henry McCulloch - 4 Tracts of 100,000 each	400,000
	Total	1,200,000

T

Table 3. Movements of John Campbell 1733-1745

Date	Location	Details	Possible visit to Bow
Nov term 1733	Bertie Co.	Petition by Campbell to keep a ferry from Gum Pt. to Edenton	Prior to early1733
May term 1734	Bertie Co.	Campbell appointed overseer of certain road maintenance	
1736	Bertie Co.	Registers his cattle mark	
Mid 1730s	NC - Britain	Promotes the tobacco trade to London-Liverpool-Whitehaven	Mid 1730s
14 Feb 1737/38	Bertie Co	130 acres on WS (west side?) Chowan River Henry Baker to J Campbell, 40pds	
18 Aug 1737	London	Pays sixpenny money to Greenwich Hospital, <i>Burrington</i>	Aug 1737
17 Jan 1738/39	London	Pays sixpenny money to Greenwich Hospital, <i>Mary & Margt</i>	Jan 1738/39
4 March 1738/39	Port Roanoke	<i>Mary & Margt</i> 3 casks of tobacco to Barbados, 500 weight, duty rated £2.1.8	
27 July 1739	Bertie Co	Witnesses deed from Henry Jarnagen to Benjamin Hill	
Nov - Feb 1739/40	London	Embargo placed on <i>Mary and Mariane</i> by British government	Nov-Feb 1739/40
4 Sept 1740	Edenton	Signs agreement to lease <i>Mary & Mariane</i> to Royal Navy till 30 Dec 1741	
24-25 Feb 1740/41	Bertie Co.	Witnesses three deeds and proves a fourth, one in county court	
18 March 1740/41	Bertie Co.	Petitions for 404 acres in Bertie Co. on both sides of swamp of Salmon Creek	
11 May 1741	Bertie Co.	Witnesses and proves deeds; makes return on estate of J Mackey to court	
~ June 1741	Port Roanoke	Swears he and P. Payne are owners of <i>Gurnesey</i> - 65 tons - built in Edenton	
July 1741	Chowan Co	Surety for Dorothy Shervin's tavern bond	
July 1741	Edenton	Surety for Vice-Admiralty Court bond of Samuel Williams	
25 Aug 1741	Chowan Co.	Witnesses a deed Samuel Saban to Samuel Gregory	
Nov 1741	Bertie Co.	Proves three deeds in county court	
Pre-Dec 1741	Edenton	Registers sloop <i>Guernsey</i> at Port Roanoke	
4 Dec 1741	Chowan Co. Atlantic Ocean	Makes deed to Timothy Lafitte for property	
29 April 1742	Ocean	Campbell and <i>Mary & Mary-Ann</i> captured and taken to St Sebastian	~June-July 1742?
10 Sept 1742	Bertie Co.	Back in North Carolina and witnesses a deed (T. Williams to J. Butler)	
7 Feb 1742/43	Bertie Co.	Witnesses will of Owen MacDaniell. Witnesses deed from Williams to Butler	
May 1743	Bertie Co.	Proves will of Owen MacDaniell in county court	
27 July 1743	Edenton	Granted 600 acres at Chowan	
10 Aug 1743	Bertie Co.	Witnesses a deed between John Hill and Abraham Herring	
23 Aug 1743	Bertie Co.	Witnesses bill of sale from Daniel Hough to Benjamin Hill	
25 Aug 1743	Chowan Co.	Witnesses a deed between Jones to Benbury	
17 Nov 1743	Chowan Co.	Petitions for 300 acres in Chowan County joining Chowan River	
18 Nov 1743	Chowan Co.	Takes an articulated apprentice mariner	
Jan 1743/44	Chowan Co.	Surety for Peter Payne as guardian for Elizabeth Slaughter	
11 Jan 1743/44	Chowan Co.	Makes deed at Edenton to Joseph Jones for Bertie 234 acres on SS Cuttawitskey	
14 Feb 1743/44	Bertie Co.	Witnesses a deed Jame Stewart to Benjamin Hill	
31 March 1744	Edenton	Proves deed before the Chief Justice (Jones to Benbury)	
April 1744	Chowan Co.	Petitions the county court but petition rejected	
May 1744	Bertie Co.	Proves deed witnessed on 14 Feb 1744 in county court, J Stewart to B Hill	
July 1744	Chowan Co.	Appointed auditor of sale J. Anderson's estate, report back at next hearing	
Aug 1744	New Bern	Burgess in General Assembly	
Oct 1744	Chowan Co.	Petitions county court in relation to two runaway indentured servants	
15 Nov - 4 Dec 1744	New Bern	Burgess in General Assembly which was sitting during these dates	

8 - 20 April 1745	New Bern	Burgess in General Assembly which was sitting during these dates	
April - May 1745	Bertie Co.?	Writes letter to A. Dobbs in which he mentions Bow and its white clay	
Sept 1745	New Bern	Burgess in General Assembly which was sitting during this month	
Oct term	Chowan Co.	Appointed auditor with A. Blackall to examine accounts of J Anderson	
6 Oct 1745	Bertie Co.	Writes and sends advertisement to the <i>Virginia Gazette</i>	

Table 4. Primary source documents which most likely refer to early Bow porcelain production

Document	Reference	Comment
1744 patent of Heylyn and Frye, 6th December, 1744	HM Stationery Office (1856)	Specifies Heylyn and Frye, raw materials, method of manufacture, and inferred location based on the domicile of the patentees. This document is signed by five people and dated
William Cookworthy letter (27th July, 1745)	Daniels (2007)	Specifies seeing China Ware <i>of their making</i> of which the critical component was China Earth derived from the back of Virginia
Journal Book of The Royal Society of London (10th February, 1742/43)	Mountford (1969)	Specifies that Thomas Bryand exhibited porcelain which was high-firing and resistant to thermal shock - properties typical of hard-paste
Vincennes Privilege (24th July, 1745)	Hurlbutt (1926)	Specifies a new English concern whose porcelain compares with Meissen because of its composition, here assumed to mean ingredients
Robert Dossie account (1758)	Dossie (1758)	Specifies a concern near London, not near Gorgie, Staffordshire etc, with an interest in china clay found on the back of Carolina
William Tomlinson Jnr. letter to Richard Howe II of Aspley Guise (14th Dec, 1744)	Bridge and Thornton (2006)	Records the granting of a ceramic patent to manufacture chinaware made from fine earth from Carolina and the involvement of Aldermen
Jno. Campbell letter (~April-May, 1745)	This paper	Specifies Bow, its chinaware, and its clay comparable to white clay found in Edgecombe County, NC. Author regards Bow to be a 'bubble'