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ABSTRACT

CERAMIC CONSUMPTION IN A BOSTON IMMIGRANT TENEMENT

August 2016

Andrew J. Webster, B.A., University of Notre Dame
M.A., University of Massachusetts Boston

Directed by Dr. Christa Beranek

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Boston’s North End became home to thousands of European immigrants, mostly from Ireland and Italy. The majority of these immigrant families lived in crowded tenement apartments and earned their wages from low-paying jobs such as manual laborers or store clerks. The Ebenezer Clough House at 21 Unity Street was originally built as a single-family colonial home in the early eighteenth century but was later repurposed as a tenement in the nineteenth century. In 2013, the City of Boston Archaeology Program excavated the rear lot of the Clough House, recovering 36,465 artifacts, including 4,298 ceramic sherds, across 14 site-wide contexts. One context, the main midden, has been interpreted as a multi-use household trash deposit dating from the 1870s to the 1910s, during which the tenement was home to a rotation of over 100 working-class families, most of them immigrants. This project couples ceramic analysis with in-depth archival research to illuminate the consumption
strategies of Boston’s immigrant working class. I conclude that tenants primarily used
decorated but mismatched and older ceramic ware types, valuing thrift and prioritizing
family needs while consuming differently than their middle-class counterparts.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This project aims to further our understanding of the history of Boston’s North End neighborhood, and more specifically, the lives and beliefs of immigrant tenants residing in that neighborhood in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It aims to understand the consumption strategies of Boston’s immigrant working class to determine their values and priorities. To accomplish this, I use archival research and ceramic analysis to compare the consumption patterns of the Catholic immigrant working class to those of the Victorian, Protestant middle class and other working-class assemblages in Massachusetts (Beaudry 1987; Charles and Openo 1987; Beaudry, Cook and Mrozowski 1991; Elia 1997; Dudek 1999; Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001; Stevens and Ordoñez 2005; Beaudry 2006; Mrozowski 2006; Heitert et al. 2014), New York (Wall 1991; Fitts 1999; Brighton 2001; Yamin 2001; Wall 1999; Brighton 2011), and California (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992; Walker 2008; Yentsch 2011) using materials recovered from the City of Boston Archaeology Program’s 2013 excavation of the Clough House at 21 Unity Street in Boston’s North End. I conclude that tenants primarily used decorated but mismatched and older ceramic ware types, valuing thrift and
prioritizing family needs while consuming differently than their middle-class counterparts.

Archaeological excavation at the Clough House occurred in May and June of 2013 under the direction of Joseph Bagley, Boston City Archaeologist. Excavations consisted of 10 1x1 meter units placed to mitigate impact from upcoming path construction (Bagley 2013a). Once excavations had been completed, the individual strata recorded in the field were consolidated into 14 site-wide contexts, of which five date to the nineteenth century or earlier. A single deposit, referred to as the main fill, dominates the site, but contains material from c. 1711-1870s, when the backyard was dug up and the drainage system replaced, possibly in conjunction with the construction of a three-story addition on the rear of the house. A second layer, the clay layer, appears similar to the main fill, and may represent redeposited glacial till or a destroyed privy. Two more layers, the layer adjacent to the Jane Franklin House and the mixed C layer are some of the oldest and most intact deposits at the site, although their assemblages are quite small. Finally, the main midden layer is a trash midden which caps the fill and dates from the 1870s to 1910s. I conducted ceramic analysis on each of these five contexts, with extra emphasis placed on the main midden as its date range matched my research question and time period.

When I began this project at the Boston City Archaeology Lab, the dig at the Clough House site had only recently been completed. As such, most artifacts had not been cataloged, the deposits were not fully dated, and only preliminary archival research had been compiled. In order to perform an analysis of ceramic consumption at the site, I
performed archival research, artifact cataloguing, deposit dating, and ceramic vessel analysis. Once I understood the history of the site and its stratigraphy better, I completed a further analysis on one site context, the main midden, in order to understand how the consumption patterns of working-class immigrants in Boston reflected their values and priorities by comparing them to other ceramic consumption patterns from working, middle, and upper classes during the second half of the nineteenth century.

The nineteenth century saw the largest increase in the number and scale of urban settlements in all of human history (Bairoch 1988). Urban archaeology contributes to our understanding of these cities on both the micro and macro scales. At the micro level, archaeology in cities is particularly adept at studying what life was like for the city dwellers, including those of absent from the historical record. At the macro level, the archaeology of cities can be used to illuminate patterns in the overall cityscape, studying things like architecture and landscape studies, showing how neighborhoods change through time (Rothschild and Wall 2014). Current social memory often identifies certain city neighborhoods with one dominant ethnic group, but this oversimplifies the fact that cities are multicultural entities with complex class, ethnic, and social relations (Mullins 2004). The archaeological study of nineteenth- and twentieth-century cities can help us understand the complexity of cities past while informing urban policy of cities present (Mrozowski 2008).

Urban archaeology brings with it several methodological challenges. Stratigraphy is often very complex, and deposits may be very deep or significantly disturbed. Also, the high visibility of urban archaeology heightens the importance of public outreach efforts.
Most of the archaeological research into urban working-class life in the nineteenth century comes from New York or California, with less from Massachusetts, with the notable exception of Beaudry, Mrozowski, and others’ study of the boarding houses at Lowell (Beaudry 1987, Mrozowski 2006). Only a handful of studies highlight the working-class experience in nineteenth-century Boston (Charles and Openo 1987; Elia 1997; Dudek 1999; Stevens and Ordoñez 2005; Beaudry 2006; Poulsen 2011; Heitert et al. 2014). Due to the high mobility of the residents in the nineteenth-century North End, urban trash deposits cannot be correlated with one specific household or family, even if they are associated with only one back lot. The varying lengths of occupancy for North End tenants creates another challenge for archaeologists—the refuse from the many short-term tenants may act as noise which masks the consumption patterns of the long-term tenants (Dudek 1999). These types of deposits are relevant but often overlooked by archaeologists in favor of deposits with closer association to a specific household, ignoring the fundamental variety in urban household types (Voss 2008:48). Since all inhabitants in the Clough House during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were in similar socioeconomic situations, the analysis speaks to patterns on a broader scale: the immigrant working class in Boston’s North End tenements.

Archival Research Methods

Previous archival research of deed transfers research by Dr. Christa Beranek and City Archaeologist Joseph Bagley identified the owners of 21 Unity Street over time (Suffolk Registry of Deeds [SRD] 1711-1742; Beranek 1999; Bagley 2013b). However,
beginning with the house’s early nineteenth-century transformation into tenement housing, the owner did not live on the property, so the deed records did not reveal anything about the site’s inhabitants during that time. To supplement this research, I transcribed and analyzed tax records and federal censuses obtained at the City of Boston Archives, the Rare Books and Manuscripts Department at Boston Public Library, and online at Ancestry.com (Boston Taking Books [BTB] 1780-1817; United States Bureau of the Census [USBC] 1790-1940; Boston Valuation Books [BVB] 1818-1821; Boston Poll Tax Records [BPTR] 1822-1920). The poll tax records show the names and occupations of every adult male living in the house for most years between 1780 and 1918 (Appendix 1). Federal censuses provide more information about every inhabitant of the house at ten-year intervals, beginning in 1790 (Appendix 2). The Boston City Directories list the later inhabitants of the Clough House until the early 1960s (Boston City Directory 1960) In addition, I conducted a search of baptismal records for the Old North Church and three area Catholic churches but was unsuccessful at determining the church enrollment of the inhabitants (Massachusetts Historical Society 1569-1997; Archdiocese of Boston Sacramental Registers 1798-1997). All of this demographic information is key to understanding which groups of people lived in the Clough House and how this changed over time, and is presented in Chapter 2.

Outline of the Thesis

Chapter 2 discusses the archival and archaeological background to the history of the North End and the Clough House in particular. Ebenezer Clough, who built the
original two-story single-family home between 1711 and 1715 as a residence for himself and his family, was a master bricklayer. For the next century, the building was owned by only two distinct families: the Clough-Brown family, and the Pierce-Roby family. The early nineteenth century brought the emergence of tenement apartments—multi-storied buildings shared by multiple families. Around 1808, a third story was added to the Clough House and the building transformed from an owner-occupant house into an absentee-landlord tenement. In total, over 180 different middle- and working-class families lived in the Clough House tenement between 1810 and 1917.

For most of the nineteenth century until the 1870s, tenants at the Clough House were primarily Anglo-American, until a three-story apartment was added to the rear of the house around 1874. By the 1880s, the house was primarily but not exclusively home to first- and second-generation Irish working-class immigrants in addition to Anglo-American workers. This lasted until the late 1890s, when Italian immigrants moved into the North End. After a period of cohabitation, competition, and instability between the two ethnic groups, the Irish ultimately moved out and the North End became the Little Italy that we know today (Green and Donahue 1979). Tenement housing as experienced by both Irish and Italian immigrants was extremely crowded and very unsanitary, and as a result, diseases such as typhus fever, tuberculosis, and cholera afflicted immigrant populations on a large scale (Puleo 2007; Brighton 2008; Linn 2008). At the Clough House, most immigrant men found work as unskilled manual laborers while the adult women kept house and took care of their children.
Chapter 3 covers the theoretical framework related to how historical archaeologists study class and consumption, especially among working- and middle-class groups in the later nineteenth century, using a case study approach. During the nineteenth century, members of the Victorian middle and upper classes expressed their class identity in many ways, including the display and use of matching ceramics, especially teaware (Wall 1991). These cultural practices became known as the Cult of Domesticity and were largely followed by the upper and middle classes, but the working class may have constructed their own consumption patterns based on different values (Wall 1999).

Chapter 4 presents the methods and data used for the study. Five contexts from the Clough House excavations were analyzed, including dating through ceramics and small finds. A vessel analysis was then completed for each of the five contexts. These analyses revealed that most contexts dated to long stretches of time in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, whereas the main midden was the most tightly dated context, dating from the 1870s until the 1910s.

The fifth and final chapter presents the results of further analysis of the ceramics from the main midden. The results show that the working-class tenants primarily used older and mismatched ceramics, with a few fancier pieces as well. I then compare the Clough House assemblage to middle-class “Victorian” assemblages from the same time period (Wall 1991; Fitts 1999; Wall 1999; Brighton 2001; Walker 2008; Brighton 2011; and Yentsch 2011) and working-class assemblages (Charles and Openo 1987; Beaudry, Cook and Mrozowski 1991; Elia 1997; Dudek 1999; Wall 1999; Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001; Brighton 2001; Yamin 2001; Beaudry 2006; Mrozowski 2006; Walker 2008;
Brighton 2011; Heitert et al. 2014), all of which I discussed in Chapter 3. I conclude that the Clough House tenants primarily bought their mismatched and older ceramics secondhand from junk stores. This consumption strategy showcases their values of thriftiness and family well-being, as it represents a choice to prioritize the well-being of their immediate families and perhaps their extended relatives abroad over any adherence to a dominant ideology favored by the American middle class.

This study adds an example from Boston’s working class to the national discussion on the material aspects of class formation and consumption habits, which has primarily been focused in other areas. It also reveals the nuances of a neighborhood in flux, in which individuals from many countries often lived under the same roof, rather than the popularized narrative of successive ethnic enclaves. Finally, it brings to light over a century of Boston’s heritage concerning the immigrant and American working classes, a story that is equally important as the city’s colonial roots.
CHAPTER 2

SITE BACKGROUND

The Clough House and Its Occupants

The Ebenezer Clough House is located at 21 Unity Street in Boston’s North End neighborhood, on the campus of the Old North Church (Figures 1, 2, and 3). It was built as a two-story single-family home between 1711 and 1715 by Ebenezer Clough, a master bricklayer and one of the builders of Old North Church (Massachusetts Historical Commission 1990). Over the next three centuries, the household and its surrounding neighborhood went through a number of architectural and demographic changes. The most notable of these was the transformation of the building from a single-family owner-occupant home in the eighteenth century to tenement apartments in around 1807, which included the construction of a third story to house the multiple working-class families now living in the building (BTB 1807-1809). In the 1870s, a rear apartment was added to the house to accommodate the high number of Irish and Italian immigrants arriving in Boston and taking low-wage labor-intensive jobs (BPTR 1874). This addition remained until the 1960s, when it was demolished and the house was renovated for preservation (Massachusetts Historical Commission 1990).
In the eighteenth century, the building was owned and occupied by four total generations of two distinct middle-class families: The Clough-Brown family from 1715 to 1756 and the Pierce-Roby family from 1758 to 1807. Notably, the property was transferred from parent to daughter in both cases.

The story of the Clough House began in 1711, when Ebenezer Clough purchased a plot of undeveloped land known as “Bennett’s Pasture” from Susanna Love and Solomon Townsend (SRD 1711:26.72). Upon it, he created what is now Unity Street and built the house between 1711 and 1715, although he may not have lived there himself. (Massachusetts Historical Commission 1990; Beranek 1999; Bagley 2013b). Deed records (SRD 1741:62.158; 1742:67.26A) continue to show that shortly before his death,
the property was passed to his daughter Elizabeth and her husband John Brown, a

blacksmith. The Clough-Brown family lived in the house until 1756, when it was purchased by Joseph Pierce, a mariner, and his wife, Sarah Cruft Pierce. Two years later, Pierce died, and Sarah married Henry Roby. The Pierce-Roby family lived in the house from 1756 until 1807. It appears that Sarah was the mother of many children—the 1790 census shows ten people living in the house from a single family (USBC 1790). According to poll tax data and census records, (USBC 1790; BTB 1780-1807) Henry kept shop as a glazier, or window glass fitter, until he grew frail and retired. His adult son

Figure 2: Location of the Clough House in Boston on Bonner's 1723 map, with detail in the lower left. Note Old North Church directly behind the Clough House. Map from Levanthal Map Center, Boston Public Library.
Joseph Roby worked as a scribe and then later a merchant partner for J. White & Company, which sold paper, pens, and other writing implements. He never married.

Figure 3: Location of 21 Unity Street on the present-day USGS base map. Boston's shoreline has dramatically changed from the eighteenth century due to many landfilling projects.

By the early nineteenth century, the processes of capitalist industrialization coupled with Boston’s position as a shipping hub created an influx of low-income laborers in need of housing. This led to the emergence of tenement apartments—multi-storied buildings shared by multiple families. We know from historic ward maps that some tenements were of new construction, but often older, colonial homes were repurposed to serve as tenement housing, as was the case at the Clough House (Woods
Tenements created from single-family homes often lacked appropriate amenities for multiple families (Sutherland 1973).

When Henry Roby died in 1807, the Clough House was passed to his wife Sarah’s two daughters, Sarah and Mary, and their husbands, Samuel Gore and Moses Grant, the latter of whom was a participant in the Boston Tea Party (Bagley 2013b). The building was vacant for a few years as Gore and Grant transformed it from an owner-occupied house to a tenement, adding a third story (Figure 4) (Nylander et al. 1986). The house received its first tenants in 1810, establishing the site’s tenement period, which lasted until the mid-twentieth century (BTB 1810; BCD 1960). Whereas the eighteenth century was characterized by two middle-class, landowning families living at the site for multiple generations, the nineteenth century was characterized by demographic instability and population growth. One way of discerning this instability is to look at Boston’s poll tax records (BTB 1780-1817; BVB 1818-1821; BPTR 1822-1920) which list the names, ages, and occupations of every adult male living at a particular address in a given year.

Figure 4: The Clough House in before (left) and after (right) the addition of a third story around 1810. Figure by Joseph Bagley, based on Cummings and Overby 1961.
Although this demographic information is far from comprehensive, the poll tax records help fill in the ten-year gap between the more detailed federal censuses. Figure 5 uses poll tax records to visualize the instability in the Clough House’s population by plotting how many adult males lived in the Clough House each year. Note the relative stability before the building’s 1810 transformation to a tenement compared to the high variability after this time. The transformation of the house into a tenement and the addition of a third story also had a profound effect on the building’s population over time. Federal Census information presented in Figures 6 and 7 confirms that there were many more people living in the house during the tenement period than previously by showing the number of inhabitants and families every ten years. The census information for both inhabitants and families shows a similar trend in population levels: an initial peak around 1830 and a more pronounced and sustained population increase in the 1870s, when a three-story addition was put on the rear of the house. The poll tax records (Figure 5) confirm this expansion.

In total, over 180 different middle- and working-class families lived in the Clough House tenement between 1810 and 1917, when the poll tax records become less detailed. Most of these families stayed in the Clough House for only one or two years at a time, often moving to other tenements in the North End or what is now Boston’s financial district, rarely staying at one place for long (BTB 1810-1817; USBC 1810-1910; BVB 1818-1821; BPTR 1822-1920). Consequently, the Clough House tenement had a very high occupant turnover rate, although a handful of families remained in the house for longer tenures. Please see Appendices 1 and 2 for more specific demographic
Figure 5: Number of adult males at 21 Unity Street from 1780 until 1917. (Source: BTB 1780-1817; USBC 1790-1910; BVB 1818-1821; BPTR 1822-1917)
information, including the complete poll tax and census records for the property. What follows is a summary of the demographic information by decade.
In the 1810s, the new tenement grew in population from one family of four people in 1810 to two families of 14 total people in 1820, with several other families moving in and out between these census periods. Poll tax records show that many men were employed in businesses having to do with ships and furniture—common occupations at the house include mariner, seaman, shipwright, sail maker, carpenter, and upholsterer—but there are also clerks, block makers (for a printing press), and a Custom House officer. All seem to be of Anglo-American descent. By 1820, a pair of jewelers lived in the Clough House, although their shop was in another part of the city. The 1820s saw a similar pattern of occupations, including skilled craftsmen and government workers. By the early 1830s, the population in the house reached a new high, with 23 individuals from five different families sharing the house. Many men at this time worked as bakers or cabinet makers. Poll tax records for the neighborhood indicate these conditions were becoming typical for the North End as industrialization transformed the neighborhood from single-family homes to rows of rental properties and tenement apartments. The census records from the early nineteenth century show that these men are almost entirely all married, many with children (USBC 1820; 1830).

In 1835, Sarah Pierce Gore and Mary Pierce Grant, now widowed, sold the property to William Dillaway, a wealthy shipwright. Dillaway owned and managed many properties in the area and lived on nearby Salem Street. The 1840s and 1850s documents continue to show members of similar professions, including a tailor, grocer, shoemakers, mariners, shipbuilders, painters, machinists, and a Custom House officer. All were of Anglo-American descent, with the exception of one possible Irishman and one German.
sea captain, neither of whom lived in the house for more than three years. During the
1860s, the house’s population continued to grow, and the male occupations included a
type-caster, sailmaker, watchman, driver, mason, furniture maker, as well as clerks, and
shoemakers.

Even though much of the surrounding neighborhood was home to newly-arrived
Irish immigrants starting in the late 1840s, the Clough continued to be occupied primarily
by Anglo-Americans until the early 1870s, when the building became home to a mixture
of Irish and Anglo-American working-class families. This can be seen through an
analysis of surnames in the poll tax records and places of birth in the census data. Likely
due to the housing demand caused by the influx of immigrants to Boston’s working-class
neighborhoods, a three-story apartment was added to the rear of the house around 1874.
By the 1880s, the poll tax records and census data show that the house was primarily but
not exclusively home to first- and second-generation Irish working-class immigrants,
along with Anglo-American workers.

**Irish Immigrants**

*An Ghorta Mór*, Irish for “The Great Hunger” and variously known as the Irish
Potato Famine or the Great Famine, was a series of repeated potato crop failures between
1845 and 1852. During this time, the potato blight caused by the fungus *Phytophthora
infestans* repeatedly destroyed the vast majority of potato harvests on the island (Meagher
2005). The blight was particularly devastating in Ireland’s rural western and southwestern
provinces--Connacht and Munster, respectively (Miller 1985). Far from urban centers,
most rural poor in these areas worked as tenant farmers for British landlords, subsisting almost entirely on potatoes (Orser 2004). When the blight hit Ireland, starvation and disease ensued on a catastrophic level. Many landlords forcefully evicted tenants from their homes when they could no longer afford rent (Dolan 2008). Relief programs run by the British Crown offered minor aid, but ultimately were inadequate for a disaster of this scope (Donnelly 2001). Of Ireland’s estimated eight million citizens, approximately one million perished and two million emigrated between the years of 1845 and 1855, mostly to the United States but also to Canada, Great Britain, and Australia (Miller 1985). These events paved the way for a century of emigration, creating one of the world’s largest diasporas: as many as 4.5 million more emigrants left Ireland between 1851 and 1921 (Orser 2004, Dolan 2008).

Prior to the 1830s, Irish immigrants to the United States were largely Protestant, with many coming from Ulster in what is today primarily Northern Ireland. By contrast, those hardest hit by the Great Hunger were often poor, Catholic tenant farmers in Ireland’s remote and rural west and southwest (Brighton 2009). The journey over was not easy or inexpensive—many emigrants relied on assistance from family, friends, or landlords. During the Famine, the landlords were technically responsible for funding public works projects to relieve their tenants, but some thought it cheaper and simpler to pay for their tenants’ emigration costs, clearing their land for the increasingly profitable dairy industry (Hickey 2002; Slater and McDonough 2005). Remittances from friends and family in the new places of settlement provided another form of assisted emigration, as some members of the diaspora could afford to contribute to a relative’s voyage.
Favorable reports from American cities painted the New World as a land of freedom and opportunity, where jobs were ripe for the taking in both urban centers and rural farms (Miller 1985). In reality, the Irish faced a great deal of hardship in the new places of settlement, but they generally had food to eat and some hope of upward mobility and self-realization.

Before the 1860s, when the introduction of steamships reduced the transatlantic voyage to a little less than two weeks, emigrants endured five to six weeks in small, poorly constructed boats. Overcrowding and unsanitary conditions coupled with insufficient food supplies and the spread of disease meant that many emigrants did not survive the journey, and the ships soon became known as “coffin ships” for their high mortality rates (Dolan 2008:77).

The vast majority of Irish immigrants to America landed in New York City, although some landed in Boston, Philadelphia, and New Orleans. From their ports of entry, the Irish spread out, most choosing to settle in established Irish communities in urban centers. In 1850, 80% of these were in New England and the mid-Atlantic, with other notable Irish communities taking shape in Chicago, St. Louis, and California. (Dolan 2008).

Most immigrants arrived with very little money and took jobs wherever they could find them. Men generally worked as manual laborers, but a few found employment as semi-skilled workers such as artisans or shopkeepers (Miller 1985). Single women often worked in textile mills, the needletrades, or as domestic servants. Married women rarely worked outside the home but instead took care of their children, managed
household finances, and sometimes ran a side business as a laundress or boarding house
keeper out of their homes (Griggs 2001, Brighton 2009). Due to their Catholic faith,
immigrant status, and supposedly barbarous culture, the Irish were often discriminated
against in the job market, housing market, and social circles (Brighton 2011).

In Irish immigrant neighborhoods across the country, living conditions were
aborrent. In Boston, as in many other American cities, the Irish lived in crowded
tenement apartments, mostly in the North End and Fort Hill neighborhoods. Many of
these tenements, like the Clough House, had once been inhabited by the upper classes of
society, but the influx of working-class citizens and immigrants radically transformed
these neighborhoods. Green and Donahue (1979) note:

“living conditions in these ghettos were wretched. Old houses and warehouses
were divided to make tenements. In addition, the lots of houses, once inhabited by
the bourgeoisie, were filled with frame dwellings that crowded conditions. Once
the home of prosperous merchants and self-sufficient artisans, the North End
deteriorated into makeshift flats and polluted alleys” (43).

By 1855, the North End was the most densely populated neighborhood in all of
Boston, with many immigrants living in dark and damp cellar apartments (Green and
Donahue 1979). These cramped and unsanitary conditions were typical of many Irish
neighborhoods across the country, and as a result, typhus fever, tuberculosis, and cholera
afflicted Irish populations on a large scale. (Brighton 2008, Linn 2008). In 1849, during
the height of a devastating cholera epidemic that was sweeping through Boston, the city’s Committee on Internal Health wrote a report on the living conditions in an Irish working-class neighborhood in what is now the heart of Boston’s financial district. The report claims:

“During their visits the last summer, your Committee were witnesses of scenes too painful to be forgotten, and yet too disgusting to be related here. It is sufficient to say, that this whole district is a perfect hive of human beings, without comforts and mostly without common necessaries; in many cases, huddled together like brutes, without regard to sex, or age, or sense of decency; grown men and women sleeping together in the same apartment, and sometimes wife and husband, brothers and sisters, in the same bed. Under such circumstances, self-respect, forethought, all high and noble virtues soon die out, and sullen indifference and despair, or disorder, intemperance and utter degradation reign supreme” (Boston Committee on Internal Health 1849:12-13).

While this report presents a chilling representation of the Irish living conditions in Boston, it also showcases nineteenth-century attitudes towards the connections between poverty, the environment, and morality.

In the nineteenth century, poverty was not seen as the result of unequal opportunity under a capitalist system, but was attributed to the moral failure of the individual (Ward 1989). In their inner city neighborhoods, the working classes were seen
as morally isolated from “superior” moral influences of the upper classes, leading them to fall prey to the temptations of sin, which was seen to fester in the decrepit environmental conditions of the tenement districts (Ward 1989; Upton 1992). With germ theory yet to be widely accepted, the high mortality rates of immigrants and the working class due to diseases like cholera were linked to a perceived lack of morality on those who died (Upton 1992). Of course, in reality, the widespread epidemics in the working-class neighborhoods of American cities were due to poor sanitation, drainage, and overcrowding. The poor lived in these areas because it was all they could afford, and there were initially few enforced regulations for tenements or protections for tenants. The blame for these environmental conditions fell squarely on the shoulders of the poor, and early movements for reform focused on changing the environmental conditions of these districts in order to set free the working classes from their immoral influence (Ward 1989). This line of thinking is clearly visible in the Boston Committee on Internal Health’s report.

It was not until the mid-1870s that the Clough House became home to working-class families of Irish descent, in addition to many Anglo-American tenants. This was atypical of a North End tenement—the City Archives show that most buildings in the neighborhood housed Irish tenants starting in the 1850s or 1860s. In the case of the Clough House, this demographic change seems to have coincided with the addition of a three-story rear apartment in 1874 (Figure 8). For the North End, this was not a clear transition to an Irish neighborhood; in fact, the house was never home to 100% Irish-born tenants. Nonetheless, in the 1870s and ‘80s, the Clough House was home to a mixture of
Irish and Anglo-American working-class families. As this was a few decades after the initial wave of Irish immigration around 1850, some of the tenants with Irish heritage were first-generation Irish Americans. The working class in Boston was incredibly mobile, and the Irish were no exception—most Irish families in the Clough House stayed only a year or two before moving, often to another nearby tenement.

These Irish families often lived in the rear apartments created by the 1874 addition. In the nineteenth-century urban Northeast, some landowners built ramshackle tenements in the lots behind repurposed colonial homes specifically for immigrant workers as a way to increase their rental income (Woods 1902; Kelleher 2015). As the influx of working-class immigrants continued, more and more multi-story tenements were constructed on all available land. These buildings filled up land plots, turned yards into alleyways, and resulted in a neighborhood of dimly lit and poorly ventilated dwellings (Sutherland 1973). The owners of the tenements rarely lived on-site and acted solely as landlords. Since a landlord’s primary goal was to collect the highest possible rent from the property with the least cost, urban tenements across the country became overcrowded, structurally unsound, and unsanitary (Orser 2011).

Both the poll tax records (BPTR 1874) and an 1874 map (Figure 9) provide evidence for my dating the addition to 1874. Beginning in the 1874 poll tax records and continuing thereafter, the word “rear” appears next to the names of certain inhabitants, suggesting that their families lived in the rear apartment. Also, the 1874 map from G.M. Hopkins & Co. shows the shape of the building as it would have appeared with the rear apartment attached (Figure 9). The second and third stories of this rear addition abutted
the adjacent building at 23 Unity Street, leaving a dark and narrow passageway from Unity Street to the rear entrance. (Cummings and Overby 1961). The rear addition was connected to the original building on all three floors via a door to the stairway (Cummings and Overby 1961). The main apartment consisted of three stories and a cellar. All floors, including the cellar, were made up of three small rooms, with one room on each floor possessing a fireplace for heating and cooking (Cummings and Overby 1961; Beranek 1999). Although it must have been very dark and damp, the cellar was most likely used as another living space for immigrant tenants, as was common practice during this time (Sutherland 1973; Green and Donahue 1979). While the architecture of the Clough House is well-documented, it is currently unknown how the various rooms were divided among tenants and families, aside from the front-rear designation on some census and poll tax records.
Figure 8: The rear apartment (outlined) c. 1961 (Cummings and Overby 1961)
Figure 9: The Clough House and vicinity in 1874. The shape of the house (in white) shows the new addition protruding from the bottom-left. Note how William Dillaway is shown as owning many nearby properties. Map by G.M. Hopkins & Co., from Ward Maps LLC.
Figure 10: The Clough House floor plan (Cummings and Overby 1961)
**Snapshot: The Clough House in 1880**

After the 1874 addition, the Clough House’s population increased dramatically. While the Clough House was home to 12 people in 1870, by 1880 it had 22 people, with over 40 families coming and going over the decade. With this much mobility and demographic change occurring, it can be difficult to characterize the neighborhood during this volatile time. The 1880 census presents a picture of the Clough House and the overall North End neighborhood during the beginning of my study’s time frame. I have decided here to present the inhabitants of the Clough House who are listed on the 1880 census, focusing primarily on two Irish families: the McLaughlins and the Colemans. While every family story is unique, the McLaughlins’ story is representative of the many Irish immigrant families who came to the New World during the Great Hunger, and the Colemans are notable for their uncharacteristically long tenure as tenants in the Clough House. To create the following narratives, I synthesized information taken primarily from decennial U.S. Censuses and the Massachusetts State Census accessed online on Ancestry.com, using the poll tax records to fill in the gaps for the years in-between (USBC 1850-1900; BPTR 1861-1892; Massachusetts State Census 1855; 1865) For smaller details, I looked at the birth, death, and marriage records for the state of Massachusetts and the city of Boston, also accessed on Ancestry.com (Massachusetts Birth Records 1856-1866; Boston Births, Marriages, and Deaths Records 1858; Massachusetts Town and Vital Records 1860-1885; Massachusetts Marriage Records 1879-1890; Massachusetts Death Records 1880-1894). The vignettes below are presented
The story of the McLaughlin family began when Bernard “Barney” McLaughlin (b. 1825/6) married Alice Kane (b. 1826/7) in Ireland. They had a son, John, in 1849, and the three came to America sometime between 1849 and 1855, when their second son, Bernard Jr. was born in Boston’s seventh ward—the same notorious neighborhood that the Boston Committee on Internal Health condemned as a “perfect hive of human beings.” Barney Sr. could not read or write and worked as a laborer, while his wife Alice kept house. In time, the couple had at least nine children, some of whom died young. The family never seemed to stay in one place for very long, but moved around from tenement to tenement, first in Ward 7 and later in the North End. Their nine children were born at six different addresses, so by the time they arrived at the Clough House in 1880, it was at least the seventh tenement they had occupied in 25 to 30 years. By this time, three of their nine children had already passed away—Dennis and Alice Jr. as young children and John of tuberculosis at age 25. The three surviving older children had moved out, leaving three to live with their parents in the tenement. In the 1880 census, Barney was 54 and still worked as a physical laborer while Alice, 53, stayed at home. Thomas McLaughlin was 19 and worked as a butcher. His sister Rebecca was 17 and worked as a sales girl, and Charles, the youngest sibling, was 12 years old and still in school. The McLaughlins only stayed at the Clough House for four years, before moving on to presumably another tenement. Their story is one of mobility, personal loss, and working hard to make ends meet.
At the same time, the Coleman family resided in a different apartment at the rear of the Clough House. Dennis and William Coleman lived in the Clough House with their mother Margaret from 1876 to 1891, easily one of the longest tenures of any Irish family at the property. Margaret and Bryan Coleman emigrated from Ireland in 1845 and also lived in Ward 7 before moving to the North End. The couple had seven children. The father, Bryan, died around 1865, so Margaret took up work as a peddler and their oldest son Jeremiah was working by age 15 to help the family scrape by. By the 1880 census, when the family lived in the Clough House, Margaret had endured the death of four of her seven children as well as that of her husband. By 1880, she was 54, suffering from rheumatism and no longer working. Dennis, the eldest child still at home, worked as a cap maker to support his mother and two siblings. A later census shows a continued family connection: in 1900, Dennis and Margaret (Jr.) still lived with and supported their mother and had not married, even though they were both in their forties.

In 1880 the McLaughlins and Colemans were just two of seven families living in the Clough House. There were 22 people in total, with ages ranging from 2 to 69 years old. The Colemans shared the rear apartment with the Hayes family: Alonzo, a first-generation English American painter, and Mary, a first-generation Irish American who remained home to care for their two young children. The McLaughlins shared their rear apartment with Patrick and Mary McGinnis and their infant son, as well as Henry Kane, who may have been a relative of Alice McLaughlin.

Two more long-term and relatively better-off tenant families, the Jenkins and the Frenches, lived in the front of the house. Joseph and Debra Jenkins resided in the front
apartment of the Clough House from 1860 until 1887, the longest tenure of any family during the tenement period. In these years, Joseph Jenkins’ career progressed from a watchman, to a mason, to a foreman, to a wharfinger, or keeper of one of the city’s wharves. The couple’s three children grew up in the house and eventually moved out. Frederick French, an English immigrant shoemaker, moved into the Clough House in 1880 at age 60, with his 69-year old wife Abigail and their adult daughter, Clarisa. The family lived in the front apartment until 1892. Their unit in the front of the house would have been more desirable due to its access to Unity Street, and it appears to have had much less turnover than other units in the building.

As will be demonstrated, in 1880 and in much of the later nineteenth century, the North End was not culturally homogeneous, with different ethnicities often residing in the same home. The next major immigrant group to call the North End home was the Italians.

**Italian Immigrants**

In 1886, the Clough House was sold by William Dillaway to Joseph Devoto, an Italian immigrant, and the building soon became home to Italians alongside Irish, English, and American-born families. In current social memory, city neighborhoods across the country are often romanticized as isolated enclaves of one ethnic group (Mullins 2004), and the North End is no exception, since it is thought of today as Boston’s Little Italy. However, during the 1880s and 1890s, the Clough House was usually home to over 20 people from many different ethnicities, many of whom did not
speak the same language. Rather than a series of homogenous ethnic occupation periods with smooth transitions from an “English” neighborhood to an “Irish” neighborhood to an “Italian” neighborhood, the archival record shows that ethnicities in the North End varied greatly on a street by street, house by house, and even room by room basis. Despite ethnic tensions, the tenements were often home to members of many different ethnicities. Noticeably missing from the Clough House are any traces of African Americans, Jewish immigrants, or Portuguese immigrants, all of whom called the North End home at some point in the nineteenth century (Goldfeld 2009). In the later nineteenth century, the North End became home to a mixture of both immigrant and American-born low-wage workers whose housing options were limited. This lasted until the early 1900s, when the house did become home to only one ethnic group—the Italians.

After the unification of Italy in 1861, many interacting factors spanning multiple decades led to mass emigration. Several years of poor harvests, natural disasters, and disease, coupled with an increase in population and high taxes on agriculture, led to widespread poverty and unemployment. This was especially true in Italy’s rural south, where agriculture was a way of life for most families (Puleo 2007). Decades of economic hardship led many working Italian men to become migrant workers, first across the Alps in Central and Eastern Europe and later in large numbers to South America, especially Argentina (Amfitheatrof 1973).

After 1880, Italians began coming in greater numbers to the United States, first as seasonal laborers but eventually as permanent immigrants. From 1880 to 1900, the number of Italian immigrants to the United States ballooned from around 12,000 in 1880
to over 100,000 in 1900 (Amfitheatrof 1973). Between 1880 and 1920, over four million Italians immigrated to the United States, with around 25% eventually repatriating to Italy (Puleo 2007). The Italian immigrants were 80% male, 80% from southern Italy, and 80% working age—between 14 and 45 years old. By this time, it was relatively easy for immigrants to raise the $30 fare for a steerage ticket, with some mortgaging their houses or farms if necessary (Amfitheatrof 1973). Still, immigrants suffered through two to three weeks spent in steerage in cramped and unsanitary conditions, although their tickets did include two or three meals a day, which was often an improvement from their days in the Italian countryside (La Sorte 1985).

Like the Irish a few decades before them, the Italians primarily entered the United States in New York, but some ships landed in Boston, Providence, or Philadelphia. Many found housing in Italian neighborhoods within these cities, while some joined Italian communities in other cities like Chicago, New Orleans, Buffalo, and San Francisco (Puleo 2007). In Boston, the Italians moved in to the North and West Ends, neighborhoods that had been predominantly Irish and Jewish. This demographic change did not take place overnight, and was marred with conflict as the Irish and Italians competed for housing, jobs, and political control; their shared Catholicism did not bridge this gap (Green and Donahue 1979). In many instances, the Irish looked down on the Italians in much the same way that they themselves were looked down upon by the Anglo-Americans (Green and Donahue 1979). Ultimately, the Irish, Jewish, and other ethnic groups left the North End for Roxbury, Dorchester, and Hyde Park, which were considered slightly nicer neighborhoods at the time. By 1920, there were 40,000 people
crowded into the North End—four times the number that live there today—and 97% of the neighborhood was Italian (Puleo 2007).

In many ways, the Italians inherited poor housing and labor-intensive jobs that the Irish left behind. As the North End’s population soared, the Clough House and other North End tenements became more and more crowded (La Sorte 1985; Puleo 2007). Life in the tenements continued to be gruesome—rooms were dirty, unventilated, and very dark due the density of buildings in the area (Figure 11) (Chandler 1902). Outbreaks of diseases such as tuberculosis were common and health was poor (Puleo 2007). Most Italian immigrants came to America illiterate and could not speak English, hindering their ability to find paid work. Furthermore, Italians were often discriminated against due to cultural and socioracial differences (Gumina 1973). Italian men found work primarily as unskilled and semi-skilled laborers, often with the services of padroni, middlemen who spoke both English and Italian and could arrange for housing and jobs, but who often took a cut of immigrants’ meager paychecks (Amfitheatrof 1973). Many worked outdoor labor jobs in construction, which was especially grueling. As one Italian immigrant put it, “I came to America because I heard the streets were paved with gold. When I got here, I found out three things: first, the streets weren’t paved with gold; second, they weren’t paved at all; and third, I was expected to pave them” (Puleo 2007:93). Other men found work as chauffeurs, clerks, mechanics, carpenters, painters, or vendors of various kinds. Most first-generation Italian women did not work outside of the home, but many second-generation women took up jobs in the needletrades. Even children were expected to
contribute—many skipped school to find jobs as wagon divers, delivery boys, or bootblacks (Puleo 2007).

In Boston’s Clough House, Italian immigrant men found construction jobs such as laborers, glaziers, carpenters, painters, and plasterers. The service and food industries were also well-represented, with several men working as fruit vendors, confectioners, cooks, waiters, bartenders, or barbers.
Snapshot: The Clough House in 1910

Shortly after the 1900 census, the last Irish American family moved out of the Clough House, and the property became home to 100% Italians and Italian Americans. The site was much less culturally heterogeneous than the decades before, where Irish immigrants were joined by other members of the working class born in the United States, England, and Canada. In 1906, the poll tax records show that the house was being remodeled, but the extent of these modifications on the property are not known. In 1908, the Clough House was home to 15 adult men at the same time, the highest number in its entire history. Some had families with children. Similar to the narratives I presented of the families living in the Clough House in 1880, the following narratives are synthesized from information taken from decennial U.S. censuses (USBC 1900-1920) and poll tax records (BPTR 1907-1917). Complete bibliographical information is presented in Appendix 2.

The 1910 federal census shows 22 inhabitants living in the Clough House. These individuals came from five families: the Florino, Riccio, Brondi, Dandero, and Chiusano families. The first family listed in the 1910 census is the Florino family, whose name sometimes appears as the Anglicized “Florence” in the records. Giuseppe and Maria Florino came to the United States by way of France, where their first child, Placido, was born around 1904. Giuseppe left for America in 1905, leaving behind his wife and child, who followed one year later. The couple had two more children by 1910, when they moved into the Clough House, where they would remain for three years. The 1910 census lists Giuseppe as a 32-year old laborer of “odd jobs,” while Maria, 33, stayed home with
the children. Neither could speak English. Also in the house were Luigi Riccio, a 32-year-old iron worker, his wife Gastena, 36, and their 4-year old daughter Orsolina. The Riccio family emigrated together in 1905, and while Luigi could speak English, his wife could not. It appears that the Riccio family stayed at the Clough House for less than a year, as they do not appear in any of the poll tax records. Similarly, Giovanni Brondi, a 32-year-old laborer, his wife Emilia, 25, and their infant daughter Maria-Giuseppa also stayed at the Clough House for less than a year.

The Dandero family continues the emerging trend of young couples with children at the property. Giovanni and Candita emigrated from Italy in 1903 with their oldest son, Adolfo. When they came over, Giovanni was 26, Candita 17, and their son only a newborn. Once in Massachusetts, they had at least four more children: Alfredo, Stefano, Enrico, and Louis, although it appears that Alfredo may have died young. The 1910 census shows that they took on a boarder, Enrico Grecco, a 34-year-old fruit salesman who emigrated in 1893. Grecco lived at the property from 1908 to 1910. The Dandero family lived in the Clough House from 1909 until at least 1920, a relatively long time for tenants. During this time, Giovanni mainly worked at odd jobs, but by 1920 he had secured a position doing wage labor as a salesman in a market, despite his illiteracy and inability to speak English. Candita kept house and took care of the children, all of whom went to school, where they learned English. By 1920, 16-year-old Adolpho, the oldest son, worked part-time as a druggist in a store in addition to attending school—not a small feat for an immigrant teenager. In the later written records, many members of the family
had their first names Anglicized—Giovanni to John, for example—as had several other Italians in the house.

The final family listed as living in the Clough House in the 1910 census is the Chiusano family. This family was another relatively long-term tenant of the Clough House, but the records speak to their mobility into, out of, and within the house during their decade-long tenure. Antonio Chiusano emigrated from Italy in 1902 at age 20 and settled in the Clough House in 1907, after the 1906 remodeling of the property. The following year, Antonio was joined by his younger brother Nicola and parents Guglielmo and Filomena, who had immigrated in 1906. In 1909, the family moved to the rear apartment, only to disappear from the Clough House records entirely by 1911. The following year, they reappear back in the front of the house. During this time, the two brothers worked as barbers to support their family. Unlike their parents, they could speak English, although they were unable to read or write it. In his sixties, father Guglielmo was in and out of work as a laborer, until he retired in 1916 at age 71. The family continued to live at the Clough House until 1918 or 1919. From 1916 on Guglielmo’s name appeared as the Anglicized William, and the family’s last name became Cusanni.

While the lived experiences of these individual Italian families in the North End are unique, when taken together they speak to similarities in the Italian immigrant experience across the North End during the early twentieth century. Together, these stories paint a picture of life in the North End that was different than in previous decades. By 1910, most of the North End was Italian. Whereas the Irish were never the sole occupants of the neighborhood, by the early twentieth century the Italian presence was
dominant—even today, the North End is Boston’s Little Italy. In this case, the Clough House did in fact represent an ethnic enclave. Most of these immigrants still spoke Italian—it was mainly members of the younger generation who learned English. Both the 1880 and 1910 censuses show that occupants of the Clough House were overwhelmingly families with several children, not single working men. The men primarily worked as unskilled manual laborers—although some found work in skilled laboring positions—and the women were responsible for domestic duties. In 1910, the population of the house was higher than before, and the poll tax records show that most families continued to live in the house for only a few years, with some families managing to stay for a decade or so. Finally, as the years progress we begin to see the Anglicization of both first names and surnames in some Italian families. The is due to two possible factors—white employers, officials, or census takers changing the names to conform to English spellings, or the families themselves changing their names in an attempt to assimilate into the broader American culture (Fucilla 1943). Both hint at the prejudice directed at all immigrants throughout American history.

A Note on Religion

While the archival record has told us many details about the tenants of the Clough House, census records in the United States do not list religion. I conducted a search of baptismal records for the Old North Church and three area Catholic churches but was unsuccessful at determining the church enrollment of the inhabitants (Massachusetts Historical Society 1569-1997; Archdiocese of Boston Sacramental Registers 1798-1997).
I am assuming that the majority of the Irish and Italian immigrants living in the Clough House were Catholic, since most immigrants from those countries to the Boston during this time period were indeed Catholic (Green and Donahue 1979). Fortunately, the archaeological record can often step in where the archival record is lacking—one of the artifacts of personal adornment associated with the late tenement period is a religious medal (Figure 12). Known as the Miraculous Medal, this type of Catholic medal was first produced in 1830, when Saint Catherine Labouré, a French nun, had a vision of the Virgin Mary, who instructed her to design a medal in her image (Romb 2006). To this day, devotees wear the medal as a reminder of their devotion to Mary and the Catholic faith, and anyone who wears it is said to receive special graces (Romb 2006). As a Catholic object, this medal would most likely have been worn by one of the Irish or Italian inhabitants of the Clough House as an affirmation of their faith and the Catholic values that were important to them.

Figure 12: The Miraculous Medal, a Catholic object of adornment. Photo by Joseph Bagley.
The Later History of the Clough House

The artifacts under study begin to taper off around 1920, a year that saw the highest population within the Clough House. The 1920 census shows 29 individuals from 8 Italian or Italian American families. Only nine people spoke English, and most worked as laborers or contractors. This year appears to be the peak occupation of the Clough House, as later records show a steady decline in inhabitants—12 in 1930 and 10 in 1940. In 1944 the heirs of Joseph Devoto sold the property to George Robert White Fund, which intended to renovate the building and make it a house museum. (Massachusetts Historical Commission 1990). However, these plans did not immediately come to fruition, and the house continued to be occupied by a limited number of residents throughout the 1940s and 50s. In 1959, the property was acquired by the Old North Foundation, the current owners, and became unoccupied in 1960 (Cummings and Overby 1961). Subsequently, major renovations were performed in an attempt to restore the house to its eighteenth-century appearance. During this time, the third floor was kept intact, but the rear addition was demolished. The property was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1990 (Massachusetts Historical Commission 1990). Today, the first floor of the home is open to the public as a museum featuring reproductions of an eighteenth-century chocolate shop and printing press, two businesses that were documented in the North End during colonial times, but did not originally take place at the Clough House itself (Conti 2013).
This chapter presents a framework for a class-based analysis of nineteenth-century consumption patterns through historical archaeology. After defining class and consumption, I discuss how the ideals of Victorian domesticity shaped the consumption patterns of the upper and middle classes, and continue by looking at how historical archaeologists have conceptualized urban, working-class consumption patterns.

Archaeology studies the material remains of everyday life of people in the past, making it uniquely suited for analyzing consumption patterns—how people acquired, used, and discarded objects. When combined with a context provided by archival, historical, and archaeological evidence, archaeologists can situate artifacts recovered during excavation into broader cultural frameworks of consumption and identity.

In *The Archaeology of Consumer Culture*, Paul Mullins (2011:2) defines the concept of consumption as “the acquisition of things to confirm, display, accent, mask, and imagine who we are and whom we wish to be. Material consumption may instrumentally display social status, evoke ethnicity, or exhibit gender, but it also can be an unexpressed process of self-definition and collective identification.” Essentially, the material culture we consume actively reflects information about us, intentional or not, at
both the individual and cultural scales. This definition of consumption draws from the work of social theorists Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood. They write that goods are formed from economic production processes but carry social meaning, and individuals construct this meaning through the consumption of these goods (Douglas and Isherwood 1966). Material culture, therefore, is full of information about not only the economic context of their production, but of their symbolic meaning at both the individual and cultural scales as well (Douglas and Isherwood 1979). Mary Beaudry, Lauren Cook, and Stephen Mrozowski (1991) have applied Douglas and Isherwood’s theories to the discipline of archaeology. They argue that artifacts are physical representations of past cultural beliefs. Since individuals choose to consume objects that actively speak to their sense of identity, artifacts express their views about society. To interpret this meaning in the present, a thorough understanding of the complete historical, political, economic, and archaeological contexts surrounding an artifact is critical to creating accurate interpretations. (Beaudry, Cook, and Mrozowski 1991).

A key component of this context is socioeconomic class. Theorists of all disciplines have long defined the concept of class in many different ways, with theories ranging from class having little relevance on culture to economic determinism. The concept of class that I draw upon is one that is often used by historical archaeologists, in which “class is defined as fixed rungs on a ladder of inequality, as in strata within an income distribution, occupation structure, or status variations” (Wurst 2006:191). Wurst describes the notion of a class as a group of individuals with similar economic situations. This view of class tends to create class hierarchies under the convenient headings of
“upper class,” “middle class,” and “working class,” which can in turn be theoretically subdivided further. However, class is best understood as more of a continuum then a set of discrete groups, since the lines that separates working class from middle class and middle class from upper class are arbitrary, as are all the subdivisions within these groups. What separates these people is their consumption—he who consumes more and who does so more conspicuously is of a higher class than he who does not consume (Cohen 2003). None of this diminishes the validity of the variety of lived experiences between people of different classes, it just makes the lines dividing the classes harder to define. As such, I prefer a continuum model of class to one of discrete groups, with the labels of “working class” and “middle class” serving as approximations for that group’s location on the continuum rather than tightly-bound categories. Within this framework, the working class label would generally refer to the poor, unskilled, semiskilled, and skilled workers, with the middle class consisting of professionals, craftsmen, and managers, and the upper class made up of capitalists and upper-level managers (Hardesty 1994). Thus, while the early nineteenth-century inhabitants of the Clough House could mostly be defined as members of the middle class, by the later nineteenth century the demographics had skewed greatly toward the working class.

The ways in which historical archaeologists have sought to analyze class have evolved over time (Wurst 2006). Often, these studies have involved ceramic analysis, as I have done here. Ceramics are ideal candidates for archaeological analysis because they are widespread, durable, datable, and vary over time (Majewski and Schiffer 2009). George Miller (1991) established CC indices that tracked the prices of various ceramic
wares over time, seemingly opening the door for quantitative class analysis based on ceramics. However, the relationship between ceramic prices and status was found to be more complex. Factors such as household size, household discard patterns, access to the ceramic market, varying choices by the consumer, and the economic climate of the period under study can all affect the value of ceramics at a particular site (Garrow 1987, LeeDecker et al. 1987, Spencer-Wood 1987, Brighton 2001). Thus, a broader consideration of the location under study and the social norms of the time is necessary for a comprehensive analysis of ceramic consumption. For the nineteenth-century residents of the Clough House, this means a discussion of the prevailing Victorian values of the time.

**Consumption and Victorian Values among Middle- and Working-Class Communities**

The Victorian era was a transatlantic phenomenon that developed in the mid-nineteenth century and lasted until the end of that century, characterized by the growth of a middle class that was economically strong and socially influential (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992). New cultural values known as the “Cult of Domesticity” governed both the public and private lives of the middle class. Before the turn of the nineteenth century, most city dwellers worked from their homes or in nearby areas. With the advent of infrastructural improvements and public transportation options, by the first decades of the nineteenth century many members of the upper class moved to new homes away from the industrializing downtown areas. This was followed by members of the middle class a few decades later, eventually leading to the rise of suburbs in the mid-nineteenth century
(Cantwell and Wall 2001). With the separation of the domestic and commercial spheres, it was the responsibility of women to create a domestic space in line with Victorian values and to pass these values on to their children (Green 1983). Homes were private sanctuaries devoted to relaxation, recreation, and most importantly, gentility and Christian morality. Homes beautified with flowers and natural symbols were believed to foster the proper Christian environment for this morality to flourish (McDannell 1989; Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992; Fitts 1999).

Not everyone had the capital to participate in this cultural shift—least of all the impoverished. While the upper and middle classes had mostly moved away from the industrial areas by the mid-nineteenth century, the poor were constrained to live in rundown, polluted areas near the centers of industry because they needed to be near their places of work and their small incomes would not allow them to move elsewhere within or outside the city (Harvey 1989). These workers were trapped in a cycle of poverty, which Orser defines as “the physical appearance of social inequality, exclusion, and the unequal distribution of wealth.” (2011:538). Brighton (2008) writes that in Victorian culture, society believed that poverty was the fault of the individual—a moral failure that was within the individual’s control to fix. There were exceptions to this rule—the “deserving poor” consisted of unmarried women, widows with young children, and invalids, and these people were provided with some form of public assistance. Immigrant workers, representing able-bodied men and women, were considered undeserving and immoral. In free market capitalism, poverty alone is hard enough to escape, since it provides a cheap and devalued labor source necessary to increase capital and profits for
the owning class and drive industrial capitalism (Harvey 1989). Victorian ideas of who was deserving of assistance made the escape from poverty even more difficult, if not near impossible, for the immigrant working class.

While Victorian domesticity was initially a Protestant phenomenon, middle-class American Catholics had also adopted a form of it by the later nineteenth century (McDannell 1989). Catholic priests and Protestant reformers taught domestic values to immigrants from Ireland, Mexico, and Italy in an attempt to assimilate them into genteel American culture (Brighton 2001, Yentsch 2011). In the Catholic model, families were to be modeled after the Holy Family, with mothers taking on the central role of Mary in the moral and spiritual growth of their families (McDannell 1989). Over time, some immigrants used material culture to participate in and eventually assimilate into this broader American middle-class culture, while still retaining their sense of religious and ethnic identity (Brighton 2011).

In the Victorian home, everything was to be neat and orderly, and dining was no exception. Etiquette books explained proper place settings and dining behavior (Brighton 2001). Drinking tea became a culturally significant social ritual, with middle-class women often inviting other women into their parlors during the afternoon. Proper ceramic teawares displayed one’s gentility (Wall 1991). Beginning in the late nineteenth century, women would host other families in their homes for dinner parties (Wall 1991). At these events, refreshments were handed out by waiters, servants, or the woman of the house herself, depending on the size and formality of the occasion. These parties had been common among the upper classes and became attainable and popular for socially-
conscious middle-class women in the 1880s (Wall 2000). Here too, everything was to be done in the proper manner with the proper materials. Both breakfast and tea, a small evening meal, required a variety of ceramic and glass vessels, including cups, saucers, and plates of various sizes. Dinner, the main meal of the day, was served in the afternoon or evening and required extensive individual place settings for each diner. In addition to the vessels necessary for breakfast and tea, formal dinner place settings called for soup plates, large plates and platters, dessert plates, tumblers, and wineglasses (Wall 2000).

Victorian dining practices are fraught with cultural meanings; therefore the anthropological and archaeological examination of Victorian-era material culture can tell us much about consumers who bought and used these items (Walker 2008; Brighton 2011). Many historical archaeologists have written about Victorian culture and its role in class formation. Most notable is Diana Wall (1991, 1999), who first brought questions of domesticity and Victorianism successfully into historical archaeology. Wall’s 1991 paper analyzes the ceramic assemblages from two mid-nineteenth-century homes in Greenwich Village, New York City. She compares an assemblage from an upper-middle-class home to one from the lower-middle class to understand how the women in these homes constructed domesticity with their material culture. Wall finds broad similarities and differences in ceramic consumption patterns between the two sites. For instance, most tableware were made of plain white granite (ironstone), many in a Gothic molded pattern that emulated the contemporaneous trend in Gothic Revival architecture. Wall argues that a home embellished with Gothic-style ceramics and furniture would further invoke the sacredness of domesticity. However, the assemblages differed in the quantity and style of
teaware. The lower-middle-class assemblage had one main ironstone teaware set that matched their tableware. The upper-middle-class assemblage included a similar set, but in porcelain, as well as an additional porcelain teaware with a pedestalled form and fancy gilt decoration. Wall hypothesizes that the wealthier family would use the plain, matching teaware set for private breakfasts and the fancier set for afternoon tea parties with other members of their social stratum, perhaps as form of competitive display and show of status. The lower-middle-class family may have had a different vision of domesticity in which those invited as guests were treated as family and given plain ceramics that spoke to the Gothic ideals of community and mutual help, certainly useful values to members of the lower-working class.

Wall’s 1999 article analyzes the ceramic assemblage of a mixed Irish and German working-class immigrant tenement in mid-nineteenth-century New York City and compares its ceramic assemblage to those of middle-class families during the same time period. Working-class women preferred ironstone and whiteware tableware, but these included a variety of molded patterns (including some Gothic) instead of the matching Gothic-style plates favored by the middle class. Likewise, their teaware consisted primarily of paneled ironstone vessels instead of fancier porcelain wares. Wall concludes that, since the working-class women did not emulate the middle class in their ceramic consumption, they were not emulating the Victorian woman’s role as moral guardian of the domestic sphere. When the Gothic pattern was used by working-class women, it was not as part of a matched set, and so may have been reserved for small visits by a friend, where the “sacred” quality of the pattern would reinforce community ties. Therefore,
working-class tenement women did not emulate the consumer choices of their middle-
class contemporaries regarding ceramics, but rather built their own view of domesticity
as one that reinforces the values of community, solidarity, and mutual aid.

Several other studies of ceramic consumption and domestic values have taken
place in New York. Robert Fitts (1999) analyzes the assemblages of several households
in 1860s Brooklyn, then a middle-class commuting suburb of Manhattan. In addition to
discussing the Gothic pattern and matched sets that Wall writes about, Fitts also covers
the primacy of nature in Victorian values and the importance of educating one’s children
in proper domestic behavior. He finds evidence of the Victorian reverence for nature in
the many floral motifs and natural designs on ceramics. Furthermore, flower pots were
used to beautify the homes of the middle class and center the design of the domestic
space on the sacredness of nature, which was believed to best foster values of Christian
morality. The recovery of ceramic toy tea sets shows that the parents of these homes were
actively teaching their children how to properly perform the genteel manners necessary to
maintain their position in Victorian society. Fitts concludes that the material culture in
these assemblages represents the active role ceramics played in portraying the values of
the middle class and conforming its members to common behaviors and materials.

The excavation of the Five Points area in Manhattan contributed greatly to our
understanding of the material lives of working-class immigrants living in crowded
tenements in the mid-nineteenth century. Like the North End in Boston, the Five Points
was home to a large Irish immigrant population and had a reputation for having some of
the worst living conditions in nineteenth-century New York City (Brighton 2001). These
immigrants were the poorest of the poor, and they left behind material culture that speaks to both their social alienation and their access to New York’s markets. Recent immigrants appeared to have purchased mismatched ceramics with out-of-date styles, although some purchased fancier wares seemingly above their income level (Brighton 2001, 2011). Even though they were living in poverty, the occupants of the Five Points tenements had access to a large variety of ceramics at many price points by virtue of their living in New York City, America’s commercial hub (Brighton 2001). New pottery could be obtained from several area crockeries as well as street auctions, while mismatched sets could be purchased secondhand from junk stores or neighborhood yard sales (Brighton 2001). Teaware made up a significant portion of the ceramic assemblage across time periods, which speaks to the importance of drinking tea, both publicly and privately, for these immigrants. (Brighton 2011). Over time, the immigrants in the Five Points tenements shifted from mostly mismatching sets of transfer-printed dishes to plain white-granite ceramics, albeit twenty or so years after these dishes first became fashionable (Yamin 2001). Vessel complexity likewise increased during the later decades of the nineteenth century, perhaps showcasing a change in dining habits more in line with the American middle class (Brighton 2011). Brighton believes that these shifts signify a broader incorporation of Irish immigrants into larger American society around 1880 (Brighton 2011).

Flower pots and figurines were recovered from several deposits, suggesting that these immigrants spent some of their meager incomes on beautifying their homes and had access to more than just essential goods (Yamin 2001). Yamin believes that these
aesthetic pieces provided more than just material comforts; the ceramic figurines could have been a source of emergency money through pawning (Yamin 2001). Likewise, the flower pots could also have been used to grow herbs for use in home medicine or cooking (Brighton 2001). Thus, these objects showcase the values of both beautification and thrift.

Besides New York, the urban centers of Northern California have also been the focus of several studies regarding consumption habits of nineteenth-century working-class immigrants (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992; Walker 2008; Yentsch 2011). Much of what the California scholars have found is similar to what I have already outlined concerning the New York scholars, so I will only touch on a few additions here. Many of these studies attempted draw patterns between ceramic consumption and ethnicity, with limited success. Mark Walker writes that the ceramic consumption patterns of railroad workers in West Oakland, California varied along ethnic and socioeconomic lines, with skilled American-born laborers following Victorian norms the most, and unskilled immigrant workers the least (Walker 2008). Similarly, Anne Yentsch concludes that while there were discernible differences in diet among immigrant groups in nineteenth-century California, there remained large class-based differences in diet and material culture, even within ethnic groups (Yentsch 2011). These correlate with studies from the East Coast, where Lu Ann De Cunzo finds no material symbols of ethnic differences discernible in the compared ceramic assemblages of American, French, and Irish American privy deposits in Patterson, New Jersey (De Cunzo 1982). De Cunzo concludes that the deposits were more reflections of mass produced availability and socioeconomic
status than any ethnic boundaries (De Cunzo 1982). What we see in these studies as well as in the Clough House are socioeconomic patterns, not ethnic ones. The ceramic assemblages of working-class immigrant neighborhoods therefore speak more to class-based consumption strategies then to ethnic ones. It is important to note that there will always be the potential for variation within broader class patterns of consumption, since the individuals, generally women, have individual agency in choosing what to consume. Their choices are not solely bound by economics, because consumption is as much a social phenomenon as an economic one (Cook, Yamin and McCarthy 1996) Thus, economic determinism cannot entirely explain the consumption patterns of the working class—while they may not control the means of production, they still express themselves individually and as a collective through their limited but still meaningful choices (Cook, Yamin and McCarthy 1996; Wilkie and Bartoy 2000 Silliman 2006). Taken together, these choices reveal broader consumption patterns among the working class.

Historical Archaeology of the Working Class in Urban Massachusetts

While New York and California have seen significant amounts of study into the material culture of the nineteenth-century working class, Massachusetts has seen comparatively little. One notable exception is the work carried out in the planned factory town of Lowell (Beaudry 1987; Beaudry, Cook and Mrozowski 1991; Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001; Mrozowski 2006). Founded in 1825 by a group of capitalists known as the Boston Associates, Lowell’s planned urban landscape included company-owned boarding houses and tenements for factory workers, housing blocks for the middling
overseers, and houses for the company agents (Mrozowski 2006). In their first decades of operation, the mill workers were primarily young Anglo-American women, by the antebellum period the demographics shifted heavily towards Irish and French-Canadian immigrants of both genders (Mrozowski 2006). The lives and schedules of these factory workers were structured by the strict rules of the mill companies, designed to impose social order (Mrozowski 2006). However, the archaeology revealed that the working-class mill operatives found ways to resist these rules and express their ethnic and class-based identities such as drinking clandestinely or smoking from tobacco pipes inscribed with Irish political messages (Beaudry, Cook and Mrozowski 1991; Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001).

The ceramic assemblages from the Lowell excavations show that occupants used flower pots to improve the appearance of their utilitarian living quarters, planting elderberry and grape seeds to beautify their surroundings and add variety to their diets (Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001). A comparison of the ceramic assemblages across class lines showed that the middle-class overseers had slightly fancier wares than the working-class boarding house occupants, with higher percentages of hand-painted and transfer-printed vessels, but overall the assemblages appeared quite similar (Beaudry, Cook, and Mrozowski 1991; Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001). Beaudry, Cook, and Mrozowski (1991) attribute some of the differences in ceramics between household types to differences in household makeup—the families living in the tenements had assemblages that more closely emulated middle-class Victorian domesticity than did the single workers in the boarding houses. Their conclusion correlates with the results of
Clements’s (1989) study of Fort Independence in Boston, where the ceramic assemblages of married officers were the fanciest and most complex, and the assemblages of the enlisted men the simplest. These studies highlight the role of the married woman as keeper of the domestic sphere and bearer of Victorian values, but they could also suggest that working-class families and singles did not have the interest or capital to participate much in Victorian consumption practices.

Archaeological studies of working-class life in Boston are few and far between. One such study is the Tremont Street Housing site in Roxbury by Charles and Openo in which excavators uncovered two trash deposits from the mid- to late nineteenth century associated with a working-class immigrant tenement (Charles and Openo 1987). The ceramic assemblage consisted primarily of undecorated English whitewares, with some utilitarian vessel and fancier styles also present, including some gilt-decorated vessels and porcelain, which represented the next most common ware type. The collection exhibited “few cross mends between sherds, few reconstructible vessels, and few vessels with the same pattern, suggesting an absence of matched sets” (Charles and Openo 1987:28). Thus, it appears the tenants at Tremont Street used a mixture of mismatched ceramic styles, most of them affordable but some a bit fancier. This appears to match the descriptions of other working-class assemblages previously outlined and does not correspond with Victorian style.

The Joy Street privy at the African Meeting House represents another residential tenement in Boston, although its privy assemblage dates to the 1820s and 1830s, over a half century before the main midden at the Clough House (Landon and Bulger 2013).
ceramic assemblage at the African Meeting House tenement was dominated by pearlware, creamware, and redware tablewares, with little evidence for patched sets but a variety of vessel forms, including serving platters, plates, and cups. Landon and Bulger conclude that the assemblage of the tenement was less fancy and more utilitarian than that of the meeting house itself.

There have likewise been few discussions surrounding the archaeology of nineteenth-century working-class culture in Boston’s North End. In the 1980s, the nearby Paul Revere House on North Square was the subject of archaeological investigations which primarily sought to study Boston’s earliest European history (Elia 1997). In the course of these investigations, a wood-lined privy pit was uncovered, which yielded an upper level of redeposited fill and an intact lower layer dating to around 1870, when the building was a boardinghouse for working-class immigrants, first Irish and then Italian. The lower level of the privy produced many artifacts from the later nineteenth century, including an extensive ceramic assemblage with several intact vessels. Whitenware (including ironstone) was the most common ware type, with small amounts of porcelain, yellow ware, and stoneware also present. The vessels exhibit a wide variety of styles and vessel forms, with only two examples of matching vessels, and these do not represent a whole set. The variety of vessel forms includes tableware, teaware, serving plates, and other specialized forms that would point towards a more genteel consumption, but the mismatched array of styles and ware types are more in line with working-class consumption patterns.
More recent excavations of the Paul Revere House site concentrated on 5-6 Lanthrop Place, a three-story brick and wood building constructed in the Paul Revere House backlot in the 1830s (Heitert et al. 2014). This building was run as a boarding house, and many of its tenants were of Irish, Jewish, and Italian descent. The report’s authors conclude that material culture retrieved from 5-6 Lanthrop Place reflects pragmatic consumer choice and mass-produced goods (Heitert et al. 2014). Without more information about the site’s boarders, the authors find it difficult to conclude whether the site’s inhabitants embraced Victorian ideals but lacked the capital for more expensive purchases or if they eschewed the cult of domesticity for more working-class pleasures.

The Endicott Street site provides another window into the archaeology of working-class life in the North End (Dudek 1999; Stevens and Ordoñez 2005; Beaudry 2006). The site consisted of a privy complex and cistern from the backlot of what used to be 27 and 29 Endicott Street, which in the nineteenth century was part of Boston’s red light district (Beaudry 2006). The deposits date to the 1860s and 1870s, and the site functioned as a brothel for part of this time period; it was also home to more middle-class professions, including a physician, policeman, and jeweler (Dudek 1999; Beaudry 2006). The ceramic assemblage included many decorated whitewares and matched table and tea sets, both plain and inexpensive as well as fancily decorated and more expensive (Dudek 1999). This suggests a focus on communal formal dining, either for the clients of the brothel or the later residents of the location. Over time, whiteware fades out in favor of undecorated ironstone (Dudek 1999). While the assemblage is mixed, it seems to
represent a more middle-class pattern than many of the others from similar neighborhoods at this time.

To summarize, historical archaeologists hold that ceramic consumption carries social meaning and can vary across class lines. In comparable late nineteenth-century archaeological sites, the ceramics of upper- and middle-class city dwellers reflected Victorian domestic ideals. These ceramics were generally newer, in-fashion ware types such as ironstone or whiteware, and were often highly decorated. Matching tea sets allowed these women to display their status through their material goods. Similar working-class urban sites produced ceramic assemblages that were comparably less decorated and more mismatched than those from middle-class sites. However, whiteware and ironstone were generally still the most prevalent ware types, and ornamental pieces like flower pots and the occasional high-quality vessel demonstrated a level of consumption above simple functionality. These studies will be revisited and compared to the Clough House assemblage in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 4

PROJECT METHODS AND CERAMIC ANALYSIS

For this project, I performed archival research, artifact cataloguing, deposit dating, and ceramic vessel analysis, as was discussed in Chapter 1. My archival methods were detailed in Chapter 1; what follows is a discussion of the archaeological methods carried out by the City of Boston Archaeology Laboratory, my laboratory methods, and the methods of my ceramic analysis.

Archaeological Investigation and Site Formation Processes

Excavations at the Clough House took place in May and June of 2013 under the direction of Joseph Bagley, Boston City Archaeologist. The subject of the archaeological investigations was the area directly behind the house, which was to be disturbed by the construction of a new path and entranceway (Figure 13). Ten 1x1 meter units were placed (Figure 14) beginning with five units (A2, C2, C4, C6, and C8) placed in an alternating grid that left no more than one meter distance between each unit and the house or walls (Bagley 2013a). This strategy was meant to intersect belowground features such as a privy, however, no privy was found. The remaining five units were placed around these
first five to pursue additional deposits, follow drainage features, and generally provide complete coverage of the area of potential effect. All units were dug to a depth of 125 cm. and produced 36,465 artifacts in total. These artifacts were relatively evenly distributed across all excavation units.

Figure 13: The rear lot of the Clough House with the project area outlined. Photo by Joseph Bagley.
Once excavations had been completed, the individual strata recorded in the field were consolidated into 14 site-wide contexts, each representing one distinct episode or group of episodes related to the site’s depositional history (Table 1). Most of these contexts proved to be more recent filling episodes with few ceramics and consequently are not relevant to this study. However, a few core deposits that have been dated to the early twentieth century and before are especially worth considering. In particular, ceramics from the main midden, main fill, clay layer, Jane Franklin context, and Mixed
C-soil contexts were vesselized and analyzed for this study. All contexts are summarized below, beginning with the most recent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Pathway</td>
<td>Pathway</td>
<td>Pathway</td>
<td>Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Upper midden</td>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>Upper midden</td>
<td>Builder’s trench for light well</td>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Main midden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Pipe fill/trench</td>
<td>Main midden</td>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main midden</td>
<td>Main midden</td>
<td>Upper midden</td>
<td>Main midden</td>
<td>Lower pathway</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Upper midden</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main midden</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main midden</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Demo</td>
<td>Jane Franklin</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Jane Franklin</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main midden</td>
<td>Below 80cm=Main fill</td>
<td>Main midden</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Main midden</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Drain fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Builder’s trench for pipe</td>
<td>Mixed C-soils</td>
<td>Mixed C-soils</td>
<td>Mixed C-soils</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Builder’s trench for pipe</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td>Main fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Assigned context by unit and stratum

By analyzing the ground surface level in the 1961 photo of the excavation area (Figure 8), Bagley determined that the garden layer and current pathway were constructed after the 1950s and therefore were not from a period of significance. Under some portions of the pathway is an earlier lower pathway, made of brick. The builder’s
trench for the light well was similarly dismissed as later, since the window well is not present in the 1961 photo. The construction activity for this light well most likely disturbed a small portion of the main midden and redeposited it closer to the current ground surface in units A2, C4, and B2. This upper midden contained only six pottery sherds, making it unpractical to analyze in great detail. The pipe fill/trench in unit A2 is probably from the twentieth century when an oil pipe was installed into the wall, providing heating fuel for the house. As unit A2 was excavated further, the excavators expected to find evidence of a builder’s trench against the rear wall of the Clough House. However, the presence of a cement support completely covering the exterior foundation of the house down to 125 cm. and the discovery of a thin metal pipe capped with concrete at the bottom of this unit indicated that the new builder’s trench for this pipe and repairs to the foundation of the Clough House completely obliterated any remains of the original eighteenth-century builder’s trench.

As excavations were carried out, many more pipe and drainage features emerged, resulting in a lattice of crossing pipelines running through most of the site (Figure 15). Central to the site was an old cistern to which almost all of the drainage features lead. This brick cistern with a stone cap was completely empty upon excavation, indicating that it had fallen out of use some time ago and was never filled. Bagley believes that the cistern itself is from the eighteenth century, perhaps dating back to the construction of the house around 1715, since the bricks in the cistern are the same size and shape as the bricks in the house (Joseph Bagley 2016, elec. comm.).
A demolition layer is present in the upper stratigraphic level across most of the site. The presence of large amounts of window glass, brick, mortar, and other building materials in this layer suggest that it was most likely caused by the late twentieth-century demolition of the rear apartment and neighboring buildings. In between the demolition layer and the main midden was a wood board plank floor across most of the site. This may have functioned as a makeshift pathway once household trash deposits ceased, leaving behind a slippery backyard.

Figure 15: Site map showing drainage features. Figure by Joseph Bagley.

The following five contexts contain artifacts dating back to the building’s use as a tenement or before, and therefore will be studied further. Overall, two contexts dominate
the site: the main midden and the main fill. The midden lies stratigraphically above the fill, which was most likely once a trash midden as well based on the volume of artifacts it contains. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it was common practice to dispose of waste in backyard or alleyway trash middens (LeeDecker 1994). These deposits lay immediately behind the Clough House and were separated by a wall from its nearest neighbor to the north, the Jane Franklin House, so I assume that all trash deposits found here came directly from the Clough House.

The main fill, which accounts for the majority of the site’s ceramic assemblage, consists of soil redeposited sometime in the mid-to-late nineteenth century, when most of the backyard was dug up to replace an older brick and slate drainage system with newer ceramic pipes. Evidence of the older drainage system was found in unit C8 (drain fill) where an early brick and slate drain led directly into a later ceramic drain, which led to the brick cistern. Once the new drainage system was installed, the now-mixed soils were redeposited in the yard as fill. The residents of the house continued to use the area for trash disposal, capping the fill with the new midden. Figure 16 displays a typical stratigraphic wall profile at the site, showing that the midden is visually and physically distinct from the fill. Mean ceramic dates have confirmed that the many levels of fill lack stratigraphy due to its quick redeposition, while the midden is temporally distinct and developed gradually. Thus, the fill can best be described as a singular event composed of long term deposits that has been mixed and redeposited in one event, whereas the midden is a longer term event comprised of several short term deposits. Coins found in the main fill put a TPQ of 1875 on the filling episode, which may have coincided with the addition
of the three-story rear apartment at some point in the mid-1870s while latest coins found in the main midden carry a TPQ of 1909. Specifically, the main fill’s metal assemblage includes two 22-caliber bullet casings with a TPQ of 1857, a mason jar lid with a TPQ of 1858, an unidentified 1860s penny, an 1867 penny, and 1875 Canadian nickel. The main midden, on the other hand, includes two Indian Head cents with a TPQ of 1859, a 32-caliber bullet with a TPQ of 1860, an 1889 Indian Head penny, a 1905 nickel, and a wheat penny with a TPQ of 1909. It also caps the main fill, which has a TPQ of 1875.

In a few of the units, there are other small deposits located below the midden and the fill. The clay layer could be natural glacial clay that has been redeposited, or it could indicate the presence of a destroyed privy, which would account for the exceptionally large amount of artifacts unearthed at this very small site. Ceramics in the clay layer appear very similar to those in the main fill, including at least one mend, so these contexts are most likely related. The layers adjacent to the Jane Franklin House and the

Figure 16: South profile photo of units A2, B2, and C2 showing typical site stratigraphy. Photo by Joseph Bagley.
mixed C layer are some of the oldest and most intact deposits at the site, although their respective ceramic assemblages are smaller when compared to those of the fill and midden.

**Laboratory Methods**

Upon the completion of excavations at the site (see Chapter 2), the more than 36,000 artifacts were brought to the City of Boston Archaeology Laboratory for processing. Lab volunteers wet or dry brushed each artifact and let dry for two days. Following an initial sorting, all artifacts were cataloged digitally using the Massachusetts Artifact Tracking System by myself, Jerry Warner, Joseph Bagley, and lab volunteers. Upon the completion of the catalog, I created sherd counts and ratios of household ceramics for each context by ware type. Five contexts had large concentrations of household ceramics and were deemed significant for further study (see Chapter 2): the main fill, main midden, the deep layers adjacent to the Jane Franklin House, the mixed C-soils, and the clay layer.

Next, I dated the ceramics in these five contexts, referencing Miller (2000), the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory (2008), and the Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery (2006). I then used these data to calculate the mean ceramic date (MCD) and ceramic *terminus post quem* (TPQ) for these five contexts (Table 2). I used TPQ-90 for my calculations in order to account for the disturbed nature of the site as well as any excavator errors. Due to their large manufacture and use ranges, redwares and porcelains were excluded in the calculation of the MCD and TPQ-90 of the five contexts.
Following this, I completed a vessel analysis of the five contexts. My vesselization methods were based on Voss and Allen (2010). First, I sorted the assemblage by ware type and context, crosschecking with the catalog to make sure everything was there. I then checked each sherd to confirm that all wares were identified correctly, making changes to the catalog as needed. I then separated each ware type into a minimum number of vessels within a context, considering only rim sherds with the exception of extremely unique sherds that were justified as not belonging to any rim. This was done using decoration and vessel size, assuming continuity around the rim. I recorded the FiskeCat info for each vessel, including the ware type, decorative style, vessel form, rim or base diameter (if measurable), height (if a complete profile), any cross mends between contexts, a unique vessel number, and notes justifying why each vessel was different from other similar ones. When the sherds were large enough, I considered rims and bases to determine vessel forms, using Beaudry et al. (1983) and Miller (2011). However, the assemblage was mostly made up of small fragmentary pieces, making rim or base diameters and vessel forms difficult to establish in many cases besides hollowware/flatware or tableware/teaware. Finally, each vessel was photographed. The results of the ceramic analysis are presented below by context.
Results of the Ceramic Analysis

Main Fill

Household ceramics were most abundant in the main fill, with 2,957 sherds (n) representing a minimum of 182 vessels (MNV) (Table 3). The main fill has an MCD of 1767 and a TPQ-90 of 1795 based on ceramics, but several nineteenth century forms as well as coins from the mid-nineteenth century show that the fill contains materials from a long period of the site’s history. The fill lacks internal stratigraphy, and is capped by the darker-soiled main midden on top. The fill was most likely once a trash midden that was dug up and redeposited in the 1870s when the drainage features in the rear of the house were replaced, possibly coinciding with the construction of the three-story rear addition. Thus, the ceramics in the main fill represent the house’s single-family beginnings in the eighteenth century and its Anglo-American tenement status in the early nineteenth century.

Refined earthenware is the most abundant ware type, representing 45% of sherds recovered (n=1327). Among the refined earthenware, pearlware is the most common ware type (n=723; 25%), representing 76 minimum vessels (42% of the MNV). Most of the pearlware dates to the site’s early tenement period, with common decorative styles including transfer-print (MNV=32), shell-edged (MNV=21), or hand-painted (MNV=20). The transfer-printed wares were almost entirely blue, with one brown-printed ware. Border patterns varied among these wares, and while the assemblage was too small to establish known print patterns, several motifs were identified. The most common of these were geometric motifs, but a small number of leaf or floral patterns were also present,
and one hanging lantern pattern was identified. One tea bowl rim featured a farm pattern on the interior, with mountains decorating the exterior. Shell-edged wares from a variety of styles were recovered, with both blue (MNV=14) and green (MNV=7) styles present. Among hand-painted pearlware vessels, blue-banded wares were the most common, followed by bands of other colors. Unique decorations included one blue banded hollowware rim with a green leaf pattern, one factory-decorated slipware, and two china-glaze style teaware vessels made to resemble Chinese porcelain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Sherd Count</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sherds</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Percent of Total MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow ware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt-Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British/Fulham Stoneware</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenish/Westerwald Stoneware</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Stoneware</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Glazed</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unidentified</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2957</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Main Fill ware types

Identifiable pearlware vessel forms include both hollowware and flatware, with bowls being the most prevalent, followed by plates and then tea bowls. Other vessel forms identified included saucers, teacups, an octagonal plate, a platter, a serving dish lid, and a teapot. These forms speak to a variety functions, from dinner to tea serving and
preparation. Despite the large number of pearlware sherds recovered, there was no indication of matched sets, but this may be explained by the fragmentary nature of the assemblage and the fact that the context was not completely excavated. The presence of expensive transfer-printed wares alongside more moderately-priced shell-edged wares and hand-painted vessels is best explained through both the changing popularity in styles over the approximately 150 years that the fill represents, as well as the changes in occupants in the Clough House from a single family to middle-class tenants to working-class inhabitants.

Creamware was also common in the main fill at 18%, with 517 sherds representing 13 minimum vessels (7% of the MNV). The MNV count is much lower for creamware than for pearlware because most of the creamware was undecorated, whereas pearlware is typically highly decorated (Miller 1980). Indeed, of the 13 vessels, 9 are undecorated, although some of these possess a scalloped edge. The other four include one Whieldon-style plate, one piece of factory-decorated slipware, and two handpainted wares—one tea bowl with a red and gold handpainted pattern, and one brown- or gold-banded ware. Other decorations found on body sherds include black transfer-printed ware and cauliflower ware. Creamware vessel forms included plates, bowls, and a tankard, with both tea and tableware present.

Later refined earthenwares are marginally present in the main fill from the house’s early Anglo-American tenement period and include whiteware (n=66; MNV=7), ironstone (n=15; MNV=1), and yellow ware (n=6; MNV=2). The whiteware consisted mainly of tableware with a wide variety of decorations, including transfer-print (blue,
brown, and red), lusterware, decalcomania, flow blue, and sponge decorated wares. The small ironstone and yellow ware assemblage primarily consists of thick hollowwares.

Redware sherds represented 14% of the ceramic assemblage (n=411; MNV=20; 11% of the MNV). Black, brown, yellow, and lead glazes, as well as trailed slip and unglazed vessels made up the assemblage, which included a minimum of three chamber pots, one teapot, and one flower pot, many with incised decorations. The redware assemblage speaks to the practical necessities of life, including vessels for personal hygiene, food preparation, and plant growth.

Tin-glaze ware, common during the eighteenth-century single-family occupation of the house, make up 21% of the main fill assemblage (n=624, MNV=13; 7% of the MNV). Most vessels were handpainted blue and red, generally in a banded fashion. Some had a purple glaze. Vessel forms were primarily hollowware, with a minimum of two chamber pots, two bowls, a cup, and a porringer. One polychrome majolica jug was also recovered. In general, vesselization was performed more conservatively on tin glazed vessels due to the inconsistent variation in tin glaze rim sizes and the fragmentary nature of the assemblage.

Porcelain sherds constituted 6% of the main fill ceramic assemblage, with 174 sherds and 28 minimum vessels (15% of the MNV). Among the vessels, underglaze blue was the most common decorative style, but overglaze enamel was also present. Most motifs were simple linear designs with some floral patterns, gilt-decorated wares, and a thistle motif included as well. The assemblage was overwhelmingly composed of teaware, and highlighted the presence of children in the Clough House, with a minimum
of one child’s creamer and six pieces of a doll’s tea set recovered. Porcelain doll parts were also recovered. The porcelain assemblage would have been more expensive than the other ware types in the fill, which would lead to the conclusion that it was most likely owned by the single-family owners of the house in the eighteenth century, although the presence of later forms, especially the doll sets, and the presence of porcelain in later contexts means that some of these high-class wares may have belonged to the building’s nineteenth-century tenants as well.

Stoneware represented 11% of the assemblage (n=317; MNV=14; 7% of the MNV), with German forms (n=135; MNV=6), especially Westerwald, as well as white salt-glazed stoneware (n=141; MNV=4) being the most common ware types. Identified vessels included four Westerwald mugs, three pieces of white salt-glazed teaware, a Westerwald chamber pot, an Albany slip storage vessel, a Nottingham bowl, and a Rhenish bellarmine. Most of the stoneware dates to the eighteenth century and would have been used by either the Clough-Brown or Pierce-Roby families.

Finally, eight vessels of other ware types were identified. Several of these are early forms, including one Astbury teaware, a style in use from 1725 to 1750, A minimum of two Iberian storage jugs were recovered, as well as one piece of footed Jackfield teaware, one Manganese mottled tankard, and two North Devon vessels, one gravel tempered, and the other sgraffito slipped. One Rockingham vessel and one Staffordshire slipped chamber pot round out the assemblage. While these ware types are uncommon in the main fill, they speak to its colonial past as a single-family hose.
Overall, the main fill exhibits a mixed assemblage of old and new vessels, ranging from inexpensive to pricy. Ware types cover a long time period from the house’s colonial beginnings to the late nineteenth century. While 45% of the identified vessels are teaware, there is insufficient evidence to support the presence of matching sets in the assemblage. Changing styles and ceramic technology coupled with the changing demographics of the Clough House during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries allowed for the recovery of a wide variety of ware types and vessel forms in the main fill.

Clay Layer

The Clay layer could be natural glacial clay that has been redeposited, or it could be the remnants of a destroyed privy, as privies were often lined with clay. This context contained 244 ceramic sherds, representing 34 minimum vessels (Table 4). The MCD of 1773 and TPQ-90 of 1795 appear very similar to the main fill. Furthermore, the only crossmend found between contexts was a creamware octagonal plate with sherds found in both the main fill and clay layer, furthering the possibility that the two contexts are related. Thus, the clay layer likewise contains material from the eighteenth-century single-family occupation period as well as the nineteenth-century Anglo-American tenement period.

Refined earthenware is the most common ware type in the clay layer at 52% of the assemblage (n=128; MNV=14; 41% of the MNV). More than half of this is pearlware, whose 66 sherds represent 12 minimum vessels. Four of these are transfer-printed—three blue and one black. Four are shell-edged, two blue and two green. Three
are handpainted—two gold-banded and one blue-banded. The final pearlware vessel is a piece of factory decorated slipware with a granite inlay pattern very similar to the piece found in the main fill. Vessel forms were a mix of hollowware and flatware, but the fragmentary nature of the sherds meant that the forms or decorative motifs could not be determined in greater detail. Like the main fill, there is a mixture of expensive and inexpensive types present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clay Layer</th>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Sherd Count</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sherds</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Percent of Total MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow ware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Salt-Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British/Fulham Stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhenish/Westerwald Stoneware</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tin Glazed</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other/Unidentified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Clay Layer ware types

Creamware included 60 sherds, but the few rim sherds present and lack of diversity in decorative styles allowed for the designation of only one minimum vessel, a Whieldon ware. Most body sherds were undecorated, with at least one piece of factory-decorated slipware. There were only two small sherds of undecorated ironstone present in
the clay layer, representing one minimum vessel. No whiteware or yellow ware was recovered from the clay layer.

Redware composed 9% of the clay layer ceramic assemblage, with 32 sherds representing 5 minimum vessels with various glaze types. Once again, the small size of sherds in this deposit made vessel forms difficult to establish, but most are hollowware, with one possible flower pot. Tin-glazed wares made up 19% of the sample (n=46; MNV=4). Two of these vessels are hand-painted blue on a white glaze. One is a blue-glazed bowl, and the other a pink-bodied flatware. Other body sherds showed polychrome painting. Eighteen Stoneware sherds established four minimum vessels: one black basalt ware, one Nottingham ware, one white salt-glazed tea bowl, and one Westerwald hollowware. The black basalt ware was the only vessel of the kind found in these five contexts. The porcelain assemblage consisted of 10 sherds and 4 minimum vessels. All teawares, three had underglaze blue decorations, two of these with additional patterns painted above the glaze. The final sherd was decorated overglaze in red. Three other ware types were recovered from this layer: marble-slipped agateware, sprig-molded Astbury type, and a Staffordshire slipped hollowware vessel. The lone agateware body sherd was the only example of agateware found on the entire site. Overall, the clay layer appears quite similar to the main fill, both in terms of ware type and vessel form.

**Jane Franklin Layer**

The Jane Franklin layer was a deep deposit found in two units adjacent to the uncovered foundation of the Jane Franklin House, which once abutted the Clough House.
A wall separated the backlots of the two houses, so the materials in this layer certainly came from the Clough House, but were found adjacent to the foundation for the wall, under the main fill and above the clay layer. The Jane Franklin layer has an MCD of 1761, a TPQ-90 of 1775, and a much higher proportion of tin-glazed wares than the two previous layers. This means that most of the ceramics here were most likely used by the Pierce-Roby family during the single-family occupation of the house.

Overall, the Jane Franklin layer produced 128 sherds, representing 12 minimum vessels (Table 5). Tin-Glazed wares were the most common ware type at 47% (n=60; MNV=2; 17% of the MNV). The two minimum vessels included one hand-painted blue hollowware, and one purple-glazed vessel. Other handpainted polychrome body sherds were also recovered, but were not included in the MNV count because they all contained blue as well. Twenty-eight sherds of redware accounted for three minimum vessels. No redware rim sherds were found in this context, so three body sherds represent the minimum number of vessels: one lead glazed on one side and unglazed on the other, one pot that is black glazed on one side and lead glazed on the other, and one with a trailed slip.

Refined earthenware makes up comparably less of the Jane Franklin assemblage, at 13% (n=17; MNV=2). Only pearlware and creamware were recovered, representing one minimum vessel each. The pearlware vessel is an undecorated serving dish lid, and the creamware vessel is an undecorated hollowware. Stoneware consisted of 13 sherds from two minimum vessels. These included one incised white salt-glazed bowl, and one Westerwald bottle or mug. Eight porcelain sherds comprised one minimum vessel, a
teaware with overglaze enamel. One body sherd had a red hatched pattern. Seven Staffordshire-slipped sherds represented a minimum of one hollowware, and there was also one piece of Jackfield teaware. Overall, the Jane Franklin layer consists of older ceramic types with a focus on food preparation and consumption with only two pieces of teaware recovered. This could be due to the fact that the tea ritual gained popularity in the nineteenth century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jane Franklin Ware Type</th>
<th>Sherd Count</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sherds</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Percent of Total MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow ware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt-Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British/Fulham Stoneware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenish/Westerwald Stoneware</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Stoneware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Glazed</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Jane Franklin ware types

**Mixed C-Soils**

The mixed C-like layer was found beneath the main fill and clay layer in three units. It was deep and mostly sterile, contributing some of the oldest ceramics found at the site. The mixed C layer possesses a TPQ-90 of 1775 and an MCD of 1718, by far the earliest of the site. Its 73 sherds make up 17 minimum vessels (Table 6).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Sherd Count</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sherds</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Percent of Total MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow ware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt-Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British/Fulham Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenish/Westerwald Stoneware</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Glazed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unidentified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Mixed C Layer ware types

Tin-Glazed wares were the most common ware type in the mixed C layer, representing 41% of the assemblage (n=30; MNV=3; 18% of the MNV). The three minimum vessels include a white glazed undecorated plate, a hand-painted blue and red flatware, and a hand-painted blue hollowware. Fifteen stoneware sherds comprise four minimum vessels—one Nottingham type, one white salt-glazed stoneware, one Westerwald mug, and one handle of unknown type. Twelve redware sherds represent three minimum vessels—one pot with a lead-glazed interior, one hollowware with a trail slip and brown glaze, and one hollowware with black glaze.

Refined earthenwares are uncommon in this context, with six sherds representing three minimum vessels. The four pearlware sherds make up two minimum vessels—one hand-painted blue rim and one transfer-printed blue vessel. The two creamware sherds
make up one minimum vessel, an undecorated plate. The five porcelain sherds represent one minimum vessel, a blue underglaze teacup or tea bowl. The assemblage also includes a minimum of one Staffordshire slipped vessel, one North Devon sgraffito vessel, and one North Devon gravel-free vessel. Overall, the sherds recovered from the mixed C-soils are older than in other contexts, but their highly fragmentary nature makes assigning vessel forms very difficult.

**Main Midden**

With an MCD of 1816 and a ceramic TPQ-90 of 1840, the main midden is drastically different from the other four contexts analyzed at the site. This darker layer capped the main fill and possesses internal stratigraphy, showing that it was used as a trash midden after the filling episode of the 1870s, which occurred around the time of the rear apartment being added on to the back of the house. Coins date the deposit from the 1870s until perhaps the 1910s. Thus, the material in the main midden was deposited over a shorter time period than other contexts and relates directly to the period in which the Clough House was a densely-packed immigrant tenement (see Chapter 2). In the main midden, 269 total sherds of household ceramics were recovered, representing 43 minimum vessels. As would be expected, refined earthenwares dominate the assemblage at 48% (n=129; MNV=17; 40% of MNV) (Table 7). But it is not the later forms of ironstone and whiteware that are most prominent in this assemblage. Pearlware and creamware make up 60% of the refined earthenware sherds and 70% of the refined earthenware vessels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Sherd Count</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sherds</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Percent of Total MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt-Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British/Fulham Stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenish/Westerwald Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Stoneware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Glazed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unidentified</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>269</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Main Midden ware types

Pearlware is the most common ware type by sherd count and the second highest by MNV, comprising 39% of the refined earthenware sherds recovered from this context (n= 50; MNV=8; 19% of the MNV). These included a minimum of three shell-edge plates (two green, one blue), two blue transfer-printed wares (one flatware, one hollow teaware), one undecorated hollowware, and two handpainted teawares (one blue and orange painted saucer and one gold banded, blue painted hollowware). The pearlwares showcase a mixture of teawares and tablewares with printed, painted, and edged styles.

The 32 creamware sherds make up a minimum of 4 vessels (9% of the MNV) and 12% of the sherd count. The vessels represented include three undecorated wares (hollowware, flatware, and bowl), and one brown factory-decorated slipware hollowware. The 27 whiteware sherds represent 2 minimum vessels (5% of the MNV), a brown transfer-
printed teapot and a hollowware with a molded rim (Figure 17). Other body sherds included black transfer-print and blue transfer-print. One of the few maker’s marks at the site was found on a whiteware flatware base. It is incomplete, but what remains of the marking date the sherd to either 1884 or 1899 (Birks 2013). The 19 ironstone sherds represent 2 minimum vessels (5% of the MNV), one undecorated hollowware and one gold banded (luster) plate. Finally, the one yellow ware sherd represents one molded vessel. Overall, the refined earthenware assemblage includes a great number of pearlware and creamware vessels that fell out of fashion decades before the 1870s.

Figure 17: Whiteware teapot lid with brown transfer-printed floral decoration from the main midden
By percent of the MNV, redwares were the most common ware type within the main midden assemblage, with 48 sherds encompassing 11 minimum vessels (26% of the MNV), around half of them unglazed. The most unique redware vessel is a pie crust mold (Figure 18). The assemblage is mostly functional in nature, with a minimum of five flower pots (Figure 19), the greatest concentration of flower pots on the site.

The 36 porcelain sherds contribute to 5 minimum vessels (12% of the MNV), with both earlier and later forms present. These include one nineteenth- or twentieth-century molded mug with a gold gilt rose pattern (Figure 20), one green luster dish with a scalloped edge, and a gold luster, pink-banded teaware. Also included was one Chinese underglaze blue bowl, and one tiny plate from a doll’s tea set (Figure 21). The main midden also included porcelain doll parts (Figure 22). While most of the porcelain
recovered from the main midden was later in style, some of it is highly decorated in gilt. Dolls and doll tea sets highlight the presence of children in the Clough House tenement, who may have used the back lot as a place to play and get away from the dozens of other inhabitants of the house.

Figure 20: Molded porcelain mug with gold gilt floral pattern from the main midden
The stoneware recovered from the main midden includes 18 sherds representing 5 minimum vessels (12% of the MNV). These include an Albany slip hollowware, a white salt-glazed tea bowl, a white salt-glazed flatware, a Westerwald mug, and a Nottingham inkwell. Overall, the stoneware collection is much older than expected, with only the Albany slip vessel common during the later nineteenth century, and some ware types,
such as the Westerwald mug, having fallen out of use a century or more before. The inkwell confirms that some of the immigrants were literate, and may have written letters back to their relatives abroad.

Twenty-five tin-glazed sherds comprise three minimum vessels (7% of the MNV), a strangely large amount considering the ware type fell out of favor almost a century before the immigrant tenants moved in to the Clough House. The three minimum vessels include one hand-painted blue, one hand-painted polychrome, and one purple-glazed vessel, but the absence of rim pieces from the tin-glazed assemblage makes it difficult to determine vessel forms. Also included in the ceramic assemblage was one Staffordshire slipped chamber pot and one piece of Jackfield teaware. While the Jackfield type is typically associated with the eighteenth century, a revival of the Jackfield type occurred in the late nineteenth century (Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory 2008).

Overall, the ceramics from the main midden present an interesting collection—while some are from common late nineteenth-century ware types such as whiteware, ironstone, and later porcelains, more than half of the vessels are from older ware types that had largely fallen out of favor by this time period, such as pearlware, creamware, tin-glazed wares, and some stonewares.

This main midden represents a substantial amount of time lag between manufacture and deposition dates. The mean ceramic date for the midden is 1816, yet coins show that this midden was not used until the mid-1870s, a gap of around 60 years. Adams (2003) has noted that a time lag of around 15-20 years between the date of a
ceramic’s manufacture and the date of its disposition is to be expected at most historical archeological sites. This number can vary according to several factors, including the “frugality effect” that is most likely at play in this assemblage—poorer people tended to use older, secondhand ceramics in order to save money (Adams 2003). Adams states that the frugality effect is signified in archaeological assemblages by a high ratio of patterns to vessels, which would indicate that ceramics were being acquired as individual pieces instead of complete sets. This is exactly the pattern exhibited by the main midden assemblage at the Clough House. Many different patterns are represented, with no one pattern making up more than one minimum vessel, with the exception of undecorated ceramics. Furthermore, the main midden contains ceramics from a wide range of time periods, from the eighteenth century up to at least the late nineteenth century.

Could the main midden simply be another part of the main fill? I argue here that the main midden is a stratigraphically distinct deposit that occurred gradually after a filling event created the main fill that covers much of the site. As I discussed near the beginning of this chapter, the main fill contains metal artifacts, mainly coins, which give it a TPQ of 1875. The main midden, on the other hand, produced two twentieth-century coins, giving it a TPQ of 1909. Furthermore, it would make sense for the filling episode (the replacement of the drainage system under the rear lot) to coincide with construction of the rear apartment onto the Clough House, an addition which I have previously dated to around 1874 based on archival records. The soil from the main midden is both visually and textually distinct from the main fill. Stratigraphically, the midden lies just above the
fill, capping it across the site (Table 1; Figure 16). If the fill has a TPQ of 1875 based on coinage, the deposition of the artifacts in the main midden must postdate 1875.

More evidence that the main midden is distinct from and postdates the main fill comes from the ceramics themselves. While the relative percentages of ware types appear similar between the main midden and the main fill (Tables 3 and 7), the dates of the ceramics themselves tell a different story. When both decoration and ware type are taken into account, the main midden has a TPQ-90 of 1840 to the main fill’s 1795, and an MCD of 1816 compared to the main fill’s 1767 (Table 2). These dates represent a significant difference of around 50 years. Thus, I posit that the main midden is indeed a more recent deposit distinct from the main fill, and the presence of earlier ceramics in the main midden is caused by a high degree of time lag due to the nature of the Clough House’s working-class tenants.

What then can the consumption pattern presented here tell us about the Clough House’s primarily working-class, immigrant tenants? What was their consumption strategy, and what can it tell us about their values and priorities? How did it compare to other assemblages of working-class groups, or did it follow Victorian dining norms? In order to find out, I conducted a further analysis on the ceramics from the main midden, comparing the ceramic consumption patterns of the Clough House tenants to others from working, middle, and upper classes during the second half of the nineteenth century.
CHAPTER 5

CONSUMPTION PATTERNS, ECONOMIC STRATEGY, AND WORKING-CLASS VALUES

Comparison to Victorian Assemblages

As a domestic trash pit in use from the 1870s until the 1910s, the main midden was the most tightly dated of all contexts at the Clough House site. This context was chosen for future analysis in order to answer my research question: what were the consumption strategies of working-class immigrant tenants in Boston, and what can they tell us about their priorities and values? How did the consumption patterns of the Catholic immigrant working class compare to other working-class assemblages and to those of the Victorian, Protestant middle class? To answer this, it is necessary to first understand what characteristics showcased the ideals of Victorian domesticity in a ceramic assemblage. Historical archaeologists such as Wall (1991, 1999), Fitts (1999), Brighton (2001, 2011), Walker (2008), and Yentsch (2011) have used a wide variety of techniques to examine the degree to which Victorian ideology was present in the ceramic assemblages from various archaeological sites. I discussed their work and the work of others analyzing the ceramic assemblages of nineteenth-century working- and middle-class sites in Chapter 3.
For this analysis, methods were selected that could be adequately applied to the Clough House collection. One of the challenges with the collection is that the assemblage is highly fragmentary. While ware types, border decorations, and basic vessel forms (such as teaware/tableware and flatware/hollowware) were easily identifiable, many sherds were too small to accurately measure rim diameters or pinpoint specific vessel forms. These restrictions meant that some methods used by other scholars could not be completed on this collection. Chief among these was using Miller’s CC-indices to ascertain the value of the cost assemblage and compare it to similar sites (Miller 1991). Besides being mainly used for older sites, Miller’s calculations require rim diameters, which could only be calculated for a small fraction of the Clough House ceramics, due to their fragmentary nature. Dating specific decorative patterns (Brighton 2011) or the presence of names or literary motifs (Fitts 1999) could likewise not be completed for the same reason.

These restrictions aside, I used the archaeologists discussed in Chapter 3 to identify a suite of ten so-called “Victorian” characteristics to look for in the ceramic assemblage (Table 8). During the second half of the nineteenth century, a proper middle/upper-class ceramic assemblage would include: 1) A diverse assemblage with many vessel forms (Fitts 1999; Walker 2008; Brighton 2011; Yentsch 2011) and 2) the presence of serving vessels (Wall 1991; Fitts 1999). This would hint at the practice of social dining, as several specific vessel forms were necessary to prepare and present food properly. Similarly, the tea ritual was important for displaying one’s respectability, so a Victorian assemblage should include: 3) a high percentage of teaware when compared to
tableware (Fitts 1999; Wall 1991; Yentsch 2011), 4) “fancy” decorated teaware (Wall 1991, 1999), and 5) the presence of matched sets (Fitts 1999; Wall 1999; Brighton 2001, 2011; Walker 2008), which would demonstrate the financial and cultural commitment that tenants had towards social tea drinking. 6) Newer, in-fashion ware types such as Ironstone with the molded Gothic pattern (Wall 1991; Brighton 2011) and 7) more highly decorated vessels than plain ones (Wall 1991, 1999; Fitts 1999) would allow consumers to show off their wealth and status. The Victorians’ affinity for nature and natural symbols could potentially be seen in 8) the presence of flower pots to beautify the home or in 9) floral motifs on ceramics (Fitts 1999; Brighton 2001). Finally, 10) the presence of toys such as dolls and dolls’ tea sets would highlight the importance of teaching children Victorian values (Fitts 1999; Brighton 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>As seen in</th>
<th>Present?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High number of vessel forms</td>
<td>Fitts 1999; Walker 2008; Brighton 2011; Yentsch 2011</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving vessels</td>
<td>Wall 1991, Fitts 1999</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More teaware than tableware</td>
<td>Fitts 1999; Wall 1991; Yentsch 2011</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fancy decorated teaware</td>
<td>Wall 1991, 1999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matched sets</td>
<td>Fitts 1999; Wall 1999; Brighton 2001, 2011; Walker 2008</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newer ware types</td>
<td>Wall 1991; Brighton 2011</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More decorated than plain vessels</td>
<td>Wall 1991, 1999; Fitts 1999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowerpots</td>
<td>Fitts 1999; Brighton 2001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural motifs</td>
<td>Fitts 1999; Brighton 2001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolls / doll tea sets</td>
<td>Fitts 1999; Brighton 2001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Victorian Ceramic Characteristics

Fitts (1999) also provided three other Victorian characteristics that did not involve ceramics. The first is that the Victorian middle class would wait until they were
financially stable to move out and get married. As a tenement for the working poor, the Clough House did not show this pattern among its tenants, but this may have not been an option for most in the working class. Fitts also writes that the American professional class would generally have fewer children than the immigrant working class. We certainly see families with a high number of Children at the Clough House, but this may be due to cultural differences, since Catholic Irish and Italian immigrant families tended to have more children than their American counterparts (Rosenwaike 1973; Guinnane, Moehling, and Ó Grada 2006). Finally, Fitts writes that natural motifs on wallpaper served to beautify the Victorian home. Surprisingly, wallpaper analysis is possible at the Clough House, as the many layers of historic wallpaper have been recorded and preserved (Cummings and Overby 1961; Nylander, Redmond, and Sander 1986). The wallpaper in the Clough House exhibits several floral styles during this time period, but it is unlikely that the tenants were the ones buying these. Rather, the choice in wallpaper was most likely up to the absentee, middle-class landlords. The landlords’ choice to incorporate floral designs on the walls may be a reflection of the middle class’s desire to reform the working class, or it may just be the popular style of the time period among the landed class.

Returning to the ceramic characteristics, from limitations in sherd size, there was no evidence for high degree of vessel complexity or the presence of many serving vessels. The exception to this is a whiteware teapot lid with a floral brown transfer-print pattern. Tea drinking appears to have been practiced by the tenants, but perhaps not in the same ways or at the same frequency as Boston’s middle class. Teaware comprised less
than 20% of the identified vessels, compared to the ~50% found in middle-class assemblages (Wall 1999; Yentsch 2011) and there was no evidence for matched sets of teaware or tableware, although this could be affected by the high turnover rate among occupants affecting discard patterns. In their investigation of Boston’s African Meeting House, Landon and Bulger (2013) found little evidence of matched sets, which they attributed to the multiple working-class families living in that house together. Still, while mismatched or piece-meal sets showcase economic hardship and may have been used for family meals more than entertaining, economically challenged groups could and did still entertain others, even with mismatched sets (Pezzarossi 2014). The teaware recovered from the main midden at the Clough House is mostly made up of older forms such as pearlware—there is no ironstone teaware present. The general lack of whiteware and ironstone vessels (and none with the Gothic molded pattern) when compared to pearlware, creamware, tin-glazed, and older stonewares indicates that the tenants did not use the most up-to-date styles of ceramics; their absence is remarkably different from contemporaneous assemblages.

Most of the vessels are decorated—around half of the sherds from all categories exhibit decoration beyond glazing, and when only the vessels are taken into consideration, this proportion grows greater, although a vessel analysis is bound to favor decorated forms. Some vessels exhibit fancy gold gilt or have floral patterns and can be associated with Victorian naturalism. Also included in the assemblage is a minimum of 5 flower pots, with rim diameters ranging from 7 to 20 cm. This is a significant number, as it represents a dramatic increase from any earlier contexts at the site (there was only one
flower pot identified in the main fill). These pots may have been used by immigrant women in an attempt to beautify their living space in the Victorian manner, no matter how unpleasant their living conditions may have been. Of course, they may have been used for a practical and thrifty purpose as well: growing herbs for medicinal remedies or tasty recipes (Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001; Brighton 2001). No ceramic figurines were recovered at the Clough House.

Finally, there is strong evidence for the social education of immigrant children—many of whom were first generation Americans. Included in the assemblage is a tiny blue underglaze porcelain plate from a doll’s tea set, along with seven porcelain doll parts. Dolls and doll tea sets were used to teach children obedience and proper social behavior. In the Victorian era, children were seen as “mini-adults” who needed to be trained in proper manners and cultural practices from an early age in order to successfully become genteel adults (Green 1983). One way to accomplish this was through the use of toy tea sets, which could be used to teach children about the social practice of tea drinking and the proper manners associated with it. Victorian toys for immigrant children would have helped the new generation assimilate and perhaps succeed in Victorian American culture (Fitts 1999). The presence of these artifacts at the Clough House shows that the small back lot, surrounded by alleyways and other tenements, was used as a play area for children, despite the large amount of household trash accumulating there. This material evidence of the presence of tenement children and the normalcy of these toys reminds us that archival information has its limits: only during decennial census years would the
names of children living in the tenements have been recorded, and children are often forgotten in the archaeological literature.

Overall, the ceramic consumption patterns among Boston’s immigrant working class at Clough House site is mostly inconsistent with the Victorian model. Tenants primarily used mismatched and older ceramic ware types, although a few owned “fancier” pieces such as decorated whiteware and gilted porcelain. Most vessels were decorated, including some with natural motifs. Some tenants drank tea, but there is no evidence for matched sets for formally hosting afternoon tea or a Victorian dinner party. If this does not match a proper Victorian assemblage, then how does it compare to the other working-class assemblages discussed in Chapter 3?

Comparison to Working-Class Assemblages

The Clough House assemblage does not contain large amounts of ironstone seen by Wall (1991; 1999) and others in both working- and middle-class assemblages of this time. While some whiteware is present, there are more creamware and pearlware sherds and vessels than whiteware, meaning that whiteware was not being used as a substitute for ironstone in large numbers. Indeed, the ceramic assemblage of the late nineteenth-century Clough House appears quite similar to the tenement at the African Meeting House (Landon and Bulger 2013), even though the African Meeting House assemblage predates the Clough House’s main midden by more than fifty years. Instead of whiteware and ironstone, the tenants at the Clough House used mainly pearlware and porcelain teawares, unlike those at Wall’s sites. This cannot simply be attributed to regional
differences, as the working-class assemblages at two other Boston sites, the Tremont Street Housing site and the Paul Revere House, both had whiteware as the most common ware type (Charles and Openo 1987; Elia 1997). Nor can it be explained by a difference in household makeup. The Clough House was primarily home to couples with children, not single people like in the Lowell boardinghouses or Fort Independence (Clements 1989; Beaudry, Cook and Mrozowski 1991). However, in other ways, the Clough House assemblage shares similarities with the Tremont Street Housing Site assemblage. Both included a majority of tablewares and teawares, but included some utilitarian vessels in a lesser amount. Both included few cross mends, reconstructible vessels, or matching patterns, suggesting that the overall assemblage was mismatched. And both included significant amounts of porcelain, including some with fancy gilt decorations (Elia 1997). Since both sites were immigrant tenements, this may represent a broader pattern in Boston’s immigrant working class, but this argument would be strengthened with more material from similar sites.

The fancier porcelains prove that even in the worst areas of the city, Boston’s working class had more than the bare essentials in terms of their ceramics, although ceramics generally did not represent a large cost when compared to other areas of expenditure. Flower pots strengthen this argument, as was also seen in the working classes of New York (Brighton 2001; Yamin 2001) and Lowell (Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001). These aesthetic pieces would provide material comforts while brightening up the tenants’ living spaces. Even in a dark, cramped, and disease-ridden tenement district we find small ways in which people were actively improving the spaces around them.
Besides flowers, some of these pots may have been home to herbs which could be used in home remedies or recipes. The redware pie mold shows that cooking was certainly a regular occurrence in the Clough House, and not just basic meals, but baked goods as well. Growing herbs for making food or medicine at home would be a way to save money—a sign that thriftiness was valued in the working-class community.

**Access to Ceramics and Locations of Purchase**

Brighton argues that over time, Irish immigrants in New York City and surrounding areas became incorporated into broader American society, a shift that occurred around 1880 (Brighton 2011). This shift is signaled in the ceramic assemblages when immigrants began using plain ironstone ceramics with an increase in vessel complexity instead of mismatched sets of transfer-printed dishes (Yamin 2001; Brighton 2011). While this may have been the case in New York, we do not see this shift in Boston, at least in the Clough House, where immigrants continued to use mismatched older ceramics well past 1880. The census records show that the Italian tenants at the Clough House in this period tended to have been in the United States for less than ten years, which might explain the lack of incorporation visible in the ceramics. But many Irish tenants had been in the country since the years following the Irish Famine of the 1840s and 50s, and the Clough House was home to a few American-born workers as well (USBC 1870-1910). Since these groups made up a significant portion of the Clough House’s tenants, it would be expected to see some evidence of incorporation in the ceramic assemblage, but this was not present.
Where were the tenants of the Clough House acquiring such a diverse array of older, mismatched ceramics? With the exception of some German stoneware, almost all of the ceramics at the site would have been made in England’s Staffordshire potteries, which would have been shipped to crockeries in the United States for purchase. In his study of the Irish in Five Points, Brighton concluded that tenants would have the opportunity to purchase new ceramics from area crockeries or street auctions, and secondhand ceramics from neighborhood sales or junk stores (Brighton 2001). The situation seems to be similar in Boston. The Clough House was located in Boston’s urban core, so tenants would have had easy access to a variety of ceramics to purchase, unlike the rural poor. The 1891 Boston City Directory shows at least three crockeries in the North End for purchasing new ceramics and 11 junk stores. These junk stores would have sold older, mismatched, or damaged ceramics secondhand for reduced prices (Brighton 2001). Most North End junk stores were located on Commercial Street, a major one-mile long road that rings the neighborhood along the waterside wharves (BCD 1891). The older and mismatched nature of the ceramic assemblage at the Clough House and the prevalence of junk stores in the area leads me to conclude that many of the ceramics at the Clough House may have been purchased secondhand at these stores.

The acquisition of most ceramics secondhand at junk stores is the very definition of the “frugality effect” that would equate to a large amount of time lag between when the ceramics were manufactured and when they were eventually discarded (Adams 2003). For these working-class consumers, consumption meant the curation and reuse of durable goods instead of throwing items away when they went out of style. In fact, the discarding
of out-of-date ceramics by the upper and middle classes is exactly how the ceramics from
the main midden found their way to junk stores in the first place, as many of these
ceramics were highly decorated and would once have been in style.

The nuances of time lag are understudied, since many archaeological reports do
not comment on the degree of time lag experienced at the site or do not take time lag into
account when dating deposits (Adams 2003). Future studies may be able to correlate
poverty with time lag, although frugality is and was practiced across class lines (Adams
2003).

Conclusion: Reasons for the Clough House Consumption Strategy

While the Clough House is an urban site and we will never know exactly who
used each ceramic vessel recovered archaeologically, the assemblage speaks for the urban
immigrant working class as a collective. However, when writing about the urban working
class, it is important to remember that these people were individuals with diverse
preferences, identities, and constraints. When combined with the narratives constructed
from the archival record, the archaeology humanizes the working class and the tenement
district (Mayne and Murray 2001). Often, urban working-class districts in all cities are
portrayed as uniformly hell-like and homogenous. But, as Mayne and Murray put it:

“To call life in these places ‘hell’ makes impossibly remote the social contexts
that shaped the data we study. It drains them of human agency. It saps the data of
the immediacy that connected them to past lives. It denies the individual and
collective strategies by which neighbours and communities maximised circumscribed life chances, and pursued goals other than those legitimised by hegemonic cultural determinants… These locales knew frustration, hurt and anger. Yet there was still laughter in the poorest of households, and achievements, and dignity displayed there in forms that diverged from the codes of respectability that were enshrined by manuals of bourgeois etiquette… Everywhere in these places are to be found the prosaic residues of lives that were centred around family and neighbourhood” (Mayne and Murray 2001:3).

My work is not meant to deny the hardships of daily existence among poor laborers. The need for cheap labor and lack of regulatory oversight led to terrible conditions in American cities, and life in the tenements was difficult, unsanitary, and often unsafe. Painting these areas as homogenous, however, ignores the diversity in lived experiences within them and how their inhabitants pursued goals which diverged from the hegemonic norm.

Why were the tenants at the Clough House choosing to purchase older, mismatched ceramics? Their consumption pattern speaks to their economic strategy and values. Part of this strategy was based on prices, since older, mismatched wares bought secondhand would have been significantly cheaper than new ceramics. Some tenants could afford fancier wares, but these were present only in small numbers, meaning that many were choosing to spend their money elsewhere. While some may have simply not had the capital to invest in the Victorian idea of proper ceramics, it seems that most chose
not to buy into this ideology, instead choosing to value thriftiness and self-reliance, as evidenced by the flower pots and pie molds in addition to opportunistic and affordable consumption from junk shops. The meager incomes of the working class and the very nature of their living situation—crowded, unsanitary tenements—may even have made the Victorian lifestyle inaccessible.

The lack of matched sets does not mean that the Clough House tenants did not ever entertain friends, as it has been shown that economically challenged groups could and did still entertain others, even with mismatched sets (Pezzarossi 2014). Wall concludes that working-class women did not emulate their middle-class counterparts, instead constructing their own view of domesticity that values of community, solidarity, and mutual aid, traits that would be especially useful to struggling members of the working class (Wall 1999). The older wares at the Clough House were often still highly decorated and would have once been expensive. In other studies of working-class individuals who used ceramics that were once expensive but had become out-of-date access to newer styles was difficult to obtain, which was not the case in urban Boston (Garman and Russo 1999; O’Donovan and Wurst 2001). Therefore, the choice to purchase older ceramics was a conscious result of a dedication to thriftiness and a priority to spend money elsewhere.

While the archival record does not show us where else the Clough House tenants were spending their money, we can infer a few possibilities given the historical context. As we have seen, conditions in the North End during this time were awful, with people crammed into overcrowded and unsanitary tenements. One reason for thriftiness with
ceramic purchases would be to save money in order to move away from the tenement district and out of the North End. Indeed, several Irish and then Italian families eventually moved out of the crowded downtown to surrounding areas in Boston and Cambridge, especially after a generation or two (Woods and Kennedy 1969). These areas, while still home to tenements like the Tremont Street Housing site, were comparatively more sanitary and comfortable than the congested central districts of the city (Woods and Kennedy 1969).

Some Clough House tenants may have eventually moved away from the North End, but others remained in the neighborhood perpetually. As I showed in Chapter 2, the McLaughlin family remained in the North End for around three decades, moving from tenement to tenement every few years. Perhaps they did not have the money to leave the North End, or perhaps they were spending it on something else. For these immigrants, sending remittances to families back in Europe was a common practice, either to support them economically or sponsor their own immigration (Miller 1985). In many cases, one member of a family would come over first and then send for relatives in a few years. This was the case with the Florino family, who left Italy for France, where their first child, Placido, was born around 1904. Giuseppe left for America in 1905, leaving behind his wife and child, who followed one year later. The family was living in the Clough House at the time of the 1910 census.

Saving money on ceramics was thus an economic strategy that allowed for money to be spent instead on what the tenants valued most—giving their family a better life in Boston, first in the North End and then perhaps in slightly more comfortable districts.
The Clough House tenants chose not to invest in the material culture of Victorian
domesticity by prioritizing family and thrift. Perhaps the friends they invited over to
entertain did not care what type of ceramics they were served because for members of the
immigrant working class, it was understood that there were more important things to
worry about. Perhaps the fancier wares found at the Clough House were reserved for
guests, but sharing a cup of tea and conversing about shared experiences of hardship
hardly requires a perfect tea set, not when the money could be spent instead on bettering
the lives of one’s family members.

While archaeological studies of ceramic consumption are common and
worthwhile within the discipline, perhaps they are not studies of the things that urban
working-class people found central to their lives. Still, most historical archaeologists,
myself included, use ceramics as central pieces in their analyses of the people they study,
sometimes using them to date sites without taking time lag into consideration. Ceramics
have become key to so many archaeological analyses due to their high durability and
well-known seriation, but we must not forget that many people in the past may have
given much less thought to their dishes than do the archaeologists of the present.

Nonetheless, the ceramic assemblage at the Clough House demonstrates that
immigrant tenants prioritized thrift and family well-being, with no blind desire to emulate
the middle class. In the case of the Clough House, the documentary and archaeological
record show a human side of tenement life in the North End: women gardening, children
playing, letters to write, pies in the oven, families doing what they could to get by and
lead a normal life. These values come out of the hardships of immigration and tenement
life, where providing the best life for one’s family at home or abroad takes precedence over aspiring to high status.

In the United States, this cycle of immigration and hardship continues perpetually, but today different immigrant groups take the place of the Irish and the Italians. If we are to understand these hardships and address them in the present, we need to adequately study them in the past. Part of this is understanding the different consumption strategies that various working-class communities undertook. This research has shown that the situation in the Clough House was different that those in New York, and indeed different from other studies in Boston. More archaeological analyses of the nineteenth-century working class are necessary, especially in cities where they have not much been studied. In balancing an acceptance for variation with a search for patterns, we can gain a deeper understanding of what poverty was like in the past, and how we can address it in the present.
APPENDIX 1

CLOUGH HOUSE POLL TAX RECORDS

Author’s note: This appendix aims to present a transcription of the poll tax records for 21 Unity Street, some of which are missing, and some of which contain contradictions. These typically record only adult men. The large numbers, when given, are the values for real estate and personal estate, in that order. Sources: BTB 1780-1817; BVB 1818-1821; 1722-1920.

1780 (no negroes, horses, or cows)
Henry Roby, Glazier
Joseph Roby, Jr., 40, trader

1781-1783
Records missing

1784 (they do not own shops, stores, barns, horses, or cows)
Henry Roby, 150, Glazier
Joseph Roby Jr., 50, trader

1785-1789
Records missing

1790
Henry Roby Senior, 175, Glazier, Lame
Henry Roby Junior, gone to Eas/war, Singleman, scribe, (shop in Ward 5)[?]
Joseph Roby Junior, 50, keeps shop, singleman.
1791 (The Robys do not own a carriage)
Henry Roby Sr., 175, Glazier
Joseph Roby Jr., 50, small shop

1792
Records missing

1793
Henry Roby, Senior, 200, Glazier
Joseph Roby, Junior, 200, scribe

1794
Henry Roby, Senior, 200, Glazier
Joseph Roby, Junior, 200, scribe

1795
Records missing

1796
Henry Roby Senior, 700, Glazier, H. and Shop
Joseph Roby, -, scribe, single, boards with his father

1797
Records missing

1798 (no dogs in the house)
Henry Roby Sr., 750, H. Glazier – Sickly
Joseph Roby Jr., -, scribe, singleman

1799
Henry Roby, Sr., 750, Old Glazier House &c
Joseph Roby Jr., -, With above, single male, a scribe

1800
Henry Roby, Senior, 600 (R. Estate), Old Glazier, no business
Joseph Roby, Junior, -, With above, single male, a scribe

1801
Henry Roby, Senior, 600 (R. Estate), Old Glazier Sto, no business
Joseph Roby, Junior, -, With above, single man a scribe

1802
Henry Robey, Glazer[?], 3000, 500
Joseph Robey, Jr., merchant J White & co., see white & co.

1803
Ebenezer Shute, House Carpenter, 800, 1000
Moses Piper, Rigger, 800, 1000

1804
Henry Robey, Tinnman, 1000, 2000

1805
Henry Robey, Tinnman, 2000, 2000

1806
Henry Robey, Gent, 3200, 2400
Joseph Roby, Stationer, 3200, see co, Partner with White

1807
Henry Roby, Gent, 3000, 1000
Joseph Roby, Stationer, 3000, see co, Ward 6 with white
Owners: Samuel Gore and Moses Grant from 1808 through 1818

1808
Grant and Gore, for Empty H. 3600, 1400

1809 (side note, William Dillaway appears living in a house he owns with 4 other men)
Grant and Gore, for Empty H 3600, 1400
1810
David M. Eaton, Auct-?

1811
Francis Holmes, Ship. Carpenter, 1000, 400
Captain Thomas Lambert, Mariner, 1800, 800
John White, mariner, 800, 600

1812
Francis Holmes, Jr. Carpenter, 1400, 200
Thomas Lambert, Mariner, 1400, 800

1813
William Totter[?], Sail maker, 1400, 800
Francis Holmes, Jr. carpenter, 1400, 800

1814
Francis Holmes, carpenter, 1200, 800
Gore and Grant, End H, 1200, 800

1815
Prince Snow, Jr Founder, 600, 200
Francis Homes, Shipwright, 1200, see co, co Rhoades in 2
Abraham Sutton, Seaman, 600, 1200

1816 (owners Samuel Gore and Mary Grant)
William Tilton, Block maker and HS, 1200, 400, sp in 2
Rufus Baxter Jr., Upholsterer + Hs, 1200, 200

1817 (Noah Lincoln* lives next door)
George Johnson, Custom House Officer, 1200, 800
Rufus Baxter Jr., upholsterer, 1200, 400
1818 (owners Grant and Gore)
George Johnson, Custom House Officer, 1200, 800
Henry Fowler Jr., Block Maker, 1200, 400, Shop in 2

Owners: Samuel Gore and Moses Grant heirs from 1819 until 1834

1819 (Owners Grant and Gore Est.)
Benjamin Dodd, Clk, 1200, 400
Freeman Dodd, Clk, 1200, 400
George Johnson, Custom House Officer, 1200, 800

1820 (Owners Grant and Gore)
William Glover, Jeweller, 1200, 400, Shop in 4
Ezekiel Jones, Jeweller, 1200, 400, Shop in 4

1821
William Glover, Jeweller, 1200, 400, shop in 4
Josiah Baldwin, Constable, 1200, 400, separate bill

1822
William Glover, Jeweller, 1200, 400
Josiah Baldwin, Constable, 1200, 200

1823
William Glover, Jeweller, 1200, 400
Rufus Baxter, Jr., upholsterer, 1200, 200

1824
Rufus Baxter Jr., upholsterer, 1200, 600, home in 4
William Cook, Carpenter, 1200, 600, home in 3 or 4
Nathaniel Dyer, jr. Carpenter, 1200, 600
Samuel Ball, jr. Carpenter, 1200, 600
John Cushing, jr. Carpenter, 1200, 600
1825
Rufus Baxter Jr., upholsterer, 1400, 600
James Maleol[...], Jr Baker, 800, 600
John Delay, Clerk, prob. office, 800, 200
1826
Rufus Baxter Jr., upholsterer, 1400, 400
Ebenezer O. Torrey, Jr. Baker, 1600, 400
1827
Edward Bell, mason, 1400, 600
Ebenezer O. Torrey, Jr. Baker, 1600, 600
John Pratt, Jr. Cabinet maker, 1600, 600
1828
Edward Bell, mason, 1600, 600
Ebenezer O. Torrey, Jr. Baker, 1600, 600
John Pratt, Jr. Cabinet maker, 1600, 600
1829
Ebenezer O. Torrey, Jr. Baker, 2800, 1000
John Pratt, Jr. Cabinet maker, 2800, 1000
1830
Ebenezer O. Torrey, Jr baker, 2800, co
John Pratt, jr cabinet maker, 2800, co
Joseph Loring, Jr sail maker, 2800, co
Caleb Pratt, jr. cabinet maker, 2800, co
Jon Davis, jr. cabinet maker, 2800, co
1831
Ebenezer O. Torrey, Jr baker, 2800, co
John Pratt, jr cabinet maker, 2800, co
Joseph Loring, Jr cabinet maker, 2800, co
1832
Ebenezer O. Torrey, Jr baker, 2800, 200
John Pratt, jr cabinet maker, 2800, 200
Joseph Loring, Jr Sail maker, 2800, 200
1833
Ebenezer O. Torrey, jr. baker, 2800, 200
John Pratt, jr cabinet maker, 2800, 200
Joseph Hollis, jr cabinet maker, 2800, 200
1834
Ebenezer O. Torrey, laborer, 2800, 400
Joseph Hollis, laborer, 2800, 400

Owner: William Dillaway from 1835-1886
1835
Ebenzer O. Torrey, Laborer, 2800, co2
Joseph Holles, Jr Laborer, 2800, co2
1836
Samuel N. Jenny, hardware, 2800, 3000
William A. Bates, Jr. paint, 2800, 3000
1837
W. A. Bates, Jr Paint, 2800, 1600
John Snelling Jr., co, taylor, 2800, c08, Co SNeiling, Ward […] Congress St.
1838
John Snelling Jun., Taylor, 2800, 1200, sp. 8 + sp 3 +P. 66
W. A. Bates, Paint, 2800, 400, sp 3 P.19
1839
John McCloud/McLeod [erased and corrected], jr tailor, 2800, co
John Snelling Jr., draper, 2800, 1200
1840
John Snelling Jr., drafter/draper [?] 28, 2800, 600
John McLeod, Jr. tailor, 30, 2800, 600 (Mccloud in 1840 Census)
1841
Thomas Lyford, grocer, 32, 3200, 800
John M. Silva, […]Rig], 37, 3200, 800
1842
Thorndike Chase, Co, shoes, 59, 3200, co, Co Buzzell 2
Charles Gray, Clothes, 3200, 1000, sp ann
1843
Thorndike Chase, Co, shoes, 3200, co, co buzzell 2
Thomas Pratt, jr. mast, 3200, co
Tomas Learnard, tender, 3200, co [tender could be machinery]
1844
Thorndike Chase, jr shoe, 3200, see co,
Thomas Pratt, jr. mast, 3200, see co
Tomas Learnard, jr tailer, 3200, see co
1845
William Alexander, Inspector CH. 3200, co
John W. Anderson, Mariner, 3200, 200
David T. Robinson, Boatman, 3200, 200

1846
John W. Anderson, mariner, 3200, see co
William Alexander, W Insp. C. H.

1847
John Lewin, Sea Captain, 3200, 400
James B. Leeds, painter, 3200, 400, see co, co Ricker Hanover St 2
Joshua M. Weeks [?], Jr. broker?, 3200 see co
George W. Leeds, [?], 3200, see co [line is crossed out]

1848
John Lewin, Sea Captain, 3200, 400
James B. Leeds, painter, 3200, see co, pt, by Mrs. Belcher, co Ricker 2 [?]

1849
John Lewin, Mast Mariner, 3200, 400
James B. Leeds, co, painter, 3200, 400

1850
John Lewin, mast mariner, 3200, 1000
James B. Leeds, co, painter, 3200, 1000, co D Ricker 4 Howard St
Osgood Chase, clerk, 3200, 1000
Edward Dickenson, caulkier, 3200, 1000

1851
James B. Leeds, co, painter, 3200, co, co Ricker 3 Union St
Osgood Chase, clerk, [?]
George Golbert, Jr mast

1852
George Golbert, Jr mast, 3200, 400, pt Empty
1853
George Golbert, Jr. Mast, 3200, co
Theophilus Nash, Gent, 3200, co

1854
George Golbert, Jr. Mast & Spar, 3600, 500
Samuel F. Holmes, Jr. Mast & Spar, 3600, 500
Joseph Hubbard, Jr. Caulker, 3600, 500
Hiram Nickerson, Jr. Machinist, 3600, 500
George H. Nickerson, Jr. Machinist, 3600, 500
Theophilus Nash, Gent, 3600, 1000

1855
Theophilus Nash, Gent, 3600, 2000
William H. Mason, Pattern maker, 3600, 2000
John Holbrook, Clerk, 3600, 2000

1856
William H. Mason, Pattern maker, 3800, 400
Theophilus Nash, Gent, 3600, 2000

1857
John M. Eaton, Type, 5000, 400
Benjamin F. Eaton, Sail, 5000, 400
George W. Dillaway, Gent, 5000, 400
Theophilus Nash, Gent, 5000, 2000, Rear, In California

1858
Benjamin F. Eaton, Sail, 5000, 500
Theophilus Nash, Gent, 5000, 500
Thomas S. Lathrop, Bunker, 5000, 500, rear.
1859
John M. Eaton, Jr. Type Caster, 5000, 500
Benjamin F. Eaton, Junior Sailmaker, 5000, 500
Theophilus Nash, Gent, 5000, 500

1860
John M. Eaton, Jr. Type Caster, 5000, 400
Frank C. Scott, Pattern Maker, 5000, 400 [penciled in] [not in census]
Benjamin F. Eaton, Junior Sailmaker, 5000, 400

1861
John M. Eaton, Jr. Type Caster, 4800, 400
Benjamin F. Eaton, Junior Sailmaker, 4800, 400
Joseph G. Jenkins, Watchman, 4800, 400

1862
Samuel E. Mills, Driver, 4500, 400
Joseph G. Jenkins, Watchman, 4500, 400

1863
Joseph G. Jenkins, Watchman, 4500, 600
Frederick W. A. Rankin*, Jr. Shoe, 4500, 600

1864
Joseph G. Jenkins, Watchman, 4500, 500
Frederick W. A. Rankin*, Shoemaker, 4500, 500

1865
Joseph G. Jenkins, Watchman, 4500, 300
John Fox, Provision/Provisory[?], rear, 4500, 300

1866
Joseph G. Jenkins, Watchman
John Fox, Furniture, Shop on Salem, rear, 400

1867
Alexander McDonald*, Gent
Joseph G. Jenkins, Watchman

1868
Joseph G. Jenkins, Mason
Alpheus F. Jenkins, Clerk
Willard R. Jenkins, Clerk
Henry J. Stevenson, Bootmaker
Alpheus Barry, Saloon

1869
Joseph G. Jenkins, Mason
Alpheus F. Jenkins, Clerk
Willard R. Jenkins, Clerk
Henry J. Stevenson, Bootmaker

1870
Joseph G. Jenkins, Mason
Henry J. Stevenson, Bootmaker
Selid P. Matthews, Clerk
Henry Joan, Laborer
Alpheus F. Jenkins, Clerk
Willard R. Jenkins, Clerk

1871
Joseph G. Jenkins, Foreman
Alpheus F. Jenkins, Upholsterer
Willard R. Jenkins, Clerk
Henry J. Stevenson, Bootmaker
Edward H. McCain, Furniture
Henry P. Coan, Clerk
1872
Joseph G. Jenkins, Foreman
Alpheus F. Jenkins, Upholsterer, “If John Persall is here he is a [?] citizen”
Thomas J. Pomeroy, Tender
James H. McKay, Ship Caulker
Henry J. Stevenson, Bootmaker
1873
Joseph G. Jenkins, Foreman
Alpheus F. Jenkins, Upholsterer
Henry J. Stevenson, Bootmaker
Alvin Rogers, Laborer
Nicholas Greet, Caulker
John Flaters, Clerk
Smith, Clerk
1874
Joseph G. Jenkins, Foreman
Andrew Peterson
Henry J. Stevenson, Bootmaker
Andrew Peters, Laborer, rear
Jacob C. Wall
William Kellary, Laborer
Richard Butler, Loafer
Edward O’Malley, Grocer, 300
1875

Henry J. Stevenson, Bootmaker
Joseph G. Jenkins, Foreman
Samuel Bangs, Tender
Jay Cook Smith, Bookkeeper
John R. Haslam, Hatter, rear
Edward O’Malley, Grocer, rear 300
Thomas Carroll, Fish, rear

1876 (new field is location in previous year)

Charles W. Green, Tender, 31 N. Bennett
Frank Schiller, Tender, 31 N. Bennett
Andrew C. Smith, Clerk, 31 N. Bennett
Joseph Frates, Tender, 31 N. Bennett
John R. Haslam, Hatter, rear, Here
William Allen, Tender, rear, Noyer[/s] Pe
Dennis Coleman, Capmaker, rear, Orleans St EB
Peter Mahoney, Fireman, rear, Orleans St EB
Charles Hoofner, Sailmaker, rear, Linden EB

1877

Charles W. Green, Tender, here
Andrew C. Smith, Gent, here
Frank Schiller, Groceries, here
Joseph G. Jenkins, Wharfinger, here
John R. Haslam, Hatter, rear, here
William Allen, Tender, rear, here
Dennis Coleman, Capmaker, rear, Orleans St EB
John Reynolds, Mariner, rear, ?
Charles Sullivan, Laborer, rear, ?

1878
Joseph G. Jenkins, Wharfinger, here, 600
Leander Poggs, Junk, ?
James Hunt, Fish, ?
Marshall Oakes, clerk, ?
William Blanchard*, clerk, ?
Dennis B. Coleman, Hatter, rear, here
James Halpin, Laborer, rear, rear 458 com. st
John R. Haslam, Hatter, rear here

1879
Joseph G. Jenkins, Wharfinger, here
John Martin I, Laborer, 1st rear, ? “1st rear, formerly nos. 1 & 2 Salem Ct.[Cr?] Now partitioned off only entrance from unity st.
John Martin II, Laborer, 1st rear, ?
Cornelius Sullivan, Laborer, 1st rear, ?
Samuel Sullivan, Laborer, 1st rear, ?
Dennis O’Neil, Laborer, 1st rear, ?
Patrick Riley [Riley?], Laborer, 1st rear, ?
Dennis B. Coleman, Hatter, 2nd rear, here
Alonzo [?], painter, 2nd rear [?]
George Clark, pedlar [peddler], 2nd rear, ?

1880
Tax records missing
1881

Joseph G. Jenkins, Wharfinger, here
Frederick W. French, shoemaker, here
Bernard McLaughlin, laborer, 1st rear, here “1st rear, formerly no 1-2 salem Ct now partitioned off only entrance from unity st”
Patrick McGinnis, laborer, 1st rear, here
Henry J. Cane, Hostler, 1st rear, OC
Dennis B. Coleman, Hatter, 2nd rear, here

1882

Joseph G. Jenkins, Wharfinger, here
Frederick W. French, shoemaker, here
Bernard McLaughlin, laborer, 1st rear, here “1st rear, formerly 1-2 Salem Ct now partitioned off only entrance from unity st”
Patrick McGinnis, laborer, 1st rear, here
Dennis B. Coleman, Hatter, 2nd rear, here
Thomas W. Dwyer, Fish, 2nd rear, 37 Baldwill

1883

Joseph G. Jenkins, Wharfinger, here
Frederick W. French, shoemaker, here
Bernard McLaughlin, laborer, 1st rear, here “1st rear, formerly 1-2 Salem Ct now partitioned off only entrance from unity st”
Patrick McGinnis, laborer, 1st rear, here
Thomas W. McLaughlin, laborer, 1st rear, 21/83 Unity Street
Dennis B. Coleman, Hatter, 2nd rear, here
Thomas W. Dwyer, Fish, 2nd rear, here

1884

Joseph G. Jenkins, Wharfinger, here
Frederick W. French, shoemaker, here
House by Women, 1st rear
Dennis B. Coleman, Hatter, 2nd rear, here
Thomas W. Dwyer, Fish, 2nd rear, here

1885
Joseph G. Jenkins, Wharfinger, here
Frederick W. French, shoemaker, here
Amasa Welch, Tender, ?
House by Women, 1st rear, here
Dennis B. Coleman, Hatter, 2nd rear, here
Margaret E. Coleman, female, 2nd rear,
Thomas W. Dwyer, fish, 2nd rear, here
Mary A. Crowley, female, 2nd rear

“Tax 1886 [?] 2 estates to Joseph Devoto ½ + Louisa + Seraphina Urata ½ [?]”

Owners: Joseph Devoto ½ Louisa and Seraphina Urata ½

1886 (new field is supposed age)
Joseph G. Jenkins, 62, Wharfinger, here
Frederick W. French, 66, shoemaker, here
Amasa Welch, 22, Tender, here
John H. Driscoll, 30, Packer, 1st rear, ?
Timothy J. Crowley, 21, Clerk, 1st rear, ?
Dennis B. Coleman, 30, Hatter, 2nd rear, here
Margaret E. Coleman, 27, female, 2nd rear, here
Mary A. Crowley, female, 2nd rear, here
1887
Joseph G. Jenkins, 63, Wharfinger, here
Frederick W. French, 67, shoemaker, here
Amasa Welch, 23, Tender, here
John H. Driscoll, 31, Packer, 1st rear, here
Timothy J. Crowley, 22, Clerk, 1st rear, here
Dennis B. Coleman, 31, Hatter, 2nd rear, here
Daniel Ahearn*, 28, laborer, 2nd rear, here [try Ahern(e) and O’Hern]

1888
Frederick W. French, 68, shoemaker, here
Clarissa R. French, 40, female,
Timothy J. Crowley, 24[23], Clerk, 21 unity 1st rear
Mary A. Crowley, 28, female
Julia Crowley, 55, female
Frank Raffaelo, 30, Jeweler [?], 1st rear, [?]
John Rosetta [?]. 48, Steam Filler [?], 1st rear, ditto
Dennis B. Coleman, 32, Hatter, 2nd rear, here
Ellen Coleman, 28, female, 2nd rear
William H. Coleman, 22, Gilder, 2nd rear
Margaret Coleman, female, 2nd rear
Daniel Ahearn*, 29, Laborer, 2nd rear, here
Mary Ahern, 32, female, 2nd rear

1889
Frederick W. French, 69, shoemaker, here
Timothy J. Crowley, 24, Clerk, here
Frank Raffaelo, 30, Fruit, 1st rear, here
John Rosetta [?]. 48, Filler, 1st rear, here
Dennis B. Coleman, 32 [33], Hatter, 2nd rear, here
Daniel Ahearn*, 29, Laborer, 2nd rear, here

1890
Frederick W. French, 70, shoemaker, here
Timothy J. Crowley, 25, Clerk, here
Frank Raffaelo, 31, Fruit, 1st rear, here
John Rosetta [?]. 49, Fruit, 1st rear, here
Dennis B. Coleman, 34, Hatter, 2nd rear, here
William H. Coleman, 25, Gilder, 2nd rear, here
Daniel Ahearn*, 30, Laborer, 2nd rear, here

1891
Frederick W. French, 71, shoemaker, here
Timothy J. Crowley, 26, Clerk, here
Frank Raffaelo, 33, Fruit, 1st rear, here
John Rosetta, 50, Fruit, 1st rear, here
Dennis B. Coleman, 34, Hatter, 2nd rear, here
William H. Coleman, 26, Gilder, 2nd rear, here
Daniel Ahearn*, 31, Laborer, 2nd rear, here

1892
Frederick W. French, 72, shoemaker, here
Timothy J. Crowley, 27, Clerk, here
Frank Raffaelo, 23, Fruit, 1st rear, here
John Rosetta, 50, Fruit, 1st rear, here
Daniel O’Hern*, 39, Laborer, 2nd rear, here
A[b]raham White, 40, laborer, 2nd rear, oc
Henry Roach [?], 35, laborer, 2nd rear, oc

1893
House vacant
Frank Raffaelo, 24, Fruit, 1st rear, here
John Rosetta, 51, Fruit, 1st rear, here
Henry Roach [?], 36, laborer, 2nd rear, here
Daniel O’Hern*, 40, Laborer, 2nd rear, here
Amos White, 45, laborer, 2nd rear, ?
Daniel Sullivan, 36, laborer, 2nd rear, 33 no. Bennett

1894
Bartholomew Merry, 29, laborer, ?
Frank Raffaelo, 25, Fruit, 1st rear, here
John Rosetta, 52, Fruit, 1st rear, here
Henry Roach, 37, laborer, 2nd rear, here
Daniel O’Hern*, 41, Laborer, 2nd rear, here
Daniel Sullivan, 37, laborer, 2nd rear, here

1895
Murdoch White [scot?], 47, Tin [?], ?
Abraham White, 36, Tin [?], ?
Frederick Cuzio, 36, Printer, [?]
Daniel O’Hern*, 42, Laborer, 1st rear, 21 unity st 2nd rear
Cesare Salvi, 25, Engraver [or Engineer], 1st rear, [?]
Henry Roach, 38, laborer, 1st rear, 21 unity st 2nd rear
James Emery, 38, Ship[?], 2nd rear, 13 Fleet
Domenico Ratti, 25, Builder[?], 2nd rear, ?
John Mundano, [Mondano?] 30, Peddler, 2nd rear, ?
1896
Murdoch White [scot?], 48, Tin [?], here
Abraham White, 37, Tin [?], here
Redmund [Redmond] P. Cook, 45, Fish, ?
Martin J. Cook, 21, Builder
Daniel O’Hern*, 43, Laborer, 1st rear, here
Henry Roach, 39, laborer, 1st rear, here
William Parker, 30, laborer, 1st rear, ?
James Emery, 39, Shipping[?], 2nd rear, here
Domenico Ratti, 26, Builder[?], 2nd rear, here

1897
Fortunato Farega, 30, laborer, ?
Angelo Letto, 31, laborer, ?
Redmond P. Cook, 46, laborer, here
Michael Redmond, 65, Fish, 1st rear, New Street
Michael J. Redmond, 30, music, 1st rear, new st
Andrew Redmond, 28, printer, 1st rear, new st
James Emery, 40, Shipping, 2nd rear, here
Edward Rogers, 30, mason, 2nd rear, [?] 
Domenico Ratti, 27, mason, 2nd rear, here

1898
Fortunato Farega, 31, laborer, here
Angelo Letto, 32, laborer, here
Daniel O’Hern*, 45, laborer, 1st rear, here
Redmond P. Cook, 47, laborer, 1st rear, here
Michael Redmond, 66, Fish, 1st rear, here
Michael J. Redmond, 31, music, 1st rear, here
Andrew Redmond, 29, printer, 1st rear, here
Edward Rogers, 31, mason, 2nd rear, here
Domenico Ratti, 28, mason, 2nd rear, here

1899
Giovanni Pentolari, 35, painter, ?
Giobatista Grecco, 25, carpenter, ?
Giovanni Moglia, 30, glazier, ?
Giuseppe Ferazza, 29, Confectioner, ?
Bendetto Molini, 23, Confectioner, ?
Daniel Ahern*, 45, laborer, here
Luigi Moltedo, 33, laborer, marble, ?
Sylvio G. Schiaffino, 33, packer, ?
Redmond P. Cook, 48, packer, rear, here
Edward Rogers, 32, mason, rear, here

1900
Record missing

1901
Giovanni Pentolari, 37, painter, here
Giovanni Moglia, 32, glazer, here
Bendetto Molini, 25, confectioner, here
Luigi Moltedo, 35, marble, here
Giuseppe Garbarino, 26, glass, rear, here
Giambatista Guiecco, 28, carpenter, rear, here
Arturo Albertini, 40, o.c., marble, rear

1902
Luigi Moldedo, 36, here, marble
Luigi Caugiano, 24, o.c., music
John Parasso, 45, 27 charter, fruit
Bartolomeo Tachella, 45, 130 Medford st, laborer
Giovanni Botacchi, 28, 11 unity, oiler
Giovanni Bregoli, 28, 11 unity, oiler
Angelo Ferrari, 35, 127 north, candy, rear

1903
Luigi Moldedo, 37, here, marble
John Joe Parasso, 46, here, fruit
Bartolomeo Tachella, 46, here, laborer
Giovanni Botacchi, 29, 11 unity, oiler
Antonio Delicato, 28, here, glass
Giovanni Bregoli, 29, 11 unity, oiler
Antonio Ferrari, 36, here, candy, rear
Pilado Mardotti, 35, o.c. marble, rear
John F. Cuneo, 23, 34 no. Bennett, sales, rear
Giovanni Batta Nassano, 60, o.c., none, rear
Raffaele Nassano, 28, o.c., glass, rear

1904
Luigi Moldedo, 38, here, marble
Joseph Parasso, 47, here, fruit
Bartolomeo Tachella, 47, here, laborer
Antonio Delicato, 29, here, glass
Giovanni Bregoli, 30, here, oiler
Giovanni Batta Nassano, 61 here, none, rear
Raffaele Nassano, 29, here, glass, rear
Canio Panara, 40, o.c., laborer, rear

1905 (after the records were taken, a large vacant was added to all records at 21 unity st for this year
Joseph Parasso, 48, here, fruit
Bartholomeo Tachella, 48, here, laborer
Antonio Delicato, 30, here, glass
Enrico Cavaliere, 31, shipper
Raffaele Nassano, 30, here, glass, rear
Canio Panara, 41, o.c., laborer, rear
Antonio Di Giuseppe, 23, laborer, rear

1906
21: House being remodeled
21 rear: House being remodeled (See in 1902-)

1907
Felice Ricci, 35, laborer
Antonio Chiusano, 25, barber
Nicola Calamanto, 25, waiter
Michele Caprozzo, 20, laborer
Giuseppe Floriano, 25, laborer
Francesco Anzalotti, 28, laborer
Salvatore Vassalo, 35, laborer, rear
Giuseppe Schenori, 30, laborer, rear
Antonio Ruggiero, 45, candy, rear

1908
Antonio Chiusano, 26, here, barber
Nicola Calamanto, 26, here, waiter
Carlo Zulillo, 43, here, baker
Giuseppe Florino, 27, plasterer
Gugliermo Chiusano, 62, here, laborer
Pietro Cuneo, 25, rear 21 unity st, painter
Leonardo Pucci, 24, here, sales
Giovanni Cuneo, 37, 4 prince, laborer
Enrico Grecco, 32, o.c., fruit
Bartolomeo Repretto, 24, laborer
Michele Manciano, 30, o.c., laborer
Giovanni Manciano, 32, o.c., baker
Antonio Ruggiero, 46, here, candy, rear
Pasquale Angelo, 33, o.c., candy, rear
Giobatta Ferrara, 30, here, laborer, rear

1909
  Antonio Chiusano, 27, here, barber, rear
Nicola Calamanto, 27, here, waiter
Carlo Zulillo, 44, here, baker
Guglielmo Chiusano, 63, here, laborer, rear
Giovanni Cuneo, 38, here, laborer
Enrico Grecco, 33, here, fruit
Bartolomeo Repetto, 25, here laborer
Severino Querio, 36, bartender
Giovanni Dondero, 32, o.c., laborer
Giobatta Ferrara, 31, here, laborer, rear
Armadio Guarardi, 36, cook, rear
1910
Giuseppe Florino, 29, here, laborer
Giovanni Brunio, 38, here, laborer
Enrico Grecco, 24, here, fruit
Severino Querio, 37, here, bartender
Giovanni Dandero, 33, here, laborer
Antonio Chiusano, 28, here, barber, rear
Guglielmo Chiusano, 64, here, laborer, rear

1911
Giuseppe Florino, 30, here, laborer
Giovanni Brunio, 39 here, laborer
Giovanni Dandero, 34, here, laborer
Felice Rizzo, 35, here, laborer
Pasquale Cangiano, 35, here, laborer, rear
Armadio Guarardi, 38, cook, rear
Giobatta Ferrara, 22, here, laborer, rear

1912
Giuseppe Florino, 31, here, laborer
Giovanni Dandero, 35, here, laborer
Felice Pizzo, 36, here, laborer
Guglielmo Chiusano, 66, here, laborer
Nicola Chiusano, 23, here, barber
Antonio Chiusano, 27, here, barber
Antonio Ferrara, 23, here, laborer, rear
Giobatta Ferrara, 22, here, laborer, rear

1913
Felice Pizzo, 37, here, laborer
Guglielmo Chiusano, 67, here, laborer
Nicola Chiusano, 24, here, barber
Antonio Chiusano, 28, here, barber
Ettore Mocci, 31, here, laborer
Giobatta Ferrara, 24, here, laborer, rear
Giovanni Dandero, 35, 21 unity st [front], bricklayer, rear
Angelo Ferrara, 40, here, waiter, rear
Lorenzo Appice, 29, here, market, rear
Primo Morelli, 29, o.c., laborer, rear

1914
Guglielmo Chiusano, 68, here, laborer
Nicola Chiusano, 25, here, barber
Antonio Chiusano, 29, here, barber
Gaetano Ricci, 39, here, laborer
Marco Fopriano, 29, unknown, polisher
Giovanni Romani, 21, 3 Salem Ct, printer
Giovanni Dandero, 36, here, bricklayer, rear
Angelo Ferrara, 41, here, waiter, rear
Lorenzo Appice, 30, here, market, rear
Antonio Latorella, 58, unknown, laborer, rear

1915
Guglielmo Chiusano, 68, here, laborer
Nicola Chiusano, 26, here, barber
Antonio Chiusano, 30, here, barber
Giovanni Romani, 22, 3 salem ct, printer
Giovanni Assinari, 31, 183 endicott, trackman
Angelo Ferrara, 42, here, waiter, rear
Antonio Latorella, 59, here, laborer, rear
Crescenzo Barasso, 34, here, foreman, rear
Quinto Prosperi, 27, 183 Endicott, laborer, rear
Michele Prosperi, 31, 183 Endicott, butcher, rear
Santo Nardini, 44, Battery st, laborer, rear

1916
Nicola Avaggi, 34, Italy, laborer
Giovanni Asinarri, 40, 40 Bennet, laborer
Antoni Cusanni, 33, here, barber
Nicola Cusanni, 26, here, barber
William Cusanni, 71, here, retired
John Romani, 22, here, printer
Antoni Esposito, 25, 21 Webster, laborer
Raffaele Scopa, 45, 70 Charter, laborer, rear
Felipe Cortelli, 22, 32 Battery, cook, rear
John Dondero, 41, here, laborer, rear
Antonio La Turelle, 59, here, laborer, rear
Michele Prospero, 33, 183 Endicott, laborer, rear
Nardini Saute, 44, 32 Battery, laborer, rear

1917
Nicola Avaggi, 35, here, laborer
Giovanni Assinari, 41, here, laborer

133
Antonio Cusanni, 34, here, barber
Nicola Cusanni, 27, here, barber
William Cusanni, 72, here, retired
John Romani, 23, here, printer
Antoni Esposito, 26, here, laborer
Sabatini Sargente, 61, 82 Charter, tinsmith
John Dondero, 42, here, laborer, rear
Michele Prospero, 34, here, laborer, rear
Nardini Saute, 44, here, laborer, rear
Eugenio Tesa, 30, 5 Prince, laborer, rear
Salvatore Bonofina, 40, 12 Greeno Lane, laborer

1918
21: Dwelling Ho Brick, 3 polls, entrance
21a: Store vacant grocer
21b: John Merino (lives Snelling Place) Store, grocer
21 rear (passageway): Dwelling Ho Brick, 4 polls, entrance

1919
21: Dwelling Ho, 3 polls, occ brick
21a: Store by grocer
21b: John Merino (lives Snelling Place) Store, grocer
21 rear (passageway): Dwelling Ho, 4 polls, occ brick

1920
21: Single Ho, 3 polls, occ brick, store by candy
21A: Single Ho, 3 polls, occ brick,
21 B: Store by grocer
Passageway
21 rear: 3 family ho., 4 polls, occ. brick
APPENDIX 2

CLOUGH HOUSE CENSUS RECORDS

Author’s Note: Several censuses have been lost over the years, and are thus not included. Primary source: USBC 1790-1940.

1790 Census
Census shows: 2 males (16+) 4 males (under 16), and 4 females.

1820 Census
All are listed as white.

William Glover
Family includes:
1 male (10-16)
1 male (26-45)
2 females (under 10)
1 female (16-26)
1 female (26-45)
1 female (over 45)
1 person is engaged in manufactures.
Ezekiel Jones

Family includes:
2 males (under 10)
1 male (10-16)
1 male (26-45)
1 female (under 10)
1 female (10-16)
1 female (26-45)

1830 Census

No colored people living in the house.

The census is not listed by house number, but the names from the poll tax records allow for the following reconstruction:

Ebenezer O. Torrey

Family includes
1 male (10-15)
1 male (30-40)
1 female (under 5)
2 females (5-10)
1 female (30-40)

Caleb Pratt

Family includes
1 male (20-30)
1 female (under 5)
1 female (20-30)

**John Pratt, Jr.**

Family includes
1 male (under 5)
3 males (20-30)
1 female (under 5)
1 female (20-30)

**Joseph Loring**

Family includes:
1 male (40-50)
1 male (60-70)
1 female (30-40)

**John Davis**

Family includes
1 male (under 5)
1 male (15-20)
1 male (20-30)
1 female (15-20)
1 female 40-50)

---

**1840 Census**

**John Snelling Jr.**

Family includes:
1 male (30-40),
2 females (under 5)
2 females (15-20)
1 female (20-30)
1 female (30-40)

1 person works in the commerce sector.
1 person works in manufactures and trades.

**John McLeod**

Family includes:
3 females (15-20)
1 female (20-30)
1 female (30-40)
1 female (40-50)

1 person works in manufactures and trades.

---

**1850 Census**

**APARTMENT 1**

**James B. Leeds**, male, (age 31), b. MA, Painter and Glazer

**Helen Leeds**, female, (age 25), b. MA

  **James B. Leeds**, male (age 8) b. MA, attends school
  **Helen F. Leeds**, female, (age 6) b. MA, attends school
  **Osgood C. Leeds**, male (age 1) b. MA

**Osgood C. Leeds**, male (age 20), b. MA, produce store

**Mary Durant**, female (age 16), b. MA
APARTMENT 2

**John Lewin [Laven]**, male, (age 42), b. Germany, Master Mariner

**Mary Ann Lewin**, female, (age 38), b. MA

**Daniel G. E. Dickenson**, male, (age 22), Caulker, b. MA

**Ann R. Dickenson**, female (age 19), b. MA

---

1860 Census

**Joseph G. Jenkins**, (age 37), b. Falmouth, MA

**Deborah R. Jenkins**, wife (age 34), b. Otisfield, ME

  - **Alpheus F. Jenkins**, male, (age 13), b. Boston, attends school
  - **Almira A. Jenkins**, female, (age 10) b. Boston, attends school
  - **Clara E. Jenkins**, female, (age 9), b. Boston, attends school

**Almira T. Winship**, female, (age 30), b. Otisfield, ME

**Rebecca Eaton**, female, (age 70), b. Boston, widow

  - **John M. Eaton**, male (age 33), b. Boston, Type maker
  - **Benjamin F. Eaton**, male (age 29), b. Boston, Sail maker
1870 Census

Everyone is listed as white.

APARTMENT 1

Joseph Jenkins, (age 46), white b. MA to MA parents, Clerk in store

Debra R. Jenkins, wife (age 43), white b. MA, keeps house

   F. Apheus Jenkins, male, (age 23), white b. MA, clerk in store
   E. Clara Jenkins, female, (age 19), white b. MA, no occupation
   E. Emma Jenkins, female (age 15) white b. MA, at home, attended school within the year
   R. Willard Jenkins, male (age 27) white b. MA, clerk in store

APARTMENT 2

J. Henry Stephenson, male, (age 55) white b. MA, bootmaker

Jane Stephenson, female (age 27) white b. MA, keeps house

Melvina Cann, female, (age 29) white b. MA, dressmaker

Cecilia Matthews, male, (age 20) white b. MA, clerk in store

J. Henry Cann, male (age 23) white b. MA, clerk in store

Joseph Webb, male (age 29) white b. MA, laborer

1880 Census

Everyone is listed as white.

FRONT APARTMENT

Joseph T./G. Jenkins, (age 57) b. 1823 in MA to MA parents, works on Coal Wharf
Debra R. Jenkins, wife (age 54) b. 1826 in ME to ME parents, keeps house

Frederick French (age 60), b. 1820 in England to English parents, book cutter

Abigail French, wife (age 69) b. 1811 in MA to MA parents, keeps house

Clarasin R. French, daughter, single (age 32) b. 1848 in MA, book cutter

FIRST REAR APARTMENT

McLaughlin, Bernard “Barney” (age 54), b. 1825/6 in Ireland to Irish parents, Laborer, cannot read or write

McLaughlin, Alice (age 53), wife, b. 1826/7 in Ireland to Irish parents, keeps house.

Both immigrated sometime between 1849-1855.

McLaughlin, Thomas W., son, single, (age 19) b. 11/20/1860 on 30 Cross St. Boston, Butcher in 1880 (marries Annie Clark on 7/19/1885)

McLaughlin, Rebecca, daughter, single (age 17) b. 1863 in MA, sales girl.

McLaughlin, Charles, son, single (age 12), b. 8/28/1868 on 3 Thacher St, Boston, at school in 1880.

More notes on the McLaughlins:

1855 MA census shows Bernard & Ally, age 29, living in ward 7 (not north end) with Rebecca (9), John (6) and Bernard Jr. (1).

1856 the couple lives at 14 Batterymarch St, Boston, where Henry is born (see below).

1860 Nov 20 Thomas is born, Bernard and Alice live on 30 Cross St. Boston (North End) (see above)

1865 MA census show Bernard and Alice plus John, Bernard Jr., Henry, Mary, Thomas, and Rebecca.

1870 Census shows these(?) children plus Henry (b. 1857 in MA) and Mary (b. 1859 in MA), Bernard and Alice. The family lived in Ward 2 (north end).

---

1 Massachusetts Town and Vital Records 1860; 1885
2 Massachusetts State Census 1855
3 Massachusetts State Census 1865
4 USBC 1870
John is born to Bernard and Alice in 1849 in Ireland. He dies a clerk in 1880 at the age of 31 at 25 Henchman St, Boston (N. End). Cause of death = *Phthisis Pulmonalis*, or tuberculosis of the lungs.  

Bernard Jr. is born in Boston in 1855 to Bernard and Alice. He marries Rosa Kane / Rose Kaine (They name their daughter Alice in 1899) (b. Ireland 23, possibly related to his mother Alice Kane) on 5/21/1890, listed as a laborer.  

Henry J. is born to Bernard and Alice on 4/7/1856, at home 14 Battery March, Boston and marries Sarah McGlone on 9/30/1879 at age 23 in Boston, working as a printer. He dies at age 38 on 12/9/1894 from “Ventral and Aortic Insufficiency”.  

Mary Ann is born to Bernard and Alice on 7/29/1858 in Boston, who are listed at living on 29 Cross St., Boston.  

Dennis is born 5/6/1866 on 51 Endicott St to Bernard and Alice but doesn’t appear to live to his fourth birthday, as he is not present in the 1870 census.  

Alice (1866-1867) at 80 Cross Street, dies of Meningitis.

---

5 Massachusetts Death Records 1880  
6 USBC 1900  
7 Massachusetts Marriage Records 1890  
8 Massachusetts Birth Records 1856  
9 Massachusetts Marriage Records 1879  
10 Massachusetts Death records 1894  
11 Boston Births, Marriages and Deaths 1858  
12 Massachusetts Birth Records 1866  
13 USBC 1870  
14 Massachusetts Town and Vital Records 1866, 1867
McGinnis, Patrick, (age 24), b. 7/1857\textsuperscript{15} in Ireland to Irish parents, laborer.

Immigrated 1866, age 9. Surname popular in Northern Ireland.

McGinnis, Mary A., wife (age 22) b. 8/1859\textsuperscript{16} in MA to Irish parents, keeps house.

McGinnis, Charles (age 7 months), b. 11/8/1879 on 25 Henchman St., Boston (N. End)\textsuperscript{17}

Lived on 25 Pearl st (Charlestown) in 1900 with 3 kids (jobs listed)

Kane, Henry J., boarder, (age 32) b. 1848 in Ireland to Irish parents, laborer/hostler. Related to Alice nee Kane? According to 1900 census, shows up as a widowed farm manager in Townsend, MA, naturalized at some point after arrival in 1861. (b may 1847)\textsuperscript{18}

Immigrated in 1861?

SECOND REAR APARTMENT

Coleman, Margaret E., widowed, (age 54), b. 6/1825 in Ireland to Irish parents, rheumatism, cannot write, keeps house.

Immigrated 1845. Surname popular in Cork

Coleman, Dennis B., son, single, (age 28) b. 2/1851 in MA to Irish parents, catheter, cap maker.

Coleman, Margaret E., daughter (age 21), b. 4/1859 in MA to Irish parents, at home.

Coleman, William H., son, single (age 14), b. 1866 in MA to Irish parents.

\textsuperscript{15} USBC 1900
\textsuperscript{16} USBC 1900
\textsuperscript{17} Massachusetts Town and Vital Records 1879
\textsuperscript{18} USBC 1900
More notes on the Coleman family:

1850 Census also has Jeremiah (infant) and Brian/Bryan/Brien Coleman (b. 1823 Ireland d. ~1864/5? MA), Margaret’s husband.19

1855 MA census has Bryan and Margaret living with many other families in Boston Ward 7. They have Jeremiah, Dennis, Julia, and Catherine.20

1865 MA census has the Colemans living with 4 other families (23 total people), some were born in US, Ireland, France, and Spain. Margaret, already widowed, works as a peddler with 6 children: Jeremiah, 15, picture frames, Dennis, 14, Julia, 12, Michael, 9, Margaret, 7, and William, 2.21 Of these, Jeremiah, Julia, and Michael do not show up in the 1880 census.22

1870 Census has the three children from 1880 plus Jeremiah Coleman (b. 1850) and a non-relative child. Margaret is till widowed. In Ward 1 (East), Boston.23

1900 has Margaret Sr. living with Dennis and Margaret Jr, who are unmarried, with 2 servant brothers, but she still can’t write.24

So the father Bryan dies, as do several children: Jeremiah, Julia, Michael, and Catherine, leaving only Dennis, Margaret Jr. and William surviving.

**Hayes, Alonzo**, (age 40), b. 1840 in MA to English Parents, painter.

**Hayes, Mary A.**, wife (age 37) b. 1843 in MA to Irish Parents, keeps house.

**Hayes, Millisa A.** (age 5) b. 1875 in MA to MA parents.

**Hayes, Elwood A.** (age 2) b. 1878 in MA to MA parents.

---

19 USBC 1850  
20 Massachusetts State Census 1855  
21 Massachusetts State Census 1865  
22 USBC 1880  
23 USBC 1870  
24 USBC 1900
1900 Census

The entire household is listed as white.

A’Hearn, Daniel, white, (age 47) b. 8/1852 in MA to Irish parents, married 23 years. Family is white and all can read, write, and speak English. Stevedore [dockworker], 4 months not employed

A’Hearn, Mary A., wife, (age 47) b. 12/1857 in Nova Scotia to Nova Scotian parents, married 23 years, immigrated to U.S. from Canada in 1871 (29 years ago), Mother to 9 children, of which 8 are living in 1900 (all at 21 Unity with their parents)

- A’Hearn, Lora M., daughter, (age 21) b. 11/1878 in MA, silver soderer
- A’Hearn, William J. son, (age 19), b. 6/1880 in MA, water boy sewer D.
- A’Hearn, Alfred, son, (age 16) b. 2/1884 in MA, Driver Team
- A’Hearn, Theresa, daughter, (age 12), b. 7/1887 in MA, at school
- A’Hearn, Sofia A., daughter, (age 11), b. 3/1889 in MA, at school
- A’Hearn, Walter J. son (age 9), b. 1/1891 in MA, at school
- A’Hearn, Francis, daughter, (age 5) b. 5/1895 in MA
- A’Hearn, Gertrude, daughter, (age 2), born 7/1897 in MA

Pendolari, John[y?] (age 30) b. 10/1869 in Italy to Italian parents, immigrated in 1887 (13 years ago), Chair Painter, 0 months unemployed, can read and write but does not speak English. Married 6 years.

Pendolari, Theresa, wife (age 31), b. 1/1/1869 in Italy to Italian parents, mother of 3 children, of which 2 are alive in 1900 and live with their parents here at 21 Unity St. Married 6 years. Immigrated in 1892 (8 years ago). Can read and write but does not speak English.

- Pendolari, Romeo, son, (age 5) b. 12/1894 in MA
- Pendolari, Medeas, daughter (age 3) b. 9/1896 in MA

**Peraso, Francesco**, (age 37), b. 9/1862 in Italy to Italian parents, married 2 years.
Immigrated in 1898 (2 years ago), Day laborer, unemployed for 4 months, Cannot read,
write, or speak English.

**Peraso, Mary**, wife (age 42) b. 5/1858 in Italy to Italian parents. Married 2 years, never
had children. Cannot read, write, or speak English.

**Mogolia, Johny?** (age 33) b. 7/1866 in Italy to Italy parents, married 8 years.
Immigrated 1891 (9 years ago), Glass Polisher, unemployed 2 months. Can read and
write but does not speak English.

**Mogolia, Candida**, wife (age 29) b. 10/1870 in MA to an Italian father and MA-born
mother. Married 8 years, had 5 children, 3 survive in 1900 and live in 21 unity st. Can
read, write, and speak English

- **Mogolia, Louisa**, daughter, (age 7), b. 1/1893 in MA, not in school.
- **Mogolia, Lena**, daughter (age 4) b. 6/1895 in MA
- **Mogolia, Frank**, son (age 3) b. 8/1896 in MA

**1910 Census**

**Florence, Giuseppe** (age 32), born in Italy to Italian parents. Immigrated to US 1905.
Speaks Italian, works as a laborer doing odd jobs. Can read and write.

**Florence, Maria**, wife (age 33). Married 8 years, has had 3 children, all living, born in
Italy to Italian parents. Immigrated to US in 1906. Speaks Italian, doesn’t work. Cannot
read or write.

- **Florence, Placido**, son (age 6), born in France to Italian parents.
- **Florence, Antonio**, son (age 3) born in Mass.
- **Florence, Rosina**, daughter (age 7 months) born in Mass.

**Riccio, Luigi** (age 32) Immigrated from Italy 1905. Speaks English. Works as an iron
worker in a foundry. Can read and write.

**Riccio, Gastena**, wife (age 36) Married 10 years, has had 1 child, living. Immigrated
from Italy 1905. Speaks Italian, doesn't work. Cannot read or write.
Riccio, Orsolina, daughter (age 4). Born in Mass.

Chiusano, Guglierno, (age 64) Immigrated from Italy in 1906. Speaks Italian. Doesn’t work. Can read and write.

Chiusano, Filornena, wife (age 64) Married 41 years. Has had 6 children, 3 are still living in 1910. Immigrated from Italy in 1906. Speaks Italian. Doesn’t work. Can read and write.

Chiusano, Antonio, son (head of family) (age 26) Single. Immigrated from Italy in 1902. Speaks English. Works as a barber in a barber shop. Can’t read or write.

Chiusano, Nicola, son (age 20) Single. Immigrated from Italy in 1906. Speaks English. Works as a barber in a barber shop. Can’t read or write.

Dandero, Giovanni (age 33). Born in Italy to Italian parents. Immigrated from Italy in 1903. Speaks English. Works as a laborer doing odd jobs. Can read and write.

Dandero, Candita, wife (age 24) Married 6 years, 4 of 4 children living. Born in Italy to Italian parents. Immigrated from Italy in 1903. Speaks Italian. Doesn’t work. Can read and write.

Dandero, Adolfo, son (age 6) Born in Italy. Immigrated from Italy in 1903.

Dandero, Alfredo, son (age 4) Born in Mass.

Dandero, Stefano, son (age 2) Born in Mass.

Dandero, Enrico, son (age 6 mos.) Born in Mass.

Grecco, Enrico, boarder (age 34). Works as a fruit salesman. Born in Italy to Italian parents. Immigrated from Italy in 1893. Speaks English. Can read and write.

Brondi, Giovanni (age 32). Works as a laborer. Born in Italy to Italian parents. Immigrated from Italy in 1899. Speaks English. Works as a laborer doing odd jobs. Can read and write.

Brondi, Emilia, wife (age 25), 1 of 2 children still living. Born in Italy to Italian parents. Immigrated from Italy in 1902. Speak English. Doesn’t work. Cannot read or write.

Brondi, Maria-Giuseppa, daughter (age 1 month). Born in Mass.
1920 Census

29 individuals from 8 families. All Italian (22) or Italian-American (7). Only 9 speak English. 2 butchers. All who work work wage labor.

**Dondero, John**, (age 43) immigrated 1905 from Italy, cannot read or write or speak English. Works wage labor as a salesman in a market.

**Dondero, Candita** wife, (age 34) immigrated 1907 from Italy, cannot read or write or speak English. Doesn't work.

- **Dondero, Adolph** son, (age 16) immigrated 1907 from Italy, attends school, can read and write and speak English. Works wage labor as a druggist in a store [while attending school at age 16!]
- **Dondero, Stephen** son, (age 12) born in Mass. attends school, can read and write and speak English.
- **Dondero, Erico** son, (age 10) born in Mass. attends school, can read and write and speak English.

**Rosalie, Francis** (mother) (age 60), widowed, immigrated from Italy in 1914, cannot read, write, or speak English.

- **Rosalie, Eugene** (son) (age 32), single, immigrated from Italy in 1914, can read and write, but does not speak English. Contractor.

**Nardini, Santo** (age 46), married (but no wife in house), immigrated from Italy in 1912, can read and write, but does not speak English. Butcher.

- **Prosperi, Michael**, cousin (age 37), single, immigrated from Italy in 1915, can read and write, but does not speak English. Butcher.

**Esposit, Antonio**, (age 28) immigrated 1911 from Italy, cannot read or write or speak English. Works wage labor as a salesman in a market.

**Esposito, Grace** wife, (age 33) immigrated 1911 from Italy, cannot read or write or speak English. Doesn't work.
Esposito, Edmund son, (age 5) born in Mass. cannot read or write or speak English; does not attend school.

Esposito, Millie daughter, (age 3) born in Mass. cannot read or write or speak English; does not attend school.

Esposito, Frank son, (age 5 months) born in Mass. cannot read or write or speak English; does not attend school.

De Lorenza, Vito (age 56), immigrated in 1910 from Italy. Cannot read or write or speak English. Works as a contractor.

De Lorenza, Marie, wife, (age 44) immigrated in 1910 from Italy. Cannot read or write or speak English. Doesn’t work.

Carbonelli, Jagamo [?] (age 60), immigrated from Italy in 1913. Cannot read or write or speak English. Works as a laborer (contractor).

Carbonelli, Marie, wife (age 60), immigrated from Italy in 1913. Cannot read or write or speak English. Doesn’t work.

Carbonelli, James, son (age 25), single, immigrated from Italy in 1913. Reads, writes, and speaks English. Works as a laborer (contractor).

Carbonelli, Nicholas, son (age 24), single, immigrated from Italy in 1913. Reads, writes, and speaks English. Works as a laborer (contractor).

Carbonelli, Joseph, son (age 18), single, immigrated from Italy in 1913. Reads, writes, and speaks English. Works as a laborer (contractor).

Rosa, Marie (mother, widowed) (age 58) immigrated from Italy in 1913. Cannot read or write or speak English. Doesn’t work.

Rosa, Antonetta (daughter, single) (age 35) immigrated from Italy in 1913. Cannot read or write or speak English. Works as a tailoress in a shop.

Anchi, Nicola (age 38), immigrated in 1915 from Italy. Cannot read or write or speak English. Works as a laborer for the city.

Anchi, Lena, wife (age 37) immigrated in 1915 from Italy. Cannot read or write or speak English. Doesn’t work.
Anchi, Frank, son (age 10) immigrated in 1915 from Italy. Attends school, Language abilities unclear.

Anchi, Saverio, son (age 7) immigrated in 1915 from Italy. Attends school, Language abilities unclear.

Anchi, Lena, daughter (age 3) born in Mass. Language abilities unclear.

1930 Census
12 Italian individuals from 4 families, including a taxi driver and fruit buyer.

1940 Census
10 Italian individuals from 5 families, including manufacturing (factory), laborer (paving), church housekeeper. Some are not yet American citizens.
APPENDIX 3

CLOUGH HOUSE CERAMIC VESSEL CATALOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Vessel #</th>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Vessel Form</th>
<th>Decoration</th>
<th>Context #</th>
<th>Portion(s)</th>
<th>Rim d. (cm)</th>
<th>Base d. (cm)</th>
<th>Height (cm)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jackfield</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td></td>
<td>52232</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>only Jackfield in this context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>flatware</td>
<td>shell-edged green</td>
<td>53202</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vessels 10 and 11 have different shell-edged green patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>flatware</td>
<td>shell-edged green</td>
<td>50002</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vessels 10 and 11 have different shell-edged green patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>flatware</td>
<td>shell-edged blue</td>
<td>53378</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>teaware, hollow</td>
<td>HP polychrome, gold banded with blue</td>
<td>53376</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>teaware, saucer</td>
<td>HP polychrome, blue and orange</td>
<td>53373</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>teaware, hollow</td>
<td>TP blue</td>
<td>49716</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Although both blue TP, vessel 15 is thin and hollow, while vessel 16 is thick and flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>flatware</td>
<td>TP blue</td>
<td>52544</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Although both blue TP, vessel 15 is thin and hollow, while vessel 16 is thick and flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>53797</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>The other decorated pearlwares have designs that would go all the way around the rim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Yellow ware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>52602</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>molded design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>FDSW brown</td>
<td>52210</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>FDSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>flatware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>49746</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>flatware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>52585</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>53213</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>thinner hollowware with different rim shape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>gold banded (luster)</td>
<td>51866/53801/49167</td>
<td>comple</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The other vessels are clearly not teapots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>teapot</td>
<td>TP overglaze brown</td>
<td>49633</td>
<td>3 lid sherds</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other interesting (body) sherds that were not included in the vesselization include Black TP, TP blue, and a base with an incomplete maker's mark dating it to either 1884 or 1899 (registry number was cut off. It is English. See pictures). Some of these could prove to be different vessels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>molded</td>
<td>53798</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>Other undecorated rim/body sherds were also present but are not included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>55142</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>gold gilt flower band</td>
<td>53214</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Porcelain note: Much of this is industrial porcelain or doll parts/ doll tea sets. This piece is gold luster rose pattern with molding on sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>green glaze, scalloped edge</td>
<td>49631</td>
<td>comple te profile</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>rim slants strangely. Green luster.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Teaware</td>
<td>gold gilt, pink band</td>
<td>49627</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>gold luster and pink painted band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>52786</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>the only chinese porcelain here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Tea plate (doll)</td>
<td>blue underglaze</td>
<td>52599</td>
<td>comple te profile</td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Part of doll's tea set. The MM also has porcelain doll parts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other interesting porcelain sherds that were photographed include 3 handles, one HP purple, and one strange green hollowware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>53393</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td>light paste There are no TG rim sherds in the MM. While there were several body sherds, only these 3 were chosen as representative of larger vessels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>Hollowware</td>
<td>HP</td>
<td>52795</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td>medium-dark paste. Extra glaze 52796. Different color scheme, different blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purple glaze</td>
<td>51905</td>
<td>base</td>
<td></td>
<td>dark paste small, possible inkwell. There were no Nottingham rim sherds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Midden</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>Inkwell</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>52596</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>&lt; 6 cm</td>
<td>There were no Westerwald rim sherds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Sherds</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>Hollowware</td>
<td>Albany Slip</td>
<td>53794</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There were no Albany slip rim shreds. Thick, possible storage vessel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>Teabowl</td>
<td>White Salt Glazed</td>
<td>53201</td>
<td>2 rim sherd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>flared rim, curved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>Flatware?</td>
<td>White Salt Glazed</td>
<td>52677</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whiter glaze, straight rim, possibly flat vessel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>Hollowware: Bowl/Chamber Pot</td>
<td>49609</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>unique vessel form: Pie crust rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Hollowware</td>
<td>Unglazed</td>
<td>49745</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unique vessel form: Pie crust rim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Hollowware</td>
<td>Unglazed</td>
<td>51305</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>shortest neck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Hollowware</td>
<td>Brown int/unglazed</td>
<td>52668</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>large neck, red paint and small diameter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Flowerpot</td>
<td>Unglazed</td>
<td>53289</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>large neck, largest diameter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Flowerpot</td>
<td>Unglazed</td>
<td>53775</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>large neck, medium diameter and slanted shoulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Lead Glaze int/ext</td>
<td>49149</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unique glaze, shape, and color</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Hollowware</td>
<td>Black glaze/brown glaze</td>
<td>52219</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unique glaze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Hollowware</td>
<td>Black glaze/yellow glaze</td>
<td>49152</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unique glaze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This context has two rim sherds of Astbury ware, but one is fragmented, so it is impossible to determine if they go together. There are also several small body sherds. Therefore, the MNV = 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Fill</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Shell Edged Color</th>
<th>3D Code</th>
<th>Rim Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jackfield</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td></td>
<td>53614</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>1 rim (body sherds dismissed). A foot was also found and photographed later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>shell-edged blue</td>
<td>54956</td>
<td>4 Rim sherd</td>
<td>Only Brown TP in MF, Thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>platter</td>
<td>shell-edged blue</td>
<td>54357</td>
<td>4 Rim sherds</td>
<td>Cord and Herringbone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>shell-edged blue</td>
<td>54356</td>
<td>2 Rim sherd</td>
<td>Different pattern, embossed with campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>tableware</td>
<td>shell-edged green</td>
<td>53052</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Shell pattern not to edge, wide band at rim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>shell-edged blue</td>
<td>54038</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Shell pattern not to edge, narrow band at rim.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above provides a summary of the findings from different fills in a site, including type of artifacts, shell edging, color, 3D codes, and rim descriptions. Each entry in the table represents a unique artifact, with additional notes provided for any distinctive features or patterns observed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Fill</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>tableware</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>shell-edged green</td>
<td>54545</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>thinner feather lines and a thinner green band at rim, smaller vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>shell-edged green</td>
<td>51699</td>
<td>2 Rim sherds</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>flatware</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>shell-edged green</td>
<td>54161</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>thicker feather lines and a thicker green band at rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>shell-edged green</td>
<td>49651</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>little dots on exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>52134</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>57385</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>small leaf interior border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>54533</td>
<td>2 Rim sherds</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>B2 Str6 Lev7 / C1 Str4 Lev6</td>
<td>2 Rim sherds</td>
<td>V with dots border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>tableware</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>52631</td>
<td>2 Rim sherds</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>tea bowl</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>C1 Str4 Lev6</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>C1 Str4 Lev6</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Peacock border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>C1 Str4 Lev6</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>dark mound within white mound border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>C5 Str4 Lev12</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>C2 Str4 Lev7</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>White 'U's with notch on right border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>51656</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Very thick, no similar patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>C2 Str4 Lev7</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Messy pools int. border, messy wavy ext. border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>C6 Str6 Lev6</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Headphone border, white on rim edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>50639</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Long wavy border</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Main Fill | 56 | Pearlware | hollowware | TP Blue | 52746 | Rim | dark with stars
| Main Fill | 57 | Pearlware | TP Blue | C6 Str6 Lev6 | Rim | int. border = 'U's with dots, ext. border = white eyes
| Main Fill | 58 | Pearlware | teacup or bowl | TP Blue | C5 Str4 Lev9 | Rim | simple dark blue band int border
| Main Fill | 59 | Pearlware | hollowware | TP Blue | B1 Str4 Lev8 | Rim | headphone border ext, X pattern on int
| Main Fill | 60 | Pearlware | bowl | TP Blue | B1 Str4 Lev7 | Rim | 17 blue band int border with white
| Main Fill | 61 | Pearlware | tea bowl | TP Blue | 55427 | Rim | int: farm, ext: mountains
| Main Fill | 62 | Pearlware | tea bowl | TP Blue | 51006 / C5 Str4 Lev9 | 2 Rim sherds | 9 white band border, int = blue background, ext = white background
| Main Fill | 63 | Pearlware | teaware | TP Blue | 50163 | Rim | fire hydrant ext border
| Main Fill | 64 | Pearlware | tea bowl | TP Blue | 50995 | Rim | int = blue floral border w white background, ext = scene
| Main Fill | 65 | Pearlware | flatware | TP Blue | 53046 | Rim | wavy interior border + floral design
| Main Fill | 66 | Pearlware | hollowware | TP Blue | 54343 | Rim | floral design with no border
| Main Fill | 67 | Pearlware | hollowware | TP Blue | 51125 | Rim | unique patterns on both int and ext
| Main Fill | 68 | Pearlware | bowl | HP Polychrome, blue, green, and yellow | 52355 | 3 rim sherds | 12 thick blue band ext border
| Main Fill | 69 | Pearlware | teapot | HP Blue | 55786 | Rim | sloppy medium blue band ext border and distinct rim shape
| Main Fill | 70 | Pearlware | bowl | HP Blue | 52353 | Rim | 13 medium blue band int border
| Main Fill | 71 | Pearlware | hollowware | HP Blue | 53167 | Rim | thin blue band border both sides
| Main Fill | 72 | Pearlware | hollowware | HP Blue | 50669 | Rim | thin blue band border both sides, no white space at top
| Main Fill | 73 | Pearlware | flatware | HP Blue | 54349 | Rim | thick with distinct pattern
| Main Fill | 74 | Pearlware | teacup | HP Blue | 50678 | Rim | blue rim edge, floral pattern ext
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Fill</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>Pearlware</th>
<th>hollowware</th>
<th>HP Blue</th>
<th>53648</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>blue edge, blue ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>53644</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>scale border int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>teacup or bowl</td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>52178</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>distinctive int/ext borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>51714</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>blue edge, blue int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>53048</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>distinctive sloppy blue band border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, green and blue</td>
<td>53106</td>
<td>2 Rim sherds</td>
<td>blue edge with green leaf pattern ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, blue and orange</td>
<td>51749</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>blue band with orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, gold banded</td>
<td>49554</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>int = 1 band, ext = 1 band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, gold banded</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1 Str4 Lev7 Rim</td>
<td>crisp dark brown band int/ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, gold banded</td>
<td>54345</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>blurry light brown band int/ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>FDSW Agate</td>
<td>50604</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>13 Granit inlay decoration int (Sussman 1997: 40) Same decoration as V.99 in Clay layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Red</td>
<td>51732</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Red painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded</td>
<td>51126</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>molded pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>55544</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>2.5 small opening unidentified undecorated hollowware. Other undecorated vessel forms not represented in the rims include a serving dish lid and a possible teapot, but I couldn't confidently exclude other undecorated rims from portions of the already vesselized decorated ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Iberian Storage Jug</td>
<td>Storage Jug</td>
<td>49660</td>
<td>1 body sherd</td>
<td>thick vessel blue int white ext</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Iberian Storage Jug</td>
<td>Storage Jug</td>
<td>54535</td>
<td>1 body sherd</td>
<td>thin vessel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Polychrome Majolica jug</td>
<td>Polychrome, pink int.</td>
<td>53174 / 52350</td>
<td>2 Rim sherds (one is the spout)</td>
<td>A handle fragment may be part of this vessel as well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Yellow ware hollowware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>51026 / 51178</td>
<td>2 Rim sherds</td>
<td>24 very large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Yellow ware hollowware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>52883</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>too small to go with 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Creamware hollowware</td>
<td>FDSW</td>
<td>50618</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>green ext., machine turning rim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Creamware tea bowl</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, red and gold</td>
<td>53168</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>10 Floral pattern ext. only HP rim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Creamware hollowware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>49584</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>beaded molded border pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Creamware plate</td>
<td>Whieldon</td>
<td>50909</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>possibly octagonal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Creamware plate</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>54126</td>
<td>2 rim sherds and 1 complete profile</td>
<td>22 16 3 inslanting walls. Plain circular plate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Creamware bowl</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>55720</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>16 bowl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Creamware plate</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>49909</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>outslanting walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Creamware plate</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>B1 Str4 Lev6</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>scalloped edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Creamware tankard (mug) or cup</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>53034</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>8.5 mug/tankard. With incision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Creamware flatware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>50085</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>scalloped edge, molded border pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Creamware hollowware</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, brown/gold</td>
<td>54547</td>
<td>2 Rim sherds</td>
<td>faded brown or gold painted band around rim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Creamware hollowware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>53182</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>deeper glaze with distinct rim shape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>54175</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>very thin. Other CW that was not vesselized but was photographed (body sherds) includes blue HP, black TP, Red/gold HP, and cauliflower ware.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>53624</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>china glaze, thin. Probable teaware.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>C5 Str4 Lev9</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>&quot;hanging lantern&quot; pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>51029</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>thin blue line border int with flowers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>52771</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>&quot;hanging lantern&quot; pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>53623</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>light blue int, white ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>53487</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>flatware</td>
<td>molded</td>
<td>52667</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>decalomania</td>
<td>55924</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>gold banded (luster)</td>
<td>50697</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>banded</td>
<td>52390 / 53173</td>
<td>2 Rim sherds</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>tableware</td>
<td>Flow Blue</td>
<td>50492</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>plate or platter</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>55215</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Other body sherds that were not included (but may prove to be) include several brown TP sherds (at least 2 vessel: one bowl and one flatware), a red Tp sherd (HW?), and several sponged decorated sherds. These were photographed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Ironstone hollowware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>52882</td>
<td>Lid, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other ironstone sherds from this context, including a handle, could not be proven to be distinct from this vessel, which is large and thick.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Pearlware hollowware</td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>54381</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China glaze &amp; pttn made to appear like porcelain (int)</td>
<td>Comparison photo 137-1340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese overglaze enamel</td>
<td>54389</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold &amp; black band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese overglaze enamel</td>
<td>55466</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red and gold patter, thin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese overglaze enamel</td>
<td>53184</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laurel design (red), thicker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese overglaze enamel</td>
<td>49835</td>
<td>2 Rim sherds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red (both sides) and gold band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese overglaze enamel</td>
<td>52881</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red and gold int, solid brown ext</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese overglaze enamel</td>
<td>51742</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple red band with gold design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>51613</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same pattern as v. 149 int</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>49684</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thick blue band int border</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain tea bowl</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>50654</td>
<td>Rim 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown ext</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain tea bowl</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>52764</td>
<td>Rim 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patterned border both sides, thick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>55650</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pattern both sides w thin brown band on edge and red flower ext</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>53189</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distinct pattern both sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>C1 Str4Lev 6</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distinct int band pattern and strange rim shape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>51673</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown band on edge, int border only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>Porcelain teaware</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>55507</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int border only, no brown band, slopier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Fill</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Markings</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>50441</td>
<td>banded int with design, outslanting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>tea bowl</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>50931</td>
<td>banded int with design, inslanting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>51710</td>
<td>no band, decorated int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td></td>
<td>no band, decorated int (thicker paint, bluer background)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>embossed</td>
<td>50517</td>
<td>embossed w lavendar thistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>Chinese overglaze enamel</td>
<td>51751</td>
<td>glaze color missing, bird int, flowers ext, no band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>creamer or jug (child's)</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>51187</td>
<td>1 rim sherd/1 body sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>cup (doll)</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>53350</td>
<td>whole vessel 1.9 1.3 2 doll teacup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>jug or teapot (doll)</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>C6 Str6 Lev6</td>
<td>Rim 1 possible doll part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>jug (doll)</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>C8 Str3 Lev6</td>
<td>comple te profile 1.5 + jug, so rim slants and this is not at its maximum height. Octagonal base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>bowl (doll)</td>
<td>gold banded (luster)</td>
<td>51574</td>
<td>Rim 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>bowl (doll)</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>C6 Str6 Lev6</td>
<td>comple te profile 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>chamber pot</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>51761</td>
<td>Rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>hollowware (possible poringer)</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>49580</td>
<td>2 Rim sherd Pink body thinner, flared rim form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>hollowware (possible poringer)</td>
<td>Purple glaze</td>
<td>53068</td>
<td>2 Rim sherd Purple glaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, blue and red</td>
<td>53067</td>
<td>Rim Blue and red banded ext, slightly lavender glaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, blue, red, &amp; green</td>
<td>52649</td>
<td>Rim 8 subdued (different) palette ext with blue band and red floral design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, blue and red</td>
<td>51729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, blue and red</td>
<td>49503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, blue and red</td>
<td>52755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>54164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>B1 Str4 Lev9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>B1 Str4 Lev9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>chamber pot</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>54458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>55214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>storage vessel</td>
<td>Albany Slip</td>
<td>54034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>White Salt Glazed</td>
<td>49669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>White Salt Glazed</td>
<td>51657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>White Salt Glazed</td>
<td>54363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>tea bowl</td>
<td>White Salt Glazed, Scratch Blue</td>
<td>50619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>chamber pot</td>
<td>Westerwald</td>
<td>53619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>mug</td>
<td>Westerwald</td>
<td>49666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>mug</td>
<td>Westerwald</td>
<td>51678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>mug</td>
<td>Westerwald</td>
<td>50509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>mug</td>
<td>Westerwald, Höhr type</td>
<td>53059/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>bellarmine</td>
<td>Rhenish</td>
<td>53846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>bottle</td>
<td>German or English brown glaze</td>
<td>53026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td></td>
<td>52588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Manganese</td>
<td>probable tankard</td>
<td></td>
<td>52132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>North Devon</td>
<td>large hollowware</td>
<td>gravel tempered</td>
<td>53163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>North Devon</td>
<td>Sgraffito Slip</td>
<td>53177</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>chamber pot</td>
<td>slipped, dot decoration</td>
<td>53041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Redware hollowware</td>
<td>black glaze both</td>
<td>52655</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>Redware hollowware</td>
<td>dark glaze ext w, incised border, brown int</td>
<td>52762</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>Redware chamber pot</td>
<td>black glazed ext, brown int</td>
<td>55554</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>Redware teapot</td>
<td>black glaze both</td>
<td>52742</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>Redware large hollowware / pot</td>
<td>brown glaze int</td>
<td>50879</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>yellow glaze int, incised border ext</td>
<td>51953</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Redware hollowware</td>
<td>brown glaze int w incised border</td>
<td>51789</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Redware large hollowware</td>
<td>trailed slip and incised int</td>
<td>53024</td>
<td>2 Rim sherd 277 also trailed slip but different pattern and thicker vessel. If this isn't flat it is quite large like 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Redware flatware</td>
<td>trailed slip int, no incision</td>
<td>52394</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>Redware large hollowware</td>
<td>lead glaze int</td>
<td>49568</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Redware chamber pot</td>
<td>brown glaze both</td>
<td>54693</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>Redware hollowware</td>
<td>yellow glaze both</td>
<td>C1 Str4 Lev8</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

166
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Fill</th>
<th>282</th>
<th>Redware</th>
<th>hollowware</th>
<th>yellow glaze int</th>
<th>55729</th>
<th>rim</th>
<th>larger vessel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>yellow glaze int</td>
<td>55671</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>smaller vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>yellow glaze both</td>
<td>53175</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>speckled, smaller vessel than other similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>unglazed</td>
<td>52640</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>10 incised ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>flower pot</td>
<td>unglazed</td>
<td>55360</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>10 flower pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>unglazed</td>
<td>52301</td>
<td>Rim sherds</td>
<td>7 plain, thinner, smaller vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fill</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>unglazed</td>
<td>54840</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>9.5 plain, thicker, larger vessel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Fill 289 Porcelain bowl (doll) undecorated C6 Str6 Lev6 whole vessel 1.3 Found with synthetic artifacts after initial vesselization was complete

Clay Layer 1 Agateware marbled slip, both sides 53749 1 body sherd Only piece of agateware at the site

Clay Layer 29 Pearlware shell-edged blue 49398 Rim small scallops

Clay Layer 79 Pearlware flatware shell-edged blue 49326 2 Rim sherds large scallops and molded curly design

Clay Layer 90 Pearlware flatware shell-edged green 54161 Rim larger, thicker vessel

Clay Layer 91 Pearlware flatware shell-edged green B2 Str5 Lev7 Rim smaller, thinner vessel medium blue band / only HP blue this context

Clay Layer 92 Pearlware bowl HP blue 49274 Rim 16 Thin, defined band w cross

Clay Layer 93 Pearlware hollowware HP polychrome, gold banded 49374 Rim medium blurry band with blue and orange

Clay Layer 94 Pearlware hollowware HP polychrome, gold banded with blue and orange 49386 Rim

Clay Layer 95 Pearlware TP Black 49323 1 body sherd Only black TP this ext
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Mfr.</th>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>53732</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Blue and white banded</td>
<td>wavy banded pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>49373</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>TP Blue</td>
<td>B2 Str5 Lev7</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>sloppy wavy banded pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>FDSW Agate</td>
<td>53748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Granite inlay similar to V.86 (MF). Only FDSW this ctx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whieldon</td>
<td>49319</td>
<td>1 body sherd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably hollowware. Body sherds included FDSW and undecorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>49261</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only 2 small sherds of ironstone in the clay layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>teacup</td>
<td>Chinese overglaze enamel</td>
<td>49417</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>underglaze blue with overglaze red petals ext. Possible band on edge. Very thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>Chinese overglaze enamel</td>
<td>49415</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>underglaze blue int with overglaze brown band on edge of rim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>Chinese underglaze blue</td>
<td>53729</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>hatched border pattern int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>Chinese overglaze enamel</td>
<td>B2 Str5 Lev6</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>red pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>49402</td>
<td>base</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue glaze both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>flatware?</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>53737</td>
<td>base</td>
<td></td>
<td>White glaze but (unusual) pink body. Other interesting body sherds include polychrome: yellow/orange/blue and blue/black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Basalt</td>
<td>49321</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only basalt ware in these contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>49318</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Nottingham rims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Layer</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Rim/Body/Other Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>bowl (tea?)</td>
<td>53750</td>
<td></td>
<td>base</td>
<td>No WSG rims. Possible tea bowl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>49272</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No Westerwald rims. This is not cylindrical mug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>Hollowware</td>
<td>49316</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible flower pot. Redware vesselized by glaze patterning. For the most part, only sherds with both sides completely visible were considered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>bowl or pot</td>
<td>53751</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>49259</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>black glaze</td>
<td>49408</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>brown/yellow</td>
<td>49248</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>clear/clear</td>
<td>53752</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only HPB sherd in this context. Hard to determine which HPB type this fits into.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Hand Painted Blue</td>
<td>54658</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only 2 TP sherds in this context. Too small to see if same design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Transfer Printed Blue</td>
<td>55401</td>
<td>2 body sherds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only Creamware sherd in this context. Most likely a plate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>flatware</td>
<td>55412</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>tea cup/bowl</td>
<td>53283</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>One blue underglaze rim, but also contains one red overglaze (imari style) body sherd and a base with a tall footring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>52064</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large sherd. White glaze, undecorated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>flatware</td>
<td>HP Polychrome, blue and red</td>
<td>55860</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Probably flatware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>53277</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>flared rim indicated different vessel form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>55850</td>
<td>body</td>
<td>only Nottingham this context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>White Salt Glaze</td>
<td>54654</td>
<td>body</td>
<td>no WSGSW rims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are other westerdal pieces in blue, purple, both, and hohr, but since they are small body sherds they do not count. Some of these were photographed. One of these may have part of a heart design seen in (the extra photographs of) the main fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>mug</td>
<td>Westerwald</td>
<td>55405</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This couldn't possibly be on any of the other vessels represented here. The handle is very small.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>55409</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>thick, red-gray-red past. Could be the base if there isn't a footing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>North Devon</td>
<td>gravel-free</td>
<td>54656</td>
<td>2 body sherds</td>
<td>darker glaze, thinner, gray paste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>North Devon</td>
<td>sgraffito</td>
<td>53282</td>
<td>2 body sherds</td>
<td>there are only staf body sherds here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>slipped</td>
<td>52051</td>
<td>body</td>
<td>there are only staf body sherds here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>pot</td>
<td>lead glazed int/unglazed ext</td>
<td>55858</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>thicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>trail slip: brown glaze</td>
<td>55411</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>thinner, similar body sherd (55413)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed C</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>black glaze/lead glaze</td>
<td>55414</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Franklin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jackfield</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>54627</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>Only Jackfield in this context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Franklin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>serving dish</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>54626</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>undecorated</td>
<td>54615</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>Chinese Overglaze enamel</td>
<td>54613</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td>HP Blue</td>
<td>49212</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Tin Glaze</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purple glaze</td>
<td>48472</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>bowl?</td>
<td>White Salt Glazed</td>
<td>49456</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>bottle, possibly mug</td>
<td>Westerwald</td>
<td>54621</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>hollowware</td>
<td></td>
<td>49210</td>
<td>rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>hollowware, probable pot</td>
<td>lead/unglazed</td>
<td>54618</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td></td>
<td>black/lead</td>
<td>49438</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td></td>
<td>trailed slip (clear glaze)</td>
<td>49461</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Cross Mends | 113 | Creamware | undecorated | Octagonal Plate | 49400 (Clay) / 55482 (Main Fill) | 2 rim sherds | These contexts were previously thought to be possibly related |
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