The Westwood Manor Archaeological Collection: Preliminary Interpretations

ortobaco

twood M

AR

Zachkia Swamp ats Pangayo



Patuxent MA

Prepared For: MR. AND MRS. PHILLIP HARRISON

Prepared By: THE ARCHAEOLOGY PRACTICUM CLASS ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

2010

The Westwood Manor Archaeological Collection: Preliminary Interpretations

The Archaeology Practicum Class St. Mary's College of Maryland

Allison Alexander	Mark R. Koppel
Skylar A. Bauer	Amy Publicover
Patricia H. Byers	Maria Tolbert
Seth Farber	Verioska Torres
Alex J. Flick	Alexandra Unger
Juliana Franck	Jerry S. Warner
Ben Garbart	Justin Warrenfeltz
Grace Gutowski	Julia A. King, <i>editor</i>
Julianna Jackson	Scott M. Strickland, researcher

2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of List of List of Acknow	of Contents Figures Tables wledgments	iii iv vi vii
I.	Rediscovering Westwood Manor	1
II.	Historical Background	3
III.	Field Investigations at Westwood Manor	10
IV.	Laboratory Methods and Collection Curation	15
V.	Reconstructing the Community at Westwood Manor Alex J. Flick	17
VI.	The Clay Tobacco Pipes Recovered from Westwood Manor Skylar A. Bauer and Verioska Torres	25
VII.	The Brass and Lead Weights Found at Westwood Manor Alexandra Unger	36
VIII.	From Firing to Farm: North Devon Gravel-Tempered Ware and its Significance in Early Maryland Trade <i>Julianna Jackson</i>	43
IX.	An Unsurprising Find: Rhenish Stoneware at Westwood Manor Maria Tolbert and Justin Warrenfeltz	49
X.	Colonial Container Glass at Westwood Manor Juliana Franck and Patricia H. Byers	56
XI.	A Silver Spoon from Westwood Manor Benjamin Garbart	61
XII.	"Fine Brown Bottles, Juggs, and all other sorts of Fine Browne stone wares:" The Artifacts of Alcohol Consumption at Westwood Manor	
	Jerry S. Warner	63
XIII.	Preliminary Faunal Analysis of 18CH621 Mark R. Koppel and Allison Alexander	71
XIV.	Reimagining Westwood Manor: Architectural Analysis Amy Publicover	79
XV.	Future Directions: Towards an Ethnography of Late 17 th -Century Maryland	
	Julia A. King	86
Referen	nces Cited	93

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
1	Reconstructed boundaries of Westwood Manor	2
2	1720 Survey of Westwood Manor	3
3	1798 Resurvey of Assinton, showing Westwood Manor,	
	Westwood Lodge, and Boarman's Rest	4
4	Overall photograph of 18CH621	10
5	Example of field notes kept by Mrs. Harrison	11
6	Plan view of excavations using Mrs. Harrison's notes	12
7	Augustine Herrman's Map of Maryland and Virginia	
	showing Westwood Manor	17
8	GIS Shapefile	18
9	Reconstructed tract map in the Westwood Manor vicinity	20
10	Complete pipe bowl fragments from Lot 3	26
11	Bore diameter frequency at Westwood Manor	27
12	Harrington's calculations of bore hole diameter variation adapted	
	for comparison with Figure 11	27
13	Bore diameter frequencies from five colonial Maryland sites	28
14	The most common bowl shape found at Westwood Manor	29
15	Bowl types from Westwood Manor	29
16	Two Lot 3 (Cellar) complete bowls with rouletting	30
17	Dutch-style rouletting and Bristol Diamond pattern	31
18	Possible Dutch molded stem fragment	31
19	Examples of Dutch floral molding designs	32
20	"X-I-F-X" mark	32
21	Robert Tippet pipe fragments	33
22	Timeline for approximate dates of production for 18CH621	
	maker's marks	34
23	The lead weight recovered from Westwood Manor	40
24	The brass weight recovered from Westwood Manor	41
25	North Devon Gravel-tempered milk pan, Westwood Manor	46
26	North Devon Gravel-tempered storage jar, Exeter	46
27	Comparison of Westerwald type jugs with Westwood Manor example	e 52
28	Rhenish stoneware jug with sprig-molded floral designs and incised	
	floral stalks, Westwood Manor	52
29	Rhenish stoneware with sprig-molded leaf-like decoration	53
30	Blue and gray body fragment with partial stamped and incised royal	
	cipher	53
31	Rhenish blue and gray stoneware with molded human face	53
32	Rhenish blue and gray jug on exhibit with face similar to that	
	depicted in Figure 31	54
33	Evolution of glass wine bottles	57
34	Wine bottle bases recovered from Westwood Manor	59
35	wine bottle seal, "IB," probably John Bayne	60
36	Silver laceback spoon with trefid handle	62
37	Maker's mark, "WS"	62
38	Possible owner's mark	62

39	9 English brown stoneware drinking vessel fragments from	
	Westwood Manor	65
40	In-situ brick at Westwood Manor	79
41	Unglazed ceramic floor tiles recovered from Westwood Manor	80
42	Finish-coat plaster recovered from Westwood Manor	81
43	Conjectural drawing, Westwood Manor	83
44	The 1674 Charles County Court House building	84
45	Hohrware presentation piece with image of William III	86
46	Tin-glazed earthenware vase pedestal and flower vase	88
47	Possible tin-glazed tea or coffee pot lid recovered from	
	Westwood Manor	89
48	Yellow lead-glazed coarse earthenware utilitarian vessel	91
49	Brown lead-glazed coarse earthenware utilitarian vessel	91
50	X-radiograph of selected metal objects, including two iron keys,	
	recovered from Westwood Manor	92

LIST OF TABLES

Page

1	Total North Devon Gravel-tempered and Gravel-free fragments	44
2	North Devon Ceramic Types	45
3	Rhenish blue and gray stoneware fragments, Westwood Manor	51
4	English Brown stoneware data, 18CH621	64
5	Site and animal species totals	72
6	Site analysis by mammal species	73

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Spring 2010 Archaeology Practicum class at St. Mary's College of Maryland is enormously grateful to a number of individuals and institutions for their assistance with this project.

First and foremost are Sandra and Phillip Harrison, the homeowners who discovered the Westwood Manor site and who carefully recovered, processed, and stored the materials found during the construction of their new house. Rather than pushing the artifacts and other materials to the side, the Harrisons recognized the importance of their discovery, consulted with a number of archaeologists and other professionals, and undertook research aimed at uncovering who left behind such interesting objects. Most generously, the Harrisons loaned the materials to St. Mary's College of Maryland to serve as the basis for the Archaeology Practicum class during the Spring 2010 semester. As a result, upper-level undergraduate students had an extraordinary opportunity to learn more about early Maryland history while contributing their own discoveries and findings about the artifacts.

Michael J. Sullivan and Scott M. Strickland helped to insure that the project both got started and got finished. Mike consulted with the Harrisons about the project, and Scott assisted with the organization and transfer of the collection to the temporary custody of the College. Most importantly, Scott, with generous support from Mike through the Smallwood Foundation, prepared a title search for the property and assisted with the cataloging of the collection. Indeed, without Mike's and Scott's assistance, the cataloging would have taken far longer than it did. Scott was also extremely generous with his findings and his expertise, and assisted many of the students with their project research.

The Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory (MAC Lab) at the Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum stepped up to insure that we had ample supplies, manpower, and professional services for documenting this important collection. Collections Manager Rebecca J. Morehouse helped us determine the curatorial supplies we should purchase and donated many more supplies as well. Lead Conservator Nichole Doub very generously x-rayed all of the metals recovered from the site, and she assisted with identifying the very small possible owner's mark on the brass weight found in the cellar fill. MAC Lab Deputy Director Edward E. Chaney and Federal Collections Manager Sara Rivers-Cofield shared their expertise concerning early colonial material culture, making library and collections resources easily available to us upon request. Finally, MAC Lab Director Patricia J. Samford put the resources of the Lab behind this project, spending many days (including Saturdays) working with us to complete the cataloging of the project. We are deeply indebted to the MAC Lab staff for their unwavering support of this effort.

Historic St. Mary's City, our neighbor and sister institution, likewise provided important and critical assistance to the project. Laboratory Curator Silas Hurry consulted with us about the artifacts, directing us to sources and making the library resources at HSMC available for our use. Archaeologist Timothy B. Riordan provided information on similar artifacts recovered from Philip Calvert's dwelling house at St. Peter's. Director of Research and zooarchaeologist Henry M. Miller, along with zooarchaeologist and private consultant Edward Otter, worked with us to assess and identify the faunal materials found in the collection. We very much appreciate the generosity of HSMC for their interest in and commitment to the project. Our colleagues at St. Mary's College of Maryland made sure that we had the resources and infrastructure to undertake this project. Anthropology Department Chair Iris C. Ford provided very generous financial resources to purchase supplies for the class, and Professor of Anthropology Daniel W. Ingersoll worked with us to prepare the anthropology laboratory in Kent Hall for our class. Professor Ingersoll also made his comparative faunal collection available to us. Associate Professor of Chemistry Randy Larsen, although on sabbatical, came in to demonstrate how the College's new X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) instrument works, and he tested a dozen samples for us, setting to rest a number of questions about the material composition of some of the recovered artifacts. Associate Provost Linda Coughlin assisted with the development of the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the College and the Harrisons, and the State of Maryland's Insurance Department, located in the Office of the Comptroller, ensured we had the right coverage for the collection. Finally, Office Associates Lucy H. Myers and Sandra L. Robbins very quietly behind-the-scenes made certain we had our supplies and materials and, for our final presentation, our room reservations and refreshments.

The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation (CW) played a crucial part in our work. We visited the DeWitt Wallace Museum of Decorative Arts, comparing our catalogs and photographs with materials on display there. We also spent several hours with Archaeology Curator Kelly Ladd-Kostro, who made the CW collections available to us for study. We were able to identify many of the artifacts from this effort and place them in a greater Chesapeake context.

Many other people came to our assistance throughout the project. Marley R. Brown III of the College of William and Mary joined us for lunch to discuss graduate opportunities in historical archaeology. Craftsman Raymond J. Cannetti examined our architectural artifacts for subtle indicators of use, decoration, and manufacture. SMCM Visiting Instructor of Photography Gabriela Bulisova provided advice on the capture of artifact images. Lost Towns Project Director Al Luckenbach shared his expertise on early material culture, and Texas A & M Associate Professor of Nautical Anthropology C. Wayne Smith shared his expertise on brass and lead weights.

We are also grateful to Mr. James Tarrant, a descendant of John and Anne Bayne who graciously shared with us his transcription of John Bayne's probate inventory. Mr. Tarrant also made a generous donation to the archaeology project at St. Mary's College.

While any errors or omissions in this report are ours and ours alone, we recognize that, without the generous support, assistance, and advice of these many individuals and institutions, we would have produced a much less substantial product. We thank them all for their confidence in us, and we are grateful for the opportunity the Harrisons gave us.

Archaeology Practicum Class Department of Anthropology St. Mary's College of Maryland May 2010

Chapter One Rediscovering Westwood Manor

In 1996, while excavating foundation trenches for their new home, Phillip and Sandra Harrison encountered traces of buried brick rubble and bits of ceramics, glass, and tobacco pipe stems. Further investigation by the couple revealed a long-ago back-filled cellar with a floor paved with unglazed tile. The Harrisons recovered several hundred artifacts from a small portion of the cellar, and they subsequently encountered a second feature, possibly a trash pit, several hundred feet south of the cellar. The Harrisons knew that they had made an important discovery and contacted archaeologists at the Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum.

The site, "18CH621" as it became designated in the Maryland Historical Trust archaeological site inventory, was located at the base of a slope just off Earnshaw Drive in Charles County, Maryland (Figure 1). As archaeologists are finding with many early colonial sites in Charles County, the site did not fit settlement patterning models developed for Calvert and St. Mary's counties,¹ but the material culture the Harrisons had recovered suggested this was a well-furnished household, the home of someone who could have chosen where to live, and who chose to live here.

Subsequent research, including that undertaken by the Harrisons and, as part of the present project, students in the Archaeology Practicum class at St. Mary's College of Maryland, revealed that this site is located on the Westwood Manor tract (see Figure 1) and was the location of Westwood House, built in the late 1670s by Thomas Gerard the Younger. The site appears to have been occupied through c. 1715, first by Gerard and then by John Bayne, his wife's second husband, and, finally, by members of the Gerard family.

The materials recovered by the Harrisons represent an extraordinary assemblage reshaping what archaeologists and historians know about this portion of Maryland in the early colonial period. Fortunately, the Harrisons recognized the importance of the materials they were unearthing, and they followed the recommendations of archaeologists, keeping notes about where the materials came from and processing the artifacts.

In September 2009, SMCM associate professor of anthropology Julia A. King approached the Harrisons about loaning the collection to St. Mary's College of Maryland, where it would be used to form the basis for an Archaeology Practicum class. After much discussion about the work to be undertaken and issues concerning collection security, the Harrisons entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with St. Mary's, agreeing to loan the collection to be processed and studied by students in the Practicum class. On Thursday, January 14, 2010, the Harrisons transferred the collection into the custody of St. Mary's. On Tuesday, January 19, students in the Practicum class convened for the first time to assess the scope of their semester's activities.

Under King's direction, the students processed the collection according to professional archaeological standards. Students then selected a topic for further investigation, and each student prepared a research paper focused on that topic. This report represents a compilation of

¹ Michael A. Smolek, "Soyle Light, Well-Watered and on the River:" Settlement Patterning of Maryland's Frontier Plantations, retrieved at <u>http://www.jefpat.org/Soyle%20Light%203-31-05.pdf</u>.



Figure 1. Reconstructed boundaries of Westwood Manor. The red dot shows the location of 18CH621. *Scott M. Strickland*.

those papers, and was prepared for the Harrisons in recognition of their generosity and faith in our abilities.

As part of our work, we covered a wide variety of topics, ranging from a study of the structure of the local community surrounding Westwood Manor to the analysis of a number of artifact types recovered from the site. Still, this study is far from exhaustive. Not only can more work be done with the topics we chose for further study, other areas remain wholly unexplored.

The tin-glazed earthenware assemblage, for example, is fairly extensive and includes unusual materials for this time and place. Many of the lead-glazed ceramics also remain unstudied, including several fragments of Morgan Jones ceramics. An elaborate bone or ivory walking cane handle, iron door keys, brass and pewter spoons, horse furniture, and many more artifacts reveal the richness of the Westwood Manor site and the stories that have yet to be told.

Nonetheless, all of these materials have been carefully documented through cataloging and digital imaging (including, in the case of metal objects, x-radiographs), enhancing opportunities for their future study.

This report represents a compilation of the information generated by the students. Student papers have been edited for accuracy and for style but are otherwise presented as completed for the course. We welcome comments and additional insights from our colleagues, and we encourage researchers to undertake projects focused on subjects not explored by our class. The original Westwood Manor artifact catalog is available for study at St. Mary's College of Maryland and copies have been placed with the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory at the Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum.

Chapter Two Historical Background

Westwood Manor, located at the head of the Wicomico River near Allen's Fresh in Charles County, Maryland, was first patented in 1651 to Dr. Thomas Gerard.² The property was described as including 1600 acres, although no original survey survives. The earliest survey representing Westwood Manor dates to 1720, when a survey of the tract found it to consist of 1456 acres (Figure 2).³ A later survey, prepared in 1798 for a tract known as Assinton, depicts the boundaries of Westwood Manor, Westwood Lodge, and Boarman's Rest (Figure 3).⁴



Figure 2. 1720 Survey of Westwood Manor. *Maryland State Archives*.

Gerard, who had been born in Lancashire, England in 1608, had immigrated to Maryland in 1638, drawn, one of his early biographers argued, by the prospect of "material betterment."5 He appears to have followed his brothersin-law, Justinian and Marmaduke Snow, to Maryland, where they were amassing sizeable estates. Gerard went on to assemble his own landholdings, first in Maryland and then in Virginia. The name, "Westwood" and "Westwood House," as the property was sometimes called, may have come from the name a distant relative of Gerard's called his property in England.⁶

Gerard was an ambitious man, to say the least, earning the recognition of Lord Baltimore in 1643 when he was appointed to the Provincial Council, a body advising the governor on matters of political importance in the colony. Gerard remained on the Council until 1660, when he went against Lord Baltimore in a manner the proprietor interpreted as rebellion. Gerard's disaffection with the

proprietary government had been building and, in the late 1650s, Gerard had been accused a number of times for his "seditious and mutinous words" and "false & scandalous speeches &

² Patent Record ABH 193/199.

³ Charles County Court Records, M2/96.

⁴ Assinton Resurveyed, Edward Edelen, 1798, Pat. Cert. 86.

⁵ David Spalding, Thomas Gerard: The Study of a Lord of the Manor and the Advantages of Manor Holding in Early Maryland, *Chronicles of St. Mary's*, vol. 7, no. 7 (1959), p. 335.

⁶ Westwood House, in the manor of Ince, Wigan, Lancashire, was the seat of William Gerard; see Sir Bernard Burke, *A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Commoners of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. 2 (London, Henry Colburn, 1871), p. 1458.

reports."⁷ After Gerard's participation in the short-lived Fendall's Rebellion, his political career in Maryland was effectively over. He moved to Westmoreland County, Virginia, where he died in 1673, owning a total of 16,000 acres in both Maryland and Virginia.



⁷ Archiv
355. Figure 3. 1798 Resurvey of Assinton, showing Westwood Manor, Westwood Lodge, and Boarman's Rest. *Maryland State Archives*.

Before his break with Lord Baltimore, Dr. Gerard enjoyed relatively high political standing in the colony, but his primary objective from his first arrival in the colony appears to have been economic advancement. Gerard "converted his manors into profitable investments," first by renting his land to tenants and secondly by establishing his own home farms.⁸ This was no small feat in early Maryland, where land was cheap and labor dear. Although Dr. Gerard did not live at Westwood Manor, he appears to have had tenants there by 1664. In that year, appraisers identified 27 cattle and 33 pigs at Westwood Manor. A building on the plantation was well-equipped with tools, domestic furnishings, and other goods, including "two books," one of which was a bible.⁹ The tenants at Westwood may have been the "servants and Overseer" Edmund Lindsey found there in February 1664 when he went in search of a runaway horse.¹⁰

At the end of 1664, Dr. Gerard leased a portion of Westwood Manor to Major William Boarman for a term of seven years. According to the agreement, Boarman was to "uphold and maintaine" the buildings on the property, using the timber on the land for "building, fencing, or Caske." Boarman was also to plant apple and pear trees to augment the "Orchard already planted" and keep it clear of brush and undergrowth. Boarman's fee for the lease included an annual payment of 5000 pounds of tobacco "and cask" as well as a portion of the cider he might produce from fruits harvested from the orchard.¹¹ This was an usually large sum compared with the rents Gerard was charging his tenants at St. Clement's Manor. Boarman paid more than three times the customary rent.

Boarman apparently took possession of the property, but Gerard was soon concerned that much of the agreement remained outstanding. He moved to sue Boarman to force him to honor his end of the deal. Boarman denied the deal as Gerard described it, but the court ruled in Dr. Gerard's favor; Boarman does not appear to have lived at Westwood Manor, but James Bowling reported that "some of Captain Boarman's servants lived upon West Wood Manor."¹²

In December, 1670, Cornelius Cornell was indicted for breaking into and stealing nails from Dr. Gerard's "Mansion howse" at Westwood; Cornell's crime had allegedly taken place in March of that year. George Groves and Daniel Lawrence served as witnesses for the prosecution; Cornell was found not guilty of the charges.¹³ Cornell, Groves, and Lawrence were all men who had come into Maryland as servants and survived their indenture, becoming small planters. All of the men were living in the Wicomico River area, and Cornell, although a free man at the time of his alleged crime, may have previously been a servant of William Boarman's. Indeed, he may have been one of the servants Boarman had at Westwood Manor in 1665. Daniel Lawrence appears to have been a servant transported to Maryland in 1662 by Thomas Gerard so he, too, would likely have been familiar with the Westwood Manor property.

The description of Cornell's alleged theft from Westwood Manor may indicate that the property was vacant or otherwise uninhabited in 1670. Even more intriguing is the fact that a "Mansion howse" was apparently standing on the manor at that date. The Oxford English Dictionary defines mansion as a "large house or other building; a dwelling place, a stopping place; ... [o]riginally: the chief residence of a lord, the capital messuage of a manor, a manor

⁸ Spalding, p. 343.

⁹ Archives of Maryland, vol. 49, p. 519.

¹⁰ Archives of Maryland, vol. 49, p. 198. ¹¹ Archives of Maryland, vol. 57, p. 32.

¹² Archives of Maryland, vol. 57, p. 35.

¹³ Archives of Maryland, vol. 57, pp. 621-622.

house."¹⁴ By 1670, Dr. Gerard had moved across the river to Westmoreland County, Virginia, and, when he had lived in Maryland, his dwelling plantation appears to have been St. Clements Manor, not Westwood Manor. Nonetheless, the use of the term, "mansion," to describe the dwelling house at Westwood Manor, and its other contemporary meanings as "a stopping place" or "large house" suggest that the property was emerging as an important landmark in this part of Maryland.

Indeed, 1670 was also the year Augustine Herman conducted the field work for his map of Maryland and Virginia, published in 1673. Herman depicted "Westwood M" on the map, indicating that the property must have been enough of a landmark to have been called out by Herman.

In 1672, Dr. Gerard sold the 1600-acre Westwood Manor and an adjacent 400-acre tract known as the Meadows to his son, also Thomas (sometimes referred to as Thomas Gerard the Younger).¹⁵ A 100-acre parcel of land within Westwood Manor was exempt from this agreement; this 100-acre parcel had been leased to one John Pyper. In exchange, the younger Gerard was to pay his maternal uncle, Marmaduke Snow, an annual rent of 6000 pounds of tobacco for a period of seven years. If Snow was to die during that period, the younger Gerard would pay the rents to Dr. Gerard (and, if he should die, to his heirs) for the seven years. Following his father's death, in 1675, the younger Gerard was forced to sue his step-mother, Rose Gerard (Dr. Gerrard's second wife) and John Gerard, her son (and Thomas's half-brother), for failing to settle the elder Gerard's estate and ignoring the earlier agreement between father and son. In 1677, the Provincial Court found for the younger Gerard.¹⁶

John Pyper (or Piper), who had in 1672 leased 100 acres out of Westwood Manor, had come to Maryland as a servant sometime before 1651, serving Dr. Thomas Gerard. Pyper, who was granted his freedom in 1652, leased both the 100-acre parcel within Westwood Manor and another tract at Basford Manor, located in St. Clement's Manor. It is unclear where Piper was living, but the records suggest he resided on his leasehold at Basford Manor. There has been some question about whether this John Piper could have been John Pryor, "merchant of London," who was at Westwood Manor in 1682, when Pryor was accused of acquiring deerskins illegally from the Piscataway. Piper, however, does not appear to have operated as a merchant, and, at any rate, he was dead by 1674.¹⁷

In 1682, John Pryor, "merchant of London," was described as "now resideing at the house of [Thomas Gerard] at Westwood."¹⁸ Pryor had been accused by Dennis Husculah of buying dressed deerskins from the Piscataway Indians then living at the "Indian towne Zachajah." The matter was of great interest to the proprietor, who required licenses for those engaged in the Indian trade in order that he would reap revenues. Additionally, 1682 appears to have been an economically tough year: Husculah complained to the Council that the local population was depending on the Indians to supply them with deerskins as "the onely hopes of Cloatheing our

¹⁴ "Mansion," The Oxford English Dictionary, retrieved at <u>http://dictionary.oed.com.proxy-</u> <u>sm.researchport.umd.edu/cgi/entry/00301420?query_type=word&queryword=mansion&first=1&max_to_s</u> <u>how=10&sort_type=alpha&result_place=1&search_id=VACg-PQrpCH-1195&hilite=00301420</u>.

¹⁵ Dr. Gerard is reported to have sold the land to his son, Thomas Gerard, in 1672; *Archives of Maryland*, vol. 717, page 12; Prov. Ct. Deeds VRC #1. 12-17.

¹⁶ Archives of Maryland, vol. 717, pp. 12-17.

¹⁷ St. Mary's City Commission Career Files, John Piper, <u>http://www.msa.md.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc5000/sc5094/003000/003311/html/sc5094-3311-05.html</u>; accessed March 14, 2010.

¹⁸ Archives of Maryland, vol. 17, p. 94.

selves this scarce yeare of goods."¹⁹ Gerard, who was called to testify, claimed he did not know anything about the purchase of deerskins, nor did he "knoweth any thing concerning the premises" at Westwood.²⁰

Although he was a merchant and presumably well known, at least in the local area in which he lived, John Pryor remains enigmatic. A record in the Calendar of State Papers in the Public Records Office in London notes that a John Pryor was on the Benjamin, bound from London for Virginia in September 1680.²¹ Edward Paine, the master of the *Benjamin*, was from a family heavily involved in maritime trading activities throughout the colonies. Genealogical records suggest potential connections between the Paine family and the Gerards.²² On board the ship with John Pryor was Edward Pye, who married Lord Baltimore's step-daughter, Ann Sewall.²³

In 1683, the Maryland Assembly referred to "Westwood House" in "An Act for the Advancement of Trade." In addition to establishing towns at St. Mary's City and "Brittons Bay" (near Leonardtown), the assembly specified a town "between the mouth of Chaptico Bay and Westwood House."24

It is clear that, as early as 1670, when Augustine Herman was preparing his map of Maryland and Virginia, Westwood Manor had become a recognized landmark in the region. Gerard the Younger, who may have lived at Westwood intermittently but who also appears to have been living elsewhere, no doubt placed Pryor on the property to provide the growing number of English settlements in that area with access to English goods. Indeed, Thomas Gerard's ship, the Gerard, was often anchored in the Wicomico, not far from Westwood Manor. Gerard's wife, Anne, was the sister of Colonel James Smallwood, who lived nearby. Smallwood named his son, born about 1680, Pryor, in honor of Gerard's merchant, suggesting a close relationship between the three men.²⁵ Pryor was still alive in 1688, when a payment was made to him from Thomas Gerard's estate.²⁶

Anne Gerard's brother, Colonel Smallwood, was valued by the proprietary government, and he was recognized for his ability as an interpreter between the English and the neighboring Indian groups. In 1678, Colonel Smallwood was appointed "Post" for Charles County "for [the] conveyance of all publick Intelligence from thence to his Lspp."²⁷ His sister, Anne, had married Thomas Gerard after the death of Gerard's first wife, Susanna Curtis.²⁸

Thomas Gerard died in 1686 in St. Mary's County, perhaps at Westwood Manor since the property was, at that time, in St. Mary's. Thomas left Westwood Manor to his wife, Anne, who remarried the following year. Anne and her second husband, John Bayne, lived at Westwood

²² A Benjamin Paine had a brother named Gerard; see

http://archiver.rootsweb.ancestry.com/th/read/PAYNE/1999-01/0917065247.

¹⁹ Archives of Maryland, vol. 17, p. 92.

²⁰ Archives of Maryland, vol. 17, p. 94.

²¹ Other individuals on the ship include Edward Round, Thomas Godsell, John Bryton, Edward Pye, Ann Hoyle, Nicholas Hayward, Strangeway Mudd, and John Houblon; PRO: E190/91/1.

 ²³ <u>http://archiver.rootsweb.ancestry.com/th/read/PAYNE/1999-01/0917065247</u>.
²⁴ Archives of Maryland, vol.7, pp. 539-542.

²⁵ Charles County Circuit Court, Birth, Deaths, and Marriage Records, Liber Q.

²⁶ Thomas Gerard 10,179 A £384.25.6 Oct 17 1688.

²⁷ Archives of Maryland, vol. 15, p. 288.

²⁸http://wc.rootsweb.ancestry.com/cgi-bin/igm.cgi?op=GET&db=mrmarsha&id=I02239: http://wc.rootsweb.ancestry.com/cgi-bin/igm.cgi?op=GET&db=mrmarsha&id=I02238.

Manor. Unlike Thomas Gerard, whose occupation was listed as a merchant, Bayne was described as a planter and an innkeeper.²⁹ Lorena Walsh's notes on Charles County contain references to an ordinary Bayne ran at Newport, perhaps at Westwood House.³⁰ Bayne also secured a license for operating an ordinary at Chandler Town (now Port Tobacco).³¹ Bayne, who was styled variously as 'Captain' or 'Mr.,' held a number of offices during his lifetime, including surveyor, militia captain, sheriff, and burgess.

An especially interesting reference, found in the records of the Provincial Council, describes a meeting the Council held at Westwood, "the house of Captain John Bayne," on June 29, 1694. On this day, 'King Peter' and five great men from the Piscataway met with the Council, along with Quassapelagh, king of the Anacostin Indians.³² The Councilors were interested in what intelligence the Indians there gathered had about "a most bloody & horrid" murder lately committed in Charles County, and they managed to convince Quassapelagh (who they suspected of the murder) to give himself up for trial at the county court house.

At some point, a church appears to have been constructed at Westwood Manor. In 1698, Gerard Sly, a nephew of the now deceased Thomas Gerard the Younger, informed the Provincial Council that there was a church "built on Westwood Manor," and the implication was that the church was in relatively good shape.³³

John Bayne died at the end of 1701 in England and Anne died a year later, in August, 1702. The Baynes had two minor children at their death, including daughter Anne, who was 15 when her mother died, and son Ebsworth, who was 13. Where the children were sent is unknown, but their status as minors may have given Thomas Gerard's nephew, John (aged about 24), an opportunity to stake a claim to Westwood Manor. Indeed the records suggest that John took possession of Westwood Manor sometime in 1703 after Anne Bayne's death, perhaps also serving as guardian to the two minor Bayne children.

The archaeological evidence indicates that someone was living at the site through the first decade and a half of the 18th century. John Gerard may have been living at Westwood Manor in 1707 when he married Jane Orrell (who appears to have been from Charles County), but they were soon living in Cople Parish in Westmoreland County, Virginia. John died in 1711 in Westmoreland County, leaving no children, and his widow, Jane, appears to have inherited Westwood Manor. Jane's father, Thomas Orrell, is reported to have been living at Westwood Manor in 1712 when Jane conveyed the property to George Eskridge, also of Cople Parish.³⁴

Orrell, who was described in 1721 as "Gentleman," is surprisingly elusive in the documents. His will mentions both real and personal property, but the property is not enumerated and no inventory survives. He is listed as a witness to a transfer of land in 1705 between Philip Lynes and Michael Ashford,³⁵ and a creditor in Richard Dodd's 1713 inventory. He was listed as

²⁹ http://www.msa.md.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc4000/sc4040/000001/000099/html/sc4040-0099-1.html. ³⁰ http://www.msa.md.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc5000/sc5094/000001/000316/html/sc5094-0316-

<u>07.html</u>.

³¹ Charles County Circuit Court, Court and Land Records, Liber R, Number 1 (1690), p. 2.

³² Archives of Maryland, vol. 20, p. 73.

³³ Archives of Maryland, vol. 23, pp. 450-452.

³⁴ Thomas Orrell is reported in a deed transaction to have been "lately in possession" of Westwood Manor;

it is significant that Eskridge was probably acting as an agent for Bideford merchants in 1715.

³⁵ Charles County Land Records, vol. 2, p. 56.

receiving a payment in 1709 from Christopher Kirtly and, in 1712, as a witness to a land transfer between Samuel Luckett and Michael Martin.³⁶

Although John and Jane Gerard may have had "peaceful possession" of the Westwood Manor property, Ebsworth Bayne was the property's lawful heir, not John Gerard. A complicated court case first heard in 1714 and subsequently decided in 1716 concluded that Bayne was the lawful heir as the court decided whether the sale of the manor to George Eskridge was legal.³⁷

The court case had developed not because Ebsworth Bayne was asserting his claim to Westwood Manor but because William Fitzredmond was suing George Eskridge over Fitzredmond's right to the property (Eskridge had purchased the property in 1712 from Jane Gerard). Fitzredmond was claiming that he had leased Westwood Manor from Charles Carroll, Esq. and that Eskridge, "with force and armes," had trespassed "into two messuages [dwellings] five out houses one orchard and ... twelve hundred Acres of Land, the Said Tract being Called Westwood Manner."³⁸ Fitzredmond (and, by extension, Charles Carroll) lost the suit, and Fitzredmond was ejected from the property.

The archaeological evidence recovered from the Westwood Manor archaeological site by the Harrisons suggests that this particular dwelling was built no earlier than the late 1670s and was abandoned sometime about 1715.³⁹ The evidence suggests that, wherever the "Mansion howse" described in 1670 stood, it was not in this location, nor were the buildings occupied by William Boarman's servants. A very few fragments of dipped white salt-glazed stoneware, found in the assemblage, indicate that this portion of the site was abandoned c. 1715. Further, the distribution of tobacco pipe stem bore diameters (discussed in Chapter Six) suggests that the site may have been abandoned abruptly, perhaps when Fitzredmond was ejected from the property.

³⁶ Harry Wright Newman, *The Lucketts of Port Tobacco* (Washington, DC, 1938).

³⁷ Archives of Maryland, vol. 77, pp. 199-206.

³⁸ Archives of Maryland, vol. 77, p. 199.

³⁹ Ivor Noël Hume, *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America* (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), pp. 114-115; some researchers have pushed this date back but, generally, dipped white salt-glazed stonewares are not found on sites pre-dating 1715 in the Chesapeake.

Chapter Three Field Investigations at Westwood Manor

In 1996, Phillip and Sandra Harrison had begun construction on a new house located at the end of Earnshaw Drive off of Penn's Hill Road in Charles County. As the Harrisons were overseeing the excavation of foundation trenches, the machinery came down on what appeared to be buried materials along the new building's rear wall. Fortunately, the location of the new structure only clipped the buried deposit, and the Harrisons immediately began collecting the exposed materials. With assistance from archaeologists at the Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum, the Harrisons began photo-documenting finds as they continued construction. The



Figure 4. Overall photograph of 18CH621, with construction trenches for the new house foundation shown to the right. *Mr. and Mrs. Phillip Harrison.*

image to the left, taken by Mrs. Harrison, shows the relationship of three main artifact concentrations at the site to the new house (Figure 4). Many of the artifacts recovered from these concentrations are the subject of this report.

Mrs. Harrison also prepared careful field notes showing where artifacts, features, and an unexpected tile floor were encountered during the course of construction. An image of one page of those field notes along with an interpretation of the notes appears on the following page (Figures 5 and 6). While Mrs. Harrison is not trained in the methods of professional archaeology, her careful observation and documentation has nonetheless resulted in the generation of important notes for locating the materials recovered from Westwood Manor in space and preparing informed interpretations of those materials. In addition, Edward E. Chaney (from the Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum) prepared a brief file report on the Harrison's excavations that has served to shape our interpretations of the site.⁴⁰

Following completion of the house, as the Harrisons used their property for the cultivation of plants both for personal use and for sale at local farmers markets, the couple continued to collect materials that would come to the surface, photo-documenting the process and keeping materials from different areas separate. As a result of their efforts and the efforts of Ed Chaney, we were able to prepare this summary of excavations at the property and to make

⁴⁰ Edward Chaney, Harrison's Westwood Manor—Summary Report (Ms. on file, Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory, Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum, n.d.), pp. 1-3.



Figure 5. Example of field notes kept by Mrs. Harrison. Note the level of detail including measurements and text description.



Figure 6. Plan view of excavations using Mrs. Harrison's notes. Skylar A. Bauer.

informed interpretations about the actions and events of those who called Westwood Manor home in the late 17th and early 18th centuries.

Although the cellar uncovered at Westwood Manor was not completely exposed. evidence suggests that the feature measures at least 21 feet north-south and 16 to 18 feet eastwest. The unglazed floor tiles were observed in the northern portion of the feature, with the tiled area measuring approximately 15 feet north-south by 16 to 18 feet east-west. One tile was removed, revealing that the tiles had been placed on a thin bed of mortar and were then mortared together. Chaney reports that, beneath the mortar bed was a "one-inch thick band of dark loam, which contained some charcoal," suggesting that the cellar originally had a dirt floor with the tile added later. A course of brick may have been used to fit the floor covering against the cellar wall⁴¹

Chaney goes on to describe the stratigraphy observed in the cellar excavation:

The north end of the tile floor was overlain by a layer of silt wash containing numerous micro-bands of soil and some artifacts, but no rubble. The wash layer was about 4 inches thick at the north end, but eventually tapered out towards the south. Above [this layer] was a 6-inch mottled clay layer containing large amounts of brick rubble. It too tapered out toward the south. Above the clay was a dark loam layer containing rubble and artifacts, which was overlain by a thick brown layer containing few artifacts of any sort. This upper layer was probably produced in part by erosion from [the] slope above the cellar to the east. The fill varied elsewhere in the cellar, but was generally layers of dark loam containing artifacts and rubble, with occasional bands of charcoal.⁴²

Chaney also found evidence for a possible bulkhead entrance into the cellar from the structure's northwest side; the cellar wall in this area was comprised of dark loamy fill, whereas in the feature's northeast corner, the cellar abutted an undisturbed subsoil wall. Chaney argues that this could explain the erosional levels in the northwest portion of the cellar.

The Harrisons found no evidence of an intact masonry foundation, leading Chaney to conclude that the building was in all likelihood of earthfast construction.⁴³ The building probably had two fireplaces, one at the northeast corner of the structure and one at the south end. The fireplace at the north end was identified by the presence of a large quantity of Dutch yellow brick and a fragment of a charred hearthstone. Although Chaney notes that Dutch yellow brick was "most commonly used in fireplaces," analysis of the Dutch bricks has indicated that the brick recovered from Westwood Manor are exclusively of the "moppen" variety rather than the "klinker" variety (see Chapter Fourteen). The fireplace at the south end of the cellar was "indicated by a large quantity of unarticulated red brick, the recovery of several charred hearth tile fragments (similar to the cellar floor tiles), and the presence of a charcoal band in the cellar fill "44

The artifacts recovered by the Harrisons come from one of up to ten proveniences on the site. The majority of the artifacts come from the cellar fill, designated "Site I" by Mrs. Harrison. Within Site I, Mrs. Harrison identified four areas, which she designated a, b, c, and d (see Figures

⁴¹ Chaney, p. 1.

⁴² Chaney, pp. 1-2.

⁴³ Chaney, p. 2. ⁴⁴ Chaney, p. 2.

5 and 6). Materials recovered from an area by a nearby walnut tree were designated Site II, and a large feature in the Harrisons' garden, probably a refuse-filled pit, was designated Site III. Mrs. Harrison also collected and curated surface finds from across her property.

While the Harrisons' work generated a large number of materials numbering in the thousands, it appears that the couple left much of the site undisturbed and it is likely that additional features and materials remain preserved at the site.

Chapter Four Laboratory Methods and Collection Curation

The Westwood Manor collection had been partially processed when it was transferred to St. Mary's College. The majority of the artifacts had been washed, and most were organized by lot and, within lot, by artifact type. The materials were transferred by the Harrisons in 32 large, sealable plastic containers. They were placed in the Lab Storage closet on the third floor of Kent Hall. Selected materials, including two nearly complete ceramic vessels, one brass and one lead weights, a bone walking stick handle, and a silver spoon were placed in a locked cabinet in Room 301 of Kent Hall.

We began the inventory by assigning each container a sequential number and creating a tracking list in a spreadsheet prepared in Microsoft Excel. Any provenience or other information found on or in the container was entered into the spreadsheet. The contents of each container were briefly described. Ten lot numbers were then assigned to account for the materials in all 32 boxes. These lots and their short titles are listed below and they follow the field provenience designations assigned by the Harrisons (refer to Figure 6 for additional locational information):

- Lot 1 Site I; Cellar, general;
- Lot 2 Site I-a; Cellar, northwest corner of excavated portion;
- Lot 3 Site I-b; Cellar, southwest corner of excavated portion;
- Lot 4 Site I-c; Cellar, northeast corner of excavated portion;
- Lot 5 Site I-d; Cellar; southeast corner of excavated portion;
- Lot 6 Site I-b & c; Cellar, combined southwest and northeast corner portions;
- Lot 7 Site II; adjacent to a standing walnut tree;
- Lot 8 Site III; Garden Feature (probably a refuse-filled pit);
- Lot 9 General Yard Collection;
- Lot 10 Other Areas.

All unwashed materials were washed and dried in the Kent Hall Anthropology Laboratory facility. Washed materials were carefully packaged in archival materials according to standards established by The Maryland Historical Trust's Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory (MAC Lab).⁴⁵ All bags and other containers were labeled with appropriate provenience information and an acid-free provenience slip was included in each container.

Artifacts were then labeled in archival ink with the site and lot number (i.e., 18CH621/1). Labels were appropriately sealed between an archival (and reversible) under- and topcoat. Following the labeling, artifacts were cataloged according to the program used by the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory. Hand-written catalogs included both text descriptions and artifact drawings.

After labeling, all ceramic fragments were pulled from their respective proveniences and assembled by type and then by vessel form. When possible, ceramic vessels were mended using archival glues provided by the MAC Lab. Individual catalog forms have been prepared for each identified vessel.

⁴⁵ Betty L. Seifert, *Technical Update No. 1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations in Maryland* (Crownsville, Maryland Historical Trust, 2005).

Metal objects were not washed, appearing to have already been washed by the Harrisons. Nearly all of the metal was bagged and transferred to the MAC Lab where the items were documented using x-radiography. The original x-ray film remains at the MAC Lab; digital images of the x-rays were taken and are curated with the images taken as part of this project.

All materials were boxed for final curation and storage in archival coroplast boxes. Each box was assigned a new tracking number that is not related to(but cross-referenced with) the tracking number system established during the collection's intake. An inventory of all boxes and all records was produced and is available for review at St. Mary's College of Maryland. These materials were created by student Grace Gutowski.



Chapter Five Reconstructing the Community at Westwood Manor

ALEX J. FLICK

Archaeological site 18CH621 is situated on what was originally a 1600 acre tract patented in 1651 by Thomas Gerard.⁴⁶ This piece of land, Westwood Manor, is one of the three manors in Maryland owned by Gerard (the other two being St. Clements and Basford) which comprised a large part of his sizeable land holdings. St. Clements and Basford Manors, adjacent to one another, have been extensively studied by Maryland historians as a number of political and social elite resided on these tracts. Additionally, a rich record of historical documents, including the St. Clement's Manor court proceedings, survives and is available through the Maryland State Archives.⁴⁷ Westwood Manor, however, has received relatively little attention to this point.



Figure 7. Augustine Herrman's Map of Maryland and Virginia (1670/1673) showing Westwood Manor.

Westwood Manor appears on Augustine Herrman's map, Maryland and Virginia (Figure 7), at the head of the Wicomico River, suggesting that it was a noteworthy location in 1670, when the fieldwork for the map was completed.⁴⁸ Artifacts recovered from the site are yielding insight into the significance of the property and its inhabitants. Nonetheless, archaeologists have long stressed the need to complement artifactual analysis with documentary sources to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of a site. its inhabitants, and its environment and context.49 Furthermore, the rural settlement system which evolved in

colonial Maryland did not necessarily preclude the development of a social community. In other words, "...commitment to private property reflects a preference for economic detachment from the community, and their focus on soil depleting but potentially lucrative crops reveals an interest in profit maximization. Simultaneously, however, colonial Chesapeake planters remained integrated socially and economically through reciprocal exchanges."⁵⁰ By looking beyond the artifacts and beyond Westwood Manor's boundaries, we can begin to identify the relationships,

⁴⁶ St. Mary's County Patent Record ABH 193/199.

⁴⁷ Spalding, pp. 335-357; Archives of Maryland, vol. 53, p. 627.

⁴⁸ Augustine Herrman, *Maryland and Virginia 1670*, published 1673; <u>www.msa.md.gov</u>; around the time Herrman was making this map, William Boarman's 7-year lease of Westwood would have been nearing its end, or recently ended.

⁴⁹ Henry Langhorne and Lawrence Babits, Anthropological Title Searches in Rockbridge County, Virginia, in *Documentary Archaeology in the New World*, Mary C. Beaudry ed. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 132-137; Garry Wheeler Stone, Artifacts Are Not Enough, in Beaudry, pp. 68-78.

⁵⁰ Allison Bell, White Ethnogenesis and Gradual Capitalism: Perspectives from Colonial Archaeological Sites in the Chesapeake, *American Anthropologist*, vol. 107, no. 3 (2005), pp. 446-460.

social and economic, of Westwood's inhabitants with the persons and properties around them. In doing so, we can achieve a more complete understanding of the 18CH621 site and its importance.

In this paper, I take a dual approach in the use of documentary sources to reconstruct the community around Westwood Manor. The first aspect of this project entails the identification and plotting of properties surrounding Westwood. This was done through the creation of a GIS, allowing the property boundaries to be projected onto various map layers. The second part involved research into the people who resided at the properties around Westwood and their interactions with the manor's inhabitants. By examining the spatial and personal relationships between those in this area, we can gain insight into how Westwood Manor's residents interacted with those around them and how the community functioned in the 17th and 18th centuries.

Creating a GIS for the Early Westwood Manor Community

To begin to examine the 17th- and 18th-century Westwood neighborhood, I started with a reconstruction of known property boundaries to establish spatial relationships among those residing at the head of the Wicomico River during this period. To accomplish this, I created a Geographic Information System (GIS) using ArcMap and ArcCatalog software to project the boundaries of these properties onto map layers containing various information. This database is a work-in-progress, as continual research may be added to the file in the future in the form of new properties and their boundaries, spreadsheets containing data from archaeological sites, etc. In the next few paragraphs, I will briefly discuss the scope of my work thus far in creating a



foundation of this database, which future work can build upon.

The base of the GIS consists of a shapefile with Maryland's modern county boundaries. Lavered on top of this are USGS geo-referenced topographic quad maps, USDA soil survey map data (with attribute table), tax maps demarcating modern property boundaries and ownership, and shapefiles of Charles County hydrography, Maryland Historical Trust properties, and known archaeological sites in the county (Figure 8).⁵¹ The shapefile with Charles County archaeological site data was severed from its database containing the relevant site information. My first task was to join the Microsoft Access table containing all site information to the shapefile within the GIS, allowing for point-and-click access of Charles County archaeological site information (within the shapefile's attribute table).

Figure 8. GIS Shapefile.

After establishing this foundation for the project, the next step was to identify and project

⁵¹ The USGS maps which cover the Zekiah Swamp area include the Pope's Creek, La Plata, and Hughesville quadrangles. These .tif files, tax map .tifs, and MHT and Archaeological Site shapefiles were obtained from Scott Strickland. Soil map shapefiles were found online at the USDA's Web Soil Survey. The hydrography file was taken from the US Census Bureau's 2009 TIGER/Line set, also available online.

the bounds of the properties neighboring Westwood Manor. The primary resources for this step of the project were plats and other available land records containing property descriptions. The process of inputting these properties involved inserting the plats into the GIS software, scaling the image to the acreage stated in the associated document, and tracing the boundaries. This trace could then be double-checked with the metes-and-bounds description from the plat. Proper positioning of the tracts relied on relational descriptions provided in the plats, and, when applicable, alignment with landscape and topographical features or modern property boundaries.

In all, ten tracts in the Westwood vicinity were added to the GIS (although more properties can be added). These properties include (below):

1. Westwood Manor: Originally patented in 1651 by Thomas Gerard for 1600 acres; 1720 survey depicts tract of 1456 acres.⁵²

2. Westwood Lodge: Patented in 1661 by Thomas Gerard for 100 acres; shown with Westwood Manor and Boarman's Rest on a 1798 resurvey of a tract called Assinton.⁵³

3. Boarman's Rest: Patented in 1661 to William Boarman for 1,000 acres: resurveyed in 1797 by Benedict Boarman—resurvey includes several other tracts, including Assinton and Hardshift.⁵⁴

4. Boarman's Meadow: Patent dates to 1791 for Raphael Boarman; Plat of property consisting of 346 acres from 1797 and another from 1946.⁵⁵

5. Turner's Forest (location approximated): Samuel Turner's 1734 resurvey of a 200-acre property called "Bow" (originally granted in 1670 to Edward Evans and Thomas Dewberry⁵⁶), a 100 acre property called "St. Ann" (originally granted in 1673 to Dennis Husculaw⁵⁷), and vacant land for 450 acres total.⁵⁸

6. Pile's Fresh (location approximated): Thomas Simpson's (probably junior) 1721 resurvey of three of his tracts and surplus land into a single 1333 acre parcel⁵⁹—"St. Thomas" (patented 1671 for 400 acres).⁶⁰ "St. Georges" (patented 1672 for 1180 acres—800 acres excluded from the resurvey)⁶¹, and "Simpkin" (patented 1671 for 100 acres).⁶²

⁵² St. Mary's County Patent Record AB & H, 193/199; Charles County Court Records, M, 2/96.

⁵³ St. Mary's County Patent Record 4, 556/594; Assinton Resurvey, Edward Edelen, 1798. Charles County Patent Certificate 86.

⁵⁴ Scott M. Strickland, History of Boarman's Rest at Hollybrook Subdivision, unpublished manuscript in possession of the author; St. Mary's County Land Records, Patent Record Liber 5 folio 50; For 1797 resurvey, see: Charles County Land Records, Unpatented Certificate 48.

⁵⁵ See Strickland, for the 1797 plat, see Charles County Patented Certificate 148, 01/25/03/17.

⁵⁶ St. Mary's County Patent Records 12/546 & 14/73.

⁵⁷ St. Mary's County Patent Records 17/247 & 17/258.

⁵⁸ See Charles County Patented Certificate 1118, 01/25/03/30 for plat. Also, by its patent description, the

St. Vincent property (PR 17/379) is located east of St. Anne. ⁵⁹ See Charles County Unpatented Certificate 384, 01/25/03/35 for plat.

⁶⁰ St. Mary's County Patent Records 13/110 & 16/270.

⁶¹ St. Mary's County Patent Records 14/509 & 16/342.

⁶² St. Mary's County Patent Records 13/108 & 16/272.



Figure 9. Reconstructed tract map in the Westwood Manor vicinity.

The early Westwood Manor community—18CH621 is circled (red); property boundaries are depicted by black line; dotted black lines signify properties with approximated locations; light green areas represent known archaeological sites.

7. *Meadows*: Originally patented as "The Meadoes" in 1663 for Thomas Gerard, consisting of 400 acres;⁶³ 1816 resurvey for Henry Gardiner combines the original Meadoes, a larger intermediary resurvey of the tract, "Meadows Marsh" (200 acres granted to John Winter in 1734), and vacant land into an 888 $\frac{3}{4}$ acre property; the plat contains the outline for the original 400 acre tract, but these bounds cannot be made out with any confidence due to the quality of the image scan;⁶⁴ additionally, the projected bounds of this property in the GIS may not line up with the shoreline bounds on the map due to natural shoreline change.

8. *Meadows Marsh*: Granted in 1734 to John Winter for 200 acres of marsh land;⁶⁵ property is also shown on the 1816 plat of "Meadows" and in that resurvey, is described as consisting of 146 acres, with 74 acres of the property omitted from survey "…lying in a Creek formerly known by the name of Herring Creek but now by the name of Allan's Fresh Creek…"⁶⁶

9. Westwood Marsh: Granted in 1740 to John Briscoe for 40 acres of marsh land.⁶⁷

10. *Mill Dam Enlarged*: Originally granted in 1672 to John Allen for 50 acres as "The Mill Dam;"⁶⁸ resurveyed in 1798 for William Swan for 98 acres, 1 rod; 1798 plat also contains a description of the "dwelling house" on the property.⁶⁹

Documentary Reconstruction of the Westwood Community

In 1678, Governor Charles Calvert, third Lord Baltimore, remarked, "the people [in Maryland] are not affecting to build nere each other but soe as to have their houses nere the Watters for conveniencye of trade...in most places There are not ffifty houses in the space of Thirty Myles...."⁷⁰ Although the area at the head of the Wicomico was still a frontier landscape, the inhabitants there did not exist in isolation. Rather, a complex web of relationships had developed among those living on the properties surrounding Westwood Manor. As these relationships developed, so too did the infrastructure of the area, allowing community institutions to emerge. By the end of the 17th century, for instance, there were a number of public roads traversing the Westwood area, as described in a 1697 "ascertainment" of roads in the county:

...from ye aforsd William Marshall's to ye Mill at ye head of Wicomico River and so over ye head of ye said River down to Budd's Creek and from ye Mill at ye head of Wicomico River aforesaid up to ye Court-house of this County...and from Budd's Creek to ye bridges over Piles his fresh branch and from thence up to Major Boareman's Quarter...⁷¹

When the Mill at the head of the Wicomico was constructed, it flooded the original bridge, which the Assembly ordered to be reconstructed over the Zekiah Swamp within two miles of the Mill.⁷²

⁶³ St. Mary's County Patent Records 5/474 & 19/416.

⁶⁴ See Charles County Patented Certificate 703, 01/25/03/25 for plat (p.12).

⁶⁵ See Charles County Patented Certificate 708, 01/25/03/25 for plat.

⁶⁶ Charles County Patented Certificate 703, pp. 11-12.

⁶⁷ See Charles County Unpatented Certificate 499A, 01/25/03/36 for plat.

⁶⁸ Charles County Patent Records 14/498 & 16/347.

⁶⁹ See Charles County Patented Certificate 724, 01/25/03/25 for plat. Also, see Charles County Patent Record IC O/388 and IM O/453.

⁷⁰ Archives of Maryland, vol. 5, p. 266.

⁷¹ George L. Sioussat, *Highway Legislation in Maryland* (Bibliolife LLC, repub. 2009), p. 122.

⁷² Archives of Maryland, vol. 2, pp. 408-9.

This task was completed by William Boarman.⁷³ The Mill, just across the Zekiah from Westwood, also hosted the Charles County Court on at least one occasion, in 1680.⁷⁴ The Mill appears throughout the records, often serving as a landmark in court cases, for instance. In one 1681 case, Richard Edelen, a resident of the Westwood area and deputy surveyor (who laid out Dennis Husculah's land), got into trouble for statements he made while at the Mill implying that Lord Baltimore would execute Fendall and Coode (Thomas Gerard's son-in-law) because he "favours the Romans."⁷⁵ Other signs of community become evident during this time too, as a number of houses of worship sprouted up in the area, including one on Westwood Manor.⁷⁶ and a chapel on Boarman's Rest.

To look beyond the spatial relationships and identify some of the connections between the inhabitants of these tracts, Dr. Thomas Gerard provides a starting point. Gerard originally patented at least four properties (for a minimum of 2200 acres) in the area, including Westwood Manor, Westwood Lodge, Meadoes, and a nearby 100-acre tract called Norwood, patented in 1661.⁷⁸ Because of a protracted legal battle between Thomas Gerard and his brother-in-law, Marmaduke Snow, an appraisal of Westwood Manor was conducted in 1664.⁷⁹ The appraisers included John Piles, Thomas Simpson, William Boarman, and Samuel Dobson. While all four of these men were from the Westwood area, three of them—Simpson, Boarman, and Dobson, lived on properties adjacent to Westwood Manor.

In 1671, Thomas Simpson (senior) patented a property called St. Thomas, immediately to the east of Westwood Manor, as well as another tract called Simpkin. The following year, he patented a piece of land called St. George, adjacent to these two properties and, in 1721, his son (and heir to his lands) resurveyed all three of these tracts into a 1.333-acre property named Piles Fresh.⁸⁰ Simpson also owned several properties patented earlier than the three comprising Piles Fresh, and likely was living on one of them at the time of the appraisal. Nonetheless, his name appeared in the rent roll for Westwood Lodge, Gerard's 100-acre property to the north of Westwood Manor.⁸¹ By 1685, however, he was definitely living at his St. Thomas plantation. next to "Mr. Gerard's Manor called Westwood," possibly with his son, Thomas.⁸²

Another appraiser, William Boarman, held vast amounts of land to the north of Westwood Manor, including his "dwelling plantation" on his Boarman's Rest property.⁸³ He had a close connection to Westwood Manor, as he leased the property for a period of seven years after the appraisal was conducted.⁸⁴ During his lease of Westwood, Boarman employed a few servants

⁷³ Archives of Maryland, vol. 60, p. 587.

⁷⁴ Charles County Circuit Court: Court and Land Records, 1680-1685, I/1, CM 376-10, p. 50.

⁷⁵ Archives of Maryland, vol. 15, pp. 407-408.

⁷⁶ Archives of Maryland, vol. 23, p. 451.

⁷⁷ See Will of Major William Boarman, 1708, in Jane Baldwin Cotton, *The Maryland Calendar of Wills:* Volume III (Baltimore, Kohn & Pollock, Inc. 1907), p. 140.

⁷⁸ See Charles County Patent Record 4/556, 593 for Norwood property.

⁷⁹ Archives of Maryland, vol. 49, p. 518-9.

 $^{^{80}}$ St. Mary's County Patent Records 13/108 & 16/272.

⁸¹ Rent Rolls, Charles County-Newport Hundred, 1642-1753, Westwood Lodge, 365-26. Accessed on MD WebGen Archives: < http://usgwarchives.net/md/charles/land.htm>.

⁸² Provincial Court Deeds, WRC 1, 402-03; See also, Lois Green Carr, Men's Career Files: "Thomas Simpson, Jr.," image no. sc5094-3783-2.

⁸³ See Will of Major William Boarman, 1708, in Cotton, p. 140; archaeological survey in the southern ⁸⁴ Archives of Maryland, vol. 57, p. 33. See p. 32 for description of bounds of the leased land on

Westwood.

to perform various functions on the property. Perhaps one of these servants was Cornelius Cornell, who is believed to have been one of Boarman's servants at this time.⁸⁵ Cornell was implicated in a few petty crimes against properties originally patented by Thomas Gerard, including the theft of nails from the Westwood Manor house in 1670 and the destruction of fences at the Norwood property, where George Diamond was a tenant at the time.⁸⁶ Cornell was acquitted in both cases. Boarman and neighbor Thomas Simpson also seem to have had a personal relationship to some degree, as Boarman speaks on behalf of Thomas Simpson and his wife, Elizabeth, at a 1665 Provincial Court in St. Mary's City when the couple was too weak to travel there themselves.⁸⁷

The third appraiser, Samuel Dobson, was a tenant on Westwood Lodge, the 100-acre property between Westwood Manor and Boarman's Rest, prior to 1672.⁸⁸ Dobson appears to have been a personal friend of Gerard, serving as his attorney in a 1662 case against Humphery Attiwickes, and that same year receiving from Gerard a cow and a calf as gifts, as well as a discharge of all his debts.⁸⁹ Dobson also appears to perform various tasks for Gerard, for instance, having the age of a boy servant named Thomas Jackson adjudged before the County Court on Gerard's behalf.⁹⁰ He is also summoned as a witness during the court case between Gerard and Boarman over the lease of Westwood Manor.

In 1673, Gerard left the Westwood Lodge property to his daughter Mary, married to Kenelm Cheseldyne (who at one point served as attorney for Samuel Dobson), when his will was probated. It is unclear whether Dobson remained a tenant there or not, but by the early 1680's, he was living around Bushwood at St. Clement's. In 1674, Dobson, along with the younger Thomas Gerard, appraised the estate of John Piper on Basford Manor; William Boarman administered the oath.⁹¹ The relationship between this group of men likely resulted from the period during which John Piper leased 100 acres on Westwood Manor.⁹²

The next known resident of Westwood Manor was merchant John Pryor or Prior. In a 1682 case, Dennis Huscalah informed the Maryland Council that John Pryor and James Smallwood had been illicitly purchasing deer skins from the Indians at Zekiah town, taking them to Westwood Manor where Pryor kept his store.⁹³ Pryor and Smallwood, who also resided in the area, had a connection beyond illegal trade. Smallwood named his son, born in 1680, Prior Smallwood.⁹⁴ James Smallwood (perhaps the junior) named his son after the subsequent resident of Westwood Manor, John Bayne—who referred in his will to his godson, Bayne Smallwood, named in his honor.⁹⁵ John Bayne had married Anne, widow of the younger Thomas Gerard, and probably the daughter of William Smallwood, and had come to possess both Westwood Manor

⁸⁵ Lois Green Carr, Men's Career Files: "Cornelius Cornell," image no. sc5094-0949-3.

⁸⁶ Archives of Maryland, vol. 65, p. 235.

⁸⁷ Archives of Maryland, vol. 49, p. 516.

⁸⁸ See Will of Thomas Gerrard, 1672/3, Wills I/567.

 ⁸⁹ Elise Greenup Jordan, Abstracts of Charles County Maryland Court and Land Records Volume I: 1658-1666 (Westminster, MD, Heritage Books, 2007), p. 123 and Archives of Maryland, vol. 53, pp. 214-215.
⁹⁰ Archives of Maryland, vol. 53, p. 204.

⁹¹ V.L. Skinner, Abstracts of the Testamentary Proceedings of the Prerogative Court of Maryland Volume I: 1658-1675 (Baltimore, Clearfield Co., 2006), pp. 111-112.

⁹² Archives of Maryland, vol. 65, p. 487.

⁹³ Archives of Maryland, vol. 17, p. 92.

⁹⁴ Genealogical information from Edward Papenfuse, A *Biographical Dictionary of the Maryland Legislature*, 1635-1789 (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979).

⁹⁵ Will of Captain John Bayne, 1700, Wills 11/217. Accessed on MD WebGen: <u>http://files.usgwarchives.net/md/charles/wills/bayne-j.txt</u>.

and the Meadows tract to the immediate south. Meadows was passed on to John's son, Ellsworth (or Ebsworth) Bayne, while it appears that John and Anne were living for a period at Westwood Manor.⁹⁶

Additionally, Bayne Smallwood married the daughter of Councilor John Courts, a friend of John Bayne who was present at the 1694 Council meeting held at Westwood Manor. Courts also owned a tract of land called Courts Pallace, adjacent to the Mill Dam at the head of the Wicomico, just across the Zekiah.⁹⁷ Courts and James Smallwood as well as Councilor John Addison (also present at the 1694 meeting) are referred to as "beloved friends" and made trustees in Bayne's will in 1700.⁹⁸

There is a certain persistence to these community relationships between people and properties. For example, Richard, the son of Richard Edelen—the deputy surveyor who laid out the three tracts owned by Dennis Huscalah (St. Anne, St. Vincent, and Huscalah's Addition) and subsequently appraised Husculah's property—later appeared in the rent rolls for 50 acres of Westwood Manor and also came into possession of Westwood Lodge in 1712.⁹⁹ Westwood Lodge appears to stay in the Edelen family for some time, as the 1783 Assessment indicates the property split 2:1 between John and Susanna Edelen, as do the family's tracts on Westwood Manor.¹⁰⁰

Prior Smallwood also named his son, born two years after the death of his brother Bayne Smallwood, "Bayne" in his honor. This younger Bayne Smallwood appears on the rent rolls for a 190-acre tract on the resurveyed piece of land combining St. Thomas and part of St. George (referring to Piles Fresh).¹⁰¹ One of Smallwood's neighbors on this tract, aside from Thomas, son of the original Thomas Simpson, was also Richard Edelen, who appears in the rent roll for this property as well.

The persistence of family names on the land in this area is quite evident—even a brief look at the modern tax maps reveals Boarmans, Bowlings, Hawkinses, and so on—all names recognizable in the 17th-century records. Allen's Fresh still retains the name of John Allen, who originally owned the Mill Dam built there. These names on the land imply a community with a deep history in this area. The residents of Westwood Manor and the surrounding properties—whether servants, planters, merchants, deputy surveyors, or gentlemen—did not exist in isolation. Rather, this messy tangle of relationships through land transfers, marriages and familial ties, court records, and other documents offers a glimpse of a zone of significant interaction between those living on the properties identified around Westwood Manor.

⁹⁶ Ibid; See also *Archives of Maryland*, vol. 20, p. 73: "At a Councill held at Westwood, at the house of Captain John Bayne..."

⁹⁷ "Courts Pallace" is referred to in the Mill Dam Enlarged plat, See Charles County Patented Certificate 724, 01/25/03/25. See also St. Mary's County Patent Records 4/564 & 5/328.

⁹⁸ See John Bayne will.

⁹⁹ Rent Rolls, Charles County-Newport Hundred, 1642-1753, Westwood Lodge, 365-26 and Westwood Manor, 364-20. Accessed on MD WebGen Archives.

¹⁰⁰ Assessment of 1783, Charles County, MSA S 1437, CH 2nd District, Land p. 4, S 1161-4-9, 1/4/5/47. Accessed: <u>http://www.msa.md.gov/msa/stagser/s1400/s1437/html/1437ch.html</u>.

¹⁰¹ Rent Rolls, Charles County, St. Thomas & Part of St. Georges Resurvey, 400-147.

Chapter Six The Clay Tobacco Pipes Recovered from Westwood Manor

SKYLAR A. BAUER AND VERIOSKA TORRES

Tobacco smoking first became fashionable in England in 1570 and was widely practiced by 1590. As the tobacco economy grew in the New World, the production of clay pipes began to take root throughout Britain and the Netherlands. By the 17th century, clay tobacco pipes were ubiquitous. Colonial English America adopted tobacco smoking as a recreational vice. Some colonies built entire economies centered on tobacco production. Doing so made tobacco readily available for consumption and inexpensive. A tobacco pipe may have been disposed of every one to two years and possibly sooner. As a result, pipes are often found on colonial sites in significant numbers and have distinct styles reflecting a specific period of occupation.¹⁰²

The earliest 16th-century pipes, for example, are characterized by a bulbous, acorn-like bowl shape with rouletting, a short stem, and a large bore diameter.¹⁰³ The 17th-century pipe saw a lengthening of the stem in response to more readily available tobacco. Cheaper tobacco led to larger bowl size allowing for more tobacco to be smoked. The stems were lengthened in order to allow the smoke to cool before being inhaled. Thicker wire was used to create the wider bores found in shorter stemmed 16th-century pipes. But the lengthening of the stem made it harder to use such a thick wire and so pipe makers would often use a thinner wire providing for a smaller bore diameter. Pipe bores decreased in size through the 17th century and into the second half of the 18th century.¹⁰⁴ This trend of decreased bore diameters makes it possible to date the pipes. One can also use typologies of bowl and heel shapes and sizes along with maker's marks and decorations to determine a pipe's most likely date of manufacture.

Minimum Number of Clay Tobacco Pipes

The archaeological record can be misleading when it comes to tobacco pipes. Tobacco pipes were fragile and cheap. So, while many measurable stem fragments may show up on a site, the data may over-represent pipe stems with smaller bore diameters. As noted, as pipe stems lengthened, their bore sizes decreased. A 17th-century 12-inch tobacco stem is bound to break into more pieces than a 16th-century 3.5-inch stem—the result being the overrepresentation of later pipes in the archaeological record.

In an attempt to reconcile this issue, the minimum number of pipes was calculated by quantifying the number of complete or near complete heels, spurs, and heelless bowl bases where heels/spurs would have been (Figure 10). By this technique, there are at least 57 whole pipes

¹⁰² Katherine D. Cavallo, An Analysis of Marked and Decorated White Clay Tobacco Pipes from the Lower Patuxent Drainage (St. Mary's Project, St. Mary's College of Maryland, St. Mary's City, 2004); available on-line at <u>http://www.chesapeakearchaeology.org/Interpretations/CavalloPaper.htm</u>; accessed March 4, 2010.

¹⁰³Billy Gaulton, Seventeenth-and Eighteenth-Century Marked Clay Tobacco Pipes From Ferryland, Newfoundland (Archaeology Unit, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1999); http://www.heritage.nf.ca/avalon/artifacts/pipemarks_intro.html; accessed May 1, 2010.

¹⁰⁴ Ivor Noël Hume, A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001a), pp. 296-312.

represented in the collection (Lot 3: 34; Lot 7: 1; Lot 8: 12; Lot 9: 10). This seems much more likely than the minimum number of 19 tobacco pipes provided by the amount of complete bowls (Lot 3: 12; Lot 7: 1; Lot 8: 5; Lot 9: 1).

If one was to measure the average length of 18CH621's stem fragments, another minimum estimate could be provided. For example, say the average length is 2.5" per stem and the Binford date is 1695. According to Iain Walker's estimate, the average pipe length around the end of the 17th century (e.g., 1695) was around 12"-13".¹⁰⁵ That means about 4.8-5.2 stem fragments represent one whole pipe. Since there are 910 measurable stem fragments at this site, using Walker's formula would yield around 175 to 190 whole tobacco pipes in this collection. This is speculative but would serve for an interesting comparison. More research would need to be collected on stem length of the collection and a more exact length for the average tobacco pipe at the time of Binford's mean occupation date in order to be more valid.



Figure 10. Complete bowl fragments from Lot 3 (Cellar) of 18CH621; a. spur b. heelless base c. heel (not to scale).

Bore Diameter Distributions

One thousand forty-three European white clay and two terra cotta tobacco pipe fragments are present in the Westwood Manor collection. Of the white clay pipes, 19 include complete bowls, 211 bowl fragments, and 813 pipe stems. A total of 910 stems (including those attached to bowls) have measurable bore diameters. The majority of the bore diameters (39 percent) measure 6/64ths-inch, which is representative of late 17th-century occupation (see Figure 11).¹⁰⁶

Two methods were used to date the site based on the measurable stem bore diameters. Binford's straight line regression formula factors in the years and mean hole diameter, dating the mean occupancy of Westwood Manor to around 1695.¹⁰⁷ Harrington's figure of periods is based on the percentage of bore diameter measurements (64th of an inch) and their fluctuations through intervals from 1620-1800 (Figure 12). According to Harrington's technique, (i.e., matching Figure 12 to a date range in Figure 11), Westwood Manor was occupied c. 1680-1710.¹⁰⁸ Binford's regression formula dates the mean occupancy of Westwood Manor at 1695 which fits well with Harrington's 1680-1710 range.

¹⁰⁵ Iain C. Walker, *History and Archaeology 11D: Clay Tobacco-Pipes*, With Particular Reference to the Bristol Industry (Ottawa: National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, 1977), p. 296.

¹⁰⁶ Eric G. Ayto, *Clay Tobacco Pipes* (Buckinghamshire, UK: Shire Publications Ltd., 2002), p. 4.

¹⁰⁷ Lewis R. Binford, A New Method of Calculating Dates from Kaolin Pipe Stem Samples. Republished in Robert L. Schuyler, editor, Historical Archaeology: A Guide to Substantive and Theoretical Contributions (New York, Baywood Publishing Company, Inc., 1978), p. 66. ¹⁰⁸ Victor Buchli, *Material Culture*. Vol. 1 (New York, Routledge, 2004), p. 238.



Figure 11. Bore diameter frequency at Westwood Manor (n=910).



Figure 12. Harrington's calculations of bore hole diameter variation adapted for comparison with Figure 11.¹⁰⁹

Figure 13 depicts the distribution of bore diameters from five 17th-/18th-century Maryland sites, including Westwood Manor. This graph shows the position of Westwood Manor in relation to the known dates of similar sites. Patuxent Point's (c. 1658-1695) bore diameter distribution is most similar to Westwood Manor's, especially the distributions of pipes with bore diameters of 6/64ths- and 7/64ths-inch. Their dates of occupation almost certainly overlap, although it appears that Patuxent Point was probably occupied a little earlier and then abandoned a little earlier than Westwood Manor.

The frequency of tobacco pipes with bore diameters of 5/64ths-inch is much greater at King's Reach (1690-1710) than at Westwood Manor, indicating that Westwood Manor was

¹⁰⁹ Noël Hume, 2001a, p. 298.
probably not occupied as late as King's Reach.¹¹⁰ But given the data provided it can be argued that the 18CH621 pipe collection represents an occupation around 1680-1700.



Figure 13. Bore diameter frequencies from five colonial Maryland sites.

A bottle seal recovered from Westwood Manor with the initials, "IB," likely refers to John Bayne, who, it is increasingly clear, lived at 18CH621. This end date of c. 1700 may correspond with Bayne's death in 1701

Significantly, ceramic evidence indicates that the site was occupied as late as c. 1715. A small number of dipped white salt-glazed stoneware fragments are found in the assemblage; these ceramics have a traditionally accepted *terminus post quem* of 1715. Noël Hume has more recently suggested, however, that dipped wares could have been available in some parts of England as early as 1700.¹¹¹

This means of analysis based on bore diameter provides a general idea of when the site was occupied but one should be cautious with this approach. For example, there is a possibility that the Binford method can result in a year when the site was not occupied. The potential error derives in part from a formula that includes calculating an average date of occupation gathered from the data.¹¹² Needless to say, this data ought to be used in correspondence with other diagnostic data (e.g., pipe maker's marks, ceramics, window leads, and historical documentation).

¹¹⁰ 4.2 percent of King's Reach's pipes are missing and their absence may affect the distribution frequencies derived for King's Reach.

¹¹¹ Noël Hume, 2001a, p. 199.

¹¹² Noël Hume, 2001a, p. 199.



Figure 14. The most common bowl shape found at Westwood Manor, sketch by Verioska Torres. This form dates c. 1690-1720 (Not to scale).



Figure 15. Bowl types from Westwood Manor, sketch by Verioska Torres (Not to scale).

Bowl Shape and Size

Tobacco pipes can also be dated by the shapes and sizes of their bowls and heels, which changed in form through time. Adrian Oswald and Iain C. Walker researched these trends and compiled data to create basic bowl typologies as a diagnostic tool to further date clay tobacco pipe collections. This is an important step in analyzing pipes and determining dates of occupation because diagnostic bowl shapes and sizes can inform one about fragments whose bore diameters are immeasurable (i.e., bowlstem junctures and bowls without stems). Bore holes at these junctures are larger than their actual bore size and, as a result, not to be recorded while bowls without stems do not have bores to measure in the first place.¹¹³

Oswald and Walker's diagnostic evolutionary series of bowls and heels validate, for the most part, the pipe stem dates derived through the Harrington (1680-1710) and Binford (1695) formulae. Twenty-four bowl shapes from Westwood Manor are diagnostic. The most common bowl, shown in Figure 14, is a narrow, heelless pipe with a relatively level rim. It resembles number 26 in Oswald's typology, but has a narrower bowl. It fits more closely into Noël Hume's pipe typology which dates the pipe c. 1690-1720. The second most common group of pipes is also best portrayed in Noël Hume's mostly English typology which dates them from 1680-1710 (Figure 15).¹¹⁴ While this group's bowl type is still relatively elongated like Figure 14, the bowl has more of a curve and is enhanced by a heel.

Most bowls in this collection have a characteristically level rim hinting towards a date at the end of the 17th century.¹¹⁵ But a particularly unusual form is that of Figure 16.

These two complete bowls with rim rouletting and 7/64ths-inch bore diameters were unable to be They have an unusually level rim for having a semi-bulbous bowl with rim categorized.

¹¹³ Cavallo.

¹¹⁴ Iain C. Walker, History and Archaeology 11D: Clay Tobacco-Pipes, With Particular Reference to the *Bristol Industry* (Ottawa: National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, 1977), p. 1543. ¹¹⁵ Ayto, p. 6.



Figure 16: Two Lot 3 (Cellar) rouletted complete bowls, $7/64^{th}$ inch, drawn by Verioska Torres. Unknown bowl form (Not to scale).

rouletting which are typically characteristic of earlier 17thcentury pipes.¹¹⁶ Further research on this style would be helpful in trying to reconcile its seemingly contradictory characteristics.

Maker's Marks and Decoration

It can be difficult to categorize some bowl types as Figure 15 shows. The pipe with the "WP" maker's mark, for example, has a more gradual curve from the base into the bowl than Walker's 1690-1720 bowl style thus making it appear more similar to Walker's 1720-1780 style. This validates the importance of using all diagnostic portions of a pipe to come up with the most accurate date for the tobacco pipe. If this mark is associated with Bristol pipemaker William Phillips, as we think it is, then it does not date 1720-1780. Records record that Phillips was freed from apprenticeship c. 1689-1690.¹¹⁷ If this pipe was made by Phillips, its shape is misleading and ought to be dated according to its maker's mark rather than the bowl shape.

But then again, the bore of this possible "WP" pipe is only 5/64ths-inch, so it is possible that it dates to a later period and was made by another maker. Nevertheless, it is important to try and make sense of Westwood Manor's maker's marks; comparing them to those found at similar sites is one way to do that. A heel marked "WP" was found at the Colony of Avalon in Newfoundland (a settlement connected to southern Maryland by a common land owner, George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore).¹¹⁸ Although the marks are located on different sections of the pipe, the initials seem to be the same style. The fact that the date range for the maker's mark fits both Avalon and Westwood Manor and that both sites are characterized by other Bristol pipe makers suggests that William Phillips is the maker of this particular pipe.

Forty white clay tobacco pipes from 18CH621 are decorated. Sixteen decorations occur as rim rouletting along the bowl, two as stem rouletting, twenty as maker's marks, and one as a floral molded stem. Rouletting is one of the most common features of 17th-century pipes.¹¹⁹ Most stem rouletting of 18CH621 appears to be "Bristol diamond" except for one which is characterized by a circled pattern (Figure 17). This circle rouletting is typical of Dutch pipes so it is possible that this pipe was imported from the Netherlands. However, it was most likely traded for given the relatively low frequency of other Dutch material at Westwood Manor.¹²⁰ However. there does appear to be one more Dutch tobacco pipe in this collection. It is a 7/64ths-inch floral molded white clay pipe stem (Figure 18). Its intricate and unique design was not found elsewhere but Figure 19 offers a comparison of other Dutch pipes portraying a similar style.

¹¹⁶ Ayto, p. 6.

¹¹⁷ Walker, p. 1245; R.G. Jackson and R.H. Price, Bristol Clay Pipes: A Study of Makers and Their Marks. (Bristol, Bristol City Museum, 1974), p. 69.

¹¹⁸ Gaulton.

¹¹⁹ Cavallo.

¹²⁰ Peter Davey and Dennis J. Pogue, eds., The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe XII: Chesapeake Bay (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports International Series 566, 1991), p. 64-h.



Figure 17. Top: Dutch-style rouletting with milling and oval chain, 7/64th-inch.¹²¹ Bottom: Probable "IP" initials with Bristol Diamond pattern, 7/64ths-inch¹²² (Photographs taken by Verioska Torres, not to scale).



¹²¹ Davey and Pogue, p. 64-h. ¹²² Davey and Pogue, p. 58-a.



Figure 19. Examples of Dutch floral molded designs (Source: Peter Davey, ed., *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe V* [Oxford: British Archaeological Reports International Series 106], p. 251.

The most abundant maker's mark is "IF," believed to be the mark of James/John Fox (Figure 20). The mark is characterized by "X" "O" markings separating the maker's initials. Westwood Manor produced six stem fragments at 6/64", four

stem fragments at 5/64", and one probable 5/64" stem fragments with the marking. Walker dates these markings c. 1680-1690 and identifies Fox as a Bristol pipe maker.¹²³ Similar marked pipes were found at the St. John's site in St. Mary's City, Maryland (1638-c. 1720). "IF" stems were also recovered from the Middle Plantation and Chalkley sites (1660-1688) in Anne Arundel County.¹²⁴ While Walker mentions that this mark cannot be attributed completely to Fox, it is still probable that it is Fox's mark. Walker points out that the distinct "IF" mark is similar to Llewellin Evans' mark; Evans was an apprentice of Fox's. In addition, Richard Tippet I may have had some relationship to Fox as Tippet finished up his apprenticeship with one of the William Evanses who also may have been apprentice to Fox.¹²⁵



Figure 20. "X°I°F°X" mark on 18CH621 stem fragment (Photograph by Verioska Torres, not to scale). Sketch of typical mark.¹²⁶

Llewellin Evans' "LE" and Richard Tippet's "RT" marks are the next most common found at 18CH621. Evans is known for his Bristol diamond rouletting. Walker dates pipes with "LE" around 1661-1686 but Katherine Cavallo, upon conducting research on these marks in the Patuxent region, found that "LE" pipes do not show up in the area's archaeological record until post-1680.¹²⁷

¹²⁴ Al Luckenbach, Esther Read, and Donna Ware, The Excavations at Jeffe's Inheritance: The Chalkley Site (18AN711). *Maryland Archaeology*, vol. 31, nos. 1 & 2 (1995), p. 48.

¹²³ Walker, p. 1141.

¹²⁵ Walker, pp. 1140-1142.

¹²⁶ Luckenbach, Read, and Ware, p. 48.

¹²⁷ Walker, p. 1428; Cavallo.

Another pipe stem sporting the Bristol diamond rouletting is marked "IP," or possibly "IR" (cf. Figure 17). This may be the mark of pipe maker Jacob/John Prosser (c. 1655-1700) whom Walker is hesitant to claim as a Bristol maker. "IP" is also said *not* to have a definite identification.¹²⁸ However, this marking also correlates with a recovered bowl marked with the initials "WP," possibly "WR" (cf. Figure 15). William Phillips of Bristol is a possible candidate as he was an apprentice for a J. Prosser c. 1674.¹²⁹ In addition, "IP" pipes have also been recovered at sites including Burle's Town Land, King's Reach, Harmony Hall, and St. John's, all of which date at least into the 1670's and most of which extend into the 1680's.

"RT" is the mark of Robert Tippet (Figure 21). It is difficult, however, to distinguish the pipes of Robert Tippet I (1660-1680), Robert Tippet II (1678-1713), and Robert Tippet III (1713-1720) because of the similar characteristics they share. Walker feels confident in attributing a



Figure 21. Top: Bowl and mark attributed to Tippet II or III, 5/64th-inch and sketch of 18CH621 "RT" bowl fragment. Bottom: Two rouletted "RT" pipe stem fragments, 7/64" and 8/64", and sketch of 18CH621 "RT" complete bowl, 5/64".

specific 5/64" bowl to either the second or third generation of Tippets. Refer to Figure 14 to see the comparison between the two 18CH621 bowls and this diagnostic bowl offered by Walker. Given the same bore diameters and similar style, these pipes may be dated c. 1678-1720 which also fits well within the hypothesized date of occupation for Westwood Manor (1680-1700).

An intriguing find was a molding of a crown over top of a harp on two sides of an immeasurable bowl fragment's heel. This fragment also has an unusual burnt and scratched interior. The crown/harp marking was also recovered at

Larrimore's Point site (1684-1730) near Edgewater, Maryland as well as at St. Mary's City's St. John's site (pre-1720). Luckenbach and Cox mention that side heel makers' marks are rare before c. 1685 and that this specific crown/harp motif is common in Anne Arundel County sites.¹³⁰

Given Larrimore's Point's initial occupation date of 1684 and St. John's end of occupation date of c. 1720, the crown/harp design fits the projected Westwood Manor occupation range of 1680-1700. Figure 22 also supports this date range in its portrayal of maker's marks from 18CH621. It appears that the bulk of the marks range from 1670-1700. However, the high frequency of "IF" and "LE" markings suggests that it was occupied most intensely in the 1670's-1680's range. But this is not necessarily representative of the whole since those markings represented in Figure 22 only reflect 1.9% of the pipe collection.

¹²⁸ Byron Sudbury, ed. *Historic Clay Tobacco Pipe Studies*, vol. 2. (Ponca City, OK, Byron Sudbury, 1983), p. 22.

¹²⁹ Walker, p. 1245.

¹³⁰ Al Luckenbach, C. Jane Cox, and John Kille, eds., *The Clay Tobacco-Pipe in Anne Arundel County, Maryland (1650-1730)* (Annapolis: Anne Arundel County Trust for Preservation, Inc., 2002), pp. 89, 103.



Figure 22. Timeline for approximate dates of production for 18CH621 maker's marks.

Trade: Clay, Decoration, and Maker's Marks

Not too much can be said about trade patterns by looking only at clay type from this site because there is so little variation. Out of the 1,045 total pipe fragments, only two are terra cotta and the rest are European white clay. While the two undecorated terra cotta pipe stem fragments may indicate trade with the local Indians, there is not substantial evidence to justify such a claim on this basis alone. Decorative styles like the floral molded stem and rouletted bowls/stems along with the appearance of maker's initials can allow for a connection to be drawn to a specific maker and hence port. As Figure 22 suggests, Bristol is the main known port reflected by this collection of tobacco pipes. Further research on local merchants of this region (e.g., John Pryor/Prior) may help provide a trans-Atlantic social network for the occupants of Westwood Manor.

Conclusion

Clay tobacco pipes can provide insight into the dates of occupation for archaeological sites. Harrington's bore diameter frequency diagram suggests that Westwood Manor was occupied c. 1680-1710. Binford's formula gives a mean date of 1695. Diagnostic bowl shapes yield a date 1680-1720. Diagnostic maker's marks suggest an occupation of c. 1670-1700 with a more intense occupation during 1670's-1680's. Each one of these dating methods has its own set of limitations. Factoring all results together may offer a more complete picture. By this understanding, Westwood Manor is argued to date c. 1680-1700 according to its clay tobacco pipe collection.

Whether or not the minimum number of pipes presented is accurate or not, the sheer number of total pipe fragments suggests that the site's occupants, like many other colonists, consumed tobacco socially. That only two fragments of terra cotta tobacco pipes were recovered indicates that interactions with Indians known to have lived in the area did not include the exchange of tobacco pipes. The two probable Dutch stem fragments do not necessarily reflect trade with Dutch merchants (as there had been earlier in the century in Maryland).

Tobacco pipes were used in the consumption of tobacco, an activity that most English colonists, including men, women, and sometimes even children, participated in. English tobacco consumption at the time was completely recreational, in contrast with the Indigenous consumption of tobacco, which was typically done for religious or spiritual purposes. Beyond evidence for the dating of archaeological deposits, the distributions of tobacco pipes can also be used to document English social interactions. The next step in the analysis of the tobacco pipes from Westwood Manor should consider how this artifact class can be used to document and interpret English colonial social life.

Chapter Seven The Brass and Lead Weights Found at Westwood Manor

ALEXANDRA UNGER

During their excavations of 18CH621, the Harrisons recovered two weights from the cellar fill. The first weight is a medium-sized lead bun weight. The second weight is a smaller brass disk weight. Each weight has distinctive markings, each symbolizing a certain concept. However, in order to fully understand the weights, it is important to have a context of the standards and economics of the 17th and 18th centuries.

Before his death in 1673, Dr. Gerard sold the property to his son, Thomas Gerard Junior. During this time, a court case in 1682 indicates that a certain John Pryor was residing on the property of Westwood Manor. John Pryor was described as a 'Merchant of London,' keeping a 'store' at Gerard's Westwood House. John Pryor was also in business with Colonel James Smallwood, brother of Anne Smallwood, Thomas Gerard Junior's wife, and so was further connected to Thomas Gerard Junior. John Pryor's presence is particularly important because the weights that will be discussed in further detail later in this paper I believe to have belonged to him.

Weight Standardization

Fair trade has always been a priority in creating a stable, profitable economy for any country. England was influenced by many other countries in the development of the English weights and measures systems, particularly German and Saxon standards.¹³¹ William the Conqueror was the first monarch to begin to regulate weights and measures. He ordered that all weights be uniform and stamped with his seal. As a greater precaution, all weight standards and trial plates for gold and silver coins were ordered to be kept in London in the crypt of Edward the Confessor.¹³²

Despite William the Conqueror's efforts to promote fair trade, abuses of the weight system persisted. In 1215, a clause was inserted into the Magna Charta often referred to as the "Assize of Measures." The Assize of Measures stated:

There shall be one measure of wine throughout our whole realm, and one measure of ale and one measure of corn-namely, the London quart;--and one width of dyed and russet and hauberk cloths--namely, two ells below the selvage. And with weights, moreover, it shall be as with measures.¹³³

This was yet another step towards the governmental regulation of weights and measures. With formal regulation, consumers were better protected against merchants and tradesmen who before had often had their own weights and were thus able to calibrate their scales to indicate that the weights were correct even if they weren't. Later monarchs would also try to regulate the

¹³¹ C. Wayne Smith, Analysis of the Weight Assemblage of Port Royal, Jamaica. (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1995; <u>http://nautarch.tamu.edu/Theses/pdf-files/Smith-PhD1993.pdf</u>;

p. 12. ¹³² Smith, p. 13.

¹³³ Britannia History, "Magna Carta;" <u>http://www.britannia.com/history/docs/magna2.html</u>.

weight systems, with much protesting by the merchants, by granting jurisdiction over certain types of weights to different guilds. Such efforts placed England in a powerful position, as foreign traders and merchants wishing to conduct business within England had to abide by the English weight standards.

The weights were also used to substitute bread and ale for money, by assigning equivalent monetary weights to certain weights of bread and ale. A new trading mechanism as well as a new form of "currency" was created. For example, the Assize of Bread and Ale first instituted the Sterling, which was equivalent to 22 grains of wheat.¹³⁴ According to Stuart Peterfreund (as cited by C. Wayne Smith), the Composition of Yards and Perches was printed to further enforce the exclusionary intent of the Magna Carta and emphasize the use of the Sterling standard mentioned before, which in turn helped to promote the "mercantile frame of mind."¹³⁵ The emphasis of the Sterling standard would prove to be an important step towards the complete regulation of weights, and this standard became the basis for the Troy standard of measure.

The Troy standard then was originally created based around the need to measure the wheat for bread, which was in high demand. The name comes from the city Troyes in France where a similar commercial pound was used. Although the Troy standard was based on the barley grain, otherwise known as the barleycorn, its use did not pertain solely to bread. In fact, the Troy standard was used to weigh gold, silver, and gemstones. Henry V developed the Troy pound specifically for the purpose of weighing precious metals.¹³⁶ The Troy system is made up of the grain, pennyweight, ounce, and pound. Again, the grain is the basic unit of the Troy system, the pennyweight is 24 grains, the ounce is 20 pennyweights, and the pound is 12 ounces.¹³⁷

The Troy standard was used by jewelers and druggists up until the 19th century.¹³⁸ A second system of measure emerged as well, and this system is called the Avoirdupois system. In French, 'avoirdupois' means "goods of weight" or "property." The primary reason for the creation of the Avoirdupois standard in England was the need for slightly heavier units. For example, there is a pound unit in both the Troy and Avoirdupois systems, however whereas the Troy pound is 12 ounces, the Avoirdupois pound is 16 ounces.¹³⁹ The units in the Avoirdupois system consist of the dram, the ounce, the pound, the stone, the quarter, the hundredweight, and the ton. For the Avoirdupois system, all units are multiples or fractions of the pound. The Avoirdupois system was created mainly to provide a standard for merchant trade, and the larger units allowed for the use of the weights in the exchanges of a variety of goods.

In 1590, the Tudor Avoirdupois standards and the Troy standards were used fairly regularly in international trade, although internal trade continued to be a source of conflict, with guilds, land barons, and nobles all struggling to become the main authorities of standardization. These two standards (Troy and Avoirdupois) were used primarily for trade and there was a separate weight standard for apothecary measures. By 1615, there was further confusion with the widespread use of the Avoirdupois standard, the Troy standard, and the Tower standard. Unlike the Troy and Avoirdupois standards, the Tower system was based on the wheat grain (three

¹³⁸ Russ Rowlett, Russ, English Customary Weights and Measures (2001); retrieved from <u>http://www.unc.edu/~rowlett/units/custom.html</u>.

¹³⁴ Smith, p. 16.

¹³⁵ Smith, p. 18.

¹³⁶ Smith, p. 19.

¹³⁷ Encyclopedia Britannica, "Troy Weight;" retrieved from

http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/606907/troy-weight.

¹³⁹ Encyclopedia Britannica, "Troy Weight;" retrieved from

http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/606907/troy-weight.

barley grains weigh the same as four wheat grains). Furthermore, the Tower pound was used primarily to weigh coins, as the wheat grain was the standard by which money was formed.¹⁴⁰

Based on the many standards available, it is fair to conclude that the state of trade was slightly chaotic. Although English standards were widely accepted by other countries, and in fact England was seen as one of the dominating forces in international trade, the nation's economy was far from standardized. The 17th century saw many attempts to reform the weights system to further regulate trade, and it is this context that is important for analyzing the weights found at Westwood Manor in terms of who made them and what their purpose was.

Economics in Colonial America

Much as in the mother country England, the monetary system in 17th-century colonial America was precarious. When the colonists first established settlements, they originally used the monetary units from Britain, as they were familiar and the most widely available.¹⁴¹ In a mercantilist setting, however, that is, the notion that a country should try to bring in as much hard money as possible by exporting more than it imported, the colonists also accepted payments of other nation's currency, such as Spanish dollars. Furthermore, many colonists used a barter system to pay for goods. This meant that there were numerous systems of exchange in circulation and no standard conversion even for international trade, unlike Britain, which of course meant difficulty in establishing prices and determining payments.

In addition to the problem of the numerous systems of currency, Britain passed several laws that further controlled the colonists' economy. In order to continue making a profit off of the colonies, the monarchy and Parliament saw it necessary to place trading and manufacturing restrictions on the colonies. One such law was the Navigation Acts by which "the colonists were forbidden to export goods in other than English vessels, or elsewhere than to England. Imports also were to be brought from England only."¹⁴² Other laws prohibited the colonists from producing and exporting anything but raw goods. This meant that any refined goods, even such things as linen and anything more than basic clothes, had to be imported, which created a shortage of hard currency.

The merchants, therefore, were an essential part of colonial life. More often than not, the everyday merchants catered to the middle-class consumers. Upper-class consumers tended to place their orders directly with agents in England.¹⁴³ Based on what we know about the high status position of the Gerards in society, it is possible, then, that John Pryor was more an agent of Thomas Gerard that kept a side store when he traveled to the colonies, than an actual merchant. This would also explain a lack of an official inventory for John Pryor. However, it does not rule out that he was merely a merchant working on the premises.

Many merchants were accused of taking advantage of the colonists as many only accepted silver, a scarce commodity, which in turn depreciated the value of tobacco, the

 ¹⁴⁰ English Weights and Measures (1997); retrieved from <u>http://home.clara.net/brianp/weights.html</u>.
 ¹⁴¹ Louis Jordan, The Comparative Value of Money Between Britain and the Colonies (1998); retrieved <u>http://www.coins.nd.edu/ColCurrency/CurrencyIntros/IntroValue.html</u>.

¹⁴² Henry W. Elson, History of the United States of America, Virginia (2001); retrieved from <u>http://www.usahistory.info/southern/Virginia.html</u>..

¹⁴³ Patricia Samford, *The Bates Site: An Investigation of a Quaker Merchant* (Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 2001); retrieved from <u>http://research.history.org/Files/Archaeo/MajorStudies/Bates.pdf</u>.

circulating medium.¹⁴⁴ We can see evidence of this depreciation in such court cases involving our own John Pryor, who sued a man for over six hundred pounds of tobacco. In order to combat this inflation and continue trade while ensuring correct payments, merchants used scale weights to weigh coins and goods. Scale weights were not only utilized for formal merchant trade, but also for informal trade between colonists, as well as references for routine activities, such as the use of apothecary weights for drugs and the preparation of food, as noted by the Gunston Hall Plantation site study.¹⁴⁵ The weights would be placed on a weighing pan, most likely on a balance scale, spring scale, or in the case of the lead weight, a steelyard, and then compared to the weight of the goods.

In the case of coins, small weights referred to as coin weights were used to ensure that the coins being accepted contained the appropriate amount of gold or silver. These weights were used on much smaller scales, which were generally sold in portable box sets.¹⁴⁶ No coin weights were excavated from the Westwood Manor site, which is an interesting point of notice, as it implies a lack of coins in the area. However, once again we cannot assume as much, particularly as the metals used for both coin and scale weights were often in demand, and thus the weights would frequently be melted down to use for another purpose, such as bullets or modified to meet the current standards of the time. The lack of coin weights in the artifact assemblage may also be a function of collection strategy, and coin weights may yet be discovered at the site.

Although recovering weights from 17th-century sites is uncommon, it is not unheard of. In an excavation of a site near Williamsburg, Virginia, a lead weight similar to the one recovered at Westwood Manor was found at the store location of a Quaker merchant, John Bates. The site was occupied by Bates at the beginning of the 18th century, though artifacts from the site are from both the 17th and 18th centuries, much like the artifacts found at Westwood Manor. The inventory of goods and the recovered artifacts from the John Bates site are much more extensive than the artifacts found at the Westwood Manor site. Though no brass weights were excavated, several brass weights were listed in the inventory along with the lead weight.¹⁴⁷ The similarity of the weights and the fact that John Bates was a merchant further supports the idea that John Pryor was the owner of the two weights at Westwood. As I noted above, however, many colonists often personally owned weighing implements because the trading of goods, such as spices and threads, was also conducted using scale weights.

I identified three sites with recovered weights similar to the Westwood examples. The first was the Burle's Town Land site, located in Anne Arundel County, which yielded a brass weight similar in shape and in surface designs to the brass weight found at Westwood Manor. Burle's was occuped from 1649 until 1676, dates close to the time when John Pryor arrived at Westwood.

The second site, the Geddy Site in Williamsburg, Virginia, dates to the early to mid-18th century. The site yielded a small bronze disk weight almost identical to the one found at Westwood in terms of markings. James Geddy Senior was primarily a gunsmith, but James Geddy Jr. was a silversmith who had a retail shop where he sold his goods.¹⁴⁸ I find it very

¹⁴⁶ Colonial Williamsburg Foundation; The Geddys: A Family of Tradesmen (Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 2010); retrieved from <u>http://www.cwf.us/Almanack/places/geddy/geddyhdr.cfm</u>.

¹⁴⁴ Elson.

¹⁴⁵ Susan A. Borchardt, Mickey Crowell, Ellen K. Donald, and Barbara A. Farner, Gunston Hall Plantation (2002); retrieved from <u>http://www.gunstonhall.org/mansion/room_use_study/instruments.html</u>.

¹⁴⁷ Samford, p. 47.

¹⁴⁸ Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

interesting that the weight was in the Avoirdupois standard if the goods being sold were silver, which is generally measured in the Troy standard (although the weight is small enough that it would have been possible to use in this capacity). It is possible, of course that the weight might be used to measure other goods being traded for the silver or guns.

The third site that had both brass and lead weights similar to the ones at Westwood was the Port Royal site in Jamaica. Thirty-two acres of land sank into the Kingston Harbor as a result of an earthquake in 1692. Once excavated, the site yielded ninety weights of different types and sizes. Due to England's major role in the transatlantic triangular trade, numerous weights bearing English ciphers and stamps were present and excavated from the site. Port Royal provides an excellent opportunity to look at the standards used at the time as well as how the standards were used in international trade. C. Wayne Smith's dissertation about the excavation of these weights was an invaluable resource in providing context and examples in order to better understand the Westwood weights.

The Lead Weight

The first of the two weights recovered from Westwood Manor is a lead bun weight (Figure 23). The weight weighs 901.1 gm and is approximately 8.89 cm in diameter. Because



Figure 23. The lead weight recovered from Westwood Manor.

lead weights oxidize over time and often acquire nicks and use wear, the mass can be affected. Therefore, it is difficult to say with certainty what the original weight was. However, based on the current weight and an assessment of the condition, I believe that this particular lead weight was originally meant to be a two pound weight, whether in the Avoirdupois or Troy standard is unclear, as unlike the brass weight, there are no markings denoting the system of measurement.

The lead weight has three significant designs on the top surface. The first, located below the top two designs, is the stamp of the Archangel Michael holding a set of scales. According to Thomas Brewer, in 1611, the Plumber's Company of London

was granted exclusive jurisdiction over lead weights (and a license to inspect iron weights) by James I.¹⁴⁹ This made the company responsible for finding, testing, correcting, amending, etc. all lead weights. All the weights that were deemed acceptable were stamped with the guild's angel seal.

The Archangel Michael was used for several reasons. He was a widely known angel, with countless paintings and sculptures that featured his image in biblical contexts. The two most common images of the Archangel Michael feature him holding a sword, standing over a defeated

¹⁴⁹ Smith, p. 22.

Satan and a compassionate being weighing the goodness of human's souls.¹⁵⁰ In either case, he is widely recognized as the champion of goodness and destroyer of evil. The stamp is a reassurance of justice and a call for loyalty among followers of the Christian Church. Likewise, the second symbol located on the right towards the top of the weight, is a cross, facing outwards. The use of the Archangel Michael and the cross were religious representations of cardinal virtues and reminders of a higher power to encourage compliance with the standards.

The last mark is a crown over the "C" insignia. This type of stamp was used to mark the monarch's approval of the weights. In this case, the design represents King Charles I or King Charles II. It was also, in a sense, a proclamation of loyalty to use weights regulated by the monarch.

The Brass Weight

The brass weight recovered at Westwood is in very good condition, and all the marks can be seen quite clearly (Figure 24). I will be discussing them in order from top to bottom and left to right. The first mark on the far-left top side is once again the crown with the "C" insignia. The second stamp is a long dagger, which was the general symbol for the City of London. Although it



Figure 24. The brass weight recovered from Westwood Manor.

represented the city of London, the stamp was not used exclusively by companies within the city. Guilds and craft houses, once in partnership with London merchants, also began to use the dagger, and so it became known more as a symbol of craftsmanship.¹⁵¹

The 'A' in the top right corner of the weight denotes the Avoirdupois standard. The brass weight weighed 224 grams, and I believe therefore was an 8 oz. Avoirdupois weight. The last stamp connects to the former stamp through the makers of the weights themselves. On the bottom center of the weight is a left-facing ewer mark. This denotes the Founder's Company whom, in 1614, received a charter from James I granting the company jurisdiction over all brass and bronze weights, a privilege which had originally belonged to the Pewter's.

Furthermore, they were given the responsibility to assize and stamp all acceptable Avoirdupois weights within London and three miles of the city.¹⁵² The fact that the ewer is left-facing indicates that the weight was most likely not made between 1655 and 1685, during which time a right-facing ewer mark was used.¹⁵³ This means that the brass weight probably dates to 1685 or later.

¹⁵⁰ Smith, p. 143.

¹⁵¹ Smith, p. 185.

¹⁵² Smith, p. 24.

¹⁵³ Smith, p. 186.

The final observation that I have made about the brass weight involves the small chip in the right hand side of the weight. After reading C. Wayne Smith's dissertation, I came to believe that the mark was in fact an owner's mark. In order to more clearly see the initials within the tiny divot, I used a microscope and photographed the images. Due to wear, the second initial is not clear enough to identify, however, the first initial I am fairly certain is a D. Possible letters for the second initial that I have identified based on the images are H, M, or E. Unfortunately, the owner's mark was discovered too late to do much extensive research, and the wear of the second initial prevents me from drawing any conclusions without further looking into people surrounding the property or involved in John Pryor's life.

The weights at Westwood Manor provide an uncommon opportunity to look further into the American and British economy in the seventeenth century. Excavation sites rarely yield weights due to the common practice of melting them down to form other objects or the other common practice of reforming to comply with newer standards. Based on my research, I strongly believe that these weights were in use by John Pryor as merchants weights. The Avoirdupois standard indicates as much, ruling out one of my first hypotheses, that the weights may have been apothecary weights of the late Dr. Thomas Gerard. Their excellent condition provides a unique look into the struggles and standards of trade in the 17th to 18th centuries.

Chapter Eight From Firing to Farm: North Devon Gravel-Tempered Ware and its Significance in Early Maryland Trade

JULIANNA JACKSON

With the arrival of the colonists in Maryland in the early 17th century, the settlers were given the task of taming what was – to them – an unknown and undeveloped landscape. They began to shape a new lifestyle for themselves in an environment significantly different from their homeland in England. The colonists had to adjust their customs and practices to fit the New World. They utilized the natural resources that were readily available to them, as well as supplies and goods that were imported from Europe, to construct their society. Trade with Europe was particularly important because it allowed the colonists to maintain ties with England and gave them access to goods that could not be produced in the colonies. Although many of the goods that were imported consisted of the niceties of life that helped the early colonists to maintain their identifies, they also included goods that served practical purposes. Ceramic wares were one such good. They were used in the kitchen, in the dairy, on the table, and even on the walls. Each specific ceramic ware has its own distinguishing characteristics that aid in their identification and also made them suitable for specific uses. Ceramics recovered from archaeological sites offer insight into the way in which they were used, the trade routes and networks that carried them to the site, and the social status of the site's inhabitants.

A large variety of ceramic fragments were recovered from the Westwood Manor site. The ceramics were excavated from three different areas of the site (I, II, and III) and include tinglazed earthenware, Rhenish blue and gray stoneware, English brown stoneware, Border ware, and North Devon ware. These ceramics all represent different aspects of life at Westwood Manor at one time in its history. The study and interpretation of these wares in conjunction with information gathered from historical documents can add a great deal to the narrative of the site. Upon looking at the assemblage of ceramics recovered it is clear that Westwood Manor is a site that has a rich and colorful history. The variety and quality of the ceramics used at the site indicate that people of considerable wealth and social standing occupied the site. This is particularly intriguing not only in the sense that it paints a clearer picture of life at Westwood Manor in the 17th and 18th century, but on a broader scale it provides evidence that there was a fairly developed and sophisticated society in Charles County early on.

The site's origin dates back to 1651 when it was first under the possession of Dr. Thomas Gerard. From that point forward the property saw many different owners and was used for many different purposes. Historical documents and records show that people from varying backgrounds lived, visited, and worked at Westwood Manor. Inhabitants and guests at Westwood Manor included: gentlemen, women, merchants, Africans, Indians, and indentured servants. Over the years the property changed hands often and by Dr. Thomas Gerard's death in 1673 the property was in possession of his son Thomas. During the time that Thomas the Younger was in possession of the land, court proceedings from 1682 show that John Pryor, a merchant, was residing at Westwood Manor and keeping a store there. Then in 1686 when Thomas Gerard died, the land was left to his wife, Anne, who then married John Bayne. At Anne's death, the property went into the possession of Thomas Gerard's nephew, John, and, in 1712, his widow, Jane Orrell Gerard, appears to have sold the property to George Eskridge. Based on the artifacts excavated from the Westwood Manor site, the dates of occupation of the site are 1680 to 1715.

One particular ceramic type found at the Westwood Manor site includes North Devon gravel-tempered earthenware (Tables 1 and 2). In total, 91 fragments were excavated, including one wholly reconstructed milk pan and another partially reconstructed milk pan of similar dimensions. This ware was produced in the Devonshire region of England with potters operating in the towns of Bideford and Barnstaple. Both of these towns have a long history of ceramic production and it is probable that there was a ceramics industry in Bideford beginning in medieval times.¹⁵⁴ However, the ceramics industry began to change in the late 15th to early 16th century when exposure to new techniques and vessel forms reached the region through trade.¹⁵⁵ At this time the industry began to expand as the need for a wide range of ceramic pieces grew. Potters catered to the needs of the market and the geographical location of Bideford and Barnstaple was ideal for trade and North Devon wares began to spread across the country and even across the Atlantic. Archaeological excavations show the presence of North Devon ceramics in Ireland and colonies in the New World; including but not limited to, Barbados, Newfoundland, Maryland, and Virginia.¹⁵⁶ North Devon wares appear in the colonies as early as 1630.¹⁵⁷ By 1680, when Westwood Manor was occupied, trade with Bideford and Barnstaple was well established, with a steady flow of ceramic wares coming into the colonies.

Table 1. Total North Dev	on Gravel-				
Tempered and Gravel-Free Sherds					
Sherd Type	Count				
Rim	29				
Base	24				
Body	38				
Total	91				

The North Devon wares that were being imported at the time included sgraffito, gravel-tempered, and gravel-free forms. The sgraffito wares are characterized by vessels that are "red, coated with a white slip through which geometric and floral patterns were incised."¹⁵⁸ All North Devon ceramics exhibit a fabric that is comprised of a very recognizable red paste with a reduced gray core, caused by oxidation during firing. This makes it easy to identify North Devon wares in archaeological assemblages. The gravel-tempered and gravelfree wares are much less refined than the

sgraffito. The North Devon gravel-tempered ware was manufactured to withstand heavy use and had a much sturdier fabric than the sgraffito ware. It is most commonly recognized "for the pebbly texture caused by protruding bits of gravel, and for the crude and careless manner in which the heavy amber glaze was applied to interior surfaces."¹⁵⁹ Similar to this ware, the gravel-free vessels are simple in appearance but were meant for use at the table and often are found in the form of jars, tankards, and pitchers. Each of these ware types is present in the archaeological collection from Westwood Manor, in a number of different forms.

Although North Devon sgraffito ware is part of the collection, there are only twenty pieces of the decorative ware that were excavated. The fact that there is sgraffito ware present at the site is consistent with what is known so far about the history of the site. This was a very fine ware and the handcrafted designs that the pieces boasted were meant to be displayed. The

¹⁵⁴ Alison Grant, North Devon Pottery: the Seventeenth Century (Exeter, University of Exeter, 1983), p. 1.

¹⁵⁵ Grant, p. 1.

¹⁵⁶ Grant, p. 110.

¹⁵⁷ Grant, p. 166.

¹⁵⁸ Noël Hume, p. 104.

¹⁵⁹ Malcolm Watkins, *North Devon Pottery and Its Export to America in The 17th Century* (Washington, DC, Smithsonian Institution, 1960), p. 19.

sgraffito was most likely imported early on in Westwood Manor's occupation. An Order in Council "forbade the import of painted earthenwares after 1675."¹⁶⁰ This no doubt affected the North Devon sgraffito market and caused a decline in the number of vessels present in the colonies. It is possible that the sgraffito fragments unearthed from the site were once fanciful and decorative vessels that graced Thomas Gerard's table or sate on the shelves of John Pryor's store.

Table 2. North Devon Ceramic Types							
Ware Type	Count	Percent					
Sgraffito	20	18					
Gravel-free	4	4					
Gravel-tempered	87	78					
Total	111	100					

There is a considerable amount of North Devon graveltempered ware recovered from Westwood Manor. The majority of the fragments found once took the shape of large milk pans (Figure 25). Almost two complete milk pans have been mended. These thick and durable vessels served utilitarian purposes and were most often

put to use in the kitchen and dairy. Many times butter and other produce were shipped to the colonies in North Devon gravel-tempered vessels.¹⁶¹ After leaving Bideford or Barnstable, ships would make their way to Ireland to pick up butter or cream before making their final destination in the colonies. This was ideal for colonists who did not keep cattle on their property. However, "those who did, needed milk pans, jugs, and butter pots in considerable numbers."¹⁶²

Analysis of faunal remains excavated from Westwood Manor and a reading of John Bayne's probate inventory confirm that there were cattle present on the site. The large number of milk pan fragments can be explained by the fact that "the greatest demand for earthenware...was generated by dairying."¹⁶³ This particular vessel form could also be used in multiple ways. In addition to being used for milk and cream these pans "could also have been used for salting butter for the home."¹⁶⁴ They were also used for washing at times and the same shape could also be used as a colander if the bottom was pierced.

Some other gravel-tempered forms that appear in the collection include basins, jars, and pipkins. A rim fragment found at the site is similar to that of a food storage jar pictured in Watkins' *North Devon Pottery and its Export to American in the 17th Century*.¹⁶⁵ This type of rim and jar is shown in Figure 26. These jars may have been used to store food produced at Westwood Manor. Another vessel form in the collection is a pipkin. These vessels were cooking pots designed to be placed directly in the hearth. They sometimes have feet that elevated the bottom. One of these small feet was excavated and identified in the Westwood Manor collection.

All of these North Devon utilitarian vessels would have been employed in the everyday activities of a household. For the most part, they would have served as a woman's tool in preparing, serving, and storing food. It is interesting to imagine the person using these items, as women are so often left out of history records at this time since literacy was usually a luxury

¹⁶⁰ Grant, p. 122.

¹⁶¹ Grant, p. 120.

¹⁶² Grant, p. 120.

¹⁶³ Grant, p. 54.

¹⁶⁴ Grant, p. 54.

¹⁶⁵ Watkins, p. 45.

enjoyed by men. Identifying and interpreting these artifacts adds to what is known about the activities of women during the 17th and 18th centuries, particularly servant women and slave women. Study of these artifacts can shed light on an unrepresented group of people.



Figure 25. North Devon Gravel-tempered milk pan, Westwood Manor.



Figure 26. North Devon Gravel-tempered storage jar, Exeter.¹⁶⁶

Although the large amount of North Devon gravel-tempered ware, particularly milk pans, may be a result of the cattle and dairy present at the site, it does not rule out the possibility that the wares were inventory in John Pryor's store. Alison Grant points out that often "even planters' stores had little stock and were probably not open all the year round."¹⁶⁷ It may not have been necessary for Pryor to have had a large inventory. Another interesting point that Grant makes is that merchants "were usually paid five per cent on English goods they sold, and ten per cent on tobacco bought."¹⁶⁸ This definitely would have encouraged Pryor to trade with Bideford and Barnstaple, but he may have been more concerned with trading tobacco and thus focused less on ceramic wares.

There is also a sampling of North Devon gravel-free ware that appears in the Westwood Manor collection. In comparison with the other North Devon ware types in the collection, the gravel-free fragment count is very small (Table 2). With its finer paste and more even glaze application, gravel-free vessels commonly took the form of tankards, chamber pots, and pitchers. In the Westwood Manor collection, the body fragments are very straight and were probably from a tankard or mug form. Such vessels were meant to be used in the home every day and as tableware. They have a nicer appearance than the gravel-tempered wares but were resilient enough to be used frequently. It is very likely that these vessels were used in one of the households during the occupation of Westwood Manor. Perhaps the fact that gravel-free accounts for the smallest percentage of North Devon pottery in the assemblage is a result of the social status of the people living at Westwood Manor. The inclusion of sgraffito and other costly

¹⁶⁶ J.P. Allan, *Medieval and Post-Medieval Finds from Exeter 1971-1980* (Exeter Archaeological Report 3, 1984), Item No. 1995.

¹⁶⁷ Grant, 119.

¹⁶⁸ Grant, 119.

ceramics in the collection indicates that the owners were fairly wealthy. Since these people could afford expensive tablewares, they may not have had a need for North Devon gravel-free ware since it seems to fall somewhere in between utilitarian vessels and decorated vessels. It is also a possibility that this ware was used by servants.

After studying the quantities and varieties of wares collected from the Westwood Manor site and consulting historical documents from the time of occupation it is apparent that trade between Maryland colonists and the towns of Bideford and Barnstaple occurred often. However, the fact that this trade was occurring between England and a region of Maryland that has received little study is extremely significant. Records in the Maryland archives from the years 1689 to 1691 show exact dates that ships from the North Devon region were in port in Maryland. Among those ships are the Expedition of Biddeford, the Happy Returne, the The Chester Merchant of Bidyford, the Loyalty, and the Maryland Merchant.¹⁶⁹ These ships made frequent trips to Marvland. as records show. The Chester Merchant of Bidyford made two voyages to Maryland in 1690, once in February and a second in November. The *Expedition* and her master Humphrey Bryant set out for Maryland September 11, 1690 with "1,200 parcels of earthenware subsidy."¹⁷⁰ No doubt these wares were then traded in the colony and could have made their way to Westwood Manor. These ships did not come to the colonies for the sole purpose of selling their ceramic wares; rather, they came to fill their holds with "strong Maryland tobacco."¹⁷¹ During the late 17th century, "outport ships were able to sell their comparatively small cargoes easily, clear their holds for return cargo and start the homeward voyage with fresh early tobacco, which fetched a higher price."¹⁷² As a result, "Bideford became an important centre for the tobacco trade."¹⁷³ This was an extremely profitable business and Maryland, Charles County, and North Devon ceramics were at the heart of it.

In 1712, Captain George Eskridge purchased Westwood Manor from Jane Orrell. A native of England, Eskridge resided at Sandy Point in Virginia and was a "planter and tobacco dealer."¹⁷⁴ His profession as a planter and dealer of tobacco would have made him a very desirable trading partner with the Bideford and Barnstaple merchants that were interested in taking tobacco back to England. Eskridge was acting as an agent for Bideford merchants in 1715.¹⁷⁵ Grant notes that "Eskridge must have acted as middleman in the sale of North Devon pottery, and his own goods inventoried in 1733 included three pieces of 'Barnstaple ware' valued at 8d."¹⁷⁶ Although the Westwood Manor site 18CH621 was abandoned about 1715, and Eskridge never lived at Westwood Manor or in Maryland, it is nonetheless significant that a proprietor of Westwood Manor was such an integral part of tobacco and ceramics trade during the 18th century. Tobacco was a huge export from the colonies at the time and Eskridge would have been involved in maintaining and shaping trade networks. Eskridge died in Westmoreland County, Virginia at Sandy Point.¹⁷⁷ If Westwood Manor was not Eskridge's principal residence it is very likely that he purchased it for commercial reasons. He may have wanted to plant more tobacco there for trade with Bideford. He also may have been aware that a store was once kept on the property and felt that he would have success selling his North Devon pottery there.

¹⁶⁹ Archives of Maryland, vol. 8, p. 238

¹⁷⁰ Watkins, p. 26.

¹⁷¹ Grant, p. 120.

¹⁷² Grant, p. 119.

¹⁷³ Grant, p. 119.

¹⁷⁴ Grant, p. 116.

¹⁷⁵ Grant, p. 116.

¹⁷⁶ Grant, p. 117.

¹⁷⁷ <u>http://wc.rootsweb.ancestry.com/cgi-bin/igm.cgi?op=GET&db=mrmarsha&id=I07408</u>.

The importance of North Devon pottery trade in the 17th and 18th centuries in connection with the tobacco trade is striking. Records for the colonies of Maryland and Virginia show that the two markets were integral with one another. The site of Westwood Manor is indicative of this in a number of ways. Its history chronicles the growth of the colony and likewise the growth and origin of these two industries. The fact that one of its owners was directly connected to this trade, in turn connects the site with this trade as well. Westwood Manor is a site that is rich in information regarding trade and commerce in the colonies and across the Atlantic as well. Knowing this about the site's history and significance has the ability to change the way that this region of Charles County is viewed. Clearly it was a location that saw a good amount of activity and was involved in important trade.

Chapter Nine An *Unsurprising* Find: Rhenish Stoneware at Westwood Manor

MARIA TOLBERT AND JUSTIN WARRENFELTZ

It is no surprise that Rhenish blue and gray stoneware was found at the Westwood Manor site. Rhenish stoneware was crafted for the everyday use of the German middleclass, and eventually for their English and colonial counterparts. The value of Rhenish blue and gray is easily evaluated in archaeological terms – it is a powerful timepiece, exceedingly valuable (yet somewhat imprecise) in dating a site. Before discussing the artifacts from the site, however, a brief history of this German stoneware is necessary for setting the scene, and establishing a context for evaluation.

Origins

Rhenish stoneware has a long history. The earliest of its type dates as far back as the 15th century, to the early gray and white forms of Siegburg. Potters at Siegburg produced this unglazed gray or pale buff stoneware throughout the 16th and 17th centuries. The potting system there fell apart in the 1630's, however, following a barrage of attacks by the Spaniards in 1587, the Elector of Brandenburg in 1615, and finally the Swedes in 1632.¹⁷⁸

On the western bank of the Rhine another stoneware producing center was established in the city of Raeren where, by 1590, potters were producing high quality *Blauwerk*.¹⁷⁹ *Blauwerk* refers to gray bodied vessels with zones or highlights of cobalt blue decoration. Raeren was the leading producer of Rhenish type stoneware from the mid-15th century to the 18th century. Raeren vessels differ from their Siegburg neighbors in quite a few ways, the most noticeable of which is the absence of the white body characteristic of Siegburg vessels.

In 1585, Raeren potters began producing gray-bodied vessels with partial *Blauwerk* decoration; first as random splashes of blue glaze, and eventually all-over decoration.¹⁸⁰ This blue glaze innovation paved the way for a new era of highly decorative German stoneware, particularly a shift from the previously favored human figure ornamentation to a preference for naturalistic or patterned decoration. With the onset of the Thirty Years' War (1618-48), however, the production of stoneware at its traditional centers was disrupted; Siegburg was sacked in 1632, and those potters (and their cohorts from Raeren) fled to the Westerwald region (Grenzau, Grenzhausen, and Höhr).¹⁸¹

Early Westerwald products were practically identical to the vessels made in Raeren prior to 1618. By the last quarter of the 17th century, however, the Westerwald region had developed its own distinctive style; "the ornamental friezes of earlier days were abandoned in favor of elaborate floral and geometric designs achieved in a combination of extremely thin sprig molding and a multiplicity of combed lines. Molded flowers would be applied and the stalks and leaves scratched or combed into the leather-hard body, the flowers then being colored in cobalt blue or

¹⁷⁸ Noël Hume (2001), p. 278.

¹⁷⁹Ivor Noël Hume, Rhenish Gray Stonewares in Colonial America. *Antiques* (September 1967), 349.

¹⁸⁰ Howard Coutts, *The Art of Ceramics: European Ceramic Design 1500-1830* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2001), pp. 55-56.

¹⁸¹ Coutts, p. 56.

manganese purple." 'Sprig-molded' meant that small clay decorative pieces were molded separately from the vessel itself and then applied while the vessel was in a leather-hard state, prior to firing. This technique allowed for intricate decorations to be applied to the vessel without worrying that it would crack from imperfectly-incised decoration. Popular motifs for these applied decorations followed a floral pattern, with sprig-molded tulips, daisies, and rosettes as well as sprig-molded leaves. In the last quarter of the 17th century, a popular decorative motif resembling a bouquet of flowers began to appear on Rhenish stoneware.¹⁸²

Later on in the evolution of Rhenish stoneware decoration, manganese purple was added to the repertoire in addition to the well-established cobalt blue. An exact date is not known for its initial introduction – it was likely gradual – but it "seems to have been a Westerwald innovation and is not known on pieces made before 1660."¹⁸³ Initially, purple decoration was confined to the individual sprig-molded ornaments, but it would eventually come to serve as an accent to the banded or reeded necks of many Rhenish stoneware jugs. Though the use of this technique likely began in the 1660s, it is exceedingly rare on American archaeological sites before the last quarter of the 17th century.¹⁸⁴

This decoration type did not last long, however. By the first quarter of the 18th century, the relief-molded ornament style embellished with manganese and outlined in cobalt fell out of popularity, and decorations were instead being stamped and incised. Stamped designs typically included circles, triangles, floral motifs, and hearts. Their designs sometimes centered around a "molded medallion bearing the cipher of the English monarch: AR, Queen Anne (1702-14), and then GR, George I (1714-27) or George II (1727-60) beneath a crown and over a winged cherub."¹⁸⁵ Other common ornaments on Rhenish ware included armorial or heraldic medallions.

Trade Record

One of the largest importers of Rhenish stoneware was England. From the 14th century onwards, the English imported this salt-glazed German ceramic in huge quantities. However

because they were shipped out of Netherlandish ports, these Rhenish products were erroneously know as 'Dutch Ware' and the potters' export business consequently suffered when, in the late 1600's, the English were devoting considerable effort to damaging the Dutch carrying trade. For this reason, as well as to placate English potters who felt that Dutch wares in general were ruining their business, a number of acts and duties were imposed to cut down the importation of 'stone and Earthen Bottles and other Earthenwares' (1695). But as there were few stoneware potters in England at that time the 'Dutch' stonewares were not long discouraged.¹⁸⁶

An earlier Order in Council (1672) placed an embargo on the import of "painted wares" to protect the English delftware industry, and remained in force until 1775. Because this order specifically excluded Rhenish stoneware, there was no such restriction placed on these blue and gray wares, and they continued to flow freely in and out of England.

¹⁸² Noël Hume (2001), pp. 280-281.

¹⁸³ Noël Hume (1967), p. 350.

¹⁸⁴ Noël Hume (2001), pp. 280-282.

¹⁸⁵ Noël Hume (2001), p. 282.

¹⁸⁶ Noël Hume (1967), pp. 353.

Rhenish stoneware came to North America in the 17th and 18th centuries by way of England. Rhenish pottery poured into the colonies in the baggage of settlers and heavily influenced the development of American stoneware, yet it never gained widespread popularity like 18th century white stoneware and porcelain. Archaeological evidence suggests "that Rhenish stonewares lost favor in England and in America in the 1760's and were no longer imported after the Revolution."¹⁸⁷ Around 1860, the Rhenish stoneware tradition was revived, and pieces from earlier centuries were imitated and reproduced.

Rhenish Basics

Rhenish blue and gray stoneware has no slip. Rhenish stoneware has a hard, watertight body with low porosity. Rhenish stoneware can run from off-white to gray or brown, with the exterior typically a different color than the interior. Rhenish vessels are for the most part wheelthrown.

Rhenish stoneware was typically used for service, storage, and food/beverage consumption. Rhenish blue and gray were found in the Chesapeake region after approximately 1650; chamber pots, mugs, and tankards were found on sites dating up until the eighteenth century. Other blue and gray forms included teapots, tea bowls, salts, terrines, storage jars, figurines, porringers, and jardinières.¹⁸⁸ By the mid-18th century, Rhenish stoneware fell out of favor as English refined earthenware and molded white salt-glazed stoneware gained popularity, although storage and sanitary Rhenish stoneware pieces were still being used.

Rhenish Blue and Gray Stoneware at Westwood Manor

In the Westwood Manor collection, there is a total of 200 Rhenish blue and gray stoneware fragments. The collection breaks down into the following:

Decoration Color ⇒		Cobalt	Manganese	Cobalt and	
Artifact Type 🗸	Gray	(Blue)	(Purple)	Manganese	Total
Rim fragments	1	14	1	6	22
Base fragments	7	5		4	16
Handle fragments	5				5
Body sherds	23	64	10	60	157

 Table 3. Rhenish blue and gray stoneware fragments, Westwood Manor.

None of the twenty-two rim fragments come from the same vessel, indicating a minimum vessel count of at least 22, and a twenty-third vessel survives in almost complete form.

The nearly complete Rhenish vessel recovered from Westwood is a small, nearly intact jug with sprig-molded vertical strips in geometric patterns infilled with cobalt and manganese. This type of decoration is characteristic of late 17th-century Westerwald Rhenish, "many of which reached America, [and] were carefully decorated with applied bands of geometric ornament or

¹⁸⁷ Noël Hume (2001), p. 283.

¹⁸⁸ Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory, Diagnostic Artifacts in Maryland: Rhenish Stoneware; retrieved from

http://www.jefpat.org/diagnostic/Historic_Ceramic_Web_Page/Historic%20Ware%20Descriptions/Rhenis h.HTM.

with sprigged flowers and fruit joined by stalks combed into the body of the pot."¹⁸⁹ The reeded neck of the jug is banded with manganese, indicating that it was made after the 1650's, when manganese was first introduced. Below is a comparison of three vessels; the first a Westerwald type jug dated to approximately 1685, the second our vessel from Westwood, and the third a Westward type mug with equestrian portrait of King William III from 1689-1702.



Figure 27. Comparison of Westerwald-type jugs with Westwood Manor example: *Left*, Westerwald type jug, sprig-molded vertical strips in geometric patterns inlaid with cobalt and manganese, dated 1685 (Source: Noël Hume [1967], 351).

Middle, Sprig-molded vertical strips in geometric patterns inlaid with cobalt and manganese, reeded neck banded with manganese. Westwood Manor, 18CH621.

Right, Westerwald type mug, sprig-molded/ manganese and cobalt decoration, reeded neck banded with manganese, equestrian William III medallion, 1689-1702 (Photo taken at the *Pottery with a Past: Stoneware in Early America* exhibit in the DeWitt Wallace Decorative Arts Museum, 2009 The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation).



By comparing these two similar vessels with the jug from Westwood Manor, it is possible to assign a tentative date range for the piece from Westwood. Based on its decorative techniques and color usage, the jug recovered from Westwood was likely produced c. 1685-1702.

The vessel depicted in Figure 27c also provides a clue for a Rhenish blue and gray jug base fragment containing multiple sprig-molded "tulips" with associated incised flower stalks (Figure 28). The broader decorative technique is attributed to the last quarter of the 17th century, and is clearly of finer craft than the 18th-century examples. When discussing a Hohrware jug with similar decoration to the one pictured above, and in a similar form,

Figure 28. Rhenish stoneware jug with sprig-molded floral designs and incised flower stalks, Westwood Manor.

¹⁸⁹ Noël Hume (1967), 350.

Ivor Noël Hume has observed that "the sprigged floral ornaments and combed stalks are identical. It is reasonable to attribute all these pieces to the period c. 1690-1714."¹⁹⁰



Figure 29. Rhenish stoneware with sprig-molded leaf-like decoration

A third fragment important for dating the Rhenish stoneware in the Westwood Manor collection is a sprig-molded leaf-like decoration on a matte blue background, with a texture similar to prunt on Colonial table glass (Figure 29). This sprig-molded leaf decoration is present on many of the floral bouquetdesigned Rhenish stoneware vessels, but most have much smaller leaves and much smaller individual "dots" in their decoration. A comparable decoration

was found on an auction website (with the description "A Westerwald stoneware pewter-mounted Williamite portrait jug"), and the date associated with this piece

was set at 1689-1699. No further information was provided on the provenience of the jug.



Figure 30. Blue and gray body fragment, hollow vessel, probable mug. Partial stamped and incised royal cipher

Another distinctive Rhenish piece from the Westwood collection is a fragment of a royal cipher medallion (Figure 30). Unfortunately, only a small fragment was recovered, depicting one of two letters incised into the medallion. Because only the second letter survives, dating the fragment becomes much more difficult. In keeping with the site's likely timeframe (1680-1715), this initial could be the initials of either William III (WR, 1690-1702) or Queen Anne (AR, 1702-1714).¹⁹¹ Knowing that at least one William III vessel exists in the collection (one Höhrware salt-glazed stoneware pitcher with incised and sprig molded decoration, emblem of William III,

with inscription: WILHELMVS: III. DGMAC. BRIT. FRANC. ET. HIB. REX.) suggests that the medallion was "WR."

One fragment depicts what appears to be a sprig-

molded decoration human face with manganese and cobalt decoration (Figure 31). Human faces do appear on German stoneware vessels, most notably as the mask typically seen on Bartmann or Rhenish brown stoneware jugs, and less frequently on Rhenish blue and gray vessels.

Two Westerwald vessels from the DeWitt Wallace Decorative Arts Museum (the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation) exhibit rather interesting floral motifs, which may help figure out this face phenomenon. The first vessel (a 1690-1710 jug) features some molded flowers on the vessel which resemble faces. Upon closer inspection they are most likely just foliage, but these abstract flowers could provide some key dating evidence, if only we could uncover some examples like it from other collections.



Figure 31. Rhenish stoneware with molded human face.

¹⁹⁰ Noël Hume (2001), p. 284.

¹⁹¹ Noël Hume (2001), p. 28.



Figure 32. Westerwald type jug with sprig-mold flowers, incised stems, possible face, and cobalt/manganese decorations, 1689-1702 (a William III medallion is on the other side of the vessel).

The second, a William the Third vessel, also appears to have decorative faces (Figure 32). In fact they seem very similar to the face on the Westwood sherd, so that may indicate a similar timeframe for our site. Not only would this vessel (1689-1702) fit the theoretical timeframe of the site (1680-1715), it would also support our previous claim; that the incomplete cipher is actually a WR medallion.

Discussion

Rhenish stoneware was made with the middleclass in mind; it was for the daily life and chores of the average person.¹⁹² We have been operating under the assumption that the people who inhabited Westwood Manor (the Gerards and then the Baynes) were wealthy, and the documentary record affirms that assumption. The *presence* of Rhenish does not indicate wealth, but the *amount* of Rhenish is significant. Twenty-three different vessels from the site seems to be a relatively large amount, especially given the limited area excavated, and that in addition to all of the other ceramics on the site suggests abundance and wealth.

The inventory of John Bayne's estate contains

a large number of chairs, beds, linens, and other furniture/home goods. Just taking a cursory look at the inventory, one of us (Tolbert) counted at least twenty-five beds and forty chairs. Perhaps this, along with the large quantity of Rhenish, indicates that more people were living and/or staying at Westwood.

In conjunction with the evidence coming out of other projects on this collection, it appears that whoever occupied this site had considerable need for quantities of alcohol. Having a minimum of ten case bottles as well as dozens more of round bottles – in conjunction with at least one English brown stoneware mug and at least sixteen Rhenish mugs and jugs– means that considerable imbibing was taking place at this residence. This could be indicative of a wealthy household, a public meeting place, or an ordinary.

It is also possible that this property could be the site of a store, though most of the Rhenish vessels date to a time period later than when merchant John Pryor is living at Westwood Manor. While it is certainly possible that another tenant, such as John Bayne, is keeping a store at this site, the types of artifacts associated with this area (possible tin-glazed earthenware vase, expensive table glass, fine plaster, William III Hohrware jug, etc.) seem to point towards a more formal space such as a meeting place. The presence of so many William III items could lend weight to the interpretation of this site as a meeting place, as it would display the owner's loyalty to the King, and also display that he is a good Protestant, and has no ties to the Catholics of the Calvert family, who were beginning to lose favor in the eyes of the British crown at this point.

¹⁹² Wilhem R. Valentiner, German Stoneware, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, vol. 6, no. 8 (1911), p. 160.

The dates that we have from the Rhenish stoneware point us towards an occupation between 1650 (at the earliest) and 1714 at the latest. The 1650 beginning date is an outlier, based on the possible identification of similar sprig-molded medallions at the Buck site which bear resemblance to fragments from Westwood Manor. If we choose to accept a more reasonable start date corroborated by the other multiple lines of evidence in this collection, we would place it at 1689, with considerable freedom to move the occupation back earlier. Due to the fact that some of the most readily identifiable pieces in the collection come from William III jugs, our range of dates is particularly limited. Though, with more time and more resources, a more accurate and precise date range could be established. In the future, more work should be done on ascertaining a more complete vessel count for Rhenish stonewares, and an emphasis should be placed n decorations not indicative of William III forms.

Chapter Ten Colonial Container Glass at Westwood Manor

JULIANA FRANCK AND PATRICIA H. BYERS

Container glass can be a diagnostic artifact despite the large number of seemingly indistinguishable fragments. The most important thing to look for is distinctive quality aspects of container glass, instead of focusing purely on the quantity excavated from historic sites. Though quantitative studies can aid in dating of the site, or perhaps discerning socio-economic status of the occupants, it take analysis of more distinctive features to contribute to a site narrative.

The Diagnostic Uses of Container Glass

Glass containers were used to hold beer, ale, brandy, spirits, whale oil, paint, fruit, or lead shot.¹⁹³ English bottles of the 1600-1800 time periods were shaped like Dutch bottles, but had shorter necks and string rims.

The steps to identify bottle types and dates begin with separating glass by color, vessel part, and manufacturing technique. Culling glass fragments by mode of manufacture aids in "preventing the gross overlapping of broad functional groupings." Classification systems described by Noël Hume and Stone can be implemented for consistent cataloguing and analysis.¹⁹⁴

Identification and quantification of vessel glass is valuable to recreate and hypothesize site history, but is affected by the life span of the container glass, site formation processes, post-depositional migration, and patterns of disposal. By counting and weighing glass fragments, archaeologists can estimate surface area or volume and can analyze the proportion of vessels on or between sites.¹⁹⁵

Chemical analysis of container glass is not generally used for colonial sites, because the information about the elemental makeup is unnecessary to evaluate form and function. Some of the destructive methods of chemical analysis, such as emission spectrometry and plasma source spectrometry, are expensive tests that will return the makeup of the vessel surface which is affected by the soil the vessel was disposed in.¹⁹⁶

Denoting function from glass shape is obvious only for traditional utilitarian forms and distinctly decorative vessels. A utilitarian vessel can be identified as containing certain contents; archaeologists have tested the inside edge of recovered containers for remnants of the liquid they held, but this only identifies the last liquid it held and does not take into account the tendency to use glass vessels multiple times.¹⁹⁷

http://www.blm.gov/heritage/adventures/research/StatePages/PDFs/Utah/utah_6.pdf; accessed April 2010.

¹⁹³ Noël Hume, 2001, p. 32.

¹⁹⁴ Dale L. Berge, Simpson Spring Station: Historical Archaeology in Western Utah (Cultural Resources Series No. 6. Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, 1980), pp. 36-37;

¹⁹⁵ Hugh Willmott, *Early Post-Medieval Vessel Glass in England c. 1500-1670* (York, England, Council for British Archaeology, 2002), p. 7.

¹⁹⁶ Willmott, p. 9.

¹⁹⁷ Berge, p. 37.

Attempting to classify glass based on function (including Wilson's "class system") can pressure archaeologists to make assumptions about "obvious or presumed functions."¹⁹⁸ Unlabeled and unmarked bottles can have different functions or contents than hypothesized. The function or contents of the vessel is not the only objective of glass analysis because dating and quantification also play a role in site interpretation.

Glass wine and case bottles surpassed ceramics as the primary form of alcohol storage and transport in the 16th and 17th century.¹⁹⁹ Case bottles have flat, vertical sides because they could be stacked in cases for transport and bottles were often shipped empty and then filled from a large cask upon arrival. By the 18th century, binning (stacking case bottles in boxes) was a common and popular practice. Taller, thinner bottles use less surface space per volume, and this would be valued by merchants seeking to reduce shipping costs. The amount of bottles on this site is high for a single home, which would support a hypothesis that the owner of the artifacts would have had an interest in the shipping, selling, or buying of bottle glass.

There is a correspondence between glass bottle shape and the size of the kick-up or pushup on the bottom. A larger push-up increased stability as bottles progressed from the shaft and globe shape towards cylindrical forms which were utilized beginning in 1720 with the mallet bottle.²⁰⁰ Squat bottles, from the shaft and globe (pre-1652-1665), the onion (1682-1705), and the squat onion, were steady sitting upright because the bases were wider than the bottle's shoulders.²⁰¹ The wide-bottomed form was sturdy, but inefficient to pack and ship because they could only be stored upright. English glass bottles from 1689-1700 were shorter, globular, with and wider base diameter and a correlating push-up of 22 mm-33 mm.²⁰² The stackable, vertical sided wine bottles of the 18th century would need high push-ups to compensate for the lack of squat and stable bases. Case bottle bases can sometimes be flat with no push-up if the design of the bottle supports upright stability.



Figure 33. Evolution of glass wine bottles; source: Colonial Williamsburg (http://research.history.org/Archaeological Research/KidsPage/ArchaeoLessons1.cfm).

²⁰¹ Wicks, p. 19.

¹⁹⁸ Berge, p. 37.

¹⁹⁹ Frederick H. Smith, Archaeology of Alcohol and Drinking (Gainesville, University Press of Florida, 2008), p. 16.

John Wicks, *Identifying Glass Bottles* (NAHOP Artifact Studies. Archaeology Unit, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 2003), p. 19.

²⁰² Wicks, p. 18.

The evolution of container glass from the shaft and globe shape of 1632 to the cylindrical utilitarian shipping bottle of 1880 contains examples of more specified time sequences, making it possible to match collection forms to the examples.

Each aspect of material culture has distinguishing factors that make it archaeologically useful. Careful planning, excavation and documentation of each artifact, its provenience and relationship to other artifacts contribute to an understanding of the site's history. Comparing the Westwood Manor site material to the seriated container form order created by Ivor Noël Hume also was combined with the dates from land records, the Maryland State Archives, pipe stem seriation, and the distributions of quantities of various ceramics. By using many sources for dating, archaeologists can be open to multiple interpretations.

Each vessel form and type of container glass vessel has characteristic measurements. Using the measurements listed in John Wicks' *Identifying Glass Bottles* can determine which vessel forms, and therefore which dates, are from the Westwood Manor collection.²⁰³

It is also relevant to note that patina, weathering and devitrification is present on all the fragments of glass; brittle glass loses significant mass at it decomposes, making it difficult to mend and reconstruct vessels from archaeological sites.²⁰⁴ As glass became more popular, "most glass from the eighteenth century onwards was produced with a more stable formula" that aged with less patina.²⁰⁵ Unsurprisingly, the older a site is, the more patina and glass decomposition will be present on the glass fragments.

The Green Container Glass of Westwood Manor

Anne Smallwood, widow of Thomas Gerard, lived on Westwood Manor with her second husband, John Bayne, occupying the site at any point between 1687 and 1702.²⁰⁶ After that, John Gerard II (son of John Gerard I, nephew of Justinian and Thomas Gerard II and grandson of Thomas Gerard I) took possession of the land save for a 100 acre parcel. The important diagnostic characteristics will be from vessels from 1670-1688 (to remove Prior as a possible owner of the vessels), 1682-1705 (the English onion and the previous vessel form produced), and the English squat onion utilized during the time right before site abandonment.

Though the Westwood Manor collection contained 534 dark green glass wine bottle body fragments in Lots 5, 8, 9 and 10, body fragments are not strong diagnostic artifacts for the Chesapeake region. Fortunately, the collection contained other more helpful glass container fragments that contributed to an understanding of the collection and site history. Container glass has various roles in the construction of a site narrative; it contributes to dating, prediction of economic status, site usage and occupation of the site's inhabitants.

There are 34 fragments of bottle rims and necks that can help generate an estimate of the minimum number of bottles in the Westwood Manor archaeological collection. This process is similar to attempt to estimate the MNI (minimum number of individuals) from faunal remains. The rims of the bottles cannot be mended, so each intact rim or neck attached to a rim are

²⁰³ Wicks, pp. 16-19.

²⁰⁴ Willmott, p. 7.

²⁰⁵ Norena Shopland, *Archaeological Finds: A Guide to Identification* (Glouscestershire, Tempus Publishing, Stroud, 2005).

²⁰⁶ See Chapter II.

representative of one individual bottle. I also included the fragments that contained rim and neck (some of which also had shoulders attached), and added them together.

There are 27 dark green wine bottle base fragments in the collection (Figure 34), and because this number is less than the amount of rims and necks recovered, I based the minimum estimate on the rims and neck fragments instead. The wine bottle bases did give us an estimate of the general size of the bottles, though I could not recreate enough of a representative bottle to estimate volume.

Most of the vessel fragments can be attributed to English onion bottle forms, imported because there was no glass manufacture in the colonies at this time. Dating is accomplished through morphological indicators and methods of typology that contribute "approximate manufacturing age range." The base of one of the bottles is about 130 millimeters in diameter; according to Wicks, this corresponds to onion bottles which were most commonly utilized from 1682-1705. The neck of the onion bottle was between 77 and 88 mm long, which helps estimate the approximate size.²⁰⁷ Another base diameter is 147.32 mm, and the bottle push-up is 41.173 mm. This bottle was an onion or an English squat onion, and would have been between 128-160 mm high, about 5-6 inches.



Figure 34. Wine bottle bases recovered from Westwood Manor.

The case bottle glass in the collection is much smaller, and though there are at least ten case bottles present in the collection (there were ten case bottle bases), only one case bottle rim and neck was recovered.

Classification based on mode of manufacture incorporates numerous attributes, such as the finish types, neck types, color, and manufacturing clues.²⁰⁸ Finishes were irregular and formed by hand until the mid-19th century, and all of the bottles recovered from Westwood Manor were formed by hand.

The container glass in the collection is mouth blown, because the site predates the *terminus ante*

quem of molded glass, which was utilized and popularized in the 1800s. This is supported by the material culture, because the Westwood Manor glass is non-uniform in shape, lacks symmetry and there is no orange peel texture which is a characteristic of heated glass touching a cold mold.²⁰⁹ Containers produced using molds would also have seams where the separate parts were

²⁰⁷ Wicks, p. 18.

²⁰⁸ Berge, p. 37.

²⁰⁹ Jane Balme and Alistair Paterson, *Archaeology in Practice: A Student Guide to Archaeological Analysis* (Malden, MA., Blackwell Publishing, 2006), p. 372.

joined together, such as large vertical seams where two halves of a bottle were joined,²¹⁰ or dip mould bulges or seams at the shoulder and body juncture.²¹¹ Molds made glass containers more accessible to the middle and lower classes because they cut production time. After molded glass became accessible, the elite required other ways to illustrate their wealth and status and could use bottle seals to flaunt status.

Bottle seals were first used in the middle of the 17th century, and the earliest seals used were reserved for gentlemen and for taverns.²¹² It was not until later, between the late 17th century and the mid-19th century, that bottle seals became a popular and less elite status symbol for a wider range of people. The IB bottle seal in the collection likely belongs to Captain John Bayne (Figure 35). Bayne was a wealthy colonist who held many offices in the colony when he married Thomas Gerard's widow in 1687, a year after Gerard's death. John Bayne probably moved to Westwood Manor at that time John Bayne and Anne Gerard lived there until c. 1701.



Figure 35. Wine bottle seal, "IB," probably John Bayne.

John Bayne was also an innkeeper (or at least he had licenses for two ordinaries in Newport and in Chandler Town); though the material culture is not specifically indicative of an inn, the number of container bottles found could have supported an inn or an ordinary at Westwood Manor. Other aspects of material culture at the site have been inconclusive, though the amount of beds, chairs and bedsteads in the probate inventory are also much higher than the average number of furniture pieces owned by elite households at the time. The average elite household had about 6 beds, which is well below the number at Westwood Manor.²¹³ Horn said that the "differences in standards of living between upper and middle class was a difference of degree rather than kind,"²¹⁴ which is why quantity of furnishings is a revealing aspect of the inventory.

The estimated number of glass containers is very high for households of the region at the time. For example, during the 17th century, only 19% of wealthy St. Mary's households owned glassware.²¹⁵ An elite household was considered having wealth of 250 pounds, comprehended more powerfully when historian James Horn reports that 50 pounds was equal to three to four years' wages for a common day worker.²¹⁶

The presence of 34 wine bottles leads us to conclude that Bayne was supplying alcohol to more than just a single family. Later in the 1700s, seals were used to track bottles back to their original owners so that empty bottles could be returned to the inn or the tavern to be reused. Though the single bottle seal is more likely to be status-oriented, we do not think that a single estate would use 34 bottles and 10 case bottles without participating in exchanges.

²¹⁰ Balme and Paterson, p. 371.

²¹¹ Wicks, p. 5.

²¹² Noël Hume, 2001, p. 61.

²¹³ James Horn, Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth Century Chesapeake (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1994), p. 327.. ²¹⁴ Horn, p. 326.

²¹⁵ Horn, p. 326.

²¹⁶ Horn, p. 323.

Chapter Eleven A Silver Spoon from Westwood Manor

BENJAMIN GARBART

Tableware artifacts are found in the Westwood Manor collection, including spoons, knives, and a single fork (the latter generally not found in a common household during this period). This essay focuses on one especially interesting tableware artifact recovered from the site: a silver spoon.

Early Modern Spoons

Through much of the 17th century, spoons were often made of brass – at least this was the metal most common for spoons being put into mass production.²¹⁷ Brass, an alloy of copper, is a fairly malleable metal and can be worked fairly easily. While not practical for making tools such as hoes or axes, brass is durable enough for use as tableware and easy enough to manipulate during the manufacturing process. At least one copper alloy spoon bowl was recovered from Westwood Manor.

Pewter spoons, common before the 17th century, were generally replaced by brass spoons toward the end of the 16th century. Toward the very end of the 17th century, however, pewter came back into style and pewter spoons began to be mass produced once again.²¹⁸ Pewter was a fairly inexpensive and common household metal and many household items were made out of it in the early colonial era of Maryland. Pewter, having tin as its main constituent, has the capability of shining like silver when it is polished. This is an attractive quality to have in goods and materials which are being used for entertaining guests and it is a cheaper alternative than purchasing silver items. Several fragments of pewter spoons were recovered by the Harrisons.

A single silver spoon is also found in this collection (Figure 36). Although this spoon does not "look" like silver, XRF testing by Dr. Randy Larsen at St. Mary's College of Maryland demonstrated that the spoon is silver and not silverplate. Like brass and pewter, silver is an easily malleable metal; however, silver is also a much more valued metal. The more valuable an object is, depending on the manufacturer, there is more likely chance that a maker's mark will have been placed upon that object to claim the craftsmanship as one's own and to advertise one's work.

The silver spoon found in the Westwood collection is what is known as a "laceback," the name derived from the lace-like decoration found on the underside of the spoon's bowl. It was a common Continental practice to place spoons face down on the table when setting it; the designs on the back would be visible to diners.²¹⁹ The spoon from Westwood Manor also has a trefid handle terminal.²²⁰

²¹⁷ Herbert, Peter, and Nancy Schiffer, *The Brass Book* (Schiffer Publishing Ltd., 1978).

²¹⁸ Donald L. Fennimore, *Metalwork in Early North America: Copper and its Alloys from the Winterthur Collection* (The Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum Inc., 1996).

²¹⁹ Michael Snoodin, *English Silver Spoons* (Charles Letts Books Ltd., London, 1982).

²²⁰ Simon Moore, *Spoons 1650-1930* (Shire Album 211. Shire Publications Ltd. Princes Risborough, UK, 1987).



Figure 36. Laceback spoon with trefid handle.



Figure 37. Maker's mark, "WS."



The spoon contains a maker's mark on the back of the spoon is found on the back of the handle. The mark, "WS" (Figure 37), is probably William Swadling. Swadling was a silver manufacturer during the late 17th century in London, and this mark, attributed to him, appears on many spoons produced from as early as 1685 through the 1690s. Interestingly, there does not appear to be a "date mark" on this spoon.

At the top of the spoon's handle are several marks, appearing as patterns of points, that appear as both a symbol (a star and other unidentifiable symbols or decorations) and a letter (a "B"), possibly for 'Bayne' (Figure 38).

When considered with the wine bottle seal discussed in Chapter Nine, this spoon provides additional evidence that the site the Harrisons uncovered in their yard was occupied by John Bayne and was, therefore, 'Westwood House.' Further, at his death, John Bayne owned sets of silver, including 16 silver spoons, which were found enumerated in Bayne's probate inventory. It is possible that Bayne acquired these spoons from his father, Walter Bayne.

Figure 38. Possible owner's mark.

Chapter Twelve "Fine Brown Bottles, Juggs and all other sorts of Fine Browne stone wares:" The Artifacts of Alcohol Consumption at Westwood Manor

JERRY S. WARNER

Through the study of English brown ceramics found in the Westwood Manor collection and through the study of historic documents of the time period, the culture of alcohol, including methods of production, social and cultural perceptions, and the roles and functions of the material culture of alcohol in 17th-century Maryland, may be observed and more clearly defined. English brown ceramics not only affirm the temporal dimensions of the site, they also offer new insights into colonial industry, slavery, gender and notions of comfort as exemplified by the commercialization of alcohol by Captain John Bayne.

English brown stoneware had a specific function – containers for the consumption of large quantities of alcohol,²²¹ and the fact that a number of fragments of English brown stoneware tankards are in the collection points to the fact, that even on the frontier of Maryland, the occupants of Westwood Manor were drinking alcohol in a very English fashion, perhaps even attempting to copy the new tavern scene of England and incorporate it to fit the social fabric of a manor in the Maryland wilderness.

English brown stoneware had its beginning with John Dwight who used the Rhenish equivalent to form an English stoneware in 1671.²²² By 1724, certain American potters were experimenting and manufacturing their own version of English brown.²²³ Also known as Fulham type stoneware for the area of London where John Dwight first produced the stoneware, English brown stoneware is typically not found on North American sites before 1690 and generally disappears from the archaeological and historical records after 1775, due to the American Revolution which brought to a standstill much of the English imports to the war-torn colonies.²²⁴

English brown stoneware was made in a handful of forms. Tankards and mugs were the most popular, either pint, quart, or even two quarts in volume.²²⁵ An earlier form of English brown was modeled after Rhenish brown stoneware bottles with their rounded and globular forms.²²⁶

There are several ways to date English brown stoneware, and these means of dating are critical in identifying the period of occupation at Westwood Manor during which these stoneware vessels were used. Fragments of English brown with a globular appearance probably belong to the early version of English brown that attempted to copy Rhenish brown, quite possibly late 17th century. Early English brown tankards (those dating from the late 17th century) also have lathe-

²²¹ Noël Hume, 2001a, p. 113.

²²² Noël Hume, 2001a, p. 112.

²²³ Noël Hume, 2001b, pp. 147-148.

²²⁴ Noël Hume, 2001a, pp. 112-113.

²²⁵ Noël Hume, 2001a, p. 113; Noël Hume, 2001b, p. 150.

²²⁶ Noël Hume, 2001a, p. 113; Noël Hume, 2001b, p. 144.
turned ribbed banding along their bases and rims.²²⁷ Additionally, in 1700, the English government ordered that all tankards have a mark or stamp added to them to identify the vessel's unit of measurement.²²⁸ Often referred to as an exchise stamp, the original stamp was "WR" signifying William III along with the volume of the tankard. Therefore, English brown ceramics that do not have the "WR" exchise stamp more than likely predate 1700. Further, the use of the "WR" was not limited to vessels made during the reign of William III; Noel Hume states that the "WR" stamp was used by potters until 1795.²²⁹ However, some potters did change with the different monarchs; the stamps "AR" (Anna Regina, 1702 – 1714) and "GR" (Georgius Rex) were also used.²³⁰ Most stamps are located near the rim of the vessel. A last way to date English brown stoneware is the presence of "sprig-molded panels" on the vessel.²³¹ Beginning by at least 1715, these sprig moldings became more and more intricate, first depicting trees and symbols and then growing to include intricate hunting scenes, depictions of English villages, and images of tavern life, including the tavern's name, date, and owner, accompanying the humorous picture or tavern scene.²³²

Analysis of the English Brown Stoneware Ceramics from 18CH621 Error! Not a valid link.

Table 4 lists the English brown stoneware ceramics found in the Westwood Manor collection. The data demonstrate that the collection includes English brown vessels for storage, dispensing, and consuming alcohol or other beverages. Seven of the nine tankards were evidenced by tankard bases, while two were evidenced by distinct tankard rims. It must be noted that these rims did not match any of the previous bases (based on size), thus leading to the number nine being used for the minimum number of vessels. The volume capacities for these tankards range from half a pint to a full pint. The collection also included one English brown mug that had been partially mended (30%). Enough of the vessel survived to allow volume to be measured. This vessel's volume is most likely a half pint. At least four bottle or jug type vessels were also encountered in the collection. With no surviving jug or bottle rims, it is impossible to tell the sherds apart and what of these two forms they may be.

Temporal Analysis of the English Brown Stoneware from 18CH621

The English brown ceramics from 18CH621 do not bear any exchise stamps or marks. This has three explanations. It is possible that the fragments from this collection predate the implementation of exhise stamps (c. 1700), or that ceramics were not used in a tavern setting where the exchise mark was required. A third possibility is that the sherds with the exchise marks were not recovered in the excavations. With the other temporal data, however, I am more inclined to support the idea that the collection predates 1700.



Figure 39. English brown drinking vessel fragments from Westwood Manor.

The presence of globular English brown ceramics points to jug or bottle forms (Figure 39). These forms are more

7th and 18th Centuries (Antique

indicative of the 17th century, although some jug/bottle forms continue until the mid-18th century. Another temporal aspect of the English brown ceramics in the collection is the existence of a short mug. Enough of the vessel was in the collection that measurements were able to be taken (Table 4) and the form identified. This mug is definitely a form popular in the 17th century; the mug in the collection compares with similar forms in *A Catalogue of English Brown Stoneware from the 17th and 18th Centuries* by Jonathan Horne. The absence of an exchise mark on the rim would place the manufacture of this mug around the 1680s to 1690s. The tankard vessel forms are the last form for analysis. Both the bases and rims of the vessel have lathe-turned ribbed banding. In my research, I have encountered no similar vessels of the 18th century that have this banding on the base or on the rim. Horne concludes that this style of decoration was not continued into the 18th century and places a rather broad time span for this design as "late 17th century."²³³

Due to the presence of globular jug or bottle stoneware fragments, a partially reassembled mug, and ribbed banding on the tankard bases and rims, one may conclude that the English brown stoneware ceramics from the Westwood Collection have a median date of 1700 with the majority pointing to an earlier usage (c. 1690, late 17th century); this late 17th century date corresponds to the occupation of the site by John Bayne from 1687 until 1703. *Discussion*

Captain John Bayne was already a man of standing in the province when he married Ann Gerard in 1687 and subsequently moved into the house she inherited from her late husband at Westwood Manor. Bayne served as the Sheriff for St. Mary's County for a season and was a burgess (member) of the Maryland Assembly. He was also a landowner and successful planter as well as an ordinary proprietor and a captain in the militia.²³⁴ By the time of his death in 1703, John Bayne owned nearly 2,500 acres of land, a portion of which was Westwood Manor, and it is his ownership and occupation of Westwood Manor that is pertinent to this project.

The presence of English brown stoneware at Westwood Manor, dating to the time period when John Bayne would have occupied the site, is an interesting yet puzzling occurrence. By the late 1680s and 90s, the production of English brown had only just begun, and to a great extent it was not being used by households. Noël Hume notes that the primary customers of English brown stoneware in the late 17th and early 18th centuries were tavern owners, and English ones at that. If this is indeed the case what are early period English brown vessels doing on a supposed domestic site on the frontier of Maryland? More importantly what does this say or imply about John and Ann Bayne?

In the late 17th century, English brown stoneware was still a new commodity, produced almost entirely for use by tavern owners. English brown stoneware was the latest ceramic container for the storage, dispensing, and consuming of alcohol. The tavern scene of England was transformed by this new ceramic as tall, pint, two pint, or half gallon tankards brimming with beer replaced the slovenly salt-glazed redware mugs.²³⁵ What about this new tavern scene and its characteristic tankards appealed to the Baynes as the ship *Gerard* returned from England with tankards tucked into straw-packed wooden cases?

²³³ Horne, p. 14.

²³⁴ Lois Green Carr Career Files, Maryland State Archives.

²³⁵ Noël Hume, 2001b, p. 155.

The settlers in Maryland, either through birth or ancestry, belonged to an English tradition of heavy alcohol consumption.²³⁶ This "culturally accepted" imbibing of excessive amounts of alcohol²³⁷ had health benefits. The water in England had been notoriously bad since the Medieval Period, bringing illnesses such as malaria and dysentery to its drinkers. The England that organized the Virginia Company and produced the Calvert family relied on ciders and ales as its main source of liquids; for the poor or middling sort, there was nothing else safe to drink.²³⁸ The daily English diet was interspersed with mild and more concentrated alcoholic beverages, and alcohol was a necessity of life as well as a source of pleasure. One early 18th-century Swiss sightseer on holiday in England remarked, "In this country, beer is what everybody drinks when thirsty."²³⁹

The same was true for the colonists of the Chesapeake. Sarah Meacham writes that colonists often had "little choice about whether to drink alcohol. Non-fermented drinks did not exist. Tea remained an expensive luxury item until the second half of the eighteenth century, and coffee was unavailable until the late eighteenth century."²⁴⁰ The waters of the Chesapeake Bay were brackish most of the year, and English perceptions of water made colonists fearful of drinking spring water, leaving most Marylanders, including the Baynes, to rely on mildly alcoholic drinks as a source of refreshment and sustenance throughout the day.

Alcohol was also a source of material comfort for the colonists in Maryland, one of the "few pleasures" to be had on the Chesapeake frontier as colonists struggled to adapt to a new and different environment. Writing on material comfort in the 17th-century Chesapeake environment, Philip Levy found that "these developments (material comfort) were neither universal nor monolithic. From what we can see archaeologically, colonists participated in comfort's material dimensions idiosyncratically, employing what they could where they could."²⁴¹ Indeed this notion of comfort as being applied "piecemeal" relates directly to the production of alcohol by colonists.

Poor and middling planters and even those with means could not always afford or rely on alcohol produced in England. Tales and complaints of broken bottles, burst seals, or terrible tasting alcohol reveal how difficult it really was to send a bottle of alcohol three thousand miles across a tempestuous ocean and have it arrive in undamaged condition. Colonists of all classes early on realized that alcohol could be made just as easily in the Chesapeake as it was in England.

Early Maryland colonists did not have access to the large fields of wheat and barley from which to produce alcohol as did their counterparts in England; such agricultural practices for the sole purpose of alcohol production were not a wise choice for settlers as their land had to be put to use either for subsistence or for the commercial venture of tobacco.²⁴² Fruits were the choice

(http://www.chesapeakearchaeology.org/Interpretations/SHALevyCoobmsMuracaPapaer.htm).²⁴² Meacham, p. 36.

²³⁶ Sarah Hand Meacham, *Every Home a Distillery: Alcohol, Gender, and Technology in the Colonial Chesapeake* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), p. 7.

²³⁷ Thao T. Phung, Julia A. King, and Douglas H. Ubelaker, Alcohol, Tobacco, and Excessive Animal Protein: The Question of an Adequate Diet in the Seventeenth- Century Chesapeake. *Historical Archaeology* 43(2) (2009), p. 61.

²³⁸ Meacham, p. 7.

²³⁹ Meacham, p. 7.

²⁴⁰ Meacham, p. 12.

²⁴¹ Philip Levy, John Coombs, and David Muraca, Notions of Comfort in the Early Colonial Chesapeake. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, York, England (2005) (available on-line at

of most colonists as a source of alcohol stock, but it took time for apple and peach trees to mature to a fruit bearing age. In the meantime, Chesapeake settlers relied on native fruits such as persimmons and pawpaws.²⁴³ By the time the orchards had matured, fruit had become the main source of alcohol for most Chesapeake colonists, used to produce a wide array of ales and ciders.²⁴⁴ However, orchards for the most part were owned by the elite. Orchards demonstrated that one had the extra land on which to grow orchards; orchards also required extra labor to graft, prune, and move the trees.²⁴⁵ Thus, for middling planters and the poor, the way to acquire alcohol was to use native fruits, purchase fruit from the large planters, or purchase alcohol directly from the large plantations.

In the late 17th and 18th centuries, the Chesapeake produced most of the alcohol that it consumed.²⁴⁶ Large planters could afford to purchase exotic beer and wine from Europe, but the less well-off produced or purchased locally made alcohol. Large planters were the source for most of the alcohol produced and sold in the Chesapeake. They possessed the finances to purchase fruit trees and invest in new technology; large planters also had the labor force required to produce alcohol on an industrial scale. Those planters willing to invest in cidering presses saw the dividends quickly climb as they were able to charge up to a shilling per gallon of cider; other planters merely forced indentured servants and slaves to beat the fruit in wooden tubs, smashing it into a pulp that could then be processed into alcohol.²⁴⁷ Ciders did not last long even when bottled properly; in a short time the cider could turn rancid, especially in warm weather.

Distilling became the next step in the commercial production of alcohol by the elite planters. The technology of distilling was even more expensive than that of cidering; costly distilling books and copper stills had to be purchased, for distilling was both an art and a science.²⁴⁸ Cider that had been distilled into brandy had a much longer lifespan and thus could be sold for more money by the large plantation owners to those in the community. While large planters relied on their tobacco stock as a source of revenue to sell to England, distilled alcohol became a lucrative commodity to sell to other colonists.

Like other large plantation owners of his day, John Bayne saw the potential in alcohol production. It is possible that John Bayne's desire for English brown tankards and storage bottles was due to his involvement in a new industry – the commercial production of alcohol. By marrying Anne Gerard, John Bayne came into the ownership of a large amount of land, nearly 2,500 acres, some of which was surely planted with fruit trees. Bayne's probate inventory of 1703 mentions "12 Syder Cask" as well as "15 old lesser Caske." These casks, if similar to traditional alcohol barrels or casks, could have held between 30 and 35 gallons of liquids. These twelve cider casks represent 360 gallons of cider and demonstrate the extent of the industry in which John Bayne was involved.

Historian Sarah Meacham writes that alcohol production, particularly cidering, was, before the mid-18th century, the domain of women.²⁴⁹ It is possible that the same applied to those that lived on Westwood Manor. Perhaps in the early years, Anne Bayne used knowledge she had learned from her mother to supply the household with alcohol. Once the commercial production

²⁴³ Meacham, p. 38.

²⁴⁴ Phung, King, and Ubelaker, p. 65.

²⁴⁵ Meacham, p. 52.

²⁴⁶ Meacham, p. 42.

²⁴⁷ Meacham, p. 55.

²⁴⁸ Meacham, p. 59.

²⁴⁹ Meacham, pp. 24-25.

of alcohol had been started, John Bayne likely used the various slaves and indentured servants to produce the cider; the slaves at Westwood, including Sarah, Fortune, Lusat, and Gareon, were probably responsible for producing marketable cider as well as tobacco. This perspective changes the way many view slaves and the Chesapeake. A look at the cidering practices of John Bayne reveals that slaves in the Chesapeake were not just confined to the tobacco fields or kitchens of the plantations, but planters used slaves to make commercial alcohol. Just as slaves in the Chesapeake were a part of global mercantilism of tobacco, they were also a critical element in the domestic fabric of the Chesapeake as they were responsible for producing the refreshment and sustenance of thousands of colonists and other slaves, English and African.

John Bayne was not just involved in cidering. A look at his probate inventory reveals that Bayne had in his possession a "copper still, worm and tubb" which was valued at nine pounds—a significant sum that could have purchased four cows or a ten year old slave. The inventory also lists six bushels of malt and a "hand mill, Spindle, and frog." Using modern standards of weight and measurement, a bushel of malt contains eight gallons and weighs 34 pounds, meaning that Bayne was in the possession of 204 pounds of malt. Malt or malted barley was the principle ingredient in making high quality, long lasting beer. Meacham states that malt was simply uncommon in the 17th and even early 18th century Chesapeake.²⁵⁰ Malt was an expensive commodity and had to be imported from England. The presence of 204 pounds of malt implies that Bayne was attempting something even bigger than cidering – he was attempting to produce high quality beer on an industrial scale that was rare or even nonexistent in 17th-century Maryland.

The "copper still, worm and tubb" as well as the "hand mill, spindle, and frog" represent the latest English technology available to the alcohol industry, and the fact that Bayne had the finances to import such products as well as large quantities of malt speaks to his financial situation as well as his idea of potential business prospects. Perhaps his foray into alcohol production initially centered around cidering; once the demand for his alcohol increased, he invested in more expensive technology in order to produce a higher quality, preferred drink, and thus more expensive alcohol. John Bayne's production of alcohol was more than a means to supply alcohol for his plantation and that of his neighbors; Bayne's inventory reveals that he was attempting a business, probably one the earliest examples of commercial alcohol production in Maryland.

The question remains in what venues was Bayne selling his alcohol and how do the relatively new and fashionable English brown tankards fit in with Bayne's production of alcohol? It is possible that Bayne operated an ordinary at Westwood Manor. In the historic records he is listed as applying for a license, "to keep an ordinary or house of entertainment at Chandler's Town at the head of Port Tobacco Brooke." Bayne also had a license for an ordinary at Newport, just east of Westwood Manor. It appears that Bayne had a string of ordinaries that he kept well-stocked with his own alcohol, suggesting the possibility that Bayne was building a corporation-like business, controlling every aspect of alcohol from production on his plantation to sale in one of his ordinaries. The presence of twenty-three beds in his residence suggests that Bayne may have used his dwelling at Westwood Manor as an ordinary as well. While the use of so many English brown tankards may seem odd in a domestic setting, the possibility that Bayne operated an ordinary at his dwelling may make better sense. If Bayne was attempting to make a high quality beer from English malted barley, it stands to reason that he would have the latest ceramics for alcohol consumption, copying the new tavern scene in England exemplified by importing and then using stoneware tankards on the frontier of Maryland.

²⁵⁰ Meacham, p. 37.

Another possibility of the purpose and function behind Bayne's purchase of English brown vessels is that of the store. Sarah Meacham writes that some planters "built special outbuildings on their plantations expressly to sell goods to small planters and laborers."²⁵¹ Meacham has located several accounts of planters operating stores on their plantations for the surrounding community, offering everything from pewter plates, earthenware, scissors, buttons, cloth, spoons, cheese, eyeglasses, and stoneware tankards.²⁵² Sometimes planters even hired individuals to operate the store and keep the store's records. Historical documents from the Maryland archives inform us that John Pryor operated a store at Westwood Manor in 1682. It is possible that this store was not Pryor renting a building to conduct business, but was a plantation store owned by the Gerard family who paid Pryor, a merchant, to run the store, perhaps also using Pryor in their trade ventures with England. There is no further mention of Pryor in the records, but one may speculate that when Thomas Gerard died in 1686 and Ann remarried in 1687, John Bayne kept Pryor on to operate the store that now belonged to him (Bayne), and through which he could market his alcohol and new English tankards to facilitate the social and material comfort of drinking his fine English beer.

The presence of English brown stoneware vessels coupled with information from historical records suggests that John Bayne was more than a planter or innkeeper; he was an entrepreneur in the domestic alcohol market of Maryland. It seems that Bayne was trying to add legitimacy to his Maryland-made English beer by importing English tankards for his customers to use in their consumption. The idea of drinking Maryland-made, English beer from the latest English tavern vessels – tankards – may have been John Bayne's response to the harshness of the Chesapeake frontier as he attempted to project his notion of the comfort and familiar society of the homeland, England, onto his customers and frontier community.

²⁵¹ Meacham, p. 46.

²⁵² Meacham, p. 46.

Chapter Thirteen Preliminary Faunal Analysis of 18CH621

MARK R. KOPPEL AND ALLISON ALEXANDER

The Westwood Manor archaeological site (18CH621) contains an abundance of artifacts. In addition a large amount of animal bone was recovered along with the more diagnostic ceramics, pipes, and glass. This assemblage of faunal remains can reveal much about the diet of the inhabitants of 18CH621 as well as hunting practices and pastoral activities. The faunal remains can also provide insight about the economic status of the residents of 18CH621.

The preceding chapters suggest that the Westwood Manor site was occupied from the late 1670s until 1715, although the site does not appear to have been intensively occupied after c. 1700. The site is presumed to be the location of a very wealthy household, and may have served non-residential uses as well. 18CH621 was uncovered by homeowners Sandra and Phillip Harrison in 1996 while constructing a new house. They uncovered a cellar and what may have been a trash pit. The Harrisons divided the artifacts into lots based on location within these two features. Lots 1-6 are from the Cellar Area, Lot 7 is from a location outside of the cellar, and Lot 8 is from the Garden Area. Only Lots 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 contain faunal remains.

Methods

The artifacts recovered from 18CH621 were processed by the Archaeology Practicum class at St. Mary's College of Maryland. Lots were divided between groups of students, who then washed, labeled, bagged, and cataloged the artifacts. Bone was not labeled or cataloged in much detail. Instead, each group split the bones in their Lot, using their own discretion to combine like with like, and then giving the count and combined weight of each new grouping. The students, having little or no prior experience with faunal analysis, grouped based on obvious commonalities, such as long bones, ribs, teeth, and obvious fish or bird. They also tried to separate between small and large-medium bones. After recording and bagging, the bones were placed back within their respective lots.

We chose to focus on the animal bone recovered from Westwood Manor for our major project. With the assistance and advice of zooarchaeologists Ed Otter and Henry Miller, we began to compile a more detailed catalog of the bone within the collection. Each previously cataloged lot containing bone was reopened, with each bone now examined individually. Bone was then divided once again based on commonality, but this time on a more precise level. Each bone was placed in record: Class, Family, Genus/Species, Number, Side (Left or Right), Element (Type of Bone), Portion (Part of Bone), and Weight. Any distinguishing features, such as burning, gnawing, or butchering, were also noted. The new catalog differed from the previous in the level of detail in identification. While the groups each divided and identified their bone slightly differently, the two students, with the aid of professional zooarchaeologists, were soon better able to differentiate between bones (though only to an extent).

This method of cataloging has the advantage of showing a gradient of detail. Even the most poorly identifiable bone can usually be identified as mammal, fish, bird, or reptile. Following that, some bone can be identified only by size (such as large, medium, or small mammal), while some can be further identified as, for example, carnivore or herbivore. The finest level of detail is to species, such as cow or sheep. Meanwhile, the bone itself can be identified

(such as rib, scapula, femur, etc.), hopefully distinguishing between left and right side of animal (or in the case of quadrupeds, front or back). The biggest advantage of this system is that it still allows for certain degrees of identification, regardless of the skill of the researcher. Of course, it goes without saying that training and experience will grant the greatest level of detail, but even the least experienced can usually distinguish between mammal, bird, or fish.

The bone condition within the assemblage itself varied a great amount. Nearly all the bones were fragmented in some way, with the notable exceptions of an intact cattle metapodial and several of the smaller mammal and bird bones. Some bones seemed to otherwise be in perfect condition, while many others were worn and weathered. Some bones had been burned to varying degrees, while the whiter shading of others implied they had been exposed to sunlight longer. Several bones had rust, or copper staining, from where they had lain against a metal artifact. Some bone was extremely dense, while other fragments were soft enough to crumble in the hand.

Data

The detailed catalog recorded Lots 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Approximately 1,156 bones and bone fragments in total were counted. The cellar fill contained around 775 of these, while the refuse-filled pit in the garden contained the remaining 381. Mammal bone was the most common, followed by Fish, then Bird, and finally Reptile/Amphibian.

Table 5: Site and Species Totals								
	Cellar		Garden	Garden		Total		
	Ν	%	Ν	%				
Mammal	721	92.6	251	65.9	972	84.1		
Bird	22	2.8	20	5.2	42	3.6		
Fish	28	3.9	106	27.7	134	11.6		
Reptile	4	0.5	4	1.0	8	0.7		
Total	775	99.8	381	99.8	1156	100.1		

As can be seen in Table 2, nearly the entirety of the Cellar samples consisted of Mammal bone, while within the Garden, mammal bone only forms approximately two-thirds of the sample. Fish samples are much more abundant in the Garden sample, while Bird and Reptile remain much the same.

Table 6 provides a closer look at the largest group, Mammals. It reveals that six species were identified, including Cow, Sheep/Goat, Pig, Dog/Wolf, Squirrel, Raccoon, and Rat. All other bone was put into a size category if at all possible (Large, Large-Medium, Medium, Medium-Small, Small). The rest (mostly shards, chips, and fragments) was cataloged as Unidentified Mammal. It is likely that the "Large" category consists mostly of Cattle bones, but this is not an assumption. The bone elements were mostly limb, scapula, or jaw fragments, with a scattering of ribs, vertebrae, and toes.

Of the Bird species, only two were identified: Chicken and Pigeon. Chicken was common (15 fragments identified), while the single Pigeon fragment was only identified with the aid of a comparative collection and a professional zooarchaeologist. The remainder is unidentified,

possibly being waterfowl or more chicken. The most common bones were limbs and sternum. Of special interest is a recovered bit of eggshell, likely from a chicken.

Fish occupied a significant portion of the collection. Only two species were identified positively, Catfish and White Perch, but the size and species of many of the fragments indicate very large fish, such as Sea Trout, Rockfish, Striped Bass, or possibly even Sheepshead. As Table 5 shows, the majority of identifiable fish fragments were found in the Garden Site, but those are mostly small items like scales, spines, ribs, and other assorted light bones. The bones found in the Cellar site are much larger, mostly from the head of the fish.

Table 6: Site			
Mammal Spe			
	Cellar	Garden	Total
Cow	167	17	184
Sheep	25	7	32
Pig	58	21	79
Carnivore	1	1	2
Squirrel	1	0	1
Raccoon	2	0	2
Rat	1	0	1
Large	43	2	45
Large-Med	123	5	128
Medium	25	1	26
Med-Small	75	21	96
Small	26	9	35
Unknown	166	172	338

The Reptile and Amphibian bone was almost entirely Turtle. Two elements were identified as Box Turtle, while the others remain unclear as exact species. Some bones appear to be from larger turtles, perhaps Snappers, but identification remains unclear. Only one bone was listed as "unknown Reptile," but it is quite possible that other bones were misidentified as small mammal. Shell, limb, and hip bones showed up most frequently in this admittedly small sample.

Analysis

The assemblage shows many signs of human interaction. The bones of the domesticated mammals show signs of butchering and consumption. None of the butcher marks showed indications of being machine-sawed. Saw marks were noted on many (12+) bones, and more may have escaped notice. Burning or burn marks were

seen on several bones, probably occurring during preparation for eating. Cut marks (finer than butcher marks) appear on several bones, including fish. This is indicative of the consumptive stage, rather than the preparatory one. One cow phalange even showed possible signs of being cooked with the hoof forcibly removed, a rare practice. Long bones were often shattered by the proximal or distal shafts, a common way to reach the marrow inside. Very few bones showed "stress" fractures on the central shaft, which are more indicative of being trodden upon.²⁵³ There is almost certainly human selection in the type of bones found: no intact skeletons were excavated.

However, humans are not the only ones to have interacted with these faunal remains. Several bones have clearly been gnawed, and several scavengers appear within the assemblage itself. While it is possible that some, like the Raccoon, may have been caught and killed for food, others, like the Rat, probably took advantage of any flesh still on the discarded bones. It is unclear how much scavenging occurred when the site was an enclosed cellar, and how much occurred later when it was possibly an open pit.

The great majority of bones are cattle, and the number increases even further if one factors in the "large unidentified bone," which is likely cattle. Pig was also common, more so

²⁵³ Simon J. M. Davis, *The Archaeology of Animals* (London, Yale University Press, 1987), p. 26.

than cattle in the smaller Garden site (see Table 6). Fish formed a large sample in terms of numbers, but not in size (though as mentioned before, several of the fish appear to be very large). Sheep appeared common during cataloging, but numerical analysis suggests that was illusory. Deer are absent, although samples could be hiding within "Medium Mammal" or masquerading as Sheep. However, it is almost certain that no Deer teeth appear among the many jaw and tooth samples.

Of the jaw and tooth specimens, most were identified as either Sheep or Pig, with few Cow teeth. Several smaller species were represented as well, including Raccoon and Dog/Wolf.

Scapulae were almost entirely Pig, Sheep, and Cow (with the possibility of Deer). Limbs were also of these three Mammals, as were the large number of ribs. It should be noted that several bags of "flat fragments" existed that the students could not tell whether they were rib or vertebrae fragments.

Fish

White Perch is a fish that is not very large, usually between 7 and 10 inches in length and weighing from 8 ounces to 1 pound.²⁵⁴ White perch are abundant in Maryland and are commonly found in the Potomac River. They are semi-anadromous, meaning they migrate to tidal fresh and slightly brackish waters to spawn in the spring.²⁵⁵ They favor brackish waters and can also be found in fresh water bodies. The Potomac River at that time was the right environment for these fish and continues to be so.

The finding of white perch scales and bones in this collection indicates the level of fishing skills that the fishermen in the area of that time had. White perch is a difficult fish to catch. They put up a fight for their size. Also, the white perch has a very hard and scaly body and sharp fins. Each of these things contributes to the difficulty level of catching the white perch.²⁵⁶

Catfish were also found in the collection. The most prevalent species of catfish in the Potomac River today is the Blue Catfish, a species that was not introduced into the Potomac River until the late 19th century. Similarly, channel catfish and white catfish were introduced into the Potomac River around the same time as the blue catfish, in the late 19th century.²⁵⁷ The Westwood Manor specimens are most likely brown bullhead catfish, a species of catfish that has been prevalent in North America for hundreds of years. They were commonly eaten in our time period by both Native Americans and Europeans.²⁵⁸

We identified two of them as Sheepshead fish and Black Drum fish. Sheepshead fish are almost extinct in the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay today. They can grow up to 30 inches

²⁵⁴ Maryland Fish Facts;

²⁰⁰⁷ White Perch. http://dnr.maryland.gov/fisheries/fishfacts/whiteperch.asp, accessed April 27, 2010. ²⁵⁵ Maryland Fish Facts;

²⁰⁰⁷ White Perch. http://dnr.maryland.gov/fisheries/fishfacts/whiteperch.asp, accessed April 27, 2010. ²⁵⁶ Maryland Fish Facts;

²⁰⁰⁷ White Perch. http://dnr.maryland.gov/fisheries/fishfacts/whiteperch.asp, accessed April 27, 2010. ²⁵⁷ Maryland Fish Facts;

²⁰⁰⁷ White Catfish. http://www.dnr.state.md.us/fisheries/fishfacts/whitecatfish.asp, accessed April 27, 2010.

²⁵⁸ James D. Rice, *Nature and History in the Potomac Country: From Hunter-Gatherers to the Age of Jefferson* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).

and 10 to 15 pounds.²⁵⁹ Black Drum fish are one of the largest fish in the Chesapeake Bay area, including the Potomac River. They can grow up to $5\frac{1}{2}$ feet long and can weigh up to 146 pounds.²⁶⁰ These fish are still common in the Potomac River and could account for some of the other large fish bones that we have in our collection.

Henry Miller suggests that some fish are probably Red Drum or large Striped Bass/Rockfish. He was unable to provide a positive identification but noted that those are also likely species for this period.

The Red Drum fish is still found in the Potomac River today and is very large. It can grow up to five feet long and weigh up to 98 pounds.²⁶¹

Striped Bass are also known as Rockfish. These fish are also still found in the Potomac River today. They were also in the Potomac River during out time period and were often used as a source of food. Striped bass can grow up to 60 inches long.²⁶² Dr. Miller told us that, if this is the fish in our collection, then it had to be a very large one. It is a commonly found fish in this time period and it is very likely our inhabitants of Westwood Manor would have eaten them.

Oysters

Oyster shells reveal considerable information about the oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) that once lived inside. For our purposes, the principal insight can be the environment in which the oysters lived and grew. This is recovered from the height-length ration (HLR), in which the height of an oyster is divided by its length. The height of an oyster is measured as its maximum dorsal-ventral dimension which means, usually, the longest part of the shell that is seen as top to bottom. The length of the oyster is measured as its maximum anterior-posterior dimension which means, roughly, perpendicular to the height and is usually seen as left to right.

This HLR gives the archaeologist a number that is fairly low. There are three ranges that give the three different environments in which an oyster can live. These three ranges are less than 1.3, between 1.3 and 2.0, and greater than 2.0. A low HLR, below 1.3, indicates that the oyster grew in an environment with firmly packed sands or mud. A high HLR, above 2.0, creates elongate growth. Elongate growth is when an oyster shell is able to grow more in its height than its length. This type of growth is found in densely clustered oyster reefs and in soft mud. Finally, the intermediate HLR, between 1.3 and 2.0, is a product of an environment with mixed sand and mud.²⁶³

In the Westwood Manor collection, there are 30 complete oyster shells.²⁶⁴ For these thirty shells, 83.33% of the full shells in this collection have an HLR between 1.3 and 2.0. Four shells have an HLR less than 1.3 and one shell has an HLR greater than 2.0. The oysters consumed at

²⁵⁹ Florida Museum of Natural History; Sheepshead.

http://www.flmnh.ufl.edu/fish/gallery/descript/sheepshead/sheepshead.html, accessed April 27, 2010. ²⁶⁰ Maryland Fish Facts;

²⁰⁰⁷ Black Drum. http://www.dnr.state.md.us/fisheries/fishfacts/blackdrum.asp, accessed April 27, 2010. ²⁶¹ Maryland Fish Facts;

²⁰⁰⁷ Red Drum. http://www.dnr.state.md.us/fisheries/fishfacts/reddrum.asp, accessed May 4, 2010. ²⁶² Maryland Fish Facts;

²⁰⁰⁷ Striped Bass. http://www.dnr.state.md.us/fisheries/fishfacts/stripedbass.asp, accessed May 4, 2010. ²⁶³ Kent.

²⁶⁴ There are 62 fragmented oyster shells in the collection, but the full shells are the only ones that can be measured for an HLR.

Westwood Manor likely came from the Wicomico River, downstream from the site. The Wicomico and Potomac rivers were teeming with ovsters during this time period.²⁶⁵

Factors

Zooarchaeology reveals the many ongoing processes affect the distribution and condition of faunal remains. *Biotic* and *Thanatic* factors take place during an animal's life and death, while Perthotaxic, Taphic, and Anataxic factors involve the environment and its subsequent interactions with the bone. Finally, there are Sullegic and Trephic factors: Excavation and analysis, essentially.²⁶⁶

We see the first two factors in several places: epiphysis fusing and tooth wear is indicative of growth, and can be used to accurately find the age of death of the animal. Several (4+) bones in the collection had unfused epiphyses, a sign of a younger animal. Several mandibles still had teeth intact, and while some were heavily worn, others were barely worn at all, or even unerupted.²⁶⁷ With the proper skills, these could precisely date the age of the animal, revealing when butchering occurred (and thus what the animals were being used or bred for). Thanatic factors like butcher and cut marks tell us how humans used the animals after death.

The middle three factors can be seen in any scavenging that occurs, any weathering, erosion, or separation. Soil acidity plays a role here, as does rainfall and fire. Ultimately these factors would account for the varying quality of bone. The final two factors involve discovery, excavation, storage, cataloging, and even publication.

What does this have to do with the collection? Well, at each stage new variables are introduced that may skew the end result, including both the data and their interpretation. What animals were consumed here, and how many are domestic? When people turn to wild resources for the diet, which animals do they choose and which do they leave alone? When an animal was butchered, was its entire carcass used or just certain parts? Where are the scraps thrown out, and where are the choice cuts discarded? These dumping locations might not even be the same place.

Afterwards, what happens to the bone? Does the rain wash smaller bones away? Are the remains then scattered by scavengers? Does fire consume them? Do the weaker bones preserve? Does the acidity of the soil even leave any bones behind?

Finally, what do we as excavators do? We might not dig the entire site, or might not notice or screen smaller bones. Even during the best excavation, accidents occur. The weight of heavy machinery, or even a human, may shatter bone. A slip of the trowel, and a new cut appears. Does the archaeologist later mistake that as evidence for butchery?

Finally, the experience level of the interpreter plays a large role. Not many are trained in the field of zooarchaeology, and even experts require the aid of a comparative collection. Experience is often the best teacher, but different regions have different animals.

²⁶⁵ Rice.

²⁶⁶ Terry O'Connor, *The Archaeology of Animal Bones* (Gloucestershire, Sutton Publishing Limited, 2000), p. 21.

Simon Hillson, Teeth (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 328-336.

Biases may creep in at any level, and there is no way to account for all variables. So even when it isn't a student project with approximate counts and tentative identifications, all conclusions should be taken with a grain of salt.

Historic Implications

When combined with the historical context, what does the faunal assemblage imply for the Westwood Manor site?

Our class was fortunate to have the benefit of the transcribed 1703 probate inventory for John Bayne, the owner of the property for much of the same period the artifacts are from.²⁶⁸ Along with all the furniture and goods, it inventories the livestock of the main house and four smaller properties. It lists, in total, 146 cows, 90 pigs, 26 horses, and no sheep at all.²⁶⁹ It is puzzling that no sheep are seen. As for the accompanying lack of horses in the archaeological record, one explanation would be that horses are nearly never butchered for food, and would possibly been sold off to a knacker, rather than be discarded at home.

Having a list of herds on property brings up the possibility of aligning the archaeological record with the documentary one. However, as is, only the number of bone and its species identification has been listed, the NSP. By looking at the elements and sides for each species, a Minimum Number of Individuals could be constructed.²⁷⁰ This should be done if at all possible, to attempt to tally how many animals are actually represented. Other studies could include an estimated biomass for each animal, to see how much food on average each sample could have provided.

At this time in the late 17th and early 18th century, this section of Maryland was transitioning from what was, to English households, a frontier to a settled region. Sheep was a relative rarity earlier in the century, due to predation by wolves, competition from deer, and the effort needed to pasture and corral them. As a result, they have been typified as a sign of wealth: one could afford the extra effort and cost to get the dual rewards of mutton and wool. However, as the region became more settled, the heavy reliance of Marylanders on wild sources of food decreased, and cultivation of livestock, including sheep, increased.²⁷¹ Cattle and pigs, unlike sheep, had thrived in the woods of Maryland, being let loose to roam far and wide for forage.

Deer was a source of meat, but the effort required to hunt made it more a meal of the wealthy, who could afford hunters to do the work for them. That isn't to say only the wealthy ate deer, all Marylanders did, but the wealthy were able to do so more often.

However, this observation is contradicted by George Alsop, an indentured servant who spent several years in the late 1650s/early1660s in Baltimore County.²⁷² Alsop reported about the consumption of venison:

²⁶⁸ A transcription of the inventory was provided to us by Mr. Jim Tarrant, a descendant of John and Anne Bayne.

²⁶⁹ Archives of Maryland, vol. 24, pp. 134-140.

²⁷⁰ Richard G. Klein and Kathryn Cruz-Uribe, *The Analysis of Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1984), 26-32.

²⁷¹ Lecture by Henry Miller, April 16, 2010.

²⁷² George Alsop, *A Character of the Province of Maryland*, ed. Newton D. Mereness (Cleveland, The Burrows Brothers, 1902), ; available on-line at

http://mith2.umd.edu/eada/html/display.php?docs=alsop_character.xml.

[Deer] flesh, which in some places of this Province is the common provision the Inhabitants feed on, and which through the extreme glut and plenty of it, being daily killed by the *Indians*, and brought in to the *English*, as well as that which is killed by the Christian Inhabitant, that doth it more for recreation, than for the benefit they reap by it. I say, the flesh of Venison becomes (as to food) rather denyed, than any way esteemed or desired.

As English settlement expanded, however, wildlife was thinning out. Less deer and wolves meant an increase in sheep, a trend likely seen here in Westwood Manor. Large fish would still be caught or perhaps bought to supplement diet, but there is simply less wild meat on the table. Chicken, or "dung-hill fowl" as they were called, remained a steady source of eggs, and eventually meat.²⁷³

Conclusion

The faunal evidence certainly suggests a wealthier household. The presence of sheep points in this direction, as perhaps does the presence of deeper-water fish (possibly indicative of trading). The lack of deer is slightly puzzling, especially if this wealthy household traded with Indians, but it could be indicative of the thinning of wildlife in those changing times. Or it could be that they were disposed of differently, for some reason. There are definite signs of human consumption, as well as animal scavenging. The abundance of fish items in the Garden certainly means something, though if it means that the garden was excavated differently, or if the site served a different purpose than the Cellar remains hard to tell. It is also difficult to say for how long the cellar remained open to the elements. Are these bones representative only of the last decade of occupation/post-occupation? Was the cellar used as a garbage pit while the structure was still used as intended? Did the scavengers come before or after abandonment? And of course, what was missed in the course of excavation?

A further analysis of the faunal remains and all related issues is recommended to gain further insight into what is proving to be a wonderful site.

²⁷³ Lecture by Henry Miller, April 16, 2010.

Chapter Fourteen Reimagining Westwood Manor: Architectural Analysis

AMY PUBLICOVER

Westwood Manor is a property located near the head of Allen's Fresh Run in Charles County Maryland. The property has a long history beginning in 1651, when it was first patented



Figure 40. In situ brick at Westwood Manor.

by Thomas Gerrard, Sr. The site was occupied by several families before archaeological evidence indicates it was abandoned around 1715. Artifacts from the site indicate a very upper class household, seemingly out of place at what would have been the fringes between St. Mary's and Charles counties. Or was it? As Phil Levy and his colleagues have observed about Chesapeake housing, "Chesapeake planters incorporated many of the elements of comfort, including forms of domestic heating, security, illumination, protection from fire, pest-control, privacy, aesthetics, and hygienic living." The artifacts from the site, domestic and architectural, indicate that Westwood Manor was solidly within the 'Atlantic World mainstream.'274

The archaeological materials that were recovered from this site, as well as the materials left *in situ*, begin to reveal what the architecture of Westwood Manor may have looked like (Figure 40). One of the

most prominent features discovered was a cellar. Paved in red, unglazed ceramic tile (Figure 41), the cellar at Westwood Manor was a feature found only in the houses of the elite in the late 17th century. Three complete flat tiles, each measuring 9.625 in by 9.625 in by 1 in, were recovered, as well as 38 fragments totaling 1789.1g of floor tile. Some tile was also left in place on the site. Similar tiles were recovered at Mattapany, the home of the third Lord Baltimore, Charles Calvert. Mattapany, located on the south side of the Patuxent near its mouth, was a socially and politically powerful place, serving not only as the principal home of Charles Calvert, the third Lord Baltimore but as a meeting place for the Maryland Council and the location of the colony's magazine.²⁷⁵ Mattapany was a large masonry building, measuring roughly 25-by-50-feet, with a

²⁷⁴ Philip Levy, John Coombs, and David Muraca, Notions of Comfort in the Early Colonial Chesapeake. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, York, England (available on-line at http://www.chesapeakearchaeology.org/

Interpretations/SHALevyCoobmsMuracaPapaer.htm. .

²⁷⁵ See Edward E. Chaney and Julia A. King, "A Fair House of Brick and Timber": Archaeological Excavations at Mattapany-Sewall (18ST390), Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, St. Mary's County, Maryland. Report prepared for the Department Of Public Works, Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, 1998. Manuscript on file, Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory, Jefferson Patterson Park and



Figure 41. Unglazed ceramic floor tiles recovered from Westwood Manor.

full cellar. The cellar floor at Mattapany was at least partially lined with tile similar to that found at Westwood Manor. At Mattapany, the tile measured approximately 10in by 10in by 1in and was given a coat of whitewash, possibly to enhance light reflection and therefore visibility in the building's cellar.

Also discovered at Westwood Manor were a number of bricks and brick fragments. Philip Levy and his colleagues note in their comparative

study of Virginia and Maryland archaeological assemblages that, "although brick houses were rare in the Chesapeake colonies before the 18th century, the Chesapeake colonists appear to have held brick in greater esteem than wood as a building material."²⁷⁶ Levy found that it was only the country-level and provincial elites that could afford brick architecture. Based on the relatively limited excavations at Mattapany and the large amount of brick recovered (well over one million grams, or over 1000 kilograms), archaeologists Julia King and Edward Chaney concluded that Mattapany was a building mostly constructed of brick.²⁷⁷ At Westwood Manor, the Harrisons collected about 1500g of red brick (1.5 kilograms), including nine whole handmade red bricks. It is clear that, despite differences in collection strategies at both sites, Mattapany yielded a far greater quantity of brick than Westwood Manor. It is unlikely, then, that Westwood Manor was of brick masonry; although the architecture incorporated some brick, probably in two brick end chimneys.²⁷⁸

Another brick type found at Westwood Manor is Dutch yellow brick. Dutch yellow bricks are, as their name implies, yellow-pasted bricks made and shipped by the Dutch. They have been recovered on many sites in the colonial Chesapeake, including Mattapany, St. John's in St. Mary's City, Notley Hall, and Chancellor's Point, as well as sites in Virginia, Delaware, and New York. There are two different types of yellow brick. The first type, the larger "moppen," brick, was specified for walls, while the smaller, harder "klinkers" were intended for chimney construction."²⁷⁹ Moppen bricks typically measure between 8.5 to 9 inches in length while the smaller klinkers have an average length of between 6.5 and 7.5 inches. While klinkers were apparently very good for hearth and firebox construction, the whole yellow brick recovered from

Museum, St. Leonard; Julia A. King and Edward E. Chaney, Lord Baltimore and the Meaning of Brick Architecture in Seventeenth-Century Maryland. In Geoff Egan and Ronald L. Michael, eds., *Old and New Worlds* (Oxbow Books, Oxford, England, 1999), pp. 51-60.; Alex J. Flick, "Att a Councill Held At:," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Middle Atlantic Archaeological Conference, Ocean City, Maryland, March 2010.

²⁷⁶ For the quote, see Amir H. Ameri, Housing Ideologies in the New England and Chesapeake Bay Colonies c. 1650-1700, Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, vol. 56, no. 1 (1997), p: 7; for more on the Chesapeake's impermanent housing, see Cary Carson, Norman F. Barka, William M. Kelso, Garry W. Stone, and Dell Upton, Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies. *Winterthur Portfolio*, vol. 16, no. 2/3 (1981), pp. 135-196.

²⁷⁷ King and Chaney, pp. 51-60.

²⁷⁸ Chaney, p. 2.

²⁷⁹ Al Luckenbach, The Excavation of an 18th Century Dutch Yellow Brick Firebox in Anne Arundel County, Maryland (Manuscript on file, Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory, Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum, St. Leonard), p. 11.

Westwood Manor was all of the moppen variety. At Westwood Manor, seven whole yellow bricks, one brickbat, and 21 fragments were recovered for a total weight of 626.5 grams. For comparison, at Mattapany, archaeologists collected a total of 1757.9 grams of yellow brick. This could point to the fact that Mattapany might have been a larger structure than Westwood Manor, or it could have just incorporated more yellow brick.

Also recovered in large number from Westwood Manor were nails. Many wrought nails and several cut nails were recovered and x-rayed. This large number of nails in a variety of sizes points to the likelihood that Westwood Manor consisted of partial wood construction. In fact, the number of nails at Westwood Manor appears to have been significant enough to prove enticing to thieves. On March 1, 1669, Cornelius Cornell was tried and acquitted of the crime of breaking into the "mansion howse of Thomas Gerrard of Westwood…betweene the [h]ours of eleaven and one…[and stealing] Seaven hundred of Nayles of the value of Fower shillings sterling."²⁸⁰ This large number of nails, and the fact that there was no pantile, or roofing tile, discovered at the site, suggests that Westwood Manor likely had a wooden roof.

Another artifact type found in the collection that helps to distinguish Westwood Manor as an elite household includes wall plaster (Figure 42). A total of 242.1 grams of plaster were recovered from the site. This includes fragments of both rough undercoat and a smooth finishing topcoat. Plaster coated walls would have improved the lighting in Westwood Manor as well as making the space easier to clean. The plasterwork again shows more resources invested into the



Figure 42. Finish-coat plaster recovered from West-wood Manor.

construction of Westwood Manor than was typical on sites from this period. However, plastered walls are expected in the dwellings of the elite.

Window glass was another artifact type that revealed a little bit about Westwood Manor's architecture. A number of fragments of window glass were recovered from Westwood Manor. One of these fragments has a possible diamond-shaped point intact. One window lead was also recovered from the site. Glazed windows are a typical feature on even ordinary planter's homes in the later 17th century. However, the presence of window glass at this site does provide

one more example of how the residents of Westwood Manor were able to better control and flourish in their environment than some of their peers. Glazed windows allowed those living in a structure to allow in light without allowing in weather. These windows, in combination with the plastered walls, would mean that even on a rainy day, Westwood Manor would have had a fair amount of natural light inside.

One architectural artifact type I found particularly interesting are the keys and locking implements that were found at Westwood Manor. Two nearly complete keys as well as several

²⁸⁰ Since the artifacts found in the Harrisons' collection appear to date no earlier than the late 1670s, it is unclear if this "Mansion Howse" is the same as that discovered by the Harrisons. It is possible that Westwood House was under construction in 1669 but not occupied; see *Archives of Maryland*, vol. 57, p. 622.

pieces of possible locks were collected from the site. The probate record for John Bayne, then living at Westwood Manor in 1703, includes no less than 13 different chests, any one of which may have had a lock and key. This inventory does not make clear which objects at Westwood Manor might have been locked away, but it is evident from the artifacts, that the residents of Westwood had some way of securing the things they held of value to them. These locks and keys, along with whatever arms were in the house, would have been the only security that the people who lived in this home had.

Another clue as to what Westwood Manor may have looked like in the late 17th century and early 18th century comes from the historical record. The inventory of John Bayne, taken in July 1703 nearly two years after Bayne's death in England, is not organized room by room, but the inventory contains significant breaks inferred from the types of goods and furnishings described. It is possible that these breaks reflect breaks between rooms. The breakdown of the inventory based on assemblage of materials is as follows:

- 1. Space One (Hall?): a space containing 50 chairs, including cane, leather, wooden, and 'Turkey work' chairs as well as chests, tables, pictures, mirrors, 2 bedsteads, and possibly a library;
- 2. Space Two (Kitchen?): a space containing chests, three "old" bedsteads, fireplace equipment, and pots, kettles, pans, and other cooking equipment. In this space the appraisers found and recorded silver flatware worth 26 pounds sterling;
- 3. Space Three (Store Room?): a space containing linens, sheets, blankets, curtains, napkins, buttons, and other similar goods;
- 4. Space Four: a space containing 13 'narrow' beds and other goods;
- 5. Space Five (an outbuilding?): a space containing salt, saws, iron bars, nails, tallow, shot, and so on.

The inventory contains many more items than accounted for in these three inferred "spaces," including goods used in food consumption and household and plantation maintenance. It is also possible that these materials could have been organized in a manner different than on the day of Bayne's death. His wife, Anne, survived him but was dead in August 1702, almost one full year before this inventory was taken. The Baynes had two children, and it is possible that they remained in the house with a guardian. Nonetheless, the inventory provides some guidance on the number of domestic spaces within the household. It appears that the dwelling at Westwood Manor consisted of at least five 'spaces' (one of which may have been an outbuilding).

At least two of these spaces had names assigned them by the Baynes or members of their household, including a "new room" and a "porch." When John Bayne wrote his will in 1701, it was in haste (he was leaving shortly for England) and included numerous cross-outs. His wife, Anne, died soon after and a case was taken to court in an effort to establish that Bayne had in fact made these cross-outs himself. A servant of Bayne testified that Bayne was writing his will in the "new room on the right hand of the entry within the porch…sitting att the table under the window by the bed."²⁸¹ Could this "new room" in fact be Space One, described above? This anecdotal mention of the layout of Westwood Manor provides an important piece of information that cannot

²⁸¹ We are grateful to Mr. Jim Tarrant for pointing out this reference to us; Mr. Tarrant reports that the reference is "found in Wills 11:217, which is the 5 Oct 1700 will of John Bayne. Included within the pages that follow the will is a 5 Dec 1701 detailed deposition by Thomas Whaholey/Whauley who wrote the will as Bayne dictated it. The language I sent you (my WP #2) is from this deposition, which was taken and recorded in Charles County."

be ascertained from the archaeological record as it stands now. The porch that Bayne's servant is describing is likely a porch tower on the front of Westwood Manor. This is fitting with Levy et al.'s analysis that the houses of the country-level elites, "in addition to the traditional hall and parlor contain small ground floor rooms including sheds, closets, and towers."²⁸² Equally interesting is the labeling of the "new room," implying that Bayne had added on to the house since coming there in 1687.

There are two examples of this type of porch tower building in the vicinity of Westwood Manor. Sarum is a property in eastern Charles County that is thought to be the oldest firmly-dated building in the county. Sarum dates to the early 18th century. While the Sarum that stands today shows clear evidence of generations of additions, by looking at the roof frame of the original house, which survives almost completely intact, the shape of the original house is evident. "The



Figure 43 . Conjectural drawing, Westwood Manor. *Amy E. Publicover*.

roof frame shows it to have been a timber-framed structure measuring 18-by 32-feet, with a centered two-story porch or stair tower on the front elevation flanked by gabled dormers."²⁸³ Architectural historian J. Richard Rivoire suggesting how Sarum appeared in 1717 prepared a conjectural drawing of Sarum that I have used to prepare a similar drawing depicting how Westwood Manor may have looked (Figure 43).

The dwelling at Westwood Manor likely had a porch tower entry that accessed a hall, with a parlor to the immediate right as a visitor passed from the porch into the hall. At the back of the hall may have been an entry to a service/kitchen area. Bayne's servant

describes him sitting in the room on the "right hand of the entry within the porch." By this, the servant may have been describing a door in the center of the porch that allowed the entry into the main block of the house.

The drawing of Sarum shows two fireplaces flanking the home. "There is also evidence that an exterior chimney stood at the east end. While it is likely that there was another chimney at the opposite end, all trace of it was obliterated when the house was subsequently altered."²⁸⁴ From Chaney's findings and my review of similar dwellings in the region, it is likely that Westwood Manor would have also had two chimneys on the exterior of the building.

Two more examples of a porch tower building come from the 1697 plat of the Charles County Courthouse. The plat depicts the court house (Figure 44), a timber building with a single end chimney and a porch tower. The second building on the plat depicts an ordinary at the courthouse run by Philip Lynes, complete with porch tower. Both buildings were timber-framed structures with hole-set posts, unlike Sarum but probably not unlike Westwood Manor. From the

²⁸² Levy et al.

 ²⁸³ J. Richard Rivoire, *Homeplaces: Traditional Domestic Architecture of Charles County, Maryland* (La Plata, Maryland: Southern Maryland Studies Center, 1990), p. 36.

²⁸⁴ Rivoire, p. 36.

plat, it looks like the courthouse chimney is leaning away from the building. This may indicate that the chimney was daub and was constructed at an angle for easier removal in the event it caught fire. I think that the amount of brick recovered from Westwood Manor and the attention paid to its foundation indicate that Westwood Manor would have had a brick chimney, possibly two. With that exception, it is likely that Westwood Manor would have looked very similar to the 1674 Courthouse.



Figure 44. The Charles County Court House (drawn in 1697), depicting a porch tower. *Maryland State Archives*.

The image of the 1674 Charles County Courthouse even depicts diamond shaped windows, like the ones that may have existed at Westwood Manor. Like the Courthouse, I think it is likely that a center porch tower would have served as the main entrance into Westwood Manor in the late 17th and early 18th centuries.

More details on what Westwood House may have looked like (assuming it was a building with a porch tower) come from the building contract James Neale signed in 1661 with Francis West for the construction of his dwelling at Wollaston Manor, at the southern end of the Wicomico River. Neale directed that his house be

...forty foote long & twenty five foote wide, framed worke to bee nine foote betweene ye groundsill & Wall plate & all ye groundsills to bee of Locust wood; ye Lower part to bee divided into five Roomes wth two chimnies below & one small chimnye above And build to it a porch ten foote long & eight foote wide; ye Loft to bee layed wth

sawed wood And to build two Dormer windowes above & other window at ye end of ye loft And to finish all Windowes & Dores below Stayres, with two paire of [?] stayers or windeing stayres & all Compleatly finished except ye covering & weather boarding.²⁸⁵

As to the size of Westwood Manor, Chaney reported that the cellar appeared to have been at least 21 feet on its north-south axis by 16 to 18 feet on its east-west axis. Sarum was an 18-by-32 foot building, the Charles County court house was to have been 22-by-25 feet, and Neale's Wollaston Manor house was to have been 25-by-40 feet. Mattapany, possibly the nicest home in Maryland at the time, was larger at 25-by-50 foot than all three Charles County structures. It would be surprising if Westwood Manor was larger than Mattapany.

The probate inventory prepared for John Bayne's estate may provide some clues about the layout of the dwelling. Although Bayne's inventory was not listed in a room-by-room fashion, changes in the enumeration of Bayne's possessions may suggest breaks linked to different rooms. Bayne's inventory at Westwood lists 50 chairs and over a dozen beds. This could be an indication that Bayne hosted guests frequently at Westwood Manor. One instance in particular points to the fact that Westwood Manor was large enough to hold a sizeable gathering. On at least one instance, the Council of Maryland held a meeting at Westwood Manor: "At a

²⁸⁵ John F. Dorman, *Westmoreland County, Virginia Records, 1661-1664* (Privately published, 1972), pp. 4-5.

Councill held at Westwood, at the house of Captain John Bayne in St Maries County the 29th day of June in...1694," reads the entry.²⁸⁶ At this particular meeting, at least 15 men were present. The Council frequently met at the homes of Maryland's elite, especially when the Council had local business in the area. The space at Westwood Manor would have had to have been large enough and presentable enough to meet the standards of the wealthiest and most important people in early Maryland.

The artifacts that Mrs. Harrison discovered provide some clues as to what the house at Westwood Manor may have looked like at the turn of the 18th century. It was likely a one-and-a-half or two-story structure with a front porch tower. The roof and most of the framework was timber while the foundation was brick and a portion of the exterior may have also included brickwork. One, but probably two, brick chimneys flanked the gable sides of the house. The Dutch yellow brick recovered from the site was probably used in this capacity, although there is no indication that it served a decorative purpose. On the interior, a center hall would have divided the home into at least two rooms per floor, but moor divisions were certainly possible. The home had a full cellar with a red tile floor. This flooring may have been continued on the ground floor of the building. The walls were covered with a smooth white plaster. This allowed the light entering through the glazed windows to diffuse throughout the space. The second floor of the building could be accessed by a stairway likely located in the center hall of the house. It is also highly likely that one or more doors at Westwood Manor would have been locked.

²⁸⁶ Archives of Maryland, vol. 20, p. 73.

Chapter Fifteen Future Directions: Towards an Ethnography of Late 17th-Century Maryland

JULIA A. KING

Beginning in January 2010 and continuing through early May of the same year, students in the Archaeology Practicum class at St. Mary's spent many hours documenting and studying a collection from what was clearly an important settlement in late 17th-century Charles County, Maryland. The work accomplished during this project is impressive; still, we are acutely aware of the yet-unrealized potential of this collection. In particular, while we now have a fairly good idea of the dwelling that stood at Westwood Manor and the material conditions of life at this early period, the next challenge involves using these materials to develop a more detailed, ethnographic account of Westwood Manor and its surrounding community, including all of the people who lived in this part of the colony.

Anne and John Bayne and, to a lesser extent, Thomas Gerard are palpably present in the materials we analyzed during the course of this work. Surviving documents as well as artifacts impressed with owner's marks have made it clear who owned and who controlled Westwood Manor during this period. The vast majority of artifacts reveal how, in this part of Maryland, no



Figure 45. Hohrware presentation piece with image of William III.

longer a frontier in the English view but still not a center of cosmopolitan life, the Gerards and the Baynes worked hard to reconstitute their material world as an English world, housing themselves, for example, in a fashionable, well-appointed 'manor house.' Animal bone remains suggest that they consumed a diet of mostly domesticated meats – that is, an English diet – along with imported wines and even English beer (both a luxury and a rarity in early Maryland). Before his death. Thomas Gerard used Westwood Manor as a place where English goods could be readily sold to other settlers in the area, and perhaps even to a few Piscataway. After Bayne's arrival, visitors to the manor house could see on display at least one and maybe more ceramic vessels bearing the image of England's new King William (1688) (Figure 45), who, it so happened, took political control of the Maryland colony away from Lord Baltimore. There was little doubt where in the turbulent political landscape this household stood.

And a turbulent political landscape it was. At the time this part of Westwood Manor was first occupied – in the late 1670s or c. 1680, the Maryland colony was changing rapidly. English settlement in the colony was no longer confined to southern Maryland; by mid-century, colonists

were well into the Piedmont and northern portions of the colony. This desire for land put untenable pressure on Maryland's Indian groups, including the Piscataway, Mattawoman, and Choptico, who, until recently, had managed to co-exist with the English through a strategy that emphasized geographical distances and barriers. Bacon's Rebellion, a violent and gamechanging uprising that took place in 1676 in Virginia, had its inception in Maryland, and the conditions that precipitated the conflict had not gone away. The Indians of southern Maryland were also under pressure from northern Indian groups, most notably the Susquehannock and the Seneca. The northern Indians, who had concluded the Piscataway were their enemy, regularly launched 'mourning wars' on the Maryland groups, seeking captives to replace members of their groups who had died or been killed. Lord Baltimore recognized the threats the Maryland Indians (who he wanted around as part of his foreign policy strategy) were under, and, in 1680, he moved many of the Piscataway into the Zekiah region, within ten miles of Westwood Manor. The move offered some protection but not much, as the northern Indians soon followed.

Into this already volatile situation a new group of people – Africans forcibly brought to the colony – were increasing in number. Africans (typically as slaves but occasionally as servants) had been in Maryland from the beginning of English settlement, but now their growing numbers were revealing, through a series of laws, English attitudes about these men and women. These laws dramatically circumscribed the possibilities for African immigrants, most of whom were expected to spend their lives as laborers on the colony's tobacco plantations. Lord Baltimore himself owned slaves, and he (and later, his son, Charles, the third Lord Baltimore) encouraged the importation of slaves into the colony. Benjamin Rozer, the son-in-law of Charles Calvert and one of the largest slaveholders at his death in 1681, lived in the Westwood Manor vicinity.²⁸⁷ The fascinating story of Eleanor Butler, an Irish servant in the employ of Lord Baltimore, unfolded in the area around Westwood Manor when, c. 1680, Butler married 'Saltwater' Charles, a newly-arrived African on the plantation of Lord Baltimore's friend, William Boarman.

The political situation was also unsettled at this time. When the second Lord Baltimore died, in 1675, his son inherited his position as proprietor. Unlike his father, who had never been to Maryland, the third Lord Baltimore had been there since 1660. A Catholic, Baltimore had a number of political enemies who used his religion against him. In 1684, Baltimore was obligated to return to England to defend his claims to Maryland's northern boundary against William Penn. The political problems for Baltimore were intensifying and, while away, his agents in Maryland made decisions that were not always in the best interests of the proprietor. In 1688, when William and Mary came to the English throne, it was the beginning of the end of Calvert political rule in Maryland. A group of rebels styling themselves the Protestant Associators (and led by a man who was an in-law of Thomas Gerard) seized control of the colony in 1689. Although Baltimore's land rights to the colony were restored, King William retained political control of the colony, installing his own government when he sent Lionel Copley as governor in 1692.

Given these changes and events, what can material culture – such as the assemblage recovered by the Harrisons from Westwood Manor – reveal that would allow us to write an ethnographic account of the Westwood Manor community in the late 17th-century? Given the role and power of material culture for not just reflecting but for shaping social and cultural relations, the Westwood Manor collection presents students of Maryland history and culture with

²⁸⁷ Charles Calvert had a 'summer home' in the Zekiah vicinity, which he built in 1673. The dwelling, believed to have been known as Zekiah House, has not yet been located. See Julia A. King and Scott M. Strickland, Prepared for the Citizens of Charles County, 2009.

the materials Thomas Gerard and the Baynes – and their servants and their slaves and their neighbors – used to forge the social web emerging in this part of Maryland.

An ethnographic or community approach serves to place the Westwood Manor household in greater context. The Westwood Manor household provided not only the domestic necessities of life, it 'performed' these functions in a social and political context. As Amy Publicover has suggested in her chapter, the dwelling at Westwood Manor appears to have been very similar to the dwellings built at Sarum and Wollaston Manor, and it was similar in form to the Charles County Court House at Moore's Lodge.²⁸⁸ In 2010, archaeologists discovered yet another building near the mouth of the Wicomico River, probably the dwelling plantation of Josias Fendall and, later, William Digges, that is characterized by many of the same artifacts found at Westwood Manor. The construction of these elite dwellings, their form, and their location in the landscape reveal that these households used architecture and its siting as expressions of social and political power. How both the powerful and the less powerful negotiated this landscape, and the economic, social, and political lines along which the material conditions of life emerged, are critical for addressing questions of class, race, gender, in sum, identity in early modern Maryland.



Figure 46. (Above) Tin-glazed earthenware flower vase pedestal foot recovered from Westwood Manor; (Right) Flower vase in a private collection.



One especially interesting artifact recovered from Westwood Manor includes a pedestal foot for a blue-on-white decorated tin-glazed earthenware vessel (Figure 46). At first, we concluded the ceramic fragment was a candlestick base, not unexpected in this context and certainly the kind of object the Gerards and Baynes would have had for making their lives in late 17th-centurry Maryland a little more comfortable. Further research, however, revealed that the pedestal foot probably comes not from a candlestick but from a tin-glazed earthenware flower vase. Figure 46 depicts a flower vase in a private collection; the pedestal foot closely resembles the Westwood Manor fragment. Similar vases have been excavated at Jamestown, Virginia, Port

 $^{^{288}}$ All dwellings appear to have been 1 1/3 story structures with porch towers.

Royal, Jamaica, and Newington Plantation in South Carolina; the excavated vessels have been dated between 1680 and 1700.²⁸⁹

In addition to the flower vase fragment, we identified what appears to be a tin-glazed beverage pot lid (Figure 47). The lid does not appear to be for a 'posset pot,' a large, bulbous and lidded drinking vessel with multiple handles. Posset pot lids tend to have lids with more steeply inclined domes, typically evidenced by a nearly 90-degree angle between the dome and the lid's everted marly. The Westwood Manor lid fragment is much flatter with shorter sides than would



Figure 47. Possible tea or coffee pot lid fragment recovered from Westwood

have been expected on a posset pot. It is possible (although not certain) that this lid may have been for a vessel used to serve coffee or tea.

The flower vase and the beverage pot lid fragments are as revealing as the William III jug. Both objects imply the availability of leisure time in a region at a time when labor was very dear. The luxury of raising flowers for display, or consuming imported tea or coffee, would have been out of reach for the majority of the people who lived in this part of Maryland.

Behind these elite dwellings and fashionable artifacts were the people who made it possible for the Gerards and the Baynes to live a more comfortable, more 'English' life. When compared with the material visibility of the Gerards and the Baynes, these people might at first be imagined as mere background shadows. Yet, the rich material culture recovered from Westwood Manor (including materials not recovered) may be valuable for learning more about these men and women.

We know from the documents that, when Thomas Gerard, Jr. died in 1686, he had 13 laborers, including eight indentured servants and five enslaved laborers. We know he had a "merchant of London" living at his house, and that this merchant was probably trading not just with colonists but with Piscataway Indians living deeper in the Zekiah. We have a good idea of who Gerard's neighbors were in the Westwood Manor vicinity and how often and in what capacity he interacted with them.

After Gerard's death, his wife, Anne, remarried, and her new husband, John Bayne, had at his death an even larger labor force, almost evenly divided between servants (14) and enslaved laborers (17).²⁹⁰ In addition to her husband's slaves, Anne Bayne had her own, including two women, three girls, and a boy. We know that Bayne, a native-born son of a wealthy immigrant, held a number of lucrative offices. We know too that Bayne had a license to keep an ordinary at Newport, and that, on at least one occasion, he entertained a meeting of the Provincial Council in his house at Westwood Manor. At that meeting, two Piscataway Indians appeared before the Council to discuss a recent murder that colonial authorities believed had been committed by the Indians.

²⁸⁹ John C. Austin, *British Delft at Williamsburg* (Williamsburg, Virginia, The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1994), pp. 18, 250.

²⁹⁰ Inventory of John Bayne, Maryland Prerogative Court, Book 24:134-140 (Maryland State Archives); transcribed copy provided by Mr. Jim Tarrant.

We know from the probate inventories of Gerard, Bayne, and the many other colonists in the area who had an estate valuable enough to inventory that people in this area were interacting with one another in myriads of ways, from lending credit to filing lawsuits.

To this, we can now bring the rich material record of at least one elite household to explore the material manifestations and consequences of those relationships.

For example, of the hundreds of artifacts cataloged as part of this project, we observed almost no artifacts of Native American manufacture. The exceptions include two small fragments of red (or terra cotta) clay tobacco pipes, and it is quite possible that these pipe fragments come from locally-made pipes produced by the colonists and not by the neighboring Piscataway. There are no Indian ceramics whatsoever found within the collection. We do not believe that this reflects collector bias, given how thoroughly the Harrisons appear to have recovered materials from the area adjacent to their new house. If objects of Indian manufacture were present, they would have been collected.

And yet, the residents of Westwood Manor, especially during through the early 1690s, lived in much greater proximity to neighboring Indian groups than their contemporaries at St. Mary's City, the colonial capital. If the court case involving John Pryor is any indication, trade between neighboring Indians and colonists in the area was going on. The goods exchanged during these transactions either do not appear to have included materials for personal use by the Westwood Manor residents, or perhaps they simply do not survive in the archaeological or probate records.

Indeed, not a single deer bone was identified in the faunal assemblage. It is admittedly the case, as Mark Koppel and Allison Alexander note in their chapter, that the faunal assemblage has only been preliminarily evaluated, but the two professional zooarchaeologists who examined the collection identified many fragments of cow, pig, and sheep bone, but saw not a single fragment that they could identify as deer. Deer, of course, have to be hunted, and the zoo-archaeological record suggests that, if deer were being brought to Westwood Manor (such as the deer skins John Pryor allegedly purchased from the Indians at Zekiah Town/Fort), venison was not, nor was it being consumed on the premises – at least within the Bayne dwelling. Nor, does it appear, that the servants or slaves attached to Westwood Manor were engaged in hunting activity on behalf of either Gerard or Bayne, although gun-related artifacts were recovered by the Harrisons.

The absence of Indian-made artifacts contrasts with assemblages recovered from inland sites located approximately seven miles north of Westwood Manor, along the Zekiah Swamp. At the Hawkins Gate site, the as-yet-unidentified servants or tenants living there in the third quarter of the 17th century appear to have acquired and used Indian-made ceramics in lieu of European ceramics. Proportionally far more terra cotta tobacco pipes were recovered from Hawkins Gate than from Westwood Manor; some of these pipes were clearly made by colonial pipemakers, but a good number are of Indian manufacture. Near the mouth of the Wicomico River, where archaeologists discovered what they believe was Josias Fendall's and later William Digges' dwelling plantations, terra cotta pipes were recovered in significant numbers, and many appear to be of Indian manufacture.

The North Devon gravel-tempered wares described by Julianna Jackson hint at the domestic work required to keep a household like Gerard's and, later, Bayne's running, and this job would have fallen to Mrs. Bayne. The North Devon ceramic vessels would have been used with the greatest regularity by Mrs. Bayne and, more likely, by her female servants and slaves.



Figure 48. Yellow lead-glazed coarse earthenware utilitarian vessel.

Many other utilitarian ceramic types are included in the collection, including Buckley and so-called 'Buckley-type' or 'Buckley-like' earthenwares and a myriad of unidentified lead-glazed coarse earthenwares. These earthenwares, which lack the visual interest of the highly decorated tin-glazed earthenwares and Rhenish stonewares, are nonetheless critical for examining household production and gender roles in early households.

The women who used these utilitarian ceramics were responsible for producing the meals at Westwood Manor. Without doubt, Anne Bayne had the final word on what was or was not acceptable in the kitchen. Nonetheless, African women – probably newly arrived and forced

immigrants or, at most, first generation native-born, would have been become versed in the methods of preparing English foods. While the majority of these meals would have consisted of traditional English meats – beef, pork, or mutton – turtle and fish bones indicate that the Westwood Manor household did consume wild species. It is possible that the women working in the Westwood Manor kitchen brought their own experiences with cooking in Africa to bear on the meals served at Westwood House.



Figure 49. Brown lead-glazed coarse earthenware utilitarian vessel recovered from Westwood Manor.

It is also likely that at least some of the enslaved women slept in the Bayne house, where they would have been on call throughout the day and night. Five "negroe" beds are listed in a space containing quantities of dry goods. While they may have enjoyed the 'comforts' enjoyed by the Baynes – a cleaner, dryer, and warmer (or cooler) house - the slaves serving the household would have had far less control over the nature of their relationship with other household members than slaves assigned to a remote quarter. The presence of a number of keys in the archaeological assemblage suggests that some goods were secured and off-limits.

Ultimately, this seemingly very local world – within the household, within the plantation, and within the community surrounding Westwood Manor – was tied into what historians call the Atlantic World. The notion of the Atlantic World has become an important organizing principle for interpreting a landscape that contains not just English men and women, but Indigenous people, Africans, and, increasingly, people from other European nations.

Thomas Gerard was an important participant in the Atlantic World economy. Not only did Gerard set up a merchant in his house at Westwood Manor, his ship, the *Gerard*, sometimes

anchored in the Wicomico, presumably with goods to exchange for tobacco. The captain of the *Gerard*, John Harris, considered himself a resident of London and of Charles County. Other ships – not the *Gerard* – brought human cargo directly from West Africa. While there is no evidence yet linking Thomas Gerard or John Bayne to the Caribbean (especially Barbados), they must have been known Captain Randolph Brandt, an English Catholic who had been born in Barbados and came to Maryland in the late 1670s. Captain Brandt, who lived near the Wicomico in what is today Newburg, patrolled portions of Charles County throughout the 1680s, during periods of Anglo-Piscataway tension.



Figure 50. X-radiograph of selected metal objects, including two iron keys, recovered from Westwood Manor. *Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory*.

The Westwood Manor area had not long been an important center of community when settlement again shifted west. Historian Lorena Walsh concluded that "Charles County was almost as much a land of newcomers [that is, immigrants] as it had been in 1660."²⁹¹ By 1690, however, a native-born population was emerging among English colonists; by 1720, more than 90 percent of the population had been born in the county, and immigrants from that point on avoided Charles County. The exception, of course, were Africans, who had no say in where they might end up. The area around Westwood Manor remained a land of Bowlings, Boarmans, and Baynes (increasingly known as Beans), and it still is today.

The archaeological collection so carefully recovered and curated by Phillip and Sandra Harrison provides another set of evidence for exploring this early period. The Westwood Manor collection only allows new questions about a transitional period in early modern and colonial history to be posed.

²⁹¹ Lorena S. Walsh, Staying Put or Getting Out: Findings for Charles County, Maryland, 1650-1720, *William and Mary Quarterly* (3d Series), vol. 44 (1987), p. 100.

References Cited

Primary Sources

Archives of Maryland Online. Various Volumes. http://aomol.net/megafile/msa/speccol/sc2900/sc2908/html/index.html.

Assessment of 1783, Charles County. MSA S 1437. Retrieved from http://www.msa.md.gov/msa/stagser/s1400/s1437/html/1437ch.html.

Charles and St. Mary's County Court, Patent, and Land Records. *Digital Image Reference System for Land Survey, Subdivision, and Condominium Plats.* Various. Retrieved from http://www.msa.md.gov/megafile/msa/stagser/s1500/s1529/html/0000.html.

Charles County Circuit Court: Court and Land Records, 1680-1685, I/1, CM 376-10, p. 50.

Charles County Court Records, M, 2/96.

Inventory of John and Ann Bayne, Maryland Prerogative Court, Book 24:134-140 (Maryland State Archives).

Provincial Court Deeds, WRC 1, 402-03 (Maryland State Archives).

Rent Rolls, Charles County. 1642-1753. Retrieved from <u>http://usgwarchives.net/md/charles/land.htm</u>.

Will of Captain John Bayne, 1700, Wills 11/217. Accessed on MD WebGen: < http://files.usgwarchives.net/md/charles/wills/bayne-j.txt>.

Will of Thomas Gerrard, 1672/3, Wills I/567.

Secondary Sources

Allan, J.P.

1984 *Medieval and Post-Medieval Finds from Exeter 1971-1980.* Exeter Archaeological Report 3, item no. 1995.

Ameri, Amir H.
1997 Housing Ideologies in the New England and Chesapeake Bay Colonies c. 1650-1700.
Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 56(1): 6-15.

Ayto, Eric G. 2002 *Clay Tobacco Pipes*. Buckinghmshire, UK: Shire Publications Ltd.

Balme, Jane. and Alistair Paterson 2006 Archaeology in Practice: A Student Guide to Archaeological Analysis. Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing. Barber, Edwin A.

1907 *Salt glazed stoneware, Germany, Flanders, England and the United States.* Philadelphia: Art Primer Pennsylvania Museum and School of Industrial Art.

1910 Flemish and Rhenish Stoneware, and the Evolution of Siegburg Forms. *Bulletin of the Pennsylvania Museum* 8(32): 54-56.

Bell, Allison

2005 White Ethnogenesis and Gradual Capitalism: Perspectives from Colonial Archaeological Sites in the Chesapeake" *American Anthropologist* 107(3): 446-460.

Berge, Dale L.

1980 Simpson Spring Station: Historical Archaeology in Western Utah. Cultural Resources Series No. 6. Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office; retrieved at http://www.blm.gov/heritage/adventures/research/StatePages/PDFs/Utah/utah_6.pdf.

Binford, Lewis R.

1978 A New Method of Calculating Dates from Kaolin Pipe Stem Samples. In Robert L. Schuyler, ed., *Historical Archaeology: A Guide to Substantive and Theoretical Contributions*, pp. 66-67. New York, Baywood Publishing Company, Inc.

Borchardt, Susan A., Crowell, Mickey, Donald, Ellen K., & Farner, Barabara A. 2002 Gunston Hall Plantation. Retrieved from http://www.gunstonhall.org/mansion/room_use_study/instruments.html.

Britannia History

2007 Magna Carta. Retrieved from http://www.britannia.com/history/docs/magna2.html.

Buchli, Victor

2004 *Material Culture*. Vol. 1. New York, Routledge.

Burke, Sir Bernard

1871 *A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Commoners of Great Britain and Ireland.* London, Henry Colburn.

Carnes-McNaughton, Linda and Mike U. Wilde-Ramsing 2008 Preliminary Glassware and Bottle Analysis from Shipwreck 31CR314, Queen Anne's Revenge Site. *Research Report and Bulletin Series*: QA-R-08-02

Carr, Lois G. n.d. *Men's Career Files*. Various. Retrieved from http://www.msa.md.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc5000/sc5094/html/index.html.

Cavallo, Katherine D. 2004 An Analysis of Marked and Decorated White Clay Tobacco Pipes from the Lower Patuxent Drainage. Retrieved from http://www.chesapeakearchaeology.org/Interpretations/CavalloPaper.htm.

Chaney, Edward E., and Julia A. King

1997 "A Fair House of Brick and Timber": Archaeological Excavations at Mattapany-Sewall (18ST390), Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, St. Mary's County, Maryland. Report prepared for

the Department Of Public Works, Naval Air Station, Patuxent River. Manuscript on file, Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory, Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum, St. Leonard.

Colonial Williamsburg Foundation 2010 The Geddys: A Family of Tradesmen. Retrieved from http://www.cwf.us/Almanack/places/geddy/geddyhdr.cfm.

Cotton, Jane B.

1907 The Maryland Calendar of Wills: Volume III. Baltimore: Kohn & Pollock, Inc.

Coutts, Howard.

2001 *The Art of Ceramics: European Ceramic Design 1500-1830.* New Haven, Yale University Press.

Cox, C. Jane

2005 *Comparative Analysis of Tobacco-pipes and Clays from Colonial Chesapeake Sites.* Report submitted to the Maryland Historical Trust. On file, Anne Arundel County Office of Environmental and Cultural Resources, Annapolis, MD.

Davey, Peter, ed.

1981 *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe V.* Pp. 251, 259. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports International Series 106.

Davey, Peter and Dennis J. Pogue, eds.

1991 *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe XII: Chesapeake Bay.* Oxford: British Archaeological Reports International Series 566.

Davis, Simon J. M.

1987 The Archaeology of Animals. London, Yale University Press.

Elson, Henry W.

2001 History of the United States of America: Virginia. Retrieved from <u>http://www.usahistory.info/southern/Virginia.html</u>.

Emerson, Matthew C.

1988 Decorated Clay Tobacco Pipes from the Chesapeake. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.

Encyclopedia Britannica

n.d. Troy Weight" Retrieved from <u>http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/606907/troy-</u>weight.

English Weights and Measures 1997 Weights. Retrieved from <u>http://home.clara.net/brianp/weights.html</u>.

Florida Museum of Natural History

2010 Historical Archaeology at the Florida Museum of Natural History: Stoneware, Rhenish Blue and Gray-Type Index. Electronic document, <u>http://www.flmnh.ufl.edu/histarch/gallery_types/type_index_display.asp?type_na</u> me=STONEWARE,%20RHENISH%20BLUE%20AND%20GRAY.

Gaulton, Billy

1999 Seventeenth-and Eighteenth-Century Marked Clay Tobacco Pipes From Ferryland, Newfoundland. *Colony of Avalon*. Archaeology Unit, Memorial University of Newfoundland. http://www.heritage.nf.ca/avalon/artifacts/pipemarks intro.html, accessed May 1, 2010.

Grant, Alison

1983 North Devon Pottery: the Seventeenth Century. Exeter, University of Exeter.

Harrington, J.C.

1978 Dating Stem Fragments of Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Clay Tobacco Pipes. In Robert L. Schuyler, ed., *Historical Archaeology: A Guide to Substantive and Theoretical Contributions*, pp. 63-65. New York, Baywood Publishing Company, Inc.

Henry, Susan

1979 Terra-cotta Tobacco Pipes in 17th-Century Maryland and Virginia: A Preliminary Study. *Historical Archaeology*. 13:14-37.

Herrman, Augustine

1673 Maryland and Virginia 1670, 1673. Retrieved from www.msa.md.gov.

Hillson, Simon

1996 Teeth. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Horn, James

1994 *Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth Century Chesapeake.* Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.

Horne, Johnathan

1985 *Catalogue of English Brown Stoneware from the 17th and 18th Centuries.* Antique Collectors Club Ltd.

Jackson, R. G., and R. H. Price 1974 Bristol Clay Pipes: A Study of Makers and Their Marks. Bristol, Bristol City Museum.

Jones, Olive, and Catherine Sullivan

1985 *The Parks Canada Glass Glossary*. Research Publications. Minister of Supply and Services: Canada.

Jordan, Elise G. 2007 *Abstracts of Charles County Maryland Court and Land Records Volume I: 1658-1666.* Westminster, MD: Heritage Books.

Jordan, Louis

1998 The Comparative Value of Money between Britain and the Colonies. Retrieved from http://www.coins.nd.edu/ColCurrency/CurrencyIntroValue.html.

Kent, Bretton W.

1992 *Making Dead Oysters Talk: Techniques for Analyzing Oysters from Archaeological Sites.* Crownsville, MD. Maryland Historical Trust 1992. Klein, Richard G. and Kathryn Cruz-Uribe

1984 *The Analysis of Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

King, Julia A., and Scott M. Strickland

2009 Archaeological Investigations at His Lordship's Favor. Prepared for the Citizens of Charles County. (Mount Victoria, MD, The Smallwood Foundation).

Langhorne, Henry and Lawrence Babits

1988 Anthropological Title Searches in Rockbridge County, Virginia. In Mary C. Beaudry, editor, *Documentary Archaeology in the New World*, pp. 132-137. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lessmann, Anne W.

1997 The Rhenish Stoneware from the Monte Cristi Shipwreck, Dominican Republic. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Office of Graduate Studies, Texas A&M University, College Station.

Levy, Philip, John Coombs, and David Muraca

2005 Notions of Comfort in the Early Colonial Chesapeake. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, York, England (available on-line at (http://www.chesapeakearchaeology.org/Interpretations/SHALevyCoobmsMuracaPapaer.htm).

Lindsey, Bill

2010 Historic Glass Bottle Identification & Information Website. United States Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management; retrieved from http://www.sha.org/bottle/index.htm.

Luckenbach, Al

1993 The Excavation of an 18th Century Dutch Yellow Brick Firebox in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. Manuscript on file, Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory, Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum, St. Leonard.

Luckenbach, Al, C. Jane Cox, and John Kille, eds. 2002 *The Clay Tobacco-Pipe in Anne Arundel County, Maryland (1650-1730).* Annapolis, Anne Arundel County Trust for Preservation, Inc.

Luckenbach, Al, Esther Read and Donna Ware 1995 The Excavations at Jeffe's Inheritance: The Chalkley Site (18AN711). *Maryland Archaeology* 31(1 & 2): 39-58.

Maryland Archaeological Conservation Lab (MAC Lab). 2003 Diagnostic Artifacts in Maryland: Rhenish. Electronic document, <u>http://www.jefpat.org/diagnostic/Historic_Ceramic_Web_Page/Historic%20Ware</u> %20Descriptions/Rhenish.HTM.

Meacham, Sarah Hand

2009 *Every Home a Distillery: Alcohol, Gender, and Technology in the Colonial Chesapeake.* Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press. Menard, Russell

1980 The Tobacco Industry in the Chesapeake Colonies, 1617-1730: An Interpretation. *Research in Economic History*. 5:128-142.

Noël Hume, Audrey

1973 A Group of Artifacts Recovered from an Eighteenth-Century Well in Williamsburg. In *Five Artifact Studies*. Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia.

Noël Hume, Ivor 2001a *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

2001b *If These Pots Could Talk: Collecting 2,000 years of British Household Pottery.* Chipstone Foundation, Milwaukee.

1974 Historical Archaeology. New York, Alford A. Knopf.

1967 Rhenish Gray Stonewares in Colonial America. Antiques (September):.

O'Connor, Terry

2000 The Archaeology of Animal Bones. Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing Limited.

Papenfuse, Edward

1979 *A Biographical Dictionary of the Maryland Legislature, 1635-1789.* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Phung, Thao T., Julia A. King, and Douglas H. Ubelaker
2009 Alcohol, Tobacco, and Excessive Animal Protein: The Question of an Adequate Diet in the Seventeenth- Century Chesapeake. *Historical Archaeology* 43(2): 61-82.

Preservation Virginia

n.d. Jamestown Rediscovery: Westerwald Stoneware. http://www.preservationvirginia.org/rediscovery/page_php?page_id=329

Rhodes, Daniel

1959 *Stoneware and Porcelain: The Art of High-Fired Pottery.* Radnor: Chilton Book Company/ Ontario: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd.

Rivoire, J. Richard

1995 *Homeplaces: Traditional Domestic Architecture of Charles County, Maryland.* La Plata, Maryland: Southern Maryland Studies Center.

Roviello, Caralyn M. 2001 Wine Bottle Seals of Colonial Southern Maryland. St. Mary's Project, St. Mary's College of Maryland, St. Mary's City.

Rowlett, Russ 2001 English Customary Weights and Measures. Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/~rowlett/units/custom.html. Samford, Patricia

2001 *The Bates Site: An Investigation of a Quaker Merchant*. Retrieved from http://research.history.org/Files/Archaeo/MajorStudies/Bates.pdf.

Shopland, Norena

2005 *Archaeological Finds: A Guide to Identification*. Tempus Publishing: Stroud, Glouscestershire.

Sioussat, George L. 2009 *Highway Legislation in Maryland*. Bibliolife LLC.

Skinner, V.L.

2006 Abstracts of the Testamentary Proceedings of the Prerogative Court of Maryland Volume I: 1658-1675. Baltimore, Clearfield, Co.

Smith, C. Wayne

1995 Analysis of the weight assemblage of Port Royal, Jamaica. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Office of Graduate Studies, Texas A&M University. Retrieved from http://nautarch.tamu.edu/Theses/pdf-files/Smith-PhD1993.pdf.

Smith, Frederick H.

2008 Archaeology of Alcohol and Drinking. Gainesville, University Press of Florida.

Snoodin, Michael

1982 English Silver Spoons. Charles Letts Books Ltd., London.

Spalding, David

1959 The Study of a Lord of the Manor and the Advantages of Manor Holding in Early Maryland. *Chronicles of St. Mary's* 7(7): 335-357.

Stone, Garry W.

1988 Artifacts Are Not Enough. In Mary C. Beaudry, editor, *Documentary Archaeology in the New World*, pp. 68-78. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Strickland, Scott M.

n.d. History of Boarman's Rest at Hollybrook Subdivision. Possession of the author.

Sudbury, Byron, ed.

1983 Historic Clay Tobacco Pipe Studies, vol. 2. Ponca City, OK: Byron Sudbury.

Valentiner, Wilhem R.

1911 German Stoneware. *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 6(8): 159-163.

Walker, Iain C.

1977 *History and Archaeology 11D: Clay Tobacco-Pipes, With Particular Reference to the Bristol Industry.* Ottawa, Canada, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch.

Walsh, Lorena S.

1987 Staying Put or Getting Out: Findings for Charles County, Maryland, 1650-1720, *William and Mary Quarterly* (3d Series) 44:89-103.

Watkins, Malcolm

1960 *North Devon Pottery and Its Export to America in The 17th Century.* Technical Publication No. 13. Washington, DC, Smithsonian Institution.

Webster, Donald B.

1971 *Decorated Stoneware Pottery of North America*. Rutland/Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, Inc.

Wertenbaker, Thomas J.
1952 The Archaeology of Colonial Williamsburg. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical* Society 97(1): 44-50.

Wicks, John2003 Identifying Glass Bottles. NAHOP Artifact Studies. Archaeology Unit, MemorialUniversity of Newfoundland.

Willmott, Hugh

2002 *Early Post-Medieval Vessel Glass in England c. 1500-1670.* York, England, Council for British Archaeology.