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Occupational Differences Reflected In Material Culture

Kathleen Joan Bragdon

INTRODUCTION

One of the basic, yet largely untested assumptions in historical archaeology is that the amount and quality of artifacts recovered from a site reflect something of the social and economic status of its former occupants. While this assumption is clearly justified at a certain level of explanation, several studies, including those of James Deetz at Parting Ways (1977), and Vernon Baker at Black Lucy's Garden (1977), have challenged the overall validity and general usefulness of the concept, as it applies to sites occupied by non-Anglo-Americans. The model must also be qualified in order to account for occupational differences, which seem to contribute as much to the nature of artifactual remains at a site as do social and economic status.

The sites chosen for a study of occupational differences as they are reflected in material culture are the Joseph Howland site, the homestead of a well-respected yeoman farmer in Kingston, Massachusetts, and the Wellfleet Tavern site, on the north side of Great Island, Wellfleet, Massachusetts, the dwelling/tavern of a socially prominent individual named Samuel Smith. The differences in the material culture assemblages from the two sites, determined through functional analysis of the artifacts, are well aligned with evidence from probate inventories representing yeomen and tavern keepers, and with what is known through historical documentation about the 17th and early 18th century occupations of tavern keeper and yeoman farmer.

The Tavern in the Late 17th and Early 18th Centuries

The consumption of alcoholic beverages was an integral part of 17th and 18th century life. The 17th century farmer drank about a gallon of ale daily (Anderson and Deetz 1970). Wine also was consumed in large quantities, as indicated by the enormous yearly wine importation from the Madiera Island (Duncan 1972:48). The importance of alcohol in Puritan Massachusetts is also indicated by the large amount of legislation concerning its sale and consumption (Pulsifer 1861, Shurtleff 1856).

As the dispenser of liquors, the character of the tavern keeper was also subject to much of this Puritan legislation. The House of Representatives for Suffolk County, for instance, voted in 1697 that "each inn holder and retailer shall be persons of good repute and obtain the approbation of the selectmen before they first have their license" (Commonwealth n.d.: 122).

In addition, the tavern keeper needed a substantial amount of capital in order to pursue this occupation. Hugh March of Newbury complained, "I was thereupon encouraged to dispense a large estate for the keeping of an ordinary, and a place which was purchased for it at a very dear rate" (Commonwealth n.d.:76). According to the same source, in 1743, another tavern keeper, Thomas Stone of Weymouth, refused to keep a tavern any longer, because of the cost and harrassment.

Laws specified the taverner's character, and the services he was to provide. In 1671, the General Court of the Colony of New Plymouth enacted eight ordinances (Brigham 1836: 287-288):

1. No liquor was to be sold, or inn to be kept, except by license of the court.
2. The innkeeper was required to provide adequate bedding, pasture, and "good beer."
3. The innkeeper was required to sell beer for no more than 2s/qt. or wine for 2p/qt, or "strong waters" for more than it cost him for "Butte or caske."
4. The taverners were not "to suffer any disorder, by excessive drinking in or at their house."
5. Liquor was not to be sold on Sunday.
6. The innkeeper was required to report the names of any "disorderly persons" to the court.
7. A committee was formed to enforce the regulations of the court.
8. The innkeeper was not allowed to serve servants, children or Indians.

The food served in the ordinaries, inns and taverns was similar to that provided in the
home (Spitulnik 1972:38). Alcoholic beverages, however, particularly the “strong waters” and certain punches and egg drinks, were the province and specialty of the late 17th and early 18th century tavern. These special elements of the “foodways” system required special containers and utensils as well (Anderson as quoted by Deetz 1973:16). These material objects made up the material culture assemblage characteristic of tavern activity.

**Tavern Assemblages**

The most common forms of drinking vessels found in English taverns in the late 17th and early 18th centuries included (Hackwood 1909:340-375):

1. the tumbler—for large draughts and heavy drinking
2. the tyg—for communal drinking
3. the bellarmine—a Frechen stoneware jug decorated with incised and molded masks and seals
4. the toby jug—a later form of jug formed in the shape of a fat human figure with a mug, pipe and three-cornered hat
5. the posset pot—used for soups and stews as well as beverages
6. the black jack—a leather drinking mug
7. the punch bowl—introduced into England with alcoholic punches such as arrack
8. the bombard—a large leather drinking vessel
9. wine and flip glasses

Pewter vessels were also common in English and Anglo-American taverns. John Wipple’s tavern in Providence, Rhode Island (1674-1685) was equipped with “pewter basins, quart pot, pint pots, gill pots, a tankard, pint pot, spoons, glass bottles and other dishes” (Field 1897:29).

Other common drinking vessels included the mug and cup, made of such ceramic wares as Westerwald stoneware, dipped and white saltglazed stoneware, English brown stoneware, mottled ware, and combed, dotted and trailed slipware (Noel-Hume 1961a, Barber 1907b, and Honey 1933). All of these ceramic types have been found on late 17th and early 18th century colonial sites in New England.

Many types of glass drinking vessels were also available in the colonial market during this period. References to “Bristol Glass” appeared in Boston newspaper advertisements as early as 1704. These advertisements specified such forms as “double flint wine glasses, common glasses, wormed wine glasses, decanters,” and other less common forms such as “cruets and tumblers” (Dow 1927:97-98). These advertisements imply that many forms and qualities of glassware were available to the public and could be bought in small quantities, or “by the hogshead” (Dow 1927:87).

The glass wine or liquor bottle was also available from the earliest periods of colonization. Most bottles were of English manufacture (Noel-Hume 1961b, McNulty 1971). The late 17th and early 18th century bottles were inefficient for “binning” or storing wine, because of their shape, and were more often used as decanters or for drawing small quantities of wine from a larger cask or barrel.

References to the importing of wine into Virginia in the colonial period are plentiful and show that it was transported both in the wood and in bottles. Merchants, having imported in the wood, were prepared to decant into bottles providing the purchaser supplied his own (1961b:111).

In fact, it was the consensus that wine should be stored in large containers rather than in bottles for hygienic reasons. John Wright, an 18th century physician, wrote:

> It hath long been our opinion, that good wine, particularly port, may be better conserved in a larger body or quantity than a quart bottle can contain ... the glass quart bottle can be conveniently used in small families or tete-a-tete parties, but in larger companies, it seems much probable that a great quantity drawn off with a syphon would be finer, more free from the carelessness of decantation ... (Simon 1927:137).

Thus, although bottles were available, they may not always have been an important part of a tavern assemblage.

An equally important element of tavern behavior, with its own characteristic accoutrements, was the smoking of tobacco. Early references to such practice referred to it as “drinking tobacco.” Taverns, drinking and smoking were so inseparable in 17th and 18th century England, that one social critic remarked, “There is not so base a groome, that commes into an ale-house to call for his pot, but he must have his pipe of tobacco, for it is a commodity that is now as vendible in every tavern” (Bridenbaugh 1967:195).

There were many early ordinances against smoking in public places, including taverns
TABLE I
MEAN VARIABLES PER INVENTORY 1690-1750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Kingston Domestic</th>
<th>Plymouth Area Taverns</th>
<th>Martha’s Vineyard Taverns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># mean</td>
<td># mean</td>
<td># mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>132 3.3</td>
<td>11 2.8</td>
<td>25 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>51 1.1</td>
<td>6 1.5</td>
<td>49 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>226 5.5</td>
<td>42 10.5</td>
<td>213 16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desks</td>
<td>2 .04</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>8 .4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlesticks</td>
<td>21 .5</td>
<td>12 3</td>
<td>7 .35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottles</td>
<td>104 2.6</td>
<td>22 5.5</td>
<td>3000 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winglasses</td>
<td>20 .5</td>
<td>13 3.2</td>
<td>21 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td>35 .83</td>
<td>52 13</td>
<td>20 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pots</td>
<td>174 4.3</td>
<td>26 6.5</td>
<td>20 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallons Liquor</td>
<td>8 .02</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>969 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I:
Comparison among inventories of Plymouth tavern keepers with those from Martha’s Vineyard and Kingston

(Pulsifer 1891:27,36,53). The practice of smoking became so widespread by the mid-17th century, however, that most inn and tavern keepers provided pipes and tobacco gratis (Hackwood 1909:381). Pipes were reused, after having been refired in a special rack in the oven. The “recycled” pipes were used in the taproom, while the new pipes were reserved for “parlour” customers (Penn 1902:151). Pipes therefore, along with ceramic drinking vessels, glassware and metal serving dishes made up the basic “material culture” assemblage of the tavern.

In summary, the documentary evidence suggests that the tavern keeper was a man of “good repute” and some substance. He would have been expected to provide the following in his tavern:

1. vessels for the consumption of alcohol, including mugs, pots, cups, tankards, wine glasses, beakers and serving vessels such as tumblers
2. serving vessels, including platters, bowls, bottles, pitchers and jugs
3. clay tobacco pipes for smoking

Probate inventories from the estates of tavern-keepers document such an assemblage of objects, in contrast to inventories of yeomen, which generally do not.

Probate Analysis

Probate inventories, although not always dependable sources (Brown 1972, Stone 1970), provide a large and readily accessible body of information concerning the use and importance of material objects. Systematic analysis of probate inventories of tavern keepers and yeomen farmers reveals differences in the patterning or occurrence of material objects, which should in turn reflect occupational differences.

Previous inventory studies have often been concerned with relating the amount and type of ceramics listed in the inventories to the economic status of the probated individual (Teller 1968, Carr 1972). Although there seems to be some correlation between wealth and the occurrence of certain ceramic types in the Plymouth Colony inventories (Brown 1972), the occupation of the individual often appears to have been an equally important determinant in which items appeared in the inventories.

The inventories for the study included:

1. All inventories of yeomen of the town of Plymouth from 1690-1730 (the date of the incorporation of the township of Kingston) and from Kingston from 1730-1750. These inventories (42) were chosen because of the location of the test domestic site, the Joseph Howland Site.
2. All inventories (19) of known tavern keepers from Martha’s Vineyard (1690-1750). Inventories of only those individuals who were known to have kept a tavern more than five years were chosen. The Vineyard inventories were chosen over those from Wellfleet (the
are summarized in Table I. Objects and items associated with tavern activities, including bottles, wineglasses, serving dishes, and specialized vessels, as well as large numbers of tables and chairs, were in all cases more frequently listed in the tavern keeper's inventories than in those of yeomen. The occupational differences reflected in the probate inventories are also visible in the artifact assemblages of tavern and domestic sites.

The results of the probate record analysis are summarized in Table I. Objects and items associated with tavern activities, including bottles, wineglasses, serving dishes, and specialized vessels, as well as large numbers of tables and chairs, were in all cases more frequently listed in the tavern keeper's inventories than in those of yeomen. The occupational differences reflected in the probate inventories are also visible in the artifact assemblages of tavern and domestic sites.

The Sites and Their Occupants

The sites chosen for the study are thought to have been the locations of different activities: the Joseph Howland site was a farmstead in Kingston, Massachusetts, occupied from 1674-1750 (Deetz 1960a,b), and the Wellfleet Tavern Site, located on the north side of Great Island, Wellfleet, Massachusetts, a tavern associated with the fishing and whaling industries of late 17th and 18th century Cape Cod (Eckholm and Deetz 1970).

The Joseph Howland Site

The Joseph Howland site was occupied by Captain Joseph Howland and his son James. Joseph Howland acquired the lands at Rocky Nook in Kingston upon the death of his father John in 1672. By the terms of his father's will, Joseph Howland inherited "the dwelling house at Rocky Nook together with all the outhousing, uplands and meadows, appurtenances and priviledges belonging thereunto," (Massachusetts Society n.d.:72).

However, according to Joseph's biography, John Howland's house was burned in 1675, during King Phillip's War (Howland Quarterly XIII:4). Foundations of a partially burned, 17th century structure on the property said to be Howland's indicate that the information provided by the biography is probably correct (Hussey 1938:11).

Joseph Howland built another dwelling on a different sector of the property, within one year of the burning of his father's house (Deetz 1960a:4). This dwelling was bequeathed to his son James in 1703 (Plymouth County Probate Records n.d.:43-45). The house and surrounding land were sold to Benjamin Lothrop in 1735 and the house continued to be occupied until approximately 1750 (Deetz 1960a, 1960b:4).

Aside from his large land holdings, Joseph Howland owned (at least at the time of his death) very little personal property, as indicated by the probate inventory from his estate (Plymouth County Probate Records 6:90):

An Inventory of the Estate of Capt. Joseph Howland
late of plimouth desased taken and apprised by us the underwritten

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imprints in his waring apparill &amp; books</td>
<td>04 10 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in armes at</td>
<td>03 06 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in puter and brass</td>
<td>03 14 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in one small silver Cupp</td>
<td>00 04 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in one bed &amp; furnetur to it &amp; curtains</td>
<td>08 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in two beds &amp; furniture to them</td>
<td>07 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in Iron pots &amp; kettell hangers</td>
<td>01 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in a grate table &amp; forme &amp; Cupbard &amp; 4 Chests &amp; a box</td>
<td>04 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in Chairs one table &amp; table lining &amp; earthenware</td>
<td>02 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in one saddle &amp; pillion 2 sives</td>
<td>01 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in New Cloath</td>
<td>03 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in one pare of small stillards, Jarr</td>
<td>00 06 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in 4 barrels &amp; one Tubb</td>
<td>00 10 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in Neete Cattle one yock oxen</td>
<td>07 10 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in 4 cows</td>
<td>11 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in 2 three year old sters at</td>
<td>03 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in 2 two year olds &amp; three calves</td>
<td>04 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in 24 sheep at</td>
<td>07 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in two Mars at</td>
<td>04 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3 wine</td>
<td>00 18 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in Cart &amp; plow and tackling</td>
<td>00 15 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in one spade one frow one drawing knife &amp; ax &amp; stih</td>
<td>00 12 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in one pestle &amp; mortar &amp; one saw</td>
<td>00 13 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item in 2 spining wheeles</td>
<td>00 08 00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John Bradford
John Cray

Yet he appears to have been a prominent member of the community. He was appointed a treasurer's accountant in 1678, a freeman in 1683, and a selectman in 1684 (Shurtleff 1957:25,189,196).
Joseph Howland's probate inventory suggests that although he was a respected member of his community, his "status" was not reflected in his material goods, but rather in his lands. His large land holdings, which constituted most of his wealth, also reflect his primary occupation, that of farming.

The Wellfleet Tavern

That Samuel Smith operated the Wellfleet tavern is suggested by a document dated 1731 in which he calls himself an "inn holder" (Hogan 1971:2). Oral history research done in 1970 reveals that a sign once hung outside his tavern, located on the north side of Great Island, which read:

Samuel Smith, He has Good Flip:
Good Toddy, If You Please.
The Way is Near and Very Clear,
Tis Just Beyond the Trees.

Positive identification of the Wellfleet site with Smith's tavern is impossible due to the destruction of the deeds from Great Island in a courthouse fire. However, local tradition, and several indirect references to Smith's holdings on Great Island make such an identification feasible (Shurtleff 1856:Vol. VI, VIII; 1857:IX).

Wellfleet, for a time, participated in the thriving economy surrounding the hunting of blackfish and whales, and the harvesting of oysters. Records of the Massachusetts General Courts describe the area in the early 18th century stating: "There is not its like for whaling and other fishing within the country, if within the province..." (Commonwealth n.d.:10).

Samuel Smith invested in other trades, as did many other tavern keepers in commercial centers (Bridenbaugh 1938). He had a particular interest in the fishing and off-shore whaling industries for which Wellfleet was famous. The Plymouth Colony court records of 1754 state:

An agent was chosen to settle the petition of Samuel Smith, Esquire, to the general court, concerning Billingsgate Beach and islands (Wellfleet). Chose a committee to prosecute the Horwich people for carrying on the Whale fishery at Billingsgate (Pratt 1844:70).

Samuel Smith's interest in fishing and whaling, and the general economic prosperity of Wellfleet in the late 17th and early 18th centuries probably explain the presence of a large tavern in such a relatively isolated spot as the north side of Great Island.

An oyster blight in 1760 (Whitman 1794:119) and the growth of deep water whaling (Kittredge 1930), caused a decline in the Wellfleet economy. This led to the depopulation of Great Island, and probably to the closing of Smith's tavern (Eckholm and Deetz 1970). His dwelling house, which was separate from the tavern, was moved to South Wellfleet in 1800.

Samuel Smith, like Joseph Howland, was a prominent member of his community. In 1735, he was appointed an agent to carry on the building of the new meeting house. In 1763, he was chosen the moderator of the first meeting of the newly formed Wellfleet. His title at that time was "Esquire" (Pratt 1844:123-124).

Socially, Samuel Smith and Joseph Howland occupied similar positions. According to Dawes (1949:80-81) only three out of 3,440 freemen in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in the 17th and early 18th centuries were designated "esquire," and only twelve had military titles. In addition, it is widely held that selectmen held the most important position in local government at that time (Wall 1965:600).

Their occupations, however, were very different. Thus, variance in the archaeological assemblages from the Joseph Howland domestic site and the Wellfleet tavern site, should reflect these occupational differences, confirming patterns seen in the probate inventories.

Artifact Analysis

The differences between the archaeological assemblages of the Wellfleet Tavern and the Joseph Howland sites, were analyzed to determine: (1) vessel form, (2) percentages of ceramic types based on glaze and paste, (3) types of decorative motifs (any applied design), (4) types and numbers of glassware, (5) types and numbers of bottles, and (6) numbers of pipe-stems.
### TABLE II
CERAMIC VESSEL FORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Plate/Pan</th>
<th>Pan</th>
<th>Pan/Dish</th>
<th>Dish</th>
<th>Lard Pot</th>
<th>Porringer</th>
<th>Cup</th>
<th>Mug</th>
<th>Mug/Beaker</th>
<th>Beaker</th>
<th>Jug</th>
<th>Bowl</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mottled Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgraffito</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slipware</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Stoneware</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltglaze</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel-Temp.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frechen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerwald</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip-Decorated Redware</td>
<td>1 11 20 1 3 5 17 3 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated Fine Redware</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated Coarse Redware</td>
<td>19 17 4 15 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11 2 22 2 1 17 8 15 29 5 4 6 21 134 9 11 37 7 6 30 21 16 56 4 15 5 19 240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joseph Howland site figures in upper quadrant  
Wellfleet Tavern site figures in lower quadrant
Ceramics

The vessels were counted and given a vessel form type through the analysis of rim and base sherds. Each base and rim was drawn, and vessel forms were determined on the basis of comparison with the rims and bases of surviving vessels, and through partial reconstruction of the vessels, when possible. It was often difficult to precisely determine the vessel form, and in these cases a category such as plate/pan was employed.

Ceramic forms were found to include thirteen shapes, including pans, lard pots, pudding pans, baking dishes, plates, patty-pans, porringer, cups, mugs, beakers and jugs. Pans, lard pots, pudding pans, and baking dishes were most often associated with food preparation and storage, especially as it relates to dairying, an important subsistence activity of the 17th and 18th centuries (Deetz 1972, Watkins, L.1966). These vessels were designed for heavy use as indicated by the coarseness and solidity of the majority of the vessels of this type (Watkins:1950).

Comparison of the ceramic assemblages from the Wellfleet and Joseph Howland sites reveals differences in the vessel form totals and in the ceramic type percentages from both sites (Table II and III).

The Wellfleet sub-assemblage consists of a greater percentage of those vessel forms associated with drinking, and fewer forms associated with food preparation and storage than does the sub-assemblage from the Joseph Howland site.

The percentages of ceramic types in each ceramic sub-assemblage differ as well. Six of the eight most common ceramic types (treated as two types) at the Wellfleet site are known to have been most often found in the form of mugs, jugs, beakers, posset pots and cups (Deetz, personal communication: 1976). Only five such types appear within the eight most common types at the Joseph Howland site (Table III).

Figure 1. Redware vessel forms from the Wellfleet Tavern.
Bottles

A minimum of eight wine or liquor bottles were excavated from the Joseph Howland site. The vessels were identified through analysis of base and neck sherds. The basal sherds were generally of a dark green or black glass approximately 1-1.5 cm. thick, and had kick-ups ranging from 1.5-3 cm. in height.

Eight neck fragments were excavated from the Howland site, which appear to have belonged to different bottles. These fragments had string rims neatly attached .3-.5 cm from the mouth. The width of the string rims was approximately .5 cm, and the thickness of the glass in the neck fragments ranged from .3-.5 cm. The diameters of the mouths and rims fell between 2.5 and 4 cm.

The minimum number of bottles found at the Wellfleet tavern site was six (Pichey 1972). Diameters of the basal sherds ranged from 16-20 cm. The kick-ups were all less than 10 cm in height. The shallow kick-ups and the pronounced curvature of the body fragments, date the bottles from 1685-1720 (Noel-Hume 1961:63-64).

Wineglasses

Three wine glasses were excavated from the Joseph Howland site. Eight rim sherds and three stem and base fragments were found. The rim sherds were of three types: a turned rim with an enclosed white band .3 cm wide encircling the edge; a turned rim with an enclosed white band .6 cm wide encircling the rim; and a turned rim with no band.

The stems included two with inverted balusters and knops, one stem having the knops separated by a collar. These stem forms were popular between 1685 and 1730 (Noel-Hume 1961:190). In addition, one stem of four molded facets known as the "Silesian" form was retrieved, which was popular from 1710-1720 (Noel-Hume 1961:191).

At least thirty-two wineglasses represented by stems were excavated at the Wellfleet site. These included six basic types: one quatrefoil form popular from 1685-1705; one double knopped form topped by a tear-drop knop; two molded pedestal "Silesian" form stems, popular from 1715-1740; two straight sided stems; eight inverted baluster and knopped forms popular from 1695-1710; and fourteen to eighteen double and triple knopped stems popular from 1700-1730 (Noel-Hume 1961:191).

The numerous wineglass bowl fragments were thin and gently curved. Although difficult to reconstruct, the most common bowl forms from the Wellfleet site appear to have been the bell-shaped form with the raised rim, and the form with a vertical lip above a marked shoulder (Pichey 1970; Noel-Hume 1961:189).

Twelve dozen basal fragments were also recovered, all of which had folded feet, the most common form from 1680-1750 (Noel-Hume 1961:189).

Tumblers and Beer Glasses

Fifteen pieces representing the bowls of at least three large drinking vessels were excavated from the Wellfleet site. The pieces are distinguishable from the wineglass bowl fragments by their size, thickness, curvature and design. Noel-Hume describes similar finds as "tumblers or beakers with small, molded diamond shaped bosses patterned over the walls, presumably to aid in the gripping of the vessel" (1961:187).

Such beakers were illustrated in the pattern
books of Measy and Greene, English glaziers of the 18th century. These forms were available in two thicknesses, and were designed for beer, wine strong spirits, toddy and flip. (Watkins, C. 1968:154; Noel-Hume 1968:13).

**Pipes**

Thousands of pipe stem fragments were excavated from the Wellfleet site. These fragments like those from the Joseph Howland site, may be dated to the period 1690-1740. The pipe stem and bowl fragments excavated from the Joseph Howland site numbered in the hundreds. Application of Harrington's and Binford's dating formula to a sample of the pipe stem fragments indicates that the largest percentage may be dated to the periods 1650-1680 and 1710-1750 (Deetz 1960a).

**Summary of the Artifact Analysis**

The tavern assemblage is characterized by: 1) a large number of vessels; 2) a large percentage of drinking vessels in relation to the total ceramic sub-assemblage; 3) a large percentage of those ceramic types most often found in the form of drinking vessels; 4) large numbers of wineglasses; 5) specialized glassware; 6) large numbers of pipestems.

Although not documented or tested, the fact that a high percentage of the local slip-decorated redware was found at the supposed tavern site suggests that such cheap, but decorative vessels were purposely supplied for the use of discriminating, but sometimes careless customers.

The domestic assemblage includes: 1) a high percentage of food preparation and stor-
Comparatively little work has been done on historic tavern sites. In addition, most of the taverns which have been excavated fall outside the range of the time period of this study. However, one report of a site of similar period and location was available. Five reports from later time periods and/or different geographic locations were also examined with the expectation that the specialized tavern behavior would be reflected in the artifacts regardless of their location in space and time.

The tavern site most similar to Wellfleet was that of John Earthy’s tavern at Pemaquid, Maine (Camp 1975). Although vessel forms were not published, an examination of the ceramic types and numbers of bottles, glasses and pipes was possible. In order to place Earthy’s tavern assemblage in the proper perspective, two domestic assemblages of the same time period from Pemaquid were also examined. The results are summarized in Table IV.

The percentages of ceramic types from John Earthy’s tavern are comparable to those from Wellfleet. Interestingly, the Pemaquid tavern assemblage also shows much the same contrast to the nearby domestic assemblages, as the Wellfleet assemblage does to that from

### Table IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAMESTOWN (Cotter 1958)</th>
<th>Bottle Fragments</th>
<th>Wine stems</th>
<th>Pipes</th>
<th>Bedware</th>
<th>Slip Decorated</th>
<th>Westerwald</th>
<th>Salt Glaze</th>
<th>Stoneware</th>
<th>Molded Ware</th>
<th>Comb Ware</th>
<th>Slipped Ware</th>
<th>Delft</th>
<th>Fireclay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure 19A, B Tavern 1694</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure 21 Domestic 1680</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEMAQUID (Camp 1975)</th>
<th>Bottle Fragments</th>
<th>Wine stems</th>
<th>Pipes</th>
<th>Bedware</th>
<th>Slip Decorated</th>
<th>Westerwald</th>
<th>Salt Glaze</th>
<th>Stoneware</th>
<th>Molded Ware</th>
<th>Comb Ware</th>
<th>Slipped Ware</th>
<th>Delft</th>
<th>Fireclay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure 2 and 2A 1674-75 John Earthy’s Tavern</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,324</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure 13 Dwelling 1680-1750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure 5 Dwelling 1696</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

age vessels in relation to the total ceramic assemblage; 2) local redware of the predominantly coarse variety; 3) few winglasses; and 4) pipestem fragments numbering in the hundreds, rather than in the thousands.

The “tavern” assemblage in particular is in keeping with what is known from documentary sources about the common equipage of an inn or tavern. The high percentage of drinking vessels, the large numbers of pipe-stems, and the specialized glassware seem to be especially diagnostic. Such a grouping of material objects known to have been symbolic of, and most often associated with, the serving and consumption of alcohol may be described as a functional grouping, and may, like that of the probate analysis, be attributed to the specific activities of the tavern.

### Comparative Sites

Because a comparison between the assemblages of only two sites can not be considered definitive, the material culture model based on the documentary information and on the analysis of the archaeological assemblages from the Joseph Howland and the Wellfleet sites was compared with the artifact assemblages from other published site reports.
the Joseph Howland site. In both tavern assemblages, the sherd count is higher, and there is a higher percentage of those ceramic types associated with drinking vessels. Both tavern sites also had a larger number of wineglasses and pipestem fragments than did domestic assemblages with which they were compared.

Another possible tavern site of a similar time period is that tentatively identified by Cotter in his excavations at Jamestown (1958). The artifact assemblage from that site and a nearby domestic site are compared in Table IV. The tavern assemblage seems to be similar to that from Wellfleet, although it has fewer wineglass fragments than the compared domestic site.

Of the positively identified tavern sites, Wetherburn’s tavern, excavated by Ivor Noel-Hume, at Williamsburg, Virginia, is the closest in time to the Wellfleet site. Although artifact lists were not published in the site report, Noel-Hume does note that large numbers of winestems, pipes, and drinking vessel sherds were found (1969).

The assemblages from four other taverns were also compared to that from the Wellfleet site. The sites included the Vereberg Tavern in Albany County N.Y. (Fiester 1975), the Searight Tavern in southwest Pennsylvania (Michael 1971), the Man Full of Trouble Tavern in Philadelphia (Huey 1966) and the Orringh Stone Tavern in Brighton, N.Y. (Hayes 1965). Although these sites differ from Wellfleet in time and location, their assemblages showed very high percentages of ceramics associated with food service and drinking, large numbers of vessels, and large amounts of glassware.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the evidence from several tavern sites, from probate inventories, and from historical documentation suggest that the differences revealed by a functional analysis of the archaeological assemblages from the Wellfleet Tavern and the Joseph Howland sites, probable tavern and domestic sites occupied by individuals of similar social status, are not merely the function of that social position, or of wealth, but also the reflection of the occupations of each individual, and the activities carried out at each site.
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