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Excavations at the Smith-Maskell Site (28CA124) in the Spring of 2011 by URS Corporation revealed a number of early 19th-century features behind what was once 318 Cooper Street in Camden, New Jersey. These features produced significant quantities of Federal period tea and tablewares, including a number of Philadelphia queensware vessels. During this period Camden was beginning its transition from a scattering of sparsely populated villages to a city of summer residences and country retreats for Philadelphia’s well-to-do middle class. The likely owners of the Philadelphia queensware found at the Smith-Maskell Site were among this prosperous middle class, and thus the presence of this ware in their household assemblages insinuates that consumer choice, particularly related to patriotism and the desire to support domestic industries, played an important factor in the ware’s apparent popularity and widespread distribution. While trade embargos in place before and after the War of 1812 certainly affected the availability of English ceramics, the Philadelphia queensware found at the Smith-Maskell site speaks to other forces at work as well.

Des fouilles menées par la firme URS Corporation au site archéologique Smith-Maskell (28CA124) au printemps 2011 ont révélé, près de l’endroit où se situait à l’époque le 318 rue Cooper à Camden au New Jersey, plusieurs éléments datant du 19e siècle. Lors de cette fouille, des ensembles à thé de même que de la vaisselle de table ont été mis au jour, dont plusieurs en Philadelphia queensware. À cette époque, la région de Camden était en pleine transition. Les villages dispersés et peu peuplés de la région de Camden ont laissé place aux résidences d’été et aux chalets de la classe aisée de Philadelphie. Il y a peu de doutes que les pièces vaisselle en Philadelphia queensware mis au jour sur le site appartenaient à la classe aisée. La présence de pièces en Philadelphia queensware dans l’assemblage de cette maisonne suggesting que le choix des consommateurs, en particulier a ce qui a trait au patriotisme et au désir d’encourager l’industrie domestique, a largement contribué à la popularité de ce type de céramique et à sa distribution. Les embargos commerciaux en place avant et après la guerre de 1812 ont eu un impact sur la disponibilité des céramiques anglaises, mais la présence de pièces en Philadelphia queensware au site archéologique de Smith-Maskell illustre bien qu’il y avait d’autres forces en jeu.

The Smith-Maskell Site (28CA124)

In March and April 2011 URS Corporation conducted Phase II and Phase III data-recovery excavations at the Smith-Maskell site (archaeological site trinomial 28CA124) in Camden, New Jersey (Affleck et al. 2012: 6.1) (fig. 1). This approximately 1 ac. site was southwest of the intersection of 4th and Cooper streets among mixed residential and commercial development, much of which is associated with the Camden Campus of Rutgers University. This parcel, slated for the construction of new student housing for the Rutgers University campus, was bounded on the north by Cooper Street, to the east by 4th Street, to the south by row houses along Market Street, and on the west by buildings along 3rd Street. Open areas of the site, prior to excavations, consisted of gravel and paved parking areas, although several buildings dating from the early 19th through early 20th centuries were also present within the project area. Portions of the project area fell within the Cooper Street Historic District, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The January 2011 Phase I survey of the property and the subsequent Phase II and Phase III data recovery excavations were conducted for John Cullinane Associates, LLC, the Michaels Development Company, and the Camden County Improvement Authority (Affleck et al. 2012: 6.1).

Mechanical stripping, mechanical trenching, and manual test unit and feature
excavation within the site during the combined Phase II and Phase III data recovery excavations revealed a total of 79 early 19th-century to early 20th-century features and recovered 19,463 artifacts (Affleck et al. 2012: 1.2). The majority of these features were identified in a yard area behind an early 19th-century structure (a former Red Cross Building) and other houses that had formerly fronted on Cooper Street, specifically 312, 318, and 322 Cooper Street. The features identified included wood-lined box privies, barrel privies, brick-lined shafts, landscaping features, and numerous other trash pits and postholes (Affleck et al. 2012: 1.1). Of particular interest to this discussion are the wood-lined box privies (Features 3, 4, and 35) found at the property line between 318 and 322 Cooper Street. These features are likely associated with the early 19th-century occupation of 318 Cooper Street, before its subsequent division into two parcels. Two of these features (3 and 4) were identified in the north and south profiles of a test trench running west from the basement of 322 Cooper Street, and their locations seem to fall within the former alleyway between the two addresses. Feature 35 was found just south of Feature 3, also falling within the north–south orientation of the historical alley. A discussion of the Philadelphia
primarily on lots purchased by wealthy Philadelphians, and by 1800 four ferry lines were operating on the Delaware River from three sites—Cooper’s Point, Camden, and Kaighnton—around each of which separate settlements developed. With the rise of early industry in the area and rising population during the first three decades of the 19th century, these individual villages, originally separated by a half mile of woods or farmland, consolidated, and the city of Camden was established in 1828 (City of Camden 2017). Indeed, the location of Camden between the Delaware and Cooper rivers—together with its proximity to Philadelphia and its established system of ferries and stages—spurred industry in Camden, and the city became the gateway that linked Philadelphia to all the important towns of South Jersey.

The 318 Cooper Street property, designated Lot 77 on the original town plan, was first sold to a George Napper in 1773, but...
was apparently still vacant when Edward Smith purchased it from Napper in 1804 (New Jersey State Archives 1804). Edward Smith, a wealthy merchant from a prestigious and affluent family, purchased, rented, sold, and built many properties in Camden from 1801, shortly after he and his family arrived in the Philadelphia/Camden area, until shortly before his death in 1837 (Munro 1888). Smith was a New Jersey ironmaster and Philadelphia iron merchant, and by ca. 1819 had purchased the Cumberland Furnace near Millville, New Jersey (Public Ledger 1838). By 1808, he was living and conducting his merchant business on North Front Street, between Race and Vine streets in Philadelphia (Robinson 1808).

Edward Smith purchased the parcels that became the neighboring 312 Cooper Street from 1801 to 1805 and eventually occupied the house there with his wife, Sarah, primarily during the summer months (New Jersey State Archives 1801a, 1801b, 1805). Indeed, Smith described this house as his “summer mansion” (New Jersey State Archives 1857). Edward Smith’s wife, Sarah “Sallie” Maskell, came from an important Presbyterian family with roots in Cumberland County, New Jersey. Sarah’s unmarried sister, Hannah, purchased 318 Cooper Street from her brother-in-law, Edward Smith, in 1811, and owned the house there until 1836 (New Jersey State Archives 1811). As an unmarried daughter, Hannah Maskell had inherited a significant amount of property from her parents after their deaths in 1803 and 1805, including a 36 ac. farm with additional farmland, woodland, and marshland in Cumberland County (Andrews 1927: 12, 16a–19). After the sudden deaths of Hannah and Sarah’s brother Abijah and his wife in the summer of 1806, however, it is not surprising that Hannah chose to make her home next to the only family she had left, her sister Sarah and brother-in-law Edward Smith.

Hannah Maskell did eventually get married, in 1816, to Dr. Samuel Moore Shute and moved to Bridgeton, Cumberland County, with her new husband. He was one of the most prominent physicians in the town, but he died a mere six weeks later, following a “short but severe illness” (Washington Whig 1816). She married again in 1823, this time to Alexander Henry, himself a widower and one of Philadelphia’s wealthiest merchants. Alexander Henry had arrived from Ireland around 1783 and ultimately found success as a dry-goods merchant. By the time he retired from business in ca. 1846, he had a fortune estimated at $500,000 (Merchant of Philadelphia 1846: 30). Hannah Maskell Shute Henry sold 318 Cooper Street back to her brother-in-law, Edward Smith, in 1836, after which time Smith began renting out the brick house on the property (New Jersey State Archives 1836). Alexander Henry died in 1847, and Hannah Maskell Shute Henry died in 1869 at the age of 87 (Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Death Certificates 1847, 1869). There is no record of Hannah having any children. After Edward Smith died in 1857 at the age of 86, he and Sarah’s eldest daughter Esther inherited both 312 and 318 Cooper Street and continued to rent out the properties, with Smith family ownership continuing into the 1880s.

According to the historical research, it seems that initial development of the project block took place around 1810 with the construction of houses at 312 and 318 Cooper Street by Edward Smith, his wife Sarah, and sister-in-law Hannah Maskell. At the time of this primary development, Camden was just beginning its transition from a collection of sparsely populated ferry villages to a city of summer residences for the well-to-do middle class. Edward Smith, Hannah Maskell, and family were among this newly prosperous middle class and, indeed, the houses at 312 and 318 Cooper Street essentially became their summer vacation homes. The desire among Philadelphia’s wealthiest residents to establish country retreats outside the crowded city accelerated after 1815, and the development of Camden coincided with this process (Clark 2006: 160).
Figure 3. Exterior view of common-shape, Philadelphia-queensware bowl from Feature 3. (Photo by Thomas J. Kutys, 2011.)

Figure 4. Exterior views of small, Philadelphia queesware hollowware vessels with everted rims from Feature 3. (Photo by Thomas J. Kutys, 2011.)
Philadelphia Queensware (and Its Contemporaries) from the Smith-Maskell Site

The presence of a number of vessels cross-mended between Features 3 and 35, and similarities in the mean ceramic date (MCD) ranges for the two features (1790–1820 for Feature 3 and 1792–1836 for Feature 35) indicate that the two privies were closely contemporary and make differentiating them chronologically problematic (Affleck et al. 2012: 5.1). The majority of the Philadelphia queensware recovered from the Smith-Maskell site was found in Features 3 and 35, with all exhibiting refined forms and featuring chalky, buff to off-white bodies with glazes in various shades of yellow. The most complete of the Philadelphia-queensware vessels, a thinly potted, common-/Chinese-shape bowl from Feature 3, bears fine, horizontal lines visible on the lower-exterior body and a number of subtle gouges and flaws throughout, likely the result of lathe trimming (FIG. 3). A band of coal soot is visible around the rim, more pronounced on the exterior, and there is a moderate amount of crazing across the vessel. As with many examples of Philadelphia queensware, very small, reddish iron speckling is visible all through the vessel. To date, the common-shape cup and bowl form, typically undecorated, seems to be one of the most commonly found Philadelphia-queensware forms (See Cress et al. [this issue] for a rare decorated example).

Mended portions of what seem to be at least two unique Philadelphia-queensware vessels were also recovered from Feature 3 (FIG. 4). The form represented is likely a baker, basin, or bowl, and is characterized by an everted rim. The appearance of two intentional, narrow, incised bands below the rims on each vessel’s exterior varies slightly between the vessels, though their similarities indicate they were probably once part of a single set. These hollowware vessels, though still a refined form, were somewhat more thickly potted than the common-shape bowl from the same feature. Four small sherds of a similar vessel were also found in Feature 4 and predate the rest of the ceramics found with it.

Figure 5. Philadelphia queensware hollowware bases from the Smith-Maskell site. (Photo by Thomas J. Kutys, 2011.)
They constitute the only Philadelphia queensware recovered from that feature. To date, no other examples of this vessel form are known to the authors.

Other Philadelphia-queensware sherds recovered from Feature 3 include a hollowware (likely a bowl) base sherd with a tooled, undercut footring that is slightly square in profile, and a straight rim sherd with a single, tooled band on its exterior and vertical body, likely from a mug or pitcher. Smaller sherds from Feature 35 include a hollowware base sherd with a wedge-shaped, free-standing footring, and two sherds that are probably from the same vessel; a small, tooled rim sherd and body sherd (Fig. 5).

In addition to these Philadelphia-queensware vessels, Features 3 and 35 combined produced over two dozen complete or nearly complete ceramic vessels (Fig. 6). Those vessels with known dates of manufacture yielded a MCD range of 1790–1826 for the combined assemblages (Affleck et al. 2012: 5.1). These contemporaries of the Philadelphia-queensware vessels included bat-printed and both Royal-pattern and Bath-pattern creamwares, and polychrome-painted, blue-painted, blue-printed, and green shell-edged pearlwares (Fig. 7). Two coins from Feature 35, a Liberty-head large cent, dated 1817, and a silver U.S. ten-cent piece dated 1820, provide the terminus post quems (TPQs) for any of the contexts where Philadelphia queensware was found.

Several undecorated, refined white earthenware vessels were also recovered from the two features, namely a round baker, a porringer, and a mug, although the bluish tint of all three of these vessels most closely resembles pearlware. One of the more unique pearlware vessels recovered from Feature 35 has a form of decoration that has come to be known to collectors as Salopian ware (Fig. 6). Consisting of a black-printed landscape motif with additional colors—in the case of the Feature 35 cup, green and yellow painted over the print—Salopian ware differs slightly from the later decorative technique known as clobbering (most common after 1840) because the additional colors are beneath the lead glaze. Clobbering always features colored enamels over the glaze.

In addition to the refined wares, a flat-rimmed, cylindrical, redware close-stool...
Figure 7. Sampling of British-made tablewares from Features 3 and 35, including a green shell-edged pearlware plate, an octagonal creamware plate, a Royal rim-pattern creamware platter, an undecorated pearlware porringer, and an undecorated pearlware baker. (Photo by Thomas J. Kutys, 2011.)

Figure 8. Sampling of predominantly British-made tea and table wares from Feature 4. Note the predominance of later cup and bowl forms (double curve and London shape), and the presence of yellow ware (potentially American made) in the assemblage. (Photo by Thomas J. Kutys, 2011.)
pan, a slip-decorated redware dish with coggled rim, and a gray, salt-glazed stoneware storage jar were also found in Features 3 and 35. The stoneware jar from Feature 3 was likely manufactured locally, in New Jersey or Philadelphia.

The predominance of common-shape tea-ware vessels in Features 3 and 35 indicates that both of these features were likely closed by the 1830s. Indeed, London-shaped cups gradually began to replace this form in the 1820s, and the complete absence of London-shaped vessels, as well as the absence of whitewares (which began to appear on American sites ca. 1820) and yellow wares (ca. 1830) from both features supports this likelihood. Appropriately, Feature 4, the wood-lined box privy also in the rear yard of 318 Cooper Street and located directly north of Features 3 and 35, produced a ceramic assemblage made up almost entirely of whitewares and yellow wares (though without any white granite) predominantly in London-shape cup and bowl forms (fig. 8). Feature 4 yielded an MCD range of 1817–1852, with a TPQ of 1840, and thus apparently was an immediate successor to Features 3 and 35, the foremost Philadelphia queensware-producing features (Affleck et al. 2012: 5.28). As it is currently being interpreted, Feature 4 was probably opened sometime in the early 1830s and closed by the early to mid-1850s.

The only Philadelphia queensware not recovered from Features 3, 4, and 35 was a base sherd from a bowl with a wedge-shaped, freestanding foot ring from Feature 34, and a rim sherd from a creamer or small pitcher from Feature 20. Feature 34, as encountered during the excavation, was extremely shallow and likely represented the bottom of a heavily

Table 1. Approximate Munsell colors for noteworthy Philadelphia-queensware ceramics from the Smith-Maskell site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Body Color (Munsell)</th>
<th>Body Color (Munsell)</th>
<th>Feature No.</th>
<th>Figure No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common-shape bowl</td>
<td>10YR 8/4</td>
<td>10YR 7/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everted-rim hollowware</td>
<td>10YR 8/3</td>
<td>2.5Y 8/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everted-rim hollowware</td>
<td>10YR 8/3</td>
<td>2.5Y 8/6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollowware base sherd with tooled,</td>
<td>10YR 8/3</td>
<td>10YR 8/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undercut foot ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everted-rim hollowware rim sherd</td>
<td>10YR 8/2</td>
<td>2.5Y 8/6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollowware base sherd with tooled,</td>
<td>10YR 8/3</td>
<td>2.5Y 7/4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freestanding foot ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollowware base sherd with tooled,</td>
<td>10YR 8/2–8/3</td>
<td>2.5Y 8/6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wedge-shaped foot ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
truncated box privy. Located at the very rear of the 312 Cooper Street property, the moderate quantity of early through late 19th-century domestic artifacts recovered from Feature 34 represents a more temporally mixed assemblage than the ones encountered in Features 3, 4, and 35, possibly resulting from the severe, later disturbance of the feature. Feature 20, a larger disturbance possibly related to an outbuilding structure was also located behind 312 Cooper Street. Feature 20 yielded a light deposit of early to mid-19th-century artifacts, including creamware, pearlware, whiteware, and redware. The single sherd of Philadelphia queensware from Feature 20 appears to be part of a pouring lip from a creamer or small pitcher, and the top of the rim seems to have been trimmed. There is fine crazing of the glaze, and the vessel may have been underfired. As has been done elsewhere in this issue, a table is provided with the approximate Munsell colors for the significant Philadelphia-queensware pieces from the Smith-Maskell site (Tab 1.). While the color of the glaze is merely the body color showing through the clear glaze, the differences in the appearance of the typically buff-colored paste and the more yellowish appearance through the glaze necessitates two Munsell notations for reference and identification purposes.

In summary, the majority of the Philadelphia queensware found at the Smith-Maskell site in Camden were recovered from two wood-lined box privies located on what was once the 318 Cooper Street property. Both privies seem to have been closed by the 1830s, and the queensware-producing contexts deposited after 1820. The MCD ranges for the other vessels found with the Philadelphia queensware extend from 1790 into the 1820s and include both British- and locally made wares. Of note is that many of the vessel forms, represented by the refined British earthenwares recovered from the two privies, have also been found in Philadelphia queensware at other sites in the region. (See examples of Philadelphia-queensware chamber pots, octagonal and shell-edge flatwares, common-shape cups and bowls, and porringer elsewhere in this issue.) Given the information gained from the archaeological excavation of Features 3 and 35, what can the history of Camden, 318 Cooper Street, and neighboring properties on the block reveal about who may have owned and discarded the Philadelphia-queensware vessels and the significance of their presence in this assemblage of Federal period tea and table wares?

Philadelphia Queensware and the Cooper Street Properties

What has become evident from the history of 318 Cooper Street is that the artifacts recovered from Features 3, 4, and 35 likely represent the combination of several related households. Hannah Maskell probably moved into her new home on Cooper Street in 1811, already with the residuals of multiple inheritances, including her parents’ “household furniture” (likely including tea, table, and kitchen wares) following their deaths in 1803 and 1805, and objects from the household of her brother Abijah and his wife Mary, who both died suddenly in 1806. Hannah would have acquired additional housewares, both new and secondhand, as a result of her brief marriage to Dr. Samuel Moore Shute in 1816, particularly in her role as the executrix of Samuel’s will. Some of the material in the 318 Cooper Street privies surely originated from this estate.

The presence of many whole or nearly complete vessels, and parts of matched sets in Features, 3, 4, and 35 implies that these features represent primary deposits, likely related to house-cleaning events, rather than due to breakage from normal, everyday use. The combined (combined due to nearly identical MCDs and cross-mends between the two neighboring features) MCD range of 1790–1826 with a TPQ of 1820 for Features 3 and 35 matches well with the date of the 1836 transfer of the property from Hannah Maskell.
to Edward Smith, particularly when accounting for time lag between dates of manufacture and ultimate deposition in the privy. The relatively short period of use for Features 3 and 35, from ca. 1810 (about when 318 and 322 Cooper Street seem to have been built) to 1836 would fit the similarly tight MCDs for the features. If the material in Features 3 and 35 is indeed the result of the 1836 sale of property, as theorized, the complete absence of whitewares in these contexts may result from the fact that 318 Cooper Street served primarily as a summer residence, perhaps not the preferred destination for Hannah Maskell’s newest, most stylish housewares. Likewise, the MCD range of 1817–1852, with a TPQ of 1840 for nearby Feature 4 could indicate that this material was deposited around the time of Edward Smith’s death in 1857 and the inheritance of both 318 and 322 Cooper Street by his eldest daughter Esther.

Given the history of 318 Cooper Street, the analysis of the early 19th-century features encountered on the property, and the material recovered from those features, what can then be said about the ownership and meaning of the Philadelphia queensware found there? As presented in the opening article of this issue (White et al., this issue), the perceived period of manufacture of Philadelphia queensware is approximately 1807–1822. This date range would then eliminate the possibility that Hannah Maskell inherited the Philadelphia-queensware vessels from the estates of either of her parents (who died in 1803 and 1805), or her brother’s family (died in 1806). The Philadelphia queensware could certainly, though, have been purchased by Hannah herself during this period or inherited through either of her marriages, to Dr. Samuel Moore Shute in 1816 or Alexander Henry in 1823. And, given the close proximity of her sister Sarah and brother-in-law Edward Smith’s house and these immediate family ties, origin in the Smith household also cannot be ruled out.

As discussed previously, Edward Smith’s prosperity was tied to iron manufacturing, but also benefited from family wealth and preexisting mercantile connections. Counted among the ranks of “professional men,” Smith was one of only five iron merchants in Philadelphia between 1814 and 1838. By 1838 Smith was so successful that the city directories no longer listed a business address for him; he was referred to as a “gentleman” living on the income from his investments (McElroy 1839: 233). By 1846, a little over a decade before his death and as one of the wealthiest citizens of Philadelphia, it was estimated that he possessed a value of $100,000 (Merchant of Philadelphia 1846: 58). Of note is that, in 1831, Edward Smith helped organize iron manufacturers and artisans in the Philadelphia area in an attempt to persuade Congress that American-made iron was of greater quality than imported English material. Smith clearly was a proponent of domestic industries.

Like Edward Smith, Alexander Henry, Hannah Maskell’s second husband, was one of the wealthiest merchants in Philadelphia. Coincidentally (or perhaps not), when John Mullowny sold the Washington Pottery warehouse in 1814 (White et al., this issue), the purchaser was an Alexander Henry. Subsequently, by June 1815, the following advertisement was being run in the Philadelphia Gazette:

To be Let very Low, Two good three story houses, in Market near Schuylkill 6th street, both houses have comfortable dwellings and large stores, calculated for almost any business. One of the Houses has accommodations for a very large family, the keys are at the Washington Pottery. Apply there, or to ALEXANDER HENRY, Minor street. (Philadelphia Gazette 1815a)

By September, Henry was still running a similar advertisement in the newspaper:

To be Let. A COMFORTABLE Dwelling House, with or without a large Store adjoining, in Market street, next door to the Orphan Assylum.
These premises will be rented low to a good tenant.—Keys at the Washington Pottery. Wanted a quantity of BEES WAX, For which the market price will be given. Alexander Henry, Midor street. (Philadelphia Gazette 1815b)

Considering Alexander Henry’s wealth and prominence in the city at the time, the Alexander Henry who purchased the Washington Pottery’s warehouse in 1814 and who was in some way still associated with the pottery by 1815 was likely the same Alexander Henry who later married Hannah Maskell in 1823. Also of note is that on 26 April 1820, an Alexander Henry was named among the newly elected directors of the Pennsylvania Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, a school recently established by David G. Seixas, also of Philadelphia queensware fame (Pennsylvania Institution for the Deaf and Dumb 1821: 5; Miller, this issue; White et al., this issue). The authors believe that this, again, is the same Alexander Henry.

Regardless of whether the purchase of the Washington Pottery warehouse and involvement in the Pennsylvania Institution for the Deaf and Dumb provided Henry direct access to Philadelphia queensware, it clearly reveals a link to the individuals and locations involved in the Philadelphia-queensware industry. Despite Alexander Henry’s personal link to both the Washington Pottery and David G. Seixas, we remain unable to determine who made the Cooper Street Philadelphia-queensware vessels, a circumstance that currently applies to the vast majority of Philadelphia queensware (with the exception of the few known marked or otherwise unique pieces). And, despite the fact that Hannah Maskell married Alexander Henry in 1823, just after the currently accepted 1822 end date for Philadelphia-queensware production, he remains a likely source for the Philadelphia queensware on the Smith-Maskell site. This is not only because of the possibility that Henry owned the Philadelphia queensware prior to his marriage to Hannah Maskell, but also because of the tenuous nature of the current 1822 end date for the ware.

Conclusions

By whatever means, Philadelphia queensware found its way into the 318 Cooper Street privies, and each of the possible sources was financially comfortable enough to afford the newest, trendiest ceramic styles. Not only were Edward Smith and Alexander Henry two of the wealthiest men in Philadelphia at the time, but Hannah Maskell herself, despite the fact that she purchased 318 Cooper Street as a 29-year-old, single woman, certainly had the means to outfit her Cooper Street house following all the current fashions because of her various inheritances. Each of the potential sources of the Philadelphia queensware was financially comfortable, making it unlikely that these Philadelphia-queensware vessels were purchased due to socioeconomic limitations. In the case of 318 Cooper Street, Philadelphia queensware was likely purchased and used as a result of other factors, perhaps as a statement by its owners.

Though trade embargos in place before and after the War of 1812 would surely have affected the availability of some products, particularly British ceramics, it is unlikely that these limitations would have been great enough, especially for the wealthy residents of 318 Cooper Street, to necessitate their purchase of local wares to maintain their desired standards for entertaining and dining. Inscribed on the grave marker of Esther Maskell, the mother of Sarah Maskell Smith and Hannah Maskell Shute Henry, was the simple saying: “A Bright Pattern of Domestic Virtue and Economy.” These attributes were among those most valued in a woman during this period, attributes that were undoubtedly passed down from Esther to Sarah and Hannah. If Sarah and Hannah indeed followed in their mother’s footsteps, this would imply that Philadelphia queensware, too, was considered stylish and trendy at one time. Considering the relative crudity and numerous flaws exhibited by many
of the known Philadelphia-queensware vessels, however, why would its purchase and probable conspicuous display in the household have become such a fad? As thoroughly presented in the opening article of this issue (White et al., this issue), the trade embargos ultimately protected local industries from British competition and thus promoted the former's development and success. It seems likely, however, that a large part of this success was the result of American consumers wanting to show their patriotism by buying American. It is already known that Edward Smith was an important proponent of local industry, and during a period of great uncertainty, when the very existence of the young republic itself was under threat, this sentiment may have been at its strongest. And, perhaps even more significantly, documentary evidence seems to link Alexander Henry directly with the Washington Pottery. Edward Smith and Alexander Henry, as affluent merchants in the urban (and summer suburban) elite, along with their wives, were at the core of America's maturing economy and would surely have endeavored to show overt support for its burgeoning industries.
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hoods, the archaeology of leisure, and the study of historic glass bottles and their distribution patterns across urban settings.
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