

Northeast Historical Archaeology

Volume 46 *Northeast Historical Archaeology*

Article 9

2017

Philadelphia Queensware at the McKean/Cochran Site, Appoquinimink, Delaware

Meta F. Janowitz Dr.

AECOM and the School of Visual Arts, meta.janowitz@aecom.com

Christy R. Morganstein

christy@medartsweb.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://orb.binghamton.edu/neha>

 Part of the [Archaeological Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Janowitz, Meta F. Dr. and Morganstein, Christy R. (2017) "Philadelphia Queensware at the McKean/Cochran Site, Appoquinimink, Delaware," *Northeast Historical Archaeology*: Vol. 46 46, Article 9.

Available at: <https://orb.binghamton.edu/neha/vol46/iss1/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). It has been accepted for inclusion in *Northeast Historical Archaeology* by an authorized editor of The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). For more information, please contact ORB@binghamton.edu.

Philadelphia Queensware at the McKean/Cochran Site, Appoquinimink, Delaware

Meta F. Janowitz and Christy R. Morganstein

Excavations at Site 7-NC-F-13 in New Castle County, Delaware, in advance of construction of State Route 1, uncovered features from a ca. 1800–1825/30 domestic occupation. Among these features was a cellar hole filled with both primary and secondary refuse, including sherds from 11 Philadelphia queensware plates with shell-edge decoration. The two families who occupied the site had connections to the political elite of Delaware and Pennsylvania. This article describes the vessels and speculates about the possible connections between the families' political ties and economic status, and their possession of Philadelphia queensware.

Des fouilles menées au site 7-NC-F-13 dans le comté de New Castle au Delaware, en amont des travaux de construction de la route 1, ont révélé des éléments datant de l'occupation domestique du lieu entre 1800 et environ 1825. Un des éléments mis au jour est une cave remplie de déchets issus de dépôts primaires et secondaires. Onze assiettes en céramique de type Philadelphia queensware ornées d'un décor de type shell-edge ont été identifiées dans ce dépôt. Les deux familles qui occupaient ce site étaient liées à l'élite politique du Delaware et de la Pennsylvanie. Cet article décrit les contenants en céramique et avance des hypothèses quant aux connexions entre les liens politiques, le statut économique et la présence de céramique de type Philadelphia queensware en leur possession.

Introduction

The McKean/Cochran site (7-NC-F-13) was excavated in 1995 by the Cultural Resource Group of Louis Berger & Associates for the Delaware Department of Transportation as part of archaeological surveys and excavations in advance of construction of State Route 1 (Bedell et al. 1999). The site was located on the north bank of the Appoquinimink River, near Odessa, on a level piece of ground above the river slope. The land had been farmed from the mid-18th century up until the construction of the highway in the 1990s. Two phases of European American occupation were identified, the first from about 1750 until 1800, and the second from 1800 until about 1830. After 1830 the site's owners moved to a different location nearby, but one of the structures, a dairy, probably continued in use and might have been used as living quarters for enslaved workers (Bedell et al. 1999: 123).

Over 100 features were identified, although most were fencepost holes or small pits. The larger features were grouped into two sets: features associated with the first household or households, probably tenant farmers;

and features associated with the post-1800 households of two prosperous owner-occupant families. The set of features associated with the second phase of occupation include: Feature 1, a cellar hole; Feature 15, the dairy; and Feature 27, a well (Bedell et al. 1999: 44–56). Feature 1, which was completely excavated, was a foundation, 26 × 18 ft., constructed of large river cobbles joined with mortar and with a plastered inner face. It was partitioned into two rooms and had an external addition, probably a root cellar, and a bulkhead entrance. There were two main strata in the cellar fill: Stratum A, washed-in silt with few artifacts; and Stratum B, demolition rubble plus household and other artifacts. The house was probably in a state of disrepair and/or had stood empty for a while before it was demolished, based on the presence of several lenses of washed-in sandy silt under part of Stratum B (Bedell et al. 1999: 54). More than 17,000 artifacts, over half the site's total, as well as uncounted pieces of brick, mortar, and plaster, were recovered from Stratum B. Stratum B was found in both of the cellar's rooms, but the bulk of the deposit was in the

northern room, where stone and brick from a collapsed chimney, as well as over 3,700 fragments of window glass, were found. The house built on this cellar hole was probably constructed between 1790 and 1805, based on the history of the site's occupation and the absence of cut nails in the demolition debris (slightly fewer than 3,000 nails were found in the feature fill, and almost all the identifiable nails were wrought). The absence of whiteware sherds in the fill suggested to the excavators that the house was demolished shortly after 1820. The ceramic terminus post quem (TPQ) for the fill was derived from five small sherds from at least two vessels of pearlware decorated with transfer printing in a stippled motif made after about 1803 (Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory 2002b). An American penny made in 1810 was also found in the cellar fill (Bedell et al. 1999: 96).

The fill in Feature 1 was composed of both primary and secondary refuse (Bedell et al. 1999: 70–72). The secondary refuse was thought to consist of redeposited artifacts from yard middens and small garbage pits. The primary refuse most likely included the contents of the house when it was demolished, along with other discards from the family living there at that time, in particular faunal materials. Some complete, unusual artifacts were found in the fill, notably a small cannonball, a stirrup and spur, a surgeon's lancet, and a prehistoric stone ax. In addition, 51 relatively intact knives, spoons, and forks were found.¹ Glass artifacts were not abundant; they consisted of sherds from 12 dark green wine/liquor bottles, 1 snuff bottle, 10 vials, 4 tumblers, 3 examples of stemware, 3 miscellaneous tablewares, and 11 unidentified vessels (Bedell et al. 1999: 87). The ceramics show the mixed nature of the fill; of the 517 identified vessels (from over 5,100 sherds), 395 (77%) were <10% complete, 69 (13%) were between 11% and 25% percent complete, 32 (6%) were between 26% and 50% complete, 10

(2%) were between 51% and 75% complete, 8 (1.5%) were between 76% and 99% complete, and 3 (0.5%) were complete.

Philadelphia Queensware and Other Ceramics at the McKean/Cochran Site

Plates made of Philadelphia queensware were part of the assemblage. Sherds from at least 11 Philadelphia queensware vessels were found; 8 from Stratum B in Feature 1 and fragments from 3 other vessels in the plowzone and the top level of the fill in Feature 27 (composed of washed-in plowzone materials). Most are <25% complete, and many are <10% complete. Seven of the eight vessels from the Feature 1 fill are plates; the eighth is represented by one sherd that appears to come from a vessel with an oval shape, probably a platter or baker. The sherds from the plowzone and Feature 27 are from at least three additional plates. Unlike other sites where Philadelphia queenswares have been found, no cups, saucers, pitchers, or chamber pots are in this assemblage.

Five of the plates from Feature 1 have straight octagonal rims, the other two and the oval platter or baker have round rims with scalloped edges. All have molded shell-edge rim motifs (FIG. 1). Their bodies are light yellow to buff colored, and their glazes are clear. Their Munsell hues are 2.5Y 6/8, 5/6, and 7/6, and 10 YR 6/8 and 5/6 (shades of brownish yellow), and 5YR 5/6 and 5/8 (yellowish red). Vessel 89A, the most complete plate, is distinctive because of its multicolored body (FIG. 2). Its base is orange, its marly and cavetto are yellow, and it has green paint around its edge, under the clear glaze and over a shell-edge molded motif. Its body-color variations are probably due to firing conditions, specifically oxidation or reduction during firing and cooling of the kiln.

The round plates have three kiln stilt marks arranged in triangles on their bases and single marks on their faces, where they rested on kiln

1. Twenty-two bone-handled knives, two bone-handled forks, seven tablespoons, one teaspoon, and handles from nineteen other utensils that were either forks or knives (Bedell et al. 1999: 90, plate 25).



Figure 1. Octagonal plate (also shown in Figure 5) and round Philadelphia queensware plate (also shown in Figure 2). (Courtesy of the Delaware Department of Transportation; photo by Rob Tucker, 1996.)



Figure 2. Multicolored plate. (Courtesy of the Delaware Department of Transportation; photo by Rob Tucker, 1996.)



Figure 3. Shell-edge Philadelphia queensware and pearlware plates. (Courtesy of the Delaware Department of Transportation; photo by Rob Tucker, 1996.)



Figure 4. Sherds from octagonal plates. (Courtesy of the Delaware Department of Transportation; photo by Rob Tucker, 1996.)

props during firing. Their body thicknesses are the same as observed with pearlware or creamware vessels. They have no foot rings and were almost certainly made using molds in imitation of pearlware shell-edge plates; the molds might even have been made directly from English-made pearlware vessels (FIG. 3). The five round plates—two from Feature 1 and three more fragmentary ones from other contexts—have simple shell-edge rim motifs with regular scalloped outlines and straight lines painted green. This style of shell-edge decoration was common on pearlware and early whiteware plates made between ca. 1800 and ca. 1840 (Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory 2002a). On pearlware or whiteware vessels, the shell-edge lines are most commonly painted in blue, often in green, and rarely in red, purple, brown, or yellow, but, so far, the only color seen on Philadelphia-queensware plates has been green. We do not know if this was for aesthetic or practical reasons. Philadelphia potters had

been using green, from copper oxide, on their red-bodied slipwares for much of the 18th century—see, for example, Myers (1980)—so would have been familiar with this colorant. Cobalt for blue decorations might not have been easily obtained. Bonnin and Morris, early (ca. 1769–1772) makers of porcelain in Philadelphia did use cobalt blue on their wares (Brown 2007), but it probably was considerably more costly than green from copper oxide. The two round plates from Feature 1 have 9 in. diameters, while the one measurable plate from outside the feature is 8 in. As a group, the round plates show light use-wear marks on their surfaces, with some stacking wear along the edges where their marlys (rims) met their cavettos (side walls).

The five octagonal plates have straight-rim outlines with molded shell edges beneath their rims. One of the plates has green painted over the lines under the glaze, but the others do not. It is possible that the color is so faint on these plates, because the pigment was not properly



Figure 5. Octagonal Philadelphia queensware and pearlware plates. (Courtesy of the Delaware Department of Transportation; photo by Rob Tucker, 1996.)

TABLE 1. Plates from Feature 1 (vessel counts)

Ware	Vessel Count
Creamware	
Undecorated	33
Pearlware, Shell Edge	
Blue	19
Green	18
Other	1
Philadelphia Queensware	
Round, green edge	5
Octagonal	2
Tin Glazed	
White glaze, blue painted	3
Blue glaze, blue painted	1
White Salt Glazed	
Molded motifs	7
Total	89

prepared or from another manufacturing defect that it is not apparent (FIG. 4). The edges of pearlware plates with octagonal-rim shapes and shell-edge lines are most often painted blue (FIG. 5). All five octagonal plates could have been made in the same mold because they are nearly identical in size and rim motifs. The mold was probably old and worn because the motifs are shallow and indistinct; it is possible that the mold was secondhand from another maker, either another Philadelphia potter or an English one. The kiln stilt marks are singular, rather than in a triangular pattern, and are found on the underside of the rims rather than on the plate bases. Although their forms are the same, no two have identical colors, and one (Vessel 92A) has a damaged, uneven glaze (FIG. 4). Only one of the octagonal plates is over 10% complete, but all show use wear, especially where the marlys and cavettos join (a vessel part that happens to be present on all the excavated plates).

The queensware plates are part of a varied tableware assemblage that includes sherds from

33 creamware and 38 pearlware plates (TAB 1). As with the queensware vessels, most of the plates are <25% complete, especially the earlier types (the tin glazed and white salt glazed), which are <10% complete. The tin-glazed and white salt-glazed plates are probably from the pre-1800s tenant household(s) that occupied the site, rather than the later owner-occupants, the McKean and Cochran families.

Small red earthenware bowls found in the Feature 1 fill (TAB. 2) are interesting because of their likely connection to Philadelphia-area potters. These bowls, measuring 5–6 in. in diameter, could have been used for beverages—in particular tea, coffee, or punch—or as individual serving vessels, akin to plates. Plates are suitable for portions of food that can be eaten with a fork, such as roasted meat or vegetables, while small bowls or porringers are more suitable for eating soups, gruels, and porridges with a spoon. (Sherds from four red earthenware porringers, identified by their handles, flared lips, and bellied bodies, were also in the feature fill.) Very similar bowls have been found at many Philadelphia sites (see, for example, Dent et al. [1997] and Gerhardt et al. [2006]). As a group, they are thin bodied—for red earthenware—and have shapes modeled on Chinese porcelain and creamware vessels, with hemispherical outlines and small bases, but their bases are trimmed in a different manner than the refined wares; bases on the red earthenware bowls are solid on their exteriors and trimmed on their interiors, leaving a depression that sometimes is partially filled with glaze.² The interiors of the bowls are usually decorated with slip, either completely, up to their rims, or in broad swirls resembling the petals of flowers (some archaeologists refer to bowls with this decoration as “tulip” bowls).³ The yellow glaze often has brown mottling or splotches from the addition of powdered manganese, and sometimes has green splotches or mottling from copper oxide. The most common vessel form is a small bowl of 5–6 in. diameter and

2. A modern-day potter, Brenda Hornsby Heindl of Liberty Stoneware, is of the opinion that a base thinned in this manner takes less work than a base trimmed on the exterior.

3. For examples of bowls with this decoration, see Magid and Means (2003: figs. 23a–c).

TABLE 2. Tea wares and small bowls from Feature 1 (vessel counts)

Ware	Cup	Saucer	Teapot	Misc.	Small Bowls
Chinese Porcelain					
Overglaze polychrome	19	24	1	7	3
Underglaze blue	10	12	—	1	3
Imari style	—	2	—	2	—
Creamware					
Undecorated	3	2	1	—	4
Overglaze polychrome	2	2	4	—	1
Molded decoration	2	1	1	1	—
Dipped	—	—	—	—	2
Pearlware					
Underglaze blue	4	7	1	—	2
Underglaze polychrome	15	17	2	—	7
Underglaze brown	3	1	—	—	—
Dipped	—	—	—	—	2
White Salt-Glazed Stoneware					
Undecorated	3	—	—	—	—
Scratch blue	2	2	—	—	2
Tin-Glazed Ware					
White glaze, polychrome painted	1	1	—	—	1
White glaze, blue painted	—	—	—	—	3
Red-Bodied Ware					
Engine turned	—	—	5	—	—
Undecorated, brown glaze	—	—	—	—	3
Mottled glaze	—	—	—	—	2
Slip decorated	—	—	—	—	18
Total	64	71	15	11	53

about 4 in. tall, although cup-sized vessels and some tablewares (a pitcher and an oval dish or baker from the Metropolitan Detention Center site in Philadelphia) have been found (Lee Decker et al. 1990; Dent et al. 1997). These vessels are associated with Philadelphia-area potters (Cosans 1974; Bower 1985) and have been found in Philadelphia, other sites in the Lower Delaware Valley, and areas along the coast where Philadelphia goods were traded (Steen 1999: 62–63). Archaeologists working in Philadelphia have called them “Lower Delaware Valley Style”⁴ vessels.

In addition to the small bowls, other probable Philadelphia-made vessels were in the Feature 1 fill. Of the 15 teapots, 5 are engine-turned red earthenwares (TAB 2). At the same time some Philadelphia potters were making their versions of creamware/queensware plates, they were also producing engine-turned red earthenwares and queenswares in various hollowware forms (Myers 1980; White et al., this issue; Miller, this issue). A recent study (Miller et al. 2017) has analyzed the chemical compositions of red-bodied earthenware vessels excavated in Philadelphia and elsewhere, using inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) in an effort to discriminate between British- and Philadelphia-made, red-bodied, engine-turned vessels. Although the preliminary results of this study are not definitive, it is clear that Philadelphia potters produced red earthenware tea- and coffeepots with engine-turned motifs in imitation of British vessels. Red-bodied teapots were used in conjunction with porcelain and refined earthenware teacups, as seen in *The Quilting Frolic* (1813) by John Lewis Krimmel, a genre painter who worked in and around Philadelphia;

in that scene a young girl holds a large tray filled with blue-and-white teacups, saucers, and a sugar bowl (all made of either Chinese porcelain or pearlware) surrounding a red-bodied teapot and a green-glazed milk jug (another possible Philadelphia product).⁵

In summary, there are two certain types and one possible type of Philadelphia-made ceramics in the Feature 1 fill; Philadelphia queensware plates, slip-decorated small bowls, and engine-turned teapots, respectively. Philadelphia-made ceramics could have been purchased in Philadelphia itself or in Wilmington or New Castle (White et al., this issue). The ensuing questions are who purchased and used these vessels, and why did they choose to do so?

Occupants of the Site

The artifacts in the Feature 1 fill could have come from either of the households that occupied the site between 1800 and 1830. As already noted, the site was occupied by tenants until about 1800; between that time and 1813 the owner and her family lived there, probably after a new house was constructed. In 1814 it was sold to a man who lived with his family in the ca. 1800 house until they constructed a larger one off-site. Philadelphia queensware was made between about 1807 and 1822 at the latest. Both of the owner-occupant families that lived at the site were well-to-do, with resources to choose among available household goods. The problem for the present discussion is whose vessels they were, the first 1800–1813 family or the second 1814–1825/30 one. In each case, the ceramic vessels were secondary refuse, but the primary refuse from which they came could have been discarded by either family.

4. This term was used by the archaeologists who analyzed the artifacts from the McKean/Cochran site and others in Philadelphia and Wilmington, Delaware (see LeeDecker et al. [1990] and Dent et al. [1997], for examples). Steen (1999: 65–66), who found identical vessels in South Carolina, calls them “clouded” because of the mottling that is common in their glazes. We prefer the term “Lower Delaware Valley Style” to avoid confusion with clouded or tortoiseshell decorations on British cream-colored vessels.

5. A copy of this image, with a zoom feature to view details, can be seen at <<https://www.wikiart.org/en/john-lewis-krimmel/the-quilting-frolic-1813>>.

Letitia McKean Thompson Clark

The first people who lived at the site after the new house was built were the family and servants of William and Letitia Clark. Letitia McKean Thompson Clark and her brother Thomas Birmingham McKean had inherited the property in 1775 from their maternal grandmother when they were both minor orphans (Bedell et al. 1999: 14). In 1788, at the age of about 15, Letitia came into sole possession when her brother died unmarried. In his will, Thomas instructed his executors, his cousins, “to rent out his real estate and invest the properties in order to supply Letitia with an ‘education, clothing, boarding and other contingent expenses’” (Burlington County [New Jersey] Estate File 11246, cited in Bedell et al. [1999: 15]). Letitia had also inherited other lands from her grandmother, as well as property in New Castle, Delaware, from her father, making her a rich young woman. She was given an education befitting a girl of wealth and prospects, including dancing lessons and tutoring in writing and arithmetic (Bedell et al. 1999: 15).

The trustees for Thomas and Letitia were their paternal uncle-in-law, John Thompson, who had married their father’s sister, and their father’s brother, also named Thomas McKean. Their father, William, a wealthy ship’s captain, had placed his children under the care of his brother-in-law, but asked his own brother to guide his son toward a career in law. The elder Thomas McKean, who started his own law career at the age of 20, was a most suitable mentor in the law. According to his nephew and namesake, Thomas McKean⁶ (cousin to Letitia), he practiced first in Delaware, but later, “when the field being thought too limited he removed to Philadelphia for a more extensive range of practice” (Thompson 1928: 77). He was successful as a lawyer and public servant in both Delaware and Pennsylvania; principal author of the first Delaware state

constitution, member of the Continental Congress, member of the Delaware Legislative Assembly, chief justice of Delaware, and, finally, three-term governor of Pennsylvania. He was also, briefly, the second “president” (governor) of Delaware, when the sitting president was captured by the British during the Revolution (Conrad 1908: 820). His nephew praised him as:

a learned jurist ... [with] experience in the science of government, being a member of Congress during the whole of our Revolutionary controversy with England, and one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence ... his attachment to the laws and institutions of the country was open and steadfast. (Thompson 1928: 111)

John Thompson, the other trustee, was also involved in public affairs (Thompson 1928: 62–65). His son stated that, although he inherited only a small patrimony, he “received an excellent English education” and “might have been denominated ‘a public man’” (Thompson 1928: 65). He served three terms as the elected sheriff of New Castle County, was an associate judge of the Court of Common Pleas, and, along with his brother-in-law Thomas McKean, was a delegate from New Castle to the 1776 Delaware Constitutional Convention and member of that state’s first legislature. He was also a merchant. He removed from New Castle after his service as sheriff to a large farm about 10 mi. from the town, where he constructed a substantial “mansion ... [a] brick house consisting of main buildings and wings” (Thompson 1928: 64). It is likely that Letitia, while growing up, spent at least some of her time living with this uncle’s family at his “mansion,” but it is also likely that she spent time in Philadelphia and New Castle society, learning to be an accomplished, proper young lady. Her cousin, John Thompson’s own daughter Elizabeth, was “absent from home at New Castle or Philadelphia” during

6. Thomas McKean Thompson, son of John Thompson and Dorothea McKean (William McKean’s sister), at the request of his daughter, wrote her a letter narrating the family history of both his McKean and Thompson forebears. This long letter was sent by a descendent to the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* in the 1920s.

much of her adolescence according to her brother's account, because her father was "not sparing of expense in promoting her education and accomplishments" (Thompson 1928: 71). Although Elizabeth was older, Letitia might have accompanied her cousin or lived with other relatives or acquaintances while learning accomplishments in Philadelphia or New Castle. Her uncle would have been justified in expending some of her inheritance on the social education necessary for an heiress. Letitia McKean married her first cousin, John Thompson II, around 1790, when she was in her late teens. First-cousin marriage was not illegal or even frowned upon in many English and Anglo-American families during the 18th and much of the 19th centuries. Marrying a cousin had two obvious advantages from the point of view of extended families—it kept assets in the family, and the families involved were, generally, already well-acquainted with each other and knew their prospective sons-and daughters-in-law well. Presumably, the young bride and groom would also know each other well. In the case of Letitia and John, they probably had spent at least some time in the same household while they were growing up in the home of John's father, Letitia's trustee. John II had been sent to Princeton Seminary, but later transferred to the newly established Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. While at Dickinson, John formally professed his faith in and devotion to God in what today might be described as a "born again" experience. He returned to Dickinson, after his graduation and probably after his marriage, to study divinity; he was licensed to preach in the Presbyterian church in 1792 or 1793 (Thompson 1928: 67). In 1794, he was called to preach in Hudson, New York, on the east bank of the Hudson River, south of Albany. John and Letitia, along with their young son, John Thompson McKean Thompson, lived there for about a year until John II became fatally ill. He applied to the presbytery to relieve him from his duties to his congregation and returned home to Delaware with his family, where he died at the family mansion in 1795 (Thompson 1928: 69). There is

no evidence that John and Letitia ever occupied the McKean/Cochrane farm. It was simply one of many properties they owned and rented out.

John left two-thirds of his estate to his son and one-third to Letitia, along with her choice of one of his two carriage horses and the stipulation that his executors buy her a "good new chaise" (Bedell et al. 1999: 15–16). According to his brother and executor, Thomas McKean Thompson, John, although he had married an heiress, "esteemed [property] no farther than as necessary for the present supply of his own wants or of others that might fall in his way." John and Letitia's son went to college, studied law, and was admitted to the Bar but died shortly afterwards at the age of 24 in 1816 or 1817, by which time Letitia herself was deceased (Thompson 1928: 70).

After her husband John's death, Letitia remained a widow for four years, until 1799. Her second husband, William Clark, came from a family whose members were also involved in public life, but not to the same extent as the McKeans and Thompsons. The William Clark who married Letitia was probably the younger son of the William Clark who, in 1784, was elected as one of seven assemblymen from New Castle County in the "General Election of Representatives, &c. for the Delaware State" held on 1 October 1784 (*Pennsylvania Journal* 1784: 3).

The elder William Clark, who died in New Castle in 1786 while his son and namesake was still a minor (Cooper 2009), had been an officer during the American Revolution, and according to a biography of his eldest son, John Clark, commanded a company at the Battle of Monmouth. John Clark held many public offices, including the governorship of Delaware from 1817 to 1821 (Conrad 1908: 831–832). Few records have been found for the younger William, possibly because he died at a relatively young age sometime between 1806 and 1810. The Clark family was associated not only with New Castle but also with Appoquinimink Hundred; Governor John Clark had a home in Appoquinimink Hundred on Duck Creek, land he had inherited from his father (Conrad

1908: 832). It is not clear whether Letitia and her son moved to the farm in Appoquinimink before or after she married William Clark. Her second husband's familial connections to Appoquinimink Hundred might have been what induced Letitia and William to move to the previously rented-out farm after their 1799 marriage, or she might have become acquainted with William after she and her son spent time there. In any case, the construction of a new house ca. 1800 is most probably associated with Letitia and her household taking up residence. Letitia appears to have continued to live on the parcel after William's death, for she was listed there in the 1810 census as a widow with two young sons (her son with John Thompson and her son with William Clark, Birmingham McKean Clark) and an African American "person," possibly an enslaved woman she had inherited from her grandmother (Bedell et al. 1999: 15–16). Letitia did not spend all of her time in Appoquinimink, however, because she was visiting cousins in Washington, Pennsylvania, a town southwest of Pittsburgh where members of the Thompson family had established themselves, when she made her will on October 14, 1813. She died very soon thereafter because the will was probated on 13 November. Her estate was divided between her two sons; her cousin and former brother-in-law, Thomas McKean Thompson, was the sole executor. No inventory of her Delaware household has been found, but an inventory taken of her possessions in Philadelphia indicates that she had an additional residence there, probably a room in the home of another relative or friend. The inventory "appears to describe the furnishings of a single ... elegant room, furnished with a mahogany writing desk and tea table, a high-post bedstead and featherbed, an open (Franklin) stove, a china tea set, a gilt framed mirror, and a gilt framed painting of the Nativity" (Bedell et al. 1999: 16).

The Robert Cochran Family

Robert Cochran was a married man with a growing family when he bought the property.

He had married relatively late, in 1808 at the age of 27, in New Castle County (Bedell et al. 1999:17). Robert and his wife, Rebecca Ryland, had six children who survived to adulthood. One, John Price Cochran, was governor of Delaware from 1875–1879. (Thus, two governors of Delaware and one of Pennsylvania were related to people who lived at the McKean/Cochran site.) Some of John's brothers and sons also involved themselves in public life in various capacities throughout the 19th century. One 19th-century source described Governor Cochran, his siblings, and their sons as lifelong "stanch" Democrats, so much so that his brother Robert was described as "bred in the school of 'Old Hickory' [Andrew Jackson]" (Runk 1899: 608).

Unfortunately, not much has been discovered about the activities of their father Robert. His family had come to Pennsylvania from Northern Ireland in the early 1740s and first lived in Chester County. In the 1780s, Robert's parents, John and Mary, lived in northern Maryland, but by 1800 they were in Delaware; their household that year included 13 enslaved people. In 1813, according to the New Castle County tax assessments, John paid taxes on 10 slaves, 41 head of cattle, and "plate," probably metal tablewares (Bedell et al. 1999: 17). There was wealth in the family, but how much was available to Robert is not known, although he appears to have bought the Appoquinimink property without a mortgage.

Who Purchased the Philadelphia-Made Vessels Found at the Site?

We can say that both families who might have purchased the vessels found in Feature 1 were of at least middling status. The McKean/Clark family members were comfortably well off with the economic resources to pick and choose which household goods they purchased for their home. Although less is known about the Cochran family's circumstances in the early years of its occupation of the property, it is known that the family was not

poor. One of these families bought and used the Philadelphia queensware plates found in the Feature 1 fill. Which one? From the fragmentary state of most of the artifacts, the fill is known to be secondary refuse, but were these vessels from a decade-old refuse pile/pit whose contents were redeposited as fill in the cellar, or were they from a somewhat later refuse accumulation swept into the fill along with fragments from earlier occupations?

One way to approach the problem is to consider when people might be apt to purchase ceramic tablewares. Klein (1991: 88) noted that ceramic purchases are often dictated by "household life cycle, income strategies, and size." Taking each of the families in turn, the McKean/Clark family had no known changes in life cycle, income strategies, or size between 1807 and 1822, the dates of manufacture of Philadelphia queensware, except for the deaths of both William and Letitia, events not commonly associated with acquiring ceramics. Robert and Rebecca Cochran married in 1808 and might have bought the queensware plates as part of their wedding goods or when they set up their household in Appoquinimink in 1814. Their family grew while they were living at the site, and it might have been necessary to acquire more plates between 1814 and 1820 to accommodate the larger family.

Another question to consider is the use life of ceramics. William Adams has stated:

A 1670s site must be expected to have ceramics made in the 1650s because the ceramic vessels had a lifespan. A site occupied only in the 1670s should be expected to contain few, if any ceramics made in that decade because it takes time for these objects to be broken and discarded. The study presented here argues that ceramic tableware vessels can have a lifespan of 15–20 years and longer. The length of ceramic (and other artifact categories) lifespans will vary due to many cultural factors like wealth, clumsiness, life cycles, frugality, and so forth. (Adams 2003: 38)

By this argument, the ceramics found in the ca. 1825–1830 Feature 1 fill, in particular the Philadelphia-queensware (1807–1822), creamware (ca. 1770–1820), and shell-edge

pearlware (ca. 1800–1840) plates would have been bought between about 1805 and 1810, the period of the McKean/Clark occupancy.

Adams cited the five most important "factors affecting the life expectancy for ceramics ... basic strength, pottery uses, mode of use, causes of breakage, and pottery costs" (Adams 2003: 40); an additional factor is household life cycle, which affects disposal as well as acquisition. The McKean household "ended," probably abruptly, with Letitia's death in 1813. We do not know what became of her household belongings; they could have been given away or sold as secondhand goods, absorbed into the households of family members or servants, or simply discarded at the site.

We cannot say with certainty whether the Philadelphia-queensware plates belonged to the McKean/Clark or Cochran households. We can speculate, however, about the possible reasons for buying them to make up part of their tablewares, alongside plain creamware and/or shell-edge pearlware plates. The makers of Philadelphia queensware were trying to take advantage of the absence of British ceramics in United States markets (Myers 1980; Janowitz et al., this issue). In addition to filling a void, they appealed to the patriotism of their potential customers and the desire of local and national governments to promote domestic manufacturers. The Philadelphia-made plates might have been purchased by either family as an act of patriotism, rather than out of necessity because there was nothing else available, especially if they belonged to Letitia McKean

Letitia McKean Clark was a woman of more than comfortable means who spent time as a girl and young woman in New Castle and Philadelphia, where she became aware of fashionable material goods. When she died, the executor of her will was authorized to sell her personal possessions to pay off her debts; her possessions included ten pairs of kid gloves, four pairs of silk gloves, and some fine cloth (Bedell et al. 1999: 16). The inventory of her room in Philadelphia included a mahogany

tea table and “china” tea set. It is likely that she chose the tea and table wares for her Appoquinimink home with some care. If the Philadelphia queensware plates are from her household, she might have made a conscious decision to “buy American,” or, more specifically, to “buy Philadelphia.” Some of the newspaper articles that advertised Philadelphia queensware appealed directly to American patriotism, but we do not have, so far, any documentary evidence about how Philadelphians, and consumers in other places where the vessels were advertised, ranked them as desirable purchases. They might have been considered fashionable, in spite of the ways they differed in appearance from English vessels, because they demonstrated their owner’s loyalty to local manufacturing. We do know, from the archaeological assemblages where Philadelphia queenswares have been found, that they were not purchased by families of straightened means, most likely because they were relatively expensive (see, for example, Cress et al., this issue; Kutys et al., this issue). We also know that both Letitia and her husband William Clark came from families who had invested considerable time and energy in the establishment of the new American republic and who might have felt a strong commitment to encouraging local manufacturing as part of furthering independence from Great Britain.

Arguments connecting the Cochran household to patriotic consumption patterns are more tenuous because the Cochrans were not, as far as documentary research has been able to tell, as intimately connected to the Revolution and the establishment of the United States as were the McKean/Clarks. The sons of the household were concerned citizens involved with government, but this connection cannot be stretched too far. Robert and/or Rebecca Cochran could have purchased queensware plates when they married (1808) or when they set up their household at Appoquinimink (1814). Adams (2003: 47) contends that “between 1807–1815 virtually no British ceramics or

other manufactures should have reached the United States” (Adams 2003: 47). This is a very sweeping statement, and probably is not completely accurate (and, even if it was, storekeepers could have had previously imported stock on hand when the Cochrans married). Nevertheless, the possibility that the Cochrans bought the plates because no others were available at the time must be considered. Philadelphia queensware plates were available by 1812, at the latest, when a December advertisement for the Washington Pottery states that “soup and shallow plates are now ready for delivery” (Myers 1980: 79). The plates may have been purchased before 1815 out of necessity, rather than choice.

At present, the question of who purchased and used the plates found in Feature 1 cannot be resolved, but, whether the plates were purchased for pragmatic or patriotic reasons, this group of Philadelphia-made vessels contributes to the understanding of American ceramic-manufacturing history. In particular, it demonstrates that the potters were imitating British pearlwares, as well as creamwares. The plates all display variations on the theme of shell-edge motifs, the most popular decoration on pearlware and later whiteware plates during the first half of the 19th century. It would be gratifying to be able to link the purchase of these Philadelphia-queensware plates to the McKean/Clark family with their Revolutionary connections; however, that is not possible, so we must be content to present the arguments for their possession and use by either family and to note their resemblance to contemporary British vessels.

References

- Adams, William Hampton
2003 Dating Historical Sites: The Importance of Understanding Time Lag in the Acquisition, Curation, Use, and Disposal of Artifacts. *Historical Archaeology* 37(2): 38–64.

- Bedell, John, Ingrid Wuebber, Meta Janowitz, Marie-Lorraine Pipes, Sharla Azizi, and Charles H. LeeDecker
1999 Farm Life on the Appoquinimink, 1750–1830: Archaeological Discoveries at the McKean/Cochran Farm Site, Odessa, New Castle County, Delaware. Delaware Department of Transportation, DELDOT Archaeology Series No. 156. Dover. Delaware Department of Transportation <https://www.deldot.gov/archaeology/mckean_cochran/index.shtml>. Accessed 10 May 2017.
- Bower, Beth A.
1985 The Pottery-Making Trade in Colonial Philadelphia: The Growth of an Early Urban Industry. In *Domestic Pottery of the Northeastern United States 1625–1850*, ed. by S. P. Turnbaugh, 265–284. Academic Press, New York.
- Brown, Michael K.
2007 Piecing Together the Past: Recent Research on the American China Manufactory, 1769–1772. In *Ceramics in America*, ed. by Robert Hunter, 76–93. University Press of New England, Hanover, NH.
- Conrad, Henry C.
1908 *History of the State of Delaware, in Three Volumes*. Henry C. Conrad, Wilmington, DE. Google Books <<https://ia600303.us.archive.org/30/items/historystatedel00conrgoog/historystatedel00conrgoog.pdf>>. Accessed 10 May 2017.
- Cooper, Laura M.
2009 William Clark. Munson, Underwood, Fairfield and Allied Families <<http://www.brazoriaroots.com/p1628.htm>>. Accessed 10 May 2017.
- Cosans, Betty
1974 *Franklin Court Report*. Manuscript, Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia.
- Dent, Richard J., Charles H. LeeDecker, Meta Janowitz, Marie-Lorraine Pipes, Ingrid Wuebber, Mallory A. Gordon, Henry M. R. Holt, Christy Roper, Gerard Scharfeberger, and Sharla Azizi
1997 Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Metropolitan Detention Center Site (36 PH 91), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Report to U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Washington, DC, from Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., East Orange, N.J.
- Gerhardt, Juliette, Daniel G. Crozier, Betty Cosans-Zebooker, Roberta Zullick Taylor, Claudia Milne, Leslie E. Raymer, Karl J. Reinhardt, Lori Aument, and Alexander B. Bartlett
2006 Life on the Philadelphia Waterfront 1687–1826: A Report on the 1977 Archeological Investigation of the Area F Site, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. “Area F” Investigations, Second to Front Streets between Gatzmer and Ionic Streets. Report to Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia, from John Milner Associates, Inc., West Chester, P.A.
- Klein, Terry H.
1991 Nineteenth-Century Ceramics and Models of Consumer Behavior. *Historical Archaeology* 25(2): 30–45
- Krimmel, John Lewis
1813 The Quilting Frolic, oil on canvas. Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, Delaware. Museum purchase, 1953.178.2. <<https://www.wikiart.org/en/john-lewis-krimmel/the-quilting-frolic-1813>>. Accessed 10 May 2017.
- LeeDecker, Charles H., Cheryl A. Holt, Amy Friedlander, Meta Janowitz, Marie-Lorraine Pipes, Mallory A. Gordon, Sharla C. Azizi, and Marian E. Craig
1990 *Archaeological and Historical Investigations of Block 1184, Wilmington, New Castle County, Delaware*. Delaware Department of Transportation, DelDOT Archaeology Series No. 78. Dover.
- Magid, Barbara A., and Bernard K. Means
2003 In the Philadelphia Style: The Pottery of Henry Piercy. In *Ceramics in America*, ed. by Robert Hunter, 47–86. University Press of New England, Hanover, NH.
- Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory
2002a Edged Wares. Diagnostic Artifacts in Maryland, Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum <<http://www.jefpat.org/diagnostic/Post-Colonial%20Ceramics/Shell%20Edged%20Wares/index-shelledgedwares.html>>. Accessed 10 May 2017.
2002b Printed Wares. Diagnostic Artifacts in Maryland, Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum <<http://www.jefpat.org/diagnostic/Post-Colonial%20Ceramics/Printed%20Earthenwares/index-Printed-Earthenwares.html>>. Accessed 10 May 2017.

Miller, Deborah L., Meta F. Janowitz, and Allan S. Gilbert

2017 Identifying Red, Brown, and Black Philadelphia "China" through Compositional Analysis: Initial Results. *American Ceramic Circle Journal* 19: 97–126.

Myers, Susan H.

1980 *Handcraft to Industry: Philadelphia Ceramics in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Pennsylvania Journal

1784 No title. *Pennsylvania Journal* 9 October: 3. Philadelphia.

Runk, J. M. (comp.)

1899 *Biographical and Genealogical History of the State of Delaware: Containing Biographical and Genealogical Sketches of Prominent and Representative Citizens, and Many of the Early Settlers*. J. M. Runk, Chambersburg, PA.

Steen, Carl

1999 Pottery, Intercolonial Trade, and Revolution: Domestic Earthenwares and the Development of an American Social Identity. *Historical Archaeology* 33(3): 62–72.

Thompson, Thomas McKean

1928 Narrative of Thomas McKean Thompson. *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 52(1): 59–77. Historical Society of Pennsylvania <<https://journals.psu.edu/pmhb/article/view/28121/27877>>. Accessed 10 May 2017.

Author Information

Meta F. Janowitz is a Senior Material Specialist at AECOM and on the faculty of the School of Visual Arts in New York City. She is an archaeologist who has been working with historic-period ceramics for more than thirty years. Her principal research interests are locally made salt-glazed stonewares and earthenwares and the potters who made them.

89 Moraine Rd

Morris Plains, NJ 07950

meta.janowitz@aecom.com

at Louis Berger in the field and identifying ceramics. She has a Masters in Library Science from Rutgers School of Library and Information Science. Currently she is the webmaster for CNEHA.org.

Medical Arts Web Design, LLC

christy@medartsweb.com

Christy R. Morganstein has worked for the Rutgers Center for Public Archaeology and