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CHAPTER 1
Historical Archaeology of Capitalism and a Quarry Town

Archeology is key to understanding modern capitalism as objects can reflect and structure the fundamental processes of capitalism: exploitation, alienation, and estrangement (Leone et al. 1987). Objects do not represent people directly, but rather their participation in the system of capitalism and their construction and negotiation of identity within unequal power dynamics. The material record echoes the social relationships and individualization that structured the distance, differentiation, and alienation necessary for capitalism to succeed. Thus, historical archaeology can be used to examine the material dimensions of capitalism and the reciprocal relationship of everyday objects to the social categories constructed in capitalism (Mrozowski et al. 2000:xiv).

Even with this purview, historical archaeology has not fully studied capitalism as a spatial and all-pervasive process and often has failed to consider all the effects of capitalism. In historical archaeology, more needs to done to critically evaluate and locate material culture in the broader scales of time and space. As discussed below, David Harvey’s notion of critical geographic materialism provides a theoretical framework to further the scope and relevancy of a critical historical archaeology and to study the nature and history of capitalism from a local context.

Capitalism is founded and reliant on unequal relationships. As such, the accumulation of wealth under capitalism derives from the exploitative nature of the relationship between the capitalist and laborer or takers and producers. This capitalist
mode of production relies on and benefits from the division of classes from each other and the divisions of classes internally (Wolf 1982:79).

The acceptance and perpetuation of these unequal relationships is essential for the functioning of capitalism. The logic of the accumulation of capital is contested but was also institutionalized as part of and through everyday life. The class consciousness essential for questioning and combating the unequal nature of this relationship is constantly fragmented by notions of the individual as an independent, autonomous agent and social differentiation. This process permeates daily life and operates continuously to realign social relations to the logic of accumulation through the different bases of consciousness formation, such as the family and community. The study of the capitalist process is complex and situational. Understanding the current operation and effects of capitalism relies on elucidating how this process worked in the past and has structured the present.

The current relationship between the capitalist and laborer began with the inception and expansion of industrial capitalism. Beginning in England in the second half of the nineteenth century, mercantilism began to shift to a new mode of production, spurred by the investment of capital and inventions which led to machine production and a transformation from craft to wage labor (Wolf 1982:266). The rise of mechanized industrial production and the concomitant changes in labor introduced a radically new way of life. The deskilling of labor, institutionalization of work, and loss of economic control had major impacts on everyday life (Gutman 1987:71).

Concurrent with the rising importance of wage labor over the span of 1789 to 1840 was the general deterioration of labor conditions in the United States (Kuczynski
1973:33). While workers protested these conditions and the movement from craft to wage labor, industrialization continued, as did the transition to unskilled wage labor (Licht 1995:58). Beginning in the 1840s and extending into the 1860s, what became known as the first golden age of industry, witnessed the rapid growth and spatial expansion of industry (Kuczynski 1973:40-41, 51). A large influx of immigrant labor was needed to make this industrial mode possible.

For both these new immigrants and native workers, industry not only structured work relations but also social life. The division of labor of capitalism increasingly became the division of labor of society and could be see in the social relations. By mid-century, these social divisions had become so pronounced they could be mapped spatially across communities (Licht 1995:67). The restructuring of social relations also meant that social life followed the ebb and flow of industry, and the crises of capitalism increasingly became national, community, and family crises.

Following the Civil War, as the growth and spread of manufacturing quickened, labor conditions worsened. This period saw a consolidation of businesses and the rise of corporations, with less concern for the plight of workers (Beaud 1983). Large-scale unrest also characterized this period, as workers organized to protest work conditions, low wages, and other concerns. The next forty years following the depression of 1873 witnessed a shift to finance capital and the concentration of capital and production (Beaud 1983:117; Kuczynski 1973:124). This concentration brought further changes to the world of work, fueled by a growing climate of national competition (Hays 1995:2). Although capitalism has undergone significant changes in scale since the industrial revolution, the basic tenets of accumulation and wage labor have remained in place.
This study seeks to detail the operation of capitalism at the local level, explore how this process affected everyday life in the past, and demonstrate the continued impact of capitalism in the present. The rise of capitalism and concurrent degradation of labor conditions for the working class are grounded historically. To understand class relations in the past and the present, these relations have to be contextualized in time and space and within the logic of capital accumulation and divisions in labor. Only through understanding the unequal segmentation of labor can current social divisions be understood (Gordon et al. 1982:2).

**Approaches to Capitalism**

Capitalism has been approached from a number of perspectives from strictly economic theories to totalizing theories of political economy. Relevant to this study is the historic trajectory of the capitalist process and the asymmetrical relationship between the capitalist and laborer. While studies specifically prioritizing this relationship have drawn from Marx or Marxist-inspired scholarship, Marxism is considered by many to be outdated for a post-modern and complex world and the equally complex capitalist system. The currency of many neo-Marxist theories, such as those of the Frankfurt School of critical theory and structural Marxism has been in decline or subject to significant modification such as in the case of the work Jürgen Habermas (1987) or Michel Foucault (Ritzer and Schubert 1991:364).

Postmodernist studies of capitalism have moved away from totalizing theories and tended to focus on specific elements of problems associated with modernity and capitalism. Further, post-Marxist theorists draw less and less from Marx’s foundation
and Marxism in general (Ritzer and Schubert 1991:362). Without such an overarching framework, however, the question of how to understand the exploitative relationship of capitalism at the local level over time and at the scale of the individual, household, and community becomes problematic. Therefore, this investigation draws on the theoretical perspective of the Marxist geographer, David Harvey, which offers a context and position for studying the entire process of capitalism. Harvey (1992) discounts postmodern critiques of using a Marxist perspective to study capitalism and, instead, argues that changes to capitalism in the more recent era are merely changes to its surface appearance and the logic of accumulation and its crises remain the same. Postmodernist analyses generally tend to view actions as more autonomous then connected to a larger process, and thus, minimizing the role of capitalism in structuring everyday life. These positions fail to place the studies in a wider context, and give such studies relevance and impact. Postmodernism accommodates modern flexible accumulation and thus, the capitalist process itself (Harvey 1990:253, 1996; Peet 1998:221).

To study capitalism effectively, David Harvey (1989:1-2) advocates for a theoretical apparatus that provides a vantage point, using an analogy proposed by Michel de Certeau (1981), similar to that of the view of the city from top of New York’s former World Trade Center. From this elevation, one sees the city as a whole and its components are comparable in a broad sense, where everything including space is observed as a totality. With such a context and understanding, the multiple confusions of the street level becomes decipherable and can be understood in reference to the large capitalist process, allowing historical archaeology to approach both local knowledge and the social structure.
Harvey’s metatheory of capitalism builds on the work of Marx, adding and prioritizing space. Through his theory, it is possible to use both vantage points, the view of the entire urbanized process and the minutiae of everyday life, and move from one to other to understand their interrelation and their unequal dimensions. Without this wider context and the ability it provides to critique the world, the knowledge gained at the local level is limited. Anthropologists like Eric Wolf (1982) have advocated for a similar broad-based perspective, one that looks at the world as a whole or as a system to understand particular populations and the interrelations between them.

The study of capitalism has been argued to be the purview of historical archaeology, through the recovery and analysis of the products of capitalist production. An archaeology of the modern world, writes archaeologist Charles Orser (1996), needs to examine a world incorporated into a capitalist economic system (Casella 2005:7). Likewise, several historical archaeologists (Handsman 1983; Johnson 1996; Leone 1995, 1999; Leone and Potter 1999; Orser 1996; Paynter 1988) have called for a historical archaeology of the modern world to be an archaeology of capitalism. However, a totalizing theory of Marxism, like that espoused by Harvey, has never taken hold in historical archaeology (McGuire 2006:124-125). In addition, few historical archaeologists have approached capitalism as an inherently spatial process, missing a crucial opportunity to understand capitalism. Several archaeologists (Delle 2000; Mrozowski 2006) have referenced Harvey’s theory of the urbanization of capital, but have only used specific elements of the theory, not engaging its full explanatory power.

The strength of Harvey’s approach is that it provides a broader scope to the study of capitalism, increasing its relevance to the discipline of historical archaeology, which
has been hampered by an inability to place sites and social relations in a wider context. Without a larger theoretical framework, it is difficult to move beyond the street level and fully understand the capitalist process impacting daily interactions. Likewise, historical archaeological studies that focus mainly on the individual perspectives of the past are limited in their ability to contextualize sites without understanding the overarching capitalist system. Further with a focus on multivocality, no position is provided for contesting competing knowledge claims that uphold the existing system (McGuire et al. 2005:364). From such a stance, it is impossible to grasp or critique a capitalist system that is based on an unequal relationship.

Understanding the dynamics of capitalism necessitates understanding capitalism as an urbanized and spatial process that attempts to structure all elements of life. Approaching multiple scales of such an ever-changing totality does not overlook “ambiguity and nuance” as Mary Beaudry (2005:307) warns in viewing capitalism and its effects through a rigid theoretical and analytical framework. Rather, with a broad encompassing framework, the whole of the capitalist enterprise and its many contradictions and ambiguities are fully contextualized.

Drawing from structural Marxism and the work of the Frankfurt school, critical archaeology privileges an understanding of capitalism as a process that uses ideology to mask and naturalize social relations, seeking to uncover ideology as expressed in material practices. From this perspective, critical archaeology examines consciousness and the history of domination and resistance, and the level to which the power of capitalism permeates daily life in the past and present (Leone 1998:63; Leone et al. 1987; McGuire 1993:124-125). Yet critical archaeology has had difficulty moving beyond localized
contexts and studying capitalism beyond imposed structures. Applying Harvey’s theoretization in critical historical archaeology’s examination of capitalism provides such a method to understand capitalism in everyday practice at multiple levels and connect such practices to the operation of capitalism.

The use of such a framework is crucial to historical archaeology. As a field of study, historical archaeology is one of the strongest means to understand capitalism in everyday practice. While historical records exist, in many cases, these records support the current system and notions of the individual (Matthews 2010). Yet, for many people in the past such historical records do not exist or provide only general data, perhaps, a name and occupation. In these and most instances of the working-class person, his or her daily existence is only available in the material record left behind. As such, the material data does not privilege elites, but rather reflects the entire society (Symonds 2004:44).

A Local Study of Capitalism

The second half of the nineteenth century saw increasing industrialism and the expansion of capitalism in the United States. This transition influenced and increasingly sought to commoditize all dimensions of life from the workplace to the home (Gutman 1976). Social relations and spaces were aligned to industrial capitalism, and were constantly being realigned to accommodate its needs. Workers were divided based on the mode of production to facilitate the exploitative relationship of capitalism and fragment class consciousness. Using material culture and landscape evidence, this study will examine the establishment and maintenance of the segmentation, separation, control, and
individualism necessary for the success and perpetuation of industry and industrial capitalism.

This dissertation will examine capitalism’s materialization contextualized through the theoretical framework of Harvey’s urbanization of capital. This framework provides a perspective from which to explore the material and spatial signature and negotiation of social relations and their dynamics within a capitalism process. From this context, it is possible to look at two fundamental parts of this process. First, the labor force had to be divided and segmented to fit an exploitative and hierarchical labor structure. Second, the nature of difference in the structure of labor was masked and perpetuated through ideology. These crucial concepts have been the subject of study in historical archaeology, and this dissertation will build upon these studies (Leone et al. 1987; Shackel 1993).

Because this study examines the unequal relationship between capitalists and laborers, the primary focus is on class and class relations. The social relations of gender, ethnicity, and race are viewed in relation to class as constructed categories of social differentiation that are drawn on to enable class relations conducive to capitalism. Situated historically, these social relations provide support to the establishment and maintenance of class relations and capital accumulation. A study that centers on understanding the capitalist process and its unequal relations has to afford primacy to the basic unequal class relationship that is its foundation or risk perpetuating and naturalizing social differences.

The small limestone quarry town of Texas, Maryland, provides the local context for understanding how ideologies and class differentiation of capitalism were manifest
and how they impacted the lives of Texans (Figure 1.1). The process and crises of capitalism played a defining role in the social relations of the industry and the history of the town itself. Wage labor was crucial to the industry of the town as the importance of Texas rests with the abundant natural resources of limestone and marble in the area and large amounts of human labor were necessary to extract and process these resources.

The raw materials were first quarried in the first decades of the nineteenth century. With the arrival of the railroad in the late 1830s, the quarrying and burning of limestone soon developed into a large-scale industry and led to creation of a town centered around the Catholic Church. The high demand for lime as fertilizer and marble for building provided unskilled and skilled employment for hundreds of people and a profitable trade for its many owners. The lime produced from burned limestone was a raw material for numerous industries and was used as a fertilizer helping to establish successful commercial agriculture in Maryland, while the quarried marble was used to build numerous buildings from rowhouses in Baltimore City to large civic structures (Anderson 1985). The community and industry continued to grow until the 1870s when the profitability of limeburning and quarrying dropped and the town began a slow decline. By the turn of the century and through the first half of the twentieth century, companies started to purchase and consolidate individual lots into larger holdings eventually expanding and mechanizing quarry operations and severely impacting the town itself.
Figure 1.1: Location of the town of Texas in Baltimore County (denoted in red), Maryland. Baltimore City is denoted in pink.

Research Questions

Several research questions are posed to test the archaeological sites within Texas and their data sets to understand the materialization of capitalism at the local level. The first research question asks how material culture was used to ensure and reinforce segmentation and stratification as the quarry industry changed and social relations shifted. Even though Texas was a community, it was not monolithic. In its early history, the town was composed primarily of native-born operators and owners and immigrant laborers and managers; the workers were both skilled and unskilled, immigrants and native-born residents.

The success of this extractive industry hinged on the separation of the owners, managers, and laborers and the hierarchy between them. Separation and segmentation would have occurred at multiple levels from the individual in a household to the relationship between the various communities. This division resulted in the
fragmentation of class consciousness and its replacement with community consciousness and a concern for consumption classes and status.

The second research question asks how material culture was used to instill and maintain individualism in the face of family and communities ties. Individualism could be contextualized as a source of alienation and locus of accumulation and how did this function with regard to consumption and notions of respectability and Victorian ideals. The other power bases of consciousness formation that Harvey details, such as the community, class, family, and state also played a part in this process. How did the different power bases interrelate and influence amiable social relations for industry? For industrialized capitalism to succeed, class consciousness needed to be minimized and conducive social relations fostered especially as the needs of the industry shifted.

The third research question builds on the previous questions and asks how the landscape specifically was used to foster and ensure control, segmentation, and separation. The built landscape was essential for ensuring the circulation of capital, and it helped to structure the necessary social relations. Segmentation was accomplished through residential differentiation. How did this spatial process occur and how was the built landscape structured and structuring in this way? The built landscape was continually realigned to allow for capital circulation and accumulation and as a result of the crises of capitalism. How did the built landscape reflect the logic of accumulation and how can its transformation be seen in this value system and what was its impact on everyday life in Texas?

While the first three research questions ask how the social relations were structured through material culture and landscape to enable the success of capitalism, the
fourth research question focuses on how workers and residents also utilized material culture and space to cope with the harsh conditions brought about by industry. What were the strategies to survive in a hostile environment and circumstances as expressed in and through material culture? Alienation and the hazards of the workplace environment which spilled over to the town would have made work and life in Texas very difficult. Yet people still worked and resided in Texas.

Michael McGerr (2003:13) argues that due to the constraints and uncertainties of working-class life, worker’s developed a culture of mutualism and reciprocity. For them, Victorian individualism was not possible and instead a rich culture of release and expressiveness developed though mutualism continued at home (McGerr 2003:20-21). The research attempts to explore the depth of such mutualism in community, family, and class bonds in comparison with the dissolving influences of money, individualism, and a privatized family. The power bases of consciousness formation also entail other potential contradictions to capitalism that must be minimized or worked around. How were these contradictions minimized or mitigated through material culture and the landscape?

These research questions seek to avoid the dualism of structure versus agency, which would create a static picture of both people and capitalism and industry. Because the process of capitalism is complex and involved in everyday life, it is necessary to explore the details of daily choices in a broader context, examining them critically from different perspectives. Focusing solely on the actions and choices of Texans could minimize the impact of industry and the unequal system in which they were enmeshed. Through the study of these workers’ choices and the subsequent outcomes, reinterpreted
through this lens, the workings of capitalism at the local level can be explained and patterns observed that could help explain the present.

*The Material Record of Texas*

In the archaeology of the modern world, material culture, including the objects of daily life and labor, industrial and domestic architecture, and the physical landscape, form the evidence for understanding the shifting social, economic, and political processes of capitalism. Given the pervasiveness of capitalism and its constant need for negotiation, material evidence of everyday interactions and experiences should provide the data needed to unpack its operation. Material culture and the landscape should reflect and structure patterns of segmentation, differentiation, control, and individualism that shift with the needs of capitalism and the industry.

In this study, I examine material culture from four archaeological sites and the built landscape of Texas to understand capitalism’s local operation. Chosen because they encompass a period of over a hundred years spanning the entire history of the town, these sites allow an examination of the effects and interaction of the industry, town, and workers from the very beginning of the industry to the town’s decline and the industry’s transformation. The nature of the data, including the excavation methods and disturbance to the sites, make it difficult to study this time span solely through the material from any single site.

Daily life and labor at Texas manifest themselves through four residential sites that were home to both skilled and unskilled workers. These sites were examined as part of two different archaeological projects. The first excavations were conducted during the late 1980s and the early 1990s by a cultural resource management firm, Mid-Atlantic
Archeological Research Associates, Inc. (MAAR) in response to proposed construction that required Section 106 review. MAAR intensively excavated three sites: the Worker’s Barracks (18BA314), 1854 to 1897; the Poe-Burns House (18BA325), circa 1854 to the 1990s; and Site 18BA313, circa 1854 to 1940. From 2010 to 2012, a field school directed by Dr. Stephen Brighton as part of his Archaeology of the Irish Diaspora and Labor Project at the University of Maryland, College Park, excavated two sites: Site 18BA313, circa 1854 to 1940, and the McDermott’s Tavern/Concannon House (18BA324), circa 1850 to the 1990s. The comparison of these assemblages and associated spaces highlights the material and spatial differences between the various segments of the working class in Texas and documents the changes each site underwent related to the quarry industry. As little detailed documentation is available for many of residents of these sites, their material culture provides the most complete record of their everyday lives.

The material culture of Texas includes artifacts and landscapes features from the 1830s to the 1980s recovered from the four sites studied and across the broader town of Texas. The over 150,000 artifacts include every functional category and different material types present in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Because the entire assemblage from Texas is too large to be viewed in its entirety, several specific classes of artifacts and material culture can be studied to examine the forces and influences of capitalism. The archaeologically recovered ceramic and glass tableware, teaware, and servingware, health and hygiene items, alcohol bottles, smoking pipes, and personal items as well as landscape elements within the social and industrial context allow for an
understanding of the everyday experiences of separation, segmentation, control, and individualism in Texas.

Relatively durable in the archaeological record, the ceramics and glassware recovered archaeologically can detail both consumption and production patterns. The vessels consumed represent the level of integration of Texans into the wider market and adherence to social norms and notions of respectability, and ultimately the creation of individuals through household consumption patterns. These patterns are observable via the decorative style and ceramic forms consumed compared to the wider social context on respectability in dining and hygiene practices. For instance, in his study of the Irish Diaspora, Stephen Brighton (2009) examined decorative type and vessel complexity in refined earthenware ceramics to illustrate changes in Irish-American identity and the incorporation of households into the larger society. This study draws on his analysis and the analysis others (Lucas 1993, 1994; Wall 1991, 1994, 2000) in its examination of the ceramics and glassware.

The ratio of servingware, tableware, and teaware demonstrates the use of these ceramics in reference to dining patterns and can be compared to prescribed dining patterns, and ultimately integration into market. In the nineteenth century, specialized vessel forms for specific functions were dictated by genteel dining etiquette (Fitts 1999). An increase in complex vessel forms and servingware suggests a change in dining rituals to those prescribed as appropriate by the wider society (Brighton 2009; Wall 2000, 1994). The decoration styles used on these ceramics also indicate an attention and the ability to participate in wider social trends and thus, integration into market and social differentiation.
In Texas, the presence of specific tableware and servingware may indicate some level of participation in the ideology of individualism and Victorian notions of dinning etiquette and respectability. Thus, their meals served to enforce segmentation and the discipline of the individual (Matthews 2010:94). In his analysis of the ceramics from the middle to late nineteenth-century New York City neighborhood of the Five Points, Brighton (2001) found working-class immigrants attempting to demonstrate the outward appearance of gentility. Similarly, Dean Saitta (2007) presents an analysis of the tableware and teaware at the striker’s tent colony at Ludlow by Amie Gray (2005) and found a balance between genteel values and traditional cultural values represented. An examination of expenditures on tableware versus teaware indicates the increasing importance assigned to the meal as a ritual as well as its commoditization (Matthews 2010:95-96; Wall 1994). Reinforcing individualism and competition through consumption eroded social bonds and reoriented individuals and families to the logic of accumulation.

In a similar manner, an examination of the complexity and styles of glass tableware, such as tumblers and stemware, provides a fuller picture of meals and speaks to whether households were aspiring to a genteel lifestyle and more individualistic dinning practices. For instance, Brighton (2009) studied the quantity and complexity of glass vessels in combination with ceramics to understand changes in dining and consumption practices in late nineteenth-century immigrant contexts in Paterson, New Jersey, and the Five Points.

Alcohol bottles and smoking pipes are examined to understand notions of respectability and community interaction. Drinking and smoking in public were not
considered genteel behavior. Stereotypes abounded of inappropriate immigrant working-class smoking and drinking behaviors (Reckner and Brighton 1999). The amount and type of alcohol bottles found at home are compared across sites to understand if households were consuming alcohol and if drinking was done in private in or at the house or within a community context, such as the tavern. This distribution also helps to understand ideas about respectability and temperance. Thus, social prohibitions against drinking especially drinking in public in these social venues can show pressure against community and class bonds that served as a means of social differentiation and alienation. Similarly, the location and distribution of smoking pipes, whether within public view and in a social setting or in a private context, illustrates adherence to notions of respectability and subsequent patterns of alienation.

Medicinal bottles are studied to understand differential participation in the medical system as well as health conditions. The ratio of patent to ethical or prescription medicine bottles indicates access to doctors and medical providers (Brighton 2008). The bottles also identify the type of medicine sought, such as common cures or more expensive treatments. For example, by examining medicine bottles from nineteenth-century privy deposits from Harpers Ferry, Eric Larsen (1994) suggests that medicinal practices were part of creating social identities but social norms also limited or directed choice. In order to be seen as successful, individuals and families should consume products accepted by the broader society and engage in acceptable behavior as far as medicinal treatment was concerned. The quantity of specific medication and hygiene items can also indicate the severity of environmental pressures as well as further dependence on the market (Shackel and Palus 2006:836).
Items, such as toothbrushes, lice combs, and ceramic toilet sets, provide an additional line of material evidence of hygiene practices. The level of participation and adherence to prescribed hygiene practices indicates attention to Victorian ideals and the internalization of individualism through these practices. For example, Paul Shackel (1993) examined toothbrushes as reinforcing individual discipline and the ideology of individualism in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Annapolis, Maryland.

Personal items, including different types of buttons, religious medals, smoking pipes, and knick-knacks, can be studied to detail consumption patterns and expressions of respectability, identity, and individualism. The types of buttons relay a concern with similar Victorian notions of respectability and display; the presence of such items can also indicate attempts at social differentiation. Comparison of the types of buttons, such as the presence of plain white porcelain buttons versus glass or transfer-printed buttons, indicates the level of expenditure on these items (Ziesing 1989). The ratio of decorated to undecorated buttons can point to the ability and desire to follow appropriate standards of dress. For instance, Stephen Mrozowski et al. (1996) detail the types and quality of personal items in Lowell mill agent and worker contexts and found that the some mill workers bought personal items, like buttons, specifically for display in that they looked pricier than they actually were.

Other personal items had the opposite effect, signaling different identities and bonds. Social bonds fostered relationships that may not have aligned with the logic of accumulation. Items such as tobacco pipes and religious medals could indicate some level of involvement in various group identities and institutions and have been studied in this regard (Brighton 2004; Reckner 2004; Ziesing 1989). Placed in context, these items
can demonstrate the level of collective bonds and the community integration of a household.

The landscape of Texas as the residue of numerous social interactions, spatial configurations, and values, also provides an opportunity to understand the influence and structure of the industry and capitalism. Studying the creation and alteration of the built environment can provide an understanding of not only work relations but life in Texas in general.

The built landscape, including buildings and other features and the space or the relationship between them, is not a mere reflection of the current mode of capitalism. While the Texas landscape has seen numerous changes in its one hundred and seventy-year history, only a fragment of the residences, roads, kilns, and other elements of the built environment remain. Documenting this residue using maps, historical accounts and records, and photographs allows for an understanding of the landscape over time and the changes it has undergone.

With a temporal reconstruction of the landscape, the landscape is studied as it was perceived, experienced, and imagined. In this way, the creation of features on the landscape are viewed as constant negotiations and reconfigurations of stratification, structures of control, and segmentation and the interplay between the dynamics of the community and capitalism as it attempts to create space conducive to its operation. The landscape that developed into Texas was partially laid out by quarry owners and landowners, and the importance of industrial operations and control appears paramount. Over time and depending on the needs of the industry, control and segmentation of the landscape shifted.
Studies in labor relations and class in historical archaeology have examined spatial relationships and architecture to understand the making and remaking of built landscapes conducive to industry and unequal labor relations (Delle 1998, 2000, 2002; Mrozowski 2006; Orser 1988; Wurst 2002). Drawing from these studies, this dissertation examines and compares the size, location, construction, and position of residences and other structures to understand social relations and residential differentiation in Texas. For example, the orientation and spatial relationships of the four sites, including their yard features, are analyzed to provide evidence of surveillance and control in the built landscape.

**Dissertation Format**

Following on the introduction, Chapter 2 provides a brief history of capitalism and worker’s relations in the United States. Different approaches to the study of capitalism are discussed with a focus on Marxist approaches and the crucial concepts of class and ideology. This discussion flows into a narrower account of historical archaeology’s study of capitalism, especially with regard to class and space. The chapter ends with a consideration of Harvey’s theorization of the urbanization of capital.

Chapter 3 lays out the theoretical basis for the dissertation, outlining Harvey’s concept of the urbanization of capital and its emphasis on capitalism as a spatial process. The circuits in which capital moves and how they operate in relation to the logic of capital accumulation are explained. Harvey’s deconstruction of space also is highlighted. Two crucial facets of the urbanization of capital that can be studied via material culture are the concepts of residential differentiation and loci of power and consciousness.
formation in the individual, class, family, community, and state. The chapter ends with a discussion of the totalizing theory’s applicability to Texas.

The history of Texas, Maryland, is inseparable from the quarry industry. Chapter 4 reexamines the history of the town in relation to the quarry industry, addressing themes including the beginning of the town and entrepreneurship, labor and labor relations, the demographics of Texas, the Catholic Church, the Civil War and identity, labor and health, and the structured landscape. The exploration of these themes allows for a fuller appreciation of the interconnectedness of the industry and the everyday life of workers. This chapter draws on a wide range of historical documents, from newspapers and census data to deeds and plat maps, to reconstruct the history of Texas and its quarry industry. Finally, the history of each site and the lives of their occupants are analyzed using census data, deeds, and newspaper articles.

Chapter 5 provides a summary of the archaeology of Texas and the methods employed to study it. The chapter begins with an explanation of the methods used in the cultural resource management and field school excavations, and then presents the methodology used to analyze the specific artifact groups. The chapter then describes the results of the excavations and presents the data from each site, detailing the deposits as well as the artifacts.

Chapter 6 discusses the broader picture and pattern of everyday life within industrial capitalism derived by studying the material culture and landscape evidence. The artifacts are considered in terms of the history of the quarry industry and Texas and within the wider context of national history and trends in capitalism. Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century social history provides a context to situate the artifacts and
understand the interrelation of capitalism and the ideals of Victorian society. From this context, the landscape and material culture are used to reveal how daily life was structured and realigned over time in support of industry and capitalism. Material and spatial patterns of residential differentiation and the interrelation of the bases of consciousness formation illustrate this process at the ground level.

Chapter 7 presents concluding thoughts on the process of capitalism in Texas and the study of capitalism using Harvey’s theoretization of the urbanization of capitalism. The chapter ends with a statement of the applicability of this analysis of Texas to the study of capitalism in historical archaeology.

Drawing from David Harvey’s metatheory allows historical archaeology to study capitalism as a process affecting everyday life while placing sites and practices in a broader perspective and structure. The town of Texas provides a local context from which to test the application of Harvey’s theories. The importance and relevance of studying capitalism from such a theoretical outline is seen in a discussion of the history of capitalism and the approaches taken in historical archaeology to analyze the impact of capitalism and their limitations.
CHAPTER 2
A Perspective of Capitalism and Historical Archaeology

Approaches to studying the history of capitalism and its effects have included both Marxist and neo-Marxist perspectives. Within these approaches, the function of ideology and the nature of class relationships are viewed as having different impacts on daily life. The result has been a movement away from totalizing theories of capitalism and Marxism and thus the inability to contextualize fully the operation of capitalism at the ground level.

Historical archaeology has drawn from these approaches to studying social relations in a capitalist system and generally has suffered from the same limitations. Historical archaeologists have advocated for a focus on capitalism, exploring the concepts of class, ideology, and space. A discussion of work in historical archaeology brings to light the breadth of scholarship on capitalism and the handicap to the discipline’s study of capitalism and its history brought about by failing to adopt the type of totalizing framework provided by Harvey.

A Brief History of Industrial Capitalism

Industrial capitalism is characterized by the wage-labor system, whereby the laborer sells his labor power to the capitalist; this relationship is seen as extractive and exploitative (Marx 1990:1005). Wage labor was regularly depicted as free labor, whereby one was free to prosper by individual merit in the competitive capitalist economy (Huston 1998:19-20; Rodgers 1978). The capitalist mode of production was expanded in the nineteenth century mainly due to the establishment of mechanized
industry (Beaud 1983:83). As earlier systems of labor were replaced by the wage-labor system, an unequal relationship grew between the laborer and capitalist. As will be discussed below, the wage-labor relationship was more than a simple economic relationship, ushering in a new way of life that became normalized over time (Gutman 1987).

*Industrial Capitalism*

The wage labor system has remained intact even as capitalism has undergone numerous shifts and crises over time. From the late eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century, labor conditions generally deteriorated in the United States (Kuczynski 1973:33). The period from 1826 to 1861 saw significant changes such as the population of the United States tripled from around 11,000,000 to 33,000,000 between 1826 and the time of the Civil War, the magnitude of everything from railroads and immigration to farm production increased (Smith 1981:xi). During this period, wage labor became the dominant manner of organizing production and economic affairs passed from the community as a whole to a special class (Gordon et al. 1982:3; Ware 1964:xi). In response, workers protested both labor conditions, the loss of control over their labor, and the shift from craft to wage labor.

Between the 1840s and the 1860s, industry witnessed a rapid growth and spatial expansion (Kuczynski 1973:40-41), however, this transformation did not result in equitable economic gains. Factories grew larger and smaller firms went out of business, while the supporting transportation infrastructure also rapidly grew to meet the needs of industrial expansion. The intensity of work and discipline of work increased during this period while health conditions deteriorated and wages did not increase relative to meet...
expenses (Kuczynski 1973:51; Ware 1964:106). Throughout this period and well into the twentieth century, immigrants helped to fill the growing demand for labor.

*The Gilded Age*

Following the Civil War, the pace, growth, and spread of manufacturing quickened, but labor conditions continued to decline. Immigration and internal migration provided new workers, but steam and electricity began to replace human muscle and machinery speeded up the process (Zinn 2003:253). Although the purchasing power of the industrial worker grew as hours worked per week shrank, the intensity of work increased, housing and work conditions deteriorated, and costs, such as transportation increased (Kuczynski 1973:111-113).

Known as the Gilded Age, this period of capitalism saw a rapid shift to industrialization and corporatization. At the end of the Civil War, the nation was still agrarian and a half or more of adults were self-employed but the nation quickly transitioned to a country where the majority of individuals worked for someone else (Dubofsky 1996:2-3). With the rise in production came an increase in wealth, and the increased availability of luxury goods and services. The rhetoric of “Americanism” served as a stabilizing force during this period as well as the belief that material well-being fostered social progress and harmony (Morgan 1970:3). The emphasis on material success also created a market to absorb the vast array of products.

Behind the veil of this apparent material prosperity or gilding were widening extremes of wealth. During this period, the government protected private property and capital and the laissez faire economic model that assisted the rise of the robber barons to positions of power (Tipple 1970:15). Generally, little responsibility was felt towards the
workers in an increasingly monopolizing climate (Dulles 1960:96-96). This period of widening economic and social distance resulted in worker strikes and violent industrial clashes and the development of an organized labor movement (Dubofsky 1996:35). The Gilded Age also saw the growth of middle-class professions, like engineers and managers.

The wage-labor relationship between the capitalist and workers expanded. From the 1870s until the beginning of the Second World War, a shift occurred in the organization of work and structure of labor markets with more jobs reduced to common, semi-skilled labor and control of the labor process concentrated among foreman and their employers (Gordon et al. 1982:3). Capital and production also became increasingly concentrated and corporatized (Beaud 1983:117; Kuczynski 1973:124).

*The Progressive Era and Beyond*

The Progressive Era saw a backlash against laissez faire economic practices and big business. While social reformers attempted to address the problems of industrialism and urbanization, the situation for the majority of workers did not improve compared to industrial progress (Dulles 1960:184-185). Middle-class progressives sought reforms, an end to class conflict, a control of big business, and a segregation of society (McGerr 2003:xv). At the same time, the labor movement grew rapidly with a resulting increase in industrial conflicts and national participation by unions in politics (Cohen 1979; Dubofsky 1994:38-39).

The social divide generally continued to widen based on the wage structure. Mechanization and centralization continued into the twentieth century with technology driving the expansion of the unskilled labor force (Jones 1999:156; Rodgers 1978).
Residential differentiation continued as well, with people living in neighborhoods based on common bonds such as religion, ethnicity, or race, which fostered shared dispositions and goals (Dubofsky 1994:236). Science and efficiency, such as extolled by Frederick Taylor, led the drive for order and control, replacing the influence of the Protestant faith and Victorian positioning (Rodgers 1978:57).

The government became increasingly involved in the affairs of business. From the 1920s onward, qualitative differences in the organization of work and labor markets were produced by political-economic forces (Gordon et al. 1982:3). Corporate paternalism faded. By the end of depression of the early 1920s, worker’s militancy was deflated, trade unionism excluded from large corporations, and the influence of the left wing of the labor movement was reduced (Montgomery 1987:6). The 1920s saw increased productivity as well as increased unemployment and industrial accidents. David Montgomery (1987:4-5) characterizes the 1930s and 1940s as a phase where the collapse of the economy pulled down the defenses of company’s new managerial styles and forced the government to intervene and reshape work relations.

The restructuring of labor arrangements and agreements benefited corporations and a portion of the labor force. The consolidation of the segmentation process and the capital-labor accord of the late 1940s and early 1950s setup social and governmental arrangements, such as the recognition of unions by employers and employer control of changes in the organization of work (Gordon et al. 1982:16). This created a new structure that segmented workers and allowed for a rise in productivity in the manufacturing and service sectors and US corporations to prosper in a world market (Gordon et al. 1982:165).
While capitalism underwent several changes in the United States during the history of industrialization, wage labor became accepted, segmented, and naturalized. As will be argued, the cumulative impact of this process has generally been negative and influenced and shaped all aspects of life in places like Texas, Maryland. While this history of industrial capitalism in the United States has necessarily been brief, the synopsis shows some of these impacts and the necessity of looking at the negotiation of them in everyday life through the wage-labor relationship.

**Studies of Capitalism in Historical Archaeology**

The history of capitalism has and is studied in a wide range of fields, from economics and history to anthropology and geography, and historical archaeology has drawn from a number of these fields. An examination of capitalism in its entirety is overwhelming and difficult (Matthews 2010:9; Orser 1996:72) nor is it possible to address the multitude of threads and perspectives of a Marxist analysis. Generally, economic models have tended to focus on the workings of capitalism, such as supply and demand, and do not consider capitalism as a social system. While political economic approaches understand capitalism as more than an economic system, Marxist approaches examine the totality of the system and have given primacy to the unequal class relationships forming the basis of the system. Using such a holistic view of society allows an examination of the systematic interdependence of all aspects of social life, including material culture (Trigger 1993:163).

A Marxist perspective is key to understanding class relations and the structure in which they are situated. Marx detailed the main class struggle as the relationship
between the buyers (capitalist) and sellers (workers) of labor power as a commodity (Harvey 1989:18). Profit was contingent on the exploitation of this labor power in production. The constant tension in the need to accumulate labor power and capital can lead to their overaccumulation and subsequent devaluation, making the system unstable and prone to crises (Harvey 1989:18; Marx 1990:742-743). This study utilizes Harvey’s theory of the urbanization of capital which sees the relationship and the bulk of Marx’s theory as a foundation to understand the process of capitalism.

Marxist and Marxist-inspired approaches have differed significantly. Neo-Marxist approaches consist a wide range of focuses such as world systems analysis, state theory, and urban and labor studies. In many cases, these lines of thought have reinterpreted or discarded basic Marxist concepts of class and exploitation, building on reductionist models taken from Weberian sociology, and thus have had less relevance for understanding the mechanisms of capitalism and all its oppressive and exploitative features (Levine and Lembcke 1987:4-5). For instance, the New Labor history’s attention to the power of working people and the private and cultural spheres has made it difficult for them to explore the persistent domination of capital in relations with labor (Dubofsky 1994:xi). Still, labor historian Herbert Gutman’s (1976, 1987) study of working class cultures and David Montgomery’s (1987, 1989) study of shop floor dynamics and history, provide detailed and significant examinations of everyday life and relations in industrial capitalism while at a more micro level.

World-systems theory, formulated by Immanuel Wallerstein (1974, 1984), examines capitalism from a spatial perspective, operating as a single global system with an exploitative division of labor between a core and a periphery. In this theory, labor
exists as a commodity on the periphery. The world-systems theory however removes wage-labor as a criteria and shifts from the analytical unit of the mode of production to the world system and further, cannot explain transitions from one social system to another (Dupuy and Truchil 1987:127, 133).

Anthropology has drawn from these Marxist inspired approaches, focusing on political economy and structural Marxism (Eriksen and Nielsen 2001:113). The work of anthropologist like Eric Wolf (1982) characterizes the political economy approach in his use of world-systems theory. In his preface to *Europe and the People Without History*, Wolf (1982) states that anthropologists had little to say until their cultural connections were rendered comprehensible when set within their political and economic context. While anthropologists have agreed on the need to look at the broader context and system, they have disagreed on how to conceptualize and approach this context. The next section details different key themes in the study of capitalism and how they have been viewed in these traditions and this study.

*Class and Ideology in Capitalism*

Class and ideology are two core concepts associated with social differentiation and consciousness. Both are complex concepts affecting the parameters and focus of a study of capitalism. At the most basic level, the value of the worker is in the production of surplus value for the capitalist (Marx 1990:644). Therefore, exploring the nature of the relationship between capitalist and worker entails looking at class and the class relationship.

Class has been viewed from many different perspectives. As Charles Orser (2004:244) notes, class is not an easy concept and social scientists do not agree on
definitions. Similarly, LouAnn Wurst (2006:190, 1999) remarks that class is an odd concept as it is an omnipresent aspect of capitalism that is used to classify people, but conversely it is said to have little application in the world as a concept, and thus has generally been avoided. This lack of consensus has opened up class as a wide analytical concept, but fragmented its weight and gravity. A discussion of the definition of class illustrates this problem as well as defines the use of class employed in this study.

While usually situated within a capitalist framework, class has been studied and used in several ways. In general, class started to supersede other names for social division as it began to be understood of as a constructed rather than inherited social position (Williams 1983:61). Raymond Williams (1983:61) presents three meanings that have been used in defining class: class as: 1) Group (objective); social or economic category, at varying levels; 2) Rank; relative social position; by birth or nobility; 3) Formation; perceived economic relationship; social, political and cultural organization. However, these definitions are often combined without distinction, leading to some of the confusion and ambiguity of the concept (Williams 1983; Wurst 1999).

Ultimately, these three definitions can be reduced into two main approaches: class as a category (either group or rank) or as relational (formation) (Wright 1997, 1994; Wurst 1999:7). As Robert Paynter (1999:185) and Raymond Williams (1983:60-69) note, these two groupings correspond with class as a descriptive grouping and as an economic relationship. For instance, Max Weber was more concerned with understanding the complexity of modern society and his conception of class tends to be more descriptive, examining the extra-economic factors involved in market decisions to
that end (Paynter 1999:185-186). Thus, the degree to which these notions of class approach the underlying capitalist system is conditional on their conceptual framework.

This study uses class as an economic relationship, but one that is not static. Thus, class has to be viewed as a fluid identity (Thompson 1968). A dialectic approach sees class as a relational, analytical, and a multiscalar category (Wurst 2006:201, 1999). Therefore, class is not perceived simply as a thing or strictly as a component of the social structure or even as levels or gradations. As LouAnn Wurst (2006:192-193) and LouAnn Wurst and Randall McGuire (1999) remark, linking economic wealth with social class and using material culture as a passive indicator of this wealth causes class to appear as a static and an unchanging category. In such a classificatory approach, social roles are reified and the hierarchy appears natural. Instead, understanding class as having multiple scales, with some scales contradicting other scales, allows a discussion of the operation of capitalism at multiple levels, highlighting its contradictions and complexity.

The reason for the persistence and perpetuation of class relationships and capitalism in general has been the subject of much debate within Marxist and neo-Marxist circles. This debate also grows out of the ambiguity in the concept of ideology in Marx’s own work (Thompson 1990:33). In its most basic definition, ideology is explained as the beliefs of a group (Random House 1990:117). In Marxist approaches, ideology is seen as hiding and masking inequality to ensure stratification and minimize violence. Scholars see ideology operating in different ways. Since material culture is an essential and operational component of many conceptualizations of ideology, the study of ideology is relevant for archaeologists. The following brief synopsis considers theories
of ideology that are pertinent to historical archaeology, particularly from a material perspective.

In *History and Class Consciousness*, Georg Lukács (1971) draws upon Marx's work in trying to understand how exploitative conditions could exist without revolt. According to Lukács (1971:86), the commodity is crucial for the subjugation of men's consciousness and for their attempts to comprehend the process or rebel against its effects and liberate themselves. The use value of the object masks its ideological content, and objects are seen as more or less autonomous, ahistorical, and separate from social relations; the object, thus, has a phantom objectivity and becomes a carrier of ideology (Lukács 1971:83; Woodward 2009:39, 53). A constant renewal of effort is necessary to overcome this reification, but it becomes unlikely, as the growth of status-consciousness suppresses radical sentiments (Lukács 1971; Woodward 2009:40).

A concern with status and object is also found in the work of Thornstein Veblen. In his *Theory of the Leisure Class*, Veblen (1994) posits that individuals attempt to follow the consumption of others higher in the hierarchy, with patterns of consumption essentially trickling down and being emulated. Thus, it becomes necessary to consume in order to accumulate and acquire property, and retain one's good name and position (Veblen 1994). Consumption allows a person to fix and show his or her place in the social hierarchy and forges class distinctions.

Building upon the work of Marx and Lukács, the Frankfurt School studies culture and psychology in an attempt to update Marxism for the twentieth century and address the question how the exploited are integrated into capitalism. The object is again central to understanding this broader conception and furthering of Marxist theory. For instance,
in the *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, Max Horkheimer and Theodore Adorno (1987) are concerned with objects and their promise of liberation. Instead of freedom, people are forced to consume as a consequence of their alienation of labor and employment for it is “the actual working conditions” that compel conformism (Horkheimer and Adorno 1987:37; Lodziak 2002:92-93). The Enlightenment promise of technology which has the power to increase control, productivity, and rationality instead, operates as an ideology, based on false needs, that is used by powerful groups to enslave psychologically those with less social power (Horkheimer and Adorno 1987; Woodward 2009:41-42).

Herbert Marcuse and Erich Fromm explore these psychological dimensions in greater depth. According to Fromm (1976), there are two modes of existing: *having*, associated and defined by having things or materialism, and *being*, which revolves around people and relationships. Fromm (1976:75) believes that consumption distanced people from human needs, such as creativity and relatedness, and acquisition became a goal in itself, leading to an attitude centered on property, profit, and the need for power.

For Marcuse (1971), technological superiority and differentiated forms of abstract knowledge become social goals of modern capitalism, structuring the material and psychological aspects of people's lives. Technology is structured to serve the needs of the free market and, ultimately, the ability of the state/industry to perpetuate itself. An industrial capitalist society creates false needs that bind people to the social order and which cannot be distinguished from true needs such as nourishment. The illusion of freedom exists, but in reality the individual has limited choices, thus, ultimately forming a homogenous or one-dimensional culture.
Coming from a structural Marxist perspective, Louis Althusser (1971) embraces the notion that everything is ideological. Althusser (1971) states that production must also reproduce the material conditions of production. Thus, the exploitative relationship must be reproduced in order for the system to function. The reproduction of labor power not only needs the reproduction of its skills, but also requires its submission to rules of the established order and to the ruling ideology (Althusser 1971:132). The ruling ideology of the dominant class, Althusser argues, is propagated through ideological state apparatuses (Thompson 1990:92). As found in objects, the ideology is a representation of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their own real conditions of existence (Althusser 1971:162, 166).

Other theorists of capitalism have explored relations of power and the internalization of the ideology. For Michel Foucault, objects are constructed in a field of power relations and in return actively construct these relations; power, knowledge, and control are exercised in everyday life. Foucault's (1995) study, *Discipline and Punish*, on the regimes of knowledge on incarceration and punishment provides examples of such objects. For instance, the panopticon provides an object or spatial mechanism by which people internalize ideas of discipline to self-regulate their own bodies and actions (Foucault 1995).

A problem with these conceptualizations of ideology is their inability to connect the everyday practice of ideology at different levels. However, Pierre Bourdieu's (1977, 1984, 1990) theory on taste and its negotiation provides a theoretical perspective on ideology that looks at both structure and practice which are historically situated. *Habitus* is the mechanism by which tastes are exercised and cultivated, and is both structured and
structuring, setting the parameters for social action (Bourdieu 1990:53). For Bourdieu, objects serve as markers of aesthetic and cultural value, whereby one's taste, rather than an objective and absolute criteria, reproduces social inequality (Woodward 2009:6). In this way, Bourdieu (1984) provides a lateral dimension so taste in consumption can be seen as used to discriminate by class fractions, which enjoy different levels of economic and cultural capital (Dant 2005:27). Thus, objects can be seen to play a role in determining and structuring interactions in the social and material world.

These theories of ideology show the different ways theorists have conceptualized the masking of inequality and the perpetuation of capitalism materially. Many of these explanations of ideology do not allow for an explanation of the interaction and practice of ideology within changing social relations tied to the capitalist process. Harvey (1989) provides an explanation of the workings of ideology at different levels that is directly related to the capitalist process and can be used to study it in that regard.

*Approaches to Capitalism in Historical Archaeology*

Several historical archaeologists (Handsman 1983; Johnson 1996; Leone 1995; Leone and Potter 1999; Orser 1996; Paynter 1988) have called for a historical archaeology of the modern world to be an archaeology of capitalism. Similarly, archaeologists like Eleanor Casella and James Symonds (2005) advocate for industrial archaeology to study the impact of the industrial era and its impact on the lives of the workers. Still, a totalizing theory of Marxism has not found a place in historical archaeology (McGuire 2006:124-125). Further, few historical archaeologists have approached capitalism as an inherently spatial process drawing from David Harvey.
Archaeologists (Delle 2000; Mrozowski 2006) have referenced the theory of the urbanization of capital, but no one has employed the theoretization in its entirety.

Understanding the dynamics of modern capitalism necessitates understanding capitalism as a spatial process. Without this framework, it is difficult to contextualize class beyond a static classification and to understand the operation of ideology at multiple scales and its role in structuring all elements of life. The power bases of urbanized capital, such as the family or community, are crucial for analyzing class and ideology in daily material practices. Without a totalizing theoretical perspective, the study of capitalism in historical archaeology is limited.

Historical archaeology has explored the role of material culture in the operation of capitalism and examined how material culture enabled the shift to modern, industrialized capitalism. The study of capitalism have been approached from different frameworks. This study draws mainly on Marxist approaches as they have at their core a concern with elucidating the unequal and exploitative relationship between capital and labor and the resulting concept of class and social relations and their expressions.

The historical archaeology of capitalism has separated into different subfields and research interests employing a variety of theoretical approaches to study topics such as study race, gender, and the diaspora. According to Robert Preucel (2010:125), the recent trend has been for these studies to be supplanted by multifaceted explanations of capitalism drawing on several different social categories. For instance, Paul Mullins (2002) looks at African Americans in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Annapolis to show how they negotiated consumption to create identities linked with citizenship against the background of power, class, and race. Other archaeologists (Yentsch and
Beaudry 2005:222) argue the Marxist model is too focused on an economic framework to provide a complete picture of society.

Marxism has undergone significant changes in its intellectual development and a new diversity of approaches, including dialectics, structural Marxism, class analysis, and critical theory, is reflected in Marxist-inspired archaeological studies (Whitley 1998:17). Two significant directions in Marxist thought are the critical archaeology approach drawing from structural Marxism and the critical theory of the Frankfurt School and an anthropological political economy approach based on the work of North American cultural anthropologists (McGuire 1992; 2006:129-130). According to Randall McGuire (2006:130), these approaches have been melded together to form an archaeology of capitalism that rejects a totalizing theory of Marxism, and instead uses class as a base from which to study social relations, ideology, cultural production, and struggle. Even though the distinctions between these theoretical approaches have been blurred, a short description of elements of these approaches will aid in better conceptualizing how historical archaeology has grappled with capitalism.

The anthropological political economy approach emphasizes the struggles among members of society over the exercise of social power (Paynter and McGuire 1991:1). Drawing from the work anthropologists such as Eric Wolf and world systems theory, advocates use a relational, Hegelian concept of the dialectic and find the driving force for cultural change to be in the conflicts resulting from tensions within social relations (McGuire 2006:133-134).

One example of this approach is Robert Paynter’s (1988) study of changes in material technology and manufacture. Paynter (1988) studied these changes, such as the
shift from blown glass bottles to mold blown and more mechanized bottle manufacture, as more than just temporal material markers, but as the residue of changes in social relations between labor and capitalists. Another example of this approach is Randall McGuire and Paul Reckner’s (2002) study of the Colorado coal towns during the strikes and the conflict of the early twentieth century using a world systems theory to focus on issues of class and class conflict.

The other effort to study capitalism has been the work of archaeologists embracing critical materialism. The critical materialism or critical archaeology approach emphasizes how archaeology has furthered capitalism’s dominant ideologies and offers ways to empower people to critique such ideologies (Hodder 1992:88; Leone 1995). Through a critical archaeological perspective, ideas such as personal freedom and individualism can be seen as ideological givens (Leone et al. 1987:285). Material culture, whether objects, structures, or even spatial arrangements, provides the physical evidence of this function because material culture plays a role in the creation and maintenance of the ideology through everyday practice in order to sustain the social relations and order needed in capitalism. Critical archaeology holds that a past can be discovered that can speak to the origins and impact of the present political and economic structure. Because of its attention to and concern with the role of ideology, this study draws on several critical archaeological studies.

*Ideology and Class in Historical Archaeology*

Historical archaeology’s definition of ideology has varied and, subsequently, so has its utility for understanding capitalism and its social relations. For instance, James Deetz (1977, 1988) interprets ideology as a mindset or worldview. Deetz (1977) uses
changes in architecture, gravestones, and ceramics to document evolving ideas, arguing that these changes reflect a shift from a late seventeenth-century mindset of communalism to a Georgian mindset embracing individualism. According to Heather Burke (2006:132), the problem with this approach is that ideology appears analogous to culture and is not separable from categories such as religion. This approach also does not get at the meaning of these ideological changes.

A more complex notion of ideology views different degrees of ideologies operating at multiple levels. Drawing from Terry Eagleton (1991), Barbara Little (1994:20-21) provides a layered model of ideology beginning at the most broad level with ideology as ideas and ending with ideology as deceptive beliefs arising from the material structure of society. As Little (1994:21) notes, ideology can be unifying and hegemonic, action-oriented, universalizing, rationalizing, and naturalizing.

In reference to class, ideologies can operate at multiple levels. Grasping the uses of ideology is critical for fully understanding disparities of power. At its most basic level, power can be seen as power to, the capacity to intervene in events, and power over, the ability to control resources and life chances (Miller and Tilley 1984). While everyone has some level of power to, ideology ensures that power over is available to some individuals or groups. Thus, a consideration of social relations in capitalism has to take into account ideology operating at different scales and fields of power.

Archaeologists Mark Leone (1988, 1999) and Robert Paynter (1988) have viewed ideology as connected to a specific means of production (Hodder and Hutson 2003:80). Using data from eighteenth-century Annapolis and drawing on Althusser (1971) and Edward Thompson (1967), Leone (1988) links the rate of appearance of objects such as
clocks, scientific instruments, and ceramics to the penetration of merchant capitalism and the acceptance of ideas about time discipline, standardization, and order in society. In another study, Leone (1999) drew from Thompson's (1967, 1974) work on the industrial revolution and the creation of the concept of individualism in studying the degree to which ceramics were used to order the table and reflect the acceptance of individualism. Leone (1999:212) posited that the ideology of individualism in turn obscures the actual lack of freedom resulting from social relations in capitalism. Individualism essentially is the interchangeability of people who thought they were unique and had personal freedom to succeed to the best of their ability (Leone 2005:154-155).

In a similar study drawing on Foucault and Bourdieu, Paul Shackel (1994) looked at the transition from craft to wage labor in Harpers Ferry, arguing that the rise of individualism can be seen in increased consumption of certain ceramic styles and in the imposition of workplace order in the home. In eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Annapolis, Shackel (1993) also demonstrated how everyday items such as the toothbrush were used to inculcate ideas about hygiene, standardize behavior, and communicate an ideology of order, hierarchy, and standardization. In both of these examples, ideology as seen through material evidence was necessary to create the social relations needed for capitalism and to perpetuate these relations, especially during shifts in the operation of capitalism.

The degree and scope to which ideology functions and to whom has been debated (Orser 1996) and opens up a broader consideration of relationships. The concept of a “dominant ideology” initially espoused by critical archaeologists considered the ideas of the ruling class as dominant, trumping the ideas of the subordinate classes. Several
archaeologists (see Beaudry et al. 1991 or Hodder and Hutson 2003) have disagreed with this perspective and questioned the potential for a role and voice for non-elites. Leone (2005) rearticulated his view of a dominant ideology using Jürgen Habermas’ notion of communicative action to understand how capitalism can be resisted successfully by some groups.

Drawing from Marxist approaches to capitalism in historical archaeology, Charles Orser (1996:174-178) outlines a multiscalar perspective of power as a network of relations, enabling an examination of capitalism’s operation at multiple levels. This position is useful for contextualizing class and ideology. Orser’s (1996) position is shaped by the work of William Marquardt (1992) who advocates a multiscalar, dialectical analysis. This perspective views social relations as constantly negotiated and historically situated and defined in relations of power. Artifacts can be seen as markers of these negotiations and shifts in power relations over time.

The dialectic approach taken by Marquardt and Orser views society as a complex web with all actors defined by their relationships to other actors (McGuire 2006:125); thus, entities or elements cannot be interpreted independently. Since entities are defined relationally, the changes to one affect the others. In this way, a dialectic approach allows an understanding of power and authority at multiple levels and provides the ability to move beyond the local or single scale to reach and understand the process of social formations (Marquardt 1992:106; Ollman 1993:10-11). From these interconnected layers of analysis, one can study the larger capitalist system and its contradictions and inconsistencies.
Several studies have approached an analysis of the capitalist system through the material and documentary evidence of social relations and class and the use of ideology. For instance, Paul Reckner and Stephen Brighton (1999) examined the rhetoric of temperance deployed by the American middle class in mid-nineteenth-century New York City and Lowell, Massachusetts, as means of class-based social control and opposition. In their analysis, Reckner and Brighton (1999) contradict the reformist literature of the period, demonstrating that contrary to their message of reform, the middle class continued to smoke and drink; they also note the interrelation and complexity of religious ideology, class formation, and ethnic and racial conflict at work.

Drawing on the work of Bourdieu, Diana Wall (1994, 1999) also critically examines the dynamics of social relations in nineteenth-century New York City. Using the evidence of material culture, Wall's analysis demonstrates the changing nature of the interrelated social relations of class, ethnicity, race, and gender due to the shift from mercantile to industrial capitalism in New York City. For instance, Wall (1994) examines the spatial separation that occurred between home and work, and also explored the establishment of the middle class and its notion of domesticity and gender roles as evidenced in household consumption of goods such as glassware and ceramic teaware and tableware. The change in the market led to a deep structural transformation in the urban lives of both women and men (Wall 1994:162-163).

Another example of a relational view of class is Michael Nassaney and Marjorie Abel's (2000, 1993) exploration of industrial development and social relations at the Russell Cutlery factory along the Connecticut River. Nassaney and Abel (2000) explore how nineteenth-century transformations of industrial production affected the relationship
between management and workers, especially with regard to control, regulation, and hiring practices. Nassaney and Abel (2000:240) find that industrial and spatial changes created and reinforced social and economic subordination in the factory and at homes. They argue that the spatial tactics of control and assertion of authority in the workplace were extended into the homes. The ability of management to control and partition space was a means to create and reproduce social inequality (Nassaney and Abel 2000:252-253).

Without examining and connecting class and social relations directly to capitalism and its operation, it is difficulty to study the direct impact of capitalism on everyday life and as a wider process. Historical archaeologists need to employ a theory that allows for an examination of capitalism at multiple scales. A more severe handicap is seen in the treatment of the space as a static setting rather than a crucial component of capitalism.

_The Landscape and Space in Historical Archaeology_

Power, hierarchy, and class have also been studied in historical archaeology through the examination of the built landscape drawing from fields like geography and anthropology. On the whole, the role and definitions of space and landscape have been unclear in historical archaeology. For instance, concerns with space and place or anything related to the land have often have been lumped under landscape archaeology. In other instances, landscape archaeology appears to be equated more with specific elements, such as historic gardens (Yamin and Metheny 1996). As James Delle (1998:14) notes, given the range of what has been cataloged under landscape archaeology, it is clear that no one specific definition has been adopted by historical archaeologists.
Initially the landscape was viewed principally as a setting for actors and events in the past. In the middle of the twentieth century, historical archaeologists examined landscapes to commemorate, reconstruct, and identify (Shackel 2003:4). The homes and gardens of elites were often excavated to provide for their reconstruction (Keller and Keller 2003). Later, the New Archaeology implied that activity and event and space were conceptually and physically separated and only contingently related (Tilley 1994:9). Space was seen as empty, inactive, and neutral, and thus separated from considerations of structures of power and domination (Robin and Rothschild 2002; Tilley 1994).

The notion of landscape as a neutral setting continues today and its limitations can be seen in several studies (Cantwell and Wall 2001; Cotter et al. 1992). For instance, in their volume on urban landscapes and slums, Alan Mayne and Tim Murray (2001) argue that people's agency and striving for respectability disproves the myth of the slum. By removing people from a specific space by stating the slum did not exist, they have considered the landscape and space as neutral and thus, not existent. Therefore, the landscape does not need to be considered and by doing so in the case of his study of Melbourne in the nineteenth century, Alan Mayne (2006) argues that he returns a level of dignity back to individuals in the past. Yet, Mayne (2006) takes his actors out of the setting and power relations and thus, inequality. Without a consideration of spatiality or even space, the slum or any space cannot be studied as a spatial material mechanism and product of the capitalist process. Instead, inequality becomes masked through ideologies of individualism and consumption.

Studies that treat space and the landscape as more than a setting for people in the past have been able to show the dynamic and active role of space. As Robert Paynter
notes, space has undergone a reconceptualization from a neutral and purely objective dimension to a culturally mediated object, allowing the landscape to be studied as an artifact. If space is a class of material culture reflecting and manipulating human behavior, then it can be studied to explore the negotiation of social power (Delle 1999:15). Opening this window into social relations allows an exploration of how and why space is produced and manipulated. From this vantage point, it possible to move from the local level to an understanding of larger spatial processes and their relations to class and ideology, and the larger capitalist system.

Several studies have looked at the role of space in relation to capitalism, for example exploring the material shift from craft to wage labor and examining how the middle-class used material culture and the landscape to differentiate themselves from the working-class. Though not taking a Marxist perspective, Diana Wall (1994, 1991) draws on Bourdieu to examine the spatial separation that occurred between home and work with the establishment of the middle class and its notion of domesticity and gender roles. Wall (1994:162-163) found that the change in the market led to a structural and spatial transformation in urban life for both women and men.

Other studies have sought to understand the role of space and power in the context of shifts in the mode of production in capitalism. Charles Orser (1988, 1991) examined the restructuring of labor and spatial relationships on plantations in the United States, focusing on Millwood Plantation in South Carolina. He argued that the landscape facilitated the maintenance of control and stratification to ensure the perpetuation of an unequal economic relationship even with the shift from slavery to tenancy by the plantation African-American population.
Orser (1988:323) found that on the antebellum plantation the planter's house was located at the center of the estate with a cluster of support or service buildings, while closer to the fields was another cluster containing the slave quarters, overseer's house, and other support structures. This spatial form placed the slaves near the fields but also under the surveillance of the overseer and planter (Orser 1988:323-324). With emancipation, the landscape was used to maintain hierarchy and power relations. While the planters became landlords and the slaves became tenant farmers, thus changing the mode of production, the classes remained in the same relative economic relationship (Orser 1988:322). The postbellum period saw the plantation more spread out but with outbuildings located closer to the main office to continue the surveillance of workers (Orser 1991).

The role of space in industrial communities has been studied by a number of historical archaeologists (Mrozowski 2006; Nassaney and Abel 1993, 2000; Shackel 1996; Shackel and Palus 2006). Paul Shackel (1996, 1998) and Paul Shackel and David Larsen (2000) explored the transition from a preindustrial to an industrial economy at Harpers Ferry and discovered how new relations of production and ideologies to substantiate them were formed. Racial inequality at Harpers Ferry also was structured through a landscape of control and exclusion. For instance, African-American slaves lived with their masters and free blacks lived with or near their employers, in both cases allowing surveillance and restrictions of their activities. Even with the shift to wage-labor in the US Armory in 1841, African Americans were excluded from jobs entailing factory discipline (Shackel and Larsen 2000:35). In order to structure labor effectively during this shift, space had to be restructured. In addition to the introduction of clocks,
efforts were made to renovate the existing armory buildings to make them more conducive to the factory system (Shackel and Larsen 2000:28).

In her study of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century western cattle town of Paradise, Margaret Purser (1999) notes increasing fragmentation, isolation, and alienation with the increasing penetration of the market. Examining both the built environment and artifacts, Purser (1999) discovered that space became more segregated and commodities that were initially articulated through a local materialism were replaced by a flood of mass produced goods and a national rather than local discourse. Thus, objects and space changed how people made sense of the world and these objects influenced people’s conceptions (Purser 1999).

The archaeology of capitalism has approached space as more than a simple setting and reflective of social relations and shifts in production. Understanding the role of space in structuring social relations and permitting regimes of control and alienation allows a more complete picture of capitalism. An even more subtle understanding of capitalism can be gained by studying the dynamic and multifaceted nature of space in reference to capitalism.

Only a handful of archaeologists have explored space as more than an absolute category in industrial capitalism. While exploring different modes of production, studies by Stephen Mrozowski (2006, 1991) and James Delle (2000, 1998) have employed the spatial theory of Lefebvre and to a smaller degree, Harvey, to understand the different dimensions of space. Specifically, their analysis of space and resulting spatialities unpack the prominent role of space in the operation of capitalism along with its complex nature.
Stephen Mrozowski's (1991, 2006) study of the landscape of the port town of Newport and the textile mills of Lowell provides an example of the application of Lefebvre's spatial categories and demonstrates the amount of landscape evidence that historical archaeology can provide. Mrozowski (1991, 2006) clearly demonstrates the use of the landscape to structure social relations as well as its role in resistance or nonconformity. Furthermore, Mrozowski (2006) presents the change from mercantile to industrial capitalism within a set of cultural, historical, and biophysical spaces.

Contrasting the mercantile port of Newport with the planned, industrial town of Lowell, Mrozowski (2006) demonstrated the application of social control by the manipulation of the landscape. While not completely comparable, the shift in capitalist systems between the two cities shows the end of more fluid, mixed-use space and the beginning of regimentation of space. As a planned community, Lowell differed from Newport, reflecting an industrial community whereby the maximization of production was the driver for everything in town including the construction and orientation of space. While some older spatial practices persisted in Lowell, other practices reflect this new order and segmentation. For instance, the size and location of homes and even the size and ornamentation of yards signaled heightened control and hierarchy (Mrozowski 2006:142). In this way, the landscape of the town was designed to reify class differences.

In a different context and drawing from historic records, the built environment, and the archaeological record, James Delle (2000, 1998) examined the social space of Jamaican coffee plantations to understand how Jamaican elites attempted to manipulate the socioeconomic turmoil of the nineteenth century to reinforce and maintain their power and wealth. Specifically, by studying coffee plantations before and after the
emancipation of African Jamaicans, Delle (1998) detailed material and social space and argued that they were altered to restructure social relations and labor relations. Drawing from Henri Lefebvre (1991), Delle (1998) analyzes space on multiple levels (physical, social, and mental) as a spatial practice. By breaking up a conception of absolute space, Delle (2000, 1998) is able explore the space relationally and as well as contested.

Both Delle and Mrozowski show how space and spatial practices are used to structure social relations geared to different modes of production and accommodate shifts within capitalism. Thus, space is seen as a crucial and complex element of capitalism. By linking the study of space and material culture, historical archaeology can provide a unique and essential perspective of capitalism. Harvey’s theoretization provides a connection of spatial practices to a more complete picture of the workings of capitalism and the capacity to critique present structures.

The Urbanization of Capital and Historical Archaeology

The application of ideas about the urbanization of capital is necessary for a more nuanced analysis of capitalism and its impact on the modern world in historical archaeology, but on the whole such an analysis has been largely absent from the field. While historical archaeologists have studied the landscape and space as an artifact of social relations, the vital and intricate role of space and spatial processes in the system of capitalism has been little used. As noted above, archaeologists like Delle (2000,1998) and Mrozowski (2006, 1991) have referenced Harvey and the spatial dynamics proposed by Harvey and Lefebvre, but few have applied the urbanization of capital thesis directly to the examination of industrial capitalism. Using such a theory can help to explain the
wider processes of capitalism, allowing historical archaeology to find relevance beyond the specific site focus.

A totalizing theory of capitalism is the only means to conceptualize the complex interplay of relationships in capitalism, and avoid the notion that it is just an economic system. In studying capitalism in this manner, capitalism needs to be afforded primacy in how, as a process, it works in everyday life. Illustrating different scales and the interactions between these different scales is static, and more so supporting capitalism, without an understanding of the processes impacting social relations at these different levels and between them. Sites and communities need to be contextualized by grasping the processes of capitalism, especially spatial, that are shaping these places and their occupants. The loci of power through which consciousness is formed provide context for understanding multiple levels and types of social relationships as well as class and ideology. Concepts, like social differentiation leading to residential differentiation and the urbanization of consciousness, illustrate the dynamics of these processes and their material and spatial patterning. Without such concepts, the impact of spatial and material practices is difficult to realize, and it is difficult to put the site into a large regional or even global perspective.

A totalizing theory of capitalism also recognizes the extent to which the capitalist enterprise permeates every element of life. Social differentiation and the urbanization of consciousness are geared to furthering production and consumption. Understanding these processes fulfills the call for a study of capitalism that looks at both production and consumption (Paynter 1988). Privileging both as elements of the logic of accumulation ensures that consumption is not skewed to be a free and emancipatory practice. Instead,
the ideological role of such an assertion becomes evident as do other forms and process seeking to alter consciousness conducive to capital circulation and accumulation. Thus, the discussion is not of agency versus structure nor the imposition of a top down structure and ideology, but of the daily practice of people and industry in a capitalist world.

The theory of the urbanization of capital has much to offer a historical archaeology of capitalism. It affords an examination of the process of modern capitalism and how it works and is materialized and spatialized at many levels. Thus, Harvey’s theorization of the urbanization of capital can serve as the basis for an analysis of material culture and the built landscape to show how capitalism has and is shaping the world. This signature can be used to understand the past at different scales, such as the small quarry town of Texas, and then draw direct parallels to the present.
CHAPTER 3
Capitalism and the Urbanization of Capital

The social theorist and geographer David Harvey’s theoretization of the urbanization of capital provides a framework to detail the many facets of industrial capitalism as an ongoing, and inherently spatial process, occurring at multiple scales. His dialectical materialism provides a method to identify the rules in which society is restructured (Harvey 2000:290). The following sections include a discussion of David Harvey’s concept of the urbanization of capital, detailing the basic components of this process. Harvey’s understanding of capitalism as an urbanized process is explained in conjunction with the three circuits of capital and the crucial role of space in the capitalist system. A brief outline is also provided on Harvey’s notions of the deconstruction of space drawing from the work of Henri Lefebvre. Harvey’s ideas on the fundamental processes and patterns of social and residential differentiation and the urbanization of consciousness are then detailed in terms of their importance to the circulation of capital and its accumulation. The section ends with a discussion of the applicability of Harvey’s ideas to the present. Much of the discussion relies on Harvey’s book, *The Urban Experience*, which combines his earlier writing and lays out his ideas in detail. While archaeology has generally not drawn on his theories, a wide range of disciplines have, especially fields like geography, urban studies, and sociology. The utility of his work to a historical archaeology of capitalism will be demonstrated in this chapter.
The Urbanization of Capital

The dynamics of modern capitalism can be made intelligible and viewed through David Harvey’s notion of the urbanization of capital. The urbanization of capital is a central tenet of Harvey’s re-conception of Marx’s historical materialism and the formulation of what Harvey (1989) calls his historical-geographical materialism. While Harvey builds on Marx and has generally avoided the work of later Marxists, such as Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser, he differs from Marx in a few ways which are relevant to this study (Castree 2007:103). The first is his concern with consciousness formation, and second is his concern with space. These two ideas make Harvey’s theories especially useful for this study and historical archaeology.

While Marx studied capitalism through the evolution of production over time, Harvey privileges an analytical focus on space rather than time. This perspective does not just situate capitalism in space as in Manuel Castells’ (1977) study of capitalism in the city or as a juxtaposition between a core exploiting peripheries (Wallerstein 1974), but views space as crucial to capitalism’s operation. Capitalism is dependent on specific spatial configurations and must produce and reproduce its own geography (Harvey 1985:xii; Lefebvre 1991). Harvey (1989) draws from Lefebvre but modifies and greatly expands upon his notion of the urbanization of capital to create an urban theory of political economy and its workings (Kipfer et al. 2008:7-8). The following discussion is an outline of space in Harvey’s formulation of the urbanization of capital as it is relevant to this study.

The urbanization of capital is a detailed theorization on how the process of modern capitalism functions that can be applied beyond its urban purview. The city is
often the unit of Harvey’s analysis, but this concrete abstraction reflects a focus on
capitalism at a specific spatial organization in this process. The value of drawing from
this theoretization is still the broader explanation of how capitalism functions as a spatial
process as well as the essential themes of accumulation and class struggle.

Even as a theoretization studying the city as the unit, this vantage point is
applicable. Cities have played a fundamental role in the circulation and concentration of
capital and thus, have had a broad impact. Further, modern cities are an integral part of
modern life and a reflection of a society that has become increasingly urbanized (Hays
2005). Harvey (1985:14), citing Marx, notes that the totality of the capitalist process
negates drawing strict delineations between the urban and nonurban; in his view, the
rural-urban dichotomy can be really seen as an expression of the division of labor.

At the core of this Harvey’s work is the assertion that urbanization involves the
internalization of surplus production within the circulation of capital and its
concentration, whereby everything is within the sphere of capitalism including space and
time (Harvey 1989). The most basic element in this process is the fundamental
relationship within capitalism whereby profit or surplus value is generated through an
unequal exchange and is traded to the capitalist from the laborer for a living wage
(Harvey 1985:1). The urban accumulation of these surpluses of capital defines the
urbanization with a geographic concentration of labor power and productive force as well
(Harvey 1989:25-27).

The accumulation of capital is the driving force in the capitalist process. The
continued accumulation of capital necessitates that the capitalist class reproduce itself
and maintain its domination over labor (Harvey 1985:1). Capital can be seen as a social
relation dependent on the expropriation of the laborer (Harvey 2000:28). The production of these capital and labor surpluses become generated by processes internal to the circulation of capital rather than processes external to it (Harvey 1989:27). This, in fact, means that the logic of accumulation produces, or has a hand in shaping, the physical and social landscape. Everything, including the traditional social relations of work, have to be realigned to this logic and its new social structures (Harvey 1985:199).

Tension arises out of the constant need to produce capital and labor surpluses while being able to absorb and make use of them effectively. The dynamic process of accumulation and absorption can be seen in the circuits within which capital moves and is deployed. In the primary circuit, surplus value is generated from an increase in the productivity of labor power (such as lengthening the work day), but this drive also has the tendency to generate excess accumulation, which cannot be immediately absorbed (Harvey 1985:4-6). The secondary and tertiary circuits of capital can temporarily alleviate this overaccumulation by absorbing this capital through investments that can directly or indirectly aid the accumulation of capital. The secondary circuit is composed of fixed assets (aids to production) and the consumption fund (aids to consumption—such as the physical framework for consumption like a sidewalk) (Harvey 1985:6). The tertiary circuit is composed of investments in science and technology and social expenditures related to the reproduction of labor power (Harvey 1985:8). Crises can occur in these circuits, reflecting problems in the flow of capital, its utilization, and the return on the investment.

The circuits of capitals demonstrate how capital moves and becomes invested in both social and physical forms. The process of capital circulation is geographically
grounded through the patterning of labor and commodity markets, the spatial divisions of production and consumption, and the organized systems of financial coordination (Harvey 1989:22). This geographical grounding creates a physical landscape of accumulation and surplus production. At the same time, this grounding creates an immovable barrier to the accumulation process and geographical expansion and thus, must be destroyed at some point (Harvey 1985:25; 60). New productions of space allow an essential “spatial fix” to these internal contradictions of capitalism (Harvey 1985:60-61). The built landscape is the materialization of these circuits and this process and thus, can be studied by historical archaeologists.

**Dimensions of Space**

Before discussing some of the spatial processes involved in sustaining the circulation of capital, it is necessary to more explicitly discuss space specifically as space plays such a large role in the transformation of conditions favorable for capitalism and its reproduction. Like time, space is a means to identify and individuate everything. Space and time provide the location and bounding parameters for these definitions (Harvey 1996:264).

The conceptualization of space determines how forms and functions are defined and observed. Space cannot be conceived of solely as an absolute or a universal category or even a structure in itself. Space, like time and place, is a social construct and has to be identified as such (Harvey 1996:324). If space is conceived of as fixed and absolute, then capitalism could be understood as more a natural and inherent process. To understand capitalism as working through local conditions in a more insidious and total manner, it is necessary to explore a wider spectrum of spatial dimensions and their transformations. In
this way, the built environment of the past can be contextualized so as to understand spatial practices and relations from the perspective of the household, community, or the logic of accumulation.

Spatial practices can be deconstructed into three dimensions, perceived, conceived, and lived dialectical each contributing to the production of space within a specific sociohistorical formation (Lefebvre 1991:39-40). Drawing from Lefebvre’s characterization, Harvey (1989:261) outlines the following three dimensions:

1) Material spatial practices (experienced) refers to the physical and material flows, transfers, and interactions that occur in and across space in such a way as to assure production and social production.
2) Representations of space (perceived) encompass all of the signs and significations, codes and knowledge, that allow such material practices to be talked about and understood, no matter whether in terms of everyday common sense or through the sometimes arcane jargon of academic disciplines.
3) Spaces of representation (imagined) are social inventions (codes, signs, and even material constructs such as symbolic spaces, particular built environments, paintings, museums, and the like) that seek to generate new meanings of possibilities of spatial practices.

All three dimensions of space need to be conceptualized to see the operation of capitalism. The relationship and tension between these three spatial dimensions allow a reading of the history of spatial practices (Harvey 1992:219; Lefebvre 1991). Through this deconstruction, the logic of accumulation and the contradictions of capitalism both can be seen through space.

It is important to note that the spatial dimensions are not specific to or derivative of capitalism. Social relations in capitalism remain abstract and ungrounded until they are specifically spatialized, that is, made into material and symbolic spatial relations (Lefebvre 1991). In this way, these dimensions of spatial practice take on meaning under specific social relations understood in their historical context. Their interpretative value
is derived when viewed within the context of the urbanization of capital, and thus, they can be used to unravel the complexities of spatial practices in this context (Harvey 1989:264).

**Spatial and Material Processes**

The spatial and material processes of capitalism are the avenues that provide evidence for archaeology to understand capitalism and its effects. While the accumulation of capital and movement in the various circuits lead to necessary spatial patterns, these elements underlay other spatial and material processes essential to this circulation. Many of these processes needed to ameliorate and mask the contradictions inherent to the urbanization of capital are observable archaeologically. For instance, capitalism operates under the assumptions of freedom, individualism, and equality whereby each capitalist acts spontaneously and creatively. However, this notion is directly contradicted by the inherent laws of capitalism that lead to conformity and coercion, and value being asserted in social terms (Harvey 1985:2). Another contradiction arises from the exploitation and violence inflicted on laborers by capitalists, leading laborers to band together as a class to resist (Harvey 1985:2).

In order for capitalism to continue and to expand, different mechanisms including spatial and material processes are needed to deal with these contradictions so that they are not realized and/or acted upon. The processes of social differentiation leading to residential differentiation and the urbanization of consciousness are used to facilitate and maintain unequal social relations and support the spatial structure necessary for accumulation. For this study, the value of understanding these two processes is that by
their nature, become spatialized and materialized, and thus, can be examined archaeologically.

**Social Differentiation**

Spatial relationships are a complex facet of modern capitalism tied directly and indirectly to the circuits of capital and exploitative nature of capitalism. The social differentiation necessary for capitalism’s operation is accomplished by at least three major forces, which lead to patterns of residential differentiation (Harvey 1989). The first and primary force is the basic social relationship of capitalism—the power relation between capital and labor leading to class structuration. Control over the means of production by capital and thus, class structure, are facilitated by institutional, legal, coercive, and ideological supports (which are all operating under or guided by the logic of accumulation) to maintain an unequal power relation (Harvey 1989:111).

As detailed by Harvey (1989:113-117), the need to preserve capitalist accumulation also requires several secondary forces. In an effort to expand production, there is a specialization of function and a division of labor both of which can lead to social differentiation. Large-scale industry needs variation in labor, fluidity in function, and the mobility of the worker in all directions (Marx 1990:617). Shifting modes of production also means constant changes in definitions and relations of the laborer (Harvey 2000:104). The lack of stabilization and inherent contradictions related to shifts in production and labor require disciplinary apparatus of surveillance, punishment, and ideological control (Harvey 2000:105).

At the other end, leading to the formation of distinct consumption classes in order to expand consumption and thus, accumulation and avoid overaccumulation of the
system, social differentiation is needed to facilitate different consumption patterns and life-styles. This consumption by the worker ties the worker back into the capitalist process and help insure its reproduction (Marx 1990:719). The expansion of production through the creation of new products necessitates the creations of needs and wants (Harvey 1992:106). Diversification in consumption practices allows more products to be consumed.

Another secondary force exists in authority relations within nonmarket institutions that are needed to sustain the power of capital over labor and the circulation of capital. While these relations appear to be independent or autonomous of the relation between capital and labor, their structure is guided by the capitalist process in which they are enmeshed and thus, their structure leads to social differentiation in the population.

Cognizance of the inequality of the capitalist and labor relationship needs to be channeled into state of consciousness conducive to the capitalist process. Social differentiation along lines other than the relationship between capital and labor serves to fragment class-consciousness. Manipulated ideological and political consciousesses are used to mask class-consciousness, their awareness of the root of social differentiation.

To ensure stability and structure, restrictions and barriers to mobility are utilized. Disparities in mobility chances are fostered through the differential distribution of skills and attributes that allow individuals to market their labor power, such as access to schools. This unequal distribution creates social differentiation and solidification of class groups and becomes relatively fixed in the social landscape.

Finally, the last force is a residual forces reflecting the social relations established in a preceding or geographically separate but subordinate mode of production (Harvey
This last force is a leftover and demonstrates how capitalism replaces structures through working through and within current relations.

Residential Differentiation

Establishing and sustaining the social order through these forces leads to spatial patterns of residential differentiation. Understanding this residential differentiation is key to observing the material reproduction and perpetuation of the social relations in capitalism. This spatial mechanism and its changes over time, reflecting changes in production and consumption, can be visible archaeologically in the built environment.

Residential differentiation involves a series of essential components that lead to structured and discernable patterns. Under the logic of accumulation, certain broad patterns of residential differentiation are produced by financial and governmental institutions that regulate the dynamics of the urbanization process (Harvey 1989:121). Neighborhoods and communities provide distinctive settings for social interaction from which individuals largely derive their values, expectations, consumption habits, market capacities, and states of consciousness (Harvey 1989:118). Residential differentiation also entails differences in access to resources, such as education, so that the labor power required for the demands of local production are reproduced (Harvey 1989:118). This spatial mechanism contradicts the ideology of the possessive individual.

The creation of communities speaks to the role of various scales of social organization and their interaction under the influences of the circuit of capital. The sense and definition of community arises from these homogenizations of life experiences. These similarities and sharing reinforces the tendency towards relatively permanent social groupings to emerge within a relatively permanent structure of residential
differentiation (Harvey 1989:120). This permanence results from the symbolic order of spaces feeding back to consciousness formation and imposing a way of thinking and doing that reinforces existing patterns of social life (Harvey 1989:250), directly impacting people’s decisions.

Material and spatial differentiation are only part of this process. In general, populations are fragmented. Thus, groupings and similarities become translated into a social awareness of a community, which serves to replace class-consciousness with a community-consciousness. Community-consciousness serves to replicate, naturalize, and conceal unequal social relations through social differentiation in space.

This same redirecting of consciousness can work against the urbanization process. Distinct communities can serve to fragment populations and thus, class-consciousness, but patterns of residential differentiation reflect and incorporate many of the contradictions of capitalist society (Harvey 1989:118). A deeply embedded community consciousness with its cultivated value systems, consumption habits, and built environment can obstruct capital accumulation. When this occurs, the community must be disrupted by speculative activity, growth, and transformation (Harvey 1989:123).

This conflict demonstrates the dynamic of different scales of powers. At the most basic level, the individual has some autonomy and preference, but at the scale of action of speculative activity, the individual in the community has almost no control over the social conditions of existence (Harvey 1989:123). Through the production process, institutions, developers, and other forces have control, and social relations between people become replaced with market relations between things (Harvey 1989:123). Individuals have little choice but to conform within legal and political framework. A much broader discussion
of the role of different social groupings and locations of power is necessary to
demonstrate how this process operates and its complexity and how it entrains a
consciousness conducive to the logic of accumulation.

The Urbanization of Consciousness

The theory of the urbanization of consciousness laid out by Harvey (1989) also
seeks to illustrate the formation of consciousness or mindsets through different bases of
power and material. For capitalism’s continued success, it must replicate labor and social
relations conducive to the circulation of capital. The urbanization of capital is dependent
on specific mindsets or conceptions and predispositions, i.e., consciousness, to facilitate
this operation. Thus, a study of consciousness formation can explain some of the diverse
and interrelated power bases that allow capitalism to function and reproduce itself. Also,
and most crucial for this study, understanding this process exposes consciousness
formation in the material and spatial realities of everyday life and the formation of
meanings (Harvey 1989:230).

Consciousness is formed and reformed through the state, class, community,
family, and individualism (Harvey 1989:231). The dynamics of these power bases
cannot be understood independent from the urbanization of capital as they are both
grounded to support the logic of accumulation as well as aid in its structure. The role and
function of the different power bases also cannot be separated from the spaces they
occupy (Harvey 1989:249). The symbolic order of these spaces imposes ways of
thinking and doing which reinforce the existing patterns of social life (Harvey 1989:250).
While the interrelated power bases and loci of consciousness formation can function to
aid the circulations of capital, they also have the capacity to obstruct them, making the formation and reformation of conducive mindsets critical to capitalism.

At the most basic levels are the interrelated notions of class and individualism. Individualism is fostered through money power that provides limited, but essential individual freedom (Harvey 1989:232). This freedom is really dependence by virtue of the alienation of labor and the fact that individuals are forced to consume (Lodziak 2002:69, 93). At the same time, the sense of class that arises from the experience of earning money is in conflict with money power and the degree of individual freedom garnered through its expenditure (Harvey 1989:232). This tension is further heightened by the separation of home and work and the subsequent shift in one’s role as seller of his or her labor power to a buyer of commodities, both of which in turn, distance production from consumption and aid in the fetishism of commodities (Harvey 1989:232-233). As a consumer, the individual and the body can be seen as a unit of space and accumulation (Harvey 1989:248, 2000; Foucault 1995).

The community plays an essential role in producing and maintaining different production classes and masking class-consciousness. People have to consume to avoid total deprivation (Lodziak 2002:135). With the mass culture of urbanization, social competition in one’s lifestyle and command of space becomes increasingly important (Harvey 1989:234-235). With this emphasis on consumption, social spaces of display and distraction become as important to culture as living and working spaces (Harvey 1989:234). Thus, spatial division via consumption is emphasized more than a spatial division of labor to make the community appear to have different consumption classes.
and status groups rather than class designations arising from production (Harvey 1989:234).

The way communities are viewed also entrains a consciousness conducive to the circulation of capital. Rather than being viewed as definitive places, as communities of money and capital, communities are seen as relative spaces that can be created and destroyed as necessary according to profitability (Harvey 1989:233). Thus, local loyalties for community are pitted against the maximization of profit by the individual. In this framework, the community competes against other communities, acting like a corporation itself seeking to maximize its capital. By this logic, the community can be reduced to a commodity and symbolic capital (Harvey 1989:233-234).

The community also can work against the logic of accumulation. The community can provide a space for active community building contrary to the individualism of money and the profit, class-bound logic of capital circulation, and notions of the family and state (Harvey 1989:235). Community solidarity and bonding can move beyond pure individualism and the logic of capital accumulation. Even consumer sovereignty offers the power to shape elements of life, but the community is always under the threat of the dissolving effects of money whereby money imposes external and homogenous values on all aspects of life (Harvey 1989:232-235).

As with community, the family can facilitate or work against the process of urbanization of capital and serve multiple functions. As a coping mechanism and safety valve to class alienation, the family is the primary means of reproducing labor power and basic class relations (Harvey 1989:237). The family can be viewed as an autonomous unit under pressure from the dissolving force of money as well as individualism. The
economic unit of the family also can diminish the protective power of the community by becoming increasing privatized and insulating individuals from external influences, reducing the need for the protection of the community (Harvey 1989:236). While the family can be a breeding ground for social relations antagonistic to money and capital, the family can serve as a space of production to ensure the family’s survival (Harvey 1989:237-238; Redclift and Mingiolne 1985)

Guided by the logic of accumulation, the state operates to ensure and enforce policies as well as adapt them to shifting relations between the other loci and the changing dynamics of capitalism. The state has the ability to define a public interest over that of an individualistic or familial interest, class struggle and conflictual community interests, and thus acts as a center of authority and legitimacy (Harvey 1989:238). The state also acts as a focus of place-based loyalties and an apparatus for propagating specific ways of thinking and acting, and ultimately ensures the proper management of capitalist urbanization (Harvey 1989:239).

The formation of consciousness arising from these powerbases cannot be construed as creating the same outcomes everywhere. Through daily experiences, a matrix of conceptions, understandings, and predispositions for action are generated and construct the prevailing conditions (Harvey 1989:240). Yet the unstable contradictions in each power base combined with the unpredictable manner in which power sources become combined, create different conditions (Harvey 1989:240-241).

The spaces produced by residential differentiation and the material culture consumed orient individuals in their relations with other people, the family, and other powers bases and are both structured and structuring. While Harvey never discussed the
materialization of these practices, material culture and the landscape are read as the products of this structure. Thus, the landscape and material culture can be studied to understand these processes and how they were practiced in everyday life.

Summary

The concept of the urbanization of capital views industrial capitalism as a specific spatial process, centralizing the accumulation of capital, production, and labor power in urban settings. The accumulation of capital and labor power often exceeds the capacity to use them, leading to crises of accumulation. The crises of accumulation are temporary alleviated with investments into the different circuits of capital and spatial fixes.

The dynamics of this logic of accumulation and the circuits of capital necessitate specific spatial configurations and lead to the structuring of everyday life. Social differentiation resulting from the labor and capitalist relationship, efforts to increase production and consumption, and residual or subordinate modes of production leads to residential differentiation. With residential differentiation, class solidity and consciousness is fragmented and replaced through separation and differential consumption. Class consciousness then becomes masked by a community-consciousness and these differentiations.

The urbanization of consciousness also fragments and realigns consciousness through the loci of power—class, individualism, family, community, and state. Through the internalized logic of the accumulation of capital, the loci of power interrelate and through this interaction maintain and reproduce the social relations needed to support capital accumulation. Conducive dispositions are entrained and lead to the creation of a
spatial order that perpetuates and feeds back a consciousness supportive of the logic of accumulation. The interactions of these loci of power, especially the regulatory role of the state, attempt to minimize contradictions and their capacity to obstruct the accumulation of capital and maintain spatial barriers.

To comprehend the role of space in the formation of consciousness and differentiation, space has to be understood as a social product and practice. Opening up the conceptualization of space as more than a one-dimensional, fixed category allows for an understanding of the different dimensions of space and the tensions between them. By reading the tensions between these relations, it is possible to begin to understand how spatial practices are necessary for urbanized capitalism and produced by this process.

Harvey’s theorization of the urbanization of capital has two major applications for this study. Its relevance derives from its thorough conceptualization of capitalism focused on social relations and its spatial dynamics, an approach is not found in other Marxist perspectives of capitalism. The first application is its power to explain the process, structure, and social relations of industrial capitalism and offer context to the history of and relationships in an industrial town like Texas, Maryland. Harvey details the accumulation of capital and surplus production and labor power beyond the basic relationship between capital and labor. The description of the circuits of capital through which capital flows makes evident the complex dynamics of the system, its spatial processes, and resulting social relations. Therefore, it is possible to examine multiple scales of capitalism affecting a specific spatial-temporal context while exploring the complex interactions taking place at the local level.
The second application of Harvey’s approach is an understanding of space and spatial signatures. Not only are the circuits of capital grounded geographically, social differentiation produces a material and spatial signature through residential differentiation. Through the state, community, family, individualism, and class, the urbanization of consciousness formulates relations and meanings that become spatialized and materialized. Understanding the role of these signatures and the process that formed them in reference to the accumulation of capital provides an analytical tool to understand capitalism and the production of space.

Without an understanding of how capital flows and the spatial processes needed to sustain and maintain it, the broad impacts of capitalism are muted and attention is not given to its more insidious and far-reaching nature. The spatial and social relations of capitalism can then be ascribed as a natural phenomenon and therefore, remain unchallenged. From this description of the urbanization of capital, it is clear that Harvey’s ideas have much to contribute to the study of life in the industrial quarry town of Texas. The next chapter details the history of Texas to provide a specific local context for understanding the impact of this process.
CHAPTER 4
The History of Industry and Texas

The town of Texas has been tied to the limestone industry for most of its history. Industry not only lead to the establishment of the town and the arrival of large numbers of Irish immigrants, every element of life was influenced and sometimes governed by it. This chapter details this intertwined history and the preeminence of industry, highlighting the built landscape and its alteration over time. Various themes and topics are used to discuss the town’s development and its social, economic, and political context. Using a range of elements of life in town provides an avenue to explore the depth of the industry’s involvement in the town and its impacts on the everyday life of individuals and the community. Detailed histories of the specific research sites are provided as they are necessary for understanding the sites in the broader history of town and in comparison to each other. A wide range of documentary data, including the buildings, landscapes, and the lives of the residents’ lives, are used to piece together the history of the each site.

Using Historical Records

Historical records provide data that can be difficult or impossible to extract from the material record. While written records contain valuable biographical data, very little was recorded about the common laborer in Texas. The primary sources for biographical information are the US Federal census and newspaper articles. Newspaper articles provide about the only source of information for specific events, such as a house burning down or industrial accidents, in Texas.
The Federal census data provides some of the only demographic data, but interpreting this information is complicated by a number of factors including the ten-year spacing/cycle of the census and the transience of some workers. Determining the specific location of many individuals surveyed in Texas is not possible. Likewise, the built environment of Texas has been pieced together from maps and historic accounts, but not every building is represented or known nor are the specific number of household units within a given structure clear. The identification of the use or uses of buildings as residences, businesses, or quarry operations is also hard to determine. Finally, the limits of what is considered Texas cannot be determined as the census enumerators do not establish clear boundaries and may have excluded areas of Texas. Given these problems, the following history represents a patchwork of different sources in an effort to provide the most complete picture of Texas and its limestone industry.

Texas and the Quarry Industry in the Nineteenth Century

With Texas, the history of the town was the history of its principal industry. The town and industry grew up together where only farms and a few small quarries had stood. Local entrepreneurs of industry created the town and thus had a hand in creating an industrial landscape. This section details the early beginnings of Texas and the limestone industry.

For much of its history, the north central part of Baltimore County was rural and agricultural. Tracts of land in the area were patented as early as 1698, but settlement began slowly (Anderson 1981:2). The land on which Texas is situated was originally patented in 1704 by Joseph Taylor and purchased by Thomas Cockey in 1725 (Anderson
Thomas Cockey operated a plantation called Taylor’s Hall. By the time of his son Thomas Cockey Deye’s death in 1807, the land holdings had grown to over 4,125 acres, and were subsequently divided in 1810 into 7 lots (Anderson 1978:3). These lots were depicted in a series of plats and show the limited development of the area. One plat shows the location of Taylor’s Hall near what would become Padonia Road while another shows residences, a quarry, and a kiln near the center of what would become Texas (Figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1: 1812 Plat from Alexander and Mary Nisbet vs. Thomas D. Cockey and others showing the west half of parcel No. 2. Image is superimposed over a current aerial image of Texas. The thick brown line is York Road while the thinner lines are the boundaries of the property and some include fence lines. A spring house is noted with “G,” a dwelling house with “F,” a dwelling house and other buildings with “C,” “D,” “H,” or “I.” The quarry is noted with “J” and the lime kilns with “B.” (Collection of the Maryland State Archives [MSA S512-3863]).

These plats provide the first evidence of buildings and quarrying in the vicinity of Texas. Yet, these small clusters cannot be construed as a town, and no additional record has been found detailing any intensive quarrying of stone in this area in the beginning of
the nineteenth century. According to John McGrain (2001a:1), the first evidence of quarrying activity in the valley can be seen in the construction of the nearby Hayfields Mansion and Cockeysville Hotel. A quarry to the west of the town of Cockeysville supplied some of the stone for the Washington Monument in Baltimore in 1815 (Matthews 1898:172-173; McGrain 2001a:1).

Figure 4.2: 1836 Anne and Thomas D. Cockey vs. Bosley Plat showing the 44-acre parcel (shaded) sold to Bosley. (Collection of the Maryland State Archives [MSA C349-295]).

The land that would become Texas lay just west of the major turnpike connecting Baltimore to York, Pennsylvania. The York Turnpike was completed from Baltimore to the area later known as Timonium, just south of Texas, by 1808 and 1809 (Heritage
Committee of the Greater Timonium American Bicentennial Committee or GTABC 1976:45). A series of taverns are depicted in along the York Turnpike in 1836 (Figure 4.2). “Worley’s Tavern” is depicted on the northwest corner of the intersection of what became Church Lane and the York Turnpike, while the “Wise Tavern” is depicted on the southwest corner of what became Galloway Avenue and the York Turnpike (Baltimore County Circuit Court Land Records TK Liber 266, Folio 534).

While the turnpike connected the small cluster of buildings to the City of Baltimore, the key to the growth of the quarry and the town appears to have been the arrival of the Baltimore and Susquehanna Railroad in the 1830s. The railroad was part of Baltimore’s effort to extend influence north to the Susquehanna River and reach markets in Pennsylvania, thus, competing with Philadelphia (Edgington and Robinson 1998:Section 8, Page 7; Scharf 1971:343-344). The railway, chartered in 1828, was begun in 1829, reached the Timonium area in 1832, passed through Texas by 1836, and reached York, Pennsylvania, in 1838 (Edgington and Robinson 1998:8.1). Portions of this track were built on limestone blocks quarried locally (Anderson 1981:3; Edgington and Robinson 1998; Maryland Chancery Court Records #6279); quarry workers in large number were probably first brought to the area for the construction of the railroad.

At the time of the railroad’s expansion into the area, some tracts of land had been subdivided (Figure 4.2) and small quarries and kilns were in operation. The railroad proved crucial for the expansion of these industries. In 1837, Amos Bosley successfully sued Thomas Deye Cockey and Ann Cockey (Baltimore County Circuit Court Records or BCCCR Liber TK 266, Folio 532) to gain an access road and rail siding from his quarry and kiln south of Church Lane through the Cockey’s property to the Baltimore and
Susquehanna Railroad. At this time, large tracts of land were owned or leased by John Clark, Thomas Galloway, Amos Bosley, Judge Nesbit, Thomas Cockey, and William Talbott; their properties and Bosley’s quarry are depicted in Figure 4.2 (BCCCR Liber TK 266, Folio 534).

With the availability of rail transport, the quarrying and lime burning industry grew. According to Thomas Scharf (1971:421), the Beaver Dam Quarry, around one mile north of what became Texas, was being operated successfully in 1835 by John B. and John F. Connolly. The lime trade was so extensive at this time that there were fears that the quarries might be exhausted; the State geologist had to step in to dispel these fears in 1839 (Matthews 1898:174). According to The Baltimore Sun (April 21, 1840), by 1840 Thomas D. Cockey was offering limestone by the ton that could be shipped on the railroad to the city wharves at prices cheaper than could be purchased on the Schuylkill or elsewhere. This stone was being used as a building material and burned to produce lime. According to Kimberly Abe (2004:5), lime was a base that neutralized acids from plant material and adding nutrients to the soil such as calcium and magnesium, and thus, was essential for more intensive agriculture.

The first evidence of a town occurs in the 1840s. The name Texas may have originated from the volunteers who left the village in 1846 to fight in the Mexican War. Known as the Texas Greens, local resident Joshua Bosley served as their captain (Republican and Argus June 24, 1846). When they returned, the town was said to have been named in their honor or because it reminded a resident of the state of Texas (Republican and Argus June 24, 1846; Smith 1927:17). According to baptismal records, the town was being called New Texas in 1846 (Smith 1927:33). The town was
apparently also known as Clarksville or Ellengowan. A November 11, 1850a, *Baltimore Advocate* article comments that the town was growing rapidly at this point and likely to be the central town of the county, but in order to do so, it had to improve the roads to the turnpike and finally decide on a name.

As early as 1847, it is evident that the limestone trade was firmly established and highly valued. In this year, the firms of Griscom and Burroughs, Fell and Robinson, and Thomas Symington submitted bids to supply lime and rubble limestone for construction of the Smithsonian Institution building (Owen 1880:604). David Owen’s (1880) documentation of this 1847 contract provides the first description of quarrying in Texas. His description highlights the numerous, small independent operations in and around Texas (Owen 1880:604-610):

1) Fell and Robinson are primarily engaged in lime burning. Their quarry lies a few paces to the west of the railroad and has average depth of 18 feet.
2) On the east side of the railroad and not far from it, 400 to 500 yards from Fell and Robinson’s quarry, is the quarry of Griscom and Burroughs with similar and equally good stone.
3) In the same vicinity, Symington’s quarry lies 300 to 400 yards from the main track and intends as do the other quarry owners to have switches built to the quarries.
4) Chisilla Owen’s quarry is one mile northeast of these quarries and should have similar stone though it has not been opened yet.
5) Other quarries near Cockeysville include those of Mrs. Taylor, Scott, Chisilla Owen (including one operated by Mr. Cooper), Baker and Connely, and Mr. Worthington.
6) Judge Nesbitt’s quarry is near Texas.

About this time, the concentration of industry shifted from the community near Cockey’s plantation to Texas and brought with it some conflict. According to the November 21, 1850, *New York Tribune*, the post office at Taylor’s Hall was official changed to Ellengowan, “…a thriving little village, of now some four hundred families…” (*The Baltimore Sun* February 16, 1850). By November 11, 1850b,
(Baltimore County Advocate), a meeting was held to protest the change of postmaster and post office to Ellengowan.

The shift is seen in the 1850 Sidney map which shows an established town and the Taylor’s Hall estate to the south (Figure 4.3). The town sits to the west of the York Turnpike which runs north to south. Perpendicular to the turnpike and running west to east from the Baltimore and Susquehanna Railroad are what would become Church Lane and Padonia road. The bulk of the town lay along these roads and between them and along the railroad.

![Figure 4.3: 1850 J. C. Sidney Map of the City and County of Baltimore, Maryland, showing Texas. The Cockey’s estate known as Taylor’s Hall is circled in blue. (Collection of the Maryland State Archives [MSA SC 1427-1-196])](image)

Although the exact boundaries of the town are difficult to delineate, the 1850 Federal Census shows a town divided by ethnicity or place of birth. The six individuals listed as limeburners or in the limebusiness were born in Maryland, Pennsylvania, or New York. Other American-born resident held both skilled and unskilled occupations
including stonemason, carpenter, merchant, shoemaker, farmer, physician, blacksmith, wheelwright, millwright, postmaster, and laborer. The town’s Irish-born residents held just a few specific occupations: shoemaker, innkeeper, constable; the vast majority were laborers. Of the three English and one Germany residents, two are listed as laborers. The other group of laborers are a small minority listed as blacks and mulattos.

To understand the town and the nature of this development, it is necessary to look more closely at the creation and the formation of the built environment. The town arose because of investment for industry, and secondarily, real estate. As a result of Bosley’s suit to gain access to the railroad for his quarry, Samuel Griscom purchased 44 acres of land from Charles and Ann L. Buchanan in 1846 (BCCCR Deed Liber AWB 361, Folio 366), land they bought from Thomas Deye Cockey of Thomas and Ann Cockey in 1843 (BCCCR Deed Liber TR 332, Folio 239). The 44 acres was divided into lots and divisions which were subdivided in lots and are depicted on the Griscom vs. Griscom 1854 Plat and include the project areas (Figure 4.4).

Griscom’s lots, which include the archaeological sites discussed below, were purchased by local entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs from the city or even some outside the state for speculating and for the quarrying limestone for building and burning into lime. Jacob Burrough purchased twenty-five lots and three whole divisions in 1854 and one lot in 1856, while Edward Rider purchased three whole divisions in 1863. Adam Denmead purchased five lots and one whole division in 1864, and by 1866 was listed with fifteen lots. Rachel Griscom purchased one lot in 1864, James Wright bought four lots in 1855, Charles Jones bought one lot in 1854, and John Byrnes bought one lot in 1864. In these deed transactions, the priority of industry is stressed with right-of-ways
for railroad tracks through lots and drains from the quarries (see for instance BCCCR Libr HMF 11: Folio 321).

The town was literally built around the quarries and kilns. Homes were principally constructed along the transportation routes leading to the quarries and kilns. The 1854 Plat shows homes along the railroad and roads and the layout of the drainage systems needed for the railroad and quarry environment (Figure 4.4). These spatial arrangements placed workers and their families next to their work. The map also shows the primacy of the railroad for industry with almost every element of the built environment from the kilns to the homes facing this major artery. The roads leading to the York Turnpike contained homes and business but these homes did not face the railroad.

With limestone providing a rich resource and source of profit, the town’s orientation shows the importance of the industry. The resources of Texas were likened to a boom. The *American Farmer* (1851:422), an agricultural magazine, writes in 1851 that after visiting Texas, the nine acres surrounding the railroad tracks was of more value "by its power of creating wealth, than any similar extent of territory of the gold regions of California."

Much of the limeburning industry was concentrated in the Texas area and already having obvious success. By 1852, there were 51 lime kilns in operation in or near Texas (Brooks and Rockel 1978:133). The industry seemed to have exhausted the local supply of wood by this time. Lime burners and quarry owners, Thomas Galloway and Michael McCabe, had advertised their lime and asked for wood brought to any spot on the rail line (*Baltimore County Advocate* February 21, 1852, March 10, 1855). McCabe also notes
burning limestone for construction uses with wood and limestone for agriculture purposed using coal (Baltimore County Advocate March 10, 1855).

The industry and town benefited from the availability and relatively shallow deposits of limestone. The Limestone Valley consisted of bands of limestone with variation in these deposits related to the best use of the limestone. (Figure 4.5). The rock around Texas is a coarse-grained crystalline marble of almost pure carbonate of lime suitable for flux or fertilizer, while a mile and a half away at Cockeysville, the stone is a finer-grained dolomitic marble rich with magnesium and well suited for building and decorative purposes (Matthews 1898:172-178).

The crushing strength of the Texas marble is very low and thus, not suitable for building purposes where small blocks are used and subjected to high loads while the inverse is true about the Cockeysville marble, though some fine-grained marble can be found at Texas (Matthews 1898:177). Therefore, most of the stone in Texas was quarried to be burnt for lime though some was being quarried for various buildings and monuments.

Even though these deposits were shallow, huge amounts of human labor were needed to remove and process them. Before steam powered tools, hammers and chisels and rods and feathers were used to split blocks of limestone for building, while gunpowder and hammers were used to break up stone for burning. In the early nineteenth century, the intermittent kiln or set kiln used for burning limestone consisted of a retaining wall around a chamber that was loaded with alternating loads of fuel (wood or coal) and limestone. According to Raymond Smith (1976:6-7) and Kimberly Abe (2004:6), the set kiln wasted heat and fuel and each charge had to burn out and cool
Figure 4.4: 1854 Ann Griscom, et al. vs. David P. Griscom Plat depicting Samuel Griscom’s 44 acres divided into divisions, lots, and with improvements. (Collection of the Maryland State Archives [MSA SC 4959-0-37]).
before it could be unloaded and loaded again, the whole process taking between to nine to
thirteen days. The more efficient, perpetual kiln was set into a hillside and could be run
continuously with loads of limestone and fuel from above and the lime could be raked out
at its base (Smith 1976:7).

By the 1850s, the industrial output of Texas was staggering. *The Baltimore County Advocate* (April 3, 1852a) details the output of Baltimore County (mostly from Texas) transported on the Baltimore and Susquehanna in 1851 as 35,920 tons of lime (784,000 bushels), 13,500 tons of limestone (202,500 bushels), 5,806 tons of marble (75,000 cubic feet), and the amount hauled away by neighboring farmers: 23,500 bushels—of that 10,000 bushels from York County. Most of the lime was coming from Texas with some being more cheaply burned with coal for agricultural purposes. This huge output can be attributed to the over 51 lime kilns in operation in 1852; Griscom and Burroughs were operating 10 kilns, Fell and Robinson 7, William Bosley 5, Joshua Bosley 5, Thomas Galloway 4, John Parks 2, J. F. Shipley 2, Levi Merryman 2, and what had been J. L. Sutton’s 12, and Judge Nisbet 2 (*The Baltimore Sun* December 27, 1852). The article further notes that marble was being taken by Thomas Fortune and Anitpas Harrington for Thomas Symington from the quarry of Griscom and Burroughs in Texas for the Washington Monument in Washington, DC, blocks for the Patent Office, and the base of Mill’s equestrian statue of Andrew Jackson; some of the blocks weighed 19 tons.

The U.S. Federal Census Bureau Products of Industry in the 8th District in Baltimore County for 1860 lists ten line burners employing 28 individuals producing 344,000 bushels of lime annually, and one quarry owner is listed with 50 workers.
Figure 4.5: 1892 Geological survey map showing the different geological zones north of Baltimore City including Limestone Valley and Texas (in red box). The white color shows the vein of limestone.

According to the US Federal Census for 1860, 15 lime establishments with an overall annual product of $134,700 were operating in Baltimore County. By 1870, there were only seven lime establishments but an annual product of $164,950. If this data is correct,
it would suggest that the industry was being consolidated, perhaps, due to the availability of, or even access to, the capital to build the more efficient perpetual kilns. A new patent kiln or perpetual draw kiln was built in 1852 by Fell and Robinson that required less wood, which was scarce and costly (Baltimore County Advocate December 25, 1852). According to the Baltimore County Advocate (April 25, 1857), William Robinson of Baltimore applied for a patent for a “perpetual lime kiln” (US Patent No. 17056). In 1860, Thomas Risteau paid Robinson $50 dollars for the right to erect such a kiln (Abe 2004:3). It appears, however, that set kilns were still being used alongside the new perpetual kilns.

The lime business was deemed crucial to health of the state and faced regional competition. It is unclear to what degree the business was regulated though one newspaper articles states that the Governor appointed John Bond as wood-corder and lime inspector in Texas in 1860 (The Baltimore Sun March 24, 1860). Several other newspaper articles mention a concern with the economic health of the industry. For instance, The Baltimore County Advocate (April 3, 1852a) notes competition with lime from the Schuylkill area based on a comment of a State agricultural chemist about the magnesia content of the Maryland lime. The wealth generated and the necessity of limestone and lime for agriculture and industry remained a concern for the state and Baltimore County during the first few decades of the industry’s operation. Likely reflecting the demands of the Civil War as well, even the transportation network was upgraded with the rail line double tracked in 1864 (GATBC 1976:54; Smith 1927:16).

The strength of the industry seemed to wane in 1870s and it began to consolidate. According to Scharf (1971:347), the receipts for lime on the Northern Central Railway
equaled 415,640 bushels in 1878, and 421,748 bushels in 1879, but only 31,495 bushels in 1880. The limestone in the valley was still being used for building stone, and was the only vein of limestone that was deemed economically important by a representative of Maryland Geological Survey (Williams 1893:135).

This economic importance may explain the significant amounts of capital invested and scale of this portion of the industry. Much of the stone for buildings was coming from north of Texas near Beaver Dam. The Beaver Dam Marble quarry, owned first by John Baker then his son in law James B. Connelly who left it to his sons, J. B. and T. F. Connelly (Williams 1893:135), was a large operation with significant capital invested. Similar levels of investment and complexity are not seen in Texas. In 1893, Hugh Sisson was operating the two to three quarries at Beaver Dam and employing 200 men (Williams 1893:135-136). Hugh Sisson was president of the Beaver Dam Marble Company and lived in the Baltimore City where he had a steam marble-mill for manufacturing monuments, tombstones, mantels, and other marble products (Scharf 1971:421). Another company, the Maryland Marble Company, was owned by Bartlett, Robbins, and Co. and other “well-known Baltimore men” (The Baltimore Sun August 14, 1872). Several of the large quarries were still owned by people outside of the area in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

The industry clearly expanded between the 1880s and the 1890s. In 1870, six establishments engaged in quarrying are listed with $22,100 in capital and employing 52 and paying $27,880 in annual wages. Limestone was also processed by other companies in Baltimore City. In 1880, Scharf (1971:421) notes that there were 41 establishments
engaged in marble and stone cutting with a capital of $462,701 and employing 1,017 and expending $335,532 in wages.

Mechanization and capital improvements were key to this industry, allowing for the cheaper and faster extraction of stone. Work became largely mechanized with diamond drills able to drill a hole one inch in diameter and two feet deep in the span of five minutes, doing the same work that would have taken three men with hammer and drill two to three hours (The Baltimore Sun August 14, 1872). Steam powered saws and other dressing machinery were used at the Beaver Dam and Cockeysville Marble Works (The Baltimore Sun August 14, 1872). Using diamond drills and wedges, blocks that were 28 ft. by 10 ft. by 3 ft. were quarried (Williams 1893:136). The stone was then dressed and shipped as 108 columns each 26 feet long for use in the US Capitol (Williams 1893:136). The newspaper article (The Baltimore Sun August 14, 1872) notes that this stone was some of the least expensive marble used at the Capitol.

Throughout the quarry’s history, limestone was used to make monuments, places of political, religious, and social power and countless residents and other buildings, roads, bridges, dams, and structures. The limestone was used in several major cities like Baltimore, Washington, and Philadelphia, in buildings such as the Washington Monument which used 163,724 cubic feet of Cockeysville marble, the Metropolitan Club of New York, the Peabody Institute in Baltimore, the US Post office in Washington, DC, the Maryland Club, Rialto Building, Baltimore City Hall, the Eutaw Place Baptist Church, the Brown Memorial Church, the spires of St. Patrick’s Cathedral in New York, and the Drexel and Penn Mutual Insurance buildings in Philadelphia (Williams
Large amounts of the marble also were used for doorstops, lintels, facings, rubble, ballast, and other applications (Williams 1893:137).

The capital reinvested and cheap labor allowed the quarries to be profitable. The marble industry did not feel the depression of 1893 due to the demand for the Cockeysville marble which furnished most of the material within the state (Matthews 1898:236). Although Texas was still burning lime and quarrying some stone towards the end of the nineteenth century, only small amounts of capital seem to have been expended. According to George Williams (1893:135), Texas was still associated with burning lime or flux owing to the lack of impurities and low crushing strength, while the Beaver Dam Marble quarries were associated with building stone. Some reinvestment was undertaken in Texas as new kilns of solid masonry were built (The Baltimore County Union April 30, 1887).

Texas was still a large source for lime in the state. In 1893, the most extensive lime burning in Maryland was at Texas, where the principal operator estimated the average annual production of the twenty kilns as 200,000 bushels of quicklime for commercial and agricultural purposes, though mainly building lime, valued at $28,000 (Williams 1893:138). The demand was said to be most economically supplied by a concentration of the industry (Williams 1893:138).

Some records indicate stone was still being quarried in Texas for buildings in the 1890s. In June 1892, L. B. McCabe and Brothers took charge of a quarry formerly used for burning limestone and with 35 men using improved machinery took out 3,000 tons ($15,000) for the Belt Line tunnel and the North Avenue viaduct, with blocks measuring 32 ft., 2 in. by 3 ft., 10 in., (Williams 1893:137).
By the late nineteenth century, Texas was facing national competition. The *Baltimore County Union* (April 30, 1887) compares Texas lime to that of lime from Ohio and Indiana demonstrating how competition had risen across the country. Improvements in transportation made it easier to move lime cheaper, opening up markets and new sources. According to George Williams (1892:101), it was more economical to get lime from the Frederick Valley rather than Texas. Some of the largest quarries in Texas were being used for industry rather than fertilizer, with lime primarily used for flux for the blast furnaces of the Maryland Steel Company (Williams 1892:101). Similarly, the Standard Lime and Stone Company of Buckeystown, Maryland, had a large quarry in Texas that shipped an average of 400 tons daily to the Maryland Steel Company at Sparrows Point (Williams 1893:138).

Although the output of stone and lime had increased, the industry had shrunken by the turn of the century. According to Matthews (1898:176), the greater abundance and higher quality of the marketable stone has enabled the Beaver Dam quarry to outlast its local competitors and operate as the only large quarry operator in the area. Quarries were still operating in Texas according to Matthews (1898:176-177), consisting of six quarry operations and at least seventeen kilns.

**Texas and Industries in the Twentieth Century**

The industry of Texas experienced major changes in the twentieth century. While quarrying was being done in Texas and Cockeysville in 1913, Edward Matthews of the Maryland Geological Survey reported that marble quarrying in Maryland was practically dead because “there have been failures upon failures and long stretches of inactivity, due
to insufficient capital, non-aggressive management and disappointed expectations” (*The Baltimore Sun* March 16, 1913). However, another article states that during the peak of the demand for white steps between 1905 and 1920, the valley could not supply enough marble (Schmidt 1963). Stone producers from Georgia and other southern operations used modern equipment and cheap labor to capture the market by underselling the Maryland quarries (Schmidt 1963). While Beaver Dam is estimated to have supplied sixty percent of Baltimore City’s marble steps, stone was also brought in from Alabama, Vermont, and Pennsylvania (Schmidt 1963).

By the 1920s, Texas was under siege with dramatic changes to the physical landscape. The industry had not stopped but changed. After 1926, only one new building was built in Texas (EA Associates 1986:2-2). Furthermore, land began to be consolidated by quarry operations. In 1919, Harry T. Campbell had started to lease the Kelly quarry and by 1926 he began to acquire land in Texas (Harry T. Campbell Sons’ Corporation 1967:2). Over time, the Campbell Company would continue to expand and invest heavily into the mechanization of the industry to produce various commodities.

The quarrying of stone still continued at the Beaver Dam Quarry in the early twentieth century. William Purdum (1940:2-3) states that the years from 1920 to 1930 were boom years for the marble industry in Baltimore County with the Beaver Dam quarry chosen to supply the marble for the Fisher building in Detroit. The importance of marble seemed to have faded after the 1920s with homebuyers no longer wanting marble steps; some home owners even painted their marble steps. H. L. Mencken exclaimed “Some people in recent times have gone so far as to paint their marble trim, an obscenity perhaps unmatched in Christendom” (Schmidt 1963). The Beaver Dam quarry was filled
with water by the time Purdum (1940:4) wrote his description in 1940; the last stone came out of the Beaver Dam quarry was used for the Arts and Sciences Building at the University of Maryland, College Park in 1934 (Schmidt 1963).

The limestone industry continued in Texas though not so much in terms of burning lime. The Maryland Geological Survey or MGS (1929:235) noted in 1929 that limeburning had declined over the last 20 to 30 years, although there was an increase in the use of ground, unburned limestone from Texas as fertilizer. Lindsay’s kiln was the only one still in operation in 1929 (MGS 1929:235). A student paper, probably written in the 1980s, contains an interview with Lloyd Parks, who worked for William Lindsay in 1915 (Student Paper 1980s:9-10). Parks states that limestone, quarried by seven to eight men, was taken from the quarry by two men and a cart drawn by three mules. A breaker used a ten pound hammer to break the limestone into eight inch pieces at the top of the kiln while two men acted as limeburners for each kiln. Parks states that they worked two shifts, 6 am to 2 pm and 3 pm to 6 am; the day burners were paid $12.50 per day while the night burners received $15.00 and laborers earned $7.50. This interview may indicate the process of lime burning during its decline or be an example of the process as it had been done in Texas since the town’s founding, suggesting that capital was not sufficiently reinvested in this operation. It is unclear whether it was more economical to keep the kilns lit and burning lime as opposed to starting a new charge every morning or whether the demand was sufficient to warrant twenty-four hour burning and the additional wages paid to the night burners. Parks remarks that the kilns were run all year except when it was too hot or too snowy to work.
An increase in the demand for limestone used for other purposes and industries also occurred at this time (MGS 1929:235). In 1940, one of the active quarries in Texas, owned by Harry T. Campbell, expanded their operation. By 1950, Campbell’s corporation controlled all of the land to the west of railroad and some of the land to the east (Anderson 1985:5). In 1979, the quarry which occupies the west half of town produced both blue and white stone. The blue stone is extracted from the open pit while the white stone or calcium carbonate is mined out through long tunnels, encompassing 26 acres, in the side of the quarry and is used in many products from antacid tablets to plastics (Henderson 1979). With this expanded demand and new technologies to remove the stone, the quarry grew. The limits of human power were overcome by machines allowing the quarries to be both deeper and larger. The quarry, its infrastructure, and related enterprises began to define the entire area west of the rail line.

While the quarry expanded in the twentieth century, the value of the surrounding landscape had shifted bringing in new forms of capital accumulation. Development marked the formerly agricultural and quarry landscape, with homes being built along the major roads, including York and Padonia Roads, in the late 1930s or earlier. Other industries also sprang up near Texas, to take advantage of the supply of cheap labor. During the First World War, a munitions plant was constructed near Padonia Road (Jeffersonian January 29, 1916). Texans also were employed in the Empire Furniture Factory which had been repurposed from the ammunition factory, and the adjacent Williamson Veneer Plant, which partially burned down in 1925 (Smith 1927:18). The Veneer Plant apparently still housed shells from its use as a munitions factory for the Poole Engineering and Machine Company (The Baltimore Sun March 17, 1925).
The pattern of wage labor shifted from the quarries to employment outside of Texas. By the end of the 1930s, the non-quarry industries were also gone from Texas. Texans were increasingly moving out of town or working outside of town. Men were employed in nearby farms and factories while both men and women worked in skilled and unskilled jobs in Towson and even Baltimore City. The shift in employment further dissolved the community and family relations.

**Industry and Health**

The nature of quarry work in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries would have severely impacted the health and well being of workers and the whole town. The physical toll on the body can be inferred from period sources. According to Abe (2004:6), the intermittent kiln was labor intensive and took between nine and thirteen days to load, burn, cool, and unload. The later perpetual kiln would have been equally labor intensive, requiring constant loading of fuel and limestone, and removal of lime. The actual process of quarrying with chisel and hammer or rod and plug was clearly hard on the body, and even the later steam drills would have taken their toll.

Not only was the regular operation of the limestone industry hazardous, the industry was inherently dangerous. The frequent accidents at these enterprises were listed in the local newspaper. For instance, the *Baltimore County Advocate* (March 27, 1852) reported that John Ryan had his leg badly broken by a rock from a blast in Joshua M. Bosley’s limestone quarry in Texas. The *Baltimore County Union* (March 26, 1881) mentions that Thomas Conway, an Irish-born laborer, after the loading of a car with lime, tried to warm himself and fell off the kiln and was killed. The *Baltimore County*
Advocate (April 3, 1852b) describes a conductor being run over and killed by lime rail cars as the train approached Texas. Even in 1910, hard rock miners in the US were sixteen times more likely to die by traumatic injury than a typical manufacturing employee (Hoffman 1915:6). The only photograph of the lime kilns in Texas when they were still being used in 1892 shows a series of towering brick stacks with make-shift covers for the workers laboring on top of the kilns (Figure 4.6) (Harry T. Campbell Sons’ Corporation 1967:1). The photo also shows the precarious nature of the industry’s extractive infrastructure.

![Figure 4.6: A Texas quarry and kilns in 1892 (Harry T. Campbell Sons’ Corporation 1967:1).](image)

The industry also impacted the town that surrounded it. The environment created by the removal and movement of limestone from the quarries and on the railroad as well as the near constant burning of limestone would have been detrimental to the health of
workers and residents or even fatal. The process of creating lime is hazardous, caustic, and done at very high temperatures (1,000 degrees Fahrenheit). Kilns ran around the clock burning for weeks and months at a time. In addition to the limestone dust and the fumes created, thick smoke would have been a constant for Texas residents, day and night. A *Baltimore Sun* (March 16, 1913) reporter noted the kiln stack sending out clouds of smoke, and workmen sprinkled with white—“…a gray, filmy, gauzy covering over everything.” Even recently, a resident of Texas across the tracks from the quarry, Theresa Sheeler, noted a thin film of white in her house if she left the windows open.

Similarly, a white covering was described by a cashier in the Lowes Home Improvement store to the east of the present quarry. This exposure to constant limestone dust and other airborne contaminants affect the health of workers and the entire town. According to a resident, Les Perry, who moved to Texas in 1920, the dust was enough to kill the wild pear and apple trees that used to surround the village (Deboalt 1993).

These airborne contaminants were also directly attributed to the death of residents. According to internment records from St. Joseph Church from 1896 to 1924, of the 229 internments with causes of death listed, 142 (62%) were due to respiratory ailments, such as tuberculosis and pneumonia. Silicosis, a lung disease resulting from inhaling silica particles, as well as exposure to other airborne contaminants, increased the susceptibility of Texans to these ailments and possibly many more. Silicosis destroys the lymph channels in the lungs, forming nodules and scarring the lungs and leading to susceptibility to infection (Foster 1985:273-274). The link between dust and such a miner’s disease was known, so this knowledge could have been used to protect workers (Foster 1985:268). The safety of the environment was more related to industry priorities.
and class relations as Janet Siskind (1988:203) found in her study of the intersection of class and silicosis in a nineteenth-century axe-grinding factory.

While not directly comparable, the 1910 Specific Death Rate for Selected Causes by Death Registration in Maryland, including pneumonia, influenza, bronchitis, and tuberculosis (Linder and Grove 1947:342-343, 378-379) divided by the death rate for all causes is twenty-two percent and contrasts the causes of death in Texas. This number from 1910 is a rough average and is limited in comparison for a number of reasons, especially as the rate of these respiratory ailments decreases with time, but the year 1910 is about in the middle of the period sampled in Texas and the number greatly differs from the cause of death in Texas, and at the least indicates a higher incidence of respiratory ailments. In general, respiratory ailments had a high death rate during this period. For instance, citing insurance records of mortality in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and New Orleans from 1889-1913, Frederick Hoffman (1970:102) lists tuberculosis of the lungs and pneumonia as having the highest death rate.

Other hazards arose from the daily activities of the quarries and kilns. The railroads would have shaken homes given their close proximity to the railroad (Figure 4.7). Quarry activities also created a danger to the town especially because of its use of explosives. The *Baltimore Sun* (May 16, 1893) provides some insight into the constant danger when it related the story of a dynamite explosion. According to the report, the blast occurred in the early morning and was so severe that people felt its percussion ten miles away. In Texas, several houses were damaged.
Finally, while the limestone is not toxic, quarrying and draining ground water changed the water table and could have affected drinking water. Water was available from springs, wells, quarries, and streams. There is one recorded instance where “dysentery is prevailing to a considerably extent” in Texas and the vicinity with several children having died (The Baltimore Sun July 23, 1853). Other possible contaminants came from the burning of coal, which produced fly ash and bottom ash with the former being airborne.
Industry and Labor

Changes in the production in the quarry industry were influenced by both competition and market demand. Thus, external factors driving the industry impacted the town and relations in the town. Examining these market trends helps to explain the broader social patterns within the industry and town. David Gordon et al. (1982:9) provides a table and explanation of the economic shifts which also correspond with crises of accumulation. This data correlates with and has been combined with the data of construction cycles in Baltimore City by Sherry Olson (1979:559) (Table 4.1). Data from Baltimore City shows smaller economic cycles but provides the closest such data available that would reflect demand for the quarry products.

The initial boom in demand for limestone and lime occurred in the 1840s and lasted until the 1870s with minor fluctuations. The 1870s until the end of the century saw the shrinking and consolidation of industry and thus, the town. The late 1890s to the First World War saw continued quarry operations but under greater consolidation and mainly under corporations. Many of the other industries, such as the furniture plant and veneer plant, failed or were closed during the interwar period. The Second World War until the 1970s saw growth and consolidation into the current mode of heavily mechanized quarry operations.

These cycles not only help to understand the trajectory of the quarry industry, they help explain social life in town. For much of the town’s history, large numbers of workers were essential for the industry, and they needed to be housed locally. By the time of the court case Ann Griscom et al. vs. David P. Griscom in 1854, the tracts of land
Table 4.1: Long Swings in the World Capitalist Economy and Baltimore Construction Cycles (Adapted from Gordon et al. 1982:9 and Olson 1979:559).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Swing</th>
<th>Phases of Growth</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Boom (Olson 1979:559)</th>
<th>Trough (Olson 1979:559)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Rapid</td>
<td>1790s to ca. 1820</td>
<td>1794-1796, 1808-1815</td>
<td>1786-89, 1801-1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Ca. 1820 to mid-1840s</td>
<td>1830-1833</td>
<td>1820-1823, 1837-1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Rapid</td>
<td>Mid-1840 to ca. 1873</td>
<td>1848-1852, 1870-1872</td>
<td>1860-1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Ca. 1873 to late 1890s</td>
<td>1885-1887</td>
<td>1873-1879, 1893-1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Rapid</td>
<td>Late 1890s to World War I</td>
<td>1905-1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>World War I to World War II</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1917-1920, 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Rapid</td>
<td>World War II to early 1970s</td>
<td>1953-1954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Early 1970s to present [1980s]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on this plat are depicted with improvements such as residences, kilns, drainage course, and sidings to other quarries and kilns (see Figure 4.4). This plat suggests that early
entrepreneurs like Samuel Griscom and then subsequent entrepreneurs constructed residences along the railroad tracks to attract much needed workers.

The layout of the town reflects its industrial nature (Figure 4.4). Workers homes were near their work, the kilns, quarries, and railroad. Although this layout may have maintained a certain sense of continuity and control over workers’ movements, it also created a hazardous environment in the daily lives of the laborers and their families. The 1866 Adam Denmead plat which is a copy of the 1854 Griscom Plat shows even dumping areas for the quarries were laid out.

The 1850s industrial boom correlates with the growth of the town. The *Baltimore County Advocate* (November 11, 1850a) noted the construction of another 20 dwellings, 2 stores, 2 smithshops, 1 Odd Fellow Hall, and 1 schoolhouse. According to the *Republican and Argus* (Feb. 4, 1854), a Catholic Church, Odd Fellows Hall, hotel and store, and eight dwellings were built in 1853.

Another building boom took place in 1854 with Griscom and Burroughs building four lime kilns and the sixteen house barracks (18BA314), Francis Wheeler building five houses on either side of the railroad, and Mrs. Lapin building two homes on the south side of Church Lane (*The Baltimore Sun* May 15, 1854). By 1854, several homes and buildings had been built on either side of the railroad and along Church Lane, the major transportation arteries in the town.

With the expansion of industry came the expansion of the town and another way to make money. The construction of these homes shows a pattern that was likely the case for almost all of the buildings in Texas. The use of ground rent allowed control over space and investment and perpetuates rent through the division of lots and the system of
ownership. Ground rent is a system under which a fee is paid for renting the land beneath a home. In the ground rent system, the homeowner buys the home but rents the land, usually paying rent at an annual or semi-annually basis. Initially, rent in Texas included a lease on the property and land. Even after the property was sold by the occupant, the ground rent passed with the property.

The system of ground rent made land more marketable by providing liberal financing terms as well as allowing land speculators to invest without expending much capital (Power 1992:317). Investment occurred in a number of ways. Land could be rented and the renter could then subdivide the lot and collect rent off of those lots to fulfill the original rental obligation. Land could also be sold or given to a builder who would then sell the property while the original owner collected rent off of the property. The landowner could even provide the builder a loan to cover construction costs, providing the landowner with another investment vehicle often with details of the construction specified with the loan (Hayward and Belfoure 1999:14). At six percent, ground rents were considered a good, stable investment (Hayward and Belfoure 1999:15). Thus, the profit potential of space could be maximized through this highly negotiable investment.

Through ground rent, workers could more easily purchase these homes. The small size of the lots and the pay-as-you-go financing made homes affordable to workers (Power 1992:318). For many, especially those who had been evicted In Ireland, owning a house provided a new level of security and the realization of a dream (Dolan 2008:89). The ninety-nine year leases associated with ground rent were renewable and thus were close to a freehold in the lot (Power 1992:319). Still, the system granted home ownership
and its responsibilities while ensuring rent. While the home was owned by the occupant or a landlord, the owners still had to pay the ground rent yearly or semi-annually. Households were turned into investments as well as small-scale real estate consumers, and thus, households were individualized and forced into paying rent.

Owning a home invested people in the community and thus, to the industry as well. Based preliminary on deed research, the majority of homes purchased in Texas had ground rent. Ground rent is found on homes on either side of Church Lane as well as homes on both sides of the railroad. The rents do not rise over time, but initially they do not seem to be a major financial burden though many of the properties were initialed offered as leaseholds with payment coming through ground rent. For example, in Lot 2 of Division 2 on the Griscom vs. Griscom plat, Thomas Kelly is given the leasehold of the property from Jacob and Elizabeth Burroughs in 1854 (BCCCR Liber HMF 13, Folio 136). The rent is $21.95 annually and paid twice a year; failure to pay the rent would have resulted in the property returning to the Burroughs. Assuming a daily wage of $0.97 at this time and working six days every week, then the average monthly pay would be $23.38. Assuming a worker works six days of week for 52 weeks then, the ground rent equals almost a month’s pay and 7.2 percent of yearly pay. Thus, the quarry owners and other investors were able to provide housing for workers that were more likely to stick around and thus, collect steady payments as well.

**The Labor Force in Texas**

While historical records exist that document the industry and financial investments such as real estate, the record of the workers in Texas is much more limited.
The current enigma of Texas partially derives from this lack of a data and the perpetuation of the town as solely an Irish enclave or a “little rowdy patch” of Ireland. For instance, a 1954 *Baltimore Sun* article by James C. Bertram states that when the Mexican War came along “…most of the young men, their fighting spirit whetted by an occasional brawl enlisted…” and even after the war the town was an Irish village. This image and the accompanying stereotypes of the rowdy and intoxicated Irish place Texas within a category and a specific and finished narrative and do not account for the role of industry in the shaping of the town’s demographics. Beyond stereotypes, closure of Texas’ history in this sense also has allowed for the town to be destroyed.

The history of Texans is far more complex than the tale told by Bertram and reflects the influence and shifts of the industry. Over its roughly one hundred-and-seventy-year history, Texan residents included Irish, native-born Americans, African-Americans, Russians, Italians, and other immigrants groups. This section provides a brief overview of these different groups and explains the broader industrial context which brought them to Texas.

The growth of the town of Texas occurred during a mass emigration from Ireland. The famine of 1845 to 1850 known as the Great Famine or Great Hunger (*An Gorta Mor*) claimed more than a million lives and led to a mass exodus from Ireland (Dolan 2008:68). The British poor law exacerbated this exodus through evictions and compelling tenants to turn over their land to their landlord (Dolan 2008:70). Between 1846 and 1851, 1.5 million Irish sailed for the United States (Dolan 2008:74). The effects of the famine and evictions were most severe in the west and southwest of Ireland,
which witnessed some of the largest numbers of emigrants leaving the country (Dolan 2008:69, 74).

The initial population of Texas included a large percentage of Irish and in several families, their American-born children. According to Smith (1927:17), Texas initially received a few Irish immigrants, and then when others heard praise for the quarry employers, more came. For instance, Texas resident William Connelly took out a personal ad requesting information on his four brothers from County Mayo, who may have emigrated prior to him (*The Baltimore Sun* June 19, 1857). Based on headstone inscriptions in St. Joseph Church Cemetery in Texas, the province of Connaught in the west saw the highest number of immigrants to Texas followed by Munster in the southwest then Leinster and Ulster, with the first two provinces representing eighty-six percent of the total inscriptions with a home county listed (Figure 4.8) (McGrain 1971). Of this wave of Irish immigrants, more than half were unskilled laborers, as many as ninety percent were Catholic, and they equally divided between males and females (Dolan 2008:75; O’Donnell 1997:16).

Immigration from Ireland continued throughout the rest of the century and into the early twentieth century. During the period from 1851 to 1921, upwards of 3.7 million left Ireland for the United States with this group comprising many from poor rural regions in the west of Ireland like Munster and Connaught. These immigrants were typically laborers and servants, and used remittances from the United States to pay for their journey (Dolan 2008:78). The other major immigrant group during this period was Germans. The period from 1853 to 1860 saw the number of Germans immigrants eclipse Irish immigrants (Knobel 1986:27).
While Germans are almost absent from the early population of Texas, the Irish were crucial to the growth of industry in Texas. The Irish represented cheap labor, and were seen as expendable. Unlike slaves, who represented property and capital investment, an Irish worker could be easily replaced with another willing Irish immigrant. If an Irish immigrant died, the employer did not lose anything (Ignatiev 1995: 109).

Marginalization was key to ensuring cheap labor, and the marginalization of the famine-era Irish is well documented. The Irish on the East Coast of the United States faced discrimination and anti-immigrant rhetoric, but those who made travelled farther west faced less and less (O’Donnell 1997:20). Discrimination centered on several issues. The antebellum Irish immigrant experienced hostility due to the perception of them as social inferiors by the upper class, by being Democrat and Catholic, the Catholic Church
being seen as being incompatible with republican principles, and being seen as degrading the conditions of labor (Ignatiev 1995:149).

Patterns of discrimination and resulting residential differentiation led to these Irish immigrants being less likely to advance. In America at the middle of the nineteenth century, the majority of Irish immigrants could be classified as blue-collar with little chance of occupational mobility due to poor education and discrimination (Dolan 2008:87). Except for Irish women, mainly of the second generation, who were employed as teachers and nurses, the Irish remained longest in the bottom levels of the workforce (O’Donnell 1997:205).

Hostility and fear fostered discrimination and outright violence against the Irish. Evidence of both can be seen in both Baltimore City and County. The town of Texas was isolated to a degree and stereotyped. Mid-nineteenth-century newspaper reports support these stereotypes, casting their difficult lives in Texas as a result of a supposed Irish penchant for violence and alcohol. For example, the Baltimore County Advocate (January 1, 1853) records the Irishmen in Texas fighting with one leg broken by a club and another due to a rut with the culprit likely being alcohol. The article continues that “It is astonishing what an amount of hard-earned money is daily spent in the rum-shops that disgrace this village, and what an amount of whiskey is consumed there… Father Matthew should have visited Texas before he left the country.” Often this rhetoric is linked to a call for efficiency and industriousness and compliance. Another document also indicates this negative regard for the Irish, equating them with the southern traitors, slaves, or inferiors. Isaac Hollingsworth of the 148th Pennsylvania Infantry Regiment Company F stationed near Texas states in a September 17th, 1862, wrote a letter to his
cousin that the folks in the area were nearly all “secesh, Irish and Niggers…” (Hollingsworth 1862).

A wider anti-immigrant, anti-Catholic, and anti-Irish sentiment is seen in the connections between the limestone and the buildings that were built with them. Even some of the buildings to which the Irish supplied stone were targeted or connected to anti-immigrant sentiment. The Irish in Texas and nearby labored to supply stone for the Washington Monument and Baltimore County Courthouse in Towson, Maryland. Between 1855 and 1858, the “Know-Nothing” Party controlled the Washington National Monument Society stealing a memorial stone donated by Pope Pius IX and slowing down progress on the monument (National Park Service 2013). In another instance, one of the architects of the Courthouse in Towson designed a Greek Revival Temple for a “Know-Nothing” Rally in Baltimore City with banners reading “Down With the Pope” and “Down With the Dutch and Irish” (Republican and Argus September 19, 1856).

Finally, the Irish faced direct violence. According to the Catholic Editing Company (1914:109), on many occasions the men in Texas had to stay up all night to guard their homes and the church from “Know-Nothing” rioters. The Baltimore County Advocate (January 7, 1854) notes that residents of Texas were often assaulted in the city. Texans may have felt threatened enough that they responded in-kind. For instance, the same article details unknown persons firing muskets at a train as it passed through Texas. The Republican (Aug. 22 1857) also reported a rock thrown at a train by a Texas resident.

Fragmentation of the Irish community based on class was essential. Besides the distinction between the Irish and native-born, the Irish in Texas were relatively homogeneous based on the general category of ethnicity and religion. The ethnic and
racial diversity that could hamper cooperation and class consciousness was not present (Asher and Stephenson 1990:6).

Prior to the Civil War, the Irish were still the principal residents of the town. As represented by the 1860 US Federal Census, Texas changed only slightly from the previous decade. Five limeburners and one quarryman are listed and one of them is Irish with the others being native born. Besides the Irish and native-born, only a handful of Germans and English are listed. The main difference between the 1850s and 1860s is the number of different jobs listed for the Irish. Although they are still predominantly laborers, some are listed as supervisors, farmers, domestics, stonemasons, shoemakers, tailors, teachers, and other occupations. Attendance at school and the age of attendance varied for the children of both the Irish and the native born. Children listed as “black” or “mulatto” are not listed as attending school in the last year, and overall this community remains small and held occupations such as cook, servant, and laborer.

In general, the harsh discrimination of the Irish seems to fade over time. By the 1870s, references to the Irish as a separate race disappeared from ethnological discussions (Knobel 1986:181). The Paddy stereotype began to take on a gentler comic quality in the 1870s and 1880s (Knobel 1986:181). The notions of race were important to citizenship with the Irish becoming accepted as white (Ignatiev 1996:3). In the 1880s, new waves of non-English speaking immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe gradually displaced the Irish as the target of discrimination (O’Donnell 1997:21).

A pronounced demographic shift is hard to see in the Federal Census data. The 1870 US Federal Census does not differ greatly from the previous decade though it would seem that the industry was smaller and seeing less outside investment or owners residing
in Texas. Only three limeburners are listed with two being Irish and one being native-born. The Irish and their American-born children represent the bulk of the town’s population with a smaller native-born population (Figures 4.9 and 4.10). The other countries of origin include only a few people from Germany and states in what would become Germany, Wales, and England. The Irish and their children are listed in several different occupations but are predominantly listed as laborers or keeping house. In the 1870s, there was an increase in the number of widows and the number of borders. Few African-American are listed and they are primarily along the railroad as laborers or in homes along Church or Padonia Lane as cooks or domestic servants. African-American children did not attend school within the year of the 1870 US Federal Census though some were working as servants.

The 1880 US Federal Census shows the shift to locals working the limeburning operations. All of the limeburners listed are Maryland-born from Irish parents. Yet the most prominent job is that of laborer and the Irish and/or their American-born children are still predominantly employed as such. More Germans are represented along with their American-born children than in the previous census and are employed in skilled trades. A larger number of widowers are present; they either take in boarders or board with someone else. The majority of children over the age of five or six are in school including some African-American children.
Figure 4.9: 1878 G. M. Hopkins Map, Atlas of Fifteen Miles Around Baltimore Including Anne Arundel County showing the expanding village of Texas. (Collection of the Maryland State Archives [MSA SC 6051-2-1]).
In the late nineteenth century or early twentieth century, Italian immigrants were living in Texas and taking the train to Baltimore every day to dig sewers in the city (Kirwin 1962:6-7). According to the Bureau of Industrial Statistics and Information of Maryland for 1884-1885 (Weeks 1886:38), “[i]n the quarries around Baltimore Italian and Negro labor is being introduced; it is a cheaper class of labor and the Italian labor may be regarded as experienced.”
Figure 4.11: 1898 G.W. Bromley and Company Atlas of Baltimore County showing Texas. (Collection of the Maryland State Archives [BCA BMS37-2-6]).

The 1898 Bromley map depicting Texas does not show a considerable difference in Texas from the Hopkins map twenty years earlier (Figure 4.11). Yet the census data, for Texas is hard to follow around the turn of the century. The 1900 US Federal Census shows a small increase in European immigrants and African-American residents in Texas. The level of boarders does not increase either. The major change from the 1880s is the employment of single women greatly increases. Occupations for women include barkeeper, servant, waiter, clerk, saloonlady, school teacher, saleslady, dressmaker, and works in shirt factory. The latter two occupations are the most frequently listed.

By the end of the century, American-born Irish were beginning to define Irish identity in the United States (Dolan 2008:104), and Irish identity even seemed to be celebrated by century’s end. *The Baltimore Sun* (March 18, 1895) ran a detailed
description of St. Patrick’s Day festivities in the County, including Texas, entitled *Ireland Forever!* The rhetoric regarding the town seems to have changed with an article in *The Maryland Journal* (June 19, 1886) detailing the hamlet of Texas as having “a reputation for peace and quietness which cannot be fairly assailed, and the average resident is of that urbane deportment which accords with the general social qualities of the humble artisan or peaceful tiller of the soil…”

Texas likely saw an increase in the African-American population going into the twentieth century. Though Baltimore had an influx of Southern African-Americans leaving rural life in the South, between 1910 and 1920 the African-American population increased by almost twenty-eight percent, then roughly thirty-one percent during the next decade (Hayward 2008:237-238). African-Americans represented the new, disposable source of cheap labor. African-American are listed as laborers in the quarry on 1910 US Federal Census. The numbers of Germans, Italians, and Russians slightly increased since the last decade.

African-Americans and other immigrants may have been marginalized in Texas. An article entitled “His Indian Blood Tamed: Big Negro Meets His Waterloo in Texas Deputy” in *The Baltimore Sun* dated September 18, 1911 details a African-American “whooping up” Texas. In the article, Charles Coates is quoted as stating he has “Indian blood” and after drinking is said to have gotten in a dispute with a white man in which Patrolman Keough deputized Edward Doyle to help him. After Doyle was struck with a beer bottle, he shot Coates in this chest. Coates was then arrested, and later taken to the hospital. This article calls Coates a powerful man who after drinking does as he pleases.
The impression from this article is that he was put back in his place by a Texan. The article mirrors articles of the Irish in Texas sixty years earlier.

Residential differentiation within the town kept the hierarchy in place. Religion may have eased the acceptance of European immigrant groups, but African-Americans were likely marginalized. Sonny Peacock, who moved to Texas in the 1930s, remembers the town as filled with Irish and Italian families with an African-American enclave down by the railroad tracks (Deboalt 1993).

This segregation was further accomplished by legal means. Segregation between whites and blacks in Baltimore City became law in 1911 under the guise of preventing conflict and preserving peace (Power 1983:289). The main and most prominent section of town were the homes on Church Lane. A housing covenant placed on a parcel of land on the north side of Church Lane and the furthest east of the town before York Road illustrates the fears and possible pressures in Texas. In a 1926 deed (BCCCR Liber WPC 633, Folio 60-62), the Archbishop of Baltimore, Michael J. Curley, sold this parcel to Patrick and Edna Caslin. The deed has a covenant that states: 1) the lot was for residential use only, 2) only one dwelling house could be constructed, 3) the value of the dwelling had to exceed 4,000 dollars 4) no house should be erected within 40 ft. of Church Lane, 5) No nuisance will be maintained or allowed that would be noxious or dangerous to health, 6) the land could not be sold or rented to “persons of negro extraction.” The covenant demonstrates the desire to keep the town residential and keep out African-Americans and possibly bad behavior or enterprise, as well as multiple family dwellings and cheaper dwellings.
By the 1940s, the demographics of Texas are hard to discern. The town spans three enumeration districts in 1940 US Federal Census. The boundaries of the town are unclear. For instance, a 1940 US Federal Census enumeration map lists Texas, as an unincorporated place with a population of 494 with 111 dwellings, 3 farm units, 8 business units, 1 school, 2 churches, 1 public building, 2 industrial plants, 1 cemetery, and 1 amusement park. At this point of time, the town was also experiencing pressure from the expanding quarry operations.

**Labor Relations**

The industry and all aspects of life in Texas were intertwined. Along with the nature of the industry and population, the history of labor and labor relations must be related. For much of its history, the quarrying of limestone for building and the burning of the stone required a large workforce. At the bottom of the labor hierarchy in Texas were the laborers. Laborers could do multiple tasks and did not belong to any single industry so it is deceptive to think of them as merely quarry workers or limeburners. Laborers moved continually and, for ancillary laborers, work could be seasonal or dependent on business cycles (Montgomery 1987:61, 64). For the much of its early history, the quarry and lime burning work was year round, necessitating a constant workforce of laborers though other nearby industries offered employment. For instance, some of the residents of Texas likely worked for the Ashland Iron Company in nearby Ashland, a company town with a population of over 200 around the end of the Civil War, but which closed due to competition around the end of the nineteenth century (Smith
1927:19-20). Other industrial towns were scattered around Baltimore County (Chidester 2004).

In Texas, the hierarchy was initially based on ethnicity. Laborers were Irish-born or from Irish-born families while native-born individuals worked as owners and managers. This stratification follows a general pattern where laborers were typically dominated by the skilled trades, especially with regards to divisions based on race (Montgomery 1987:63). Over time, the Irish and later their children came to occupy more skilled professions a decade or two before African-Americans and other ethnicities were being employed as laborers.

Laborer’s wages were the room for ensuring profit. Even in 1852, facing competition from the Schuylkill area, the lime burners were “happy” to supply lime at prices as low if not lower than can be obtained elsewhere; the article goes on to say that lime should be purchased from within the state to support the state (The Baltimore County Advocate April 3, 1852a). Lowering wages were often the means of lowering production costs (Montgomery 1987:171)

Drawing from several studies, David Montgomery (1987:69) provides a compiled table of daily wages (Table 4.2). While the different categories are not directly comparable due to the methods of tabulation, the data provides and interesting comparison to the wages of laborers in Texas.
Table 4.2: Index of daily money wages for laborers and others from 1858-1891.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Laborers (male)</th>
<th>Avg. in Manufacturing</th>
<th>Factory unskilled</th>
<th>Laborers and Shop Workers</th>
<th>Avg. of Quarry Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1858-1860</td>
<td>$0.97 (100%)</td>
<td>$0.96 (100%)</td>
<td>$0.81 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872-1873</td>
<td>$1.64 (166%)</td>
<td>$1.49 (155%)</td>
<td>$1.36 (170%)</td>
<td>$1.75-2.30 (1872)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1878</td>
<td>$1.23 (133%)</td>
<td>$1.38 (132%)</td>
<td>$1.13 (143%)</td>
<td>$1.50-2.00 piecework (1879)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887-1889</td>
<td>$1.39 (140%)</td>
<td>$1.50 (157%)</td>
<td>$1.21 (150%)</td>
<td>Quarry workers: $1.15 Laborer, $1.25 Teamster, $1.00 “colored” (1884-1885); Texas: $1.25-1.50, 1.75(1887)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>$1.39 (141%)</td>
<td>$1.53 (159%)</td>
<td>$1.22 (151%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Montgomery (1987:69-70) cautions about generalizing from this data, but the data shows the rapid advancement of laborer’s wages until the depression of 1872 to 1878 and the slow rise afterwards. Only snippets of wage data is available for Texas as no company records have been located. In the early years of the industry, some workers did not receive cash pay. Instead, they would take their pay in corn, wheat, pork, and tobacco (The Baltimore County Advocate April 3, 1852a). Articles on strikes provide
potential wage data. The wages seem to follow the general trend illustrated by this chart. Wages provided by the Bureau of Industrial Statistics and Information of Maryland (Weeks 1886, 1888) may reflect actual wages and are much lower than the wages presented by Montgomery (1987) and the strike data.

The 1884-1885 Bureau of Industrial Statistics and Information of Maryland (Weeks 1886:38) discusses the quarries in the state stating that the quarry workers work 9 months of the year and the daily wages are: drilling boss $2.00-2.50, drill hands $1.50, Labor $1.15, Teamsters $1.25, and “Colored” men $1.00. There was a tendency to cut prices in this work, but “hands live for the most part in the neighborhood of their work and are poor” (Weeks 1886:38). What is telling for this data is the stratification of wages based on organized labor, skilled labor, unorganized labor, and race.

As cited before in the census data from the 1850s to the 1900s, the number one occupation for males was laborer of one form or another. For women, centers of heavy industry had little industrial employment (Montgomery 1987:138). This trend is supported by the lack of many jobs for women until the 1900 US Federal Census were women are listed as employed in various jobs, such as dressmaking and in shirt factories, but primarily still as housekeeping. The possibility exists that women and children may have tended gardens, preserved foods, and had some livestock.

Based on the census data, most children did not work until 15 or 16 years of age. Over time the majority of the children attended school with some attending school into their upper teens. The work age and attendance of school bucks the trend in American cities where thirteen was the typical age for full-time employment and by the turn of the century, the norm of working-class life was that children should finish about six years of
elementary education before being sent to work barring something happening to the father (Montgomery 1987:131-132). African Americans in Texas went to work at a much earlier age with both men and often women working. Men tended to be laborers while women servants and cooks. African American children are not listed in school until the 1880s.

Labor interactions are difficult to piece together as well. Only two local strikes are found with very much detail. They included strikes at the Beaver Dam that involved both skilled and unskilled labor. On May 1, 1879, a wage strike occurred at the Beaver Dam quarry as well as a possible assault at the quarry by a laborer (The Baltimore Sun May 2, 1879). Hugh Sisson who owned the quarry told the 100 or so workmen that he understood there was trouble among them about wages and “they should have an opportunity to settle the matter among themselves. He would close up the work, and he ordered the discharge of all hands and the foreman, notifying them that they would be paid off Friday” (The Baltimore Sun May 2, 1879). On May 2, 1879, the 25 or 30 stonecutters were still on strike unless they received higher wages (The Baltimore Sun May 3, 1879). According to the articles, the quarrymen did not join in the strike for stonecutters engaged in piecework but were joined by the day men. The boss got several men to start work, but all left except one (The Baltimore Sun May 3, 1879). Some of the men who were discharged and paid off “… are of the better class of mechanics, disclaim an idea of intending to strike, and are willing to return at the old rates” (The Baltimore Sun May 3, 1879). Hugh Sisson also appears to have been involved in the Baltimore Federal of Labor as he listed in their illustrated history (Baltimore Federation of Labor 1900).
The following year another strike occurred due to piecework rates for stone for the dam of the Gunpowder water works. All of the stonecutters, 45 in number, quit work. A strike occurred on the ninth of February to protest cutting certain stone at the rate set by the contractor though the contractor claims this was the same price as last summer (*The Baltimore Sun* February 28, 1880). An agreement was made to pay two workers by the day to cut the stone and the workers claim that the contractor agreed not to discharge any of the men involved in the strike, but the contractor denied this claim and discharged five men. The rest of the stone cutters refused to go to work unless they were reinstated, but the contractor refused stating that he had too many hands at the moment and the quarry would not be put into operation (*The Baltimore Sun* February 28, 1880). While these strikes may not characterize the quarrying and lime burning industry in Texas, they do show the split between the different classes of labor, and the division between them. The instability of employment was also evident in the example of these two strikes.

Few strikes are mentioned in Texas and only one instance of a successful strike in Texas has been found. In 1887, a strike by the limeburners of Texas was said to be imminent (*The Baltimore Sun* May 4, 1887). In that year, “lime-kiln hands” struck for seven days demanding an increase in wages from their winter wages of $1.25 and summer wages of $1.50 to $1.75 a day and won their increase (Weeks 1888:79).

No instance of organized labor in Texas has been found beyond an article in *The Catonsville Argus* (April 30, 1887), which reported a 350-member Assembly of the Knights of Labor at Texas. Yet workers faced unified opposition from the different limestone operators. Many of the limestone operators were related through family
connections and marriages. For instance, Thomas Fortune, a stone mason and quarry manager, married Elizabeth Bussey. His brother-in-law was Clement Bussey, who owned the stone quarries operated by Fell and Robinson and was married to Mary Cockey, daughter of Thomas Dye Cockey (Smith 1927:64-65). Dr. John Galloway’s mother was a Clarke (Smith 1927:71), and the Galloway and Clark families had quarry operations. According to The Baltimore County Union (April 30, 1887), several of the lime burning companies in Texas formed an organization for mutual protection as well. It is unclear what the article means by protection. Likewise, while not a company town, many aspects of life were connected through these family relations to industry such as possibly stores or even the taverns. These relationships meant that industrial relations would have permeated other aspects of town life and it would have been difficult to separate them.

The constant threat of being replaced and the continual pressure of competition were felt beyond the industry. These pressures may have forced workers to try to protect what employment they had. For instance, according to the Baltimore Sun (May 17, 1854), a handbill was posted warning strangers from coming to Texas to work, on peril of their lives; “the hands there, endeavoring in this way, to bring the employers to terms.” The article continues noting that a ‘strange’ man went to work for Fell and Robinson and that same night he was caught and beaten by some persons.

Dissatisfaction was voiced in other ways beyond strikes. In the second half of the nineteenth-century, sabotage was another common means of disruption utilized by workers (Montgomery 1980:89). Accidents and damage to the quarries and railroads was common though it is unclear whether these incidents were a result of sabotage of
truly accidents. An explosion damaged the office of the Ideal Stone and Lime Company in Texas as well as the nearby homes of Hugh Lindsay, Martin O’Hara, and William Parks, with the blast arousing households for a ten-mile radius (The Baltimore Sun May 16, 1893). The explosion was blamed on mischievous boys who stole dynamite from the magazines of Ditman and Co. and Frank M. Lee. Since the building that was most damaged was the Ideal Stone and Lime Company, it does not appear that this incident was caused by ill-mannered boys. The causes of other fires are unknown. For instance, the stone saw mill at the Beaver Dam Marble Company had just been renovated and machinery repaired when it burned down in 1913 (The Baltimore Sun May 14, 1913).

Little documentation can be seen about the direct interactions between industry and the town though they were intertwined. Most of the known complaints arose from the proximity or laying of tracks or roads near homes or businesses. Margaret Connor opposed the laying of track in the siding opposite her house and protested by sitting in chair on the siding (The Baltimore Sun Nov. 5, 1902). In The Baltimore Sun December 9, 1891, Mrs. E. M. Quinn and Mrs. Annie Naughton complained that additional tracks laid by the Northern Central Railway Company in the village of Texas were blocking the road in front of their property.

**Stratification on the Landscape**

Throughout the town’s history, workers were stratified on the landscape. Social stratification was more than just being Irish, Black, non-white, or the other, it encompassed gradations within the community. Spatially, the west side of the tracks had a different connotation and name. Beyond the homes of owners, the industries and
stores, these homes were of the most marginalized. The homes sat only a few feet from the rail line. The branch of Beaver Dam Creek running north to south just west of the rail line on the west half of town was even called the Rio Grande with the land west of it called Mexico and to the east, Texas (Kirwin 1962:4). Further, when the school was split around the time of the Civil War, the priest’s school on the west side of town was called the “American House.”

More broadly, the segregation extended to those inside and those outside the community. For instance, outsiders were called “Virginians” (Kirwin 1962:5). Eventually, this segregation began to fade. An article in The Maryland Journal (June 19, 1886) details the fragmentation of the town and its incorporation into the mainstream:

The hamlet of Texas, in the 8th District, has a reputation for peace and quietness which cannot be fairly assailed, and the average resident is of that urbane deportment which accords with the general social qualities of the humble artisan or peaceful tiller of the soil, but that there is some unhappiness engendered in some families.

The article continues to detail a family dispute and fight between Mary Poe and John Storm in which Mrs. Poe attempted to shoot him. The article does show that the town was no longer maligned, instead, families were maligned as discipline had been internalized and African-Americans and other groups had been made invisible.

Some level of differentiation was still needed for the industry. Workers were needed close to their worksite. Even in the second half of the nineteenth century, in Baltimore, it was not economical for workers to commute (Hayward and Belfoure 1999:73). Supplying cheap labor in the form of other marginalized groups sufficed.
Resistance to workers from employers was made effective through such new workers (Montgomery 1987:4).

Spatially these workers needed to be segregated and placed in easily controlled or monitored locations. The area near the railroad became an African-American enclave as they represented the new cheap labor. Over time, mechanization reduced the need for labor, and improvements in transportation meant that workers did not need to live close to where they worked. Instead of homes being needed, the land was. In Baltimore City in the 1930s, areas characterized as blighted and in need of improvement were predominantly African American (Hayward 2008:244). Baltimore County officials detailed “negro areas” and promised enforcement of county health and sanitary department requirements, “slum betterment” (The Baltimore Sun June 3, 1943).

The large block of rowhouses on the west side of the tracks (Figure 4.7) is listed as one such building: “Forty-five Negro tenants of a dilapidated, three-story, rat-infested ‘apartment’ house at Texas, walk one hundred yards across dangerous main-line railroad tracks to a well for their drinking water; they dip laundry water from a near-by stream, believed to be polluted” (The Baltimore Sun June 3, 1943). These conditions likely were the same for earlier residents of the building though it was not noted as a slum. Further, no record of efforts to improve the building have been found, such as sanitation infrastructure. Instead, in 1957, the large three story block of rowhomes on the west side of the railroad burned down when a kerosene lamp tipped over on the first floor causing forty African-Americans to be homeless (The Baltimore Sun April 22, 1957).
The Church, Community, and Industry

The other major institution was the Catholic Church. For much of the town’s early history, the Catholic Church was the center of the community, encompassing the social, educational, and spiritual life of many in the town. The Church acted as both a source of bonding and division and potentially legitimization of the industry and hierarchy. In his summation of articles on Irish-American communities from 1880 to 1920, Timothy Meagher (1986:185) finds that Catholicism was the most stable source of social cohesion, even beyond that of Irish nationalism.

Ties to industry and the local entrepreneurs meant that the Church and industry were linked and dependent. The Catholic Church in town, St. Josephs, was the primary source of social organization for most of the town for much of its history. Another church was not built in the immediate area until the Texas United Methodist Church was built on nearby Galloway Avenue in 1912 (McGrain 2001:8).

Industry was crucial for the success of the town, and thus, the health of the early Church. The industry owners played a key role in Church life and, thus, most have had considerable influence. Within the Church, the hierarchy of the town was congregated. How this social division was represented in the Church is unclear. Yet, having everyone together in the same spiritual community would have made the stratification seem more natural. Prior to the 1880s, Catholic thinking saw society as a “static, stratified social system, and each level of this divinely designed order had its own responsibilities” (Dolan 1985:325).

The influence of the industry owners and operators extended beyond attendance at mass. Some of the quarry operators and owners helped house the priests and build the
Church. In the beginning, the priest stayed with the quarry owner, John Clark, and said mass at his house (Smith 1927:37). Clark later donated the land and stone for the first Church. The stonemason Thomas Fortune was in charge of the stonework and a Mr. Wheeler, a contractor, worked on the carpentry for the church, which was completed in 1852 (Smith 1927:40).

Prior to the construction of a rectory, most of the priests stayed in the homes of prominent residents. In 1853, Rev. John Constant stayed with a Mr. McGann and also Thomas Cockey in his home near Padonia Rd (Smith 1927:42). His successor, Father Patrick Dalton, rented a house on the west side of the railroad in 1853, while the next priest Father John Stephen, only occasionally visited Texas and lived with Thomas Fortune in 1863 (Smith 1927:43). In 1863, Father William Mahoney lived on the west side of the tracks where he started his short lived school (Smith 1927:43-45). The next priest, Father Michael O’Reilly, finally saw the building of the priest’s house in 1865 (Smith 1927:45).

Religion was a unifying factor for Texas and the surrounding other communities, especially in terms of Irish identity. The pastors of St. Joseph had a name of Irish origin from its beginning until 1923 when Albert Smith became priest at the Church (St. Joseph Church 1977:8). The Church was also the only Catholic Church around for many years. The nearest churches had been in Hickory, roughly seventeen miles away and Govans, roughly eight miles away, until 1883 when Immaculate Conception was opened in Towson (Smith 1927:33). To the north, the Catholic residents of Beaver Dam came down to St. Joseph Church and to the northeast residents came from Ashland. The boundaries of the parish were very large. The parish ran from the Oregon Furnace to the
West, the Pennsylvania line to the north, Warren to the east, and Chestnut Ridge, Riders and Townsend, presumably to the south (Catholic Editing Company 1914:109). These boundaries would have included a large corridor likely following the York Turnpike and the railroad north from Texas.

The larger community tie of Catholicism and the importance of the establishment of the Church to the Catholic community also can be seen at the dedication of the Church. The dedication included processions from the St. Vincent’s and St. Patrick’s Beneficial Societies that assembled at the Calvert Station Depot in Baltimore City along with a band formerly belonging to the “Independent Greys” (Catholic Mirror November 6, 1852). Around a thousand people traveled from the depot to Texas, where many Protestant citizens of Baltimore County assisted in the dedication including the president of Loyola College (Catholic Mirror November 6, 1852; Guilday 1927:5).

Within the town, the Church was the center of many aspects of social life, and to a degree work life. Community organizations were grouped around the Church and would have structured leisure activities and labor organization. By the 1880s, the Catholic Parish was more than just a religious institution; it became a community institution with numerous societies, reaching its peak in the 1920s (Dolan 2008:112). The Quarryman’s Union and Beneficial Society was founded in 1868 and not only paid disability benefits, it was the first trade union organized in the County (St. Joseph Church 1977:8). The St. Joseph’s Beneficial and Temperance Society was the first organization established at the parish in 1870 to promote sobriety and, through collections, help society members in time of sickness and death (St. Joseph Church 1977:7). Three years later, The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick was founded, offering similar death and disability benefits and required
certain duties at Easter (St. Joseph Church 1977:7). The membership of this organization was so large that attendance at funerals of members would shut the quarries down temporarily (St. Joseph Church 1977:8). Likewise, the Catholic Benevolent Legion was founded in Brooklyn in 1883 and the Texas Council No. 488 was franchised in 1895 and operated for over thirty-two years as an insurance society (St. Joseph Church 1977:8). The St. Joseph Lyceum was started sometime between 1896 and 1914 and existed for ten years, and was devoted to social and athletic activities like organizing a baseball team (Smith 1927:110). Recreation, entertainment, and exercise would have provided an outlet for stress as well as a collective identity.

Another major tie between the community and the Church was education. Connected to the church was the school, operating as another center of social cohesion and the primary source of education for children. The earliest school was believed to have started in 1853 as a parish school at St. Joseph Church (Anderson 1981:7) though one is pictured on the 1850 Sidney map. The Baltimore County School Commissioners came to the financially strapped school in 1858 and reopened it under their supervision (Smith 1927:98-99). Though the general public was free to enroll as the school was funded by the County School Commission and followed a curriculum in accordance with the public school education system, it did not infringe on the school’s right to teach religion (GATBC 1976:93).

Alternatives existed to the school and thus, alternatives to the Church’s control also existed. According to the Annual Report to School Commissioners for 1857 (GATBC 1976:78), an old stone house on Church property was being used as a school in Texas for seventy-one students and taught by Patrick W. Kenny, while at the southern
end of Texas, a good stone house on private property was being used as a school for thirty-one students. This school likely sat on Padonia Road, and was an alternative to the Church school.

The County School Commission also operated two public schools nearby that were in operation in the 860s or at least by the 1870s (GATBC 1976:94). Still, the school affiliated with the Church remained funded by the County until 1926 when it became exclusively Catholic and operated by the Sisters of Mercy of Baltimore City (GATBC 1976:94). By the 1890s, the two public schools may have closed and some students from Texas may have attended school in Lutherville, and later after 1926, may have been transported to the Cockeysville Consolidated School (GATBC 1976:95).

Even within the parish there was a conflict in education. The parish school burnt down in 1861 (GATBC 1976:94). Two schools were operated after the fire with one operated by Father Mahoney in a house on west side of Church Lane and the other by the principal, Miss McAvoy (GATBC 1976:94; Smith 1927:98). A conflict resulted over which school the children should attend and the children were allowed to vote, picking Miss McAvoy’s school; Father Mahoney’s school was moved to the “American House” in Texas where he continued with a new teacher and without school commission funding (GATBC 1976:94; Smith 1927:98). A new school building was finally started in 1867 (Smith 1927:98).

The Church itself was not always unified or without incident. Friction between the Church and residents can perhaps be inferred. Several incidents occurred that could point to such tension, but the causation is not entirely clear. For instance, several of the Church buildings burned down or were threatened with fire. In 1861 or 1862, the first
parish school burnt down as nearly did the church (Smith 1927:97). Afterwards, a schism split the parish school.

Likewise, the Church did not have the same priest for more than ten years until Father Lenaghan arrived in 1875. The Church went through nine different priests between 1850 and 1874 with five different priests in the years, 1863 and 1864 alone. In 1890, the sexton attempted to kill the priest, Father Lenaghan, wounding him in the process (The New York Times March 28, 1890). The article states that sexton had been in the Almshouse previously, characterized as semi-insane and addicted to the drink, and perhaps, set fire to the rectory previously. In 1896, Father Lenaghan was transferred to another parish (The Baltimore Sun August 25, 1896).

The Church was also under financial pressure. A fair was held in 1891 to pay down the debt on the parsonage (The Baltimore Sun August 29, 1891), and another fair had been held in 1897 to raise funds for the Church and Church property debt (The Baltimore Sun October 1, 1897). Further, the Church was unable to run the school financially without County help until the 1920s.

Though Catholicism linked St. Josephs to other churches and thus communities in the mid-nineteenth century, their religious identity also isolated them from non-Catholics. The Protestant majority viewed the growing Catholic minority with alarm (McAvoy 1970:244). This fear was coupled with the fact that in the mid-nineteenth century, the Catholic Church was predominantly composed of foreign-born due to the large numbers of European Catholic immigrants (Ellis 1957:81).

To ensure its survival, the Catholic Church and its followers had to be accepted and become American. For nativists, Catholic immigrants could not be considered to be
true Americans, and the Catholic Community faced violence and threats in the middle of the nineteenth century (Dolan 1985:295; Hennesey 1981:125). The Church struggled to avoid alienation from the American mainstream, and as result the Catholic community became ultra-patriotic (Hennesey 1981:126). Pressure, in turn, would have been put on its congregations to fit into mainstream America. This position puts it at odds with residents of Texas at points as well as labor. In the nineteenth century, the Catholic Church condemned the use of violence and secrecy, the later which was essential for organizing (O’Donnell 1997:211).

The Church embraced an American identity, but still faced hostility. The resentment of immigrants, the rapid growth of the Church, and the continued insistence on parochial schools by Catholics when Protestants were shifting to secular, state-controlled schools led to renewed anti-Catholicism in the 1880s and 1890s (Hennesey 1981:183). But by 1908, Pope Pius X had declared that the Church in the United States was no longer a missionary territory but on an equal basis with the established churches of Italy, France, and Germany (Ellis 1957:122). Peter Guilday’s (1927:11) sermon marking the Diamond Jubilee of St. Joseph Church speaks to this integration when he ties the “stable, invincibly right and righteous institution [the Catholic Church]” to American ideals such as liberty, justice, and equality.

Having secured and established itself, the Church eventually moved beyond Texas in the twentieth century. The town was no longer needed. The Irish priests were “well qualified as shepherds…” but the Church needs a “…financier in order to initiate programs of growth to keep pace with a rapidly swelling Baltimore metropolitan area” (St. Joseph Church 1977:8).
Identities in Texas

The Civil War provides several documents that show issues of identity, divisions in the community, and the wider Catholic Community. The town was divided in the Civil War. Locals in the area joined both sides during the war (GATBC 1976:64-66). A priest who later was pastor at St. Joseph from 1871 to 1874, Father Henry Riordan, served in the Confederacy as a Chaplain, still carrying a bullet when he worked at St. Joseph (Smith 1927:46). Patrick Scally fought for the Confederacy (Smith 1927:78). He is characterized as “…a poor, ignorant, drunken man…” who was hurried off in 1864 during Gilmor’s raid (Smith 1911:222). Scally joined Gilmor’s command at Texas, Company C, Second Maryland Battalion and was given a horse, a gun, a sword, no uniform and was in the fight at Washington, before he deserted and went to work in several different jobs eventually making it back to Texas that year (Smith 1911:222-223).

Besides these two known instances, the majority of support or involvement with the South was with native-born wealthy landowners. For instance, T. D. Cockey of “I” at Ellengowan was running men down to the south and Richard Worthington invested in Confederate bonds (Smith 1911:90-91). Charles Cockey in Texas was comrade-in-arms with local Confederate raider, Harry Gilmor, another wealthy land owner (The Baltimore Sun July 13, 1899).

The reasons for supporting or sympathizing with either side are complex. Many Irish Americans linked the Republican Party with nativism and the “Know-Nothing” Party, but support for the Union can be seen as a degree of American identity and belonging and as a reaction to England’s pro-Confederate stance (Samito 2009:26-28).
The residents of Texas might have supported the South due to their general support for the Democratic Party and fear of competition from free blacks. In general, racial and economic prejudices alienated the Irish from the abolitionist cause (McCafferty 1997:102). Irish support for the Confederacy or Union may have been linked to one’s position relative to the Mason-Dixon Line as well (McCafferty 1997:103). A number of other factors supported Irish and Irish Americans support and involvement in the Union cause and account for the larger number of Irish joining the North (Samito 2009:29).

This issue was not distant or remote to the people of Texas. Texas was the scene of military action that would have drawn out these splits. Running through town, the Northern Central Railroad was an important link between Washington and points North and West (Scharf 1971:347). Portions of the line were damaged to prevent troops from reaching Washington in April of 1861 by order of the mayor and police commissioner of Baltimore City (GATBC 1976:64; Scharf 1971:347). A small Union garrison was posted at Cockeysville and along the line and soldiers from both sides were reported confiscating horses from locals (GATBC 1976:65-66). In 1864, during Harry Gilmor’s raid, bridges were once again burned on the Northern Central Railroad (GATBC 1976).

Another encounter in Texas during the war shows not only divided loyalties or sentiments in the town, but also the international connections that Catholicism provided the Catholics in Texan. In 1862, Louis J. Weichmann went to work for Rev. William Mahoney at Texas and remained there until December 1863 when the school burned down, Mahoney then supplied a note of recommendation for Weichmann (Oldroyd 1901:155-156). This timeframe would have put him in Texas when Lincoln passed through on the train to deliver the Gettysburg Address. In 1864, Weichmann took his
friend John H. Surratt to “Little Texas” where they met Henri Beaumont de Ste. Marie (Oldroyd 1901:157-158). Ste. Marie, a Canadian, was working as a teacher in Texas and later joined the Union Army as a substitute but was captured and released (Oldroyd 1901: 229). Both John Surratt and Louis Weichmann were suspected in Lincoln’s assassination. John Surratt’s mother, Mary Surratt, was executed for her involvement in Abraham Lincoln’s assassination. Afterwards, John Surratt fled the country and found his way to the Papal States where he worked as a Papal Zouave under an alias (Cummings 1946:191). Ste. Marie went to work as a Papal Zouave where he happened to see and identify John H. Surratt still working as a Papal Zouave (Cummings 1946:191; Oldroyd 1901: 229). John Surratt was eventually extradited to the United States.

**Texas after the 1930s**

Texas experienced a slow transition beginning in the 1930s. The current spatial order of accumulation which had opened up to new industries did not need workers around the quarries. Transportation had compressed space with the ability to move people faster and over longer distances. Further, the quarry industry with mechanization did not need the large amounts of labor power. The town no longer needed had to fill that role. The area also was being to experience another change with increasing urbanization and later suburbanization coming out of Baltimore City.

The evidence of these transitions are visible in aerial photographs. A 1938 aerial of Texas (Figure 4.12) shows the old quarries filled with water while the new quarry lies off the photograph to the west. Large sections of land are still barren of trees and several ruined structures can be seen. A strip of new single-family homes extend northward
along the York Road. By the 1952 aerial image, vegetation has begun to fill in the landscape and the large expansion of the quarry is visible encroaching on the west side of town (Figure 4.13). The infrastructure of suburbanization is visible. The new highway lies in the southwest corner of the image along with an electrical substation and high-tension electrical lines. More single-family detached homes are evident.

At least by 1968 and more likely much earlier, Texas was no longer needed as a location for workers. A US Court of Appeals Fourth Circuit Case (407 F.2d 969, pages 139-140) heard in 1968 between the National Labor Relations Board and the Harry T. Campbell Sons’ Corporation details how workers for the Texas plant were picked up by bus in Towson and brought to plant and returned to Towson at the end of the day. The community identity that had helped fracture class-consciousness and residential differentiation was no longer necessary or needed to be transferred somewhere else.

As the land was no longer needed for workers as workers were not needed, land became valuable for new other forms of capital accumulation, the growing quarry and development. Likewise, the town itself was thus not necessary. The post office was closed in Texas on May 15, 1951 with mail going to Cockeysville and later passenger train service was expended (GATBC 1976:187). Remarking in 1991, St. Joseph’s Monsignor Cook stated that the school was growing, but Texas is gone (Eck 1991). “’I don’t think the community has an identity any longer’ says Cook. ‘It has a memory, but not an identity’” (Eck 1991). The new spatial forms of accumulation had erased the old spatial forms.
Figure 4.12: A 1938 Aerial image of Texas. The rail line is along the left of the picture while the York Road parallels it on the right side. Between them at the top is Church Lane or Texas Lane and between the rail line and York Road at the bottom of the picture is Padonia Road.
Figure 4.13: A 1952 aerial of Texas. The active quarry is on the left of the picture while vegetation has grown around the old quarries, some of which had been filled in. The highway is in the lower left. New power lines extend from this corner to the far right. Increased development is evident on the major roads.

Lot Histories

All the lots in this study were part of the 44 acres Samuel Griscom’s purchased from Charles A. and Anne L. Buchanan in 1843 who had purchased them from Thomas Deye Cockey of Thomas and Ann Cockey in 1843. After Griscom’s death and the subsequent court case, Anne Griscom et al. vs. David P. Griscom, the appointed trustee’s Powell and Samuel E. Griscom sold parcels of land from 1854 into the 1860s. These
parcels and lots along railroad and Church Lane formed part of the initial settlement of Texas. Deed references are included in the Chain of Title for each property in Appendix A. The 1876 and 1896 Baltimore County Tax Assessments from the Maryland State Archives in Annapolis are detailed in Appendix B.

Poe/Burns House

The Poe-Burns house was a stone duplex just to the east side of the railroad and south of Church Lane (Figures 4.14 and 4.15). The duplex was 2.5-stories tall and is described in the HABS report authored by Kenneth Baumgardt (1994c). The dimensions of the building allowed three rooms. The basement on the north half was 14 ft. 2 in. by 13 ft. 9 in. while the south half was 14 ft. 2 in. by 15 ft. 4 in. The first floor of each was originally one room deep with fireplaces on the outside walls. The rooms were roughly 14 ft. 5 in. by 15 ft. 8 in. Wood additions to the rear on the north side included a 14 ft. 2 in. by 15 ft. 9 in room with a further 4 ft. by 12 ft. addition to the north while the south half had a smaller 11 ft. 2 in. by about 14 ft. addition. The second floor had fireplaces scars along the outside wall and rooms measuring 15 ft. 7 in. by 14 ft. 3 in. on the north side unit and 14 ft. 8 in. by 15 ft. 7 in. on the south side unit. The north unit also had a room addition to the rear measuring 12 ft. 7 in. by 14 ft. 2 in. deep. The attic floor rooms were partitioned on each side to make west and east halves each between 7 ft. 6 in. to 8 feet by about 14 ft. 6 in.

The north side of the house was occupied by John Burns or Byrnes, hailing from County Roscommon, and his wife Abigail who came to Texas in 1848; he was a merchant in town (Smith 1927:64). At least by 1854, John Burns purchased Lot 1 in Division 9 from Jacob Burroughs with a rent of $19.20. In the 1850 US Federal Census,
he was already living on the lot and listed as a shoemaker with his wife and son, James. The following decade according to the 1860 US Federal Census James is still employed as a shoemaker with his wife listed as Elizabeth and with two other children, Mary and Catherine. The oldest two children were attending school, and John could not read or write. In 1860, they are also listed with a domestic, Bridget Bannett or Barrett, from Ireland and her infant son Michael. Bridget is listed as either death, dumb, blind, insane, idiotic, pauper, or convict.

While John Burns died in 1868, his wife survived until 1893 (Smith 1927:64). Abigail was listed as keeping house in the 1870 US Federal Census with her daughters Margaret and Catherine. The value of her real estate was $600 and her personal estate $200. They also had Irish boarders, Patrick and Annie Costeler, with Patrick working as a laborer. By the 1880 US Federal Census, Abby Burns, who could not write, was keeping house helped by her daughter Katie while the other daughter Mary worked as a schoolteacher. They again had another occupant, Edward Dillion, who is listed as Abby’s brother and a laborer.

Catherine or Katie married Martin Hyland and received the property in 1894 after Abigail’s death in 1893. Martin Hyland was listed as a merchant in the roll book of Catholic Benevolent Legion around 1895 (Catholic Benevolent Legion 1895-1942). It is unclear if they were living on the property at this time or renting it out, because in the 1896 County Tax Assessment, they are listed as owning two properties in Texas. In 1921, they sold the land to Ervin and Maude Poe who would later pass the land to Ervin Poe Jr. and Carrie Poe in 1938. At the time of the Phase III excavations, Carrier Poe was living in one half of the duplex.
John Burns purchased the property, Lot 12 Division 9, to the north as well in 1864 from Samuel Griscom. No record of a home could be found for this property which stays in the family going to Catherine Hyland in 1868 and is sold to Ervin and Maude Poe in 1921 who pass it to their son and his wife in 1938.

The other side of the house, the south side, was occupied by Thomas and Margaret Kelly. Thomas Kelly purchased the property, Lot 2 Division 9, at least by 1854 from Jacob Burrough with an annual ground rent of $21.95. The Kelly’s were living on the property in the 1850 US Federal Census with Thomas working as a laborer and with his son, Thomas. By the 1860 US Federal Census, Thomas Kelly is still a laborer with children, Thomas (who was attending school), Mary, Cathrine, Timothy, and John. Thomas Kelly is listed with real estate valued at $600 and a personal estate at $100. The chain of title is unclear but the property seems to have been sold in 1856 to John Bosley and then back to Thomas in 1896. The nature of Bosley’s ownership of the parcel is unclear though he likely rented it back to the Kellys as the Kellys were living in the building through the second half of the nineteenth century.

The 1870 US Federal Census has Thomas Kelly still as a laborer and Margaret keeping house. The children in the house included Michael, Margaret, Ann M., and Joseph. Michael and Margaret had attended school in that year. A decade later according to the 1880 US Federal Census, Thomas Kelly is listed as a stone cutter and Margaret as keeping house, with children Maggie (working as a dressmaker), Phebe, Thomas (a stone cutter), and Joe and Ann (both at school).
Figure 4.14: Lots of Division 9 near Church Lane marked on the 1854 Griscom vs. Griscom Plat. (Collection of the Maryland State Archives [MSA SC 4959-0-37]).
In 1895, Thomas Kelly is listed as a watchman in the rolls of the Catholic Benevolent Legion (1895-1942). Thomas died in 1912 and Margaret in 1915, and they had thirteen children (Smith 1927:72). Margaret T. Kelly bought the property from the administrators of the estate of John Bosley in 1923. The property then passed through a series of owners: Charles Cougle Jr. and Elizabeth Cougle from 1923 to their mortgage default in 1925, then Frank Wheeler who flips the land with it being sold in 1926 to James A Downs Jr. and Florence M. Downs who flip the property back to the attorney who sells it to Ervin and Carrie Poe in 1937. By 1938, Ervin and Carrie Poe owned Lots
1, 2, and 12 in Division 9. According to a newspaper article, they had cattle that used to graze on the more than ten acres they owned in Texas (Eck 1991). In 1971, the quarry operator Genstar purchased Carrie Poe’s home and most of the land, and in a 1991 article, she remarked, “Genstar’s got everything I had” (Eck 1991). The more than a dozen stray quarry cats she fed she nicknamed “genstars” (Deboalt 1993).

Lots 4 and 5

Lots 4 and 5 lie just to the east of the railroad south of the Poe-Burns House (Figures 4.14 and 4.15). Homes were built on Lots 4 and 5 sometime between 1846 and 1854. For Lot 4, the 1854 Griscom vs. Griscom Plat depicts a two-story duplex with six bays, and three doors, and with one central chimney along the eastern edge of the Baltimore and Susquehanna Railroad and property that stretches to a road on the eastern edge of the lot. The limited excavation of the foundation of the rowhouse does not indicate the orientation of the different units. Each of the three buildings likely was originally one-room deep with dimensions of 14 ft. by 14 ft. A secondary wall to the east could have been part of an addition creating another series of rooms, perhaps about 10 ft. by 14 ft. similar to the addition on the Concannon House.

Attached to this dwelling to the south on Lot 5 is a three-story dwelling with four bays, one door and two chimneys (one central and one on the south end) and property that stretches to a road on the eastern edge of the lots.

As with Lot 11, the land for Lots 4 and 5 in Division 9 were deeded to Jacob Burroughs in 1854. In the case of Lot 5, Burroughs leased the land to Thomas Keating in 1854 who arrived in Texas in 1847 (Smith 1927:72). The 1870 US Federal Census lists Thomas Keating and his wife Annie Keating as having nine children, Kate, Annie, Mary,
John, Ella, Timothy, Jane, Thomas, and William. Thomas Keating and his son John were listed as laborers while Ella, Timothy, Jane, and, Thomas the younger attended school. By the 1880 US Federal Census, Thomas Keating is listed as working in a stone quarry while his son John was a stone cutter, his son Thomas worked in iron mines, and only Jennie and Willie were home. Around 1882, his wife died (The Baltimore Sun May 21, 1902). According to his obituary (The Baltimore Sun May 21, 1902), Thomas Keating was a foreman in the lime quarries of Jacob Burrough as well as at the Ashland Iron Company. His son was a special officer at Texas but was killed on the railroad in 1897 (The Baltimore Sun May 21, 1902).

After Thomas Keating died in 1902, the land was leased to Joseph F. Byrne. He gave the land to his daughter Cecilia Byrne in trust through Lawrence and Margaret Scally. After Cecilia’s death in 1919, the land was sold to Lawrence and Margaret Scally. It is unclear whether the Scallys occupied the home or rented it. A home is depicted on both the 1938 and 1952 aerials. When Lawrence died in 1967, Margaret sold the leasehold to Harry T. Campbell. On a 1969-1970 Baltimore County Planning Department map, the building is marked as being demolished. The Campbell Corporation could have destroyed the home at this time.

Burroughs also leased Lot 4 to James Wright for the annual rent of $36.60 in 1854. Wright is mentioned as having completed a tavern house in 1852, which could have sat on the property (Baltimore County Advocate July 26, 1852). Wright then subdivided the parcel and leased the northern section to Samuel Wagner in 1856. Upon Wagner’s death, the land was sold to Patrick Connor in 1860.
Patrick Connor and his wife, Margaret (Finarty), came to Texas in April 1848 (Smith 1927:67). Patrick Connor was in charge of the Burroughs and Griscom quarries until his death in April 1863 (Smith 1927:67). The 1860 US Federal Census lists Patrick Connor as 38 years old and living with Margaret with children Catherine, Mary, Michael, Ellen, and Cecilia.

After Patrick Connor’s death, Margaret and the children owned the property till 1904. In the 1866 Baltimore County Directory, a Margaret Connor is listed as operating a country store with wines and liquors (Hollifield 1979:20). According to the 1870 US Federal Census, Michael worked as a clerk in a store and his mother Margaret Connor is listed as storekeeper with her daughters Margaret, who helped keep house, and Mary Ann, who is a dressmaker. It is unclear whether the store sat on the property or closer to Church Lane. Stores are listed on the 1850 Sidney map and 1863 military map of Baltimore County but they are depicted south of the site.

Margaret Connor died December 13, 1906 (Smith 1927:67), but it is unclear the land ownership of the parcel after the 1904 fire. The Connors remained in Texas as Michael was Court Clerk at Towson, taught school at Texas, and was secretary in The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick (Smith 1927:67-68, 105).

The southern section of the property Wright leased to Lysander Patterson for the annual rent of $23.30 in 1857. When Wright was selling his store, he stated that his store had daily cash sales of $10 to $30 dollars a day (Baltimore County Advocate August 30, 1856). Patterson in turn deeded the land to Henry Grosscup in 1858 who mortgaged the land right back to Patterson. According to St. Joseph’s 1927 Diamond Jubilee (Smith 1927:18) around 1845, a Mr. Patterson began to supply the needs of the villagers with
foodstuffs and dress goods. The Baltimore County Advocate (October 25, 1850) mentions Patterson opening a dry goods store. Mr. Grosscup also acted as general merchant. It is unclear at this time whether their store or a possible storehouse was located on their property or closer to Church Lane.

After Patterson’s death, the land was split again and the southernmost section sold to Edward Doyle in 1860 who in turn deeded the land to James Connor in 1866 in trust for Bridget Doyle. Bridget Doyle is listed as married to Edward Doyle, a carpenter in the 1870 US Federal Census with children Maria, Kate, Thomas, John, and Maggie. In the 1876 and 1896 County tax assessments, Edward Doyle is listed as having two properties with improvements and one lot as well as two hogs in 1876. By the 1880 US Federal Census, Edward Doyle was still a carpenter with Bridget, Katie, Thomas (who worked as a laborer), Maggie, Lizzie, Celia, and Edward living at home. Edward Doyle was an election deputy for the Eight District in 1902 as well as a member of the Catholic Benevolent legion and is listed as a clerk in that year (The Baltimore Sun November 2, 1902, August 6, 1903; Catholic Benevolent Legion 1895-1942). The Doyles may have moved to Lot 11 or a different lot after the 1904 fire.

The other section split (northern half in the split) was sold to Thomas Kilroy in 1860. The 1860 US Federal Census lists Thomas Kilroy as a laborer living with Mary and with children Kate and Thomas. In the 1870 US Federal Census, Mary Kilroy is widowed and listed with her children Patrick, Elizabeth, Mary A., Ella, and Thomas, and possibly a boarder, Michael McMurphy. By the 1880 US Federal Census, Mary Kilroy who is now 52 years old is head of household with her children, Ellen and Thomas, with Thomas working as a laborer. Thomas Kilroy also was financial secretary of the Friendly

According to *The Baltimore Sun* (October 12, 1904) “a large stone building, or three houses under one roof” burned down at 5:00 am that day due to the sparks from a south-bound freight engine. The middle house caught fire as it had earlier that year, but had been earlier put out. The article mentions that a bucket brigade was employed and that some damaged furniture was saved, but the home was destroyed. At the time of the fire, the house was occupied by Margaret Connor, Mary Kilroy and Edward Doyle. Yet this was the second time since the spring of 1904 that this building had caught fire (*The Baltimore Sun* October 12, 1904). The fire began on Mary Kilroy’s house and burnt down to the ground. The property was sold in 1912 to Israel Berlin in a tax sale. The deed mentions that the two-story building on the property had burnt down.

The building is depicted as a duplex in 1854 and may have had an addition in the back. By the 1938 aerial, a possible foundation is visible, but no structures are depicted on the lot. The parcel was not renovated or redeveloped, and Baltimore County was unable to determine the current owners since the fire. A 1996 inquisition for the condemnation of property lists three separate divisions on Lot 4. Yet, the three divisions are listed as: 1) the heirs of Patrick Connor, 2) Alvin Berlin, Jerome K. Berlin, and A. Jerome Diener (representative for the deceased Isabelle Zaldin), and 3) James Connor (trustee to Bridgette Doyle). It is difficult to follow the ownership of the property after the residence was destroyed in 1904; it is highly likely that the property remained vacant for the remainder of its history. In archaeological survey, Ted Payne and Kenneth
Baumgardt (1987) record an asphalt pad where the house stood and a gravel road running west to east across the house.

Lot 11

Lot 11 is located at the town’s center on the southeast corner of Church Lane and the railroad and extends southward just east of the railroad (Figures 4.14 and 4.15). The Tavern and Concannon complex is far more complicated and is described in the HABS report authored by Baumgardt (1990a). Initially, the series of buildings was a two story duplex attached to three other buildings on the 1854 plat. The Concannon duplex was two stories tall with two rooms on each floor separated by partitions. The front rooms each measured roughly 15 ft. 3 in. by 15 ft. 9 in. with one of these rooms still containing a fireplace when the HABS documentation took place in 1990. The back room was 7 ft. 9 in. by 14 ft. 8 in for the north side and 7 ft. 9 in. by 15 ft. 4 in. on the south side. The upper floor was one room measuring roughly 16 ft. 6 in. by 14 ft. 8 in. on the north side and 16 ft. 6 in. by 15 ft. 4 in. on the south side.

Since 1854, the internal and external layout of the tavern complex seems to have changed with its use as a bar, hotel, and for other purposes. The building may have consisted of three units each with rooms of about 15 ft. by almost 15 ft. The large building on the north end may have been added later (Baumgardt 1990b).

In 1854, Jacob Burroughs purchased several lots including Lot 11 from Powell Griscom (Figures 4.12 and 4.13). The following year Burroughs leased the property to Thomas Cockey of Joshua for the annual payment of $30. The 1850 Sidney map labels the building in the vicinity of Lot 11 as Thomas Cockey’s Tavern. In 1858, Cockey sold the land to Patrick W. Kenny.
Patrick Walter Kenny had come to Texas in 1850 and taught school in Texas that year and then in other parts of the county until 1865; he also taught in a private school in Ashland (Smith 1927:72-73). According to Smith (1927:73), he was active in the lime business and introduced a new process in the patent lime kiln. He was married to Nora (Travers) and had the following children: J. Frank, Elizabeth G., Sallie T., and Nora Agnes (Smith 1927:73). No mention could be found of Patrick Kenny operating a tavern. It is possible that Cockey was still operating a tavern on the property.

Upon Patrick’s death in 1869, his executor, James Kenny, sold the land to Francis Kenny in 1875 who in turn sold it to James Kenny that same day. In 1875, James Kenny mortgaged the property to Alfred J. Intoes, trustee for Ella A. Nelson, but Intoes defaulted and James Kenny seized the land in 1880 and the land was transferred to Mary Ann Kenny in 1880. Upon her death, the property transferred in 1900 to Nora Agnes, Sarah T., and Elizabeth G. Kenny. It is unclear if the Kennys were leaving on the property or renting up until 1910. The 1878 Hopkins map (see Figure 4.9) does not depict a structure or a name on the southeast corner of Church Lane and the railroad tracks.

In the 1910 US Federal Census, Frank Kenny is listed on the property as a solicitor of life insurance with his sisters Sarah and Nora who works as a dressmaker. According to the 1930 US Federal Census, James Kenny is listed as insurance adjuster as well as residing on the property with his sisters, Sarah and Nora. Nora still is listed as a dressmaker and Sarah is listed as housekeeper. The Kenny’s may have operated a tavern at this location or rented a portion of this space out to another individual or individuals who operated a tavern. It is unclear who occupied the duplex until the 1930s.
The land also was still subject to ground rent at this time. The ground rent had transferred between the Griscoms and Burroughs and eventually Edward Doyle received the land in 1909. In the 1910 US Federal Census, Doyle was listed as renting a home along Church Lane near Railroad Avenue with his occupation as “whiskey retailer” and housing an African-American servant, William Devine, who was listed as a waiter for a private family. According to the 1915 Baltimore County Directory, Doyle is listed, along with Catherine Kenny, as being hotel owners along Railroad Avenue. Edward Doyle’s family consisted of wife, Annie, son, Edward, and two daughters, Elizabeth and Annie in the 1920 US Federal Census. Their granddaughter Evelyn Dukes was also living with them.

Doyle may have operated his hotel and/or bar on Lot 11 during this period. A beer token with his name on it found in the 2009 excavation of Lot 11 suggests he operated a tavern. Yet by 1920, Doyle is listed as “inspector” at the nearby shell factory. The discrepancy might be related to Prohibition beginning in 1919. Based on land records, it is clear that Edward and Annie Doyle transferred the deed to John A. and Mary A. Murk in 1915 whom in turn passed it to Ernest T. and Anne Lee Newell in 1929. The Newells placed the land in trust with the Mercantile Trust Company of Baltimore in 1929 who sold the interest to the Albert P. and Anna V. Caslin in 1947.

Based on their position in the 1930 US Federal Census, Edward and Margaret Concannon may have been renting the attached duplex from the Kennys. According to the 1930 US Federal Census, Edward Concannon, who worked as a general farm laborer, was married to Margaret and had the following children, John E. (who was an odd jobs laborer), Anne T., Margaret, Joseph, and two daughters, Amelia and Helen. By the 1940
US Federal Census, the Edward was still listed as a farm laborer while Joseph and his son-in-law, William Walter, were listed as ditch diggers for a water line. Margaret and their daughters, Amelia and Helen, as well as their grandchild, William Walter, also lived in the house. Ralph Fletcher may have rented the southern half of the duplex according to 1940 US Federal Census.

Because of their position in the 1940 US Federal Census, it would seem that Walter Turnbaugh was renting a portion of 163 Church Lane between the Kennys and Concannons. Walter worked as a pipe layer laying water line while his sons, Raysten and Walter B., who were ditch diggers, and his other son Thomas who was a truck driver for a contractor. Walter’s wife, Bertha, and their children, Philip, Helen, Dolores, Ella Mae, and daughter-in-law, Christina, also lived in the house.

In 1934, the property was transferred to a straw man (G. William Parker) but immediately back to the Kennys. James F, Elizabeth, and Nora Agnes all continued to own the property into their seventies though they were not listed as working in the 1940 US Federal Census. It is not until 1943 that the property passes out of the Kenny family to Frank C. and Mary V. Kearns. After Frank died in 1944, Mary Kearns sold the property to Albert P. and Anna V. Caslin the following year.

By 1947, the Caslins owned both the land and structures on Lot 11. In 1948, the Caslins split Lot 11 between the attached duplex along the southern end and the remaining structures to the north with Dorothy and John E. Concannon receiving the deed to the duplex in 1948 and James B. McDermott receiving the northern buildings in 1953. McDermott owned the northern half of the property until it was condemned and seized by Baltimore County in 1991. For most of that time, McDermott operated a bar on the
property. Dorothy Concannon transferred the deed in a life estate to Harry Woodward and Dawn and William Selby in 1980, but the land was seized in 1991 by Baltimore County.

*The Workers Barracks*

The Workers Barracks sat on the west side of railroad north of the Ward-Cole house and Padonia Road. The Workers Barracks Site was built in 1854. The Barracks is depicted on the Griscom vs. Griscom Plat, which is the only known map of the building showing the building as a series of attached housing units (Figures 4.16 and 4.17). The Barracks has the smallest housing units in the study with each unit likely comprising one room on the first floor and one room on the second. The dimensions of the rooms were likely about 13 ft. by 15 ft. 6 in., encompassing a total of 403 sq. ft. When the Barracks was improved prior to 1896, the space doubled and the number of occupants halved. The residents then had access to upwards of 806 sq. ft. with two rooms on each floor, each around 13 ft. by 15 ft. 6 in.

The biography of the Maryland Governor and later Senator, Herbert R. O’Conor, mentions his father visiting relatives and friends down on the “Catholic Row” after 1899 went he left to work in the city (Kirwin 1962:6). Smith (1927:63) refers to Catholic Row as a group of houses on the Ward estate which was occupied by members of the parish engaged in the lime works and quarries about Texas. This date however contradicts the date the barracks burnt down. According to Smith (1927:73), John and his brother Hugh Lindsay also originally lived in the Barracks coming to Texas around 1847.
The Barracks was built by a May 15, 1854 *Baltimore Sun* article which describes Griscom and Burroughs building sixteen dwelling houses for laborers along with four kilns. By 1854, Powell Griscom sold Lot 2 to Jacob Burroughs. The Barracks was located on Lot 2 Division 2. Four years later the property is sold to Adam Denmead whose trustees sell the property in 1869 to Thomas Ward.

The lives of the Wards and Barracks and industry appear intertwined. Thomas Ward and his wife came to America in 1844, and Thomas worked for the Oregon Iron
Ore Company. (Smith 1927:81). Thomas Ward eventually left this work to become a farmer and contractor, living in the neighboring Green Spring Valley, then moving to the “Green Quarries” in Texas in 1860 to start a lime and stone industry (Smith 1927:81). Thomas Ward’s wife died in 1875 (Smith 1927:81).

The home occupied by the Wards was on Lot 1 Division 2 according to the 1854 Griscom Plat. Ward became insolvent by 1880 and the property was sold to James Mackubin according to the deeds. An August 18, 1880 article in the *Baltimore Sun* lists a number of properties belonging to Thomas Ward in Texas and along Falls Road, including tenant houses, crops, quarries, and kilns. The Barracks is mentioned as sixteen tenant houses. Unfortunately, it is difficult to locate the Barracks on the census. On the 1880 US Federal Census a listing of laborers and their families may correspond to the occupants of the Barracks. All but one set of these families were Irish-born or from Irish-born parents.

Ella Ward, Thomas Ward’s daughter, recovers the property a year later in 1881 and continued to own the property until her death in the 1920s. According to his obituary on March 10, 1910 (*The Baltimore Sun*), Thomas Ward was still engaged in the lime and stone business up into the turn of the century and had been a contractor for the Western Maryland Railroad and Loch Raven Dam.

The 1896 Tax Assessment for Ella Ward lists an improved barracks. The improved barracks may have been converted into eight houses instead of sixteen. The *Baltimore Sun* details the fire that burnt down the Barracks in 1897. Six residents were living in the building that had eight units. The improvement to the building appears to have consolidated the space. The building may have been separated into north units and
south units with a party wall between them. At the time of the fire, the occupants occupied the north and south halves of their respective units as artifacts mend across the north and south sections.

The Ward family appeared to have trouble with some members of the community. In 1882, Thomas Ward was found guilty of assault on Miss Florence Collins (The Baltimore Sun Jan. 19, 1882). Again in 1887, Thomas Ward was accused of striking and throwing down stairs an African-American women, Hannah Davis (The Baltimore Sun November 23, 1887). By 1892, Ella Ward appealed in The Baltimore Sun (May 19, 1892) for a lockup in town as the conduct of drunken men, especially on Sunday, is “disgraceful” and when the police take a prisoner to the nearest jail in Towson, the disorder increases.

Ella Ward and Thomas Ward were living in Chicago with her sister and his daughter Mrs. William B. Pettit, formerly Fannie Buckingham and wife of William Pettie who was in the legal department of the Pullman Car Company from 1894 to 1899 (The Baltimore Sun July 13, 1899). Ward’s daughter, Fannie Buckingham, was an actress that performed at the Baltimore County Fair, in part of the play Mazeppa (The Baltimore Sun October 4, 1884). This timeframe does not fit the other articles, but the article does note that their family was originally from County Roscommon. Mrs. Pettit details her life in Texas and mentions going to see shows and that the school teacher stayed with them in Texas. The article makes it sound like the teacher was Father Gibbons, later Cardinal Gibbons, and that he told her to attend a particular school. Mrs. Pettit along with two of her brothers had worked on the stage in New York.
In 1897, the Barracks burned to the ground and the newspaper account shows the animosity between the Wards and their renters and possible workers. John Ward was running the limestone business around this time. The Barracks burnt down on Christmas day 1897 at about 2:30 pm. *The Baltimore Sun* (December 27, 1897) details the fire. The eight houses in a row owned by Ella Ward were occupied by George Price, Michael Ellwood, Dell Chapman, Joseph Simmons, Peter Payne, and August Thomas. The last two residents are listed as African-American. One of the houses was to be rented that day and the other was used by Ella Ward to store furniture. The fire began in the house of August Thomas and spread rapidly as the houses were only divided by lath and plaster partitions. When it appeared nothing could be done to save the building, the occupants and neighbors set to saving the furniture, the children saved their presents, and the
women were saving their Christmas dinners, including two partially cooked turkeys. The summer kitchen attached to the west end did not burn and George Price and his brother-in-law, Thomas McGraw, and another man tore it down and burned the lumber the next day. John Ward remonstrated the men and Price struck Ward’s right hand badly with a club, the wound later dressed by Dr. B. F. Bussey. Ella Ward swore out warrants in Towson for Price and McGraw and was afraid of bodily harm from McGraw. Ella Ward estimated her loss at about $5,000 and complained there was no protection against fire and was unable to telephone the Towson fire engine as the store with the phone was locked up.

All the families who lost their homes found shelter with family and friends and the men were laborers in the quarries of Texas. Michael Kilroy and George Price were accused of tearing down and burning a shed or outhouse attached to the barracks that did not burn down during the Christmas dawn fire (The Baltimore Sun January 7, 1898).

Information on the residents of the Barracks is difficult to find. Some of the occupants may have stayed in Texas. The 1900 US Federal Census lists a George W. Price, age 41, who was born in Maryland and who was married to Rosie Price, age 33 and born in Maryland, with ten children, eight of which were still living. George Price’s parents were born in Maryland while Rosie Price’s parents were born in Ireland. In 1900 according to the US Federal Census, George was working as a day laborer and renting the house, while Rosie was a housekeeper and eldest daughter, Mary Price, age 15, worked in a shirt factory. The remaining children above the age of five were in school. Twenty years earlier, George Price was living in the Barracks with his widowed mother Adline Bannahan, age 49, whose mother was born in Ireland and father in Maryland, and with
three sisters, a nephew, and William Thomas, age 10, who is listed as a black servant. George is listed as a laborer while his mother keeps house and one sister, age 14, is in school. His father disappears between the 1860 and 1870 censuses. Based on the 1870 US Federal Census they own a house, but by 1880 his mother has remarried or changed her name and is listed as a widow.

The 1900 US Federal Census also lists a possible Michael Elwood, age 40, married to Annie M. Elwood, age 41, and both are from Ireland with Michael Elwood immigrating in 1882 and working as a day laborer. Another individual, Joseph Seemon, possibly Joseph Simmons, age 42, was married to S. Charlot, age 47, with two children. The parents emigrated from Italy in 1887 and their one daughter was born in New Jersey and the other Maryland. The children were in school while Joseph worked as a day laborer and his wife as a housekeeper. Unfortunately, it is not possible to track down the other workers in later census enumerations nor has it been possible to find the residents of the Barracks before or after the fire, accept for George Price.

Summary of Lots

The sites all represent the homes of unskilled and skilled labor. The Barracks was built in 1854 and likely rented by laborers in the lime and quarry business. The rowhouse building had sixteen households until possibly 1896 when it was improved to just eight households but burnt down the following year. The rowhouse home on Lot 4 was built sometime around the 1850s and was owned by storekeepers until the 1860s when skilled and unskilled workers lived on the property until it burned down in 1904. The home on Lot 5 was likely built around the same time and occupied by a skilled laborer and his family into the twentieth century. The Poe-Burns house was a duplex built around the
same time occupied by two skilled workers and their families into the beginning of twentieth century. The Concannon House/Tavern site was built around the late 1840s and housed a tavern and/or hotel and was home to a number of skilled and unskilled residents till the end of the twentieth century. The next chapter builds upon this historical account of Texas by detailing the excavation of these properties and the material recovered. The methods used in the identification and analysis of this material are also discussed.
CHAPTER 5
The Archaeology of Texas and a Methodology

The material and spatial evidence provides the essential context from which to study changes in everyday life and the impact of capitalism over the town’s history. The four sites excavated in Texas are crucial to understanding change over time as they represent a sampling of over one hundred years of the town’s existence. This data includes a wide range of material culture from the different residential sites at various points of time from the 1840s until the 1940s allowing for a comparison across class which is essential for understanding a political economic system based on unequal class relationships and their continuance. Thus, the material and built environment are the foundation for the application of Harvey’s critical geographical materialism at the local level.

The resulting material and documentary record though relatively small in terms of the record of the entire town is large enough to test Harvey’s theorization but is unwieldy when first approached. The methodology formulated and employed to examine the artifacts and landscape is critical for managing the collection and being able to answer the research questions. Understanding the data and its recovery is equally important as the excavation and methodology employed in the analysis as all of them shape the applicability of the data sets. The strength of historical archaeology is not only being able to recover material, but to understand its use and deposition and thus, situate artifacts in time as well as space. The efficacy of this context is dependent on the scientific methods employed by historical archaeologists. This chapter not only details this methodology, the chapter describes the excavation of the sites and features. The
recovered assemblages are listed by the artifact groups that can address the research questions.

**Excavations and Data**

Both assemblages are the result of methodical and systematic scientific archaeological excavations. The initial assemblage from Texas was excavated by the cultural resource management firm Mid-Atlantic Archaeological Research Associates, Inc. of Delaware (MAAR) in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The second assemblage was recovered by Dr. Stephen Brighton’s Research Program and Field School of the Archaeology of the Irish Diaspora and Labor Project operated through the University of Maryland College Park in 2009 through 2011.

Using standard archaeological methods, both projects placed artifacts and the sites in temporal contexts. The methods allow from a location of artifacts in time and space and thus, relationships over time. This association is accomplished by several basic but fundamental practices in historical archaeology. Sites are set within a three-dimensional matrix. This grid provides the framework to enable the entire site and its artifacts to be understood relational in time and space. The grid includes vertical and horizontal control accomplished through the delineation of separate discrete units that are mapped and recorded as such. Different soil contexts and/or features are determined by the analysis of soil texture and color. Understanding the distribution of these soils and their associated artifacts across the site or even sites allows for a reconstruction of time and depositional processes. Aiding this temporal designation are the production histories of
many everyday objects that saw changes in form or design over time and which can be read as temporal markers (Noël Hume 1969).

The similarity in the excavations from these two projects allows for a comparison of the sites together and across time. MAAR and Associates conducted a series of Phase I, II, III surveys and excavations of some of sites documented in their assessment of the historic resources in the suggested paths of the extension of Beaver Dam Road and the realignment of the existing railroad tracks to accommodate the present Light Rail system. This work included a mix of shovel test pits or STPs, hand excavated units, trenching, and machine scraping. In total, their excavations resulted in 31 boxes of artifacts with the bulk of these boxes related to the Phase III excavation of the Worker's Barracks Site (18BA314). The remaining artifacts were recovered from three mid-nineteenth to twentieth-century houses on the east side of the railroad south of Church Lane. These residences include the Poe/Burns Duplex (18BA325), the Concannon House and McDermott’s Tavern (18BA324), and a site containing four different lots (18BA313). The location of all of these sites in Texas can be seen in Figures 5.1 and 5.2.

In 2009 through 2011, Stephen Brighton’s Field School of the Archaeology of the Irish Diaspora and Labor Project, excavated portions of some of these sites using excavation units. In 2009, 29 units were excavated at 18BA324 uncovering 36 features and over 55,000 artifacts. In 2010 and 2011, this research program and field school excavated 18BA313 with 12 units relocating a possible icehouse and other features and 15,000 artifacts (Figure 5.3).

The excavation of each of these sites and their assemblages are detailed further. Only the data and assemblages relevant to the analysis are summarized below.
Percentages are provided and rounded to the nearest whole number. Therefore, the total percentages may vary slightly from 100 percent. Photographs of a sample of the artifacts analyzed are included in Appendix C.

Figure 5.1: Boundaries and locations of the analyzed sites on a current aerial image of Texas.
Figure 5.2: The same site locations on a 1938 aerial photograph of Texas
Figure 5.3: Excavation units completed during the 2009, 2010, and 2011 field seasons at 18BA324 and 18BA313 on a current aerial.
Methodology and Analysis

The first step in this analysis was to gather all of the assemblages. Artifacts and field notes from the MAAR excavation were obtained on loan from the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory in St. Leonard, Maryland, and temporarily housed in the Archaeology of the Irish Diaspora and Labor lab of Stephen Brighton at the University of Maryland. The second step was to reexamine these artifacts together with the artifacts excavated recently through the Archaeology of the Irish Diaspora and Labor Project Field School and combine the catalogs, especially for the icehouse feature.

Great care was employed in selecting representative artifact groups. Glass and ceramic artifacts as well as buttons, smoking pipes, and personal items were selected for analysis due to their durability and ability to answer the research questions. While all of these items may reflect a small percentage of a household’s expenditures, they do have interpretative value in understanding possible behavior and values.

From the combined catalog, the artifacts categories relevant for the analysis were pulled and minimum number of vessel or MNV counts were calculated. Minimum vessel counts for glass and ceramics were used to calculate the number of vessels represented and remove the distortion of sherd or piece counts (Sussman 2000). Different depositional events affected the artifacts and their quality, and thus, a consistent manner of calculating the MNV that addresses each of these separate assemblages is crucial. Minimum number of vessels counts were performed through several steps. After attempting to mend assemblages, the ceramic rims and glass bases were examined further.
As rims are the most diagnostic portions of a ceramic vessel, all of the rims were analyzed based on form, ware type, decoration, rim radius, percentage of rim, and use wear. Vessel type included porcelain, whiteware, white granite, pearlware, creamware, stoneware, yellowware, and redware. Decoration and surface treatments were also noted, but this step required referring to distinct exclusive categories like transfer-printed, molded, and banded. Using rim radius and form, the vessels were classified by form, such as plate or cup, and function, such as tableware or teaware. Rims were counted with each unmended rim representing a vessel. Any rim diameter less than 10% intact was not counted due to the uncertainty of analysis. These rims were still examined and provided useful information for dating. Ceramics were then separated by function: serving, teaware, tableware, and hygiene categories. Within these categories, the vessels were identified by specific form.

For bottles, minimum vessel counts were accomplished in a similar manner. Bases were first mended if possible and categorized by color (aqua, blue, cobalt, clear, green, brown, amethyst, red). Glass was then separated by form, such as bottle or jar. Only container or tableware glass was considered for the analysis. Decoration and surface treatment (embossed, molded, etched, plain, labeled, painted) was used to divide the glass further and help identify the form or in the case of bottles, contents. Glass also was broken down by the different technologies of manufacture and treatments, such as mouthblown, blown in mold, machine made, followed by lip finish. Each base was counted as a vessel, except any base diameter that was less than 10% intact which was still examined for dating purposes.
These analytical categories were used to help to determine the specific function and type of the glass vessel: either alcohol (type), beverage (type), cosmetic or sanitary (type), medicinal (proprietary or ethical), food (type), and other. The beverage category was included to account for nonalcoholic drinks. For this study, soda water is included in beverages rather than medicinal. While the early mineral and soda waters were mainly consumed for medicinal purposes, soda water moved more and more away from purely medicinal use to a flavored refreshment by the 1830s and after (Riley 1958:5-8). The other category was used for paneled bottles that could have carried medicine, food extracts, or other liquid products and thus, could not be placed in a specific category.

Buttons and smoking pipes were also mended but with marginal success to arrive at the minimum number of items count. The buttons are small enough and many are hard enough that most were whole and intact except for some of the shell buttons which had deteriorated.

Smoking pipes were classified by material and the type of pipe. The decoration and modifications of the pipes were relevant to understanding identity and thus were also recorded. Most of the pipes were single-use ball clay pipe and were readily disposable. To overcome the large number of pipe stems that could possible represent only one pipe, only the pipe bowls were quantified. The stems were analyzed to provide qualitative data on the type and maker of the pipes.

Personal items included buttons, combs, toothbrushes, and figurines. The presence of lice combs, toothbrushes, religious items, and figurines was noted for each site. Buttons were analyzed by material form, decoration, and size. The buttons were separated by material: metal (by type), prosser, bone, shell, vegetable ivory, rubber (by
color), glass (by color), and other. Due to corrosion and rust, it was difficult to separate out buttons by their material beyond the general categories of iron and copper-alloy. The designation of prosser was used for any porcelain buttons made by the compressed clay process originally patented by Richard Prosser in 1840 (Hughes and Lester 2010:51). Basic delineations were made by form including attachment styles, such as holed or loop, as well as the shape of the button. Decoration delineations were based on color, molding, or applied or engraved embellishments. A wide variation in treatments were observed negating a finite classification system. Based on diameter, measured in lignes, buttons were separated into sizes.

Linking buttons to a specific garment proved highly problematic as the buttons could have been used or reused by many different members of the household. The same button could be found on different articles of clothing for men, women, and children. For instance, gaiter buttons were not only found on some men’s gaiters, they could also be found on women’s and children’s dresses (Luscomb 2006:76). To facilitate the uncovering of notions of display, a simplistic delineation was made between decorated and undecorated. This analysis draws from Grace Ziesing’s (1991) Master Thesis analysis of buttons from Boott Mills in Lowell. Ziesing (1991:110) separated buttons into fancy and plain with plain being two and four-hole porcelains and everything else being fancy. In this study, undecorated buttons with no signs of embellishment are listed as undecorated while those buttons with embellishments are listed as decorated. Any button that was uniform related, such as a military button, is grouped in the “other” category. For the decorated and other categories, the buttons are described further. The plain buttons are not described further.
The landscape required a different approach. The landscape represents the accumulation of various material manifestations and modifications (Lanier and Herman 1997). The built landscape does not change like mass-produced items (Purser 1999) and is not replaced but added to and altered over time. In Texas, though the built environment has been radically changed, some buildings and features remain to indicate the modifications to the landscape. This record is augmented by a scattering of historical documents, photographs, and maps showing the landscape and structures at specific times. Recreating the landscape at specific times and understanding its evolution is necessary if capitalism is to be viewed as a spatial process that was interpreted locally. This recreation was accomplished through ArcGIS mapping software. Historic maps were overlaid on current maps. This layering of maps allowed for an incomplete picture of Texas over time, but it did not allow some of the landscape to be recreated over specific time frames.

**Worker’s Barracks (18BA314)**

The Worker’s Barracks site as named by MAAR is located just to the northwest of the present intersection of Old Padonia Road and the Light Rail Tracks. The site is now the location of a gas station and convenience store.

*Excavations*

The Barracks site saw excavation with shovel test pits and excavations units during Phase I, II, III testing. The Phase I utilized a series of STPs and one 2 ft. by 6.5 ft. excavation unit that straddled the interior and exterior of the center of the barrack’s north exterior wall (Brown et al. 1986: Section II). While the Phase I report contains an artifact
catalog, the Phase I artifacts and associated records are missing and thus, not considered here.

The Phase II work (Payne and Baumgardt 1987:Section II) excavated the interior of the Barracks with four judgmental excavation units (three 5 ft. by 5 ft. units and one 5 ft. by 5 ft. with a 2.5 sq. ft. extension) and the exterior with two judgmental units (one 5 ft. by 5 ft unit and a 4 ft. by 2 ft. unit with a 10 ft. by 1 ft. extension) (Figure 5.4). The upper levels of these units were only sampled. In the interior of the Barracks (Units 1 to 3 and 5), the uppermost fill strata were sampled (20% screened) due to the large amount of modern material. In EU 5 (location of EU 1 in the Ph. I excavation), Strata A and B were taken out as one unit and sampled. Only Unit 5 had substantial cultural deposits below the burned zone. Outside of the building, Unit 4’s upper strata was topsoil and compacted fill (10% sifted) with only glass tableware kept, everything else was discarded as duplicates. Below this level, there were three strata of cultural deposits. Unit 6 was placed outside of the wall to the south and then extended into the building foundation.
Figure 5.4: Phase II excavation map of 18BA314 (Payne and Baumgardt 1987:II2)

Based on this work, a Phase III mitigation was performed (Payne and Baumgardt 1994:Section II). In their Phase III work, MAAR removed the post-habitation fill deposits in the building’s interior with mechanical stripping (Figure 5.5). The interior of the Barracks was divided into five loci: the interior of the present shed on the west end and the remainder as four quads (Quads A-D). Excavation units were used inside the building. The shed contained three excavation units (a 9 ft. by 3 ft. unit, a 3 ft. by 4 ft. unit, and a 3 ft. by 6 ft. unit). After the area was stripped to subsoil, the quads each contained twelve 5 ft. by 5 ft. excavation units, and outside the Barracks there were seven excavation units (10 ft. by 10 ft units, a 7.5 ft. by 8 ft. unit, a 2.5 ft. by 3.5 ft. unit, and a 12 ft. by 8 ft. unit). Eight units between the quads were also excavated. STPs were also used to the north of the building.
The general soil profile below the stripped fill consisted of: Layer A- blackish brown silty loam (disturbed); Layer B- plaster fragments; Layer C- burn layer with charcoal; and Layer D- brown clay and silty clay mix with charcoal.

In the northern yard area, the area was stripped of the modern topsoil and subsurface fill layers and mine tailings according to Payne and Baumgardt (1994:II-1). In all of the stripping, diagnostic artifacts were recovered and noted and mostly discarded. The remainder of units were hand excavated and screened. The units along the northern limit of the north wall seem to follow a general pattern. Postholes are found along the wall and extending outward about seven feet north. The postholes go down into subsoil and through some layers and likely represent the supports for an overhang of a wooden porch on the north side of the building. All the posts are about seven feet from the house wall when the field maps are examined.

**Building**

Based on the excavation data and historical documents, the Barracks building measured 115 ft. by 35 ft. and was two stories tall. The existent exterior walls on the west and east sides were stone while traces of stone supports and the north and south foundation walls were found during excavation (Payne and Baumgardt 1994). Payne and Baumgardt (1994:II-11) note a lack of sufficient amount of masonry rubble and thought the stone might have been robbed out. The building burnt down in 1897 and was never rebuilt with the area around and in the building used to dump fill. A crushed stone road in the west half and an earthen ramp for a barn just to the south were present in the 1980s.
Figure 5.5: Phase II and III Excavations of 18BA314 with house divisions superimposed (adapted from Payne and Baumgardt 1994).
Analysis

Two problems developed in the course of this analysis. First, the existing records for the site are difficult to interpret with regards to depth. The second problem arises from the lack information on the construction of the building, specifically the construction of the floor. Parallels can be drawn from a similarly constructed stone two-story rowhouse block still standing near the Jones Falls River in Hampden, Baltimore (Figure 5.6). This building is composed of single units, but has the same general layout and a wood floor slightly above the ground surface and no subsurface storage features.

Figure 5.6: Similar stone rowhouse unit along Clipper Mill Road, in Hampden, Baltimore City.
No substantial pit or cellar feature was found during the excavation of 18BA314. The shallowness of the units within the building’s interior also seems to indicate that the building did not have any cellars and either a dirt or, more likely, wood floor similar to the building in Hampden. The sheer volume of burned cut nails also supports this assertion. Making this determination affects the analysis. The thin strata below the fill layers would then have to date to the time of the fire, December 25, 1897. The formation of the strata is likely the result of the collapse and burning of the buildings floors and their subsequent decay. No pre-fire deposits were then located. Likewise, most of the units just north of the building contained post-fire fill and fill resulting from the fire. In these yard deposits, older material likely was mixed with any fire and post-fire deposits.

Based on the dimensions and depiction of the building on the 1854 plat, the building was originally divided into eight houses on the north and south sides. At the time of the fire as noted earlier, the “improved” barracks had eight units, each encompassing the north and south sections of the structure and likely the second floor. These new houses were roughly 14 ft. by 35 ft. These house divisions were measured out and superimposed over MAAR’s excavation map to determine which units represented which house (Figure 5.5). Any units, which straddled the house divisions, were labeled as between those houses. This created assemblages between units which cannot be ascribed to one house for quantitative purposes, but which can be drawn upon as likely artifacts of one of the houses. They are therefore included in the following descriptions.

Artifacts and Context

The artifacts in the house and just outside of it at the time of the fire and subsequently recovered are almost entirely domestic, except for architectural debris and
some quarry worker’s tools, and date to the second half of the nineteenth century (Figure 5.7). Many of these artifacts were burned in the fire, and a large percentage of the recovered glass was been melted beyond recognition and thus, unavailable for the analysis.

Intrusive levels dating to after the fire were noted and removed from the analysis. They likely reflect the trash of the occupants of the Ward-Cole House after 1897. The post-fire fill was removed in the Phase II by hand but either sampled and/or discarded. During the Phase III excavation, the post-fire fill was removed by backhoe. The stripping of these upper layers led to the possible mixing of some of the upper layers of the deposits formed at the time of the fire. Some mixing of the fire-period deposits and post fire deposits likely happened during the site’s history, especially since the Barracks was robbed of some of its stone.

To compensate for the fire and post-fire mixing, the field notes were consulted to document where the mixing was seen during excavation. Further, the presence of artifacts dating to after 1897 were noted. The levels containing this mixing were recorded. The close proximity of the date of the fire to the introduction of fully machine made bottles via the Owens machine (1904 and later according to Miller and Sullivan [1984:94]) provides another indicator to establish this delineation. In order to avoid contamination of the data set in these possibly mixed levels, only the artifacts that were burned were retained in the analysis; everything else in these levels was not considered in the analysis. (Figure 5.7). Unit levels that were sampled were not included in the analysis as they reflect a potentially biased recovery of the material culture. This selection,
resulting from the excavation methods employed, greatly limits the analysis, but is the only means of securing a representative and appropriate assemblage.

Figure 5.7: A selection of artifacts from inside the Barracks delineated during analysis by context and house.

Another problem observed with the assemblage of the Barracks, though also noted with the other MAAR excavated sites, are incongruities between the field notes, artifact catalog, and archived assemblage. Attempts to figure out these contradictions have been made and noted. Unfortunately, several artifacts that may have had “collectible-value” such as military buttons or pipes are not found in the curated assemblage. These artifacts are noted in the analysis.

The following is a brief description of each house unit. It is not possible to document every disturbed level. Based on the methods detailed below, disturbed levels were excluded. This section details the units excavated and the features encountered in
each house. It is not possible to assign occupants to each house nor to know which were not occupied at the time of the fire. Therefore, all of the houses are presented. Roughly 41.4 percent (1,482.5 sq ft) of the total interior square footage (3,584 sq. ft.) of the Barracks was excavated.

House 1

House 1 was excavated with two units (Unit 3 [Ph. II] and SD2W). No features were encountered, though in their Phase III field notes, MAAR notes disturbed levels with beer bottles dating to the 1910s and 1920s. Only 64 sq. ft. (14 percent) of the total square footage of the interior of House 1 was excavated.

House 1 Artifacts. Thirteen fragments were found of clay single-unit pipes (Figure A.1). Of these fragments, only one bowl was present and was decorated with stars and a fan-like acanthus leaf similar to the pipes (minus the stars) of Duncan McDougal (1846-1967) and Thomas Davidson Jr. and Co. (in his 1880 catalog and in operation from 1862 to 1911), both from Glasgow (Davey 1987:340, 345; Gallagher 1987:79-80; Gallagher and Price 1987:133). The marked stems included “Prince” and “Prince” and Gouda.” Prince was the mark of a Dutch pipe maker, and the city of Gouda was a major center in the Dutch clay pipe industry (Bradley 2000:117). Additionally, a pipe spark cap with a copper-alloy cut-out star was found. These caps are found on some wooden and porcelain pipe bowls (Bradley 2000:122).
Table 5.1: Glass by Function from House 1, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Vessel Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage</td>
<td>Soda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetic or Sanitary</td>
<td>Ointment or deodorant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware/Serving</td>
<td>Tumbler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt or Pepper Shaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Extract</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Extract or syrup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extract or oil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The glass category artifacts (Table 5.1) included a small but wide assortment of bottles and vessels: alcohol (n=2), beverage (n=1), cosmetic or sanitary (n=1), serving or tableware (n=2), food (n=2), and other (n=3). Alcohol bottles included one beer bottle and one liquor flask. The beverage category included a Frank Phillips soda bottle. The cosmetic or sanitary category contained one jar for ointment or deodorant. The serving or tableware category contained a paneled tumbler and a molded checkered patterned salt or peppershaker. The food category contained W. H. Crawford extract bottles. W. H. Crawford operated a spice mill in Baltimore as early as 1860 and then became involved in the wholesale spice business in 1886 and was in business past the 1920s and in competition with McCormick and Co. (Zumwalt 1980:94). The other category contained two unidentified extract or syrup bottles and a McCormick and Co. extract or oil bottle. Based in Baltimore, McCormick began in 1889, eventually selling a range of products from extracts to glue to proprietary medicines and operates to this day (Zumwalt 1980:289-291).
The ceramics (Table 5.2 and Figure A.2) also were a small but diverse assemblage with servingware (n=3), teaware (n=2), tableware (n=2), and hygiene (n=1).

The serving vessels are the most numerous with three different wares represented in pitchers (n=2) and an egg cup (n=1). These vessels include one plain porcelain egg cup. A similar style egg cup is pictured in the post-1881 Silber and Fleming catalog (Wordsworth 1990:47). The remainder are one plain small whiteware pitcher, and a small molded and paneled yellowware milk pitcher. Molded or pressed yellowware is found in the 1860s up into the twentieth century (Leibowitz 1985:13).

The teaware include a plain porcelain saucer and molded white granite saucer. The white granite saucer is molded in the Huron shape, which was registered by William Adams in 1858 (Wetherbee 1996:214). The tableware include a 9-inch plain whiteware plate and a 5-inch plain whiteware bowl. The hygiene category includes one pink and black industrial slipware banded shaving mug. The mug has the mark of the Maryland Pottery Company, which was in operation in Baltimore from 1888 to 1914 (Lehrner 1988:281-282).
Table 5.3: Buttons by Material and Decoration in House 1, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black rubber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Total

- Decorated: 30
- Plain: 62
- Other: 7
- Total: 100

Personal items (Table 5.3 and Figure A.3) includes buttons (n=27). The majority of buttons are plain (n=17) with prosser, bone, shell, iron, brass or copper-alloy types.

The decorated buttons (n=8) are black glass, prosser, and an incised black hard rubber with "N. R. CO. GOODYEAR'S PAT." on the back. The back mark is of the Novelty Rubber Company of New York that used Nelson Goodyear’s patent from 1855 to the late 1870s (Hughes and Lester 2010:74). The brass or copper alloy button is a four-hole with stippled-like molding. The prosser buttons (1840 to the present) were a white domed gaiter and a white four-hole dish-type button with brown paint. The black glass includes loop shank buttons with a molded five-pointed flower and dots and one with a dotted diagonal molded pattern. Black glass buttons became popular when Queen Victoria wore black often with jet buttons to mourn the death of Prince Albert in 1861 and started a fashion for black (Albert and Kent 1949:56-57).

The two other buttons were military buttons. One is a brass coat button with the Virginia state seal. The buttons is crudely made with an unreadable backmark. Therefore, the button may have been made locally during the war when there was a
shortage of buttons for the Confederacy. The button matches a staff button made by a northern firm by Steele and Johnson, which operated from 1858 to 1875, in the north and which sold buttons to the south, possible making the button look local to avoid detection (Tice 1997:61, 497). The other button is a US Artillery button possibly for a kepi or cuff, dating around c.1845 to c.1880, and which would have been worn by officers only after 1854 (Albert 1973:39; Wyckoff 1984:45). The buttons may have been worn by the user of the Confederate button as Confederate uniforms have been found with buttons from Union troops (Luscomb 2006:48).

*Between Houses 1 and 2*

The area between Houses 1 and 2 was excavated with two units (SD1 and SD2E). The Phase III field notes indicate that Unit SD1, which straddles Houses 1 and 2, was excavated by machine to remove the post-fire fill but the machine removed all of the fill to subsoil accidentally. Unit SD2E contained a mixed fill with 1910 and 1920s beer bottles. The backhoe stripping may have impacted Unit SD2E according to the field notes. About 39 square feet were excavated.

*Artifacts between Houses 1 and 2.* Due to the mixed fill encountered and the excavation methods employed, only one level was available for the analysis. Only three buttons were recovered, three prosser buttons. The only decorated button was a blue prosser gaiter.

*House 2*

House 2 was excavated with six units (SD3, A1, A9, WB1, C1, and C9). No features were uncovered. About 129.5 sq. ft. (29 percent) of the total square footage of the interior of House 2 was excavated.
Artifacts from House 2. The smoking pipes included twenty-one fragments of clay single-unit pipes (Figure A.4). Five pipe bowls were recovered. All five were decorated or finished. Two had polished, thick bowls that imitated meerschaum pipes. Another bowl resembled that of a meerschaum pipe and had a stem decorated with bands and circles and marked “I. H. Bergmann & G…” and “New York” which could be a pipemaker or advertisement (Alexander 1983:223; Reckner and Dallal 2000:230). Another bowl was decorated with a ring of stars around “T D” on the bowl facing the smoker. These letters are believed to have appeared in the late 1700s and been the initials of a quality pipemaker that were subsequently copied becoming a popular symbolic decorative element (Bradley 2000:112). The final pipe represented a fragment of bowl and stem. The stem was decorated with leaves and banded rouletting and “Peter” “Dorni” on the sides of the stem. The name Peter Dorni was also associated with better quality products and also copied by others (Bradley 2000:116). Of the solely stems, one had the mark of Davidson of Glasgow (1862-1911).

Table 5.4: Glass by Function from House 2, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Vessel Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Wine or beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicinal</td>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>Tumbler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Extract or syrup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A small amount of glass (Table 5.4 and Figure A.5) was recovered from House 2 with the following categories alcohol (n=2), medicinal (n=1), tableware (n=2), and other (n=2). The alcohol bottles included a wine or beer bottle and a liquor flask bottle. One
proprietary medicine was recovered. B. L. Fahnestock’s Vermifuge was advertised as a worm medication for adults and children, and found in the second half of the nineteenth century and into the beginning of the twentieth century (Fike 1987:161-162). The tableware consisted of a paneled mug and etched tumbler with a floral motif. This motif resembles the motif on a tumbler pictured in the Silber and Fleming’s post-1881 catalog (Wordsworth 1990:136).

The majority of ceramic (Table 5.5) vessels included tableware (n=8) followed by teaware (n=5), and servingware (n=2). The tableware were the most numerous with several different wares represented in bowls (n=3), plates (n=4), and a mug (n=1). One 5-inch bowl is molded, white granite with the Twin Leaves shape. This shape was registered by James Edwards in 1851 and James Edwards and Sons operated from 1851-1882 (Dieringer and Dieringer 2001:86; Godden 1994:230-231). The other bowls include a 5-inch whiteware bowl and a 6.5-inch blue, green, and white-banded
whiteware bowl. By the 1850s, slipware colors had become more conservative with gray, blue, or black bands, not the earlier brighter earthier colors, and the American market for British industrial slipware was on the wane (Carpentier and Rickard 2001:128, 132). American manufacturers produced plainer utilitarian wares, and slip banding continued into later nineteenth century with American yellowware manufacturers (Carpentier and Rickard 2001: 132).

A gray stoneware mug was impressed with vertical rouletting and "Flaccus Bros. Wheeling, W. VA." which operated between 1879 and 1906 and was a grocer turned seller of preserves and other items (Lockhart et al. 2007:2). The mug was likely an advertising mug.

The plates varied in size with a 4.5-inch plain whiteware plate, a 7.5-inch paneled but unimpressed blue shell-edged plate, an 8.5-unimpressed blue shell-edged plate, and a 9.5-inch blue transfer-printed plate. Impressed lines on shell-edged vessels disappear around the 1860s, and the unimpressed shell-edged style disappears by the 1890s (Hunter and Miller 1994:437). The blue transfer-print plate has a coral-like floral design on the marley that was produced from 1784 to 1856 (Samford 1997:18).

The teaware also contain a range of ware types and decorative styles of saucers (n=3), a cup (n=1), and a teapot (n=1). The saucers include one plain whiteware and two molded white granite saucers with one paneled and the other in the Star Flower Shape by J. W. Pankhurst who operated from 1850-1852 (Dieringer and Dieringer 2001:102). The other teaware include a plain whiteware cup and a molded rockingham teapot. The teapot features the “Rebekah at the Well” motif that was introduced in 1851 and became very popular lasting into the twentieth century till 1936 (Claney 2004:81). Rockingham
glazed vessels were inexpensive, mass-produced wares of the mid-nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries, manufactured in both England and North America (Claney 2004:xiii). The servingware included a “ship shape” blue and white banded pitcher and yellowware nappy. The nappy often served like a bowl—used for mixing, preparing, and serving the food (Ketchum 1987:32).

Table 5.6: Buttons by Material and Decoration in House 2, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ferric metal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal items include buttons (n=64) (Table 5.6) and three glass beads (blue, black, and white). The beads could be part of a rosary. The buttons include decorated (n=10) and undecorated (n=54). The decorated buttons are prosser, shell, copper-alloy, and black glass. The black glass is a faceted domed button with a loop shank. The prosser buttons include a brown two hole, a green four-hole, two brown painted four-hole, a pink painted four hole, and two white domed gaiters. The shell button is four-holed with an incised feather, crescent, and dot motif. A copper-alloy slotted sew-through buttons has a scrolling decoration and "Patent 1873"on the reverse (Figure A.6). The patent refers to the single piece of metal with cross bar button patented by Clark M. Platt in 1873 (Patent #138,525). The face of the button states "Hopkins and Fairchild
Balto." In the Baltimore City directory of 1853 to 1854, Hopkins and Fairchild was a firm, likely selling clothing (Matchett 1854:151).

House 3

House 3 was excavated with nine units (A2, A5, A6, A10, WB2, C2, C5, C6, and C10). In the center of House 3 stood a large stone footer or pier (Feature 19) probably an internal wall or foundation that paralleled the north and south walls. Excavations uncovered 213.5 sq. ft. (48 percent) of the interior of House 3.

Artifacts from House 3. Eleven fragments of white clay single-unit smoking pipes were found in House 3. Out of these fragments, five bowls were recovered with all but one decorated. One bowl has vertical fluting on the bowl and another has cross-hatching. Another bowl has a petal over stem design likely of Duncan McDougall of Scotland (Davey 1987:345; Gallagher 1987:79-80). The last pipe has “T D” on the bowl facing the user and a “4” on the stem. The stem has also been whittled down to refit a hollow stem and likely to be reused. The solely stems include "L. F." on one side made by Louis Fiolet in France, 1765-1919 (Reckner and Dallal 2000:29), Peter Dorni, and "I.G.PRENCE" and "INGOTHA." The later stem with its misspelling is likely a poor imitation of the mark of I. G. Prince (Figure A.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Vessel Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicinal</td>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>Tumbler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7: Glass by Function from House 3, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)
The glass artifacts (Table 5.7) include alcohol (n=1), medicinal (n=1), and tableware (n=3). The alcohol bottle includes a liquor flask. The medicinal category includes a proprietary bottle of the laxative Thomas & Thompson’s Citrate of Magnesia (Figure A.8). Though not noted in the table above, House 3 included a small fragment of Ely’s Cream balm for hay fever and catarrh (Fike 1987:19). The remainder of the glassware were tableware including a cup, pressed plate with flowers and leaves, and a tumbler with vertical panels.

Table 5.8: Ceramics by Function from House 3, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, molded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, painted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, painted, molded</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, luster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, transfer print</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware, shell-edged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware, banded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of ceramics in House 3 (Table 5.8 and Figure A.9) are teaware (n=9) followed next by tableware (n=4), servingware (n=1), and hygiene (n=1). The teaware includes saucers (n=6), teacups (n=2), and a cream pitcher (n=1). The saucers vary in ware and decoration with the majority being molded white granite: one in an unknown paneled shape, one in the Scrolled Bubble shape by J. W. Pankhurst, operating from 1850-1851, one in the Laurel shape by Wedgwood and Co. after 1860, and another with the impressed mark of "J. Clementson. Ironstone China, Chinese Shape" which operated from 1839-1864 (Dieringer and Dieringer 2001:68,100; Godden 1994:150). The other
two saucers were whiteware and one sprig-painted floral pattern (c. 1835-1870s) and the other with a polychrome cut sponge pattern (1840s to the 1870s and possibly later) (Miller 1991:6; Samford and Miller 2012). One of the teacups is decorated with a sprig-painted design that resembles the saucer. The other cup is plain porcelain. The last teaware is a whiteware cream pitcher molded with a floral motif and luster paint. These luster “jugs” or pitchers of the post-1837 period were inexpensive and very popular coming in countless variations (Godden and Gibson 1991:293-294).

The tableware include plates (n=3) and a bowl (n=1). The plates include one plain porcelain butter pat plate with the mark of Charles Field Haviland used in 1876 according to a Havilland collector society (Haviland Online 2013). The other plates are a one 9.5-inch impressed blue shell-edge pearlware plate (c. 1830-c.1860) and a 6.5-inch molded white granite plate with an unknown floral and ribbon motif (Hunter and Miller 1994:434). The bowl is a 5-inch white-banded yellowware.

The serving vessel was a platter or serving dish with a molded and pink airbrushed decoration. The hygiene vessel is an ointment jar shape with a black transfer print sheet pattern, which were produced from 1795 to 1867 (Samford 1997:6; Samford and Miller 2012).

Table 5.9: Buttons by Material and Decoration in House 3, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent of Total**

|              | 30 | 70 | 0  | 100 |
The personal items include buttons \((n=39)\) (Table 5.9) and one white glass bead. The bead could be part of a rosary. The buttons are decorated \((n=12)\) and undecorated \((n=27)\). The decorated buttons include copper-alloy, iron, prosser, black glass, and shell. The copper-alloy appears to have been fabric-covered. The four iron slot sew-through buttons have a chain-like recessed border. The black glass buttons are faceteted with one beveled loop shank and the other a cone-shaped gaiter. The prosser buttons include a blue four-hole, a four-hole molded piecrust shape, and a green painted four hole. The shell buttons are a two-hole fish-eye cut and an incised four hole with a starburst and hash marks.

*House 4*

House 4 was excavated with seven units \((A3, A7, A11, WB3, C3, C7, \text{and} C11)\). Feature 16 was a brick scatter located along the north dating to the fire. Feature 19 extended in to the center of the house from House 3. Feature 21 was a coal ash dump and Feature 18 was likely a trash pit. Excavations uncovered 163.5 sq. ft. or 37 percent of House 4.

*Artifacts from House 4.* The smoking pipes numbered 20 fragments of which two were stoneware bent elbow or reed stem, one redware bent elbow or reed stem, and seventeen single-unit white clay. Seven bowls were recovered including the two stoneware bent elbow pipe with fluted bowls. The refined redware bent elbow pipe also had a fluted bowl. Only one of the white clay pipe bowls was undecorated. The other pipes included one with “T D” on the bowl, another had a bowl shaped like a meerschaum pipe and covered in wax or resin, and the last one had a fluted bowl and scrolled border with a stem impressed with Davidson and Glasgow (1862 to 1911).

Table 5.10: Glass by Function from House 4, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Vessel Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage</td>
<td>Soda or mineral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>Tumbler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Baking ingredient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Extract or syrup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The glass artifacts (Table 5.10) included alcohol (n=1), beverage (n=1), tableware (n=1), food (n=1), and other (n=1). The alcohol category includes one beer bottle marked “Rob Portner Tivoli Beer, Norfolk.” The Robert Portner Brewing Company, Tivoli Brewery in Alexandria, Virginia from 1883 to 1916 (Van Wieren 1995:374). The beverage category includes a soda or mineral water bottle embossed likely with F. McKinney, Philadelphia. The tableware includes one packer’s tumbler with a ribbed interior. The food category had a baking ingredient bottle embossed with Rumford. The Rumford Chemical works was incorporated in 1859 and produced several different products, but baking powder was their main output (American Chemical Council 2013). Finally, the other category contained a bottle for extracts or syrups.
Table 5.11: Ceramics by Function from House 4, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, gilded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, transfer printed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, painted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, molded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, sponge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, transfer print</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of ceramics (Table 5.11) include teaware (n=17), followed by tableware (n=21), and hygiene vessels (n=2). The teaware category has cups (n=9) and saucers (n=8). The saucers are made of whiteware (n=6) with different decorations; two plain, one sprig-painted (c.1835-1870s), two paneled, and one paneled blue transfer printed with the Claremont Pattern by Barker and Son operating from 1850 to 1860 (Godden 1994:54; Williams and Weber 1986:229). The remaining saucers (n=2) are molded white granite in the Wheat and Hops shape which had multiple makers c. 1875 and c. 1890 and a small brown sheet transfer-printed porcelain (1795 to 1867) (Dieringer and Dieringer 2001:127). The majority of cups (n=7) were also in different decorative styles of whiteware: three plain, one polychrome cut sponge painted which was popular according to potter’s price lists from c. 1840 to 1870s but also continued into the twentieth century (Miller 1991:6; Samford and Miller 2012), two painted with chrome colors in floral and abstract patterns (1830s-), and one unidentified floral blue transfer print pattern. The other cups (n=2) were porcelain with a gilded lip and plain pearlware.
The tableware was less numerous with plates (n=4) and a bowl (n=1). The plates included a molded red transfer-printed whiteware butter plate with a Chinoiserie pattern (produced from 1783-1873) (Samford 1997:6). The other plates varied slightly in size with a 8-inch paneled blue transfer print plate in the Columbia pattern by William Adams and Sons c.1850, a 8.5-inch plain porcelain plate, and a 9-inch plain whiteware with a back mark of "Stone China E & C Chalinoir England" dating from 1862 to 1891 (Godden 1994:137; Williams and Weber 1986:237). The 5.5-inch molded white granite bowl is in the Twin Leaves shape registered in 1851.

The hygiene category included a molded white granite chamberpot (Figure A.11) and a molded, gilded whiteware wash pitcher with a blue transfer print with a backmark of Willets Manufacturing Co. Trenton, New Jersey, in business from 1879 to 1909 (Lehner 1988:522).

Table 5.12: Buttons by Material and Decoration in House 4, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal items include buttons (n=32) (Table 5.12) and a bone toothbrush. A porcelain figurine also was recovered of a women or girl in a multi-colored skirt (Figure A.12). The buttons are decorated (n=12) and undecorated (n=20). The decorated buttons include copper-alloy, iron, prosser, and black glass. The copper-alloy loop shank button
depicts a lady with wide brimmed hat and flowers cut out with scrolling design around rim (Figure A.13). The other copper-alloy loop shank buttons include one with a leaf and grape or berries design on a flat face with rope-like border and a convex front and loop shank. The four iron slot sew-through buttons have a chain-like recessed border. The prosser buttons include a brown four-hole and two four-hole molded piecrust shape.

Between Houses 4 and 5

The area between Houses 4 and 5 contained six units (A4, A12, 2 (Ph. II), WB4, C4, and C12). The excavated area between Houses 4 and 5 included roughly 131.2 sq. ft.

Artifacts between Houses 4 and 5. The smoking pipe fragments numbered 27 fragments of which one was a refined redware and the rest single-unit white clay. Twelve bowls were recovered of which only two are unaltered or undecorated (Figure A.14). The refined redware bowl is burnished as is one of white clay bowls. Three pipes have “T D” on the bowl with two of these pipes are stamped with “78 W. White” “Glasgow” on the side of the stems. This pipe is listed in 1900 price list for White as “small plain T. D.” (Gallagher 1987b:149). William White and Sons in Glasgow were in operation from 1806 to 1955 (Davey 1987:350). One of these pipes, the White pipe, has deep grooves in the stem to hold the shortened pipe in the mouth (Figure A.15).

Another bowl has “18” on the spur. One bowl has a shield on the bowl with cross-hatching and five stars while another has scroll marks and a cross-hatched shield on the bowl. Another bowl has rouletted banded lines with oak leaves as is marked with "Dorni" "Peter" on stem and 51 with a crown on the burnished bowl dating from 1850 to likely 1898 see (Reckner and Dallal 2000:35). The last bowl has crosshatching on the bowl that matches a Davidson pipe in the 1880 catalog (Gallagher and Price 1987:138).
The marks solely on recovered stems are "Davidson" and “W. White” and “Murray” "Glasgow" (1830-1861) (Gallagher 1987a:105).

Table 5.13: Glass by Function between Houses 4 and 5, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Vessel Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicinal</td>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetic or sanitary</td>
<td>Perfume or toiletry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Sauce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pickle or preserve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The glass between the houses (Table 5.13 and Figure A.16) includes medicinal (n=1), cosmetic or sanitary (n=1), and food (n=2). The medicinal bottle included a blue bottle of embossed Bromo-Seltzer, Baltimore which was an antacid sold in a non-machine made bottle from 1889 to 1907 (Fike 1987:111). The cosmetic or sanitary category has a perfume bottle with a molded leaf design. The food category has a sauce bottle with vertical ribbing and a wide-mouth jar for pickles or preserves.

Table 5.14: Ceramics by Function between Houses 4 and 5, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, molded</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, sponge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware, banded</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ceramics (Table 5.14 and Figure A.17) consisted of mainly teaware (n=7) and tableware (n=5). The teaware include saucers (n=3), a cup (n=1), and a serving bowl (n=1). These saucers include three plain whiteware, one sprig-pained whiteware (c.1835-
1870s), and one unidentified paneled white granite. The teacup includes a purple and blue sponge-painted whiteware, a decoration common from the 1820s to the 1860s (Majewski and O’Brien 1987:161; Samford and Miller 2012). The serving bowl is porcelain molded and with gilded wing-like pattern.

The tableware are bowls (n=4) and a plate (n=1). Two 5.5-inch molded white granite bowls are in the Twin Leaves shape. The other bowls included a 4-inch blue and brown-banded yellowware bowl and a 7-inch brown and white banded yellowware.

Table 5.15: Buttons by Material and Decoration between Houses 4 and 5, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal items include buttons (n=22) (Table 5.15) and a painted porcelain figurine of a reclining dog, figurine base, and another of a person holding a gun or stick (Figure A.18). The personal items also include twelve octagonal-sided clear glass beads with an iridescent finish. These beads could have been part of a rosary.

The buttons are decorated (n=8), undecorated (n=12), other (n=2). The decorated buttons include brass or copper-alloy, prosser, shell, white glass, and black glass. The brass or copper alloy button is convex front with a loop shank. The black glass button is a swirled iridescent gaiter while the white glass is a domed gaiter. The prosser buttons
include hobnailed-molded pink painted four-hole, a domed gaiter, and molded half-round gaiter. The shell buttons are a fish eye-cut two hole and a four-hole inkwell. The other buttons include two general service buttons, one with burned, both with eagles and federal shield on front and a “Scovill MFG CO Waterbury, Ct” marks on back dating to the 1850s to the 1860s (Tice 2002:71-73).

*House 5*

House 5 was excavated with 3 units (5 [Ph.II], A8, and C8). Excavations uncovered 75 sq. ft. (17 percent) of the area of House 5.

*Artifacts from House 5.* Smoking pipe include 20 fragments of white clay single-use pipes. Of these fragments, six bowls were recovered, all of which were decorated (Figure A.19). One bowl was shaped like a meerschaum pipe while another had vertical fluting. Two bowls had the same design as found in House 4 with fluting on the bowl and a scroll border and impressed with “Davidson” and “Glasgow” on the stem. Another bowl has the cross-hatched shield and five stars similar to that found between Houses 4 and 5. The last bowl has a leaf design on seam, and on the bowl, one side with anchor and the other with a crown, and "McDougall" "Glasgow" on stem (1846-1967).

The marks solely on the stems include Davidson and McDougall in Glasgow and “D79 W. White" and Glasgow on stem, possibly 1805 to 1891. The number 79 shows up in a 1900 White's price list as “carved T. D.” (Gallagher 1987b:148; Reckner and Dallal 2000:229). The “D” may indicate a model number.
Table 5.16: Glass by Function from House 5, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Vessel Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>Tumbler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Baking ingredient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Extract or syrup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The glass vessels (Table 5.16 and Figure A.20) recovered from House 5 include tableware (n=2), food (n=1), and other (n=1). The tableware are the most numerous and contain two tumblers, one with arched panels and the other with thin vertical ribbing. One food bottle embossed with Rumford likely held baking ingredients. The other category included an extract or syrup bottle.

Table 5.17: Ceramics by Function from House 5, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, gilded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, painted</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, plain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, molded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, shell-edge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, transfer print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware, banded</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White enamel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of ceramics (Table 5.17 and Figure A.21) were teaware (n=7) and tableware (n=5) followed by hygiene (n=3). The teaware have saucers (n=3) and cups (n=4). The cups are two plain white granite, one paneled white granite, and a gilded lip and handle porcelain. The saucers include a white and blue marbled enameled metal and two molded white granite—one in the Western shape registered by Hope and Carter in
1862 (in operation 1862 to 1880) and the other in the Chinese shape with a backmark of T & R Boote, registered 1858 (Dieringer and Dieringer 2001:26, 108; Godden 1994:334).

The tableware include bowls (n=2) and plates (n=3). The 5-inch and 5.5-inch bowls are molded white granite in the Twin Leaves shape. The plates are a 6.5-inch molded white granite with the Tiny Oak and Acorn shape by J. W. Pankhurst, c. 1860s, a 8.5-inch molded blue transfer print whiteware with the Lucerne Pattern by J. W. Pankhurst & Co circa 1852 to 1880, and a 9.5-inch unimpressed blue shell-edge (c.1860s to c. 1890s) (Dieringer and Dieringer 2001:89; Williams 1978:321).

The servingware include a serving dish (n=1), a salt (n=1), and a serving bowl (n=1). The serving dish includes a porcelain dish shaped like a leaf. The salt is rectangular and molded with a scroll and shell motif and painted pink and blue. The last vessel is a banded yellowware serving bowl.

Table 5.18: Buttons by Material and Decoration from House 5, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal items include buttons (n=36) (Table 5.18), religious medals (n=2), bead (n=1), and a large tiger cowrie shell (n=1) (Figures A.22-A.24). The top of the shell had been dipped in acid to give it a purple top. This species of cowry ranges most of the
tropical Pacific from Polynesia and Hawaii in the east to Japan, Singapore, and Australia in the west (Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History 2013).

The buttons are decorated (n=9), undecorated (n=26), and other (n=1). The decorated buttons include brass or copper alloy, rubber, prosser, and iron. The brass or copper alloy four-hole button is molded with tick marks. The rubber buttons are two hole, one black and one brown, with molded bands and "N R CO: Goodyear's P=t 1851" on the back (1855 to the late 1870s). The iron button was fabric covered. The prosser buttons include a blue four-hole, a domed gaiter, and brown painted two-hole ringer, plain four-holed inkwell and a four-hole ink well-shaped button painted black. The shell buttons are an inkwell shape and fish eye-cut two hole. The other button includes a gilt US Navy uniform button used from 1852-1941 according to Hughes and Lester (2010:937), and a backmark fragment of "…MFG Co. Waterbury"- likely Scovills 1850-1860s (Tice 2002:70-74). This button was the most common type of US Navy button used in the Civil War (Tice 1997:162).

The remaining personal items are two religious medals and a bead. The Miraculous medal was first made 1832 based on the visions of Mary reported by later St. Catherine Labouré (Ball 2003:356). The Miraculous Medal emphasized Mary conceived without sin (Taves 1986:39). The other medal, which may be part of a chaplet or rosary of the Seven Sorrows of Mary, depicts Mary with her heart pierced with seven swords or daggers. The Seven Sorrows of Mary are an expansion on the five sorrowful mysteries of the Rosary (Ball 2003:525). The cylinder shaped orange glass bead with an iridescent finish may be associated with the rosary.
**Between Houses 5 and 6**

The area between Houses 5 and 6 was excavated with five units (B1, D9, EB1, D1, and D9). Feature 23 was an interior wall or foundation aligned with Feature 19. Feature 20 included a hole in the north foundation wall, possibly for a joist. The excavated area between Houses 5 and 6 included 120 sq. ft.

*Artifacts between Houses 5 and 6.* The smoking pipes include four fragments of single-unit white clay pipes. One of these fragments was a bowl and imitated the shape of meerschaum pipe.

| Table 5.19: Glass by Function between Houses 5 and 6, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Function** | **Form** | **Vessel Count** | **Percent** |
| Alcohol | Wine | 1 | 25 |
| Medicinal | Proprietary | 1 | 50 |
| Tableware | Tumbler | 1 | 20 |
| **Total** | | **4** | **100** |

The glass artifacts (Table 5.19 and Figure A.25) includes alcohol (n=1), medicinal (n=2), and tableware (n=1). The alcohol category includes one wine bottle. The medicinal category includes two proprietary medicines. These medicines include a bottle of B. L. Fahnestock’s Vermifuge worm remedy and a bottle of Godfrey’s cordial which was used for infants and children for a wide range of symptoms and potentially lethal and highly addictive with one grain of opium per two ounces (T. E. C. 1970). The tableware was a paneled tumbler.
Table 5.20: Ceramics by Function between Houses 5 and 6, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, molded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, molded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, banded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ceramics (Table 5.20 and Figure A.26) consists of mainly teaware (n=3) followed equally by tableware (n=1), servingware (n=1), and hygiene (n=1). The teaware includes cups (n=2) and a saucer (n=1). The cups are a plain porcelain and a chrome-colored floral patterned whiteware. The saucer is a plain white granite.

The tableware include one 6-inch blue-banded whiteware bowl, impressed with “England” on the base mark. The word “England” appears on most English marks after 1891 (Godden 1994:239). The servingware is a plain whiteware oval-shaped platter while the lone hygiene vessel is a molded white granite chamber pot in a pattern almost identical to that of the chamber pot found in House 4.

The personal items include buttons (n=4) and a bone toothbrush (Figure A.27). The buttons are all two and four-hole prosser buttons and undecorated.

*House 6*

House 6 was excavated with six units (B2, B5, D10, EB2, D2, and D5). Feature 22 was a posthole towards the center of the house. Excavations uncovered 138.5 sq. ft. (31 percent) of the interior of the house.
Artifacts from House 6. Smoking pipes include five fragments of white clay single-use pipes and one of a composite bent elbow stoneware pipe (Figure A.28). Of these fragments, only one bowl was recovered. The bowl was from the bent elbow pipe with fluting decorating the bowl. One of just the stems is marked "…LY" and "G…" possibly McInally Glasgow (1876) (Gallagher 1987a:104).

The glass vessels recovered from House 6 included only one vessel that was linked to the time of the fire or identified and that vessel could be no be placed in a single category.

Table 5.21: Ceramics by Function from House 6, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, molded</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, molded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ceramics (Table 5.21 and Figure A.29) include teaware (n=2), tableware (n=1), servingware (n=1), and hygiene (n=1). The teaware has cups (n=2). The cups are one plain white granite and a painted floral pattern porcelain with a fragment of the gilded words, “Forget Me Not.” A similar cup is pictured in the post-1881 Silber and Fleming glass and ceramic catalog (Wordsworth 1990:44). The tableware include a plate (n=1). Of the tableware, the 8.5-inch plate is a plain whiteware. The servingware is a leaf-shaped plate with a yellow green and red glaze. The hygiene category includes a molded white granite chamber pot in the same pattern as found between House 5 and 6 as well as House 4. The patterns vary slightly so they are not the same vessels.
A ribbed, porcelain decal-decorated sauce tureen was found in House 4 and was extensively burned. The vessel is marked on the base with the mark of Bishop and Stonier England. This mark was used from 1899 to 1936 according to Geoffrey Godden (1994:76-77). Postdating the fire in 1897, the date for the mark may be incorrect or it may reflect later fill. Without knowing the age of the vessel, the vessel had to be excluded from the analysis.

Table 5.22: Buttons by Material and Decoration from House 6, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal items include buttons (n=33) (Table 5.22 and Figure A.30), a bone toothbrush, and a round black glass bead. The bead may be part of a rosary. The buttons are decorated (n=9), undecorated (n=23), and other (n=1). The decorated buttons include brass, rubber, prosser, and shell. The brass two piece loop shank button has traces of gilding. The rubber button is a two-hole with molded lines around the rim. The prosser buttons include a blue two-hole, a four-hole molded piecrust, two four-hole inkwells (one with orange and one with pink paint), one four-hole with hobnail molding, and a four-hole with a brown transfer calico. The shell button is a four-hole with an incised cross.

The other button includes a gilt two-piece brass loop shank button of the Baltimore City Police Department (Figure A.31). Based on the history of badges used by
the Department, the Maryland state seal appears on badges introduced in 1890 (Driscoll 2013). The button also has the state seal and may date from this time period or later.

**Between Houses 6 and 7**

Between Houses 6 and 7 sat two units (B6 and D6). The excavated area between Houses 6 and 7 included 50 sq. ft.

**Artifacts between Houses 6 and 7.** No smoking pipes were found between Houses 6 and 7. The glass includes a vessel in the other category (n=1). The vessel is an extract or syrup bottle.

### Table 5.23: Ceramics by Function from Between Houses 6 and 7, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, banded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ceramics (Table 5.23 and Figure A.32) consist of tableware (n=5) and servingware (n=1). The tableware includes bowls (n=2) and plates (n=2). The bowls include a 7.5-inch shallow bowl with yellow-painted floral design and a 5-inch blue-banded whiteware bowl. The plates include a plain whiteware butter plate and a 6.5-inch plain whiteware plate marked on base with "BM & CO Extra Quality" of Burroughs and Mountford Co., Trenton, in operation from 1878 to 1882 (Lehner 1988:69).

The one serving vessel is a small whiteware pitcher, perhaps, for milk. Three vessels, a cup and two saucers, matched the sauce tureen from Bishop and Stonier
England in House 6 and one also had the same backmark. Though they were burned, they were excluded from the analysis.

The personal artifacts included buttons (n=3) and a bone toothbrush. The buttons are all undecorated with two shell and one prosser two- and four-holes.

House 7

House 7 was excavated with seven units (B3, B7, B11, EB3, D3, D7, and D11). Excavations uncovered 165.8 sq. ft. (37 percent) of the interior of the house.

Artifacts from House 7. Smoking pipes number six fragments of single-use white clay pipes. One of these fragments was a burnished bowl. The sole stem fragments include the Peter Dorni mark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Vessel Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Champagne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>Tumbler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stemware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Extract or syrup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The glass (Table 5.24) includes alcohol (n=1), tableware (n=2), and other (n=1). The alcohol bottle is a champagne bottle. The tableware vessel is a tumbler with four bands of vertical lines and the molded base to stemware glass. The other vessel is an extract or syrup bottle.
The ceramics (Table 5.25 and Figures A.33-A.35) consist primarily of hygiene items (n=11) followed by teaware (n=2), tableware (n=2), and servingware (n=1). The hygiene items represent the bulk of the items recovered including chamber pots (n=4), wash pitchers (n=2), wash basin (n=2), soap dish (n=1), shaving cream dish or razor rest (n=1), and a shaving brush holder (n=1). Three of the chamber pots are whiteware with a black line along the rim. Two whiteware lids, one with yellow and pink bands and lines and the other with blue and black lines, may fit these vessels. The other chamber pot is a molded whiteware that matches the chamberpot pattern from House 4, between House 5 and 6, and House 6.

A wash basin and a wash pitcher are whiteware and have the same blue and black painted design as the chamber pot lids. The other wash basin has a black and pink line and band resembling a similar set. The wash pitcher’s back mark matches that of the mark of the Maryland Pottery Company, which operated from 1888 to 1914 (Lehner 1988:281-282). The brush holder cup has blue and black bands and lines matching this set. Fragments of a pink and yellow equivalent brush holder were also found.
A molded whiteware soap dish with rope motif on the lid and strainer are also present. The soap dish and small whiteware dish for a razor rest or shaving cream dish had backmarks of Sampson Bridgwood and Son, who operated from 1885 to 1891 (Godden 1994:102).

The last wash pitcher was molded white granite with the mark of Henry Burgess in Burslem on the base, which operated from 1864 to 1892 (Godden 1994:116). The majority of all these vessels came out of the same unit next to the north wall of the Barracks.

The tableware include a plate (n=1) and a bowl (n=1). The 6.5-inch whiteware plate has a scalloped rim and gilded floral design. The bowl is a 5-inch blue and brown banded yellowware. The teaware are equally small with a saucer (n=1) and a teapot (n=1). The molded white granite saucer base is impressed with "J. Clementson. Ironstone China, Chinese Shape" who operated from 1839 to 1864 (Godden 1994:150). The teapot is a molded whiteware. Finally, the servingware includes a plain whiteware serving dish or baker with a black mark on the base with crown and "warranted", Maryland Queensware Company or the Maryland Pottery Company 1879-1914 (Lehner 1988:281-282).

Table 5.26: Buttons by Material and Decoration from House 7, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The personal items include buttons (n=18) (Table 5.26) and two bone toothbrushes. The buttons are decorated (n=8) and undecorated (n=10). The decorated buttons include black glass, brass or copper alloy, rubber, prosser, and shell. The black glass has a star-like domed pattern with a loop shank. The brass or copper alloy four-hole has a texture pattern around the rim. The rubber button is a china mound with the “N…Goodyear” mark (1855 to late 1870s) on the back. The prosser buttons include a blue painted four-hole, an orange painted four-hole, a four-hole molded piecrust, a blue painted four-hole, and a blue painted four-hole. The shell button is four-hole with incised radiating lines.

House 8

House 8 was excavated with three units (B8, B4, B12, EB4, 1 [Ph.II], D4, D6, and D12. The continuation of the center support wall or foundation, Feature 23, was uncovered in the center of the House Excavations uncovered 192.5 sq. ft. (43 percent) of House 8.

Artifacts from House 8. Smoking pipes number three fragments of single-use white clay pipes. No pipe bowls were present. The glass includes a tableware (n=1). The tableware is a 5-inch pressed clear glass bowl with a vine and leaf motif.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, plain</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White granite, molded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, transfer printed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.27: Ceramics by Function from House 8, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)
The ceramics (Table 5.27 and A.36) consists of servingware (n=2), tableware (n=1), and hygiene (n=1). The servingware are a platter (n=1) and an egg cup (n=1). The oval platter is plain whiteware. The egg cup is a plain porcelain. The sole tableware is a molded 8-inch whiteware plate with a blue transfer print in the Doria pattern by John Ridgway and Co., who operated from 1841 to 1855 (Williams 1978:253). The hygiene category included one molded white granite wash pitcher burned in the Vintage Shape by W. Adams and later E. and C. Challinor circa 1865 (Dieringer and Dieringer 2001:123).

Table 5.28: Buttons by Material and Decoration from House 8, 18BA314. (Deposited 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal items (Table 5.28 and Figures A.37-A.39) include buttons (n=23) and a painted porcelain figurine of a woman or girl in a skirt. The buttons are decorated (n=6), undecorated (n=16), and other (n=1). The decorated buttons include black glass and prosser. The black glass has a self-shank and a molded dragonfly. The prosser buttons include three blue four-hole, a four-hole molded piecrust, a blue painted four-hole, and a black transfer print of flowers on a four-hole.

The other button was a brass uniform button. The coat button is from the US Corps of Engineers circa 1840 to 1940 (Wyckoff 1984:78-79). The button backmark of
"Scovills & Co Superfine" matches buttons made in the 1840s by Scovill (Tice 2002:69-71). The button may then be associated with another Civil War uniform button.

**Exterior Units**

Eight units were excavated outside of the foundation with seven on the north side of the building (X1 to X7 and 4 [Ph. II]) and one on the south side of the building (6 [Ph. II]). The units exposed 607.8 sq. ft. and located postholes, mortar layers, steps, and pits. Beyond the Units 4 (Ph. II) and X7, no substantial deposit of artifacts was found. The most of the features and layers dated to the time of the fire and the building’s destruction or were difficult to date earlier.

Only two units were excavated away from the house (Eu 4 [Ph.II] and Eu 7 [Ph.III]) contained possible pre-fire fill. Units X7 and 4 are the only units away from the building. Feature 37 was a shallow, stinky, amorphous pit cut into subsoil that was a privy according to the Phase III fieldnotes. Feature 36 also was believed to be a privy. The lack of information on the stratigraphy of this unit hampers its analysis. Unit 4 contained layers of coal fill and red sandy clay fill overlaying nineteenth-century deposits. The presence of architectural debris such as window glass, burned cut nails, and ceramic door knobs suggest that these units saw debris from the house at the time of the fire or just after. These features are not discussed in the analysis as the artifact counts were small and could not be attributed to a specific house.

**Poe-Burns Site (18BA325)**

The Poe-Burns House site sat south of Church Lane on the east side of the present railroad tracks. The house was a stone 2.5-story duplex destroyed for the realignment of
these tracks. A portion of the rear yard remains a grass lot and contains a cemetery of the reinterred burials from Taylor’s Hall.

**Excavations**

In the Phase II excavation, STPs and one unit were used to test the rear yard of the duplex. Not enough data is available to understand the excavation of the STPs and the 3 ft. by 3 ft. unit during the Phase II (Figure 5.8). Therefore, these excavations are excluded.

![Figure 5.8: Phase II Site Map of 18BA325 (Payne and Baumgardt 1987:II31)](image)

The Phase III excavations used a series of twenty-four judgmental units (mainly 4 ft. by 4 ft.) placed with a grid to test the rear yard area (Figure 5.9). While several features were located, only one feature with relatively large amounts of fill was located, the privy (Features 20 and 22) in the north yard area. The layers of the privy were undifferentiated and dated to the second half of the nineteenth century after 1855 due to
the presence of rubber button with a Goodyear patent backmark. A more recent privy still was standing when MAAR did their Phase II work in 1986 and was located also in the middle of the yard. In the south yard, a privy was located with stonewalls and concrete form walls. Located at the rear of the yard, the privy had been cleaned out and filled with 1950s and 1960s material. An earlier privy was not located.

Figure 5.9: Phase III Excavation Map of 18BA325, (Payne and Baumgardt 1994: II75)

The remainder of the units had smaller artifact counts associated with yard scatters and features. For this dissertation, the interpretative value is hampered because the data set represents mainly yard scatter and smaller fragments, making dating less accurate. Yet the large amount of units placed in the yard provides a valuable window into the use of the rear yard area. The artifacts recovered from rear yard are primarily domestic in nature and range from the early nineteenth-century into the 1980s reflecting this continual use of the property over its history.
A series of postholes recovered archaeologically along this same west to east axis which divides the north and south yards attests to this division of the yards as does the lack of any artifacts that mend across this dividing line. Feature 2 was one of these postholes used at or after 1895. Five postholes in the same unit, Unit N32-35 E 39-42, also show the continued maintenance of this division. Features 3A, 3B, and 3C (postholes) date to around 1880 or later while Feature 4, an earlier posthole, dates to the mid-to-late nineteenth century, possibly reflecting the parcels earliest use. Further east lies two postholes (Features 8 and 9), one of which cuts into the other and a metal post lies above a wooden post. The artifacts date to the mid-to-late nineteenth century and possibly into the twentieth century with Feature 9. Feature 15 was also a posthole on this west to east division line. A posthole, Feature 1, dating to 1840 or later represents one of the postholes for the southern boundary of the south lot.

Analysis

Based on the position of postholes over the sites history and the presence of foliage and fences still in 1986 when MAAR documented the property, the yard areas (north and south yards) will be treated as representing the occupants of the northern and southern halves of the duplex independently.

The yard scatter limits the analysis and is used for qualitative comparison. Only the contents of the privy will be detailed. Further complicating the analysis, is the uncertainty of the excavation methods of MAAR and disturbance to the north yard by the quarry operator between the Phase II and III work.
Artifacts from the North Yard Privy

Clay single-use pipes include two fragments of which two were bowls. One of the bowls was burnished while the other had an eagle with a federal shield (Figure A.40).

Table 5.29: Glass by Function from the North Yard Privy, 18BA325. (Late 1855-1880s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Vessel Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Decanter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicinal</td>
<td>Ethical or proprietary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Extract or syrup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of glass (Table 5.29) recovered is medicinal (n=2) followed by alcohol (n=1) and other (n=1). The majority of glassware recovered is medicinal. One of the ethical or proprietary bottle is embossed "...s & …URGGI… Baltimore…" while the other is small with ten-paneled sides. The twelve-sided fluted prescription bottle (some of which were only ten or eleven-sided) was a popular drug container in the nineteenth century (Figure A.41) (Griffenhagen and Bogard 1999:26). The alcohol category includes a wide-based decanter with legs. The other vessel is an extract or syrup bottle.

Table 5.30: Ceramics by Function from the North Yard Privy, 18BA325. (Late 1860-1880s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White granite, molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware, Plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ceramics are all tableware (n=4) (Table 5.30). The tableware include plates (4) and a bowl (n=1). The 5-inch bowl is whiteware with a scalloped rim. The plates include one 9-inch plain whiteware, a 9-inch pearlware, a 10-inch molded white granite with luster band and unidentified molded arch shape, and a 8-inch paneled whiteware with a blue transfer print in the Eon pattern by George Wooliscroft, who operated from 1851 to 1864 (Williams 1978:257). Copper luster trim was popular on white granite for the second half of the nineteenth century (Wetherbee 1996:150).

**Table 5.31: Buttons by Material and Decoration from the North Yard Privy, 18BA325. (Late 1860-1880s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rubber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Ivory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal items include buttons (n=23) (Table 5.31 and Figure A.42) and a bone toothbrush. The buttons are decorated (n=7) and undecorated (n=16). The decorated buttons include black rubber, vegetable ivory, and prosser. The black rubber button is a molded two-hole china mound with the NRC Goodyear Pat. backmark (1855 to the late 1870s). The prosser buttons are four hole, one with red and black around the rim, another with calico transfer design, and two with blue paint on the rims. Transfer-printed buttons or calicoes were a popular type for specialized clothing (Hughes and Lester 2010:51). The other prosser is a two-hole black china mound. The vegetable ivory button is two-hole in a china mound. Made from the tagua nut, vegetable ivory was
used by British manufacturers for buttons in the mid-to-late 1850s and peaked in popularity between 1870 and 1950 (Hughes and Lester 2010:405).

18BA313

At the time of MAAR’s excavations, 18BA313 consisted of an asphalt pad and a grass lot (Figure 5.10). Currently, the house site lies under the railroad tracks and an asphalt road. A portion of the rear yard is a grass lot.

Excavations

Shovel test pits were used to test the site during the Phase I, II, and III excavations. Excavations targeted the house foundation and rear yard. During the Phase II excavations, two units (roughly 4 ft. by 3 ft. and 2 ft. by 11 ft.) were used to locate and test the house foundation to the east of the asphalt pad and the yard was tested with STPs. After breaking through the pad in the Phase III work, a backhoe was also used to strip the post-fire fill. Post-fire fill from the stripping was sampled but little was collected. In the Phase III work, three units (two roughly 2 ft. by 4 ft. and one 3 ft. by 4 ft.) were hand excavated within the cellar. These units tested two of the rowhouses in the three-rowhouse block, the north and middle units. The majority of material was fill postdating the fire.
A backhoe was also used to strip a wide section of the rear yard to expose features. A large square feature was exposed which was labeled as a store foundation. Towards the eastern limit of the rear yard area sat a 12 ft. by 12 ft. foundation extending down 9 ft. below the surface. In the Phase III work, four units (each 4 ft. by 4 ft.) were placed within the foundation and taken down to bedrock. In 2010, the field school re-uncovered the feature and found and excavated the previously unexcavated portions of the feature with two 5 m by 5 m units, one 2 m by 1.5 m unit, one 2m by 2.5 m unit, one 1 m by 2 m units. Interior fill was almost exclusively domestic, excluding the architectural debris.

A secondary wall not observed in the MAAR excavation was also found in the interior. This wall was added after the construction of the original walls and faced on the interior side and unfaced on the exterior side. The wall was not parallel to the original
walls and sat about three feet from the east wall at its widest. The purpose of this wall is unknown though it may have served as a support or even an insulating space for an icehouse. Artifacts from the interior of the fill mended with artifacts in the primary fill, suggesting this space was filled at the same as the rest of the icehouse.

Based on the combined records of both excavations, the feature was filled during the 1870s with one or perhaps two fill major fill sequences. The first fill had a ceramic TPQ of 1864 and contained a range of artifacts, soil, and few rock. The second fill above the first had a TPQ of 1867 and contained far more rocks and larger rocks. Generally, the ceramics should date earlier than most of the associated material culture (Adams 2003:38). The glass provides similar dates with dates of manufacture ending in the 1870s and 1880s. The field school encountered artifacts from early twentieth century but these artifacts were found in parts of the units with backfill from MAAR’s excavation.

The depth and dimensions of the rear yard building suggests it was an icehouse or used for cold storage (Figure 5.11). An associated builder’s trench contained artifacts from creamware to whiteware and, thus, a wide potential date range exists. Chrome-colored painted whiteware, dating from the 1830s on, and sprig-painted whitewares, dating from the mid-1830s and common up into the 1870s and possibly later, were found (Miller 1991:8; Samford and Miller 2012). Other diagnostic artifacts include cut and wrought nails. No artifacts with a beginning date of after the 1830s were found. This fact could suggest the construction of the feature sometime between the 1830s and the 1860s.

The refill of portions of the icehouse by MAAR led to some mixed contexts within the feature when the remainder was excavated in 2010. These modern artifacts
were removed from the assemblage. Further, the upper two strata saw later mixing of the fill after the final fill of the icehouse in the 1870s. These strata were excluded from the analysis.

The construction and closing of the icehouse seems to follow the tenure of the storekeepers on the property. Storekeepers owned the property: James Wright from 1854 to 1857, Lysander Patterson from 1857 to 1858, and Henry Grosscup and Lysander Patterson from 1858 to 1860. The lack of many sets or several of the same artifact suggests the fill is not from a store, but likely from a resident or residents of Lot 4 after the icehouse was no longer used and likely fell into disrepair in the late 1860s.

Figure 5.11: Icehouse feature of 18BA313 showing units excavated in 2010 and the interior stone wall.

The rear yard area was tested with three 1 m by 1 m units and again with four more 1 m by 1 m units in 2011 (Figure 5.12). These last units appear to sit on the
adjacent historical Lot 5, just south of Lot 4. All of these units encountered fill or trash pit features and postholes as well as mixed yard scatter dating from the nineteenth into the late twentieth-century. The artifact counts were very small from these features and are limited in their interpretative use for this study, but some of the artifacts are drawn upon qualitatively in the analysis. A description of their context is described in the analysis.

![Figure 5.12](image.png)

Figure 5.12: Units excavated in 2010 on Lot 4 and in 2011 on Lot 5 on a current aerial.

**Buildings**

A two-story stone rowhouse sat on the property, likely with three separate units and an attached back building. The rowhouse burnt down in 1904 and was used for trash until the 1940s when an asphalt pad was laid over a portion of the foundation. Ted Payne
and Kenneth Baumgardt (1987:II45-46) detail in their report that a local resident, Warren Tracey, mentioned a rented garage was built on the site of the house in the 1930s and 1940s, and thus the site was paved by asphalt to create a floor. The informant also stated that the local community regularly deposited their trash in such ground depressions (Payne and Baumgardt 1987:II46). The 1938 aerial shows either the foundation or possibly a garage, but it is difficult to discern which one.

Artifact from the Icehouse Fill

Artifacts from the Icehouse Fill are grouped into the two separate fill episodes.

First Fill. Clay single-use pipes include 80 fragments of which 33 are bowls. Fifteen of these bowls are decorated with fluting (n=6), rouletting (n=4), impressed marks (n=3), molded crown (n=1), molded ring of stars and floral design (n=1) (Figure A.43). Some of the stems were marked with “Davidson” “Glasgow”, “Jan Prince” “Gouda”, and “Peter” “Dorni.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Vessel Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicinal</td>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical or proprietary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>Tumbler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Baking powder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Extract or syrup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of glass (Table 5.32) recovered was medicinal (n=4) followed by tableware (n=2) and alcohol (n=2), beverage (n=1), and other (n=1). Proprietary medicines are a bottle of Injection Brou for genital diseases (Figure A.44) and St. Drake’s
Plantation Bitters, advertised as a tonic, appetizer, and stimulant (38.2% alcohol) (Fike 1987:33, 168). The ethical or proprietary bottle is embossed with “Baltimore” on the paneled side and matches several Baltimore druggists’ bottles.

The alcohol category contained one wine bottle and a bottle of porter embossed with J. Reichard Co." and "Dyottville Glassworks, Philada." The bare iron pontil was used from 1845 to 1870 (Munsey 1970:48). The closest match is a John Reichard who was brewing in Wilkes-Barre into the 1850s (Van Wieren 1995:359). The beverage bottle was blown in a mold and its contents may range from wine to mineral water.

The tableware includes two tumblers, one with arched panels and the other with straight vertical panels. The food category includes a bottle embossed with “Baking Powder, Baltimore.” The other category includes an extract or syrup bottle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White granite, molded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware sponge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, banded</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, shell-edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, transfer print</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, flow blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware, shell-edge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined redware, luster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ceramics (Table 5.33 and Figures A.45-A.46) mainly consists of teaware (n=13) followed by tableware (n=6) and servingware (n=4). The teaware include saucers (n=3), cups (n=9), and a teapot (n=1). The cups are two plain whiteware, a blue sponged
whiteware, floral sprig–painted whiteware, two blue transfer-printed whiteware—one unidentified and one in the Rhine Pattern. This Rhine pattern was made by John Meir and Son, who were in operation from 1837 to 1897 (Williams 1978:387). A molded white granite cup is in the Twin Leaves shape, registered 1851. A plain pearlware and a plain white granite cups are also present. Saucers are two plain whiteware and a molded white granite in the Huron shape (registered 1858). The teapot is a refined redware with a brown luster glaze.

The tableware include plates (4), bowls (n=1) and a mug or tankard (n=1). The one whiteware bowl is a 5.5-inch blue and green banded in a London shape. The plates vary in terms of ware and decoration. One plate is a 4-inch pearlware with an impressed and scalloped blue shell-edge dating to circa 1810 to circa 1835 (Hunter and Miller 1994:434). Two of the plates are whiteware, one with a paneled marley and blue transfer print of the Columbia pattern by Adams and Son circa 1850, who operated from 1819 to 1864 (Godden 1994:21; Williams 1978:237). The other plate is decorated with a diamond and floral flow blue pattern on a paneled marley dating to the 1840s and continuing into the twentieth century (Miller 1991:9; Samford 1997:24). The other plate is 9.5-inches and white granite in the Grape Octagon shape, circa 1845 (Dieringer and Dieringer 2001:28).

The servingware vessels include platters (n=4). Three of the platters are impressed blue shell-edge whiteware of which two are octagonal and one oval shaped (c. 1830 to c. 1860) (Hunter and Miller 1994:434). The other platter is plain whiteware and oval shaped.
Fragments of a child’s 6.5-inch molded and blue painted black transfer-printed plate was found. The pattern is called "Mounted Camels" by Bailey and Ball operating from 1843 to 1850 (Figure A.46) (Birks 2013; Riley 1991:302).

Table 5.34: Buttons by Material and Decoration from the First Icehouse Fill, 18BA313. (1870s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal items include buttons (n=18) (Table 5.34) and one copper-alloy religious medal (Figures A.47-A.49). The buttons are decorated (n=6) and undecorated (n=12). The decorated buttons include brass and copper alloy, shell, ceramic, and prosser. The brass or copper alloy buttons are one gilded with a molded geometric pattern and wobble shank and the other is flat with beveled edges. The prosser button is four holes with blue paint on the edges. The shell button is four hole with an engraved star shape and radiating lines. The iron button had been fabric covered. The ceramic button is a green, red, and brown marbled redware with a pinhead shank attributed to the Norwalk pottery company. Norwalk Pottery buttons were made in Connecticut between 1825 and 1853 (Luscomb 2006:139). The religious medal was a Miraculous Heart of Mary devotional medal.

Second Fill. Clay single-use pipes include 82 fragments of which 29 are bowls. Fifteen of these bowls are decorated with fluting (n=4), rouletting (n=7), impressed
marks (n=1), an eagle with federal shield (n=1), leaf and scroll design (n=1), leaf motif (n=1). Some of the stems were marked with “Peter” “Dorni.”

Table 5.35: Glass by Function from the Second Icehouse Fill, 18BA313, (1870s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Vessel Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Decanter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicinal</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetic or Sanitary</td>
<td>Florida Water</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>Tumbler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Extract or syrup</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of glass (Table 5.35) recovered was other (n=6) followed by medicinal (n=3) and then tableware (n=2), alcohol (1), and cosmetic or sanitary (n=1). The majority of glassware is in the other category as extract or syrup bottles. The medicinal bottles include two ethical bottles with flat panels, one with “J. A. Webb & Co., 210 Madison Avenue, Baltimore MD” and the other with “Charles E. Brack Druggist and Chemist Baltimore” in business from the 1860s to 1915 (Figure A.50) (National Association of Retail Druggists Journal [N.A.R.D.] Journal 1917:507). After the 1850s, the French-square shape became popular for prescription bottles, lasting possibly into the 1880s (Griffenhagen and Bogard 1999:35-36). The other ethical bottle is a large molded bottle.

The tableware included two tumblers, one is paneled and the other has vertical fluting. The cosmetic or sanitary category includes a bottle of Florida water. The alcohol category had an optic-molded decanter with a geometric arch design.

The ceramics (Table 5.36) mainly consist of teaware (n=10) followed by hygiene (n=7), servingware (n=3), tableware (n=2). The teaware include cups (n=4), saucers (n=4), a sugar bowl (n=1), and cream pitcher (n=1). The cups are a plain whiteware, a
unknown molded and paneled patterned whiteware, plain porcelain, and a paneled mulberry colored transfer print of the Lucerne pattern produced by J. W. Pankhurst and CO., circa 1852-1880 (Williams 1978:321). The use of mulberry in transfer print ranged from 1818 to 1870 (Samford 1997:20). The saucers are three plain whiteware and a paneled whiteware. The sugar bowl is whiteware decorated with a flow blue geometric and floral pattern with panels and an angular lidded rim. The cream pitcher is a refined redware with a luster finish and molded decoration.

Table 5.36: Ceramics by Function from the Second Icehouse Fill, 18BA313. (1870s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White granite, molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, shell-edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, transfer print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, flow blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware, plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware, banded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined redware, luster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hygiene category includes chamber pots (n=5) and wash basins (n=2). One wash basin is a molded white granite marked on base with the royal coat of arms and "Royal Patent Ironstone W. and E. Corn" who were in operation 1864 to 1904 (Godden 1994:175). The other wash basin is white granite with molded panels and a scalloped rim. The chamber pots include a plain pearlware, a plain yellowware, two blue, brown, and white banded yellowware, and a black, blue, and white banded yellowware (Figure A.51).
The tableware include a bowl (n=1) and a plate (n=1). One whiteware bowl is 5-inch molded whiteware with arched panels and a rope motif similar to the Twin Leaves shape. The 8-inch plate is plain whiteware.

The servingware are platters (n=2) and a bowl (n=1). One of the platters is octagonal and whiteware with impressed blue shell edged (c.1830s to c.1860s) while the other platter or possible stand is oval shaped and plain whiteware (Figure A.52). The bowl is molded blue shell-edge whiteware with a dot and grass motif (1820s to 1830s) (Samford and Miller 2012).

Table 5.37: Buttons by Material and Decoration from the Second Icehouse Fill, 18BA313. (1904- c. 1940)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rubber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal items include buttons (n=31) (Table 5.37), one copper-alloy religious medal, a porcelain poodle figurine with an applique design, and a bone toothbrush and lice comb (Figures A.53-A.54). The buttons are decorated (n=8) and undecorated (n=23). The decorated buttons include black rubber, brass and copper alloy, shell, and prosser. The black rubber is two-hole china mound with a fish-eye like cut. The brass or copper alloy buttons are a button inset with a black and brown glass or ceramic disk possible a Norwalk pottery button, a gilded loop shank button, an engraved
loop shank, a flat face loop shank, a mounded loop shank. The iron button had been fabric covered. The shell button is a four-hole incised fish-eye cut around a sunburst.

The religious medal or pendant depicts Mary or a saint and the words “Pray.” The remainder of the medal is too corroded to read.

*Artifacts from the Foundation Fill*

Clay single-use pipes were also found in the fill. Eight fragments were recovered, but no bowls (Figure A.55). The stems were marked with unknown mark of “BPF”, “G. 79 W. White” “Glasgow”, and “Peter” “Dorni.”

**Table 5.38: Glass by Function from the Foundation Fill, 18BA313. (1904- c. 1940)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Vessel Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage</td>
<td>Soda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicinal</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetic or Sanitary</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware or serving</td>
<td>Tumbler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stemware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cruet jug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Extract or syrup</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of glass (Table 5.38 and Figures A.56-A.57) recovered was alcohol (n=32) followed by other (n=8), then medicinal (n=4), tableware or serving (n=4), beverage (n=1), and cosmetic or sanitary (n=1). The majority of glassware recovered are alcohol bottles (66%) consisting of Gottlieb-Bauernschmidt-Strauss (1901-1920) and Fred Bauernschmidt (1900-1920) beer, and one Schlitz beer (n=27) and liquor (n=4) (Van Wieren 1995:129). The GBS or Gottlieb-Bauernschmidt-Strauss Brewing Co. was a trust of merged breweries (Kelley 1965:542). Prohibition provides an end date for the
beer in the 1920s. The liquor bottles were flask bottles with one in the union oval shape. The beverage bottle included a Frank Phillips soda bottle. The medicinal bottle includes one castor oil bottle embossed Chas. H. Fletcher Castoria, which was introduced in the early 1890s and continued through the twentieth century (Fike 1987:162). Two ethical bottles, one with graduated measurements on body, and "Swindell 5" on base, the Swindell Bros. was a bottle making company in Baltimore from 1880 to 1959 (Toulouse 1971:452-453).

The other bottles included an ethical or proprietary bottle. A possible milk glass medicinal, cosmetic, or sanitary bottle was also found with the Whitall Tatum Mark used from 1890 to 1901 (Lockhart e al. 2006:5). The remainder of glass was unidentified extract of syrup bottles (n=8) and tableware or serving ware. The servingware and tableware are a pressed glass tumbler and stemware glass with sunburst motif on the bases and a paneled and floral engraved oil cruet jug. The jug resembles one pictured on Silber and Fleming’s post-1881 catalog (Wordsworth 1990:136).

Table 5.39: Ceramics by Function from the Foundation Fill, 18BA313. (1904- c. 1940)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Ware</th>
<th>Tea</th>
<th>Tableware</th>
<th>Serving</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, transfer printed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White granite, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, molded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, transfer print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ceramics (Table 5.39 and Figure A.58) consists tableware (n=3), teaware (n=3), servingware (n=2), and hygiene (n=1). The teaware include saucers (n=2) and a
cup (n=1). The saucers are a plain whiteware and a molded porcelain with a scalloped rim and scrolling motif and a gilded, cross-hatching.

The tableware include bowls (n=2) and a plate (n=1). One whiteware bowl is a 5.5-inch with a scalloped rim and molded scroll designs and gilded lines. The other whiteware bowl has scalloped rim, molded scrolls below lip, which are airbrushed orange. The center of the bowl has a polychrome transfer print of Queen Louise of Prussia while on the back is the mark of the East Palestine Pottery Co, Desoto shape, circa 1905 to 1909 (DeBolt 1994: 47).

The servingware are bowls (n=2). One bowl is porcelain with a scalloped rim, gilded flowers, a molded flower design, blue airbrushed with a polychrome transfer print of flowers in the center. The other bowl is whiteware and highly decorated with the gilded outline of leaves, molded dots and scalloped rim. The hygiene vessel is a plain whiteware wash basin.

Table 5.40: Buttons by Material and Decoration from the Foundation Fill, 18BA313. (1904-c. 1940)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Button Material</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brass or copper alloy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rubber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal items include buttons (n=34) (Table 7.40) and a porcelain figurine of a boy with a top hat (Figures A.59-A.60). The buttons are decorated (n=13) and undecorated (n=21). The decorated buttons include black rubber, brass and copper alloy,
shell, and prosser. The black rubber is a two-hole with a molded spoke-like pattern with the Goodyear backmark. The brass or copper alloy buttons are a blue glass disk set in copper button with iron back and loop shank and a loop shank with a hurricane-like spiral and "Imperial standard +" on back. The prosser buttons include two blue four-hole inkwell shape, three dome gaiters, a four-hole molded piecrust, and a molded two-hole. The shell buttons are four-hole with incised circular decorations and one with drilled hobnails.

**McDermott’s Tavern/Concannon House**

The tavern and attached duplex sat on the southeast corner of Church Lane and the rail line and extended south along the rail line. The rear yards of the buildings were excavated by the field school in 2009 and 2011 and earlier by a limited Phase II excavation by MAAR in the 1986. The properties were seized by Baltimore County and subsequently destroyed in the 1990s. The buildings would have sat where the Light Rail tracks are currently located. Portions of the rear yards remain as grass lots.

MAAR’s Phase II excavation included two 3 ft. by 3 ft. and one 2 ft. by 2 ft. units in the rear yard between the main tavern building and the duplex (Figure 5.13). Modern artifacts were recovered in disturbed contexts so artifacts were only sampled and no further excavations were undertaken (Payne and Baumgardt 1987:II10). Due to the sampling, the artifacts are not considered in this study.

The 2009 Field School excavations used 28 units (twenty-seven 1 m by 1 m and one 0.5 m by 1 m units) to test the rear yard and the only remaining portion of the site (Figure 5.14). The units were excavated first in a checkerboard pattern then by judgmental units based on the presence of features. This pattern covered most of the
remains of Lot 11 and a portion of Lot 12. One 1 m by 1 m was excavated in 2011 to attempt to locate the privy from the duplex or Lot 12.

The excavations uncovered 37 features including walls and foundations, pits, and fence posts. The largest of these features was a dry-laid stone privy foundation and later Portland cement rectangular foundation that incorporates the older cleaned out privy. The rectangular foundation may have been cold storage for the bar, but was filled in with artifacts ranging from the 1850s to the 1980s.

Figure 5.13: Phase II Excavations of 18BA324 (Payne and Baumgardt 1987:II27)
The yard saw intensive use through its history. Many of the earlier features were impacted by later use of the yard, and so many of the features are modern or heavily disturbed. Also, the yard saw use at least by residents of the duplex and those from the tavern. Separating these two contexts is problematic. Therefore, it is difficult to draw from the over 55,800 artifacts recovered from these excavations for analysis with any temporal distinctions or specific context. At this time, no quantified assessments can be made outside of one series of features. The remaining artifacts can be drawn on for qualitative comparisons.
Three small and connected features were selected from this site because they were not entirely impacted by later use and they represent a domestic context likely of the duplex. Features Q, R, and AH were part of the same pit feature that extended into Units 21, 23, and 24. These units would have been behind the duplex. The features date to the first quarter of the twentieth century based on the Gottlieb-Bauernschmidt-Straus (GBS) bottles (1900-1920) and a 1907 US penny. The features rested above subsoil and the upper portions of the original features were impacted by later features and activity.

*Artifacts from the Pit Feature*

The pit feature contained a small range of artifacts, but its interpretative value lies in comparison of these artifacts to the other sites. Only one unmarked pipe stem was found. The other smoking related artifact was part of a composite pipe, a tan mouthpiece possibly amber or plastic still threaded into a portion of the wooden pipe.

The glass includes alcohol (n=13) and medicinal (n=1). Of the alcohol, the bottles include beer (n=10) and liquor (n=3). The alcohol bottles includes one beer or wine, eight beer bottles (GBS), one Darley Park GBS beer bottle (1901-1912), a machine made strapped-sided warranted flask, and two tooled lip strapped-sided warranted flasks (Van Wieren 1995:133). The medicinal is limited to a proprietary medicine, a machine made Bromo-Seltzer bottle (post 1907) (Fike 1987:111).

The ceramics also are limited. The tableware and teaware include a saucer (n=1) and a plate (n=1). The saucer is decorated with scalloped rim and a polychrome decal floral motif. The 10-inch plate is a heavily decorated as well with a scalloped rim and gilded lip, molded lines and polychrome decal floral motif. The mark of the East Palestine Pottery Co. is on the back. The mark dates to c. 1895 to c.1905 according to
Gerald DeBolt (1994:46). The other vessel is a small leaf-shaped porcelain plate with traces of purple paint and gilding and including a gilded word or initial beginning with an “A”.

The personal items included buttons (n=4) and a bone lice comb (Figure 5.14). The buttons were two four-hole white prosser buttons and a four-hole bone button. The decorated button was a white prosser stud.

**Summary and Comparison**

The assemblages from these four different sites contain a range of artifacts from various types of features. The Poe-Burns site contained a yard scatter dating from the late 1840s to the 1980s and a privy in the North Yard dating sometime from 1855 to circa 1890s. The privy represents the largest assemblage that has a fixed time period, but the assemblage is small and limited in quantitative comparison with the other artifacts from the other sites.

The Concannon/Tavern site contained many features and a yard scatter spanning the late 1840s to the 1990s. The inability at this time to separate the tavern contexts from domestic contexts and the intensive use and thus, mixing of deposits greatly hampers the interpretative potential of the site. One pit feature (Features Q/R/AH) dating to the first quarter of the twentieth century is included for qualitative comparison with the other sites.

The 18BA313 site features represent larger assemblages. An icehouse on the property was filled in the 1870s. Two main fill sequences were discovered, but occurred at relatively close intervals. The icehouse fill is thus considered as one large fill episode for the analysis. The other large feature on the property is fill from the foundation of the
residence on the property. The fill dates from the fire that destroyed the building in 1904 to the 1940s when an asphalt pad was put over part of the foundation. Yard scatter and small features were found in the rear yard in historic Lots 4 and 5 but this data lacked a large enough size and temporal boundaries for quantitative comparison.

The last site, the Barracks, represents the largest group of assemblages. The Barracks was divided into the eight historic houses occupied when the rowhouse block burned down in 1897. Without any subsurface features in the Barracks, the deposits date to 1897 and represent the assemblages used by these occupants at that moment in time.

The artifacts found between these houses, based on the placement of the excavation units, are used in the analysis but not considered as representing a specific house in comparisons. Many of the artifacts located outside of the Barracks date to the fire but are small in number and are unaffiliated, and thus, have limited qualitative value.

The comparison between these assemblages are considered under the context of their deposition. Outside of the Barracks, the artifacts from all of the sites with fill represent artifacts disposed of intentionally in most cases. The Barracks house’s artifacts represent artifacts within the house at the time of the fire. If the historical account of the fire is correct, then the residents had some time to remove objects from the houses during the blaze, especially if they were recorded as removing food and furniture and allowing their children to take out items. In most cases, the valuable and accessible items would have been removed. What was left in the houses could be seen as the least valuable and/or immovable objects. With this consideration, the Barracks artifacts recovered can be comparable to the other assemblages as they all partly represent the least valuable objects at the time they made into the archaeological record. The assemblages also have
to be understood in light of this context as a sample of the material owned and/or used by the residents not its entirety.

The assemblages include mainly domestic artifacts of the sites or the neighboring sites occupants. Only specific artifacts were selected for the analysis. These artifacts include ceramics: tableware, teaware, servingware, and hygiene items. The glass includes alcohol, medicines, tableware, food, cosmetic and sanitary, and other. The other major artifacts sets are the tobacco pipes and personal items, primarily buttons. The North Privy artifacts are potentially the oldest followed by the artifacts from the icehouse fill, the Barracks, the pit feature from Concannon/Tavern site, and lastly by the foundation fill.

The next section situates these artifacts relative to the research questions. The role of material culture is detailed, followed by an examination of the historical context of these artifacts and the time period to understand the meaning afforded these artifacts in a particular time and situation. Similar analyses of these artifact types and the methods employed bolster this study’s analysis and are thus detailed as well. With this discussion, the landscape and its study in historical archaeology are related back to the research questions.
CHAPTER 6
A Material Culture of Industrial Capitalism in Texas

Using David Harvey’s theoretization provides a framework to examine the local operation of capitalism. As Texas was created, maintained, and heavily impacted by industry, the urbanization of capital can help illustrate the facets of this process seen through the built landscape and material culture of Texas. This analytical position views Texas not as a stage of or for capitalism but as a record of and a participant in capitalism. The prioritization of space over time in this theoretization does not hamper this study as this study examines a relatively short time frame, a hundred years in the life of one town, and an industry based on one predominant mode of production, wage labor.

The concepts of residential differentiation and the urbanization of consciousness provide a means to study the influence of changes in capitalism at the site level. This framework provides a dialectical reading of the different values and meanings articulated through the different bases of consciousness formation. When situated historically, the artifacts and landscape can illustrate how daily practices and spaces in Texas conditioned life to the logic of accumulation and the necessary class relations. This context includes the social history and ideals of the Victorian and Progressive eras coupled with the trends and patterns of industrial capitalism. Through a linkage, the interconnection between the social history of the middle of the nineteenth-century up until the early twentieth century and industrial capitalism becomes apparent. Placed within the historical framework, practices on the built landscape and in dress, dining and dining rituals, health and hygiene, smoking and alcohol consumption, and medicine illustrate patterns of control, segregation, and segmentation within the town to Texas. The tensions arising from
periods of crises and contradictions of the capitalist process are also seen materially when understood temporally and through a comparison of the worker’s sites and the difference that arise between the different contexts of labor.

A Pattern of Material Life in Texas

The signature of life in an industrial capitalistic world is seen then in the patterning of the material culture and space. Capitalism as a social process comes to influence all aspects of life. People are forced to consume based on the alienation of their labor (Marx 1990). Objects are purchased and consumed within a field of social relations. Thus, the consumption of objects has to be situated within the historic context and subsequently, the power relations at work (McCracken 1988; Orser 1998:318; Patterson 2009). Material culture is not naturally imbued with meaning. Therefore, the issue in studying consumption is not so much what people buy, but the social relations which limit or enable what they consume (Wurst and McGuire, 1999:196). When these relations are placed in reference to capitalism and the logic of accumulation, the artifacts as commodities can illustrate patterns of differentiation, alienation, and exploitation.

Removing this context from a study of consumption makes the study of capitalism impossible and instead facilitates capitalism. Much of the scholarship on consumption, such as Laruen Cook et al. (1996), has sought to show the self-determination of shopping and its potential empowerment (Mullins 2009:212). Viewing and emphasizing consumption as an autonomous and intentional act removes individuals from any context. Focusing solely on the creation of identity presents a misleading picture that supports capitalism and individualism. According to Conrad Lodziak (2002:vii), the consequence
of this approach is that little is included about economic phenomena and consumer culture is seen as the product of imaginative and creative consumers rather than of commercial interests.

Instead, with the artifacts and landscape referenced in the different power bases of consciousness formation, processes of differentiation and segmentation can be seen over time. The consumption of goods not only shows ideologies at work that structure everyday practices, but understood in the context of the power bases, the practices have the potential to contradict the logic of accumulation. When viewed relationally, objects are then seen as both symbols of resistance and the dominant ideology (Mullins 1998:26). The complexity of the interaction of the different power bases is articulated through a historical perspective that combines the life of the town with the process of capitalism.

Texas and the Expansion of Industry, 1840s to the 1870s

Industrial capitalism was already established by the time Texas was founded. In the beginning of this period, the nation was experiencing a rapid acceleration in infrastructure, population, and industry (Kuczynski 1973:40-41; Smith 1981:xi). In Baltimore County, this expansion saw the creation and growth of small industrial hamlets scattered around an agricultural county (Chidester 2004). The need for lime and limestone to feed the growing industries and populations spurred the growth of the quarry industry and the town of Texas around it.

The quarry industry did not just appear; its creation, growth, and sustainment was predicated on regimes of value and perceptions that were all aligned to the accumulation of capital and its logic. The first step in this shift in values was the State or the different
levels of government, which has the authority to define such values and alter the system. The State legitimized the industry and supported the value of accumulation over the old spatial forms and even private property.

The quarry boom was spurred after the establishment of the railroad through the area, enabled through Baltimore City and the State of Maryland. The railroad itself was a response by Baltimore and Maryland to compete with other cities and locations like Philadelphia. This investment demonstrates that such communities, like Baltimore and later Texas, were conceptualized as communities of money in competition with each other and guided by the logic of accumulation. This concept again is seen in the Maryland court system legitimizing Bosley’s claim to access to the railroad, placing the needs of industry and new capital accumulation over the old form of plantation agriculture and slave labor of the Cockey estate. Thus, the State used its authority to extinguish old community structures and even private property for new forms of accumulation because of the priority given to the logic of accumulation.

The quarry that became established was based on the unequal relationship between the capitalist and laborer in the wage labor system. The industry needed a stratified workforce and an exploitable workforce. This labor force came in the form of cheap immigrant labor. The built landscape was crucial to bringing in this labor and dividing it. Unlike slaves, the new Irish immigrants, who were the cheap labor of the middle of the nineteenth century, did not require an outlay or continual investment of capital nor was capital lost if they died.
**Built Landscape**

Understanding the differing values perceived in this early landscape shows how the town could have been established and people brought to work in such conditions. The opportunity of housing and work attracted the Irish immigrants and their families. For many, owning a home was a major improvement from tenancy or renting in Ireland, especially coupled with the appearance of free labor (Dolan 2008). To native-born entrepreneurs, the landscape was viewed as a source of revenue.

The capital employed in the secondary circuit of capital also provided an investment opportunity to provide a return on that capital. Not only were they able to house their workers, entrepreneurs used the division and sale of the land to their advantage. Ground rent provided a means of doubling their investment opportunities in the collection of a yearly rent and the division and sale of land developed by another. Rental agreements similarly generated an investment and reinforced the hierarchical relationship between the owners and workers, in that they supplied the owners with another source of surplus on the backs of the workers. The chance to own property and one’s own labor for the workers as well as the chance to have a labor force and generate revenue for owners initially outweighed the disadvantages of being so close to such a hazardous industry.

The landscape created was one that segmented and stratified the workforce to ensure the necessary social relations for the quarry industry. The built landscape was crucial in reinforcing the perception of difference and differing social value via material and spatial segmentation. These differences became reinforced through residential differentiation visible in architecture and spatial relationships.
Much of the original housing was stone rowhouses or a variation on them in a two-bay form. The rowhouse provided a uniformity of design as well as quickly satisfied the demand for dwellings and speculation and thus, profit (Alexander 1975:68). They also could include different configurations and design elements to satisfy different classes of buyers. Housing reinforced the position of workers as the two-bay rowhouse configuration would have been familiar to the immigrants travelling through the seashore towns of Baltimore or Philadelphia. The rowhouse was the norm for working-class housing in Baltimore (Hayward 1981:33). The early homes in Texas were essentially variations on this form.

In Baltimore City, around the 1840s and 1850s, a new working-class house type was built, the two-story house and attic (Hayward 1981:45). Imitating the Greek revival style, the attic had two small square windows near the attic floor with a high center ceiling allowing two rooms in the attic and extra space. The first floor had a double parlor plan, each parlor was about 11 ft. sq. and had a winder staircase along the inside wall and a fireplace in each room (Hayward 1981:50). The smallest version, the half-house rowhomes, were built for the lowest income residents and were strictly rentals (Hayward and Belfoure 1999:45). A smaller of version of this house form was built in Texas.

The two-bay configuration of the early housing in Texas varied by size for worker’s housing according to the class hierarchy. Similar patterns of hierarchy inscribed in architecture and space are found in other nineteenth-century towns such as Boott Mills in Lowell (Mrozowski 2006:74). This stratification crucial for industries meant higher rents for the owners and the perception that households were the same
based on the similarity of the housing configurations, but differed based on social standing. Social standing meant more—more space and more house and more space outside, creating distance between neighbors. The gradations of space and size created a continuum of form that could be read relative to status. The perception based on status was competition between households or families to be successful within this landscape.

At the lowest end, the Barracks was the smallest housing unit with each unit likely comprising one room on the first floor and one room on the second. At the next level, the attached rowhouse block of 18BA313 had two floors and slightly bigger rooms. The Poe-Burns house had similar dimensions but an extra garret floor. The Tavern and Concannon complex is far more complicated, but the Concannon duplex and attached units had larger sized rooms. As discussed further in the chapter, competition also can be seen in material items during the remainder of the second half of the nineteenth century.

This grammar in construction does not extend beyond the housing along the railroad. Most of the housing built along Church Lane, which was built slightly later, and the housing on the perimeter of the town does not adhere to this grammar. Many of these homes are either duplexes or single-family homes. This difference would have reinforced a division and the hierarchy between the workers along the railroad and the owners, skilled workers, unskilled labor, and other professions elsewhere in town.

Further, the homes on Church Lane were closer to the social and spiritual center of the town—the Catholic Church, the York Road—the outside world, and farther away from the quarries. Thus, the position of the homes on the landscape reinforced another layer of residential differentiation in that one’s proximity to industry and the railroad would have had an impact on health and the ability to adhere to notions of respectability.
Success and advancement for workers meant movement away from the hazardous location along the rail line and next to the quarries. It also meant being closer to the outside world on Church Lane and in a sense, God, through the Church. The Barracks, home to renting laborers and their families, was farthest from the Church and Church Lane while the other homes studied, a mix of skilled and unskilled labor, were just south of Church Lane.

The majority of quarry owner’s homes were vastly different architecturally than the homes along the railroad and most along Church Lane, reinforcing the initial relationship based on industry of owner and worker as well as landlord and renter/ground renter. Unlike the homes on Church Lane, the homes of the quarry owners show ornamentation and different layouts. While no photographs can be found of the row houses of 18BA313 or the Barracks, the images of them depict simple two bay-wide configurations. McDermott’s Tavern and the attached Concannon Duplex saw substantial modification reflecting an ability to alter the visual appearance, but which also precludes a comparison to the other structures.

With historic photographs, the Poe-Burns Duplex, which likely resembled the other buildings under study, can be compared visually with the Fortune House (Figures 6.1 and 6.2). Both buildings faced the railroad and were made of limestone. Depicted in the 1980s, the front façade of the Poe-Burns Duplex was built with uncoursed stone with simple brick soldier arches over the openings and quoined corners. Also, depicted in the 1980s, the Fortune House, which was home to quarry owners and a stonemason, was made with coursed limestone with an ashlar finish. The openings had carved and
dressed limestone lintels. Further, the building is three bays wide with a center door with sidelights, and a first story porch.

The difference between these two structures in terms of space and appearance would have been apparent to everyone in town. Surrounded by limestone, everyone understood the difference in limestone construction. Workers could probably measure the amount of sweat and blood it would have taken to finish the stonework of the Fortune House. The architectural pattern of social differentiation in the early town would have appeared as part of the natural order of the town. The visible expenditure of one’s labor in the physical structure of a building may have been a sense pride and accomplishment, but also literally represented the basic relationship of capitalism carved and set in stone, hidden under the veil of status.

Figure 6.1: Poe-Burns Duplex. (Photographed by Herbert Harwood, Jr. 1987, photo courtesy of the Baltimore County Public Library photograph collection).
The control of space was also dependent on the hierarchy and ideology. Homeowners along the railroad had the ability to expand their homes in the rear if they had rear yard space. The sites close to Church Lane all had modular additions to the back of the houses allowing them to create more space. The Barracks was a rental unit and there is no evidence of such additions. This control of private property and privacy was still limited. Little privacy was afforded workers outside of the confines of their house, and their movements and activities possibly were exposed to everyone. Activities done outside would have been full view of neighbors, the town, and the outside world with the railroad. While the houses along the railroad did have rear yards, the 1938 aerial shows a denuded landscape where line of site would not have been obstructed, so that barring fences, one’s smoking or drinking outside would be in full view of the neighbors (Figure 4:12). Outside the Barracks, even with a nineteenth-century barn to the north, this
behavior would be observable by railroad passengers and the occupants of the Ward House. The denuded landscape was close to how the landscape looked going back to the middle of the nineteenth century, especially with the demand for wood for the kilns.

Fences indicate a concern with marking the boundaries of private property and its segmentation and privacy concerns. Archaeologically, two rear yards (18BA324 and 18BA325) were tested beyond the buildings. At the Poe-Burns Duplex, the division of the north and south yard areas appears to have been maintained through the history of the lots until possibly after 1986. In MAARs Phase II survey, Payne and Baumgardt (1987) document wire fences in photographs and on maps. A succession of postholes recovered archaeologically spanning the entire history of the lot along this same west to east axis which divides the north and south yards attests to this division as does the lack of any artifacts that mend across this line. The intensity of activity in the small yard area of the Tavern/Concannon site makes it difficult to interpret the segmentation of the yard though numerous recent and older postholes were found.

This residential differentiation between the worker’s and owners served to reproduce the social relations. Residential differentiation was structured and structuring. One saw oneself as worker because he and his family lived in worker’s housing. They labored with fellow workers, but in a stratified landscape. Wages provided disposable income and the appearance of freedom, but the landscape helped to keep them in their position and ensure their alienation. The illusion of self-imposed separation through competition allowed for the creation of privatized families more disconnected from the influence of the community. In this manner, bonds between workers were minimized for the sake of the family unit and competition with other households. While families may
have viewed establishing private property boundaries as a way to improve their homes and position, they were also fragmenting the community and class consciousness.

Overall, the control of private property was an illusion because though homeowners viewed the property as their own and under their control, the landscape and town really was based on industry and the logic of accumulation. The State could authorize the destruction of private property at any time. More so, the landscape was always an industrial landscape. The footprint of the quarry industry would have been all-pervasive throughout much of Texas’ history. Limestone dust and smoke would have filled the air and drifted over town and into homes. The towering kilns and derricks would have been visible before much of the town was visible (Figure 6:1). For instance, a derrick at the Beaver Dam quarry in 1872 was 150 feet tall and similar derricks were likely at Texas (The Baltimore Sun August 14, 1872). The noise from the various machines, engines, and blasting made conversation almost impossible next to the quarry (The Baltimore Sun August 14, 1872). Even within the confines of homes, the residents were not able to separate themselves from the industry; the industry was constant and in control of the atmosphere. The only people with a say over this environment were the industry owners; this fact reinforces the class relationship between capitalist and owner. Yet, even the owners of the industry were beholden to the industry in order to maintain their investment and its perpetuation (Marx 1990).

The alienation is evident at the community scale as residential differentiation applied to the position of the town in Baltimore County. The town was one of many industrial nodes in a largely agricultural county; the town was surrounded farm fields. A town composed of mainly Irish immigrants from the same general areas of Ireland was
attractive and comfortable to these immigrants. Immigrants were surrounded by people familiar to them religiously and culturally, and they were slightly removed from anti-immigrant and anti-Catholic sentiment. While this community afforded some comfort and cohesion, the immigrant’s concentration also saw them isolated from other workers and discriminated as a collective community based on their identity. Chances for class consciousness outside of the town were lessened. To the native-born owners, ethnic and religious prejudices against the town as Irish and Catholic meant less uproar over the industrial conditions and treatment of workers. This spatial pattern of segregation fed back on itself and allowed the social relations of industry to be reproduced (Harvey 1989:118).

The same residential differentiation, which established and reproduced the social relations necessary for industry is full of the contradictions of capitalist society as well (Harvey 1989:118). To maintain the class division, different spatial means of control were used. The behavior of most of the homes along the railroad was in full view of neighbors, the wider community, and the railroad. Likewise, movement of workers along the railroad was similarly exposed to view. The position of workers homes meant they would have to pass by either the homes of owners and/or the Church to travel out of town. Thus, workers would have been constantly under pressure to conform to acceptable regimes of behavior. At the same time, the close proximity of the workers might have forced interaction and some degree of mutualism even in the face of competition. The openness of outside activities promoted bonding between neighbors or discouraged individualism and the privatization of the family.
Alcohol Consumption and the Taverns

The use of alcohol shows the contested nature of this space. People likely congregated in open public spaces, such as streets or saloons, to smoke and drink (Reckner and Brighton 1999:77). The tavern was the only other major social venue outside of the Church in town. The taverns would have been not only an outlet but also a place for reaffirming identity and class cohesion (Cumbler 1979:7). The taverns as public spaces were sources of solidarity and bonding for workers and under their control to some degree as well as a means of escape for male workers (Hall et al. 1987:164; Rorabaugh 1979:151; Montgomery 1987:91). Yet worker’s bonding threatened the segmentation and control of the industry. At least one instance of a strike is known in the 1850s with workers actually fighting outsiders from coming into town to work and thus, breaking the strike (Baltimore Sun May 27, 1854).

The threat that social drinking posed to industry is seen in the attacks against it through the Church, Victorian ideals, and stereotypes linked with the working class. Drinking in the tavern or out in the open would have been in conflict with notions of respectability and industriousness. Many of the instances of violence and inappropriate behavior in town documented in the newspapers were tied to the consumption of alcohol with sobriety linked to the virtue of hard work and, ultimately compliance with industry. The rowdiness and incompliance of the Irish in the 1850s, the sexton in 1890, an African-American in 1911, and others are all blamed on alcohol. Blaming alcohol also was used an excuse to mask underlying tensions, nonconformity, release, and inequity.

The consumption of alcohol and perceptions of its consumption were used to construct and justify class and labor identity and ultimately citizenship and segmentation.
For the middle class, espousing temperance served as a means of holding their position above the lower classes and above the excesses of the upper classes (Reckner and Brighton 1999:67). During the nineteenth century, the drinker was labeled as an outcast and outlaw and this characterization allowed control over immigrant groups as well as the use of legal and governmental authority in that control (Tropman 1986:30-31).

Temperance was also crucial for the perpetuation of the Church, and pressure was placed on residents of Texas. The Catholic Church in the mid-nineteenth century was struggling to gain acceptance in the United States, and the promotion of temperance was an effort to promote American ideals of freedom and liberty which temperance literature said could be obtained from self-control, integration into a moral society, and the ability to be productive (Rorabaugh 1979:200-203). In Texas, the mission of the St. Joseph’s Beneficial and Temperance Society was to bring material relief to its members during illness and death but also to promote sobriety (Smith 1927:105). Therefore, the social and religious identity of Catholic workers placed some degree of pressure on them to conform as well.

Although the data represents much of the second half of the nineteenth century, the artifacts show limited alcohol usage in the home suggesting possible consumption outside of the homes in the taverns. Understanding alcohol consumption is difficult from many of the sites for several reasons. First, the data set is small and limited in its use in comparison. Second, the proximity of the Concannon House to the tavern on the corner of Church Lane and the railroad makes it difficult to examine and separate the Concannon House deposits from that of the tavern. Third, the other sites near Church Lane, the Poe-Burns Duplex and 18BA313, would have between this tavern and Miss
Kate’s tavern, which was in operation from the second half of the nineteenth century into the twentieth century. Further complicating this picture, at the Barracks site much of the glass was burned beyond recognition.

Barring the twentieth-century deposits, which are discussed later, evidence of alcohol consumption is limited. At none of the sites are there more than two alcohol bottles present, but alcohol bottles and related vessels were found at all the sites, except in Houses 5, 6 and 8 of the Barracks. These data indicates that all but the residents of House 5, 6, and 8 of the Barracks were consuming alcohol at home. The paucity of evidence suggests they were either drinking outside of the home perhaps in the taverns, disposing of their bottles in another manner, or not drinking very much. Few other glass beverage bottles, such as soda water, are found either in the recovered deposits. Overall, the lack of bottles and caches of bottles suggests that the residents were not drinking much or drinking in the taverns, which undercut some of the class fragmentation and competition.

*The Catholic Church*

The Catholic Church, St. Josephs, represents the other social institution in town and like the industry was dependent on the population for its perpetuation. The Catholic Church indirectly supported the industry in several ways. First, the Catholic Church was struggling like its immigrant base to establish itself in the United States. The Church therefore sought to promote values that would ease its and its member’s integration into American society. Adopting Victorian values to a degree, the Catholic Church can be seen as promoting individualism and respectability, and thus class divisions.
Second, the Church in Texas was reliant on industry and industry owners as they provided the space, stone, money, and skilled workmanship to build St. Josephs and its buildings. The owners also housed the priest in their own home prior to the building of the rectory. Further, the Church could not afford to run the school and was in debt in the 1890s. Therefore, the benevolence of industry owners to the Church was crucial in its early years. This relationship between Church and industry meant that the Church was less likely to criticize the industry, its operation, and owners. This reticence coupled with the push for respectable behavior likely lead to conflict. This conflict may explain the large number of priests the town went through prior to the 1870s as well as the shooting of a priest and several Church buildings being burned.

The Church also provided connection to a wider community and an identity that would have been fostered through membership and involvement in the Church. Religious identity provided a community and support for Catholics that spanned nationality and ethnicity. The consecration of St. Joseph Church as well as the connections to Lincoln’s assassination attest to the larger community as does the linking of other industrial communities by faith with Catholics coming to Texas for mass. The Church was a venue for different segments of the population to interact and form a community. The organizations of mutualism, the benevolent organizations, were organized through the social venue of the Church as was the Friendly Order of St. Patrick, which did have the collective power to close the quarries during funerals of its members (Smith 1927). The power of these organizations were limited by the relationship between the Church and industry.
The Church also provided one of the only avenues that could affect one’s mobility chances, education. Baltimore County funded education but for all purposes the Church ran the school. This position provided them with authority and an avenue to instruct notions of respectability to children and likely inculcate a respect for the quarry industry.

Being Catholic also marginalized the residents outside of their Catholic community and fostered residential differentiation. Linked with their ethnicity, their religion was seen as a threat and resulted in intimidation and violence from “Know-Nothings” and other groups. Moving outside of these bounds in the middle of the nineteenth century would have been difficult. Similarly, moving into the community without this identity would have been difficult as well. A non-Catholic denominational church was not built in the immediate area until the twentieth century.

Catholic identity and involvement in the Church is seen in the historical documents and archaeological record and attests to community bonding but also the inculcation of values conducive to industry. Many of the residents of 18BA313 and the Poe-Burns Duplex were active in the Church based on historical records. At some point in time, the residents of the Barracks were involved in the Church as the Barracks was known as Catholic Row (Smith 1927). Religious identity also is evidenced by several medals and possible rosary beads. Catholic religious items were found in all but the Poe-Burns site, though the Burns and Kellys were involved in the Church. The Icehouse Fill contained a Miraculous Heart of Mary devotional medal in the first fill and a medal depicting Mary or a saint and the words “Pray” in the second. A disturbed soil layer (EU6 Context 11) in the rear yard area of 18BA313 also contained two religious pendants or medals with one depicting St. Anne de Beaupre holding the infant Mary with the
Basilica of Ste.-Anne-de-Beaupré in Quebec on the reverse. The Basilica depicted dates from 1876 to 1922 and is associated with pilgrimages and several miracles (Shrine of Ste.-Anne-de-Beaupré 2013). St. Anne was the mother of Mary and is patron of widows, pregnant women, plague victims, childless women, and nursemaids (Ball 2003:549).

The rear yard of the Concannon/Tavern Site also held a soil layer (EU41, Context 1) just below the surface with a mix of twentieth century and modern material that contained a small lead statue of St. Joseph holding Jesus. St. Joseph, father of Jesus, was declared the patron of the Catholic Church (Taves 1986:39). The Barracks, Houses 2, 3, 5, and 6 and between Houses 4 and 5, contained possible rosary beads. Performing the rosary was a personal and/or group devotion. House 5 also contained a Miraculous Heart of Mary medal and a Seven Sorrows of Mary medal.

The medals speak to Catholic religious practices that would have harmonized with Victorian values. All of the Marian devotions focused on Mary as a symbol of purity, fertility, and a grace-filled mediator (Taves 1986:39). Emulating a proper Victorian household would have mean stressing purity and bounty and the segmentation of unclean elements. The devotional medals also fit with Victorian ethic of being an industrious and hardworking individual. As in the case of the Seven Sorrows of Mary devotion, getting closer to Mary’s suffering to get nearer to Jesus’s suffering was seen as a way to help oneself reach salvation and accept his or her own suffering for something better later on. Saints, like Mary, Joseph, and Anne, are said to intercede for the faithful with Christ and God and the ultimately, the devotees salvation (Ball 2003:505). Through private devotion to the saints, the Sacred Heart, rosary or other devotional elements, people entered into an individual, personal ritualistic relationship (Dolan 1985:231).
Devotion allowed a potential bond with the sufferer, giving meaning to their own suffering and the expectation of a later reward; thus, this devotion could offer relief and solace (Dolan 1985:239). Devotion was a way to accept the harshness of industry and life in Texas, and internalize salvation, putting the responsibility for success on the individual.

These medals are coupled with organizations within the Church dedicated to devotion, which strengthened the power of the Church as an institution. The Church had several different organizations to foster devotional life such as the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin, the Sacred heart League, and the Holy Name Society (Smith 1927:111). The devotional practices promoted in the mid-nineteenth century “…directly and indirectly enhanced the hierarchy’s control over the laity, while fostering a distinctively Catholic identity with international as opposed to national ethnic overtones” (Taves 1986:111).

**Political Identity**

During this period, the expression of political identity also shows a class divide. The divide indicates the desire for inclusion in American society and a fear of competition from other groups and races. On the whole, the majority of Texans supported the Union; this support was reflective of a number of factors like employment, inclusion, and citizenship. Evidence of this backing or involvement is found in the rear yard of Lot 4 (Unit 5 Context 11) with a Lincoln campaign or funeral button as well as at the Poe-Burns House and the Barracks, which contained Union uniform coat buttons. Different Union military branches and designations were found in the different houses of the Barracks including the Navy, Army, Army Corps of Engineers, and Artillery. While
the Barracks reflects a deposit dating thirty-two years after the Civil War, the buttons could be from residents or their family members.

Support for the South reflected a fear of competition as well as a desire for inclusion. The Irish tended to vote Democratic-Republican and then Democratic because the Democratic Party eased their assimilation as whites and rejected nativism (Ignatiev 1995:76). The Democratic Party also guaranteed them a favored position over the free African-American people of the North who were regarded as the main threat to their position (Ignatiev 1995:87). The Barracks had a Confederate button from the state of Virginia, and the historical records also document at least one laborer fighting reluctantly for the south and the involvement of one resident who worked in Texas in Lincoln’s Assassination. Native landowners made up the other segment of the population supporting the Confederacy and pressured locals into siding with the South, possibly stoking fears of the enfranchisement of African Americans.

By the end of this time period, the town was at its peak and the Church was growing. The Irish were still employed predominantly as laborers but more Irish and their offspring worked in skilled jobs. Most of the Irish sent their children to the school at the Church. Yet the industry was taking a toll on the health of workers and the greater town through accidents and the cumulative effects of exposure.

Industry and Consolidation, 1870s to the 1890s

By the early 1870s, the industry of Texas and the town had begun to decline. The downturn began around or before the start of depression in 1873 and was felt through the 1890s. The national concentration of wealth and capital meant Texas was exposed to
increasing national competition. By the 1880s, the limeburners and quarry operations included native-born owners and owners of Irish descent in several small operations. Towards the end of this period, capital was used by outside corporations operating quarries in other locations to begin quarrying in Texas.

The pressure of the downturn was felt in Texas. Workers’ wages were cut to ensure the generation of a profit. The operations in Texas were faced with competition and the need to reinvest capital to compete. The development of capitalist production necessitated a constant increase in capital for industrial undertakings, subordinating the capitalist to the laws of capital production (Marx 1990:739). Quarry operations did not reinvest substantially in the industry, and became less competitive. The strikes of this period in Texas were responses to the decreases in wages.

The impact of the decline of industry filtered down into the households. Several decades of quarry operations had made many widows. The need for additional income saw women working inside the homes as dressmakers or outside as storekeepers as well as taking in boarders in the 1870s. The male population of the town was still primarily working as laborers.

*The Built Landscape*

The landscape during this period physically remained the same until the 1890s. Gradually, the pressure felt by people meant less and less investment in their homes. The initial outlay of capital in the town by native-born entrepreneurs and owners was not repeated by later owners. Therefore, the built landscape saw a slow degradation over time. The hazards and exploitation of the industry began to outweigh the attraction of
home ownership and jobs. By the 1890s, buildings started to burn down and were not rebuilt.

The landscape of control and segmentation of the 1850s and 1860s began to fade. Irish and Catholic identity became less of a stigma. Yet the vast inequity of wealth that characterized the Gilded Age characterized Texas as well. Segmentation became reflected in relative wealth and social standing. The formation of a middle-class divided class-consciousness and stratified the population further. Social status made these divisions seem a reflection of one’s own effort rather than residential differentiation which limited one’s mobility chances through unequal access to resources. Material aspirations masked the segregation on the built landscape and of class and made difference appear a result of social standing. This mindset returned the blame on the individual and family rather than the exploitative industry.

Industry, Status, and Victorian Respectability

Status relied on prescribed manners and practices that perpetuated ideologies of capitalism. Through practice, these standards were a means to form social relations needed for industry. Etiquette was not a new concept, but etiquette in the Victorian era derived from the need for elites to differentiate themselves from new Americans as well as provide the means for others not only to distinguish themselves but also appear to move up the social ladder (Kasson 1987:131; Williams 1985:6). Codes of behaviors served to limit a completely democratic order and support the current structure instead (Kasson 1990:3). Codes also provided standards from which to assess and classify others.
Adherence to notions of respectability was the responsibility of the individual. For the middle class, the Victorian ideology of individualism extolled them to be self-disciplined and self-reliant to be successful (McGerr 2003:8-9). According to this ideal, one bore the responsibility for his or her station thorough ascription to notions of gentility utilizing an increasing array of diverse goods, and with success, could move up or maintain his or her own social position. This ideology served to make self-disciplined and consuming workers who thought they acted autonomously and thus bore the responsibility for their current state.

Material culture were part of this order in communicating it and essential in reinforcing it through practice. Internalizing rules in the household would have imported and replicated the outside order into the home and privatized the family and individual. The outside order was the structure necessary for the success of the industry in Texas. The segmentation of society became internalized in the bases of consciousness formation, the individual, family, class, and community, and a part of everyday life.

These rules were reinforced through discipline. Punishment entailed removal from this potentially rich world of material objects as well as conditioning to proper behavior and materials. The Secretary of the State Lunacy Commission of Maryland, Arthur Herring (1909:773-774), details a woman confined to a small room, bare of furniture, and who had to eat her meals from a tin can for eight years at the Baltimore County Almshouse, which was perched on a hill within sight of Texas. Reform of this inmate was possible through reorientation of the individual. Through this incarceration, the visual, aural, and olfactory landscape was changed to eliminate any moral infection and contagion (Upton 1992:65-69). This episode illustrates the role material culture
played as well as how the proper material culture was needed to create a respectable citizen.

The material differences between workers became more pronounced during this period and show stratification masked as status distinctions and the internalization of the logic of accumulation. Periods of crises where social boundaries harden are manifest in material culture and social relations (Mrozowski et al. 2000:xvi; Paynter 1988). The majority of the artifacts from Texas span this period and show the solidification of this hierarchy and an increasing acceptance of the logic of accumulation.

Acceptance of the logic of accumulation led to individualism and the privatization of the family. Money power provided the worker will a small degree of freedom, which was in conflict with the class in which that money was gained. Money power afforded the social power to act like a free-thinking individual without reference to others (Harvey 1992:103). In this way, money power also could be in conflict with the family and community when the individual feels he or she can act autonomously without them. The logic of accumulation is internalized in the individual and his or her value system.

Money power was used at the family level to insulate and privatize the family whereby the family believes it can operate autonomously from the community. The actions of the family are most visible as household assemblages, but it is not possible to link artifacts to specific individuals. The households are made up of several people, related and unrelated, with potentially different interests and concerns (Kruczek-Aaron 2002), but without a wealth of historical data, differentiation of assemblages at the level of the individual person is not possible archaeologically beyond conjecture.
The artifacts show individualism and the privatized family and the formation of consumption classes. The specific lifestyle choices, consumer habits, and desires created not only a more compliant workforce, they presented marketable niches for consumption (Harvey 2000:112-113). This consumption was essential for the expanding manufacturing base of the United States. In his 1992 study, Kenneth Ames (1992:236) documents a wealth of diverse goods that served the Victorian middle class efforts to emulate the upper class and create a material world of respectability. This model of emulation produced a demand for more and more products. The workers’ in Texas represented similar niches that absorbed some of the surplus production.

**Alcohol Consumption**

The type of alcohol consumed shows a concern with status and appropriate standards of behavior. While most of the residents were either not drinking much or drinking at the tavern, the alcohol bottles coupled with the glassware, shows a differentiation based on class across the sites (Figure 6.3). Besides a bottle of champagne and a stemware base in House 7, only beer and liquor are found in the house assemblages from the Barracks. House 7 could have been used to store Ella Ward’s furniture and was not then the home of a worker. A wine bottle, possibly champagne, was found between the houses as well. Near Church Lane, the alcohol consumption differs with beverages that can be viewed as more refined. Wine, a bottle of porter, and a decanter were found in the Icehouse Fill while in the North Yard privy of the Poe-Burns House a decanter and a small cordial or wine glass were recovered. Besides these two items, no other definitive alcoholic vessel was recovered from either side of the Poe-Burns House.
These higher alcoholic beverages and potentially whatever was in the decanters were more acceptable to consume and, perhaps, a response to pressure to follow genteel rules or disassociation with stereotypes of the Irish and/or working-class drinking. Beer was equated with the immigrant working class. A middle-class family in 1885 may not have consumed beer or other alcoholic beverages even whiskey which was seen as a “low and vulgar” and wine which was expensive (Rorabaugh 1987:41-42).

Baring the fact that lager beer was not available in bottles until the 1870s (Munsey 1970), the alcohol consumption shows stratification based on notions of respectability or affordability and thus, consumption classes. If this pattern is reflective of adherence to genteel norms, it would also mean that the residents of the sites along
Church Lane would be frequenting the taverns less. Paul Reckner and Stephen Brighton (1999) examined drinking in working-class and middle-class contexts in nineteenth-century New York City and Lowell, Massachusetts, and did not find a consistent class stratification based on alcohol consumption. In Texas, the disparity in the types of alcohol consumed indicates that the status differentiation was more relevant in the closed setting of the community.

_Tobacco Consumption_

Evidence of smoking shows similar stratification in pipe forms and symbolism based on class. Like alcohol, smoking also was seen as a useless and unproductive habit (Gutman 1976:19). Yet smoking had a different connotation then alcohol. Smoking was more of an accepted habit across class for men in the second half of the nineteenth century. Disagreements arose primarily due to the location and context of smoking (Cook 1989:219).

Smoking was an important social recreation evidenced by its ubiquity and distribution in Texas. Pipes are found at all of the sites indicating smoking was common amongst individuals in all the households though who is smoking these pipes besides men is uncertain. Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century pipes are found scattered throughout the rear yard of both lots of the Poe-Burns Duplex and 18BA313. In addition, within and outside of the Barracks smoking pipes were recovered. People were smoking outside the homes and some level of social interaction and bonding occurred.

The majority of the pipes are similar and consisted of single-use clay pipes. Many different styles are present with a proliferation of decorative styles. This variety is reflective of the diversity of goods produced in the second half of the nineteenth century.
For instance, the pipemakers of Glasgow produced a wide variety of pipe designs in the nineteenth century, with even more varieties in the second half of the century (Gallagher 1987a:70). Still, many of the same pipes are found across the sites. For example, in the Foundation Fill of 18BA313, “Peter Dorni” and “G 79 W. White Glasgow” stamped clay pipes were recovered, and the same pipes were found within the Barracks. The same pipes found at the different sites indicate that the residents were buying these pipes from the same store(s) and/or the stores were selling the same pipes.

Differences in form and symbolism point to the expression of different identities and illustrate class fragmentation and division. Some of the white clay pipe forms were associated with workers. Smoking pipes for the nineteenth-century working man had a smaller stem to reduce the load on the teeth while smoking and working and could be bought as such like the Scottish cutty or the Irish dudheen or altered after purchase (Ayto 2002:10). A cutty pipe even appears in a 1900 McDougall price list as Number 389-“Irish Workmen” (Gallagher 1987a:70; 1987b:147). Only at the Barracks between House 4 and 5 and House 5 were short-stemmed pipes recovered.

The symbolism on smoking pipes points to a similar division. The more skilled workers and landowners along Church Lane had pipes with American imagery (Figure 6.4). Lot 4 in the Icehouse Fill and Poe-Burns House North-yard privy and yard scatter had pipe bowls with an eagle clutching arrows and a raised federal shield. No such pipes are found at the Barracks, which was home to renting laborers. Instead, at least two pipe bowls adorned with “Home Rule,” both of which include harps with one with shamrocks as well were found in the stripping and outside of House 8 (Unit X4) (Figure 6.5). Another pipe with a harp and “Stewart Dublin” on the bowl was found outside of House
3 (Unit X1). Other pipes with Irish symbols are noted in the Ph. I and III excavation reports, but were not present in the collection. While the pipes with Irish symbols from the Barracks cannot be linked to the time of the fire, they were pipes from the Barracks and used by its occupants at some point in time.

Figure 6.4: Home Rule and Stewart Dublin pipe bowls from the Barracks.

Figure 6.5: Eagle and shield motif on smoking pipe bowls from the Icehouse Fill and Poe-Burns House.
The contrast between statements of American and Irish nationalism speaks to the class and status differentiation between the sites. The American imagery illustrates an investment in identity and a desire for full membership in American society while the “Home Rule” pipes and Irish symbolism denote a different identity. Towards the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the Home Rule campaign advocated for political and economic freedom along with Irish self-government (Brighton 2009:109). In the United States, the Home Rule movement also was linked to labor struggles (Foner 1978; Reckner 2004). Workers at the Barracks may have adopted such symbols as an expression of Irish heritage and/or in support of the labor movement. Unlike other sites with late nineteenth-century working-class Irish and Irish-Americans like Paterson, New Jersey, and the Five Points neighborhood in New York City (Brighton 2008; Reckner 2004), the sites in Texas do not show a mixing of these two different types of symbols. This division shows that class consciousness was fragmented and the depth of residential differentiation.

Other forms of tobacco consumption point to the same divide based on social differentiation. Chewing tobacco was seen as offensive to middle-class sensibilities in the Victorian era. Etiquette authorities turned respectability against this practice by the late nineteenth century. (Kasson 1990:126). The only evidence of chewing tobacco is from the presence of two spittoons from the Barracks, House 4 and between House 5 and 6. Such a practice would have alienated them from residents trying to cultivate respectability.
Dining Practices

Attention to notions of respectability and inclusion in society through consumption are seen in the ceramics and glassware used in dining from all the sites. Meals and the act of dining were one of core social rituals and its preparation required considerable amounts of labor in processing (Jameson 1987; Venable et al. 2000:20). The table manners learned at home were necessary for people to take their place in the wider society (Jameson 1987:65; Kasson 1990:194). Through repetition, manners would be become habit and associated with the natural act of eating and internalized as natural; one’s class position and prestige could then be seen by extension as natural (Kasson 1990:198).

Ideas of segmentation, separation, individualism, control, hierarchy, and consumption were naturalized in this setting and enabled the shift from a relationship of community to a relationship based on the logic of accumulation. The meal without the structured etiquette ran the risk of breaking down norms into collectivity and melting away the strictures of segmentation and individualism through fellowship (Kasson 1987:139-140). Such a collapse would subvert the social order and one’s place in it. Therefore, the dining rules needed to be followed with the appropriate material culture.

Victorian dining protocol as laid out in period etiquette books and popular women’s magazines stressed the need for separation and segmentation in the serving and consumption of food (Jameson 1987; Williams 1985:19). The meal allowed the ordering of a household’s world. The divisions necessary to aspire to gentility required an uncontaminated meal. Separation ensured purity and it was often the role of women to ensure this order, and thus the social order (Jameson 1987:64). For instance, different
wines were linked with various courses and had their own distinctly shaped glasses, and likewise, each individual needed his or her own individual settings and dining space (Jameson 1987:60). In this way, the meal served to transform, classify, and order the natural world.

This etiquette was not all or nothing. Gradations or levels of attention to these practices existed with a market to fill the void or fake it. In antebellum America, a market arose for such items, mass-produced imitations of costly luxuries, and by the second half of the nineteenth-century, the ceramics, glass, and silver industries catered to different tastes and budgets, expanded their business in the process (Kasson 1990:43,188). Mail-order catalogs also served this growing market.

The dining ritual changed as the prescribed style of dining service evolved over the nineteenth century. In the early nineteenth-century, the Old English style was the primary method for food service. Food was set in specific serving vessels on the table along with individual place settings (Williams 1985:150-151). Individual and specific dishes were needed. By the middle of the nineteenth-century, the service à la Russe or Russian service had become fashionable and became widespread by the end of the century (Jameson 1987:61-63; Venables et al. 2000:29-30). In the Russian service, decorative tableware and centerpieces were displayed on the table while the table was left cleared of serving dishes (Venables et al. 2000:29-30). Courses were taken to and from the table following a distinct order, making dinner resemble a drama (Kasson 1990:207). This led to a further individualization of the diner and an increase in table decoration (Jameson 1987:61).
Eventually, the strict formalism transitioned to a more casual dining movement in ordinary households by the 1920s and 1930s. This transition moved away from competition in the ability to follow formal rules. Instead, casual dining stressed a competition in the arena of commercialized leisure with social gatherings out of the house and sets of novelty dishes (Venables et al. 2000:21, 48). This competition also meant more rapid and regular consumption. The heirloom set remained popular in the 1920s, but smaller sets of tableware that were more easily purchased and replaced to stay in touch with the quicker changes in tabletop fashion became popular (Venables et al. 2000:65-66).

The tableware, teaware, and servingware, analyzed from several different dimensions, show the general emulation of Victorian dining practices across sites. First, the dining ritual seems to have become more important as other have noted archaeologically in the middle and second half of the nineteenth century (Brighton 2008; Wall 1991). Overtime, the ratio of teaware to tableware decreases suggesting that the ritual of the meal was increasing in importance to that of the formal tea ritual (Figure 6.6). The Icehouse Feature has a ratio of 74% teaware to 26% tableware, while the Barracks shows wide variability with House 2 at the lowest with a ratio of 38% teaware to 62% tableware and the highest in House 4 with a ratio of 77% teaware to 23% tableware. The average across the Barracks is even at a ratio of 50% teaware to 50% tableware. The later deposits of the Pit Feature in 18BA324 and the Foundation Fill are very small and not applicable but share the same ratio of 50% teaware to 50% tableware. The North Privy contained a small amount of only tableware as well.
Factoring in the glass tableware into this ratio produces a similar decreasing trend in the teaware-to-tableware ratio (Figure 6.7). With the glass tableware, the variation in this ratio between houses of the Barracks increases. The variability in the Barracks suggests differing levels of importance to the ritual of tea consumption or the ability to adhere to tableware dining rules. The population of the Barracks at the time of the fire included at least two African-American laborers. African Americans were being paid less than general laborers in the quarry industry at this time. The variation in the teaware-to-tableware ratio in the Barracks might reflect this inequality.

Figure 6.6: Ratio of teaware to tableware across all the sites.
Second, while the dining ritual grew in importance, the formality of the dining ritual shows a slight increase over time and wide variation (Figure 6.8). The adherence to the Russian style would have dictated using servingware and centerpieces. The Icehouse Fill contains the most servingware and a high ratio when compared to tableware. The later Foundation Fill contains a larger ratio of servingware to tableware but generally a small number of ceramics. The North Yard privy of the Poe-Burns Duplex and Pit Feature of the Tavern/Concannon House have no servingware, but small ceramic counts. The houses in the Barracks have a variable ratio of servingware to tableware and amounts, but generally low amounts of servingware. Five out of eight houses have a higher ratio of tableware to servingware than the Foundation Fill and Icehouse Fill.

Some of this variability is minimized when the form of vessels in the Barracks are examined. Few specialty forms of servingware are found at the Barracks. The
Barracks occupants may have used a few dishes to serve the food onto individual plates. Still, specialized vessels are found in the Barracks: a fragment of a decorative pressed glass vase or celery holder in House 3, porcelain egg cups in Houses 1 and 8, and butter pat plates in Houses 3 and 4. Specialized food service vessels allowed for complexity even if a family could not afford all the dishes needed for a multiple coursed meal (Venables et al. 2000:30). The presence of such dishes in homes with low servingware-to-tableware ratios demonstrate an effort to follow formal dining in some capacity as well as segment and individualize the elements of the meal and create a decorative dining experience.

The form and decoration of tableware and teaware also indicates a limited ability to follow the current ideal of dining. Matching ceramics are not present for most households though they were available. George Miller et al. (1994:238) notes that...
teaware and tableware were separate purchases for most consumers until the late
nineteenth century, when there were large sets that combined them. Ceramic would have
been purchased singularly or in some sets. The nearest comparable data set is that of the
Oregon Store account books which detail goods purchased on credit during the 1870s
into the 1890s in the store of the Ashland Iron Company in Oregon, about 3.8 miles
northwest of Texas. In the accounts examined, the servingware ceramics are purchased
one at a time. The plates and tumblers are purchased a half dozen at a time. Texas also
was near Baltimore, a major port and ceramic production center, so shopkeepers would
have had access to a wide range of ceramics.

All of the residents except for those of Lot 4 had few matching ceramics, based on
decoration and form, and used a miss-match of different sized and decorated vessels. The
residents of Lot 4 may have been able to purchase more than one vessel at a time, and
thus set their table and drink their teas closer to prescribed rules. The Foundation Fill
from the same lot has fewer vessels matched based on decoration and/or form, which
could be reflective of a number of possibilities. The vessels could represent the discards
of multiple neighboring households and do not accurately represent a household or the
sample is too small. More likely, the vessels represent the transition to more leisured
dining practices as several of the ceramics are later decoration styles such as decal-
printed.

Comparing these decoration and ware types across sites demonstrates the
division of consumption classes, and thus, residential hierarchy. The Icehouse Fill on Lot
4 had some older ceramics, such as the pearlware, but they also had styles more popular
styles at the time like molded white granites, transfer-printed whitewares, and flow blue
whitewares. Transfer-printed wares which saw a revival in the 1870s after falling out of popularity around the mid-century, remained popular until the use of decals in the early 1900s (Majewski and O’Brien 1987:145-147; Samford and Miller 2012). The higher-end white granites were used in the teaware along with a paneled flow-blue sugar bowl. Imported to the US since the 1840s, white granite, initially was more expensive than transfer-printed wares but cheaper by the 1860s. White granite increased in popularity by the 1850s, only declining in the 1880s according to invoices (Ewins 1997:32, 34, 48; Wetherbee 1996:2). White granite served as a cheap and durable substitute for the more high-end ceramics of the market consisting of French porcelains (Ewins 1997:46-49).

The tableware from the Icehouse Fill included cheaper blue shell-edged as well as transfer-printed and flow blue whiteware. The servingware was primarily platters and one bowl that were either plain or shell-edge whiteware. This edged ware was the cheapest decorated tableware for most of the nineteenth century (Miller 1991:6). If the residents of Lot 4 followed the Russian service, then these cheaper serving platters were not seen by guests and instead the resident could use their finer tableware and teaware.

Many of the ceramics in the houses of the Barracks are similar ware types and decoration styles as those in the Icehouse Fill, filled about thirty years earlier, and in the North Yard Privy. Only a few of the newer heavily decorated and molded whitewares and porcelains are found in the homes of the Barracks. Few of the gilded and flowered English semiporcelains that grew in popularity in the Victorian Era are found (Wetherbee 1980:120). The newer ceramics may have been saved from the fire, but it is unlikely to have such a range of ceramics and to not have been using them. Instead, the Barracks contained a wide range of dishes in many different styles and reflects the resident’s
acquisition of older, less popular but cheaper-priced pieces, such as the molded white granites and blue transfer-printed whitewares, many from the 1860s and 1850s respectively. A few Staffordshire potters were still producing lighter weight white granite after the 1891 McKinley Tariff Act, but generally they were offering toilet sets and hotel wares (Wetherbee 1980:120). Some of the other vessels in the Barracks were mass produced and inexpensive wares such as banded slipware or rockinghamware.

Likewise, in two of the residences along Church Lane, there were aspirations towards instilling individualism and proper behavior in children. Two children’s plates, one in the Mounted Camels pattern and one with the word “read,” were found in the Icehouse Fill and a mid-to-late nineteenth century context in the south yard of the Poe-Burns Duplex. Children’s wares were sold by the same methods as other inexpensive ceramics (Riley 1991:16). Still, these wares represent a specific expenditure that would have instilled individualism and sought to foster appropriate behavior.

By the time of the Foundation Fill, heavily decorated ceramics that were the style of the early twentieth century are the majority in the Fill. One such item typifies the creation of individualism and the ideology of consumerism. A decorated serving bowl from this fill contains the transfer-print image of Queen Louise of Prussia (Figure 6.9). The users of the bowl presumably would be looking at their own image reflected back. After they finished consuming, the image of a famous young queen, in a sense, would be their reflection. The individual or family’s consumption would lead them to images of royalty or class, youth, and beauty.
The ceramics point to a general trend towards following current dining practices—genteel than leisure dining habits, in the ratio of tableware to teaware, presence of specific-functioned vessels, and the ratio of servingware to tableware. This analysis is hampered by a relatively small ceramic assemblage from the sites, which has produced variability in the data, but the lack of matching ceramics in the Barracks as opposed to the Icehouse Fill explains the variation as more of a function of residential differentiation. A similar pattern was seen in Michael Lucas’ (1994) comparison of tableware from the household of a local businessman and from a boardinghouse in late nineteenth-century Harpers Ferry, West Virginia. Based on the vessel complexity and ware type, Lucas (1994:88-89) found that the businessman’s household was regularly adhering to formal dining rules while the boardinghouse switched between formal and less formal dining.
In general, the ceramics and glassware from all the sites illustrate attempts to adhere to period dining practices. These practices promoted the increasing segmentation of the family from other families through competition as well as the privatization of the family away from the community. Within the family, these dining practices fostered segmentation and dissolution of the family through individualism. At the same time, the practices led to more consumption and the reification of the autonomous family and autonomous individual.

The presence of knick-knacks further details attention to these notions of respectability. Knick-knacks or bric-a-brac have been studied in working-class households as efforts to construct identity and a respectable house and express tastes (Brighton 2008; Fitts 2001; Mullins 1998, 2002). Though they were relatively inexpensive, they would have had a role in the production of genteel subjectivity, creating the appearance of exoticism and affluence (Mullins 1998:26; 2002:164).

Knick-knacks were found at all of the sites and could have played a role in dinning as well. Figurines could be used as decorative centerpieces for families trying to follow the Russian dining service. While figurines were found in mixed contexts such as the Icehouse Fill and early twentieth-century contexts in the Poe-Burns House south yard, figurines and knick-knacks were also found in the Foundation Fill and Barracks Houses 4, 5, and 8, and between Houses 4 and 5. A number of porcelain figurines were found in mixed contexts of the rear yard of the Concannon/Tavern Site, including a gilded and painted porcelain figurine fragment in a level that cut into Features AH/Q/R. Figurines were an inexpensive way of crafting a respectable home that was attainable for the residents of all the sites.
Buttons and Patterns of Dress

The buttons mirror the same general pattern as the ceramics and glassware. Often overlooked (White 2008) but ubiquitous, buttons represent differentiation at the level of the household as well. Clothing, and thus buttons, show physical appearance which reflects personal and cultural ideas and individual, but more so, group identity (Cunnington 1964:8; Entwistle 2000:139; McCracken 1988:66-70; White 2008:17-18). Thus, buttons are both functional in their use in securing garments and communicating and expressing ideas. Buttons also represent much of the only evidence of the dress of the individuals in a household as virtually no fragments of clothing were recovered archaeologically from Texas. Clothing and cloth were purchased locally and advertised for sale by stores within the town.

The buttons indicate the efforts of individuals within a household to differentiate themselves while following appropriate standards of dress. Fashionable clothing could serve to enhance an individual’s social capital, but was mainly accessible to the middle and upper classes during the nineteenth century (Crane 2000:94). No particular working-class dress code is visible, instead, differences were apparent in quality or condition rather than style (Blumin 1989:141-143).

The buttons exhibit a general increase in individualism through the use of decorated dress. The analysis examined 413 buttons, of which 118 (29%) were decorated, 288 (70%) were undecorated, and 7 (2%) were classified as other. The Barracks provides eight separate households with varying percentages of decorated buttons ranging from 16% decorated in House 2 to 44% decorated in House 7 (Figure
6.10). The average for the Barracks is 27% of the buttons being decorated with all but three houses (Houses 2, 4, and 7) being + or – four percentage points from this mean.

![Figure 6.10: Buttons classified by decorated or non-decorated in the Barracks.](image1)

![Figure 6.11: Buttons classified by decorated or non-decorated across the sites.](image2)
The North privy buttons (30% decorated and 70% undecorated) and Icehouse Fill buttons (29% decorated and 71% decorated) are at or within one percentage point of the average across the sites (Figure 6.11). The Pit Feature is lower (25% decorated and 75% decorated) but the sample size (n=4) is too small to be representative. The Barracks showed some outliers as well but the average for the houses was within two percentage points from the mean between of all the sites. The only other later site context is the fill from the Foundation in Lot 4 with the second highest percentage of decorated buttons (38% decorated and 62% undecorated). Either the Foundation Fill is an unrepresentative sample or it shows an increase in concern for ornate attire over time. The latter is more applicable based on the results of the ceramic analysis.

The buttons also represent attempts to emulate current styles. Black was a popular color. According to etiquette books in the second half of the nineteenth century, a married woman was supposed to wear darker and richer colors, and lavishly trimmed outfits, but when she grew older she should dress more quietly in grey or black because black was seen as economical and dignified (Byrde 1992:118-119). The ideal gentleman was to assume the appearance of a “solid, substantial, inexpressive businessman” with a somber colored wardrobe, with men’s formal coats in black by the 1850s (Hughes and Lester 2010:xxii; Kasson 1990:118). All houses in the Barracks had black glass buttons that would have imitated more expensive jet which came in vogue in the 1860s and would have been for women’s clothing. Black rubber buttons also were found in half of the houses of the Barracks (Houses 1, 5, 6, and 7) as well as the North privy, Foundation Fill, and Icehouse Fill.
Other buttons styles were found. In all the houses of the Barracks, Foundation Fill, and North Yard privy, colored or painted prosser buttons were found, some with transfer prints (Houses 6 and 8 of the Barracks, and North Yard privy). The Icehouse Fill had brass and inlaid colorful buttons, but no colored prosser buttons. Gilt buttons or brass buttons with a thin layer of gilt were made between 1800 and 1865 and perhaps were worn by women when men stopped wearing fancy buttons (Luscomb 2006:79).

Assuming the use of the buttons on garments is consistent with the period, a basic analysis of color suggests that in all of the houses adult married men and/or women wore respectable dress in their use of black buttons, whether glass or rubber. At the Barracks, the decorated black glass buttons would have been worn by women, or perhaps children, and were an inexpensive means of fancy display on somber colored outfits. The trend in the buttons in the Barracks mirrors the buttons of mill workers at Lowell some of which were imitations of more expensive buttons (Mrozowski et al. 1996; Ziesing 1989, 1991).

The trend for jet and black glass buttons may have been too late to show up in the contexts of the Icehouse and North Yard privy. More expensive buttons, such as a marbled Norwalk pottery button in the Icehouse Fill as well as gilt copper buttons and a copper button with a blue glass inset in the Foundation Fill would have been worn by women in the second half of the nineteenth century and considered fancy buttons. The colorful prosser buttons in the Foundation Fill and Barracks fit with colored or colorful clothing and efforts to stand out or also could have been used in children’s clothing. Prosser buttons came in different colors and were also given transfer-print decorative patterns, known as calicoes, that were intended to better match fabric (Luscomb 2006:31). Overall, the main difference between the buttons is in quality and thus,
reflective of social differentiation. Though the analysis is limited, the buttons show that all the houses adhered to notions of display and respectability with differing abilities, which in turn, fostered residential differentiation.

*Health and Hygiene*

The larger pattern of residential differentiation is apparent in the material culture of medicine and hygiene. Health and hygiene is the intersection where the harsh conditions of the industrial town interfaced with concerns for safety and the prescribed notions of gentility. By the middle of the nineteenth-century, cleanliness was valued as a mark of betterment and moral superiority—a mark of “control, spiritual refinement, breeding” while a dirty and offensive smelling person was seen as degraded and “vulgar, coarse and animalistic” (Bushman and Bushman 1988:1228). Without aspiring to regimes of cleanliness, one could not be a part of the middle and upper classes (Bushman and Bushman 1988:1231).

The industrial conditions in Texas made it harder for Texans to sustain these standards or even levels of good health, and thus, imposed a level of residential differentiation on the residents of Texas, especially in relation to their proximity to industry. The gradual deterioration of the environment and health conditions with industrial capitalism has been noted in other industrial towns as well (Mrozowski 2006).

The use of toiletry and hygiene-related items show an attention to Victorian notions of cleanliness and sanitation (Bushman and Bushman 1988; Majewski and Schiffer 2001:45). Not until the 1850s did regular washing become a routine embraced by a large percentage of middle-class households, and the basin, pitcher, and washstand
had become standard in middle-class bedrooms (Bushman and Bushman 1988:1225). Cleanliness became a big business, requiring the necessary material culture from washstands to house cleaning to yard improvements (Bushman and Bushman 1988:1232-1233).

Texans participated in this market and discipline. Beyond chamber pots, a few toiletry specific ceramics were found though no complete sets were recovered. The toiletry set was a necessary item in a respectable home. In House 1 of the Barracks, a banded shaving mug was found and in House 7, several toiletry items of at least three sets were found. A wash pitcher was found in the House 4 and 8, a wash basin in the Foundation Fill, and a wash pitcher and basin in the Icehouse Fill. The assemblage in House 7 is an outlier or belonged to Ella Ward, who was more likely to have had several toiletry sets. The presence of toiletry items indicates participation in Victorian hygiene practices, but the small amount from each site is a sign of the lack of resources to devote to the purchase of full or larger sets.

Another personal hygiene item that was ubiquitous was the toothbrush.

Toothbrushes were required for membership in gentile society. Further, toothbrushes required regular and systematic use, enforcing personal discipline and creating the individual through this habit (Shackel 1993:21). Unfortunately, the bone toothbrushes found at the Concannon/Tavern site were in mixed contexts as were the bone toothbrushes of the Foundation Fill and Lot 5 yard and the stripping artifacts of the Barracks and just outside of the Barracks. Brushes were found in the Icehouse Fill, the Poe-Burns North Yard privy, Barrack Houses 4, 6, and 7 (n=2) and between Houses 5 and 6 and 6 and 7. This aspect of personal and individual hygiene seems to be common
across sites and would have been an easy and cheap hygiene practice. Inexpensive toothbrushes for the general public were being produced after the Civil War (Mattick 1993:165).

Efforts to conform to health standards and mitigate the effects of industry and crowded conditions in town were seen across the sites as well. Bone lice combs were recovered from the Concannon/Tavern Pit Feature, North Yard privy of the Poe-Burns House, and the Icehouse Fill as well as House 4 of the Barracks. The large number of people, including boarders, in many of these houses would have helped spread lice and other parasites and would have made control very difficult (Buxton 1940:603).

The medicine recovered show disparities in health care that conforms to the pattern of residential differentiation across the sites. Medicine during the nineteenth century included physician or druggist prescribed medicines or ethical medicines, proprietary medicines, and home remedies. With a lack of floral data, home remedies consisting of plants are largely absent from the sample. Other medicines were available including homeopathic medicine as documented in a 1937 Slave Narrative (Works Progress Administration 2006:14-15).

Physicians were part of the health and hygiene of the town’s residents. The town had some access to doctors. A doctor lived near York Road outside of town and doctors worked at the Almshouse and likely saw patients from Texas. According to Baltimore County’s first directory in 1866 (Hollifield 1979), John Galloway was a physician in the area. A Dr. Joseph Galloway attended a burn victim in Texas in 1880 (The Baltimore Sun May 28, 1880). Further, the railroad had a local doctor on call. The regularity to which the residents saw the doctors is unclear. Texans probably tried to avoid physicians
at the almshouse as much as possible if they could avoid it. Reports throughout the second half of the nineteenth century detail overcrowding at the Almshouse built in 1872 and deplorable conditions in the twentieth century (Baltimore Sun December 7, 1929; Reports of the Lunacy Commissions 1897:22, 1901:24; State Board of Charities and Reform 1878:10).

Residential differentiation existed between the Barracks and the occupants of sites along Church Lane and shows up in the medicinal bottles, signaling a different approach and/or access to health care. Proprietary drugs are protected by secrecy, copyright, or patent against competition while ethical drugs were sold by a doctor’s prescription (Fike 1987:3). Proprietary medicines remained popular into the twentieth century even in the face of new regulations, such as the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906 (Armstrong and Armstrong 169-171). Proprietary medicines or possible proprietary medicines were found at all the sites (Figure 6.12). The few medicinal bottles include basic remedies associated with: constipation, such as castor oil and citrate of magnesia or indigestion and headache, such as Bromo-Seltzer. House 3 included a fragment of Ely’s Cream balm for hayfever and catarrh (Fike 1987:19). The other more serious medications point to stress and pressure and sanitation. Theses medicines include the Injection Brou for genital diseases, St. Drake’s Plantation Bitters—advertised as a tonic, appetizer, and stimulant (38.2% alcohol), B. L. Fahnestock’s Vermifuge worm remedy, and the highly addictive and potentially lethal Godfrey’s cordial for infants and children (Fike 1987:33, 161, 168; T. E. C. 1970).

Ethical medication bottles are found in the Icehouse Fill, Foundation Fill, and North privy, but not in the Barracks. This difference may reflect a disparity in access, the
ability to see doctors or medication, or preference to see doctors. These difference fit with the general pattern of residential differentiation in Texas and across these sites. Without access to doctors even though doctors were just outside of town, the health of the workers and the families at the Barracks would have been affected, reinforcing residential differentiation.

![Figure 6.12: Number of Proprietary and Ethical Medicines from all sites.](image)

*Residential Differentiation*

The medicinal bottles, alcohol, ceramics, and pipe symbols highlight a division between the residents of the Barracks and the residents of the homes along Church Lane. This divide is based on skilled and unskilled labor and owner/ground renter and renter. Owners/ground renters on Church Lane were invested in private property and the residents of the Barracks did not own their own homes and were less invested in the community. Only one of the names of the occupants of the Barracks at the time of the fire is present in the Barracks in the 1880 US Federal Census. Most of the occupants at
the time of the fire disappear from the town and area by the 1900 US Federal Census, three years after the fire. Most of the residents of the Barracks in the 1890s must have been transient laborers, moving from one job to another (Montgomery 1987:87).

As renters, the Barrack’s residents were less vested financially in the community. The fact that they did not see doctors is one more line of evidence for their marginalization beyond that of their wages and opportunities. They may have viewed the town and industry unfavorably and had the freedom to move elsewhere for work or felt isolated from the community. The destruction of the Barracks and the general concern with saving their possessions rather than the Barracks also indicate a strong disinvestment.

The pattern of residential differentiation of the community and anti-Catholic and anti-Irish sentiment had significantly decreased by the 1890s. This change allowed workers more freedom of movement and the ability to shift jobs. This change reflects why only one member of the sixteen households of the Barracks in 1880 is still present in the Barracks at the time of the fire. Ella Ward’s improvement of the Barracks in 1896 from a sixteen to eight-house rowhouse was as an effort to attract workers to a horrible location and industry with the promise of more space.

The disinvestment and dissatisfaction also explains the labor movement in Texas in the 1880s. Like much of the country at this time, Texas saw labor unrest. In the 1887 and 1888, laborers working as lime burners struck for higher wages (The Baltimore Sun May 4, 1887; Weeks 1888:79). While no known union operated in Texas, the closest organization was the Quarryman’s Union and Beneficial Society, founded in 1868, and which paid disability benefits and likely operated as beneficial society (St. Joseph Church
1977:8). A 350-member assembly of the Knights of Labor did meet in Texas during the year of strike in 1887 (The Catonsville Argus April 30, 1887).

While there is a pattern of residential differentiation, the homes all show attention to and participation in notions of respectability and desire for inclusion in wider society. People consumed to gain this status. The ideals provided ways to segment the community and family and foster individualism and competition rather than solidarity. People had to consume because they were divorced from their own production. People were locked into wage labor to satisfy their needs and demands, which perpetuated the system. The artifacts then represent material commodities in a worldwide capitalist process that structure relations conducive to production and consumption.

By the 1880s, the privatization of the family had put responsibility on the family not the community. The community was no longer seen as a problem or in need of isolation. The Maryland Journal (June 19, 1886) details the hamlet of Texas as having “a reputation for peace and quietness which cannot be fairly assailed, and the average resident is of that urbane deportment which accords with the general social qualities of the humble artisan or peaceful tiller of the soil, but that there is some unhappiness engendered in some families…” Besides mischaracterizing the mode of production to paint a picture of autonomy, hard work, and creativity, the article squarely blames nonconformity and ungratefulness, and thus, responsibility on the family. The family was reproducing the appropriate class of labor, not the community anymore.

At the end of this period, the industry and Texas underwent a transition. By the 1890s, Texas was still burning limestone, but at much smaller amounts and with smaller local operations. However, larger corporations with operations in other areas of
Maryland had started to invest in operations in Texas. They used mechanization and technology and started to not burn the limestone. The new operations did not need a large workforce. This transition in the industry greatly impacted what had been its source of labor, the town.

**The Decline of Texas and a New Industry, 1890s to the 1930s**

The 1890s saw the continue decline of industry in Texas as well as a gradual depopulation. The town saw buildings destroyed and only one home built after this period. While the quarry industry began to be consolidated and mechanized, other industries filled the vacuum. They represented new spatial forms of capital accumulation, taking advantage of a ready reserve of workers. Generally, labor became less and less skilled in the United States; a pattern evident in Texas. Even the building stone quarries were having trouble. Though they reinvested capital, during this period, they faced national competition. By the 1930s, only one local operator was still burning lime and the Beaver Dam quarry was soon to close.

Spatially, the lack of investment in the town and smaller population saw the destruction of homes. The ground rents never increased from their original terms, making ownership of the land less of an investment. Further, with the compression of time by new forms of transportation, the benefit of having a local work force decreased. The proximity of industry to the homes along the railroad tracks now overrode their value to the industry and homeowners. This transition is seen in their destruction and homeowners leaving or renting out their properties, including all of the sites in this study that had not burned down. The 1900 US Federal Census shows a town fractured over
three enumeration districts. The census also shows a significant rise in the employment of single women as employment in the quarries and kilns decreased and the workforce expanded into new industries and further outside of Texas.

At this time, the labor movement was still growing rapidly nationally (Cohen 1979; Dubofsky 1994). Laborers had successfully struck in 1887 as the industry was waning. Yet new mechanized and large scale operations were growing. This new iteration of industry needed a small but cheap workforce, and since the Irish and Irish-American were more accepted in mainstream society, the industry sought out a new exploitable population, African Americans. From the 1900s to the 1930s, many freed slave families emigrated to the north and north-central states seeking employment and economic security as wage laborers in major cities (Jones 1991: 202-204). Baltimore saw large waves of African Americans migrating from the South, and the industry began to use more and more African Americans in the quarry industry.

A similar pattern of residential differentiation and prejudice occurred as it had with the Irish sixty years earlier for the sake of the industry and its need for cheap labor. African Americans who had lived with whites around the turn of the century, but generally along the railroad, came to live on the west side of the railroad. The conditions of this housing was labeled a slum in the 1940s.

The power of the State was needed again to enable exploitation and segregation. Differentiation was legitimized at the Federal, State, and City governments with segregation laws. At least one housing covenant by the Catholic Church forbade African-Americans from living on Church Lane. Another source of labor around the turn of the century were Italians immigrants who were also considered cheap labor though not to the
same degree as African Americans. Religion allowed Italians to become a part of the community though African Americans seemed to have remained segregated from the town. Alcohol is blamed again in newspaper articles and used as an excuse to stereotype and marginalize African Americans in a similar manner as they did the Irish in the 1850s. In the later version, the Irish-descendants are the honorable members of the town and African Americans are the rowdy and drunk. Italians did not appear in these articles because they did not need to be marginalized to the same degree.

The artifacts for this period are limited, consisting of the small assemblages of the Pit Feature of the Tavern/Concannon House and the Foundation Fill of Lot 4. Most of the artifact categories have already been discussed though alcohol bottles show the continuing trend of privatization of the family and further dissolution of the community. They also show how strict regulations of behavior began to shift to ensure production. Around the turn of the nineteenth century, the commercial needs of gratification and self-indulgence needed the removal of moral and social restraints and by the early twentieth century, with gentility being now seen as “excessive conventionality, false delicacy, and exaggerated refinement” (Kasson 1990:34, 258). While women, the working classes, and ethnic groups grew in their importance as consumers of these products, the class and social segmentation persisted except under the appearance of sectors of national markets (Kasson 1990:258).

Alcohol Consumption

The alcohol bottles recovered from this period show increased consumption and a completely different pattern than the last period. The Foundation Fill and Pit Feature contain much larger amounts of alcoholic beverages and of beer and liquor as well as a
piece of stemware in the Foundational Fill. The Fill could have been empty bottles from the taverns though the bottle could have been returned to the bottler or brewer especially if consumed within the tavern. The tavern was more likely to return the bottles than a consumer (Busch 1987:72). Situated near the station along the rail line, the tavern had easy access to ship these bottles back, especially as many of the bottles from this fill were lager beer bottles of the local Baltimore breweries of George-Bauernschmidt-Strauss and Fred Bauernschmidt. Thus, the bottles were more likely from home consumption and reflect subsequent discard.

More drinking at home would mean less drinking in the taverns. For the unskilled laborers increasingly occupying this space along the railroad, this consumption pattern meant an increasing privatization of the family and dissolution of the community. Chances for class solidarity would have been further minimized, and if workers were not Catholic, they would have had little tie to the social venues of the town and the community itself.

This data coupled with ceramics from these features show the privatization of the family and individualism that was necessary to make compliant and dependent workers as well as consumers. The privatization of the family worked against the community, and individualism came to identify with money power at the expense of the family and its bonds. The family faded as the central source for the transmission of specific, class-based values and skills (Coontz 1988:332, 336). This transition shifted power and control away from the family to the state, institutions, and ultimately the market or the logic of accumulation. The pressure on the family was noted by religious institutions and
seen in the sermons of the Church in Texas in the first quarter of the twentieth-century, which call for the preservation, and sanctity of the family.

_Catholic and Political Identity_

The Church meanwhile had expanded outside of Texas and was growing. Though Catholic medals were found in the yard areas, the community did not solely represent the Church anymore. The population included more unskilled labor that was not Catholic or strictly aligned as Catholic. This fact is characterized by one artifact. A Hoover campaign badge was found in the rear yard area of the southern half of the Poe-Burns House. Herbert Hoover was the successful 1928 Republican Candidate for President running against the Democratic Candidate, Al Smith. If the ribbon belonged to the occupants of the southern half of the duplex, they would have gone against the Democratic Party and a Catholic candidate of Irish descent. Twenty-six years earlier and a few doors down, Edward Doyle was involved in the Democratic Party, and a few years earlier a large open air meeting was held in Texas for a Democratic executive committee candidate (_The Baltimore Sun_ October 22, 1894).

_The Rise of the Quarry Industry and Removal of Texas, 1930s to the Present_

The history of Texas after the 1930s was based on a new mode of production, an increasingly mechanized quarry operation. Limestone was no longer burned but instead removed in larger and large quantities. The requirement for the quarry was less and less man power and more and more space. At least by the 1960s if not earlier, workers were being bused in to work. The current industry needs only a handful of workers.
The industry continued to expand and become consolidated, finally at a global scale. Because of competition and the conditions of class struggle, capitalism is technologically dynamic, but this innovation devalues and/or destroys labor skills and past investments (Harvey 1992:105-106). The town of Texas was one such built investment in the way of the expanding quarry. The other institution that had been reliant on the industry and the workers and their families was the Church. The Church’s community had become established and financially stable as well and moved beyond Texas and did not need the community either.

The power base that was crucial for legitimizing new spatial forms of accumulation was the State, which was needed for the quarry industry to expand. Harvey (1989:118) notes that one of the contradictions of residential differentiation is the formation of community consciousness. Though this community consciousness replaces and thus, masks a class consciousness, it also possibly engenders community bonding that can impede future capital accumulation. To allow for new spatial configurations, the community must be disrupted. The State provides the authority and legitimacy to do such actions or sanction them.

In Texas, the value of industry and the mode of production were never questioned and the industry and later other commercial industries eventually distanced themselves from the town, because they did not need it except for its land. The need for new spatial configurations of accumulation meant that the value of the quarry industry and new development was weighed against the value of the town. The result of this comparison can be seen in the destruction of the town by legal methods and illegal methods that were sanctioned as there was little penalty for the offenders.
Eminent domain and removal were used to redefine space, a space that was continual devalued based on the logic of accumulation. Starting in the 1930s, Israel Berlin likely burnt down his businesses, the Empire Furniture Plant and his four-story building in the center of town, likely for the insurance money. The court endorsed this activity by sending the African-American watchman to jail for the burning of the plant though he claimed Berlin had paid him and instructed him to light the fire.

Throughout the rest of the century, building after building was destroyed to make way for new forms of capital accumulation. African-American housing in Texas was labeled a slum and was set up to be removed. Disinvestment and neglect of the town by industry and the State led to demolition by neglect. By the 1950s, portions of the town along the tracks were in disrepair. Church Lane was described by a reporter as looking as though it had been shelled by heavy artillery (Bertram 1954).

This process has continued in more recent years. In 1980, Texas was deleted from a list of neighborhoods slated to receive community development funds for projects such as sidewalks, storm drains, park and recreation facilities, and road improvements (The Baltimore Sun December 4, 1980). The infrastructure for new forms of capital accumulation also required space. The 1986 Section 4(F) of the National Transportation Act of 1966 assessment details the historic properties that might be impacted by the extension and widening of Beaver Dam Road and later the Light Rail. The impact to the standing properties on the east side of the railroad, including the Poe-Burns House, McDermott’s Tavern, Concannon House, and Gagliano House, was deemed unavoidable because the roadway could not be shifted east due to the quarry, its railway spur, and the Genstar calcite processing building which would have cost several millions dollars to
move according to EA Associates (1986:3-8). The quarry was weighed as more valuable than the buildings of the workers and their heritage as well as the tavern that still functioned as a center of community bonding. The buildings could have been moved to the east as suggested by the report, but they were not. Essentially Texas became a non-place when balanced against the logic of accumulation as it was not needed by industry and no longer defined by it, but instead removed by it.

Summary

Employing David Harvey’s theoretization of the urbanization of capital allows for understanding of capital’s operation in everyday life in Texas. The logic of accumulation can be seen to play apart in structuring every aspect of life through residential differentiation and the interactions of the bases of consciousness—the State, community, family, class, and individualism. Changes to the industry in Texas saw shifts and different alignments in these bases. Through this conceptualization, it is possible to see how the exploitative relations of capitalism could be established, perpetuated, and then renewed in new forms.

In Texas, a community was built around a hazardous and deadly quarry industry that fueled the wider expansion of industry. The landscape was structured in such a way to ensure control, segmentation, and stratification of an already marginalized population, Irish immigrants. While the landscape and employment offered opportunity to the Irish, the landscape and employment were investment vehicles for seeking the maximization of profit.
The community was divided based on class with this identity gradually obscured more and more with status and consumption differences. Dining patterns represented by ceramics and glassware, drinking patterns represented by alcohol bottles, patterns of dress and respectability seen with buttons and knick-knacks, and hygiene practices represented toiletry items, lice combs, and toothbrushes show similar notions of respectability and inclusion in society. These practices also fostered an ideology of individualism and a privatized the family that based value in terms of the logic of accumulation while creating consumption classes to absorb surplus production.

The everyday practices also show a difference in the ability to adhere to these norms caused by residential differentiation. Unequal access to resources would have affected one’s ability to follow these ideals. This differentiation was seen in all the artifact categories except for uniform buttons and smoking pipes. Residential differentiation explains the lack of ethical bottles in the Barracks suggesting the inability to see doctors, which would have compounded the effects of the residential differentiation. Divergences fostered by residential differentiation are seen in the symbols of group identity or affiliation such as symbols on smoking pipes and uniform buttons. These identities would have served to fragment class consciousness and demonstrate competing goals of inclusion and citizenship and equality in the workplace.

The sites of social interaction and bonding in the community were the tavern and Catholic Church. The tavern served as a potentially dangerous space for industry and was attacked by the Church and Victorian ideals and was used to marginalize the workers. Still, the tavern remained a social institution until the 1990s though over time
the privatization of the family eroded the degree of community bonding and levelling at
the taverns.

The Church, supported by industry, served as the social, spiritual, and educational
life of the community, and it too was the subject of attack by nativist and anti-Catholic
rhetoric in an effort to marginalize the community and workforce. In order to gain
inclusion in American society, the Church promoted Victorian values aligned to
individualism and segmentation, and thus, social relations conducive to the industry. The
religious medals also show devotional practices that would have promoted individualism
and the acceptance of one’s exploitation.

Overall, the success of capitalism’s process in Texas is seen in the continued
existence of the industry and wage labor and the dissolution of the community. The role
of the State was to ensure the success of capitalism. The State enabled the creation of the
industry and community over the old plantation system. When the industry shifted at the
end of the nineteenth century, the State ensured and legitimized the exploitation of
another group of workers, African Americans. Finally, when mechanization and large
scale quarry operations demanded space and other new spatial forms of accumulation
were available, the State legitimized the destruction of the community consciousness and
the town when the workforce, and thus, the town was not needed.

The complex material pattern of this process and its disastrous effects are present
archaeologically. Harvey provides a theoretical framework to understand this process, its
ideology, and how it played out at the site level in the social, economic, and political
aspects of everyday life. The final chapter concludes with a summary and some general
observations of this study and its applicability to a historical archaeology of capitalism and the present.
CHAPTER 7
Conclusion: From Urbanized Capital to Texas to the Present

This dissertation has demonstrated the strength and relevance of using David Harvey’s theoretization of the urbanization of capital to understand industrial capitalism. Industrial capitalism has shaped the history of the world over the last two hundred years, structuring and impacting all elements of life. Texas is one local example and a short span of that history. The material and spatial record of Texas provides evidence of the process of capitalism.

Historical archaeology has been unable to detail fully capitalism and its history because it has lacked an applicable perspective. The priority given to space as an essential component of this process has been not been adopted in historical archaeology either. Harvey’s theoretization provides historical archaeology with a conceptualization of the entire capitalist process and the apparatus in which to contextualize the workings of capitalism at the site level and use sites to explain the present.

The study of Texas through this lens has shown how to overcome these limitations. Four sites within Texas were examined as they spanned much of the history of the town and industry from their beginning in the 1840s to the more recent decline of the town and expansion of industry. These sites, including the Poe-Burns, Tavern/Concannon, 18BA313, and Barracks, represented different segments of the working-class population of Texas and offered a unique data set within a bounded community to explore the material and spatial signature of class differentiation.

A range of artifacts from the sites were used to demonstrate how Harvey’s abstract theories could be successfully applied to a material data set to shed light on the
daily lives of Texans and the influence of industry and capitalism. The ceramic and glass tableware, teaware, and servingware, hygiene items, alcohol bottles, smoking pipes, and personal items were selected because they are durable artifact groups and found across the sites. Placed within the social history of the Victorian era and industrial capitalism, the consumption of these goods was not the result of free, autonomous choice, but of values conducive to industry. The Victorian ideal of respectability characterized the bulk of the social practices and rituals. Understood through the five bases of consciousness formation—the State, community, family, class, and individualism, the ideals of this period entrained social relations and thinking conducive to the quarry industry and the logic of accumulation.

Over the nineteenth century, the United States became increasingly industrialized. This transition entailed huge amounts of human labor and saw the spread of wage labor and work conditions deteriorate. Texas was one such location where a town was built to serve the dangerous industry and investment opportunities. Initially, the landscape was constructed to segment and control an exploitable and expendable immigrant population, the Irish, for the quarry industry.

The materials consumed by the residents were efforts to adhere to notions of respectability and gain acceptance in wider society. These practices also aided social division and the fragmentation of class consciousness reinforcing residential differentiation inside and outside the town. The material practices and rituals of the Victorian then later the Progressive eras also cultivated individualism and a privatization of the family based on the logic of accumulation while creating consumption classes to absorb surplus production. This value structure worked against family, class, and
community bonds by presenting the individual and/or family as autonomous and eventually beholden to the market. The State legitimized this position and values.

At all the sites, the material points to this ideology at work. Dinning practices segmented and separated the family entraining this discipline in members of the household. The hygiene items reinforced the discipline of the individual, while documenting the harshness of the industry and conditions of the town and the lengths to which Texans had to go to meet hygiene standards. Buttons similarly show attention to notions of respectability. A material difference in the ability to adhere to these norms caused by residential differentiation, mainly between the workers of the Barracks and the workers near Church Lane, is apparent. Disparities in resources led to a social differentiation viewed as status rather than as a class divide.

Alcohol bottles and smoking pipe forms and symbols show class fragmentation and the desire for inclusion, equality, and citizenship. Workers close to Church Lane were more vested as home owners and consumed alcoholic beverages that were deemed more acceptable and used pipes with American symbols. The workers of the Barracks as renters were more transient and consumed alcoholic beverages that were less accepted as respectable or cheaper and chewed tobacco which was reviled. Some smoking pipes from the Barracks contained Irish symbolism that is linked both to Irish nationalism and the US labor movement. Residential differentiation was reinforced and compounded in the lack of access to doctors noted by the paucity of ethical bottles in the Barracks.

Beyond the industry, the primary institutions were the tavern and Church. The tavern afforded a space for bonding and egalitarianism and was a threat to the industry and was attacked by the Church and Victorian ideals. The tavern remained a social venue
until recently though individualism and the privatization of the family counteracted bonding.

The other social venue, the Church, was the social, spiritual, and educational center of the community. Throughout the nineteenth century, the Church was supported by industry. In order to gain acceptance in American society, the Church promoted Victorian values aligned to individualism and segmentation. The religious medals also show devotional practices that promoted individualism and the Church’s position.

The quarry industry underwent transitions that match the wider cycles and crises of capitalism. Texans found employment increasingly beyond the quarry industry and town. In the first quarter of the twentieth century, African Americans were the source of cheap quarry labor. With the consolidation of industry at the turn of the century, new industries and development began to fill the void, but many industries did not last the economic crises of the first half of the twentieth century. Both the Church and industry did last and eventually outgrew the town and the need for a local population. This transition to new spatial forms of accumulation has seen the destruction of the town legitimized by the State.

The success of the capitalist process is seen in the perpetuation of the industry going from a labor intensive operation that killed or injured workers and townspeople to a heavily mechanized and large scale operation with the need for large amounts of capital and space but few workers. During this slow 170-year transition, social relations and an entire town were realigned to maximize production and deal with the crises of overaccumulation. The logic of accumulation defined the value of relations and even justified the destruction of the town and people.
Harvey’s theoretization also highlighted the inherent contradictions of this process. These contradictions showed efforts to confront some of these realities, foster class consciousness, and even address the industry. The community consciousness that masked class consciousness also served to inhibit capitalism’s expansion and may have been fostered in the social spheres of the community, the Church, and taverns.

The continued expansion and subsequent new spatial forms of accumulation are often accomplished through violence and destruction to move beyond these contradictions and crises (Harvey 1989). Demolition of the built landscape has served this purpose. A Texas resident noted, “‘The old ones are all gone, and the young ones don’t know anything.’ Their difficulty in remembering what used to be may stem from the fact that, once a section of the town fell to outside forces of change, it was completely obliterated” (Orrick 1987).

The material and spatial record of this process remains in Texas. Historical archaeology as a study of capitalism is charged with studying the record, which exists archaeologically, to understand this inherently spatial process. Such an examination entails employing a complex and totalizing theory that allows for an explanation of the abstract process on the ground day after day. This theoretization permits sites and their occupants to be situated and studied relationally and within fields of power and ideology to be seen in everyday practices. Space is viewed as playing an active part instead of being ignored as simply a neutral setting, which masks inequity as natural.

Privileging class over other social relations shows the workings of this dynamic and the pervasive and insidious nature of capitalism, all based on the exploitation of workers and the generation of a surplus from that relationship. A historical archaeology
of capitalism has to study capitalism in this manner to understand how such a process has operated in the past or it risks participating in naturalizing social differentiation and inequity. Far from being limiting, this perspective provides infinite avenues from which to examine daily life without minimizing or simplifying the unequal system that characterizes today’s capitalist world.

Understanding the operation of the capitalist process in Texas shows how this process has worked at the local level. From such a study, people in the past and their actions can be studied in context. The contradictions of this process in the past provide avenues to find ways to contest the devastation of this process. The pertinence of such a critique is found in the present. The rapid pace of change of today’s world is now accepted as an attribute of modernism and the modern world and has led to fragmentation, ephemerality, and chaotic change (Harvey 1992:11). This increased and frantic pace means that it is even more relevant to understand this process and its practice at the many levels in which it operates and then find ways to contest it.

As more studies in historical archaeology approach the study of the modern world using Harvey’s theorization, a more nuanced perspective on capitalism and its pervasiveness will be gained in different contexts. Comparison of these studies will provide a richer understanding of the different ways capitalism works in local material contexts and has impacted people’s lives all over the globe in the past and in the present. This study represents a beginning in this effort.
Appendix A
Baltimore County District 8 Tax Assessments
### 1876 Tax Assessment

#### Lot 4, Division 9 (18BA313)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assessed Value ($)</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assessed Value ($)</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assessed Value ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Lot 1 (18 ft. by 100 ft.)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Lot (25 ft. by 100 ft.)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store goods</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lot 2 (25 ft. by 94 ft.)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 3 (67 ft. by 94 ft.)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hogs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>furniture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>330</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>592</strong></td>
<td><strong>265</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Lots 1 and 2, Division 9 (18BA325)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomas Kelly</th>
<th>Assessed Value ($)</th>
<th>Abigail Burns</th>
<th>Assessed Value ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot (32 ft. by 153 ft.)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2 Lots and Houses</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>390</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>425</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Lot 5, Division 9 (18BA313)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomas Keating</th>
<th>Assessed Value ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot (32 ft. by 200 ft.)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Yearling</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lots 1 and 2, Division 2 (18BA314)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assessed Value ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land on Chestnut Ridge (503 acres)</td>
<td>7,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land in Texas (19 acres)</td>
<td>6,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Mules</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Horses</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cows, 2 Hogs</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Wagons</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Carts, 1 Buggy</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry tools</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18,585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1896 Tax Assessment

#### Lot 4, Division 9 (18BA313)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Margaret Connor</th>
<th>Edward Doyle</th>
<th>Mary Kilroy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot (17 ft. by 100 ft.)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 (18 ft. by 150 ft.)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2 (25 ft. by 94 ft.)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3 (67 ft. by 94 ft.)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Lots 1 and 2, Division 9 (18BA325)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomas Kelly</th>
<th>Abigail Burns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot (17 ft. by 130 ft)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lot 5, Division 9 (18BA313)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assessed Value ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot (32 ft. by 175 ft.)</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lots 1 and 2, Division 2 (18BA314)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assessed Value ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Property (4.5 acres)</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>2525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land on Chestnut Ridge (10 acres)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Mules</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Horses</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cows, 2 Hogs</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Wagons</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Carts, 1 Buggy</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry tools</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Property Chain of Titles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Liber/Folio</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/23/1953</td>
<td>GLB 2310/557</td>
<td>Albert P. and Anna V. Caslin</td>
<td>James B. McDermott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/1948</td>
<td>JWB 1636/531</td>
<td>Albert P. and Anna V. Caslin</td>
<td>Dorothy and John E. Concannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/1947</td>
<td>JWB 1613/89</td>
<td>Mercantile Trust Co. of Balt. (trustee for Ernest T. and Anne Lee Newell)</td>
<td>Albert P. and Anna V. Caslin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/1945</td>
<td>RJS 1409/532</td>
<td>Mary V. Kearns</td>
<td>Albert P. and Anna V. Caslin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/1943</td>
<td>RJS 1279/182</td>
<td>Sarah T. and Elizabeth G. Kenny</td>
<td>Frank C. Kearns (died 10/10/1944) and Mary V. Kearns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/1934</td>
<td>CWB Jr 923/459</td>
<td>G. William Parker</td>
<td>James F. Kenny (deceased), Nora Agnes Kenny (deceased), Sarah T. and Elizabeth G. Kenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/1934</td>
<td>CWB Jr 923/458</td>
<td>Nora Agnes, Sarah T., and Elizabeth G. Kenny</td>
<td>G. William Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/1929</td>
<td>WPC 586/60</td>
<td>John A. and Mary A. Murk</td>
<td>Ernest T. and Anne Lee Newell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6/1920</td>
<td>WPC 535/526</td>
<td>James Kenny</td>
<td>Michael J. Fitzpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/1920</td>
<td>WPC 535/523</td>
<td>Nora Agnes Kenny et al.</td>
<td>Michael J. Fitzpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/15/1915</td>
<td>WPC 438/545</td>
<td>Edward J. and Anne Doyle</td>
<td>John A. and Mary A. Murk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/1909</td>
<td>WPC 352/438</td>
<td>Leslie Griscom and Robert H. Bussey</td>
<td>Edward Doyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/1900</td>
<td>NBM 248/424</td>
<td>James F. Kenny (Admin. for Mary A. Kenny)</td>
<td>Nora Agnes, Sarah T., and Elizabeth G. Kenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/21/1880</td>
<td>WMI 118/120</td>
<td>N. Rufus Gill (Attorney) and John Hand</td>
<td>Mary Ann Kenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/1875</td>
<td>JB 60/306</td>
<td>James Kenny</td>
<td>Alfred J. Inlais? (Trustee for Ella A. Nelson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/1875</td>
<td>JB 90 316</td>
<td>Francis Kenny</td>
<td>James Kenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/1875</td>
<td>JB 90 318</td>
<td>James Kenny (Executor of Estate- Patrick W. Kenny)</td>
<td>Francis Kenny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 163 Church Lane Chain of Title Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Liber/Folio</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/1/1867</td>
<td>EHA 57/102</td>
<td>M. Whitridge and Trustees</td>
<td>James Kenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/1866</td>
<td>JHL 51/12</td>
<td>Thomas D. Cockey of Joshua</td>
<td>Patrick W. Kenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8/1862</td>
<td>GHC 35/399</td>
<td>Beulah Griscom, Edwin A. Griscom, Sarah W. Griscom, Chalkley Griscom,</td>
<td>Rachel D. Griscom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel E. Griscom, Horace Griscom, Sarah P. G. Griscom, William</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marst and Emeline Marst (Griscom), Jacob and Elizabeth Burrough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/3/1861</td>
<td>GHC 34/104</td>
<td>Benjamin F. Horowitz (Trustee for Powell Griscom- insolvent debtor)</td>
<td>Jacob and Elizabeth Burrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/1856</td>
<td>HMF 14/451</td>
<td>Jacob and Elizabeth Burrough</td>
<td>Ann Griscom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/1855</td>
<td>HMF 13/529</td>
<td>Jacob and Elizabeth Burrough</td>
<td>Thomas D. Cockey of Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/1855</td>
<td>HMF 13/528</td>
<td>Thomas D. Cockey of Joshua</td>
<td>Jacob Burrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/1854</td>
<td>AWB 394/256</td>
<td>Powell Griscom Trustee</td>
<td>Jacob Burrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/1854</td>
<td>HMF 10/217</td>
<td>Powell Griscom (Trustee)</td>
<td>Jacob Burrough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9937 Railroad Ave “Concannon Duplex”, Part of Lot 11, Division 9 (18BA324)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Liber/Folio</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/27/1991</td>
<td>SM 8319/672</td>
<td>Dorothy E. Concannon</td>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/1980</td>
<td>EHK Jr. 6166/569</td>
<td>Dorothy E. Concannon</td>
<td>Dawn and William Selby (remaindermen) and Harry A. Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/1948</td>
<td>JWB 1636/531</td>
<td>Albert P. and Anna V. Caslin</td>
<td>Dorothy and John (died 10/2/1969) Concannon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the earlier chain of title see deeds for 163 Church Lane.
### Lot 12 Div. 9 (18BA324)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Liber/Folio</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/9/1921</td>
<td>538/132</td>
<td>Catherine and Martin Hyland</td>
<td>Ervin and Maude Poe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/1868</td>
<td>Will JLR 3/320</td>
<td>John Burns</td>
<td>Catherine Burns [Hyland]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/1864</td>
<td>JHL 40/121</td>
<td>Samuel E. Griscom</td>
<td>John Byrnes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9929 Railroad Avenue North Side of “Poe-Burns Duplex”, Lot 1, Division 9 (18BA325)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Liber/Folio</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/9/1921</td>
<td>538/132</td>
<td>Catherine and Martin Hyland</td>
<td>Ervin and Maude Poe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abbe Burns (wife of John following his death in 1869)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/26/1854</td>
<td>HMF 10/423</td>
<td>Jacob Burrough</td>
<td>John Byrnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/1854</td>
<td>HMF 10/217</td>
<td>Powell Griscom (Trustee)</td>
<td>Jacob Burrough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9927 Railroad Avenue South Side of “Poe-Burns Duplex”, Lot 2, Division 9
(18BA325)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Liber/Folio</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/3/1937</td>
<td>CWB Jr. 1006/484</td>
<td>H. Courtenay Jenifer</td>
<td>Ervin G. and Carrie E. Poe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/1913</td>
<td>WPC 408/273</td>
<td>Joseph F. Byrne</td>
<td>Lawrence T. and Margaret Scally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/1926</td>
<td>WPC 635/117</td>
<td>H. Courtenay Jenifer</td>
<td>James A. Downs Jr. and Florence M. Downs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/1927</td>
<td>WPC 616/12</td>
<td>Frank I. Wheeler</td>
<td>H. Courtenay Jenifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>default on mortgage to Timonium Build. Assoc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/1923</td>
<td>WPC 571/514</td>
<td>Margaret T. Kelly</td>
<td>Charles Cougle Jr. and Elizabeth P. Cougle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/1898</td>
<td>NBM 234/124</td>
<td>Thomas Kelly Sr.</td>
<td>Margaret T. Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/22/1923</td>
<td>WPC 571/512</td>
<td>John C. Bosley (Admin. for estate of John</td>
<td>Margaret T. Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bosley of William)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/1892</td>
<td>LMB 193/102</td>
<td>John Bosley of William</td>
<td>Thomas Kelly Sr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/16/1856</td>
<td>HMF 16/164</td>
<td>Thomas Kelly</td>
<td>John Bosley of William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/26/1854</td>
<td>HMF 13/136</td>
<td>Jacob Burrough</td>
<td>Thomas Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/1854</td>
<td>HMF 10/217</td>
<td>Powell Griscom (Trustee)</td>
<td>Jacob Burrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Liber/Folio</td>
<td>Grantor</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 9A</td>
<td>9/7/1860</td>
<td>GHC 30/306 John F. Shipley and Powell Griscom (Admin. for Samuel Wagner (died 12/20/1859)</td>
<td>Patrick Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 9B</td>
<td>5/12/1912</td>
<td>WPC 395/576 County Commissioners</td>
<td>Israel I. Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/1/1860</td>
<td>GHC 30/382 Robert R. Boarman (Trustee to Lysander Patterson)</td>
<td>Thomas Kilroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/13/1858</td>
<td>GHC 10/372 Lysander Patterson</td>
<td>Henry A. Grosscup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/7/1858</td>
<td>GHC 22/438 Lysander Patterson</td>
<td>Henry A. Grosscup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/10/1857</td>
<td>HMF 20/197 James and Caroline Wright</td>
<td>Lysander Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 9C</td>
<td>10/2/1866</td>
<td>JHL 50/380 Edward and Bridgette Doyle</td>
<td>James Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/22/1860</td>
<td>GHC 33/278 Robert R. Boarman (Trustee to Lysander Patterson)</td>
<td>Edward Doyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/10/1857</td>
<td>HMF 20/197 James and Caroline Wright</td>
<td>Lysander Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Parcels</td>
<td>12/18/1996</td>
<td>SM 12021/430 Unknown Heirs of Patrick Connor (9a); Alvin Berlin, Jerome K. Berlin, and A. Jerome Diener (Rep. for Isabelle Zaldin deceased) (9B); James Connor (Trustee to Bridgette Doyle) (9C)</td>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/13/1909</td>
<td>WPC 352/491 Robert H. Bussey and Leslie Griscom (Trustee)</td>
<td>Israel I. Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/3/1861</td>
<td>GHC 34/104 Benjamin F. Horowitz (Trustee for Powell Griscom- insolvent debtor)</td>
<td>Jacob and Elizabeth Burrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/26/1854</td>
<td>HMF 10/319 Jacob and Elizabeth Burrough</td>
<td>James Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/27/1854</td>
<td>HMF 10/217 Powell Griscom (Trustee)</td>
<td>Jacob Burrough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lot 5, Division 9 (18BA313)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Liber/Folio</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/27/1940</td>
<td>CWB Jr. 1114/438</td>
<td>Lawrence T. and Margaret Scally</td>
<td>Ervin G. and Carrie E. Poe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/1937</td>
<td>CWB Jr. 1006/484</td>
<td>H. Courtenay Jenifer</td>
<td>Ervin G. and Carrie E. Poe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/1913</td>
<td>WPC 408/273</td>
<td>Joseph F. Byrne?</td>
<td>Lawrence T. and Margaret Scally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/1926</td>
<td>WPC 635/117</td>
<td>H. Courtenay Jenifer</td>
<td>James A. Downs Jr. and Florence M. Downs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/26/1854</td>
<td>HMF 11/394</td>
<td>Jacob and Elizabeth Burrough</td>
<td>Thomas Keating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/3/1861</td>
<td>GHC 34/104</td>
<td>Benjamin F. Horowitz (Trustee for Powell Griscom- insolvent debtor)</td>
<td>Jacob and Elizabeth Burrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/1854</td>
<td>HMF 10/217</td>
<td>Powell Griscom (Trustee)</td>
<td>Jacob Burrough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Worker’s Barracks”, Lot 2 Division 2 (18BA314)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Liber/Folio</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/8/1924</td>
<td>WPC 466/405</td>
<td>Ella A. Ward</td>
<td>Consolidated Gas and Electric Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/1916</td>
<td>WPC 466/405</td>
<td>Ella A. Ward</td>
<td>William B. Pettit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/1918</td>
<td>WPC 504/126</td>
<td>Ella A. Ward</td>
<td>William B. Pettit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/1889</td>
<td>JWS 177/5</td>
<td>Ella A. Ward</td>
<td>M. W. Offutt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/1881</td>
<td>WMJ 125/211</td>
<td>James Mackubin and wife</td>
<td>Ella A. Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/1880</td>
<td>WMJ 119/338</td>
<td>R. R. Boarman (Trustee)</td>
<td>James Mackubin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/1869</td>
<td>EHA 61/247</td>
<td>Talbott and Mary E. Denmead</td>
<td>Thomas Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/1858</td>
<td>GHC 24/438</td>
<td>Benjamin Horowitz (Trustee of Jacob Burrough)</td>
<td>Adam Denmead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/1854</td>
<td>HMF11/321</td>
<td>Powell Griscom</td>
<td>Jacob Burrough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Chapter 5 Artifact Photographs
Figure A.1: A sample of smoking pipe stems and bowl from House 1.

Figure A.2: Sample of ceramic tableware, teaware, and servingware from House 1
Figure A.3: Sample of buttons from House 1.

Figure A.4: Sample of smoking pipe stems and bowls from House 2.
Figure A.5: Glass bottles and mug from House 2

Figure A.6: Hopkins and Fairchild Button from House 2.
Figure A.7: Smoking pipe stem impressed with “I. G. Prence”

Figure A.8: Thomas and Thompson’s Citrate of Magnesia bottle Hutchinson stopper and wire.
Figure A.9: Ceramic teaware, tableware, and servingware and hygiene jar from House 3.

Figure A.10: Fluted smoking pipe impressed with “Davidson” from House 4.
Figure A.11: Molded white granite chamber pot in House 4.

Figure A.12: Figurine of girl or woman in a hooped skirt from House 4.
Figure A.13: Button depicting a woman in a wide brimmed hat from House 4.

Figure A.14: Smoking pipes from between House 4 and 5.
Figure A.15: Detail of a short stemmed pipe with indentations at the bite from between House 4 and 5.

Figure A.16: Bromo-Seltzer bottle and perfume bottle from between House 4 and 5.
Figure A.17: Ceramics teaware and tableware from between House 4 and 5.

Figure A.18: Figurines from between House 4 and 5.
Figure A.19: Smoking pipes from House 5.

Figure A.20: Glass bottles from House 5.
Figure A.21: Ceramic tableware and teaware from House 5.

Figure A.22: Tiger Cowrie Shell from House 5.
Figure A.23: Buttons from House 5.

Figure A.24: Seven Sorrows of Mary Medal from House 5.
Figure A.25: Glass bottles from between House 4 and 5.

Figure A.26: Ceramic teaware, tableware, servingware, and hygiene items from between House 5 and 6.
Figure A.27: Bone toothbrush from between House 5 and 6.

Figure A.28: Composite reed stem or bent elbow smoking pipe from House 6.
Figure A.29: Ceramic teaware, tableware, servingware, and hygiene item from House 6.

Figure A.30: Buttons from House 6.
Figure A.31: Baltimore City Police Button from House 6.

Figure A.32: Ceramic tableware from between House 6 and 7.
Figure A.33: Ceramics from House 7.

Figure A.34: Whiteware soap dish and lid made by Sampson Bridgwood and Son from House 7.
Figure A.35: Ceramic teaware, tableware, and servingware from House 8.

Figure A.36: Banded whiteware toiletware from House 7.
Figure A.37: Figurine of a woman or girl from House 8

Figure A.38: Army Corps of Engineers button from House 8
Figure A.39: Black glass button from House 8.

Figure A.40: Smoking pipe bowl with eagle and shield from the Poe-Burns House.
Figure A.41: Eleven-sided prescription bottle from the Poe-Burns House.

Figure A.42: Buttons from the Poe-Burns House.
Figure A.43: Smoking pipes from the first icehouse fill, 18BA313.

Figure A.44: Injection Brou Medicine Bottle from the first icehouse fill, 18BA313.
Figure A.45: Ceramic tableware and teaware from the first icehouse fill, 18BA313.

Figure A.46: Child’s plate in the Mounted Camels pattern from the first icehouse fill, 18BA313.
Figure A.47: Miraculous medal from the first icehouse fill, 18BA313.

Figure A.48: Buttons from the first icehouse fill, 18BA313.
Figure A.49: Norwalk pottery button from the first icehouse fill, 18BA313.

Figure A.50: Charles E. Brack prescription bottle from the second icehouse fill, 18BA313.
Figure A.51: Pearlware chamberpot from the second icehouse fill, 18BA313.

Figure A.52: Octagonal sided, impressed blue-shell edge platter from the second icehouse fill, 18BA313.
Figure A.53: Porcelain dog figurine with appliqué from the second icehouse fill, 18BA313.

Figure A.54: Bone toothbrush from the second icehouse fill, 18BA313.
Figure A.55: Smoking pipe stems from the foundation fill, 18BA313.

Figure A.56: Beer bottles from the foundation fill, 18BA313.
Figure A.57: Cruet jar from the foundation fill, 18BA313.

Figure A.58: Ceramic teaware, servingware, and spoon handle from the foundation fill, 18BA313.
Figure A.59: Porcelain figurine of a boy from the foundation fill, 18BA313.

Figure A.60: Buttons from the foundation fill, 18BA313.
Figure A.61: Bone lice comb from the pit feature, 18BA324.
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