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ABSTRACT

This thesis uses a household-based archaeological approach to examine changing settlement patterns and lifeways associated with a period of crucial change on Newfoundland’s southern Avalon Peninsula – namely the first half of the 19th century. The period witnessed a significant increase in permanent residents (including a large influx of Irish Catholic immigrants), the downfall of the migratory fishery (and resulting shift to a family-based resident fishery), and radical political/governmental changes associated with increased colonial autonomy. As part of these developments, a new middle class emerged composed mainly of prosperous fishermen and individuals involved in local government. A micro-historical approach is used to analyze a single household assemblage in Ferryland, thus shedding light on the development of a resident ‘outport gentry’ and changing use of the landscape in this important rural centre. Though likely initially built by a member of Ferryland’s elite (Vice-Admiralty Judge William Carter), the major occupation of the structure, as seen archaeologically, appears to be represented by the tenancies of two upper middle-class families. Comparative analysis places this household and its social landscape in the broader community of Ferryland, as well as emergent upper middle-class society in North America.
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Chapter 1 - Introduction and Research Objectives

Considerable archaeological and historical research has focused on the migratory fishery and early permanent English settlement on Newfoundland’s Avalon Peninsula in the 17th century (Gaulton and Tuck 2003; Pope 2008). The Southern Shore has been a particularly important locus of research.¹ The southern Avalon was one of the earliest areas in North America to be visited seasonally, then permanently settled by European fisherfolk.

Much of our archaeological understanding of this early period derives from research at the outport community of Ferryland (Figure 1.1), one of the most important harbours for the migratory fishery and demonstrably the most successful early permanent settlement in the area south of St. John’s (Gaulton 2013; Tuck 2013).

As a result of over 25 years of continuous excavations in Ferryland, a substantial amount of data relating to these early periods has been accumulated. Settlement, population dynamics, and micro-historical lifeways are thus relatively well understood for the 17th century. Minimal directed archaeological research has been conducted into

¹ The Southern Shore refers to the coastal communities south of St. John’s between Bay Bulls and Trepassey that share a common cultural heritage.
the later modern period after approximately 1760, and it is this period that is of particular interest for this thesis. Much of the extant material dating to this period has come from disturbed contexts in Ferryland; however, in recent years several discrete post-1760 deposits have been recorded, thereby offering the opportunity for a more sustained study of this later occupation.

The period comprising the late 18th to early 19th century has been scrutinized by historians from various different perspectives – those interested in political/legal developments (Bannister 2003), historical geography and immigration (Head 1976; Handcock 1989; Mannion 1977, 1986, 1988, 1989), through the lens of gender (Keough 2001, 2002), religion (Healey 1994; FitzGerald 1997), labour history (Cadigan 1995), and from an economic standpoint (Alexander 1976; Ryan 1981). A material and micro-historical perspective has largely been missing from these previous approaches – something that archaeology is uniquely situated to provide.2 This study draws on this body of secondary historical research in Newfoundland, using it as a broad framework, while adding a material and micro-historical dimension through the use of the archaeological record and other untapped primary sources.

The primary focus is a household site (hereafter referred to as the Downs House) excavated in the summer of 2017 that dates to the first half of the 19th century. The

---

2 Archaeological research in Ferryland has amply demonstrated the productivity of a micro-historical household-based approach. Through fine-grained excavations, it has been possible to link individuals to discrete archaeological deposits. Examples include George Calvert’s manor complex, a substantial domestic dwelling and midden associated with the Kirke family (Gaulton 2006; Gaulton and Casimiro 2015), and an early 18th-century dwelling likely occupied by James Benger and his wife Mary. Furthermore, numerous other structures have been excavated whose occupants are unknown to history, but about whose lives we have nonetheless gained intimate details (Nixon 1999; Crompton 2001; Hranka 2007; Leskovec 2007).
structure is located on what seems to have been a sparsely occupied meadowed headland known as the Downs located well outside the core of the town (Figure 1.2).

It was occupied by a series of different families who all appear to have their origin in the West Country of England, before becoming Newfoundland residents. They also appear to have all been members of the resident gentry class (largely composed of English Protestants) formed of merchants, professionals, and members of public office. The material culture, architecture, and landscape setting of this household reveal clues about changing settlement patterns and lifeways during this period and demonstrate how the occupants of the household expressed their gentility during a rather turbulent time in
Newfoundland history. Assemblages from a different part of Ferryland harbour (the Pool) are used to help contextualize the Downs House (hereafter DH). The Pool was the focal point of the earliest permanent (17th-century) settlement in Ferryland and has been the primary area of archaeological research over the past several decades. Recent work sheds light on the use of the area during the 19th century, including the repurposing of several earlier activity areas, allowing for an examination of changing use of space and relationship with the past in Ferryland during the period of interest.

Embracing recent calls by historical archaeologists in the Anglophone tradition (Brooks 2015a), this thesis emphasizes the archaeological importance of the 19th century and seeks to remedy the relatively limited focus that it has received in Newfoundland to date. While the concept of the long 19th century has been thoroughly explored by historians (Hobsbawm 1962), it has escaped the attention of archaeologists in many areas of the world. This is particularly true of Britain itself, which is somewhat paradoxical given its prominence as a global industrial, social and economic centre during the 19th century (Brooks 2015a: 1). Archaeologists working throughout the world encounter 19th-century British material culture, whether within the confines of the former Empire or without. Thus, the lack of a comparative database of material from Britain itself has been bemoaned by archaeologists working in colonial contexts elsewhere (Lucas 2006a). One of the goals of this project, then, is to add to the comparative global database of 19th-century British material culture, as established by researchers working within the global historical archaeology paradigm (e.g., Brooks 2000, 2002; Orser 2008; Brighton 2009). This will allow for further evaluation of some of the macro-level consumption patterns
identified with respect to the material culture of various colonial versus imperial contexts (Lawrence 2003).

The 19th century has certainly not been universally ignored by archaeologists; however, it has certainly received lesser attention in many areas of the world where a superlative interest in earlier settlement predominates. Newfoundland is undeniably an example of the latter. In the United Kingdom, as Brooks (2015a: 2) explains, the immense temporal depth of the archaeological record has resulted in the more recent post-medieval periods receiving considerably less attention. In the United States, there has certainly long been an interest in the 19th century (and lately, in even more recent periods). As Brooks (2015a: 7) hints at, much of this research relates to a quasi-nationalist vision of the American state viewed in isolation from Britain and the Empire. This is not a flawed approach, but merely a different focus. For example, Canadian research on the same period is more explicitly British-oriented. The situation is more fully fleshed out elsewhere (Brooks 2015a) and is not fully relevant here.

In Newfoundland, perhaps this emphasis on the earlier archaeological record is due to a belief that earlier settlement (less well-documented historically) may benefit more from an archaeological perspective. While certainly true that documentary evidence is more widespread in later periods, it must be emphasized that historical records are but another form of material culture with their own inherent biases; thus, they provide an extremely narrow viewpoint. Historical documents are products of specific sociocultural and temporal contexts and are only one of many data sources available to archaeologists (Wilkie 2006: 13-14). They do not adequately encompass all actors, nor are they without
their own agendas and subjectivities. This point is by no means novel and is often emphasized as a driving force for historical archaeological research but is certainly worth repeating at the outset.

Finally, it should be noted that the aforementioned dearth of archaeological research into 19th-century Newfoundland is by no means absolute. For example, as part of his extensive longitudinal study of the French fishery on the Petit Nord, Peter Pope and his students have recorded many 19th-century sites. Hatcher’s (2013) examination of an English occupation at a French fishing room at Champ Paya between 1790 and 1820, and Jones’ (2009) analysis of a 19th-century homestead at Genille are two notable examples of contemporary research. Several studies have examined 19th-century material in various parts of Labrador, including Burke (1991), Temple (2006), and Jurakic (2007). Examples of prior archaeological research on contemporary sites in the English Shore area are largely confined to urban (Penney 2010) and military contexts (Jelks 1973; Crompton and Noël 2010). Venovcevs’ (2017) archaeological investigation of winter housing includes several 19th-century sites that provide comparative material for this study. There is a notable lack of contemporary research pertaining to the specific research area of interest to this thesis, namely the rural areas of the Southern Shore.

Much of the archaeological data that we have for late 18th- to early 19th-century

---
3 This is the name given to the eastern side of Newfoundland’s Northern Peninsula between Quirpon and Cape St. John by French fishermen.
4 The English Shore represents the area of earliest English settlement on Newfoundland’s southeast coast. It was originally made up of a stretch of coast between Bonavita Bay and Trepassey traditionally exploited by West Country fishermen (Pope 2004: 440). The boundaries of the English Shore expanded over time as a result of the treaties of Utrecht (1713) and Versailles (1783). In this context, the term refers to the original iteration of the area (i.e., pre-1713), which has a long history of permanent occupation and was the focal point of later Irish immigration.
Newfoundland derives from compliance or salvage work, and there has been little attempt to synthesize this data or approach it using a rigorous research framework. It is this void that this thesis will aim to begin to fill. The primary goal is thus to demonstrate how a fine-grained archaeological perspective can add to the excellent work undertaken by historians of this period. Archaeologists have access to a unique dataset that, when combined with other documentary information and other data sources such as oral history, can create detailed and nuanced narratives. This will be explored through a rather narrow micro-historical examination of middle-class/gentry life in Ferryland.

Evidently, the restriction of a study to arbitrary temporal limits like the turn of a century is cumbersome and overbearing; instead, the concept of the Hobsbawmian long 19th century (beginning in 1789, ending in 1914) is useful (Hobsbawm 1962, 1987). Brooks (2015a: 4) advocates for an earlier beginning date (1750) to this ‘long century’ when discussing the social and technological developments leading up to the 19th-century global spread of British material culture. For the purposes of this thesis, the focus will be exclusively on the first half of this long 19th century. The specific temporal limits imposed here will correspond roughly to the occupation of the DH site: ca. 1790-1850.

These dates correspond to important developments in Newfoundland history discussed further in Chapter 3: the beginning date accords with the collapse of the migratory fishery and the early stages of mass immigration/permanent settlement, while the later date corresponds with the development of representative government and finally the granting of responsible government. This represents a turbulent time in Newfoundland history and can perhaps be seen as a bridge period between the early
incipient settlement and the post-colonial state. Newfoundland was officially a latecomer to the British colonial world, only obtaining colonial status in 1824 and representative government in 1832. Thus, the period of interest straddles the birth of Newfoundland as an independent entity (at least in a legislative sense). It is perhaps a period where a true Newfoundland-based resident identity emerges, as opposed to the more transient European-based populations of earlier periods (Matthews 1973: 249-250).

The primary objective of this thesis revolves around the interpretation of lifeways associated with the various occupants of the DH over the first half of the 19th century. This will be based primarily off excavations at the site in conjunction with relevant documentary information. To place this household within the broader context of 19th-century Ferryland, a contemporary assemblage of material from the Pool will be consulted for comparative purposes. More broadly, this will lead to a macro-level discussion of changing settlement patterns and lifeways in Ferryland during the period of interest. Finally, a discussion of other contemporary sites will allow for comparisons between the DH and other relevant occupations.

The following research questions/objectives will be pursued:

1. What are the dates of occupation of the DH? This basic question will be addressed using both archaeological and documentary information. Answering this question will allow for more in-depth interpretation of the DH and its occupants alongside macro-scale events in Ferryland and beyond. This also relates to the construction of a more detailed chronology of occupational phases (development cycles) and formation processes at the site.

2. How are aspects of identity encoded in material culture, architecture, and landscape in Ferryland? This broad question will examine lifeways at the DH,
with a particular focus on how facets of identity such as ethnicity, class and power relationships are represented in the archaeological record. The period under study is one often marked by ethnoreligious tension and thus may be characterized by heightened expression of material identity. The various occupants of the DH appear to have been members of the middle/upper-class gentry, primarily formed of English Protestants. They were numerically inferior to the (largely) Irish Catholic plebeian class, and thus may have explicitly displayed their identity and power to retain their sociopolitical dominance. On a broader scale, the experience and material identity of the DH occupants will be contrasted with contemporary middle to upper class individuals in other parts of the Anglo-American world. Such a global framework is imperative for an historical archaeology of the 19th century (Brighton 2009, Orser 2008). Broader settlement patterns in Ferryland and the influence of landscape and existing infrastructure on subsequent settlement are also briefly addressed.

Chapter 2 contains a theoretical background, presenting the framework for the subsequent discussion which draws primarily on perspectives of household (including especially themes of identity and consumption) and, to a lesser extent, landscape archaeology. Chapter 3 provides further context by presenting a historical background of the study area and period, as well as a brief summary of the archaeological research to date in Ferryland. Chapter 4 follows with a narrower micro-historical perspective on the DH and describes archival and archaeological research on this site, primarily addressing the first research question. Field methodology is also discussed in this section. Chapters 5 and 6 present, discuss and interpret the archaeological data with particular attention to the second set of research questions. The scale of inquiry is also broadened to place the DH in wider contexts in Ferryland and beyond.
Chapter 2 - Theoretical Background
This research draws from several different theoretical perspectives, in particular household archaeology which also includes the related strands of consumption theory and theorizations of identity. Perspectives from landscape archaeology are also incorporated to further contextualize the Downs House site in the broader townscape of Ferryland. The overall project falls under the rubric of historical archaeology, drawing especially upon the tenets of documentary archaeology which has been particularly fruitful in American historical archaeology (Beaudry 1988; Little 1992; Wilkie 2006). This paradigm stresses the importance of blending multiple different types of source material and reconciling their different spatial scales and temporal resolutions.

2.1 Household Archaeology
One of the areas in which historical archaeologists are currently forging multi-scalar global perspectives with remarkable success is in the study of households. Such explicit global perspectives are well represented in a recent edited volume on historical household archaeology (Fogle et al. 2015). As Cobb (2015: 189) notes, households “mediate the local and the global” and are particularly well suited to micro-historical and multi-scalar approaches. Though household archaeology often takes place at a local particularistic scale, households can and must be linked to larger scales of analysis such as communities and cities (Matthews 2012: 560).

The concept of household archaeology has been common in archaeological practice for several decades, dating back to Wilk and Rathje’s (1982) seminal article. This article advocated for an increased focus on the household as a kind of middle ground between the then-popular large-scale analyses of settlements and the practical fine-
grained scale of archaeological data (essentially echoing Binford’s [1983: 19-24] middle-range theory). This kind of middle-ground approach remains one of the strengths of household archaeology. Wilk and Rathje’s (1982) characterization of households reflects a processual preoccupation with environmental adaptations and economic function; however, the basic three-part definition offered (ibid: 618) is useful. In this framework, the household is made up of a social, material and behavioural component, where the social represents the number of occupants and their relationships to one another, the material represents physical structure, objects, and activity areas, and the behavioural represents activities performed by the household. Conceptualizations of households have since evolved away from economic perspectives (which emphasize the production and distribution of resources) and large-scale patterning (South 1977; Wilk and Rathje 1982) to more recent contextual and nuanced approaches (Beaudry 2004).

The analysis of domestic assemblages is not restricted to historical archaeology but is in fact a unifying theme of all archaeological sub-disciplines, as exemplified by numerous trans-disciplinary volumes (e.g., Allison 1999). Part of the appeal of household archaeology is its applicability to widely divergent cultural groups and temporal frameworks. The domestic unit, although varying widely in its size and internal constituency, is a universal concept in time and space. Historical archaeologists have, however, been at the forefront of household archaeology in recent years. The ability to incorporate documentary records into their investigations is part of what makes household archaeology a particularly useful approach for historical archaeologists. It is often possible to construct detailed chronologies of household phases (consisting of
individuals and associated chronologies); this forms a framework within which the archaeological record can be interpreted. Thus, discrete deposits can often be directly linked to specific household occupants (e.g., Beaudry 2010), lending a material dimension to a micro-historical approach.

During the Georgian period and onwards, a greater separation of homespace and workspace took place alongside shifting gender roles and societal values relating to economic structures and residential patterning. Diana diZerega Wall (1991, 1994, 2010) has thoroughly explored shifting gender roles during this crucial period which, she argues, resulted in the establishment of separate women’s and men’s spheres or areas of influence which correspond to the home and work space respectively. This in turn relates to changing divisions of labour. Far from passive subjects, women played a major active role in the reconstituting of a vision of domestic life during this period (referred to as the cult of domesticity). Such an emic distinction between home life and the outside world does appear to have been increasingly recognized by individuals living at this time, at least amongst the middle and upper classes (Wall 1994: 8). Thus, a narrower focus on an archaeology of the household seems to make particular sense for the 19th century, given this major shift.

While acknowledging the concept of division between home- and workspaces, it should also be noted that this distinction is by no means an absolute binary (De Cunzo and Ernststein 2006: 259). As Beaudry (2015: 4) notes, it is all too easy to fall into the trap

---

5 This view is not without its criticisms, particularly with respect to the assumed uniformity/pervasiveness of the cult of domesticity and the sometimes-assumed notion that lower classes sought to uncritically emulate aspects of domesticity practised by middle and upper classes (Mytum 2010).
of the prescriptive form of the household (particularly through modern biases), but “we cannot assume that everyone used the internal spaces of houses as they were supposed to”. Nevertheless, it is pertinent to think about the division and the accompanying differences in activities/behaviour (and therefore material culture patterning). At the core of a household are domestic activities such as eating, drinking, and leisure (socializing).

In the context of 19th-century outport Newfoundland a fairly strict division between domestic space and other work-related spaces seems appropriate. This period saw the collapse of the migratory fishery and its replacement by a resident-based fishery carried out mainly by permanent occupants. The migratory model relied largely on wage labour undertaken by itinerant migrant labourers. In contrast, the resident fishery was characterized by a family-based labour model, which was highly gendered. Keough (2001: 208-328) explores the gendered labour cycle of Newfoundland outports on the Southern Shore that developed in the wake of permanent settlement and the rise of the resident fishery.

A gendered division of labour did exist, but it was not as rigid as that described by Wall and other researchers in the United States or in other capitalist economies. Men were primarily engaged in tasks associated with the fishery, and the actual fishing itself was almost exclusively carried out by men. This was not necessarily due to the physical exertion of the job (women carried out many similarly physically arduous tasks) but was related to women’s reproductive roles and land-based physical duties, such as the processing of fish and carrying out agricultural activities (ibid: 250-251). Women worked both indoors and outdoors in various capacities (engaging in both productive and
reproductive roles) (ibid: 233-241). Women’s reproductive roles meant that they were largely responsible for child care, though not exclusively so (ibid: 254-255). Roles were fluid and men and women often crossed over into each other’s traditional roles depending upon seasonal rhythms and requirements. There was no stigma attached to the performance of hard physical outdoor labour by women, as there was in many contemporary Victorian cultural settings. In fact, this type of work (particularly associated with the fishery, as well as subsistence agriculture) was a source of pride amongst working-class women. Where possible, working-class women even hired domestic servants to manage household tasks and care for children so as to allow them to focus more of their efforts on the ‘productive’ outdoor work.

By contrast, middle and upper-class women embraced the concepts of gentility and domesticity described above; a stigma was increasingly placed on this type of outdoor work by this class. Thus, gentry-class women increasingly took on household-focussed roles such as the supervision of servants. The ability to retreat to the interior and leave the outdoor work to hired help was seen as evidence of their gentility (ibid: 326-327; see also Cook 1993). Wage labour was also undertaken by working-class women as part of a diversified economic strategy – this often entailed domestic roles such as seamstresses, laundresses, and other service-related tasks (Keough 2001: 256-280). The separation of the household (often associated with reproduction and domestic work) and the exterior world of production was thus definitively recognized in Ferryland in the 19th century; conceptions of gender roles and divisions of labour were fluid (especially amongst the working class) and heavily influenced by class.
The rigid separation of the spheres defined above appears to have particularly been an urban American phenomenon, as revealed by contemporary traveller’s accounts and the reactions therein (Wall 1994: 8). Nonetheless, researchers have demonstrated that the concept of domesticity and a redefined division of labour was also influential in rural areas and overseas in Europe (Simonton 1998: 123-124; Mytum 2010). As Keough (2001: 208-328) demonstrates, there did exist a gendered division of labour, though certainly quite a fluid one, with close ties to the interior/exterior (or homespace/workspace) on the 19th-century Southern Shore. She also notes that members of the gentry class appear to have observed the main traits of the cult of domesticity and aspects of gentility (in contrast to the working class). It is possible to test these class-based hypotheses of domestic life archaeologically and this is addressed in Chapter 5.

Another point which should be raised concerns the variability in household composition. It should not immediately be assumed that a household is made up of a single nuclear family, although this unit is often the most common one. Historical archaeologists have recently emphasized non-traditional household units such as boardinghouses, brothels, and barracks (e.g., Peña and Denmon 2000; Gilfoyle 2005; Newcombe 2017). It is also common to encounter domestic sites that were occupied by multiple different families (or multiple households), which can complicate interpretation (Beaudry 2015: 4). In the context of 19th-century Ferryland, the nuclear family unit is paramount, but other members of households may include servants, boarders, seasonal labourers, or non-nuclear relatives. The specific household composition of the Downs House, as ascertained from available documentary records, is discussed at length in
Chapter 4.

To sum up, a household archaeology framework treats the household and its domestic space as a basic social unit and the basic unit of archaeological analysis. This includes the physical structure of the household (i.e., the house), in addition to its occupants, and other elements of the homelot such as outbuildings, gardens, cellars, etc. Treating the household as the lowest unit or common denominator allows for comparative research between households. Recently, archaeologists have also sought to ‘dehomogenize’ the household; this rejects the notion that the household can be seen as a single homogenous economic or social unit (Kruczek-Aaron 2002). Instead, longitudinal change (with respect to household lifecycles) and individual agency are stressed (Prossor et al. 2012). While the household is still a useful common denominator at some scales of analysis, it must also be seen as a site of conflict or tension between its various constituents (see Kruczek-Aaron 2002). For example, Buchli (2010) argues that domestic violence and the oppression of women (initially challenged in the early 20th century with emancipation movements) can be linked to the 19th-century concept of the home as a wholly separate domestic sphere (see Wall 1994). Thus, in addition to their role as shelters, households serve a more nefarious purpose as sites of oppression based on gender. These internal dynamics (Beaudry 2015: 3) must thus be explored at an intra-household scale. Kruczek-Aaron (2002: 175-176) stresses the importance of carefully examining the relationships between individuals making up households in an attempt to understand their particular motivations. This perspective views the household as a dynamic entity, rather than a static one and is well-suited to the micro-historical
perspective commonly employed in historical archaeology (King 2006; Lucas 2006b; Wilkie 2006).

2.1.1 **Consumption**

Within the broader framework of historical household archaeology, a number of related themes are often explored. Two of these will be briefly discussed here as they are particularly important to consider in the context of 19th-century Ferryland: consumption and identity. The multi-disciplinary framework of consumption examines how individuals (consumers) interact with and derive meaning from objects in different cultural and historical contexts (Mullins 2011a). Archaeologists have long implicitly studied issues of consumption, given their focus on material culture. The traditional archaeological definition views consumption as a narrow stage in the life cycle of an object (synonymous with ‘use’), alongside other phases of the chaîne opératoire such as procurement of raw materials, the technology of manufacture, trade, reuse, discard, and destruction (Miller et al. 2000: 3).

Paul Mullins, in a definition that will be adopted here, argues for a more wide-ranging consumption framework that “examines how people socialize material goods”, while “embrac[ing] the agency of consumers and recogniz[ing] that goods assume meaning in a tension between structural and localized processes” (2011a: 134). It is through the daily use of objects by individuals and the interaction with wider sociocultural spheres that objects develop meaning. Such a definition is clearly grounded in Bourdieu’s (1977) practice theory and Giddens’ (1984) theory of structuration. It is now widely recognized that consumption is not necessarily a rational process that can be
reduced to simple economic terms (Mullins 2011b: 2-5). The fluidity, complexity, and local particularities of identity preclude such rational behaviour and simplistic/prescriptive explanations (see below); however, the presence of larger structural forces (whether economic, social, or political) cannot be denied.

Historians and historical archaeologists particularly point to an ‘Age of Consumption’ that flourished in the latter part of the 18th century with the influence of the Industrial Revolution. While human interaction with material culture is evidently as ancient as humanity itself, this period saw an unprecedented increase in mass production, standardization, marketing, and distribution of material goods that precipitated modern mass consumerism of the 20th century. Researchers have argued that this consumer revolution had its origin even earlier in the 16th century (itself associated with an earlier phase of the Industrial Revolution) in Britain and other parts of Europe and that it is associated particularly with the increased mobility (including overseas expansion), regional connectedness, and economic prosperity of this period (Pogue 2001; Pope 2013). This resulted in the breakdown of local systems of class relationships (based on innate kinship ties) and their replacement with a system based on portable and universally understood status markers (Pogue 2001: 52).

The connection between status (as a form of identity) and consumption is one that has seen considerable archaeological attention. Researchers often use the notion of gentility to refer to the desire of consumers to acquire material goods to display their identity. This is particularly relevant in the 19th century, which saw the creation of a new middle class founded on these principles of genteel consumption (Praetzellis and
Praetzellis 1992). Proscribed behaviour is evident in the multitude of etiquette manuals that were aimed at Victorian women as they sought to construct their domestic sphere. It appears that many of the tenets of gentility and consumerism were indeed pursued by the middle classes, as evidenced by considerable archaeological data (Fitts 1999). While it is often assumed that social emulation influenced working-class people to also aspire to these notions of gentility, it has been demonstrated that different social classes varied in their approaches to consumption (Wall 1991). Nevertheless, archaeological research has shown that working-class individuals living in perceived slums did have access to fine ceramic tablewares and thus subscribed to some elements of middle-class culture (McCarthy 2001), though they may have been selective and strategic in their emulation, absorbing certain elements of Victorian gentility while retaining traditional systems of meaning (Brighton 2001: 24).

Most archaeological studies of consumption in the late 18th to 19th centuries have been undertaken by scholars in the United States (see Mullins 2011b), though much of the material under study is of British origin (Brooks 2015a). Many of these studies examine how British-produced objects took on different meanings in the new political and socio-economic climate of early America (Pogue 2001). Newfoundland was no exception in the spread of mass-produced British material culture in the 19th century, and this material undoubtedly took on new meaning in these local contexts. In a late 20th-century context, Pocius (1991: 11) has examined the impact of mass consumerism on traditional Newfoundland outport societies, arguing that the influx of these objects did not serve to erode traditional culture but was rather incorporated into existing
conceptualizations of everyday space. It can perhaps be assumed that similar processes characterized the incorporation of mass-produced 19th-century goods.

2.1.2 **Archaeologies of Identity**
As noted above, the study of various aspects of identity (as evinced through the selective use of material culture) is at the core of studies of consumption (Mullins 2011b: 2). The archaeology of identity has received increased focus since the rise of post-processualism in the 1980s but has always been (at least implicitly) at the centre of archaeological inquiry. Several recent volumes have formalized concepts of identity and examined trans-disciplinary archaeological approaches to the topic (Casella and Fowler 2005a; Diaz-Andreu et al. 2005; Insoll 2007; Amundsen-Meyer et al. 2010). Identity is a complex multi-faceted human construct defined as “individuals’ identification with broader groups on the basis of differences socially sanctioned as significant” (Díaz-Andreu and Lucy 2005: 1). This notion of difference is an important concept; a large part of identity involves conceptualizing one’s self in opposition to an ‘other’ and in congruence with a certain group.

Identity is thus used to foster group identity and social belonging (Casella and Fowler 2005b), but it can also serve as a form of resistance (to fracture social belonging). Importantly, identity is not an innate concept; it is learnt from an early age and transforms over the lifecourse (Lucy 2005). It is also highly situational and fluid, taking different forms depending on the context. To summarize, identity can be thought of as a relational and situational construct. All of this considerably complicates the archaeological study of identity. Some researchers have even suggested that it is a futile enterprise in the absence
of complementary information such as documentary records (see Reher and Fernandez-Götz 2015: 401). This is a somewhat pessimistic position, and it downplays the nuanced archaeological perspectives that can be provided by a fine-grained contextual approach to the analysis of material culture (ibid: 402). Nonetheless, it is certainly helpful to be able to draw on complementary documentary sources to further support archaeological data, and this is undoubtedly one of historical archaeology’s great strengths with respect to the study of identity. Finally, as noted above, identity is often constructed with reference to a larger group, but the concept of agency and the study of the individual are other important avenues of inquiry closely associated with the archaeology of identity (White 2009).

While somewhat arbitrary, it is useful to divide identity into a series of pseudo-discrete categories of analysis. In their edited collection, Díaz-Andreu and Lucy (2005) define five facets of identity: gender, age, status, ethnicity, and religion. Noticeably absent from the list are race and nationality, two important areas of study in historical archaeology which often relate closely to but are not the same as ethnicity. Race is a particularly important analytical topic in the United States (e.g., Orser 1998, 2004), while nationality has increasingly become a popular topic throughout the world (Brooks and Mehler 2017). Of these categories, ethnicity is likely the one with the most longstanding archaeological interest, having been an important component of research since the dawn of professional archaeology. Jones (1997) presents a detailed examination of the history of archaeological inquiry into the topic of ethnicity, demonstrating how the study of ethnicity has evolved over time with shifting theoretical positions in archaeology and
input from various other related disciplines. An important characteristic of identity is its intersectionality; this concept examines how the various facets of identity relate to one another and coexist in complex ways.

The five categories identified by Díaz-Andreu and Lucy are all relevant to the study of 19th-century Ferryland. Willeen Keough (2001) used gender as her main topic of inquiry (in addition to other categories of identity) in an exhaustive historical study of the Southern Shore during the period of interest. Ethnicity, age, and status are particularly important forms of identity to consider during this period, as they are closely related to one another in forming intersectional identities. In the early 18th century, the English Shore was composed almost entirely of people of English origin. By mid-century, settlers of Irish ethnicity made up 40% of the total population in the same area (Mannion 2001). Over the course of the 18th century, growing labour demands in Newfoundland’s migratory fishery and economic struggles in Ireland resulted in large-scale immigrations of Irish labourers. The majority of them were Catholic and came from southeast Ireland (English 1998; Keough 2001: 2). Two broad groups thus formed: a “propertied class” (merchants and planters) composed of English Protestants, and a “relatively cohesive” servant class composed of Irish Catholics (Bannister 2003: 10). There were of course also tradespeople, members of public office, and independent fishing families (small-scale planters) interspersed between these two broad classes. By the end of the 18th century, Irish Catholics formed a significant majority on the southern Avalon (Keough 2001), completing a demographic upheaval that began earlier that century.

Ethnicity is thus also closely related to nationality here, although there are
smaller-scale (local) ethnic ties which undercut national categories. For example, English (1998) and Keough (2008: 13) suggest that rivalries between different Irish factions (Munster and Leinster) were largely to blame for the events of the 1789 Ferryland riots, which saw 114 men charged during a single winter. Thus, nationality should not be seen as a monolithic category. It is also possible that this period witnessed the creation of an ethno-national form of Newfoundland identity. Due to a fundamental shift in the settlement pattern of Newfoundland (related to the residential character of the fishery), a new sense of attachment to place and a form of Newfoundland identity (or at least isolated regional identities [Matthews 1973: 233-239]) may have been fostered. It has been argued that there was no recognition of a Newfoundland identity amongst those inhabiting the island in the 18th century; instead, close ties were maintained to their Old-World places of origin (ibid: 248-253). An overt politically-motivated Newfoundland nationalism was visibly evident by the mid-19th century, but a more implicit identity likely emerged earlier. This may become visible in the form of localized patterns as more sites dating to this period are excavated and analyzed.

The household is a particularly fruitful place to explore identity. Households encompass a complex array of private and public spaces. Certain household rituals such as dining represent explicit instances of identity display and negotiation (Symonds 2010). The household is also a locus for the formation and display of identity (Buchli 2010), and this idea has been thoroughly explored archaeologically. Bourdieu’s (1977) practice theory has been at the core of many of these approaches, as the household is the scene where the habitus is formed through daily practice. In this sense, identity is created and
re-created through everyday activity (Lightfoot et al. 1998; Lopiparo 2006: 134). The household is seen by some as a kind of sanctuary providing “security through which we learn to negotiate acceptable relationships” (Allison 1999: 1). Thus, domestic space is seen to act as a kind of physical and metaphysical protective barrier mediating wider societal influences. This echoes Giddens’ (1985) front space/back space concept of performance (where the household is seen as a back space), whereby identity is selectively performed depending on the audience. There are, however, limits to the concept of the household as a sanctuary. As Andrzejewski (2008) demonstrates, Victorian domestic architecture placed a strict emphasis on the careful control of space, especially with respect to surveillance and bodily discipline vis-à-vis domestic servants. Thus, for some individuals in a household the back space may be severely limited or non-existent. This recalls the point mentioned above about intra-household tension and the need to problematize the concept of the household as homogenous unit (Kruczek-Aaron 2002). Household approaches often tend to overemphasize the head of household, perhaps due to the greater visibility of the latter in documentary records. Careful attention must be paid to the diversity in household composition.

2.2 **Landscape Archaeology**
The second major theoretical perspective employed in this research is that of landscape archaeology. The landscape concept is a nebulous one that has been enacted by archaeologists and other scholars under many different theoretical guises (see Anschuetz et al. 2001 for a thorough overview of the concept up to the beginning of 21st century). A basic goal of landscape archaeology is defined by Anschuetz et al. (2001: 160) using the
following problematic: “the fundamental nature of the relationship(s) between people and the spaces they occupy”. Landscapes are not simply natural environments; instead they are culturally constituted and constructed through the transformation of “physical spaces into meaningful places” (ibid: 161). This project employs landscape archaeology perspectives in two different ways: the first is a long-term view of landscape (similar to Ingold’s dwelling perspective) that examines the influence of previous occupations on subsequent use of the landscape; the second views landscape as a series of power relationships which are exploited by inhabitants to emphasize social differences.

The palimpsest concept is particularly apt for understanding the archaeological record of Ferryland. In parts of the Pool, there is an essentially uninterrupted record of human occupation of the landscape for 500 years from the earliest 16th-century occupations by Beothuk peoples and European migratory fishermen, to the permanent 17th-century English colony of Avalon, to the re-established 18th- and 19th-century rural capital of Ferryland and finally to the recently-demolished 20th-century houses of the Pool and the current archaeological heritage landscape with its pedestrian boardwalks, interpretive signs and exposed archaeological remains. This long history of occupation attests to the longstanding importance of the Pool as a focal spatial point. The landscape of the Pool is thus one that has been continuously built upon; this is what Holtorf and Williams (2006) term an ‘accumulative landscape’. It is truly compatible with Ingold’s (1993) characterization of landscape as “an enduring record of – and testimony to – the lives and works of past generations who have dwelt within it, and in so doing, have left there something of themselves” (152).
This *dwelling* perspective then emphasizes the influence of ‘the past in the present’. This is especially relevant with respect to the remains of the 17th-century colony established in Ferryland because of the enormous and lasting impact that this venture had on the landscape. The various elements of the maritime cultural landscape of the migratory fishery (Pope 2008), while still visible, are certainly much more ephemeral. The persistent traces and high visibility of this landscape of permanence (which is striking today and would have been all the more so in the 19th century) may have triggered episodes of remembrance in the 19th century and certainly remained in public memory well into the 20th century (Tuck 1993). This may either take the form of social memory, defined as a collective imagined past, or a more personal memory (Holtorf and Williams 2006). Such retrospective memories are tied to specific places in a landscape (ibid: 238). The crucial point to be made here concerning landscape is the long-term temporality inherent in it; in the case of Ferryland, this temporality is especially clear. Approaching this topic archaeologically (i.e., ‘the past in the past’) can be challenging, but many recent studies have eloquently and empirically addressed the notion of a historically-situated temporality (Bradley 1998; King 1996, 2001; Orser 2007a).

### 2.2.1 Powered Landscapes

Another topic of archaeological inquiry with respect to landscapes is how they are used in power relationships to emphasize and maintain social differences, often through the creation of boundaries (either physical or symbolic). The notion of boundary creation and maintenance has long been a popular archaeological concept, since the earliest explorations of culture spheres/areas under culture-historical paradigms. More recent
approaches borrow from concepts of social geography to examine how landscapes such as built environments contain carefully ordered spaces and boundaries that reflect facets of identity such as status (Triggs 2005; Kosiba and Bauer 2012).

The concept of intervisibility (closely related to surveillance) has been a fundamental component of many investigations into powered landscapes. Visibility has been seen as an important determinant in the location of many types of sites, for different variables such as defensibility (e.g., Sakaguchi et al. 2010) or monumental placement for social/ritual impact (Bongers et al. 2012). Foucault (1979) famously described the potency of the visual gaze and its ability to control bodily discipline through constant surveillance in his treatment of the Panopticon. Epperson (2000) employs the Panopticon concept in his analysis of the power dynamics and visibility spaces of 18th-century plantation landscapes. Similarly, Spencer-Wood (2012: 512-513) describes the patriarchal power relationships that dictated the distribution of dwellings belonging to different classes in a California logging camp; the omnipotent gaze of the camp director from an elevated location on a hill kept the workers’ barracks under constant surveillance. Recent advances in computer hardware and software (especially in the realm of Geographic Information Systems) have allowed for sophisticated quantitative analyses of visibility using viewshed techniques. As the technology has evolved, increasingly refined methods and interpretations have countered some of the early biases and assumptions that characterized the use of GIS in viewshed analysis (Kosiba and Bauer 2012; Supernant and Cookson 2014).

Some historical archaeologists, particularly Mark Leone and his students, have
used a Marxist framework under the umbrella of a ‘critical archaeology’ to examine how elites manipulated elements of the landscape to reinforce and naturalize social inequalities (De Cunzo and Ernest 2006: 256-258). They argue that built landscapes were constructed to reflect power structures, thereby reifying them in the eyes of subaltern peoples. Others have advocated for less of a top-down approach, such as the sophisticated heterarchical model developed by Spencer-Wood (2010), which is grounded in a feminist framework that rejects traditional dichotomies of domination and resistance (see also De Cunzo and Ernest 2006). Power dynamics remain at the centre of this model, though it is less centred on class and rejects the dominant ideology approach.

One approach that is particularly applicable to this research is the idea of ethnic landscapes (Anschuetz et al. 2001: 179-181), defined as the creation of spatial boundaries by members of a community identifying with a certain ethnicity. These boundaries result in increased cohesiveness within an ethnic group and may act to enhance differences between groups. Typically, ethnic landscapes are most visible in circumstances where migration has recently occurred and where there is a significant power imbalance (both of which apply to Ferryland in the late 18th and early 19th centuries). Traces of a landscape divided along ethno-religious lines remain in many of the outport communities along the Southern Shore and elsewhere in Newfoundland: for example, discrete settlement enclaves based on certain aspects of identity (typically religion/ethnicity) continue to exist in many communities (though these are fluid). In many small communities, separate places of worship (Anglican vs. Catholic churches and cemeteries) continue to exist and a
denominational school system was only recently abolished. Ethnic clustering was especially prevalent in the communities of Conception Bay where populations were more mixed (Keough 2005: 18). The predominately homogenous Irish population of the Southern Shore likely made ethnic clustering less visible and restricted most macro-level ethnic tension (Keough 2008: 13); however, other residential patterning on the basis of class or another facet of identity may have existed in its place. The ethnic landscape concept is similar to the political landscape approach advanced by Kosiba and Bauer (2012) which is grounded in the notion of ‘geographies of difference’. Once again, boundaries are used to direct movement on the landscape and to influence the perception of landscape according to an observer’s social position. These various approaches share a common thread in that the landscape is seen to be manipulated to express certain aspects of identity (whether class, gender, ethnicity, etc.); boundaries are thus created and maintained.

In sum, household archaeology is a particularly useful theoretical framework for this research, given its domestic focus and evidence for an ingrained (emic) conceptual divide between the household and the exterior workspace (or the productive sphere, as Keough [2001] terms it) during the period of interest. Consumption and the notion of identity are particularly important topics which relate closely to the archaeology of the household. Finally, landscape archaeology is used as a broader framework to understand the role of the Downs House as a locus within the larger Ferryland landscape.
Chapter 3 - Historical Background
The social, economic, political and legal history of late 18th/early 19th-century Newfoundland has been examined in depth by numerous academic historians. The following section will present a general history of the broader area of the southern Avalon during this period based primarily on these secondary sources. This will be followed by a brief sketch of the community of Ferryland during the same period drawing on a variety of primary sources. A formal community history of Ferryland has yet to be published, but there are several volumes which contain significant community-level content (e.g., Keough 2001; Barnable et al. 2013). Pocius’ (1991) monograph provides a detailed historical and contemporary narrative of the neighbouring community of Calvert, and much of it is relevant to the present discussion.

3.1 Permanent Settlement and the Mode of the Fishery
As noted previously, the study period witnessed turbulent change, much of which can be tied back to the collapse of the migratory fishery and the accompanying growth of a resident population. Such a transition did not happen instantaneously; a resident population had been steadily growing over the course of the 18th century, existing alongside the migratory fishermen visiting the shores of Newfoundland each spring. Permanent settlement had in fact existed in Newfoundland since the early 17th century. Peter Pope (2004) has demonstrated that this settlement existed on a much larger scale than had been previously thought. Excavations in Ferryland have likewise corroborated the scale of early settlement. The intended permanence of such occupation is evident in the massive landscape modifications and laborious stone construction characteristic of early Ferryland settlement (Gaulton 1997).
The issue of permanent settlement and the struggle between planters, the English government, and West Country mercantile interests has been at the forefront of Newfoundland historiography from the outset of serious study. Early narratives, of which Prowse’s (1971) nationalist history is representative, stressed the oppressive nature of the West Country merchants in preventing permanent settlement in Newfoundland. This was the narrative pushed by reformers seeking political change in the 19th century (Bannister 2003: 256). These reformers were in fact mainly recent immigrants who were influenced by political and social developments in the British Isles; they concocted a nationalist narrative that did not fully mesh with actual developments in Newfoundland. Under the guise of popular politics, the reformers were in fact mostly pursuing gentry-class agendas (ibid).

This traditional interpretation of mercantile and government oppression, however, continued to influence the work of early professional historians in the 20th century and still continues to influence popular history. Revisionist histories, originating with Matthews’ (2001) influential paper have since challenged this narrative. Cadigan (1995) argues that it was Newfoundland’s limited resource base (i.e., an economy solely focussed on the fishery and an inability to develop alternatives such as agriculture), rather than merchant oppression, that can be blamed for the slow development of settlement and political/legal structures.

Early legislation, such as King William’s Act of 1699 (An Act to Encourage the Trade to Newfoundland), encouraged the growth of the migratory fishery at the expense of permanent settlement (Matthews 1973). Over the course of the 18th century, however,
an increase in the resident population gradually necessitated the institution of legal
structures in Newfoundland. This is a complex topic which cannot be fully addressed
here, but an exhaustive analysis of these critical developments is provided by Bannister
(2003). In essence, a naval government replaced the earlier fishing admiral system of
justice and remained in force (in combination with local civil courts) through an elaborate
system based on statute and customary law until the 19th-century reforms. In the mid-
1820s the naval government was abolished and the island was officially recognized as a
Crown colony, though it was still ruled by an appointed governor and Executive Council
(i.e., no legislature) (Webb 2001a). Reforms culminated in representative government in
1832, bringing with it an elected Assembly (elected members from the various districts),
and an appointed Legislative Council. Disputes quickly formed between elected and
appointed officials, often on the basis of class, religion, and ethnicity (ibid). Political
events in the United Kingdom (particularly related to Irish emancipation and the Act of
Union) also had important effects on local politics in Newfoundland. By the mid-19th
century, another shift was underway towards responsible government as part of a broader
movement in the British colonies. This form of government was installed in 1855 and
lasted until 1934 (Webb 2001b). This system was still made up of an appointed
(Executive) and elected (Assembly) council, but the former was now drawn from
members of the political party holding the majority of the latter and was responsible to
the legislature, meaning that they could only remain in power with the support of the
majority of the elected council.

Alongside the increase in permanent settlers, the migratory fishery continued to
experience considerable growth in the 18th century. Matthews (1973: 166) suggests that this continued growth in the migratory sector stayed concerns about the development of a resident population. Despite some discussions surrounding the formation of a local legislature in the latter half of the 18th century, the prevailing attitude of the government was that the migratory fishery should be promoted first and foremost. A political battle between merchants and government ensued: merchants favoured permanent settlement and private land ownership to stabilize the fishery (though they were against the establishment of a formal colony), while the government was against both.

By the last decade of the 18th century, the migratory fishery was declared to be nearly defunct (Matthews 1973: 176). The transition relates largely to the increased stability of the resident fishery in Newfoundland during the wars of the late 18th and early 19th centuries (ibid: 183-185). Migratory fishermen making the transatlantic journey (and especially those engaged in the bank fishery) were particularly vulnerable to impressment or privateering. As a result, many of the individuals engaged in the fishery chose to stay in Newfoundland, rather than return to the British Isles. This change affected all classes of society (ibid: 175-184). Merchants and their agents increasingly stayed in Newfoundland to engage in trade speculation. An increased permanent population representing a ready pool of labour led them to finance the construction of more permanent fishing and storage infrastructure, which required full-time mercantile agents and craftsmen for upkeep. This gave rise to a new type of merchant that Cuff (2014) calls the “resident outport merchant”.

An important outcome of the growth of a resident population was the
reconceptualization of land tenure and private property. In the 17th century, large-scale grants of land were issued to individuals such as George Calvert and David Kirke for proprietary colonies, but tenure for individual grants of land was generally not officially recognized during the era of the migratory fishery. Land was meant to be used for the purposes of conducting a shore-based fishery and was thus allocated on a first-come first-serve basis. In the late 18th century, naval governors did grant land to individuals, which could even be willed to descendants; crucially, however, land could only be retained if it was continually used in the fishery. Thus, land was not recognized as a fixed commodity, as it had been in the Old World (Pocius 1991: 102-104). Land titles were generally not recorded in the 18th century except in certain situations when petitions were made to the governor. Formal land registration began only in the 19th century (Head 1976: 146-147).

Interestingly, when land ownership and inheritance became established, a relatively egalitarian system of inheritance and customary law arose in Newfoundland whereby women enjoyed significant property rights (Johnson 2002). The desire to keep land within the family apparently often overruled the traditional male inheritance emphasis of English common law.

The notion that it was illegal to own land in early modern Newfoundland was incorporated into the nationalist historiography noted above. It was argued that merchants pressured the government to restrict settlement by discouraging agriculture and making property ownership illegal, thereby preventing the development of a landed gentry (Cadigan 1995: vii). As Head (1976: 146) explains, however, the 1699 King William’s Act was very clear on this issue: property held by planters prior to 1685, or not used by
the migratory fishery between 1685-1698, could legally be kept by them. There were no provisions securing use of land by migratory fishermen on a year-to-year basis; it was thus common for ship crews to leave individuals behind to safeguard their premises, which led to the development of an incipient resident population and property ownership (Norrie and Szostak 2005: 234). On the 19th-century Petit Nord, such individuals were referred to as *gardiens* and often became founding members of permanent settlements (Jones 2009).

In 1776, new legislation affecting legal title to land was introduced. This act (commonly called Palliser’s Act) aimed to promote the declining migratory fishery and made all unoccupied land in 1776 officially ships’ (ie migratory) land. Head (1976: 207) emphasizes that legislation likely did not adequately reflect the situation on the ground though. In practice, the typical situation was probably “quiet occupancy of land without formal title until someone stronger saw need to appropriate it” (ibid: 146); typically, the latter probably only occurred when occupancy was in direct conflict with the migratory fishery (Bannister 2003: 125). According to Newfoundland’s first Chief Justice, 75% of land was held without title in 1793 (ibid: 123-134). Similarly, the oral history of the community of Calvert indicates that squatter’s rights became the norm over the years (Pocius 1991: 106). Sometimes, these early land transactions were based on bartering (ibid), while at other times there do appear to have been monetary exchanges. Kercher (2010: 609) describes the practice of land holding in late 18th- to early 19th-century Newfoundland as “a combination of popular resistance to official policies on land holding and government neglect [which] led to the buying and selling of land”. Such
practices led to the bottom-up development of a body of customary law (ibid: 611).

There was also a clear ethnic and class-based dimension to the early acquisition of land: merchants of English background were first given access to land and it has been suggested that many of the common fisherfolk (of Irish origin) did not have an interest in the acquisition of large parcels of land (Pocius 1991: 105). The Irish were undoubtedly discriminated against when it came to land tenure. Catholics were forbidden from purchasing property as part of the Irish Penal Laws, which appear to have been partly, though ambiguously, transferred to Newfoundland (Mulcahy 1985: 13). The British Relief Act of 1778 subsequently removed the property limitation, though other civil restrictions still applied (Rollman 1987).

The plebeian population of the southern Avalon (mostly Irish) also seems to have taken communal action in preventing individuals from acquiring large parcels of land. Pocius (1991: 104-105) relays a fascinating oral history account concerning the attempts of the Ferryland Carters to accumulate large tracts of land in order to obtain rental income (i.e, aspiring to become landed gentry). In response, communal action was taken to block Carter’s claim (it is not specified which Carter), thereby symbolically and explicitly denying land ownership. The lack of early registration of large tracts of lands also relates to the absence of large-scale agricultural enterprises in this area of Newfoundland; this contrasts with the situation in other contemporary colonies where there were incentives to clear and improve enormous tracts of land for agricultural purposes (Pocius 1991: 107-108; Cadigan 1995: 3-4).

By the 19th century, legal attitudes towards property ownership were changing.
As noted above, this may not have had a profound effect upon the actual situation on the ground. The Judicature Act of 1824 allowed for the first time the granting of land for purposes not related to the fishery (Department of Fisheries and Land Resources 2018). A district court model was used for land registration under this Act; the Southern District Court encompassed the area around Ferryland. These new regulations did not really impact communities outside of St. John’s, where communal attitudes towards land ownership were already in force (Pocus 1991: 105). In Calvert, as was likely the case in many rural communities, the formal registration of land did not occur immediately in the wake of the new acts (ibid: 106-107). The first registration of land in that community occurred in 1847 (though systematic registration elsewhere began in 1830), and the notion of land as communally recognized rather than an individual commodity persisted into the 20th century. In contrast to other North American colonies, the land grants that were made tended to be very small – only a few acres. Only around St. John’s were large tracts of lands acquired by upper-class individuals for the creation of large estates (Prowse 1971: 427). The decentralization of land records prior to 1824 and the lack of consistent regulation after this date complicate the tracing of property tenure in 19th-century Newfoundland.

A critical parallel development of the resident fishery was an increase in the number of women and the growth of families in Newfoundland. Prior to the 19th century, there were relatively few women in Newfoundland. This is largely due to the fact that the large servant population associated with the fishery was predominantly male. In the late 17th century, females made up only 1/8 of the population (1/6 in the winter, when the
servant population was diminished) (Pope 2004: 215). Bannister (2004: 155) notes that women made up less than a third of the population for much of the 18th century. As late as 1830, males still outnumbered females 2:1 (Mannion 1989: 112). It must be reiterated here again that a significant residential fishery did exist in Newfoundland prior to the late 18th century, and this included the presence of women and children. Of the 1/8 proportion of females noted above, half were children (Pope 2004: 215). Women were present from the very beginning of settlement on the English Shore, and many played instrumental roles in the running of fishing plantations with their husbands, or more rarely as widows (ibid: 56). As noted above, however, the servant population heavily skewed the sexual balance. With the wage structure of the migratory fishery, the family unit did not play a large role in the early fishery (Bannister 2004: 155). This began to change with the growth of permanent settlement.

3.2 Immigration and Ethnicity
As Bannister (2004: 154) notes, Newfoundland immigration cannot be understood in the traditional sense of the term. There were essentially three different patterns of settlement in the 18th century: 1) seasonal migration - arriving in the spring for the summer fishery, returning to the British Isles in the fall; 2) temporary migration - merchants and planters who stayed for a few seasons and brought their increased fortunes back overseas, or servants who were contracted for a ‘Newfoundland summer’ (two summers and a winter); and 3) permanent settlement - planters and merchants who resided permanently in Newfoundland with fixed capital, or servants who remained after serving their contracts. The increased stability of the resident fishery resulted in a substantial
permanent immigration movement to Newfoundland. The island-wide resident population increased from about 1,000 in the late 17th century to 15,000 in the late 18th and again to 20,000 in the early 19th century. The most dramatic increase took place in the first few decades of the 19th century, such that the total population reached almost 60,000 by 1827 (Staveley 1977: 53).

The opportunities offered by a prosperous and stabilized fishery were especially attractive to the many economically disenfranchised inhabitants of the British Isles. This was particularly true of the landless labourers of southeast Ireland. As John Mannion (2000a, 2001) has thoroughly explored, the sudden increase in immigration from these counties was in fact based on a connection that had developed in the late 17th century. Migratory ships leaving the West Country of England would routinely stop in the southeast Irish ports to collect salt provisions; this led to the recruitment of servants for the fishery from the same ports. In the second half of the 18th century, a lack of English servants (due to the disruptions of the various wars) necessitated increased participation of Irish servants in the Newfoundland fishery (Keough 2008: 12). This recruitment of manpower for the fishery had an extremely local character, with almost all participants coming from the port of Waterford and its hinterland (Mannion 1993: 4).

The 18th-century migrations were composed overwhelmingly of single young men employed in the fishery (Mannion 1993: 2). The vast majority of them did not remain permanently in Newfoundland. Thus, it was a migratory pattern that very much resembled the movement of indentured servants elsewhere in the British colonies prior to the American Revolution (Mannion 1989: 112). The nature of migration changed
considerably during and after the Napoleonic Wars. Seasonal or temporary migration was replaced around this time by a tendency to immigrate and settle permanently in Newfoundland; this immigration movement peaked around 1815 (ibid: 109).

Permanent settlement of course necessitated the presence of female migrants, as well as their single male counterparts (Mannion 1989: 112). In the latter half of the 18th century, female migration increased despite the protests of the colonial administration (Mannion 1993: 8). Seasonal workers still made up a large portion of the migrant population until the collapse of the migratory fishery in the last decade of the 18th century (ibid). Even well into the 19th century, single males made up the bulk of the migrant stream (Mannion 1989: 112). Overwhelmingly, these were single individuals; families were rare and families with children were even rarer, in contrast to 19th-century Irish migrations to the North American mainland (ibid). Thus, it was the ultimate goal of those seeking permanent settlement to marry and start families in their new homes.

Mannion (ibid: 118) points to the important role of these colonial marriages in the forging of new identities in the New World. People of different backgrounds were brought together and assimilated; thus local identities were lost but new ones were formed. This echoes Keough’s (2008: 13-14) discussion of the formation of a common identity amongst the plebeian fisherfolk. Mannion (1989: 121) notes that, in his case study of New Ross area immigrations, marriage patterns were ethnocentric, which contrasts with Keough’s (2001: 136-207, 2008: 13-14) findings of intermarriage and conversion. This may relate to the more mixed population of the destinations in Mannion’s case study and the ensuing desire to maintain distinct identities, as
hypothesized by Keough (2005: 18). In any case, by 1840 Irish migration had essentially stopped (Mannion 1993: 8), bringing an end to a half-century of intensive movement. Thus, the Newfoundland migrations were over by the time of the famous Great Famine migrations of the 1840s, which saw over 1.5 million individuals emigrate between the mid 1840s and the early 1850s (Gráda and O’Rourke 1997: 4). The characteristics of these later migrations are very different and should not be conflated with the Newfoundland migrations.

The scale of pre-Famine immigration to Newfoundland is quite remarkable, encompassing thousands of individuals every year (Mannion 1993: 6). This resulted in a demographic upheaval; whereas the English Shore had been composed nearly exclusively of people of English origin throughout the 17th century, the Irish made up 40% of the population of the same area by 1750 (Mannion 2001: 257). This demographic reversal happened particularly quickly on the southern Avalon, where many of the immigrant Irish settled. By the beginning of the 19th century, the population of the area was 90% Irish Catholic, and the 1845 census reports a proportion of 97% (Keough 2008). Immigration had also slowed considerably by this point; for example, the 1857 census indicates that almost 92% of the inhabitants of the Ferryland district were Newfoundland-born (with a mere 7% Irish-born and 1% English-born) (Staveley 1977: Table 2.1).

Ethnicity was of course very closely correlated with religion on the southern Avalon; those of English origin were almost exclusively Protestant while those of Irish origin were nearly all Roman Catholic. Furthermore, ethnoreligious identity was correlated with class: the merchant and professional class was almost exclusively
composed of English Protestants, while the plebeian majority (servants and small-scale planters) were overwhelmingly Irish Catholics. Thus, despite being the significant minority in terms of population, the merchant class held a disproportionate amount of power. Notably, many of the immigrant Irish were not fluent in English, which was the language of government and business. Many spoke only Irish or very little English, and most were illiterate (Mannion 2000b: 18). Language and writing can thus be seen as potent tools of power in early Newfoundland (see Macdonald 1997). As Bannister (2003: 283) notes “law was an expression of social power”; though unwritten law and custom were important, written law was very significant.

The Newfoundland migrations had an extremely local character. Kinship ties likely played an important role in the movements and eventual destinations of individuals, though it is difficult to identity and quantify kinship relations for early migrations (Mannion 1989: 113). It is likely that kinship played an increasingly important role in migrations as time went on: in the 19th century, resident Newfoundlanders played important roles in recruiting their kin, as well as non-kin members of their home networks (ibid: 118). As noted above, the southern Avalon during the study period was essentially composed of two ethnoreligious groups: English Protestants from the southwestern English counties and Irish Catholics from the southeastern Irish counties. While other ethnic groups did exist on various pockets of the island (Mannion 1977), these two groups made up the majority of the population. Irish immigrants were mainly concentrated on the Avalon Peninsula; elsewhere, people of English origin predominated (Staveley 1977: 53).
Ethnoreligious tension is an important theme in the historiography of Newfoundland settlement. This tension seems to have been relatively muted on the southern Avalon in comparison to other areas such as Conception Bay or St. John’s where there was more of a mixed population with distinct identities (Keough 2005: 18). In Conception Bay, for example, even if aggregate populations of Irish Catholics and English Protestants were relatively even, most communities were dominated by one or the other, and larger communities had distinct ethnic enclaves. This allowed for the maintenance of distinct identities and boundaries and sometimes culminated in ethnic-based conflicts (Keough 2009). Keough (2008: 12) suggests that Irish identity was not explicitly expressed on the Southern Shore, but rather was inherent in aspects of everyday life; elsewhere, in the presence of an English Protestant ‘other’, there may have been more explicit expression of identity to maintain boundaries. She further argues that a common identity was quickly established between Irish and English inhabitants on the Southern Shore, particularly amongst the working-class fisherfolk (ibid: 13-14). This is based on the fact that the English Protestant population appears to have been assimilated into the plebeian Irish class through intermarriage and conversions (rather than out-migrations).

A picture thus emerges of a relatively homogenous plebeian class forging new local identities. This somewhat obscures the presence of an ‘other’ on the Southern Shore in the form of a small, but powerful, English Protestant gentry class. If ethnic tension was muted, class-based divisions (carrying significant ethnoreligious undertones) must still have been very apparent. In the face of an expanding Irish plebeian population, the gentry
class may have felt especially compelled to make their identity explicit and visible, even if it did not result in as many explicit ethnic conflicts as elsewhere in Newfoundland. The gentry class likely knew that ethnic conflict and communal violence was not in their best interests due to their significant numerical inferiority. Though communal violence on the Southern Shore (and much of the Avalon) does appear to have been rare (Mannion 2000b: 18), communal action nonetheless did occur, such as in the land dispute described by Pocius (1991: 104-105) in Ferryland. Countless other similar incidents must have occurred, without the explosive effects of communal violence experienced elsewhere (Keough 2005). Such communal action would seem to undermine Keough’s (2001: 670) assertion that the plebeian majority of the Southern Shore lacked a class consciousness. Mannion (2000b: 19) terms this communal disaffection, which was “normally expressed in peaceful petitions or memorials to the authorities” and tended to revolve around issues of economic survival, rather than outright political motives.

While Keough emphasizes the homogeneity of the population, there were likely still pockets or enclaves in southern Avalon communities characterized by inhabitants of a particular identity. While outright ethnic conflict in the area may have been rare, ethno-religious tension was still evident for example in the disparaging remarks made by various governors⁶, government officials, merchants, and planters towards the Irish Catholic population. Such comments were particularly common during the various

⁶ Attitudes towards the Irish shifted depending on the governor in power. As the governors possessed quite a bit of leeway in their administration of the law, policies towards the Irish tended to fluctuate, which must have created a high degree of uncertainty. For instance, although religious freedom was granted in Newfoundland in 1779, there was a resurgence of anti-Catholic policy a decade later under Governor Mark Milbanke (Bannister 2003: 219).
wartime periods of the long 18th century (Anglo-French conflicts), as the loyalty of the Irish was heavily questioned (Mannion 2000b). Accusations of drunkenness, idleness, and petty crime are also very common (Mulcahy 1985: 7). Despite this discourse, the masters of the Irish fishing servants (mostly English) supported their presence because they recognized the crucial role they played in the fishery. Repressive legislation, however, severely limited the rights of the Irish and was especially harsh in the early and mid 18th century before the repeal of the Penal Laws (Mannion 1993: 5). The original essential tensions between English Protestants and Irish Catholics that were present during the study period, though greatly reduced, are still visible in vestigial form in elements of the contemporary and recent landscape, such as the recently defunct denominational school system, and the separate Anglican and Catholic churches and cemeteries that exist in Ferryland and other Southern Shore communities.

3.3 **Labour and Social Structure in a Resident Population**

In essence, the social structure of late Georgian/early Victorian outport Newfoundland was quite straightforward. Three distinct classes are traditionally identified: merchants, planters, and servants (Cadigan 1995; Bannister 2003). Class relations were based on an industrial capitalist fishing economy and depended on the relationship of each group to credit and the means of production in the fishery. Merchants supplied provisions/gear and exported processed fish to external markets. Planters were a kind of independent middlemen (both merchant client and fishing master) who usually owned fishing vessels and contracted wage labour to undertake the actual fishing; they were typically obliged to sell their catch to a particular merchant. Servants were the main labour force, and they
were hired on wages (rather than shares). Initially, they were young men recruited seasonally from southwest England or (increasingly) southeast Ireland; later, they were typically local resident individuals. Thus, each group was linked to the other in a chain of credit relationships. There was certainly potential for upward mobility in Newfoundland society (considerably more so than in the Old World [see Mannion 1998]), and it was the goal of incoming servants to eventually establish their own independent fishing households (Mannion 1989: 121). Bannister (2003: 8) argues that no middle class existed in 18th-century Newfoundland but that this appears to have changed with the growth of a resident population as craftsmen, artisans, professionals, and minor government officials began to emerge in the 19th century. As with middle classes elsewhere (Young 2003: 5) it is difficult to define the Newfoundland middle class solely with respect to its relation to labour. It is argued herein that the development of a middle class in rural Newfoundland, sharing certain traits with burgeoning middle classes elsewhere in the Anglo-American world, can be seen in the archaeological record of the Downs House.

Terminology in contemporary documents is confusing and inconsistent; someone engaged in the fishery is often referred to as a fisherman (whether they were a planter or a servant), and the terms fisherman and servant were often used interchangeably (Cadigan 1995: xii; Bannister 2003: 9). This may suggest a high degree of fluidity in the system. As noted earlier, merchants have often been vilified in nationalist narratives and popular history because of their supposed authoritarian and exploitative practices. As Cadigan (1995: viii) notes, merchants were indeed generally influenced by economic motivations, but he further correctly notes that it is ahistorical to expect “that the
merchants should have developed the fishery philanthropically”. Merchants and fishermen were dependant on one another in a system that was fraught with instability due to its reliance on a narrow economic base.

Cuff (2014: 4, 7) points to the importance of not characterizing all merchants in the same way. He notes that, while some merchants were undoubtedly exploitative in their actions (likening them to Victorian factory owners or Gilded Age industrialist robber barons), many were also important community philanthropists who made significant contributions to social and cultural life in the outports. He further correctly posits that the Newfoundland fishery could not “have existed and expanded through the 19th century without the business-owners who provided the considerable capital and profit-driven vision to prosecute both domestic development and international trade” (ibid: 4). Drawing again from Cadigan (1995: viii), history should not serve as “an apologia for the merchants”, but they must be understood as complex individuals who were absolutely necessary for the survival of the fishery and who may have also had altruistic aims7, in addition to their profit-driven motivations.

Following Keough (2001: Appendix A), the approach taken here will be to treat the population as broadly consisting of two sections: the plebeian and gentry classes. There is of course considerable variation within these two groups. The plebeian group could range from the landless servant to the independent planter (contracting labour from the lower-class members of the plebeian class). The gentry group might range from the
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7 Examples may be seen in the journals of Robert Carter (1832-1852), an early 19th-century Ferryland merchant which contain many references to providing welfare and relief to the poor, especially during the winter seasons.
ambitious planter or low-level government official (e.g., clerk) to the powerful merchant/political office holder. Thus, neither group should be seen as homogenous. Keough (2001) recognizes such variation in the gentry group by referring to them often as middle-upper class. She does not seek to clearly define the middle class as a distinct group, and her focus is decidedly on the plebeian class. As noted, a somewhat distinct middle class can be seen in the group of professionals and lower-level government officials in the 19th century. Documentary evidence reveals that this middle class was more closely socially aligned with the traditional gentry class, hence the lumping described above. Again, the class system presented here is one heavily based on ethnoreligious identity; the large differences between the two groups (in ethnoreligious terms) perhaps precludes the existence of a definable third middle class. Another group that may be identified as a rising middle class includes the urban reformers of the mid-19th century who were at the centre of the debates around governmental change (Bannister 2003: 258-261). These individuals were primarily Irish Catholics seeking increased political power and differed from the rural middle class that forms the focus herein.

As the resident population grew, a reorientation of the labour system involved in the fishery took place. The presence of a pool of Newfoundland-born labour within the families of fisherfolk, combined with the increased risk of transatlantic travel and shortage of imported (migratory) labour in wartime made a family-based labour system a considerably more attractive option. Often, fishing operations made use of their own extended family and kin networks for supplying labour (Bannister 2004: 163). By the late
18th century, the fishery had become a decidedly Newfoundland-based operation with the family as the primary social unit (Bannister 2003: 8). After 1805 it became rare for servants to be seasonal wage labourers; more typically, servants came from local families who did not possess the capital to participate independently in the fishery (Cadigan 1995: xii). The basic social structure remained the same. Another reason for the move towards family labour can be traced to the changes in master-servant law in Newfoundland (see Bannister 2004 for an exhaustive treatment), which saw servants increasingly winning suits brought against their masters. It should also be noted that different sectors of the fishing economy had slightly differing labour systems; for instance, the Labrador fishery and the seal fishery continued to rely on wage labour to a much greater degree than the inshore southern Avalon cod fishery (Cadigan 1995: x). The increased presence of women and families in Newfoundland also impacted labour systems. Women’s labour roles on the southern Avalon have been thoroughly explored by Keough (2001: 208-324).

3.4 Developments in Ferryland
The general comments above about the economy and demography of the southern Avalon apply to the community of Ferryland. More detailed information can be gleaned from some of the primary sources. This section will review some of the more detailed data at the community level.

As noted earlier, the main settlement areas appear to have moved away from the Pool (inner harbour) after the destruction of this area during the French raid of 1696 (Tuck 1993). Archaeological evidence and later maps (see below) make it clear that the Pool remained an important area during the study period. It was in fact resettled
immediately after the French raid, with inhabitants returning in the spring of 1697. The next several decades, however, were characterized by continued hostilities with France and resulting debt and depression in the fishery associated with the destruction of the English Shore (Hranka 2007: 18-21); population in the area fell dramatically as a result (Pope 2004: 201). Around the same time, there was also a significant realignment in the English migratory fishery in the area. The 17th century had been dominated by North Devon ports such as Bideford and Barnstaple. By the 1730s, these ports had dropped out of the fishery to be replaced by South Devon ports such as Dartmouth in the mid-18th century (Head 1976: 153). Thus, there are likely limited connections between Ferryland’s late 17th-century population and the inhabitants that made up the area a century later, which is reflected in the surname records. This demographic upheaval relates to the devastation of the English fishery in the area in the late 17th century and the Irish immigrations which followed in the mid-18th to early 19th centuries.

As part of the 1697 resettlement, the main population centre may have shifted elsewhere. It is likely that the Pool remained the centre of the Ferryland fishery, given its value as the most sheltered harbour in the community. The high density of fishery-related infrastructure on the shores of the Pool on later maps corroborate this. In present-day Ferryland the Pool remains the most important centre of the still-functioning, though greatly reduced, fishery. Based on maps from the 18th and 19th centuries (examined in further detail below), it seems that Ferryland’s North Side (Cold East point) and the
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8 Notably, Robert Carter progenitor of the Ferryland Carters, arrived in the area from Sidmouth, South Devon around the mid-18th century (Keough 2001: 616).
elevated mainland area west of the Pool (beneath the Gaze) became the most important settlement areas. These continue to be the most densely settled areas today. It is also evident from the archaeological record, however, that the Pool retained a domestic character into the 19th century (which continued into the late 20th century). An account from an 1827 navigator’s volume (Blunt 1827: 554) emphasizes the fishery infrastructure of the Pool, in addition to its domestic component, describing it as “a point of beach, where you ride in 12 feet water at low water… the stages being near, several planters, inhabitants, live in this place”.

Ferryland’s demography appears to follow the general trends outlined above for the Southern Shore. In 1739, Governor John Byng bemoaned the great number of Irish Catholics arriving in Newfoundland, noting that they were “especially at Ferryland, almost all” (Mulcahy 1985: 7). While this is evidently a hyperbolic statement⁹, it emphasizes the importance of the community of Ferryland as an early destination for Irish immigrants. As noted previously, this early Irish component of the population was very small in the grand scheme of the migratory fishery. For example, English servants outnumbered Irish nearly 8:1 in the winter of 1732 (and Irish masters were outnumbered 44:1) (Mannion 2001: Table 5).

The situation, however, changed rapidly: a 1753 census of wintering inhabitants in Ferryland lists Irish inhabitants as outnumbering English ones (130 to 120) (Head 1976: 98). Similarly, a 1760 census lists 16 Irish families versus 14 English ones (Head 1976: 98).

---

⁹ Indeed, most of the early complaints from the colonial government about the Irish seem to be characterized by a high degree of hyperbole (Mannion 2001: 278).
1976: 155), indicating that ethnic ratios were approximately equal amongst permanent inhabitants in the mid-18th century. Following the patterns identified above, rapid increases in the Irish population of Ferryland continued over the latter half of the 18th century. By 1787, the population was said to be 74% Catholic, and this increased to 95% in 1795 (English 1998). A nominal census conducted in 1800 for the Ferryland District gives some details on the resident population and fishery in Ferryland at the turn of the 19th century. The census is composed of three parts: the first lists nuclear family groups consisting of parents and their children, the second lists the names of masters and overwintering servants/dieters, and the third gives a detailed breakdown of the structure of the fishery for that year (numbers and types of vessels, names of those involved). From these detailed records, one can begin to see the establishment of major merchants and fishing families; many of their descendants continue to reside in the community today.

The presence of both a Roman Catholic and Anglican priest in the community census indicates Ferryland’s importance as a regional centre during a time when resident priests were rare in Newfoundland. After the granting of religious freedom in 1779, Ferryland became an important centre for Catholicism on the Southern Shore. The Irish Franciscan priest James Louis O’Donel founded a parish in Ferryland (along with parishes in Harbour Grace and Placentia) shortly after his arrival in 1784 and went on to become the first Catholic bishop in North America outside Quebec (DCB 1983).

A detailed 1836 census also provides a snapshot of the community. By this point, Ferryland was one of the most populous communities in the district with 84 dwelling houses and a total population of 747 (240 of whom are identified as servants). The
servant population is heavily skewed sexually, with 223 of them being male. Of the 240 servants, 77 are also identified as being heads of their own households. The census also gives details on land tenure and land clearance activities in the community: it is indicated that 199 acres have been cleared and 514.5 acres are defined as ‘possessed’. Thus, landholding and agricultural activities are clearly relatively well advanced, the latter indicated by the over 8000 bushels of potatoes and 61 bushels of oats/grains reported. Early 19th-century Ferryland land-use was typically described in the record books as belonging to one of three uses: either a garden, meadow or dwelling house (Pocius 1991: 106). The agricultural yields listed in the census corroborate the garden references, and the livestock annotations (21 horses, 62 cattle, 51 sheep, and curiously only 3 hogs) attest to use of meadows as pasture land. Furthermore, the administrative importance of the area is indicated by the presence of two schools servicing 68 pupils. Finally, the religious breakdown is unsurprisingly heavily skewed towards Catholics at close to 90%.

Ferryland evidently was an extremely important community during the 17th century, and it effectively served as the colonial capital of David Kirke’s Newfoundland Plantation (Pope 2004: 6). This important administrative role carried over into the 18th and 19th centuries, when Ferryland became an important regional centre as the capital of a judicial district (one of six on the island) first created in 1729 which ranged from Bay Bulls to Cape Spear (see Bannister 2003: 69-71). Plans were also made to construct a jailhouse in Ferryland, making it one of two regional jailhouses in Newfoundland (the
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10 This refers only to the ‘family population’ category – detailed breakdown of servants’ religion is not provided.
other being in St. John’s), in an attempt to enhance the administration of justice (ibid: 72). Surrogate naval courts and quarter sessions (presided over by magistrates) were also held in Ferryland (ibid: 152). Bannister (ibid: 153) emphasizes the important social aspect of the yearly arrival of naval officers for surrogate court sessions. Documentary evidence indicates that these were important events where merchants would gather information on colonial affairs and socialize with the presiding officers. It is likely that many of the important members of surrounding communities would descend upon Ferryland for these events.

Ferryland remained an important administrative centre after representative government was granted as well. Extending from Petty Harbour to Cape Race, it was one of nine electoral districts from which representatives for the first elected Assembly were drawn (and remains an electoral district today). It continued to have an important judicial role after the fall of naval government as the location of the Southern District Circuit Court (Barnable et al. 2013: 321-322).

A dramatic event which must be mentioned here is the Ferryland riot of 1788. This was not a case of sectarian violence, although it was perhaps construed as such by certain members of the local gentry (English 1998: 6). The local English Protestant gentry may have sought to capitalize both financially and politically on the image of a violent working class by sowing discord amongst the Irish (Bannister 2003: 235). Some historians have also interpreted the event as evidence of sectarian conflict or class antagonism (Barnable 1994: 6). Sectarian violence was indeed quite rare in Newfoundland in the 18th century (though the threat was there and there were occasional
flare-ups) (Bannister 2003: 221). The 18th-century Irish, many of whom were itinerant labourers only, were not politically active in Newfoundland, despite the fears of colonial administrators (Mannion 2000b: 18). Sectarian conflict became more commonplace during the political debates of the 19th century, particularly after the granting of representative government in 1832 (Bannister 2003: 220). Such events, however, were rare on the southern Avalon by comparison, as discussed by Keough (2005).

The events in Ferryland in 1788 instead centred on a conflict within the ranks of Irish inhabitants, which can be traced back to tensions between immigrants from different provinces/factions (Leinster and Munster) (Bannister 2003: 234). These tensions were stoked by a conflict between two Catholic priests in the community: one of them, Patrick Power, a renegade (i.e., not appointed or recognized by Bishop O’Donel) and one of them, Thomas Ewer, the official appointee (Barnable 1994: 7). Thus, it would appear that the event largely represents a carryover of traditional faction fighting practices from Ireland to Newfoundland, perhaps exacerbated by the tedium of the winter offseason (English 1998) and tied up with the politics of the nascent Catholic parish (Bannister 2003: 235). Interestingly, the events appear to have started as a hurling match on the Ferryland Downs, apparently a common yearly affair (English 1998). Further evidence that the events likely do not relate to a class-based conflict can be found in the conviction of a prominent Irish Catholic merchant for his role in the affair. The scale of the event is notable: it involved 45% of the adult male population of the district and was responsible for 21% of cases heard in district court for the next quarter century (ibid). What the event clearly demonstrates is that the Irish plebeian class cannot be seen as a homogenous
group; there were evidently tensions which cut across class boundaries.

3.4.1 **Cartographic Evidence**

Extant historical maps provide information about the nature of settlement patterns in Ferryland during the study period. The maps discussed here are summarized in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 - Maps relevant to the study area and time period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cartographer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Archival Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Edmund Scott Hylton</td>
<td>A plan of Cape Broil, Capeling Bay, &amp; Ferryland Harbor</td>
<td>G 3437 F4 1752 H9 1970 MAP (CNS MUN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Joseph FW Des Barres</td>
<td>A report of Ferryland Harbour in the island of Newfoundland with a sketch there of taken in obedience to your order; dated at St. Johns the 29th Sept. 1762</td>
<td>NMC 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>A map showing the anchorage at Ferryland</td>
<td>NMC 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Joseph Gilbert</td>
<td>A chart of part of the coast of Newfoundland showing Caplin Bay, Ferryland and Aquafort Harbour</td>
<td>NMC 79977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Plan of Ferryland Harbour and Capeling Bay In Newfoundland</td>
<td>Add MS 33231 II-14 (British Library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Thomas Jefferys ( engraver/publisher), Michael Lane (surveyor)</td>
<td>A chart, containing the following particular plans of harbours on the eastern side of Newfoundland with sailing marks</td>
<td>G 3436 P55 1794 J4 MAP (CNS MUN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810-1812</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Chart of Ferryland Harbour, the entrance to Caplin Bay and Aquafort, Newfoundland</td>
<td>NMC 15562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827-1837</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>RPA MG 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Unknown (Sherriff Wright?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RPA MG 247, File 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>John Orlebar</td>
<td>Broyle Hr to Renewse Hr Including Caplin Bay, Ferryland Hr, Aquafort Hr &amp; Fermeuse Hr</td>
<td>NMC 187198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic maps can be assessed using several different criteria, including spatial accuracy and attribute accuracy. Spatial accuracy refers to the scalar and positional accuracy of a map, i.e., how well do its features reflect spatial reality? This can be assessed by georeferencing maps on the modern landscape using GIS software. Thus, the positional and scalar accuracy of features can be directly assessed by comparing the elements of historical maps with modern data sources such as orthophotos and topographic maps.

Most georeferencing applications rely on the use of discrete control points (points that are common between data sets) to register and mathematically transform maps; this is the standard method for registering modern spatial data such as remote sensing or aerial photography. These types of geostationary control features (such as road networks or buildings) were not sufficiently available on the maps consulted; thus, a more generalized georeferencing approach was taken involving manual scaling, rotation, and translation of maps to approximately fit the modern landscape. This approach mitigates against the overreliance on inaccurate control points. Where graphical scales are present on the original maps, the maps can be accurately scaled using the measurement tools integrated into the GIS package. When scales are not present, the maps can only be approximately scaled. This method does not allow for highly accurate georeferencing due to its reliance on generalized features such as shorelines, but it does allow for the assessment of the relative spatial accuracy of the historic maps. Evidently, some features such as shorelines, riverbeds, and so on are subject to temporal change. Historical maps can be useful for assessing such changes, if the spatial accuracy of the original map can be confirmed.

Attribute accuracy refers to the accuracy of the qualitative details of the map, i.e.,
does the level of detail reflect the actual landscape? Rather than reflecting the technological aspects of the survey procedure used to produce the map, attribute accuracy generally reflects a conscious decision on the part of the cartographer vis-à-vis the level of detail included on the map. The amount of attribute data will depend on the intended audience and purpose of the original map. The maps consulted here vary considerably in their spatial and attribute accuracies. Even if the maps are more schematic in nature (i.e., low accuracy), they are useful for assessing generalized settlement patterns. Maps which are high in their depiction of details of individual feature locations and attributes are extremely useful for archaeological interpretation.

The earliest map of relevance to the study period is the 1752 Hylton map (Figure 3.1). This map has incredible spatial accuracy and a high degree of terrestrial detail. The largest cluster of dwelling houses is located about 500m west of the Pool beneath the promontory known as the Gaze, which is close to the main population centre of the community today. Another cluster of dwelling
houses and stages is located on Ferryland’s North Side on a peninsula located about 1 km north of the Pool. The Pool itself appears to be relatively bereft of dwelling houses but has a dense concentration of stages and fishing rooms, particularly on its southern side. To the south, there are a number of parcels of land indicated, which likely represent cleared land under cultivation. The western half of the Downs shows some activity as well with a few stages, several parcels of (enclosed?) land and a couple of probable dwelling houses. The depiction of enclosed land set back from the coastline is somewhat surprising, given the reluctance of the colonial government to officially grant land for purposes unrelated to the fishery prior to the 19th century. The area around the DH contains several enclosed parcels of land, wharves, and structures (Figure 3.2). Several structures near the coast are likely associated with
fishing activities while an L-shaped structure shown just to the east of the site is likely a dwelling house.

The 1762 Des Barres map is considerably less accurate spatially and is also limited in its attribute detail (Figure 3.3). Its thematic focus is on elements of the coastal defense of Ferryland and thus shows a number of proposed battery positions. There are stages/wharves shown along almost the entirety of the coast from the Pool to the North Side, but these are quite schematic in appearance (the latter is true for most of the terrestrial detail of the map). The annotations on the map are informative: the area beneath the Gaze (between the Pool and the North Side) is labelled as ‘Ferryland Town’ in contrast to other toponyms such as ‘The Pool’ and ‘Ferryland Down’. Thus, it is clear that the accepted centre of town by this point is this location on the mainland. It is difficult to trust most of the detail on this map due to its largely schematic nature. It is clear that the purpose of this map is not the accurate portrayal of terrestrial detail, but rather the depiction of the proposed defenses (most of which are centred on the Downs and Ferryland Head).

Another map from 1762 (cartographer unknown) (Figure 3.4) appears to largely be of a schematic nature as well, as nearly all the structures and wharves depicted appear the same.
Spatially, it is not very accurate with particular errors associated with the coastline north of the Pool and the chain of islands in the harbour. The general settlement patterns noted above remain consistent, with a cluster of settlement beneath the Gaze west of the Pool and on the North Side and a low density of structures/stages along the coast between these two locales. Several stages and a few structures are also depicted in the vicinity of the Pool and there are three structures shown in the central part of the Downs. Thus, the map confirms these settlement patterns but is not of great use for examining individual features for the purposes of archaeological interpretation.

The 1770 Gilbert map\textsuperscript{11} (Figure 3.5) differs from the previous few in that it depicts greater detail for the marine environment, including numerous soundings and details on rocks, shoals, and so on. There is also considerable terrestrial detail. General settlement patterns remain the same as discussed above. This map also depicts several enclosed parcels of land, although it is not as detailed in this

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure_3.5_Detail_of_1770_Gilbert_map}
\caption{Detail of 1770 Gilbert map.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{11} There is no annotation identifying the cartographer on the map itself. It is attributed to Joseph Gilbert by Archives of the Hydrographic Department, British Admiralty
regard as the Hylton map; the parcels are much larger and fewer in number. Overall, the map depicts a very high degree of spatial accuracy. Interestingly, it appears to depict a seawall-type feature on the north side of the Pool. A large area of cleared land and a curious stippled feature is shown in the centre of the Downs near the Downs House site. Archaeological evidence discussed below does not suggest considerable activity at the DH at this early date, but this may be evidence of earlier occupation nearby. This may corroborate the features shown in the same area on the 1752 Hylton map.

A 1775 map (Figure 3.6) similarly shows details of the coastal and marine environment (high spatial accuracy) with a near-complete absence of terrestrial

---

12 Note date or cartographer indicated. Date provided by Norman B. Leventhal Map Center (Boston Public
detail. There is a river depicted near the North Side labelled ‘Watering Place’, perhaps indicating its importance as a source of fresh water. This map depicts soundings, shoals, reefs, and beaches in considerable detail and is evidently aimed at marine navigation.

The 1794 Jefferys map (Figure 3.7) is part of a North American nautical atlas and depicts the community of Ferryland\textsuperscript{13} at a smaller scale along with the neighbouring communities of Cape Broyle, Calvert, Aquaforre, and Renews. Of these communities, Ferryland has the highest terrestrial detail but it is largely schematic and likely not very accurate. The emphasis of this map is again on coastal and nautical attributes. The Ferryland inset appears to have been copied from an earlier map of the Avalon Peninsula coast, initially surveyed in 1773 by Michael Lane.

A ca. 1810-1812\textsuperscript{14} map (Figure 3.8) is largely focussed on Ferryland’s coastal defenses but contains considerable other detail, although it is quite spatially inaccurate with the east-west distance being exaggerated relative to north-south. In terms of settlement patterns, a cluster of structures

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure3_8.png}
\caption{Detail of ca. 1810-1812 map.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{13} This inset was copied from an earlier survey done in 1773 by Michael Lane.
\textsuperscript{14} This map is undated. It is a chart from the Governor Duckworth papers – the dates reflect his term as governor of Newfoundland.
is shown south of the Pool near Freshwater Cove. The familiar cluster near the North Side is also shown, but the concentration west of the Pool is absent; this may simply be an oversight as the detail is mostly schematic. Structures are differentiated, however, unlike some of the other maps. There are several structures which are drawn more prominently, showing partial facades with various details such as chimneys, windows, etc. There are surprisingly few stages/wharves depicted, though the majority of fishery-related shore infrastructure is shown in the Pool. Given the absence of some of these types of known features, it is difficult to place great faith in some of the other depicted features. The land around the Pool is shown with a strange stippled texture; the significance of this is unknown. As for the battery positions, the same emphasis on the Downs and Ferryland Head is present, along with a new position on the North Side.

A fascinating map dating to approximately 1827-1837\textsuperscript{15} (Figure 3.9) provides a very detailed look at architecture and land-use in a small portion of the Ferryland community (the North Side). The primary focus is on the Holdsworth premises.

\textsuperscript{15} Pocius (1982: 222) suggests this date based on a bill of sale for the property.
Several different types of dwellings are shown in bird’s eye/oblique view with individual annotations. These range from simple one or two-room structures to large Georgian facades; the architecture depicted on this map is discussed in detail by Pocius (1982). Other features such as stages, fishing rooms, stores, gardens, meadows, a burying ground, and a lime kiln are also shown, giving an impression of a very bustling area. This is a very valuable source for tracing land use and land tenure in this part of the community.

A ca. 1837\textsuperscript{16} map (Figure 3.10) gives similar details regarding individual structures through the use of an oblique perspective. Spatially, this map is very inaccurate and it is clearly intended to be a sketch map with importance placed on identifying

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure310.png}
\caption{Ca. 1837 map.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{16} This date is based on an annotation on the map, indicating that a similar map was filed in 1837.
individual structures/features, their functions, and their owners. It shows two different parts of the community – the Pool/Downs and a section along the main road through the community to the west of the Pool (below the Gaze). Based on annotations, it relates to a land dispute. The section around the Pool has less detail and may only show major features to provide context. While clearly an expedient sketch map, it provides perspectives on land ownership and use in a couple different areas of the community. This map is significant in the interpretation of the DH site and is discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

The final map, dating to 1863, is primarily a nautical chart and is very accurately drawn (spatially). It does depict some terrestrial detail but is fairly limited. Of note is a road that branches off from the main road (now Highway 10) towards Freshwater Cove, where a small community has clearly developed. Otherwise, the same settlement patterns noted above persist with the main settlement areas a little west of the Pool and on the North Side. There are only a few structures and stages shown in the vicinity of the Pool, and the Downs is shown as completely empty of any activity.
Chapter 4 - Documentary/Archaeological Evidence of the Downs House

This chapter will focus on the specific context and setting of the DH site, examining it through both archaeological and documentary evidence (as well as some of the limited relevant oral history) to establish a framework for the analysis of the material culture presented in Chapter 5. It will aim to address the first series of research questions which relate to the sequence of occupation of the site and the basic layout and appearance of the structure and premises. The site is located approximately 300m east of the Pool and 1.4 kilometres east of the main population centre beneath the Gaze (Figure 1.2). The immediate environment consists of a gently sloping grassy meadow which descends towards the ocean. There are no extant structures within the immediate vicinity, and the land was, until recently, used for subsistence agriculture and pasturing.

4.1 Documentary Evidence

A wide variety of documentary sources were investigated in an attempt to shed light on the DH and its occupants. One of the primary goals was the establishment of a chain of ownership/occupation for the structure from its construction until its abandonment (or as near thereunto as possible). Appendix A summarizes all references that have been used to compile this occupational timeline. These sources are discussed in further detail below.

Due to the paucity of land-use records for pre-1850 Newfoundland, particularly in the outports, there are many gaps and uncertainties in the documentary record of the DH. References discussed below come from a variety of different sources including wills, grants, deeds, journals, letters, maps, drawings, censuses, and church records (baptism, marriage, death). Some of the references are quite unambiguous and we can be certain that they refer to the structure in question. Others are less certain, and there is some
conjecture associated with their interpretation. Cross-referencing of different sets of records helps to strengthen them.

The Carter affiliation\(^\text{17}\) originally derives from a map dated ca. 1837 (Figure 3.10). The map, briefly discussed above, is part of the Carter-Benger-Nason Papers (MG 247) at the Rooms Provincial Archives. These papers were part of a set of family-held documents which relate to the Nunan vs. Carter land dispute court case\(^\text{18}\) and were donated to the provincial archives in the 1970s (pers. comm., M. Dunne, Feb 10 2018). It is part of a booklet that contains copied transactions of government grants made in Ferryland, Aquaforte, Fermeuse and Renews between 1750 and 1815\(^\text{19}\), presumably related to the above land dispute. The structure annotated ‘L’ on the map is a substantial 2.5-storey Georgian-style dwelling house. The associated annotation reads ‘Wm Carter’s Stone House occupied by Gillard’ and the caption beneath the structure also notes the presence of gardens. Two centre chimneys are shown and three stylized and monogrammed flags are depicted (the gable ends read ‘N’ and the centre flag reads ‘C’).\(^\text{20}\) The significance of the flags is unknown, but it should be recalled that the map likely relates to a dispute between the Carter and Nunan families (matching the flag letters). The centre portion of the building is symbolized differently than the lateral

\(^{17}\) The site was originally referred to as the Carter House site, after the reference on the 1837 map. Further documentary research revealed that the Carter connection is more tenuous than later occupations. The Downs House toponym is a common one in the written record, and it was decided that this was a more appropriate name for the site, better reflecting its overall character.

\(^{18}\) This lengthy and bitter dispute, which took place in the mid-19th century between the Nunan and Carter families, was over the possession of properties pertaining to the Richard Nason estate in Ferryland.

\(^{19}\) The 1815 date is indicated on the cover of the booklet, but the contained annotations contain several references to post-1815 transactions.

\(^{20}\) The caption directly beneath the house appears to read ‘Stone Houses’ pluralized, indicating several separate structures. The legend annotation may be interpreted as either ‘House’ or ‘Houses’.
sections: the latter are textured with additional smaller circles (similar to the Norris House, labelled ‘L’) that may indicate stone construction. The Carter House and the Norris House are the only ones on the map textured in this way. Thus, the central portion of the structure may be timber-framed with the lateral ends stone, perhaps added later.

The exact date of the map is not provided; an annotation at the bottom indicates that a similar map from 1837 was provided by Deputy Sherriff Wright and is on file with ‘Rich Nasons Administration’, thus providing a TPQ. The Gillard reference likely provides a terminus ante quem (TAQ) of 1845 (see below), thus providing a range of 1837-1845. It is difficult to ascertain the exact location of this structure from the map alone; it is clearly east of the Pool and north of the road leading to the Downs and appears close to the coast, but the map is evidently not carefully scaled. This is the only definitive reference to William Carter occupying a dwelling house on the Downs. Other nearby features on the map include two flakes (labelled ‘M’ – ‘Mce Brazels flakes and Gardens’), a significantly smaller and more austere dwelling house (labelled ‘K’ – ‘Mce Brazels dwelling House), and another small structure (labelled ‘I’ - Mce Brazels Stores). Curiously, the William Carter House is the only one not labelled as a ‘dwelling house’ (labelled rather as a ‘stone house’), but the chimneys and numerous windows seem to make it quite obvious that it is indeed a dwelling house, rather than a store. Perhaps it is implied that it is a dwelling house, given its stone construction.

\[21\] Thank-you to Dr. Barry Gaulton for noticing these details and suggesting the partial stone construction theory.
The stone construction is significant, as it was extremely rare in Ferryland during this period in contrast to the extensive stone building industry which existed during the 17th century (Gaulton 1997). As an important regional centre, however, Ferryland did have more stone construction than the surrounding outports on the Southern Shore (Pocius 1982: 219). The best-known example of stone construction in Ferryland is the aforementioned Holdsworth House, formerly located on the north side of the harbour and demolished in the early 20th century. Several surviving photographs depict this imposing structure (Figure 4.1). There were apparently several other stone outbuildings located on the property as well (ibid: 220), and the plat discussed above shows a lime kiln, indicating some local demand for mortar.

Another smaller stone structure is located close to Ferryland’s North Side (ibid). It is called the Freebairn-Coffey House after its early 20th-century inhabitants (NHT 1978). The early circumstances of the structure are somewhat uncertain; some sources claim that it was associated with Peter Tessier, an affluent merchant based in St. John’s and brother-in-law of William Carter (ibid). Local tradition claims that it was a rectory associated with the nearby Anglican church (Pocius 1982: 220). An upper timber story was later
added on to this structure. If indeed it was a full or even partial stone construction, the Downs House can be added to this limited list of stone buildings in Ferryland during the early 19th century. It is clear that stone construction on this scale was only undertaken by the wealthiest inhabitants of Ferryland. Undoubtedly, many houses in Ferryland incorporated stone into their construction (in hearths or footings perhaps), but substantial stone construction was limited to those who could pay for the extra labour involved. The Downs House and Holdsworth House are clear examples of the gentry-class building tradition identified by Pocius (1982: 219:220) which existed in Ferryland in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. These Georgianized forms were heavily influenced by British architectural trends and existed in timber form as well as stone.

The William Carter referred to on the ca. 1837 map is likely Judge William Carter, born in Ferryland in 1751. He appears to be the only William Carter in Ferryland at the time who could be viably associated with the structure. He held the apparently lucrative position of Vice-Admiralty (VA) judge (Prowse 1971: 387) and would thus have befitted a large dwelling house such as the one depicted on the map. He had attained this position by 1789, the previous VA judge having died in 1787 (Smallwood 1978: 31). The Newfoundland VA court was one of 11 in North America in the mid-18th century, stretching from Newfoundland to the Carolinas (Ubbelohde 1960: 5). Despite being an extremely powerful position associated with honour and prestige, the position of VA judge was not always a lucrative one financially. Ubbelohde (1960: 7-9) claims that many

---

22 His son William Carter died in 1812. He also had a grandson, William Weston Carter, born in 1812 but he apparently lived in St. John’s and emigrated to the United States. Another grandson, William Thomas Skinner Carter, was born in 1832 (Morry 2016).
of the VA judges in the New World colonies were engaged in other income-generating practices outside their judicial duties. By contrast, evidence suggests that Judge Carter earned a handsome salary of 200£ per annum in 1804, making him the second-highest paid official in Newfoundland (behind only the Governor) (Smallwood 1978: 33). Furthermore, this salary was increased to 500£ in 1810, behind only the Chief Justice (at 700£) and the Governor (800£) after it was explicitly stated that Judge Carter had no involvement in any mercantile activities. Clearly, then, the situation described by Ubbelohde (1960: 6-7), where VA judges had no fixed salaries and low income, did not hold true in Newfoundland. The colonial VA courts were extensions of the centuries-old English Admiralty Courts (ibid: 12-13). They essentially had three jurisdictional areas: disputes between merchants and seamen, regulation of trade, and disposition of captured prize vessels. These functions seem to have been reflected in the activities of the Newfoundland VA court, established in 1736 in St. John’s. The court’s responsibility over master-servant disputes was, however, revoked in 1786 (Bannister 2003: 93, 162). Judges were selected by colonial governors and tended to be experienced lawyers (Ubblehde 1960: 8). These men usually resided in major port cities and conducted court business in a public building in that city. They also had the right to convene court wherever they chose, such as in a private residence outside the city (ibid: 9).

Given that the VA court was located in St. John’s, William Carter would presumably have had to spend a considerable amount of his time in the capital. Perhaps

23 William Carter was apparently educated in England (Smallwood 1978: 31), though it is unclear if he trained in law.
the house was mainly meant to be a rural retreat\(^{24}\) that he only occasionally frequented. Smallwood (1978: 31) notes that Carter continued to spend time in Ferryland during his posting at the VA court and retired there permanently after his tenure as VA Judge ended. As noted above, VA judges were also able to hold courts wherever they chose (including private residences) and it may thus be possible that Carter used his rural estate for just such a purpose. There is no documentary evidence for this, however, and the distance\(^{25}\) between Ferryland and the capital St. John’s would seem to make it unlikely. A building (‘E’) annotated as ‘Wm Carters Office’ on the Sherriff Wright map may also have been used for this purpose, though it is unknown when it was first constructed/occupied.

In any case, it is clear from the annotation on the map that William Carter was no longer occupying the house by 1837, by which point he would have been 86 years old. In his will (Carter 1840), he specifies that he is living in a house “commonly called Dr. Moore’s house”. The location of this ‘Dr. Moore’s house’ is uncertain, but there is a reference in the same copybook noted above (RPA MG 247 File 1) from the Carter-Benger-Nason Papers to a claim by William Carter’s heirs of Dr. Moore’s property. In any case, the reference in the will (dating to 1840) corroborates the ca. 1837 map stating that he no longer occupies the Downs House. In his will, he also makes reference to rents on various plantations and fishing rooms that he owns. Thus, it would appear that he accumulated properties and charged rent for them, thereby effectively attaining the status

\(^{24}\) The practice of holding rural retreats was common amongst the St. John’s gentry. See for example, Governor Thomas Cochrane’s journal accounts where he records spending significant time at his rural retreat called Virginia Cottage (Perkins 2014). There are also numerous references in the journal to Judge William Carter spending time at Virginia Cottage with Cochrane.

\(^{25}\) The travel time appears to have been about 9 hours by water in the early 19\(^{th}\) century based on contemporary accounts (e.g., see Dec 17 1836 entry in Carter 1832-1852).
of landed gentry. This corroborates Pocius’ (1991: 104-105) account of the Carters’ efforts to accumulate land on the Southern Shore. Surveys undertaken by John Maher in the later 19th century show the enormous landholdings of the ‘Estate of the William Carter Esq’, with properties concentrated in Ferryland and ranging up and down the Southern Shore from Aquahor to Witless Bay (Maher 1877-1888). When the main Maher survey of Ferryland was undertaken in 1877, the Downs House property was apparently not part of the Carter Estate. There is another property on the Downs, however, that was part of the estate. This parcel of land is much further east, located on the isthmus separating Sandy Cove and Back Cove just west of Ferryland Head.

The sequence and location of the dwelling houses in Ferryland occupied by William Carter over his lifetime has remained unclear, despite considerable research by local amateur and family historians. Based on the evidence, it appears that he occupied at least three different houses over the course of his lifetime. He married Catherine Weston ca. 1770 (Morry 2016) and must have occupied a dwelling house prior to the construction of the Downs House, as archaeological evidence does not indicate a date as early as this for the house. The assumption is that William Carter did indeed occupy the Downs House, although the only documentation linking him to it is the ca. 1837 map. In the absence of contradictory information and accepting that such a house as that depicted on the map would befit him, it is assumed that he did occupy this structure. As established above, he occupied Dr. Moore’s house towards the end of his life. Perhaps the lack of other references to dwelling houses occupied by William Carter in Ferryland is due to him having spent the majority of his time in St. John’s.
The earliest potential reference to the Downs House occurs in Henry Sweetland’s 1786 will (probated 1792). He bequeaths his “Title in the Dwelling house wherein I now live adjoining to Mr. Robert Carter’s Dwelling House” to his wife Ann Sweetland. There is no specific mention as to where this dwelling house is located in Ferryland, though there are other references in the will to properties on the Downs including a “plantation or fishing Room situate on the Down in Ferryland formerly Mogridges plantation” and a “Meadow or Inclosure and Cellar situate upon Ferryland Down near Dogswell adjoining Mr. Robert Carters Inclosure”. No other information could be found for Mogridge or the Dogswell toponym. The Robert Carter referred to is either William Carter’s father, progenitor of the Ferryland Carters who arrived in Ferryland in the mid-18th century or the latter’s son, also named Robert, who was born in 1752. The Sweetlands were a merchant family from Devon, and thus had close social ties with the Carters. Henry Sweetland married Anne Carter (daughter of Robert Carter and Anne Wylly), thus making him William Carter’s brother-in-law (Morry 2016). The reference in the will indicates that Henry Sweetland and Robert Carter shared an adjoined duplex-style house. Though the reference may be unrelated to the Carter Downs House, it does provide some insight into contemporary land use on the Downs, as well as housing practices amongst the gentry class (demonstrating the practice of residing in adjoining dwelling houses with close kin).

There are two sketches (both from the RPA MG 31 Carter Family Papers) that may depict the Carter Downs House. One is undated (MG 31.74) and depicts the façade of a large dwelling house (Figure 4.2). The house has four bays and is two and one-half
storeys tall with 12 sash windows on the second storey and ten on the first. Four of the first-floor windows are full-length with cornices, while the others are sash style. A substantial door is shown in the middle. Keough (2001: 620) suggests that the four bays may be separate residential units (though there does not seem to be any other evidence to indicate this) and that the large entrance is “a central archway for carriage entrance to the stores”. The sketch is labelled “The Judges Old House in Ferryland”. The associated finding aid describes it as “the old Downs House” and notes that “this house is mentioned by Issac C.”. The identity of the latter is unfortunately unknown.

The second sketch is also undated but is drawn on parchment with an 1822 watermark (Figure 4.3). This is a caricature-style sketch showing a large Georgian structure with four bays and a central doorway, also 2.5 storeys. Gable-end chimneys are shown, as well as a picket fence around the property. The structure sits atop a kind of
terrace that slopes down towards the fence. The house has a saltbox-style roofline with what appears to be a linhay (see Pocius 1982: 222) at the rear of the house, as well as a one-storey addition on one of the gable ends. An outbuilding is also visible in the foreground – it does not appear to be within the picket fence enclosure. A number of individuals are shown engaged in conversations: there is a vignette in each bay of the main

![Image](Figure 4.3 - RPA MG 31.73.)

house and two figures shown in the window of the outbuilding. Unfortunately, the text is mostly too faint to decipher. Where the figures can be made out, they are shown to be well-dressed in top hats, boots, and overcoats. The sketch is untitled, but the associated finding aid lists it as “Cartoon Sketch of Carter House, Ferryland”.

The ambiguous labelling of the sketches, the differences in their structural details, and the lack of other information about the location of the structures makes it unclear if the two sketches and the house shown on the ca. 1837 map are indeed all the same
structure, though it does seem plausible. While there are differences between the two sketches in terms of their details, it is clear that they both show four-bay 2.5 storey Georgian mansions associated with Ferryland Carters. There must have been a very limited number of structures in Ferryland at the time that could fit these descriptions. While they differ in their details (e.g., number of windows, presence of outbuildings), it is possible that this may relate to artistic license or changes in the structure over time. The sketch on the map also differs in that it has three, rather than four, bays with a door on each bay and two central hearths. Again, there is probably considerable artistic license associated with this map, which is largely schematic. In all, the sketches provide a perspective on what the house probably looked like, even if they do not all show the same structural features. The main elements of the house conform to elements of Georgian architecture, which would be expected of a gentry-class dwelling house in Ferryland in the late 18th or early 19th century (see Pocius 1982).

There is a reference to a fire occurring in Ferryland in 1832 which was said to have destroyed William Carter’s dwelling house (Smallwood 1978: 31). The account notes that the “valuable contents” of the structure were destroyed, although it is does not appear that any lives were lost. His wife, daughter, and sister were apparently living with him at the time. Unfortunately, Smallwood does not provide a primary source reference. Thus, the specific date and details of the fire are unknown. It was not reported in Robert Carter’s (1832-1852) journal which begins on August 24, suggesting perhaps that it occurred before this date.\(^{26}\) If the fire occurred at the Downs House, it would be expected

\(^{26}\) Thank-you to Chris Morry for this interpretation.
that there would be archaeological evidence of such a conflagration, if indeed it destroyed
the house as the reference suggest. There was, however, no evidence for a fire of this
scale. It is conceivable that the house may have been rebuilt or cleaned up and then
reoccupied, thereby obscuring any evidence of the fire. If so, this may have been the
reason for Carter’s move to Dr Moore’s house. Without further details on the original
source for this reference, however, it is impossible to say with certainty that it refers to
the Downs House. Another reference in 1832 from Robert Carter’s (1832-1852) journal²⁷
mentions that “Judge Carter asked all the family into his garden to eat fruit - first time
since Mrs. Carter came out” (Oct 7, 1832). Again, no specifics are given with regards to
the location of the dwelling house. Smallwood (1978: 31) reports that Judge Carter
retired around 1830-1831 and moved back to Ferryland at this point. The journal quote
seems to imply that his wife had recently moved to Ferryland to be with him as well.

The above references mostly pre-date 1836 and are generally quite ambiguous.
The situation becomes somewhat clearer after this date, beginning with a deed dating to
1836. In this grant, William Coulman bequeaths a “House and Plantation, and all
appurtenances thereunto belonging to it situated on the Downs of Ferryland and generally
known by the Down’s house [emphasis added]” to his daughters Ann Winsor, Eleanor
Jillaird [sic], and Eliza Coulman. It is noted in the deed that Coulman’s right to the
property derives from his “marriage with my present wife”. This refers to Elizabeth Ann

²⁷ This daily journal was kept between 1832 and 1852 by Robert Carter III (nephew of Judge Carter and
grandson of Robert Carter I) and is an invaluable source for the study of daily life in 19th century Ferryland.
It was transcribed and indexed in a monumental effort by Jean Carter Stirling and is now on file at the
Centre for Newfoundland Studies. It was also recently published by the Law Society of Newfoundland and
Labrador (Barnable et al. 2013).
Hill, whom Coulman married in 1805 (Morry 2016). The latter was the daughter of Anne Carter and Henry Sweetland, mentioned above. Thus, William Coulman was Henry Sweetland’s son-in-law. It is unclear how exactly the Downs House and property made its way to William Coulman, as there is no known documentation which details it, but it seems likely that it is related to his connection to the Carter family. The reference makes it clear that the Downs House is a well-known toponym. It also suggests that the Downs was sparsely populated, if a somewhat generic reference such as the ‘Downs House’ can be taken to refer to a single structure.

There is a compelling reference in 1836 to a structure on the Downs in the Robert Carter journal. The reference notes that “a light appeared at the House on the Downs last night – on enquiry today found Mrs Hn’y Winser was there to take possession of it as having claim thereto” (June 5 1836). This refers to Ann Winsor (Coulman), wife of Henry Winsor, noted above in the above Coulman grant. The implication in Carter’s journal entry is that this is the first time in some time that he has seen a light at the house, suggesting perhaps that it is being reoccupied after a hiatus. Thus, it appears that the Winsors may have made a claim to the house and briefly occupied it before the Jellards arrived (see below). This reference must certainly refer to the Downs House, though, due to the direct Coulman connection. Again, this demonstrates the pervasiveness of this toponym and the low population density on the Downs.

The ca. 1837 map makes it clear that property is occupied by someone named ‘Gillard’ at the time of its production. This appears to be a misspelling of the surname
Jellard\textsuperscript{28}, referring to a John Jellard who married William Coulman’s daughter Elanor (see the deed discussed above). Jellard was thus related to the Carters through his marriage. The deed above makes it clear that Jellard’s connection with the structure originates through his wife’s acquisition of the property from her father. This marriage occurred in 1835 according to an entry in Robert Carter’s journal (August 25 1835). Jellard seems to have settled more permanently (at least for a decade) in Ferryland after his marriage and started a family, though he had been present in the area since at least 1833 according to the Carter journal (Dec 25 1833). The 1836 deed correlates well with the 1837 map, suggesting that the Jellards took up residence in the Downs House probably sometime in 1837 (given the November date of the deed). Jellard was a merchant vessel captain who had close ties to Robert Carter (nephew of Judge William Carter), and is mentioned many times in the latter’s diary. It is unclear how he ended up in Ferryland, but he came from South Devon where there were evidently close ties with the Newfoundland fishery. The entries in Robert Carter’s journal seem to suggest that he gradually increased social standing, starting out with an involvement in the fishery (e.g., Jan 17 1834, July 17 1835), becoming a merchant vessel captain and close associate of Robert Carter (e.g., July 31 1840, Dec 1 1842, Jan 6 1843) and eventually a member of the restricted gentry class (e.g., Jan 23, 1845).

\textsuperscript{28} Note that this surname appears in various forms in a number of different records, including Gillard (ca. 1837 Wright map), Jillaird/Jillaird (SDCR 1836), Jillard (FDCR 1840-1859; Cater 1832-1852), and, most commonly, Jellard (Carter 1832-1852). They all appear to refer to the same person; the variation in spelling may relate partly to the fact that the surname never became established or common in the area. Jellard is likely the correct spelling, as it is most common and appears on a monument in Jellard’s hometown of Shaldon, Devon (pers. comm., C. Morry, October 2017). Aside from John Jellard’s family, there do not appear to have been any other Jellards in Ferryland, and none remain today.
The voter’s lists for Ferryland district (FDCR 1840-1859), established after the granting of representative government, are also very helpful in tracing occupation of the structure. The lists enumerate the eligible voters in each district, as well as their home community and, most significantly, other local descriptors such as road names or toponyms. The lists begin in 1840, where it is noted that ‘John Jillard’ is occupying the ‘Downs’. The same information is noted for 1841, 1842, and 1844 (no records for 1843). Interestingly, he is the only individual listed as occupying the Downs for these three years (further evidence of sparse population on the Downs). In 1844, there is an annotation noting that Jillard left in 1845. This is corroborated by an entry in Robert Carter’s journal from May 5 1845 which reads: “Capt Jellard taking his family with him to settle at St John’s”. There is only one further reference to Jellard in the Carter journal after this date: a passing reference indicates that the ship he was captaining (the Symmetry) was spotted passing north from Renews. Thus, he apparently remained active in the shipping industry but was clearly removed from Ferryland social life. He apparently returned to Devon later in life and completed a journey of circumnavigation (Jellard 1938) before succumbing to a laudanum overdose in New Zealand in 1860 (Morry 2016).

Further evidence of Jellard’s occupation of the site comes from an 1843 deed (SDCR 1843). In this deed, William Sweetland (the son of the aforementioned Henry Sweetland and Ann Carter) conveyed a parcel of land to Elizabeth Carter (wife of Robert Carter II, brother of William Carter). The Sweetland estate appears to have owed money to the Carters, and this debt was paid through the conveyance of land. The parcel of land
is described as being situated on the Downs and “now in the occupation of one John Jillard”. Knowing from the voter’s lists that Jellard is still on the Downs at this point, it is clear that this deed refers to the parcel of land containing the Downs House, though no further details are furnished except for mentioning that the property is “bounded on the North East by the property of the late Judge Carter and on the South East by waste land”. The Judge Carter reference perhaps suggests that he had claim to a larger parcel of land including the Downs House, which was subsequently subdivided.

It is not clear when or how the property passed from William Coulman in 1836 to William Sweetland. As noted above, however, Coulman married Henry Sweetland’s daughter, so perhaps the property remained in the Sweetland family the entire time and Coulman never actually owned it. This deed makes clear that Jellard was leasing, rather than owning the property; the same may have been true of Coulman, who was simply passing the lease on to his daughters. This apparently early and persistent Sweetland connection to the property perhaps suggests that the above-mentioned Henry Sweetland will reference may be relevant, though it is admittedly certain that Henry Sweetland owned many properties in Ferryland. It is clear that Sweetland did have a stake in the Downs property, though there is currently no documentation to demonstrate when this arose. It may be that he acquired the property shortly after Judge Carter left it, after which time the former leased it to Jellard before it made its way back into Carter hands with this 1843 deed. This deed also makes clear that Elizabeth Carter is not living in Ferryland, but rather Exeter in Devon. So, even after she acquired it she acted as an absentee landlord and continued to lease the property to Jellard.
The 1846 voter’s lists then indicate that Henry Garlick Clow is residing on the Downs, again the only individual listed as occupying the Downs. The 1847 records are more specific, indicating that Clow resides in the ‘Downs House’ (again the recurring toponym). The reason for this specification may be due to there being two other individuals (William Frampton and John O’Donnell) listed as being on the Downs for that year. Clow is again listed as ‘Downs’ for 1849 and 1852. The only other two references (aside from the two 1847 ones previously noted) to the ‘Downs’ for the 1840-1859 voter’s lists are George Mead and James Meany, in 1852 and 1859 respectively.

With the timing of Jellard’s departure and Clow’s arrival, combined with the reference to the ‘Downs House’ in the records, it appears certain that Henry Garlick Clow became the next resident of the Downs House in 1845. He apparently arrived in Ferryland with his family in 1839, having moved from Harbour Grace to take up the position of Clerk of the Peace (Barnable et al. 2013: 472; Colony of Avalon n.d.). The voter’s records for 1840-1844 indicate that Clow resided on the ‘North Side’ (1841-1842) and at ‘Trees’ (1844) before moving to the Downs. The ‘Trees’ reference is presumably to members of the Tree family who immigrated to Ferryland from Boston during the American Revolution (Murray 1968: 110). There are no other explicit references to Clow’s occupation of the site. It seems likely that he was the last resident of the structure, probably not long after his final appearance in the voters’ list in 1852 (FDCR 1840-1859). Oral history provided by Clow’s direct descendants indicate that he resided at Freshwater on Ferryland’s south side towards the end of his life, where he had a dwelling house and fishing plantation (pers. comm., L. Clowe, May 25 2018). He died in 1855,
only a few years after his tenancy in the Downs House (Reddigan 2016). Based on the
timing of Clow’s death/departure from the Downs House, it appears he was the last
occupant of the Downs House, which the archaeological evidence indicates was
abandoned around the mid-19th century (see below).

There are a couple intriguing references in the Robert Carter journals which may
relate to Clow’s tenancy. Throughout the first half of October 1846, there are references
to a Rob’t Hall “at work on the Downs” (e.g., Sept 30 1846). From other references in the
journal, it appears that Robert Hall is a mason; for example on August 8 1841, he is
described as being “at work about the chimneys” and on October 31 1845 he is described
as “at work on wall in front”. While the references to the Downs are not specific enough
to confirm that he is working on the Downs House, it would seem likely given the
previously established low density of houses in the area. Thus, it appears that there is
likely some work going on at the property in the fall of 1846, perhaps to make some
repairs during Clow’s tenancy.

An 1848 Crown land grant (SDCR 1848) confirms Elizabeth Carter’s ownership
of the same parcel of land initially defined in the 1843 deed. This grant represents the
official registration of the land under Elizabeth Carter’s name. Further details on the size
of the parcel are provided – it measures 7 acres and 9 perches (about 2.8ha or 28000 m²),
representing a much larger area than just that occupied by the DH premises. A sketch
included with the grant shows unequivocally that the parcel is located north of the road
leading to Ferryland Head and wholly encompasses the DH site. The grant provides more
details on the boundaries, indicating that it is defined on the south edge by the public road
(evidently well established by this point), on the east side by ungranted land, on the north side by the shoreline of Ferryland Harbour and on the west by land belonging to the Judge Carter Estate. The grant also indicates that the parcel is known as the “Downs Farm”\textsuperscript{29} (the familiar, albeit slightly different, toponym). There are no references to any tenants or structures on the property, which is not atypical of Crown land grants.

The next reference to the property occurs in 1853 and is found in Robert Carter III’s (the diarist) will (1853). In the will, he bequeaths to his wife Sarah “One third part of Down's house & plantation\textsuperscript{30} rented to Gov'ment”. The reference to the property being rented to the government likely refers to Henry Garlick Clow’s tenancy, while he was employed as clerk of the peace. The allusion to the ‘one third part’ seems to imply that the property has now been subdivided amongst multiple shareholders. The Elizabeth Carter mentioned above, who acquired the property from the Sweetlands a decade earlier, was Robert Carter III’s mother (i.e., Robert Carter II’s wife) (Morry 2016). Thus, it appears that Robert III acquired his stake in the property from her (perhaps subdivided between him and his two siblings, Eliza Howe Carter and James Howe Carter). The will also makes reference to two other properties on the Downs, including “one third part of the land unfenced out in the Downs” and “one third part of a Meadow towards the Downs next Coleman’s”. The Coleman reference is potentially interesting, as there is a meadow

\textsuperscript{29} The term ‘farm’ has been used in Newfoundland to refer to land located away from the coastline (Story et al 1990: 170-171).

\textsuperscript{30} This is the second reference that includes the use of the term plantation when referring to the property. It thus seems likely that a fishing operation was carried out at the site as well (see Story et al. 1990: 381-382; Pope 2004: 442 on the use of the term ‘plantation’ in the Newfoundland context). It is likely that the premises consisted of the main dwelling house and a series of outbuildings, similar to the Holdsworth premises but perhaps on a smaller scale.
on the 1837 Wright map south of the Downs House labelled ‘Coleman’s meadow’, presumably in reference to the above-mentioned William Coulman.

In another deed, dating to 1865, James Carter (1865) references the property when he sold to William Carter:

“two third parts or shares in all that piece of land known as the Downs or Sweetland property in Ferryland aforesaid Extending from a field the property of the late Judge Carter to a large rock on the common or Downs bounden on the Upper side by the Public road and on the lower side by the Waters of Ferryland aforesaid”.

Again, the property remains subdivided amongst multiple shareholders. This James Carter is the son of James Howe Carter, and nephew of Robert Carter III. The property boundaries given appear to match those described by the 1843 and 1848 Elizabeth Carter grants. It is unclear if there are any tenants on the property at this point. Perhaps the lack of reference to tenants (in contrast to the two other grants which mention them) is evidence for the property having been abandoned. Interestingly, the Sweetland association with the property persists in this grant, despite it having passed out of Sweetland hands more than two decades prior. The deed also contains a valuable inventory of household goods, shedding light on the household possessions of one of Ferryland’s mid-19th century gentry families. James Carter had no children, and thus appears to have identified a William Carter as his heir. This is likely William Thomas Skinner Carter, his brother-in-law (Morry 2016).

James Carter’s will (1925) also contains a reference to “the land known as the ‘Downs’”, which he bequeathed to Mary A. Carter and Fanny Carter. It is unclear if the parcel referred to is that which contains the Downs House. It is perhaps unlikely, given that he sold his share of that property to William Carter in 1865. The will of the latter
would clarify the ownership of the property at this point, but it unfortunately could not be located. The property has been in the possession of the family of the present owner since the 1960s, when his grandfather acquired it from the Sullivans (pers. comm., L. Clowe, Nov 2016). It is unclear how or when the Sullivans acquired it.

Several volumes of *The American Coast Pilot* contain references to a “white house on Ferryland downs” as a navigational aid for avoiding rocks off Cape Broyle (e.g., Blunt 1827: 568). The earliest reference comes from the fifth edition of the volume (1806), and it persists up to the 21st edition (1867). This is not a reference to the lighthouse which sits on Ferryland Head, the latter not having being constructed until 1870 (Parks Canada 2006). No further details are provided, making it impossible to confirm the specific location that the guide is referring to. Given the low population and lack of built infrastructure on the Downs and the imposing prominence of the Downs House, it does seem possible that this reference is to the Downs House. If so, the reference to the ‘white house’ may indicate that its exterior was lime plastered, though there was scant archaeological evidence for this aside from a few rubble fragments that appeared to have a lime wash coating.

Collection of oral histories did not play a major role in this project, but some information about the place of the Downs House in Ferryland’s oral history was gleaned from informal discussions with residents of the community and amateur historians. In all, it would appear that the Downs House does not occupy a prominent position in the oral history of the community. This contrasts significantly with the contemporary Holdsworth House, another stone structure associated with members of Ferryland’s 19th-century
gentry, which was located on the North Side. An early photograph of this structure hangs prominently in the local grocery store and details about the construction, occupation, and eventual demise of the structure are fairly well-known (O’Brien 1999). This can probably be best explained by the apparent longer lifespan of the Holdsworth House, as it was not torn down until the early 20th century (though it had apparently been a ruin for some time before its eventual destruction). Even after its destruction, the Holdsworth House continued to live on in public memory and oral history, due to direct kinship ties between its former occupants and current/former residents of Ferryland. Such direct links for the Downs House do not appear to exist or are much less visible. For example, the Jellards (for whom the most documentary evidence of occupation in the Downs House exists) lived in Ferryland for only a decade or so and none of their descendants remain in the community. Similarly, there are no Carters remaining in the present-day community (although there are recent descendants with other surnames). Another factor is the high turnover in the occupancy and ownership of the Downs House, which seems to have prevented a long-term association with any one family.

Fascinating references from Howard Morry’s (1957, 1965) memoirs demonstrate that, even a half-century ago, the Downs House was shrouded in mystery. Howard Morry was a local amateur historian, whose extensive memoirs touched on various aspects of Ferryland’s recent and more distant history. In a 1957 account, he notes that:

“I can never find out who lived in the Downs house – out on the Downs. My great-grandmother Windsor of Aquaforte told me that when she as a little girl she went out there with her mother to a dance. The Officers were all dressed grand with white stockings and silver buckles on their shoes. The foundation is still plain to be seen.”

The great-grandmother that Howard Morry refers to is Anne Coulman Winsor, the wife
of Henry Winsor, noted above in the reference to the light at the Downs House in the Robert Carter journal. Anne Coulman was born in 1807 (Morry 2016), implying that the Downs House must have been built and occupied in the first quarter of the 19th century if she frequented dances there as a young girl. The reference demonstrates that the ‘Downs House’ toponym persisted well into the 20th century, though the history of the structure and its occupants was largely forgotten in public memory. The mention of foundations being visible is intriguing and this is at odds with the present landowner’s memories of the property in the 1960s. He describes the property in the 1960s as essentially resembling its appearance today (i.e., no discernable above-ground foundations). Perhaps the foundations Howard Morry refers to are the piles of stone rubble still visible on the surface today, which likely accumulated sometime in the early 20th century (certainly before 1951, according to aerial photographs). Another memoir from 1965 contains a similar account:

“My grandmother also remembered being with her parents to a dance out in a large house on the Downs on the way to the light house on the Harbour side of the road. I could never find out who owned it but they must have been wealthy as there was a ballroom thirty by forty feet. She said all the officers from the ships went there and she could well remember their white stockings and shoes with big silver buckles on then. Dave Sullivan owns this property and it would be interesting to see what a little digging would uncover.”

There are several interesting points in this account. First, it closely matches the above 1957 reference with respect to the accounts of dances, socializing among the gentry, and difficulty in determining who owned the house. The recorded size of the ballroom is almost certainly exaggerated if indeed the structure recorded archaeologically is the house in question. Two other aspects of information do seem to support the attribution of the described property with that investigated archaeologically. First, the description of the
structure on the north side of the road leading to the lighthouse matches the excavated site. Second, the reference to a Sullivan owning the property in 1965 fits, because the present landowner’s grandfather purchased the property from the Sullivans in the 1960s (pers. comm., L. Clowe, May 25 2018). Interestingly, in this reference there is no mention of the ruins or foundations being visible any longer, which accords with the present landowner’s memories of the property when he was a child at the time of the recording of the memoir (ibid).

4.2 Archaeological Fieldwork
This section describes the methodology and results of fieldwork undertaken at the Downs House site. The focus in this section will not be on the material culture per se (except for dating purposes – a more in-depth breakdown and analysis is provided in Chapter 5), but rather on the interpretation of the stratigraphy and features uncovered for the purposes of
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detailing formation processes and establishing a chronological framework. The reader should refer to the site map shown in Figure 4.4, which depicts the test trenches and units discussed below. Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 provide short descriptions of the events and features recorded during fieldwork, which are shown in Harris matrix form in Figure 4.5.

Table 4.1 - Event descriptions, Area I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Desc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td>Sod/topsoil horizon covering the surface of the entire site. Brown sandy to clay loam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951</td>
<td>Light brown gravelly/pebble loam matrix above subsoil throughout TT1. Significant charcoal inclusions at the south end of the trench Likely represents an A-horizon/ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952</td>
<td>Light brown/yellow slope wash layer below E951 in E354 S90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>953</td>
<td>Compact (puggy) light brown/yellow clay aggregate in the south half of E354 S94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>Brown loam with charcoal and coal fragments mixed in with large chunks of rubble in the north half of E354 S94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955</td>
<td>Redeposited subsoil in south portion of E354 S94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956</td>
<td>Loose mix of redeposited subsoil, brown clay loam, and angular/round rubble. Also some patches of sand and mortar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>Dark brown, dry, pebbly loam matrix in E360 S92 - midden deposit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958</td>
<td>Loose surface rubble making up Fea 213. Range in size from fist-sized to very large rubble, including many fragments which are angular/dressed and others which are round fieldstones. Features 211, 212, and 214 are made up of a similar matrix of varying sized rubble with very little soil. These features appear to be contemporaneous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959</td>
<td>Light brown gravelly clay loam with some fist-sized angular rocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>Crushed angular rock and brown loam beneath E958 in E357-358 S92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961</td>
<td>Mottled orange clay with patches of sand in E360 S92. Sterile and likely natural. Overlies a more compact subsoil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>Layer of dense angular (and some round) rubble in TT3 (E357-358 S100) just beneath the sod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>Dark brown/black organic sandy matrix in E357-358 S100 - midden deposit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>964</td>
<td>Yellow silty clay matrix in the eastern half of E358 S100. Contains medium (fist-sized) angular rubble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965</td>
<td>Brown loam (varying in colour from light to medium) with large angular chunks of rubble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>966</td>
<td>Medium brown silty clay loam (with some sand particles as well) - part of the same midden deposit as Event 963.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Light brown/yellow/orange clay with gravel and small beach cobbles. Likely the ground surface on the exterior of the structure, perhaps fill used for the hearth foundation builder's trench.

Light to medium brown clay loam with rubble fill in Fea 222 trench.

Light brown pebbly clay loam beneath Event 966.

Light brown to yellow gravelly clay loam uncovered in TT4.

Medium brown loam with small angular rocks and cobbles in likely Fea 224 builder's trench in western portion of E358 S100.

Redeposited yellow gravelly subsoil beneath E969 in E358 S100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Desc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Surface rubble in depression west of lower terrace (likely root cellar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Surface rubble at western end of lower terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Surface rubble at eastern end of lower terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Surface rubble to the north of lower terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Slot trench and retaining wall (stockade) in TT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Shallow single-course fieldstone and angular stone feature in TT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Substantial dry-laid retaining wall in TT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Shallow trench running east-west in E356 S100 butting up against west face of fireplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Dressed, clay-bonded wall in TT3 - southern arm of west-facing fireplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Trench in E358 S100, butting up against east (back) edge of fireplace. Extents unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term ‘event’ (see Tuck 1993: 297) is mostly analogous to Harris’ (1989) layer concept, and is the main stratigraphic unit used in recording Ferryland’s complex stratigraphic record. Events are numbered sequentially and are simultaneously correlated and recorded across the site in a master database, removing the extra step of post-excavation correlation of single-unit contexts (Harris 1989: 105-107). This encourages synthesis and site-wide interpretation in the field and simplifies recording. Close to 1,000 discrete events have been recorded over more than 25 years of excavation in Ferryland.

Features are similarly numbered sequentially across the site. These can be
upstanding features (such as walls) or intrusive features (such as ditches or wells) and may comprise several different events. A total of 23 events and 10 features were defined over the course of the fieldwork. The events and features were divided into six different periods based largely on their stratigraphic properties (Figure 4.5); these periods can then be correlated with the documentary record to create a framework within which the material culture can be investigated. Phasing/periodization involves the amalgamation of related stratigraphic events into groups and is largely done independently of the contained artifacts but can be informed and refined by datable materials (Harris 1989: 115). The six periods defined are as follows: I – Natural (pre-occupation); II – House/Estate
Construction (late 18th to early 19th-century – containing events related to the construction of the Downs House and its landscape); IIIA – Structural Modifications (events that appear to post-date the initial construction period); IIIB – Main Occupation (occupation layers and middens); IV – House Destruction/Site Abandonment (events which relate to the collapse and abandonment of the structure and landscape); V Post-Occupation/Recent Use (events which have accumulated recently after the abandonment of the site).

Periodization is undertaken once a valid stratigraphic master sequence has been developed (ibid: 109-113). This consists of a temporal sequence of the deposition of stratigraphic units (events and features) for the entire site. Superfluous stratigraphic relationships (Harris 1989: 36-39) are removed to simplify the master sequence, which contains all unique stratigraphic units and their superpositional relationships. It is thus based only on the stratigraphic information recorded and not the documentary record or material culture. Combined with documentary information, the periodized stratigraphic sequence provides an interpretive framework within which the artifactual record can be analyzed (Triggs 2005, 2011). Harris (1989: 129) defines three different types of material which have recurring ‘non-historical’ characteristics with respect to their stratigraphic deposition: 1) indigenous remains (approximately contemporary with the creation of the deposit); 2) residual remains (significantly pre-dating their deposition); and 3) infiltrated remains (post-dating the creation of the deposit and infiltrated at some point afterwards). A periodized stratigraphic sequence provides for greater control over depositional processes leading to the incorporation of different types of material into single
stratigraphic units.

When using artifacts to date archaeological deposits, it is crucial to use as many classes of material culture as possible in order to derive the most accurate date (Gaulton 2006: 39-46). Different types of objects typically have varying degrees of time lag between their manufacture and introduction into the archaeological record (Adams 2003); the effects of this lag can only be understood when studying multiple facets of a collection in broader context. Depending on the time period under study, certain artifact classes are more effective than others for dating archaeological deposits. For example, clay pipes and glass bottles are the most sensitive indicators of chronological change when examining 17th-century sites, while ceramics are less effective for dating these sites (Gaulton 2006: 43, 46).

For the late 18th and 19th centuries, however, ceramics are among the most sensitive indicators of chronology (Majewski and O’Brien 1987) and will be relied upon heavily in this section. Clay pipes, on the other hand, are less effective for dating 19th-century deposits, whether relying on typological (morphological) change or stem-bore dating. The increasingly mass-produced nature of clay pipe manufacture and the resulting monopolization by a few key production centres in the 19th century means that pipes from this period are considerably less diagnostic (Walker 1970: 19). Despite being less diagnostic on the basis of morphology, specific designs and, especially, marked examples are still extremely useful. In contrast to earlier examples, 19th-century pipes

---

31 Stem bore dating is fraught with many interpretive challenges due to the myriad variables that may effect stem-bore diameters. See Gaulton 2006: 41-43 for a succinct discussion of archaeological research into pipestem bore-dating and its limitations.
tend to have maker’s marks and place of manufacture stamped on the stems. This practice started in the latter half of the 18th century in England (ibid) and eventually spread to pipe manufacturers throughout the world in the 19th century. As will be discussed further in Chapter 5, there were relatively few pipes recovered from the Downs House site; this is another reason for the greater reliance on ceramics, which were extremely abundant.

Glass vessels, especially bottles (Jones 1986), are useful for dating purposes as well but were not recovered in great quantities at the Downs House site. Dated artifacts, such as coins are particularly effective in providing absolute dates. Establishing dates for artifact assemblages provides a terminus post quem (TPQ) or the date after which an artifact must have been deposited, and thus theoretically the date after which a deposit must have formed. As Adams (2003: 39) outlines, interpretations of TPQ are rarely so simple, but it remains a fundamental archaeological concept.

Taken as a whole, the assemblage from the Downs House site suggests that it was occupied beginning in the late 18th century and abandoned perhaps just after the mid-19th century. The most intensive use of the site appears to be during the second quarter of the 19th century, i.e., the several decades leading up to the mid-19th century. The artifacts point to a remarkably short period of occupation (given the initial labour investment) with no concrete evidence for 17th- or early 18th-century occupation32.

32 Several sherds of North Devon and Totnes-type coarse earthenwares were recovered from the Downs House site. These wares are typically found in 17th or early 18th-century contexts at Ferryland and are generally considered diagnostic of this period, but coarse earthenwares from Devon continued to be manufactured and exported in the second half of the 18th century (Allen and Pope 1990: 51) and as late as the mid-19th century (Lewis 1848: 50). Given the known connections between inhabitants of the site and the county of Devon, it is conceivable that these wares could have been imported during the period of occupation.
Conversely, there is very little evidence to indicate any kind of substantial occupation in the second half of the 19th century. This is demonstrated in particular by the lack of ironstone/white granite, which became the dominant ceramic type in North America in the second half of the 19th century (Miller 1991: 10). Other noticeably lacking late 19th century horizon markers are flow blue transfer-printed wares (1844-1900) (Triggs 1993: Table 16.2), hotelwares (late 19th to early 20th century) (Samford 2002; Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 124), Prosser buttons (1840+) (Sprague 2002), and machine-cut nails

The majority of the domestic refuse dates from the second quarter of the 19th century, probably resulting from Jellard’s and Clow’s occupations, and there is some evidence to suggest that the initial construction occurred in the late 18th or early 19th century (discussed further below). This corroborates with the documentary record, which places the last recorded occupation at the site in the early 1850s.

Prior to commencing fieldwork, a controlled drone survey of the study area was undertaken with the assistance of Dr. Peter Whitridge (Department of Archaeology, Memorial University). The goal of this survey was to obtain high-resolution ortho-imagery for subsequent mapping exercises, as well as to generate a detailed elevation model of the site to be used for identifying anomalies and tracing the evolution of the site.

---

33 Dating sites using nails is highly regionally dependant (see Adams 2002). The general progression is from wrought to machine-cut to wire nail manufacture, but the dates at which this occurred should be obtained locally. In Newfoundland, the first foundry to manufacture cut nails was the Angel Foundry in St. John’s in 1857 (Cuff 1981). Mass production followed with the St. John’s Nail Manufacturing Company in 1883. Wrought nails were thus in use well into the 19th century, meaning the traditional late 18th to early 19th century introduction date for cut nails and late 19th century date for wire nails (Nelson 1968; Noël Hume 1970: 253) can not be used in the Newfoundland context. Of course, nails would have been imported along with other supplies from mainland Canada and elsewhere, further complicating their use as an accurate temporal marker.
landscape over time. Existing geospatial data is coarse in resolution and not appropriate for fine-grained archaeological analysis.

A total area of 10 acres (4 hectares) was surveyed at an altitude of 50m (front overlap 85%, side overlap 70%) with a DJI Phantom 3 Professional equipped with a 12-megapixel camera. This allowed for a ground sampling distance of 2cm. Data was processed in Agisoft Photoscan, producing a 2cm orthophoto (Figure 4.6) and a 4cm digital elevation model (Figure 4.7). Subsequent processing of the elevation data in a GIS program can allow for further manipulation, such as hill-shading (Figure 4.8), contour extraction (Figure 4.9), slope derivation (Figure 4.10), and other terrain analysis (aspect, ruggedness, index etc.).

Figure 4.6 – Drone-derived orthophoto of the Ferryland Downs.
Figure 4.7 - Digital elevation model of the Figure 4.6 survey area.

Figure 4.8 - Hillshaded terrain model of the Ferryland Downs.
The drone survey allows for the analysis of the Downs House site within the broader landscape of the Ferryland Downs. The plough furrows which run north-south across

Figure 4.9 - Contours extracted from drone survey.

Figure 4.10 - Slope model of the Downs landscape. Note the flat terrace near the Downs House site.
nearly the entirety of the landscape are the most noticeable feature. These attest to the long-standing use of the area for subsistence agriculture. Many of the furrows are visible when walking across the landscape, but others are less obvious, perhaps having been abandoned and diminished through erosion and infilling. Agricultural activities on the Downs largely ceased around the turn of the 21st century (pers. comm., L. Clowe, May 25 2018), and its meadows are mostly vacant now. This may relate to the increased availability of produce at the local grocery store and nearby St. John’s, as well as the effects of the meadow vole, whose burrows are plainly visible amongst the furrows.  

Vestigial traces on the landscape indicate, however, that the land was once intensively used. References to agriculture in Ferryland extend back to the early 17th century (Wynne 1622) and likely occurred on the Downs (Carter et al. 1997), given its treeless landscape and proximity to the Pool. Such activity likely became more intensive in the early 19th century with the growth of a resident population and continued up until the past couple of decades. Aerial photos going back to the 1950s confirm this recent activity (Figure 4.11). More recent aerial photographs (1980) show that the majority of this agricultural activity is concentrated on the south side of the present-day road leading to the Downs, presumably due to there being more usable land on this side. By contrast, the drone imagery shows that there was intensive agricultural activity on the north side of the road near the Downs House site (more so than on the south side). This is where the

---

34 Many Ferryland residents have stated that one of the reasons they stopped gardening on the Downs was due to the voles destroying large portions of their crops (pers. comm., B. Gaulton, June 2018).
35 It should be noted that the area south of the road in the drone survey was only partially captured and was not subjected to as many overlapping photos as the north side; thus, the elevation data for the south side is not as precise. Nevertheless, some traces of furrows are visible, indicating that coverage was sufficient for modelling.
largest land area on the north side of the road exists; as one moves east along the road, there is only a thin strip of land before the steep break-in-slope. By 1980, however, most of this activity is concentrated on the south side of the road, and it is difficult to identify definite cultivated areas on the north side of the road near the site. Looking at the 1951 aerial photo, it is clear there are several cultivated fields on the north side of the road just east of the site. Thus, it appears that in the earlier 20th century (and perhaps 19th century) agriculture tended to be concentrated on the north side of the road on the western half of the Downs. Later in the 20th century, there was a greater concentration of activity on the south side of the road on the eastern half of the Downs. Discrete terraces resulting from ploughing and enclosure are especially evident when viewing the extracted contour data (or a slope-derived raster). While the orientation of the furrows is remarkably consistent (running north-south) over the larger area, abrupt gaps or slight changes in orientation
likely indicate property boundaries and separate fields. A dry fieldstone boundary wall tradition does not seem to have developed in Ferryland. This is somewhat surprising, given the preponderance of this technique in the Old World (e.g., Tarlow 2007: 44), and its importation into many other areas of Newfoundland (e.g., Grates Cove, Trepassey, and Upper Island Cove on the Avalon Peninsula). Property boundaries visible today are in the form of wooden fence lines. Interestingly, the boundaries visible in the drone imagery (separate discrete fields) cross-cut the present-day boundaries, indicating a degree of fluidity to this land use.

The other major land use on the Downs, aside from agricultural, was likely animal husbandry. Like the agriculture, the use of the land for pasture only ceased in recent years (pers. comm., L. Clowe, May 25 2018) and probably dates initially to the 17th century (Carter et al. 1997). There are references to husbandry and the clearing of pasture land in the 17th century (Wynne 1622), and the Downs would be a logical spot for such activity (treeless, close to the Pool). Evidently, this practice does not leave the same obvious traces on the landscape that farming does.

In addition to the plough furrows and terraces, other intriguing depression and mound anomalies are visible. Several of these anomalies appear in the immediate vicinity of the Downs House site. A rectilinear terrace measuring approximately 7x12m (N-S by E-W) stands out as the flattest area in the survey zone. This will be referred to as the lower terrace of the site (Figure 4.12 and Figure 4.13). To the south of this terrace is a steep slope which runs for several metres, then another terrace (though it is much steeper than the lower terrace) which will be referred to as the upper terrace. There are two
mounds close to the boundary between these terraces, which are especially visible when a hill-shade effect is applied. These mounds are spaced approximately 13m (40 ft) apart centre-to-centre. Linear ridges extend northward from the mounds for about 10m, their distance from one another correlating with the width of the lower terrace. A third terrace is present south of the upper terrace and just below the level of the modern road. This terrace was recently used by the present landowner for root vegetable cultivation (pers. comm., L. Clowe, Nov 2017). To the north of the lower terrace, the land slopes gently to
the coastline. The break-in-slope where the meadow drops sharply to the sea varies from about 20 to 30m to the north of the lower terrace.

Several rubble features are visible on the surface in close proximity to the lower terrace. These features, in addition to the clear anthropogenic terracing, are what initially signalled the archaeological potential of the site. There are four separate rubble-filled features (Figure 4.6) – three are mound accumulations, while the fourth is a rectilinear depression filled with rubble. The latter feature (Feature 211), which is the westernmost of the four, appears to be a rubble-lined root cellar. The main depression containing the rubble measures approximately 1.7x4m and is oriented north-south, while a mound of slumped soil surrounding it measures approximately 4x6m. The slumped soil likely represents the eroded superstructure of the cellar. The feature was not excavated and thus its date is unclear, but it may be contemporary with the Downs House. Two other rubble features (Features 212 and 213) are situated at the southern edge of the lower terrace, on its eastern and western edges respectively. These features align with the linear mound features noted above. Many of the stones in these features had mortar traces or are clearly cut stone derived from a structure; there are also several bricks amongst the rubble matrix. In addition to larger cut stone, there are smaller round fieldstones that are unlikely to have been part of a structure. The last rubble feature (Feature 214) is at the northern periphery of the lower terrace. It is similar in composition to Features 212 and 213 but has a higher concentration of smaller fieldstones.

It initially seemed likely that the structure was located on the lower terrace due to its size and the nearby concentrations of rubble. It was unclear when the rubble piles had
accumulated or if there were structural features underlying them, but they are visible on aerial photos going back to the 1950s and thus did not accumulate in the past several decades. Notably, the furrows which characterize much of the rest of the Downs stop just short of the boundaries of the site. It was likely avoided initially due to the presence of the standing structure, and later due to the significant remaining rubble from its collapse.

The existing 1m master grid (see Tuck 1993) from the main excavation area was extended to the Downs House site to allow for consistency in horizontal control. The new area was designated Area I, following the established convention of labelling discrete areas of excavation at Ferryland. Because Area I is located approximately 300m away from the main excavation area in the Pool, several intermediary datums were required. The total station was set up on grid point E147 S16 in the Pool and three temporary datums were established to extend the grid to Area I. These datums were not placed at specific grid locations, but rather at convenient sight lines and distances (their exact locations were recorded afterwards). The temporary datums were marked by wooden stakes and labelled ‘DW Datum X’. The main datum at the Downs House site was established at grid point E343 S94 and a rebar stake was installed at this location.\(^{36}\) The

---

\(^{36}\) After establishing the grid at the Downs House site, it was discovered one of the backsight points used in the Pool was slightly off. While the error on this particular point was relatively small (5-10cm) and was later corrected, the multiplication of this error over the distance required to reach the Downs House magnified the error. This means that all grid points at the Downs House site are offset from the main grid by approximately 70 cm (located about 60 cm north and 40 cm east of their real position). Because this error was discovered after excavation was already well underway, it was determined that the grid points at Area I should not be relocated. Given the independence (spatial separation) of the two excavation areas, this error should not cause problems. Most importantly, the internal accuracy of the Downs House data remains very high, even though the entire spatial dataset is slightly offset from the main grid. Thus, the crucial accuracy of the spatial relationships within Area I remains valid. The error was accurately measured by obtaining dozens of control points using a high-precision RTK GPS device. The spatial error can thus be corrected in a GIS system to allow for the accurate georeferencing of this data, and the error for any individual point can be determined. Because the site grid is an arbitrary system, this discrepancy is
temporary datums were left in place along with the permanent rebar datum to allow for the re-establishment of the grid in future excavations.

Excavation work began with a controlled test pitting survey (approximately 50x50cm rectilinear pits) at 10m intervals across the site centred on the lower terrace (Figure 4.4). A total of 11 test pits were excavated. Test pitting was undertaken to assess the stratigraphic integrity of the site to identify refuse areas or architectural remains for further investigation.

![Figure 4.14 - Artifact frequency by test pit.](image)

The brief survey was successful in demonstrating that the site retained stratigraphic integrity, especially in areas that lacked surface evidence for ploughing. Material recovered all dated from the late 18th century through to the mid-19th century, indicating that the site dated approximately to the period indicated on the ca. 1837 map.

---

relatively minor but is nonetheless important to note. Thus, when grid coordinates are reported in the catalogue and in the text they have not been corrected (to avoid the cumbersome use of decimals).
Material was present in significant enough quantities to suggest that there was indeed a nearby domestic occupation. Artifacts tended to be more numerous in close proximity to the terrace and rubble concentrations (Figure 4.14), confirming the suspicion that the structure was located somewhere close to these features. The material to the north (downslope) tended to be more fragmented and intermixed, likely indicative of ploughing activity. This was substantiated by the discovery of a horseshoe in one of these northernmost test pits, likely related to horse-drawn ploughing. A couple of broad trends were also noted in that the material to the north and northeast tended to date to the mid-to-late 19th century, while that to the west was more typically late 18th to early 19th century, perhaps indicating changing refuse disposal practices. Two likely midden deposits were encountered: in TP6 at the southeast edge of the survey area and TP4 in the north end of the lower terrace – this was indicated by dark soil and high artifact quantities. The TP6 deposit was especially rich, yielding the highest artifact count out of any test pit, despite being the only pit not excavated to completion. Particularly low artifact counts in the northernmost row of test pits confirmed that the structure was likely located further south. In addition, the northernmost test pits tended to be shallow and consisted of only a topsoil/ploughzone horizon above subsoil.

The most significant find occurred in TP5, at the southern edge of the lower terrace, where an intriguing stone feature was uncovered. This consisted of a dense concentration of large round rubble and a trench filled with a redeposited subsoil clay matrix (Figure 4.15). A trench appears to have been excavated into the subsoil, into
which the rubble was placed. The fill from the trench was then thrown behind the rubble concentration as a backing. The trench could not be fully excavated due to the small size of the test pit, so its depth is unclear. Artifacts in the trench fill were few in number but included sherds of English white salt-glazed stoneware, ‘China Glaze’ pearlware and several fragments of what appears to be an 18th-century wine bottle (thick glass, many seed bubbles), thus indicating an early date for the feature. Miller and Hunter (2001) assign a date of ca. 1775-1812 for China Glaze pearlwares, and the TPQ of English white salt-glaze stoneware manufacture is generally accepted to be 1785\textsuperscript{37}. The coarse dry-laid nature of the rubble feature suggests that it is not part of a structure, but rather some kind of the test pit.

\textsuperscript{37} It was manufactured between ca. 1685 and 1785 and was most popular during the 1720-1770 period when it was the predominant ceramic tableware (MACL 2002).
of retaining feature. A separate fill layer is also visible on the east side of the test pit; this is a denser clay matrix than the redeposited sandy-gravel subsoil and appears to have been dug into the latter. This separate fill layer appears to have been deposited sometime later, perhaps to strengthen the retaining wall. Artifacts recovered from TP5 were fewer in number compared to the others, but generally larger in size (suggesting a more intact deposit).

After the discovery of the feature in TP5, a 5m long trench was opened just to the east running north-south to further investigate this feature by providing a cross-section through it and the lower terrace. This was designated Test Trench 1 (TT1) and is made up of units E354 S90-94 (Figure 4.4, Figure 4.13, and Figure 4.16). The northernmost units of the trench were characterized by shallow deposits consisting of a topsoil horizon (Event 950) above what appears to be the original A-horizon or ground surface (E951). This latter deposit is not a rich occupation layer but rather a thin layer composed of a slopewash gravel-like material intermixed with redeposited subsoil. Sheet refuse, mostly dating to

![Figure 4.16 - TT1 west profile.](image)
the second quarter to mid-19th century was uncovered throughout the trench. Several McDougall pipe stems indicate that the deposit was exposed after 1846 (Walker 1970: 25). It is likely that the material in the topsoil horizon has not been substantially disturbed, as the site does not appear to have been ploughed. Recent disturbances were minimal – a large iron prybar was uncovered directly beneath the sod in the southern end of the trench and there were pieces of a plastic bucket/container in the same area, but no other modern disturbances were noted. In the southern end of the trench, E951 was characterized by more charcoal and coal inclusions. E951 overlies the subsoil in all units in TT1. Some architectural debris was present (especially window glass, as well as nails, and fragments of brick and mortar), but it quickly became apparent that the structure was not located on the lower terrace. As noted above, refuse appeared to be distributed fairly evenly throughout the trench; thus it appears to be more of a scatter/sheet midden than a concentrated deposit. A curious stone feature (Feature 220) was uncovered in the northern end of the trench. This consisted of a rough, one-course deposit of large
round (and some angular) rocks beneath the topsoil and atop E951 (Figure 4.17). It may be a rough pavement-type feature; artifacts found atop the feature are contemporary with those in E951 throughout the rest of the trench. Two additional units were excavated to confirm that the feature continued to the west. In these units, excavation ceased at the level of the feature. The feature thus measures approximately 1m north-south and continues west for an undetermined distance. There appears to be an eastern edge in E354 S90, though it is possible that the feature continues east. A sterile deposit of redeposited subsoil (E952) was recorded beneath E951 in E354 S90. This may have been deposited to raise the grade of the terrace – the natural topography slopes downwards towards the water. The function of Feature 220 remains uncertain, but it appears to be contemporary with the rest of the activity on the terrace.

The southernmost units of TT1 were deeper and more complex. A concentration of rubble overlies E951 in units E354 S93-94. This matrix (E954) is composed of a dark brown loam with angular and round rubble. Some of it is cut stone and may derive from the collapse of a structure. Significant quantities of charcoal and coal inclusions were also recorded, along with several iron fragments which appear to be stove parts. The rubble concentration is heaviest at the south end of the trench and peters out to the north in E354 S93. An intact iron sickle was discovered on the surface of E951 in E354 S93, indicating that agricultural activities took place nearby. It is likely that this dense rubble represents the same deposit as that recorded in the test pit just to the west. Several sherds of English brown stoneware (c. 1690-1775) (Noël Hume 1970: 114) were recovered from E951 in the southern end of the trench, representing significantly earlier dates than the majority of
the ceramics recorded elsewhere in TT1.

A dense yellow gravelly clay deposit (E953) overlaid the rubble matrix in E354 S94. This appears to be the same context as the dense clay fill noted above in TP5 (especially visible in its eastern profile). Beneath this, at the very southern end of the trench, a redeposited subsoil matrix (E955) appears to correlate with the deposit recorded in TP5 (especially visible on the west profile of the test pit). A shallow feature (25-30 cm deep at its deepest point) excavated into subsoil was recorded beneath the E954 rubble. This is likely the feature from which the redeposited E955 derives. This shallow trench appears to align with that recorded (but not fully excavated) in TP5. The fill (E956), which is composed of a loose mix of redeposited subsoil, brown clay loam, and rubble contains several diagnostic artifacts, including a scalloped blue edged pearlware bowl, a pearlware blue transfer-printed chamber pot, a pearlware teacup handle, and an English white salt-glazed egg cup. This material pre-dates much of the E951 refuse. The feature also contains traces of five closely spaced post moulds (approximate diameter of 10cm), indicating that it is a shallow slot trench that housed a stockade/retaining wall feature (Figure 4.18). Based on the stratigraphy, the following construction sequence can be proposed: a shallow slot trench was excavated into subsoil, into which a series of posts were placed to form a retaining wall and the trench backfilled (E956). The redeposited subsoil excavated from the trench was thrown behind this feature (E955). At some later point, a deposit of rubble (E954) was added just to the north of the stockade wall, perhaps to strengthen it. Later again, a dense clay fill appears to have been deposited to the south
of the stockade as a kind of backing (E953). The initial construction of the stockade wall appears to pre-date much of the refuse found on the lower terrace. Undoubtedly, the feature encountered in TP5 represents the same stockade feature, and the limited stratigraphy visible and artifact sample collected from the pit seems to confirm this.

Based on the orientation of the feature in TT1 and that recorded in TP5, the slot trench
appears to meander along the southern edge of the lower terrace in a sinuous fashion. Excavations in TT1 suggested that the Downs House does not sit upon the lower terrace. Significant domestic refuse does, however, suggest that it was an important activity area.

Next, a trench was laid in perpendicular to TT1 to obtain a section through Feature 213, one of the surface rubble features (Figure 4.4 and Figure 4.19). The units composing this trench (TT2) are E358-360 S92. The unit immediately east of the initial TT1 (E355 S92) had the same stratigraphy and artifact content as the other units in this trench and is thus considered to be an extension of TT1. The rubble in Feature 213 is a loose matrix composed of fieldstones, small cobbles, and some angular building stones (E958). This rubble proved to be about 50cm thick and overlaid a crushed angular rock and brown loam deposit (E960) which is likely an interface between the rubble matrix and the topsoil horizon encountered elsewhere at the site.
Objects in the rubble matrix date to the 20th century (including crown top bottles, recent beer bottles, and gardening gloves). Some earlier 19th century material was also noted in this mixed deposit. Based on the artifact content, the depth of the deposit, the presence of fieldstones and the fact that it appears to overly the topsoil horizon elsewhere on the site, the feature represents a relatively recent (i.e., post-occupation) clearance cairn. It must pre-date the 1951 aerial photo, and thus may date to the early 20th century. Some of the rubble undoubtedly derives from the collapse of the Downs House, but it does not represent a structural feature. It is likely that much of the material accumulated from clearing activities to the south (near the present road), after which the stones were thrown into a rough pile down the slope. The two other surface rubble mounds (Features 214 and 215) probably represent similar clearance cairns. Excavation was ceased at the level of E960, as the underlying deposits likely mirror those encountered elsewhere in TT1. At the eastern edge of Feature 213, there is a noticeable mound abutting the feature, which is visible on the drone-derived imagery. A substantial rough dry-laid stone
A retaining wall was revealed beneath the surface (Fea 221) (Figure 4.20, Figure 4.21, and Figure 4.22). The easternmost unit in TT2 (E360 S92), on the downslope side of the mound, provided more information on this intriguing feature. The topsoil matrix in E360 S92 is noticeably darker and more organic than its counterpart in TT1. A rich dark brown sandy loam underlaid the sod and root mat (E957), and this clearly represents a midden deposit. The majority of the refuse dates to the second quarter of the 19th century, though some earlier 19th century material is also present. The topsoil overlies the retaining wall feature (Feature 221), but E957 buts up against it and does not continue west towards the lower terrace. Beneath E957 is a lighter brown gravelly clay loam layer with small angular rocks (E959). The material in this deposit is noticeably earlier than the majority of the overlying E957 (including several fragments of tin-glazed earthenware, China Glaze pearlware, and Westerwald stoneware). A builder’s trench for Feature 221 was revealed at approximately 80cm depth below surface (DBS). The builder’s trench fill appears to be composed of the same E959 matrix; thus, this fill was used to backfill the trench and raise the grade to the east of the lower terrace.
A builder’s trench is excavated into a mottled orange clay deposit (E961), which appears to be natural. This overlies a more compact subsoil encountered at 120cm DBS. The base of the retaining wall (and bottom of the builder’s trench) occurs at approximately 130cm DBS. The wall survives to a height of about 3 feet. Thus, a significant quantity of fill appears to have been deposited on the east side of the wall. Much of this fill likely derives from the excavation of a builder’s trench for the retaining wall, and it may also have come from the excavation of the lower terrace itself. It is likely that there was a pre-existing natural terrace, which was further leveled. A midden deposit then accumulated outside the lower terrace, butting up against the retaining wall. The wall itself is a rough construction of angular and round stones but would have been a substantial feature (measuring 4' in width and surviving to a height of 3'). It is clearly meant to delineate the lower terrace. The adjacent clearance cairn may partly derive from the collapse of this wall. It is unclear how far north or south the retaining wall continues.

On the western side of the lower terrace, there is another surficial rubble feature that likely represents another clearance cairn (Feature 212). Adjacent to this feature (to

---

38 This layer is noticeably different from subsoil encountered elsewhere on the site but is sterile and likely a subsoil deriving from a slightly different parent material. Its horizontal distribution is unknown, as it was only encountered in E360 S92. It is approximately 40cm thick. It may also be an early (sterile) fill layer deposited east of the terrace.
the west) is a mound similar to the one on the eastern side of the terrace, which contains the Feature 221 retaining wall. Thus, it is almost certain that a similar stone retaining wall exists on the west side of the terrace, delineating its opposite side. In all, excavations on the lower terrace demonstrated that it was not the location of the structure proper. Several retaining wall features (stone and a wooded stockade) do indicate, however, that the lower terrace was a carefully designed landscape. The presence of significant domestic refuse, present on the terrace as sheet refuse and contained in a discrete midden deposit just east of it, is a testament to the intensive use of the area. This material is discussed further in Chapter 5. Thus, the lower terrace is likely an enclosed courtyard forming part of the broader estate landscape of the Downs House site.

Figure 4.23 - TT3 south profile.
Attention then shifted to the upper terrace for the remainder of the fieldwork. Clearing the long vegetation revealed more fully the two substantial mounds which appear on the drone imagery. Closer inspection also revealed that the mounds were made up of a dense rubble matrix. A 1x3m trench (E356-358 S100 – TT3) was placed to provide a cross-section through the eastern mound (Figure 4.4, Figure 4.12, Figure 4.23, and Figure 4.24). Beneath the sod/topsoil horizon, a dense layer of angular rubble was revealed (E962). This appears to be a destruction horizon representing the collapse of the Downs House. The majority of the rubble is angular/dressed and clearly derives from a building. This extended throughout most of the trench, tapering out in the western end.

Beneath this, in the east end of the trench, a very rich black sandy loam deposit was uncovered (E963). Preservation of organics in this deposit was excellent, allowing for the collection of a substantial sample of faunal remains. The large volume of domestic refuse and faunal remains in this deposit clearly points to it being a midden deposit. Charcoal and ash inclusions throughout suggest that it was partly formed through the deposition of hearth sweepings. An 1843
Nova Scotia half-penny provides an absolute date as a TPQ. A McDougall Glasgow pipe also provides a post-1846 date (Walker 1970: 25). This accords quite well with the large sample of ceramics recovered from E963 and accompanying midden layers (E966 and E969) which includes early to mid-19th century refined earthenwares (the vast majority being whitewares, including painted, edged, and transfer printed decorations). Several examples of mid-late 18th-century wares were also found in these events, including Clouded/Tortoisehell (1740-1770), Jackfield (1740-1780), tin-glazed earthenware (up to 1800) (South 1977: 210-212) and what appears to be a sherd of Totnes coarse earthenware, which has been documented extensively in 17th-century deposits in Ferryland (e.g., Allan and Pope 1990; Gaulton 2006). These may be curated or residual items from an earlier occupation. The vast majority of this midden deposit, however, is made up of 19th-century material; furthermore, as noted above, the absence of ironstones, hotelwares, sprig-painted wares, flow blue transfer prints and only small quantities of yellowwares, sponged vessels, or coloured transfer prints is strongly suggestive of an occupation limited to the first half of the 19th century.39

At the very east end of the trench, a thin layer of yellow silty clay with some rubble inclusions (E964) overlies E963. It is unclear how far east this layer extends. Several small fragments of mortar were uncovered, as well as material that cross-mends with E962 and E963. It likely represents another destruction layer, similar to E962.

39 Note that the absence of some of these ware and decorative types may relate to factors such as consumer choice and preference. This is discussed further in Chapter 5. The lack of ironstone is particularly telling, however, given its immense popularity in North American in the latter half of the 19th century (Miller 1991: 10). Time lag must also be considered – it is perhaps not overly surprising to see earlier 19th century ceramic types existing alongside coins and pipes from the 1840s, given the (minimum) 15-20 year time lag often associated with ceramics (Adams 2003).
Beneath E963, a more compact but similar dark sandy loam (E966) is likely part of the same midden deposit; there are fewer charcoal/ash inclusions, making it likely that it represents a different depositional episode, but the artifact content is very similar.

Beneath this, a lighter pebbly clay loam (E969) represents the end of the midden deposit. This is a very thin layer containing significant brick, mortar, and charcoal inclusions; it was found only in E358 S100. In the western portion of the trench, another rubble collapse deposit was uncovered (E965). It is quite similar to E962 in that it is largely composed of angular rubble; the surrounding soil is darker and the rubble is generally larger, so it was assigned a different event, but likely represents the same destruction/collapse episode. The midden events (E963/966) bleed into E965 in the middle of the trench, where there is considerable admixture between the midden and destruction episodes. This larger rubble was mostly absent from the east end of the trench (where the bulk of the midden is).

As the loose rubble (Figure 4.25) was removed, a rectilinear stone feature (Feature 223) appeared beneath this event (Figure 4.26 and Figure 4.27). It measures 4' east-west by an undetermined distance north-south. The feature is made up of substantial dressed stone and is clay bonded; no mortar is visible in the foundation, though many fragments were uncovered in TT3 (Figure 4.28). Based on its size and orientation, along with the presence of significant quantities of ash and charcoal directly to the east, this feature is probably the foundation of a west-facing gable-end fireplace. The large quantity of overlying rubble directly to the south and west clearly derive from the collapse of this feature. The sloping midden layers to the east are evidence of refuse
disposal immediately adjacent to the structure. Based on this quantity of refuse, it is likely that the back door of the structure is somewhere in this immediate vicinity.

A sondage was excavated in the western half of E358 S100 to further expose the eastern face of Feature 223. Time did not allow for the full excavation of the rest of the unit, so it was decided that as much of the feature as possible should be exposed.

Excavation in the east half of the unit ceased at the surface of E981, a yellow gravelly matrix which appears to be redeposited subsoil. This overlies a lighter brown loam with small rubble inclusions (E980). This layer is approximately 30cm thick in E358 S100 and tapers out to the west. It is likely building debris from the construction of Feature 223, and probably represents a builder’s trench fill. The cut for this feature (Feature 224) is likely further east; the backfilling would have brought the grade up to the level of E981

Figure 4.25 - Rubble removed from TT3 (E962/E965).
(disturbed subsoil horizon which may be just above the natural subsoil level).

Beneath E980 is a mottled clay loam deposit that varies from yellow to orange to light brown (E967). This is likely part of a redeposited subsoil fill created by the building of the Feature 223 foundation and represents the original ground surface. It butts up against Fea 223 on all sides, extends throughout the trench and overlies the subsoil. At the southwest corner of the feature (in E358 S100), a shallow pit feature was discovered (Feature 222, Event 968). Evidently it relates to the construction or perhaps later repair of Fea 223, as it is dug into E967 (the original ground surface) and butts up against the feature.

Feature 223 aligns with the section of the retaining wall uncovered in TT2 (on an alignment just east of north). As noted previously, there is a linear mound

Evidence for a possible repair may be seen in the different character of the stones in the southwest corner of the feature. There are several smaller whitish round rocks which contrast with the larger grey slate that characterizes the majority of the foundation.
which appears to run south up the slope to the larger mound which represents Feature 223. It is thus almost certain that the retaining wall runs right up to and adjoins the structure, creating an enclosed estate landscape. An identical rubble mound is located approximately 40' to the west of that which contained Feature 223; assuredly, there is an identical east-facing fireplace feature in the western mound, representing the western gable end of the structure. The northern and southern boundaries of the structures are as of yet uncertain. It is likely that the structure had a two-room deep plan, following conventional Georgian building practices (Johnson 2010: 164).

Assuming the east-west dimension is approximately 40’, the north-south dimension may be approximately 20-25’. The contemporary Holdsworth House on Ferryland’s North Side.
measured 60' x 24', and a petition for the construction of a 50' x 20' foot structure was made in Ferryland in 1787 (Pocius 1982: 220). Thus, the proposed dimensions of the Downs House are in line with these contemporary gentry structures. Pocius (ibid) points to two distinct (albeit broad) building traditions that coexisted on the Southern Shore during the study period: they were related in form (hall-parlour) but differed markedly in size and building technology. What Pocius calls the ‘mercantile tradition’ often incorporated stone and frame technology with dimensions as described above, while the ‘fishermen tradition’ tended to consist of vertical-stud or log constructions measuring 13-16' in width and 20-24' in length. These smaller dwellings tended to have two-room floor layouts with gable-end chimneys.

A small 1x2m test trench (TT4 – E352 S98-99) was excavated between the two rubble mounds on the upper terrace in what was hypothesized to be the interior of the structure. Disappointingly, no evidence for flooring or an occupation layer was uncovered. Perhaps not surprising for the interior of a structure, very few artifacts were recovered. Beneath the sod/topsoil, a similar layer of angular rubble to that found in TT3 was uncovered (E962), most of which was in the southern portion of the trench. The majority of the artifacts from the trench came from E950 and E962. Beneath E962, at 25cm DBS, a yellow/orange gravelly clay loam deposit was encountered (E970). This deposit was mostly sterile and resembled a slopewash or redeposited subsoil horizon. At 50cm DBS, the slopewash transitioned to a lighter matrix, and subsoil was reached at 80cm DBS. There was no indication of any features in the subsoil or any evidence for a floor surface.
Several possible explanations for this exist. It may be that the south wall of the structure is further south. The trench aligns with the south edge of Feature 223, but the back wall of the structure could be further south. The large amount of rubble in the upper layers and in the south profile does suggest that a collapse event occurred nearby. It is also possible that some of the building stone may have been robbed out. The lack of any evidence for a floor surface is more puzzling, given the almost certain location of this trench inside the structure. It is almost certain that the structure would not have had a simple earth floor, given the labour invested on the rest of the structure and landscape. Erosion or later ploughing may be responsible for the erasure of features which would indicate a wooden floor. It is also possible that wood may have been robbed and reused in a similar fashion to stone, as there is a documented tradition of reuse of earlier building timbers in Ferryland (pers. comm., B. Gaulton, June 2018; Pocius 1982: 220).

Unfortunately, only a small area of the interior of the structure could be sampled; further investigation will be required to determine the interior layout and floor material.

A single unit was also excavated to the north of the lower terrace to explore a concentration of early refuse (late 18th/early 19th century) uncovered during test pitting. Time did not allow for the complete excavation of this unit, but a sample of refuse was recovered from a sheet deposit and is further discussed in Chapter 5.

In all, excavations confirmed the location of a substantial domestic occupation on the Downs. Archaeological evidence helps clarify the timeline compiled from the archival record. There is ample evidence to suggest a late 18th- or early 19th-century construction date from material uncovered from discrete structural deposits. The majority
of the domestic refuse seems to date to the period when the structure was occupied by John Jellard and Henry Clow (1836-1852). It is likely that another midden deposit exists elsewhere on the site that contains earlier refuse, assuming that Judge William Carter occupied the structure in the early part of the 19th century. It is also clear that the site was abandoned around mid-century – there is very little evidence to suggest a late 19th-century component to the occupation of the site. It thus seems likely that Henry Clow was the last occupant of the property. As grant records indicate, the property was subdivided in the latter half of the 19th century and there are no further mentions of tenants. The peripheral location of the structure was probably largely responsible for its eventual demise. Even today, the Downs is an isolated, barren environment and it must have been all the more so in the early 19th century. The exposed location of the structure may have accelerated its fall into a state of disrepair.

Assuming the structure was of full-stone construction\textsuperscript{41}, this may have been another factor leading to its abandonment. Stone construction was rare in Ferryland during this period; the expertise and cost required for repairs may have been difficult to furnish. Stone construction required an enormous initial cost input, and despite the durability of the material, would likely also have necessitated expensive repairs. Gardiner (2014: 16) suggests that the decision of whether to repair an existing building or to build a new one entirely is influenced largely by the initial capital investment involved in its

\textsuperscript{41} It has not been possible to prove this archaeologically thus far. Certainly, there were substantial stone gable-end fireplaces and the large volume of rubble indicates a substantial amount of stone was incorporated into the original construction; however, no other stone foundations were found. The eastern face of Fea 223 (fireplace) was not excavated to its full depth, so it cannot be determined as of yet if it was keyed into a stone footing/foundation. It is also likely that a considerable amount of stone was robbed out for other construction after the structure’s abandonment.
construction. It seems likely that the initial investment in the construction of the Downs House was very large; this may have been responsible for the renovations of the 1840s, discussed above, but ultimately the structure was abandoned not long after its initial construction. Costly repairs may have played a role, but the isolated location of the structure may be the best explanation. It is also likely that the owners of the property were unwilling to invest money in it, given that they do not appear to have been interested in residing in the structure after 1836 (occupied by tenants after this date). Ultimately, it is impossible to determine with certainty why the structure was abandoned. There is no evidence in the archaeological record for a catastrophic event such as a fire. Rather, evidence points to a slow abandonment.
Chapter 5 - The Material Culture of the Downs House

This section will examine the material culture assemblage recovered from the Downs House Site. The focus will be almost exclusively on material recovered from the main unit excavations. Material from the test pits will only be mentioned briefly where appropriate and is not incorporated into this analysis. The reason for this is that the material from the test pits comes from a variety of different locations and deposits on the site, whose stratigraphic relationships to one another are unclear. The material from the partially excavated E364 S84 is included in this discussion, though the major focus is on the test trenches, in particular TT1 (lower terrace), TT2 (stone retaining wall), and TT3 (fireplace) from which the largest artifact assemblages were recovered.

A total of 6,559 (5,959 from unit excavations) artifacts were catalogued. This does not include charcoal, coal, brick, and mortar fragments, although samples of each were retained. Nails are also excluded from the catalogue and were instead examined and reburied, following the standard protocol of the Ferryland Archaeological Project, which arose due to the staggering quantity of nails recovered from the site and the challenges associated with long-term curation.

The analysis of the material culture associated with the Downs House site will be organized using a series of behavioural/functional categories. These categories address various aspects of the lifeways of the former inhabitants of the site. Archaeologists have thoroughly debated the use of functional categories in the cataloguing and analysis of material culture. Brooks (2005b) provides a cogent discussion of the issues in the context of Australian historical archaeology, but the main points are transferrable to all areas of
historical archaeology. In essence, these sorts of classificatory schemes are used to organize the data and render it more amenable to analysis. They place the analytical focus on the consumer, by emphasizing function (rather than form, manufacture, and date) (ibid: 7-8). Despite the limitations imposed by functional classification and the caveat that not all artifacts fit neatly into mutually exclusive categories, a functional classification is deemed necessary for a coherent discussion.

The functional classification employed here mostly follows the system devised by Adrian Praetzellis and colleagues at the Anthropological Studies Center at Sonoma State University (ASC 2010), designed specifically for mid-19th to early 20th-century sites. This system is similar to several other functional classifications including South (1977), Sprague (1980), and Parks Canada (n.d.). Each of these systems uses a hierarchical classificatory system based on function, rather than material type. The main broad functional groups, which are consistent across the different classification systems (albeit with slightly varying names) are: Domestic, Architectural, Personal, and Activities. These are then split into increasingly refined functional categories, called classes.

5.1 **Domestic Group**
The vast majority of artifacts falling under the Domestic group relate to foodways, defined by Anderson (1971: 2) as “the whole interrelated system of food conceptualization, procurement, distribution, preservation, preparation, and consumption”.

5.1.1 **Ceramics**
Within the Domestic Group, ceramics predominate. A total of 3,767 sherds (63% of the
overall assemblage) were recovered, representing a minimum of 307 vessels. Analyses resembled the methods used by Gaulton (2006: 144) in dealing with substantial quantities of material. Every sherd was examined in a preliminary fashion but only diagnostic sherds were further analyzed. These include rims, bases, handles or other large sherds diagnostic of form, as well as informative decorative elements and datable attributes. This allows for a degree of interpretive rigour (the construction of a minimum vessel count), while allowing for the timely completion of analysis. Similar procedures were followed for the analysis of the glass vessels and clay tobacco pipes.

The use of vessel counts, rather than raw sherd counts, has been shown to be the preferred data structure for ceramic analysis. Aside from the obvious point that people in the past used vessels rather than sherds, analysis based on vessel counts has been shown to be a more statistically robust method of analyzing ceramic assemblages (Sussman 2000). Empirical research has demonstrated that sherd counts cannot be used as substitutes for object counts and that doing so may skew interpretation (ibid: 103). This is not to say that sherd counts have no interpretive value. They are a crucial first step in the cataloguing process due to their computational ease (Brooks 2005a: 21). Sherd counts should always be included in a basic catalogue and may be useful for comparing with subsequent vessel counts. In terms of total abundance, sherds and vessels tend to correlate with one another (Hull 2007: 86-87) and thus may be used to assess assemblages at this macro-level. Problems begin to appear when attempting to use sherd counts for relative analysis of different ware types or decorative types within or between ceramic assemblages. This is primarily due to the differential breakage rates (Orton 2000:
52) of different ware types (i.e., more robust types such as stonewares tending to break into larger sherds than finer types such as porcelains) and the tendency for sherd counts to overestimate undecorated types (Brooks 2005a: 21). These are the two main statistical problems that arise when using sherd counts as vessel equivalents. This is a particularly important consideration when dealing with 19th-century refined earthenwares (REW), which were primarily categorized and marketed based on decoration (Miller 1980, 1991).

Sussman (2000: 96) correctly points out that sherds and vessels are two wholly separate categories of data that reveal different types of information and are independently suited to different research questions. Essentially, sherds are viewed as refuse, and vessels are viewed as objects or the useful lifeform of that refuse. As refuse, sherds are instrumental in the analysis of formation processes of the archaeological record, as well as the refuse disposal practices of the individuals under study.

One potential pitfall in the use of MVC is the variability in the methodology used to compute it. One of the major strengths of the MVC, however, is its normalization of data sets, and it is often used for comparative analyses between different assemblages. The process of deriving MVC must therefore be made explicit, though there is almost always a subjective component to it. The subjectivity often arises from the need to group sherds together into vessels without being able to physically join them (Orton 2000: 51). Of course, not all archaeological assemblages are created equal: the more complete the assemblage is (in terms of vessel completeness), the more accurate the MVC will be. Fragmentary and spatially isolated assemblages thus do not lend themselves well to MVC analysis; for this reason, the assemblages recovered from the test pits have been excluded.
from this analysis, as explained above.

The methodology employed here for MVC calculation essentially follows the ‘sensible minimum’ technique outlined by Brooks (2005a: 23) and is a combination of the quantitative and qualitative techniques described by Voss and Allen (2010: 1). Sherds were initially grouped by event, then separated into different ware types. Next, sherds were separated according to different decorative types and finally by form. Thus, increasingly small groups of distinct vessels were formed. Redundant non-diagnostic (body) undecorated sherds were removed entirely to reduce noise and allow for easier categorization. Rims were typically used as the primary diagnostic element for defining unique vessel forms because they outnumber bases/handles and are generally more diagnostic of form. Initially, groupings were made within discrete events; afterwards, comparisons were made between events and vessels were combined across different events where appropriate. Cross-mending was undertaken in some cases to further elucidate vessel form and determine MVC for groups of sherds with similar characteristics. Using this methodology, a minimum number of vessel groupings was created, which were assigned individual numbers (DW Vessel #) (see Appendix B). Not every sherd was assigned to a vessel grouping (see Hatcher 2013: 48); unassigned sherds were grouped by ware type and decoration and left aside.

The following discussion is based on the established vessel counts and analyzes the Downs House (DH) ceramic assemblage on the basis of ware type, decoration, form, and function. Spatial analyses at different scales cross-cut these analytical categories. Some brief comments concerning the developmental history of the British ceramic
industry in the late 18th and early 19th century are required first.

Barker (2010) characterizes the period between ca. 1720-1750 as a ceramic revolution, centred on northern Staffordshire, and particularly affecting tableware ceramics. This is considered to be part of a broader ceramic revolution which began in the 16th century and entailed an increase in the range of ceramic wares, decorative types, and forms available (Barker and Majewski 2006: 209). The Industrial Revolution of the 18th century particularly accelerated the pace of change in the ceramics industry. Mass production meant increasing standardization as the process of ceramic manufacture became broken down in an assembly-line type setup where individual workers were responsible for very specific parts of the overall process (Richards 1999: 4; Carter and Norton 2013: 23). As such, finished products displayed a high degree of uniformity. Such vessels were familiar sights wherever the British Empire had colonial interests (as well as areas outside the Empire where active trade took place) (Brooks 2015: 1-2).

As part of the consumer revolution (Pogue 2001) and the ceramic revolution noted above, ceramics became an important social medium. Gaimster (2009: 528) describes the transformation of ceramics from a previously utilitarian role to a commodity with a prominent place in social settings. This implies a heightened symbolic and performative role for these objects. Orser (2000: 12) emphasizes the juxtaposition between traditional coarsewares and the new English refined wares in the rural Irish context, with the former representing “the old-fashioned, the backward, and a dark past” and the latter “modernity, progress, and a bright future” in the eyes of contemporary upper-class commentators.
External influences were crucial to the development of the British ceramic industry. Attempts to emulate white-bodied Chinese porcelain led to the success of first English tin-glazed earthenware, and later salt-glazed stoneware. The latter became the dominant ceramic tableware of the mid-18th century (MACL 2002), replacing English delftwares due to their increased durability. The demand for teawares and porcelain provided the initial impetus for the ceramic revolution, which was later spurred on by changing dining practices associated with the Georgian period (Barker 2010). Important technological developments including the use of new materials, lathe turning, moulds, and separate biscuit/glost firings helped to revolutionize British ceramics.

By the 1760s, another important change occurred with the rise of the refined earthenware known to archaeologists as creamware and initially marketed successfully as ‘Queen’s Ware’ by Josiah Wedgwood (Noel Hume 2001: 209-211). Creamware overlapped in the mid-18th century with salt-glazed stoneware, and similar forms were produced in the two wares. The success of creamware curtailed English attempts to develop their own porcelain industry (Miller and Hunter 2001). The chinoiserie patterns painted on English refined earthenwares beginning in the 1770s also helped to fill the demand for Chinese porcelain. Creamware was initially an expensive high-status ware, but its price had lowered by the end of the century, when plain cream-coloured ware was the cheapest refined earthenware available. By this point, ceramics were priced and marketed based on decoration (Miller 1980, 1991).

The range of decorative types expanded rapidly at the end of the 18th century as new technologies (such as transfer printing and engine turning) emerged. It was around
this time that the ceramic known to archaeologists as pearlware was introduced. This was a blue-tinted refined earthenware achieved through the addition of cobalt oxide that continued the trend towards increasingly white-bodied earthenwares (compared to the earlier yellow-tinted creamware) (Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 118). It is difficult to put an exact date on its introduction, but numerous Staffordshire potteries appear to have been producing it as early as 1775 (Miller and Hunter 2001). Wedgwood referred to this “whitened creamware” as Pearl White (Noel Hume 2001: 224).

It is during these transitional periods when many factories were experimenting with different paste and glaze compositions that sorting sherds into discrete ware categories can be very difficult (ibid: 227). Pearlwares nearly always had some form of decoration, whereas creamwares were generally plain. Miller and Hunter (2001) explain that the term pearlware was never recognized by contemporary manufacturers and consumers because it was not seen as representing a wholly different ware type. The main difference was in the proliferation of decorative techniques. Thus, “china glaze and pearlware did not replace creamware: decoration replaced creamware” (ibid: 154, emphasis in original). Instead of identifying these changes by a new ware type, vessels began to be designated based on the decorative type. Miller’s (1980, 1991) breakthroughs in this area have been fundamental to the analysis of 19th-century refined earthenwares. He not only demonstrated that decoration was a more robust (and emic) system of classification but was also able to empirically show how these decorative types related to one another in terms of cost. His Cream Coloured (CC) Index tracks the prices of different decorative types over the course of the 19th century (based on the documentary
record) and shows that there is a persistent hierarchy in the cost of these types.

The main decorative types present on white-bodied refined earthenwares are plain, edged, sponged, dipped, and transfer printed. Plain vessels were common in early refined earthenwares, but became less common after about 1830, when they were restricted to more utilitarian vessels such as chamber pots (Miller 1991: 5). These undecorated wares remained the cheapest type of ceramic throughout the 19th century.

The cheapest type of decoration available for most of the 19th century was edged – this type consisted of a painted border and often moulded edges on flatwares (ibid: 6). Blue was the most common colour, but green was also common prior to 1840. By 1860, this type of decoration became quite rare. Another cheap form of decoration was sponged and spatter designs. Spatter or powdered designs refer to the use of powdered colour, whereas sponged designs are applied with a cut sponge (ibid). The former has a long tradition in the British ceramic industry, but the latter only became common in the late 1840s. They were similar to edged vessels in terms of price. Sponged designs were also often combined with painted designs after 1840 (ibid: 8). Dipped decoration refers to those ceramics, often lathe-turned, which are primarily decorated with the use of slip (liquid clay) (Rickard 2006: 1). A variety of different decorative slip techniques were used, which have been assigned varying terminology by archaeologists and collectors. Rickard (ibid: 4) assigns a date of approximately 1770 to the introduction of dipped wares. They become quite uncommon after the mid-19th century (except for simple banded wares) (Miller 1991: 7). Dipped designs are rare on teawares and are generally limited to hollowware vessels (ibid).
Handpainting was another common decorative method. Although often found on tin-glazed earthenwares and porcelains, this was not a common technique in the Staffordshire area prior to 1760 (ibid: 8). From approximately 1775 until 1795 (ibid), cobalt blue was the dominant paint colour, being used to produce Chinese-inspired motifs (Miller and Hunter 2001). Other colours were introduced around 1795, including muted earth-toned browns, greens, and yellows (‘early palette’). These remained popular through the 1820s and are often found on teawares (Miller 1991: 8). Around this time, cobalt blue became increasingly popular again in floral motifs, either on its own with broad brush strokes or combined with other early palette polychromes (MACL 2002). By 1830, a new colour palette (‘late palette’) was introduced which included lighter (sometimes almost fluorescent) reds, yellows, blues, greens, and blacks (Miller 1991: 8). These ‘chrome colours’ were prepared with the help of chrome oxide and became tenable with the addition of borax to the glaze (ibid; MACL 2002). More delicate sprig-painted designs became common around mid-century as well (Miller 1991: 8). Painted wares were typically the second-most expensive white-bodied refined earthenware, behind only transfer printed wares.

Transfer printing, involving the transfer of an inked design from a copper engraving on to a sheet of tissue paper then on to the unfired ceramic body itself, was first tested on porcelain in the mid-18th century then applied to Staffordshire earthenwares thereafter (Miller 1991: 9; Samford 1997). A transfer print design known as flow, involving a blurry print, became extremely popular in the 1840s and 1850s (Collard 1984: 118; Samford 1997: 24). Transfer printed wares remained the most expensive of
the white-bodied refined earthenwares but fell in price over the course of the 19th century. They were replaced in popularity by white granite/ironstone around mid-century (Miller 1991: 24).

By ca. 1820, refined earthenwares were becoming increasingly whiter again, transitioning into what most archaeologists refer to as ‘whiteware’ (Miller 1980: 2). This is described by Majewski and O’Brien (1987: 119) as “a logical development along a continuum of refinements in paste and glaze”. The impetus for this development may have been the rise of the British bone china industry (Miller 1980: 17). Whiteware was a stark white compared to the blue-tinted pearlware that existed in the first couple decades of the 19th century. The creamware-pearlware-whiteware triumvirate thus describes the general progression of refined earthenwares over a period ranging from approximately 1760-1820. Archaeologists generally agree on the usage of these terms and the approximate dates at which the wares were introduced. The main problem is that the categorization of sherds into these three categories is a difficult and subjective process; thus, different archaeologists will invariably arrive at slightly different categorizations (Miller 1980: 2; Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 130). This stems from the fact that the three ware categories were not uniformly recognized by manufacturers and consumers as discrete categories, i.e., they are etic terms applied by archaeologists. It is clear from the various terms applied by manufacturers that some differences in refined earthenware bodies were recognized, but the terms were not consistently or uniformly applied. There is thus considerable overlap amongst the different types, despite the general trajectory. The distinction between whiteware and pearlware can be particularly difficult.
Creamwares tend to be more obvious, especially early versions which have a darker tint. A lighter creamware became more common after 1775, when Staffordshire potters gained access to kaolin clays in Cornwall (Miller 1991: 5).

Despite these issues, this ware-based classification system is engrained in archaeological analysis and does retain some chronological validity. While the criticisms discussed above are valid, the typology is a useful, if imperfect, step in the cataloguing process. Decorative technique would have been a much more important consideration for consumers, as Miller’s important work (1980, 1991) has demonstrated. Dating refined earthenwares based on decorative techniques and motifs is generally more precise. Refined earthenwares remained the dominant tableware ceramic type from the introduction of creamware in the mid-18th century until the proliferation of ironstone/white granite a century later. Nonetheless, whiteware remained popular into the 20th century (Brighton and Levon White 2006: 113).

Ironstone refers to a variety of vitreous or semi-vitreous refined earthenware that is intermediate in hardness between white-bodied refined earthenwares and porcelain (Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 120). Collard (1984: 125-130) identifies two different phases of ironstone in the Canadian import context – the first was a finer, dense blue-tinted earthenware produced to emulate Chinese export porcelains in the early 19th century. The second was the much more common heavy-bodied semi-vitrified whiter ware more typically identified by archaeologists as ironstone. This may have been

---

42 Another common term for this ware is ‘white granite’ (Brooks 2005a: 30, 35). As with the various refined earthenwares, ironstone does not refer to a single ware type but is a continuum of vitreous to semi-vitreous wares that existed alongside refined earthenwares.
produced in response to the growing popularity of French porcelain. Majewski and O’Brien (1987: 121) refer to this latter type as ‘classic ironstone’; it debuted in the 1840s and quickly became a popular type. It is typically undecorated but features moulded designs that are temporally diagnostic (see MACL 2002). Classic ironstone was the dominant ceramic type of the second half of the 19th century (Miller 1991: 10). Significantly, it was developed as an export ware and was never popular in Britain, despite its enormous success in North America (Brooks 2002: 55). As noted previously, the lack of late ironstone from the DH is a good indicator that occupation did not extend far into the second half of the 19th century. Some archaeologists have suggested that a lack of ironstone at some North American sites may be due to recent immigrants from England not having been previously exposed to it (Pyszka 2017: 56), though this seems unlikely given the widespread popularity of ironstone elsewhere in Newfoundland/Labrador (e.g., Burke 1991: 61; Jones 2009: 82-83) and Canada (Collard 1984: 125-136). The lack of other mid-19th century horizon markers suggests that there is a chronological (rather than consumer choice) explanation for its absence.

Form designations are fairly standardized in analyses of late 18th- and 19th-century ceramic assemblages. This is because many of the most common vessel forms used during this period remain in use to this day (Brooks 2005b: 46). Where form was not identifiable, vessels were either classified as unidentified flatware, unidentified hollowware, or simply unidentified.

The primary functional differentiation is between tablewares and utilitarian wares. Tablewares are “the vessels for which the primary intended function is the serving and
consumption of food and drink”, while utilitarian wares are “typically intended for the
storage and preparation of foods” (Brooks 2000: 81). Brooks also includes vessels related
to “non-food related activities” under utilitarian, but these are excluded here. Vessels
which fit the latter definition are those related to hygiene (such as chamber pots) and are
discussed under the Personal Group.

Ware types are strongly correlated with this functional division, and Brooks (ibid:
163-164) essentially conflates ware type and function, lumping all refined earthenwares
and porcelains under the tableware category. There are, however, some exceptions which
he is careful to note (ibid: 198). For instance, tableware forms such as mugs do
sometimes occur in coarseware\textsuperscript{43} types (though there are very few examples at the DH
site). Refined earthenwares and porcelains are almost exclusively tablewares, with the
exception of some hygiene-related vessels. The overlap between coarseware and
tableware forms typically occurs in bowls and jugs (ibid: 73, 142); otherwise, the forms
are very distinct.

Tablewares can be further subdivided based on form (primary intended function)
into the following categories: teawares (cups and saucers), serving vessels (e.g., platters,
jugs), food consumption (bowls and plates), and beverage consumption (mugs). These
further subdivisions are significant because they reflect dietary practice, often related to
other aspects of identity such as ethnicity and status. When form was not identifiable,

\footnote{Brooks (2000b: 208) uses the term ‘coarseware’ to refer to all coarse earthenwares, coarse stonewares
and yellowware. I include yellowware as a refined earthenware, given its high-fired nature, mass
production, and decoration with methods found on other refined earthenwares (industrial slip, transfer print,
etc.), but it is admittedly an intermediary between the white-bodied refined earthenwares and coarsewares
and is produced in both tableware and utilitarian forms (ibid: 255). Coarsewares from the Downs House are
almost exclusively utilitarian forms.}
function could only be broadly surmised as either tableware or utilitarian (based on the ware type or partial form). The distribution of vessels by broad ware type and function is shown in Table 5.1. Whether based on sherd counts or vessels, refined earthenwares are clearly the dominant ware type. Functionally, the assemblage is dominated by tablewares, indicating a clear emphasis on dining and the tea ceremony (Figures 5.1 and 5.2).

Figure 5.1 - A variety of teawares from the DH. Top row: left – ‘China Glaze’ painted teapot (Vessel 183), right - plain teapot (Vessel 345). Middle row: left – late palette painted saucer (Vessel 176), right – transfer-printed unidentified pattern saucer (Vessel 221). Bottom row: left – transfer-printed Two Temples pattern teacup (Vessel 216), right – late palette painted teacup (Vessel 151). Scale increments are 1 cm.
Figure 5.2 – A variety of dining vessels from the DH. Top row: left – blue edged plate (Vessel 198), right – transfer-printed unidentified geometric floral pattern (Vessel 220). Second row: transfer-printed Wild Rose pattern (Vessel 219). Third row: left – transfer-printed unidentified geometric floral pattern plate (Vessel 232), right – transfer-printed unidentified floral pattern bowl (Vessel 377). Bottom row: left – transfer-printed unidentified Chinoiserie pattern plate (Vessel 227), right – pink edged plate (Vessel 204). Scale increments are 1 cm.
The presence of high numbers of tablewares is in itself not indicative of a high-status occupation. By this period, ceramic tablewares were cheap enough to be afforded by even very low-income individuals (McIlvo 2018). Thus, nearly every 19th-century ceramic assemblage will be dominated by tableware forms. Some research has suggested that utilitarian wares may outnumber tablewares at sites occupied by individuals of lower socio-economic status, although the relationship between status and broad functional groups is uncertain (Pyszka 2017: 53-54).

Clearly, a reliance on a certain number of utilitarian wares is necessary regardless of socio-economic status. There is some indication, however, that locally produced coarsewares may have been looked upon disparagingly by elites in some 19th-century contexts (Orser 2000: 10). It has also been argued that there is a relationship between socio-economic position and the overall density of ceramic vessels present on a site (O’Donovan and Wurst 2001: 77; Hull 2007: 83). This relationship appears to exist independently of the tableware:utilitarian ratio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware type</th>
<th># vessels</th>
<th>% total vessels</th>
<th># sherds</th>
<th>% total sherds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coarse earthenware</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse stoneware</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined earthenware</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>3623</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined stoneware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin-glazed earthenware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3767</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 - Vessel and sherd distribution by broad ware type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th># vessels</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 - Vessel distribution by functional category.
Tablewares

The distribution of tableware vessels by form is shown in Table 5.3. The most common forms are plates, cups, bowls, and saucers. Other specialized forms include tureens, platters, drainers, and egg cups. Due to a relatively high fragmentation rate and the nature of the sampling design, a number of vessels were identifiable only to general form (hollowware vs flatware). Approximately one fifth of the assemblage was unidentifiable past these general categories. Many researchers have pointed to the importance of vessel forms in elucidating details of diet, which often relates closely to status or ethnicity. John Otto’s (1977) work proved foundational in attempting to discern status differences from ceramics. His analysis involved the study of ceramics from discrete documented contexts associated with planters, overseers, and slaves at an antebellum plantation. One of the primary contributions was a careful focus on the vessel forms and their relation to the different foodways in which different social classes participated. For example, bowls were seen to be more commonly associated with slaves, while flatwares were associated with planters. This in turn relates to known differences in diet – slaves tended to consume basic stews, whereas planters had access to more expensive cuts of meat and vegetables.

Consumption of large quantities of meat was particularly seen to be a symbol of high status in the early modern period (Miller 2015: 494). This association of hollowares

---

Drainers are flat serving vessels that are made to fit into platters. They are covered in a pattern of holes and are often used for serving fish or meat, allowing the excess liquid to drain into the underlying platter (Coysh and Henrywood 1982: 115). They differ from colanders, which are associated with food preparation and typically found in coarsewares.
and flatwares with class-based dietary patterns has continued to be applied in a variety of different contexts throughout the world (Mrozowski 2006: 122-123; Hull 2007; Cowie 2011: 130; Brooks and Rodriguez 2012: 84) but should not be assumed to be universally valid (Burke 1991).

Broadly speaking, rural folk foodways seem to be often, though evidently not universally, characterized by a notable emphasis on single-pot stews/pottages, despite cultural, geographic, and chronological differences (Groover 2003: 238). For example, stews were mainstays of the rural Welsh diet (Brooks 2000: 85), oatmeal was a staple of the rural Irish diet (alongside the ubiquitous potato) (Brighton 2009: 131), and hollow vessel forms were characteristically used to consume milk-based products in the Hebrides (Webster 1999: 69-71). The discrepancy in the number of plates and bowls at the DH site is significant, with plates more than doubling bowls. The variety in plate sizes also indicates different dining functions (see Miller 1980: 11).

Other serving forms such as platters, tureens, serving bowls, and drainers indicate that complex formalized dining was undertaken (Figure 5.3), following the expectation for genteel middle/upper class individuals at the time (Richards 1999: 157-161; Young 2010). Cressey et al (1982: 165-166) have suggested that the presence of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Form</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egg cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teapot</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tureen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/I Flatware</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/I Holloware</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 – Tableware form distribution.
serving vessels indicates affluency because they are: a) more expensive than common tableware forms; and b) luxury items which are not essential to the consumption of food.

The archaeological evidence is paralleled by frequent references to social dining amongst the Ferryland gentry in the Robert Carter journal (1832-1852). Similarly, Lawrence (2012: 193-200) discusses the importance of such social engagements amongst the 19th-
century gentry in various other British colonies. Beaudry (2010: 62-64) uses the concept of social funds to explore how elites in rural Massachusetts negotiated status through networks of interaction with their peers. One of the important strategies involved “social display through hospitality extended in the form of tea and supper parties” (ibid: 62). The events recounted in Robert Carter’s journal are seemingly evidence of similar interactions amongst Ferryland’s elite, and the DH refuse suggests such activities were undertaken there.

The functional breakdown of tablewares is shown in Table 5.4. The high numbers of teawares (cups and saucers), as well as at least 6 teapots point to the importance of the tea ceremony. Numerous references in Robert Carter’s journal provide further evidence of the significance placed upon tea drinking by the gentry class. When first introduced in Europe in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, tea was a luxury that could only be enjoyed by the elite (Miller 2005: 139-140). By the second quarter of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, tea had become more widely available to a larger demographic. By the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, it seems to have been available to nearly all social classes (Richards 1999: 131), even in very rural areas (e.g., Cabak and Loring 2000; Brighton 2009: 118).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Consumption</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Consumption</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaware</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The simple presence of teawares must not be interpreted as an indicator of status, but the tea ceremony certainly did play an important role in the negotiation of status and display of gentility in the Georgian/Victorian worldview (Richards 1999: 141). The importance placed on teawares by consumers is reflected in the typical higher cost outlay devoted to
them compared to other tablewares (e.g., Miller 1980: 12; Shepard 1987: 182; Brighton 2009: 118). A similar pattern is reflected in the DH assemblage, with the highest proportions of porcelain and transfer-printed earthenwares found in the teaware category. Wall (1991: 75) also notes that the difference between teawares and other tablewares is significant because of how they operated in different social arenas. Dining was typically (though certainly not always) limited to immediate family members, while the opposite is true of the tea ceremony – the latter was typically undertaken with non-family members.

Methods and meaning of tea consumption would of course have varied considerably depending on class affiliations as well (Martin 1996: 78-79). Based on the evidence from the Robert Carter journal, the tea ceremony played an important social role amongst the gentry in Ferryland. Wall (1991: 79) suggests that tea was particularly significant for middle-class women, because it represented an occasion when women could associate closely with one another. Otherwise, gentry women tended to be somewhat isolated in domestic spheres as dictated by Victorian expectations of gentility. Keough (2001: 326) suggests that aspiring middle-class women in Ferryland would have withdrawn into domesticity in a similar manner.

The teawares from the site would thus have probably had immense gendered social importance. This certainly does not preclude the possibility that men frequently made use of the teawares, and this is made obvious by references in the Carter journal. With the increasingly rigid gender divisions of the 19th century, however, tea certainly held a special significance among women and particularly those of the middle class (Gray 2013). In the 18th century, a fairly rigid gender divide was created in the social
consumption of beverages by the middle and upper classes (Richards 1999: 142-143). As previously noted, tea was associated with polite conversation amongst women in drawing rooms/parlours. Meanwhile, men would often gather around a punch-bowl, which served as “the focal point of male conviviality”, often in association with tobacco (ibid: 143). This could take place in either public or private settings, and the same domestic space was often used by men and women at different times for different purposes (ibid: 105). Further research is needed to better understand how beverage consumption meshed with the nuanced gender and class roles of 19th-century Ferryland.

Spatial analysis reveals that functional types are not evenly distributed across the site (Table 5.5). For example, teawares are most common in TT1, making up nearly 30% of the assemblage. The slightly higher proportion compared to other areas suggests the preferential use of the courtyard/lower terrace area for the consumption of tea. Perhaps the area was used as a leisure space for tea ceremonies during fair weather. Serving vessels, meanwhile, are rare in TT1 (only 7.4%) and much more common in TT2 and TT3 (21% and 13%), indicating that these middens reflect dining activities. The ‘tea garden’ was an important social setting for the British gentry; it was a particular type of pleasure garden that developed in 18th-century Britain as part of the Picturesque landscape garden tradition (Miller 1993: 100-102). Lawrence (2012: 135-180) describes the close association between genteel women and ordered garden landscapes in the 19th century. Ornamental gardens were intended to be extensions of the house, providing spaces for genteel leisure (Bushman 1992: 130).
White-bodied refined earthenwares

The vast majority of the tableware assemblage is represented by white-bodied types of the late 18th to mid-19th century (the creamware-pearlware-whiteware triumvirate). As noted previously, Miller (1980, 1991) has demonstrated that decoration was the main way in which these ware types were marketed and sold. Based on an exhaustive analysis of documentary records, he established a hierarchy in ceramic cost based on decorative type.

These types can be grouped into four different categories: undecorated, minimally decorated (edged, sponged, dipped), painted, and transfer printed (Miller 1980: 3-4).

Miller also demonstrated that form typically relates to expenditure: teawares tend to have the highest index values, while bowls are lowest (1980: 11). This may relate to the role of these items in displays of status.

Other ware types are also included in Miller’s CC index, including black basalt, ironstone, and English porcelain.

These are generally more expensive than the decorative types listed above when included

Table 5.5 - Functional distribution by area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>% Area Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Consumption</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Consumption</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaware</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Consumption</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Consumption</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Consumption</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Consumption</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaware</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the area counts add up to a higher total than the MVC count. This is because some vessels are spread across multiple areas. For the purposes of a spatial analysis, these were separated. This will ultimately give two different counts – one that is a minimum number and the other that will allow for better proportional comparisons between areas (even though the total will be bigger).
in the lists. Because the latter three types were recovered in only very small amounts, they are not considered here as part of the decorative analysis.

The use of CC indices has certain problems, despite its enormous utility. Brooks (2005a: 17-18, 61-63) provides a summary of some of these critiques, and a full discussion need not be repeated here. They can essentially be broken down into two categories: methodological and theoretical. Methodologically, the technique relies upon very tight chronological control. For optimal use, assemblages should span no more than 20 years (Miller 1991: 4). This is because the researcher must choose a specific year of index values (which vary temporally). Thus, the absolute quantitative relationships between different decorative categories is not fixed year-to-year. This is partially countered by the fact that the relative relationships remain consistent, meaning the hierarchal order of decoration and cost remains the same over time (i.e., undecorated is always cheapest, transfer printed is always most expensive). Another issue concerns the applicability of the technique in different geographical and cultural contexts. Miller’s initial work focussed on prices in the British and American wholesale market. The transferability of these prices to other contexts (e.g., rural Newfoundland) should not simply be assumed. Nonetheless, the relative cost hierarchy should remain largely consistent, regardless of local economic variance.

Based on these two methodological caveats, a proportional examination of the decorative classes, rather than the actual calculation of index values seems more appropriate. Theoretically, the main issue is the direct conflation of cost and status/socio-economic position. The acquisition of objects and their incorporation into household
assemblages is governed by affordability, availability, and desirability (Martin 1996: 93). Only the first factor can be directly addressed by the CC index method. Consumer choice is an important and complex consideration (O’Donovan and Wurst 2001) and cannot be fully explained by purchasing power.

The distribution of decorative types is shown in Table 5.6. The vast majority of the vessels (almost 50%) are transfer-printed, the most expensive decorative type available. The second-highest category is painted wares, which comprise just over 20% of the assemblage. When the decorative types are aggregated into the four groups defined by Miller (1980: 3-4) (Table 5.7), a clear pattern emerges: cost is positively correlated with frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decorative Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dipped</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponged/Speckled</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: one Whieldon (clouded) ware vessel has been removed – it pre-dates Miller's categorization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No decoration</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal decoration</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Categories after Miller 1980: 3-4. Spatial analysis reveals some differences in decorative distributions between areas (Table 5.8).

For example, TT1 has a significantly higher proportion of painted and sponged wares, while TT2 is significantly higher for transfer-printed wares and TT3 has the most plain wares.
Not surprisingly, decoration varies by form/function. Table 5.9 shows the relationships between function and decoration. In all cases except beverage consumption, transfer-printed wares constitute the majority of each category. As expected, edged wares are absent from teawares and dominated by flatwares in the food consumption and serving categories. Painted wares are especially popular amongst the teawares, accounting for almost 40%. As noted above, many of these derive from TT1. The painted teawares outnumber all other painted wares combined. Teawares are dominated by the two most expensive categories, suggesting an important social function for these wares.

Wall (1991: 79) notes that the domestic consumption of tea typically took place in two very different settings: one would have been largely in the company of family at the dinner table (typically breakfast), while the other would have been afternoon tea, probably in the parlour and amongst non-family members. She suggests that different sets of dishes were often used to reflect these different social settings. It is clear that multiple different discrete sets of teawares were used by the DH inhabitants. These may relate to different social uses as Wall (1991) suggests or different occupations entirely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>% Area Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponged</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speckled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponged</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfortunately, the discrete midden deposits do not appear to represent discrete occupations; instead, they are contemporary and represent continuous refuse disposal over several decades, probably representing aggregations of different occupations.

Beverage consumption (mugs) are represented by minimally decorated wares, suggesting a utilitarian function for these.

Table 5.9 - Function and decorative type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function/Decoration</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beverage Consumption</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Consumption</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serving</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaware</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of matching sets in ceramic assemblages has often been interpreted by archaeologists as a subscription to a Victorian aesthetic/ideology (Hull 2007: 85). Matching tea and tableware sets were very rare before 1830 (Adams 2003: 50), making them a distinctly Victorian phenomenon. After this point, it became more common to purchase matched sets, but they did not become commonplace until the late 19th century (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992: 88). It has been suggested that the quantity of matching sets may be positively correlated with socio-economic status (Hull 2007: 85), though this is not always the case (Shepard 1987: 191). Two criteria must be realized for the purchase of matching sets: first, one must have enough capital to make bulk purchases; and second, the matching set must be available for purchase. Because of the
rapidly changing nature of merchant inventories, it is difficult to acquire matched ceramics in a piecemeal fashion (Hull 2007: 85).

Researchers have demonstrated that it is often difficult to acquire matched sets of vessels in rural areas located some distance from market centres (Brighton 2009: 117). Assemblages from these areas are often piecemeal and characterized by ad hoc acquisition. There are several examples of matching sets in the DH assemblage, perhaps indicating that the inhabitants strived for the order and symmetry demanded of middle-class gentility (Wall 1994: 147; Fitts 1999: 50). This also demonstrates that the rural community was well connected to larger spheres of interaction. The mechanics of ceramic trade in rural Newfoundland in the 19th century are not well understood, but it seems clear that there was easy access to well-stocked merchants. Most likely, the majority of these ceramics were purchased from retailers in the capital St. John’s. It is also possible that itinerant merchants sold a limited selection of wares in Ferryland. In any case, the presence of numerous matched vessel types implies deliberate (perhaps even consigned) orders. It is also possible that some vessels may have been directly acquired from English merchants. The Ferryland gentry seems to have remained well connected with family and associates in England. The Carter journal indicates that John Jellard made frequent trips overseas; he may have been able to acquire specific desired ceramics during these trips.

There are eight vessels with the ubiquitous Blue Willow pattern, which was manufactured by many different factories throughout the entire 19th century. It was so popular that it was treated as a wholly separate decorative category by ceramic retailers
(Miller 1980). It is unlikely that these were purchased as a set, because of the enormous popularity and widespread nature of this pattern. Differences in colour and quality suggest that the examples are from several different firms. Other examples of matching sets include the Triumphal Car pattern (seven examples) produced by the Scottish firm J. & M.P. Bell & Co. beginning in 1842 (Kelly 2006: 27), Muleteer (two examples) produced by Davenport, Wild Rose (five examples) which was produced by several different companies around the second quarter of the 19th century and was one of the most popular pattern types up to 1855 (Coysh 1974:48), a Willow variant known as Two Temples (four examples) produced by several different companies, and 10 other unidentified patterns (Figure 5.4).

Many of the patterns are unidentifiable due to fragmentation but can be assigned to the broad groups defined by Samford (1997): there are examples of Chinese (peak production 1790-1814), Pastoral (1819-1836), Classical (1827-1847), Romantic (1831-1851), and Gothic (1841-1852) types. The Pastoral types appear to be especially
prevalent, while the British Views types depicting cities, famous buildings, and stately homes (Samford 1997; Brooks 1999) are noticeably absent. Brooks (1999: 57) suggests that pastoral scenes were meant to “project a powerful symbolic image of a calm and prosperous rural Britain”. These images may have resonated with the inhabitants of the site, who all appear to have had connections to rural southwest England. Many vessels were only identifiable by their border design. The continuous floral border is very common in the assemblage and was popular between 1820 and 1836 (Samford 1997: 21).

The transfer-printed vessels are nearly exclusively blue: out of 115 vessels, there are six black, four brown, and one green with the remaining being blue. Most of these are medium or dark blue, popular between about 1817 and 1835 (Samford 1997: 20). Black and brown prints were popular between 1825-1838 and 1829-1843 respectively, while green was popular between 1832-1850 (ibid). The dominance of blue prints is partly indicative of the early date of some of these vessels. There is evidently a preference for blue even in later periods, however, given that a wide variety of other colours were widely available from the late 1820s onward.

Refined stoneware
A small collection of English white salt-glazed stoneware (EWSG) was present in the assemblage. This ware type was manufactured between ca. 1685 and 1785 and was most popular during the 1720-1770 period when it was the predominant ceramic tableware (MACL 2002). Interestingly, there were no sherds recovered from TT3, despite the enormous quantity of vessels recovered there. A large sherd from a EWSG bowl was also recovered from TP5, in association with Feature 215 (the stockade retaining wall).
Tin-glazed earthenware

Tin-glazed earthenware (TGEW) was also recovered in very small amounts. As with EWSG, this ware type was largely phased out during the late 18th century with the rise of the refined earthenwares. It was also severely affected by the rise of EWSG as the dominant tableware type in the mid-18th century (Noel Hume 1970: 115). TGEW was produced by many different countries in imitation of porcelain beginning in the 16th century (MACL 2002). By the 19th century, production in England had essentially stopped. The recovered sherds were very fragmented and it is impossible to date them more specifically. They represent at least three different vessels. The sherds were recovered from TT2 and TT3 from early stratigraphic periods – building construction and the main occupation.

Porcelain

For the purposes of this discussion, ‘porcelain’ refers to the various vitrified wares that typically make up 19th-century assemblages – including Chinese and European hard paste porcelain, English soft paste, and English bone china. A relatively small amount of porcelain was recovered – 19 sherds amounting to a minimum of 14 vessels (Figure 5.5). This is a very small amount compared to most assemblages dating only a few decades earlier (Madsden and White 2009: 11). The bulk of export
porcelain recovered in North America is found on 18th-century sites. By the late 18th century, tariffs imposed in England had essentially eliminated Chinese porcelain from the market (Miller 1991: 8) and the English East India Company withdrew from the porcelain trade in the early 19th century (Madsden and White 2009: 14). In earlier contexts, export porcelain is assumed to be a very good indicator of high status, given its high cost and rarity. As availability increased over time, the luxury status of porcelain declined, though it remained one of the most expensive ceramic types available. Miller (2005: 138-139) identifies the start of the 18th century as the period when porcelain became increasingly available to middling classes and its use transformed to more of a quotidian function (rather than purely decorative).

Export porcelain has also been documented at sites occupied by low-status individuals, such as slave quarters (Madsden and White 2009: 11). Its role as a status marker is thus not clear-cut, particularly after the 17th century. Nonetheless, porcelain has still been considered to be an important status item for 19th-century ceramic assemblages (Miller 1980: 3; Cowie 2011: 101). English attempts at replicating porcelain resulted in a soft paste porcelain by the 1740s, a hard paste version by the 1770s, and finally bone china in the 1790s (Miller 1980: 11). Bone china was the most successful of these British-made porcelains (both in Britain and abroad) (Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 115). In continental Europe, many more factories had success with hard-paste porcelains (ibid: 126). Tariffs imposed on the Chinese trade, the withdrawal of the English East India company from the porcelain trade, and the success of imitant pearlwares marked the end of the Chinese export porcelain market. Perhaps, then, porcelain regained its role as a
more exclusive luxury item (harkening back to the 17th century) with this limited early 19th-century supply. Its market price is not as well understood as the contemporary refined earthenwares, but it does seem to have been the most expensive ware type available (ibid: 32). Given the apparent high price and the fact that refined earthenwares were only imitations, true porcelain probably remained a luxury item.

A variety of different types are present in the DH porcelain assemblage. Examination of the wares under shortwave ultraviolet light proved to be an extremely useful technique for differentiating them (Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 128). Hard paste porcelain appears magenta to dark purple, while bone china appears a stark white under these conditions. Soft-paste porcelain lies somewhere in between, appearing a dullish pink-gray or milky white (Majewski and O’Brien 1987; Grant 2000; MACL 2002). This is a definitive way to verify groupings made on the basis of paste and glaze. It is, however, very difficult to identify the country of origin for 19th-century hard-paste porcelains (Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 127). The state of archaeological knowledge of 19th-century porcelain is still developing and is complicated by the myriad different sources for these wares. As suggested by Majewski and O’Brien (ibid), researchers should rely primarily on the physical/technical characteristics of hard paste, soft paste, and bone china for preliminary categorization. Further attribution is done on the basis of observable qualitative characteristics but is complicated by similarities between different wares. Chinese export porcelain tends to have a noticeable bluish tint, although this can vary depending on whether the decoration is overglaze or underglaze (the latter tends to result in a bluer cast) (MACL 2002). By contrast, European porcelain tends to be much
whiter. This was the main criteria used for differentiating the two. Decorative motifs and style are more certain, but the fragmentation of the vessels made this difficult in most cases. The majority of archaeologically-recovered Chinese porcelain tends to be blue-painted underglaze; the overglaze enamelled variety is more expensive and rarer (Noel Hume 2001: 286; Madsden and White 2009: 12). The opposite is true of European porcelain: overglaze decoration was the most common decorative method on European porcelain until 1880 (Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 128).

Seven of the vessels are Chinese porcelain, three are bone china, two are English soft-paste porcelain (including one which appear to be glass-frit [Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 126]), and a single vessel was identified as European hard-paste porcelain. All are tablewares, and most of the identifiable forms are teawares (including five cups and two saucers).

Consumption patterns of porcelain in Canada apparently differed from those in the United States – British bone china held the major market share in Canada, whereas Chinese export porcelain was typically more popular in the American market (Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 129). At the DH, the majority of the porcelain vessels are of the Chinese variety, though there are several bone china vessels present as well. All Chinese porcelain vessels exhibit underglaze painted blue decoration, with one vessel also incorporating overglaze enamelling in an Imari-inspired design (Madsden and White 2009: 110). The latter type is significantly more expensive than the typical underglaze blue (ibid: 47). The bone china and European hardpaste vessels are all overglaze enamelled, while the glass-frit example is plain moulded and the English softpaste vessel
is transfer-printed in a Chinoiserie motif. The distribution of porcelain across the site is relatively consistent and not dominated by any one area.

**Other ware types**
Aside from the white-bodied refined earthenwares, there are 8 other refined earthenware and 4 vitrified earthenware vessels in the assemblage. There is one Astbury-type vessel, one canaryware, one Jackfield-type, four yellowware, and four ironstone (including two early types and two late examples).

The Astbury vessel is a lathe-decorated teapot dating to c. 1765 (Madsden and White 2009: 25) and may represent an heirloom vessel, as it was discovered in a much later midden context (E957) (Figure 5.6). The Jackfield vessel is a similarly early teapot (1740-1790) recovered from the fireplace midden alongside typically later vessels (TT3). Canary ware is a bright yellow glazed white-bodied earthenware that was popular for a brief time in the early 19th century (Mazrim 2007: 180). Four yellowware vessels were recovered: one has a Rockingham-type decoration (teapot from TT2), two are plain (a flatware and hollowware from TT1 and TT3 respectively), and one is a white and blue banded cup (TT3). Only four ironstone vessels were recovered. Two of the vessels appear to be early ironstone (hollowares from TT2 and TT3). Only two are of the classic heavy ironstone
popular in the second half of the 19th century. Both of these come from Period V contexts (E950) and likely post-date the main occupation.

There are only two coarseware vessels identified as having tableware functions: a Westerwald stoneware mug and a Derbyshire-type (Gusset 1984: 1-2) stoneware beaker (Figure 5.7). Stoneware mugs (English and German) were very common in the 18th century. The vessel was recovered from the TT2 midden (including sherds from both E957 and E959). The beaker is an unusual vessel form recovered from TT1 (E951); several exact copies of it were recovered by Jelks (1963: Fig 80) in excavations at Signal Hill in St. John’s.

**Utilitarian coarsewares**

The proportion of utilitarian wares based on vessels is slightly higher than the same proportion based on sherds due to the greater variety of ware types amongst the utilitarian assemblage. Tableware vessel counts may be underestimated due to the consistency of the fabric and glaze compositions and similarity in decorative types. Even with these conservative estimates, utilitarian wares form a minority of the assemblage. There are a variety of ware types present, including English coarse red earthenwares (North Devon
smooth, North Devon gravel-tempered, Totnes-type), Iberian coarse red earthenware, and many other examples of unidentified coarse red earthenwares likely originating from the British Isles and possibly the United States. Similarly, examples of both British (Derbyshire, Bristol Glaze, English Brown) and American coarse stonewares are present. No single type dominates the utilitarian assemblage, perhaps indicating an *ad hoc* form of acquisition. Given that Newfoundland did not have its own local coarseware industry in the early 19th century and Ferryland had active trade connections with a variety of Old and New World locales, it is not surprising to see this diversity.

Coarseware vessels are often obtained locally (Psyzka 2017: 53; Hull 2006: 99), given the low cost and lack of display/communicative function involved with these vessels. Perhaps it was more difficult to obtain coarseware vessels at low cost in Newfoundland, given the lack of a local potting tradition. Coarsewares do not appear to have held the same significance in Newfoundland that they did elsewhere. For example, Hull (2006) argues that coarsewares are intrinsically linked to agri-social position in rural Ireland because of their direct role in agricultural output (and thus access to land). Such a use for coarsewares, directly linked to economic output, likely did not exist in Newfoundland.

The fragmentary nature of much of the utilitarian ware assemblage makes specific vessel attribution difficult. Nonetheless, some trends can be noted. None of the utilitarian vessels can be directly linked to cooking. By the 19th century, ceramics were typically no longer used as cooking vessels and mostly served tableware or storage functions (McIlvoy 2018). Orser (2000: 10), however, provides evidence of locally-manufactured
coarse earthenwares used for cooking purposes in 19th-century rural Ireland. These wares were apparently very common in these areas but were generally looked upon disparagingly by the upper classes. Holloware storage forms (bottles, jugs, crocks, and jars) dominate the utilitarian assemblage (Figure 5.8). Several other specialized forms include two milk pans (indicating dairying activity) and a colander (Figure 5.9). In all, the relatively small number of utilitarian vessels and their fragmentary state suggests that there may be another midden on the site that contains more kitchen-oriented refuse related specifically to the preparation and storage of food. The sheer number of tableware ceramics suggests that intensive and elaborate dining was undertaken at the site, and this would have required a substantial food processing and storage infrastructure. Kitchens in Georgian houses were typically located at the back of the house. This ‘back space’ was clearly separated physically and symbolically from the ‘front space’, which was reserved for dining and entertaining (Johnson 2010: 185). This was the structural manifestation of the separation of food preparation from consumption which took place during the Georgian period (Richards 1999: 161-163).

Interestingly, the majority of the utilitarian vessels were recovered from TT2. When looking at absolute values, the distribution of utilitarian vessels between areas is similar. When considering proportional distributions, however, the utilitarian vessels are present in nearly double the quantities of TT1 and TT3. It was proposed above that the kitchen may have been located towards the back of the house. The utilitarian refuse in this midden may relate to another detached building (such as a summer kitchen), perhaps located further to the east. Detached kitchens were fairly common in other British
colonies, particularly in hot climates (Lawrence 2012: 211). This further served to reinforce the divide between the chaotic practice of food preparation and the refined act of consumption. Ultimately, further excavation will be required to better understand the layout of the premises and resulting differences in refuse disposal.

5.1.2 Glass Vessels
Compared to the ceramic vessel assemblage, glass vessels are quite limited. A MVC was also established for the glass vessels using a similar technique whereby diagnostic fragments (bases, necks, finishes, and unique decorative types) were pulled from the
collection and examined across different events.

**Bottles**

A relatively small number of green glass ‘wine’ bottles were recovered (Figure 5.10).

This refers to a very common type of cylindrical bottle that was the main type produced by British factories in the 18th and 19th centuries (Jones 1986: 5). They were most commonly used for storing and serving alcoholic beverages (not exclusively wine) but have also been documented as holding other liquids (ibid: 17). A total of only 161 wine bottle sherds were recovered from the Downs House site (3.2% of the assemblage). These amount to a minimum of 5 vessels, with diagnostic sherds recovered from each of TT1, TT2, and TT3.

Several other bottles which likely served as containers for alcohol were also recovered. These are panel-type bottles which probably held liquor (Figure 5.11). Two were recovered from TT2 (E957 and 959), while one was found in TT3 (E966). They range in colour from light green to dark green. One is definitely rectangular in cross-section, while the other two are either rectangular with chamfers or flat octagonal (see Jones and Sullivan 1985: 102-103). They might also be decanters similar to the square version depicted by Jones and Sullivan (1985: Fig 106). There are unfortunately no fragments of the vessel necks or finishes, which would allow for a definitive
identification. Based on their apparently large volumes, however, and the green tint of the glass it seems likely that they initially held gin or similar spirits. It should also be noted that several of the coarse stoneware ceramic bottles may have been used for the storage of beer. Finally, glass liquor bottles were known to have been extensively recycled and reused (Busch 1987). Although perhaps originally used for storing alcohol, they may have been repurposed for other liquids.

Given the immense quantity of tableware ceramics recovered, the collection of alcohol-related glass vessels is quite limited. Possible reasons for this are further discussed in Chapter 6. Certainly, wine bottles were still an extremely popular method for storing alcohol amongst all social classes in the 19th century. Upper class estates held many hundred bottles in their cellars (Jones 1986: 20). The role of wine bottles at the table (i.e., as serving vessels) is more ambiguous. There is some evidence to suggest that the presence of dark wine bottles at the dining table was looked down upon, but there are also many references to the use of such bottles by the gentry class (ibid: 22). The alternative was the clear glass decanter or carafe (Jones and Sullivan 1985: 133). A single probable decanter fragment was recovered from the site. It appears to be a neck ring fragment from a three-ringed decanter, a very popular decanter form between ca.

**Tableware**
A variety of different types of tableware glass vessels were identified. These include stemware, tumblers, and other vessels. These glass vessels outnumber the alcohol-related bottles discussed above. A total of eight stemware/drinking glass vessels were recovered from various contexts – three from the retaining wall midden (TT2), one from Fea 213 (clearance cairn), three from TT3, and one from TT1. These are complemented by a total of five tumbler drinking vessels – two from TT2, one from E364 S84, one from TT1, and one from TT3 (Figure 5.12). Unsurprisingly, the bulk of these vessels were recovered from the two midden contexts in a pattern similar to that observed for the ceramics.

![Glass drinking vessels: fluted tumbler (left) and stemware (right).](image)

*Figure 5.12 - Glass drinking vessels: fluted tumbler (left) and stemware (right).*

assemblage. Compared to the glass bottle assemblage, this is a relatively high number of drinking vessels (n=13). Finer glass tablewares are typically more common in high-status
homes, whereas the dark green ‘wine’ bottles were considerably more ubiquitous (Rottenburg and Tomlin 1982: 1).

Several other glass tableware vessels were also recovered. This includes four lead glass press-moulded vessels (Figure 5.13): two larger deep plate vessels (one from TT1, one from TT2), a smaller cup plate (TT4), and an unidentified hollowware vessel (likely a pitcher, from TT2). These vessels probably form part of a larger pressed glass tableware set. Press moulding dates back to the 17th century, but the production of large complex objects was not possible until the first quarter of the 19th century (Jones and Sullivan 1985: 34). These early pressed glass sets were made of colourless lead glass, as are the examples from the DH site, demonstrated by the icy blue fluorescence of the sherds under shortwave UV light (Grant 2000: 1). Lead glass was replaced by soda-lime glass in the 1860s (Rottenberg and Tomlin 1982: 1). This new type of glass made the pressed vessels considerably cheaper and presumably available to a wider range of consumers. Pressed glass was primarily manufactured in the United States and later also occurred in Canada and England (Jones and Sullivan 1985: 34). Another curious glass tableware vessel is a dark purple-tinted fragment with a linear moulded design, recovered from TT3 (E967). It is spout-shaped but may be a finial for a cover for
a sugar bowl or similar dish (Figure 5.14).

5.1.3 **Other Evidence of Food Preparation and Consumption**

Ceramics were not widely used by the 19th century for food preparation. Only colander and milk pan forms relate specifically to food preparation (and neither relate to actual cooking). Thus, it appears that cooking was undertaken using a different medium. There are several fragments of cast iron that may be pots or cauldrons. These provide the best evidence for cooking-related food preparation. Two fragments are from TT1, one is from TT3 and one pot/kettle leg was recovered from TT2 in the clearance cairn rubble matrix. The context of the latter is uncertain, but it is not a modern object and likely derives from the 19th-century occupation of the structure. A possible iron handle, perhaps from a pot lid, was also recovered from E969 (TT3). A large iron hook from TT1 (E951) may also be a piece of cooking hardware. Several probable stove components were also recovered from TT1 (two each from E950 and E951), along with significant quantities of coal refuse, particularly at the southern end of the trench. This area may represent a deposit of stove debris, located down a slope and presumably near an entrance to the structure. There may have been a staircase leading from the lower terrace up to the structure. The stove parts themselves may have accumulated after the abandonment of the structure.

It is unclear if a stove was used for cooking at the Downs House site or exclusively for heating (or both). Heating and cooking stoves are closely tied to one another in their developmental history (Du Vall 1988: 112), although the latter appear to have been more common than the former. Though the technology was developed earlier, the widespread use of cast iron stoves did not occur until the late 18th century (ibid).
These stoves often included boilers and ovens and would have produced considerable residual heat. Certainly, cooking stoves were in fairly wide use by the early 19th century, though they were costly to install and maintain, which prevented their adoption in many lower-class homes (ibid: 113). Excavations have demonstrated the presence of what appears to be a substantial fireplace at the site, so it is clear that the house was at least partially heated by open hearths as well. The coal stove may have been a smaller model, perhaps installed in the drawing room for instance. Coal was initially not a heating material of choice amongst the gentry classes in England due to the fumes it gives off when burned in open fireplaces (ibid: 236). It was adopted out of necessity due to a lack of wood fuel, though this is unlikely to have been an issue in rural Newfoundland. Coal was certainly readily available in Ferryland: there are many references in Robert Carter’s (1832-1852) journal to shipments of coal arriving in the harbour (e.g., Oct 23 1844). Temple (2006: 47-48) describes structural transformations at a 19th-century dwelling (described as being occupied by “well-off” planters) in southern Labrador involving the dismantling of a chimney and installation of a cookstove around mid-century. There is no evidence to suggest that the hearth/chimney at the Downs House was dismantled. The installation of a stove may have had significant meaning, contributing to the refined and modern character of the household. In the neighbouring community of Calvert, the details surrounding the arrival of the first stove were remembered several generations later in oral history (Pocius 1991: 35).

Two utensils were also recovered. One is a fork with part of the bone handle remaining recovered from E963 (fireplace midden). The other is a knife blade from TT4
with the handle missing but a copper rivet in place. Bone-handled utensils are extremely common on 19\textsuperscript{th}-century archaeological sites. These are simple, functional items. The durable nature of ferrous utensils (and the potential for recycling) makes their limited presence in the archaeological record unsurprising.

5.1.4 Faunal Remains
Faunal analysis was undertaken by Deirdre Elliot, PhD Candidate in the Department of Archaeology, Memorial University. This included the analysis of faunal material from two separate domestic occupations at Ferryland: the DH Site and a deposit from the Pool (Structure 19). These reports are provided in Appendix C. Only the DH material is discussed briefly here. A broader discussion is provided in Chapter 6.

The DH faunal assemblage is dominated by fish (mostly cod, but also some herring, capelin, and salmon), which accounts for 88.9\% of the vertebrate taxa assemblage (Elliott 2018a). The lack of fishing implements from the site either indicates that the occupants were not catching the fish themselves or that this equipment was kept elsewhere. It is certainly plausible that this equipment would have been kept at a fishing store/stage closer to the water, rather than in the domestic structure. Significant quantities of fishing equipment from contemporary assemblages elsewhere in Ferryland (e.g., E763), however, demonstrate that these items do occur in domestic contexts. The presence of cranial bones indicates that fresh fish were consumed, as they were brought up to the site whole (rather than gutted, headed, salted, and dried). Heavy reliance on fish was supplemented by domesticated mammals (pig, cow, and sheep/goat), bivalves (mussels), and some sea birds. There were no terrestrial wild taxa identified in the
assemblage, although a single seal specimen was found. In all, the faunal data points to a relatively pluralistic subsistence regime, with a heavy emphasis on fish (much of which appears to have been fresh).

The spatial distribution of the assemblage is also informative: it derives almost exclusively from TT3 (98.3% of the assemblage). Wet screening of some of the TT3 deposits may have skewed these quantities slightly, but it is nonetheless clear that the hearth midden was the dominant location for disposal of food remains. The TT2 wall midden deposit is the next most frequent (68 specimens); the lack of faunal remains in this deposit is significant, given the large quantity of other domestic refuse (particularly ceramics). The hearth midden, in close proximity to the house, was obviously a more convenient place for the immediate disposal of faunal refuse. The makeup of the TT2 faunal deposit is, however, noticeably different; though it is a small sample, mammal remains outnumber fish (32 vs. 29). The significance of this is unclear and may simply be due to a small sample size, as the refuse in both areas is clearly contemporary and derives from the same household. It is also possible that seasonality may influence the distribution of species in different areas if discrete refuse areas were used seasonally.

5.2 **Architecture Group**
Architectural finds comprised many of the artifacts recovered. As noted above, nails were not included in the main catalogue, but all observed samples appeared to be of the hand wrought variety. Whether they were imported or manufactured locally is difficult to surmise, but there was likely a combination of both. The absence of appreciable quantities of cut nails is supportive of a construction date earlier in the 19th century.
A significant quantity of window glass was recovered (n=1,495). The distribution of glass at the site is informative (Table 5.10). Notable concentrations were found in TT1, suggesting that: a) the north façade had a significant number of windows (as suggested by contemporary drawings) and b) portions of the structure likely collapsed down the hill to the north. Densities were also quite high in all test trenches in close vicinity to the structure. The relatively distant E364 S84 is comparatively barren. Very high concentrations to the north of the structure, and lower ones to the south suggest that the north (water-facing) façade had more windows.

Archaeologists have attempted to date 19th-century cylinder-type window glass based on thickness, following the principle that thickness increases over the course of time. Weiland (2009) provides a thorough critical review of the various techniques employed. The enormous sample of window glass recovered from the DH, presumably deriving from one structure and fitting within the prescribed time period for these techniques, provides an opportunity for testing the method. Following Weiland’s (2009: 39-40) suggestion, the Moir and Schoen methods were employed, given that the glass can reliably be assumed to be from a single structure. Some manipulation of the original catalogued data was required. First, all flat glass with a thickness of greater than 3mm was removed (assumed to be modern), following Moir’s, Walker’s and Ball’s suggestions (Weiland 2009). Further manipulation was required because not all glass was initially measured. For

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>% of area artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E364S84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT1</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT2</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT3</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
catalogue entries that are composed of more than three sherds, only two sherds were measured (representing a range); the mean of this range was then taken. The assumption here is that glass thickness within these grouped assemblages is relatively consistent. Using the Schoen formula, a date of 1833.6 was calculated. The Moir formula yielded a date of 1847.5. Both formulae have standard deviations of 6-7 years (Weiland 2009). These estimates accord well with most of the domestic refuse (mostly from Period IIIB) from the site which dates to the second quarter of the 19th century. As was previously speculated, discrete structural deposits (Period II) suggest an initial construction date and sparse occupation earlier in the 19th century. Some structural modifications (Period IIIA) appear to have occurred just before the main occupation (tenancies) of the 1830s and 1840s; this may have included the installation of new windows.

Large quantities of plaster window putty/glazing material were also recovered from several different contexts at the site (Figure 5.15). The highest concentrations of this putty material were in the same areas where high concentrations of the glass itself were recorded (TT1), but fragments were recovered from every test trench. Large quantities of window glass are expected, given the emphasis of the Georgian style on symmetrically-arranged sash windows (Johnson 2010: 160). The archaeological literature on window putty is quite limited, but anecdotally it is not a particularly common find on early 19th-century
sites. This is further evidence of the labour investment involved in the structure and its intended permanence. The enormous amount of glass recovered from a relatively small excavation sample suggests that the contemporary depictions of the structure with four or five bays of windows may be accurate.

Other building materials were noted. The retaining wall feature bordering the eastern edge of the lower terrace was dry-laid and did not have any mortar traces. Several large fragments, however, along with many flecks were recovered from TT3 in association with the fireplace foundation (Figure 4.28). No mortar traces were noted in the extant foundation, which appears to have been clay bonded, but clearly the foundation or the upper portions were once mortared. The mortar was likely produced locally; a lime kiln appears on an early 19th-century map of the north side of the harbour.

Several brick fragments, including a large intact brick in the E967 fill, were also recovered from TT3 (Figure 4.28). The full brick measures 22cm x 10cm x 6cm. Another half-brick with the same dimensions, and several large fragments of yellow brick were also recovered. No bricks were recorded in situ; it is possible that the apron or hearth floor interior was laid in brick, or perhaps the upper portions of the chimney. A complete brick with much smaller dimensions was also recovered from E951 in TT1. It measures 17cm x 8.5cm x 4.5cm and is composed of a much different matrix.
than the aforementioned examples from TT3 (a darker and much coarser clay). A fragment matching this was also recovered from TT2 and has glazing on the butt end (Figure 5.16). There does not appear to be a slip present, classifying it as an enamelled brick (Gurcke 1987: 100). These bricks tend to have glaze over one or more sides and were used for a variety of purposes such as for sanitary reasons (in areas that are often exposed to water) or for decorative purposes, typically outdoors. A large fragment of yellow brick was also recovered from the latter context. Several broken brick fragments appear to have also been incorporated into the retaining wall rubble matrix. Brick fragments and inclusions were generally common finds in the upper horizons of the site, likely indicative of a destruction horizon. In all, three different brick types were recovered in secure contexts – large bright red examples, smaller coarser dull red ones (some fragments of which are enamelled), and yellow ones. They were evidently incorporated into the structure in different ways, but none were recovered in situ. Finally, no evidence of roofing material was recovered; this suggests the structure was roofed with wooden shingles.

The final class of architectural material consists of building hardware. This includes two large iron strap hinges from TT1 (22 and 25 cm long respectively) and a robust iron hinge fragment from TT2 (E957). One of the hinges from TT1 was recovered from E953 and may have been discarded in this fill as part of a remodelling episode. A possible copper hinge pin was also recovered from TT1; it is robust and measures approximately 7.5 cm in length.
5.3 **Personal Group**

5.3.1 **Smoking**

The smoking class is represented by fragments of clay tobacco pipes. A total of 153 fragments (2.6% of the assemblage) representing a minimum of 35 pipes were recovered; their distribution is shown in Table 5.11. MNV was calculated on the basis of unique bowl fragments and stem/bowl junctions; unique stem features such as maker’s marks, glazing, and so on were noted but were not counted towards MNV. This is a relatively small number of pipes compared to the typical output of contemporary sites (reasons for this are discussed further in Chapter 6). The spatial distribution shows that the largest concentration is in TT3. This is unsurprising, given the rich midden deposit encountered here. The low total in TT2 is notable, considering the large number of ceramics and other domestic refuse encountered there. Smoking is clearly more represented in the units in immediate vicinity to the structure (TT1 and TT3), perhaps suggesting more leisure time was spent in these areas compared to TT2 (the retaining wall and midden outside the terraced area).

*Table 5.11 - Distribution of pipes by area.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>% Area Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E364S84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of pipe bore diameters is shown in Figure 5.17. Linear regression dating techniques are not effective on pipes dating to...
the late 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} century (Reckner and Dallal 2000: 5). The general progression of stem bores towards an increasingly small diameter is, however, a valid trend as initially noted by Harrington (1978). Towards the end of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, the relationship starts to break down as it begins to inverse (McMillan 2010: 64). As initially suggested by Harrington, the production of histograms based on stem bore diameter is useful for broadly assessing occupation chronologies/settlement patterns (see Deetz 1993: 5-10). As expected, the histogram for the Downs House site shows that the vast majority of pipes (92%, n=93) are in the 4/64 and 5/64 category. The lack of larger (earlier) bore sizes is further clear indication of a lack of earlier activity on the property.

Two Glasgow pipemakers are represented in the assemblage: Duncan McDougall and William Murray. The dates of operations for these manufacturers are 1847-1967 and 1830-1861, respectively (Bradley 2000: 117). These are the only identifiable maker’s marks present on the site. The lack of Montreal makers is significant, given the success of the city’s pipemakers beginning in the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century (ibid: 25). This may indicate that, in Ferryland, overseas provisioning was more significant than that from the North American continent (see also Clausnitzer 2011 for a Labrador example). Jones (2009: 140) also reports that all identifiable marks from Genille, a mid-late 19\textsuperscript{th}-century site on Newfoundland’s Northern Peninsula, are of Glasgow manufacturers. Meanwhile, 19\textsuperscript{th}-century sites on the Canadian mainland are typically dominated by Montreal makers (Smith 1986; Reid 1994). While overseas provisioning was significant (see Collard 1984: 10 on Scottish ceramics in Newfoundland), it is more likely that occupation of the Downs House had ceased by the time the Montreal pipe industry expanded. The first Montreal
pipemaker was established in 1846 (Smith 1986: 57-58); this provides further evidence for an occupation limited to the first half of the 19th century (and coinciding with the departure of Henry Clow ca. 1852). Nineteenth-century pipes in Newfoundland have received little study to date, and mechanisms of supply and distribution are poorly understood.

The identifiable motifs present on the pipes are mainly those typical of the first half of the 19th century. This includes two different types of TD (the standard incuse facing toward the smoker and a ‘shield’ version), various fluted/ribbed, and leaf/wheat-sheaf decorations (Figure 5.18). These are typical, mass-produced motifs. A somewhat less common design is found on two pipes with a fouled anchor motif, which perhaps appealed to the marine-oriented lifeways of some of the site’s inhabitants. A single pipe also has a relief-moulded grape design. The lack of pipes with ethnic/political/nationalist motifs is intriguing, given the pervasiveness of pipes of this nature during this period (Bradley 2000) and the importance of ethnic identity during this period of Newfoundland
history (Keough 2005). Pipes bearing Irish motifs have been found elsewhere in Ferryland and other Newfoundland sites (see Chapter 6), making their absence at the Downs House (albeit in a small sample) notable.

5.3.2 **Personal Adornment**

Clothing and personal adornment are significant artifact categories in the study of identity (e.g., Voss 2008a: 252-286, 2008b). They relate closely to personal identity through their symbolic performative role in outward bodily expression (White 2004: 39; Lawrence 2012: 12). Clothing was a commonly understood system used to convey information about one’s standing. Thus, clothing is thought to relate closely to status (Lindbergh 1999: 50). A variety of different artifacts falling under this category were recovered.

Artifacts specifically relating to clothing are represented by buttons and buckles. A total of 7 buttons were recovered, all except one from the TT3 midden deposit (Figure 5.19). Five are bone, including two small (14mm) plain one-hole discs, and three larger four-hole concave (16, 17, and 19 mm). The one-hole discs may have been used as blanks/backs for Dorsets/Cartwheels (a type of cloth-covered button) or may have been fastened with a pinshank (Lindbergh 1999: 51). The multi-hole varieties are sew-through
types. Small bone buttons were typically used for either undergarments or fastening shirts and trousers. A plain copper alloy button (from TT2) and an iron button (both with shanks) were also recovered. These are also small types (13 and 17 mm diameters respectively) and were probably used for fastening shirts. The fact that the button assemblage is entirely represented by small utilitarian types is perhaps unsurprising. Undoubtedly the occupants also made use of more decorative buttons. These more expensive, and status-laden buttons were likely more carefully curated. The presence of buttons in the large domestic midden suggests intentional discard. Several copper alloy straight pins were recovered (also from TT3). Though often assumed to be associated with sewing, these ubiquitous items may have been used as fasteners for various types of clothing and were most typically worn by women (Beaudry 2007: 13-15).

Though the buttons were relatively plain, a few more decorative fasteners were recovered including a small delicate copper alloy wire clothing hook containing a small amount of gold plating (E963), a small thin silver faceted object that may be a fragment of a brooch or buckle, and several fragments of a larger white metal (likely pewter) buckle (Figure 5.20). The latter has a stippled/filigree design and is plated (in silver or perhaps tin) in several areas. It is in poor condition but would have been rectilinear in shape and just

Figure 5.20 - Variety of small finds - copper alloy hook pin, silver brooch, pewter buckle. Scale increments are 1cm.
under 6cm in length. Because of its poor condition and uncertain form, it is unclear exactly what type of buckle it was. It is within the expected range for late shoe buckles, though laces had generally replaced the latter by the early 19th century (White 2005: 39-41). Shoe buckles tend to be the most commonly recovered buckle type. Noel Hume (1970: 86) suggests that shoe buckles are rare after ca. 1815 and contends that the pewter varieties were quite cheap, even though they were elaborately cast. The shoe buckle designation seems the most likely one based on the form, material, and size.

Three beads were also recovered, all from TT3 (Figure 5.21). Two are very small ‘seed beads’ used in embroidery. It should be noted that TT3 was the only context that was water screened, and consequently the only context from which seed beads were recovered; however, the other areas did not yield any other bead types, and barely yielded any clothing-related items. The third bead is a larger wound oval-shaped example decorated with blue dots (11mm length). It likely made up part of a necklace or bracelet.

A curious lead comb was recovered from TT1 (Figure 5.22). They are extremely rare in the archaeological record (pers. comm. C. White, March 8 2018). Lead combs were used for darkening hair since at least the Roman period and apparently became especially popular amongst men for darkening beards during the Restoration in England (Sherrow 2006: 88). They were not, however, exclusively used by men; there are many
references to women using lead combs (e.g., Goldsmith 1835: 321). One such use is the darkening of eyebrows, which became particularly fashionable amongst women in the 18th century (Downing 2012). The darkening process occurs through a gradual deposition of lead salts, which form dark sulfides over time (Murphy 2000: 321). A certain superstition appears to have been attached to their use, as the comb was thought to have had some magical properties due to the way in which it darkened hair (Lester and Oerke 2004: 134). Despite their rarity in the archaeological record, historical literary/documentary references point to widespread use of lead combs by both men and women (e.g., Rennie 1826: 114; Dumas 1846: 70; Rifelj 2010: 123). Who owned it and how it ended up in the archaeological record is uncertain, but it was almost certainly lost and deposited accidentally, as it was discovered intact with all teeth present. Lead could easily be melted down and repurposed for shot, weights, and so on.

Rarity of lead combs in the archaeological record likely relates to this high potential for repurposing. The context is significant – it was recovered in the fill used to support the posts in the slot trench retaining wall on the lower terrace. It may thus have been dropped by one of the individuals involved in the construction of this feature, or perhaps later by one of the

Figure 5.22 - Lead comb, used for darkening hair.
inhabitants or visitors to the house while spending time in the enclosed courtyard. Clearly, the owner had a concern for personal appearance.

Footwear is represented by an iron heel tap, leather scraps, and a possible eyelet. The copper alloy grommet/eyelet was recovered from E963 and the heel tap from E966, both in the TT3 midden. The leather scraps include iron nail fragments and were found in the topsoil in TT1.

Several (n=7) anomalous sherds of flat glass may be mirror fragments. These appear to be plate glass, rather than cylinder-type window glass, as suggested by their thickness and the presence of what appear to be ground/bevelled edges on some sherds (Jones and Sullivan 1985: 171). The manufacturing process for plate glass involved casting and hand grinding and was considerably more expensive (Lorrain 1968: 37). It was most commonly used for small mirrors in the 19th century (ibid). There is no evidence of silvering on the glass sherds, so they cannot be conclusively identified as mirror sherds. In the absence of this silvering, mirror sherds often appear identical to window glass (Jones and Sullivan 1985: 171). Because windows in the 19th century were very rarely made of plate glass and mirrors commonly were, it is a strong possibility that they represent mirror sherds (ibid). After the mid-19th century, plate glass was becoming increasingly cheaper as the manufacturing process became mechanized (Tarlow 2007: 173). Most of the plate glass recovered at the Downs House site, however, comes from secure early contexts (five sherds from the TT3 midden), suggesting that it is the high-cost variety and unlikely to have been used in windows. Mirrors are rarely addressed in the literature, perhaps because of the difficulty involved in identifying them.
archaeologically, but their presence signals a clear concern with personal appearance.

5.3.3 **Health and Hygiene**

Artifacts relating to health and hygiene are represented by several ceramic and glass vessels. Four chamber pots (one in plain whiteware, one in plain creamware and the other two a matching set in transfer-printed pearlware) were recovered – one each from TT1 and TT2 and two from TT3. The plain vessels are not surprising: chamber pots are often undecorated, reflecting their utilitarian function (Miller 1980: 3). The matching pearlware vessels are deposited in two different locations: one in the builder’s trench for the stone retaining wall (TT2), and the other in the builder’s trench for the wooden stockade (TT1). It is possible that they represent the same vessel; one sherd, however, appears to be thinner and the design is not as crisp. Their deposition in these two separate features is significant and provides further evidence of their contemporaneity. A robust jug (Vessel 243 – from TT3) from E966 is probably a ewer and a possible basin base was also recovered (Vessel 247 – from TT1). Both are transfer-printed. Ewers and basins were used for washing/cleaning as part of hygiene routines (Brooks 2005a: 48-50). Personal

![Figure 5.23 - Transfer-printed vessels related to hygiene practices. Left - chamber pot rim (Vessel 223), right - ewer rim (Vessel 243).](image-url)
cleanliness was thought to be an important part of genteel life, and ewer/basin sets were commonly found in private bedrooms amongst the middle class (Young 2003: 97). The presence of transfer-printed ewers, basins, and chamber pots (Figure 5.23) indicates that expensive types of pottery were considered important even for these private tasks.

Five probable toiletry/pharmaceutical bottles were also identified in the glass vessel assemblage (Figure 5.24). Their fragmentary state and lack of identifying inscriptions make further attribution difficult, but they are clearly too small/delicate to be alcohol-related vessels. These were scattered across the site: a small dark green bottle base (2.5" diameter) and a light blue bottle were recovered from TT1, an aqua-coloured finish with a down-turned lip and a lead glass rectilinear base from TT3, and a lead glass flat-sided finish from TT2.

5.4 Activities Group
The Activities Group represents a broad array of economic and subsistence tasks.

Fishing-related equipment is represented by three fishhooks (from TT1, E364 S84, and TT3) and two possible lead weights (TT1 and TT3). One of the hooks is very small and almost certainly used for freshwater fishing (Figure 5.25). This material does not indicate
an intensive involvement in fishing activities at the site, despite the dominance of fish in the faunal assemblage.

Animal husbandry is represented by two horseshoes. One is from a test pit in the ploughzone to the north of the main area of the site and may post-date the occupation (relating to the use of horse-drawn ploughing for agriculture). The other is from the E966 midden context in TT3 and is clearly associated with the main occupation. Another possible piece of horse-related furniture recovered from TT3 is a brass crotal bell (Figure 5.26). These small enclosed brass bells could serve a variety of functions, for example livestock tracking, elements of horse saddlery, music/dancing accompaniment or use in religious ceremonies (Motture 2001; Butz 2017: 70-71). They appear to be fairly rare in the archaeological record. A current resident of Ferryland, remarked that, when horse and carriage travel was common in Ferryland, all carriages were equipped with similar bells, so as to warn oncoming travellers of one’s approach (pers. comm., L. Clowe, May 25 2018).

Agricultural tools are also represented by a complete sickle found on the surface of TT1 (Figure 5.27). Its presence on the surface of this occupation layer is somewhat
curious, because it appears to be in quite good shape, missing only the very tip of the blade (Figure 5.27). Even broken, it could be recycled or repaired. It may be that it was misplaced and lost if the surface vegetation was dense. A more modern example of such an occurrence was coincidentally found in the upper levels of the same unit, where a large modern prybar was found just beneath the sod. It would appear to have been laid down and forgotten. The presence of the sickle may indicate nearby grain/cereal cultivation, perhaps for use as fodder. An iron axe head was recovered from the retaining wall midden (E957); only the butt portion remains, perhaps explaining its discard.

A small collection of firearms-related material was also recovered. This includes a single small (27x24mm) gunflint manufactured from a crude chert (Figure 5.28). Several fragments of chert/flint debitage were also found. A small collection of lead shot (n=18) was recovered from E963 (perhaps deposited as part of animal carcasses) and a gun ball from TT1 and TT3 respectively. One gun ball measures 0.46" and the other 0.38". This is
in the expected range for rifle balls (larger than buck shot and smaller than muskets) (Whitacre 2013: 72). Curiously, a solid iron ball with a diameter of approximately 3cm was also found in TT3 (E980). This is about the expected size for canister shot from a six-pounder gun; the same size was also used in hand grenades (USAOD 1850: 29). How it came to be deposited at the site is unknown, but there were active batteries at Ferryland as late as 1812 according to cartographic evidence.

Two artifacts suggest that the occupants were literate. One is a fragment of a smoothed slate tablet from TT3 (Figure 5.29). It is not a local type, as it has a distinct purple hue in contrast to local varieties which are blue/blue gray (pers. comm., B. Gaulton, August 2018). It has one finished edge and may have been mounted in a wooden frame. Many small scratches are visible on it, but no discernable text. A small fleck of sealing wax was also recovered from the wet screen in E963. It is not surprising that the inhabitants were literate, as this was a defining characteristic of the gentry class. Literacy was an important tool of power in early modern
Newfoundland (Macdonald 1997: 99). Two coins were also recovered. One is a Nova Scotia half penny token, dated 1843, recovered from the E963 midden in TT3. The other is a half penny (based on diameter) of unknown date recovered from E364 S84. There appears to be a portion of Britannia’s shield visible, suggesting it is a British coin. A variety of low-denomination coinage would have been in use in Ferryland at the time, though the economy was largely still oriented around credit through the truck system.

Sewing implements are represented by three thimbles and several copper-alloy straight pins (Figure 5.30). Although most commonly associated with sewing, it should be noted that copper pins were known to serve other functions, particularly as clothing fasteners but additionally as prophylactic devices (Beaudry 2007: 10-43). In fact, professional tailors/seamstresses would have made very little use of pins; their use is more typical of home sewing. The presence of thimbles, combined with the dimensions of the pins, is strongly suggestive of a sewing function. Beaudry (ibid: 25) notes that common sewing pins were referred to as short whites and were just over an inch long.

The thimbles were recovered from a variety of different locations – TT3, TT1,
and TP3. They are all made of the ubiquitous copper alloy characteristic of mass-produced thimbles. These are thus clearly utilitarian items, though thimbles were produced in a variety of different types of material less practical for sewing, which certainly played roles in the display of status. The latter were referred to as ‘parlor thimbles’ and became especially popular in the 18th and 19th centuries (ibid: 99, 104); they are much less common in the archaeological record. Thimble size relates closely to function and intended user, with small child’s ‘training’ thimbles at one end of the scale and large thimbles intended for men or heavier work at the other end (ibid: 105). The former were typically made of the cheap copper alloy material, as they would be quickly outgrown by their wearers. For this reason, they also tend to show little wear. A very small thimble (13mm in height with a diameter of 14mm) in excellent condition was recovered from TT3 and is likely an example of a child’s thimble. This artifact is significant as being one of the only artifacts from the site that can be explicitly tied to children. It may well have been used by Selina or Mary Paige Jellard, daughters of John and Eleanor Jellard born in 1836 and 1838 respectively (Morry 2017). By the time Henry Clow took up residence on the property, his youngest daughter would have been 27 years old (Reddigan 2016). In the context of the rural Avalon, it is notable that plebeian women were commonly employed as seamstresses by the gentry class (Keough 2001: 267). While some sewing was evidently undertaken by the residents of the household (as perhaps suggested by the presence of the child’s thimble), this type of transaction may well have taken place at the Downs House as well. The other two thimbles are larger, measuring about 24mm high x 21mm wide.
Chapter 6 - Discussion

6.1 Social Differentiation, Gentility, and the Emerging Middle Class

The occupants of the Downs House site were mainly members of the emerging middle class that arose with the increase of permanent settlement in Newfoundland. Keough’s (2001: 670-679) two-tier class model of the 19th-century southern Avalon – plebeian and gentry – at first appears somewhat simplistic, but rightfully acknowledges the important ethnic- and religious-based divide inherent in the class system. She also acknowledges the nuances of the system and the rise of a middle class, though does not go to great lengths to define it as her focus is decidedly on the plebeian class. As Young (2003: 4) points out, the middle class is a nebulous group which is notoriously difficult to define. In the Newfoundland context, these nuances are more fully explored by Nemec (1973) and Macdonald (1997) who emphasize the middle-class element forming as a result of new local government positions and greater hierarchy/variety in the fishing economy. This complex and diverse group emerged in Newfoundland for the first time in the 19th century, alongside a developing middle class in other parts of the Anglo-American world that shared a common ‘culture of gentility’ (Young 2003: 4).

Lawrence (2012: 4-5) is somewhat critical of the association of gentility and the middle-class, arguing that the latter term is too difficult to define and subject to a high degree of fluidity in particular colonial settings. She argues that there were “gradations of gentility”, expressed materially (ibid: 235), which were determined by access to both financial and cultural capital. This appears to be largely an issue of semantics but captures the difficulty of defining the middle class along a single set of variables (e.g., work, income, political affiliation – see Young 2003: 5), particularly in varying colonial
contexts. As Nemec (1973: 19) notes, the two-tier system specifically related to labour relationships is more appropriate in the early migratory fishery setting in Newfoundland before the development of intensive outport settlement. In the resident fishery, class systems cannot be tied solely to labour, because many individuals were involved in both public roles and subsistence production (ibid: 19-20). Interactions between what might be considered the middle and upper class are clearly evident in many of the social events described in Robert Carter’s 19th-century journal. Keough’s (2001) terminology reflects this close association, as she often lumps together the middle and upper classes under the term gentry. Perhaps driven by emulation, these groups would then be more closely affiliated with each other than with the working class. Ethnic and religious affiliations were probably significant mitigating elements in these kinds of interactions (Keough 2001). Some researchers have also noted that an urban middle class emerged in St. John’s in the 19th century, composed of recently immigrated Irish Catholics pushing for political reform (Bannister 2003: 258-261). This latter group differs significantly (socially, politically, and ethnically) from the rural middle-gentry class that is the focus here.

The earliest period of occupation at the Downs House and its association with VA Judge William Carter is poorly understood. Judge Carter was certainly not a member of the middle class and would have indeed been one of the most powerful men on the island at the time. Evidence for his and his family’s occupation of the structure is elusive but appears in the form of discrete deposits of early material in structural contexts and in small scatters of early 19th-century domestic refuse across the site. Granted, some of this early material may represent heirloom items from later occupation, and there are few
discrete refuse deposits that can be definitively tied to an early 19th-century occupation. There may yet be a larger undiscovered deposit of material which relates to this occupation. It is currently hypothesized that the structure may only have been used occasionally as a kind of rural retreat in its early phase. Better documented occupations (both historically and archaeologically) begin in the 1830s and 1840s and continue to mid-century with the tenancies of John Jellard (a ship captain) and Henry Clow (a clerk of the peace), both firmly members of the rural middle class. Remodelling or renovations, perhaps following a period of abandonment, leading up to these later occupations may have also erased earlier traces of occupation.

Middle-class ideology appears to be expressed through several aspects of the material culture assemblage from the DH. This is interpreted as the materialization of a culture of gentility expressed by the inhabitants of the house and is particularly significant, given their status as members of the ascendant middle class. The documentary evidence (in particular Robert Carter’s journal) indicates that the Jellards associated closely with members of Ferryland’s elite. Projecting an image of gentility, partially through emulation, would have been crucial in acquiring a degree of respectability with this group. As a new immigrant to the area, John Jellard may have had to work to establish himself amongst the native gentry class. This was partially achieved through his marriage to Eleanor Coulman (the Coulmans appear to have been well established in the area), as well as through his connections with Robert Carter. The Jellards subsequent occupation of the Downs House after their marriage may have been a calculated move to further establish themselves, perhaps taking advantage of the prestige
that came with occupying a house previously associated with William Carter, one of Ferryland’s most respected inhabitants at the time.

Though ethnicity and religion are closely tied to class during the period, there is no evidence of explicit expression of religious or ethnic identity in the material assemblage. In other words, there is an absence of clear ethnic markers which might signify “bounded and distinct ethnic identities” (Brighton 2009: 2). This theoretical approach is rather limited and is aimed at identifying broad ethnic differences which might indicate ethnic enclaves or communities. Orser (2007b: 119) is skeptical about the search for ethnic markers, arguing that ethnic identity is too complex to be represented in single artifacts. Some artifacts, such as clay tobacco pipes, do commonly bear symbols which appear to be explicitly ethnic or political (e.g., Reckner 2001). Some researchers have suggested, however, that these ethnic markers are more significant for their role in class formation/solidarity. They are, nevertheless, clear ethnic symbols (Brighton 2009: 2-4). Researchers have also used other proxy methods of examining ethnicity, through consumption patterns of mass-produced objects (typically ceramic and glass vessels). Again, intersectional identity complicates an ethnic attribution to these patterns (ibid).

Evidently, identity was expressed through material or immaterial means other than explicit ethnic markers, but these are extremely difficult to identify archaeologically. For example, Brooks (1999) has suggested that 19th-century transfer prints were used to reinforce national identities in the newly formed United Kingdom. A less explicit ethnic display seems to fit rather well with the interpretation forwarded by Keough (2008) based on the social history and oral record of the 19th-century Southern Shore: “Irishness was
simply part of the rhythm of life, in cadence of speech and customary practice” (12).

While the search for ethnic markers alone is often a dead-end pursuit (Orser 2007b: 119; Brighton 2009: 5-6), their absence at the Downs House is notable, given the presence of such ethnic markers recovered archaeologically elsewhere in Ferryland and in Newfoundland. A simple one-to-one relationship (the Irish symbol on this pipe indicates the smoker was Irish) cannot be assumed, but the communicative power of symbols must also not be underestimated.

Pipes with explicit ethnic, political, and nationalist/patriotic symbology became common over the course of the 19th century (Bradley 2000: 112). A wide variety of different types were produced including Scottish, Irish, English, American, and Canadian designs incorporating flags and various different types of national/ethnic symbology. Irish examples are particularly common and have received the bulk of archaeological attention. These include various types of ethnic, political, and nationalist motifs such as harps, shamrocks, triskelions, the Red Hand of Ulster, slogans related to reform movements, and examples honouring revolutionary heroes and popular figures (Walker 1970:31; Alexander 1986; Cook 1997: 26-28; Reckner 2001, 2004; Mrozowski 2006: 130; Brighton 2004, 2009: 109-111, 149-152; Hull 2016). These pipes become especially prevalent in the later 19th century, which may partly explain their absence at the Downs House site, though examples are also known from the first half of the 19th century, particularly associated with reform movements (Hull 2016: 771).

Elsewhere in Ferryland, at least seven examples of pipes with Irish slogans or symbols (including harps and shamrocks) have been documented from various contexts
in the Pool. Excavations at nearby Signal Hill in St. John’s have also produced examples of harp pipes (Bradley 2000: 112), Father Mathew temperance pipes (Jelks 1973: 73) and political slogan pipes (Jelks 1973: 73-74). The Father Mathew example is particularly interesting in light of the discovery of similar symbology on a teacup in a privy in Five Points, occupied by Irish immigrants in New York City (Brighton 2008a). This hints at a common dialogue/worldview shared by individuals involved in the Irish Diaspora. While John Jellard and Henry Clow were both Protestants born in West Country England, there were undoubtedly individuals of Irish ethnicity present on the site, perhaps as domestic/fishing servants or dieters. Perhaps they chose not to openly smoke pipes with explicit ethnic or political symbols in the presence of the English-descended inhabitants of the structure, given the sometimes-tense relationships between ethnic groups on the Avalon Peninsula (Keough 2005). Such an interpretation is admittedly based on a relatively small collection of pipes from only a sample of the site. Mannion (2000b: 18) suggests that the 18th-century Irish immigrants to Newfoundland were not politically active. This may have changed with the reform movements of the 19th-century, both in Newfoundland (see Bannister 2004: 258-261) and abroad. Increased sectarianism characterized this period and while this is thought to have been more muted on the southern Avalon (Keough 2005), there is some evidence of sectarian tension reported in Robert Carter’s journal (Jan 1 1837).

It should also be noted that the different occupants who inhabited the structure at various times appear to have been at very different points in their family life cycles, which in turn affects the acquisition and use of material culture (Groover 2001, 2004;
Prossor et al. 2012). When the Jellards moved into the structure, they were a recently married couple with a new family, having married in 1835 and likely having moved into the structure in 1837 (Eleanor was 25 years old at the time and John’s age is unknown but probably similar). Their children were born in 1836, 1838, 1841, 1842, and 1846 (Morry 2017). This would place them firmly in the early stage of the household cycle, which typically begins when children are born (Groover 2004: 26). By contrast, by the time Henry Clow moved into the structure ca. 1846 (at age 68), his youngest child would have been 18 and he had been widowed for 16 years (Reddigan 2016). The majority of his children would have already started their own families and households, placing him firmly in the late stage of the household cycle (Groover 2004: 26). Similarly, William Carter’s youngest child turned 18 in 1813 (Morry 2017), suggesting that he too would have been in the latest stage of the household cycle by the time the Downs House was built. These stark differences in life cycle should significantly influence the archaeological record. Along with household succession, Groover (2001, 2004) suggests that family life cycle is the major determinant of change in the archaeological record of domestic sites.

The Jellard marriage of 1835 may be particularly significant. Marriages often bring with them significant material acquisitions, as couples begin to establish their households. For example, tableware acquisitions often correlate with marriages and the establishment of new households (Prossor et al. 2012: 820, 824), similar to the contemporary ‘wedding china’ phenomenon. Furthermore, based on a note in Robert Carter’s journal, the Downs House appears to have been unoccupied/abandoned for some
time before the Jellards moved in, meaning that the beginning of their occupation marks a significant moment in household succession that would have required material acquisitions. As previously discussed, many of the ceramics from the site date to the second quarter of the 19th century, meaning they would have been quite new and fashionable at the time the Jellards moved into the structure. It is also particularly significant to note the lack of ceramics which became popular around the middle of the century, most notably flow blue transfer prints and ironstone (white granite). Given that Henry Clow was at a very late stage of the life cycle, one would perhaps not expect him to own these types of new wares. Household succession often brings about changes in refuse disposal as well (Groover 2004: 33). The major midden contexts (E957 and E963/966) do not contain substantial amounts of material dating to the first quarter of the 19th century. Several test pits on the western periphery of the site do, however, reveal concentrations of earlier material. This may indicate shifting refuse disposal patterns associated with household succession. Such a shift does not seem to have occurred between the tenancies of Jellard and Clow.

The notion of gentility is most often associated with the Victorian period, but it has its origins in the consumer revolution of the Georgian period (see Hodge 2014). The concept of Georgianization as a reordering of the ideological and material world was famously elaborated by Deetz (1977). The possession of a certain set of material goods, combined with the knowledge of how to use them, forms the backbone of gentility. The rapid spread of new types of material goods brought about by the earlier consumer revolution was fundamental to the 19th-century culture of gentility (Young 2003: 4-5).
Lawrence (2012: 3-4) similarly describes gentility as performative in nature, anchored in material culture/behavioural expression, and closely associated with consumption. Many have posited that this was a top-down process, whereby the middle class (and even the working class) emulated lifeways established by the upper class (e.g., Cowie 2011: 127). Hodge (2014), however, argues that this early period of Georgian consumption gave rise to a middle class that were important drivers of consumption themselves, rather than simply emulators of the elite (see also Richards 1999: 1-7). American scholars have similarly emphasized the important role of the middle class in the development of full-blown consumer culture in the 19th century (Brighton 2009: 123).

The most obvious indicators of the culture of gentility are to be found in the large and diverse ceramic assemblage from the Downs House. The degree of vessel complexity and the presence of a high number of serving forms is evidence of the importance placed on formal dining and entertainment. The variety of teawares also demonstrates the importance of the tea ceremony. Based on the general pattern types and the dates of manufacture of specific types (e.g., Triumphal Car (1842+), Wild Rose (1830+), Sicilian (1820+), Muleteer (1835+)) (Coysh 1974; Coysh and Henrywood 1984; Kelly 2006; Middleton 2008; Cessford 2018), many of the ceramics would have been quite current at the time of their use (assuming that the site was abandoned ca. 1850). Matching sets also indicate bulk purchases and a well-ordered table setting. The fact that the structure was occupied for such a short period of time and is represented by a relatively small archaeological sample makes the assemblage even more impressive and speaks to the intensive dining and entertainment practices which took place there.
Comparisons with other contemporary sites allows for a better understanding of the character of the ceramic assemblage. The refined earthenware component of an approximately contemporaneous assemblage from the Pool was fully analyzed using the same MVC methodology to provide comparative data. This assemblage derives from the interior of an early 17th-century stone kitchen (Structure 19). After its destruction as part of the 1696 French raid on the settlement, the building appears to have been re-used as a refuse dump. The large amount of 19th-century refuse in the interior of the building suggests that it represents a secondary deposit, as primary household refuse typically does not accumulate in large volumes on household floors during occupation. The use of abandoned structures as rubbish dumps is well documented in various contexts (LaMotta and Schiffer 1999). The major use of the structure for secondary refuse disposal seems to date to the late 18th/early 19th century, though there is material dating from the early 18th all the way up to the mid-19th century. This refuse is found in two contexts – in fill layers deposited atop the interior floor (intermixed with large amounts of rubble) and in a large well in the southwest corner of the building. This well probably dates to the 17th century when the building was in use as a kitchen and appears to have been very rapidly filled in the early 19th century. Cross-mends between the uppermost and lowermost deposits of the well (vertically separated by several metres) are evidence of this rapid filling episode. There are also cross-mends between the material in the well and the refuse on the floor of the structure, indicating that these filling activities were contemporary. Several restorable (nearly complete) vessels and uniform deposits within the well suggest that part of the assemblage may represent a clearance episode (Brooks and Rodriguez 2012: 74). The
refuse may derive from several different households or structures; many vessels are represented by only a sherd or two. None of the material from the well or floor refuse events appears to post-date ca. 1850, making it an excellent comparative assemblage.

Figure 6.1 shows the distribution of refined earthenware forms in S19 alongside those from the DH. A few trends are readily apparent – bowl forms are more than twice as common in S19, while plates are present in approximately equal proportions. This suggests that liquid-based foods played a more significant role in the dietary practices of this group of Pool residents. Teawares are also less common in S19; cups are especially rare, though saucers are present in similar proportions. Mugs are more than twice as common in S19, again suggesting that beverage consumption took a much different form. Clearly, the tea service played a smaller role, based on the distribution of mugs, cups, and saucers between the two structures. Finally, serving forms – tureens, teapots, serving bowls, platters, and drainers – are nearly nonexistent in the S19 collection, indicating that dining practices may have been less formalized.

![Figure 6.1 - Distribution of refined earthenware forms at S19 and DH.](image)
A comparison of decorative types between the two structures is shown in Figure 6.2. As is the case in the DH, transfer prints are the most common decorative type at S19. There are differences in their respective proportions, however, with just over 30% at S19 and just over 45% at the DH. The remaining decorative types have similar proportions, though plain vessels are more abundant and dipped vessels are twice as common in S19. There is also some evidence for matched vessel sets within the S19 assemblage. In particular, there are four bowls decorated with a pastoral-type scene depicting two men fishing in a river with a church and cottages in the background. There are also two examples of the Gondola pattern, produced by the Scottish Bell firm in the mid-19th century (Kelly 2006). Though not part of a matching set, there are two examples of Exotic prints (Samford 1997), a genre which is not present at the DH. One is the Monopteros pattern (Coysh 1974: 64), depicting a temple and pastoral scene in India based on a print from late 18th-century travel literature, and the other features camels, palaces with minarets, and figures sitting near cooking pots.

![Figure 6.2 - Comparison of refined earthenware decorative types at S19 and DH.](image-url)
The lack of Exotic-type prints at the DH may suggest the inhabitants identified more with familiar patterns such as Pastoral and Romantic scenes (Samford 1997; see Brooks 1999). Along with the ubiquitous Willow Pattern, there are several vessels from S19 with patterns that match examples from the DH. This includes Triumphal Car and an unidentified pattern with a geometric herringbone type pattern that also matches a vessel recovered at a mid-19th-century dwelling in Labrador with a ‘Davenport 1836’ mark (Temple 2006). Clearly, then, there are some parallels in the assemblages, despite some of the differences mentioned above. The S19 refuse may derive from a couple of different nearby households, but the component examined here is contemporaneous with the DH occupation and provides an appropriate comparative assemblage. The major differences relate to the teaware and dining emphasis, as shown by the high number of serving forms and cups/saucers at the DH (contra the bowls and mugs of S19). The prevalence of the expensive transfer prints is also notable. Because the S19 assemblage also pre-dates the widespread adoption of white granite, this decorative comparison is significant. The adoption of white granite complicates such a comparison, because it cut into the popularity of transfer-printed wares. After 1850, printed vessels decline significantly in popularity (Burke 1991: 49), a fact which is important to consider in comparative decorative analyses. Nevertheless, they do continue to form substantial components of later assemblages (ibid). In some areas, the decline in cost of transfer-printed vessels may have actually led to an increase in their abundance. For example, Brooks (2000: 185-195) found that transfer-printed vessels do not constitute the major part of ceramic assemblages amongst the rural poor in some areas of the UK until the mid-19th century.
The ability to acquire transfer-printed vessels in large quantities in the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century is, therefore, significant.

Another assemblage from Ferryland suitable for comparative analysis is a large collection of domestic material that appears to be associated with a structure (Feature 208) built atop the infilled 17\textsuperscript{th}-century defensive ditch in the Pool (Gaulton and Hawkins 2017). It may be one of the ‘old houses’ marked ‘H’ on the 1837 Sherriff Wright map (pers. comm., B. Gaulton, 2017). The material spans the late 18\textsuperscript{th} through to the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century, representing a much longer occupational period than the DH. Nonetheless, as one of the few discrete 19\textsuperscript{th}-century assemblages from the Pool it is a valuable comparative assemblage. The ceramics were not examined in full detail, but the catalogue was used to derive a breakdown of decorative types based on sherds. The resulting distribution, compared to S19 and the DH, is shown in Table 6.1. It is immediately apparent that sherd counts and vessel counts produce markedly different results, particularly with respect to the number of undecorated ceramics (Brooks 2005a: 22).

\textit{Table 6.1 - Decorative techniques on REW sherds from three contexts at Ferryland.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E763 (Fea 208)</th>
<th>Structure 19</th>
<th>Downs House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponged</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Printed</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, the distribution does reveal a significantly lower number of transfer-printed, but a higher number of all other decorative types. Plain sherds are approximately equivalent between the three assemblages. This is an imperfect comparison because it is
based on sherd counts rather than vessels and derived from catalogue descriptions alone, but time did not permit for a full examination and quantification of the assemblage. The Feature 208 collection is a significant assemblage which deserves fuller attention in the future.

Examples of mended/repaired vessels are present in both S19 and the Fea 208 assemblage, and absent in the DH assemblage. The frequency is not particularly high in either of the assemblages in which they are present (only a few vessels), but the absence at the DH may be significant. Reasons for ceramic mending are complex and cannot always be explained by socioeconomic phenomena (Beaudoin 2017), but the ability to readily replace broken vessels must be acknowledged and may be partly explanatory.

There are several other excavated assemblages in Newfoundland which are worth briefly mentioning for comparative purposes. Direct comparisons are complicated by the fact that each researcher employed slightly different ways of categorizing and analyzing their collections. Nevertheless, some broad trends in ware types, decoration, and form can be discussed. Three main assemblages are discussed here. Jones (2009) analyzed an assemblage of material from an Irish gardien household on the Petit Nord (Northern Peninsula) that dates to the mid-late 19th century. Hatcher (2013) examined a late 18th- to early 19th-century collection of British ceramics from a French fishing room on the Petit Nord. Finally, Burke (1991) analyzed a collection of British ceramics from a mid-late 19th-century seasonal fishing station in Red Bay, Labrador. These collections all represent rural contexts, but differ somewhat in their date, geopolitical situation, cultural affiliation, and site function. In the brief analysis below, some reference is also made to other
contemporary sites elsewhere in the Anglo-American world. There is of course a large database of comparative ceramic material outside of Newfoundland, though such a comparison is beyond the scope of this thesis. Nonetheless, it is hoped that the analysis of the material from the DH can add to the compendium of large-scale analyses being undertaken by historical archaeologists of 19th-century British material culture (e.g., Brooks 2000, 2002; Lawrence 2003). International comparative ceramic analysis is a complicated endeavour because of variables such as regional supply and consumer preferences.

Table 6.2 shows the ware breakdown of each site compared to the Downs House site. Coarsewares are relatively low at all sites; Genille is the highest at 16.4%. The low percentages at Champ Paya and Red Bay may perhaps be explained by their roles as seasonal migratory fishing stations. Burke (1991: 103) suggests that a large amount of utilitarian storage-related vessels would not be necessary under these conditions. He also hypothesizes that the crowded nature of migratory ships would have mitigated against the carrying of large utilitarian vessels with low transportability. Hatcher (2013: 173) argues that the lack of coarsewares in the Anglo ceramic assemblage at Champ Paya, compared to the French one, suggests more of a middling occupation making use of fewer utilitarian wares. The majority of the coarsewares from this assemblage are drinking vessels, rather than storage-related (Hatcher ibid: 57-61), again suggesting that storage-related vessels were not considered a crucial component of these migratory assemblages. This association of coarseware abundance with status is a common interpretation. Cowie (2011: Table 5.11) noticed a class-based patterning to coarsewares in the mid-late 19th-
coarsewares, while middle and upper-class ones contained 15-20%.

Table 6.2 - Ware types at four 19th-century sites in Newfoundland and Labrador.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Downs House</th>
<th>Genille (Jones 2009)</th>
<th>Champ Paya (Hatcher 2013)</th>
<th>Red Bay (Burke 1991)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Earthenware</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Stoneware</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined White Earthenware</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White Fine Earthenware</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Stoneware</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin-Glazed Earthenware</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such a relationship is, however, not always so straightforward: Hull (2006) argues that, in early- to mid 19th-century rural Ireland, greater amounts of coarse earthenware equated to increased agricultural outputs, more control of land, and higher agri-social status. Orser (2000, 2001) has also written about the use of coarsewares in 19th-century rural Ireland. These wares were extremely important to rural lifeways, apparently often comprising close to 50% of these assemblages (Orser 2001: 90). Given the substantial Irish immigrations to Newfoundland in the early 19th century, one has to wonder if the importance placed on these vessels was transferred to Newfoundland. Their role in agri-social class systems would certainly have decreased, but the significant relationship between rural life and coarseware vessels may have persisted. The role of coarsewares in 19th-century Newfoundland and their relation to social hierarchies is not well understood; as noted above, there appears to be a relationship between the mode of settlement (i.e.,
permanent vs. migratory) and the abundance of coarsewares in an assemblage. More examples of coarseware assemblages associated with permanent settlement and the resident fishery are needed to better understand these nuances. Brooks (2003: 127-128) suggests that coarsewares may be more abundant at late 18th- or early 19th-century sites because refined tablewares were newer and more expensive at this time. As the price of these wares drops over the century, tablewares may become more common in relation to coarsewares. Such a temporal relationship does not appear to exist in this dataset though.

At Ferryland, Fea 208 has a relatively low amount of coarseware and porcelain (3.9% and 0.3% based on sherds), comparable to the 3.0% and 0.5% from the Downs House. Meanwhile, the S19 assemblage (floor and well) contains 19% coarseware and 0.6% porcelain. As noted previously, porcelain is another ware type thought to be closely tied to status. It is nearly completely absent from the Red Bay and Champ Paya assemblages. Meanwhile, it makes up nearly 5% of the DH assemblage. Cowie (2011: 130) again shows a close relationship between porcelain abundance and social class at Fayette: the upper-class assemblage contains over 20% porcelain and the middle and working classes range from 3-6%. Brooks (2000, 2003; Brooks and Connah 2007) also emphasizes the status connotations of porcelain (especially teawares) in 19th-century British ceramic assemblages. This may prove to be an important indicator of status in Newfoundland assemblages, though more comparative material is required. There does appear to be a relationship between mode of settlement (permanent vs. seasonal) and the

---

45 Some of this may be attributable to admixture with 17th-century refuse, but the total nevertheless appears very high by comparison.
presence of porcelain, based on these four assemblages. The presence of ironstone in the assemblages, which varies greatly, is largely indicative of the date of deposition. Based on these data, ironstone clearly made its way into the Canadian market but does not appear to have eclipsed transfer-printed wares in the same way that it did in the American market (Brooks 2000: 188). Its popularity is also reflected in the documentary record (Collard 1984: 125-136). The Canadian market may thus be somewhat intermediary between the American market (where moulded ironstone was so popular that it apparently universally overtook transfer-printed wares) and the British one (where ironstone was never popular) and was probably also characterized by significant local variation. This is an interesting and fairly poorly understood topic that deserves further study but will not be addressed here. Lumped together, the refined earthenware (white and non-white) and ironstone assemblages are relatively even between sites, making up the majority of the ceramics present.

Refined white-bodied earthenware decorative types for each site are shown in Table 6.3. There are some major differences in the assemblages. The DH has the highest amount of transfer-printed wares, with Genille and Red Bay having nearly identical amounts. The proportion at Champ Paya is considerably lower, perhaps reflecting the slightly earlier date (and consequently higher prices for transferwares). Notably, only four of 128 transfer-printed vessels at Red Bay are of the flow variety, which is perhaps surprising given the popularity of this type at the time (Collard 1984: 119). Burke (1991) suggests that the low amount of flow ware is due to its high cost. Similarly, only five of 47 transfer printed vessels from Genille are of the flow variety. Plain vessels are
considerably more numerous at Genille and Champ Paya, doubling the proportions from the DH and Red Bay.

Edged and dipped wares are conspicuously absent from Genille; at Champ Paya and Red Bay they combine to equal approximately 20% (slightly higher than DH), though edged wares are considerably more common at the former and dipped wares at the latter. An anomalously high number of sponged vessels were recovered from Genille and Red Bay. Burke (1991: 90) cites several contemporary assemblages with proportions of 2-3%, which are more in line with the amounts at DH and Champ Paya. Sponged wares are often associated with Scottish manufacturers (Dalgleish 2009), and Burke (1991: 90-92) notes that very high numbers of Scottish ceramic imports were received at ports in Newfoundland. Clearly then, spongewares were widely available in 19th-century Newfoundland, as these two sites indicate.\(^\text{46}\) Collard (1984: 10) notes that it was common practice for Newfoundland sealing vessels to take cargoes of Scottish ceramics in exchange for oil. This is perhaps significant in light of John Jellard’s known involvement in sealing, as documented in Robert Carter’s journal (e.g., May 4 1844, April 21 1845). Perhaps some of the Scottish vessels from the site (such as the Triumphal Car series) were acquired in such transactions. Despite their availability, sponged ceramics are rare at the DH, perhaps due to their common association with the working class (Burke 1991: 109). Painted vessels are relatively common at all sites, though they are particularly common at Champ Paya and comparatively rare at Red Bay. In all, the other assemblages

\(^{46}\) Feature 208 in Ferryland also appears to have a higher number of sponged wares compared to S19 and the DH (based on sherds), although this was not quantified in terms of vessels.
have considerably more variety/equity in decorative types – transfer-printed wares dominate at the DH with painted wares and plain a distant second, and all other vessels comprising under 10%.

Table 6.3 - Refined earthenware decorative types at four Newfoundland and Labrador sites (based on vessel counts).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Downs House</th>
<th>Genille (Jones 2009)</th>
<th>Champ Paya (Hatcher 2013)</th>
<th>Red Bay (Burke 1991)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponged</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also interesting to examine the breakdown of transfer-printed colours (Table 6.4). As previously mentioned, the DH assemblage is dominated by blue transfer prints. Blue was always the most common colour, but printed wares in black, brown, green, purple, and red were available from the second decade of the 19th century and became especially popular in the late 1820s and early 1830s (Samford 1997: Table 5). This means that coloured printed wares were available during the occupation of the DH but were apparently only purchased in very small amounts. Other colours are considerably more common at Genille and Red Bay.

Table 6.4 - Transfer printing colours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Downs House</th>
<th>Genille (Jones 2009)</th>
<th>Red Bay (Burke 1991)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to differences in the typologies and formal classifications used by the different researchers, some aggregation and manipulation of the data was required for comparisons of form (Table 6.5). High amounts of teaware at all sites emphasize the universal importance of tea consumption in the 19th century, challenging the association of teaware and status during this period (cf Cowie 2011: 130). The presence of teapots in high amounts at each site (at least double that of the DH) is interesting. Burke (1991: 105-107) notes that teapots were often used for storing and consuming other types of liquid in rural Newfoundland. The bowl:plates ratio also reveal interesting patterns: Genille and Champ Paya reveal approximately equal ratios, while the DH and Red Bay assemblages are dominated by flatwares. As previously noted, the association between hollow/flat vessels, diet, and status is an archaeological mainstay (e.g., Cowie 2011: 130). Burke (1991: 107) notes that such an association can not be uncritically applied, arguing that the increased availability of fish is the reason for the large numbers of flat vessel forms. Such an association may partly explain the high number of plates at the DH as well, given the predominance of fish in the faunal assemblage. Deeper flatwares can also be used for the consumption of liquid-based meals. The presence of tableware serving vessels in the assemblage is particularly high at the Downs House: 8.2% compared to 4.1% at Red Bay (Burke 1991: 107) and 0.9% at Champ Paya (Hatcher 2013: 113) (teapots excluded). Analysis of several 19th-century winterhouse sites in Newfoundland by Venovcevs (2017: 157-158) indicates that undecorated vessels with a limited range of vessel forms predominate at these sites. This is the exact opposite of the pattern identified at the DH, which is characterized by highly decorated vessels and a wide range of forms. The
isolated nature of winterhouse sites likely explains this pattern, as they show considerably less elaboration than the contemporary permanently or seasonally occupied coastal sites in the province.

Table 6.5 - REW vessel forms at 19th-century Newfoundland and Labrador sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Downs House</th>
<th>Genille (Jones 2009)</th>
<th>Champ Paya (Hatcher 2013)</th>
<th>Red Bay (Burke 1991)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plates/Platters</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaware</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teapot</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to the ceramic assemblage, the glass vessel assemblage is quite small. This is similar to the pattern observed by O’Donovan and Wurst (2001: 78) at a contemporary rural farmstead occupied by lower-class farmers in upstate New York. They suggest that the generally higher cost of glass vessels may explain this. The character of this New York glass assemblage, however, is very different from the DH one, containing only three tableware vessels. By contrast, there are 18 vessels from the DH site with various tableware functions (including stemmed glasses, tumblers, dishes, plates, and hollowware forms). These far outnumber the bottle forms.

Conspicuously absent from the glass assemblage, however, are large numbers of medicinal bottle forms. A total of five bottles were identified as either pharmaceutical or toiletry-related items. Howson (1993) has argued that prioritization of and access to health care is fundamentally determined by social status. Others have suggested that a focus on health and bodily hygiene was one of the defining characteristics of a genteel lifestyle and the 19th-century middle class (Young 2003: 95-112). The medicine bottle
assemblage at the DH site is quite small compared to other 19th-century sites (e.g., Mrozowski 2006: 128-129; Brighton 2009: 132-139). This may relate partially to its date, as proprietary medicines became especially widespread in the latter half of the 19th century (Howson 1993: 145). Brighton (2008b) has convincingly argued that changing proportions of medicinal types in Irish immigrant assemblages in the United States are illustrative of degrees of alienation. The relative lack of medicine bottles in the DH assemblage may relate to the rarity of these types of objects in 19th-century rural Newfoundland. More research is needed for a fuller understanding of attitudes towards health and hygiene and how this relates to class in rural 19th-century Newfoundland.

Historical archaeologists typically place a heavy focus on ceramics (in particular refined earthenwares) because of their ubiquity. As Brighton (2009: 121) notes, such a focus “fails to capture the complexity and total pattern of the types and forms of table settings”. The comparative analysis above focussed on ceramics, because the available Newfoundland and Labrador studies either exclusively focussed on this material category or placed a heavy emphasis on it (at the expense of glassware forms). As O’Donovan and Wurst (2001) point out, though, an analysis of consumer choice and consumption patterns based only on a single category of material culture can be misleading. As with the ceramic assemblage, the glass assemblage from the DH, with its tableware emphasis, signals an emphasis on complex table settings and elaborate dining.

The concept of vessel complexity has been used by Brighton (2009: 120-132; 2011) to examine changing dietary practices and ideologies of consumption amongst the immigrant Irish in urban America. He defines vessel complexity as “those forms not
considered necessary in the everyday routines of eating or drinking” (ibid: 120). Serving dishes are considered to be especially representative of this kind of complex eating behaviour. Brighton suggests that evidence of increasing vessel complexity in these assemblages is illustrative of shifting identities and a desire to achieve respectability in the eyes of American nativists. As discussed above, the ceramic assemblage at the DH has considerably more vessel complexity than an approximately contemporary deposit of domestic refuse at Ferryland. The same is true of the glass vessel assemblage which contains examples of stemmed wares, tumblers, and various tablewares. The available data also suggests that the DH had a higher degree of vessel complexity than several other 19th-century Newfoundland/Labrador assemblages. A complex array of forms (particularly flatwares) would have been necessary to successfully follow the established dining conventions of the à la Française style, popular in the early 19th century (Gray 2015). It is hypothesized that the vessel complexity in the DH assemblage is reflective of the importance of formal dining and socializing in the lifeways of Ferryland’s gentry class. This behaviour is hinted at in the documentary record, most notably in Robert Carter’s journal (1832-1852). As members of the emergent middle class, perhaps with aspirations of joining the limited circles of Ferryland’s gentry, the inhabitants of the Downs House (in particular the Jellards) would have needed to display a keen understanding of such refined behaviour.

The smoking pipe and alcohol-related glass vessel assemblage from the site is striking for its limited size. Only five wine bottles were identified at the DH, while S19 yielded a minimum of nine wine bottles from the well feature alone (glass from the floor
deposit was not examined). Wine bottle glass comprises 2.7% \((n=161)\) of the assemblage at the DH versus 26.3% \((n=1,883)\) at S19 and 6.0% \((n=100)\) at Fea 208 (E763 and E930). The particularly high value from S19 may be evidence that part of the assemblage derives from a tavern; this is supported by the presence of large numbers of mugs and several bowls that may be small punch bowls (see Breen 2012). There appears to be more glass present in S19 than in the 18\(^{th}\)-century tavern assemblage from Ferryland analyzed by Leskovec (2007). Jones’ (2009) analysis of a 19\(^{th}\)-century household on Newfoundland’s Petit Nord yielded 12 wine bottles (from only ten excavation units). The archaeological evidence to date has suggested that alcohol consumption at Newfoundland winterhouse sites was quite limited due to the isolated nature of these dwellings (Venovcevs 2017: 157). The same problems of supply and isolation would not have existed in Ferryland.

There are a few different explanations for the limited presence of wine bottles at the site. It is possible that the occupants consumed alcohol via mediums other than the classic wine bottle, although the limited evidence for other liquor and the ubiquity of the cylindrical wine bottle during this period (Jones 1986) strongly suggests otherwise. It may be that alcohol consumption declined compared to earlier periods. There is evidence that a decrease in consumption occurred in America after 1820 with the increased success of the temperance movement and the reliance on caffeinated beverages such as coffee and tea (Larkin 1988: 175). Temperance was an especially popular rhetoric amongst the middle class in the Victorian period; it is a topic that has received considerable archaeological attention (Reckner and Brighton 1999; Smith 2003; Mrozowski 2006: 147; Brighton 2009: 141; Lawrence and Davies 2011: 299-300). Certainly, the
archaeological evidence at the Downs House points towards a much greater emphasis on the tea service than on alcohol consumption. This is significant, because archaeological research in various 19th-century contexts has demonstrated that the behaviour of middle-class individuals did not always line up with their supposed values, with respect to alcohol consumption (Reckner and Brighton 1999; Mrozowski 2006: 128-129). The temperance movement in Newfoundland appears to have been well underway by the mid-19th century (Lambert 2010: 189-192). Although Irish Catholics have received the bulk of attention in previous research, there is ample evidence that Protestants formed similar temperance groups (ibid: 189). The movement was centred in St. John’s but apparently had branches in many of the larger outports as well (FitzGerald 2003). Keough, however, suggests that temperance movements were “totally absent” on the southern Avalon (2002: 65). Even if organized movements were rare in the area, the ideas were certainly familiar to Ferryland’s inhabitants and may have been privately adhered to. For example, a temperance poem about the effects of alcohol on fishermen was apparently transcribed by Ann Carter in 1843 and is found in the Carter Family Papers (RPA MG 31) (Keough 2001: 627). More research into contemporary archaeological assemblages is also needed to better understand class- and ethnic-based variation in alcohol consumption.

Some documentary records suggest that drinking was a point of contention in ethnic- and class-based discourse on the southern Avalon (e.g., English 1998; Keough 2001: 127-128). Archaeologists have also recognized the consumption of alcohol as an important component of class conflict and an element of employer-worker relations addressed in corporate paternalism (Smith 2015). Alcohol was a vital component of the
paternalistic relationship between masters and servants in Newfoundland (Bannister 2003: 12). Some attempts do appear to have been made to explicitly control the consumption of alcohol by labourers in the Newfoundland fishery. For example, decrees were made preventing the purchase of liquor on credit (ibid: 161). Peter Pope (1989) has noted that alcohol played a pivotal role in the 17th-century fishing economy and that fishermen consumed alcohol at a rate significantly higher than their working-class peers in England. The role of alcohol in early modern Newfoundland labour is a complex topic which will not be fully explored here. Hay’s (2008: 52-86) exhaustive treatment of the nuanced role of alcohol in labour relations in Labrador, as evinced in George Cartwright’s 1770-1786 journal is a valuable discussion of a nearly contemporary paternalistic relationship.

Clay pipes were also relatively rare at the Downs House, compared to contemporary Ferryland assemblages. Clay pipes make up only 2.6% (n=153) of the DH assemblage versus 11.2% (n=804) at S19 and 8.9% (n=325) at Fea 208 (E763/E930). They are also very common finds at contemporary winterhouse sites in Newfoundland, where Venovcevs (2017: 96-97, 129-130) noted proportions of 11.4% and 7.5% at two sites in St. Mary’s Bay. Jones (2009: 140) reports relatively low numbers of pipes at Genille (n=45). While the relative proportion is unclear, a total of 1,053 ceramic sherds were recovered from the same site, representing a ratio of 23.4 ceramics:pipe versus a nearly identical 24.3 at the Downs House.

The best explanation for the relatively limited assemblage of clay tobacco pipes at
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47 Nails removed from assemblage to allow for comparison with the Ferryland material.
the DH site may lie in the changing perception and social meaning of pipe smoking in the 19th century. While clay pipes appear to have been used almost universally at the beginning of the 18th century, class- and gender-based divides became ingrained by the late 18th century and especially into the 19th. In an age of increasing refinement amongst the middle class, the act of smoking, along with the consumption of alcohol, was “a vice that was the target of middle-class scorn” (Mrozowski 2006: 129-130). The upper classes certainly did continue to consume tobacco; the medium of consumption changed, however, as the higher classes began to turn away from pipes towards cigars and snuff, which were seen to be a more refined means of consumption (Gojak and Stuart 1999: 40). Cigars were the most expensive method of consuming tobacco and were thus a significant indicator of status (Larkin 1988: 188). Pipes did continue to be used by the upper classes as well, but new materials such as meerschaum and briar wood became more popular at the expense of the clay pipe.

Clay pipes were particularly seen as closely associated with working-class life (Reckner 2001); the act of smoking while working is thought to be an expression of pride and identification with the working class (Morzowski 2006: 130). The context of tobacco consumption was also important. Amongst the upper classes, tobacco use clearly demarcated gendered spaces. Upper-class women did not smoke, while many lower-class women did (particularly in the earlier part of the 19th century) (Larkin 1988: 169). Smoking amongst upper-class men was a carefully controlled activity and generally did not occur in the presence of women or in public (Mrozowski 2006: 130). Smoking was thus a communicative act along class, gender, and ethnic lines (Beaudry et al. 1991: 167-
168). These connotations were undoubtedly part of the *lingua franca* of the culture of gentility and may explain the limited size of the clay pipe assemblage at the Downs House. There is no archaeological evidence for alternate methods of tobacco consumption at the site, but these would generally not be visible archaeologically. Though impossible to demonstrate conclusively, the bulk of the pipe assemblage may represent smoking undertaken by servants or other labourers at the site. Such a pattern has been demonstrated elsewhere archaeologically, such as in the 19th-century factory towns of Lowell and Fayette, where the presence of pipes is correlated with class groupings (Mrozowski 2006: 130; Cowie 2011: Table 2.1).

The simplistic association of clay pipe abundance and status is complicated by the presence of multiple status and gender groups on a single site, supply and market access, localized systems of meaning, and individual preferences. Pervasive social norms surrounding tobacco consumption are, however, one explanation for the seemingly low abundance of pipes at the Downs House site compared to contemporaneous deposits in Ferryland. Over the course of the 19th century, pipe smoking remained popular amongst the rural working class, but appears to have especially been a male pursuit, having declined considerably amongst women (Larkin 1988: 169). It is unclear, however, if this gendered division existed in Newfoundland as well.

A few other characteristics of the assemblage appear to solidify the middle-class status of the inhabitants. The presence of writing-related items is significant, given the importance of literacy as a tool of power in 19th-century Newfoundland (Macdonald 1997). Evidence of lamp chimney glass fragments in early contexts suggest the use of
new more expensive lighting technology. Lamp chimneys become much more common archaeologically after the advent of cheaper kerosene fuel, which was not introduced in St. John’s until 1860 (Woodhead et al. 1984: 58). Such lighting technology may have been rarer in lower-class households (cf Mrozowski 2006: 126). The lack of fishing-related equipment, despite a heavy reliance on fish in their diet, seems to indicate that the inhabitants of the site were not directly engaged in the resource extraction component of the fishery. Other domestic contexts from the Pool (especially Feature 208) have yielded considerable evidence of fishing-related equipment, presumably related to the working-class roles of these inhabitants. Similar patterns have been noted elsewhere in the province on contemporary sites (Temple 2006; Jones 2009: 143).

The relative lack of such equipment at the Downs House may also be a manifestation of the increasing separation of home and work spaces during the period. Mrozowski (1991: 96) associates this shift with the transition from mercantile to industrial capitalism. He argues that the productive role of the household was vastly diminished and replaced by social reproduction (whereby the household and its associated landscape become particular status symbols) especially among the middle and upper class. The bulk of the assemblage at the DH is indeed domestic in nature, with a particularly large component represented by refined earthenware teawares and tablewares, which played crucial roles in middle-class gentility. Similarities in this regard (matching sets, expensive decorative types, vessel complexity) with other middle-class
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48 A total of 23 fishhooks were recovered from E763 alone, representing 0.7% of the assemblage. By contrast, only three were recovered from the Downs House site (0.05%).
assemblages (e.g., Fitts 1999, Hayes 2011) appear to substantiate Young’s (2003: 6-7) definition of middle-classness as an extranational phenomenon that transcends boundaries (see also Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992: 75; Lawrence 2012: 235). These markers of gentility would have been clearly understood across the British colonial world, as Johnson (2010: 164) remarks about Georgian architecture.

There is also some evidence for the display of status in the small collection of items related to personal adornment. While most of the fasteners are strictly utilitarian in nature, a few items are more decorative including a gold-plated cloak pin, a plated pewter buckle, and a possible silver brooch. Possible mirror fragments, a lead comb, and several beads also point towards a preoccupation with personal appearance. If more elaborate items of personal adornment were used, they were carefully curated. Perhaps such items were one of the main distinguishing elements between Ferryland’s middling class and the select elite; however, the role of items of personal adornment in defining class boundaries began to erode towards the end of the 18th century as these items became more widely available (White 2004: 62). The DH assemblage points towards some attempts at elaborating personal appearance and clearly has a few items which are purely decorative (as opposed to functional), but it is not remarkable in its elaboration (cf White 2004). The inhabitants may have chosen to exhibit their refined lifestyle primarily in a more communal fashion through elaborate tea and dinner ceremonies with a large array of ceramic and glass wares, rather than through individualistic displays of personal adornment. Ultimately, more research and larger samples are needed to understand variations in patterns of personal adornment in early 19th-century rural Newfoundland.
The lack of evidence of toys at the site is somewhat surprising. Amongst the middle and upper classes, play was often used as a form of teaching genteel practices to children in the Victorian period (Cessford 2018). Items directed towards specific genders were intended to solidify particular behavioural norms. For example, miniature tea sets and dolls were marketed towards young girls (Wilkie 2000: 102). These kinds of items have been documented in small numbers at other sites in Newfoundland (Jones 2009: 136-137), including at Feature 208, the contemporary dwelling in the Pool at Ferryland. Although toys appear to have been more common amongst the upper classes (perhaps due to their cost), they are also commonly found among the working class. Patterns of use, however, appear to be different; some research suggests they may have been less commonly used in domestic settings (Yamin 2018). The only item from the DH that may be conclusively linked to children is the child’s thimble noted previously. Of course, children would have used many other objects that archaeologists view as ‘non-children’s artifacts’ (Wilkie 2000: 100; Cessford 2018), making it difficult to detect them archaeologically. The presence of children’s items at archaeological sites is often closely linked to household cycles (Cessford 2018). Given that the Jellards had several young children during their tenancy, the presence of toys would be expected. When they departed in 1845, however, the oldest of their four children was only nine years old (with the others aged three, four, and seven), perhaps suggesting that they were too early in the household cycle to allow for significant toy deposition.

Finally, diet and foodways may be an important area of status differentiation. The consumption of meat was a particularly important indicator of wealth in the post-
medieval period (Hodgetts 2006: 128). The diet of the working class tended to be high in carbohydrates and low in protein due to the higher cost of meat (Mant and Roberts 2015: 190). The topic of status-based variation in diet has received considerable attention in the archaeological literature (e.g., Reitz 1987). A popular analytical method has been the use of price indices to assess the relative monetary value of different faunal assemblages based on the presence of different cuts of meat (e.g., Henry 1987). This method is similar to Miller’s (1980, 1991) CC Index for ceramics. Such a detailed analysis is far beyond the scope of this project, which will instead focus only on broad taxonomic categories. Faunal material from S19 provides an opportunity for comparative analysis. This material was analyzed by Elliott (2018b) using the same methodology as that applied to the DH assemblage (Elliott 2018a) (see Appendix C).

The assemblages are examined as total site assemblages for the purposes of assessing inter-site variation. This seems appropriate, given that the vast majority of the DH assemblage comes from a single context and that there are demonstrated relationships between the S19 well and floor\(^{49}\) refuse deposits. It is possible that some refuse from the 17\(^{th}\)-century occupation of the structure is mixed in with the interior deposits, but admixture is likely minimal given the interior context and the presence of a clear 17\(^{th}\)-century midden to the east of the structure. The assemblages are generally similar, with the most noticeable difference being the much lower proportion of fish in the S19 assemblage (26.1% of vertebrate taxa vs. 88.9%). Preservation and methods of recovery may account partially for these differences, although the preservation at S19 was

\(^{49}\) It was only possible to fully analyze a sample of this material, but it appears to be representative.
characterized as mostly excellent or generally good (Elliott 2018b: 7). Comparisons between wet-screened and dry-screened deposits also show a high degree of similarity suggesting that the discrepancies are indeed significant.

Element abundances indicate that codfish were being brought to the DH whole and probably consumed fresh (Elliott 2018a: 5); such a pattern was not noted in S19. Fish prepared for the market would be gutted and headed at shoreline fishing premises in advance of salting (Hodgetts 2006: 133). Birds are also more common at the DH, comprising 3.7% of the vertebrate taxa vs. 1.4%. When the influence of fish is removed, the significance of their contribution can be better seen: the ratio of mammal:bird at S19 is 51.9 vs. 1.75 at DH. Identification beyond the mammal class was rare at the DH and as such only a limited picture of mammal consumption is provided. Pig are most common (n=9), followed by caprines (n=5), and cattle (n=2). A single seal specimen is also present. As Elliott (2018a: 5-6) suggests, the contributions of mammals to the diet is likely underestimated due to prior butchering and the presence of boneless cuts of meat. A greater number of specimens were identifiable at S19, indicating the importance of pig (n=61), cattle (n=33), and to a much lesser degree caprines (n=6). Seal was also present in small numbers (n=3). This pattern parallels the relative importance of different types of mammals observed by Hodgetts (2006) for 17th-century diet at Ferryland, indicating a degree of continuity.

Hodgetts’ (2006) in-depth analysis of faunal remains from Ferryland provides some context to draw on. Although it is focussed on 17th-century contexts, many of the conclusions are worth noting. One important point concerns the role of meat (in terms of
quantity and quality) as a status symbol. Hodgetts (2006: 135) suggests that immigration to Ferryland would have presented most individuals with greater access to meat (particularly wild game) than was available in the Old World. Orser (2007b: 115) indicates that the same phenomenon was observed in New York amongst mid 19th-century Irish immigrants. Differences may still be visible, however, in the quality or variety of meat present in the diet. Newfoundland presents a particular difficulty for overwintering livestock due to harsh weather and a lack of suitable fodder. This is particularly problematic for cattle because they require a more specific diet. Thus, only certain individuals appear to have had the ability to keep cattle, whereas nearly everyone likely kept pigs (Hodgetts 2006: 129). Diet apparently remained consistent over the course of the 17th century at Ferryland; it was a balanced diet composed mainly of five relatively even mammal contributors: pig, cattle, caprines (goat/sheep), caribou and seal (ibid: 129-134). Interestingly, fish do not make up more than 50% of the NISP in any of the assemblages analyzed by Hodgetts (ibid: 133). The presence of considerable numbers of cranial and upper vertebrae fragments indicate that fresh fish were also consumed during the fishing season. Birds are also present in limited numbers, including seabirds and other wild birds.

The lack of wild species in both the S19 and DH assemblage is significant in light of Hodgetts’ (2006) findings concerning the importance of caribou and seal to the 17th-century diet. Wild mammals are clearly a less significant component of the 19th-century diet in Ferryland based on these two assemblages. This may be due to greater availability of fodder as more land was cleared and a higher degree of stability provided by the
growth of permanent settlement. Perhaps because of the greater availability of wild game across class lines, it became less of a status-laden component of diet. There is evidence for this type of social levelling in the 17th century as well, as no significant differences were noted between the amounts of wild game in different assemblages in Ferryland (Tourigny and Noel 2013: 234). Hunting was of course still undertaken, as evidenced by the presence of wild birds in the DH faunal assemblage, the recovery of numerous pieces of lead shot, and documentary references (see below). Ferryland’s role as a larger rural centre and its proximity to the urban centre St. John’s may have meant that there was easy market access to local domesticates and imported salted meat. The issue of rural and urban supply has been examined in the historical zooarchaeological literature (Landon 2005: 19) and it has been shown that urban assemblages are often characterized by fewer wild species. Though Ferryland was not an urban centre, it was certainly a kind of rural nexus/capital. The presence of larger amounts of wild species in isolated areas of Newfoundland has been demonstrated by Venovcevs (2017) in his analysis of winterhouse sites.

Robert Carter’s (1832-1852) journal provides some interesting anecdotes about diet, which are useful to consider alongside the faunal assemblage. There are several references to concerns about mild weather spoiling fresh meat (Jan 17 1835, Feb 16 1836), suggesting that autumn slaughters were undertaken to provide fresh meat for the winter. There are also references to keeping pigs (Sept 9 1832), cows (May 1 1836), and sheep (Nov 17 1837). Salmon appears to have been a fairly rare addition to the diet, as it is noted that a catch of five represented the largest catch of the year in 1845 (June 14
Salmon may thus have been something of a luxury item in the area. A single salmon element was recovered from the DH. There are also references to catching trout in a nearby river (June 10 1836). These activities were apparently undertaken by members of the gentry themselves. Likewise, there are many references to hunting birds including sea ducks (Jan 29 1845) and partridges (Nov 7 1840). The Downs and Ferryland Head are mentioned as popular spots for hunting birds. Again, these were activities apparently undertaken by gentry men and may have been seen as a kind of leisurely pursuit. In seasonal occupations, Tourigny and Noel (2013: 235) suggest that hunting wild game might have been largely restricted to upper-class individuals who could devote time to it during the busy fishing season when the lower class (composed of servants and fishermen) would be constantly occupied by fishing. They note, however, that the same argument does not apply to permanent settlements, where ample time for hunting would have been available during the winter. Nevertheless, differences in the proportion of seasonally available wild game may be significant, if observable.

6.2 Landscape, Architecture, Permanence (and Impermanence)
Chappell (1994) describes architectural transformations during the Georgian period in 18th-century England that led to what he describes as the ‘refined house’. A reordering of space introduced clear separation of rooms with different functions (private vs. public) to be used by various different social classes. An emphasis was placed on spaces of entertainment and formal dining. Symmetrical facades dominated by large windows characterized the exteriors of these buildings (Johnson 2010: 160). In the American context, this transformation occurred primarily in the decades after the Revolution.
(Chappell 1994), making it roughly contemporary with the appearance of Georgian-influenced architectural styles amongst the gentry class on Newfoundland’s Southern Shore (Pocius 1982: 219-220). This Georgian transformation was experienced mainly by the upper classes; it was widespread, as evidenced by its presence in the various different British colonies (Johnson 2010: 164) but was also unattainable by many individuals, particularly in rural areas where vernacular forms continued to predominate (Tarlow 2007: 115). Thus, architectural changes during the period reflect “a growing disparity between kinds of people rather than a general advance in the quality of life” (Chappell 1994: 171).

Similar developments occurred on the Southern Shore during this period, where two broadly different architectural traditions developed along class lines (Pocius 1982: 220). Although the full-blown Georgian structures described above were limited to the upper classes, influences were also felt in the more common architectural styles, particularly in the symmetrical two-room forms (Pocius 1991: 204) and neoclassical elements (Tarlow 2007: 96) incorporated. As noted previously, a handful of large mercantile structures were built in Ferryland and the surrounding communities using these Georgian principles. This was also the case in other large Newfoundland outports. Notable examples include the Blenheim House in Placentia, the Lester-Garland premises in Trinity, Ridley Hall in Harbour Grace, and the Rorke House in Carbonear.

The Downs House, as depicted historically and evinced archaeologically, conforms to many elements of Georgian architecture. Several contemporary sketches show a balanced façade with centrally located doors and symmetrically-arranged
windows. The sketches indicate that the structure stood 2 or 2.5 storeys tall and likely had a hearth on each gable end. Pocius (1991: 204) notes that end chimneys often indicate upper storey hearths as well. Archaeological evidence confirms the substantial emphasis placed on fenestration in the construction of the house – window glass accounts for 25% of recovered artifacts. For comparison, a total of only 362 sherds of glass were recovered from the 10 units associated with the 19th-century gardien structure at Genille on Newfoundland’s Petit Nord (density of 36.2/m²) (Jones 2009: 129). From the eight units excavated in TT1 at the DH, a total of 910 sherds were recovered (density of 113.8/m²). The recovery of many fragments of window putty indicates that the windows were well installed. They were likely of the sash variety – the presence of muntins/glazing bars would have necessitated the use of greater amounts of putty.

Georgian façades were typically oriented to face a road, so as to impress passersby (Larkin 1988: 117-118). It is likely that the road-facing side of the DH would have had an impressive façade, given that the road would have been the main way of approaching and entering the structure. The isolated setting of the structure may have meant that the road was not well-travelled. There is some indication, however, that (as is the case today) the Downs was a popular spot to enjoy a walk. This is based on an entry in Robert Carter’s journal (April 25 1835). Meanwhile, the ‘rear’ water-facing façade would have been highly visible and symbolically important. It would have been prominently visible to the rest of the community and any ships on the water. Thus, it would have been imperative that this façade be equally striking, transmitting a clear message of status to the rest of the community. Clearly, the water-facing side was given
plenty of attention with a carefully groomed terrace and accompanying retaining walls. As previously noted, archaeological evidence shows that the water-facing façade had a high concentration of windows. The dining and entertaining rooms would most likely have been on the water-facing side, with the kitchen and service rooms presumably on the other side.

Thus, the house may have had two quite similar facades due to its unusual arrangement - one facing the main road and approach that likely would not have seen much casual traffic, and the other facing the harbour and the community but rather unapproachable. There may not have been a clear front and back to the house, but rather two equally elaborate facades. Perhaps a footpath along the coast would have allowed access to the house and landscaped yard from the water side.

Excavations also confirmed the location of one substantial fireplace beneath a rubble mound at what appears to be the gable end of the structure; an identical one almost certainly lies beneath a similar mound some 40' to the west. A dense midden deposit just to the east of the exposed hearth indicates that it is located on the eastern periphery of the structure and hints at the location of a nearby door. Assuming the floor plan was double pile, following Georgian conventions (Johnson 2010: 169), the north-south dimensions may have been about 25’.50 The distance between the south edge of the fireplace and the break-in-slope that likely represents the north edge of the structure is about 15’, meaning that the fireplace probably sits in the northern half of the structure (if it is indeed double-}

50 The Holdsworth house had a depth of 24' (Pocius 1982: 220) and appears to have had a double pile plan with three rooms across, i.e., six per floor (O’Brien 1999). The smaller width of the Downs House (compared to the 60’ Holdsworth House) likely means that it was two rooms wide, and two deep.
pile in plan). There may well have been an additional fireplace to the south (i.e., two on each gable end), but the surface evidence suggests that the rubble mound represents a single fireplace.

If the dining and entertaining rooms were on the water-facing side of the structure, then the kitchen would probably have been on the south (road-facing) side if the floor plan conformed to the typical Georgian layout. A central hall would probably have separated the two halves of the structure (see Pocius 1991: 204), allowing for access to any room without having to pass through intervening ones. The main living quarters were probably on the second floor, with the servants’ quarters located in the attic, perhaps accessible via the kitchen as in the Holdsworth House (O’Brien 1999). This is purely conjectural but would follow the typical Georgian conventions. As previously noted, a small trench (1x2m) excavated in the presumed interior of the structure failed to reveal any information about the flooring or any internal partitioning. Determining the north-south extent of the structure and the internal floor plan remains one of the most pressing research objectives going forward.

Extensive transformations of the landscape accompanied the architectural revolution of the Georgian period in England: these relate mainly to enclosure, transportation, and estate planning (Chappell 1994: 170). Estate planning is particularly evident at the Downs House, as seen in the labour-intensive construction of dry-laid stone retaining walls bounding a levelled terrace. Mrozowski (1991: 96) points out that ornamental landscapes were important status symbols amongst the upper classes in the 18th and 19th centuries. Contrary to working-class house yards, such landscapes were not
designed to be productive spaces. In this way, inequality was reflected in the landscape. Leone’s (1984, 1988) famous interpretation of late 18th-century pleasure gardens in Annapolis similarly demonstrated how such designed landscapes were intended to naturalize social order through physical and ideological control of the environment.

The terraced area was probably used as a leisure area, perhaps in a similar fashion to English tea gardens, as suggested by high amounts of teawares recovered in the area. A much lower density of refuse in the area, however, suggests that it was not preferentially used for disposal. Other midden areas (closer to the structure and on the other side of the stone retaining wall east of the terrace) suggest a carefully controlled system of refuse disposal. The refuse on the lower terrace is more of a low-density sheet deposit. Zierden (1996: 297-301) describes patterns of refuse disposal at contemporary households in Charleston, noting that work yards in proximity to outbuildings tend to have dense deposits of refuse, while pleasure gardens have a relatively limited amount. While there is no direct stratigraphic evidence of a garden horizon at the Downs House (cf Triggs 2015: 38-40, 174), the space does appear to be quite functionally segregated. Another retaining wall, composed of closely-spaced wooden posts, marks the boundary between the lower terraced courtyard area and the upper terrace where the structure was located. A staircase probably provided access between the two levels, which differ by about 2m in elevation.

Spatially, the location of the structure within the community is significant. The Downs is an unforgiving exposed environment that was never a high-density residential area in the past or present. The Downs House would have been one of the few standing
structures in the area and almost certainly the largest. Indeed, it was probably one of the most imposing structures in the entire community. Because of the lack of other substantial architecture in the area, the denuded landscape, and its position on an elevated plateau, it would have been very visible from practically all areas of the community, as well as to ships approaching from the water. Passing through the narrow entrance to the harbour just off Ferryland Head, the Downs House would have stood out prominently as one of the first landmarks to be seen. A commanding viewshed would have been attainable from the site of the structure. The positioning of the structure on this elevated plateau is undoubtedly no accident; it is a clear expression of power on the part of Judge William Carter, the presumed initial builder of the structure. Thus, the structure may have been intended as a symbolic reminder of Carter’s position as one of Ferryland’s most prominent residents. As previously noted, the house may have been intended as a rural retreat for Carter before taking up full-time occupation upon his retirement from the VA court. It was common practice amongst the British gentry to maintain a secondary retreat to escape urban life, often referred to as a ‘garden house’ (Leech 2003). The practice was also followed by some of Newfoundland’s elite (Perkins 2014).

A settlement pattern characterized by upper class housing on elevated plateaus overlooking lower-class residential areas is a common phenomenon, making use of an almost panoptic design. Archaeologists have used Foucauldian principles of surveillance and discipline to explain these kinds of situations, which create boundaries and hierarchies maintained by the visual gaze. This arrangement of the built landscape is particularly common in contexts of industrial capitalism (Brandon and Davidson 2005:}
A similarly panoptic gaze may have been part of the motivation behind the setting of the Downs House. Indeed, the Pool may have functioned as primarily a working-class area associated with the fishery. Based on the cartographic evidence, it contained a dense cluster of wharves and stages in relation to other areas of the community. There may not have been many dwellings in the Pool in the 19th century, but the limited archaeological evidence to date does point to more of a working-class occupation (Fea 208 and possible tavern refuse from S19). If the Pool was a centre of the fishing industry, it might be expected that members of the gentry would want their dwellings to be located away from it, in relatively tranquil areas such as the Downs.

Though it was the centre of the earliest occupation in Ferryland, the Pool does not appear to have maintained this symbolic importance in the 19th century. King (1996) has explored how certain important areas of early settlement in Maryland developed into ‘frozen landscapes’ which were maintained as important sites, influenced by the Romantic notion of the ‘cult of the ruin’. There are of course some interesting parallels to be made between Ferryland and Maryland because of the Calvert connections to both places. In the Maryland case, certain ruins (including the ruin of the dwelling house of Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore) appear to have been kept up as reminders of the past and even justification for the present (ibid). Such a situation does not seem to have occurred at Ferryland, perhaps because of the demographic upheaval caused by the destruction of the English Shore in the late 17th century and the replacement of the population majority by Irish immigrants who did not have a prior connection to the
landscape. The ruins of the Pool Plantation were certainly exploited for resources such as building materials, but there does not seem to have been a symbolic importance attached to them, despite the fact that they would have remained prominently visible. This is reflected in the lack of references to the 17th-century ruins in the 19th-century documentary/cartographic record and the subsequent erasure of the true location of Calvert’s colony in public memory.

The documentary and archaeological evidence, though incomplete, indicates that the Downs House was substantial and well-built, conforming to many elements of Georgian architecture which were generally reserved for the elite in the region (see Pocius 1982). Despite the apparently high labour and financial investment in the structure and landscape, it appears that it was abandoned after, at most, a half-century of occupation. As previously discussed, there is no archaeological evidence for a destructive fire, suggesting instead that it simply fell into disrepair and was abandoned. The isolated location of the structure and the high cost of repairs may be the best explanatory factors. The apparent early association of the structure with William Carter must have lent the structure a degree of prestige, which may have been seen as advantageous by its later occupants. Curiously, it does not appear to have been occupied by any other members of the Carter family. After being abandoned, the structure appears to have disappeared from public memory rather quickly. This contrasts with several contemporary structures in Ferryland which are well remembered, such as the Holdsworth House and the Freebairn-Coffey house). Howard Morry’s poignant memoirs from the mid-20th century demonstrate that the details surrounding the Downs House had been lost to public
memory a mere century after its abandonment, even though its ruins were apparently still visible on the landscape.
Chapter 7 - Conclusion

This research has attempted to provide a window into early 19th-century settlement in Ferryland with a focus on a single structure occupied by a series of individuals and families from the local gentry. Research objectives included an examination of ‘genteel lifeways’ as represented by material culture and architecture, as well as an examination of changing settlement patterns and use of land/landscape in Ferryland as settlement expanded outside the core of the initial settlement area of the Pool. In particular, the archaeological record of the Downs House provides evidence of occupation during the 1830s and 1840s, when several middle-class tenants inhabited the structure. Although it appears to represent a relatively short period of occupation of only a few decades, the archaeological record is remarkably rich.

The assemblage is dominated by domestic refuse, particularly tableware ceramics related to elaborate dining practices and the tea ceremony. There is evidence of the purchase of matching sets and current patterns, in line with the ideology of middle-class gentility. It is hypothesized that these purchases relate primarily to the Jellard occupation and represent a relatively brief period of material acquisition as an attempt by a young family to perpetuate an air of gentility. The purchase of elaborate sets of dinner and teaware seems to represent the primary means by which the occupants chose to convey a sense of gentility on a daily basis. Evidence for elaborate dress and personal adornment is comparatively rare, though this may be a simple reflection of the sample obtained from the site. Future excavation of other contexts, including interior domestic spaces, will help to overcome this sample bias and provide information on different activity areas.
Given this large assemblage of domestic refuse, the relative lack of clay tobacco pipes and the usually-ubiquitous green glass ‘wine’ bottles is particularly notable. This may relate to the increasingly negative views of clay pipe smoking and the influence of the temperance movement amongst the gentry. The demographic makeup of the household may have also played a role in filtering certain aspects of material culture. Specifically, in the case of the Jellards, the dearth of objects related to alcohol and tobacco may represent an attempt to convey an air of morality and gentility, as an example of proper behaviour for their young children. Alternatively, the demanding needs of a growing family may have mitigated against the large-scale consumption of such recreational substances, regardless of temperate pressures. In this sense, household structure may be seen as partly dictating material behaviour.

The lack of toys and other items relating specifically to children, often so prevalent in middle-class Victorian contexts (Yamin 2018), is also notable in light of the structure of the Jellard household. One possibility is that such items were confined to another part of the site, perhaps an interior part of the house such as a nursery. Toys were mass-produced and widely available to middle-class consumers, and the ceramic assemblage clearly indicates that the occupants had access to current markets and the means to purchase such items. It should again be reiterated that this analysis is based on a relatively limited sample of the site. Other refuse deposits or occupation layers may shed a different light on daily lifeways.

Items relating specifically to the prosecution of the fishery are rare, and this seems to reflect the different labour roles played by the inhabitants of this site. The faunal
Evidence certainly demonstrates the consumption of large amounts of fish (much of it fresh), but the equipment needed to catch it is relatively absent from the sampled deposits. Whether or not this observation has any significance in terms of class-based patterning is, however, merely conjectural at present. Other refuse areas, perhaps used in different seasons, may also yield different insights on subsistence patterns.

Excavations demonstrate that a substantial structure was located on the site, possibly of full stone construction. At a time when stone construction was rare in Ferryland and houses were more typically of the two-room timber variety, this represents a significant labour investment and display of status. The structure appears to have followed the standard aspects of Georgian-inspired architecture, including a large number of windows and two gable-end fireplaces. A manufactured landscape consisting of a terraced courtyard, large stone retaining walls, and a stockade wall created an imposing landscape highly visible to the rest of the community. The prominent location of the house on a high plateau facing the rest of the community is also a significant statement. The apparent lack of other concentrated domestic occupation on the Downs suggests that the establishment of a large structure represents a clear choice to break with traditional established settlement patterns.

Ironically, the location of the structure on this prominent, yet isolated and exposed, plateau may have led to its abandonment after an occupation of only 50 years. The later middle-class occupants of the structure may have been partly drawn to it by the prestige of the William Carter association, in addition to the allure of residing in what would have been recognized as a structure befitting members of the Southern Shore
gentry. Combined with the isolation of the Downs, the cost of upkeep associated with a large structure may have been beyond the means of these members of the ascendant middle class. In the absence of an archaeologically-visible cause of abandonment, these interpretations, though conjectural, seem plausible. The transient nature of its occupation resulted in it quickly fading from public memory. While certain aspects, including recurring toponyms, remain in oral history and the documentary record the detailed history of the structure remains elusive and evidently has been for some time. Archaeology provides an avenue to fill in and enhance some of these gaps.

Further excavations at the site would help refine our knowledge of its spatial layout, construction details, and chronology. For instance, the earliest periods of occupation are only hinted at by a handful of discrete deposits and limited discarded refuse. It is quite likely that other deposits such as middens exist on the site which relate to the Carter period. Evidence of other potential occupants of the structure, such as servants or dieters, is also nebulous. Further work may reveal if these individuals resided in the main structure itself or in separate quarters nearby. Other discrete areas of refuse related to such occupants would also provide valuable evidence of their lifeways.

Perhaps most importantly, more work needs to be done in analyzing 19th-century assemblages on the rural Avalon to understand the nuanced lifeways that existed in the area. This analysis has successfully provided a relatively narrow view of an upper middle-class occupation related to aspiring members of Ferryland’s restricted gentry circle. Some aspects of the assemblage conform with observations made by researchers studying contemporary middle-class assemblages elsewhere in the Anglo-American
world, suggesting that these ideologies and accompanying material culture extended into even the most remote parts of the former British Empire. This must be complemented by archaeological studies of other 19th-century occupations in the Ferryland area to better understand class- and ethnic-based variation. For example, did those outside the restricted group of English-descended gentry similarly employ symbols of gentility for their own purposes (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 2001)? On a broader level, archaeological investigations of 19th-century life in Newfoundland are still in relative infancy, echoing Jones’ (2009: 181) sentiments from a decade ago. This is, however, beginning to change with recent work (Jurakic 2008; Jones 2009; Hatcher 2013; Venovcevs 2017). A database of material providing perspectives on different cultural, geographical, and economic situations for this complex period of Newfoundland’s history is thus beginning to form. It is hoped that this research provides one perspective on this fascinating period and may contribute to the globally-connected field of 19th-century historical archaeology.
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## Appendix A: Documentary References to the Downs House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Individual(s)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Henry Sweetland to Ann Sweetland (Carter)</td>
<td>Henry Sweetland will (PROB 11/1215, The National Archives)</td>
<td>“also all my Right and Title in the Dwelling house wherein I now live adjoining to Mr. Robert Carter's Dwelling House”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806-1867</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The American Coast Pilot (Blunt 1827)</td>
<td>“a white house on Ferryland Downs”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822 (TPQ)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>RPA MG 31.73</td>
<td>-Carter House caricature sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undated (probably early 19th century)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>RPA MG 31.74</td>
<td>-Carter House façade sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>William Carter</td>
<td>Smallwood 1978</td>
<td>“William Carter's dwelling at Ferryland was destroyed by fire, together with what most of what were described at the time as its &quot;valuable contents&quot;. Living in the house with him at the time were his wife, his daughter and his sister, Mrs. Morey (née Carter, first hus. Sam Hill, second husband Henry Sweetland, 3rd Matthew Morey Sr.)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5 1836</td>
<td>Ann Coulman (Winser)</td>
<td>Robert Carter III diary (Barnable et al. 2013)</td>
<td>“a light appeared at the House on the Downs last night – on enquiry today found Mrs Hn’y Winser was”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>William Coulman to his daughters (Eleanor Coulman [Jellard], Ann Coulman [Winser], Eliza Coulman [Morry])</td>
<td>SDC V3 F7-8</td>
<td>&quot;the House and Plantation, and all appurtenances thereunto belonging to it situated on the Downs of Ferryland and generally known by the Down’s house&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 1837</td>
<td>William Carter, Gillard</td>
<td>Sheriff Wright map (RPA MG 247, File 1)</td>
<td>&quot;Wm Carters Stone House occupied by Gillard&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-1842, 1844</td>
<td>John Jillard</td>
<td>Ferryland District Voter’s Lists (FDCR 1840-1859)</td>
<td>-specifically refers to the Downs House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>William Sweetland to Elizabeth Carter</td>
<td>SDC V3 F240</td>
<td>&quot; all that lot piece or parcel of land and premises situate and being on the &quot;Downs&quot; in the Harbour of Ferryland aforesaid and now in the occupation of one John Jillard, as tenant thereof bounded on the North East by the Harbour of Ferryland, on the South West by the Road leading to Ferryland Head and on the North West by the property of the late Judge Carter and on the South East by waste land&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Rob’t Hall</td>
<td>Robert Carter III journal (Barnable et al. 2013)</td>
<td>“at work on the Downs”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846, 1847, 1849, 1852</td>
<td>Henry Garlick Clowe</td>
<td>Ferryland District Voter’s Lists (FDCR 1830-1849)</td>
<td>-one entry refers specifically to the Downs House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Elizabeth Carter (Crown grant)</td>
<td>SDC V2 F371</td>
<td>“all that piece and parcel of Land situate and being On the South side of Ferryland aforesaid Known as Downs Farm abuten and bounden as follows that is to say by a Line commencing at a point on the North East side of a public Road leading to the Head and at the south East Angle of land belonging to the estate of the late William Carter thence bounden by the said public Road and following its direction South East Seventeen chains and Eighty two links more or less thence bounden by ungranted and Running by the Magnet in 1847 North Forty eight degrees thirty minutes Two chains and Seventy five links more or less to the shore of Ferryland Harbour thence bounden by the same and following its windings in the North Westerly direction Nineteen chains and fifty links more or less thence South Thirty four degrees west two chains and thirty two links more or less to the place of commencement”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Robert Carter (III) to Sarah Carter</td>
<td>Robert Carter III will (Carter 1853)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“One third part of Down's house &amp; plantation rented to Gov'ment”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>James Carter to William Carter</td>
<td>SDC V4 F336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Also my two third parts or shares in all that piece of land known as the Downs or Sweetland property in Ferryland aforesaid Extending from a field the property of the late Judge Carter to a large rock on the common or Downs bounden on the Upper side by the Public road and on the lower side by the Waters of Ferryland aforesaid”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>James Carter</td>
<td>James Carter will (Carter 1925)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the land known as the ‘Downs’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Howard Morry</td>
<td>Howard Morry Memoirs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“My grandmother also remembered being with her parents to a dance out in a large house on the Downs on the way to the light house on the Harbour side of the road. I could never find out who owned it but they must have been wealthy as there was a ballroom thirty by forty feet. She said all the officers from the ships went there and she could well remember their white stockings and shoes with big silver buckles on then. Dave Sullivan owns this property and it would be interesting to see what a little digging would uncover”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Faunal Reports

Ferryland (CgAf-02) Structure 19 – Report on Faunal Remains
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March, 2018

Methodology

This report provides the results of analysis of a sample of faunal remains (selected by Duncan Williams) recovered from Structure 19 at Ferryland (CgAf-02) from the 2011, 2012, and 2013 field seasons. Analysis of faunal material from Ferryland was conducted using the zooarchaeological reference collection in the Archaeology department at Memorial University of Newfoundland, as well as relevant web-based and print resources (Cannon 1987; Gilbert 1990; Gilbert et al. 1996; Hillson 2005; Perdikaris et al. 2004; v. Busekist 2004; VZAP 2015).

Specimens were first identified to class (mammal, bird, fish, bivalve) on the basis of general skeletal characteristics, such as the thickness of cortical bone and the presence of cancellous (spongy) bone. Specimens were considered identifiable beyond this level only if diagnostic features such as articular surfaces and processes were present, and/or if a significant proportion of the element was represented (an element is defined as the original, complete bone in the body). If an identification could not be made with certainty (for example, if a reference specimen was not available, if the specimen was slightly abnormal, or if not quite enough of the element was present to be fully certain), the specimen record was given a “cf.” label. For all specimens that were identified below class, the taxon (scientific and common name), element, completeness (how much of the original bone is present), portion (which part of the original bone), stage of epiphyseal fusion, and side (left, right, or midline) were also noted where possible. Where possible, mammal specimens unidentifiable below class level were grouped into size classes (see Appendix 1). Small mammals include those smaller than a rabbit/hare. Medium mammals include those between (and including) rabbit/hare and wolf. Large mammals include those larger than a wolf (such as a large pig, or deer). Very large mammals include moose and adult cows, though only some elements in their skeletons can be distinguished from smaller mammals when fragmented.

All identified specimens were examined for evidence of cut marks, gnaw marks, digestion, and burning, all of which can speak to cultural practices and/or the depositional environment (for example, the presence of carnivores). These features were scored by presence/absence, and anatomical locations on the bone of cut or gnaw marks were noted where applicable, in order to aid in reconstruction of butchery or scavenging patterns. When evidence of burning was present, the extent of burning was scored on a scale from 1 to 6, following the recommendations of Costamagno et al. (1999) and Stiner et al. (1995), as overall patterns of burning in the
assemblage can provide insight into cooking, disposal, and site preservation conditions. Extent of weathering, following a modification of the scale presented by Behrensmeyer (1978), was also noted for each specimen (Appendix 2).

Results and Discussion

A total of 767 faunal specimens from Structure 19 at Ferryland (CgAf-02), weighing a combined total of 3682.1 g, were analyzed. A breakdown by class is given in Table 1 (NISP = number of identified specimens, %NISP = percent of total NISP of all taxa). The faunal assemblage as a whole was well-preserved, however due to a high degree of fragmentation and extensive burning within much of the assemblage, the majority (68%) of specimens were unidentifiable below the level of class, and an additional 5% of specimens were unidentifiable to class. The majority of specimens (68%) were identified as mammal, though this number likely reflects differential preservation and recovery methods to some degree; fish (24%) and bird (1.5%) remains are likely under-represented. Bivalves (unidentified clam, mussel, or cockle shells) made up 5.7% of the assemblage. A breakdown of vertebrate specimens by taxon is given in Table 2.

Table 1: Structure 19, Ferryland (CgAf-02) faunal remains by Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>%NISP</th>
<th>(NISP)</th>
<th>%Mass</th>
<th>(Mass[g])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bivalve</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>(519)</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>(3576.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>(189)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>(81.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(767)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(3682.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Vertebrate taxa identified in the Structure 19, Ferryland (CgAf-02) faunal assemblage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>%NISP</th>
<th>(NISP)</th>
<th>MNI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>Indeterminate mammal</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>(390)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyla</td>
<td>Even-toed ungulate</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>Domestic pig</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecora</td>
<td>Even-toed ungulate (except pig)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovidae</td>
<td>Cow/sheep/goat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>Domestic cow</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprinae</td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivora</td>
<td>Carnivore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canidae</td>
<td>Dog/wolf/fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canis lupus</td>
<td>Dog/wolf</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocidae</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagophilus</td>
<td>Harp seal</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodentia</td>
<td>Rodent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattus sp.</td>
<td>Rat</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MAMMAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>71.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>(519)</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>Indeterminate bird</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcini</td>
<td>Auk/razorbill/murre</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatidae</td>
<td>Duck/goose/swan</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laridae</td>
<td>Gull/tern</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BIRD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>(10)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Indeterminate fish</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadidae</td>
<td>Cod family</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadus morhua</td>
<td>Atlantic cod</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FISH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>(189)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>(724)</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identified mammal remains are largely from domesticated animals (primarily pig, cow, and sheep/goat), as well as harp seal, and the remains of what is likely a single domestic dog. Identified bird remains are from common, locally available wild species. Finally, identified fish remains are comprised exclusively of cod, likely from the commercial fishery. These results are further broken down by feature below (Table 3).

The minimum number of individual animals (MNI) that might have contributed to the assemblage was calculated for each useful taxon, based on the frequency of the most numerous sided element, after mends or potential mends (i.e. a specimen identified as the proximal end of a humerus may have originally mended a specimen identified as the distal end of a same-sided humerus, and the two specimen together would therefore count as one individual). However, given that recovered assemblages are almost never complete, and that complete skeletons are
rarely deposited, MNI can be misleading, and should not be taken as the true frequency of various taxa in the diet. As the three contexts analysed here are thought to be closely related, MNI was calculated based on the assemblage as a whole.

Identified mammal remains are predominantly those of domesticates – primarily pig, followed by cow and sheep/goat (though cow was likely more important to the diet than their lower numbers suggest – given their size, boneless or heavily butchered cuts of beef, with low archaeological visibility, may have been brought into the household). It should be noted that the majority of the identified pig remains were teeth, and it is these from which the MNI for pigs was derived. It is not known at this point whether this indicates the presence of salt or fresh pork, as head portions are present in both. However, the predominance of head parts, and the absence of ribs and vertebrae, suggest that pork was entering the household as butchered cuts (either fresh or cured), and not whole. Since the Structure 19 assemblage was not analysed in its entirety, this pattern of body part representation may shift with further analysis. As demonstrated by Guiry et al. (2012), both imported barrelled salt pork and locally-raised pork were available at Ferryland (at least in the 17th century). There has historically been little standardization that would conclusively bias the assemblage in favour of a select few elements (see Guiry et al. 2012 for a discussion), and butchery techniques are similar for both fresh pork and pork to be cured. Salt pork is recorded frequently in historic records, and salt beef is not unknown (though it is less common). Although recipes and records do exist for salt mutton/lamb/goat elsewhere, these meats do not lend themselves as well to salt preservation (Bowen 1993), and were more likely kept live on site or nearby and consumed fresh. Documentary records and other faunal analyses from Ferryland do suggest rearing of livestock – perhaps even on a large scale – though the practice does not appear to always have been a stable one (see Hodgetts 2006 for a summary of 17th century accounts). Body part representation for both cow and sheep/goat in Structure 19 is more even than for pigs, suggesting the consumption of fresh (or at least local) beef and sheep/goat. Stable isotope analysis (δ¹³C and δ¹⁵N) of the pig remains recovered from Ferryland may provide further evidence for either case (Guiry et al. 2012). Interestingly, no caribou remains (or other wild, terrestrial mammal) were identified in the samples identified here, though they are common in other contexts at the site (Hodgetts 2006). Whether this reflects household preferences, game availability, or scheduling conflicts is not yet known.

The identified bird remains from the Carter House hearth midden suggest consumption of opportunistically-hunted sea birds, with little or no input from domestic bird species. Fish remains consisted exclusively of cod-family fish. Not all elements within the cod skeleton are diagnostic to the level of species, and other cod-family fish – such as haddock and pollock – exist in the area, and so many elements are identified as “Gadidae”. However, no specimens were identified as these other species, and so it can safely be assumed that at least the majority of the Gadids are likely to be the only positively identified Gadid species – Atlantic cod.
Table 3: Vertebrate taxa identified in the Structure 19, Ferryland (CgAf-02) faunal assemblage, by feature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Structure interior</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Root cellar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%NISP</td>
<td>(NISP)</td>
<td>%NISP</td>
<td>(NISP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>(266)</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>(110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even-toed</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ungulate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>Domestic pig</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecora</td>
<td>Even-toed ungulate, except pig</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovidae</td>
<td>Cow/sheep/goat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>Domestic cow</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprinae</td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivora</td>
<td>Carnivore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canidae</td>
<td>Dog/wolf/fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canis lupus</td>
<td>Dog/wolf</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocidae</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagophilus</td>
<td>Harp seal</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groenlandicus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodentia</td>
<td>Rodent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattus sp.</td>
<td>Rat</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MAMMAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>(354)</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>(147)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>Indeterminate bird</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatidae</td>
<td>Duck/goose/swan</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laridae</td>
<td>Gull/tern</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcini</td>
<td>Auk/razorbill/murre</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BIRD</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>(9)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadidae</td>
<td>Cod family</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadus morhua</td>
<td>Atlantic cod</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FISH</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>(128)</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>(44)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>(496)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>(193)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The faunal assemblages from all three contexts examined here (the interior of Structure 19, the well associated with Structure 19, and a root cellar associated with Structure 19) are similar to one another, with the exception of a higher proportion of fish remains in the root cellar (though the small size of this assemblage may be misleading in this respect). Additionally, the interior of Structure 19 contained fragmentary remains (some of which mend directly) of an adult, medium-sized dog. These remains, as well as others in the Structure 19 interior and those in the root cellar, appear to have been accessible to carnivores (likely dogs and/or foxes), as they display a relatively average incidence of carnivore gnawing, as compared to other historic sites (see Table 4, below). Faunal remains recovered from the well feature displayed very low incidence of carnivore gnaw marks, indicating that the well was likely used primarily as a primary disposal area, such that carnivores did not have access to the remains.

Table 4: Presence of carnivore gnawing in the Structure 19, Ferryland (CgAf-02) vertebrate faunal assemblage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Structure interior (n=484)</th>
<th>Well (n=193)</th>
<th>Root cellar (n=35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%NISP</td>
<td>(NISP)</td>
<td>%NISP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canis lupus</td>
<td>22.2 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>28.6 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprinae</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>15.4 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyl</td>
<td>40.0 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>9.8 (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8.9 (43)</td>
<td>0.52 (1)</td>
<td>5.7 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*%NISP within class

Cut marks were identified relatively frequently within the Structure 19 assemblage, and particularly in the structure interior (where preservation is best). Though overall numbers of remains with evidence of cut marks are too low to definitively reconstruct butchery patterns, cut marks observed within the assemblages from Structure 19 are consistent with common butchery practices that produce bone-in cuts of meat (though boneless cuts may also have been consumed). Cut marks on identifiable remains occur only on “food” species, and though they are rare or not identified on fish and bird remains, this is likely due, to some extent, to the obscuring of cut marks by weather (see Table 7).
Table 5: Presence of cut marks on vertebrate taxa in the Structure 19, Ferryland (CgAf-02) faunal assemblage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Structure interior (n=484)</th>
<th>Well (n=193)</th>
<th>Root cellar (n=35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%NISP</td>
<td>(NISP)</td>
<td>%NISP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadidae</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecora</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprinae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyl</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*%NISP are within taxon (Gadus morhua subsumed under Gadidae)

Incidence of burning in the Structure 19 assemblages ranged from 3% of specimens (in the root cellar) to 9% (in the structure interior) (see Table 6). Of these, in all three contexts, all or nearly all burned specimens were calcined (burning extent 6), which is indicative of direct exposure to high temperatures (over 500 °C) over period of several hours (Lyman 1994:386-389), either from use of bones as fuel, intentional disposal by burning, or accidental or post-depositional fire exposure. The lower incidence of burning observed within the root cellar may be a result of higher proportion of fish remains, which are less likely to survive heat damage than more robust mammal bones. The assemblages of mammal remains consistently displayed a higher incidence of burning than other classes. Fish remains either did not survive being burned, or were not burned as often (possibly due to the odour they produce when this is done). Generally, burning (beyond burning extent 2) results in bone deformation and fragmentation, such that modifications (cut and gnaw marks) cannot be easily observed, and taxonomic identification is rendered difficult, and sometimes unreliable.

Within the structure interior, the majority (55%) of specimens exhibited weathering to the 1st and 2nd stages (see Table 7) (stages are a modified version of those presented by Behrensmeyer, 1978). This is excellent preservation for archaeological assemblages in general, and especially for archaeological sites in Newfoundland, and is an indicator that, overall, taxonomic identification and the identification of bone modifications (cut and gnaw marks) was not hindered by weathering. Within the well, 85% of specimens exhibited weathering to the 2nd or 3rd stage, indicating generally good preservation of faunal remains. While cut and gnaw marks on fish remains may have been somewhat obscured by weathering, identification was largely unhindered. Bird and mammal remains are largely not impacted to any significant degree by weathering. Within the root cellar, 89% of specimens exhibited weathering to the 3rd or 4th stage, indicating preservation of faunal remains verging on poor. Fish and bird remains may have been lost to weathering, and identification of surviving remains of all classes is somewhat hindered. Cut and gnaw marks on all remains may have been obscured by weathering.
Table 6: Evidence of burning in the Structure 19, Ferryland (CgAf-02) faunal assemblage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Structure interior (n=528)</th>
<th>Well (n=193)</th>
<th>Root cellar (n=35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%NISP*</td>
<td>(NISP)</td>
<td>%Mass*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivalve</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*% within Class

Table 7: Extent of weathering in the Ferryland (CgAf-02) faunal assemblage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Weathering</th>
<th>Structure interior</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Root cellar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%NISP</td>
<td>(NISP)</td>
<td>%Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>(270)</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>(207)</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(528)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The faunal remains recovered from Structure 19 at Ferryland to date point towards a heavy reliance on domesticated species (pigs, cows, and sheep/goats), supplemented by locally available fish (probably procured through the commercial cod fishery), shellfish, and opportunistically hunted seals and sea birds. The presence of a partial dog skeleton within the structure interior indicates that domestic dogs were likely kept by some people at the site, though the nature of that relationship is difficult to discern. Further analysis, both zooarchaeological and isotopic, may point to the provenance of the domesticated species present at the site (whether they were reared locally or brought in from elsewhere, as live animals or as preserved cuts of meat). Given the generally good preservation at the site, more can also be learned regarding butchering practices, cooking, disposal, and the different consumption practices across the site once a larger portion of the total site assemblage is analysed in detail.
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Appendix 1

Mammal size classes used for grouping fragmentary remains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size class</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Approx. weight range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small mammal</td>
<td>Mice, rats, voles, shrews, squirrels, chipmunks</td>
<td>&lt; 1kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium mammal</td>
<td>Rabbits/hares, dog/wolves, small seals, beavers</td>
<td>1-50kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large mammal</td>
<td>Deer, medium seals, bears, caribou, pigs</td>
<td>50-400kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large mammal</td>
<td>Moose, cows, whales, very large seals, walrus</td>
<td>&gt; 400kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Weathering</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bone appears fresh. It may be greasy to the touch or have soft tissue attached, but above all, this stage is characterized by a lack of physical or chemical weathering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bone is dry but displays minimal weathering. Very minor cracking or exfoliation of the cortical surface has occurred, but does not impede identification of taxon and modifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bone displays a moderate amount of weathering. This includes shallow surface cracking and minor or localized cortical exfoliation. Identification of taxon and modifications (cut or gnaw marks) is not impeded unless weathering occurs on diagnostic features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bone displays significant weathering. This may include moderate cracking and general exfoliation of the cortical surface, as well as minor mechanical and chemical breakdown by root activity. Identification is more difficult, but often still possible, if only to a higher taxonomic level. Evidence of modification may be lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bone displays heavy weathering. This may include deep and abundant cracks, extreme exfoliation of the cortical surface, mechanical and chemical breakdown by root activity, and/or the loss of cancellous bone. Identification is usually impossible, and evidence of modifications is typically obliterated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bone is falling apart. Characterized by splinters of bone and bone dust. Unidentifiable and uncountable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

This report provides the results of analysis of a sample of faunal remains (selected by Duncan Williams) recovered from Ferryland (CgAf-02) from the 2017 field season. Analysis of faunal material from Ferryland was conducted using the zooarchaeological reference collection in the Archaeology department at Memorial University of Newfoundland, as well as relevant web-based and print resources (Cannon 1987; Gilbert 1990; Gilbert et al. 1996; Hillson 2005; Perdikaris et al. 2004; v. Busekist 2004; VZAP 2015). Specimens were first identified to class (mammal, bird, fish, bivalve) on the basis of general skeletal characteristics, such as the thickness of cortical bone and the presence of cancellous (spongy) bone. Specimens were considered identifiable beyond this level only if diagnostic features such as articular surfaces and processes were present, and/or if a significant proportion of the element was represented (an element is defined as the original, complete bone in the body). If an identification could not be made with certainty (for example, if a reference specimen was not available, if the specimen was slightly abnormal, or if not quite enough of the element was present to be fully certain), the specimen record was given a “cf.” label. For all specimens that were identified below class, the taxon (scientific and common name), element, completeness (how much of the original bone is present), portion (which part of the original bone), stage of epiphyseal fusion, and side (left, right, or midline) were also noted where possible. Where possible, mammal specimens unidentifiable below class level were grouped into size classes (see Appendix 1). Small mammals include those smaller than a rabbit/hare. Medium mammals include those between (and including) rabbit/hare and wolf. Large mammals include those larger than a wolf (such as a large pig, or deer). Very large mammals include moose and adult cows, though only some elements in their skeletons can be distinguished from smaller mammals when fragmented.

All identified specimens were examined for evidence of cut marks, gnaw marks, digestion, and burning, all of which can speak to cultural practices and/or the depositional environment (for example, the presence of carnivores). These features were scored by presence/absence, and anatomical locations on the bone of cut or gnaw marks were noted where applicable, in order to aid in reconstruction of butchery or scavenging patterns. When evidence of burning was present, the extent of burning was scored on a scale from 1 to 6, following the recommendations of Costamagno et al. (1999) and Stiner et al. (1995), as overall patterns of burning in the assemblage can provide insight into cooking, disposal, and site preservation conditions. Extent of weathering, following a modification of the scale presented by Behrensmeyer (1978), was also noted for each specimen (Appendix 2).
Results and Discussion

A total of 5729 faunal specimens from the Carter House at Ferryland (CgAf-02), weighing a combined total of 1107.5 g, were analyzed. A breakdown by class is given in Table 1 (NISP = number of identified specimens, %NISP = percent of total NISP of all taxa). The faunal assemblage as a whole was well-preserved, however due to a high degree of fragmentation within much of the assemblage, the majority (76%) of specimens were unidentifiable below the level of class, and an additional 0.4% of specimens were unidentifiable to class. The majority of specimens (84%) were identified as fish – high for a household archaeological assemblage, reflecting the largely excellent preservation and the use of wet screening with fine mesh (though even without, fish still dominate). Fish and bird remains are likely still somewhat underrepresented. A breakdown of vertebrate specimens by taxon is given in Table 2.

Table 1: Carter House, Ferryland (CgAf-02) faunal remains by Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>%NISP</th>
<th>(NISP)</th>
<th>%Mass*</th>
<th>(Mass[g])*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bivalve</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>(315)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>(86.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinoderm</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>(350)</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>(384.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>(37.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>(4804)</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>(594.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>(4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(5729)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(1108.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* reported masses for small animal remains (bird, fish, bivalve, echinoderm) are highly subject to rounding error (individual identified specimens registering a mass of 0.0g), and are therefore underestimated here.
Table 2: Vertebrate taxa identified in the Carter House, Ferryland (CgAf-02) faunal assemblage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>%NISP</th>
<th>(NISP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>Indeterminate mammal</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>(326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyla</td>
<td>Even-toed ungulate</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>Domestic pig</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovidae</td>
<td>Cow/sheep/goat</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>Domestic cow</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprinae</td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocidae</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodentia</td>
<td>Rodent</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus sp.</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MAMMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>(350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>Indeterminate bird</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>(176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alle alle</td>
<td>Dovekie</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatidae</td>
<td>Duck/goose/swan</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procellariidae</td>
<td>Fulmar/petrel/shearwater</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BIRD</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>(200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Indeterminate fish</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>(3497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clupea harengus</td>
<td>Atlantic herring</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallotus mallotus</td>
<td>Capelin</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadidae</td>
<td>Cod family</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>(887)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadus morhua</td>
<td>Atlantic cod</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>(394)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonidae</td>
<td>Salmon/trout</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squalidae</td>
<td>Dogfish shark</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scorpaeniformes</td>
<td>Sculpin/scorpionfish</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FISH</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>(4804)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(5408)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identified mammal remains are largely domesticated animals, with a single seal specimen, and elements from at least one mouse. Identified bird remains are from common, locally available wild species. Finally, identified fish remains are comprised overwhelmingly of cod, likely from the commercial fishery, but consumed in a domestic context. These results are further broken down by feature and discussed below. Values for %NISP are given within class for remains unidentifiable below class, and within identifiable remains within class for remains identifiable below class, to convey both the identifiability of remains, and the relative importance of each taxon.
Table 3: Vertebrate taxa identified in the Carter House, Ferryland (CgAf-02) faunal assemblage, by feature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Stone wall midden</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Hearth midden</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%NISP (NISP)</td>
<td>MNI</td>
<td>%NISP (NISP)</td>
<td>MNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>Indeterminate mammal</td>
<td>84.4 (27)</td>
<td>94.0 (299)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyla</td>
<td>Even-toed ungulate</td>
<td>40.0 (2)</td>
<td>15.8 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>20.0 (1)</td>
<td>42.1 (8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5 (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprinae</td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>20.0 (1)</td>
<td>21.1 (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivora</td>
<td>Carnivore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocidae</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>20.0 (1)</td>
<td>5.3 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodentia</td>
<td>Rodent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mus sp.</em></td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MAMMAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50.8 (32)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0 (318)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>Indeterminate bird</td>
<td>100.0 (2)</td>
<td>87.9 (174)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Alle alle</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatidae</td>
<td>Duck/goose/swan</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0 (6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procellariidae</td>
<td>Fulmar/petrel/shearwater</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.8 (17)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BIRD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.2 (2)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7 (198)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.3 (14)</td>
<td>72.9 (3483)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Clupea harengus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4 (5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic herring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mallotus mallotus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 (18)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadidae</td>
<td>Cod family</td>
<td>33.3 (5)</td>
<td>68.3 (882)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Gadus morhua</em></td>
<td>66.7 (10)</td>
<td>29.7 (384)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonidae</td>
<td>Salmon/trout</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squalidae</td>
<td>Dogfish shark</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scorpaeniformes</td>
<td>Sculpin/scorpionfish</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FISH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>46.0 (29)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89.4 (4775)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 (33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100 (63)</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100 (5344)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The minimum number of individual animals (MNI) that might have contributed to the assemblage was calculated for each useful taxon, based on the frequency of the most numerous sided element, after mends or potential mends (i.e. a specimen identified as the proximal end of a humerus may have originally mended a specimen identified as the distal end of a same-sided humerus, and the two specimen together would therefore count as one individual). However, given that recovered assemblages are almost never complete, and that complete skeletons are rarely deposited, MNI can be misleading, and should not be taken as the true frequency of various taxa in the diet.

Stone Wall Midden (TT2)

The analysed sample of faunal assemblage from the stone wall midden is small, and consists of mammals (pig, sheep/goat, and seal, one individual each) and fish (at least three cod family fish, at least two of which, and likely all, are Atlantic cod) in roughly equal proportions, with a small contribution from birds.

Hearth Midden (TT3)

The large sample of faunal remains analysed from the midden associated with hearth deposits consists primarily of fish remains, and of these, cod family fish overwhelmingly predominate. Not all elements within the cod skeleton are diagnostic to the level of species, and other cod-family fish – such as haddock and pollock – exist in the area, and so many elements are identified as “Gadidae”. However, no specimens were identified as these other species, and so it can safely be assumed, given the large sample size, that at least the majority of the Gadids are likely to be the only positively identified Gadid species – Atlantic cod. A minimum of 29 individual Gadids were identified in the sample, at least 27 of which are Atlantic cod. These fish were most likely caught in the course of the commercial fishery, and element abundances strongly suggest that fish were being brought to the house whole (gutted, at most), as cranial, pectoral, and vertebral elements are all present in roughly the same proportions in which they occur in the body (allowing for taphonomic effects). The sheer number of cod in the analysed sample indicates they were a household staple. Other identified fish are those that might be used as baitfish, be consumed in their own right, or have been in the stomachs of cod (herring and capelin), by-catch and those that might be caught off the end of a dock (or that might have been in the stomach of a very determined cod - sculpin and the tiny dogfish shark), and those that were likely welcome additions to the diet, and may have been sought off-site (the single salmonid – though there may have been more, as salmonid remains preserve very poorly).
The identified bird remains from the Carter House hearth midden suggest consumption of opportunistically-hunted sea birds, with little or no input from domestic bird species. Identified mammal remains, on the other hand, are exclusively those of domesticates – primarily pig, followed by sheep/goat and cow (though cow was likely more important to the diet than their low numbers suggest – given their size, boneless or heavily butchered cuts of beef, with low archaeological visibility, may have been brought into the household). It should be noted that almost all of the identified pig remains were teeth, likely from two individuals. It is not known at this point whether these indicate the presence of salt or fresh pork, as head portions are present in both. As demonstrated by Guiry et al. (2012), both imported barrelled salt pork and locally-raised pork were available at Ferryland (at least in the 17th century). There has historically been little standardization that would conclusively bias the assemblage in favour of a select few elements (see Guiry et al. 2012 for a discussion), and butchery techniques are similar for both fresh pork and pork to be cured. Salt pork is recorded frequently in historic records, and salt beef is not unknown (though it is less common). Although recipes and records do exist for salt mutton/lamb/goat elsewhere, these meats do not lend themselves as well to salt preservation (Bowen 1993), and were more likely kept live on site or nearby and consumed fresh. Documentary records and other faunal analyses from Ferryland do suggest rearing of livestock – perhaps even on a large scale – though the practice does not appear to always have been a stable one (see Hodgetts 2006 for a summary of 17th century accounts). Stable isotope analysis (δ¹³C and δ¹⁵N) of the pig remains recovered from Ferryland may provide further evidence for either case (Guiry et al. 2012). Interestingly, no caribou remains (or other wild, terrestrial mammal) were identified in the samples identified here, though they are common in other contexts at the site (Hodgetts 2006). Whether this reflects household preferences, game availability, or scheduling conflicts is not yet known.

Table 4: Evidence of burning in the Carter House, Ferryland (CgAf-02) faunal assemblage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Stone wall midden (n=70)</th>
<th>Hearth midden (n=5659)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%NISP *</td>
<td>(NISP )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivalve</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>(128)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 17% of specimens identified in the wall midden, and 7% of specimens in the hearth midden were burned. Of the wall midden burned specimens, all 12 were calcined (burning extent 6), which is indicative of direct exposure to high temperatures (over 500 °C) over period of several hours (Lyman 1994:386-389), either from use of bones as fuel, intentional disposal by burning, or accidental or post-depositional fire exposure. Within the hearth midden, 98% we calcined (burning extent 5 or 6), again indicative, most likely, of disposal of bones by burning, or accidental fire exposure. The low incidence of burning observed within the hearth midden is likely a result of predominance of fish remains, which are less likely to survive heat damage than more robust mammal bones.

The smaller assemblage of mammal remains displayed a high incidence of burning, indicative of intentional disposal in a fire. Fish remains either did not survive being burned, or were not burned as often (possibly due to the odour they produce when this is done). Generally, burning (beyond burning extent 2) results in bone deformation and fragmentation, such that modifications (cut and gnaw marks) cannot be easily observed, and taxonomic identification is rendered difficult, and sometimes unreliable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Weathering</th>
<th>Stone wall midden</th>
<th>Hearth midden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%NISP (NISP)</td>
<td>%Mass (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90 (51)</td>
<td>1.09 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>72.75 (4117)</td>
<td>68.33 (706.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.08 (1476)</td>
<td>30.46 (314.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.27 (15)</td>
<td>0.12 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TOTAL 100 (70)</td>
<td>100 (74.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the wall midden assemblage, 74% of specimens exhibited weathering to the 3rd stage (stages are a modified version of those presented by Behrensmeyer, 1978). This is relatively average for archaeological assemblages in general, and relatively good for archaeological sites in Newfoundland, and is an indicator that, although some bone modifications (cut and gnaw marks) may be obscured, taxonomic identification of mammal remains was largely unaffected by weathering, while fish and bird remains were likely impacted more heavily.
Within the hearth midden, 73% of specimens exhibited weathering to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} stage, indicating generally excellent preservation. This is evidenced by the high proportion of fish remains, and especially by the presence of very small fish, and even lightly ossified cartilaginous fish (the dogfish shark) remains. While cut and gnaw marks on fish remains may have been somewhat obscured by weathering, identification was largely unhindered. Bird and mammal remains are largely not impacted to any significant degree by weathering.
Table 6: Presence of cut marks on vertebrate taxa in the Structure 19, Ferryland (CgAf-02) faunal assemblage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Stone wall midden (n=63)</th>
<th>Hearth midden (n=5344)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%NISP (NISP)</td>
<td>%NISP (NISP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadidae</td>
<td>0.5 (6)</td>
<td>0.6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procellariidae</td>
<td>29.4 (5)</td>
<td>4.3 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>50.0 (1)</td>
<td>1.1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprinae</td>
<td>100.0 (1)</td>
<td>100.0 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate mammal</td>
<td>7.4 (2)</td>
<td>4.3 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate bird</td>
<td>1.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4.8 (3)</td>
<td>0.6 (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*%NISP are within taxon (Gadus morhua subsumed under Gadidae)

4.8% of specimens within the wall midden assemblage, and 0.6% of specimens within the hearth midden assemblage displayed cut marks of some kind (chopping or sawing). The incidence of cut marks within the wall midden assemblage is average for well-preserved historic assemblages, though the very small sample size limits further interpretation. The incidence of cut marks within the heart midden assemblage, by contrast, is very low, and is a direct product of the predominance of fish bones, all but the most robust of which rarely display cut marks. As expected, cut marks were observed predominantly on mammal and bird remains – cut marks occur only rarely on fish remains, which tend to splinter as they are chopped, making the marks less visible. Fish remains also weather more easily than those of birds and mammals, and areas of bone that have been damaged (by cutting or gnawing, see below) are the first to disappear. Of the cod remains displaying cut marks, all were vertebrae, cut through sub-longitudinally, in a manner consistent with (somewhat sloppy) deboning. The sea birds with identified cut marks within the hearth assemblage have been prepared for the table by cutting through the joint just above the un-feathered feet. Identified cut mammal bones consisted mainly of rib sections.

Table 7: Presence of carnivore gnawing in the Structure 19, Ferryland (CgAf-02) vertebrate faunal assemblage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Stone wall midden (n=484)</th>
<th>Hearth midden (n=193)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%NISP (NISP)</td>
<td>%NISP (NISP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadidae</td>
<td>0.3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>50.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprinae</td>
<td>50.0 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate mammal</td>
<td>3.7 (1)</td>
<td>1.3 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate fish</td>
<td>0.03 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*%NISP within class

Carnivore gnaw marks were observed on 1.6% of specimens within the wall midden faunal assemblage, and 0.2% of specimens within the hearth midden. These frequencies are relatively low in comparison to other assemblages (those from Structure 19) at the site, and for assemblages accessible to Canids (domestic dogs, wolves, and foxes) in general. However, the Carter House assemblage, overall, consists predominantly of fish remains, which typically do no survive the effects of carnivore action to display gnaw marks (instead being consumed completely). That carnivore gnaw marks were observed at all suggests that dogs and/or foxes (wolves, though present in Newfoundland at the time, being more leery of human settlement) had at least occasional access to the middens or to animal remains that were later deposited there.

**Summary**

Though other (17th century) contexts at the site show sometimes heavy reliance on wild taxa (particularly caribou) (Hodgetts 2006), no terrestrial wild taxa were identified within the Carter House samples analysed here. Instead, analysed samples from the Carter House show evidence of heave reliance on cod, likely caught in the course of the commercial cod fishery, supplemented by mammal domesticates (pig, cow, and sheep/goat), bivalves (predominantly mussels), and a variety of opportunistically caught sea birds. Further analysis, both zooarchaeological and isotopic, may point to the provenance of the domesticated species present at the site (whether they were reared locally or brought in from elsewhere, as live animals or as preserved cuts of meat). Given the generally good preservation at the site, more can also be learned regarding butchering practices, cooking, disposal, the relative importance of each species, and the variation between households at the site once a larger portion of the total site assemblage is analysed in detail.

**Future Directions**

For the ambitious Master’s student, an osteometric analysis of the cod remains (which exhibit significant size variation) recovered and identified from Ferryland might contribute important insight to our knowledge of their fishing practices, as well as to our knowledge of the cod population through time. Stable isotope analysis of pig remains (following Guiry et al. 2012) will aid in determining the origin (import or local) of pork consumed at the site. In the more distant future, a comparative analysis of consumption patterns between households and establishments at Ferryland might illuminate
differences associated with status or profession. It would be particularly interesting to examine how notions of status (as they concern meat consumption) transferred from Old World to New, given the new circumstances, opportunities, and taxa available to those who emigrated (as suggested by Hodgetts 2006:128).
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Appendix 1

Mammal size classes used for grouping fragmentary remains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size class</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Approx. weight range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small mammal</td>
<td>Mice, rats, voles, shrews, squirrels, chipmunks</td>
<td>&lt; 1kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium mammal</td>
<td>Rabbits/hares, dog/wolves, small seals, beavers</td>
<td>1-50kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large mammal</td>
<td>Deer, medium seals, bears, caribou, pigs</td>
<td>50-400kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large mammal</td>
<td>Moose, cows, whales, very large seals, walrus</td>
<td>&gt; 400kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Weathering</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bone appears fresh. It may be greasy to the touch or have soft tissue attached, but above all, this stage is characterized by a lack of physical or chemical weathering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bone is dry but displays minimal weathering. Very minor cracking or exfoliation of the cortical surface has occurred, but does not impede identification of taxon and modifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bone displays a moderate amount of weathering. This includes shallow surface cracking and minor or localized cortical exfoliation. Identification of taxon and modifications (cut or gnaw marks) is not impeded unless weathering occurs on diagnostic features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bone displays significant weathering. This may include moderate cracking and general exfoliation of the cortical surface, as well as minor mechanical and chemical breakdown by root activity. Identification is more difficult, but often still possible, if only to a higher taxonomic level. Evidence of modification may be lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bone displays heavy weathering. This may include deep and abundant cracks, extreme exfoliation of the cortical surface, mechanical and chemical breakdown by root activity, and/or the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>loss of cancellous bone. Identification is usually impossible, and evidence of modifications is typically obliterated.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Bone is falling apart. Characterized by splinters of bone and bone dust. Unidentifiable and uncountable.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>