

Chapter 7: Interpretations and Conclusions

This public archaeological study concentrated on the northwestern portion (0.39-acre area) of Block 587, Lot 1, a privately-owned property in Woodbridge Township, Middlesex County, New Jersey. The 0.39-acre area is referred to as the Study Area. The study was confined to the north and west sides of the 18th-century Dunham House on the property. The Trinity Episcopal Church of Woodbridge currently owns the parcel and graciously granted access to conduct the studies. The study was undertaken as a research project intended to inform Middlesex County residents of the historical significance of the property, serve as a planning tool for future undertakings on the parcel, and interpret the lifeways of early site residents. The archaeological studies were conducted in 2002 by Monmouth University as a graduate student research project and in 2019 by the Archaeological Society of New Jersey through grant assistance by Middlesex County Office of Arts and History. In 2004, the property was listed in the New Jersey Register and National Register of Historic Places as the Trinity Episcopal Church and is listed under Criteria A, C, and D in the areas of religion, architecture and archaeology. The historic property has a period of significance between ca. 1717 and 1874. Specific significant architect/builders associated with the Trinity Episcopal Church historic property include Richard Upjohn, C. Harrison Condit, and Georg Hogan. The specific dates of significance include ca. 1717, 1858-1861, and 1873-1874. However, based on dendrochronology data, the period of significance should be revised to range from 1709 to 1874.

Given the use of county funding, the 2019 study complied with the New Jersey Register of Historic Places Act. The studies identified and investigated the Dunham House Site (28-Mi-220). The 2002 and 2019 excavations collectively yielded 7,155 artifacts. Of these, 1,147 were recovered during the 2002 Monmouth University excavations and the remaining 6,008 were found during the 2019 ASNJ excavations. The excavations also identified a brick cluster (Feature 1 in EU 4), remains of a 19th-century oval or teardrop-shaped cobble drive (Features 3 and 4 in STP 61), a foundation for a former attached rear addition to the Dunham house (Feature 5 in EU 9), an earlier outbuilding foundation (Feature 6 in EUs 7 and 9) that appears to pre-date Feature 5, and an unsampled, artifact-rich soil stain (Feature 7 in EU 9) within Feature 6.

In addition to the archaeological studies, a dendrochronological study indicates that the first-floor joists in the oldest (patterned brick) section of the Dunham House were cut in the spring of 1709 during the Benjamin and Mary Dunham ownership period. The study also determined that the attic rafters were cut from trees felled in the spring of 1871, which corresponds with the extensive remodeling effort conducted to the house and the construction of a massive rear addition.

A ground penetrating radar (GPR) survey was conducted by EPI in the side yard west of the Dunham House. There, the GPR survey identified a large, buried oval or circular drive. In addition, two anomalies were identified in the front or south lawn of the house that may represent former building locations. While the drive was identified as Features 3 and 4 and consisted of two layers of stone cobbles, the two anomalies identified in the front yard were not archaeologically investigated during this study.

7.1 Prehistoric Site Occupation

Of the 7,155 artifacts recovered, two consist of prehistoric cultural material. The two recovered artifacts include two chert flakes, the product of chipped stone tool manufacture. One flake was recovered from STP 71 and was found in the subsoil. A second chert flake was recovered from STP 23 in the topsoil and was found with historic artifacts. These artifacts indicate that the portion of the Dunham House Site examined was used by Pre-Contact period Native Americans, but the site occupation was extremely limited to chipped stone tool manufacture. Given the extent of excavations north and west of the Dunham House, the recovery of only two prehistoric artifacts strongly suggests the Pre-Contact occupation of the site was ephemeral and of limited function.

7.2 Historic Site Occupation

The historic site occupation is separated into two data sets. The first is the western portion of the Study Area that was owned by Woodbridge Township and used as a Meeting House Green until as late as 1784 or later. The second is the portion of the Study Area that was owned by the Dunham, Van Horne, and Barron families, amongst others and used as a residential property until 1873. Both areas are separately discussed below.

7.2.1 Meeting House Green

From the 1690s into the 1780s, the western half of the Study Area was part of the Meeting House Green. At an indeterminate point after the 1780s, Samuel Barron or one of his heirs acquired the portion of the Meeting House Green within the Study Area. The eastern boundary of the Meeting House Green was situated roughly 40 feet west of the patterned brick Dunham House, and encompassed the area of ASNJ STPs 66-71. Stratigraphy was generally natural in this area and excavated STPs yielded one chert flake and 50 historic artifacts. The historic artifacts include sewer pipe, coal, brick, mammal bone, creamware, redware, whiteware, pearlware, stoneware plastic, oyster shell, and vessel glass fragments. No artifacts with beginning and ending manufacturing dates prior to the late 18th century were recovered, suggesting that the limited quantity of material found post-dates the 1780s. The lack of use of the Meeting House Green prior to 1784 is likely a primary reason for the notably low density of household and architectural refuse found in this area. The presence of one chert flake from an intact subsoil layer in STP 71 also indicates that Pre-Contact period Native Americans used this portion of the Study Area in chipped stone tool manufacturing activities.

No cultural features were identified during STP excavation in this portion of the Study Area.

7.2.2 Dunham House Property

History

Extensive background research, coupled with two archaeological studies determined that prior to the 1870s, the eastern half of the Study Area was owned by the Dunham family (1696-1727), John Van Horne (1727-unknown), the Barron family (as late as 1778-1872), William Peterson (1872-1873), and George Hance (March-December 1873). Sometime after 1784, the Barron family acquired the portion of the Meeting House Green in the Study Area for residential use and as an extension of the western side yard of the house.

It appears that in 1709, Benjamin Dunham, an innkeeper, erected the patterned brick home that stands on the property. Benjamin constructed his dwelling in a way that showcased the ornate sides of the home, i.e., the south and west sides, to face south and west toward the Meeting House Green. This provided visible public exposure of the family's wealth and permanence in the community. Within the home, Benjamin resided with his wife Mary. Benjamin likely operated an inn elsewhere given that he was referenced as an innkeeper in the deed in which he received his father's home lot.

Following Benjamin's death in 1715, Mary continued ownership and likely residence of the house until her sale of the property to wealthy New York City merchant John Van Horne in 1727. Van Horne died in 1735 and no record exists of the property leaving Van Horne family hands. By the 1750s, Samuel Barron resided on the property, possibly as a tenant, based on a 1752 advertisement that describes his residence and the presence of a large brick house, a new barn and kitchen and a good orchard on the parcel. Barron likely acquired the former Dunham and Van Horne tract in the 1750s soon after Barron, a widower, remarried. There, he resided with his new wife Johanna and his children Ellis, Mary, Deborah, Samuel, Jane, John, and Joseph. Samuel Barron was a well-educated, wealthy landowner, who had acquired several farms, operated a nearby tannery, practiced law, and served as a chairman of the Committee of Freeholders. Barron's name is depicted on a 1778 map of the area and his home is illustrated adjacent to the Meeting House Green on a 1784 survey map of the Green. From December 2, 1776 to June 22, 1777, the British Army used the nearby church as a military barracks and it is conceivable that Samuel's property was affected or used. Samuel's political stance regarding the revolution was not recorded. In the 1780s, Samuel owned several horses, numerous cattle and enslaved laborers.

After writing his will in 1796, Samuel Barron died in 1801 and his property with the patterned brick home passed to his son John. An inventory of Samuel's estate in 1801 records a well-stocked household, befitting of a wealthy, landed businessman. His inventory also lists an assortment of farm tools, numerous cows, hogs, sheep and horses, a crop of corn, hay in the "little barn" and four enslaved laborers, including one unnamed wench, an unnamed child, a man named Sharper, and a man named Cornelius. To his son Ellis received two enslaved men named Benjamin and Briston who likely lived on a different farm Ellis occupied.

John and Nancy Barron took control of the family home in 1801, where they resided with their children Samuel, Johanna, and John Ellis (John E.). John operated the property as a farm and also co-owned nearby tan vats with his brother. By 1839, John E. took over control of the property, where he lived until his death in 1848. John's brother, Samuel, soon took over the property and occupied the home with his wife Eliza, and children Eliza, Sarah, Sarah Ann, and Julia and Irish-born Margaret Barron. Several additional domestic servants and laborers lived with the family in 1860. During his tenure, Samuel was a farmer and also served as a Chosen Freeholder. Samuel died in 1870. His will, written in 1869, indicates that he and Eliza lived to the northwest of the Study Area. It is unclear if their removal from the home was due to structural improvements that appear to have been completed by 1871 when a large addition was constructed on the north side of the patterned brick house, the roof height was raised, and the building was extensively remodeled in the gothic revival style. The property was eventually sold to the Woodbridge Trinity Episcopal Church in 1873, which continues to own the parcel and use the home as a rectory.

Dendrochronology and GPR Data

Dendrochronological analysis indicates that patterned brick portion of the Dunham house was erected in 1709 and was remodeled in 1871. A GPR survey conducted in the west yard area revealed the presence of an oval or teardrop-shaped former, 19th-century driveway with an outside diameter of 37 feet east/west and 55 feet north/south. The driveway measured roughly nine feet wide (see Appendix D). The west side of the drive was situated roughly 37 feet from the west side of the patterned brick house. A geophysical anomaly measuring roughly 12 feet by 15 feet in plan may be present in the eastern-central section of the drive that may relate to foundation remains (Feature 6) identified in 2019.

2002 Archaeological Data

Archaeological data from the 2002 Monmouth University research study yielded 1,147 artifacts. The study revealed the presence of dense, but largely temporally mixed cultural deposits in the yard areas west and north of the Dunham house. These mixed deposits are attributed to up-cast artifact-rich soil resulting from soil displacement during the 1871 rear addition construction activities. Monmouth University STPs 2, 3, and 13 encountered a layer of cobbles, roughly one foot below the ground surface, which may represent a historic ground surface or paved driveway that was later designated as Features 3 and 4 by the ASNJ. Shovel test pit 23 encountered what may be an in-filled cellar or other 18th-century feature. Within EUs 4 and 5, north of the house, rich midden deposits were noted. These deposits contained a mixture of 18th- and 19th-century material and appear to have been disturbed and covered over during the building's expansion in the 1870s. The excavations indicated that an artifact-rich site, containing substantial deposits of early colonial material, is present. Recovered early items include window leads from EU 4, none of which were marked. A piece of lead type, a ship carpenter's chisel, and a fragment of possible early kiln furniture were also found in deposits from EU 4. These deposits extended to great depth and were not fully sampled during the 2002 excavations.

2019 Archaeological Data

In 2019, the ASNJ conducted a series of STPs and EUs to target west yard areas. The discussion below details identified cultural features and analysis from specific artifact deposits.

Cultural Features

During these excavations, five cultural features were identified and dense, deep cultural deposits were encountered. Of the cultural features, two distinct, stacked layers of densely packed cobbles separated by a thin soil lens were found in STP 61 and were designated as Features 3 and 4, respectively. These features represent different layers of the oval or teardrop-shaped, buried driveway that formally existed in the west, side yard. Whiteware found in a fill layer below Feature 4 indicates the driveway post-dates 1820. A thin soil lens below Feature 3 contained Rockingham yellowware, indicating Feature 3 post-dates 1830.

Feature 5 was identified in EU 9 and consisted of a dry-laid stone foundation. The northwest corner of the foundation was exposed. Feature 5 represents the foundation of a rear addition to the patterned brick dwelling, extending roughly 12.5 feet north of the dwelling's north wall. Feature 5 and the rear addition appear to have been removed in 1871 when the current rear addition to the patterned brick dwelling was constructed. The function of the Feature 5 addition is unclear, but it may represent a service or kitchen wing similar to that of the ca. 1680 stone Conference House (also known as the Billop House) in Tottenville, Richmond County, New York, which contains an 18th-century attached frame kitchen wing over a stone foundation (Figure 7.1).

Feature 6 represented a deeply buried north/south oriented mortared, platy stone foundation. Feature 6 was encountered in STPs 50 and 57 and in EUs 7 and 9 roughly 3.3 feet below ground surface. Based on a poorly-defined geophysical anomaly (see Appendix D), the building representing Feature 6 may have extended roughly 13 feet west of STPs 50 and 57 and measured approximately 17 feet north/south from the northwest corner of the patterned brick dwelling. The orientation of Feature 6 is unclear and it is uncertain if the portions of the feature found in EUs 8 and 9 represent the same wall or two perpendicular walls. Feature 6 may have served as an out building and appears to have been removed by the late 18th century. The construction date of the building is unclear. It may have been built at the same time as the Dunham house or may represent a structure built before 1709. This feature appears to have extended below and pre-dated Feature 5. Overlying fill is largely composed of material with beginning manufacture dates extending into the late 18th century. Extensive rodent bioturbation; however, has resulted in the introduction of later artifacts into the fills immediately above Feature 6. The removal of the outbuilding may have been an attempt to modernize the property.

Feature 7 was identified at the base of EU 9 and was not excavated due to time constraints. This feature was covered in plastic sheeting and covered. Feature 7 may represent interior crawlspace fill within the Feature 6 building footprint.



Figure 7.1: View of the Conference House (Billog House), Hylan Boulevard, Tottenville, Richmond County, New York, showing the ca. 1680 stone dwelling and a later rear service addition (HABS NY, 43-TOTVI, 1--3) (HABS nd).

Artifact Deposits

Tables 6.2, 6.3, and 6.5 detail identified artifact deposits found during EU excavation. Fill 1 and Levels 3-4 of Fill 2 in EU 8 contain a temporally mixed deposit of 18th- to 20th-century artifacts. Many deposits represent 1871 demolition fill from the removal of the Feature 5 building and alterations to the dwelling, along with redeposited soils up-cast during 1871 crawlspace excavations. These were present as the O-horizon and Fills 1 and 1A in EU 7 and as the O horizon, and Fills 1, 1A, 2, and 3 in EU 9. A notable artifact found in Fill 2 of EU 9 includes a circular glass wax stamp seal. The item was likely affixed to a ring or handle and was used to impress a mark in wax on documents. The stamp contains an open hand below a sun casting down rays of light and is flanked to the left by a child figure and an adult figure and to the right by two adult figures. The figures are displayed in a Classical style over a line and scroll. It is unclear to whom the item belonged, but based on the design, it may date from the late 18th or early 19th century when neo-classical motifs were in vogue. Fills 4 and 5 in EU 7 Fills 4 and 5 in EU 9 appear to date to the John Barron (1801-1839), John E. Barron (1839-1848) and Samuel Barron (1848-1870) occupation, but certainly contain mid- to late 18th-century artifacts as well.

Fills deposited during the early 19th century that contain a mix of 18th to early 19th-century artifacts were identified in Fills 5A, 6, 7, and 8 in EU 7 and Fill 6 within EU 9 above Feature 6. These fills were likely redeposited to fill the footprint of the Feature 6 building and primarily consist of 18th-century artifacts. Collectively, these deposits yielded 635 historic artifacts.

Intact deposits dating from the late 18th century associated with Samuel Barron's occupation and a possible house cleaning episode following Samuel's 1801 death were identified in Levels 5 to 7 of Fill 2 and Fill 3 in EU 8. Table 6.4 details those artifacts from Levels 5 to 7 in EU 8 and a minimal vessel count for ceramic and glass artifacts from these levels and Fill 3 from the same EU is detailed in Appendix J. Architecture items (n=93) consist of brick, wrought and machine cut nails, window glass and mortar.

Food remains (n=198) are composed of oyster and clam shell, bird, chicken, fish, hoofed animals, sheep or goat, cow and pig bones. Zooarchaeologist Adam Heinrich indicates that the faunal assemblage appears to reflect the documentary record in regards to proportions of animals on site and husbandry practices in regards to ages at which animals were slaughtered due to meat or labor intentions (see Appendix K). High proportions of beef and mutton, which were possibly boiled, reflect a traditional English cuisine. Miscellaneous items include a British soldier's ice cleat or creeper, likely used when the British occupied the area in 1776 and 1777, an 1840s ceramic button, a knife, one fragment of coal ash, a metal bracket, one 19th-century porcelain marble, and 10 clay tobacco pipe fragments.

The remainder consist of 346 domestic artifacts, including 59 glass and 287 ceramic vessel fragments. Recovered glasswares are mainly comprised of round bottle fragments, as well as medicine bottles, case bottles and stemware. The ceramics, presented in order by frequency, include: earthenware (n=1), North Devon gravel free (n=1), brown bodied stoneware (n=1), Buckley-like (n=1), white granite (n=1), buff bodied earthenware (n=2), jackfield (n=2), white earthenware (n=2), tortoiseware (n=3), porcelain (n=5), pearlware (n=5), manganese mottled (n=6), white salt glazed stoneware (n=15), whiteware (n=17), North Midlands (n=23), tin glazed (n=23), gray and buff bodied stoneware (n=27), creamware (n=39), and redware (n=113). While not based a minimum vessel count, the data from ware type fragment counts reveals a heavy reliance on redwares, likely in food preparation and storage activities, for which stoneware was also used in smaller quantities. The families also used a moderate quantity of white salt glazed stoneware, North Midlands coarse buff earthenware, tin glazed earthenware, and to a higher extent creamware to set their dining table and from which to drink tea and punch. Of the North Midlands ceramics recovered several fragments of a single, highly decorated, relief molded charger or dish were found that dates from the late 17th to early 18th century (see Figure 6.10). Curiously, tortoiseware (1750s-1770s), Jackfield (1740-1800) porcelain, and pearlware (1775-1840s) were found in notably low numbers. With the exception of the pearlware, the other listed material represents teawares. Teawares are also represented by some creamware and some white salt glazed stoneware fragments. It is possible that the deposits in this portion of the yard better reflect that of a working kitchen and that other household refuse, including dining and tea equipment, was discarded elsewhere during the 18th century. Few items were

recovered with manufacturing dates beginning in the 19th century. These include whiteware and ironstone vessel fragments, along with machine cut nails.

Artifact deposits recovered from Levels 5-7 of Fill 2 and Level 8 of Fill 3 in EU 8 are largely detailed in Table 6.4. These deposits appear to represent material discarded from either a household cleaning episode following Samuel Barron's death and also date to the period of the Samuel Barron occupation, which spanned from at least 1752-1801. A breakdown of ceramics is provided in Appendix J and in Tables 7.1-7.6. In total, nine glass vessels are represented, including one vase, five case bottles, one round bottle, one stemware, and one indeterminate vessel form.

Table 7.1: Ceramic Vessels from EU 8 Levels 5-8 (Coarse Earthenware).

Ceramic Type/ Vessel Form	Teaware	Large Bowl	Small Bowl	Dish/Charger	Mug or Jar	Pot	Pan	Milk Pan	Large Pan or Bowl	Chamber Pot or Jug	Drinking Cup	Jug	Chamber Pot	Hollowware	Indeterminate	Total
Total	1	1	3	4	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	28
Buckley Type																(1)
Plain															1	1
Manganese Mottled																(1)
Plain															1	1
Midlands Purple																(1)
Plain					1											1
North Midlands																(2)
Black Dot Slip											1					1
Black Slip														1		1
Red Earthenware																(23)
Plain Lead Glazed			2				3	1		1		2	1	2	2	14
Black Glazed						1			1							2
Copper Oxide Decoration		1														1
Lead Glazed with White Slip			1	3												4
Lead Glazed with White Slip and Copper Oxide				1												1
Engine Turned	1															1

Table 7.2: Ceramic Vessels from EU 8 Levels 5-8 (Refined Earthenware, Stoneware, and Porcelain)

Ceramic Type/ Vessel Form	Teapot/Lid	Saucer	Tea Bowl	Teaware	Cup, Bowl or Creamer	Plate or Saucer	Cup	Small Bowl	Plate	Mug	Tableware	Jug	Tankard or Mug	Punch Bowl	Hollowware	Indeterminate	Total
Total	5	11	3	1	1	6	3	1	5	2	1	1	1	2	10	5	58
Creamware																	(20)
Plain	2						1	1								2	6
Melon	1																1
Beaded or Diamond					1				1								2
Scalloped		1															1
Feather Edge						1			1								2
Royal Pattern		1				5			2								8
Flow Blue																	(1)
Transfer Printed															1		1
Jackfield																	(1)
Plain	1																1
Nottingham Stoneware																	(1)
Plain										1							1
Pearlware																	(8)
Blue Transfer Printed		1															1
Polychrome Painted							1										1
China Glaze		1															1
Neo-Classical Painted							1										1
Blue Painted				1												1	2
Annular															1		1
Mocha										1							1
Porcelain																	(9)
Plain		1															1
Blue Painted		4	1														5
Enameled		2	1														3
Red Stoneware																	(1)
Engine Turned	1																1
Stoneware																	(7)
Plain															4		4
Blue Painted												1			2		3
Tin Glazed Earthenware																	(4)
Plain														1	2		3
Blue Painted														1			1
White Earthenware																	(1)
Negative Blue Printed																1	1
White Salt Glazed Stoneware																	(3)
Plain			1														1
Dot, Daiper and Basket								1									1
Debased Scratch Blue													1				1
Whiteware																	(2)
Blue Printed											1						1
Black Printed																1	1

Table 7.3: Ceramic Vessels from Chesapeake, Delaware Valley, New York, and Central New Jersey Sites.

Functional Group/ Vessel Form	Oxon Hill* ¹	Kingsmill Quarter* ²	Bray Site* ³	Benj. Wynn* ⁴	McKean/Cochran* ⁵	Charles Robinson* ⁶	Thomas Dawson** ⁷	William Strickland** ⁸	Michael Katz Privy ⁹	Wilson Tract Site ¹⁰	Seabrook/Wilson ¹¹	Foundation Site-Early Period ¹²	Foundation Site- Forman ¹²	Foundation Site- Mixed Contexts ¹²	Sites Farmstead-1 st Occupation ¹³	Sites Farmstead-2 nd Occupation ¹³	William Forman ¹⁴	Dunham Site (EU 8 Level 5-8)
Teawares																		
Cup	1	20	13	32	13	58	34	19	7	45	3	1	5	26	17	23	20	3
Saucer		10		32	19	52	24	10	8	53	1			18	8	23	17	11
Muffin										1								
Mug										1								
Teapot (Lid)		5		9	1	46	9	3	5	9	2		2	10 (6)	5	3	6	4 (1)
Coffee Pot									1			1						
Sugar/ Creamer																		
Cream Jug										1								
Misc.		1					5	1	1	2		2	1	7	1	2	5	3
Tablewares																		
Plate	3	29	15	25	2	36	3	26	7	38	5		1	37	3	12	18	5
Saucer								24		3								
Plate/Saucer																		6
Soup Plate																		
Dish or Muffin		9	1						1					4	1			
Bowl	17	26	26	19	12	27	19		1	88	16	1	5	36	8	12	19	4
Pitcher				1		6								2				
Porringer		3	1	3	10		9	4	2	18		2	1	5	3	2	5	
Tureen																		
Platter		2		3	2	4		3		1				1			1	
Sauceboat		1							1					1				
Mustard										2								
Condiment Dish		1																
Baker										1								
Salt		1																
Misc.		1		2	8	1	8				2			11		2	11	1
Non-Tea Drinking Wares																		
Mug	1	18	15	6	7	8	17	41	1	4	2	1		3	11	6	2	3
Tankard												2		4			2	
Cup								10										1

Table 7.3; cont.

Functional Group/ Vessel Form	Oxon Hill*1	Kingsmill Quarter*2	Bray Site*3	Benj. Wynn*4	McKean/Cochran*5	Charles Robinson*6	Thomas Dawson**7	William Strickland*8	Michael Katz Privy ⁹	Wilson Tract Site ¹⁰	Seabrook/Wilson ¹¹	Foundation Site-Early Period ¹²	Foundation Site- Forman ¹²	Foundation Site- Mixed Contexts ¹²	Sites Farmstead1 st Occupation ¹³	Sites Farmstead2 nd Occupation ¹³	William Forman ¹⁴	Dunham Site (EU 8 Level 5-8
Bottle		1	2															
Punch Bowl		5								1				6	9			
Posset Pot												1		2				
Misc.					16													
Storage																		
Jar	4	9	8	11	10	34	9	4	1	29		1		1				
Pot								13					2	5	1		5	
Bottle							1			4								
Syrup Jug														1				
Butter Pot																		
Food Preparation																		
Milk Pan	3			6	15	5	17	23	1	7			2	18			2	1
Pipkin		5			1					1				2				
Basin										1		1		1			1	
Colander					1													
Cooking Pot		1	1												2	2		1
Butter Churn											1							
Patty Pan		1	5															
Pudding Pan										1								
Multi-function																		
Dish/Charger				26	10	91	11	8		56	8	4	3	34	8	9	18	4
Pan		8	12	17	12	90	9		1	27	1			9	2	3	7	3
Jug			5	6	5	9	6			5	3			6	1	1	10	3
Pitcher									1							1	1	
Bowl				21	2	54	2	15	3	1	2			12	2		4	2
Misc.					2				1							2		
Hygiene																		
Chamber Pot		11	6	1	3	6	2	9	4	8	2		1	4	1	1	6	1
Ointment Pot		9			1			4										
Drug Jar								1										

Table 7.3; cont.

Functional Group/ Vessel Form	Oxon Hill* ¹	Kingsmill Quarter* ²	Bray Site* ³	Benj. Wynn* ⁴	McKean/Cochran* ⁵	Charles Robinson* ⁶	Thomas Dawson** ⁷	William Strickland* ⁸	Michael Katz Privy* ⁹	Wilson Tract Site* ¹⁰	Seabrook/Wilson* ¹¹	Foundation Site-Early Period* ¹²	Foundation Site- Forman* ¹²	Foundation Site- Mixed Contexts* ¹²	Sites Farmstead* ^{1st} Occupation* ¹³	Sites Farmstead* ^{2nd} Occupation* ¹³	William Forman* ¹⁴	Dunham Site (EU 8 Level 5-8)
Basin									2									
Other																		
Toy																		
Candlestick								1										
Ink Well																	1	
Flower Pot									1									
Unidentifiable																		
Hollowware		80	5	8			223	20		23	3	3	1	26	11	7	26	13
Flat			1															
Unidentified	11		3								18			4	3	2		9
Total	40	186	119	229	152	528	405	237	51	431	68	20	24	302	97	113	187	86

*Information from Chesapeake and Delaware Valley sites from Bedell et al. (1999).

** Information from Bedell et al. (2002).

¹Oxon Hill Site, Feature 5000 (1750-1800) and Well Stratum A (1750-1840), Plantation work area, Prince Georges County, Maryland (Garrow and Wheaton 1986); ²Kingsmill Quarter Site, Slave Quarter, (1780-1800), James City County, Virginia (Kelso 1984); ³Bray Site, Plantation (1720-1750), James City County, Maryland (Kelso 1984); ⁴Wynn Site, Tenant Farm (1765-1822), Kent County, Delaware (Gretler et al. 1996); ⁵McKean/Cochran Farm Site, Tenant Farm (1750-1800), New Castle County, Delaware (Bedell et al. 1999); ⁶Charles Robinson Site, Farmstead (1720-1776), New Castle County, Delaware (Thomas et al. 1994); ⁷Thomas Dawson Site, Farmstead (1740-1780), Kent County, Delaware (Bedell et al. 2002); ⁸William Strickland Site, Farmstead (1726-1740), Kent County, Delaware (Catts et al. 1995); ⁹Michael Kantz Privy (Feature 19), Urban House Site (1777-1806), Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania (Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. 1997:V-48, V-51); ¹⁰Wilson Tract Site 1780-1820, Chester County, Pennsylvania (Affleck, et. al., 2004); ¹¹Seabrook/Wilson House Site, Farmstead (1775-1820), Monmouth County, New Jersey (Gall et. al. 2006); ¹²Foundation Site, Farmstead (ca. 1768-1786), Monmouth County, New Jersey (Gall et al. 2008); ¹³Sites Family occupation at the Sites Farmstead and Prehistoric Site (1720s/1740s-1760s and 1760s-1825), Union County, New Jersey (Gall et al. 2011); ¹⁴William Forman occupation at the Manalapan Village House Site, Farmstead (1776-1800), Monmouth County, New Jersey (Gall et al. 2007).

Blank cells have a value of zero.

Table 7.4: Vessels Identified at the Site by General Ware Type.

Occupation	Date	% Coarse Earthenware	% Coarse Stoneware*	% Refined Ware**	% Porcelain	Total Ceramic Vessel Number	% Glass of All Vessels	Total Glass Vessel Number
Dunham House (EU 8 Levels 5-8)	1750s-1801	32.5	9.3	47.7	10.5	86	9.5	9
Stites Farmstead and Prehistoric Site (1 st) ¹	1720s/1740s-1760s	34.7	9.5	48.4	7.4	95	12.84	14
Stites Farmstead and Prehistoric Site (Benjamin/Isaiah Stites) ¹	1760s-1825	25.5	4.7	64.1	5.7	106	15.2	19
Manalapan Village House Site (Out Kitchen) ²	1800	35.8	7.4	44.4	12.3	81	12.9	12

*Excludes Jackfield, Red Stoneware, and White Salt Glazed Stoneware

**Includes Jackfield, White Salt Galzed Stoneware, Red Stoneware, Tin Glazed

¹Stites Family occupation at the Stites Farmstead and Prehistoric Site (1720s/1740s-1760s and 1760s-1825), Union County, New Jersey (Gall et al. 2011)

Table 7.5: Percentage of Coarse Redware and Buff Earthenware Vessels in the EU 8, Levels 5-8 Assemblage and Contemporary New Jersey Assemblages.

Site	Period	Location	Coarse Redware	% of Assemblage	Coarse Buff Earthenware	% of Assemblage
Dunham House (EU 8 Levels 5-8)	1750s-1801	Piedmont, New Jersey	23	27%	4	5%
Sites Farmstead and Prehistoric Site ¹	1720s/ 1740s- 1760s	Piedmont, New Jersey	6	6%	21	22%
Sites Farmstead and Prehistoric Site ¹	1760s-1825	Piedmont, New Jersey	18	17%	7	7%
Hart Farmstead Site ²	1732-1768	Piedmont, New Jersey	15	48%	2	6%
Hart Farmstead Site ²	1768-1814	Piedmont, New Jersey	41	41%	2	2%
Manalapan Village House Site ³	1776-1800	Coastal Plain, New Jersey	75	40%	15	8%
Manalapan Village House Site (Out Kitchen Assemblage) ³	1800	Coastal Plain, New Jersey	25	31%	4	5%
Foundation Site ⁴	1733-1768	Coastal Plain, New Jersey	2	10%	9	45%
Foundation Site ⁴	1768-1787	Coastal Plain, New Jersey	13	54%	1	4%

¹Gall et al. 2011; ²Gall et al. 2010; ³Gall et al. 2007; ⁴Gall et al. 2008

Table 7.6: Percentage of ware types in the Chesapeake, Delaware Valley, New York, and Central New Jersey.

Site	Region/Locale	Date	Type	Coarse Earthenware	Coarse Stoneware	Refined Wares	Porcelain	Total # of Vessels
Oxon Hill ¹	Chesapeake	1750-1800	Plantation	18.9%	10.8%	56.8%	13.5%	40
Kingsmill Quarter ²	Chesapeake	1780-1800	Slave Quarter	6.2%	8.4%	64.4%	21.0%	186
Benj. Wynn ³	Lower Delaware Valley	1765-1822	Tenant Farm	45.4%	0.5%	53.7%	0.5%	229
McKean/ Cochran ⁴	Lower Delaware Valley	1750-1800	Tenant Farm	52.5%	0%	37%	11%	152
474 and 476 Pearl Street, Feat. AF, ASII ⁵	New York City	Late 1780s-1812	Urban Baker House	12%	4%	71%	13%	127
Michael Katz Privy ⁶	Lower Delaware Valley	1777-1806	Urban Row House	27%	2%	65%	6%	51
Wilson Tract Site ⁷	Lower Delaware Valley	1780-1820	Cottager	50%	2%	44%	4%	431
Hart Farmstead ⁸	Delaware Valley	1732-1768	Farmer	57%	3%	40%	0%	30
Hart Farmstead ⁸	Delaware Valley	1768-1814	Farmer, Miller	43.4%	3%	52.5%	1%	99
Seabrook/ Wilson ⁹	Monmouth County	1775-1820	Farmstead	48%	25%	26%	1%	68
Ephraim Allen, Jr. ¹⁰	Monmouth County	1740-1780	Farmstead	46%	18%	32%	4%	278
Foundation Site- Hankinson ¹¹	Monmouth County	Ca. 1733-1751	Farmstead	55%	25%	20%	0%	20
Foundation Site- Mixed Assemblage ¹¹	Monmouth County	Ca. 1733-1790s	Farmstead	44.7%	8.3%	41.7%	5.3%	302
William Forman ¹²	Monmouth County	1776-1800	Farmstead	48%	13%	29%	10%	187
William Forman Out Kitchen ¹²	Monmouth County	1800	Farmstead-Out Kitchen	35.8%	7.4%	44.4%	12.3%	81
1 st Occupation (Stites Farmstead and Prehistoric Site) ¹³	Union County	1720s/1740s-1760s	Possible Farmstead	34.7%	9.5%	48.4%	7.4%	95
Benjamin/ Isaiah Stites (Stites Farmstead and Prehistoric Site) ¹³	Union County	1760s-1825	Farmstead	25.5%	4.7%	64.1%	5.7%	106
Dunham House (EU 8 Levels 5-8)	Middlesex County	1750s-1801	Farmstead	32.5%	9.3%	47.7%	10.5%	86

*Information from Chesapeake and Delaware Valley sites from Bedell et al. (1999).

¹Oxon Hill Site, Feature 5000 (1750-1800) and Well Stratum A (1750-1840), Plantation work area, Prince Georges County, Maryland (Garrow and Wheaton 1986); ²Kingsmill Quarter Site, Slave Quarter, (1780-1800), James City County, Virginia (Kelso 1984); ³Wynn Site, Tenant Farm (1765-1822), Kent County, Delaware (Gretler et al. 1996); ⁴McKean/Cochran Farm Site, Tenant Farm (1750-1800), New Castle County, Delaware (Bedell et al. 1999); ⁵474 and 476 Pearl Street, Lot 7 and 8, Feature AF, ASII, Artisan Baker (Late 1780s-1812) (John Milner Associates, Inc. 2000:A-50); ⁶Michael Kantz Privy (Feature 19), Urban House Site (1777-1806), Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania (Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. 1997:V-48, V-51); ⁷Wilson Tract Site 1780-1820, Chester County, Pennsylvania (Affleck et al. 2004); ⁸Amos Moore Occupation of the Hart Farmstead Site (1768-1814), Mercer County, New Jersey; ⁹Seabrook/Wilson House Site, Farmstead (1775-1820), Monmouth County, New Jersey (Gall et al. 2006); ¹⁰Ephraim Allen, Jr., Farmstead (1740-1780) (MAAR Associates, Inc. 1988); ¹¹Foundation Site, Farmstead (ca. 1768-1786), Monmouth County, New Jersey (Gall et al. 2008); ¹²William Forman occupation at the Manalapan Village House Site, Farmstead (1776-1800), Monmouth County, New Jersey (Gall et al. 2007); ¹³Stites Family occupation at the Stites Farmstead and Prehistoric Site (1720s/1740s-1760s and 1760s-1825), Union County, New Jersey (Gall et al. 2011).

Levels 5-8 in EU 8 reveals that Samuel Barron and his family discarded some of their household ceramics in a portion of the yard northwest of the home. This area was situated just north of a former outbuilding and a possible rear, attached service wing, and the deposits found in Levels 5-8 of EU 8 may be related to activities associated with the outbuilding and service wing addition. Teawares are well represented. These consist of a creamware melon teapot, an engine turned redware teapot, an engine turned red-bodied stoneware teapot, a Jackfield teapot, and a plain creamware teapot and lid (Tables 7.1-7.2). Porcelain saucers and tea bowl fragments were identified, along with white salt glazed stoneware tea bowl, decorated pearlware saucers, and scalloped and royal edge creamware saucers. The teaware assemblage appears to represent mixed pieces. Teaware sets were not identified, though this assemblage is comprised of only four levels in a single EU. In addition to teas, the family appears to have consumed punch from two tin glazed earthenware vessels.

Plates, largely composed of royal and feather edge-decorated creamware, and dishes/chargers of redware are moderately represented and may be individually equal to the number of small bowls found. Several (n=6) vessels that could represent plates or saucers were also found, though the fragments were too small to determine the function. The data suggests that the Barron family appears to have equally engaged in consuming meals as soups, stews and gruels served in bowls, and portioned meals and along with meat, vegetable and fruit-based pies served on chargers/dishes and plates. Similar ratios of small bowls, dishes/chargers, and plates were identified in the 1800 William Forman out kitchen assemblage in Manalapan Township, Monmouth County, New Jersey (Gall et al. 2007).

Other vessel forms include large bowls, mugs, pans, a milk pan, a pot, jugs, cups, chamber pots, and indeterminate hollowware forms (see Tables 7.1-7.2). The presence of pans, large bowls, jugs and a pot, along with indeterminate hollowware forms speak to the proximity of EU 8 to a former kitchen wing or out kitchen. Such vessels would have been essential to food preparation activities and food storage. Such vessels were also well represented in the 1800 out kitchen deposits at the Manalapan Village House site (Gall et al. 2007). The Dunham House deposits also yielded stoneware vessels with watch spring motifs applied in blue cobalt that appear to have been manufactured by the Morgan pottery in Cheesequake, New Jersey between 1775 and 1784. At least one stoneware vessel (vessel 24c) from EU 8 contains Morgan style decoration, and several other stoneware fragments from EUs 7 and 9 were also found with watch spring motifs revealing that the Barrons had access to and purchased wares produced by local potters.

Few pearlware vessels are present given the end date of the assemblage suspected to coincide with Samuel Barron's death in 1801. Creamware and redware ceramics are the highest represented amongst all ceramic types. The prevalence of creamware compared to the low number pearlware vessels represented suggests Samuel and his wife were not focused on keeping pace with contemporary late 18th-century table setting fashion. Indeed, a similar trend is represented at the William Forman out kitchen assemblage in Manalapan Township, Monmouth County, New Jersey, which dates to 1800 (Gall et al. 2007). Conversely, in both the Dunham House deposit and the 1800 Manalapan Village House Site out kitchen deposit, it may also be argued that the families of both sites stored older

wares in their out kitchen for use in food preparation activities, while a greater range in contemporaneously popular wares, such as decorated pearlwares, were stored within the dwelling proper.

Other commonalities exist in the data between the Manalapan Village House Site and the Dunham House Site assemblages, as well as a pre-1760s assemblage from the Stites Farmstead in Scotch Plains (see Tables 7.4-7.6). The percentages of coarse earthenware, coarse stoneware, refined ware, and porcelain vessels are notably similar. When compared to other sites in the Chesapeake watershed, Delaware Valley, central New Jersey, Philadelphia, and New York City, the data indicates that the percent of refined earthenware in an assemblage surpasses that of coarse earthenware and stoneware in more urban and suburban areas and those in the Chesapeake drainage (see Table 7.6). One explanation is that such areas have greater access to a larger range of refined wares, individuals may be influenced by urban genteel consumerism, and individuals are less likely to require ceramic equipment related to dairying like churns and milk pans. Further, Chesapeake sites also reveal a greater preference for refined wares compared to coarse earthenware and coarse stoneware (Bedell et. al. 1999; Bedell 2002: 72; Magid and Means 2003: 47-49). Conversely, farmstead sites from more rural areas in central New Jersey and the Lower Delaware Valley dating from the mid-18th to the early 19th century overwhelmingly yield a greater percentage of coarse earthenwares compared to refined wares (see Table 7.6). This is particularly true in the lower Delaware Valley, which had greater market access to ceramics produced by redware manufacturers in the Philadelphia area. Exceptions to this include the 1800 out kitchen deposit at the Manalapan Village House Site and the earlier occupation phase (1720s-1760s) of the Stites Farmstead and Prehistoric Site (see Table 7.6).

Glass vessels are represented in low numbers in the EU 8 contexts, comparable to the 1800 out kitchen deposit at the Manalapan Village House Site in Manalapan Township and the 1720s-1760s deposits associated with the Stites Farmstead and Prehistoric Site in Scotch Plains (see Table 7.4). It appears that the use of vessel glass, from which spirits and other liquids were consumed and stored, was much less important to the Barron family occupants and the occupants of Central New Jersey than to those who lived farther south in the Chesapeake region. One principle reason was the way in which spirits were processed, transported, purchased, and consumed. In the Chesapeake, archaeologists, such as John Bedell et al. (1999), have argued that residents purchased vast quantities of imported wine and whisky from foreign nations, such as Great Britain and France, and tables were lavishly set with stemware and glass cups. It appears that in the Chesapeake, imported spirits were preferred to locally made alcohol, as was the case with ceramics as well as suggested by Table 7.6. In the Lower Delaware Valley and in New Jersey, a different regionally distinct pattern was present. Here, residents, particularly the farming classes and laborers, put a greater value on locally distilled hard cider and whisky (applejack), as well as non-alcoholic cider in general, rather than imported liquors.

The process of creating brandy, whisky and cider started on the farm, at the orchard. Most farmers in this area owned orchards and harvested their own apples. An advertisement for the property dating from 1752 mentions the presence of an orchard, but does not reveal the

types of fruit or fruits grown. They either pressed their apples at home, or transported numerous bushels to a local distiller. The farmer brought with him or purchased from the distiller large wooden casks or barrels that the distiller filled with hard cider. Travels through the state commonly declared that cider spirits produced in New Jersey were the best in the nation and even the world (Wacker and Clemens 1995:163-164). The large casks used in this process made bottles, which were costly and had to be purchased, less relevant. Consequently, the Barron family, like most families in the region, may have placed a greater importance on the consumption of locally-made cider stored in casks than on imported bottled alcohol. This may have been due to a regionally developed palette and regional pride. The result is a decreased use of bottle glass in rural New Jersey and the Lower Delaware Valley than in other southern regions and urban areas.

A cursory examination of central New Jersey probate inventories from the turn of the 19th century does indicate that not all New Jerseyans preferred local ciders to imported wines. Indeed, members of the more affluent, genteel class and white-collar workers, such as lawyers, appear to have relied more heavily on the use of glass bottles, possibly due to a greater consumption of wines and entertainment. This, however, does not appear to be the case for the Dunham assemblage, where the quantity of glass vessels represented is quite low (see Table 7.4).

Collectively, the information from the Dunham House Site has provided significant information about the use of space and consumer behavior associated with the Samuel Barron and his family. The dwelling itself also provides an exceptional example of patterned brick architecture in northeast New Jersey and the far-reaching influence of patterned brick style that enjoyed mass appeal in the Delaware Valley during the early to late 18th century. The site assemblage also bears commonalities with central New Jersey and lower Delaware Valley rural contemporary sites, suggesting that the residents of Woodbridge may have been more heavily influenced by such areas than the nearby New York City market economy. More intensive, focused excavations to delineate Feature 6 and its interior fill, along with additional excavations behind the former Feature 6 structure have the ability to provide significant data about site occupants. Further, the eastern side yard, which currently has not been archaeologically explored has great potential to yield intact artifact bearing contexts associated with the Dunham and Barron families.