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The house at 71 Essex Street is easy to overlook, nestled as it is among the street’s larger, more impressive houses. But its apparent anonymity belies its architectural and archeological significance. Built around 1670, the Narbonne House is one of the five oldest buildings in Salem. It retains a diverse set of architectural elements from its 300 years of occupancy and still sits on its original city lot.

Purchased by the National Park Service in 1964 for $17,000 (NPS, Master Deed Listing), the Narbonne House was added to Salem Maritime NHS because “[i]t is...an important example of the architecture of the period during which it was built..., in essentially pristine condition.” Additionally, the “house is typical of the modest abodes of the ordinary mariners of the late 17th and early 18th centuries in Salem, just as the stately mansions of Chestnut Street reflect the mode of living of the later Salem merchants” (Report No. 660 to H.R. 976 1963:2-3).

Archeological fieldwork was conducted at the site in order to help architects better understand the changes made to the structure and interior of the house over time. Nearly 160,000 artifacts were recovered during the three field seasons held during the summers of 1973, 1974 and 1975, including “most of the ceramic forms and types known to have been used in the colonies and in the young republic in the 17th, 18th and [first] half of the 19th centuries. There are also some striking examples of wares [ceramic types] infrequently seen.” (Moran et al 1982:82)

Given its state of preservation, long and well-documented occupancy and large and diverse archeological collection, the Narbonne House is a wonderful addition to Salem Maritime NHS in its mission to preserve and interpret Salem’s maritime history. This booklet provides a brief background for each of the families that lived in the Narbonne House and the impact they had on the structure and yard. General results from the three field seasons of archeological excavations will also be discussed, most notably the ceramic collection.

The Families of the Narbonne House

Although named after its late 19th-century inhabitants, the Narbonne House was home to at least six families from the time it was constructed, circa 1672 to its purchase by the National Park Service in 1964. Despite the damage done by plowing and the construction and demolition of outbuildings, the Narbonne House and its collection are a unique, urban time capsule of 300 years of one of this nation’s most active and prosperous seaports. The households that produced this time capsule are: Thomas Ives and family (1672-1699), Simon Willard and family (1700-1750), Captain and Mrs. Joseph Hodges and tenants (1750-1780), Jonathan and Mary (nee Gardner) Andrew and family (1780-1820), and Sarah (nee Vincent) and Mary Narbonne (1820-1905). By the time the Hale family (1905-1964) moved into the house, Salem had municipal or private trash disposal services. Therefore, most of the items they used and the food they ate would not be found in the backyard as they were for the other families.
The lot upon which the Narbonne House now sits was purchased around 1670 by Thomas Ives, a butcher, from his neighbor, Paul Mansfield, a fisherman. The original house was built either for or by Ives shortly thereafter and was much smaller than the one we see today. Like its contemporaries, it consisted of a one-room, two-story structure with a chimney on one side and a steeply pitched, gabled roof (Moran 1976:194). Historic documentation and archaeological investigations both suggest that this was the first house on this property (Moran et al 1982:55).

Unfortunately there is no information on Ives’s place of birth, but vital records note that he was baptized in 1640 (Moran et al 1982:230). He was residing in Salem by 1668 (Perley 1928, vol. II:424) and married his first wife, Martha Withe, four years later. They had three children, two of whom survived. He was widowed sometime between 1675 and 1679, at which time he married his second wife, Elizabeth (no last name known). They had four children together before he died in September 1695. The following January, Elizabeth Ives married John White, who was also a butcher. They sold the house and property to Simon Willard in 1699. Elizabeth Ives White was widowed again a few years later (Moran et al 1982:55-56, 230).

Ives’s probate inventory describes the Narbonne House as having a northern and a southern room as well as a kitchen. Using the furnishings list for each room, it is possible to determine what activities may have taken place there. The original ground floor, now the northern room with the three exhibit cases, appears to have been multi-functional. Furnishings for sleeping, eating, reading, storage and sitting are all listed for this room. The second-floor chamber above, now off-limits to visitors, seems to have served principally as a bedroom, as only “a trundle bed with bedsteads” and “a cupboard” are listed (Essex County Probate Records, Docket No. 14656). “The southern lower room” and “southern chamber” were in the 12’ addition on the southern wall of the original two-storied structure (Moran et al 1982:61), where the gambrel-roofed ell now stands. The furnishings list of the first-floor room suggests that it was a storage and/or workspace of Ives. The second-floor chamber seems to have been the parents’ bedroom (“a bed & coverlit, boulsters & pillows”) and social “parlor” (“seven chayrs”, “round table”) (Essex County Probate Records, Docket No. 14656). The parlor was usually on the first floor for visitor ease and the family’s privacy. The Ives household also had a kitchen lean-to added onto the northern end of the outside east wall of the original structure sometime between 1672 and 1695. At the time, it was customary to move cooking-related activities out of the “hall” (in this case the northern first-floor room) into separate kitchen facilities. Due to the colder climate, New Englanders kept the kitchen near the living quarters and used the heat from cooking to heat the main house. Their contemporaries in England and in the southern colonies often built separate outbuildings for cooking to reduce the chance of fire damaging the main house (Moran et al 1982:56, 59). The lean-to and gambrel-roofed ell that we see today are not the ones constructed and used by the Ives/White households. The extant structures have been dated to the mid-to-late 18th century based on construction techniques evident within.

The probate inventory also mentions an outbuilding, “the shop,” the location of which has yet to be determined. It is probably the same structure mentioned in the 1699 deed when Simon Willard purchased the property from the Whites (Essex County Deeds, vol. 31:152).

With respect to the archeological record, “no clearly defined, undisturbed 17th century [feat-
tasures were found anywhere on the site.” (Moran et al 1982:61). While many artifacts (e.g., kaolin pipe stems, diamond-shaped window panes, Westerwald pottery) dating to this time were recovered from the backyard, they were scattered in what is called the sheet refuse and not isolated in distinct features like many later artifacts (Moran et al 1982:61). It was customary at the time to dispose of one’s trash by simply throwing it in the backyard. While many artifacts were recovered from a sheet refuse, they have no provenience upon which to determine a sequence of events at the site. Furthermore, many of the ceramics types available to the Ives/White households were still available when the Willards lived in the Narbonne House. Without a stratified provenience, it is impossible to tell which household was using which ceramic vessels.

The Willard Household (1699-1750)
Simon Willard purchased the Narbonne House and accompanying land from the Whites in 1699. He was 50 years old at the time and would live in the house until his death in 1731 at the age of 82. He was born on November 23, 1649, in Concord, Massachusetts, where his father, Capt. Simon Willard, had been a militia commander for many years. The younger Willard had moved to Salem from Ipswich in 1681. Historical documentation lists his occupation as “weaver,” “worsted comber” and “clothier” during his years in Salem (Perley 1928:171).

Unlike the Ives and White families, the four surviving children of Simon Willard and his wife, Martha (nee Jacob), were all teenagers when the family moved to 71 Essex Street. After their mother died in 1721, some of them returned with their spouses to care for their aging father and so the timetable of ownership and occupancy becomes complex. On January 6, 1728/29, Simon Willard sold the house and land to one of his four sons, Josiah, for “£170 in ‘Province Bills of Credit.”(Cummings 1962:7). Josiah already owned property elsewhere in Salem, so it is doubtful that he and his children moved back. (He was a widower by this time with six small children.) (Moran et al 1982:232) Instead, six months later, he sold the northern half of the house (the original two-storied structure) and some land to his younger brother, Richard, for £85. The very same day, Richard quickly mortgaged his portion to Captain Thomas Ellis for £60 (Cummings 1962:8). Richard died the following year, and, as his probate inventory listed no other properties, it is believed his widow (and second wife), Susanna Parkman Willard, continued to live in this part of the house with his children from his first marriage. Josiah, who still owned the southern half of the house, died in 1731.

Like his sons, Simon also remarried after the death of his first wife. At the age of 73, he married the widow Priscilla Buttolph in July of 1722. Their union was short-lived, however, as Priscilla had left him by 1731. Shortly before his own death, Simon deeded all his personal household goods with “Love, good will & affection” to another daughter-in-law, Sarah, wife of his son, Jacob. Simon made it a point to specify “that whereas my wife Priscilla had left me for a Considerable time, in all my sickness & illness, I do renounce her…from receieving [sic] any part…of my estate…” (Essex County Deeds, vol. 49:37). According to Josiah’s probate records Jacob and Sarah were renting the southern half of the house for “[£] 40.” in 1731 (Cummings 1962:9). It is possible that Simon was living with Jacob and Sarah during the last years of his life, which may explain his deeding Sarah his possessions. Jacob died within three years of his father. Sarah died twelve years later in 1743 (Moran et al 1982:234).

Captain Joseph Hodges purchased the southern half of the house and most of the land from
Josiah and Jane Willard’s children in 1750. He purchased the rest of the property from the heirs of Thomas Ellis in 1757, thereby uniting the Narbonne House under one owner for the first time in 28 years. Needless to say, with so many deaths and changes of ownership, it is difficult to determine who was living in the two halves of the Narbonne House from around 1731 to 1757.

Given Simon Willard’s respected family name and considerable standing in the community, it will, perhaps, come as no surprise that he was involved in the infamous Salem witch trials. He and several other men testified against Rev. George Burroughs, stating that the latter’s “prodigious strength” and size could only be the result of his association with the Devil (Perley 1928:280).

With respect to the house and the lot, as stated earlier, an outbuilding was mentioned in the deed when Simon Willard bought the property from the Whites in 1699. The gambrel-roofed ell we see today was rebuilt from the original ell in the later years of the Willard period. Posts and other framing elements from the first ell were reused as floor joists. All the windows in the house were also replaced at this time. Both the new ell and the original northern half of the house have sliding sash windows with rectangular panes, rather than the casement windows with leaded, diamond-shaped panes common in the 17th century. Many fragments of these latter panes and their lead framework were recovered from the backyard during the archaeological excavations. Other 18th-century interior features, such as folding window shutters, corner cupboards and paneled fireplace walls have also been dated to this remodeling (Moran et al 1982:11, 15-18, 64, 69).

The Willards also built the wood-lined well in the backyard. The first mention of a well on the property is in the late 1720’s, when Josiah and Richard Willard divided the property. It is safe to assume that the Ives/White households also had a well, but no other one has been discovered in the yard.

The remains of the well are now under a pedestrian walkway constructed by the NPS. During the 1973 field season, the walkway was pulled up and the well was excavated in 6-inch increments. Original elements include the wooden wall and pump. The well was repaired during the Hodges period and eventually filled in during the Narbonne period. Most of the artifacts recovered from the well date to this later time period (1820-1905) (Moran et al 1982:41).

The Hodges Household and Tenants (1750-1780)
Captain Joseph Hodges (1715-1785) consolidated ownership of the Narbonne House and its property for the first time in nearly thirty years when he purchased the southern half of the house in 1750 from the heirs of Josiah Willard (Essex County Deeds, vol. 94, p. 248; Essex county Deeds, vol. 96:22) and the northern half in 1757 from Richard Ellis, son of the man to whom Richard Willard had mortgaged his half in 1729 (Essex County Deeds, vol. 103:236; John Frayler 1998). Hodges was born in 1714/15 and married Elizabeth Stone in 1742. They had no children.

Captain Hodges was still a mariner in the 1750s when he purchased the Narbonne House and its land. Historical documentation lists him as the master of the schooners Eagle and Mary as well as the sloop Success (Cummings 1962:12). These vessels were involved in the coastal trade
along the eastern seaboard and Caribbean islands. Given the Narbonne House’s proximity to Salem Harbor, it is not surprising that Hodges would have wanted to live there. Eventually though, Hodges became a successful merchant and like his contemporaries he moved to a grander residence. His will, dated 1778, mentions the “Mansion House I live in,” which was bequeathed to his brother, John. “His Mansion house…in East Parish” (Essex County Probate Records, Docket No. 13482) is also listed in his estate’s 1785 probate inventory. He had sold the Narbonne House to Jonathan Andrew by that time.

It is assumed that Captain Hodges leased out the property at 71 Essex Street after he and his wife moved out. The lack of extensive interior remodeling during this time seems to confirm that belief. Given his increasing wealth and social position, it is safe to assume that Captain Hodges would have wanted a house to befit and reflect his new economic status. He could remodel the house he already lived in or purchase a new, larger, more stylish residence. As we can see from his will, he chose the latter option. Regrettably, however, there is no mention in Salem’s contemporaneous municipal records or Hodges’ personal papers as to who lived in the Narbonne House from the time of the Hodges’ departure until Jonathan Andrew bought the property in 1780.

While the house remained relatively unchanged during Captain Hodges’s ownership, the property around the house did not. The driveway was filled with about 6-10 inches of soil to match the rising surface of Essex Street. It is believed the fill came from the backyard. This first of the three layers of fill was dated to the Hodges period based on the ceramic types found within it (white salt glazed stoneware, Westerwald, and delft, 1725-1775, 1575-1775 and 1567-1802, respectively) (Brown 1982:2-4). During the course of archeological excavations, the original driveway and lean-to foundation were discovered. The former extends under the current lean-to (Moran et al 1982:23-26).

The well was also rebuilt during this time period. The vertical wood planks that had originally lined the well had begun to rot above the waterline. They were replaced with a brick liner. A large builder’s trench around the well testifies to the amount of work involved in this repair.

Other features attributed to the Hodges period are a number of trash pits. Unlike those of the later Andrew period, these were not originally dug for use as trash pits. Rather, the occupants of the house were filling in abandoned privies or natural depressions in the backyard (Moran et al 1982:72).

The Andrew Household (1780-1820)
Captain Joseph Hodges sold the property to Jonathan Andrew, “tanner,” on March 6, 1780, for the sum of £200 of “lawfull money” (Essex County Deeds, vol. 137:177). Andrew died a little more than a year later, leaving most of his estate to his children, which they were to share “as they respectively arrive at the Age of twenty one years.” His widow, Mary (nee Gardner) Andrew, received £130-06-08 from his estate (Essex County Probate Records, Docket No. 665). Two years later she inherited £650 and “a pair of silver Canns” from her father’s estate (Moran 1976:202). She continued to live in the house until her death in 1820. Her eldest daughter, also named Mary, married Joseph Hodges (1757-1826) in 1783. He was the nephew of the man that had sold the property to her father, thus maintaining a family lineage amongst the house’s residents for over 200 years.
Two architectural alterations, one major and the other minor, were made to the house during the time Mary Andrew lived there. The former was the replacement of the original kitchen lean-to with a narrower structure. The new lean-to was also longer than its predecessor, extending along the entire east side of the house. This provided another room adjacent to the ell and is where visitors now enter and leave the house. This narrower lean-to also provided better access to the carriage house that Mrs. Andrew had had constructed in the backyard. The minor architectural change involved adding Federal-period mantles to all the paneled Georgian fireplace walls. This extra surface area provided Mrs. Andrew with a place to display her collection of fine ceramics and tea service items (Moran et al 1982:23, 26, 33, 43, 75).

The backyard also saw many changes during Mary Andrew’s residence. She constructed a carriage house at the end of the driveway along the east property line. The driveway was filled in again for a second and third time to keep up with the rising level of Essex Street. Lastly, many pits were excavated in the backyard for the express purpose of holding trash (Moran et al 1982:43-44, 47, 51, 75). It was customary up until the last quarter of the 1700’s to dispose of one’s trash by simply throwing it into the yard. In the late 18th century, people also began to use natural depressions in the yard as trash pits. Additionally, holes that had originally been dug for other purposes (e.g., privy, dairy) were also filled in with trash when abandoned. Before long, people began to dig pits intentionally for the disposal of trash. Three of the eight features associated with the Andrew household are these kinds of pits. They also filled in the dairy with trash. Lastly, the carriage house was built over a privy that had been abandoned and filled in with trash prior to construction (Moran et al 1982:61, 69, 72, 75; 77; Moran 1976:196-197, 201). The Andrew period features accounted for over 5,000 artifacts. Many of these represented the finest ceramic types of the time, namely creamware and rosso antico.
The Narbonne Household (1820-1905)

Jonathan Andrew, Jr. (1773-1844), “trader”, lived in the Narbonne House his entire life. In 1798, he inherited the portion of his father’s estate that included the house and later bought out the interests of the other heirs (Essex County Deeds, vol. 216:233; vol. 219:67). His mother, Mary, continued to live in the house with him until her own death in 1820. Also living in the house were Jonathan’s sister, Sarah, her husband, Matthew Vincent, and the couple’s five children. The Vincent children continued to live in the house with their uncle after the deaths of their parents and grandmother, all of whom died before 1821. One of the children, Sarah, remained at 71 Essex Street after her marriage to Nicholas Narbonne in 1823 and raised the couple’s two children there. While there is no record of Nicholas’s death, Sarah was listed in the 1842 Salem directory as a “sempstress” (seamstress). The directory also noted that Jonathan Andrew, the house’s owner, was living with Sarah and her family (Moran et al 1892:77). Upon his death in 1844, Jonathan left the Narbonne House and its land to Sarah Narbonne, “widow” (Essex County Probate Records, Docket No. 31378). She continued to live there, along with her unmarried daughter Mary, until her death in 1890 at the age of 95 (Cummings 1962:14). Mary Narbonne stayed in the family home until her own death in 1905 (Moran et al 1982:77, 239).

Mary Narbonne died intestate, and ownership of the property passed to her nephew, Gardner H. Narbonne (Essex County Probate Records, Docket No. 96286). He was residing in California at the time, so he rented the house to his cousin, Frank Hale. The Hales raised their family there and eventually assumed ownership of the property in 1948. Ten years later, the title was transferred to Margaret Hale, a daughter of Frank and his wife, Mary. Margaret sold the property to the National Park Service in 1964 for $17,000 (NPS, Master Deed Listing). Sarah Narbonne and her daughter ran a “Cent Shop” in the northern-most end of the lean-to. In order to accommodate their customers, they widened the shop’s door onto Essex Street. Aside from this they made no major alterations to the house. Copies of circa 1891 photographs currently exhibited in the Narbonne House’s north room clearly show this, as one is able to pick out 18th and early 19th century objects and architectural features (Moran et al 1982:77). The women seemed content to live among family heirlooms in a house acquired by Sarah’s grandparents in 1780 (Moran et al 1982:77, 79).

Sarah and her daughter also made few changes in the yard. The large number of flowerpot fragments and cobblestone borders recovered during the archeological excavations of the backyard attest to their shared love of gardening. Their relative, Frank Hale, was also a gardener, as one can see in a 1905 picture of the Narbonne House’s backyard currently on display at Salem Maritime NHS.

The most noteworthy alteration was the filling-in of the well at about the time Essex Street was hooked up to the city’s public water system, about 1868. There were also a number of coal ash trash pits discovered in the backyard during the archeological excavations that attest to how the women heated their home.

The Narbonne House collection, totaling nearly 160,000 objects, is the result of three seasons of archeological excavations in the summers of 1973, 1974 and 1975. Nearly half of the collection comprises ceramic vessels and sherds. Other material types include metal (e.g., nails, straight pins, thimbles), glass (e.g., drinking glass, bottles, window glass) and bone (e.g., artifacts and animal remains). The latter represents not only the by-products of the house’s two butchers (Ives and White) but also the dietary choices and habits of all the residents. Geese, ducks, chickens and turkey were the most numerous bird species noted among the faunal remains. The most common mammal remains include domesticated sheep, cow and pig. The lack of fusion in the uncovered remains indicates husbandry practices that favored young animals. Fish bones were the second most numerous faunal remains but most have yet to be identified for genus and species (Moran et al 1982:269-306). As the reader may remember, Sarah Narbonne was a seamstress and she and her daughter ran a “Cent Shop” from the northern-most end of the lean-to. Many of the straight pins and thimbles in the collection were recovered archeologically (the archeologists excavated under the floor boards) from that area of the house.

The ceramic artifacts account for nearly half of the entire Narbonne House collection. The majority of the most common and popular ceramic types from the late 17th century to mid-20th century are represented. As in the case of the trash pits, some of these ceramic types were used to date features found in the backyard.

As an example of how the collection can be used to interpret the lifestyles of the Narbonne House residents one has only to look at the many beautiful teapots and teacups recovered from the trash pits attributed to the Andrew family. Most were made of some of the finest materials of their time, namely porcelain, rosso antico, Jackfield and creamware. Their presence attests to Mrs. Andrew’s social status, in which serving tea to visitors played an integral part, and her wealth. Some of these pieces were inherited by Mrs. Andrew’s descendents. They can be traced through probate records or seen in the corner cupboard behind Sarah Narbonne in the circa 1888 photograph.

In addition to the more refined ceramic types, nearly half of the entire ceramic collection is made of redware. This ceramic type is best known to us as the unglazed, rust-colored flowerpots you can buy at any hardware or flower shop. Redware was produced in this country shortly after the first colonists arrived. While some types, such as trailed slipware, can be assigned a range of manufacture dates, most cannot. Therefore, redware is not used as a dating tool. In recent years, however, archeologists have begun to study redware in hopes of determining regional and chronological distinctions (Turnbaugh 1983). The large number of redware sherds from the Narbonne House collection (over 34,000) and the long-term occupancy of the house would provide a wonderful and unique opportunity to enhance this ongoing research.

The ceramic collection is a wonderful study collection as it chronicles the acquisition and usage of available ceramics by five households over a nearly 300-year period at one location. The same can be said for the collection as a whole. This is highly unusual in the archeological
record. More often than not, an original house lot is subdivided and historical records chronicling a house’s ownership and occupancy are rare. While an archeologist can make general assumptions about the residents’ past activities from a house’s archeology collection, the Narbonne House provides a unique opportunity to study 300 years’ worth of material culture from one house.

CONCLUSION

The Narbonne House in Salem Maritime National Historic Site is a remarkable time capsule of 300 years of one of this nation’s busiest historic seaports. Unlike the magnificent houses that grace Salem’s Chestnut Street, the house at 71 Essex Street represents people of modest means. With their ordinary occupations of “butcher,” “clothier,” “tanner” and “sempstress,” the residents of the Narbonne House provided the backbone of Salem’s economy before, during and after her maritime shipping supremacy. While the stories of “King” Derby’s and John Turner’s (of the House of the Seven Gables) exploits never cease to amaze, it is in the lives of Salem’s less noteworthy residents, such as those of the Narbonne House, that we learn her true story.

Archeological excavations pits from 1974 field season. Note “A” which is the well and “B” which is the dairy.
GLOSSARY

**Creamware:**
Perfected by Josiah Wedgwood circa 1762 in Burslem, England, and remained in production until circa 1820. North American assemblages of this ceramic type post-date 1770. Tablewares (plates, cups, bowls, pitchers, platters, and coffee and tea pots) and toiletries (chamber pots) are represented in the Narbonne House collection. The feather-edged plate in the middle exhibit case dates to circa 1765-1790. The molded coffee pot on the fourth shelf of the same case dates to circa 1766-1820.

**Delft:**
An earthenware ceramic type with a tin-glaze. It was originally produced in Delft, Holland. Its traditional blue and white design is an imitation of Chinese porcelain, which the Dutch East India Company was importing, with varied success. Delft was produced in England, namely London, Liverpool and Bristol, after about 1567 due to the emigration of two Dutch potters, Jaspries Andres and Jacob Janson. It remained the principal ceramic export of England until supplanted by white salt-glazed stoneware and creamware in the eighteenth century. Tin-glaze is opaque and thick. It sits on top of the earthenware (porous) paste and is easily chipped off. Most of the delft recovered at the Narbonne House is believed to be from England, due to the trade restrictions in place at the time. British tin-glazed enamelware is referred to as “delft” whereas that from Holland is called “Delft,” in homage to its birthplace and city that shares its name.

**Pearlware:**
Also perfected by Josiah Wedgwood, circa 1779. The whiter paste of pearlware versus creamware is due to the use of a little more flint and white clay. The bluish hue of the glaze is the result of the addition of blue cobalt pigment. It is an imitation of Chinese porcelain, which was becoming harder to get due to high tariffs. It nearly surpassed its predecessor, creamware, in popularity by 1785. The various decorative styles exhibited in the Narbonne House are dated as follows: shell-edged (circa 1780-1830), floral handpainted polychrome (circa 1790-1815) and annular (circa 1795-1820).

**Porcelain:**
A ceramic type with “an extremely vitreous, translucent white paste” and “a glossy surface glaze,” Chinese porcelain has a hard-paste body and is fired only once. English porcelain has a soft paste body and is fired both before and after the decorative glazes are added. Exhibited styles are handpainted under and overglaze polychrome with gilding (circa 1700-1780), overglaze handpainted polychrome (circa 1660-1800) and underglaze handpainted blue (circa 1680-1800). English porcelain makes up the bulk of the over-glaze polychrome pieces. England limited the amount of Chinese porcelain imported into her North American colonies. After winning their independence, Americans actively traded with the Far East for both tea and porcelain. Some of the Chinese porcelains listed in Mary Narbonne’s probate inventory were probably pur-chased and used by her great-grandmother, Mary Andrew.

**Rosso Antico:**
An unglazed, red paste stoneware developed by John Dwight and called “red porcelain.”
Josiah Wedgwood called his version “Rosso Antico.” Its most common vessel form was the teapot. It was decorated with sprig-molded appliques (as is the teapot on display in the Narbonne House) and bore a pseudo-Chinese maker’s mark on its base. This ceramic type was produced during the mid-to-late 18th century.

**Westerwald:**
A salt-glazed stoneware from the Westerwald area of Germany. Production began in the 16th century and continues to this day. Decoration techniques include incising, stamping, glaze combing and/sprig-molding. The ceramic type is also known for its bold cobalt blue or manganese purple glazes. Declined in popularity in both Great Britain and her American colonies around 1760, due to the emerging popularity of Chinese porcelain.

**White salt-glazed stoneware:**
A ceramic type from Great Britain produced from 1720 to 1805. The slightly pitted surface was achieved by throwing salt into the kiln as the pieces were firing. It was considered an acceptable social substitute for porcelain and a price-wise competitor of pewter. Molded pieces, such as those found at the Narbonne House, became popular after 1730. The “dot, diaper, basket pattern” exhibited there dates to the 1740’s. Production declined after 1775 due to the invention and popularity of cream-ware. Its presence in the Narbonne House collection shows someone had the means and desire to purchase this rather elite ceramic type.

*Whole and reconstructed vessels recovered from Narbonne House archeological excavations. They include redware pitcher and pearlware banded mug (back row), redware lead glazed mug and wine bottle (front row).*


Frayler, John, personal communication


National Park Service - Land Resources, Division, Master Deed Listing, Status of lands as of 12/31/92, Deed #7.

Perley, Sydney. *History of Salem*

**Notes**

1 Archeologically, a feature is a man-made immovable area, such as a hearth, grave, cellar hole, etc.

2 An artifact is a man-made, movable object, such as a bottle, pottery sherd or nail. Unlike features, artifacts can be removed from a site without altering or damaging them.

3 Provenience is the three-dimensional location of an artifact or feature within a site. In an undisturbed stratigraphy, objects on the bottom are older than the ones at the top.

4 The date is given in this way to reflect the transition from the Julian calendar, which started the year on March 25, to the Gregorian calendar, which we use today, which starts the new year on January 1. Therefore events occurring from January 1 to March 24 would be at the end of a Julian calendar year or at the beginning of a Gregorian calendar year. This transition took place at different times around the world. The accepted date for Britain and her colonies is September 5/16, 1752, several hundred years after many other parts of Europe. Eleven days also had to be added to the year by the time of Britain’s transition because the Julian calendar was too short.
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