University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2014

Facing crisis : maintaining class status in Victorian Old Louisville.

David Walter Schatz
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schatz, David Walter, "Facing crisis : maintaining class status in Victorian Old Louisville." (2014).
Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 1270.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1270>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

FACING CRISIS:
MAINTAINING CLASS STATUS IN VICTORIAN OLD
LOUISVILLE

By David Walter Schatz
B.A. University of Kentucky, 1996

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Anthropology
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2014

Copyright 2014 by David Walter Schatz

All rights reserved

FACING CRISIS:
MAINTAINING CLASS STATUS IN VICTORIAN OLD LOUISVILLE

By
David Walter Schatz
B.A., University of Kentucky, 1996

A Thesis Approved on
April 11, 2014

by the following Thesis Committee:

Jonathan Haws, Thesis Director

John Hale

Michael J. Stottman

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my wife and best friend, Ronda Schatz. She has shouldered the majority of our family duties so that I could devote the time necessary to complete my degree. Without her support this thesis would not have been possible. Ronda, you have my admiration and love. You are an inspiration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the help and support of many people in my life.

Cathe Dykstra and the Family Scholar House: Thank you for your generous use of material from the original Phase III report that this thesis draws on.

Dr. Haws and Dr. Hale: Thank you all for the kind words, advice, suggestions, and constructive criticism. Gentlemen, it has been a pleasure.

And soon to be Dr. Stottman: I really appreciate all of your input and direction. Your suggestions and criticism really pushed me to explore new ideas and directions for my analysis.

Anne Bader, Susan Andrews, Duane Simpson, and the many coworkers I have had over the years. Thank you all for your help and friendship. You all have helped me maintain my interest and love of archaeology over the years.

Chris Sims and Shelley Biesel: You guys rock. It has been a pleasure meeting you both. You made grad school much easier to navigate with your advice and support. The next round's on me!

Mathia Scherer: You've always been a welcome ear for my griping as well as my admittedly strange sense of humor. The fact that you agreed to read this thing all the way through to proofread for me speaks volumes about our friendship.

Ron and Brenda Smart: Thank you for your continued support for Ronda and me. A second thank you for being my Yuengling connection!

My parents, Mom, Dad, Joe, and Mary: Thank you for the encouragement, cajoling, and support for the last 47 years. The life examples that you provided me have given me the strength to push through all of the obstacles in my life. And thank you for giving me the tools that I have needed to get me to the great place I am now.

My children, Connor, Ava, and Walker: None of you really know it, but your smiling faces and enthusiasm for life have brought me such joy. I'm looking forward to watching your journey in life.

My indescribably awesome wife, Ronda: I couldn't have done this without you. Thank you with all my heart.

ABSTRACT

FACING CRISIS: MAINTAINING CLASS STATUS IN VICTORIAN OLD LOUISVILLE

David W. Schatz

April 11, 2014

The late Victorian era (1876-1915) was a time of economic and social crisis as America entered into the industrial age. Multiple economic crises including three market crashes and resulting depressions placed a strain on the economic viability of the growing middle classes. The changing nature of middle class work also created a social crisis as professionals and entrepreneurs were forced into clerk and managerial positions within the government and corporations to maintain their middle class lifestyle. One of the ways that middle class families mitigated the social and economic crises was to participate in the practice of segmented dining. Segmented dining was a way that a family could emphasize its wealth, status, and gentility by investing during a highly ritualized multi-course meal structure. How a family navigated this complex ritual had an impact on how it was perceived by social peers and social elites that might participate. Using historical research about Victorian culture, economics, and society I attempt to show reasons why middle class families, both immigrants and native born, were engaging in segmented dining practices. In addition I utilize the artifact data generated from the Family Scholar House site to create an analysis scheme that shows the quantifiable presence of

segmented dining practices within each of the households that could be linked to the archaeological record.

I started this thesis with three questions based on the original results of the Family Scholar House investigations. First, does the ritual and display of the Victorian era reflect the struggle to maintain class position during a period of financial uncertainty? My research indicates that the answer to this question is „yes.“ The Victorian Era was dominated by a hegemony of excess. In order for the upper classes to maintain their domination of society they invested the middle classes into this hegemony by promoting values of display that were also linked to values of restraint and comportment. Second, given the economic turmoil of the period, how did the households living at the Family Scholar House site maintain their class position and identity? One of the principal ways they maintained their class position and identity was through social acts of display and segmented dining. The acts of display reinforced a families’ social position by presenting the viewer with a tangible vision of wealth while the ritual dining experience demonstrated their social refinement. Third, were there differences between the strategies employed by the German and German Jewish immigrants and the native born dwellers of the neighborhood? The answer to this question is ambiguous. The different households did not appear to display any ethnicity in their maintenance of social status using display and ritual dining, based on the archaeological record. Any differences in social maintenance are probably linked to social contacts that are beyond the scope of archaeological investigations. So the answer is „no,“ based on the artifacts recovered from the site. I believe that I have developed several analytical tools that future archaeologists

could use to discern segmented dining in other site assemblages and to answer the questions I posited above and new ones that data from new sites might suggest.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE NO.
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Theoretical Frameworks	5
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND AND CULTURAL CONTEXT	11
Early Louisville History	11
Community Development.....	12
Pre-Victorian Economy	14
The Victorian Cultural Era	16
CHAPTER 3: THE HUMAN ELEMENT.....	24
Germans.....	27
The Coldeway Household	29
The Gorman Household	30
German Jews.....	30
The Isenberg Household.....	32
The Solomon Household.....	32
The Native Element	33

The Elliot Household	33
The Carpenter Household.....	34
The Patterson Household	34
The Herr Household.....	35
CHAPTER 4: LOCAL ECONOMY AND LAND RECORDS.....	36
Ownership Patterns.....	41
CHAPTER 5: DISPLAY AND RITUAL.....	53
Homes, Parlors, and Dining Rooms	54
Segmented Dining	57
Segmented Dining in the Archaeological Record	61
CHAPTER 6: FAMILY SCHOLAR HOUSE ARCHAEOLOGY	64
Archaeological Data	68
Phase III Analysis Methodologies.....	69
Segmented Dining Analysis Methodology.....	74
Dining Artifact Analysis	78
Analysis Summary	93
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS	95
REFERENCES.....	101
APPENDIX.....	111
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	113

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1. Location of the Family Scholar House site, 15JF767 (USGS 7.5 West Louisville, IN-KY Topographic Quadrangle).....	3
Figure 1.2. The Downtown Family Scholar House site during the excavations.....	4
Figure 3.1. 1892 Sanborn Insurance Map showing the Ethnicity of Households with Recovered Archaeological Data.....	25
Figure 4.1. 1851 Plat map from DB 79, page 549, showing the original lots purchased by James Breckinridge.	37
Figure 4.2. A section of the 1876 Abstract and Loan Association atlas showing existing dwellings within the project area.	37
Figure 4.3. 1884 Hopkins Atlas showing existing dwellings within the project area.	39
Figure 4.4. 1892 Sanborn map of the project area showing existing dwellings.	40
Figure 4.5. Chart of property ownership for 1840 to 1930.....	43
Figure 4.6. Average acre value in 2014 dollars for developed lots.	48
Figure 6.1. 1892 Sanborn map of the excavated portion of the project area showing the feature locations and classes.	67
Figure 6.2. Location of features subjected to detailed analysis, shown over the 1892 Sanborn map.....	71
Figure 6.3. Decorated cup fragments from the Elliot/Gorman assemblage.....	84
Figure 6.4. Alcoholic beverages and wine bottle from Elliot/Gorman assemblage.	84
Figure 6.5. Decorated serving vessels from the Elliot/Gorman assemblage.	85

Figure 6.6. Decorated plates from the Coldeway assemblage.	88
Figure 6.7. Decorated tea cups from the Coldeway assemblage.	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1. Per Acre Price for Individual Lots, Average Prices, Developed Lot Prices, and 2014 Price Equivalent Averages per Year	45
Table 4.2. Household Tax Value by Year in Contemporary and 2014 Dollars	51
Table 6.1. Ceramic Index Values, 1890–1899 (Manson and Snyder 1996:5)	74
Table 6.2. Socioeconomic Ceramic Scale for the Households Analyzed (Andrews 2011:282)	74
Table 6.3. Dining/Eating Vessel Forms and Decoration/Types by Household.	80
Table 6.4. Dining/Service Vessel Forms and Decoration/Types by Household.....	80
Table 6.5. Dining/Eating Vessel Form Percentages by Household.	82
Table 6.6. Dining/Service Vessel Form Percentages by Household.	83
Table 6.7. Eating/Service Vessel Form Percentages by Household.	90
Table 6.8. Eating/Service Vessel Form Percentages without Beverage Bottles by Household.	90
Table 6.9. Vessel Form Diversity by Household.....	91
Table 6.10. Dining/Eating Decoration/Types Percentages by Household.	92
Table 6.11. Dining/Service Decoration/Types Percentages by Household.	92
Table 6.12. Eating/Service Decoration/Types Percentages by Household, Combined. ...	93

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The late Victorian Period (1876-1915), also called the Gilded Age in the United States, was a time of unprecedented growth economically, technologically, and industrially. It was also a period that exhibited a huge disparity in wealth between the upper class, or industrial bourgeoisie and the working class, or proletariat. This disparity is best seen in the poverty rates of the working classes, 80 percent of whom lived just above or below the poverty level (Schlereth 1991:34). Caught between them was the burgeoning middle class, or petty bourgeoisie, who were under tremendous pressure in the face of volatile economic conditions. The years 1873-1896 were characterized by significant fluctuations in the worldwide economy (particularly in Western Europe and the United States) and multiple financial crises (Glasner 1997). In Louisville, like much the rest of the United States, the Victorian Period saw extensive growth of both the city and its industrial base. In addition to the economic factors of crisis, there were social ones as well. The shape of the middle classes changed in response to the economic environment that increasingly marginalized entrepreneurs and professionals. From the 1860s onward middle class men and women entered the ranks of the bureaucracies of the government and corporations as clerks and managers in large numbers. This change gradually altered the meaning of „middle class“ into what we regard it as today (Aron 1987).

The stresses of the economic and social fabric of middle classe led to progressively more extravagant displays of wealth in an effort maintain and climb the

social ladder. The examination of these ideas leads to multiple questions: does the ritual and display of the Victorian era reflect the struggle to maintain class position during a period of financial uncertainty? Given the economic turmoil of the period, how did households maintain their class position and identity? Were there differences between the strategies employed by immigrants and the native born families? This thesis attempts to answer these questions by examining the material artifacts recovered from the Downtown Family Scholar House site (15JF781) as well as land records and tax lists.

The Family Scholar House site, named after the program that places abused women and their children in a safe environment where they can attend college and exit the cycles of poverty and abuse that characterized their lives, was located between First and Second Streets on the south side of Breckinridge Street in Old Louisville (**Figure 1.1**). Initial Phase I excavations at the site, conducted in 2009 by AMEC, identified intact deposits from the late nineteenth century and determined that further work would be necessary to determine the site's significance (Schatz 2009). As part of this process an extensive review of historical deeds, census, maps, and other documentation was undertaken. It quickly became apparent that the social structure of the site was decidedly middle class based on the information uncovered. Starting in the late 1860s, the block transformed from an urban periphery to a mixed middle to upper middle class neighborhood by 1900, settled primarily by middle class Germans and German Jews. In 2010, based on the results of the Phase I investigations and archival research, the remains of this neighborhood were unearthed by AMEC archaeologists prior to the construction of the Family Scholar House housing complex (**Figure 1.2**) (Andrews and Schatz 2011).

Figure 1.1. Location of the Family Scholar House site, 15JF767 (USGS 7.5 West Louisville, IN-KY Topographic Quadrangle).

Photo Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 1.2. The Downtown Family Scholar House site during the excavations.

Like the historical research the excavations and subsequent analysis of the artifact assemblage further reinforced the determination that the social structure of the site was middle class. Furthermore the artifacts recovered indicated that segmented dining was taking place in many of the households. Segmented dining was a ritual method of displaying wealth and status to social equals. Rituals of display have long been noted in various cultures as a response to crisis (Wolf 1999). The Victorian era was definitely a period of crisis, both economically and socially as I detail in **Chapter 2**. One of the ways that middle class families responded to this crisis was through displays of wealth and status via segmented dining. But how does one observe segmented dining in the archaeological record? There has been extensive cultural-historic research done on the topic, and some archaeological endeavors that have delved into this topic. However there has been little done specifically to quantify how segmented dining practices appear in the

archaeological record. I attempt to remedy this issue in the archaeological analysis chapter of this thesis by looking at how vessel function and decoration are indicators of segmented dining practices.

Theoretical Frameworks

Because the Victorian era is a period of economic crisis and social change it is helpful to understand some of the theoretical models of ideas, power, hegemony, and especially, class and crisis. Class in particular can be a difficult term to describe particularly when talking about a class that resides between the working classes and the moneyed classes. In this section I will describe the origins of the Victorian middle classes and how this class structure interacts with economic and social crisis.

Eric Wolf's 1999 book on ideology and power in times of crisis is a great place to start. Wolf considers that there is an intimate connection between displays of power and the ideas from which they are derived (Wolf 1999:1). Ideas to Wolf, are "about something" in that they have functions as "emblems and instruments of power and cooperation and conflict" (Wolf 1999:3) Ideas in turn are condensed into an ideological narrative that "underwrite and manifest power" for the dominant hegemony (Wolf 1999:4). Hegemony is a worldview that may appear on the surface to represent all social classes but in reality it serves the vested interests of the ruling classes (Crehan 2002:97). Gramsci considers hegemony to be a "practical activity" that spawns "social relations that produce inequality and their justifications" (Crehan 2002:174). Wolf elaborates on Gramsci's concept of hegemony by adding an element of state power. He considers hegemonic processes as being part of the coercive aspects of the state via ideologically

controlled government institutions (Wolf 1999:45). I would go further in stating that hegemonic processes are coercive aspects of society as well.

Wolf (1999) believes that there are four modes of power; power of the individual, power of interaction, power of context, and most importantly to Wolf, structural power. Structural power is the “power to deploy and allocate social labor,” a Marxist concept, and combined with governance is an “exercise of action upon action,” an idea put forward by Foucault (Wolf 1999:5). Structural power, within the context of the Family Scholar House site, is manifested in the class character of the area and how the Victorian residents of the site maintained their status with forms of display. Wolf considers that within the concept of structural power, ideas are central, and that these are communicated by both verbal and nonverbal means. Communications in this sense form social codes that vary by context, forming a fluctuating web of power within culture (Wolf 1999:6-7). Communication is therefore instrumental in the maintenance of dominant hegemonies (Bourdieu 2010[1982]) in the form of codes, which are apparent in Victorian era displays of wealth and status via dining and other social activities.

The Victorian period is a time of turmoil socially as well as economically. The mid to late 1800s witnessed huge changes in the social fabric of the United States. Economics, class, and modernization all had their impact on American culture. But what is culture and how does it define a social group or class? Culture has been interpreted in many ways but I find it useful to look at two competing views and how they can be effectively combined. Wolf views culture as a construct that is best understood by the relationships of power interacting within the social structure (Wolf 1999:66). In contrast, Antonio Gramsci views culture as „how a class lives“ and that understanding the realities

of how people live as the key to understanding culture (Crehan 2002:6,28). The difference between Wolf and Gramsci appears to be scale, with Wolf taking a broader view of the concept of culture and Gramsci, a more narrow class view. I don't think that these views are incompatible and they are effectively combined by Howe (1976). Howe views culture as a constantly changing system that includes "beliefs, attitudes, and techniques" that are communicated inter-generationally by learned behavior (Howe 1976:5). This includes power and class structures, as well as religion, politics, professions, etc. However, culture is not just a collection of traditions, but a common personality of society including both social constructs and material culture (Wolf 1999:9, Howe 1976:5). Class in a traditional sense is a dialectical conflict between two groups, the industrial bourgeois who allocate the surplus of labor and the proletariat who produce the surplus (Marx and Engels 2010[1888]). While this is a useful starting point, I feel that it misses the nuance of society and culture. Between these dialectical groups there has always been a smaller group that bridges this gap. For the purposes of this thesis, the middle class is made up of professionals, entrepreneurs, and, by the late nineteenth century, clerks and managers or, as Bourdieu (2010[1982]) refers to them, the petty bourgeois. It is on this group, living and working between upper class and the working class, that this thesis focuses on.

The turmoil of the Victorian era can be seen as a power struggle for social and economic viability between the working classes and industrial capitalists. The middle class conformed or resisted the dominant modalities of power as their position within society changed during the latter half of the nineteenth century. This class struggle, still ongoing today, has its roots in the economic crisis that characterized the last quarter of

the nineteenth century. Times of crisis, to Wolf, provided the best opportunity to dissect the cultural aspects of society (Wolf 1999:16-17). During crisis, culture tends to fragment, laying bare the threads that constitute it. Wolf's study of the Kwakiutl, Aztecs, and National Socialists reveal this fragmentation very clearly. Kroeber (2010[1955]) also sees the utility in looking at extremes of human society focusing anthropological inquiry on various cultural phenomena in times of crisis (Kroeber 2010[1955]:199). Both Wolf and Kroeber are building on a theoretical foundations laid by Weber (2010[1922]) and Marx and Engels (2010[1888]). Weber, in his study of charismatic leaders, uses social crisis as a fulcrum for his inquiries, while Marx and Engel view bourgeois capitalism as a system destined for failure as it moves from "crisis to crisis...eliminating its own safeguards" (Marx and Engels 2010[1888]:25). The capitalist crises during the late 1800s were a cause of social and economic turmoil, but what were the effects and what were the responses by the middle class?

The middle classes underwent drastic changes from the 1850s onward (Aron 1987). Early in the century the middle class was made up of male professionals, small entrepreneurs, wealthy farmers, business agents, and clerks (Aron 1987:3 DeCunzo 1995:31). Middle class women typically did not work unless they were single or widows, and the professions open to them were few. This changed following the Civil War as the changing economy required more managers and clerks for the growing Federal and corporate bureaucracies that were needed to manage the growing industrialization of the United States economy (Aron 1987:4). The changing nature of middle class work had its roots in the early nineteenth century in eastern cities like New York, where families began segmenting themselves from their places of work (Wall 1994). Up until this time

period, middle class families and many laborers resided at the same location as their workplace (Wall 1994:4-5). This separation between work and home created segmentation within the middle class social structure where men were responsible for the households' economic health and women became the gatekeepers for the households' social health (Wall 1994:5). With the changes in middle class labor into the later nineteenth century this segmentation of work, home, and gender came under stress once again as men and increasingly women began to compete in a job marketplace where they no longer answered to themselves but to a hierarchical structure created to serve either the government or corporate bureaucracies (Aron 1987:8). But these changes created a crisis within the growing middle class as they transitioned from self employment to salaried work. The crisis was one of status and value (Aron 1987:9). As the economic stresses of the late nineteenth century increased, many small businesses failed leaving both middle class men and women struggling financially. This prompted many men and some women to seek white collar work for the financial stability that it offered (Aron 1987:13). But the value of such work was seen as less than that of self-employed people. Therefore a cultural shift began to occur where the increased structure, punctuality, and regulations necessary for the workplace caused middle class families to use manners and gentility as a basis for middle class values instead (Aron 1987:9, 14). These values came to dominate relationships between households.

The hegemonic processes that underlay structural power came under increasing stress during the late nineteenth century in America. As American culture changed in response to increasing industrialization and economic instability a new middle class emerged, one that was transitioning from self employed entrepreneurs and professionals

to salaried workers who worked for both government and corporate bureaucracies. In this volatile economic climate, the middle class adopted many symbols of the economic elite to communicate their status in society. One symbol of social status was segmented dining, a practice that emphasized many of the Victorian cultural virtues espoused by pundits and social commentators of the era. This thesis focuses on segmented dining as a way that middle class families maintained their status in society as a way to mitigate economic uncertainty.

The rest of this thesis is broken into six chapters. **Chapter 2** examines the background of Louisville and the Downtown Family Scholar House site to place the economic and social crisis of the late nineteenth century into a historical context. **Chapter 3** discusses the turn of the century residents of the Family Scholar House site including their ethnicity, and household structure. **Chapter 4** discusses the real estate transfers and values to establish how the economic crises might have been affecting the residents of the Family Scholar House site. **Chapter 5** examines the display and ritual that surrounds the Late Victorian Era middle class obsession with dining and what it demonstrated about middle class values. **Chapter 6** presents the methodology and findings of the excavations and analyzes the artifacts found at the site in the context of segmented dining and then compares the various households. **Chapter 7** concludes this thesis with a discussion of the original questions proposed in the introduction.

CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND AND CULTURAL CONTEXT

Wolf (1999) and the Comaroffs (1991) emphasize that in order to understand how class structure manifests and maintains within society, it is necessary to understand a culture in its particular period of time and place. Wolf in particular uses the concept of cause and effect to explain cultural change, as he describes it, a “stream of development” (Wolf 1999:8). Like Wolf, I believe that when discussing social structures it is important to examine the historical context in which these structures operate. Victorian Louisville was a product of the rise of industrialism that swept the United States and Britain starting in the middle of the nineteenth century. But how did it evolve in the Louisville area in Kentucky? To answer these questions I will need to present a brief history of the city adapted from Andrews and Schatz (2011).

Early Louisville History

Louisville is located in Jefferson County, one of the three original counties in Kentucky. Originally part of Virginia, the county was created in 1780 by an act of the Virginia General Assembly and named after Thomas Jefferson (Morgan and Jett 2003:1). It was gradually broken up over the following 100 years leaving its northwestern extent, surrounding Louisville, as the only part of the original county remaining. Louisville is located on the south bank of the Ohio River just above the Falls of Ohio, a barrier to river traffic and a major crossing for land animals and humans moving from the north or south

side of the river (Andrews and Schatz 2011:13). Early French trappers and later American explorers and settlers found the Louisville area to be an excellent location to settle with its abundant natural resources and its access and control of the Ohio River. The first surveys in the Ohio River valley were conducted at the behest of the Governor of Virginia, Lord Dunmore around 1770 (Casseday 1852). It wasn't until the Fincastle survey of 1774 that the Louisville area was surveyed, and settlement did not begin until 1778 (Morgan and Jett 2003:1, Kleber 1992:574). An expedition led by George Rogers Clark arrived in the Louisville area that year with soldiers and settlers established a camp first on Corn Island and later on the south shore of the river. The settlers named the community after the French King Louis XVI, an ally of the American revolutionaries (Kleber 1992:574). The community was surveyed in 1779 and granted a charter by the Virginia General Assembly 1780. The town was originally governed by seven trustees who considered that it should be made up of freeholders (Yater 1979). Initial settlement in the area was slow. Even though Louisville was the county seat, the city was no larger than other Jefferson County communities when Kentucky became a state in 1792 (Andrews and Schatz 2011:13).

Community Development

The community that would become Louisville expanded out from the original settlement at Corn Island and later Fort Nelson, located on the south bank of the Ohio River (Riebel 1954; Yater 1979, 1992). As the numbers of settlers increased, the character of the city became gradually segregated both culturally and economically. The influx of European, primarily Germans and Irish, immigrants in the 1840s, created distinct boundaries that translated into both daily living and work spaces (Andrews and

Schatz 2011:14). The peripheral settlements surrounding Louisville became the home of various migrant communities. As the city boundaries expanded, these migrant communities were often incorporated as neighborhoods and maintained a distinct cultural flavor for much of the nineteenth century (Andrews and Schatz 2011:14).

The original urban and industrial heart of the city was located at the mouth of Beargrass Creek, where it originally flowed into the Ohio at the north end of Third Street during the early 1800s (Louisville Directory 1832). This urban industrial area had ready access to the river, and with this access developed the regional economic supremacy that allowed the city to eclipse other communities in the area. As the city expanded and its population grew, the closest settlements became progressively less important and several ceased to exist as their populations dispersed (Collins 1874; Butler 1971). The city's continued expansion also undermined the admittedly limited plantation economy that surrounded the city, and like many of the smaller communities, these plantations either disappeared or became urban farmsteads as the areas surrounding them formed the basis of new suburbs of the city (Stewart-Abernathy 1986; O'Malley 1987).

Louisville's population increased after 1810 when it had a population of around 1,000. By 1820 the city's population had grown to 4,012 and by the time Louisville was granted city status in 1828 and incorporated in 1829, the population was approximately 10,000, not including the suburbs surrounding the urban core (Wade 1959:198). The city's population and growth rate likely would have been higher if the areas surrounding the city had not been swampy and prone to flooding. These two problems contributed to sanitation problems that resulted in epidemics like the cholera epidemic that occurred in

1822. The continuing outbreaks of disease earned the city the dubious title “Graveyard of the West” (Wade 1959:300-302).

Despite its sanitation problems and rampant diseases, Louisville continued to attract a wide variety of migrants and immigrants that made the city both socially and economically vibrant and segregated. Many immigrants and migrants gravitated to areas settled with similar cultural and economic values based on class and ethnicity (Wade 1959:104). Neighborhoods such as Irish Hill, Butchertown, and the northern part of Old Louisville, the residents of which are subject of this paper, were settled by lower class Irish, lower class Germans, and middle class Germans and German Jews respectively (Andrews and Schatz 2011:15). Upper Class neighborhoods were located at the west end of town along the river, although this pattern changed around 1900 as upper class families moved to new suburbs like the Highlands and St Matthews. Following the Civil War, the African American population grew considerably and, like their immigrant counterparts, settled in areas segregated from other cultural groups (Andrews and Schatz 2011:15).

Pre-Victorian Economy

The population growth of Louisville, described in the previous section, expanded dramatically between 1810 and 1820. This population growth was accompanied by a boom in the commerce economy directly linked to steam boat traffic that began arriving in the city starting in 1811 (Andrews and Schatz 2011:16). While keel boat traffic was common on the river before this date, the steam boat was able to move more cargo at a faster rate from ports as far away as New Orleans in the south and Pittsburg in the north (Kleber 1996:575).

Louisville was an overland transit location as cargo and people had to transfer between boats above the Falls of the Ohio at Louisville and below at Portland the majority of the year due to low water or dangerous water conditions. This commercial bottleneck was alleviated in 1830 with the opening of the Portland Canal (Crews 2003).

In addition to the river commerce, the city was connected regionally by a growing number of roads and rail lines. Roads in the Louisville area and indeed the entire mid-west region of the country were initially primitive but improvements began in 1835 (Coleman 1935). Formal turnpikes were constructed connecting Louisville to other nearby towns until the 1850s, when railroads became the preferred way to travel and ship goods overland. The first of these routes was opened in 1851 to Lexington, and within a decade lines were established between Nashville and Indianapolis as well (Kleber 1992:576).

Louisville's economic development between 1830 and 1860 was demonstrated in the city's population growth and urban expansion. The census figures show that Louisville's population doubled between 1830 and 1840 and again between 1840 and 1850 (Kramer 1978). The next decade saw another increase by more than 50 percent. As the population continued to grow, the city annexed two large eastern suburban areas; Cave Hill and the remainder of Butchertown in 1854 and 1856 respectively (Kramer 1978).

Like much of Kentucky prior to the Civil War, industry thrived in and around Louisville, mainly on the backs of slave and immigrant labor. Even during the war Louisville's economy continued to flourish with the large amount of Federal money flowing into the city for the construction of fortifications, supply centers, hospitals, and

other facilities and infrastructure that supported the war effort (Kleber 1992:576). After the war, Louisville was forced to adjust to the collapse of the southern plantation economy; new merchandising methods were initiated, and railroad links were established with other major cities in the South. With the influx of freed slaves, displaced laborers, and the newly released military looking for employment, the industrial output of Louisville grew (Andrews and Schatz 2011:16).

The Postbellum period is characterized by urbanization throughout most of the United States. Migration of both white and African-Americans from the South and immigration from Germany, England, and Ireland led to a shortage of living space. One newspaper, the Louisville Daily Democrat (1865), commented that there were few houses to rent or buy and that those that were commanded high prices.

The Victorian Cultural Era

The cultural hegemony that typified the Victorian Era was dominated by white Anglo-Saxon protestants, although select immigrant populations were able to participate to varying extents (Schlereth 1991:xii, Howe 1976:9). Other groups like Native-Americans, African-Americans, Hispanics, and Eastern European immigrants were largely excluded from the benefits of the era while still being subjected to its exertions of social control and power (Schlereth 1991:xii, Howe 1976:6). Schlereth (1991:3) describes Victorian culture as being fascinated with systems of order and control and used these systems to organize society into “departments, groups, and classes.”

This period in American history had a variety of impacts on the social fabric, many of which reverberate into the present. For the first time industrial production, commercial agriculture, and technological innovations led to that massive accumulation

of wealth by the industrial barons, or as Marx and Engels referred to them, the industrial bourgeois (Schlereth 1991:xiii, Marx and Engels [1888]2010:27). The accumulation of wealth was made possible by urbanization, bureaucracy, occupational specialization, and education, all largely built and maintained by the middle classes or petty bourgeois (Schlereth 1991:xiii, Bourdieu 2010[1982]). The era was also typified by the increasing control by corporations that strove, under the leadership of the moneyed classes, to create a hierarchical society focused on standardization, quantification, and control. This led to an obsession of sorts with time clocks, exams, and statistics that I would argue continues today (Schlereth 1991:xiii). The modernization of the Victorian Era also led to the mass production of goods as well as a distribution network that moved the goods to consumers, and advertising to sell the goods. The availability of these manufactured goods changed ideas about status and wealth and promoted the ideology of „plenty“ to which the middle classes and working classes aspired (Schlereth 1991:xiii). While it is tempting to attribute the changes in middle class culture as the result of hegemonic domination by the upper class, it is worth noting that, like the French petty bourgeois described by Bourdieu (2010[1982]), the middle class largely participated in, and many ways controlled, the agendas of political, social, and cultural power for their own benefit (Schlereth 1991:xiii). They maintained their class positions within society with education and expertise as well as with social displays of wealth (Schlereth 1991:xv). This is not to say that there were not dissenters and deserters from the Victorian hegemony or that families and groups did not involuntarily fall out of the middle class (Howe 1976:6).

As the era progressed, the middle class that had traditionally resided in both rural and semi-urban settings became increasingly urbanized, gravitating towards metropolitan

areas and increasingly participating in a consumer economy made possible by Victorian modernity. The desire to acquire land for economic stability and status transformed into desires for homes, wealth, and material goods (Schlereth 1991:xiv). Not only did the middle classes participate and support the Victorian hegemony, but they actively imposed Victorian ideals on the working classes by promoting consumer culture and ideas of comportment and status as well as quantification, regimentation, and standardization (Schlereth 1991:xiv, 29). It should be noted that, like the middle classes, the working classes also desired to participate in Victorian society, only with a smaller degree of success.

As stated in the introduction, the economy of the Victorian Era was generally fragile, with multiple financial crisis and doldrums, even while those at the top of the social hierarchy lived in extravagance. The growth of the middle classes was inconsistent during this period with the panics of 1873 and 1893 setting the stages for two acute depressions from 1873-77 and 1893-97 (Schlereth 1991:xiv). Although the Panic of 1873 slowed urbanization in Louisville somewhat, the population increases through immigration and migration did not slow (McBride and McBride 2008). There were often violent conflicts between labor and capital between 1879 and 1889, the worst of which was in 1886 (Schlereth 1991:xiv). Called the „Year of Great Upheaval,” 1886 bore witness to the Haymarket Massacre in Chicago, anti-Chinese riots in the Pacific Northwest, and continuing warfare between Federal troops and Native-Americans in the Southwest (Schlereth 1991:xiv). All of these were symptoms of capitalist hegemony that pervaded the cultural fabric of the period; labor exploitation, fear of the „other,” and land and mineral acquisition. However, despite the dominant capitalist hegemony, socialism

began to penetrate politics, largely due to Western European immigrants, especially Germans, who brought progressive ideologies with them after the failed revolution of 1848 (Kleber 2001:338, Wolf 1999:216).

During the 1880s, urban population grew at a greater rate than the rural population within Kentucky (McBride and McBride 2008). This increased urbanization led to the growth of residential suburbs and resulted in crowding and the decline in housing conditions in Louisville and other large cities within the state. As noted in the last section, there was a scarcity of housing as early as 1865 and in Victorian Louisville this trend continued. As the population increased, the structure of the household changed and family size decreased. Families, strapped for money during this period of economic flux, began to take in boarders and extended family members to make ends meet, thereby increasing the household size (McBride and McBride 2008). McBride and McBride (2008:937) found that the Jefferson County had five times more people per household than per family than Muhlenberg, Anderson, or Fayette Counties. In addition, tenement houses became more common as large, single family structures were converted to multifamily rental units (Kemp 1909, Andrews and Schatz 2011:17).

The last decades of the nineteenth century in Louisville were times of extensive cultural and industrial growth. Mercantile trade gave way to the manufacture of steam engines and boilers, furniture, cement, iron pipes, and agricultural equipment as seen within Business Directories (1888, 1889) and on the 1884 Hopkins Map of the city that identifies proprietors and businesses within the city. Gas, electric, and water works became competitive civic entities. Urbanization in the western end of the city was pronounced as growth to the east and south were inhibited by its hilly terrain, the number

of cemeteries, a belt of stockyards, and manufacturing concerns to the east, and drainage problems in the southern extremities of town. With the exception of the south end of town, the city was divided into large parcels by the 1880s (Andrews and Schatz 2011:17).

Enthusiastic promoters of Louisville of the 1890s decried,

“Every house here has its yard, whether it be the palace of a millionaire or the cottage of a laborer. So liberal has been the ground plan of the town that every man is able to own his yard where the grass grows... and where he can double or treble the size of his residence if he pleases” (English 1960:26)

Socially Louisville grew as well with the first Kentucky Derby run in 1875 at Churchill Downs. The city started a National league baseball team in 1876 and hosted the Southern Exposition for 1883-1887. By 1890, Frederick Law Olmstead was designing numerous parks and parkways throughout the city that promoted social leisure activities. Social stratification was evident in the city’s architecture, especially in the southern sections of Old Louisville and the Highlands (Andrews and Schatz 2011:17).

As stated before, the economy between 1870 and 1900 was very volatile and prone to crisis. Within this 30 year span there were multiple banking crisis (1873, 1884, 1890, and 1893) and two depressions (1873-1879, 1882-1885). While most of the crises were related to monetary policy, primarily the conflict between the gold and silver standards, they precipitated systemic depressions that affected the national economy (Glasner 1997). The crisis of 1873 and subsequent depression began in Europe with the collapse of the stock market in Vienna, Austria that cascaded through the financial markets of the rest of Europe and into the United States. In the United States, the post Civil War period had been a boom time, especially for the steel industry that was supplying the rapid expansion of the rail system from the Eastern seaboard to the West (Glasner 1997:132). At this time the United States economy was fragmented, with no

central banking institutions, and seasonal with money demands low in the summer and higher in the fall and winter (Glasner 1997:132-33). The collapse of the Cooke and Company Bank in the fall of 1873 caused many smaller banks and the Northern Pacific Railroad Company to go bankrupt, which resulted in a decline in the demand for steel (Glasner 1997:133). By the end of the year the banking crisis was resolved but the economy remained stagnant for another six years. As noted, the rail industry and related construction and supply businesses were hit hard while the rest of the economy made little progress with prices falling as much as 25 percent (Moseley 1997:148). The depression created social and economic unease, especially among farmers and the working class. Farmers began to organize and workers began a series of crippling strikes that eventually had to be broken by President Hayes (Moseley 1997:149). By 1879 a resurgence of railroad construction and record harvests had ended the depression. Unfortunately this upswing did not last; by 1883 the economy was once again in crisis leading to a new depression.

Preceding the depression, the American economy was booming with little unemployment, a prosperous housing market, and major expansions of the railroad system. Beginning in 1882, a gradual decline in profits led to a banking crisis in 1884 (Sorkin 1997:149). The main cause was a decline in public confidence in railroad stocks and bonds. This led to a contraction in rail construction and layoffs of workers (Sorkin 1997:150). The rapid increase in unemployment caused sharp economic declines in other industries as well. The banking industry took a huge hit with 11 New York banks and over 100 smaller banks going into receivership or failing as investments plummeted (Sorkin 1997:150). Of particular concern was the large amount of gold reserves held by

banks that were sent overseas to satisfy debt to British and continental banks. Businesses also failed in large numbers as well as demand for products sharply declined (Sorkin 1997:151). The market had stabilized by 1885 and a bumper harvest and a reorganization of the rail industry ended the depression as factories reopened and construction surged (Sorkin 1997:151). This decade and its economic crisis caused many middle class men and some women to enter into salaried work which provided a way for families with failed businesses to maintain their place on the socioeconomic ladder (Aron 1987:9, 13).

There was a brief banking crisis in 1890 but it did not create any lasting economic disruptions. It was however a prelude to a crisis in 1893 over the 20 year struggle between the silver and gold monetary standard (Timberlake 1997:516). In 1893 the Treasury Note Act, which repealed a requirement that the United States government buy large amounts of silver, led to a rising demand for gold and gold backed securities by foreign banks and governments, putting a strain on the United States monetary system (Timberlake 1997:517). The crisis was mitigated by banks limiting gold withdrawals. This alleviated the immediate monetary crisis but its effects caused a depression that lasted until 1897 (Timberlake 1997:517; Shifflett 1996:56). This depression led to up to 20 percent unemployment and was the worst depression of the 1800s (Shifflett 1996:56). The adoption of the gold standard in 1900 ended the monetary volatility that had caused so much economic stress to middle and working class families leaving them vulnerable to economic disaster (Aron 1987:8).

The national economy does appear to have had some effect on the local economy, as detailed in **Chapter 4**. Both land and tax records show that the local economy was volatile for some of the families that resided at the Family Scholar House site. Because

middle class families in the project area were affected it is highly likely that working class families in Louisville were also impacted, although more research needs to be conducted to determine their level of economic stress.

But who were the families and households that lived at the Family Scholar House site? The households that resided at the site were largely middle class with professionally employed members of the family providing for both close and extended family members. Some households housed boarders as well. Using census data and other records, a detailed description of the families that could be associated with discreet archaeological contexts utilized in the analysis is presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 3: THE HUMAN ELEMENT

Archival research revealed that the block had once been occupied by households of German immigrants, German Jewish immigrants, second generation immigrants, and native born residents in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (**Figure 3.1**). Using historic maps and census data, house lots were matched with corresponding households to determine who was living on the block during this period. Census research revealed that a German immigrant household (Anton Coldeway), four German Jewish households (Goodkind Isenberg, Joseph Solomon, Adolph Hay, and Sarah Kuhn), and three native born households (Annie Herr, Cora Carpenter, and Robert Elliot/Charles Gorman) composed of extended family members lived on the block at the turn of the twentieth century (Andrews 2001:287). These households could be linked to discrete archaeological deposits excavated during the investigations at the site. The discussions of the households focus on the last decade of the nineteenth century by necessity, as earlier archaeological and historical data is unclear or missing.

During the late Victorian era many middle class families mitigated the economic turbulence in several different ways. One way was to purchase a home that would provide a tangible asset for the family that could be sold if necessary. Interestingly, immigrant families were even more likely to purchase a house than their native born counterparts (Schlereth 1991:101). However, home ownership was not the norm for younger households, rather ownership appears to be linked to age, with a greater number

of middle aged income earners owning real estate and personal property (Aron 1987:22-23). In addition, a home, if large enough, could also provide extra income by renting rooms to boarders (Schlereth 1991:100). Even home renters utilized this strategy to make extra income (Schlereth 1991:104). Home ownership and the use of the home as a way of generating income helped maintain the financial stability and therefore the status of middle class families within the study area (Andrews 2011:290).

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 3.1. 1892 Sanborn Insurance Map showing the Ethnicity of Households with Recovered Archaeological Data.

There were two points of stress during the life cycle of families during the late Victorian period; childhood and old age. Middle class families with young children and

under economic stress might take in boarders to mitigate their financial woes (Schlereth 1991:104). Another strategy was for young families to live with other family members or parents who may have also received some measure of economic stability with this arrangement. This strategy was employed by several households in the study area, especially the native born households described later in this chapter. Old age was also a stress on the economic well being of a family. Without any form of social safety net, households containing elderly and retired individuals also took on boarders and family members to relieve financial hardships. The Isenberg, Coldeway, Gorman, Elliot, Patterson, and Herr Households used one or both of these strategies during the late nineteenth century (Andrews 2011:289).

Victorian American was characterized by the mobility of goods, capital, and in this case, people. While the United States was founded on immigrants by the mid-nineteenth century these early migrants were established „natives“ who often resented newer immigrants to this country. Nativists sought to limit immigration, especially by Jews, Catholics, and Asians, to maintain their cultural dominion over pre-Victorian society. Unfortunately for them, the Federal government encouraged immigrants, especially those from Western Europe, to move to the US to increase the pool of labor for burgeoning industries and to claim land from embattled Native-Americans (Schlereth 1991:8). In 1854, 427,833 immigrants were admitted to the United States and less than thirty years later this figure rose to 788,992 in 1882, the peak year for German immigration (Kleber 2001:339).

Germans

The Germans were one of the most successful ethnic groups that established themselves in America's cities. German enclaves were more than just a collection of individuals from the German Principalities but were actually full-fledged communities with functional institutions of both a formal and informal nature (Daniels 1990; Kleber 2001:338). In Louisville, numerous social institutions sprang up including newspapers like the *Anzeiger*, and social clubs like the Louisville Turnverein – a gymnastics society. Churches and schools maintained and promoted German culture by retaining the use of the German language and business institutions. Germans influenced local institutions as well, instituting kindergarten and bilingual classes into the public school system (Kleber 2001:338-39).

German immigrants began arriving in significant numbers in the 1830s, establishing homes, churches, cemeteries and businesses. They usually immigrated as families rather than as individuals. Unlike many other immigrant groups Germans immigrated for economic reasons, although significant numbers departed as the result of the failed 1848 Revolution in Prussia (Andrews 2011:288, Wolf 1999:216). Germans generally wished to reestablish their social and cultural settings in the United States rather than to begin anew like other immigrant groups (Andrews 2011:288). The early German immigrants, especially those arriving after the 1848 Revolution, were generally progressive politically, establishing political parties that advocated for the abolition of slavery and voting rights for women (Kleber 2001:338). Their liberal ideology conflicted with the anti-immigrant, anti-Catholic Nativists who in 1855 sparked a riot in Louisville

that resulted in deaths and property destruction among Germans, Irish, and African American residents (Kleber 2001:338-39).

After arriving, Germans tended to settle close to medium sized cities in the mid-west rather than the large metropolitan cities of the east (Andrews 2011:288, Kleber 2001:338). Second generation Germans continued this trend (Andrews 2011:288). German immigrants in Louisville and their children usually were self employed in a variety of skilled trades including brewers, bakers, butchers, furniture makers, machinists, and tailors (Andrews 2011:288). Many went on to found or run banking and business institutions. German businesses did well during the Civil War and into the Victorian Era. Because of their progressive politics Germans were strong supporters of the Union and profited accordingly both socially and monetarily (Kleber 2001:339). German businesses proliferated after the war, with Germans running businesses as diverse as manufacturing, banking, food distribution, and undertakers (Kleber 2001:339).

German immigration reached its peak in 1883 and declined in following years (Kleber 2001:339). The German born population was at its greatest in the census reports of 1890 but declined sharply over the next two censuses as immigration slowed and the original German immigrants died (Bergquist 1984:17). German Americans also began to associate themselves less and less as Germans, having assimilated themselves into the prevailing American culture. This decline is seen in the shrinking membership of German social groups and the demise of German language newspapers in most major cities. Laws were passed in Illinois and Wisconsin limiting the use of the German language and in Louisville the continued use of German in public schools was a source of social friction that eventually led to an end of its usage (Bergquist 1984:18).

The Coldeway Household

Anton Coldeway was a prominent Louisville businessman, president of the Western Bank, and the earliest resident of the Family Scholar House site. The Louisville Business Directory (1859) listed Anton Coldeway as a cabinetmaker prior to his career as a banker. It was determined through Louisville business directories and tax records that Anton Coldeway, his wife Anna and several children moved into the property in 1867 upon completion of 2.5 story Italianate mansion (Federal Tax list 1866, Andrews and Schatz 2011:34). They lived on the property through 1900 when Anton died. Anton's will (Jefferson County Clerk 1900) listed several items that indicated his wealth and status. His estate included a horse and carriage, household furniture and plate, property, and a personal estate (cash, etc). His wife Anna inherited all of the personal belongings and 1/3 of the personal estate and property as well as the use of the family home for her lifetime. The rest of the personal estate and real estate was divided among the children when they reached the age of 21 and 25 respectively (Jefferson County 1900). Because the Coldeways lived at their home from 1863 to 1910, their household was used as a finding aid to identify other households within the project area on the US Census records (1870; 1880; 1900; 1910). This includes renters who don't show up on the real estate records discussed in **Chapter 4**. The Coldeways were an affluent family as shown on the city tax records (see Chapter 4). There was brief period in the 1880s when their taxable property was significantly diminished, but by 1891 their fortunes had rebounded. The Coldeway's were the only German American immigrant household identified at the site. It is interesting, based on the material culture recovered from the site, that little in the way of

distinctive „German“ artifacts were recovered indicating that the Coldeways had fully assimilated materially into Victorian culture (Andrews 2011:290).

The Gorman Household

The other household with German ethnicity was that of Charles Gorman, a second generation German immigrant. The Gorman household rented their house from the Gaulbert's, a wealthy real estate family in the Old Louisville area. It is unclear how long they lived in the home as there is no record of them prior to 1900 U.S. Census. The 1900 census provided a large amount of information about the household. There were ten members including Charles, his wife, Annie, two sons, one daughter, a sister-in-law, a niece, and two boarders (U.S. Census 1900). The household had occupants between the ages of 30 and 62, indicating that there was minimal age related stresses on the family. Unlike Charles, Annie was of English decent. Both of the boarders were second generation English immigrants as well. The family occupations included an engraver, a bank clerk, a stationer, a music teacher, and a teacher. One of the boarders was also a stationer and the other was as assistant secretary (U.S. Census 1900). The overall impression of this family is one of relative affluence with five professional family members in addition to income from the two boarders.

German Jews

In many ways the German and German Jewish populations in Louisville are closely linked, both in language and culture despite their religious differences. The economic disruptions that impelled many Germans to migrate also spurred the German Jewish population to immigrate to the United States. In addition, prior to their acceptance as full citizens in the German state in 1871, the desire to avoid special taxes and

discriminatory legislation that encroached on their civil rights was a motivation to immigrate (Kleber 2001:446, Wolf 1999:243-44). Like other German immigrants, German Jews also migrated in family groups (Daniels 2002). German Jewish immigration is difficult to discern in the overall movement of Germans to the United States because the census records do not list religion. German Jews can be teased out of the historical record by examining both synagogue and cemetery records (Andrews 2011:288). Jewish residents of the Scholar House site were identified in this way.

Several other characteristics besides religion set German Jews apart from the larger German migration. First among these was the fact that few Jews settled outside of urban areas. Second, German Jews were rarely artisans or tradesman other than tailors due to discriminatory practices in the German Principalities that they left (Andrews 2011:288, Wolf 1999:243-44). In Germany, Jews were part of the burgeoning middle class with occupations centered on commerce and banking. Unfortunately, their association with these professions made them targets for the discontented who were increasingly looking at capitalism as the source of social woes (Wolf 1999:244). In the United States, Jewish immigrants continued to practice commercial retail trades and many began as travelling itinerate peddlers while others ran wholesale enterprises in larger towns and cities. In Louisville, German Jewish men and women were crucial to commercial development, and many rose to prominence as retailers, distillers, and entrepreneurs in the city. Both of the Jewish households within the Family Scholar House site fell into this pattern of occupation (Andrews 2011:288).

In Louisville, like their non-Jewish German counterparts, the German Jewish population attempted to maintain their distinctive identities by organizing social

organizations. Also like their German counterparts, German Jews integrated themselves into American society even while they operated within their own communities.

Successful German Jewish acculturation is likely a product of the Reform movement in Judaism which considered that adaptation to a modern environment required that the strict adherence to Jewish laws be abandoned and that some of the cultural customs of the societies in which they lived should be followed. (Andrews 2011:289).

The Isenberg Household

The Isenbergs settled in the block at the close of the nineteenth century and lived there until at least 1920. The Federal Census (1900) lists a household of five, including Goodkind Isenberg, his wife Bertha, daughter Hattie, a son-in-law, as well as a servant. Goodkind, who emigrated from Germany sometime in the mid-nineteenth century, was a “dealer in hides” and operated a family owned wholesale store (U.S. Census 1900). His listing in both the 1910 and 1920 censuses shows that he had become the president of a wholesale wool warehouse. His Jewish religion was determined after examination of Jewish cemetery records for Louisville. Both Goodkind and Bertha were interred at the Temple Jewish Cemetery on Preston Street in Louisville (Andrews 2011:260). As a wholesale store owner Goodkind was likely well off financially, although it is possible that he may have struggled during the fluctuating economy during the late Victorian era.

The Solomon Household

The second German Jewish household within the Family Scholar House block is that of Joseph Solomon and his wife Eva. Joseph and Eva were immigrants from Germany, arriving in United States in 1864 (Andrews 2011:267). In the 1900 census they are living in the house that they purchased in 1892. Joseph has no occupation listed in the

1900 census, indicating that he may have been a retiree. The rest of the household consisted of Eva and three daughters and one boarder. No occupation was listed for the boarder. Joseph and Eva Solomon were practicing Jews and were buried in the Jewish Temple cemetery (Andrews 2011:267). The Solomon's moved into Louisville prior to 1892 from Nelson County, Kentucky, settling within the small German Jewish community around First and Second Streets. The Solomon's son Leon, a doctor, also lived nearby on Ormsby Street (U.S. Census 1900).

The Native Element

Native born families are households whose members have no referenced ties to foreign countries. These are families that have been in the United States for multiple generations and are fully acculturated into „American“ culture. Four Native born households were associated with artifacts recovered from the Family Scholar House site. These families are detailed below.

The Elliot Household

The Robert Elliot household consisted of a large extended family based on the U.S. Census (1900). Like the Gormans, who lived next door, the Elliots were renters of property owned by the Gaulberts. The household consisted of fourteen members including Robert and his wife Annie, five daughters, two sons, two granddaughters, two grandsons and a daughter-in-law (U.S. Census 1900). The Elliot household is characterized by related individuals of various ages ranging from 2 to 77 years old. Robert, aged 77, and his wife, aged 61, were quite elderly and although listed as head of household, Robert did not have an occupation and was likely retired. The family's income was likely derived from Robert's two sons Edwin (aged 41), a manager at a type

writer factory, and Robert (aged 36), a telegraph operator (U.S. Census 1900). The income that the two sons contributed likely left the family economically strained.

The Carpenter Household

Like several other households in the project area, the Carpenter's were renters. They lived on property owned by Annie and E.V. Thompson. Cora F. Carpenter is listed as the head of household living with her son and daughter. Her listed profession is listed as "Keeping Boarders" on the 1900 census, an acceptable occupation for middle class widows or single mothers (U.S. Census 1900). No professions are listed for the four boarders indicating that they may be laborers or have other itinerant employment. As a single mother Carpenter was likely economically stressed. However, by taking on boarders she was generating enough income to rent a large house in a new suburb of Louisville for her and her children.

The Patterson Household

The Patterson household also rented from the Gaulbert family. Like the Elliot household, the Patterson's consisted of extended family members. The U.S. Census (1900) lists John Patterson as a manufacturer of cigars. The remainder of the household was composed of 12 members with his wife, Belle, three young sons, two young daughters, a widowed mother-in-law, two sisters-in-law, a widowed aunt, a cousin, and an older widowed cousin. Only two members of the household are listed with occupations; John Patterson and his cousin Henry Sutton, also a cigar manufacturer (U.S. Census 1900). All of the individuals in the household were native born Americans from the south who likely migrated north to take advantage of better jobs opportunities in Louisville (Andrews 2011:275). The size of this family would seem to indicate that they

would be in financial difficulties due to the young age of many of the children and only two sources of income.

The Herr Household

The last household that researchers were able to link to artifacts recovered from the site was that of widow Annie Herr. She rented the residence, also from the Gaulbert's, and her household was composed of six family members; a divorced daughter and her young son John, two daughters, and two sons (U.S. Census (1900)). Like other families at the Family Scholar House site, Herr had a boarder. Only two of the occupants in this household had income, her son, a bank clerk, and the boarder, a teacher (U.S. Census (1900)). Like many of the other households, Herr likely took in her boarder to supplement the income brought in by her son. This would appear to leave the family economically constrained.

The various households researched during the Family Scholar House project were all living in a newly built suburb of Louisville. Originally settled in the 1860s, by the 1890s it was a thriving middle class neighborhood. However, many of the households present in 1900 showed potential signs of economic stress. Several of the families were quite large and had limited incomes that necessitated taking on boarders or extended family members. However, other households were relatively small with income earners that had high income potential. This mixture of relative wealth may have prompted many families to use segmented dining as a way to acquire social status despite their perceived economic constraints.

CHAPTER 4: LOCAL ECONOMY AND LAND RECORDS

One way of determining the economic volatility in Louisville between 1870 and 1900 is to look at the land records, or deeds, that record the transfers of property from one owner to another. These records can show how often and for how much property was sold. This information can in turn be correlated with national economic trends that may have impacted the residents of the Scholar House. A detailed reconstruction of the land records follow as well as analysis of the sale prices and what trends they show. Portions of this section have been adapted with permission from a chapter of the Scholar House Phase III report (Schatz 2011b).

The northern portion of Old Louisville was originally part of the land grant awarded to Col. Arthur Campbell. Upon his death, his holdings south of Prather Street (Broadway) were subdivided for sale and development as a new suburb of the city. The 14 lot site area was initially divided into 5 parcels as shown on the 1851 plat of the property (**Figure 4.1**) purchased by James Breckinridge, a prominent early citizen and land speculator of Louisville from the Arthur Campbell heirs. No homes are known to be present on the site at this time. In 1860 sections of the site were owned by three families, the Robertson's, who owned Lot 52 on the 1851 plat, the Steins, who owned what was then called Lot 4, and the Wedekemper's, who owned Lots 1 thru 3. By 1876 there were six homes located within the northwest and southeast sections of the Downtown Family Scholar House project area, three along Breckinridge and three facing First Street (**Figure 4.2**).

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 4.1. 1851 Plat map from DB 79, page 549, showing the original lots purchased by James Breckinridge.

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 4.2. A section of the 1876 Abstract and Loan Association atlas showing existing dwellings within the project area.

Only five property owners are shown on this map, indicating that while home construction was ongoing, a large portion of the site was rented or undeveloped. The earliest known construction at the site was within Lot 79, built by Anton Coldeway in 1866. It is unclear when the other five dwellings were constructed.

The 1876 map shows that the area around the Downtown Family Scholar House site was not heavily developed; it consisted of numerous vacant lots (Figure 2.2). Most of these are concentrated to the south of the site, while the lots to the north are largely developed. This is a good indication of the progression of urban expansion from the north to south.

By the 1880s two additional dwellings were constructed within the site boundaries. These were constructed on what would later be called Lots 81E and 75 (Lots 7 and 15 in **Figure 4.3**). With a few exceptions, the area surrounding the project area, except for the areas extending to the south, were heavily developed at this time. Lot ownership at this time had expanded to up to eight families. The Gaulberts held the most land, owning seven of the 15 lots at this time.

The late 1880s and 1890s saw an explosion of development within the project area due to both real estate speculation and influxes of immigrants. Seven new homes were constructed along with numerous out-buildings (**Figure 4.4**). An alley was also added between the First Street lots and Lot 82, which faced Breckinridge Street. The construction boom is shown in the surrounding area as well, with the construction of homes and a few businesses on what had been the vacant lots of the 1880s. The vast majority of the construction from the 1870s to the 1890s was for the building of homes. Interestingly, the number of individual home owners did not expand greatly in the 1890s.

Lot ownership expanded to only nine, with the largest landholder still being the Gaulbert's, who owned five of the 15 lots.

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 4.3. 1884 Hopkins Atlas showing existing dwellings within the project area.

The early 1900s showed little difference in the ownership patterns within the site area. Ten different owners were identified during the deed research. The Gaulbert's still held five of the properties, while the Coldeways owned two. The remaining lots were owned by individuals. Census data shows that the project area was increasingly inhabited by tenants as some of the upper middle class households moved or the owners died. An increasing number of businesses began moving into the Old Louisville area during this period as well. By 1905, Lot 88/160 had an addition built onto the First Street frontage to accommodate businesses. The surrounding area saw similar development as residences were demolished and industrial buildings replaced them.

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 4.4. 1892 Sanborn map of the project area showing existing dwellings.

The ownership pattern within the project area was fairly static until the 1920s. During the 1920s, the Gaulberts sold their five lots while almost all of the remaining 10 lots changed hands. Only the Coldeway lots remained in the family. Ownership changes became fairly frequent with few of the lots remaining with the same owner for more than 5 years into the 1940s. It was during this period that the Filson Club bought Lots 81W and 81E (1927) for use as their document repository. Based on available photographs viewed at the Filson Club, by the mid to late 1940s many of the dwellings throughout the project area had been demolished.

Ownership Patterns

As noted in the previous section, the ownership patterns during the study period (1870-1900) remained fairly static, with relatively few land transfers (**Figure 4.5**). This trend is especially true for the lots within the areas of the site excavated during the Phase III data recovery portion of the project (Lots 79 to 88/160). However, when the First Street Lots 75 to 78 are included, the various property transfers form temporally discrete clusters that correspond with some of the economic downturns that occurred toward the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. The period between 1870 and 1900 was a period of rapid economic changes (Glasner 1997). The first group of property transfer clusters occurred around 1880, just prior to the crisis of 1883 and following depression. Seven of the 15 properties were transferred during this period. This may indicate that the stresses in the economy were already manifesting in the real estate market, resulting in an increase in property transfers likely from cash strapped owners to land speculators who subsequently resold the properties for a profit. Deeds on six of these properties were transferred at least two times in the span of 4 to 5 years. The economic recession during the early to mid-1890s is likely responsible for a second series of transfers, although these are confined to three lots. Two of these lots exhibit multiple deed transfers, again indicating land speculation in property that longer term owners may have been unable to make payments on.

After the 1890s depression, the real estate market seems to have settled until approximately 1910, when another series of transfers on nine of the 15 lots occurred. Although the economic conditions were still unsettled, the volatility of the late 1800s real estate market does not appear during this cluster of transfers. Unlike the previous two

clusters of land sales, the 1910 series were single transfers, five of which were transfers from the Gaulbert family to the family owned Gaulbert Realty Company. One other lot (84) involved the transfer of property within a single family. The three remaining were transfers between different families upon the death of the former owners. The economic turbulence during the 1910s appears to be much milder than the previous decades.

This changed following World War I, when a series of economic down turns led to widespread hardship (O'Brian 1997: 152). The economic problems extended into the real estate market between 1920 and 1930. The volatility in the market within the project area is shown in **Figure 4.5** when 11 of the 15 properties changed hands, many multiple times.

The clusters of property transfers led to an initial assumption that they were a result of cash strapped families selling or land speculators. Upon reflection, it was possible that the actual sale prices might illuminate the degree to which this assumption was correct. To that end the sale prices were obtained, if available, for all of the lots within the Family Scholar House project area. This required looking at 30 different deed books to cover the period between the 1850 and 1925. Having gathered this data, which was by no means complete, it became apparent that the sale prices might not be comparable from year to year due to the economic volatility. For that reason I decided to convert the historic monetary value of the property sales into 2014 dollars so that a meaningful comparison could be conducted. This is by no means a new idea and has been done extensively by economists in a modern context as well as in almanacs about the Victorian era (Shifflett 1996).

To get the base numbers from which to convert, I first converted the sale prices of the land into a per acre value so that there would be value equivalency across all of the lots. I then averaged the per acre prices for each of the years that sales occurred between 1850 and 1925. I ended with two averages because I felt the data values would be skewed down if developed and undeveloped lots were averaged together. For this discussion I focus on the developed lots, which I consider to be a better indicator, not just because they give consistency for the entire time period, but because the developed lots are where households live (**Chapter 3**) and generate archaeological deposits (**Chapter 6**).

The values presented in **Table 4.1** represent the per acre cost of each land sale, the average per acre cost, the average cost per acre cost for developed properties, and the 2014 monetary equivalents for each sale year. The 2014 monetary equivalence data was generated using charts provided by the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (2014) and was calculated as follows: $2014 \text{ Price} = A \times (701.5 / B)$ where „A“ is the sale price of a lot and „B“ is the average consumer price index for a given year. Once this conversion was completed I converted the table data into a chart (**Figure 4.6**) that clearly shows the fluctuations on real estate values between 1850 and 1925.

Several trends can be seen from both the table and chart. The 1870s depression and recovery can be seen by the generally flat land prices punctuated by a tripling in land value in 1879 right at the tail end of the 1873-79 depression. This value drops by over a third the following year but then begins to climb throughout the 1882-1885 depression. By 1888 land prices spiked to over double the 1885 average. Land prices once again fell by 1889 and continued to mildly fluctuate until 1896, when an incredibly low sale price for lot 81E drove the average value to 1870s values. This is an anomaly, however, as the

Table 4.1. Per Acre Price for Individual Lots, Average Prices, Developed Lot Prices, and 2014 Price Equivalent Averages per Year

Property/ Year	Lot 75	Lot 76	Lot 77	Lot 78	Lot 79	Lot 80	Lot 81W	Lot 81E	Lot 82	Lot 83	Lot 84	Lot 85	Lot 86	Lot 87	Lot 88/160	Avg. By Year	Developed Avg.	2014 Developed Avg.		
1851	5,829.00				2,291.70											\$4,060.35	\$0.00	\$0.00		
1857						1,000.00										\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		
1863					7,656.25											\$7,556.25	\$0.00	\$0.00		
1867				10,937.50												\$10,937.50	\$10,937.50	\$182,682.29		
1871				12,500.00												\$12,500.00	\$12,500.00	\$243,576.39		
1874				14,218.75												\$14,218.75	\$14,218.75	\$293,366.27		
1876	13,125.00	17,750.00														\$10,840.60	\$10,840.60	\$237,646.28		
1877								11,647.00								\$7,476.64	\$0.00	\$0.00		
1878	8,750.00			7,476.64										\$8,750.00	\$0.00	\$0.00				

Property/ Year	1896	1898	1909	1912	1920	1921	1922	1924
Lot 75				11,562.50				
Lot 76								
Lot 77								
Lot 78								
Lot 79								
Lot 80								
Lot 81W								
Lot 81E								
Lot 82	12,187.50	44117.00/2 7058.00	8,000.00					
Lot 83								
Lot 84					30,000.00	45,454.50		
Lot 85								
Lot 86								
Lot 87								
Lot 88/160						41,954.50	36,363.60	
Avg. By Year								
Developed Avg.								
2014 Developed Avg.								
	\$12,187.50	\$35,587.50	\$8,000.00	\$11,562.50	\$30,000.00	\$37,278.38	\$36,363.60	\$53,125.00
	\$12,187.50	\$35,587.50	\$8,000.00	\$11,562.50	\$30,000.00	\$37,278.38	\$36,363.60	\$53,125.00
	\$341,981.25	\$998,585.25	\$207,851.85	\$279,692.89	\$349,584.72	\$487,887.75	\$507,138.48	\$723,634.71

Figure 4.6. Average acre value in 2014 dollars for developed lots.

price reflects an inter-family property transfer rather than a market crash. The average land price returned to the 1890s trend by 1898. While out of the time scope of this paper, it is worth noting that the real estate market took a plunge between 1898 and 1909 when land averages again dropped to 1870s levels. While there was a steady trend upwards for the next 15 years, the values never again reached the high averages of the late 1880s and 1890s.

While the land sales showing four clusters of property transfers within the project area seem to demonstrate the various economic recessions impacting the Louisville real estate market, this is not necessarily reflected in the average prices for land during the 1870-1900 period. It may be that the sales during the depressions of the 1870s and 1880s along with the monetary crisis of the 1890s did not lead families to sell at bargain prices. While there may have been economic reasons for selling, there were buyers willing to pay high prices for developed lots within the project area. Based on the research it appears, at least for the owners of property at the Family Scholar House site, that real estate was an effective way to maintain class status and economic stability. It also appears that the larger national economic issues did not penetrate into the local real estate market. However, more research needs to be done in this area. It would be illuminating to do expanded research in Old Louisville and other parts of Louisville to see if the trend at the Family Scholar House site was an anomaly or indicative of the overall real estate market during the late Victorian era.

Tax records are another avenue of inquiry into the economic status and stability of households at the Family Scholar House site. These contain a variety of information about the taxable property owned by each household. I had hoped to be able to directly

link households that were subjected to archaeological analysis to tax data. Unfortunately, I encountered several difficulties, the most critical being that the Jefferson County and Louisville tax assessment books stop at 1891, so there was no data available for the households at the turn of the century, which were the focus of the archaeological analysis (**Chapter 6**). The second issue was the uncertainty involved with identifying in which district of the city a family lived. There were between three and five districts covered in each tax year, none of which have a map key for what was included in each district, making it difficult to locate a specific person on the lists. The third issue was the quality of the microfilm on which the tax lists are available. Many of the pages are badly exposed and illegible. The final issue concerns the lists themselves. None of the books are indexed and many of the earlier ones are only alphabetized by the first letter of the surname. Taken as a whole, these issues made it next to impossible to systematically find records for all 25+ owners of the various properties and the 13 known renters. If the originals could be located several of these issues might be mitigated, making it possible to do more intensive tax research. That said, I was able to get a snapshot of the personal property value of several of the land owners (**Table 4.2**).

Due to the volume and difficulties in the identification, I decided to look at the census years from 1870 to 1890. In addition, I looked at the mid-decade years of 1875 and 1885. Unfortunately, I was only able to find two names on the 1885 list and none on the 1875 list. I also substituted 1891 for 1890 because I could only find one lot owner. The 1891 tax book (Jefferson County Clerk 1891) had seven identifiable land owners present. Only two were identified on the 1885 lists (Jefferson County Clerk 1885). Three were found on the 1880 list and two were found on the 1870 list (Jefferson County Clerk

1880, 1870). The only consistent listing found was for A.F. Coldeway. In 1880, Coldeway had considerable assets. His combined real estate and personal property was the 2014 equivalent of over \$1.8 million. He owned 16 properties and \$5,500 in personal property. His wealth only slightly decreased in 1880, although his personal property value increased almost fourfold to almost \$22,000. By 1885, Coldeway's fortunes had changed. The value of wealth was barely a quarter of his 1880 valuation. However by 1891, his fortunes had been reversed and he once again had \$1.8 million in assets.

Table 4.2. Household Tax Value by Year in Contemporary and 2014 Dollars

Lot/Year	1870	1880	1885	1891
Lot 75			J. Caldwell \$113,900/ \$2,959,290	Mary Caldwell \$5,825/ \$151,352
Lot 76		Wm. Duvall \$3,800/ \$91,920		
Lot 77	J.C. Hale \$2,100/ \$38,767			Martha Trabue \$2,600/ \$67,552
Lot 78				Wm. Harrison \$4,080/ \$106,004
Lot 79/80	A.F. Coldeway \$101,600/ \$1,875,589	A.F. Coldeway \$73,700/ \$1,782,777	A.F. Coldeway \$16,200/ \$420,900	A.F. Coldeway \$70,135/ \$1,822,211
Lot 81W		Mickel Enright \$12,000/ \$290,275		Michael Enright \$5,400/ \$140,300
Lot 81E				E.V. Thompson \$20,215/ \$525,216
Lot 84				Sarah Kuhn \$8,615/ \$223,830

In contrast, the fortunes of the Caldwell's were much different. In 1885, they had almost \$3 million in assets including \$34,000 in personal property. Unlike Coldeway, the Caldwell's wealth did not increase by 1891. In fact their assets plummeted in value to

barely 3 percent of their 1885 valuation. Other residents of the site had much more modest estates than Coldeway in 1891. Michael Enright, while losing wealth from 1880 to 1891, was still assessed at \$140,300. Other residents ranged from \$67,000 to \$525,000 indicating that the neighborhood was solidly middle class, although some families were obviously more economically stressed than others.

My contention is that this economic stress as well as Victorian social values led many families to participate in elaborate social rituals that displayed their gentility, manners and taste. The most prominent of these rituals was segmented dining, a highly ritualized activity involving very specific practices including dress, comportment, and conversation. The following chapter details the ritual of segmented dining.

CHAPTER 5: DISPLAY AND RITUAL

The Victorian Era has been called the „Gilded Age“ due to the perceived prosperity that typified the time between 1870 and 1915. This term was first coined by Mark Twain and Charles Warner in 1873 (Schlereth 1991:xi). The Gilded Age is typified by contradictions of extremes; confidence-desperation, moral-immoral, gentile-course, and efficiency-waste to name a few (Schlereth 1991:xii). The dining rituals that originated during this period of societal crisis evolved to mitigate the perceived threat of social egalitarianism to the hierarchical social structure as well as to earn status (Schollander and Scholander 2002:11).

The display of wealth and power in many societies are a response to acute social crisis that arise during periods of social upheaval. Jean and John Comaroff (1991) detail this type of display in their discourse on the social changes to Tswana brought on by the penetration of their society by British missionaries. Tswana leaders made displays of traditional wealth and power to maintain their status while at the same time adopting symbols and material artifacts of power brought by the missionaries (Comaroff and Comaroff 1991). Eric Wolf also looks at the relationships between display, ritual, and power (Wolf 1999). He discusses three different societies; the Kwakiutl, Aztecs and National Socialist Germany. All three societies are described in a time of crisis; the Kwakiutl, reeling from colonial capitalist penetration, the Aztecs, consumed with

mitigating the effects of constant environmental crisis, and the National Socialists, seizing power during the economic calamities of the 1930s. In all three, displays of social power through ritual activities were viewed as a way of maintaining social hierarchies in the face of new social realities.

In the case of Victorian Louisville and specifically the Family Scholar House site, we see the same interaction between a profound social crisis, the rise of industrial capitalism and its hegemony of consumption, and the maintenance of societal order (Erbsen 2009:6-7). The rituals of dining and display were two of the ways in which the Victorian middle classes maintained their class position, which poses the question: how does the display of wealth and ritualistic dining maintain class status?

Homes, Parlors, and Dining Rooms

The middle class Victorian home was seen by many, just as they are today, as a visible sign of the wealth and status of their owners or residents. Those that could, purchased homes while the less well-off rented the finest homes they could afford (Schlereth 1991:87). The increased industrialization and pace of life led to the view that the home was more than a place to live, but rather a symbol retreat from the world where middle class families could relax and pursue recreational activities (Schlereth 1991:95). As I presented earlier, the ideal of home ownership became a national dream during the Victorian Era, and between 1870 and 1920 the rate of home ownership climbed from 1/5 to 1/4 of households (Schlereth 1991:95). In order to afford home purchases, many middle class families would rent vacant rooms to boarders and for some, like the Carpenters and Herrs discussed above, this was a source of income that allowed them to maintain not only their homes but their class status (Schlereth 1991:103). Like most

things related to the daily concerns of the home, women were in charge of boarders, which provided employment for women in the home (Schlereth 1991:104).

The Victorian home consisted of formal (for visitors) and private spaces (for family). Boarders were not considered family and were generally restricted to the formal spaces in the home. The front hall was the first place that a visitor to the house would see, and the decor would demonstrate the wealth and status of the residents in the types of wall paper and furnishings (Ames 1982:212). One piece of furniture was critical; the card receiver, where visitors would leave calling cards as part of an elaborate social ritual. Calling cards provided an avenue to entering middle class society through invitations to social functions and changes of address and social status (Schlereth 1991:117). Women primarily did the "calling," and were critical to the maintenance of social status (Schlereth 1991:118). Other important items for the hall included a hall stand and chair. The hall stand was where the residents hung coats and hats, which provided a ready visual symbol of the wealth and status of the residents (Schlereth 1991:117; Ames 1982:213).

The parlor was usually the second locale that visitors would see in a middle class home. This room was a ceremonial as well as social space where family heirlooms, paintings, and other items were presented to visitors as a way to display the family's history as well as wealth and status based on the consumer goods present in the room (Schlereth 1991:119). Artifacts and consumer goods, to the Victorian middle classes obsessed with material culture, "defined space, the physical world, and social relations" (Schlereth 1991:xv). Within the parlor, furniture was important for this reason and was not only gender, but age specific as well. Women sat in chairs with no arms while men

sat in high backed throne-like chairs (Schlereth 1991:122). The parlor was ultimately where a woman's "artistic and cultural refinement" was demonstrated and where she had control (Schlereth 1991:119; Williams 1985:8). This was a room "devoted to sociability" and demonstrated the Victorian "compulsion to purchase, accumulate, and display" (Schlereth 1991:121).

Like the parlor, the dining room was a place of ritual, where the manners and respectability of the host was demonstrated materially through the act of dining. Its very presence within a home was seen as a demonstration of taste and refinement and was decorated accordingly (Clark 1987:147). It was a place to display the finest linens, tableware, and silverware that a family could afford and represented the spiritual unity of the family (Schlereth 1991:124, Clark 1987:149). The dining room was at least 13" by 15" with plain but substantial furniture representing the steadiness of the family (Clark 1987:161). The décor usually consisted of a carpet and curtains of neutral colors along with a dining table and sideboard where the finest settings were displayed. Good light was also a must for the plants growing to demonstrate a woman's ability to nurture (Clark 1987:152). Like the majority of the house, the dining room was part of the realm of the woman. The way in which the room was decorated, like the parlor, represented the woman's artistic potential. The presentation of the food and table settings was also seen this way (Clark 1987:157). Not only was the dining room a ritualized space, but the act of dining was a ritual that defined the class status of the host. Overall the dining room was a "showcase for middle class accomplishment" where segmented dining took place (Clark 1987:172).

Segmented Dining

Segmented dining can be seen as a reaction to the economic and cultural uncertainty in the Victorian Era. To start his essay, *Rituals of Dining*, John Kasson quotes Victorian Era anthropologist Garrick Mallery [1888] talking about the process of food consumption;

“Brutes feed. The best barbarian only eats. Only the cultured man can dine. Dining is no longer a meal, but an institution” (Kasson 1987:114)

I think this quote appropriately sums up the Victorian attitudes toward the consumption of food and society. Anthropologists have long considered eating as a form of ritual practiced in all cultures. Even animals exhibit social eating although it is not tied to a cultural ritual as seen in human societies (Kroeber 2010[1955]). Kasson quotes another Victorian pundit on manners, Cornelia Richards, dealing with the issue of animalism;

“Eating is so entirely a sensual, animal gratification, that unless it is conducted with much delicacy, it becomes unpleasant to others” (Kasson 1987:126).

The way a culture consumes food speaks to that culture’s attitudes about the body, social relationships, and social order but it is not the „key“ to its understanding (Kasson 1987:115). Rather, eating rituals “mediate among ambiguous and frequently contending realms of value” (Kasson 1987:115). This is to say, that the act of social eating often mediates between the contradictions in the social order especially in times of crisis. Victorian segmented dining practices are firmly invested in these contradictions. But how did this form of ritual dining originate, and how did it mitigate the cultural uncertainties of the period?

From the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries the rituals of dining grew in complexity, especially among the upper classes that were increasingly under stress by Enlightenment thought (Wolf 1999). As this complexity increased, so did its social value

as an outward sign of status and refinement. In addition, the more elaborate dining rituals established order and authority within one of the most important of daily activities; the consumption of food (Kasson 1987:119). By the mid-nineteenth century the “restless, mobile, urbanizing, and industrializing democracy” that was the United States had added social stresses caused by the rapid expansion of the middle and working classes both economically and politically. This expansion led to fears within the upper classes of increasing equity among the various classes, displayed in what was seen as course familiarity and rudeness (Kasson 1987:119-120; Erbsen 2009:7).

In an effort to stem this tide of egalitarianism and solidarity among the middle and working classes, social reformers instigated a program to segment the classes, although not in any deliberate centralized fashion. In this way ideology gradually transformed into hegemonic systems that the middle and working classes adopted to one degree or another (see Comaroff and Comaroff 1991, Wolf 1999, and Crehan 2002). In this way the “rituals of the human body,” in this case eating, became a symbol of society (Kasson 1987:127). Dining also became a symbol of plenty, although it needed to be balanced with the perception of greedy consumption. Social conservatives of the era, keenly aware of the contradictions of consumption, promoted the ideals that, according to Kasson;

“Diners might properly enjoy abundance and, if their means allowed, even luxury, but appetites were satisfied in a quiet and orderly way, and the cool control of intellect never faltered for an instant. The ritual structure of Victorian table manners mediated between contending needs that were central to maintenance of social order; between individual appetite and communal order, bodily satisfaction and social modesty, egalitarianism and hierarchy, and public and private” (Kasson 1987:129).

Dining, therefore, had high ritual stakes that ran to the heart of the social and economic crisis between 1870 and 1900 (Kasson 1987:130). The segmented dining ritual, promoted by the upper classes (Williams 1985:22), and later the middle classes that

expanded and hegemonized it, mirrored, and reinforced the segmented nature of society. The act of dining and the way it was conducted became a test of the hostess to show her family's refinement and „good breeding“ (Kasson 1987:131, Andrews 2011:283). Social position could be gained or lost through mistakes made by both the host and visitor during a segmented Victorian dinner.

So, how was the dining ritual conducted? A formal segmented dinner began with an invitation delivered via calling card. Invitations were only sent to people of perceived equal or greater social standing in an effort to maintain the respectability of the hostess. Full formal evening dress for both men and women was required as was punctuality; early arrival was considered as much a social blunder as being late (Erbsen 2009:42). The guests were initially entertained in the parlor where the hostess's decorative artistry and wealth was on display. When dinner began, guests proceeded to the dining room based on their social standing and age, where they were seated in a hierarchical fashion with napkins and hands in their laps (Kasson 1987:133).

The actual meal was also steeped in hierarchical structure and was a demonstration of class position and social proficiency (Dempsey and Woodard 1987:3, 9). Based on their means, a hostess might have as few as five or as many as 18 courses. Typically the first course was a raw meat, like oysters, and champagne which was followed by a soup or vegetable entrée. Several meat courses could follow interspersed with freshening drinks. Following the meats there could be multiple courses of salad, cheeses, pastries, iced dishes, fruits, and nuts. Various alcoholic and soda beverages would be served with these courses. At the conclusion of the meal, the women would retire to the parlor to talk and drink tea while the men would remain in the dining room

for a time drinking and smoking and then later join the women for a demitasse and drinks (Kasson 1987:134).

Etiquette demanded that dinners not extend more than two hours during which time the diners avoided topics related to the food they were consuming. Commenting on the food was seen as a breach of the social compact, as were any outward signs of bodily discomfort. Etiquette required that diners eat slowly with small measured mouthfuls and „cleaning the plate“ was a terrible social faux pas (Kasson 1987:135). Furthermore, to maintain distance and purity while dining, food was not to be touched, and even touching the rims of food containers could be considered a social blunder. Other social considerations, while dining, included minimizing knife use, not leaving teeth marks, and maintaining a measured composure and avoiding displays of emotion. If accidents occurred, the hostess was to stay serene and the victim was to stay calm and make no gratuitous apologies (Kasson 1987:135-38). The table manners and dining rituals maintained and reinforced Victorian ideals of order and hierarchy in a time of social crisis by providing an arena where the public uncertainties of the economy and social change were mitigated in the private world of friendship and family (Kasson 1987:139).

As noted above, when the meal concluded the guests were expected to visit for at least an hour, anything less and the hostess and other guests would conclude that they only came for the food. In return for hosting the dinner, the hostess and her family expected to be invited for dinner at the homes of all of the guests sometime in the future to repay the „debt of hospitality“ (Kasson 1987:138, Andrews 2011:283). In this way the complex interconnections of Victorian society were maintained through the ritual of dining.

Maintaining Victorian social order was at the heart of the ritual dining experience. It elevated and protected the dignity of the participants as well as the values of respect and tact that were so valued in this period (Williams 1985:5). Furthermore dining was an expression of self-mastery (Kasson 1987:138). Ritual dining, by design, limited social interactions of the participants to people of similar social status and “reinforced existing social relationships” in an effort to mitigate against the changing social climate (Kasson 1987:141). In this way Victorian segmented dining defended against the dissolution of social distinctions into what Victor Turner (1969) called “communitas” or equality among the social classes (Kasson 1987:139).

Segmented Dining in the Archaeological Record

Segmented dining was a social experience structured in courses used by middle class families to demonstrate their social refinement and wealth to guests, some of whom may have been professional and social contacts as well as friends and family. The dinner courses followed a blueprint of uncooked meats followed by cooked meats, salads, fruits, and desserts, all meant to be an expression of a family’s status as members of the middle class and helped maintain that identity to a dinner’s attendees. A well run segmented dinner could even elevate a household’s social status amongst its participants and provide a springboard to greater social elevation within the middle class society. But how does the practice of segmented dining appear in the archaeological record?

The archaeological record holds many clues to household behavior, whether consumer choice, food preferences, or in the case of this thesis, segmented dining. The segmented dining experience, as noted, follows a course structure that should leave correlates within an archaeological assemblage. Particular vessel forms both for eating

and service are the primary way to identify these correlates. When looking at eating forms, for instance, a wide variety of ceramic plate sizes can be associated with the various parts of the meal structure; large plates would be indicative of the cooked meat courses, while medium plates would be associated with salads and uncooked meat courses. Smaller plates would be indicative of dessert courses. The presence of glass table ware and beverage containers can be another indicator, as different courses were associated with certain types of drinks. As a result a variety of drinking forms and bottle types could be expected in an assemblage from a household participating in segmented dining.

Likewise, serving forms can also indicate segmented dining practices based on the amounts and diversity of vessel forms. A preponderance of hollow ware forms might indicate that a family preferred soups or other dishes that needed high walled vessels. An assemblage dominated by platters would indicate that the meat courses were preferred. A wide variety of both eating and serving forms would be indicative of the full range of the course structure of a segmented diner.

Decoration can also be an indicator of this dining practice. Decorations, while usually associated with wealth and consumption patterns, can also be used to identify segmented dining as the nature of the course structure mandates that the most expensive and decorated pieces are reserved for the later portions of the dining ritual. Thus the percentage of decorated and undecorated material can be indicative of a household's participation in segmented dining.

The following chapter discusses the material record of segmented dining recovered from the 2010 Family Scholar House archaeological project. By looking at the

vessel forms, their percentages and diversity as well as the decorative elements, the analysis will show which households are invested and to what degree in the segmented dining ritual.

CHAPTER 6: FAMILY SCHOLAR HOUSE ARCHAEOLOGY

While prehistoric and early historic sites have traditionally been the focus of Kentucky archaeologists, in the last 25 years there has been a change in focus in historic archaeology. Prior to 1990, post-Civil War sites were not typically subjected to extensive investigation via literature studies, oral history interviews, or archaeological surveys. The results of the Standiford Field expansion project revealed information on houselots, as well as the development of status models for class structure within the neighborhood examined (DiBlasi 1990). This study ushered in a more modern approach to urban questions within the discipline of historic archaeology that allowed needed studies about status differentiation within the Falls region (Spencer-Wood 1987).

Urban archaeology and the development of an urban historic research design for the City of Louisville and the Falls region evolved out of the University of Louisville. In 1983, the University of Louisville Archaeological Survey undertook the first historical archaeology investigations of residential sites and neighborhoods, commercial districts, industrial sites, and religious sites (Stottman and Watts-Roy 1995). Over twenty historic urban sites were surveyed or tested yielding considerable data on early to mid-nineteenth century lifeways in semi urban and rural areas in Jefferson County (Smith 1983; Granger 1983; Granger 1984; Barta and Goforth 1984; Granger et al. 1989; O'Malley 1987; Stottman et al. 1992). Initial attempts at archaeology in the city center suggested that many areas had been disturbed by subsequent development and would yield little to research. These projects included limited excavations and monitoring at the Galleria,

Louisville Science Museum, and the Jefferson County Court House (Granger 1983; Otto and Gilbert 1982; Stottman 2008). However, extensive excavations at the Convention Center site (15JF646) in 1995, limited excavation of the Muhammad Ali Center (15JF697) in 2003, and the Family Scholar House site (15JF767) in 2010, have shown that significant archaeological deposits still exist in these areas (Bader 2003; Stottman 2008; Andrews and Schatz 2011).

The archaeological investigations of Louisville's historic neighborhoods have focused in the past on understanding residential and commercial lots and the households that occupied them (McBride 1993; Stottman 1995; Stottman and Watts-Roy 1995). Overall topics of research included sanitation, socioeconomic status, consumerism, race, ethnicity, and health (Stottman 2008). The excavations of the Grand Avenue site (15JF572) located in the Parkland Neighborhood of Southwest Louisville yielded valuable information on turn-of-the-century urban living (Stottman et al. 1991). Substantial information was gained on the lifeways of a working class neighborhood in the early twentieth century (Stottman and Watts-Roy 1995). Later investigations at Highland Park (15JF607-623), a late nineteenth to early twentieth century neighborhood, found distinct class and race-based differences in privy vault construction (Stottman 1995, 2008). The Highland Park project represented the first large scale sampling of an entire neighborhood to occur in Louisville (Stottman and Watts-Roy 1995:18).

Urban archaeology to date in Louisville has documented excellent feature preservation with projects that have employed machine stripping to reveal features (Stottman 1995; Bader 2003). Due to the nature and magnitude of urban development and the Downtown Scholar's House Project in particular, machine stripping, feature mapping,

and feature excavation was the recommended protocol for data recovery. Unit excavation was employed only to the extent necessary to document site stratigraphy and to sample midden deposits where such existed. Efforts were made to strip and map feature locations within entire lots, so the interpretation and analysis could address aspects of social status and economic class through ethnicity and nationality as well as the site structure itself (Schatz 2011a).

A total of 145 historic cultural features representing nine feature classes were identified and investigated during the data recovery at the Downtown Family Scholar House site (**Figure 6.1**). Features were identified within each of the 11 houselots exposed. The features within these houselots represent activities that occurred on the block from 1865 to 1960s. Only those features that could be linked through chronology or those that were filled before 1920 and were relatively undisturbed by modern activities were chosen for analysis. A total of 78 cubic feet of artifacts were recovered from the site, making a total of 9,011 artifacts.

The complexity of deposits combined with intense modification of the archaeological record in urban contexts mandates that archaeologists should shift their focus away from “sites” as typically defined to “deposits” as spatially defined evidence of historical-behavioral events within a larger context like a “neighborhood” (Andrews and Schatz 2011:23). This approach is particularly useful for urban assemblages. For the Family Scholar House project, deposits found with each lot were tied to specific households using census data and deed research. Only those deposits that could be tied to specific households were used in developing and completing the analysis. Toward that end,

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 6.1. 1892 Sanborn map of the excavated portion of the project area showing the feature locations and classes.

deposits were chosen from specific lots for analysis to explore ethnic, economic, and social differences in ritual behavior (Andrews and Schatz 2011:23).

Archaeological Data

The use of material culture to create a framework for social commentary has long been used by archaeologists (O'Brian et al 2005; Hodder 2012). Studies about class, gender, and consumerism among other topics can all be derived from the archaeological contexts in which material culture (artifacts) are recovered (Stottman 1995; Wall 1994; Andrews 2011). The artifacts themselves can often shed light on functionality and manufacturing processes as well as their relevance to culture and history (Schlebecker 1982; Beckow 1982).

The archaeological data used in this thesis was originally analyzed to answer questions about production and consumption among middle class families during the late 1800s (Andrews 2011:250). While I am using the same data, my emphasis is on the ritual practice of segmented dining rather than consumerism. Like consumer behavior, ritual behavior and display can be seen in the archaeological record. To make sense of the artifacts recovered, it is necessary to connect the artifacts to primary documentary sources as well as supplemental material from historians, and social theorists (Henry 1987). Based on this assertion, I am theorizing that the artifacts from the Family Scholar House site (15JF767) will show that the segmented dining practices common to the Victorian era are a response to the wider economic crises during this time period, individual household economics, and social status in the community. As discussed in **Chapter 5**, ritual dining and display is a reflection of class status and aspiration (Schlereth 1991; Kasson 1987; Williams 1985). This status is determined by a variety of

factors including occupation, income, education, and ethnicity to name a few (Andrews 2011:260). Archeologists have used a variety of analytical tools to compare households, including ceramic cost indexes (Miller 1980, 1991; Henry 1987) and foodstuffs (Reitz 1987).

Andrews determined that the most appropriate way to discern consumer patterns within the Family Scholar House site was to look at each household unit, defined by individual lots as the basis for her comparison (Andrews 2011:260). Part of her analysis addressed the social status of the residents by identifying differences in frequencies of ceramic forms, decorative elements, and ceramic price indexes. Ceramics are used extensively in the identification of class status and wealth because their costs and types are fairly well documented (Miller 1980, 1991; McBride and Esarey 1995). Ceramic diversity is also an accurate indicator of wealth and status based on the number and type of vessel forms (Yentsch 1990; Andrews and Sandefur 2003; Andrews et al. 2009). Archaeologists have also determined that sets of dining ware items are an indicator of class status as sets were costly to acquire. Other indicators of status that Andrews considered, relevant to this thesis, were convenience foods, beverages, and condiments (Andrews 2011:260).

Phase III Analysis Methodologies

The materials recovered from the Family Scholar House site were initially cataloged by functional association modified from South (1977). Because most archaeologists use this method to divide artifacts into functional categories, the results can be effectively compared to other sites within the United States (Simpson 2011:100). Ten functional groups were used during the initial analysis including, architecture,

personal, furniture, clothing, and, most important to this paper, the kitchen group. A total of 9,011 historic artifacts were identified and cataloged from 15JF767. Of that total 8,912 were from features subjected to detailed analysis. Based on the Phase III analysis, 1,939 were potentially related to segmented dining practices.

Artifacts were collected from a sample of historic features (Features 1, 24, 28, 36, 37, 42, 49, 51, 55 and 56) excavated during the project, associated with seven households that resided within the project area during the late nineteenth century (**Figure 6.2**). The artifacts recovered were subjected to detailed analysis rather than inventoried like the rest of the collection. The detailed analysis consisted of breaking each functional group into artifact types (i.e. ceramics, bottle glass, etc) and then further identifying manufacturing and production techniques, decoration, color, and other indicators (Simpson 2011:100). The variations in the way artifacts are manufactured and decorated can be directly associated with a particular time period and, by extension, can provide a date range of the feature from which they are recovered. Using these dates, the artifact assemblage can then be associated with households known to live in a particular lot at that time.

Kitchen Group artifacts are those that are related to the preparation, consumption, storage, and disposal of food and beverages. Artifact types that are included in this group include ceramics, tableware, and container glass; types that can be indicative of segmented dining (Simpson 2011:102). The faddish nature and technological changes of ceramics makes them easily dated, and are therefore the most artifacts that can be recovered from historic archaeological sites. Ceramics also can yield data on ethnicity, gender, economic status, and consumption patterns (Simpson 2011:102; Wall 1994;

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 6.2. Location of features subjected to detailed analysis, shown over the 1892 Sanborn map.

Andrews 2011). This is typically why ceramic materials are subjected to detailed attribute analysis, vessel analysis, sherd analysis, and economic scaling.

Ceramics are generally categorized into two classes, unrefined and refined wares. Refined wares are the primary indicator of dining practices and include porcelain, pearl ware, white ware, and ironstone and were used as dinner or tea service (Simpson 2011:102). Each ware class is further divided by paste type, glaze type, and decorative type each being a chronological indicator (Raycraft and Raycraft 1990; South 1977; Majewski and O'Brien 1987).

The second kitchen artifact type related to segmented dining is container glass. Container glass, like ceramics, has strong chronological, functional, and social indicators derived from fragments and complete specimens of bottles, jars, and storage vessels (Jones and Sullivan 1985). Unlike ceramics and container glass, table glass does not have a distinctive chronology that can make the different manufacturing techniques reliably datable. While some manufacturing types, like press glass, were more popular toward the end of the nineteenth century, they continued to be popular into the twentieth century (Deiss 1981:71-76). Decorative styles did change over time, so it is possible to date some of the more distinctive ones (Innes 1976).

Another analytical tool used by Andrews (2011) was a vessel form and function analysis adapted from Worthy (1982). This type of analysis utilized form and functional categories for ceramics based on their location within the food preparation cycle (Andrews 2011:261). It was also important to recognize „sets“ in this process as objects with similar decoration may have different functions within the segmented dining course structure. Different courses had differing decorative etiquette that represented the “taste,

elegance, and wealth” of the hostess (Dempsey and Woodard 1987:10). Sets were also an indicator of class status. Expensively decorated full sets would have been purchased by the well off, while households of more frugal means would purchase separate pieces or sets of less expensive wares (Miller 1980, 1991; Andrews 2011:279).

As a way of determining the economic status of the households within the site, Andrews conducted sherd analysis to determine ware, decorative type, and function. These categories were tied to the other analytical schema used for the ceramic artifacts recovered, especially economic scaling (Andrews 2011:279). Economic scaling of ceramics was an analytical method developed by Miller (1980, 1991) that created a point scale that would allow households to be ranked and compared (Andrews 2011:279-280). Unfortunately, Miller’s indices did not go beyond 1881, and it fell to other investigators to create indices for the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (see Manson and Snyder 1996). The results of this analysis show that, based on the ceramic index created by Manson and Snyder (1996) (**Table 6.1**), the households analyzed fell into the low to mid range of the economic scaling (**Table 6.2**). When compared to one another, it is easy to see the differences in economic and social position within the neighborhood. When the results of ceramic scaling was compared to the form and functional analysis, there was a high correlation between households that had the widest varieties of forms and those with the highest scale values (Andrews 2011:282). The historical data and economic scaling also appeared to correlate as well. However, as shown in my analysis below, this scaling technique, which accurately links material culture to class, is not necessarily an accurate indicator of segmented dining. One could assume from **Table 5.2** that the households

Table 6.1. Ceramic Index Values, 1890–1899 (Manson and Snyder 1996:5)

Class	Category Description	Index Number
I	Common whiteware. Plain white. May have scalloped edges.	1.00
II	Ironstone. Plain white. May be scalloped or embossed. Includes thick style ironstone.	2.00
III	Common whiteware or ironstone. Simply and minimally decorated generally concentrating near the rim. Includes simple and one color transfer prints, and hand painted designs. May have scalloped edges and molding.	2.33
IV	Common whiteware or ironstone. More elaborate decorative patterns which may include multiple types of foliage, flowers, vines, ribbons, or scrolls. Two or more colors in transfer prints, flown transfer prints and decals, often with gold bands or trim. Scalloped edges and embossing common.	3.76
V	Porcelain. Plain and simply decorated with one or two colors with floral or band motifs. May have small amount of gold trim. Edges may be scalloped.	3.83
VI	Porcelain. More elaborate decoration in two or more colors with multiple motifs including flowers, vines, ribbons, scrolls, and bands. Gold trim (gilding) is common and may be heavy and elaborate. Has scalloped and embossed edges.	7.78

Table 6.2. Socioeconomic Ceramic Scale for the Households Analyzed (Andrews 2011:282)

Household	Sherd Count	Index Value
Anton Coldeway	1038	2.37
Goodkind Isenberg	20	3.84
Cora Carpenter	162	1.75
Joseph Solomon	51	1.86
Robert Elliot/Charles Gorman	79	3.56
John Patterson	154	1.76
Annie Herr	132	2.24

with the highest index value would be the most likely to be participating in the segmented dining ritual. That however is not always the case.

Segmented Dining Analysis Methodology

The focus of this section is to identify patterns in the material record that are indicative of segmented dining practices. As discussed at the end of the last chapter, vessel forms for both eating and service are critical aspects of this type of dining ritual. The percentages of certain types of vessel forms as well as the diversity of forms are important indicators of segmented dining practices. Large percentages and diversity of plate types for example would indicate that multiple courses were being consumed while large numbers of flat ware service pieces would be an indicator that cooked meat courses predominated. The percentages of decorations within and between each household assemblage can be an indicator as well. Decorative elements were favored as a way to demonstrate status with the most elaborate decorations reserved for the later courses.

I began my analysis with data derived from the Phase III analysis conducted by AMEC in 2010 (Andrews and Schatz 2011). Because I was only interested in identifying and quantifying indicators of segmented dining, I limited my analysis to Kitchen Group artifacts from three categories, ceramics, table glass, and container glass. These are the core artifact types that could be related to segmented dining. Other Kitchen group material types could be related, like metal utensils or plate, but these artifacts are usually not recovered from archaeological sites due to preservation or deposition issues.

Using the vessel form attributed to each artifact, I divided the ceramic, table ware, and container glass into five different functional groups and based my categories loosely on Worthy (1982). Worthy uses six different categories grouped into two groups, food vessel, including serving, eating, drinking, and utilitarian, and non-food vessels; including decorative and utilitarian types (Worthy 1982:340-341). To focus on

segmented dining, I created four vessel groupings based on vessel function; dining/eating, dining/service, food preparation, and non-food. The eating/dining group consists of vessel forms associated with the active consumption of foods and beverages. Forms in this category would include plates, cups, bowls, and table ware. The dining/serving group contained vessel forms used to hold or contain food and beverages presented during segmented dining. Vessel forms within this group would include serving flat ware and hollow ware, wine and beer bottles, and pitchers. Food preparation vessel forms were used in the kitchen or pantry to prepare and store foods. The non-food vessel group contained forms for sanitation, health, and toiletry. Neither the food preparation nor non-food groups were included in my analysis because they were not integral to segmented dining. It should be noted that the vessel forms utilized in this analysis are derived from the analysis of individual sherds.

By looking at the types of vessels within each group I was able to compare the percentages of these types within each household and then compare between households. Utilizing these percentages I could then draw conclusions as to what elements of segmented dining each household was focused on relative to each other. I was also able to identify the diversity of vessel forms in each household and then compare between them to identify other patterns related to segmented dining.

I further divided artifacts in both the dining and service groups into decorated and non-decorated categories because decoration is so closely linked to the status, wealth, and display that underlie the ritual of segmented dining (see Woody 1982; Schollander and Schollander 2002). As described in **Chapter 5**, segmented dining was not just an exercise in eating, but was a chance for both the hosts and guests to display their social

refinement. Part of this demonstration as the host was to utilize the full extent of the household's ceramics, silver, linens, and glassware; the more decorated the better (Dempsey and Woodward 1987:9). While plain service and eating pieces were used, they were usually part of the early courses, with the most decorated pieces reserved for the dessert courses. For well off households it was typical for each course to utilize different decorative patterns for both eating and service (Dempsey and Woodward 1987:9-10). By breaking the vessel forms into decorative and undecorated categories, it should be easy to discern which households were fully participating in the segmented dining ritual.

Of the four functional groups that I created for this analysis, only two are specifically related to segmented dining/eating and dining/service. The other two groupings, food preparation and non-food artifacts, are only summarized and compared to the other groups at the end of the analysis. For each of the two groups subjected to my analysis, I utilized the vessel form categories designated by Andrews (2011) to group the artifacts into groupings irrespective of material type. Because I wanted to address the decorative element within the assemblage, it became apparent that the type of artifact would need to be differentiated as well. For example, when looking at the cup functional category, I realized that to separate the decorated and undecorated artifacts I would also need to differentiate glass table ware as well, because table ware decorative elements were not specified in the original Phase III analysis. Therefore, within each of the two groups that I looked at in detail, my analysis had to consider not only decorative elements on the ceramic artifacts but, by necessity, to also separate the glass artifacts as well. I realize that grouping decorative elements into a single group does not differentiate between decorative applications or ceramic paste types that vary by date. By grouping

them all together I hope to demonstrate that the percentage presence of decoration rather than the type or decoration is what is important to determining the level of participation in segmented dining.

So, what did the analysis of the eating and service groups reveal? By looking at the various vessel forms in each grouping, I was able to discern patterns that I consider indicative of segmented dining within each household. I was then able to compare percentages of artifact decorations/types to identify patterns between households.

Dining Artifact Analysis

The dining groups artifacts recovered from the Family Scholar House site are the focus of this analysis. There were 14 vessel forms within the dining/eating group (**Table 6.3**) that are utilized in the consumption of food as part of both formal and informal dining. The dining/service group contained 18 different forms (**Table 6.4**). The immediate observation is that some of the household assemblages are small compared to others making it difficult to make concrete assumptions based on the scarcity of the artifacts.

In order to compare between households I also prepared tables showing the percentages of each vessel form for both eating and service (**Tables 6.5 and 6.6**).

Feature 1 was a shared privy along the lot lines of the Elliot and Gorman households.

Only 42 eating group artifacts came from this context and as they are a mixture of both households, a definitive pattern is hard to identify. That said, there are a large number of cup fragments, 36 percent of the assemblage, most of them decorated, that came from this context (**Figure 6.3 and 6.5**). Cups are utilized in the latter courses of a segmented dinner when desserts and fruits were served along with coffee and tea. Also present is a variety

of plates/saucers of various sizes, most of them decorated as well. Plates alone accounted for 24 percent of assemblage and would be used during the main meat courses. These artifacts, especially the decorated ones discussed later in this analysis, would be used while entertaining guests during a segmented dinner. There are also tumbler fragments, used for after diner drinks that also are indicative of the dining ritual. Interestingly, there were few hollow ware pieces (7%) indicating that perhaps soup courses were not part of the dining experience at these households. The service artifacts give an even clearer picture about the segmented dining practices in these households. While the bulk of the service artifacts were alcohol related (48%) (**Figure 6.4** and **Table 6.6**), there were also fair numbers of platters (22%) and serving dishes (11%), many decorated, a necessity for the segmented dining experience (**Figure 6.5**). The presence of alcoholic beverages is also an indicator of segmented dining, although there is a chance that one or more of the residence could have been an alcoholic.

Table 6.3. Dining/Eating Vessel Forms and Decoration/Types by Household.

Vessel Form	Decoration/ Type	F1 Elliot/ Gorman	F24 Patterson	F28 Herr	F36, F42 Solomon	F37 Carpenter	F49, F51, F55 Coldeway	F56 Isenberg	Totals
Bowl	Table Ware	1					3	4	8
Cigar jar	Undecorated						2		2
Cup	Decorated	13	8			2	73	1	97
Cup	Undecorated	2	2	1	4	2	76	2	89
Cup	Table Ware						8		8
Flatware	Decorated		1		1	2	22		26
Flatware	Undecorated	1	5	4		5	78	1	94
Hollow ware	Table Ware						2		2
Hollow ware	Decorated	2	9	4	2	14	34	1	66
Hollow ware	Undecorated	1	3	3	4	64	68	2	145
Mug	Undecorated						1		1
Mug	Table Ware						5		5
Other	Undecorated					1			1
Plate	Decorated	3		32			101	3	139
Plate	Undecorated	7	14	16	1	1	164	2	205
Saucer	Decorated	4	9	8		1	51		73
Saucer	Undecorated		11	7	2	7	38		65
Shot glass	Table Ware						1		1
Small plate	Decorated	2	1	3			9	2	17
Small plate	Undecorated						10		10
Stemware	Table Ware		3			2	17		22
Tankard	Decorated						1		1
Tumbler	Table Ware	6	3	1	8	9	96	1	124
Totals		42	69	79	22	110	860	19	1201

Table 6.4. Dining/Service Vessel Forms and Decoration/Types by Household.

Vessel Form	Decoration/ Type	F1 Elliot/ Gorman	F24 Patterson	F28 Herr	F36, F42 Solomon	F37 Carpenter	F49, F51, & F55 Coldeway	F56 Isenberg	Totals
Alcoholic Beverage	Bottle/Jar	16	1	1		3	134	13	168
Beer Bottle	Bottle/Jar	13					69	6	88
Cruet	Table Ware						1		1
Flatware Serving	Decorated	1					9		10
Flatware Serving	Undecorated						2		2
Condiment	Bottle/Jar						14	1	15

Table 6.4. Dining/Service Vessel Forms and Decoration/Types by Household.

Vessel Form	Decoration/Type	F1 Eliot/ Gorman	F24 Patterson	F28 Herr	F36, F42 Solomon	F37 Carpenter	F49, F51, & F55 Coldeway	F56 Isenberg	Totals
Hollow ware	Table Ware						2		2
Hollow ware	Decorated	1	13	6	1	2	12		35
Hollow ware	Undecorated		3				18		21
Mineral Water	Bottle/Jar						3		3
Other	Decorated					1	4		5
Pitcher	Table Ware						3		3
Pitcher	Decorated	5					33		38
Pitcher	Undecorated	5				1	7	14	27
Platter	Decorated	17							17
Platter	Undecorated	4				2	19		25
Serving Dish/Bowl	Table Ware	2		1			23	11	37
Serving Dish/Bowl	Decorated	8					37		45
Serving Dish/Bowl	Undecorated						16		16
Small Pitcher/Creamer	Decorated	4	2				3		9
Small Pitcher/Creamer	Undecorated						1		1
Soft Drink Bottle	Bottle/Jar	2	1				86	12	101
Sugar	Decorated						1		1
Teapot	Decorated						1		1
Tureen	Decorated						3		3
Vase	Table Ware						2		2
Whiskey Bottle	Bottle/Jar	1					16	2	19
Wine Bottle	Bottle/Jar	15	1		1	15	16		48
Totals		94	21	8	2	24	535	59	743

Table 6.5. Dining/Eating Vessel Form Percentages by Household.

Vessel Form	F1 Elliot/ Gorman	F24 Patterson	F28 Herr	F36, F42 Solomon	F37 Carpenter	F49, F51, F55 Coldeway	F56 Isenberg	Totals
Bowl	1 (2%)					3 (.4%)	4 (21%)	8 (.7%)
Cigar Jar						2 (.1%)		2 (.1%)
Cup	15 (36%)	10 (15%)	1 (1%)	4 (18%)	4 (4%)	157 (18%)	3 (15%)	194 (16%)
Flatware	1 (2%)	6 (9%)	4 (5%)	1 (5%)	7 (6%)	100 (12%)	1 (5%)	120 (10%)
Hollow ware	3 (7%)	12 (17%)	7 (9%)	6 (27%)	78 (71%)	104 (12%)	3 (16%)	213 (18%)
Mug						6 (.7%)		6 (.5%)
Other					1 (1%)			1 (0%)
Plate	10 (24%)	14 (20%)	48 (61%)	1 (5%)	1 (1%)	265 (31%)	5 (26%)	344 (29%)
Saucer	4 (10%)	20 (29%)	15 (19%)	2 (9%)	8 (7%)	89 (10%)		138 (12%)
Shot glass						1 (.1%)		1 (0%)
Small plate	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	3 (4%)			18 (2%)	2 (11%)	26 (2%)
Stemware		3 (4%)			2 (2%)	17 (2%)		22 (2%)
Tankard						1 (.1%)		1 (0%)
Tumbler	6 (14%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	8 (36%)	9 (8%)	96 (11%)	1 (5%)	124 (10%)
Artifact Totals	42	69	79	22	110	860	19	1201

Table 6.6. Dining/Service Vessel Form Percentages by Household.

Vessel Form	F1 Elliot/ Gorman	F24 Patterson	F28 Herr	F36, F42 Solomon	F37 Carpenter	F49, F51, & F55 Coldeway	F56 Isenberg	Totals
Alcoholic Beverage	16 (17%)	1 (5%)	1 (12.5%)		3 (13%)	134 (25%)	13 (22%)	168 (23%)
Beer Bottle	13 (14%)					69 (13%)	6 (10%)	88 (12%)
Flatware Serving	1 (1%)					11 (2%)		12 (2%)
Condiment						14 (3%)	1 (2%)	15 (2%)
Hollow Ware	1 (1%)	16 (76%)	6 (75%)	1 (50%)	2 (8%)	32 (6%)		58 (8%)
Mineral Water						3 (.5%)		3 (.4%)
Other					1 (4%)	4 (.7%)		5 (.6%)
Pitcher	10 (11%)				1 (4%)	43 (8%)	14 (24%)	68 (9%)
Platter	21 (22%)				2 (8%)	19 (4%)		17 (2%)
Serving Dish/Bowl	10 (11%)		1 (12.5%)			76 (14%)	11 (19%)	98 (13%)
Small Pitcher/Creamer	4 (4%)	2 (9%)				4 (.7%)		10 (1%)
Soft Drink Bottle	2 (2%)	1 (5%)				86 (16%)	12 (20%)	101 (14%)
Sugar						1 (.1%)		1 (.1%)
Teapot						1 (.1%)		1 (.1%)
Tureen						3 (.5%)		3 (.4%)
Vase						2 (.4%)		2 (.3%)
Whiskey Bottle	1 (1%)					16 (3%)	2 (3%)	19 (3%)
Wine Bottle	15 (16%)	1 (5%)		1 (50%)	15 (63%)	16 (3%)		48 (6%)
Totals	94	21	8	2	24	535	59	743

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 6.3. Decorated cup fragments from the Elliot/Gorman assemblage.

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 6.4. Alcoholic beverages and wine bottle from Elliot/Gorman assemblage.

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 6.5. Decorated serving vessels from the Elliot/Gorman assemblage.

The Patterson household artifacts were recovered from an open drainage/cess pit that was located at the rear of this house lot. The eating assemblage contained large numbers of plates (20%), cups (15%), saucers (29%), and hollow ware (17%), which suggests that the Pattersons were fully engaged in segmented dining (**Tables 6.3 and 6.5**). While most of the plates were undecorated, the bulk of the cups, hollow ware, and saucers indicated that the household had some economic limitations that caused them to invest in smaller decorated forms rather than larger ones. The service pieces were mainly hollow ware serving vessels (76%), most of which were decorated (**Tables 6.4 and 6.6**). Again, there seems to be an emphasis on the presentation of the food via decorative serving vessels over the eating forms.

The Herr Household artifacts came from a midden deposit located at the rear of the household lot. This deposit produced a large number of plate forms (61%), most of

which were decorated (**Tables 6.3 and 6.5**). Other vessel forms were sparse, suggesting that the Herrs focused their dining display efforts on plate courses rather than soups or after dinner teas and drinks. The variety of plate forms still suggests that the segmented dining in this household emphasized multiple plate courses rather than soups. Few serving vessel forms were recovered from this house lot although almost all were decorated. Of the service vessels, 75 percent were hollow wares indicating that meat courses were not preferred fare at the Herr table (**Tables 6.4 and 6.6**).

There were few eating or service artifacts recovered from two midden features within the Solomon house lot. Most of these were hollow ware forms (27%) and tumblers (36%), suggesting that segmented dining was not a normal activity within this household (**Tables 6.3 and 6.5**). Decorative elements were also not prevalent, reinforcing that view. The fact that the Solomon's were older may have influenced their lack of participation in elaborate segmented dining. They may have also had limited means as well due to the fact that they had taken on a boarder and had no employment income.

The Carpenter household artifacts came from a keyhole cellar at the rear of the house lot. This feature provided the second largest eating assemblage from the site and fair variety of eating vessels (**Tables 6.4 and 6.6**). There were few plate forms recovered compared to the hollow ware forms (71%), indicating that soups rather than plate meals were common in this household. Service vessels consisted mainly of wine bottles (63%) and a few other table serving forms (**Table 6.6**). This household had the poorest economic scaling determined by Andrews (2011) and a large number of boarders. In this context, the high number of undecorated hollow ware forms suggests that segmented dining was rarely practiced in this household.

The Coldeway household had the richest variety and largest number of both eating and service vessel forms. These artifacts came from three privies located within the Coldeway house lot and represented over 30 years of occupation. Large numbers of almost all vessel form categories were present from this assemblage, the majority of which were plates (31%) (**Figure 6.6**) and hollow ware eating forms and alcoholic beverage service forms (**Tables 6.3 thru 6.6**). Also present in large numbers were cups (**Figure 6.7**) and tumblers. While the majority of the eating vessel forms were undecorated, the majority of the serving vessels were, suggesting that the presentation of the food was emphasized over the consumption. This household also had the highest number of glass table ware forms, indicating that the Coldways had enough means to purchase expensive wine and water glasses. Compared to the other households, the number of condiment vessels is interesting. Condiments were a status item in the late 1800's (Andrews 2011:258) and would have been a definite sign of wealth to dinner guests. Also present in the Coldeway assemblage were cigar jar fragments and glass vase fragments. Cigar jars were a fixture of the after dinner conversation, while the vase would have been a center piece for the table or side board. The sheer variety of eating and service forms suggests that the Coldways were heavily invested in the practice of segmented dining. Coldeway was a banker, and would have likely been expected to host dinner parties for clients and friends to maintain his social status and access.

The Isenberg household assemblage contained few artifacts compared to the Coldeways, which came from a privy located at the rear of the house lot. Like the Coldeways, the Isenbergs were economically well off based on the economic scaling

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 6.6. Decorated plates from the Coldeway assemblage.

Image Courtesy of Family Scholar House

Figure 6.7. Decorated tea cups from the Coldeway assemblage.

(Andrews 2011:282). The eating forms recovered were generally spread equally between cups, hollow wares, and plates, which were evenly split between decorated and undecorated forms (**Tables 6.3** and **6.5**). The variety of forms suggests that segmented dining was taking place, but perhaps the intensity was not on par with other households. The service vessels emphasize drinking rather than eating (**Tables 6.4** and **6.6**). One explanation could be that their dinners were more modest with an emphasis on the later, social aspects of segmented dining.

Looking at the households as a group, it becomes apparent that most were participating in segmented dining to one degree or another based on the vessel forms recovered from the excavations. However, while my analysis to this point has presented data that is useful for determining the relative participation by each household, there needs to be a way of directly comparing them to each other and potentially to other site assemblages. To this end I took both the eating and service artifacts and reduced them to comparative tables.

Looking at the percentages of eating and service vessel forms by household it is apparent that five of the seven household assemblages are dominated by eating vessel forms (**Table 6.7**). The Elliot/Gorman and Isenberg households, have a preponderance of service forms. This would seem to indicate that the presentation of the food was more important than the consumption. It also suggests that later courses such as fruit and desserts were not emphasized in these households. However, the large numbers of beverage bottles from many of the household assemblages appears to be obscuring a comparison of the vessel forms associated with food. In order to overcome this data bias,

I eliminated the beverage containers from the comparative analysis to see if another pattern was present (**Table 6.8**).

Table 6.7. Eating/Service Vessel Form Percentages by Household.

Dining Group	F1 Elliot/ Gorman	F24 Patterson	F28 Herr	F36, F42 Solomon	F37 Carpenter	F49, F51, & F55 Coldeway	F56 Isenberg	Totals
Eating	42 (31%)	69 (77%)	79 (91%)	22 (92%)	110 (82%)	860 (62%)	19 (24%)	1201
Service	94 (69%)	21 (23%)	8 (9%)	2 (8%)	24 (18%)	535 (38%)	59 (76%)	743
Total Artifacts	136	90	87	24	134	1395	78	1944

Table 6.8. Eating/Service Vessel Form Percentages without Beverage Bottles by Household.

Dining Group	F1 Elliot/ Gorman	F24 Patterson	F28 Herr	F36, F42 Solomon	F37 Carpenter	F49, F51, & F55 Coldeway	F56 Isenberg	Totals
Eating	42 (47%)	69 (83%)	79 (92%)	22 (96%)	110 (95%)	860 (80%)	19 (30%)	1201 (79%)
Service	47 (53%)	14 (17%)	7 (8%)	1 (4%)	6 (5%)	211 (20%)	26 (70%)	316 (31%)
Total Artifacts	89	83	86	23	116	1071	64	1517

Analyzing the data without the beverage containers did not significantly alter the findings when the beverages were included. In fact, it shows how heavily the preponderance of eating forms was within the assemblage. I believe that the emphasis on the eating vessel forms is a result of the inclusion of both common meals and segmented dining within the assemblage. This analysis method does not appear to offer a good way to differentiate between the two.

The next analytical tool looks at the diversity of forms within each assemblage (**Table 6.9**). Within the eating vessel group, most of the households have between six and eight of the 14 vessel forms. As noted in the initial analysis, the forms differed by

household, but almost all had approximately the same number of vessel forms. The Coldeway household was the exception, having 13 of the 14 vessel forms within its household assemblage. The service vessel forms were not as consistent as the eating forms with the Solomon household having as few as two forms and the Coldeway household having all 18 forms. There does not appear to be a pattern between the diversity of forms and the practice of segmented dining. Rather, it suggests that the particular type of forms used are more important than the diversity of forms present within a given assemblage.

Table 6.9. Vessel Form Diversity by Household.

Dining Group	F1 Elliot/ Gorman	F24 Patterson	F28 Herr	F36, F42 Solomon	F37 Carpenter	F49, F51, F55 Coldeway	F56 Isenberg	Total Forms
Eating	8	8	7	6	8	13	7	14
Service	11	5	3	2	6	18	7	18

The final analytical tool that I use in an attempt to quantify the presence of segmented dining looks at the decorative elements of the assemblage. **Table 6.10** shows the percentages of decorated and undecorated artifacts from each household. I emphasize the decorated/undecorated aspect in this case because I consider it to be a good indicator of the presence of segmented dining. It appears that from the percentages of the decorative forms that an average over 40 percent is an indicator of segmented dining practices at this site.

By comparison the dining/service table (**Table 6.11**) diverges wildly. Some households that would appear to be practicing segmented dining based on the eating group show the opposite based on the service group percentages. However, when looking at the overall total percentages, the same trend is present in both groups; that decorated

forms are an indicator for segmented dining. The variation within each household between the two tables indicates that either this type of analysis doesn't accurately predict dining behavior or that the eating forms are much more indicative than the service forms.

Table 6.10. Dining/Eating Decoration/Types Percentages by Household.

Decoration/ Type	F1 Elliot/ Gorman	F24 Patterson	F28 Herr	F36 Solomon	F37 Carpenter	F49, F51, F55 Coldeway	F56 Isenberg	Totals
Artifact Total	35	63	78	16	99	725	14	1028
Decorated Percentage	24 (69%)	28 (44%)	47 (60%)	3 (19%)	19 (19%)	291 (40%)	7 (50%)	419 (41%)
Undecorated Percentage	11 (31%)	35 (56%)	31 (40%)	11 (81%)	80 (81%)	434 (60%)	7 (50%)	609 (59%)

Table 6.11. Dining/Service Decoration/Types Percentages by Household.

Decoration/ Type	F1 Elliot/ Gorman	F24 Patterson	F28 Herr	F36, F42 Solomon	F37 Carpenter	F49, F51, & F55 Coldeway	F56 Isenberg	Totals
Artifact Total	45	18	6	1	6	167	14	257
Decorated	36 (80%)	15 (83%)	6 (100%)	1 (100%)	3 (50%)	103 (62%)	0	164 (64%)
Undecorated	9 (20%)	3 (17%)			3 (50%)	64 (38%)	14 (100%)	93 (36%)

With this in mind, I combined the two tables (**Table 6.12**) and the results were somewhat surprising. All but one of the households held to the dining/eating form trends shown on **Table 6.5**. The Isenberg household was the only one that flipped, showing that perhaps segmented dining was not taking place within this household after all. This is curious since they had the highest ceramic index within the study area.

Table 6.12. Eating/Service Decoration/Types Percentages by Household, Combined.

Decoration/ Type	F1 Elliot/ Gorman	F24 Patterson	F28 Herr	F36, F42 Solomon	F37 Carpenter	F49, F51, & F55 Coldeway	F56 Isenberg	Totals
Artifact Total	80	81	84	17	105	892	28	1285
Decorated	60 (75%)	43 (53%)	53 (63%)	4 (24%)	22 (21%)	394 (44%)	7 (25%)	583 (45%)
Undecorated	20 (25%)	38 (47%)	31 (37%)	11 (76%)	83 (79%)	498 (56%)	21 (75%)	702 (55%)

While I think that this approach shows that segmented dining can be shown when looking at the percentages of decorated and undecorated ceramic forms, more comparative analysis between sites needs to be conducted to verify the overall results. I am guardedly optimistic that this approach will work on other collections, although some reanalyzing may need to take place. For instance, table ware could be included in this type of analysis if decorative elements were cataloged in a similar fashion as ceramic assemblages. Another way that the overall analysis might benefit is if glass bottle artifacts were classified according to dining function. This would expand the basis for inter-household comparisons.

Analysis Summary

My analysis indicates to me that while some households were not as wealthy as others based on the ceramic index, they were still participating in the segmented dining ritual. A good example is the Patterson household, which according to my analysis has a wide variety of eating forms although a comparatively fewer number of service vessels. Patterson's household has a high percentage of decorated ceramics indicating to me that he was a participant in the segmented dining in vogue during the Victorian era. However, the Patterson's have the second lowest ceramic index (Andrews 2011:282) of the

analyzed households. This contradiction gets to the heart of my questions about the use of segmented dining as a way to maintain class status. This family appears to be using decorations on cheaper wares as a way to mitigate their lower wealth while maintaining their status and participation in the segmented dining ritual. Another issue that came up in my analysis was differentiating between the Elliot and Gorman households. My analysis does not allow for differentiating between the two. I had to draw on the historical background information to determine that it was the Gorman's, who as professionals, would have had the means and the motivation to participate in segmented dining, rather than the Elliot's, who had a large number of dependents.

Several aspects of my analysis however, did not yield very good results. Segmented dining practices were not evident in either the eating/service comparisons or the diversity of vessel forms between each of the households. This indicates to me that the presence of segmented dining doesn't necessarily correlate with the percentages between eating and serving forms or in the diversity of forms.

Overall, I consider that some portions of my analysis scheme were a useful way of determining the presence of segmented dining. Looking at the percentages of particular vessel forms was useful in determining what aspects of segmented dining a particular household emphasized or participated in. The decorative element analysis seemed to be the best indicator of the presence of the segmented dining practices with a 40 percent baseline determining if a household participated in the practice. I consider that these two methods show that many of the families were participating in segmented dining as a way to display their status as middle class families although there did not appear to be differences based on ethnicity.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS

The mid to late nineteenth century saw a dramatic rise in the ranks of the middle classes. From 1860 to 1910 the middle classes grew from 750,000 to 4,420,000, almost six times the 1860 number. This dramatic increase was almost exclusively city based, and was made possible by the increasing economic opportunities that came with industrialization during the Victorian Era (Schlereth 1991:29). That is not to say that the increases in the middle classes were homogenous and without uncertainty. The middle classes are rather “fluid categories that include individual and family self definition, tastes, and attitudes” and as such are heterogeneous and full of contradictions (Schlereth 1991:29). These contradictions are evident when looking at the historical and archaeological record associated with the residents of the Family Scholar House site.

The Family Scholar House residents’ adherence to Victorian middle class segmented dining practices was discussed in this thesis using the material culture recovered from the archaeological excavations at the site. Building on Worthy (1982) and Andrews (2011), I created an analysis scheme that quantifies the vessel forms, diversity, and decoration so that meaningful comparisons can be drawn between the various households and hopefully other sites in the future. It is clear that most of the households participated in rituals of display and dining, although some were better able to participate than others during the last decade of the nineteenth century, a period of financial as well as social crisis. The families with the most investment in segmented dining appear to be the Elliot/Gorman, Patterson, and Herr households. These households had the largest

percentages of decorated ceramics found at the site and generally exhibited a variety of both ceramic and glass forms that were an important outward display of affluence and gentility.

The Coldeway household, arguably the highest status household at the Family Scholar House site, resided at the site the longest and had professions with the most potential for affluence. They also had the highest diversity of vessel forms although its percentage of decorated forms was lower than the Elliot/Gorman, Patterson, and Herr households. It is the sheer diversity of vessel forms that makes the best case for their participation in segmented dining rituals based on the artifacts although diversity does not appear to be a good indicator by itself. Coupled with the historical data about the family, it is plain that the household participated fully in the practice, likely to entertain banking clients and social contacts.

Because the assemblages from the Elliot and Gorman households are mixed, one must look at the household composition to determine which family was more participatory in the rituals of Victorian display and dining. Both households were composed of multi-generational family members, although the Gorman's also had boarders. However, the Gorman household contained members with the youngest median age and the greatest number of professionals making it most likely that they, rather than the Elliot's were participating fully in segmented dining. The Elliot's may have participated, but the lack of family professionals that would have produced affluence make it less likely that they would have been participating in these dining rituals.

Based on the artifact assemblages recovered, the Patterson and Herr families appear to have been a much more modest participation in the display and ritual of

segmented dining. The Patterson household had one of the lower ceramic scales at the site but still had one of the highest percentages of decorated ceramics, making it likely that they were using segmented dining as a way to mitigate their modest means. The Herr household was similar in this respect as well. While the diversity of the vessel forms recovered from the Herr lot was not extensive, the household still had the second highest percentage of decorated vessel forms. As a widow it is likely that there were economic constraints to their participation, but the act of taking in boarders likely mitigated their financial issues enough for them to host some versions of a segmented meal.

The Solomon's seem to have not participated in segmented dining based on the results of my analysis. There was little diversity of vessel forms, and the Solomon household had the second lowest percentages of decorated forms. The Solomon's were likely restricted based on income and the age of the Joseph and his wife. However they just as likely may have chosen not to participate in segmented dining to the degree others at the site did because there was no social or professional reason to do so. It may also be possible that they may have participated at another venue, namely at their son Leon's home a few short streets away.

A similar case can be made for the Isenberg's. Although this household had the highest ceramic index recorded at the site, they had the least diversity in vessel forms and decorative vessel forms. While undoubtedly affluent based on the historical data, the Isenberg's may have made a choice to dissent from the hegemonic nature of Victorian culture. Another possible explanation is that they may have participated segmented dining at another venue rather than host such events.

The household at the lowest rung on the status ladder was the Carpenter's. This

household does not appear to have participated in segmented dining practices, or if they did, there is no evidence of it in the archaeological record. As a widow with multiple children, she likely did not have the wealth or time to invest in formal dinners. Instead she ran a modest boarding house, a respectable profession for a woman in her position. That is not to say that she was poor. The Carpenter's did live in a very large house in a very nice neighborhood. It is likely that they were just not able to finance any extravagant dinners.

Further research is necessary, but gender also likely played an important role in the maintenance of the Family Scholar House site's Victorian middle class. While gender is not always obvious in the archaeological record, Victorian dining and ritual has a distinct gendered quality to it (see Schlereth 1991; Wall 1994). Even though men are the heads of their households and primary generators of wealth, and therefore class, it is women who are the primary gatekeepers of the social status of the family. Women ran and controlled the display and ritual that surrounded the home and meals. It is they that decorated the „public“ areas of the home to display the wealth and status of the family. They also designed and hosted the elaborate dining activities that were so popular among the middle classes. This is especially obvious in the case of Annie Herr, who was responsible for the financial as well as social aspects of the home and participated fully in segmented dining even if less elaborate than some of her neighbors. The Carpenter household is at the other end of the spectrum having either chosen or unable to participate in the ritual and display of segmented dining.

The overall impression of the Family Scholar House residents is one of general middle class affluence with some families like the Coldeway's and Isenberg's standing at

the top of the local social order and the Elliot's and Carpenter's at the bottom. The residents of the Family Scholar House site aspired to the Victorian ideals imposed upon them by the social elite and in many ways supported the ruling hegemony by participating both involuntarily and voluntarily in the ritual activities of the period. There was little differentiation between the households based on ethnicity, and Germans, German Jews, and native born families attempted to uphold Victorian ideals. However, the economic crisis that shadowed Victorian Louisville caused many of the residents of the site to modify their behavior and household composition to meet social expectations. In the long run, the friction between the economic realities and the social aspirations caused the social fabric to reorder itself during the early twentieth century. Germans, German Jews, and native born households conformed and resisted the cultural hegemony of the Victorian period as they are able within the volatile economic climate. Victorian gentility and ritual is eventually discarded by the masses as the „Gilded Age“ was revealed to be a time of excess and economic domination by the industrial bourgeois.

It is clear that the Victorian Era was a time of social and economic stress on the American middle classes. I started this thesis with several questions based on this statement. First, does the ritual and display of the Victorian era reflect the struggle to maintain class position during a period of financial uncertainty? My research indicates that the answer to this question is „yes.“ The Victorian Era was dominated by a hegemony of excess. In order for the upper classes to maintain their domination of society they invested the middle classes into this hegemony by promoting values of display that were also linked to values of restraint and comportment. Second, given the economic turmoil of the period, how did the households living at the Family Scholar House site maintain

their class position and identity? One of the principal ways they maintained their class position and identity was through social acts of display and segmented dining. The acts of display reinforced a family's social position by presenting the viewer with a tangible vision of wealth while the ritual dining experience demonstrated their social refinement. Third, were there differences between the strategies employed by the German and German Jewish immigrants and the native born dwellers of the neighborhood? The answer to this question is ambiguous. The different households did not appear to display any ethnicity in their maintenance of social status using display and ritual dining, based on the archaeological record. Any differences in social maintenance are probably linked to social contacts that are beyond the scope of archaeological investigations. So the answer is „no,“ based on the artifacts recovered from the site.

Modern society is still obsessed with the outward displays of status and materialism that were so prevalent at the turn of the last century. Although not necessarily in the context of Victorian style display and ritual dining, modern American society is still taken with ideas associated with home ownership, material goods, clothing, and personal appearance that in many ways emulate those of the Victorian Era.

REFERENCES

Ames, K.L.

- 1982 Meaning in Artifacts: Hall Furnishings in Victorian America. In *Material Culture Studies in America*. Edited by T.J. Schlereth, pp. 206-221. American Association for State and Local History, Nashville.

Andrews, S. C.

- 2011a Chapter 9: Consumer Behavior. In *Reading the City: Urban Archaeology of the Family Scholar House Site (15JF767) in Old Louisville, Kentucky* (2011).

Andrews, S. C. and D. W. Schatz, pp. 249-286. AMEC CRM Report No. 2011-003, Louisville.

- 2011b Chapter 10: Summary and Interpretations. In *Reading the City: Urban Archaeology of the Family Scholar House Site (15JF767) in Old Louisville, Kentucky* (2011). Andrews, S. C. and D. W. Schatz, pp. 287-294. AMEC CRM Report No. 2011-003, Louisville.

Andrews, S. and T. Sandefur

- 2003 *Climbing the Social Ladder: Archaeology and the Enos Hardin Farmstead, Owen County, 1825-1870*. Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Division of Environmental Analysis, Frankfort.

Andrews, S. C. and D. W. Schatz

- 2011 In *Reading the City: Urban Archaeology of the Family Scholar House Site (15JF767) in Old Louisville, Kentucky* (2011). Andrews, S. C. and D. W. Schatz, pp 11-46. AMEC CRM Report No. 2011-003, Louisville.

Andrews, S.C., K.D. Simpson, and S.L. Darr

- 2009 *Intensive Archaeological Investigations at the McAlpine Locks and Dam, Louisville, Kentucky Volume III; Shipping port: A Town on the Urban Frontier - Historic Component at the Shippingport Site (15JF702)*. Report No. 09-0317, AMEC E&E, Louisville.

Aron, C.S.

- 1987 *Ladies and Gentlemen of the Civil Service: Middle-Class Workers in Victorian America*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Bader, A.T.

- 2003 *Archaeological Data Recovery at the Muhammad Ali Center Construction Site (15JF697) Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky*. Report No. 03-015, AMEC E&E, Louisville. 2007 *Shippingport: A Historic Context of Shippingport Island, Jefferson County, Kentucky*. Corn Island Archaeology LLC, Cultural Resources Report No. TR7004, Louisville, Kentucky.

Barta & Goforth Inc.

- 1984 *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Phoenix Hill, Louisville, Kentucky*. Community Development Cabinet; Louisville.

Beckow, S.M.

- 1982 Culture, History, and Artifact. In *Material Culture Studies in America*. Edited by T.J. Schlereth, pp. 114-123. American Association for State and Local History, Nashville.

Bourdieu, P.

- 1984 The Production and Reproduction of Legitimate Language. In *Readings for a History of Anthropological Theory*. 3rd edition (2010). Paul A Erickson and Liam D Murphy eds. pp. 451-468. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Butler, M.

- 1971 *Valley of the Ohio*. Kentucky Historical Society, Frankfort.

Casseday, B.

- 1852 *The History of Louisville from its Earliest Settlement Till the Year 1852*. Hull and Brother, Louisville. Reprint 1970

Clark, C.E., Jr.

- 1987 The Vision of the Dining Room: Plan Book Dreams and Middle Class Realities. In *Dining in America, 1850-1900*, edited by Kathryn Grover, pp. 142-172. University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst.

Collins, L.

- 1874 *History of Kentucky*. (Revised by R.H. Collins) Collins and Co., Covington.

Coleman, J.W.

- 1935 *Stage Coach Days in the Bluegrass*. Standard Press, Louisville.

Comaroff, J. and J. Comaroff

- 1991 *Of Revelation and Revolution: Christianity, Colonialism, and Consciousness in South Africa, Volume I*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

Crehan, K.

- 2002 *Gramsci, Culture and Anthropology*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Crews, C.F.

2003 *A Concise History of Louisville*. Cathedral Heritage Foundation [Online www]. Available URL www.cathedral-heritage.org/concisehistory [Accessed 01 March 2003].

Daniels, R.

2002 *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*. Second Edition. Harper Collins Publishers, New York.

DeCunzo, L.A.

1995 Reform Respite and Ritual: An Archaeology of Institutions; The Magdalen Society of Philadelphia, 1800-1850. In *Historic Archaeology*, Volume 29, Number 3. Journal of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Philadelphia.

Deiss, R. W.

1981 *The Development and Application of a Chronology for American Glass*. Midwestern Archaeological Research Center, Illinois State University, Normal.

Dempsey, L. and J. Woodard

1987 *Let Us Go to Diner, and I Will Soon Tell You Whether You Are a Well Bred Man or Not*. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.

DiBlasi, P. J.

1990 *Report of Phase I Archaeological Investigations for the Proposed Standiford Field Airport Expansion*. Program of Archaeology, Department of Anthropology, University of Louisville, Louisville.

English, J.H.

1960 *Louisville's Nineteenth Century Suburban Growth: Parkland, Crescent Hill, Cherokee Triangle, Beechmont, and Highland Park*. Masters Thesis, Division of Humanities, University of Louisville, Louisville.

Erbsen, W.

2009 *Manners & morals of Victorian America*. Native Ground Books & Music, Asheville.

Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis

2014 Consumer Price Index 1800-2014. [Online www]. Available URL https://www.minneapolisfed.org/community_education/teacher/calc/hist1800.cfm [Accessed 21 March 2014].

Glasner, D. (editor)

1997 *Business Cycles and Depressions: an Encyclopedia*. Garland Publishing, New York.

Glasner, D.

- 1997 The Crisis of 1873. In *Business Cycles and Depressions: an Encyclopedia*. Edited by D. Glasner, pp. 132-133. Garland Publishing, New York.

Granger, J.E.

- 1983 "The Urban Archaeological Potential of Louisville: Two Decades of Disparity: A Point of Departure." Symposium on Ohio Valley Urban and Historic Archaeology; *Proceedings* Vol. 5:1:25-43.

- 1984 David Ward's Mill: Entrepreneurism in a Semi-Peripheral "Econotone" Between the Urban Core and Rural Periphery of Early Louisville. Symposium for Ohio River Valley Urban and Historic Archaeology; *Proceedings* Vol. 2:74-88.

Granger, J.E., E.E. Hardesty, L. Becker, M.J. Stottman

- 1989 *University of Louisville's 2111 South First House: Documentary Archaeology on a College Campus Located in the 19th Century Urban Semiperiphery*. Department of Anthropology; University of Louisville, Louisville.

Henry, S.L.

- 1987 Factors Influencing Consumer Behavior in Turn of the Century Phoenix, Arizona. In *Consumer Choice in Historical Archaeology*, edited by Suzanne M. Spencer-Wood, pp. 359-382. Plenum Press, New York.

Hodder, I.

- 2012 *Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships Between Humans and Things*. Wiley-Blackwell, Malden

Howe, D.W.

- 1976 Victorian Culture in America. In *Victorian America*, Edited by D.W. Howe, pp. 3-28. University of Pennsylvania Press

Innes, L

- 1976 *Pittsburgh Glass 1797-1891: A History and Guide for Collectors*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, Massachusetts

Jefferson County Clerk

- 1851 Deed Book 79 pp. 549. On file at Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives, Frankfort

- 1870 Tax Assessment Book. Microfilm on file at Louisville Metro Archives.

- 1880 Tax Assessment Book. Microfilm on file at Louisville Metro Archives.

- 1885 Tax Assessment Book. Microfilm on file at Louisville Metro Archives.

- 1891 Tax Assessment Book. Microfilm on file at Louisville Metro Archives.

1900 Will Book 23, pp.197. Microfiche on file at Jefferson County Clerk Records.

Jones, O. and C. Sullivan

1989 *Glass Glossary for the Description of Containers, Tableware, Flat Glass, and Closures*. Studies in Archaeology, Architecture, and History. National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Ottawa.

Kasson, J.F.

1987 Rituals of Dining: Table Manners in Victorian America. In *Dining in America, 1850-1900*, edited by K. Grover, pp. 114-141. University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst.

Kemp, J.E.

1909 Report of the Tenement House Commission of Louisville. Louisville Tenement House Commission, Louisville.

Kleber, J. E. (Editor)

1992 *The Kentucky Encyclopedia*. The University Press of Kentucky, Lexington.

2001 *The Encyclopedia of Louisville*. The University Press of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

Kramer, Carl

1978 Two Centuries of Urban Development in Central and South Louisville. Louisville Survey: Central and South Report. City of Louisville, KY.

Kroeber, A. L.

1955 On Human Nature. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11 (3):195-204.

Louisville Abstract and Loan Association

1876 *Atlas of the City of Louisville*. Louisville, Kentucky

Louisville Business Directory

1859 Business Directory

1888 Business Directory

1889 Business Directory

Louisville City Directory

1832 City Directory

Louisville Daily Democrat, Newspaper

1865

Majewski, T. and M.J. O'Brien

- 1987 The Use and Misuse of Nineteenth-Century English and American Ceramics in Archaeological Analysis. In *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, M. B. Schiffer, editor, Academic Press, Inc., New York, pp.97-207.

Manson, J.L. and D.M. Snyder

- 1996 *Evaluating Sites with Late Nineteenth or Early Twentieth Century Components for Eligibility in the National Register of Historic Places: Using Turn-of-the-Century Whitewares as Economic Indicators in Assessing Collections and Developing Contexts*. NCPTT Grant Number: -424-5-NC-019.

Martin, T.J., and F. Mansberger

- 1987 Abraham Lincoln's Neighborhood: An Archaeological Perspective. *The Living Museum*. 49(4):45-48.

Marx, K. and F. Engels

- 1888 Bourgeois and Proletarians. In *Readings for a History of Anthropological Theory*. 3rd edition (2010). Paul A Erickson and Liam D Murphy eds. pp. 22-29. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

McBride, W.S. and M.E. Esarey

- 1995 The Archaeology of the Ashland Privy, Lexington, Kentucky. In *Historical Archaeology in Kentucky*, edited by K. McBride, W.S. McBride, and D. Pollack, pp. 265-295. Kentucky Heritage Council, Frankfort, KY.

McBride, K.A. and W.S. McBride

- 2008 Chapter 8: Historic Period. In *The Archaeology of Kentucky: Past Accomplishments and Future Directions*, vol. 2, edited by D. Pollack, pp. 903-1055. Kentucky Heritage Council, State Historic Preservation Comprehensive Plan Report No. 3. Kentucky Heritage Council, Frankfort.

McBride, W.S.

- 1993 Archaeological Test Excavations at Ten Sites in the Russell Neighborhood, Louisville, Kentucky. Report No. 326. Program for Cultural Resource Assessment, University of Kentucky, Lexington.

Miller, G.L.

- 1980 Classification and Economic Scaling of Nineteenth-Century Ceramics. *Historic Archaeology* 14:1-40
- 1991 A Revised Set of CC Index Values for Classification and Economic Scaling of English Ceramics from 1787 to 1880. *Historical Archaeology*, 25(1): 1-25.

- Morgan, D. and R. Jett
 2003 *Jefferson County History and Timeline*. Jefferson County Office of Historic Preservation and Archives [Online www]. Available URL. www.co.jefferson.ky.us/AboutHistory.html [Accessed 01 March 2003].
- Moseley, F.
 1997 The Depression of 1873-1879. In *Business Cycles and Depressions: an Encyclopedia*. Edited by D. Glasner, pp. 148-149. Garland Publishing, New York.
- O'Brian, A.P.
 1997 The Depression of 1920-1921. In *Business Cycles and Depressions: an Encyclopedia*. Edited by D. Glasner, pp. 151-153. Garland Publishing, New York.
- O'Brian, M.J., R.L. Lyman, and M.B. Schiffer
 2005 *Archaeology as a Process: Processualism and Its Progeny*. The University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
- O'Malley, N.
 1987 *Middle Class Farmers on the Urban Periphery: Historic Archaeological Investigations of the Johnson/Bates Farmstead Site, Jefferson County, Kentucky*. Archaeological Report 162; Program for Cultural Resource Assessment; University of Kentucky; Lexington.
- Otto, J.S. and G.D. Gilbert
 1982 *Monitoring Galleria*. University of Louisville Archaeological Survey, Louisville.
- Raycraft, D. and C. Raycraft
 1990 *Collectors Guide to Country Stoneware and Pottery (Second Series)*. Collector Cooks, Paducah.
- Reitz, E.J.
 1987 Vertebrate Fauna and Socioeconomic Status. In *Consumer Choice in Historical Archaeology*, edited by Suzanne M. Spencer-Wood, pp. 101-107. Plenum Press, New York.
- Riebel, R.C.
 1954 *Louisville Panorama, A Visual History of Louisville*. Louisville, KY.
- Schatz, D.W.
 2009 A Subsurface Reconnaissance for the Proposed 2.67 Acre Scholar House Project, Louisville, Kentucky. Report No. 09-034, AMEC E&E, Louisville.
- 2011a Field Methods and Results. In *Reading the City: Urban Archaeology of the Family Scholar House Site (15JF767) in Old Louisville, Kentucky* (2011). Andrews, S. C. and D. W. Schatz, pp 47-54. AMEC CRM Report No. 2011-003, Louisville.

- 2011b Urban Development Patterns. In *Reading the City: Urban Archaeology of the Family Scholar House Site (15JF767) in Old Louisville, Kentucky* (2011). Andrews, S. C. and D. W. Schatz, pp 214-248. AMEC CRM Report No. 2011-003, Louisville.
- Schlebecker, J.T.
1982 The Use of Objects in Historical Research. In *Material Culture Studies in America*. Edited by T.J. Schlereth, pp. 106-113. American Association for State and Local History, Nashville.
- Schlereth, T.J.
1991 *Victorian America, Transformations in Everyday Life*. HarperCollins Publishers, New York.
- Schollander, W. and W. Schollander
2002 *Forgotten Elegance: the Art, Artifacts, and Peculiar History of Victorian and Edwardian Entertaining in America*. Greenwood Press, Westport.
- Shifflett, C.
1996 *Victorian America: 1876 to 1913*. Facts on File Inc., New York.
- Simpson, K.D.
2011 Lab Methods and Materials Recovered. In *Reading the City: Urban Archaeology of the Family Scholar House Site (15JF767) in Old Louisville, Kentucky* (2011). Andrews, S. C. and D. W. Schatz, pp 100-155. AMEC CRM Report No. 2011-003, Louisville.
- Smith, S.D.
1983 Excavation of a Mid-Nineteenth Century Trash Pit, Wynnewood State Historic Site, Sumner County, Tennessee. *Tennessee Anthropologist* 8(2):133-181.
- Sorkin, A.L.
1997 The Depression of 1882-1885. In *Business Cycles and Depressions: an Encyclopedia*. Edited by D. Glasner, pp. 149-151. Garland Publishing, New York.
- South, S.
1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*. Academic Press, Inc., New York.
- Spencer-Wood, S.M.
1987 Miller Indices and Consumer-Choice Profiles: Status-Related Behaviors and White Ceramics. In *Consumer Choice in Historical Archaeology*, edited by Suzanne M. Spencer-Wood, pp. 321-358. Plenum Press, New York.

Stewart-Abernathy, L.C.

1986 Urban Farmsteads: Household Responsibilities in the City. *Historical Archaeology* 20(2):5-15.

Stottman, M.J.

1995 *Phase I/II Testing at the Site of the New Louisville Convention Center, Jefferson County, Kentucky*. Kentucky Archaeological Survey, Frankfort

2000 Out of Sight, Out of Mind: Privy Architecture and the Perception of Sanitation. *Historical Archaeology* 34(1):39-61.

2008 Ohio Valley Urban Centers. In *The Archaeology of Kentucky: Past Accomplishments and Future Directions*, Vol. 2, edited by D. Pollack, pp. 997-1005. Kentucky Heritage Council, State Historic Preservation Comprehensive Plan Report No. 3. Kentucky Heritage Council, Frankfort.

Stottman, M.J. and J.L. Watts-Roy

1995 *Proposal for Archaeology Weekend 1995 at Riverside: The Farnsley Moremon Landing*. MS submitted to the Jefferson County Office of Archives and Historic Preservation, Louisville.

Stottman, M.J., A.T. Bader, and J.E. Granger

1992 *Phase III Archaeological Investigation of the Hall-Standiford site (15Jf571) on Shewmaker Air Force Base Standiford Field Airport Jefferson County, Kentucky*. ARCS, Louisville.

Timberlake, R.H. Jr.

1997 The Panic of 1893. In *Business Cycles and Depressions: an Encyclopedia*. Edited by D. Glasner, pp. 516-518. Garland Publishing, New York.

United States Federal Tax Records

1866 Louisville, KY

United States Population Census

1860 Published Returns

1870 Published Returns

1880 Published Returns

1900 Published Returns

1910 Published Returns

- Wade, R. C.
 1959 *The Urban Frontier: Pioneer Life in Early Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Lexington, Louisville, and St. Louis*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- Wall, D.D.
 1994 *The Archaeology of Gender: Separating the Spheres in Urban America*. Plenum Press, New York.
- Weber, M.
 1922 The Sociology of Charismatic Authority. In *Readings for a History of Anthropological Theory*. 3rd edition (2010). Paul A Erickson and Liam D Murphy eds. pp. 89-94. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Williams, S.R.
 1985 *Savory Suppers and Fashionable Feasts : Dining in Victorian America*. Pantheon Books, New York.
- 1987 Introduction. In *Dining in America, 1850-1900*, edited by Kathryn Grover, pp. 3-23. University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst.
- Wolf, E.
 1999 *Envisioning Power: Ideologies of Dominance and Crisis*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Worthy, L.
 1982 Classification and Interpretation of Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Ceramics. In *Archaeology of Urban America*, edited by Roy S. Dickens, Jr., pp. 329-358. Academic Press, New York.
- Yentsch, A.E.
 1994 *A Chesapeake Family and Their Slaves: A Study in Historical Archaeology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Yater, G. H.
 1979 *Two Hundred Years at the Falls of the Ohio: A History of Louisville and Jefferson County*. Filson Club, Louisville, Kentucky.
- 1992 Jefferson County. In *The Kentucky Encyclopedia*, edited by J. E. Kleber. The University Press of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.

APPENDIX

Family Scholar House Permission Letter

Gladys and Lewis "Sonny" Bass
Louisville Scholar House Campus
Downtown Scholar House Campus
Stoddard Johnston Scholar House Campus
Parkland Scholar House Campus

April 22, 2014

To Whom It May Concern,

Re: Use of material from the Downtown Scholar House archaeological report:
Reading the City: Urban Archaeology of the Family Scholar House Site (15JF767) in Old Louisville, Kentucky (2011). By Andrews, S. C. and D. W. Schatz

In 2010, Family Scholar House, broke ground on its second campus, subsequently called Downtown Scholar House. As part of the site preparation and construction, Family Scholar House initiated an archeological study for the site. In Family Scholar House's work with disadvantaged single parent and their children, there is emphasis on understanding who one is based on one's family heritage and past experiences in order to set and reach goals for the future and live into who one wants to be. Understanding the history of the ground that is now home to the Downtown Scholar House campus fits into the work that Family Scholar House does with disadvantaged and disenfranchised families and offers lessons of healing and hope for participant families.

David Schatz, a graduate student in the University of Louisville, Department of Anthropology, has permission to use graphics, images, and selected text from the archaeological report *Reading the City: Urban Archaeology of the Family Scholar House Site (15JF767) in Old Louisville, Kentucky* as part of his master's thesis on segmented dining and class status. Mr. Schatz may use these materials with appropriate attribution to Family Scholar House and the Downtown Scholar House campus.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Cathe Dykstra
Chief Possibility Officer
President & CEO

Changing lives, families and communities through education.

403 Reg Smith Circle | Louisville, KY 40208 | Phone: 502.584.8090 | Fax: 502.584.8091 | www.FamilyScholarHouse.org

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: David Walter Schatz

ADDRESS: 615 Cochran Hill Rd
Louisville, KY 40206

DOB: March 30, 1967

EDUCATION:

B.A., Anthropology
University of Kentucky
1996

M.A., Anthropology
University of Louisville
2014

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES:

Kentucky Organization of Professional Archaeologists

Falls of the Ohio Archaeological Society

POSITIONS HELD:

Project Archaeologist/Historian, Corn Island
2011-Present

Staff Archaeologist/Historian, AMEC Environment & Infrastructure,
2001-2011

Senior Archivist, Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives
1999-2001

Field Technician, Indiana University
1998

Archaeology Technician, Program for Cultural Resource Assessment
1990-1997

PROJECTS:

Poster: A Spatial Analysis of the Historic Kitchen and Architecture
Artifacts Recovered from Excavations at the Locust Grove Historic Site,
Jefferson County, Kentucky
Advanced GIS, University of Louisville
Spring 2013

Poster: A Spacial Analysis of Prehistoric, Historic Kitchen, and Historic
Architecture Artifacts Recovered from Excavations at the Locust Grove
Historic Site, Jefferson County, Kentucky
Introduction to GIS, University of Louisville
Fall 2012

CONFERENCES/PRESENTATIONS:

Posters: A Spatial Analysis of the Historic Kitchen and Architecture
Artifacts Recovered from Excavations at the Locust Grove Historic Site,
Jefferson County, Kentucky and;
A Spatial Analysis of Prehistoric, Historic Kitchen, and Historic
Architecture Artifacts Recovered from Excavations at the Locust Grove
Historic Site, Jefferson County, Kentucky
GIS Day, University of Louisville
Fall 2013

Poster: A Spatial Analysis of Prehistoric, Historic Kitchen, and Historic
Architecture Artifacts Recovered from Excavations at the Locust Grove
Historic Site, Jefferson County, Kentucky
Kentucky Heritage Council Conference
Spring 2013

Reading the City: Urban Archaeology of the Family Scholar's House Site
(15JF767) in Old Louisville, Kentucky
Kentucky Heritage Council Conference
Spring 2011

A Pit is Just a Pit - Or is It? Features at the Panther Rock Site (15CL58)
Kentucky Heritage Council Conference
Spring 2009