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ABSTRACT

For much of the early 19th century, the British Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) dominated commercial activity throughout the Pacific Northwest. Following development of the Oregon Trail in the 1840s and 1850s, however, the HBC saw increasing social and economic competition from American settlers. This research examines nationalist attitudes evident during the transition to the American colonial era and effects on the consumption of commercial goods. Analyses compare archaeological ceramics from two retail sites located in what is now Vancouver, Washington: an 1850s American sutler’s store and the HBC Sale Shop. Additional comparison is made with a contemporaneous U.S. Army Officers’ Quarters to understand influences on domestic versus commercial contexts. The comparisons suggest associations between nationality and consumption, although practices were also dependent on socioeconomic class. Collectively, these findings provide insights on the materiality of national identity and the broader associations between consumption and identity expression.
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## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHS</td>
<td>Archaeological and Historical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmbd</td>
<td>centimeters below datum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBC</td>
<td>Hudson’s Bay Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>minimum number of vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWC</td>
<td>North West Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC</td>
<td>Pacific Fur Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

From 1829 to 1860, the British Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) controlled a massive fur trading empire that extended across much of the Pacific Northwest. Following the arrival of the U.S. Army in the region in 1849 and the concurrent influx of Euroamerican settlers, the HBC faced increasing challenges to its social and commercial authority (Hussey 1957; Erigero 1992; Schwantes 1996; Clayton 2000; Sinclair 2004). In this thesis, I examine the transition between the British and American colonial periods and its effects on the consumption of commercial goods at Fort Vancouver, the HBC’s former headquarters and the cultural center of British mercantile colonialism. Analyses focus on archaeological ceramics excavated from three loci in what is now Vancouver, Washington: the 1850s U.S. Army Sutler’s Store, the HBC Sale Shop, and a contemporaneous U.S. Army Officers’ Quarters (Table 1.1; Figure 1.1). Comparisons of HBC and Army assemblages allow us to explore differences among British and American consumers and provide insights into the historical associations between consumption and nationality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Trinomial</th>
<th>Approximate Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBC Sale Shop</td>
<td>45CL163 (HBC Fort)</td>
<td>ca. 1843 to 1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Sutler’s Store</td>
<td>45CL162 (Vancouver Barracks)</td>
<td>1850 to post-1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Officers’ Quarters</td>
<td>45CL160 (Officers’ Row)</td>
<td>1850 to 1865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary impetus of this research was the discovery of the Sutler’s Store in 2004 and its rich ceramic assemblage. While by far most pottery recovered from the Fort Vancouver area tends to be British in origin—indicative of the HBC’s longstanding commercial and colonial influence—preliminary analyses indicated that many of the
Sutler’s Store ceramics appeared to be of French manufacture. Researchers at the time recognized this discovery as unusual; however, information available at the time was limited, and the ceramic artifacts remained largely unidentified for nearly two decades. Moving forward to the present, my immediate research goals centered on identification and description of these artifacts. Through my investigations, it became apparent that these materials dated to approximately the 1850s, the period during which both the U.S. Army and the HBC occupied Fort Vancouver. Given the significant sociopolitical and economic change occurring at that time, this realization led me to consider how these artifacts may relate to historical events, commercial competition, and the expression of nationality.

Nationality, and identity more broadly, has long been a point of discussion among anthropologists and social theorists. From the role of nationalism in archaeology, to the origin of the Nation itself, these analyses vary widely in scope, yet each serves as a reminder of its perennial relevance in modern society. Current events in the U.S. and abroad continue to raise questions of how nationality is defined both formally and in practice, often with very real and substantial consequences. Because concepts of nationality are traditionally based on shared aspects of a community’s past, a historical perspective is necessary to understand how these identities form and evolve over time. In this regard, historical archaeology is particularly well situated to provide insights into the development of identities. By combining the study of material objects with historical data, historical archaeologists may consider both formal, written concepts of nationality and how these identities translate into real-world practices evident in the archaeological record.
FIGURE 1.1. Locations of the Sale Shop, Sutler’s Store, and Officers’ Quarters at Fort Vancouver relative to 1854 structures and extant buildings. (Figure by author, 2023.)
Based on this idea, I developed my thesis research to explore the potential relationships between the Sutler’s Store ceramics and the sociopolitical environment of 1850s Fort Vancouver. To begin, Chapter 2 provides historical context and describes the nationalist and colonialist attitudes that characterized early Anglo-American relations in the Pacific Northwest. In Chapter 3, I present the theoretical perspectives which informed my research, predominantly theories of practice and identity, and I develop research questions exploring how differences in ceramic use may have reflected national identities. To examine consumption at different scales, I establish hypotheses comparing ceramics from commercial contexts (the Sale Shop and the Sutler’s Store) as well as a household assemblage (the Officers’ Quarters).

In Chapter 4, I describe each of the three artifact assemblages and the laboratory methods used to investigate material expressions of nationality. This chapter includes a detailed writeup of individual features within the Sutler’s Store because these features have not been previously described, and to establish comparability with the Sale Shop and Officers’ Quarters. Results and interpretations, including an analysis of site formation processes and post-depositional effects, are presented in Chapter 5, with a brief summary and directions for future research in Chapter 6. Supplementary data, including photographs and detailed descriptions of the French ceramics, are included in the appendices.
2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Pacific Northwest is a modern designation for the region encompassing the northwestern coast of North America. Although specific definitions vary, this area is generally recognized as including the American states of Washington and Oregon, the Canadian province of British Columbia, and often parts of Idaho and northern California (Schwantes 1996). The Pacific Northwest today corresponds roughly with the 19th-century fur trading district known as the Columbia Department. Also called the Oregon Country, the Columbia Department stretched from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific between Russian America and Alta California, a vast area host to dramatic landscapes and diverse Indigenous peoples (Hussey 1957; Erigero 1992; Deur 2012). The boundaries established by early traders were based generally on political and physiographic divisions that today reflect over 200 years of Western colonialism.

The Fur Trade and HBC Fort Vancouver

Although European exploration of the Pacific Northwest began in the 1500s, colonial activity escalated significantly during the late 18th century (Schwantes 1996). By the 1790s, Russia, Spain, France, Great Britain, and the U.S. had each undertaken efforts to investigate the coasts of the northern Pacific. Voyage objectives were ostensibly geopolitical, cartographic, and economic in nature and yielded extensive information on the natural and cultural environments. Expedition reports also spurred considerable interest in the region’s fur-bearing mammals, fueling a brief but intense period of maritime fur trade (Gibson 1999). Under this system, traders, primarily from the U.S. and Great Britain,
obtained furs (particularly sea otter pelts) from Indigenous hunters along the Northwest Coast. Ships transported these to Canton (Guangzhou) for profit and subsequently returned to London and Boston laden with Chinese porcelain, spices, and other valuable goods. Competition and overhunting soon forced merchants to shift efforts inland, however, leading to the growth of a land-based trade. After about 1800, the continental fur trade formed the basis of the colonial economy in the Pacific Northwest.

Unlike the maritime trade, the continental fur trade concerned itself mainly with the pelts of beavers and other terrestrial species. The roots of this trade stretched over half a continent away, in the Hudson Bay watershed of eastern and central Canada. Known historically as Rupert’s Land, trade in this region had revolved around the exchange of peltry since the mid-17th century. By 1804, two enterprises dominated the industry: the HBC and the North West Company (NWC) (Carlos 1981). Formed by royal charter in 1670, the HBC operated under the guidance of its London governors and employed a business model rooted firmly in British mercantilism. The company’s royal backing granted the HBC the de facto power of government throughout Rupert’s Land. The NWC, meanwhile, was headquartered in Montreal, although like the HBC its leadership consisted generally of British or British-Canadian men, predominantly of Scottish heritage. Rivalries between the two firms occasionally resulted in violence among traders and with Indigenous communities (Hussey 1957; cf. Carlos 1981).

Competition between the HBC and NWC intertwined closely with land acquisition and resource exploitation. Firms strove constantly to “extend the trade” as they drove westward from Hudson Bay to the Rocky Mountains and beyond (Hussey 1957). NWC
partner Alexander Mackenzie completed the first overland route to the Pacific Ocean north of Mexico when his party landed at Bella Coola in July 1793 (Nicandri 2004). This journey not only gave the NWC its first foray into the Pacific Northwest, but also incited a competing effort from the U.S. In 1802, a copy of Mackenzie’s journal made its way to the desk of Thomas Jefferson, provoking the American president to authorize a federal expedition to the Pacific. Though the Corps of Discovery, as the Lewis and Clark Expedition was called, would also address scientific pursuits, Jefferson’s economic goals were unambiguous: his subsequent instructions to Meriwether Lewis stated that the crew’s objective would be to explore “the most direct and practicable water communication across this continent for the purposes of commerce” (Jefferson 1803). The Lewis and Clark Expedition was not the first American presence in the Pacific Northwest but was nonetheless fundamental to American enterprise in the region.

As Americans mobilized, the NWC expanded throughout the region and established forts along the Fraser, Columbia, and Snake rivers that would later substantiate British territorial claims (Schwantes 1996). Meanwhile, the Pacific Fur Company (PFC) founded the first American post in the district, Fort Astoria, at the mouth of the Columbia River in 1811. Like the Corps of Discovery, Astoria represented an opportunity to extend American interests, albeit this time by a private company engaged in mercantile colonialism, rather than by federal commission. The nationalist aspirations are evident in an 1813 letter from Thomas Jefferson to PFC owner John Jacob Astor. A decade after his initial instructions to Meriwether Lewis, Jefferson expressed his hopes that the fort would become “the germ of a great free and independent empire” stretching across the continent.
(Jefferson 1813). Clearly, Jefferson was among those who believed merchants would “carry nationality,” although whether they also conveyed political sovereignty remained a point of debate (Twiss 1846:226–232). The legitimacy of territorial claims by private traders would figure centrally in subsequent affairs between Britain and the U.S.

Prior to Astoria’s founding, British and American merchants had engaged in a competitive but generally peaceful maritime trade within the Pacific Northwest. Tensions heightened significantly, however, with the U.S. declaration of war against Britain in 1812 (Schwantes 1996). In turn, the Royal Navy announced its intent to seize American settlements on the Pacific. Upon disembarking at Fort Astoria in December 1813, however, the warship HMS *Racoon* found the fort already in British hands. Evidently, the PFC had preemptively sold all assets to the NWC. Nonetheless, sailors raised the ensign and renamed the post Fort George in honor of the British king.

Although Astoria’s transfer to the NWC had been nonviolent, it remained a point of contention. Britain skirted carefully around the topic during the 1814 Treaty of Ghent until American diplomats revived their grievances in 1818 (Merk 1950:590). British representatives countered that Astoria’s sale was not technically subject to wartime reparations but ultimately agreed to reinstate it as an American possession—at least in name. The NWC continued operations at the fort despite the formal change in ownership.

---

1 Despite Jefferson’s visions for Astoria, Americans comprised only a fraction of the PFC’s workforce, including its primary leadership. Of the company’s nine partners, only three were American citizens, while the remainder were Scots, formerly of the NWC; Astor himself was an American of German birth. The Scottish partners evidently expressed “no intention of laying aside their national character” for the company and had even received assurance that “they would be respected as British subjects” in the event of war (Twiss 1846:17–18). This scenario led English jurist Travers Twiss (1846:247) to conclude that Astorians lacked the collective national character requisite for claims of sovereignty, and highlights some of the complexities of navigating individual, corporate, and national identities.
Britain asserted strongly that the restitution signified only that Americans had occupied Astoria before the war and was not a concession of American territorial rights more broadly (Twiss 1846:148). Eschewing a formal boundary decision, British and American ambassadors passed an agreement stipulating that the Columbia Department would remain “free and open” to both nations for a period of 10 years (Twiss 1846:251). The 1818 convention made no acknowledgment of Indigenous land tenure.

Facing violent competition in Rupert’s Land and pressure from the British government, the HBC absorbed the NWC and its assets in 1821 (Hussey 1957). Prior to this time, the HBC had not established a significant presence in the Pacific Northwest, but thanks to the merger found itself in possession of the NWC’s extensive holdings. The HBC carried on the NWC’s operations from Fort George, but, lacking sufficient defenses or agricultural potential, the post proved generally unprofitable (Clearman 2020:9–10). In 1825, the HBC moved inland to what is now Vancouver, Washington, and constructed Fort Vancouver as the new headquarters of the Columbia Department. HBC governors stated that the name was intended to “identify our Claim to the Soil and Trade” with Captain George Vancouver, an English naval officer who had surveyed the coast over three decades prior (Merk 1950:611). The HBC relocated Fort Vancouver approximately one mile west in 1829 to a floodplain along the Columbia River (Clearman 2020). The new location provided an ideal locus for a trading entrepot and was soon cemented as a powerful nexus for commercial and cultural exchange.

Business at Fort Vancouver proceeded according to the HBC’s mercantilist policies. In general, this approach relied on the import and sale of English goods while also
striving toward self-sufficiency wherever possible. In addition to trading furs, the HBC cultivated large gardens, milled grain and lumber, raised livestock, processed salmon, and sold retail goods, among other ventures (Erigero 1992). Supporting these extensive undertakings were as many as 600 to 1,000 employees and their families, who resided in the Village adjacent to the main trading fort (Figure 2.1). This community hosted a multicultural assortment of Native Hawaiians, French Canadians, Métis, Scots, and Native Americans from across the continent (Kardas 1971; Deur 2012). By the 1840s, Fort Vancouver had developed into one of the largest and most ethnically diverse settlements on the Pacific coast (Wilson and Langford 2011).

*The Oregon Question*

Though the HBC enjoyed a comfortable position at Fort Vancouver, geopolitics posed recurring challenges to the company’s social and economic dominance. Arguably, the most pressing among these was Americans’ persistent interest in the Oregon Country. In 1827, Britain and the U.S. had once again avoided formal partition of the border and renewed the joint occupation agreement, opening wide the doors to settlement.

Following renewal of the agreement, American activity in the Columbia Department was largely confined to a handful of trappers, traders, and government surveys. These included reconnaissance by former U.S. Army officer Benjamin Bonneville and trader Nathaniel Jarvis Wyeth in the early 1830s, and the Wilkes and Frémont expeditions in the early 1840s (Schwantes 1996). Meanwhile, Wyeth’s travel companion, Reverend Jason Lee, founded the Pacific Northwest’s first Protestant mission in 1834 in the
Willamette Valley, where he also set up a small store for church adherents (Chapman 1984). Generally speaking, these early operations lacked the size or stability to compete with the HBC long-term—a fact of which the Americans were bitterly aware (Swagerty 2003). Until well into the 1840s, the HBC remained the region’s foremost colonial institution and the primary source of European goods in the Pacific Northwest.

As a general rule, the HBC treated individual visitors with a cautious courteousness. Nevertheless, the growth of American activity unsettled the company. Administrators feared foreign settlement would threaten the company’s stronghold on the region and soon enacted countermeasures against American colonization. Historically, the company had
implemented destructive “fur desert” policies to ruin productive trapping ranges and dissuade American trappers from entering HBC territory (Ott 2003). With the upturn in immigration during the late 1830s and 1840s, the HBC also refused to hire Americans and prohibited employees from extending credit to “destitute” Americans (Hussey 1972:192). John McLoughlin, the chief factor at Fort Vancouver, frequently ignored the latter, however, as he recognized the importance of maintaining amicable relations with the American populace (Hussey 1957; Swagerty 2003). As Euroamerican immigration intensified, retail sales comprised an increasingly important portion of HBC operations.

Despite the HBC’s efforts, westward migration grew exponentially during the 1840s, escalating particularly after the establishment of Protestant missions along the Oregon Trail. In 1843 alone, approximately 900 Americans traveled overland via this route (National Park Service [NPS] 1981:91), leading HBC governor George Simpson to estimate that “out of a population of about 3,000 souls, not more than one-third are British subjects” (Schafer 1909:4). Settlers soon recognized the need for a general governing body, and in May 1843 American and French Canadian settlers convened at Champoeg to establish the Oregon Provisional Government. According to John McLoughlin, the new legislature was “divested of all nationality of character, having no national objects in view” (Swagerty 2003:509). Despite its stated impartiality, however, lawmakers openly acknowledged the likelihood of one day falling under American jurisdiction (Holman 1912:121). American immigration maintained a rapid pace, and by 1849, the territorial census indicated that out of a total population of about 9,000 persons, nearly 97% of those enumerated were U.S. citizens (Eriger 1992).
The decades-long “Oregon Question” culminated at last in the years following the 1844 U.S. presidential election when President James Polk decreed Americans’ “clear and unquestionable” title to the Oregon Country and pushed for a northern border at 54° 40’ N (Merk 1934:38). While Americans responded to this assertion with mixed reactions—revolving generally around the balance of free versus slave-owning states—Polk’s address caused consternation among some British readers (Merk 1934). Such an arrangement would have placed the international boundary at the edge of Russian America, wholly eliminating British frontage along the Pacific. To HBC administrators, this was blatantly unacceptable, although the British Foreign Secretary expressed hesitance to become involved in what many considered an unnecessary conflict. After significant pressure from the HBC, the Royal Navy ordered the HMS Modeste to Fort Vancouver in November 1845 to assert HBC interests and provide support for Oregon’s British subjects (Gough 1971). Meanwhile, the USS Shark arrived on behalf of American citizenry the following July (Shine 2008). Though the warships’ presence offered reassurance for some, Gray (1870:213) suggests the show of gunboat diplomacy ultimately “increased the anxiety and hastened the effort to organize for self-defense on the part of the American settlers.”

Though tensions continued to mount, neither nation was eager to risk war over Oregon. Following yet another series of tumultuous negotiations and naval posturing, the 1846 Oregon Treaty finally settled upon the 49th parallel (Merk 1934, 1950; Gough 1971). Under this agreement, the southern portion of Columbia Department was conferred to the U.S. and came to constitute the Oregon Territory officially established in 1848; lands north of this latitude and the entirety of Vancouver Island became British possessions later
comprising the Canadian province of British Columbia. Fort Vancouver, meanwhile, sat over two hundred miles south of the line, squarely on American soil.

Suddenly finding itself in foreign territory, HBC dominance along the lower Columbia River quickly began to unravel (Erigero 1992). Although the treaty recognized the company’s rights to continue trade in Oregon, the HBC became subject to import tariffs averaging as much as 26% (Steele 1975). HBC administrators soon relocated their headquarters northward to Fort Victoria, relegating Fort Vancouver to a secondary role in the fur trade; however, retail sales remained a major industry (Steele 1975). The HBC faced further losses due to personnel desertion during the California Gold Rush, while American competitors also began to undercut profits more significantly in the 1850s (Hussey 1957; Erigero 1992; Swagerty 2003). By 1850, approximately 164 new merchants were operating across the Oregon Territory (Chapman 1993:37). Construction of a U.S. Army post directly north of Fort Vancouver in 1849 placed further strain on the HBC (Sinclair 2004).

*Arrival of the U.S. Army*

As immigration to Oregon intensified and conflicts with Indigenous peoples grew more frequent, the U.S. government recognized the need for a military presence along the Oregon Trail. Led by Brevet Major John S. Hatheway, Companies L and M of the 1st Artillery Regiment landed in Vancouver in May 1849 and constructed a temporary encampment, Camp Vancouver,² on the terrace above the British trading post (Sinclair

---

² The name of the military post was changed to the Columbia Barracks in 1850, to Fort Vancouver in 1853, and finally to the Vancouver Barracks in 1879.
The Regiment of Mounted Riflemen arrived in October after an overland trek from Fort Leavenworth (Settle 1940). The Mounted Rifles overwintered in Oregon City, 20 miles to the south, and returned to Fort Vancouver in the spring.

Sinclair (2004) reports that initial interactions between the HBC and U.S. Army were amicable. In the years following the Army’s arrival, the HBC rented structures to the Army to house troops and leased their fields and sawmill; officers also socialized with HBC gentlemen (Erigero 1992; Sinclair 2004). Pleasantries did not prevent the relationship from turning sour, however. Despite guarantees of possessory rights under the 1846 treaty, the HBC experienced repeated encroachments on their properties (Hussey 1957). After the 1850 Donation Land Claim Act opened Oregon to homesteading, HBC lands became “covered with squatters, English and American” (Bancroft 1888:112; Wilson 2014).

Although many Americans remarked positively upon the HBC’s role in developing the Pacific Northwest, others saw British influence as an obstacle to national prosperity. Merchants were especially critical of the HBC’s association with the British Crown, which they felt gave “the Leviathan” an unfair advantage over American commerce (Swagerty 2003). Anti-HBC sentiment permeated local attitudes: customs agents aggressively enforced new tariffs against HBC ships (Steele 1975), while politicians proposed laws to undermine HBC business (Bancroft 1888:112–138). One particularly vociferous legislator even succeeded in renaming the local post office from Vancouver to Columbia City, allegedly to avoid association with the HBC fort (McArthur 1929:132).
FIGURE 2.2. Lithograph of Fort Vancouver in 1854, showing the U.S. Army post along the slope at left and the HBC fort and Village at right (Sohon 1855; courtesy of the Library of Congress, Washington, DC.). The locations of the Sutler’s Store, Officers’ Quarters, and Sale Shop are indicated within the white rectangles (added by author).
As Wilson (2014) discusses, however, social divisions cut deeper than disputes over land or commerce. Americans’ distrust of the HBC was underpinned with racist and nationalist prejudices that settlers often directed at the company’s Indigenous laborers. Since the time of the American Revolution, Americans had accused the British of “poison[ing] the minds” of Native Americans and inciting them to violence (Swagerty 2003:491; Harding 2015:207–215). This conspiratorial mentality proved highly pervasive on the Western frontier and resulted in various acts of discrimination against the fur trading community. At Fort Vancouver, soldiers openly vandalized HBC property, including destruction of employee housing and defacement of the company’s cemetery. The physical replacement of the HBC Village by the Army Quartermaster Depot further underscored the demise of the fur trade era (Wilson 2014).

Formal legislation, too, ensured that only White Americans would be free to settle in the Pacific Northwest. In 1844 and 1849, the regional governments passed racial exclusion laws that prohibited African Americans from residing in Oregon (McClintock 1995), as legislators feared that Black and Indigenous populations would align against White settlers. Lawmakers additionally proposed to ban Catholicism in 1848, and in 1855 officially barred “half-breeds” from property ownership. These latter efforts clearly referenced the predominantly Catholic, multiethnic families of the fur trade and prevented many HBC employees from settling permanently in Oregon. Discriminatory laws specifically targeted Indigenous workers and laid bare the racialized motives of the White Protestant majority. Loss of personnel, coupled with high tariffs and waning profits,
ultimately forced the HBC to terminate operations on the lower Columbia River and abandon Fort Vancouver in 1860 (Hussey 1957; Wilson 2014).

**Merchants at Fort Vancouver**

For much of the early colonial period, the HBC represented one of few, if not the only, retail entities in the Pacific Northwest. With the growth of American immigration in the 1840s, the HBC was the primary provisioner of settlers, missionaries, and others living in the Columbia Department, even after the 1846 Oregon Treaty. Only after about 1854 did American merchants fully overtake the market for consumer goods (Roulette and Chapman 1996:7–12). The following subsections briefly describe the HBC Sale Shop—the heart of HBC retail operations at Fort Vancouver—and the U.S. Army Sutler’s Store, a nearby competitor that arose during the early 1850s.

**HBC Sale Shop**

Since the HBC’s peak in the 1840s, the Sale Shop formed an integral part of the fur trade landscape at Fort Vancouver. Based on historical illustrations and written descriptions, this structure was constructed between about 1841 to 1845 (possibly by 1843) along the western edge of the HBC stockade (Hussey 1972:185–187; Figure 2.1). Historical and archaeological data indicate the Sale Shop’s dimensions were approximately 40 × 81 ft. and sat roughly on the footprint of an earlier storehouse of similar function, although archaeological excavations have not yielded any clear evidence of the prior structure (Hussey 1972; Hoffman and Ross 1974:57). Like other HBC structures at Fort
Vancouver, the Sale Shop was of post-on-sill construction with a hipped roof. The building stood at one-and-a-half stories, the upper portion of which was used for storage. Historical photographs indicate a catwalk connected this space to the adjacent “New Store” built in 1844 (Hussey 1972:238; Hoffman and Ross 1974:62). Meanwhile, very little is known of the Sale Shop’s interior layout. Based on artifactual data and comparisons with other HBC stores, archaeologists have hypothesized that the Sale Shop may have contained various storage areas, a temporary living space for store clerks, and a waiting area for customers, among other uses (Hoffman and Ross 1974:66–74; Steele et al. 1975:137–140).

While the fur trade was instrumental in Fort Vancouver’s founding, by the 1840s retail sales formed the core of HBC business in the Pacific Northwest (Hussey 1972:195). The HBC Sale Shop was the primary locus for provisioning employees, missionaries, and American colonists arriving in the Oregon Country. Historical inventories attest to the wealth of goods received in the annual outfit at Vancouver during this era: in 1844, the Sale Shop stocked assorted articles of clothing, dishes, glassware, metal hardware and implements, provisions, tobacco, firearms and lead shot, toiletries, and numerous other manufactured items (Hussey 1957:217–226). According to Ross (1976:129), the HBC imported approximately 90% of all items from Britain.

Sale Shop pricing adhered to a complex system of tariffs that varied by season and by the socioeconomic class or ethnicity of the purchaser. For manufactured goods, HBC gentlemen were typically subject to the lowest markups, which were set at cost plus 25% during the summer season and 100% during the winter (Cromwell 2006:128). For the same items, most servants received a 50% markup, although Native Hawaiians were charged
200% over cost. Payments were conducted largely on credit or in exchange for furs, as physical cash in the Columbia Department was typically limited (Hussey 1972:192). As settlement of Oregon increased in the 1840s and agriculture became more widespread, the HBC later accepted wheat as payment; gold too became more prevalent after the California Gold Rush. By this time, the Sale Shop’s retail sales increasingly catered to settlers, missionaries, and other non-employees, all of whom the HBC charged cost plus 100%—evidently a reasonable rate, given the great expense of importation during the early fur trade era. Narcissa Whitman, an American missionary, remarked positively upon the Sale Shop’s prices when she visited Fort Vancouver in late 1836, apparently impressed by both the economy and quality of HBC goods (Hussey 1972:191). Others less financially well-off than the Whitmans, such as the HBC’s Native Hawaiian laborers, presumably found the Sale Shop less affordable, however (Cromwell 2006).

Following the Oregon Treaty, the Sale Shop continued to post significant profits in conjunction with the uptick in immigration. In fact, Sale Shop income peaked in 1849, when they profited over £14,000—and this in spite of the $6,800 paid in taxes. However, by the early 1850s, the Sale Shop had begun to succumb to tariffs and American competitors. By 1854, the HBC was experiencing the “full decline” of the mercantile trade at Fort Vancouver, with demand dwindling to effectively nothing by 1860 (Steele et al. 1975:1, 3, 20). Figure 2.3 shows the Sale Shop in May 1860, just before the HBC abandoned Fort Vancouver. At the time, the Army reported the Sale Shop to be “entirely unsuitable for any military purpose” and began to dismantle the structure (Hussey 1957:156). The Sale Shop and other HBC buildings sat in disrepair for several years before
burning to the ground in about 1866 (Hussey 1957:160; Hoffman and Ross 1974:13; Steele et al. 1975:39). The Army variously used the area surrounding the former Sale Shop until 1948, when the property was transferred to the NPS as a National Monument. Since 1966, the site has been encompassed by Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, an NPS unit aimed at researching and interpreting the area’s fur trade and military history.

FIGURE 2.3. West-facing view of the Sale Shop in 1860. The Sale Shop sits at center behind the tall wooden belfry. Other buildings shown include the New Store and adjoining catwalk (left) and the octagonal bastion at the stockade’s northwest corner (right). (North American Boundary Commission 1860a; courtesy of the Library of Congress, Washington, DC.)

U.S. Army Sutler’s Store

Located a quarter-mile north of the HBC fort, the Fort Vancouver Sutler’s Store was one of several alternatives to the Sale Shop that arose during the late 1840s to 1850s. The Sutler’s Store was established in conjunction with the U.S. Army fort and offered a source of manufactured goods for the barracks and surrounding communities. As a civilian contractor to the Army, the sutler exemplifies both the shifting economic situation in the Pacific Northwest as well as the growing social influence of the American military.
For much of the 19th century, the sutler stood as a central figure at military posts across the North American frontier. These private traders were contracted by the Army to supply soldiers with general goods, although they accommodated civilian and Native American customers as well (Delo 1998). Some of these varied clienteles are visible in Figure 2.4, which shows the interior of a typical sutler’s shop in the 1860s. Per the terms of their contracts, sutlers paid a head tax into the Post Fund and in return received the sole privilege to provision regiments with foodstuffs, clothing, supplies, and other items not provided by the Quartermaster and Subsistence Departments (U.S. War Department 1847:50). Original ledgers list crockery, tobacco, toothbrushes, clothing, shoes, coffee, and dried fruit among the numerous items stocked by one Fort Vancouver sutler in the early 1850s (Dall 1852; W. H. Barnhart and Company 1853). The exact prices charged for these goods are not known, although sutlers often maintained a reputation for exorbitant rates. Steep markups led some troops to regard the sutler as a “necessary evil” (Delo 1998:8).

Sutlers typically assumed multiple roles in addition to their storekeeping duties. Archaeological and historical evidence demonstrate that sutlers at Fort Vancouver doubled as postmasters, newspaper agents, and restaurateurs as well, apparently serving meals and liquor, despite prohibition of the latter (U.S. War Department 1847:57; Weekly Oregonian 1853:3; McArthur 1929:130; Horton 2007a). Sutlers socialized with Army officers and generally enjoyed a high social standing, aside from their problematic reputation among soldiers (U.S. War Department 1847:56). In distributing news, food, and supplies to customers, the sutler provided both the tangible comforts of home and a public space for information and exchange (Lees and Kimery-Lees 1984; Delo 1998). Delo (1998:143)
credits the post sutler as a major stabilizing force among military forts of the American West.

FIGURE 2.4. Interior view of the sutler’s store at Fort Dodge, Kansas (Davis 1867; courtesy of the Library of Congress, Washington, DC.)

Situated north of the St. James Mission property and west of the HBC cemetery, the Fort Vancouver Sutler’s Store first appears on a map dating between 1850 and 1851 (Bomford [1851]). For reasons unspecified, Erigero (1992) suggests it may have been a former HBC building. Census records indicate that Robert Wilson³ was the sutler at the Columbia Barracks in November 1850, after which ownership passed to James R. Shepherd and James B. Leach (Clark County Territorial Auditor 1850; Weekly Oregonian

³ After departing Vancouver in April 1851, Wilson continued suttling at various military forts for several decades (Weekly Oregonian 1851c:2; Simon 1991:130). He later testified at the impeachment trial of Secretary of War William Belknap in 1876, who had been charged with corruption and the illegal sale of post trader positions (U.S. House of Representatives 1876:178–183). The House of Representatives impeached Belknap by a unanimous vote, but the Senate ultimately failed to convict him.
This partnership was dissolved in May 1851, although recurring advertisements for the Sutler’s Store appear in newspapers until at least the following April (Weekly Oregon Statesman 1852:4; Weekly Oregonian 1851b:3). The names of individual proprietors during this time are currently unknown.

Much of the historical information regarding the Sutler’s Store originates from the period between 1852 and 1853. The store features briefly in the accounts of Ulysses S. Grant, then a brevet captain and quartermaster at the Columbia Barracks. In October 1852, Grant wrote to his wife that he had struck up a business agreement with Elisha E. Camp, a sutler who had accompanied the 4th Infantry from New York (Simon 1967:268). Thanks in part to a $1,500 investment4 from Grant, Camp managed a highly successful enterprise, for which he advertised “a general assortment of DRY GOODS, GROCERIES, CLOTHING, BOOTS, SHOES, &c.” (Gleason and Cheung 2007). However, the partnership deteriorated rapidly. Biographer Ron Chernow (2017:77) explains that, as a gesture of good faith, Grant had destroyed a promissory note he held against Camp, trusting the sutler would honor the debt. Unfortunately, Camp did not, and instead deceived Grant as to his true profits. Adding to the state of affairs, the store “blew up” sometime prior to April 1853 after gunpowder in the store accidentally ignited (Simon 1967:297; Chernow 2017:77).5 The degree of damage caused by the explosion is unknown but presumably

4 For reference, in 1853 a first lieutenant in the infantry (Grant’s effective pay rate) could expect a total monthly salary of about $79.50 (Adjutant General’s Office 1853:22, 39).

5 Chernow does not explain how the gunpowder was set alight, although some sort of criminal mischief may have been involved. I note at least two other military stores in the Pacific Northwest which also caught fire under unusual circumstances. In 1863, for instance, a liquor store near Fort Hoskins mysteriously exploded. The incident was never fully investigated, although foul play by soldiers was suspected (Schablitsky
In what Grant later called a “deranged” state, Camp returned to New York, still owing Grant about $800 (Simon 1967:305). Grant spent several years attempting to collect upon the debt, but the matter was never settled (Chernow 2017:90).

Whatever the precise circumstances of the explosion, operations at the Fort Vancouver Sutler’s Store evidently carried on after Camp’s departure, as the store continues to appear in map and illustrations throughout the 1850s (e.g., Figure 2.5). It is not known whether this was the same shop depicted on earlier maps or a new building reconstructed in its place. Illustrations from this period also provide the earliest three-dimensional views of the store, showing it as a one-and-a-half or two-story gabled structure situated within a tall stockade, both of which are visible at the left edge of Figure 2.2. Historian Marc Carpenter speculates that the stockade may have served to prevent theft or vandalism, or to obscure illicit activity (Shine and Carpenter 2013:104). Some illustrations also indicate a second gabled structure just outside the stockade’s north wall, the historic function of which remains unknown.

The store’s last known appearance occurs on an 1859 map; a decade later, it is gone, presumably demolished or removed (Wheeler and Dixon 1859; U.S. War Department 1869). The 1860 federal census does not explicitly list any sutlers residing at the garrison, although it records several merchants and a “peddler” within the adjacent Vancouver

---

6 Perret (1997:105), another Grant biographer, states the explosion reduced the store to “matchsticks.” However, he cites an April 1853 letter penned by Grant (here cited as Simon 1967:297), which mentions only that the store had “blown up,” with no further description of the damages.
townsite (U.S. Census Bureau 1860). Various secondary sources mention a sutler at Fort Vancouver as late as 1866 (Lewis Publishing Company 1899:448; Carley 1982:283), but it is unclear whether they continued working from the location north of the Catholic mission during this time. Based on historical photographs, Erigero (1992) hypothesizes that the sutler may have shifted operations to a different structure by late 1859 or 1860.\(^7\) This estimate is only slightly earlier than the archaeologically determined dates, which provide a \textit{terminus post quem} after 1860. Abandonment of the Sutler’s Store may have also been tied to the withdrawal of regular troops during the Civil War.

Due to rampant profiteering by sutlers during the Civil War, the Army abolished sutting in 1866, although the position was effectively reinstated as the post trader during the following year. Thus, subsequent references to “sutlers” technically denote the post trader (e.g., \textit{Morning Oregonian} 1872:3, 1875:3, 1878:3). A post trader appears on an 1874 map of the Vancouver Barracks but was not staffed after about 1877 (Ward 1874; Shine and Carpenter 2013:76). To discourage soldiers from frequenting the town saloons, in 1880 Colonel Henry A. Morrow established the 14th Infantry Regimental Canteen, where soldiers could socialize, purchase food and beer, read, and play billiards. Following the success of the Vancouver canteen, the Army adopted the canteen system nationwide in 1889. Reorganized as the Post Exchange in 1892, the “PX” became the foundation for the Army and Air Force Exchange Services which today provides support for American military service members worldwide.

\(^{7}\) An 1860 photograph taken by the Northwest Boundary Commission (1860b) appears to show an early iteration of the 1874 Post Trader’s store, which replaced the sutler after the Civil War.
FIGURE 2.5. Map of Fort Vancouver in 1854 (Mansfield 1855; courtesy of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site). The Sutler’s Store is labeled “O,” north of the Catholic Church.
3. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Historical accounts characterize the decline of the British fur trade and the concomitant growth of American influence as a period of profound social and political change. As the U.S. and Britain vied for control of the Pacific Northwest, this era saw the emergence of social divisions tied to Western nationalism and colonialism; for American settlers especially, this included an explicitly racial component directed against HBC laborers. Based on the historical evidence for such divisions, I attempt to examine the materiality of national identities using archaeological data from mid-19th-century Fort Vancouver. Drawing from theories of identity, practice, and consumer behavior, this research inquires how consumption practices—specifically, the acquisition and use of pottery—may have expressed or reinforced national, ethnic, or other identities.

Identity and Consumption

Academic uses of the term “identity” are numerous yet often difficult to state concisely. Some early literature describes identity as the innate quality separating one culture from another, whereas others equate it with self-concept (Barnard and Spencer 1996; Meskell 2002). Today, it is generally recognized as a dynamic, contextual process based on social and individual factors such as gender, ethnicity, nationality, or religion. As a result, identity remains something of a heuristic device in archaeology. Whether socially or individually derived, identity allows a glimpse into the ways individuals and groups differentiate “us” from “them.” In recognition of the multiplicities surrounding identity, this work adopts the definition offered by Díaz-Andreu and Lucy (2005:1), who suggest
that identity is one’s association with a group “on the basis of differences socially sanctioned as significant.” This explanation stresses the influence of social conventions upon identification (the process of constructing identity) and employs the core principles of practice theory. Pioneered particularly by Bourdieu (1977) and Giddens (1979), practice theory incorporates a range of perspectives addressing the dialectic between society and individual agency (Ortner 1984:148). Identification with a group requires conscious or subconscious knowledge of acceptable conduct and alternatives (orthodoxy and heterodoxy; collectively “doxa”), which in turn guide individual action, or “practice.” Individuals shape and reconstitute the group through practice, thus creating a cycle founded in both historical precedent and current circumstance (Pauketat 2001).

Although practice may occur as any number of socialized activities, I examine identity expression at Fort Vancouver through the practice of consumption. According to McCracken (1988:xii), consumption refers not only to the purchase of goods or services, but to any interaction leading up to or following it, including acquisition, use, possession, and disposal. This definition crucially integrates consumption within wider systemic processes (Purser 1992; Wurst and McGuire 1999; Brooks 2009), which might include manufacture, importation by wholesalers, procurement from retailers, and use and deposition by households. Practice at each stage is governed in part by the setting and the agents involved (Barrett 1988; Pauketat 2001; Mullins 2011).

Consumer behavior models combine perspectives from economics, psychology, and anthropology to examine the dynamics of consumption and culture (Spencer-Wood 1987). Modern behavioral frameworks consider both utilitarian and symbolic needs of
consumers, similar to Binford’s (1962) anthropological concepts of technomic, sociotechnic, and ideotechnic functions, or Brooks’ (2010) primary intended function and primary intended use. Consumer behavior approaches link patterns of consumption to societal norms and conceptualize goods as the physical “blueprints” of culture (McCracken 1988:74). Under this theoretical perspective, objects exist as part of a larger system of norms, values, and ideas around which society is organized and reproduced. The act of consumption (or non-consumption) thus offers a means of negotiating and retransmitting selected norms (Spencer-Wood 1987; cf. Cook et al. 1996; Wurst and McGuire 1999).

To examine the expression of social identities at Fort Vancouver, I focus on consumption practices tied to historical ceramics. While any commercial goods could theoretically impart some aspect of identity, I emphasize ceramic consumption for several reasons. On a fundamental level, ceramic artifacts are very common archaeologically and provide a large body of data with which to address consumption practices. The abundance of these items is due not only to preservation factors, but also to their widespread historical use. Ceramics are nearly ubiquitous among archaeological investigations at Fort Vancouver and other historical sites within the Pacific Northwest region, appearing across nearly all areas, occupations, and time periods (Chance and Chance 1976:61–105; Ross 1976, 1977; Sussman 1979; Cromwell 2006). Most importantly for this study, however, is the symbolic value traditionally ascribed to these items.

Thanks in part to their sheer ubiquity and diversity of types, ceramic artifacts typically carry a wealth of social information used to communicate ideas and identities (Majewski and O’Brien 1987; Burley 1989; Deetz 1996; Cromwell 2006; Nassaney and
Brandão 2009; Peelo 2011; Holschuh 2013). While historical archaeologists have devoted much attention to the study of socioeconomic class (Spencer-Wood 1987), ceramics may also communicate ethnicity or race, gender, status, or kinship ties through channels such as ceramic form or ware type. Referring to the vessel shape represented, ceramic form shares obvious functional associations with subsistence and dining (Otto 1975; Plane 2004) but may also relate to ritual, ideology, or individuality (Leone 1982, 1999; Marshall and Maas 1997; Croucher and Wynne-Jones 2006). In the northwestern Great Plains, for instance, tea sets functioned as integral symbols of Métis social organization and gender roles during the 19th century (Burley 1989). Ware type (variously defined by clay composition, glazes, and other embellishments) is similarly correlated with distinct styles and social groupings (Binford 1962:220; Majewski and O’Brien 1987; Thompson 2016).

Though the importance of visual characteristics is easily apparent, the communication and interpretation of those symbols depend simultaneously upon context. Meanings attributed to goods are situationally fluid and rely on real-world patterns of use (Marshall and Maas 1997; Cabak and Loring 2000; Cromwell 2006; Cruz 2011). Form does not wholly dictate function, nor does decoration retain any intrinsic meaning without the social knowledge to interpret or reconstruct it. Consumption may be further contingent upon the goods available and consumers’ ability to purchase (Wilkie and Farnsworth 1999), in-group or out-group communication (Wiessner 1983), or ritual versus everyday settings (Marshall and Maas 1997).

Whalen (2017) offers a useful illustration of the latter point in contrasting public and domestic consumption practices in post-medieval Ireland. Adopting perspectives based
in performance theory, Whalen concludes that locally produced ceramics were associated with maintenance of Irish ethnic identity, but only among goods intended for public consumption. The conspicuous use of Irish-made kaolin tobacco pipes thereby symbolized active opposition to English colonization, whereas domestically used English tablewares did not. By avoiding categories of essentially “Irish” or “English” artifacts, Whalen emphasizes the selective consumption of objects to communicate identity. Ceramics at Fort Vancouver may likewise reveal differing engagement with consumer goods.

*Ceramics at Fort Vancouver*

A recurring thread in historical ceramic research of the Pacific Northwest centers around the prevalence of English earthenwares (Ross 1976, 1977; Sussman 1979; Cromwell 2006; Holschuh 2013). As part of the larger pattern of British mercantilism, the HBC imported immense quantities of ceramics to North America throughout the 19th century. Britain, and particularly the English Staffordshire potteries, led the globe in earthenware production at this time, and North America represented their largest export market (Nelson 1980; Majewski and O’Brien 1987:114; Ewins 1998). The HBC held a contract with the esteemed Spode/Copeland firm of Stoke-on-Trent, which operated under the name Copeland & Garrett from 1833 to 1847 and subsequently as W.T. Copeland until 1868. Beginning in 1837, Copeland & Garrett was the HBC’s sole provider of ceramics; while the firm lost its monopoly in 1847, the HBC continued to import Spode to Fort Vancouver until at least 1853 (Cromwell 2006). As a result, British ceramics, and particularly Spodewares, are all but ubiquitous at many North American fur trade sites.
The omnipresence of ceramic vessels at such sites reflects not only the massive scale of British pottery industry, but also their overwhelming social importance. On a fundamental level, crockery and other vessels were necessary for many everyday tasks, such as cooking, dining, or hygiene—the daily practices through which identities are actively formed and negotiated. As such, ceramics occur in some form across all segments of Westernized societies, but to varying degrees (Cromwell 2006; Holschuh 2013; Horton 2014). In general, historical archaeologists have placed significant emphasis on socioeconomic inequalities visible in the artifactual record (Spencer-Wood 1987), with several notable studies involving ceramics. Fur trade society, and Victorian society at large, revolved around deep-seated concepts of social class that compelled individuals to engage in Victorian goods acquisition and consumption (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 2001). The fixation on class expectations permeated all aspects of life and influenced practices ranging from home construction methods to everyday dining. The selection of certain types of pottery likewise reflected the good taste and refinement of its users.

At Fort Vancouver, social divisions tied to ceramics aligned primarily with socioeconomic class but also varied according to ethnicity and occupation (Holschuh 2013). At the top of this hierarchy sat the HBC gentlemen, who included persons such as the chief factor, chief traders, clerks, and other elite roles within the company. Most of the individuals within this group were of either English or Scottish descent and often came from upper class backgrounds. Archaeologists and historians have typically associated HBC gentlemen with costly wares that communicated the owner’s social refinement, such as porcelain, lusterware, or transferprint. Data also indicate that these ware types occurred
in numerous forms, such as tablewares, serving wares, and hygiene or toilet items (Cromwell 2006). Studies particularly underscore the importance of tea wares in fur trade society, which were necessary for adherence to Victorian sensibilities and etiquette (Burley 1989; Cromwell 2006; Holschuh 2013).

The servant classes constituted the lower tiers of HBC society and encompassed the tradesmen, voyageurs (boatmen hired to transport goods between the fort and the HBC’s remote outposts), and other manual laborers. A great diversity of individuals made up this class, which tended to include the HBC’s many Indigenous employees, French Canadians, and others. Because of their limited financial means, servants often selected less costly ware types, such as whitewares, bandedwares, or other utilitarian types. Transferprint represented a significant investment but was not entirely inaccessible (Cromwell 2006). Excavations in the HBC Village at Fort Vancouver have recovered a variety of ceramic forms associated with employee households, although the proportions of some vessels vary from those found in gentleman households (Cromwell 2006). Like the gentleman assemblages, the Village assemblages also include a high large proportion of tea wares. However, use-wear patterns on slop bowls (vessels used for discarding cold tea and tea leaves) suggest that some employees used these for serving food rather than the traditional Victorian tea service (Cromwell 2006:290).

Despite the diversity of people at Fort Vancouver, it is necessary to consider the corresponding variety of ceramics within the broader colonial context. Ceramics at the fur trade fort were largely English-made goods imported by the HBC and thus reflect the material culture of the dominant British influence. Especially during the early fur trade
period, alternatives to Spode and other HBC goods were few and far between (Chance et al. 1982:250–257; Cromwell 2006:131), and local production was extremely limited (Peterson 2008). In fact, the North American pottery industry as a whole lagged behind European manufacturers until after the American Civil War (Majewski and O’Brien 1987:115). As a result, ceramic assemblages are skewed towards British material culture and may mask variability that would otherwise be present. The lack of variety has stymied prior attempts to “find ethnicity” or other distinct identities potentially evident in fur trade assemblages (Kardas 1970).

As American settlement increased, however, new competitors to the Sale Shop began to take root, bringing new variety and alternatives to HBC goods. For example, the shift away from total reliance on the HBC may be evident in the household ceramic assemblage of William Earl, a wealthy farmer who settled in the Willamette Valley in the 1840s and 1850s (Roulette and Chapman 1996). Contrary to contemporaneous HBC sites, the Earl Site contains little Spode, although other British trademarks are present. The authors suggest that the lack of Spodewares represents consumers’ adoption of alternative sources of goods and the shifting economic situation of the Pacific Northwest.

Other important studies that have addressed ceramics include the reports of excavations in the HBC Village authored by Chance and Chance (1976) and Chance et al. (1982), which offered some of the first direct comparisons of fur trade and Army ceramics at Fort Vancouver. Outside of Fort Vancouver, Sprague’s (1980) work in the San Juan Islands also provides perspectives on ceramics excavated elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest and how these fit into regional patterns of consumption. Meanwhile, Horton’s
and Eichelberger’s (2019) respective discussions of military material culture offer insights into the ways U.S. Army officers used ceramics and other goods to communicate their rank or class to other officers and soldiers.

**National Identity**

The sociopolitical milieu of Fort Vancouver in the mid-19th century raises questions about nationality or national identity as a potentially salient division. Although definitions vary, national identity here refers to identification with a political state and geographic region (Trigger 1996:212; Kohl 1998:226; Brooks and Mehler 2017:8). In some cases, nationality appears interchangeably with ethnicity, a social group defined on the basis of shared culture, language, or heritage. Although ethnicity and nationality may overlap in the case of an ethnostate, the terms are not necessarily synonymous within culturally pluralistic societies. Meanwhile, citizenship traditionally denotes a formal legal status that may or may not correspond with either national or ethnic identity (Camp 2011, 2013). Social and political scientists have frequently remarked upon the confusion of these terms (Anderson 1991; Connor 1994; Jones 1997; Camp 2013).

Within archaeological discourses, discussions of nationality most often pertain to the creation or maintenance of the nation through archaeological inquiry, or what Kohl (1998:226) terms “nationalist archaeologies” (cf. Trigger 1984). Nationalist archaeologies are those developed for the purpose of constructing or reinforcing nationality, the collective sense of unity or cohesion among a nation. Since the Industrial Revolution (and arguably earlier), such studies have sought to establish connections with distant cultural
predecessors, to bolster national pride or patriotism, or to legitimize colonial and imperial regimes. These aims typically draw narratives from a common past, which may be either real or invented (Brooks 1997, 1999; Kohl 1998). Interestingly, Trigger (1984:358) notes that nationalist archaeologies share a close association with the development of archaeology as a whole, suggesting further that “most archaeological traditions are probably nationalistic in orientation.” Other archaeologists have since echoed Trigger’s observations regarding this relationship, and case studies from around the globe now highlight the entwined histories of archaeology, national identity, and nationalism (Anderson 1991; Kohl and Fawcett 1995; Jones 1997; Brooks and Mehler 2017).

Perhaps less frequently discussed, however, is the materiality of nationality itself, or how national identities affect practice in tangible, observable ways. When discussions of archaeology and nationality coincide, these are often oriented toward processes of globalization, politics, trade, and other systemic factors affecting consumption, such as war, colonialism, and immigration (Brooks 2009; Brooks and Rodríguez 2012; Brooks and Mehler 2017). While crucial for building the context within which consumers negotiate identities, these works often lack an explicit discussion of identity’s ideological aspects.

Meanwhile, other studies directly address nationality as an internalized concept. These consider ideological questions surrounding nationality, including how consumers communicate, reproduce, or invent national identities through material culture. For example, Brooks (1997, 1999) explores the appropriation of Celtic imagery on English earthenwares to create a pan-British identity. George (2022) similarly reflects upon the symbolism of transferprint designs within domestic assemblages from New York City.
during the post-Revolutionary War period. Focusing on transferprint decorated with “American” motifs, George examines consumption practices evident in three household assemblages from Lower Manhattan and how these may reflect the emergent American identities of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The author provides a descriptive history of each residence and, using documentary evidence, delves into the occupants’ personal and financial circumstances. Although such nuance is not achievable for all archaeological sites, these details impart important context and highlight the numerous factors potentially constituting one’s identity. In interpreting each assemblage according to the subjects’ socioeconomic class, family structure, and other personal dynamics, George underscores the fluid, mutable forms that national identities may take.

Regarding the latter point, Camp (2011, 2013) provides an additionally valuable contribution by investigating the interrelationships between race, citizenship, and consumption. Camp examines the materiality of American citizenship by touching upon topics such as racial disenfranchisement and the conflation of consumption and patriotism. While ostensibly focused on citizenship (i.e., the legal status and rights conferred) rather than national identity (the internalized concept), strictly speaking, Camp’s studies indicate that, like identity, citizenship too represents a contested and malleable construct, subject to ongoing change and societal pressures. In light of the overt prejudices of American settlers against HBC-affiliated minorities (Wilson 2014), Camp’s work provides an additional lens from which to approach American national identity in the colonial Pacific Northwest. As discussed in Chapter 2, American settlers engaged in both formal and informal acts of racism against Indigenous peoples, implying that both nationality and citizenship involved
significant ethnic and political barriers. Harding (2015) suggests that this racial aspect entered the American consciousness more in the decades following the American Revolution, and particularly after the War of 1812. In shedding its status as a British colony, the U.S. turned toward the Western frontier to assert its economic and social interests. Through the process of westward expansion, the role of “settler” became entrenched in the American consciousness, upending the prior pattern of marginalization by Britain and transforming the U.S. from colony to colonizer. In turn, American settlers united against a new “other,” the Indigenous peoples of the American West.

British national identity at this time, meanwhile, was arguably not predicated so heavily upon race, but rather class (Brooks 1999; Lawrence 2003). This dimension of Britishness also contended with the various nationalities and ethnicities comprising the collective British identity, which Brooks (1999:53) asserts is a relatively modern creation. Clayton (2000) further correlates British national identity with economic prosperity achieved via its imperial endeavors, particularly its robust manufacturing and export industries. As a mainstay of British culture and economy in North America, the HBC thus epitomized Britishness itself; the company’s royal charter and its role as de facto government of Rupert’s Land additionally formalized the relationship between the HBC and the British state. Historical attitudes surrounding the early fur trade and Oregon

---

8 In juxtaposing the socioeconomic aspects of 19th-century British identity versus the racism of American settlers, I do not mean to suggest that the HBC lacked these prejudices entirely. The HBC also engaged in racist practices evident in the paternalistic attitudes with which they regarded Indigenous employees (Deur 2012; Holschuh 2013; Wilson 2014). If any distinctions may be drawn between the HBC’s treatment of these groups and that of American settlers, it might be said that the HBC at least maintained a general tolerance for Native American peoples, in contrast to Euroamericans’ largely exclusionary policies.
Question attest that this association was not lost upon the HBC nor their American neighbors in the Pacific Northwest (Swagerty 2003).

*Ceramics and Nationality*

Previous ceramic studies at Fort Vancouver have addressed the material vestiges of ethnic identity or class (Cromwell 2006; Holschuh 2013), but it is unclear precisely if or how nationality may have influenced consumption. Certainly, archaeological analyses at Fort Vancouver and elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest suggest distinctions between 19th-century American and British ceramic use. Chance and Chance (1976), for instance, noted that HBC strata in the HBC Village site regularly contained over 50% transferprint, whereas plain whitewares were most prevalent in U.S. Army layers. In fact, the authors asserted that “Assemblages high in plain whiteware were found to be invariably diagnostic of the Army,” a difference which they attributed both to cost and (poor) personal taste (Chance and Chance 1976:62, 69, 263). Excavations the following year, however, saw greater numbers of transferprint among Army occupations, possibly signifying purchase of HBC ceramics by Americans or admixture with HBC strata (Chance et al. 1982:221).

Sprague (1980) describes a similar distinction among ceramics from British and American sites on San Juan Island in northwestern Washington state. The British assemblages tended to include more transferprint, shell-edge, lusterware, and mocha wares than their American counterparts. American assemblages meanwhile exhibited greater variability in manufacturing locations. While English wares (particularly those from the Staffordshire district) predominated in all assemblages, the American sites contained the
greatest variety of non-British ceramics. Sprague (1980:182–183) suggests this may have resulted from American families and non-military personnel bringing personal dishes into communities, versus the predominantly military populations at British sites. Chapman’s (1993:111) discussion of homestead sites in the French Prairie area, about 40 miles south of Fort Vancouver, echoes Sprague’s observations regarding product origin: “[I]t appears from scant information available that American settlers from the 1840s time period did not possess significant amounts of material items, nor were English ceramics a major component of 1850s American homestead.” She additionally states that French Canadian sites in the same area contained greater quantities and varieties of English ceramics, particularly Spodewares, due to occupants having better relationships with HBC traders.

The apparent divide in ceramic consumption patterns extends beyond local or even regional trends as well. Brooks (2009), for instance, mentions variations in transferprint color preferences among Britain, America, and the British colonies as well as Americans’ growing predilection for ironstone during the mid-19th century. In general, the predominance of ironstone in American assemblages has been well established (Chance and Chance 1976; Sprague 1980; Ewins 1998; Lawrence 2003; Brooks 2009), but there is some disagreement as to the exact nature of this trend. According to certain scholars (Chance and Chance 1976:263; Wetherbee 1996; Horton 2014:494), ironstone became the choice of “homesteaders, farmers and working-class peoples” due to its durability and low cost, whereas decorated wares remained the preference of the upper classes. As Horton (2014:497) explains, ornately decorated wares “stood as a contrast to the plain white or Gothic-molded [ironstone] dishes supplied by the Quartermaster” and provided an avenue
for officers to assert their rank over enlisted men and other officers (cf. Eichelberger 2019). In this regard, Horton likens Army officers to the gentleman classes of HBC society, with whom officers occasionally socialized (Sinclair 2004:19).

Others, however, maintain that this partiality was, in fact, a matter of taste rather than practicality, and was not restricted to the working classes. According to Brooks (2009:293), Ewins (1998), and others, ironstone grew in popularity at this time because it mimicked the appearance of expensive French porcelain. In examining the commissioned Army officers’ quarters at Fort Hoskins and Fort Yamhill (each approximately 60 to 75 miles southwest of Fort Vancouver), Eichelberger (2019:313–314) states that Americans increasingly favored this ware type over other non-transferprinted ceramics (i.e., plain whitewares) after 1840, and ironstone came to represent association with the middle and upper-middle classes. However, Eichelberger (2019:315) clarifies that porcelain and transferprint remained the most expensive decorated ware types. This assertion is borne out by ceramic price indices from this era indicating that by about 1855, the cost of ironstone was on par with that of transferprint, which had reportedly begun to fall out of fashion during this period (Miller 1980).

Importantly, historical inventories indicate that merchants were keenly aware of consumer demands and adjusted their shipments accordingly. Since at least the late 18th century, British potteries had catered to American tastes by manufacturing designs with American or even anti-British imagery (Nelson 1980); evidently, the potters’ business acumen superseded any strong patriotic sentiment in these cases. Ewins (1998), meanwhile, explores the role of the pottery dealer in 19th-century Boston and St. Louis,
who acted as an intermediary between manufacturers and markets and maintained a close familiarity with consumer demands. Merchants in the Oregon Territory presumably paid similar attention to market trends, as made evident by local advertisements touting cargoes “packed expressly for the Oregon market” with goods “suited to the wants of the country” (*Weekly Oregonian* 1851a:3, 1851d:3). Statements such as these imply an awareness of local demands and preferences that ostensibly extended to ceramic vessels.

**Research Questions**

Historical evidence establishes the existence of social divisions at Fort Vancouver along national, ethnic, and class lines. Prior archaeological studies appear to corroborate these and particularly suggest differences between British and American ceramic consumption practices. Accordingly, I developed two research questions to test whether expressions of nationality may be visible within the archaeological record.

**Hypothesis 1: Commercial Assemblages**

My initial research question adopts a broad approach to nationality by examining consumption at the community level. Specifically, I contrast the ceramic assemblages of American and British merchants to understand how the nationalities associated with each may be reflected archaeologically. As a form of consumption in itself, it is assumed that the selection of store inventory relied partially upon merchants’ knowledge of their respective clienteles, which they used to stock desirable goods, or even to fabricate demand (e.g., Twitchell 2000:60–69). Furthermore, an initial emphasis on commercial contexts is
integral to understanding household consumption patterns because merchants ultimately regulate the accessibility of goods for most domestic consumers. Of course, external factors also dictate the accessibility of goods from manufacturers to distributors and retailers. Brooks (2009), for instance, discusses the impact of the American Civil War on British earthenware imports to Australia. Though Australian consumption patterns at this time usually resembled those of other former British colonies (besides the U.S.) in preferring colorful transferprint dishes, the wartime collapse of American markets forced manufacturers to divert surplus cargoes of ironstone to Australia, rather than their intended audiences in America. As a result, Australian ceramic assemblages from this period occasionally include higher than expected proportions of plain, white ironstone. In considering these largescale trends as well as the general sociopolitical and economic environments, commercial inventories offer insights into consumer practices that may illuminate broad distinctions between British and American ceramic use.

I selected two stores to test this hypothesis: the HBC Sale Shop and the U.S. Army Sutler’s Store. Due to their inherent similarities and contemporaneity, these stores offer convenient loci for comparing consumption among American and British populations. Both catered to the broader Vancouver community and likely offered comparable types of general merchandise. Despite sharing a similar function and physical proximity, however, preliminary research indicates that each ostensibly differed in ceramic offerings. Whereas nearly all vessels imported by the HBC originated from a single Staffordshire firm (Sussman 1979), the presence of French pottery in the Sutler’s Store suggests deviation from established practices (Gleason and Cheung 2007).
Based on these assumptions, I developed the following three-part hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 1**: The Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store ceramics will vary based on nationality.

- **H1A(ware)**: The Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store contain different ware types.
- **H1A(form)**: The Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store contain different vessel forms.
- **H1A(location)**: The Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store contain ceramics from different countries.

Difference in assemblages were tested according to three properties: ware type, vessel form, and manufacturing location. The rarity of French goods at Fort Vancouver provokes the present interest in product origin, although actual consumption patterns may have conformed to any number of traits. Nation of manufacture, while often salient today, may not have been a major selling point historically. Form and ware type were also analyzed to identify other potential distinctions between the Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store assemblages. As mentioned previously, form and ware type share associations with nationality or ethnicity that may be evident in archaeological assemblages. Table 3.1 lays out the general distributions of ceramics expected within each context.

### TABLE 3.1
**PREDICTED CERAMIC DISTRIBUTIONS IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN ASSEMBLAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>British (Sale Shop)</th>
<th>American (Sutler’s Store)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ware Type</td>
<td>Predominantly transferprint, although many other ware types may occur, such as shell-edge whitewares, lusterware, mochaware, yellow wares, etc.</td>
<td>Predominantly whitewares and ironstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Form</td>
<td>Many; tea wares prevalent</td>
<td>Many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Location</td>
<td>Britain; predominantly Spode</td>
<td>Britain and other locations; greater variety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2: Domestic Assemblages

Whereas the first hypothesis emphasizes broad, societal patterns within commercial contexts, the second component of this research attempts to evaluate these findings against domestic practices. This aspect aims to illuminate the social factors driving individual consumer choice by comparing a contemporaneous household site with any widespread patterns potentially established by Hypothesis 1. Inferring social identities from the historical record, the second research question considers not only how nationality may be visible in the archaeological record, but also how it may have varied in relation to consumers’ ethnicity or socioeconomic class. Ideally, in assessing how household practices do or do not align with commercial assemblages, these assemblages may highlight which aspects of consumption, if any, are more strongly tied to nationality. I therefore developed the following research questions paralleling Hypothesis 1:

**Hypothesis 2:** Ceramics from the Sutler’s Store and American households will be similar based on nationality.

- $H_2A(\text{ware})$: The Sutler’s Store and households contain different ware types.
- $H_2A(\text{form})$: The Sutler’s Store and households contain different vessel forms.
- $H_2A(\text{location})$: The Sutler’s Store and households contain ceramics from different countries.

To address this question, I chose to compare the Sutler’s Store ceramics with those from a contemporaneous Officers’ Quarters at Fort Vancouver. Located a short distance away in the Officers’ Row area of the Vancouver National Historic Reserve, the quarters in question were used by U.S. Army officers between 1850 and about 1865 (Thomas 1988), roughly the same period during which the Sutler’s Store operated at the fort. Based on the
historical context, it is assumed that the associated artifact assemblage would be broadly representative of American consumption practices during the period of HBC and Army co-occupation at Fort Vancouver. Presumably, if the sutler catered to American clientele, then the ceramics in each site should be similar.

I acknowledge a few caveats surrounding this hypothesis and its underlying assumptions, particularly those regarding individual variability. Although the historical record provides a coarse-grained sense of social organization according to nationality, ethnicity, or class, at an individual level these divisions were likely much more nuanced and intersectional. Neither citizenship nor association with a nationalist, corporate, or imperialist entities such as the HBC or U.S. Army are necessarily indicative of national identity or loyalties, as fur trade historians have occasionally pointed out (Haines 1949; Swagerty 2003; Twiss 1846:17–18). Interpretations of household-level datasets must additionally consider the rank or class of the occupants, as these also share associations with ethnicity, nationality, and consumption practices (Lawrence 2003; Holschuh 2013; Horton 2014; Eichelberger 2019; Sinclair 2019). As mentioned previously, HBC gentlemen were predominantly of English or Scottish origin; similarly, in 1850, all Army officers at Fort Vancouver were American-born citizens of the U.S. In contrast, nearly half of all enlisted men were immigrants, mainly from Germany and Ireland (Sinclair 2019). Those in different ranks or classes might have felt differently compelled to express nationality. Although analysis at the level of the individual may not be possible archaeologically, discussions must nonetheless recognize the potentially diverse experiences tied to nationality and other individual factors.
In addition to social context and the intersection of diverse identities, further consideration should be given to the accessibility of goods. Based on Brooks’ (2009) and others’ discussions of global events affecting British earthenware exports, it is apparent that the physical availability of goods to consumers holds significant sway over consumption practices. This held particularly true within distant areas such as the Oregon Country, which were far removed from the manufacturing centers of Europe and the eastern U.S. Especially during the early fur trade period, these remote areas were frequently subject to scarcities and other market fluctuations. Chapman’s (1993:22–25) analysis of ceramics from the French Prairie, for instance, mentions recurring shortages of ceramic tablewares during the 1840s. According to Chapman, these shortages at times compelled settlers to adopt alternatives to an ideal Euroamerican table setting, including the use of tin dishes when no ceramics were obtainable (Chapman 1993:20, 23). From this it is clear that English earthenwares were potent symbols of gentility and domesticity in 19th-century North America (Burley 1989; Wall 1991; Fitts 1999; Praetzellis and Praetzellis 2001; Cromwell 2006; Warner and Purser 2017) but evidently not without substitutes. Consumption and non-consumption of certain ceramics may therefore reflect availability as much as identity-based preferences (Wurst and McGuire 1999; Brooks 2010:160).
4. METHODS AND MATERIALS

Chapter 3 describes the theoretical perspectives behind this thesis and develops two research questions exploring the materiality of national identity. To test my hypotheses, I examine local consumption practices using archaeological ceramics excavated from the 1850s U.S. Army Sutler’s Store and the HBC Sale Shop. Both stores operated at Fort Vancouver in the period directly following the Oregon Treaty and provide insights into broad, societal-scale patterns of consumption. To test these assumptions at the household level, additional comparison is made to a domestic assemblage from the Officers’ Row area of U.S. Army Fort Vancouver. This chapter describes the datasets employed in this research and laboratory analysis methods. I also discuss individual proveniences within the Sutler’s Store as background for the site formation processes analyzed in Chapter 5.

HBC Sale Shop

From the 1840s to 1860, the Sale Shop was the main locus for HBC retail operations in the Columbia Department. As an extension of British mercantilism in the Pacific Northwest, the Sale Shop represents a key means to examine the material culture of the British colonial era at Fort Vancouver. Ceramic data for the current study are derived from the 2001 excavation of the Sale Shop. Although other studies of the Sale Shop have also yielded ceramic artifacts, only those from the 2001 excavations have been analyzed to current laboratory standards (Wilson et al. 2009). However, because the full 2001 excavation report remains pending, I also provide brief descriptions of the previous archaeological investigations.
From early in the administrative history of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, the NPS identified reconstruction of HBC Fort Vancouver as a potential venue for public interpretation and education (Merritt 1993). NPS policy, however, required sufficient architectural data before approving reconstruction (NPS 2008:91), so archaeologists set out to locate the buried remains of the original HBC fort. After finding portions of the wooden stockade which formerly surrounded the fort, NPS archaeologist Louis Caywood successfully identified the footings of the Sale Shop in 1952 using systematic sampling to delineate the building outline (Caywood 1955:10). The discovery later contributed to Hussey’s (1957, 1972) structural history of the Sale Shop and other HBC buildings, but no Sale Shop reconstruction occurred as a direct result of this work. The NPS installed asphalt pads over the building footprint during the 1960s (Hoffman and Ross 1974).

After a 21-year hiatus, the NPS resumed excavations of the Sale Shop in support of additional reconstruction and public education initiatives. As part of a series of excavations within the former HBC fort (45CL163), archaeologists commenced testing of the Sale Shop in 1973 and 1974, including a collaborative effort with the Oregon Archaeological Society during the latter season (Hoffman and Ross 1974; Steele et al. 1975). In 1973, the NPS opened a total of 17 excavation units of various sizes along the Sale Shop’s northern wall, eastern wall, and interior (Hoffman and Ross 1974:4). Field efforts in 1974 excavated nineteen 10 × 10 ft. units and two smaller units within the shop’s interior and along the northern, southern, and western walls (Steele et al. 1975:22). Stratigraphy consisted generally of native soils overlain by intact HBC deposits, 19th-century flood sediments, and a layer of sand and gravel added by the U.S. Army’s Spruce Production Division during
World War I (Figure 4.1). Most HBC deposits sat at a shallow depth, less than approximately 1.5 ft. (0.46 m) below surface (Hoffman and Ross 1974:92–94; Steele et al. 1975:295–298). The 1973 and 1974 field seasons resulted in the identification of numerous features such as additional footings, subsurface pits, and disturbances relating to NPS activity, including evidence of Caywood’s excavations in 1952 and installation of the asphalt pads in the 1960s. Excavations collectively recovered nearly 100,000 artifacts, including over 10,000 ceramic fragments. Concentrations of artifact types across the site led investigators to hypothesize the layout of activity areas associated with the Sale Shop, such as storage spaces, personal or residential spaces, customer waiting areas, and areas for refuse disposal (Hoffman and Ross 1974:66–74; Steele et al. 1975:137–140).

FIGURE 4.1. Typical Sale Shop sediment profile as excavated in 1973, showing the World War I Army stratum, 19th-century flood sediments, and HBC deposits including a Sale Shop footing (Hoffman and Ross 1974:figure 3; courtesy of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.)
After the 1974 field season, excavation of the Sale Shop ceased for nearly three decades, although reconstruction remained central to NPS interpretation goals. At the close of the 20th century, the NPS expressed interest in an expanded research and education center geared towards the curation, study, and display of artifacts recovered from the Vancouver National Historic Reserve National Historic District (DT-191; NPS 2008). Administrators proposed reconstruction of the Sale Shop and New Store to house such a facility. In 2001, NPS archaeologists organized a field school in partnership with Portland State University to unearth additional portions of the Sale Shop.

The archaeological field school took place from June to August 2001. Under the supervision of NPS archaeologists, university students dug 35 excavation units amounting to a total volume of approximately 14.7 m³. Discoveries included approximately 20 subsurface features relating to HBC operations at the Sale Shop or subsequent modifications by the U.S. Army and NPS. Local stratigraphy was comparable to that described for prior excavations (Hoffman and Ross 1974; Steele et al. 1975). Overall, the field school yielded about 25,000 artifacts assumed to represent commercial activities at the HBC Sale Shop. Of these, nearly 2,000 were pieces of ceramic vessels (n=1,946), for which the mean ceramic date was 1848.1±6.6 years (South 1972). The assemblage was heavily fragmented, with approximately 95% of all sherds recovered measuring less than 30 mm in maximum diameter (Figure 4.2). The small sherd sizes suggest these artifacts reflect a surficial scatter of secondary refuse, such as yard sweepings or small items which fell through the floorboards. However, the degree of breakage may also result in part from the various disturbances which impacted the site after the store’s closure in 1860.
**U.S. Army Sutler’s Store**

Historical records indicate that operations of the Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store coincided for approximately ten years (1850–1860). In sharing parallel functions and physical proximity to the Sale Shop (Figure 2.5), the Sutler’s Store provides a valuable point of comparison against goods distributed by the HBC. This section details the background and results of the 2004 archaeological excavation of the Fort Vancouver Sutler’s Store. Particular effort is made to describe historical evidence and interpret site stratigraphy, as a final excavation report has not been published at this time.

Archaeological excavation of the Sutler’s Store was conducted in support of the lease and transfer of the West Barracks area from the U.S. Army Reserve to the City of Vancouver, Washington. The West Barracks is a modern designation for a 13-acre section of the Vancouver Barracks National Historic District (45CL162), which, like the Sale
Shop, also falls within the Vancouver National Historic Reserve National Historic District (DT-191). The West Barracks area today is bounded by Interstate 5 to the west, Evergreen Boulevard to the north, Fort Vancouver Way to the east, and East 5th Street to the south.

To satisfy review requirements under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, archaeological testing for the West Barracks project commenced in 2002 (Cromwell and Gembala 2003). NPS archaeologists excavated 94 total 0.5 × 0.5 m shovel tests throughout the West Barracks to identify subsurface cultural deposits. Cromwell and Gembala recovered high densities of 19th-century artifacts in four shovel tests placed near Hatheway Road, which the investigators associated with the location of the 1850s Sutler’s Store based on historic maps. Due to the likelihood of uncovering additional archaeological materials, Cromwell and Gembala recommended further testing if the undertaking were to disturb intact sediments. Subsequent 1 × 1 m test units placed along either side of Hatheway Road in 2003 yielded few to moderate artifacts and clarified the horizontal extent of the intact 19th-century strata (Gleason and Cheung 2007). Consistent with historical illustrations, stratigraphic analyses revealed a slope cut along the northern aspect and leveled with fill along the southern for construction of Hatheway Road. Archaeologists found that grading had disturbed deposits north of Hatheway Road but believed intact materials might be preserved south of and beneath the modern road surface. The latter assessment was corroborated by the discovery of Feature WB-12 during sewer trench monitoring west of the intersection of Hatheway Road and Fort Vancouver Way. Feature WB-12 contained artifacts similar to those observed in the 2002 Hatheway Road shovel tests and appeared to delineate the eastern edge of intact materials. The feature extended
from 1 m north of the south side of Hatheway Road and continued north for about 3 m. Feature WB-12 was visible only in the west wall of the sewer trench.

Despite attempts to avoid Feature WB-12, subsurface utility work the following year encountered numerous artifacts beneath Hatheway Road. Trackhoe operators removed an approximately 0.3 m deep trench of asphalt and gravel fill to reveal a buried macadam road laden with various artifacts, including abundant ceramics, likely from the Sutler’s Store. Archaeologists placed seven 0.5 × 0.5 m shovel tests (ST04-01 through ST04-07) within the trench at intervals ranging between 3 and 5 m. Testing yielded profuse artifacts, and archaeologists expanded three shovel tests into 1 × 1 m excavation units for archaeological data recovery. Altogether 14 excavation units (EU43 through EU56) were opened within the trench, which was excavated stratigraphically with all materials screened through nested 1/4 in. and 1/8 in. (6 and 3 mm) mesh hardware cloth. Figure 4.3 shows the location of the 2004 excavation trench relative to structures shown on the 1854 Mansfield map of Fort Vancouver (cf. Figure 2.5). Findings for each level were documented on paper excavation forms and feature forms with additional observations recorded in field notebooks and photographs. At least one stratigraphic profile was drawn for each excavation unit except EU52 and EU55. Following excavations, the trench was lined with filter fabric and backfilled.
FIGURE 4.3. Location of 2004 Sutler’s Store excavation trench relative to 1854 structures and extant buildings. (Figure by author, 2023.)
FIGURE 4.4. Plan view of Features 23–25 at 80 centimeters below datum. (Figure adapted by author from sketch by Eric Gleason, 2007.)
Excavations totaled 7.7 m$^3$ and yielded over 70,000 artifacts dating generally to the mid-19th century, including over 9,000 ceramic vessel sherds (Table 4.1). Archaeologists identified the discovery as a privy and refuse pit (Feature 23), bordered on the west by a row of wooden pickets (Feature 25) and a massive sheet trash concentration spreading to the east (Sutler’s Store yard) (Figure 4.4). A single square post and post hole (Feature 24) was found within the sheet trash, as well as a small sediment lens originally mistaken for a post mold (Feature 22). The approximate age of each feature is provided in Table 4.2, with additional descriptions in the following subsections. Note that discussions provide only a partial summary of artifacts within the Sutler’s Store because laboratory analyses of several material classes remain ongoing. Total artifact counts (other than ceramics) are thus approximations based on existing field and laboratory data. Interpretations emphasize ceramics per the scope of this research but also reference other datasets, as available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum/Analytic Unit</th>
<th>Sherds (n)$^a$</th>
<th>Volume Excavated (m$^3$)</th>
<th>Sherds/m$^3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yard (includes Feature 22)</td>
<td>7,592</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2,199.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 23 (Privy)</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>315.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 24 (Post Hole Fill)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>647.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 25 (Picket Trench Fill)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Fill Above Feature 23</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>827.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macadam</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>345.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (West of Feature 25)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,104</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,175.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Excludes non-vessel forms (n=20).
TABLE 4.2
APPROXIMATE DATES AND RELATIVE AGES OF THE SUTLER’S STORE FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum/Analytic Unit</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Mean Ceramic Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature 25 (Picket Trench Fill)</td>
<td>Early 1850s</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard (includes Feature 22)</td>
<td>Early 1850s; postdates Feature 25</td>
<td>1851.3±4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 23 (Privy)</td>
<td>1850s to post-1860</td>
<td>1854.8±7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 24 (Post Hole Fill)</td>
<td>1850s to post-1860; possibly associated with Feature 23</td>
<td>1858.3±13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Fill Above Feature 23</td>
<td>1860–1870</td>
<td>1854.7±9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macadam</td>
<td>Post 1860–1870 to early 20th century</td>
<td>1851.6±5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (West of Feature 25)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sutler’s Store Yard

The Sutler’s Store yard was a broad debris field encompassing over 21,000 individual artifacts. Likely a westerly continuation of Feature WB-12, the deposit averaged about 0.3 m thick and spread at least 17 m east to west between EU55 and ST04-01 (Figure 4.5), occurring mainly within the disturbed 19th-century B-horizon (Stratum XV in Table 4.3) but also extending slightly into the overlying macadam fill. The privy (Feature 23, below) may have cut into the western extent of the sheet trash. The sheet trash did not continue westward beyond the wooden pickets (Feature 25, below). Historical discard behaviors suggest the deposit corresponded to the yard surrounding the Sutler’s Store, possibly the rear (north) portion if historical depictions are correct in showing the main entrance along the south side (Covington 1855; South 1978).

By field estimates, ceramic artifacts comprised approximately 40% of all items recovered from the yard area, such that archaeologists in 2004 described the deposit as a dense “pavement” of pottery. The assemblage included a highly fragmented assortment of transferprint and other earthenwares, ironstone, porcelain, and stoneware dating generally to the late 1840s and early to mid-1850s. The mean ceramic date was approximately
1851.3±4.6 years. Estimated manufacturing ranges for some vessels extended into the 1860s, but none were conclusively assigned to this period. No complete vessels were found, and 80% of all sherds measured under 3 cm in maximum diameter (Figure 4.2). The single largest fragment was less than 10 cm in size. The degree of fragmentation implies that artifacts were broken prior to discard, possibly as a result of shipping damages or even the 1853 explosion. Although sheet trash cannot usually be associated with a single household or occupation (LeeDecker 1994), it is interesting to note that the sutler Elisha Camp may have experienced issues with cargo arriving in poor condition, per a letter from his suppliers in San Francisco (Folger and Tubbs 1853). A small proportion of sherds were burnt (4.4%). Gastroliths (gizzard stones), including one ceramic gastrolith, may additionally indicate the presence of domestic fowl in the yard (Taber et al. 2019).

![FIGURE 4.5. Yard strata in EU53 and EU47, north wall profile. Depth measurements are cm below datum (cmbd). (Figure adapted by author from sketch by Danielle Gembala, 2004.)](image_url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Modern asphalt road surface and 20th-century fill (removed with backhoe).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Highly compacted macadam surface; dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2; dry) to very dark grayish brown (10YR 2/2; moist); up to 90% granule- to cobble-sized gravels by volume; few to moderate artifacts, including occasional 20th-century debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Gravel fill for macadam roadbed; dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2; dry) to very dark grayish brown (10YR 2/2; moist); hard; thin platy structure; somewhat lower gravel content than Stratum I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>Gravel and cobble fill for macadam roadbed; dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2; dry).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Fill for roadbed. Gravelly and sandy silt loam; yellowish brown (10YR 5/4; dry) to dark brown (10YR 3/3; moist); no roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Fill for roadbed. Gravelly silt loam; brown (10YR 4/3; dry) to dark brown (10YR 3/3; moist); fine subangular blocky structure; abundant fine roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Fill for roadbed. Gravelly silt loam; brown (10YR 4/3; dry) to dark brown (10YR 3/3; moist); fine subangular blocky structure; common fine roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse. Concentration of yellowish red (5YR 4/6; dry) brick and calcined bone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse. Gravelly silt loam; brown (10YR 4/3; dry) to dark brown (10YR 3/3; moist); fine subangular blocky structure; abundant fine roots. Mixture of brick and Stratum V sediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIIb</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse. Brick and ash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse. Charcoal lens with unburnt wood; abrupt lower boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIIIb</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse. Charcoal and ash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse. Gravelly silt loam; brown (10YR 4/3; dry); fine subangular blocky structure; friable; common fine roots; abrupt lower boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse. Gravelly sandy silt loam to gravelly silt loam; brown (10YR 4/3; dry); fine granular structure; soft common fine roots; abundant artifacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill. Light gray ash (7.5YR 7/1; dry).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse. Silt loam; dark yellowish brown (10YR ½; dry); abundant woody debris; common medium to fine roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIIa</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse. Wood, ash, cobbles, mixed artifacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse. Coarse sand; yellowish brown (10YR 5/4; dry); fine granular structure; loose; few fine roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIIIb</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse; possible excrement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIIIc</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/refuse/excrement. Silt loam; dark yellowish brown (10YR 3/6); moist cemented sediments; granular structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIIIId</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill. White deposit of lye or lime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Feature 23 fill/C-horizon slump. Coarse sand; yellowish brown (10YR 5/4; dry); small to medium subrounded cobbles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>B-horizon (disturbed). Gravelly silt loam; dark brown (10YR 3/3; moist); moderate to high artifact content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>B-horizon (intact). Gravelly silt loam; dark yellowish brown (10YR ½; moist).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>C-horizon. Coarse sand; yellowish brown (10YR 5/6); small to medium subrounded cobbles; poorly sorted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>C-horizon. Coarse sand; yellowish brown (10YR 5/6; moist).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feature 22 (Sediment Lens)

Feature 22 was a thin sediment lens found in the Sutler’s Store yard deposit during initial shovel testing. Archaeologists first observed this feature as a concentration of square nails within a circular stain of loose brown (10YR 4/3) sediment, located on the eastern half of ST04-02 at 42 cm below surface, or approximately the top of the yard deposit. Charcoal was also found in association. Archaeologists at first hypothesized Feature 22 was a post mold, but upon further excavation determined it was only a very thin lens. Original sketch maps suggest the total area of Feature 22 was 100 cm². No ceramic artifacts were recovered from this feature.

Feature 23 (Privy) and Historic Fill

Underneath the 19th- and 20th-century macadam, archaeologists identified a filled depression spanning EU56, EU43, and EU45, which they interpreted as a privy and refuse pit. First observed during shovel testing in ST04-05, the depression measured approximately 1.4 m deep by 2.1 m wide (east-west) at the top and 0.9 m at the base. As excavations bisected only a portion of the feature, the full north-south extent is unknown. Archaeologists identified at least 25 unique stratigraphic units in and above Feature 23, as summarized in Table 4.3 and illustrated in Figure 4.6 and Figure 4.7.
FIGURE 4.6. Feature 23/privy, north wall profile. Depth measurements are cm below datum (cmbd). (Figure adapted by author from sketch by Douglas Wilson, 2004.)
FIGURE 4.7. Feature 23/privy and Feature 25, south wall profile. Depth measurements are cm below datum (cmbd). (Figure adapted by author from sketch by Douglas Wilson, 2004.)
The basal stratigraphy of Feature 23 was consistent with that of a pit latrine, or privy (Caywood 1955:20–25; Chance and Chance 1976:32–34; Ross and Carley 1976; Wheeler 2000; Horton 2014:281–285). The feature extended from the disturbed B-horizon (XV) into the C-horizon (XVIII), where excavators discovered two 4 × 4 in. timbers positioned along the privy’s western and eastern margins. These may represent the remains of wooden cribbing. Above the C-horizon, the floor of the feature included a 5-cm-thick deposit of moist, granular sediment identified by excavators as fecal matter (XIIIc). The rate of accumulation for a two-seater outhouse estimated by Ross and Carley (1976:10) and Cromwell (2006:166) indicates a short use-life in this regard—perhaps as few as six months, barring any clean-out episodes. No evidence of nightsoil removal or other privy clean-out events were noted. For comparison, Ross and Carley (1976:10) proposed as many as 15 years of use for privies within the HBC stockade. With the exception of the possible cribbing, artifacts within Stratum XIIIc were few and small (n=4), although several complete glass bottles and tumblers were recovered directly on top of the stratum. Gleason and Cheung (2007) found these vessels to be consistent with a mid-19th-century manufacture. No ceramics were observed in the privy stratum. Deposits of white lye or lime (XIIIId) also found at this depth were likely dumped into the pit to neutralize odors. Collectively, the materials within and on top of Stratum XIIIc appear to be household debris associated with the daily use and maintenance of the latrine.

Above Stratum XIIIc, the primary function of Feature 23 evidently shifted from that of a latrine to a refuse pit. According to field estimates, artifacts comprised as much as 70% of the excavated volume and included items ranging from butchered animal bones to
textiles, bricks, children’s toys, and barrel hoops (Gleason and Cheung 2007; Horton 2007a). Ceramics within Feature 23 (n=558) dated from the late 1840s to the 1860s with a mean ceramic date of 1854.8±7.9 years. Sherds of at least three separate vessels postdating 1860 were found between 48 and 145 cm below datum. Allowing time for importation, these establish a terminus post quem only slightly after Erigero’s (1992) hypothesized abandonment of the Sutler’s Store in 1860.

Refuse within Feature 23 appears to reflect a mixture of at least two secondary refuse aggregates (Wilson 1994): intentional disposal into the privy, and spillage from the yard deposit. The former is substantiated by several partially reconstructible ceramics indicating discard of complete or near-complete vessels (Figure 4.8) and by the larger average size of sherds within Feature 23 (Figure 4.2). That numerous sherds cross-mended across excavation levels may demonstrate that the pit was filled over a relatively short interval. Many of the smaller, non-mending artifacts, meanwhile, may have originated in the yard deposit and were transported into the privy by wall slumping or pit filling activities. Stratigraphic profiles illustrate lobes of artifact-laden silt loam pushed inward from the edges of the pit (VII, IX, X, XII), which probably correspond to the disturbed B-horizon sediments (XV) above the privy. Commonalities in ceramic content also support this interpretation, as both the yard and privy shared a similar assortment of handleless ironstone cups as well as several transferprint patterns. Of the 14 transferprint patterns noted in the privy, at least 9 also appeared in the yard. Frequencies of each shared pattern were considerably greater in the yard and probably indicate dispersal into Feature 23 from the 19th-century ground surface.
The uppermost feature strata consisted of gravelly silt loams (VII) interbedded with distinct layers of ash and charcoal (VIIb, VIII, VIIIb). The preponderance of bricks, window glass, and other architectural items probably correspond to demolition debris associated with the abandonment of the Sutler’s Store and privy. Fragments of window glass (n=1,975) concentrated near the top of the feature were consistent with panes manufactured between 1845 and 1855 (Roenke 1978; Appendix A). The feature was capped with additional layers of gravelly silt loam fill (III, IV, V) which also overlaid the adjacent row of pickets (Feature 25). The leveled surface was then covered by a compact gravel roadbed and macadam surface (I, II/IIa). Historic maps depict a road in this vicinity by 1886 that was macadamized by 1935 (Thomas and Hibbs 1984: figure A-19; Erigero
1992: map 15). The macadam contained 19th- and early 20th-century artifacts, such as an automotive fuse. Asphalt pavement was laid over the macadam later in the 20th century.

Due in part to the limited excavation of Feature 23, details regarding the privy’s presumed superstructure are scant. While the pit was possibly large enough to constitute a “two-holer” (Horton 2014:282), little other information is available to discern the privy’s above-ground construction. Logs and nails found within the lower privy strata may represent structural remains, but the secondary context currently precludes association with an outhouse versus the Sutler’s Store itself or any other particular structure. The logs could also be remnants of the wooden palisade (Feature 25) adjacent to the privy. Despite the lack of clear architectural data, it seems likely that the privy would have possessed some form of shelter or covering. Historical and archaeological evidence attests to the use of sheds and other structures over pit latrines at the soldiers’ barracks, officers’ quarters, and the HBC fort (U.S. Surgeon General’s Office 1870:421–422; Caywood 1955:20–25; Carley 1982:286; Horton 2014:281–285). Carley (1982:286) explains that these often consisted of a hut placed over an earthen pit, which was moved to a new hole once the first privy was full. Given the documented use of outhouse structures at nearby residences, the sutler probably opted for similar accommodations.

**Feature 24 (Post Hole)**

Feature 24 was an upright square post and associated post hole located within the Sutler’s Store yard, approximately 2.5 m east of the privy (Figure 4.4). The post hole was first observed along the west wall profile of EU47 and then fully exposed during excavation
of the adjacent unit, EU53. The circular post hole measured 15 to 20 cm in diameter and extended from 30 to 105 cm below datum. The post itself was about 7 cm wide by 7 cm thick, not unlike a 4 × 4 in. corner brace observed in an Army officers’ privy identified in the Officers’ Row area at Fort Vancouver (Horton 2014:282). A large rock on the east side of Feature 24 likely secured the post in place. A sparse assortment of artifacts within the post hole fill included 22 pieces of vessel glass, 10 ceramic sherds, and 5 wrought nails. Ceramics generally resembled those of the surrounding yard. Based on depth measurements taken in the field, the feature was originally dug through the disturbed B-horizon and into the C-horizon (XV, XVI, XVII) and therefore postdates the yard deposit. If associated with Feature 23, this may confirm that the privy also postdates the yard.

Feature 25 (Stockade)

Feature 25 was a north-south row of five wooden pickets, each ranging from 7 to 18 cm in diameter and extending from 52 to 110 cm below datum (Figure 4.7 and Figure 4.9). The picket trench intruded into the B-horizon (XV/XVI) and contained large rocks ostensibly used to stabilize the base of each timber. The upper ends of the pickets, presumably cut or otherwise truncated, were capped by a silt loam fill (V). Archaeologists in 2004 hypothesized that Feature 25 represented the remains of the Sutler’s Store stockade as depicted in various sketches and maps between 1854 and 1859 (Bonneville 1854; British Columbia Archives [1854]; Covington 1855; Hodges 1855; Mansfield 1855; Sohon 1855).
Based on its north-south orientation and its location relative to the privy and yard, Feature 25 was likely a portion of the stockade’s western wall. Within the stockade (east of Feature 25), artifacts were plentiful throughout the privy and yard. In EU56 alone, the unit directly east of Feature 25, the total artifact count exceeded 8,000 items, or approximately 12,000 artifacts/m³. West of the pickets in EU52, artifact counts dropped off steeply (n=241, or fewer than 600 artifacts/m³). Six pieces of fire-cracked rock were found in the disturbed B-horizon in EU52. The remaining artifacts were restricted to the fill and macadam, stratigraphically above and therefore postdating destruction of Feature 25. Shovel tests west of EU52 (ST04-06 and ST04-07) were similarly low in cultural
materials (n=152 and n=6, respectively). The sharp contrast indicates that the majority of artifacts east of Feature 25 were deposited while the stockade was still standing.

**Officers’ Quarters**

The domestic assemblage used for this study comes from Thomas’ (1988) Feature 5, a kitchen cellar associated with the 1850–1865 Army Officers’ Quarters. Located less than a half mile from either the Sutler’s Store or Sale Shop, the Officers’ Quarters provides a means to examine household consumption practices with respect to locally available options. Its historical association with Army officers affords opportunity to consider domestic consumption not only as it relates to nationality, but also rank and class.

Thomas (1988) identified Feature 5 with one of nine log structures built atop the hill north of the HBC stockade by the Army in 1850. These included the two-story Commanding Officer’s quarters as well as four single-story officers’ quarters on each side. Each of these dwellings are visible along the top of the slope shown in Figure 2.2. Construction commenced in spring 1850, and officers of the Mounted Rifles took up residence in November (Horton 2014:63). Each of the single-story structures contained four rooms and an attic with a detached kitchen and privy in the rear. Horton (2014:87) states that the kitchens were attached after about 1854. The structures were of rudimentary construction, and by the mid-1850s occupants’ complaints revealed their deteriorating condition (Horton 2014). Despite maintenance and other improvements, inventories in 1863 reported rotting wood foundations. To replace the two westernmost quarters, in 1865 or 1866 the Army constructed three new frame buildings, two of which remain standing at
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present; Thomas (1987, 1988) designated these as Buildings 7 and 8. While Horton (2014:88) hypothesizes that destruction of the log quarters occurred shortly after construction of the new frame structures, at least one of the log buildings had already burnt to the ground in January 1865 (*Morning Oregonian* 1865:2). Based on historical maps, the other westernmost log building was removed or demolished by 1869. Use of the six remaining single-story log quarters continued until the late 1880s (Thomas 1987:20).

Feature 5 was rediscovered in 1987 as part of the larger Officers’ Row redevelopment project for the City of Vancouver. Added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1974, Officers’ Row (45CL160) corresponds to the historic center of activity by U.S. Army officers at Fort Vancouver since 1850. Its location is today defined along the north side of Evergreen Boulevard between Interstate 5 and East Reserve Street. For the purposes of Section 106 compliance, the Smith-Macht Development Company contracted Archaeological and Historical Services (AHS) of Eastern Washington University to conduct cultural resources surveys and related support for the Officers’ Row project. Pedestrian survey for the project in spring 1987 found no archaeological materials visible at the ground surface (Thomas 1987). Due to the likelihood of subsurface materials, AHS recommended additional testing, monitoring, and mapping of features for avoidance.

Subsequent construction work for the project in 1987 uncovered artifacts in a lateral sewer trench parallel to Building 7. The discovery prompted partial archaeological data recovery led by AHS (Thomas 1988). The sampling strategy involved a north-south trench of seven 1 × 1 ft. (0.3 × 0.3 m) excavation units dug up to 5.5 ft. (1.7 m) in depth. Units were excavated stratigraphically in the five southernmost units and in 0.5 ft. (0.15 m) levels
in the two northernmost. All sediment excluding soil samples were screened through 1/4-in. hardware mesh. AHS identified 14 individual strata within the trench, although the final excavation report describes only Strata 6 through 13 (Thomas 1988:7–8). Feature stratigraphy was generally composed of alternating sediments and burnt cultural debris. Seventy-one percent of all artifacts were classified as architectural items, consistent with its interpretation as demolition debris. Fragmented ceramic artifacts (n=121) were interspersed evenly throughout the feature. Twenty-three dateable sherds produced a mean ceramic date of 1848.7±2.3 years. As the remainder of the cellar was preserved in situ, AHS recommended Feature 5 for avoidance.

Following initial processing by AHS, artifacts from Feature 5 remained in the possession of the City of Vancouver until 2000, at which point the city conveyed the collection to the Vancouver National Historic Reserve Trust. The collection was then transferred to Fort Vancouver National Historic Site in 2002. Specific provenience information was missing from most artifact tags upon deposit, and no field forms or notes accompanied the artifacts (O’Rourke 2011). Subsequent attempts to relocate this information by NPS archaeologist Elizabeth Horton in 2013 and myself in 2019 both proved unsuccessful, although Horton (2014:320–322) was able to approximate the location of the 1987 trench using utility maps and original excavation photographs. Due to the comparatively small ceramic assemblage and the lack of specific provenience data, all ceramics artifacts were retained for statistical testing in the present study.
Artifact Analysis

Artifacts from the Sutler’s Store, Sale Shop, and Officers’ Quarters are curated at the museum and repository at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site in Vancouver, Washington. These comprise portions of accessions FOVA 3024, FOVA 2996, and FOVA 3043, respectively. I completed laboratory analyses of the Sutler’s Store ceramics in accordance with the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Archaeology Laboratory Manual (Wilson et al. 2009), excerpts of which are provided in Appendix B. Standard laboratory procedures record the basic physical characteristics of each artifact, including ware type, form, portion, maximum sherd diameter, and decoration, where discernible. Potters’ marks, surface modifications, cross-mending, estimated vessel rim diameters, and other observations were also noted as applicable. For the purposes of this study, additional fields were created for functional categories based on those of Cromwell (2006:156) and Sprague (1981). Analyses utilized only ceramic vessels and excluded other ceramic items such as tobacco pipes, knobs, dolls, and buttons, as separate behavioral patterns govern consumption of these items (e.g., Wynia 2013).

Analyses of the Sale Shop ceramics were completed after the 2001 field school by students, NPS staff, and volunteers, while those from the Officers’ Quarters were reanalyzed in about 2011 by NPS archaeologist Leslie O’Rourke. NPS archaeologist Elizabeth Horton later provided several corrections to O’Rourke’s work. Each dataset for the Sale Shop and the Officers’ Quarters contained most of the information specified in the current laboratory manual but required reformatting by myself. This frequently consisted of adjusting categorical data to match standardized groupings (e.g., changing an artifact
description from “Whiteware, white glaze, undecorated” to “Whiteware, undecorated”) but also included the correction of missing, duplicate, or otherwise erroneous data. Due to differences in the ways O’Rourke and Horton grouped sherds, additional review was necessary to avoid duplication when merging their respective datasets.

Ceramic assemblages were quantified by raw sherd count (n) and the minimum number of vessels (MNV). The most basic form of ceramic quantification, sherd count is calculated by tallying individual fragments of pottery and is amenable to most mathematical operations, particularly those for which a large sample size is required (Hull 2007; cf. Lyman 2008). However, varying degrees of breakage may cause certain types to appear overrepresented during statistical testing. For example, fragmentation rates may be influenced by vessel form (Chase 1985), temper and firing temperature (Müller et al. 2010; Anderson 2011), or post-depositional effects (Ammerman 1985). Some archaeologists therefore argue that analysis of whole vessels, not sherds, more accurately reflects patterns of human behavior (Spencer-Wood 1987:18; Sussman 2000; Voss and Allen 2010). To this end, MNV offers a conservative estimate of complete objects in an assemblage. However, MNV is subjective and may vary according to sample size, or the specific techniques for vessel identification (Sutton and Arkush 2009:122–125, 262–263; Voss and Allen 2010). Archaeologists have recommended various alternative methods for quantifying the relative abundance of ceramics, such as weight, surface area, rim sherd counts, or other estimated vessel equivalents (Orton and Tyers 1991; Byrd and Owens 1997), although these also depend on factors such as ceramic density and survivorship bias. To address some of these
concerns, the interpretations in Chapter 5 incorporate discussions of sherd counts, MNV, and sherd sizes. The procedures used to estimate MNV in this study are described below.

I evaluated the MNV for the Sutler’s Store and Sale Shop assemblage based on my own laboratory analyses and NPS datasets produced after the field school. Horton estimated the MNV of the Officers’ Quarters as part of her 2011 corrections. The MNV for porcelain, stoneware, transferprint, and other decorated earthenwares was determined qualitatively according to unique combinations of pastes, glazes, patterns, marks, and forms (Voss and Allen 2010). The MNV for undecorated wares (ironstone and undecorated whitewares) relied mainly upon form and the presence of any manufacturers’ marks. As fragmentation often made specific form indiscernible, I supplemented qualitative methods by comparing rim circumference measurements with estimated vessel diameters. In these cases, quantitative data generally corroborated qualitative estimates. Vessel numbers were assigned conservatively: because of the apparent matched sets within the Sutler’s Store, sherds received different vessel numbers only if they were clearly separate vessels. Conversely, sherds only received the same vessel number if the fragments cross-mended with one another. Finally, due to the apparent mixing of sediments within the Sutler’s Store, the MNV was calculated in aggregate rather than by analytic unit or stratum. If fragments possibly belonging to the same vessel were found across multiple areas, the vessel number was assigned to the provenience containing the greater concentration of sherds, as this was assumed to reflect the initial disposal location versus subsequent scattering.

Statistical analyses consisted of Pearson’s chi-square tests, or Fisher’s exact tests whenever expected counts were less than 5. These non-parametric methods highlight
differences between expected and observed counts of categorical data by measuring the probability \( p \) that observed frequencies would be at least as extreme given a normally distributed population. The significance level \( \alpha \) for all tests was set at 0.05. Cross-tabulations used the following variables:

- **Assemblage**: The museum accession associated with each site or provenience. Based on the community primarily associated with each (British/HBC and American/U.S. Army), these are used as a proxy for nationality.
  - Sale Shop (Museum Accession FOVA 2996)
  - Sutler’s Store (Museum Accession FOVA 3024)
  - Officers’ Quarters (Museum Accession FOVA 3043)

- **Ware type**: The physical composition or paste of a vessel, as defined by the current Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Archaeology Laboratory Manual (Wilson et al. 2009; Appendix B). Each category may be further subdivided according to glaze type or other embellishments.
  - Earthenware
  - Ironstone
  - Porcelain
  - Stoneware
  - Transferprint\(^9\)

- **Function**: Categories of ceramic forms are modified from those used by Cromwell (2006:156) and Sprague (1981).
  - Tablewares (flatware, bowls, serving dishes, mugs, jugs)
  - Tea wares (cups, saucers)
  - Storage (jars, crocks, ink or blacking bottles)
  - Other (ale bottles, chamber pots, wash basins, flowerpots)

- **Manufacturing location**: The country in which the vessel was produced, typically determined by potters’ marks or other unique decorations. Locations other than Britain are uncommon at Fort Vancouver and are grouped for statistical purposes.
  - Britain
  - Other

\(^9\) Strictly speaking, transferprint is a decorative method rather than a paste type, but due to the prevalence of these vessels at Fort Vancouver, the laboratory manual designates it as a unique ware. Transferprint at Fort Vancouver is most commonly associated with white earthenware vessels but may occur on any clay body.
5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chapter 4 describes the methods and materials used to investigate ceramics from the U.S. Army Sutler’s Store, the HBC Sale Shop, and the Army Officers’ Quarters. In this chapter, I present the results of statistical testing and offer potential interpretations. To establish comparability among assemblages, I first discuss site formation processes and post-depositional effects associated with each site or feature. Because preliminary analyses suggest that the Sutler’s Store privy (Feature 23) represents a distinct context with formation processes not directly comparable to the Sale Shop, I elected to omit this feature from subsequent analyses of commercial assemblages. Privy ceramics are therefore excluded from hypothesis testing but are shown in tables and figures for comparison.

Site Formation Processes

Although the assemblages described in Chapter 4 are comparable with regards to date, location, and general content, the interpretation of each depends additionally upon site formation processes affecting the archaeological record. Inherently incomplete, the archaeological record is but a partial representation of consumption practices at 19th-century Fort Vancouver and embodies “a distorted reflection of a past behavioral system,” shaped by both cultural context and post-depositional processes (Schiffer 1976:12). To interpret these materials, archaeologists must negotiate the disparities between the original context of discard and the remains observed in the present (Schiffer 1972, 1976). At a given location, this requires consideration of site function, the nature of items initially deposited from the systemic context, and any subsequent additions or transformations (Lees and
Kimery-Lees 1984; Schiffer 1976; South 1979). These site formation processes and post-depositional effects collectively create the archaeological context. The following subsections compare site formation processes within the Sale Shop, the Sutler’s Store, and the Officers’ Quarters and how these may influence site interpretations.

**Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store**

A key component of this research hinges upon comparison of sites based on historical function. Due to their shared use as mercantile establishments, it is assumed that the Sutler’s Store and Sale Shop sites encompass broadly similar formation processes, including the general items stocked and the manner by which each was deposited into the archaeological context. Contrary to domestic sites, most merchandise presumably did not enter the archaeological context on-site because goods were typically purchased for consumption or use elsewhere. Instead, what remains are the items not sold due to loss or damage and *de facto* architectural refuse (Lees and Kimery-Lees 1984). Business inventories confirm that archaeological materials reflect only a fraction of those kept on hand by either store and further underscore the importance of supplementary information from domestic sites (W. H. Barnhart and Company 1853; Hussey 1972).

While both stores were primarily mercantile in function, historical and archaeological evidence allude to potential overlap with domestic spaces. In particular, a large volume of faunal remains excavated from the sutler’s privy indicate that the site likely functioned both as a store and an eatery, where the sutler may have prepared and sold fresh food (Horton 2007a, 2007b). It is also possible that the sutler resided on-site. The recovery
of complete glass bottles from the base of the privy further supports interpretation as a domestic component. Portions of the Sutler’s Store may therefore reflect commercial debris as well as domestic patterns of use and deposition.

Meanwhile, scant evidence exists for a comparable domestic component within the Sale Shop. Based on the spatial distribution of personal objects, archaeologists hypothesized that portions of the Sale Shop may have served as quarters for store clerks, but these were probably temporary in nature (Steele et al. 1975:137). It is doubtful that the space included any sort of kitchen area, as HBC policy prohibited stoves and other potential fire hazards within storehouses (Hussey 1972:201). In contrast, a chimney or stovepipe is clearly visible in most illustrations of the Sutler’s Store. It is therefore assumed that ceramics within the Sale Shop predominantly represent commercial activity tied to the HBC, whereas the mixed function of the Sutler’s Store may reflect both business operations and a domestic space.

Comparison of individual contexts within the Sutler’s Store corroborates the existence of unique activity areas, possibly corresponding to domestic versus commercial use. The two largest proveniences, the privy and yard area, are particularly contrasted in terms of ceramic artifact size, with sherds in the privy being considerably larger and more complete, on average, while those in the yard were highly fragmented (Figure 4.2). The differences in sherd size likely reflect separate sources of refuse—that is, the artifacts in each context accumulated as a result of differing activities and associated means of disposal. The larger average sherd size within the privy indicates disposal of near-complete vessels, potentially consistent with incidental breakage through everyday use. This
interpretation is consistent with historical behaviors surrounding privies, which frequently doubled as receptacles for household rubbish (Wheeler 2000). In contrast, ceramics within the Sutler’s Store yard were small and were clearly broken prior to deposition. The sheer volume and density of these materials, including fragments of multiple matched dish sets, appear consistent with commercial refuse dumped *en masse*.

Based on the differences in fragmentation, I am led to believe that the yard contains a greater proportion of commercial artifacts and would therefore be most comparable to the HBC Sale Shop. Although both the yard and privy may contain a combination of domestic artifacts, the large quantity of matched wares appear consistent with a commercial setting, while the condition of wares in the privy suggests a greater proportion of household goods. Because the artifact content and formation processes within the Sutler’s Store yard are most comparable to the HBC Sale Shop, only these materials are included in subsequent testing scenarios. To highlight the 1850–1860s era as much as possible, analyses additionally omit artifacts recovered from the macadam and other fill layers within the Sutler’s Store assemblage (Strata I–V in Table 4.3), as these clearly postdate the period of focus. Areas west of Feature 25 are also excluded because these represent a separate activity space outside of the Sutler’s Store stockade.

**Officers’ Quarters**

In contrast to commercial sites, domestic assemblages represent a distinct suite of practices and disposal behaviors. Unlike the retail assemblages within the HBC Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store, domestic ceramics associated with the Officers’ Quarters presumably
entered the archaeological context as part of the cycle of household use, including individual acquisition, everyday use, and eventual loss, breakage, or disposal. As generally valuable and durable materials, ceramic vessels were particularly susceptible to lengthy use-lives versus immediately consumable products (Adams 2003).

Like the Sutler’s Store, the Officers’ Quarters site may have once encompassed various sub-areas corresponding to unique domestic activity areas. Thomas’ (1988) interpretation of Feature 5 as a cellar, for example, might imply association with kitchen tasks, rather than dining, personal hygiene (e.g., Horton 2014:280–285), or other household needs. However, the smaller sample size limits opportunities for more fine-grained analysis in this regard and is further obscured by the site’s interpretation as demolition debris. Thomas indicated that ceramics were dispersed evenly throughout the feature, possibly indicating sediment mixing prior to reburial. The current lack of specific provenience data additionally precludes more detailed spatial analysis of site formation processes.

Post-Depositional Effects

In addition to formation processes, archaeological interpretations must also account for subsequent disturbances. Following initial discard, post-depositional effects continue to alter the condition of cultural deposits through additions, removals, or modifications to the archaeological record (Schiffer 1976). Disturbances may arise from a variety of natural phenomena, such as flooding, decomposition, or bioturbation, or as the result of human activity. Activity by the U.S. Army in particular has affected the sites of the Sale Shop, Sutler’s Store, and Officers’ Quarters since the mid-19th century.
Sale Shop

Of the assemblages discussed here, the Sale Shop has undoubtedly been subject to the greatest degree of disturbance. As a largely surficial deposit (generally within 1.5 ft. of the ground surface; Hoffman and Ross 1974:92–94; Steele et al. 1975:295–298), refuse from operation of the Sale Shop has been exposed to a variety of post-depositional effects since the store’s abandonment in 1860. After the destruction of the HBC fort by fire in about 1866, the Army variously used the area as pasture and as a skirmish range (Ward 1874; Homan 1891). Nineteenth-century activities probably did not introduce significant amounts of pottery to the site but may have churned or otherwise disturbed preexisting deposits. These disturbances may have also contributed to the assemblage’s highly fragmented condition. Floods have also periodically submerged the site, leaving behind thin layers of waterborne silt. Hoffman and Ross (1974:30) attributed most flood silts near the Sale Shop to the 1894 Columbia River flood but also identified sediments from subsequent 20th-century inundations.

Development of a spruce mill during World War I resulted in significant subsurface intrusions to the site of the Sale Shop. Despite operating for less than a year, the Spruce Production Division at the Vancouver Barracks assembled an extensive array of buildings, railways, refuse pits, and other constructions in a 50-acre area covering the former site of the HBC fort (Eriger 1992). Caywood (1955) depicts one of these rails cutting east-west through the vicinity of the Sale Shop. Spruce mill activities also deposited a layer of coarse sand and gravel atop the area (Hoffman and Ross 1974:4) that may have introduced unassociated artifacts to the site. Since the late 1940s, NPS activity has further impacted
the Sale Shop, including installation of asphalt pads over the building footprint, bulldozing along its southern edge, and various archaeological excavations (Caywood 1955; Hoffman and Ross 1974; Steele et al. 1975). Backfill from these earlier studies comprised a portion of sediments encountered during the 2001 Sale Shop excavation.

Sutler’s Store Yard

As an initially surficial deposit, the Sutler Store yard is the most comparable to the Sale Shop in terms of immediate post-depositional effects, although these disturbances occurred over a shorter period. Like the Sale Shop, the uppermost layers of the Sutler’s Store yard were likely subject to trampling while exposed at the surface. The small sherd sizes in this area may therefore reflect formation processes tied to discard habits (disposal of small fragments) as well as subsequent breakage in situ. However, the deposit was covered by a road sometime in the mid- to late 19th century, protecting the site from most later disturbances. Road construction continuing into the early 20th century resulted in some admixture of yard sediments with the overlying macadam (Stratum II in Table 4.3).

Officers’ Quarters

The Officers’ Quarters cellar (Feature 5) was found largely intact, probably by virtue of its subsurface location. Like the Sutler’s Store privy, the cellar was infilled and buried shortly after use, although Thomas (1988:7) noted some construction-related disturbances just prior to his excavations. The preservation factors likely contributed to the larger average sherd size in both assemblages.
Hypothesis 1: Commercial Assemblages

To examine consumption patterns at the commercial level, I first compared ceramics from the Sutler’s Store yard with those from the HBC Sale Shop. I conducted Fisher’s Exact tests for ware type, function, and manufacturing location. Analyses yielded statistically significant differences for all variables. Results are presented in Table 5.1 through Table 5.7 and Figure 5.1 through Figure 5.6. These tables and figures also include data pertaining to Hypothesis 2 (Domestic Assemblages) and the Officers’ Quarters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Sale Shop</th>
<th>Sutler Yard</th>
<th>Sutler Privy</th>
<th>Officers' Quarters</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>23 32.4%</td>
<td>19 19.0%</td>
<td>1 1.0%</td>
<td>1 1.0%</td>
<td>52 23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black *</td>
<td>1 1.4%</td>
<td>54 54.0%</td>
<td>1 4.2%</td>
<td>2 7.4%</td>
<td>58 26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>1 1.4%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>1 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1 1.4%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>1 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>1 1.4%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>1 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>7 9.9%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>7 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRONSTONE</td>
<td>1 1.4%</td>
<td>14 14.0%</td>
<td>6 25.0%</td>
<td>3 11.1%</td>
<td>24 10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
<td>3 4.2%</td>
<td>1 1.0%</td>
<td>1 4.2%</td>
<td>3 11.1%</td>
<td>8 3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1 1.4%</td>
<td>1 1.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>2 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>2 2.8%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>1 4.2%</td>
<td>3 11.1%</td>
<td>6 2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5.1, CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Sale Shop</th>
<th>Sutler Yard</th>
<th>Sutler Privy</th>
<th>Officers' Quarters</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STONEWARE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff, brown salt glaze</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff, brown slip glaze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff, buff salt glaze</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff, oxblood glaze</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff, yellow salt glaze</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, black salt glaze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, brown salt glaze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, buff salt glaze</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, undecorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red, black glaze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This category includes several plates printed in combinations of black, blue, and/or green. Each dish featured a black center with a border in one or more of the contrasting colors (Appendix C). Because individual vessels were identified based on fragments of the central design, these are noted here as black transferprint.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Sale Shop</th>
<th>Sutler Yard</th>
<th>Sutler Privy</th>
<th>Officers' Quarters</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTHENWARE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandedware</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>3,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennington/Rockingham glaze</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottageware</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusterware</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra cotta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, blue shell-edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, gilt edge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, molded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, undecorated</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>2,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow ware</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFERPRINT</strong></td>
<td>847</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>5,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/blue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>2,481</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>3,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue with hand-painting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark blue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow blue</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inky blue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green with hand-painting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, hand-painted *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ware Type</td>
<td>Sale Shop n</td>
<td>Sale Shop %</td>
<td>Sutler Yard n</td>
<td>Sutler Yard %</td>
<td>Sutler Privy n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRONSTONE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STONEWARE</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff, brown salt glaze</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff, brown slip glaze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff, buff salt glaze</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff, oxblood glaze</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff, yellow salt glaze</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff (no glaze remaining)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, black salt glaze</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, brown salt glaze</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, buff salt glaze</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, undecorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red, black glaze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7,592</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These sherds are fragments of plates which included both transferprinted and hand-painted embellishments (Appendix C). These are therefore classified as transferprint vessels despite lacking the corresponding transferprint portion.
FIGURE 5.1. Ware types, by total number of vessels. (Figure by author, 2023.)

FIGURE 5.2. Ware types, as a proportion of the total number of vessels. (Figure by author, 2023.)
Ware Type

H$_{10}$(ware): *The Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store contain similar ware types.*
H$_{1A}$(ware): *The Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store contain different ware types.*

Fisher’s Exact tests of the Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store yard indicate a statistically significant difference in ware types (\(p<.0001\)) (Table 5.1–Table 5.2; Figure 5.1–Figure 5.2). This difference was noted mainly within the ironstone and stoneware categories. The Sutler’s Store yard contained a larger proportion of ironstone (14%) but considerably fewer stoneware vessels (1%); these comprised 1% and 23% of the Sale Shop assemblage, respectively. Proportions among other ware types, however, were generally comparable. Transferprint predominated in both assemblages, comprising 62% of the Sale Shop assemblage by MNV and 76% of the Sutler’s Store. Both assemblages also exhibited small amounts of earthenware and porcelain (all under 10%), although the kinds of earthenware present in each varied. The Sale Shop encompassed a greater diversity of earthenwares, including lusterware, terra cotta, and gilt-edged wares, while the Sutler’s yard contained mainly bandedwares. Both assemblages also contained cottage wares and yellow wares.

To some degree, differences in ware type may be reflective of the methods used to estimate MNV. Approximation of MNV relies largely upon ware type and consequently tends to underrepresent undecorated wares. Conversely, decorated wares such as transferprint are relatively overrepresented. This problem is particularly apparent among plain whitewares, as these types comprise a large number of the total sherds in each provenience but a comparatively small proportion of vessels. Approximately 41% of all sherds in the Sale Shop and 25% of those in the Sutler’s yard were whitewares, yet no full whiteware vessels were identified in either area. The actual difference between sherd and
vessel counts, however, probably lies somewhere in between, as some fragments may correspond to undecorated portions of other white-bodied earthenwares, such as bandedwares or transferprint.

Methodological concerns aside, the ware types observed in the Sale Shop generally resemble those previously reported among HBC occupations at Fort Vancouver, including an abundance of transferprint, various gilt-edge wares, lusterwares, bandedwares, and cottagewares (Hoffman and Ross 1973, 1974, 1975; Steele et al. 1975; Ross 1976; Cromwell 2006; Holschuh 2013). As with previous studies of HBC pottery, transferprint accounts for over half of all ceramic artifacts (Chance and Chance 1976:265). Overall, this assortment appears broadly consistent with the ceramic assemblage of a 19th-century British fur trade community and confirms the Sale Shop as the likely source of these goods.

In contrast to the Sale Shop, the Sutler’s Store varies somewhat from expectation. As predicted, the sutler carried a greater assortment of ironstone vessels: while a single ironstone sherd was identified in the Sale Shop, the Sutler’s Store yard contained 1,410 fragments comprising at least 14 different vessels. Contrary to other Army assemblages, however, ironstone comprises only a small portion of the sutler’s ceramics overall. This may again be due to underrepresentation in vessel counts and how previous studies delineated ware type categories. By sherd count, ironstone accounts for a slightly larger proportion of the Sutler’s Store yard (19%); if ironstone fragments are grouped together with undecorated whitewares, as Chance and Chance (1976) and Sprague (1980) do, it accounts for 44% of sherds, consistent with their assertions that assemblages with upwards of 40% white-colored wares (i.e., white earthenwares and ironstone) are diagnostic of the
Army. However, transferprint remains the largest category by MNV and fragment counts, making up 53% of all sherds in the Sutler’s Store yard. By comparison, Chance et al. (1982:228) report that transferprint comprised only 20% of all sherds in the Army strata at their Operation 26. Interestingly, the larger proportion of transferprint sherds in the Sutler’s Store yard more closely resembles HBC assemblages recovered from Fort Vancouver.

Various explanations may account for this apparent similarity. First, I considered whether these artifacts may indicate overlap in the intended clienteles of each store. Prior research has established a strong correlation between HBC occupations and the presence of transferprint, potentially indicating that sutlers anticipated selling goods not only to American soldiers and settlers, per their contractual obligations, but also to the British fur trading community, and modeled their wares after those offered by the Sale Shop. On its own, however, this explanation seems somewhat unsustainable, given that most HBC employees had access to Spodewares at the Sale Shop for a comparatively modest markup. Besides this, HBC laborers were paid in company credit and often lacked the cash to purchase elsewhere, had they wished to do so (Cromwell 2006:102). An alternative explanation may be that Americans’ reported preference for ironstone was not as unilateral as historical evidence has previously suggested.

Though the proportions of transferprint in the Sutler’s Store and the Sale Shop are broadly similar, significant stylistic differences also bear noting. Transferprint patterns in the Sale Shop were predominantly Spodewares and other popular British patterns that featured romantic, classical, exotic, floral, or other motifs (Table 5.3; Williams 1978; Sussman 1979; Samford 1997). Various colors were present, with blue the most popular.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Mfg. Date</th>
<th>Sale Shop</th>
<th>Sutler Yard</th>
<th>Sutler Privy</th>
<th>Officers’ Qtrs.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesop’s Fables</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Spode / Copeland &amp; Garrett / W.T. Copeland</td>
<td>1830–1860</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Rose</td>
<td>Floral</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1825–1860</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broseley</td>
<td>Chinoiserie</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1818–1860</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broseley / Temple</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1814–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Flowers</td>
<td>Floral</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1815–1860</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and Flowers</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1826–1860</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geranium</td>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1818–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1816–1860</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkmaid</td>
<td>Pastoral</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1819–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Vase</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1831–1860</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>Chinoiserie</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1814–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1819–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B772</td>
<td>Floral</td>
<td>Copeland &amp; Garrett / W.T. Copeland</td>
<td>1839–1860</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B772 / B773</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1839–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B773</td>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1839–1860</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Flowers</td>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1829–1860</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Views</td>
<td>European Views</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1833–1860</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Views / Byron Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1833–1860</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla</td>
<td>Floral</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1833–1860</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Views</td>
<td>European Views</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1845–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (Radiating) Sprigs</td>
<td>Floral</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1833–1847</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1837–1860</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw</td>
<td>Exotic Views</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1838–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw / Pagoda</td>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1838–1860</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagoda</td>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1838–1860</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphaellesque</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1845–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>European Views</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1835–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1835–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watteau</td>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>1847–1860</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Mfg. Date</td>
<td>Sale Shop</td>
<td>Sutler Yard</td>
<td>Sutler Privy</td>
<td>Officers' Qtrs.</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>W.T. Copeland</td>
<td>1848–1860</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convolvulus / Garland</td>
<td>Floral</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1849–1860</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotus</td>
<td>Floral</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1850–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruins</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1848–1860</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn and Poppy?</td>
<td>Floral</td>
<td>W.T. Copeland &amp; Sons</td>
<td>1863–1970</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Seaport</td>
<td>European Views</td>
<td>John Maddock &amp; Sons</td>
<td>1830–1850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucerne</td>
<td>Pastoral</td>
<td>Joseph Clementson</td>
<td>1839–1864</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>American Views</td>
<td>Podmore Walker &amp; Co.</td>
<td>1849–1859</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venus</td>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>Podmore Walker &amp; Co.</td>
<td>1834–1859</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>Thomas Edwards</td>
<td>1846–1848</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canova</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>T. J. &amp; J. Mayer?</td>
<td>1826–1850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhone Scenery</td>
<td>European Views</td>
<td>T. J. &amp; J. Mayer</td>
<td>1843–1855</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide's Bower</td>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>1830–1850</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Lakes</td>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>J. &amp; M. P. Bell &amp; Co.</td>
<td>1842–1860</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Exotic Views</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1842–1860</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rébus</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Geoffroy de Boulen &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>1849–1851</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amants Bretons</td>
<td>Daily Life</td>
<td>J. Vieillard &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>1845–1895</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral Sheet</td>
<td>Floral</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1845–1895</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Juif Errant</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1845–1895</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Comte de Monte-Cristo</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Lebeuf Milliet &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>1846–1849</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeux d’Enfants</td>
<td>Daily Life</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1846–1849</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Révolution de 1848</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldats-2</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1846–1849</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troubadours</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1847–1849</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assiettes Parlantes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>1838–1895</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN ORIGIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>611</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>847</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5,008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast, the majority of vessels identified within the Sutler’s Store yard were *assiettes parlantes*, a unique style of dessert plate manufactured mainly in France (Appendix C). Also known as “speaking plates,” these are easily distinguishable from Spode and other transferwares in both subject matter and visual appearance. In lieu of the floral arrangements and landscapes favored by HBC elites, *assiettes parlantes* were decorated with narrative scenes from popular culture, history, or daily life, among other topics. Ideal for group settings, each plate within a set presented a unique vignette and inscription for users to share and discuss over the course of the meal. The colorations were additionally unusual for Fort Vancouver ceramics: although not a defining feature of *assiettes parlantes* in general, most plates in the Sutler’s Store were printed in black or dichromatic color schemes, or even dichromatic with additional hand-painted embellishments. Each of these variations are very uncommon among HBC assemblages at Fort Vancouver (cf. Chance and Chance 1976; Ross 1976; Cromwell 2006).

Due to the collective importance placed on ceramic tablewares, it is unlikely that these distinctions were purely coincidental. Although arguably all transferprint patterns possessed communicative value (Brooks 2010:160), *assiettes parlantes* were designed specifically for the purposes of social discourse. The narrative illustration styles inevitably prompted discussion and provided users a medium through which to display their knowledge of politics, culture, or current events (Musée Ariana 2017:9–10; cf. Yeoman 2017). In France, some *assiettes parlantes* even saw use as political propaganda (Hamman 2006; Bouyssy 2014). With this explicit focus on social topics, the difference from Spode or other British styles would have been patently obvious to the discerning consumer.
The conspicuous social component of the *assiettes parlantes* necessarily raises the question of why the sutler may have opted for merchandise so clearly distinct from HBC goods. Potentially, these were perceived simply as novelty goods intended for entertainment. Indeed, several plate designs draw upon then-recent events, such as the 1848 French Revolution, or newly published books, such as the *Count of Monte-Cristo* or *Le Juif Errant*, that enjoyed a viral popularity in the 1840s (Lyons 2008). Popularization of the serialized novel during this era resulted in increased use of literary illustrations for transferprint designs, but unless consumers were familiar with the source material, Lucas (2003:140) suggests the sale of such patterns was “unsustainable” in the long term, leading to more short-lived or “trendy” use. Alternatively, the plates may have simply been cheaper than other alternatives, although this possibility is difficult to establish without prices or other historical documentation.

That these goods were neither manufactured in Britain nor imported by the HBC may have additionally underscored this distinction. The HBC drew upon Britain’s global economic strength; accordingly, American settlers readily conflated the HBC with British interference (Chapter 2). As such, any rejection of HBC goods may have symbolized refusal of the HBC and British imperialism more broadly. I explore this economic and political aspect further within my discussion of Manufacturing Location, below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLEWARES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, dessert/luncheon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, soup</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter/serve dish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other flatware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA WARES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORAGE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle, ink/blacking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, ginger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber pot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash basin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle, ale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowerpot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Sale Shop</td>
<td>Sutler Yard</td>
<td>Sutler Privy</td>
<td>Officers' Quarters</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLEWARES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, dessert/luncheon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, soup</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter/serving dish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other flatware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA WARES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORAGE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle, ink/blacking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crock</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, ginger</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber pot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash basin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle, ale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowerpot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>3,799</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7,592</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5.5
FORM/FUNCTION, BY SHERD COUNT (N)
FIGURE 5.3. Functional types, by total number of vessels. (Figure by author, 2023.)

FIGURE 5.4. Functional types, as a proportion of the total number of vessels. (Figure by author, 2023.)
Vessel Form

H1₀(form): The Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store contain similar vessel forms.
H₁ₐ(form): The Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store contain different vessel forms.

A Fisher’s Exact test of functional categories also proved statistically significant for the Sutler’s Store yard and the Sale Shop (p<.0001) (Table 5.4–Table 5.5; Figure 5.3–Figure 5.4). Tablewares (mainly flatwares) within the Sutler’s Store were considerably more frequent than expected and comprised nearly all identified forms in that assemblage (MNV=83). Tea wares were also more prevalent than expected but made up only a small proportion of vessels overall (3%). Storage vessels were represented by lid fragments from a single Chinese porcelain ginger jar.

The prevalence of tablewares within the Sutler’s Store is most likely tied to the numerous transferprint vessels in the assemblage. Because the arrangement of decorative elements often provides information about vessel form, functional analyses are typically more successful for these ware types. The presence of transferprint on both sides of a sherd might indicate a hollow form, for instance, versus only one side for flatwares. Furthermore, over half of all transferprint sherds (n=2,047) were fragments of the assiettes parlantes described previously. Because these patterns occur exclusively on dessert plates, even very small fragments could be assigned to the tableware category.

In contrast, form was indeterminate for fully 85% of vessels within the Sale Shop (MNV=60). Storage containers (MNV=5) were responsible for just under half of all identified forms, followed by ale bottles (MNV=3), tablewares (MNV=2), and one flowerpot. Curiously, no tea wares were identified. Tea wares represented important symbols of gentility and domesticity within Victorian and fur trade society (Burley 1989;
Cromwell 2006), so their total absence is unusual, especially considering that previous investigations of the Sale Shop have each recovered portions of tea services (Hoffman and Ross 1974; Steele et al. 1975). The lack of tea wares in the 2001 excavations may reflect identification issues relating to sherd size and post-depositional disturbances.

The degree of fragmentation in the Sale Shop is undoubtedly a major concern and inhibits full comparison with the Sutler’s Store assemblage. Nonetheless, tentative inferences may be drawn from available data. In particular, the abundance of tablewares and tea wares within the Sutler’s Store may point towards slight variations in site function, consistent with the site’s historical use as a store and eatery (Horton 2007a, 2007b). The latter component was ostensibly absent from the Sale Shop, which consisted of a storefront and warehouse (Hussey 1972:207–215). While both establishments clearly sold serving vessels, the preparation of meals at the Sutler’s Store may have ensured that more tablewares remained on-site.

Meanwhile, the range of other forms in the Sale Shop may indicate that the HBC maintained a more diversified stock of goods overall. Based on the proportion of storage vessels, for instance, this may have included greater emphasis on bulk goods or other supplies kept in such containers (Hoffman and Ross 1974:80; Steele et al. 1975:56). However, according to historical receipts, the sutler also carried items potentially stored in utilitarian vessels (e.g., pickles, chutney, or liquor), so their relative scarcity may again be due to identification issues. Utilitarian ware types, such as stonewares or yellow wares, were present within the Sutler’s Store yard, although fragmentation precluded functional analysis for most of these sherds.
### TABLE 5.6
MANUFACTURING LOCATIONS, BY VESSEL COUNT (MNV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturing Location</th>
<th>Sale Shop MNV</th>
<th>Sale Shop %</th>
<th>Sutler Yard MNV</th>
<th>Sutler Yard %</th>
<th>Sutler Privy MNV</th>
<th>Sutler Privy %</th>
<th>Officers' Quarters MNV</th>
<th>Officers' Quarters %</th>
<th>TOTAL MNV</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5.7
MANUFACTURING LOCATIONS, BY SHERD COUNT (N)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturing Location</th>
<th>Sale Shop n</th>
<th>Sale Shop %</th>
<th>Sutler Yard n</th>
<th>Sutler Yard %</th>
<th>Sutler Privy n</th>
<th>Sutler Privy %</th>
<th>Officers' Quarters n</th>
<th>Officers' Quarters %</th>
<th>TOTAL n</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2,931</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>3,961</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>6,111</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7,592</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>10,217</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 5.5. Manufacturing locations, by total number of vessels. (Figure by author, 2023.)

FIGURE 5.6. Manufacturing locations, as a proportion of the total number of vessels. (Figure by author, 2023.)
Manufacturing Location

H1_0(location): The Sale Shop and the Sutler’s Store contain ceramics from the same countries.
H1_A(location): The Sale Shop and the Sutler’s Store contain ceramics from different countries.

Tests indicate a statistically significant difference among manufacturing locations for the Sale Shop and the Sutler’s Store yard (p<.0001) (Table 5.6–Table 5.7; Figure 5.5–Figure 5.6). Among the 54 vessels in the Sale Shop for which origin was determined, 94% were from English potteries and 6% were Chinese porcelains. Manufacturing location could not be ascertained for the remaining 17 vessels. By comparison, British vessels from England and Scotland (MNV=16) represented only 16% of vessels within the Sutler’s Store yard, while those from locations other than Britain comprised an unexpectedly large portion. Most of these were assiettes parlantes and other French dishes (MNV=62), although fragments of at least one Chinese vessel were also identified. Twenty-one vessels in the Sutler’s Store yard could not be attributed to a particular country.

As with the other variables discussed above, identification of manufacturing location also appears highly dependent on ware type and is particularly associated with the abundance of transferprint. For most ware types, precise origin is discernible only through makers’ marks or occasionally through unique glazes or shapes (absent any sophisticated chemical analyses). In contrast, any portion of a transferprint pattern may effectively serve as a trademark. Although earthenwares, ironstone, porcelain, and stonewares collectively comprised over half of the Sale Shop’s total sherd count, only 11% of these possessed marks or other embellishments sufficient to determine origin. By comparison, manufacturing location was known for 28% of transferprint sherds in this assemblage. This
issue was also apparent within the Sutler’s Store yard, in which 87% of transferprint sherds but only 3% of other ware types could be reliably sourced. Accordingly, of the 133 total vessels in the Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store yard for which origin could be determined, 84% were transferprint. As a result, analyses of manufacturing location are skewed towards transferprint vessels.

Even if accounting for this disparity by considering only transferprint vessels, comparisons nonetheless suggest significant differences between the Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store. While British transferprint in the Sale Shop is consistent with historical patterns of importation and British mercantilism under the HBC, the prevalence of French vessels in the Sutler’s Store is highly unusual for Fort Vancouver. Among both Army and HBC occupations, very few French ceramics have been reported in the area (Chance and Chance 1976:68), and even some of those have been misidentified (Caywood 1955:56; Langford and Wilson 2002:53). Clearly, the abundance of French pottery in the Sutler’s Store yard signifies a major departure from established importation practices.

Assorted factors may explain the unusual concentration of French ceramics. Among these, cost and economic reasons probably bear discussing first. Steele (1975) hypothesized that historical tariffs unilaterally raised the price of foreign goods, leading American consumers to opt for the least expensive ware types, which Chance and Chance (1976:69, 263) and Sprague (1980:39) generally understood to include undecorated whitewares and ironstone. While customs duties would explain the relative decline in British wares, these would not necessarily account for the apparent increase in French imports, as tariffs should translate as a reduction in foreign imports overall. No such trend
is evident within the assemblages analyzed, nor is any concurrent increase in domestically produced goods. American wares are nearly absent from either assemblage, probably due to the limited scale of American ceramic industries at the time.

If the sutler selected French ceramics over comparable English products solely based on price, then presumably these items were less expensive to begin with, prior to taxation. While possible, the lack of precise historical data makes this difficult to determine conclusively. At present, no purchase records corresponding directly to the French plates have been identified, and other sources of information provide only a vague sense of their cost. While historically *assiettes parlantes* could be quite affordable, prices varied considerably, and French earthenwares as a whole tended to be more expensive than their British equivalents (Newton 1836; Bontemps 1841:1854–1855; Musée Ariana 2017:9). The presence of certain manufacturing errors such as smeared or blurry transferprint might corroborate a cheaper product acquired by the sutler at a discount\(^{10}\) (Crook 2011), although not all of the French vessels exhibit these defects. On the other hand, some of the French plates include both transferprint and hand-painted decorations (Appendix C:185–186); these added details and would have likely entailed a commensurate increase in cost (cf. Horton 2014:496–497). Given the potential variability of prices and quality, the French pottery from the Sutler’s Store cannot currently be characterized as either more or less costly than English wares in the Sale Shop. Future studies should attempt to locate historical documents that establish a more precise price comparison.

\(^{10}\) Archival documents indicate that sutler Elisha Camp acquired at least some goods at auction, but it is unknown whether these included any ceramic vessels (Wolf Brothers 1853).
Absent any specific data regarding product costs, purely economic factors do not appear entirely compelling, suggesting that the French plates in the Sutler’s Store additionally reflect a societal inclination for products according to the nation of manufacture. Historical data corroborate this possibility: according to Brooks (2009:293), French goods had been *en vogue* among American consumers since the 18th century and represented good taste and sophistication among the upper classes. While English pottery was also well regarded (Sprague 1980:33), French porcelain in particular drove American ceramic preferences during the mid-19th century and led to the popularity of imitative wares, such as ironstone.\(^{11}\) While archaeological materials suggest that the sutlers did not sell much porcelain, they may have attempted to stock other desirable items by capitalizing upon the perceived social value of French imports in general. The potential emphasis on prestige goods would prove additionally consistent if sutlers tailored their stock to Army officers and other members of elite society.

Previous researchers have hypothesized that *assiettes parlantes* in the Sutler’s Store may have embodied not only an American preference for French products, but also a conscious rejection of British mercantilism (Gleason and Cheung 2007; Horton 2014:169). Considering the resentment harbored against the HBC by some Americans (Swagerty 2003), this certainly may have factored into the sutler’s selection. As alluded to previously, the HBC was intrinsically bound to British imperialism and relied upon British goods to

\(^{11}\) To recapture American interests, some English potteries began labeling their products with French or French-sounding names (Birks 2022). Evidently, this tactic proved successful, as historians have since opined that competition with British ironstone “did more damage to the French ceramic export trade than Nelson’s fleet” (Graham 1947). One of these English marks, manufactured by John Ridgway & Company, has been excavated from the Army Parade Ground at Fort Vancouver (Langford and Wilson 2002:53).
extend its influence throughout the Pacific Northwest. Due to this inherent link, the non-
consumption of HBC goods could therefore symbolize denunciation of British
imperialism. Historically, boycotts have been used as expressions of national pride and
opposition (Camp 2013:14), and American merchants of the colonial Pacific Northwest
were likewise eager to assert their independence from the HBC (Chapman 1984; Roulette
and Chapman 1996). As a contractor to the U.S. Army—an extension of American
colonialism in its own right—the sutler may have felt especially inclined to promote
nationalist interests. In conjunction with the plates’ unique appearance, this explanation is
particularly interesting, as the French designs would have highlighted both the consumer’s
good taste as well as an obvious divergence from HBC products.

However, if the sutler’s ceramic assemblage represents a deliberate attempt to
boycott British tablewares, then it appears that the sutler did not—or could not—commit
fully to the effort. At least 16 British vessels were found in the Sutler’s Store yard,
including five of these vessels produced by either Copeland & Garrett or W.T. Copeland,
successors to the prestigious Spode/Copeland firm. Given the HBC’s long-term agreement
with Spode/Copeland (Sussman 1979), these items most likely originated from the Sale
Shop and were bought by the sutler for resale or personal use. Individual purchases by the
sutler may also explain the presence of other transferprint vessels which occur in small
quantities, such as J. & M. P. Bell’s Palestine (MNV=2) and Italian Lakes (MNV=1);
Joseph Clementson’s Lucerne (MNV=1); Thomas Edwards’ Waverley (MNV=1); or
Adelaide’s Bower (MNV=2; manufacturer unknown). Both Palestine and Italian Lakes
have appeared within HBC contexts at Fort Vancouver (Carley 1982: figure 29l; Ross
1976:453–455). That these appear in the sutler’s assemblage may simply reflect the sheer dominance of the English earthenware market at the time. Considering the massive scale of the British industry compared to other options, the sutler simply may not have been able to avoid British ceramics altogether, had they wished to do so.

Finally, besides catering to economic, nationalist, or class-based interests, it is also conceivable that sutlers may have selected French goods as an appeal to ethnic identities. The *assiettes parlantes* include French-language text that may have invited purchase by local francophones, such as French Canadian HBC laborers or French-born soldiers in the U.S. Army. However, neither group comprised a particularly large part of the population at Fort Vancouver at this time. The HBC Village had fallen from a seasonal peak of 1,000 residents in the mid-1840s to just 52 employees in 1850; three years later, that number had dwindled to 12 (Kardas 1971:169; Cromwell 2006:75–78). The number of French-born soldiers at the Columbia Barracks was similarly modest. Out of nearly 300 persons enumerated at the barracks in 1850, only seven reported having emigrated from France (Clark County Territorial Auditor 1850). As these groups comprised only a small part of the local community, they probably did not represent an especially reliable or lucrative customer base for the sutler. Possibly, the French ceramics stocked by the sutler may have intrigued Army officers for whom speaking French was a sign of refinement, but this might again signify an appeal to elite tastes rather than customers’ cultural or linguistic heritage.¹²

¹² Sinclair (2019:111–112) describes at least one instance of French-English bilingualism by an Army officer. While stationed at the Columbia Barracks in the early 1850s, Lieutenant Theodore Talbot occasionally wrote his personal records in French, which Sinclair states was to obscure the contents from prying eyes. Apparently, Talbot realized that few of the enlisted men could read French and took advantage of this fact to conceal sensitive information.
While the French-speaking contingent at Fort Vancouver in the early 1850s was probably minimal, a sizeable population of French Canadians resided in the Willamette Valley south of Fort Vancouver. However, whether these individuals would have considered goods from Vancouver also seems questionable. As population centers shifted south of the Columbia River in the 1840s and commercial options expanded, consumers became collectively less reliant on Vancouver as a hub for household commodities. As early as 1845, the HBC had expressed concern over settlers’ tendency to bypass Fort Vancouver for stores in the Willamette Valley, even if the latter proved more expensive (Chapman 1993:32). By this time, consumers could evidently afford to be more selective with regard to the physical proximity and convenience of domestic goods. Therefore, the few French ceramics which have been identified at sites in this area were likely not acquired from the sutler (Chapman 1993:166–167, illustration 92; see also Appendix C:191). The source of these materials is not known but may have been the “French Store” built in Oregon City in 1849 (Chapman 1993:36–37). This store was established to support French Catholic colonization efforts in the Willamette Valley and was supplied by the French ship *L'Étoile du Matin* until the store’s closure in 1853 (Bancroft 1888:326–327).
Hypothesis 2: Domestic Assemblages

Comparison of the Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store yard establishes differences in the type, form, and origin of ceramics stocked by each merchant. However, the commercial assemblages represent a generalized view of consumption practices that may obscure the intersection of nationality with other social identities. To assess how these may have played out on a domestic or individual level, the second component of this study compares the Sutler’s Store ceramics to artifacts from the 1850s Officers’ Quarters. While it was expected that the Sutler’s Store and Officers’ Quarters would be generally similar, statistical testing indicates differences among ware types, vessel function, and manufacturing locations.

Ware Type

H20(ware): The Sutler’s Store and Officers’ Quarters contain similar ware types.
H2A(ware): The Sutler’s Store and Officers’ Quarters contain different ware types.

A Fisher’s Exact test suggested significant differences in the ware types present within the Sutler’s Store and Officers’ Quarters (p=0.0005) (Table 5.1–Table 5.2; Figure 5.1–Figure 5.2). The Officers’ Quarters contained less transferprint (44%) than the Sutler’s Store, but relatively more earthenware (22%), porcelain (11%), and stoneware (11%). Amounts of ironstone were similar and comprised between 10% and 15% of vessels in each assemblage. Among the earthenware vessels, bandedwares and cottagewares appeared in both areas, although the Officers’ Quarters also included varieties of plain and molded whiteware vessels not identified in the Sutler’s Store yard. Some of this variability may relate to site function, while other aspects may reflect socioeconomics.
Generally, the variety of ware types observed in the Officers’ Quarters appear consistent with that expected of a middle to upper-class household at Fort Vancouver. Although the Officers’ Quarters contained less transferprint than the Sutler’s Store, it included other expensive ware types, such as porcelain tea wares and a stoneware bowl decorated with Chinese Oxblood glaze (Horton 2014). Presumably, the officer acquired the latter elsewhere, as it does not correspond to any known vessels in either the Sale Shop or Sutler’s Store. Collectively, these suggest a household of some socioeconomic means, although Horton’s original artifact analysis notes indicate some issues regarding vessel quality. Manufacturing errors present on certain vessels (e.g., messy hand-painting) may denote a lower quality product, perhaps obtained at a discount (Crook 2011). If so, the mix of expensive and cheaper ceramics could represent officers’ attempts to demonstrate an elite status, to the extent that they could afford it. However, such a possibility remains speculative without additional archival evidence detailing household finances and expenditures.

Despite the obvious lacunae surrounding price, these results provide certain insights with regard to Hypothesis 1. Primarily, the similarities in ironstone in each context continues to suggest that presence of this ware type is an appropriate metric for distinguishing “American” sites from fur trade occupations at Fort Vancouver, while acquisition of other ware types likely involved greater variability.
Vessel Form

H2_0(form): *The Sutler’s Store and Officers’ Quarters contain similar vessel forms.*
H2_A(form): *The Sutler’s Store and domestic sites contain different vessel forms.*

Differences in vessel function were also statistically significant between the Sutler’s Store and the Officers’ Quarters (*p* < 0.0001) (Table 5.4–Table 5.5; Figure 5.3–Figure 5.4). Only one-third of vessels in the Officers’ Quarters were tablewares compared to over 80% in the Sutler’s Store yard. The Officers’ Quarters contained a greater range of utilitarian forms than observed in the yard, such as crocks and toilet wares (wash basins and chamber pots). Tea wares, including cups and saucers, also made up a larger amount of the Officers’ Quarters (30%). Form was unknown for six vessels (22%).

Contrary to the emphasis on tablewares in the Sutler’s Store, the Officers’ Quarters ceramics encompass a greater range of functional categories. This variation is likely due to differences in the activities occurring at each location. For the Officers’ Quarters, artifacts reflect various household activities, including items for hygiene, food preparation, and dining, as well as those used for social interactions tied to status. As members of the upper-middle classes, Army officers were subject to a strict sense of decorum and propriety that they communicated through various social and material channels (Horton 2014; Eichelberger 2019). To convey their present or projected status, officers engaged in displays of gentility to distinguish themselves not only from enlistees, but also to other officers. As in British Victorian society, tea wares and routines surrounding formal dining played a crucial part of these interactions. Especially in light of the parallels between the HBC social hierarchy and that within military context, it seems that these data may be more indicative of rank and class than nationality alone.
Manufacturing Location

H2₀(location): The Sutler’s Store and Officers’ Quarters contain ceramics from the same countries.
H₂ᴬ(location): The Sutler’s Store and Officers’ Quarters contain ceramics from different countries.

Differences among manufacturing locations were also statistically significant for the Sutler’s Store yard and the Officers’ Quarters (p=.0024) (Table 5.6–Table 5.7; Figure 5.5–Figure 5.6). Compared to the Sutler’s Store, the Officers’ Quarters contained more British vessels (26%) and fewer vessels from other locations (11%). All British vessels identified in the Officers’ Quarters were produced by the Spode firm or its successors and were probably purchased from the HBC Sale Shop. Like the Sutler’s Store, the Officers’ Quarters included ceramics from China and France, as well as one vessel attributed to the U.S. This was a stoneware crock lid stamped “[SA]CRAMENTO,” assumed to denote its origin. Location could not be determined for 63% of vessels (MNV=17).

As part of Hypothesis 1, I discuss the prevalence of non-British ceramics in the Sutler’s Store, citing possible explanations such as price, sociocultural preferences, or intentional avoidance. In comparison, Hypothesis 2 indicates that, at least for this household, actual consumption patterns did not adhere strongly to the trends observed in the Sutler’s Store, nor did it contain nearly as many English ceramics as did the Sale Shop. Instead, identifiable manufacturing locations were distributed more evenly between British and non-British sources. As with the Sutler’s Store, issues of cost, taste, or avoidance may also apply in the domestic context, although once again lacking substantive price information, I focus on a combination of the latter two explanations.
If the presence of French or other sources signifies a boycott of the HBC, then artifacts from the Officers’ Quarters would suggest only partial avoidance of English wares, at best. (In this regard, the crock from Sacramento provokes interest, although utilitarian containers were not typically subject to the same economic pressures nor the same scrutiny as tablewares and other vessels used in social interactions.) Nonetheless, it leads one to consider how Army officers would have navigated such a situation. Army officers were compelled by the Victorian status hierarchy of the HBC gentility, but also by their military obligations. This was presumably complicated by their physical proximity to the HBC at Fort Vancouver. Whereas missionaries elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest were actively promoting American colonization and alternatives to HBC goods as an anti-British stance, any comparable expression of nationalistic sentiment by Army officers would have required a certain level of tact. Perhaps, the acquisition of transferprint allowed them a means to negotiate these conflicting goals, simultaneously melding Victorian sensibilities with American identity and material culture. In tandem with the decorative differences apparent among English Spode and French assiettes parlantes, these artifacts may represent an attempt to emulate the British hierarchy with an American twist.

While this study considers only the Officers’ Quarters in any detail, a brief review of other locations containing French ceramics provides some additional context as to their use and meaning. Some of these, including the Officers’ Quarters, have been previously reported upon (Thomas and Hibbs 1984:477; Thomas 1988:10–11, 20), and I have identified several more occurrences over the course of this research. At present, French
assiettes parlantes have been identified within Officers’ Row, the U.S. Quartermaster Depot, the former HBC Village, and the HBC cemetery (Table 5.8; Figure 5.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Structure/Feature</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOVA 1813</td>
<td>HBC Village</td>
<td>Clerk’s Dwelling/Operation 53</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOVA 3011</td>
<td>HBC Village</td>
<td>House 5</td>
<td>H5-06, Stratum III (Quartermaster Deposits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOVA 3023</td>
<td>HBC Village</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ST-110, Stratum II (Archaeological Fill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOVA 3218</td>
<td>HBC Village</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ST-111, Stratum IV (Yard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOVA 3043</td>
<td>Officers’ Row</td>
<td>Officers’ Quarters/Feature 5</td>
<td>Unknown/provenience data missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOVA 3080</td>
<td>Officers’ Row</td>
<td>Officers’ Privy/Feature 810</td>
<td>OR 31/41/42, Feature Level 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOVA 3024</td>
<td>West Barracks</td>
<td>Sutler’s Store</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, as a general observation, I note that the presence of French fragments beyond the Sutler’s Store supports their interpretation as commercial goods at that location—for sale to the public rather than exclusively localized use by the sutler (for the restaurant, for example). More importantly, the broad distribution of French ceramics also demonstrates clear spatial and temporal patterning. The incidence of French transferprint is highly correlated with U.S. Army occupations at Fort Vancouver and suggests that use of these items was indeed a largely American phenomenon in the early 1850s. Even within the HBC Village site, vessels are concentrated within Army-era sediments or within structures associated with military activities. These locations include a former Quartermaster clerk’s dwelling constructed in 1850 or 1851 (Thomas and Hibbs 1984:439–440) and the Little Proulx House excavated in 2013. Named for an HBC servant who lived at Fort Vancouver between about 1845 and 1852, the HBC rented the Little Proulx House to Army surgeon
Levi Holden between October 1849 and June 1850 and to Bureau of Indian Affairs agent Andrew Bolon between February and August 1852 (NPS 2012). The Army removed the house around 1855. French ceramics have also been found in Army-era sediments near House 5 and in Army fill within the former HBC cemetery (Cromwell et al. 2014). Shovel testing in 2003 yielded fragments of *assiettes parlantes* in the southern portion of the Village, in the general vicinity of Kardas’ (1970) rock feature, but these materials have not been conclusively assigned to any known structure or occupation.

Finally, in addition to being strong indicators of Army occupation ca. 1850–1855, the distribution of French transferware at Fort Vancouver also seems to confirm an association with higher status or socioeconomic class. Nearly all identified fragments have been found near structures linked to Army officers or other ranked individuals. In addition to the potential links to Andrew Bolon, Levi Holden, or the Quartermaster’s clerk, these include the fragments originally identified in Thomas’ (1988) Features 5 and 6 in Officers’ Row and those excavated in 2008 from Horton’s (2014) Feature 810, a privy located a short distance north of Thomas’ excavation trench. Conversely, none of these ceramics have yet been identified in the barracks. Although full analysis of these assemblages is beyond the scope of this thesis, the spatial distribution of French fragments does raise implications regarding the intersection of rank or class and nationality. The association of these artifacts not only with American occupations of Fort Vancouver during the 1850–1860 period, but specifically within upper middle-class contexts, confirms a relationship between class and consumption practices. Based on this, it is again apparent that any attempts to examine nationality within the archaeological record must account for potential class differences.
FIGURE 5.7. Locations of French ceramics currently identified at Fort Vancouver. (Figure by Douglas Wilson, 2023.)
Summary of Results

Table 5.9 summarizes the results of hypothesis testing and compares observations with the expectations previously stated in Table 3.1. At the commercial level (Hypothesis 1), all tests yielded statistically significant results that suggest an association between nationality and consumption. Tests comparing the Officers’ Quarters and Sutler’s Store (Hypothesis 2) were also statistically significant and indicate differences in American domestic versus commercial consumption practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HYPOTHESIS 1 (SALE SHOP × SUTLER’S STORE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>Transferprint predominant in both commercial assemblages, although Sutler includes more ironstone.</td>
<td>Transferprint predominant in HBC contexts; whiteware and ironstone predominant in Sutler’s Store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Many forms; tea wares especially prevalent in HBC context.</td>
<td>Tableware prevalent in Sutler’s Store; no tea wares in Sale Shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Both predominantly British, but more variety in American sites; Sale Shop mainly Spode.</td>
<td>Sale Shop predominantly Spode; Sutler’s Store predominantly French with few Spodewares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HYPOTHESIS 2 (SUTLER’S STORE × OFFICERS’ QUARTERS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>Similar proportions of ironstone; more transferprint in Sutler’s Store; more porcelain and other wares in Officers’ Quarters.</td>
<td>Whiteware and ironstone predominant in both Army sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Greater variability of forms in Officers’ Quarters, possibly due to differences in site function.</td>
<td>Many forms with similar proportions in both sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Officers’ Quarters include more British wares and Spode, although vessels from France and other locations are present.</td>
<td>Both predominantly British, but also a variety of non-British and/or non-Spodewares.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. CONCLUSION

In analyzing the ceramics of the Sutler’s Store, Sale Shop, and Officers’ Quarters, this thesis provides a novel contribution to scholarship on archaeological ceramics from the Pacific Northwest. This research improves current understandings of the range of goods available to consumers at Fort Vancouver and describes one of the various alternatives to the HBC Sale Shop during the mid-19th century. In particular, analysis of the French ceramics documents a class of material culture at Fort Vancouver that until present had not been thoroughly investigated. The descriptions provided here and in Appendix C may assist future identification of these artifacts and lead to better understandings of their distribution and use in the Pacific Northwest and at historical sites elsewhere.

Regarding the visibility of nationality in the archaeological record, comparisons of the U.S. Army Sutler’s Store and HBC Sale Shop confirm differences in ceramic consumption practices among American and British merchants at Fort Vancouver. Variations in ware type, form, and origin occur along national lines, but these may not be due solely to the nationality of the respective consumers. The complex relationships between consumption, economic factors, and social identities indicates that expressions of nationality were likely multifaceted.

Previous archaeological studies and historical accounts establish a strong association between American consumers and ironstone ceramics. Although ironstone is present within the Sutler’s Store assemblage, the prevalence of transferprint challenges the assumption that ironstone or other white-bodied ceramics are “invariably” characteristic of Army sites at Fort Vancouver. Because the sutler was presumably marketing to American
soldiers and settlers, this may indicate more significant variability in the content of a “typical” American ceramic assemblage at this time.

The emphasis on transferprint in the Sutler’s Store suggests some similarity to the HBC consumption behaviors evident in the Sale Shop assemblage. Stylistic differences (namely, the *assiettes parlantes*), however, imply a departure from transferprint patterns favored by British fur traders. The fact that these were made in France rather than England contributes further to the apparent divergence. The presence of French *assiettes parlantes* in the Sutler’s Store minimally confirms differences in supply chains and acquisition by local vendors, but taken in the context of regional politics, these also point to the shifting consumption patterns of American consumers versus the British fur trade community.

To a certain degree, the conclusions drawn from the two commercial assemblages are borne out by comparisons with the Officers’ Quarters. As noted, the Sutler’s Store and Officers’ Quarters contain similar proportions of ironstone, each of which are greater than proportions present in the HBC Sale Shop. This distinction confirms that local use of ironstone represents a largely American behavior, although not necessarily to the extent suggested by previous studies. Outside of ironstone, the Officers’ Quarters assemblage generally lacks a one-to-one correlation with the Sutler’s Store in terms of ware type, form, and manufacturer. The distinctions between the domestic and commercial contexts highlight three points:

First, artifactual differences underscore the distinct formation processes affecting each site. The beginning of Chapter 5 explains how practices and the associated material culture vary according to the activities occurring within a given context. As such, some of
the variability observed between the Sutler’s Store and Officers’ Quarters, such as
differences in vessel form, may be due to site function. Meanwhile, the Sutler’s Store and
Sale Shop are more comparable in terms of initial formation processes because both
represent surficial refuse deposited within a retail context. However, post-depositional
disturbances since 1860 have heavily impacted the Sale Shop ceramics, leading to high
fragmentation rates and artifact identification issues. Comparatively, burial of the Officers’
Quarters and Sutler’s Store in the 19th century has limited post-depositional disturbances
to these sites.

Second, comparison of the Sutler’s Store and Officers’ Quarters points to
variability in household acquisition behaviors. Within the Officers’ Quarters, the presence
of Spodewares—traditionally associated with HBC importation at Fort Vancouver—as
well as French transferprint, implies that the associated Army officers’ households
acquired their ceramics from multiple sources, including the Sutler’s Store and the Sale
Shop. Other sources, yet unknown, are also evident in vessels not clearly linked to either
establishment. Taken collectively, this information signifies that consumers in this
household were not exclusive to any particular store on the basis of nationality. Selection
of ceramic vessels may have instead drawn from other personal and external factors, such
as taste, availability, and cost.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, is that consumption tied to nationality is not
cleanly cut and is highly dependent on individual circumstances. Based on this and prior
studies of archaeological ceramics at Fort Vancouver, socioeconomic class constituted a
significant factor for consumers within both fur trade and Army occupations. The cross-
cultural significance of socioeconomic class, as seen in the strict hierarchy of HBC society, as well as the rank-based system seen in the U.S. military, meant that both American and British consumers were guided by the social pressures of gentility in tandem with the economic wherewithal to purchase them.

On one hand, similarities in each assemblage highlights the parallels in how rank and class were conceived of within both British and American Victorian society. Both nationalities made conscious and unconscious efforts to communicate their social standing through social and material means. On the other hand, distinctions in precisely how status was expressed are also evident in the archaeological record. British identity was arguably tied to the nation’s economic and industrial prowess; accordingly, artifact assemblages establish that the HBC opted for British-made goods, with particular predilection for Spode transferprint. American officers, however, evidently acquired ceramics from a wider range of sources not delimited to the HBC nor to British goods in general. Such differences may represent a means to distinguish themselves from British cultural and economic influence while maintaining the classist structures common to British and American society.

The associations between nationality, ethnicity, and rank or class no doubt require further consideration as well. Despite the ethnic diversity present within fur trade society, ceramic assemblages largely reflect the material cultural of the HBC gentleman class, who ascribed to upper-class British sensibilities regarding use and display of pottery. Similarly, numerous ethnicities (almost entirely Euroamerican) comprised the ranks at U.S. Army Fort Vancouver, although much of this diversity was concentrated within the enlisted barracks rather than the officer households examined here. However, it is difficult to
extricate any one of these social identities from the others, especially without additional
data specific to individual households and occupants’ unique personal circumstances.

This thesis provides several preliminary conclusions, and there are numerous
opportunities to improve and build upon its findings. First, I note that this study is
regrettably lacking in its discussion of economic costs. Without a detailed historical record
of the Sutler’s Store ceramic inventory, the dollar amount charged for these items cannot
be ruled out as a reason the sutler or others apparently preferred one ceramic type versus
another. This information may be available in archives, but at the time of this research
many repositories had closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. As facilities reopen and
public access is restored, future studies should attempt to locate business records from the
Sutler’s Store or customs offices. Such documents, if located, may offer a better assessment
of the economic value of goods in the Sutler’s Store and how prices may have influenced
purchase decisions. Archival data may additionally provide information on individual
sutlers that would refine the site chronology.

Besides continued historical research, I also recommend expanding datasets to
include other museum accessions associated with the Sale Shop, Sutler’s Store, and
Officers’ Quarters, where available. The datasets used here are only partial representations
of historical consumption practices and possess various deficiencies affecting data quality
and interpretation. In particular, heavy fragmentation of the Sale Shop and Sutler’s Store
assemblages precluded functional analysis in many cases, and the findings presented here
are probably reflective of post-depositional processes as well as historical practices.
Additional studies should compare the datasets used here with previously excavated Sale
Shop accessions that may be more intact or well-preserved. Meanwhile, no other ceramic assemblages associated with either the Sutler’s Store or 1850s Officers’ Quarters have been excavated at this time, although these could become available in the future.

I also acknowledge that the comparison of domestic sites is limited in its range. The Officers’ Quarters’ cellar is representative of but one type of household specific to the upper-middle class of the American military, and therefore offers only a partial view of consumption practices within the larger community. The distribution of French sherds across Fort Vancouver seems to corroborate differences in ceramic assemblages tied to nationality, but it is beyond the scope of this thesis to examine all of those instances in depth. Comparison with additional domestic sites might provide a more complete sense of ceramic consumption and practices tied to nationality. Depending on the sites selected or the theoretical perspectives adopted, further studies could assist understandings of the relationship between ceramics and other identities, such as ethnicity or gender, and how these may have influenced concepts of national identity. Studies should also extend to households outside of U.S. Army Fort Vancouver, as the military environment undoubtedly affected practice and daily routines in ways different from that of civilians. Future researchers might additionally consider adopting a more diachronic approach to this topic by examining changes in ceramic assemblages over time. This might confirm the temporal range of the observations made here, and to what degree they may represent a temporary, situational reaction to the local and regional politics of the Pacific Northwest.

Finally, while this study pertains only to ceramic vessels, additional research should address matters of nationality using other artifact classes or material types; future studies
might consider clay tobacco pipes to explore practices related to smoking, for instance, or glass vessels and faunal remains to investigate potential differences in diet or dining practices. The results presented herein suggest that variations in consumption patterns tied to ceramics may have a national basis, although these practices may not have applied unilaterally. Consumption and practice are highly contextual and may vary according to the objects in question, the individuals involved, or the circumstances surrounding their use. Future studies may find that other archaeological datasets support or refute the conclusions formed here.

As discussed, the study of identity is highly complex, and this thesis provides only a glimpse into the numerous factors comprising national identity. By framing consumer practices within the context of a colonial setting, this research considers how and under what circumstances national identity was conceptualized in the 19th-century Pacific Northwest, with particular regard to class, socioeconomics, ethnicity, and race. While I adopted a comparatively narrow focus in examining consumption of historical ceramics, the theoretical basis of this work—the fundamental links between what we do, what we do not do, and who we are—retains applicability beyond a single artifact type, region, or timeframe. By continuing to recognize the relationships between consumption and practice, future researchers may be better equipped to address contemporary issues surrounding nationality and identity.
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APPENDIX A:
Sutler’s Store Flat Glass Analysis
SUTLER’S STORE FLAT GLASS ANALYSIS

Over the past four decades, archaeologists have recognized the value of flat glass as a tool for dating archaeological sites. Its abundance at historic sites provides a wealth of data with which to examine site chronology and use. This appendix discusses the flat glass assemblage associated with the 1850–1860s Army Sutler’s Store at Fort Vancouver.

Background

The use of flat glass to date historic sites is well documented among archaeologists (Chance and Chance 1976; Roenke 1978; Weiland 2009). Individual approaches vary, but broadly operate around the assumption that historic window glass thickness increased at a measurable rate over time. Of these investigations, Karl Roenke’s 1978 study is perhaps the most widely used among historic sites in the Pacific Northwest. Roenke’s method examines the mode thicknesses within an assemblage to provide a relative date for the site or structure. It is intended for sites with initial construction dates between 1810 and 1915.

Roenke developed his methods using 21,965 fragments of flat glass from 15 archaeological sites in Washington state and northern Idaho. He analyzed complete samples of sites wherever possible, but for large assemblages collected a random sample from each stratum or level. Variations in excavation techniques within and across sites were noted. Roenke recorded the thickness of each piece of glass to the nearest thousandth of an inch, measuring each three times to account for variations in thickness. The average of the minimum and maximum measurements was used for graphic representation. Roenke then distributed his data into size class intervals which were rounded to the class midpoint. Upon plotting the data for each site, Roenke found that glass from sites with initial
construction dates prior to 1850 were thinner than those postdating 1850. Based on known site chronologies, Roenke developed approximate glass manufacturing dates corresponding to each thickness interval (Table A-1). Roenke suggested these date ranges could be applied throughout the region by comparing the mode thickness from a given site. The mode would represent the initial date of construction, while bimodal distributions likely signified new construction or modifications.

### TABLE A-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval Midpoint (in.)</th>
<th>Manufacturing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>1810–1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>1820–1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>1830–1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.045–0.055</td>
<td>1835–1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>1845–1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>1850–1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>1855–1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>1870–1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>1900–1915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another significant component of Roenke’s work is the use of mean and median data. Roenke (1978:48–49) asserted that when examining complete samples of a site, “means and medians provide important information because our focus is much broader and the increased sample size, in many cases, enables us to more accurately represent the raw data with a single value.” Viewed collectively, these measures provide a more comprehensive view of site use and reuse. Roenke’s statement deviates in this regard from the approach developed by Chance and Chance (1976:248), whose data Roenke incorporated into his study.
Methods

Flat glass fragments from the Sutler’s Store assemblage were analyzed at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site in 2006 by archaeologists Jacqueline Cheung, Eric Gleason, Daniel Martin, and Angela Susak. In accordance with the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Laboratory Analysis Manual (Wilson et al. 2009), archaeologists measured the thickness of each piece of glass with digital calipers to the nearest thousandth of an inch and entered these data into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Raw data were then sorted into the size intervals as defined by Roenke (1978).

For statistical analyses, I excluded fragments of flat glass recorded as having silver oxide coating, which would suggest use as mirror glass rather than a window (n=10). I also limited my study to materials east of Feature 25, the historical Sutler’s Store stockade. As described in Chapter 4, areas west of Feature 25 are assumed to fall outside the yard and activity areas associated with the Sutler’s Store. Twenty (20) pieces of flat glass were found west of this feature.

Results and Interpretations

The total sample size was 3,351 fragments of window glass (Table A-2). Feature 23 (the Sutler’s Store privy) contained the greatest density of flat glass with 1,975 total fragments, or 1,115.8 fragments/m³. Much of this was concentrated near the top of the feature: nearly half of all flat glass (n=963) in the privy occurred within the top 20 cm, and over 80% occurred within the upper 30 cm. The historical fill directly above Feature 23 (below the macadam) demonstrated a similarly high artifact density (n=338; 768.2
fragments/m³), possibly due to admixture with feature sediments. The Sutler’s Store yard meanwhile contained 903 pieces of flat glass, or approximately 261.4 fragments/m³. A total of 134 pieces were found in the macadam (85.9 fragments/m³), and only one in Feature 25 (12.4 fragments/m³). No flat glass was recovered from Feature 24, the post hole.

All flat glass fragments measured under 6 cm in maximum diameter. Laboratory analysts recorded two fragments as having been burnt (one each from the macadam and yard deposits) with an additional 30 fragments exhibiting signs of devitrification. Devitrification is a physical process in which glass is transformed from an amorphous solid to a crystalline structure, usually by exposure to extreme heat (Cummings 1997:44–45). The result is a dull appearance and brittle texture. Most devitrified flat glass was recovered from the upper portions of the privy feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval Midpoint (in.)</th>
<th>Feature 23 (Privy)</th>
<th>Feature 25 (Stockade)</th>
<th>Yard</th>
<th>Historical Fill</th>
<th>Macadam</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3,351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mode thickness for all areas was 0.065 in. (Figure A-1), except for Feature 25, which contained a single piece of flat glass measuring 0.071 in. Based on Roenke’s estimates, a mode of 0.065 in. correlates to manufacture between 1845 and 1855, consistent
with the store’s assumed construction in about 1850 or any reconstructions following the 1853 explosion. All distributions were unimodal. Meanwhile, the combined mean for the Sutler’s Store (all proveniences) was 0.071 in. and the median was 0.070 in. The right-skewed distribution implies continued deposition after the 1845–1855 period, again consistent with the historical chronology of the Sutler’s Store. The structure remained in use as a store until at least 1858 before disappearing between 1860 and 1869.

Comparing the means and medians within each area of the Sutler’s Store proved additionally informative. The mean thickness for the privy, historic fill, and macadam were 0.070, 0.070, and 0.076 in., respectively, with medians of 0.070, 0.069, and 0.072 in. These
distributions also skewed to the right (Figures A-2 and A-3). Fragment thicknesses within the yard, however, were more centrally distributed with the mean and median both at 0.068 in., possibly indicating an earlier average date for this provenience. Eighty-three percent of all fragments in the yard fell within the intervals between 0.055 and 0.075 in., more than any other provenience. Over 19% of fragments were in the 0.055 in. interval alone, while no other provenience contained more than 12% in this size class.

![Ogive of cumulative glass thicknesses, by analytic unit. (Figure by author, 2023.)](image)

Sheet trash by its nature is often difficult to date, so it is curious that the yard deposit is the most centrally distributed area within the larger Sutler’s Store assemblage. While all proveniences returned a mode corresponding to the years 1845 to 1855, other areas suggest use extending beyond this period. A potential explanation is that the yard was used for only
a short period before being covered or otherwise abandoned. Certainly, the dense and highly fragmented ceramic deposit in the yard resembles a mass disposal event more so than gradual accumulation. If it were a temporary or makeshift disposal area, then it may have been covered more promptly. In addition, Feature 24 cut through a portion of the yard, indicating that it was at least partially buried by that time.

Subsequent reconstruction or modification may further explain variability among distributions. The upper portions of the privy and historical fill apparently represent structural debris (Chapter 4), probably from the final abandonment of the Sutler’s Store between 1860 and 1869. If true, then the glass deposited might have incorporated newer, thicker panes to replace those presumably damaged by the 1853 explosion. The macadam fill meanwhile probably contains glass from various sources not necessarily associated with the Sutler’s Store.

**Conclusion**

The window glass data presented here provide an informative look into the remains of the 1850s Sutler’s Store at Fort Vancouver. Like the ceramic dates discussed in Chapter 4, window glass dates suggest varying timeframes and modes of disposal associated with each area of the store. These data augment the known history of the site and provide valuable information about site use and reuse. Artifactual data such as these will continue to refine local site chronology as additional materials from the Sutler’s Store are analyzed.
FIGURE A-3. Box-and-whisker distribution of glass thickness classes. (Figure by author, 2023.)
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APPENDIX B:
Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Archaeology Laboratory Manual (Ceramic Analysis and General Measurement Procedures)
Ceramics

Degree of Difficulty: HIGH

The ceramic category encompasses any objects made of fired clay, including pottery, dishes, figurines, doorknobs, insulators, etc. These objects are typically classified into three primary groups—earthenware, stoneware, and porcelain—based on the properties of the clay and the temperature to which they were fired.

Ceramic vessel sherds represent one of the most frequently analyzed artifact categories in historical archaeology, due to the large numbers of industrially-manufactured ceramic vessels that were shipped world-wide in developing market economies. Here at Vancouver National Historic Reserve, it is not uncommon for ceramic sherds to compose 25–30% of the total number of artifacts recovered in an excavation. This reflects the durability of ceramic sherds in the archaeological record, while showing the relative fragility of ceramic vessels in everyday life. European- and American-made ceramic vessels of the 18th to 20th centuries can be used to interpret various behaviors, economic status, consumer choices, and gender and age differentiation of the individuals who utilized and disposed of them.

This introduction cannot teach you all that you need to know about ceramic vessel analysis. Indeed, it can take many months of active analysis to grasp all ware types, decoration types, and vessel forms that are encountered here. However, this will help you become familiar with the vocabulary and types of vessels. Please schedule a short training meeting with a lab supervisor before beginning analysis. A particularly useful and concise introduction to ceramic ware types, and decorations commonly found at Fort Vancouver can be found in Linda Ferguson Sprague’s thesis on San Juan Island Ceramics (1980:15–40). Another useful reference to familiarize you with ceramics is the Diagnostic Artifacts in Maryland website: www.jefpat.org/diagnostic/index.htm. Information on more specific decoration types can be found in the references and archaeological reports listed below.

A short description of the most common types of ceramics is provided below:

**Earthenware:** A ceramic type that is typified by a soft porous opaque paste, which can vary in color from white to tan to gray. It is the lowest fired ceramic ware, and without a glaze, will allow liquids to penetrate into its body. When broken, these wares tend to be quite porous on the edges. Most earthenwares tend to be glazed on both sides, which may craze. This category of ware is the most common found at Fort Vancouver, and is represented by most tablewares such as plates, cups, saucers, and serving pieces.
Stoneware: A ceramic type that is typified by a hard opaque paste, varying in color from gray, to tan, to red. It is higher fired than earthenware, and will resist liquid penetration unless soaked for prolonged periods of time. Stonewares are typically glazed, most often with a “salt glaze” to enhance appearance and water resistance. Most vessels made of stoneware are utilitarian in nature and used for food transportation or storage, such as bottles, jars, jugs, and crocks.

Porcelain: A ceramic type that is typified by being highly fired and smooth, varying in color from white to gray. Due to its strong, compact nature, porcelains can be very thin, and are translucent when thin enough. Porcelains are fired to the point where they are nearly a glass, and are completely impermeable to water without requiring a glaze. Most porcelains recovered at Fort Vancouver are represented by wares exported from China and Japan, with grayish bodies, and blue hand-decorated designs. Many of these are semi-vitrified and not technically true porcelains, however we will classify them as such. Late 19th-century and early 20th-century porcelains tend to be Chinese, European, and American, and may have thin, clear glazes protecting decal or hand painted designs.

Transferprint: Though actually a decoration type, and not a ceramic ware, we include this as a major category in our analyses due to its high frequency at Fort Vancouver. Transferprinted wares were the most common type of decorative ware produced by the potteries in Staffordshire, England in the early to mid-19th century. Transferprinting involved engraving an image on a copper plate, inking the plate, then transferring the ink to an unfired clay vessel with a special thin paper. The vessel is then glazed and fired, leaving a permanent, rapidly replicable design. Most typically found on earthenware with a white body, transferware can be found with blue, red, green, brown, black, or pink designs. Transferprint on ironstone is also frequent for ceramics dating from the 1850s at Vancouver National Historic Reserve.

Ironstone: A ceramic type that is of a harder consistency than earthenware, semi-vitrified, yet often softer than stoneware, and always white in body. This type was patented in England in 1813, and was quite common throughout the 19th century. Ironstone is typically white with a transparent glaze, undecorated, and often formed in angular or impressed designs. This type is also sometimes referred to as “white graniteware.” Please see the Wetherbee (1996) reference for more information.

Lot: Fill in the assigned lot number.
Spec: Fill in the assigned specimen number.
Unit: Fill in the assigned unit number, include operation if applicable.
Level: Fill in the assigned level number
Object: Be as specific as possible: the following are common object names we get at Fort Vancouver, but you need not be limited to these.

EARTHENWARE
IRONSTONE
PORCELAIN
STONEWARE
TERRA COTTA
TRANSFERPRINT

N: Identify the number of objects or fragments.

Condition: First record the completeness of the object:
  COM (Complete – you have the entire object)
  INC (Incomplete – you have more than half of the original object but not all of it)
  FRG (Fragment – you have less than half of the original object)

Then record the condition of the object:
  EX (Excellent – no damage or deterioration)
  GD (Good – minor damage and no active deterioration)
  FR (Fair – some damage and/or active deterioration)
  PR (Poor – significant damage and/or active deterioration)

As a guideline, a fragment will never be defined as Excellent due to its broken edges. Items that fall apart with casual handling are in Poor condition.

Size (mm): Record the size of the artifact using the size target (see General Measurement section).

Description: This field’s entries will vary based on which ceramic type is being analyzed.

Earthenware
Color of body, and color and type of decoration, e.g.:
  Color of body, Bandedware, (Describe Decoration; e.g., Catseye)
  Creamware
  Color of body, Lustreware
  Color of body, Mochaware
  Redware, Brown Albany Slip
  Redware, Brown Lustre Glaze
  Redware, Brown Salt Glaze
  Redware, Brown Slip Glaze
  Redware, Clear Slip Glaze
Redware, Red Slip Glaze
Redware, White Tin Glaze
Redware, White Slip Glaze
Redware, Rockingham Glaze
Redware, Lustre Glaze Exterior, White Slip Interior
Redware, Yellow Slip Exterior, White Slip Interior
Redware, Brown Salt Glaze Exterior, White Slip Interior
Redware, Rockingham Exterior, White Interior
Whiteware, Brown Slip Glaze
Whiteware, Gold Leaf Rim Band
Whiteware, Mold Impressed Flower Petals
Whiteware, Scalloped Edge, Green Hand Painted
Whiteware, Undecorated
Whiteware, White Salt Glaze
Whiteware, With Gilding
Whiteware, Black Stamped Makers Mark
Whiteware, Blue Hand Painted
Whiteware, Blue-Green Slip Glaze
Whiteware, Cottageware, (Describe Decoration; e.g., Polychrome hand painted plants)
Whiteware, Gothic Molded
Whiteware, Green and Blue Underglaze Hand Painted
Whiteware, Molded Grass Blades
Whiteware, Molded Scallops
Whiteware, No Glaze
Whiteware, White Shelledge
Whiteware, Blue Shelledge
Whiteware, Green Shelledge
Whiteware, Soft Paste Molded
Whiteware, Overglaze Bands
Whiteware, Spongeware
Yellowware
Yellowware, Molded Raised Scallops

Ironstone
Impressed shapes:
  Angular
  Floral
  Fluted
  Gothic
  Impressed Grapes
  Impressed Wheat
  Woven
Porcelain
Color of body, and color and type of decoration:
   Electrical Porcelain
   Gray With Blue Hand Painting
   Gray With Red Hand Painting
   White, Undecorated
   White, Blue Hand Painting (or other colors)
   White, Gold applied edge

Stoneware
Color of body, and color and type of glaze:
   Buff, Buff Salt Glaze Exterior, Brown Luster Interior
   Buff, Buff Salt Glaze Interior and Exterior
   Buff, Brown Salt Glaze Exterior, Clear Salt Glaze Interior
   Buff, Brown Salt Glaze Exterior, Unglazed Interior
   Buff, Brown Salt Glaze Exterior, Yellow Slip Glaze Interior
   Buff, Brown Salt Glaze Exterior and Interior
   Buff, Yellow and Brown Slip Glaze
   Buff, Yellow Salt Glaze Exterior, Brown Slip Interior
   Buff, Yellow Salt Glaze Exterior, Unglazed Interior
   Buff, Yellow Salt Glaze Interior and Exterior
   Clay Pigeon
   Gray, Undecorated
   Gray, Brown Salt Glaze Exterior, White Salt Glaze Interior
   Gray, Brown Salt Glaze Exterior, Clear Slip Glaze Interior
   Gray, Brown Salt Glaze Exterior and Interior
   Gray, Brown Salt Glaze Exterior, Yellow Slip Glaze Interior
   Gray With Clear Salt Glaze
   Gray, Brown Slip Glaze Exterior, Unglazed Interior
   Gray With Yellow Slip Glaze

Terra Cotta
Color of body, and color and type of glaze (if present)

Transferprint
Color(s) of transferprinted design:
   Black
   Blue
   Brown
   Dark Purplish Blue
   Flow Blue
   Flow Dark Blue
   Green
   Mulberry
Purple
Red

If the body of the ceramic is ironstone and not earthenware, specify that as well.

Form: Record the vessel form as best as can be determined from the sherd. If you cannot determine the vessel form more specifically, use “Unknown,” “Hollowware,” or “Flatware,” to the extent you can identify the vessel.

Ale Bottle
Blacking Bottle
Bottle
Bowl
Cup
Chamber Pot
Crock
Dinner Plate
Dessert Plate
Figurine or Toy (be as specific as possible)
Flatware
Flower Pot
Fruit Dish
Ginger Jar
Handle
Hollowware
Ink Bottle
Jar
Jug
Mug
Pitcher
Sauce Boat
Snuff Jar
Soy Sauce Pot
Tea Pot
Plate
Pot
Platter
Saucer
Sewer Tile
Slop Bowl
Soup Tureen
Soup Plate
Vegetable Dish
Unknown
Wash Basin

Type: Record the component of the vessel that the sherd represents.

- Base
- Body
- Foot
- Handle
- Lid
- Rim
- Spout

Style: Record the pattern name for Transferprint wares if determinable, e.g., “Broseley.” Common patterns found at Vancouver National Historic Reserve are shown in Sussman (1978, 1979) and Chapman (1993).

Manufacturer: Record the name of the manufacturer if determinable. Since company names changed over time, be sure you use the correct version of the name for the date the piece was manufactured. Examples are:

- Charles Meigh
- Copeland & Garrett
- W.T. Copeland
- Dillwyn & Co.
- Edward Challinor & Co.
- Enoch Wood and Sons
- G. Phillips, Thomas Godwin (Chapman, p. 146)
- Henry & William Davenport
- J. & M.P. Bell
- James & Thomas Edwards
- John and William Ridgeway
- John Mier
- John Thomson
- Joseph Clementson
- Marple, Turner & Co.
- Minton, Stoke-On-Trent
- Podmore, Walker & Co.
- Ralph & James Clews
- Robinson & Wood
- Samuel Alcock
- Spode, Various Others (See Chapman, p. 162
- T. Hughes
- T. J. & J. Mayer
T. Mayer
Thomas Dimmock Jr. & Co.
Thomas Edwards
Unknown
Various
William Adams & Son
William Davenport & Co.
William Davenport Firm
William Ridgeway & Co.
Wood & Brownfield
Unknown

Manufacture Dates: For identified patterns, record the dates of manufacture. If the ceramic is 19th-century Staffordshire of unknown type, it is likely of Hudson’s Bay Company origin, and it is appropriate to use the dates of “ca. 1829–1860.”

Place of Manufacture: Record the place where the ceramic was likely made:

- China
- England
- Europe
- Japan
- USA
- Unknown

Surface Modifications: Record the presence of any of the following surface modifications:

- Burned
- Crazed
- Pot Lidded
- Use Wear

Notes: Record any other relevant information you feel is necessary for this ceramic sherd. This includes the vessel number category. All sherds that obviously belong to the same vessel should be given the same vessel number, beginning with “1.” This can be difficult to keep track of, so it is important to document how vessel numbers are assigned and tracked, preferably in a sheet of lab notes. We often keep a separate Word or hand-written document with notes on analysis (conventions, shortcuts, etc.), especially for the more complex artifact types.
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General Measurement Procedures

Using the Size Target

Many artifact types are measured with the size target. The size target is similar to a bull’s eye, but its use is much different. This target will enable you to quickly determine a size range (in mm). The size target is used to measure the maximum dimension for a specific artifact. Many types of artifacts, such as ceramics and glass, often break in irregular patterns, making it difficult and unwieldy to record every dimension of a sherd. Therefore, we only measure and record the maximum dimension for these artifacts. The size target is not used for every artifact type, since some objects require the use of calipers for more specific measurements. Please refer to the specific information for each artifact type to determine if you should use the size target or the calipers.

On the size target, center the artifact over the bull’s eye. Let your eyes center the artifact; most people innately place an object in the center of a circle. Looking at the artifact, determine the largest dimension—look for corners and edges that extend further over the target lines than other areas of the artifact. With the artifact centered, and the areas that extend the furthest out from the center determined, look carefully at the size target. Record the measurement that corresponds to the ring closest to the maximum dimension of the artifact that is not actually intersected by any part of the object. In Figure 3 the artifact should be recorded as 40 mm.

Figure 3. Using the size target.
APPENDIX C:
Sutler’s Store French Transferprint Patterns
SUTLER’S STORE FRENCH TRANSFERPRINT PATTERNS

Archaeological excavations have revealed a large concentration of French transferprint ceramics associated with the 1850–1860s Sutler’s Store in the West Barracks area of U.S. Army Fort Vancouver. Although British ceramics associated with the activities of the Hudson’s Bay Company at Fort Vancouver have been subject to extensive archaeological and historical study (Sussman 1979; Cromwell 2006; Wilson et al. 2009), the import of French ceramics to this location is less well documented. To aid future identification and analysis of these materials at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (FVNHS), this appendix summarizes information on French transferprint patterns excavated from the Sutler’s Store in 2004, including photographs, pattern names, makers’ marks, dates, and manufacturing locations, where known. It also provides a brief background on the 19th-century French earthenware industry.

Faïence Fine and Porcelaine Opaque

The ceramics described herein are white-bodied earthenwares known in French as faïence fine. This term refers not to tin-glazed earthenwares (designated variously as faïence, faïence commune, majolica, or delftware) but rather to ceramics possessing an opaque white paste and transparent lead glaze. Widespread production of faïence fine began in France by the mid-18th century and rapidly expanded to include numerous varieties and subtypes.1

1 According to Figuier ([1877]:363), other names given to faïence fine include, in French, porcelaine opaque, demi-porcelaine, cailloutage, lithocérame, granit, and china; he also provides several English near-synonyms, among them “earthen vase, flint-vase, ironstone, Wedgwood, white glaze, white-granit, cream-
Broadly speaking, European ceramic industries at this time revolved around the massive consumer demand for porcelain goods. However, because porcelain itself was costly to produce, earthenware factories often focused upon cheaper alternatives that mimicked the strength and whiteness of genuine porcelain. The leaders of this effort were arguably the Staffordshire potteries, but French manufacturers of faïence fine likewise sought to improve upon their products, introducing a so-called porcelaine opaque in the early 19th century. Contrary to its name, this ware was not a true vitrified porcelain and was instead made by incorporating flint and feldspar into a fine plastic clay (Beauvoit et al. 2020). Porcelaine opaque was modeled after popular English earthenwares and was thus also known as faïence anglaise. To perfect the manufacturing process, French potteries hired managers with expertise in the English methods, among them Thomas Hall at Gien, Pierre-Honoré Boudon de Saint-Amans at Bordeaux, and George Vernon at the factories of Creil and Montereau (Labadie 1916; Bontillot 1997; Richard 2012).

Despite these measures, historical sources have stated that the early French earthenwares were considered generally inferior to their English antecedents. One French encyclopedist opined that French ceramics were perhaps whiter than those from England but lacked sufficient hardness (Bontemps 1841:1855). Others meanwhile maintained that the French product was of comparable quality but could not compete with English potteries in terms of cost (Newton 1836). The success of French potteries was significantly inhibited

colour, [and] pearl-glaze.” He notes that these terms are not strictly interchangeable and denote assorted subtypes of faïence fine rather than a single homogeneous product. Figuier’s commentary on the variety of terms is not unlike that discussed over a century later by Majewski and O’Brien (1987), Peiffer (2003), and numerous others. Clearly, inconsistent naming conventions for white-bodied ceramics is neither a solely modern issue nor one restricted to English-language authors.
by poor access to seaports, disadvantageous trade agreements, and the scarcity of cheap fuel for kilns, among other issues (Newton 1836; Bontemps 1841:1854–1855; Bontillot 1997). However, some writers later noted modifications to *porcelaine opaque* that may have improved consumer perceptions. Increasing the proportion of feldspathic minerals, for instance, enhanced strength and durability, and the addition of cobalt oxide to the paste and glaze further whitened its appearance (Beauvoit, Amara, Cantin et al. 2020; Beauvoit, Amara, Tessier-Doyen et al. 2021). Chemical analyses suggest that potteries also made adjustments to the firing process over time (Beauvoit et al. 2020). By the close of the 19th century, at least one American magazine agreed that *porcelaine opaque* rivalled English whitewares in quality and had “legitimately compelled the public favor” (Foy 1898:12).

**Assiettes Parlantes**

Most of the French vessels identified within the Sutler’s Store are plates known today as *assiettes parlantes*. While both *faïence fine* and *porcelaine opaque* denote the physical composition of the paste and glaze, the term *assiette parlante* refers to a particular decorative style applied mainly to dessert plates. Fragments of *assiettes parlantes* have been found previously at Fort Vancouver (Thomas and Hibbs 1984:477; Thomas 1988:11) but until now have not been described in depth.

Also known as “speaking plates,” *assiettes parlantes* are defined broadly by their narrative illustration style. Whereas other decorative modes tended to depict generic landscapes or floral designs, *assiettes parlantes* routinely drew upon popular culture for inspiration, providing explicit commentary on current events and poking fun at daily life.
Table C-1 describes some of the topics portrayed on *assiettes parlantes* from the Sutler’s Store. Plates were usually produced in sets of 12, each of which bore a unique image and accompanying caption. Sets were ideal for use at social events: as the meal progressed and guests revealed their respective plates, the subject matter depicted would inevitably encourage conversation. Bouyssy (2014:133) remarks that the name “speaking plates” therefore referred not only to the inscription on each plate but also for the discussions they undoubtedly prompted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Imagery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td><em>Révolution de 1848</em></td>
<td>Lebeuf Milliet &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>Soldiers; civilians; Parisian buildings and scenery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Soldats-2 (Maniement d’armes)</em></td>
<td>Lebeuf Milliet &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>French soldiers; Napoleonic emblems and weaponry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Troubadours</em></td>
<td>Lebeuf Milliet &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>Medieval courts; minstrels and ladies; castles; horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td><em>Rébus</em></td>
<td>Geoffroy de Boulen &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>Rebus puzzles with assorted symbols and text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td><em>Le Comte de Monte-Cristo</em></td>
<td>Lebeuf Milliet &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>Characters from novel by Alexandre Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Le Juif Errant</em></td>
<td>J. Vieillard &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>Characters from novel by Eugène Sue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Life</td>
<td><em>Jeux d’Enfants</em></td>
<td>Lebeuf Milliet &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>Children’s toys and games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified Series /</td>
<td>J. Vieillard &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>French villagers; rural scenery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Amants Bretons</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the stylistic origins of *assiettes parlantes* extend to at least the 18th century, industrialization during the 19th century increased their prevalence exponentially (Decker 2003; Musée Ariana 2017). As factories intensified production, the originally hand-painted plates gave way to transferprint, allowing for quicker and cheaper replication of designs. Now widely available, *assiettes parlantes* were marketed to a range of socioeconomic classes in France and gained particular traction among the middle classes between 1830
and 1850. Interestingly, the Musée Ariana (2017:5) also associates the popularity of *assiettes parlantes* with the shift from French to Russian serving practices at this time. The former, *service à la française*, is a formal style of dining in which all items within a course arrive simultaneously, and guests serve themselves from dishes arranged on the table. *Service à la russe*, meanwhile, involves consecutive courses each brought from the kitchen and apportioned by servants. The latter style of serving requires individual place settings for the dessert course, for which *assiettes parlantes* were well suited.

*Assiettes parlantes* excavated from Fort Vancouver are typically printed in combinations of black, green, and/or blue. Due to their unique appearance, these are easily distinguishable from transferprint vessels distributed by the Hudson’s Bay Company (Sussman 1979). Table C-2 characterizes some of these stylistic differences. Note that not all French transferprint vessels are *assiettes parlantes* (e.g., the *Service Turc* or *Floral Sheet* patterns) nor should it be assumed that any *assiette parlante* is necessarily French, as manufacturers from Belgium, Switzerland, Germany, and England also produced plates in this style (Musée Ariana 2017:4). That stated, all *assiettes parlantes* in the Sutler’s Store assemblage have been attributed to French potteries. Trademarks associated with each of these companies are illustrated in Table C-3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assiettes Parlantes</th>
<th>Other Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mono- or polychromatic; examples in Sutler’s Store often black and/or blue.</td>
<td>• Usually monochromatic; often blue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rébus (Photo courtesy of FVNHS.)</td>
<td>Camilla (Photo courtesy of FVNHS.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Themes follow popular culture, history, etc.; includes a caption for each scene.</td>
<td>• Often depict floral, romantic, classical, or oriental motifs and panoramas; designs do not typically include text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers-2 and Le Comte de Monte-Cristo (Photo by author, 2018.)</td>
<td>Palestine (Photo by author, 2018.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Character-centric; people feature prominently in narrative scenes.</td>
<td>• People, if present, serve mainly to provide a sense of scale or setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers-2 (Photo courtesy of FVNHS.)</td>
<td>Adelaide’s Bower (Photo by author, 2019.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE C-3
FRENCH POTTERY TRADEMARKS WITHIN THE SUTLER’S STORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark/Inscription</th>
<th>Manufacturer/Date</th>
<th>Associated Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebeuf Milliet &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>1845–1849</td>
<td>Jeux d’Enfants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Le Comte de Monte-Cristo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Révolution de 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soldats-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Troubadours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEBEUF MILLETS & CIE \ Médaillles d’or \ 1834–39 ET 44 \ Porcelaine Opaque \ Creil et Montereauch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark/Inscription</th>
<th>Manufacturer/Date</th>
<th>Associated Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Vieillard &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>1845–1895</td>
<td>Le Juif Errant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unnamed Floral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheet Pattern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. \ Vieillard \ & Cie. \ Bordeaux \ Porcelaine Opaque Anglaise D. Johnston.

Photo by Troy Wayrynen, 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark/Inscription</th>
<th>Manufacturer/Date</th>
<th>Associated Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Vieillard &amp; Cie.</td>
<td>1845–1895</td>
<td>Unidentified Series / Amants Breton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photo by Troy Wayrynen, 2019.

[J. \ VIEILLARD \ & CIE.] \ PORCELAINE[E D. JOH]NST[ON. \ MÉDAILLES D’OR \ BORDEAUX.]

Geoffroy de Boulen & Cie. | Rébus

1848(?)–1851

InfoFaience (2020) provides a date range of March 1848 to October 1851 for this mark. Ariès et al. (1995:105) meanwhile state that the Gien pottery of Guyon de Boulen & Cie. rebranded as Geoffroy de Boulen & Cie. “for a few months” in 1851 before several subsequent name changes.

Photo by Troy Wayrynen, 2019.

[MÉDAILLE EXPOSITION 1844]. \ [G]EOFFR[O]Y \ DE BOULEN \ & CIE \ GIEN. \ [POR]CELAINE OPAQUE.
PLATE IMAGES AND SUMMARIES

Plate summaries are organized according to manufacturer. For plates produced by Lebeuf Milliet & Compagnie, particular credit is due to Jacques Bontillot’s (2015) extensive research of the Creil-Montereau potteries, including use of Bontillot’s pattern names and manufacturing date ranges. Summaries of the Gien and Bordeaux potteries are based on a variety of French and English-language sources from academics, collectors, and online vendors.
Lebeuf Milliet & Cie.

**Jeux d’Enfants**

The *Jeux d’Enfants* series illustrates various children’s games and toys (Bontillot 2015:217–220). Plates excavated from the Sutler’s Store are printed in black with a border of blue dots.

![Fragment of a porcelain plate from the Jeux d’Enfants series]

Photo by Troy Wayrynen, 2019.

**Manufacturer:** Lebeuf Milliet & Compagnie

**Manufacturing Location:** Creil, France

**Date:** 1846–1849. Bontillot (2015:220) indicates this pattern was produced after May 1846 to sometime before April 1867. Marks found with plates in the Sutler’s Store date to 1845 through November 1849 (Bontillot 2015:9).
Le Comte de Monte-Cristo

The series *Le Comte de Monte-Cristo* depicts scenes from Alexandre Dumas’ 1844 novel of the same name (Bontillot 2015:229–232). Engravings appear to be based on Paul Gavarni and Tony Johannot’s illustrations for the 1846 edition of the book. Plates excavated from the Sutler’s Store are printed in black with a blue floral border.

**Manufacturer:** Lebeuf Milliet & Compagnie

**Manufacturing Location:** Creil, France

**Date:** 1846–1849. Bontillot (2015:232) indicates this pattern was produced after May 1846 to sometime before April 1867. Marks found with plates in the Sutler’s Store date to 1845 through November 1849 (Bontillot 2015:9).
Lebeuf Milliet & Cie.

Révolution de 1848

The Révolution de 1848 series depicts historical scenes from the French Revolution of 1848 (Bontillot 2015:275–278). The central scene is printed in black. The border, printed in blue, includes a repeating pattern of five-pointed stars, flags, and leafy cartouches each containing the words FÉVRIER, MAI, or JUIN.

Manufacturer: Lebeuf Milliet & Compagnie

Manufacturing Location: Creil, France

Date: 1848–1849. The plates depict events which took place in 1848 and therefore postdate that time. Marks found with plates in the Sutler’s Store date to 1845 through November 1849 (Bontillot 2015:9).
Lebeuf Milliet & Cie.

**Soldats-2 (Maniement d’armes)**

The *Soldats-2* series depicts soldiers of *La Grande Armée* demonstrating the proper handling of arms (Bontillot 2015:283–286). The engravings are printed in black and appear to be based upon a series of lithographs produced by artist Jean-Victor Adam sometime after 1824 (Adam [1824]). The border, printed in blue, is decorated with military symbols including imperial eagles, garlands, and period weaponry.

Photo by Troy Wayrynen, 2019.

**Manufacturer:** Lebeuf Milliet & Compagnie

**Manufacturing Location:** Creil, France

**Date:** 1846–1849. Bontillot (2015:286) indicates this pattern was produced after May 1846 to sometime before April 1867. Marks found with plates in the Sutler’s Store date to 1845 through November 1849 (Bontillot 2015:9).
Lebeuf Milliet & Cie.

Troubadours

The Troubadours series displays various scenes relating to minstrels and medieval courts (Bontillot 2015:287–290). The central designs are printed in black. Three associated border patterns have been identified: two of these are printed in either blue or green with additional hand-painted flowers. The third variation (not pictured) is printed in black and lacks hand-painted decoration.

Photo by Troy Wayrynen, 2019.

Manufacturer: Lebeuf Milliet & Compagnie

Manufacturing Location: Montereau, France

Date: 1847–1849. Bontillot (2015:290) indicates this pattern was produced after January 1847 to sometime before April 1867. Marks found with plates in the Sutler’s Store date to 1845 through November 1849 (Bontillot 2015:9).
Border Variations:

Photo by Troy Wayrynen, 2019.
Geoffroy de Boulen & Cie.

**Rébus**

The Rébus series is a set of rebus puzzles, which employ a combination a pictures and letters to depict a word or phrase. Complete examples of some plates in the series have been located, but the remaining puzzles remain unsolved. All fragments within the Sutler’s Store are printed in black.

![Photo of rebus fragments](image)

*Photo by Troy Wayrynen, 2019.*

**Manufacturer:** Geoffroy de Boulen & Compagnie

**Manufacturing Location:** Gien, France

**Date:** 1848(?)–1851 (Ariès et al. 1995:105; InfoFaience 2020).
Le Juif Errant is a collection of vignettes from Eugène Sue’s 1844 novel of the same name. The engravings for the plates appear to be based on Paul Gavarni’s illustrations for the 1845 edition of Sue’s book. Plates recovered from the Sutler’s Store are printed in blue.

Manufacturer: J. Vieillard & Compagnie

Manufacturing Location: Bordeaux, France

Date: 1845–1895
J. Vieillard & Cie.

*Unidentified Series/Amants Bretons*

Fragments of a rural scene entitled *Amants Bretons* were recovered during the Sutler’s Store excavations. Associated marks indicate the plate was manufactured by J. Vieillard & Compagnie, although neither the original series name nor the remaining plates within the series have been identified. The central design is printed in black with a plaid border in black and blue.

*Manufacturer: J. Vieillard & Compagnie*

*Manufacturing Location: Bordeaux, France*

*Date: 1845–1895*
J. Vieillard & Cie.

**Floral Sheet Pattern**

This sheet pattern consists of seven-petaled flowers separated by long, leafy vines. The original pattern name is currently unknown.

Manufacturer: J. Vieillard & Compagnie

Manufacturing Location: Bordeaux, France

Date: 1845–1895. Fragments found in the Sutler’s Store are marked “J. Vieillard & Compagnie” (1845–1895). Complete examples from online vendors indicate this pattern was also produced by the firm’s predecessors, D. Johnston & Compagnie (1840–1844).

**Service Turc**

The *Service Turc* pattern depicts various Middle Eastern scenes, including exotic birds, grape vines, and acanthus leaves. All fragments identified in the Sutler’s Store are green, although Le Taillandier de Gabory (2007:122) indicates *Service Turc* was produced in 11 different colors. *Service Turc* also appears among the French Prairie sites in Oregon discussed by Chapman (1993:166–167, illustration 92).

![Photo by Troy Wayrynen, 2019.](image)

**Manufacturer:** D. Johnston (1834–1840); D. Johnston & Compagnie (1840–1844); J. Vieillard & Compagnie (1845–1895)

**Manufacturing Location:** Bordeaux, France

**Date:** 1837–1895. No potters’ marks were found with this pattern in the Sutler’s Store. Marks on complete examples indicate *Service Turc* was produced by David Johnston, David Johnston & Compagnie, and J. Vieillard & Compagnie. Le Taillandier de Gabory (2007:113, 122) states that David Johnston hired Pierre Lacour, the creator of the *Service Turc* pattern, sometime after the summer of 1837.
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