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ABSTRACT

Chinese Porcelain and Seventeenth-Century Port Royal, Jamaica. (May 1998)

Helen Catherine Dewolf, B.A. Hon., University of Waterloo

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Donny L. Hamilton

This dissertation examines 17th-century Chinese porcelain found in Port Royal, Jamaica during the various land and underwater excavations carried out since the late 1950s. The focus of the study is on the artifacts recovered during the underwater excavations conducted from 1981-1990, by Texas A&M University, the Institute of Nautical Archaeology and the Jamaica National Heritage Trust. The presence of the porcelain artifacts, their type, their use and their exportation into Europe and the New World are discussed.

The possible significance of the location and association of these artifacts within the archaeological remains of the 17th-century city of Port Royal is also explored. Ultimately this dissertation presents conclusions as to the trade networks used to bring porcelain to Port Royal, Jamaica and the possible reflection of status these artifacts may exhibit.

The role of the documentary evidence found in the Jamaica Archives, as well as records available from contemporaneous trade centers is also addressed. Journals, diaries, and letters of various individuals of the period supplement the written and archaeological records to provide the personal observations of those associated with trade, politics and daily life in the 17th century.
A comparison of the various types of ceramics found in the Port Royal excavations and an analysis of the contemporaneous documentary records of Jamaica assist in providing a context in which to view the Chinese porcelain artifacts found. The wills and inventories of numerous inhabitants of Jamaica, in general, and Port Royal, specifically, provide the majority of documentary evidence researched.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The splendid assemblage of Chinese porcelain associated with the 17th-century provenance of excavations at Port Royal, Jamaica illuminates a complex system of trade, some of it illicit, in the Caribbean New World. Identified by a variety of names in wills and inventories, these seemingly exotic wares are revealed in several structures that were excavated by Donny L. Hamilton between 1981 and 1990. This dissertation examines porcelain artifacts and explores their relationship to not only the archaeological remains of this bustling sea port, but also the contemporaneous records of Jamaica, other colonial settlements, English port records, and diarists. Such an interdisciplinary perspective produces a balanced, holistic discussion of the archaeology, history, material culture, and lifeways of Port Royal and the inhabitants thereof.

The original focus of this study was to be solely the porcelain artifacts that had been found in the archaeological investigations of Port Royal. Investigations began in the 1950s (Link 1960; Marx 1967, 1968) when underwater archaeology was still in its infancy. Terrestrial investigations of the site were conducted through the 1960s and 1970s (Mayes 1972a, 1972b; Brown 1996; Aarons 1980), and since 1981, a collaboration of effort between the Jamaica National Heritage Trust (JNHT), the Texas A&M

This dissertation follows the style and format of Historical Archaeology.

As with terrestrial excavations, the methodology used in underwater archaeology has greatly improved over the last half century. The precision in mapping and maintaining provenance has become more exact with the use of new technologies, especially the introduction of computer data base systems, computer assisted drawing programs, and SHARPS (Sonic High Accuracy Ranging and Positioning System) (Hamilton 1988b). These tools allow for the rapid retrieval of information and statistics and, ideally, more rapid and accurate interpretation and dissemination of that information.

The Port Royal Project underwater excavations conducted by Dr. Donny Hamilton were integrated as part of a TAMU summer field school program, which ran from 1981 to 1990 (Hamilton 1984, 1985, 1987, 1988c, 1989, 1990a, 1990b, 1991). In addition to directing the field excavations, Dr. Hamilton supervises the on-going conservation and research at the field facilities provided by the JNHT and at the Conservation Research Laboratory (CRL) at TAMU. Under Dr. Hamilton’s direct supervision, a number of students have investigated different aspects of Port Royal for their theses and dissertations (Wadley 1985; McClenaghan 1988; Gohelpe-Miller 1990; Franklin 1992; Heidtke 1992; Thornton 1992; Clifford 1993; Darrington 1994; Hailey 1994; and Smith 1995). In most cases, the research has not relied exclusively on the
recovered artifacts; it also includes historical records and documentary evidence. As such, these works have contributed a greater understanding of Port Royal’s cultural context, as well as Europe’s New World colonies in general. This dissertation adds to the growing body of knowledge.

As the research progressed, and as new data came to light, this dissertation’s direction began to change. The trading practices that brought these artifacts to Port Royal took on a greater significance, as did the associations of artifacts within the city. The expanded objective of this study, therefore, is to identify the types of porcelains found and their importance in the trading practices of China and various European nations. The routes by which these pieces reached Port Royal and other contemporaneous settlements in the New World are also explored.

The study presented herein is divided into 10 Chapters. Following this introduction, chapters II and III explore the history of Port Royal and the results of the numerous archaeological investigations of this English colonial city. Chapter IV investigates the contemporary trade practices and laws and considers the relationship of Chinese porcelain to these practices and the Europeans who trafficked in ceramics. Chapter V provides a brief overview of the different types of ceramics recovered from the underwater excavations conducted from 1981-1990, while Chapter VI examines the origins of Chinese porcelain and development of its trade; trade that eventually led to the New World. This chapter also serves as the backdrop upon which the porcelain of Port Royal can best be analyzed. The discussion in Chapter VII addresses the Port Royal Chinese porcelain recovered from levels that date from 1655 to 1692. The architectural
context within which the porcelain was found is analyzed to determine the cultural activity conducted within the structures. Chapter VIII briefly discusses the previous excavations conducted in Port Royal and their associated assemblages, and the analysis of historic records and documents in Chapter IX relates the Chinese porcelain assemblage from the 1981-1990 excavations to contemporary records. This analysis provides the final details necessary to arrive at the conclusions presented in Chapter X.

The 17th century was a time of enormous change and expansion in the realm of international trade. As knowledge of the globe increased, so too did the opportunity for increased economic transactions. With it came an increased need for wealth. As European mercantile companies sent out more vessels on voyages, cash was required to cover expenses. This meant that cash flow was weighted towards purchase of commodities and ship outfitting expenses rather than to the crew. As a result seamen often resorted to 'private' trade to provide for themselves and their families. This private trade of seamen as well as others, be they captains, soldiers, priests, planters, or colonists, was not always complementary to the trade of the country or the company for whom they sailed. This resulted in a dichotomy of private and corporate trade.

In the 1660s and 1670s, Thomas Papillon (1887:78), an English merchant, notes that both private trade and Dutch trade were infringing on the English East India Company (EIC) monopoly, and by extension, on the Crown’s share of the profits of that trade. Papillon (1887:80-84) also reports that interlopers and private trade account for the distribution of a large volume of goods, much of it Asian. Not all of these
commodities were properly taxed or had duties paid to the Crown, thereby skirting the import and export regulations of the period.

Private trade was generally not condoned by the East India companies, especially the Dutch Vereenigde Oostindische Company (VOC) or the governments of various nations. Indeed, at specific times, this trade was illegal. It is unlikely that common seamen and officers involved in private or illicit trade would have kept possibly incriminating records of their business dealings. The use of ledgers, diaries, and ships logs to record clandestine trade practices was kept to a minimum. It is therefore not surprising that specific documentary evidence recording this kind of activity either does not exist or is hard to find. This lack of detailed documentary evidence on the private trade practices of seamen, military personnel, civil servants, clergy, and merchants hampers the study of 17th-century trade.

Previous porcelain research has suggested that post-1700, and especially after 1710, the boom in the movement of Chinese porcelain by the English into England and her colonies is substantial (Macintosh 1977:116-117; Godden 1979:18-19, 27, 1982:57, 61-63; Mudge 1986:110-112). Prior to 1700, however, this movement is significantly less, and before 1692, it is but a trickle in comparison. There is little in design or manufacture that differentiates the Chinese porcelain produced during this critical transition period of ca.1685-1710 from other periods. However, the quantities of porcelains traded and the routes of trade do change from the beginning to the end of this period and thus the question of the route used by the porcelain to arrive in Port Royal is also investigated in this study. Blue and White porcelain wares predominate in the export
trade, however, observable differences in *Blue and White* motifs do occur between the different European countries, depending on taste and the retail trade.

The Dutch primarily imported *Blue and White* wares, which seem to be reminiscent of the heavily decorated *Kraack porcelein* of the early 17th century. The name *Kraack* refers to the Portuguese carrack, the European vessel that first brought Chinese porcelain to Europe. This naming practice is analogous to the term *galleyware* that referred to the early 16th-century tin-enamel wares which were imported into England in galleys. The Dutch also imported *Batavia* wares, which were transported to Batavia in Indonesia by Chinese traders for the Asian and European markets. These wares have a brown wash under the glaze on the exterior of the vessels and underglaze blue decoration on the white interior. *Blanc de Chine* figurines were also imported by the Dutch and initially were of Chinese subjects, animals, and traditional Buddhist figures. However, in the late 17th century, these figurines began to follow the Dutch requests for European subjects. Like the Dutch, the Portuguese tended to trade predominantly in the heavily decorated *Blue and White* wares but concentrated more on floral and geometric designs due to their trade links with Islamic ports. In contrast, the excavations of the 1702 Spanish outpost of ‘Old Mobile’ revealed a large number of *Blue and White* and overglaze polychrome sherds, especially of large vases (Shulsky 1997, pers. comm.). Numerous sherds of *Blanc de Chine Appliqué* cups (Shulsky 1997, pers. comm.) were also evident.

The Spanish and the English seem to exhibit the most varied tastes in porcelain. Perhaps, more accurately, they imported whatever they could get their hands on. There is
evidence at Port Royal of *Blue and White* wares of both heavy and sparse decoration; pieces of different forms and sizes; *Batavia* ware of different forms and sizes; and *Blanc de Chine* ware of the traditional types and forms, *Appliqué* and *An Hua* designs, and Buddhist figurines. Thus it appears that European countries and their colonies reflect their preferences in the Chinese porcelain they traded.

The last aspect of this city's rich tale come from its cultural diversity. The documentary records of Jamaica (Island Record Office [IRO] Wills and Grantors, Jamaica Public Archives [JPA] Inventories) reveal the names of individuals from a wide range of religious, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds: Sephardic Jews, Quakers, Huguenots, Catholics, Dutch, English, Irish, Scottish, Portuguese, Spanish, West African, Madagascan, and North American Indian. This diversity also plays a role in the investigation of porcelain in Port Royal. Comparison of the porcelain found in the excavations and the general trend of cultural tastes, as well as this cultural diversity suggests probable trade routes used to transport Chinese porcelain to Port Royal.
CHAPTER II

THE HISTORY OF PORT ROYAL

In the 16th and 17th centuries, the island of Jamaica was an important strategic outpost for European colonial powers. Its location in the center of the Caribbean allowed relatively easy access to surrounding islands as well as the Atlantic Ocean (Figure 1). On the south side of the island a long, narrow land spit separates a large natural harbor from the Caribbean Basin. Known today as Kingston Harbor, it is the seventh largest natural deep-water harbor in the world (Figure 2). Throughout Jamaica’s history this harbor has been the location of the island’s only major ports of Port Royal and Kingston.

Arrival of the Spanish

By 1509, the Spanish had begun the conquest of Jamaica, and colonists were planting sugar shortly thereafter (Gibson 1967:11-12; McAlister 1987:94) It is known that prior to 1514, Pedro de Rentería, business partner of Bartolomé de las Casas, had an encomienda [a pseudo-fiefdom] in Jamaica in which he was raising pigs and growing manioc (Brading 1991:60). It was not until the 1520s that the first water-powered sugar mill was built on the island ( McAlister 1987:220, 224).
Figure 1. Map of the Caribbean.
Figure 2. Map of Jamaica.
Throughout the Spanish period, Jamaica was utilized by the Spanish as a cattle, horse, and to a lesser extent, sugar producer. The island was not so intensely colonized as were New Spain and Peru, and although by 1570, Jamaica boasted three towns, it was still considered by the Spanish as strictly an agricultural colony (Dunn 1973: 204; McAlister 1987:94, 144, 221, 224). Consequently, the major settlements of the island, and the capital were located inland on the Liguanea Plain on the harbor’s north shore. Jamaica was not considered important to the Casa de Contratación (Spanish House of Trade), since it did not provide the same quick monetary returns as did Spain’s larger colonies. Indeed, during the 16th and 17th centuries, the Spanish Crown’s priorities centered on New Spain and Peru and agricultural Jamaica could not justify a full military complement for its defenses.

Although the Spanish recognized the advantages of the naturally protected harbor, no major towns were located on this body of water. Passage Fort was built at the mouth of the Rio Cobre which flowed into the harbor. The small area at the end of the land spit, known as the Caguaya, which was to be so important in the defense of the harbor by the English, was used by the Spanish only for careening their vessels. It was not fortified, since the Spanish Crown could ill afford to maintain a large defense force throughout the Caribbean, let alone the small island of Jamaica.

It would seem then that the English takeover of Jamaica in 1655 was not necessarily due to their superior military ability (McAlister 1987:307-308), but rather to the Spanish colonists’ inability to stop them. As Roberts (1971:52) notes, “the English had taken Jamaica from Her [Spain] with ridiculous ease.”
This is not to say, however, that the Spanish were quick to give up any of their claims in the New World. In fact, it was not until 1670, 15 years after the seizure and settlement of the island by the English, that Spain finally conceded Jamaica (Roberts 1971:70).

Arrival of the English and the Emergence of Port Royal

In 1655, Oliver Cromwell’s expedition led by General Robert Venables and Admiral William Penn was unsuccessful in its attempt to take Hispaniola from the Spanish. The fleet sailed therefore into the harbor past Caguaya on the southern Jamaican coast and took Jamaica, in what was essentially a last-ditch effort to take any Spanish holding before returning to England. Upon lowering their anchors off Passage Fort in this ‘consolation’ prize, however, the potential strategic significance of the site soon became apparent (Curtin 1991:45). The original English settlers of the area around Jamaica’s southern harbor were, in fact, those few left behind by the Penn and Venables expedition. They built fortifications at the end of the 14-mile-long sand spit known as the Palisadoes (Figure 3); by 1665 several forts had been completed and the English were actively settling a harbor side town (Mayes 1972a:5-8). This was the beginning of the town of Port Royal.

This initial English enclave consisted primarily of soldiers and artisans. In time, colonists were recruited from Barbados and New England, as well as the gaols and
Figure 3. Map of Port Royal and Kingston Harbor.
debtors prisons of England, Ireland, Wales, and Scotland. Pawson and Buisseret (1975:99) describe some of these colonists as “indentured servants [who] had been shipped to Jamaica as a punishment for various criminal misdemeanors.” It should be noted that “355 convicted rebels from Monmouth’s rebellion” were also sent to the port (Pawson and Buisseret 1975:99-100). Even traveler and diarist, Reverend John Taylor brought with him three “servants” (convicts from Newgate Prison), whose indentures (contracts) were sold along with those of other convicts on 4 January 1688 (Taylor MSS 1688:177).

Although it is from this group of soldiers, artisans, servants, ne’er-do-wells, paupers, and deserters that the early English population of Jamaica and Port Royal emerged, it is not entirely true that Jamaica was “the Receptacle of Vagabonds, the Sanctuary of Bankrupts, and a Close-stool for the Purges of our Prisons...populated exclusively by prostitutes, convicts and drunks,” as Ned Ward suggested in 1698 (Ward 1933:13; Dunn 1973:149). Rather, Port Royalists were a hardy lot with little fear of authority and a willingness to try whichever endeavor was necessary to make a living (and hopefully a fortune), be it wreck salving or privateering on land or at sea. Indeed, Port Royal was seen by many as the logical rendezvous point for all manner of people and occupations (Zahedieh 1986b:215). This became increasingly true as a result of the increasing mercantile endeavors of the city’s growing English and European population, which quickly developed a reputation of readily, even eagerly, dealing in goods of all kinds, both legitimate and illicit (Zahedieh 1986b:216). According to
Roberts (1971:49, 62), buccaneering was considered to be the "sweet trade," and Port Royal was "destined to be the greatest of buccaneer cities."

During the 1660s and into the early 1670s, this piratical enclave evolved into a base for many privateers, operating under Crown sanctions with letters of marque as licenses to plunder England's enemies, fleets, and colonies (Mattingly 1962:145-146). Although the Treaty of Madrid (1670) did for a short time officially end hostilities between the Spanish and the English, there seemed always to be an enemy to plunder, be it the Spanish, the French, or the Dutch (Zahedieh 1986a:574).

During the 1600s, interaction between European nations and their merchants' trading companies had both direct and indirect influences on the city of Port Royal. These influences were based on the premise from which each European nation operated. For instance, the French theory of colonization followed the ancient Greek concept of making each colony a satellite of the mother country. Culturally, politically, and commercially, the colony was to be an integral part of the original. England and Spain, however, were closer in theory to the Roman concept of colonization, whereby the colonies were in existence only to enrich the motherland and her merchants (Roberts 1971:66). In the recent past this concept of exploitation has been described as a major element of current World Systems Theory. The East and West India Companies of the English and Dutch traded at the open French ports, but this free trade policy depleted the volume of goods and produce that should have been going home to France. This prompted the French Crown after the 1674 abolishment of the Compagnie des Indies Occidentales (CIO) to establish stricter trade regulations like those already enacted by
rival European nations and companies (Roberts 1971:65, 67-68). The attempts by various European nations to enforce trade laws often encouraged individuals to circumvent restrictions.

As a result of the delays in the arrival of official notification to the colonies of the latest political alliances, privateers were often not working under current letters of marque. They would, therefore, revert from Crown-sanctioned privateers into pirates and vice versa without the parties involved necessarily being aware of the changes in the political climate. This, in essence, is what happened to the man who may be Port Royal's most famous 'pirate,' Henry Morgan. His experience was typical of the fluctuations of the politics of the time that were, in turn, dictated by European political unrest.

Morgan and his fleet, with their letters of marque, left Jamaica to attack and plunder Spanish ports, in 1671. Unfortunately, by the time word reached Jamaica that a treaty with Spain had been signed, it was too late to catch and stop the fleet. Upon his triumphant return to Port Royal, Morgan was thus labeled a pirate by the representatives of the Crown and was required to travel to England to defend his actions at trial. As it turned out, Morgan was not only cleared of any wrong-doing but knighted and made Lieutenant Governor of Jamaica (Black 1983:47-48). The English Crown had by this time recognized the power and usefulness of privateers on Jamaica and the island's strategic importance as a home base for both legitimate trade and privateering in the Caribbean. The English Crown may have viewed Jamaica as a source of revenue, but it did not consider it worth a huge investment of money and men. Consequently, privateers were the ideal response to this situation. With a minimal investment by the Crown, there
was an assured percentage of the overall 'take.' The initial financial gain was multiplied by access to goods otherwise inaccessible or outrageously expensive through normal trading channels, and with none of the risk. In essence, England's exploitation of Jamaica began with its exploitation of her privateers. The more intelligent, or at least restrained, privateers quickly recognized the potential for personal financial growth through activities that were personally less risky.

By the 1680s and 1690s, several of the more successful privateers in Jamaica had become landowners, planters, entrepreneurs, and even gentry. In turn, they began to see privateers, especially foreign ones, as a hindrance to their ability to carry out trade. Henry Morgan, for example, wrote a letter to Charles II complaining of French privateers in July 1680. According to him, these privateers were not only attempting to persuade English servants to run off and join them but were, more importantly, interfering with the Jamaicans ability to trade with the Spanish: "These privateers [French] do discourage the Spanyard from hording with us a Private trade, which otherwayes would bee very considerable. This Colony in a small time will gratefully answer the charge his most Gracious Majy is pleased to bee att in Countenanceing it" (Public Records Office [PRO] 1680: f.179-181).

The former privateers diversified their holdings, taking advantage of every opportunity to accumulate ever more wealth and power (Claypole 1972:33). As the Reverend John Taylor notes, "To this Port bellongs allway about one Hundred Stout Sloops or Shalloops, which trade about the Island, and with the Spaniards, and Indians, in those parts..... Mechanics and Trademen...live here Verey well, earning thrice the Wages
given in England, by which means they are enabled to maintain their families much better than in England” (Taylor MSS 1688:259, 267). Many of these entrepreneurs had homes in Port Royal as well as Great Houses on their plantations. Some sent their wealth home to England, to their families, to build great houses and mansions in anticipation of their ‘retirement’ from enterprises in the colonies (Armstrong 1990:258-259).

By 1692, Port Royal was a bustling entrepot of between 6,000 and 6,500 people living and working in some 2,000 buildings occupying an area of up to 55 acres (Pawson and Buisseret 1975:98-99). According to the Reverend Taylor (1688:252), “at least 600 well built brick houses, and as many more built with Timber: ye houses are built four story high.” Many structures were half-timber construction, while others were of timber and clapboard. Archaeological excavations of the site have further revealed that these buildings were usually multi-storied and had clay tile, slate, or wood shingle roofs; floors of brick, plaster, or dirt; and interior walls of brick (sometimes plastered) or wood. Some of these buildings even had brick-paved yards and sidewalks. It is also known that the real estate values in Port Royal were comparable to those of Cheape Side, an upper class residential area in London (Taylor MSS 1688:252; Cox 1984:39;), and since land in the city was at a premium, lots were frequently subdivided and sold off or leased in smaller and smaller pieces (Island Record Office [IRO] Grantors, Deeds, Old Series, 1694-1696 Vol. 25; Jamaica Public Archives [JPA]: Port Royal Plat Book, 1661-1713 Vol. 28).

According to Cox (1992:4-5), Port Royal had a density of approximately “47 dwellings or 150 persons to the acre...about the same as Central London prior to World War II.”

This density is most closely represented by the area excavated by Priddy (Brown 1996)
on New Street; the area excavated by Hamilton at the corner of Queen and Lime streets has a much lower density per acre, with larger more substantial structures. This area at Queen and Lime is also considered part of the "mercantile center of the town," with a density of "about 25 dwellings per acre and population density of about 88" (Cox 1992:6) (Figure 4). And all of this was built on a sand spit with the water table between 1 and 6 ft. below surface. Understandably, construction of the buildings represented quite a challenge, and, some of these structures were, in fact, built by some of the best tradesmen available - ship carpenters, shipwrights, and even an architect who laid out construction specifications (Cox 1984:39, 47, 1992:8).

When a massive earthquake hit Port Royal on 6 June 1692, at 20 minutes before 12 noon, the city literally sank straight down into the harbor by a process called liquefaction (Link 1960:173; Hamilton 1984). The waves created by the massive tremors washed across the sinking buildings, knocking down walls and flushing vessels from the harbor into the town. One ship, for example, was washed down Queen Street so fast it plunged straight through the front wall of a tenement (Port Royal Project excavation notes 1987-1990). This bustling port, which was rivaled only by Boston in the English New World in size and importance, sank in a matter of moments. It was a catastrophe that resulted in the immediate deaths of 2,000 inhabitants. Within weeks, another 2,000 succumbed to disease and injury (Pawson and Buisseret 1975:123-124). Only a few acres and one-tenth of the buildings survived the inundation brought on by the earthquake (Curtin 1991:45).
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Figure 4. Section of Modern Map Detailing Queen and Lime Street Intersection (after TAMU Port Royal, Jamaica Map 1983, Past and Present Features).
After the earthquake, and after yet another disaster, the hurricane of 1702, many Port Royal survivors attempted to construct new lives across the harbor at the new settlement of Kingston. Many believed that these destructive occurrences were visited on the city by God for the wickedness and godlessness that appeared to be rampant (Black 1988:26-30). But, in reality, 1692 Port Royal, differed little from other thriving cities of the period. Poverty was common, and so was great wealth. It was a city comprised of slaves and indentured servants; it was full of artisans, smiths, coopers, and carpenters. “Practitioners in Physick and Chyrurgeons” (Taylor MSS 1688:260, 262, 264-265), vintners and victualers; tavern keepers; merchants of fabrics, dry goods, hardware, and tools; land owners and planters; seamen and privateers; a few converted buccaneers and pirates; and prostitutes and ladies of leisure. In short, all aspects of English colonial society were reflected in the city.

Port Royal has been referred to as the storehouse or “Treasury of the West Indies,” since goods from all over the world were traded there for the products of the Caribbean (Taylor MSS 1688:261; Mayes 1972:6; Pawson and Buisseret 1975:72). This is partially because it was the only legal port of entry for Jamaica. Barlow, an English seaman of the period, notes in his diary that Port Royal “is the chief port and harbor of that island” (Barlow 1934:313). Port Royalists owned 100 vessels in 1688 and had access to vessels coming and going in the hundreds during the 1680s and 1690s (Pawson and Buisseret 1975:64-71). The exceptional nature of this port lies in its access to the quantities of goods that most other colonial ports did not share and a diverse population enterprising enough to trade in these goods (Zahedieh 1986a:570, 579-580, 591, 593).
In the case of the Chinese porcelain, we see this in the archaeological record. In the case of monetary wealth, we see this in the wills and inventories of the inhabitants of the island.

By 1706, a substantial part of the land lost during the earthquake had been reclaimed, and what could be salvaged of the ruined buildings from the sunken city was brought to the surface to help rebuild. For a time, Port Royal tried to maintain its status and credibility but as natural and man-made disasters took their toll, it atrophied into the sleepy fishing village that exists today. Approximately 13 acres of the city remain underwater, most of that untouched for almost 300 years.
CHAPTER III

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF PORT ROYAL

The devastation of the earthquake on the city of Port Royal, on 7 June 1692 was monumental. The earthquake ravaged the whole island, and everywhere, houses, mills, churches, and towns had been destroyed (Crocket 1692:1). The survivors of this natural disaster fell at once to reclaiming and salvaging all they could from their broken and drowned city and battered island. It would be weeks before outside assistance, materials, and supplies could arrive.

Salvaging of materials occurred both above and below the sea and was not always practiced with honest intentions. The city of Port Royal was a small compact community, each member aware of the activities and wealth of other members. Many probably knew where such wealth was stored, and as noted by a contemporary broadside printed in London, took advantage of the temporary commotion: “the very same Night they were at their Old Trade of Drinking, Swearing, and Whoreing; breaking up Ware-houses; Pillaging and Stealing from their Neighbours, even while the Earthquake lasted” (Crocket 1692:1). But if the residents of Port Royal lived up to their reputation as salvers (“...a good ship near 400 tons...she being a little top heavy...she was fallen over and over set and sunk down to Rights. She was sunk in nine fathom water yet there being several good divers with great cost and trouble...she was weighed again and recovered” [Barlow 1934:331]) there were also considerable honest salvaging attempts.

To date, not all of the analyses have been completed on the ceramic assemblage from Port Royal. In fact, much analysis remains to be done on the site as a whole. It is important to note that inherent in any archaeological endeavor is the prolonged period of time necessary to analyze and document all aspects of the site investigated. This becomes an even longer process (especially in underwater excavation) when artifacts must be conserved so that the rest of the analysis can be completed. It has been said that for every month in the field, up to one year in the lab is necessary to complete the work (Hamilton 1994, pers. comm.). In the case of the Port Royal Project’s 25 months of work over 10 years of excavation, a lifetime may not seem long enough. Analyses of some of
the recovered artifacts have resulted in a number of theses and dissertations (Wadley 1985; McClanahan 1988; Gotelipe-Miller 1990; Franklin 1992; Heidtke 1992; Thornton 1992; Clifford 1993; Darrington 1994; Hailey 1994; and Smith 1995). These works provide the foundation for this dissertation’s discussion of the ceramic types and their context in Port Royal and have contributed greatly to the research on Chinese porcelain.

The significance of the archaeological site at Port Royal comes from its ‘catastrophic’ nature.

Port Royal belongs to one of a select group of sites which include Pompeii and Herculaneum in Italy and Ozette in the state of Washington. Sites such as these are unique “catastrophic” sites - sites created by some disaster that preserves the cultural features and material and the all-important archaeological context. At this type of undisturbed site, the archaeologist is not dealing with a situation where - over a long span of time - houses, shops, warehouses, churches and other buildings were constructed, added on to, fell into disrepair, were abandoned, eventually collapsed, were razed and then possibly built over...after 37 years of existence...this bustling city sank into the harbor in only a matter of minutes... (Hamilton and Woodward 1984:38-39).

Objects were found as they were being used or where they were stored. Cast-iron skillets and pots were still in the hearth with the charred wood from the fire concreted to their surfaces. Stacks of pewter plates were found as they fell from their storage space under the stairs in what is surmised to be the serving area of one building. The remains of children were found among the broken walls of their home. Also uncovered were the remains of barrels and baskets containing the trash of the day, including the trimmings of a man’s beard and hair in a yard area. Many ceramics were found intact or broken where they fell, while sherds of others were widely dispersed.
Not all of the artifacts were safely entombed by falling walls and the sediments of the harbor that accompanied the seiche waves. Some remained exposed for long periods, and some that lay closer to the surface may have been systematically exposed and buried by the multiple hurricanes, tremors, and storms that plagued the beleaguered city of Port Royal and the island of Jamaica in general. In fact, Port Royal and Jamaica have been hit from 1597 to 1994 by 47 hurricanes and major storms, at least nine earthquakes of major or moderate intensity, as well as two major fires (Millás 1968; Pawson and Buisseret 1975:123-124; Cox 1984:Appendix B; Brown 1996:230). It is a testament to the tenacity and courage of the residents of Port Royal that they continue to live there even to the present day.

A high percentage of intact ceramic vessels would be an anomaly in most archaeological sites because generally the items found come from trash piles and refuse left behind by the previous occupants of a building. Often, a site is continuously occupied for a prolonged period, or the occupants have vacated it for any number of reasons, taking with them their belongings and leaving only the bits and pieces of their lifeways. When the earthquake struck Port Royal, the occupants of the city's buildings were not given the opportunity to pack their belongings and leave. Thus many artifacts are recovered intact or broken but with all or most of their pieces.

When discussing the relationship between the various ceramic types found in Port Royal, it is necessary to realize that this was an English colonial port of the late 17th century. As such, certain types of ceramics are likely to be found. These include various coarse and refined earthenwares made in and imported from England, such as North
Devon gravel-tempered storage jars, Borderware pots, delft chamber pots, and Staffordshire slipware drinking vessels, and other cooking and storage vessels. Also expected in the assemblage would be wares from other points of origin: tin-glazed wares, Delft and faïences from Holland, majolicas and olive jars from Mexico and Spain, and Rhenish and Frêchen stonewares from Germany. Trade between these European countries was extremely commonplace in this period, even when politically, they were at odds. From documentary evidence, such as the Port Records of Bristol, London (Public Records Office [PRO] 1681-1682, 1694-1695), and the inventories and grantors records of Jamaica (IRO and JPA), it is known that textiles, clay smoking pipes, wines, rugs, carpets, furniture, glass bottles, and drinking cups were part of the manufactured goods from Europe imported into Jamaica in the late 17th century. It is due to the cosmopolitan nature of Port Royal that we see examples of ceramics not only from Europe but from throughout the world. For example, Chinese porcelain (both decorative and functional) and a single piece of stoneware possibly from Southeast China have been recovered by the excavations. This is particularly intriguing, since in most other 17th-century English colonial sites, porcelains occur in very limited numbers (Noël Hume 1985:257; Janowitz 1993:18).

Most of the Chinese porcelain recovered in the TAMU excavations at Port Royal is associated with a single building. Why was such a unique collection of porcelain found in only one place? Apparently, the collecting of porcelain was in vogue in England at the time (de Beer 1955:147, Jourdain and Jenyns 1967:40). Moreover, area inventories from
New Amsterdam show that Dutch merchants were also collecting this commodity in large quantities (Cornelius 1926:38; Mudge 1986:93-99)

The Chinese porcelain items discussed in this dissertation are part of a cultural context. The pieces found may be the private collection of one resident of this bustling entrepôt, or it may be that this collection, along with some elegant pieces of tin-enamel ware and pewter, are the inventory of a shop that dealt in luxury goods. Alternatively, this collection may represent some of the serving and drinking vessels from a coffee house. All of these possibilities are discussed in the following chapters.
CHAPTER IV

TRADE PRACTICES AND LAWS

The focus of this chapter is trade in the 17th century, particularly the trade of the island of Jamaica and Port Royal. This discussion encompasses the trade practices of various European countries in the New World and in Asia. From this the chapter develops to include both legal and clandestine trade. Trade company records are examined with respect to the presence of Chinese porcelain and its juxtaposition to other Asian commodities. Each major trading nation is examined in relation to Port Royal, with reference to the ethnic groups represented in the city's population and the trade links these groups might have. The probable routes and methods used to bring Chinese porcelain into Port Royal are also analyzed.

It was the willingness of the Caribbean colonies to participate in trade that went outside the laws and regulations of the mother country that proved to be the driving force behind their economies. The necessity to import all manufactured goods opened them to opportunity for trade, both according to and circumventing legal restrictions. It is also possible to relate, in part, the rise in legitimate public, private, and illicit trade in the Caribbean to the growth and success of the naval strength of various European nations up to the end of the 17th century. French corsairs were initially succeeded by English privateers of the Elizabethan era, as well as Dutch filibusters of the late 16th century. In fact, the Dutch West Indies Company seemed to have held virtual domination of
Caribbean trade in the early decades of the 1600s (Zahedieh 1986a:574). By the middle of the 17th century, however, the balance of sea power in the Caribbean seemed again to shift, first with the reappearance of English marauders and a little later, the buccaneers of the Americas. These buccaneers expanded their range to include the Pacific, laying waste to Spanish ships and coastal settlements from Peru to Mexico (McAlister 1987:429-430).

**Beginnings of Public Trade**

Claypole (1972) notes that the English government was not in a financial position to commit resources to commercial ventures, especially in the late 1500s and early 1600s, since the military conflicts in Europe were absorbing any working capital the Crown might have for such undertakings. As such, England’s approach towards colonial and commercial ventures up to and into the 1700s was characterized by private enterprises initiating and bankrolling ventures, with the Crown gladly receiving its share of any profits. By the end of the 17th century, the growing English merchant community was well-established in trading on the Iberian Peninsula. For these entrepreneurs, the New World and her colonies were the next logical step (Claypole 1972:9, 25, 27).

The English Crown allowed colonies to grant patents for monopolistic trade. These guaranteed the Crown a share without having to invest in ventures. Interlopers were a problem because it was extremely difficult to police the areas of monopolies; there were too few people to stop illicit trade and too much potential profit to discourage it (Claypole 1972:28). These patents did convey great power to the merchant class, and led
to development of trading companies for long-term trading ventures. But there was also
the development of short-term adventures by joint stock syndicates that were assembled
only for the duration of a specific venture. This mode of merchant associations appears
to have been a standard trading practice in Port Royal (Claypole 1972:31; JPA, Inv.1686-
1694:Vol. III, f. 46-47, 64-65, 66-69, 347-348, 383-385, 404-405), and many of the
merchants and artisans of Port Royal had money tied up in trading ventures throughout
the Caribbean. From the perspective of the Spanish, some of these ventures were illegal
trade with various Spanish holdings (Schurz 1959:369-370, 395; Kemp and Lloyd
addition to widespread trade, there were the plundering expeditions on the coastal towns
along the Spanish Main. The capture of Panama City by Henry Morgan in 1670, as well
as the capture of Maracaibo, are two particularly spectacular examples.

Trade Links between Spanish Colonies and Jamaica

Spanish-held ports and coastal towns may have been the most readily available
sources for Chinese porcelain. Asian and Middle Eastern exotic goods and porcelains
were conveyed across Mexico from Acapulco through Mexico City to Veracruz where
they were supposed to be transported to Spain. The actual volume of porcelain that
actually found its way to Spain is unknown. New Spain received and retained the bulk of
these shipments from Manila, with only a secondary transfer of a small percentage of
these commodities to the peripheral outposts throughout the viceroyalty of New Spain.
Some goods also moved from Acapulco to Panama to be distributed throughout the viceroyalty of Peru (Lister and Lister 1987:235). At this time, Spain was losing 500,000 pesos of Peruvian treasure annually to China through the port of Acapulco, pesos that were ostensibly supposed to go to Spain to cover debts (Smith 1940:101). English merchants and privateers, based in Port Royal intercepted these traveling goods to collect what they considered their fair share of the silver and the commerce (Zahedieh 1986a:571). Port Royalists traded European manufactured goods for specie and other commodities, including porcelain. This perhaps explains the more common occurrence of Chinese porcelain in this English colony than in the English colonies in North America.

During the late 17th century, Jamaica was also the source of the majority of the gold and silver exported to British North America and England (Zahedieh 1986a:584, 591, 1986b:222). For example, in 1690, the Royal African Company exported “£100,000 worth of bullion” to England (Zahedieh 1986a:583-584).

Perhaps, the least discussed but probably the most common activity was the smuggling conducted between both Jamaica and Cuba, as well as the rest of the Spanish holdings throughout the Spanish Main (Zahedieh 1986a:575, 578, 580, 584). Jamaicans repeatedly traded on the River Sevilla in Cuba, and throughout the 1660s to 1700 the Spanish came to Port Royal to purchase slaves (Zahedieh 1986a:575, 580). By the late 1680s, the Spanish actually had an Assiento [factor] stationed in Port Royal for this specific purpose (Zahedieh 1986a:590). Zahedieh (1986a:576) notes that the 1679 records of the Jamaican Naval Office show that sloops of the island “had done approximately £20,000 worth of traffic with the Spaniards in the previous sixteen
months," and that "40 of the 87 ships that had come into port that year had gone on to Spanish territory to load [Central American] logwood or to trade." From various merchants' papers and inventories, the contribution of these small vessels in the contraband trade is evident, especially that between Jamaica and Cuba. Zahedieh (1986a:580-581) states that "little designs with the Spanish did most to stimulate the growth of the Jamaican merchant marine." There was a steady increase in the numbers of vessels involved in this trade: "1670 - 40 ships, 1679 - 80 ships and 1688 - 100 ships."

The Spanish were a major source of Oriental goods by way of the Manilla Galleons. These goods found their way across New Spain to the Flota [fleet], which took them through Cuba and then on to Spain. The Galeones [galleons] transported the products of the Spanish colonies of South and Central America to Cuba and on to Spain (Haring 1975:305). The Manila Galleons and the Flota are a likely source of much of the porcelain that was found at Port Royal (Figure 5). Excavations of several Spanish New World colonial outposts reveal that Chinese porcelain of the Ming and Ching dynasties found its way to some of the farthest reaches of the colonies (Deagan 1987:97, 99, 100).

Historians and archaeologists have noted the evidence and influence of the contraband trade in Spanish America. For example, Bushnell (1997), Hoffman (1997), and Ruhl (1997) emphasize the settlement of St. Augustine and the region of La Florida and their illicit trade with other European powers. Although the Spanish-American colonies and outposts relied on the situado for goods from Spain, practicality and a burgeoning attitude of self-reliance encouraged these colonies to find other means to acquire needed goods and materials (Bushnell 1997:19; Hoffman 1997:27). The situado
Figure 5. Map of Spanish Colonial Ports and Trade Routes. (a. Flotas, b. Galeones, c. Manila Galleons).
was the annual subsidy given to the provinces by the central treasury at the order of the Spanish Crown to cover the infrastructure costs of the province (McAlister 1987:435). The *situado* also helped defray the cost of the supply fleet sent to the Spanish New World colonies with the manufactured goods from the motherland necessary for the colonies to survive. To the *Casa de Contratación*, the *situado* provided a guaranteed market for Spanish manufacturers in the New World at inflated prices. The colonists found they could acquire manufactured goods of higher quality and lower cost through a clandestine trade with other European traders. St. Augustine is an excellent example of this trade occurring outside the Spanish trade restrictions (Ruhl 1997:42). According to Ruhl (1997:41-42), as early as the late 17th century and well into the 18th century, English commodities moved illegally through St. Augustine. It is safe to assume that if this ‘peripheral’ maritime colony of the Spanish-American empire had evidence of contraband trade, other Spanish-American ports with greater access to a larger cross-section of goods and specie would also be involved (Bushnell 1997:19).

Both legitimate and contraband trade were conducted not only through colonial entrepôts, but also through European ports, such as Cadiz, Lisbon and Seville, by resident English and French merchants (Smith 1940:94; Schurz 1959:395; Sheridan 1970:67; MacLeod 1973:351). It was “an open secret that merchants of the guild habitually trafficked with foreigners in Seville, acting as intermediaries for the shipment of exotic wares to the colonies and furnishing channels for the exodus of treasure brought back from the Indies” (Smith 1940:94). Bushnell (1997:19) discusses the documentary evidence regarding post-1680 illicit trade in Florida: “The written record produced for
the Crown and its representatives was designed not to expose the inner workings of the colony and invite interference and taxation but to leave a paper trail demonstrating compliance with bureaucratic forms.” It can be assumed that a similarly doctored or misrepresented paper trail would exist in other Spanish-American colonies as well as English colonies (Zahedieh 1986a:570, 1986b:217, 220; McAlister 1987:375).

Port Royal Trade

Port Royal's economic development and prosperity were dependent both on long-distance trade and inter-island clandestine trade (Pawson and Buisseret 1975:63; Zahedieh 1986a:582-584; Rossano 1988:20). The Royal African Company, which had factors in Port Royal, was the monopoly holder for the slave trade, but by 1689, interlopers had cut into the company's business to such an extent that this monopoly was revoked (Dunn 1973:157, 231). One might surmise that these interlopers not only dealt in slaves but also had an assortment of small easily transported goods (gold, ivory, ebony) as a means of increasing profit margins and offsetting any losses en route (MacLeod 1973:363-364; McAlister 1987:123).

Evidence from the Port Royal port records reveal that between 1686 and 1691, 240 vessels arrived from England and Africa, and 363 came in from North American colonies (Pawson and Buisseret 1975:65). The transatlantic vessels carried a total tonnage of almost three times that of the vessels from North American colonies. However, this statistic does not include unrecorded vessels; in a port catering to
privateers and smugglers, this would presumably be quite a few. Vessels were routinely going to logwood ports illegally and returning to Port Royal stating they had been to a sugar port in order to avoid problems with the customs assessor (Rossano 1988:20, 24).

English vessels were known to go to the colonies of their on-again-off-again enemies (Spain and France), even when the Spanish-American ports were officially closed to English vessels. These English vessels were rarely turned away from Spanish-American ports on Hispaniola, Cuba, and the Bay of Honduras, and usually returned to Port Royal with cocoa, hides, sarsaparilla, jewels, plate, hogs, horses, and mules (Claypole 1972:127, 129-130; Dunn 1973:11; MacLeod 1973:358, 361, 367; Zahedieh 1986a:582, 584).

English Trade Practices and Laws

During the first half of the 17th century, England allowed her colonies to work within a system of essentially unrestricted trade with other Europeans. In the 1650s, this changed with the implementation of the first of a series of Navigation Acts. These acts were rules by which the colonies could participate in world trade (Perkins 1980:18). As Mudge (1986:87) notes, the first Navigation Act, which passed in 1651, was aimed to “cripple the Dutch.” The 1660 Navigation Act was meant to be stronger and, indeed, did reduce the total amount of goods transported in Dutch vessels, but the Acts did allow East India Goods which had been “loaded south and east of the Cape of Good Hope” (Mudge 1986:87). In short, the various Navigation Acts were implemented to funnel all
proceeds from trade, directly or indirectly, into the coffers of the mother country. These acts were also designed to ensure that domestic manufactures had a guaranteed market in the colonies, with foreign manufactures significantly assized duties, and colonial manufactures restricted to "prevent and curtail colonial infringement on the English market" (Perkins 1980:22). Perkins (1980:18) states these acts may be seen as the "ground rules for colonial participation in world trade." They consisted of four major provisions:

1. Vessels of foreign registry were excluded from trade with English colonial ports;

2. Manufactured goods from other European countries had to be traded through English home ports before they could go on to her colonies.

3. Bounties were authorized for colonial products that were desired by the home markets.

4. Especially valuable colonial products (in international trade) were "enumerated," and permission was granted that these goods (furs, ship masts, rice, and tobacco) be shipped to English ports.

The reality was that the English colonies heavily traded among themselves and with other European traders without benefit of England's direct intervention and some of the commodities traded were in contravention of the Navigation Acts. According to Perkins (1980:26), "...the so-called triangle trade between the northern colonies, the West Indies and England was in truth quite small. The vast majority of vessels sailing from
colonial ports for the Caribbean returned directly home without ever leaving the hemisphere.” Mereness (1916:3, 10-11) cites examples of precisely this kind of activity taking place in England’s colonies. In June 1691, the Council of Virginia threatened the Governor of Massachusetts "...to impound goods from New England because contrary to Acts of Parliament divers goods are imported into New England not directly from England." It is also noted that “four vessels came into Boston with Canary wine but only two were from Bristol, and a vessel arriving at Salem directly from Cales, Spain was loaded with wine and anchovies and had sold Potter's tobacco in Cales for £22 a hogshead.”

Logwood was one of the commodities considered as money because of its ease of resale and steady value. This staple of international trade was a dyestuff that was an excellent means to acquire European goods and avoid the restrictions of the Navigation Acts. There was an almost steady stream of vessels from North America stopping at Jamaica on the way into and out of the Bay of Campeche in an attempt to hide illegal logwood trade through misrepresented customs entries and so avoid blatant contravention of the Navigation Acts (MacLeod 1973:367, Rossano 1988:19-20, 23). Zahedieh (1986a:570, 1986b:217, 220) notes that according to the Naval Officer's Returns of Jamaica, all vessels coming into port were listed. In reality, only the vessels departing for England or English colonies were recorded between 1680 and 1705. This does not account for the activities of all of the 150-200 ships entering and leaving Port Royal, the undeniably busiest English port in the Caribbean. Most of these vessels would
then trade the logwood directly with continental Europe, many in direct contravention of

This trade put Jamaica directly in the middle of a very lucrative trade system, and
it is very likely that payment for Jamaica’s part was commensurate with its participation.
The proof that the Navigation laws were ignored by the Jamaicans is seen in the papers
and letters of some merchants from 1688 and 1689 (Zahedieh 1986b:210). If there is an
opportunity for a businessman to do business, it will not matter with whom he does that
business, survival (of any kind) is incentive enough for creative alternatives to
government restriction (McAlister 1987:374).

In the Memoirs of Thomas Papillon of London, Merchant (1623-1702), the
importance of the repercussions of the Navigation Acts on merchants in England is
evident. Along with Sir Josiah Child, Papillon (1887:70-74, 78-83) is concerned with the
decay of English trade and the prosperity of Dutch trade and regards private trade and the
Dutch as rivals to the East India Company and the ever-increasing numbers of interlopers
as interfering with trade. In November 1681, the East India Company sent a petition to
the King stating that “some persons for their own private lucre and gain... have of late
taken upon them in an irregular and clandestine way to send ships, and to trade into those
countries and to hold correspondences with those heathen Princes and Governors...and
...that unless such Interloping and irregular trading be restrained, it will be impossible...to
hold and maintain the said Trade” (Papillon 1887:70-74, 78-83).

To acknowledge that greed and self-preservation are significant motivators of
much of the activities of European and Chinese merchants in the 17th century is
reasonable; to extrapolate that this can be applied specifically to the inhabitants of Port Royal is not all that far-fetched. If an opportunity arose for those to take on the life of a privateer or pirate or enterprising merchant, certainly it would have been seized. The journals of seamen of the period allude to situations in which the temptation to enter into private trade becomes too powerful to ignore (Godden 1979:64). The pay and living conditions for most seamen, and even officers, were mean and exploitative (Barlow 1934:83, 140, 218, 333, 352, 425, 455, 527-528). The risks were hardly a deterrent, and the rewards could make a wealthy gentleman out of almost any lowly-born individual.

The Navigation Acts had both beneficial and detrimental effects on colonial trade. The influence of foreign competition was significantly reduced and so ensured a market for goods that may not have been as competitive on a large-scale market. The economic elite of the colonies was still involved in foreign trade bringing in goods not always available within the Navigation Acts trade system (Perkins 1980:34-36).

**European Trade Laws, Privateering, and Illicit Trade**

How did Chinese porcelain make its way to Port Royal, Jamaica in the 17th century? Throughout the century, the governing bodies of various European nations tried to legislate monopolistic trading systems with their own various outposts and colonies, the essence of the Navigation Acts of England. In most cases, however, wars, economic upheavals, and individual greed upset their best-laid plans. The common practice of granting letters of marque to privateers may have ensured the safety of these outposts to
some extent, but it also promoted a circumvention of the various acts and policies meant
to restrict trade.

**England**

The English had factories and colonies in East Asia (Bantam), India, St. Helena,
the Lesser Antilles (Barbados), Jamaica, and Northeast North America. In England, both
the government and the East India Company employed people to intercept in coming and
out going vessels in order to prevent and catch smugglers (Barlow 1934:78, 218, 276,
364, 406). But it was not an uncommon practice for vessels to pull into bays and
moorings for emergency repairs and provisions (Barlow 1934:198-199, 305, 385, 450).
These detours, often legitimate, must have presented a prime opportunity to evade the tax
man and the company assessor and allow private business to carry on if not flourish.
Moreover, the geography of the North American colonies was particularly conducive to
smuggling; it was easy to avoid detection from the English naval vessels that were
inadequate to guard the coastlines (Hornstein 1988:111-113). Although the Treaty of
Madrid did not allow the much sought-after direct trade between the English and the
Spanish in the West Indies, it did hint at future trade possibilities, and it did allow vessels
of either nation, through the *arribada maliciosa*, permission to enter the other's ports in
the event of bad weather, shipwreck, repair, refit, or revictual. This, in turn, opened up
less covert opportunities for illicit trade (Zahedieh 1986a:574). The merchants of the
*Casa de Contratación* had their vessels follow the same activities in order to prevent the
government assessors from finding and seizing or demanding a share of the smuggled goods (Vieten Linaje 1688:48; Kroell 1988:1-3).

Until 1680, the protection of merchant vessels in the Mediterranean was the primary focus of the English Navy; the New World, particularly the West Indies, held a very low priority. Merchant vessels on their way to the West Indies would travel south from England with a convoy headed for the Mediterranean or the Far East and then race across the Atlantic trying to avoid any pirates patrolling the Lesser Antilles (Rogers 1712:7-9; Barlow 1934:311, 328, 387-388, 443, 461; Hornstein 1988:104-105). It was the responsibility of the governors of the various English colonies to see to the security of their own vessels. This led to the granting of letters of marque to individual captains and vessels. Even with the ‘permanent assignment’ of one or two vessels by the navy to the individual colonies for protection, there were far more pirates than there were protectors. Those vessels that were to serve in merchant convoys as escort ships from the North American colonies also engaged in a little trade of their own, totally in contravention of their mandate to protect the merchant fleet from marauders and prevent illegal and contraband private trade (Hornstein 1988:110-115). It appears the that as long as everyone financially benefitted from private trade and even smuggling, strict adherence to the law did not occur.

France

The French had factories in East Asia (Bantam), Madagascar, the Lesser Antilles, and North America (Louisiana and Quebec). Until 1661, the French Crown’s interest in
colonization was cursory, since political intrigues and international policies were of far more consuming importance (Roberts 1971:57). With the rise of Jean-Baptiste Colbert to Controller General of Finances, changes began to occur in the Caribbean. The Compagnie des Indes Occidentales (CIO) was granted a 40-year charter, and new governors and new outposts were established (Roberts 1971:57-58). By 1674, Colbert had convinced Louis XIV to abolish the CIO, and the outposts became colonies under Crown direction (Roberts 1971:65). Colbert abolished the customary pattern of free trade in the Caribbean colonies and instituted a similar set of regulations to the Navigation Acts that were implemented by the English and the Spanish. Unlike the English, however, the French did not use the absentee landlord system but, instead, diversified the types of crops produced and improved methods of agricultural production on her colonial plantations (Roberts 1971:67-68). The Crown appointed Paul Tarin de Cussy governor of Saint Domingue, and in 1689, he was finally allowed to use buccaneers as well as the militia to actively attack the English and the Spanish. With de Cussy’s death in 1691, Jean-Baptiste du Casse took over the governorship of the colony and began to build its economy and expand its sphere of influence. He put the local government in order and laid down his law to the French colonists and to the Spanish (Roberts 1971:74, 78). When the earthquake hit Jamaica, du Casse promptly sent raids to the island to plunder what was left (Roberts 1971:79). After 1700, the French East India Company was in such dire financial straits that in order to send out voyages it was required to take out loans and could only pay its crew in paper money redeemable only in
Paris. However, captains and officers made large profits from their voyages, presumably from smuggling (Kroell 1988:4).

The French Crown was interested in promoting French New World colonies and felt no compunction in attacking other colonies using the buccaneers available. Like the English in the 1670s and early 1680s, royal commissions were given to these pirates in order to give official sanction to their deeds (Roberts 1971:73). It can be assured that all manner of goods were plundered and dispersed by these pirates.

Netherlands

The Dutch had factories and outposts at Formosa, Batavia, India, St. Helena (for a short time), Brazil, West Africa, the Lesser Antilles, and the Hudson Valley. The East and West India companies of the Netherlands were groups of merchants who formed trade companies. These syndicates generally represented the merchants of a specific area or city, with little or no concern for colonization. The main focus was to establish the most expedient method of utilizing the resources available with an eye on the profit margin.

During the 1600s, the Dutch in New Amsterdam understandably had strong connections with Amsterdam, even after the 1664 English take-over of the colony. After 1674, four ships left Amsterdam annually for New York to conduct trade, in spite of the Navigation Acts meant to curtail such trade. English trade was growing by the last quarter of the 17th century, but the English “could not eclipse the Dutch,” due to the

In 1680, the old Dutch West Indies Company (WIC) was dissolved by its membership, and a new West Indies Company was formed to take over the business of the old company. In essence, the company was restructured, dividing the area of trade into two classes of colonies and outposts. The first ‘class’ was under the complete monopoly of the company, and any interloper caught was to be imprisoned and their goods confiscated (Goslinga 1985:1-2). The territory included in this ‘first class’ area was the West Coast of Africa from the Tropic of Cancer to 30° south of the equator, and the islands of Aruba, Bonaire, Curaçao, Essequibo, and Demerara in the Americas. The ‘second class’ included the West African Coast north of the Tropic of Cancer and all the Americas not in the ‘first class’ territory. These ‘second class’ areas were open to all private traders from the United Provinces, but they were required to pay a ‘recognition fee’ for the privilege. Some areas in the Leeward Island and on the northern coast of South America were under direct proprietorship to separate Dutch companies until 1683 (Goslinga 1985:2, 31).

From 1690 to 1719, the new WIC yielded profits through the slave trade funneled through Curaçao. The restructured company’s orientation was primarily towards trade, with little emphasis on colonization. The Heren X [Board of Directors] were far more concerned with the intrusive trade of the lorrinaiders [interlopers] and their own slave trade. These lorrinaiders and sluykers [smugglers] were Dutchmen operating outside the WIC charter, and the Heren X put forth a number of decrees in an effort to stop them
(Goslinga 1985:28-29). However, this kleine vaart [inter-insular trade] was conducted throughout the Caribbean and began to blossom. By the end of the century the WIC decided it was easier to get fees from the those operating within the kleine vaart than try to stop it (Goslinga 1985:190, 196).

The Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie (VOC) or the Dutch East Indies Company, established in 1602, had been trading with the Chinese through Indonesia and Formosa. By the end of the 17th century, this trade had grown by leaps and bounds, funneled vast quantities of East Asian commodities into Europe (Cheng 1984:96).

Spain

The Spanish had colonies in the Philippines, Mexico, Central America, South America, Florida, Cuba, Hispaniola, and the Canary Islands. They employed three major systems of trade. The Carrera de Indias was the “maritime lifeline linking Spain and the Indies,” and it encompassed the fleets sailing to and from the New World and those ports that directly served those fleets (McAlister 1987:201-202). The African slave trade was based initially on monopolistic trade licenses, but in 1532 it was moved under the umbrella of the Casa de Contratación and changed to non-monopolistic licences. The Canaries trade system involved direct trade links between the Canaries and the West Indies. It provided goods for the settlements in the Antilles and the Spanish Main that were not directly served by the Carrera de Indias fleets. The primary exchange was usually that of local produce and American gold and silver for European goods. This system was directed under the governing hand of mercantile tribunals but was actually
under the jurisdiction of the Casa de Contratación. When the fleets came into the coastal cities they underwent significant changes, from the normal sleepy town to bustling entrepôt. Both Veracruz and Portobelo would swell with the influx of merchants and goods as part of the trade fairs associated with the transshipment of goods into and out of the colonies (Gibson 1967:124).

A fourth system of trade, contraband trade, filled the gaps left by the legitimate trade systems. It provided European goods that were not being supplied, African slaves that were not finding their way to these settlements, and scarce goods at much lower prices than those demanded by the legitimate systems. These goods were paid for with local products and illicit precious metals. Early in the 17th century, the principal agents of this trade were French corsairs, Canary Islanders, and slavers utilizing the legitimate trade systems as cover for the illegal trade. "The Carrera itself accommodated illicit traffic through the collusion of ship captains, merchants and custom officials" (McAlister 1987:235-236). "Royal authorities, both in Seville and Central America, often acted in collusion with law breakers or broke the laws themselves by enthusiastic participation...clamor for manufactured goods from Europe was so great that some governors deemed it advisable to turn a blind eye to smuggling in order to avoid public unrest or sedition" (MacLeod 1973:353).

According to MacLeod (1973:349), participation in contraband trade in Central America was the result of desperation, brought on by an economic depression during the 17th century. This area of the Caribbean Basin was not served directly by the Carrera, and the agricultural producers of the area were in need of a regular reliable system of
trade to get their perishables to market. According to MacLeod (1973:354), Central America did not have the silver of Veracruz, and Panama (Peru); and the gold of New Granada (Venezuela area); only the agricultural products cacao and indigo, both of which became increasingly important to Europeans, especially the English, by the end of the century. He also notes that "cacao did not become an important luxury beverage in Europe until the 17th century was well advanced, and by that time only the Costa Rican fields were of any importance" (MacLeod 1973:354). A decrease in imports of indigo from the Orient, by almost half, and the rising demand for dyes from a growing textile industry in Europe, necessitated that Costa Rican indigo fill the need and take on greater economic importance (MacLeod 1973:368-69).

Portugal

The Portuguese had trade outposts or 'factories, and colonies in East Asia and India, as well as outposts in Brazil, West Africa, South Africa, East Africa, and the Atlantic Islands (the Azores, Madeiras, Cape Verdes, São Tomé, Príncipe, and Fernando Po). McAlister (1987:386) notes that in the late 1600s, the English traded in contraband with the colonists of Bahia and Rio de Janeiro. There seemed to be no need to do so in any surreptitious manner, even East Indiamen regularly came into port at Bahia, obviously for provisioning and surely for private trading. McAlister (1987:386) also alludes to the same activity occurring at Spanish American ports, "...no one knows the volume of clandestine traffic."
After 1649, Portugal tried to introduce similar restrictive trade policies to those practiced by the Spanish but were similarly unsuccessful. In 1658, the Portuguese also attempted to regulate and monopolize trade through the use of merchant trading companies similar to the English and Dutch companies. However, these too proved to be unsuccessful (McAlister 1987:386).

Other European Countries

The following discussion does not include the outposts and short-lived colonies of, for example, the Danes, Swedes, and Austrians. With all of these factories and outposts manned by the settlers and merchants of numerous European countries and supplied by vessels from their own and other countries, specific areas at specific times must have had a large number of in-coming and out-going ships. All of these vessels were under the same physical constraints and prone to attack by the same pirates and privateers. For the most efficient navigation of the oceans by sail, there were specific routes everyone traveled. Encountering vessels of other nations must have been a reasonably common occurrence. As the privateer Captain Woodes Rogers (1712:305) writes in his journal, "twenty-six vessels met at the Cape of Good Hope...English, Dutch, Danish...twenty-three bound for Europe...three for East India...twenty-one sail in a convoy to Europe...for safety."

In his sea diary, Barlow (1934:328, 343, 443, 461) notes that vessels tried to sail in convoys as much as possible, sometimes sailing with vessels of other countries if they were all headed in the same general direction or for a common destination. On several
occasions, Barlow describes how the seamen of a vessel were so desperate for fresh food or water, they would hail another vessel to trade or buy what was needed. It is not unreasonable to assume that these exchanges included other items of value as well. In 1682, the English East India Company compiled a set of regulations to address the ongoing private trading being conducted by its crews. The sentiment was that this trade would occur with or without the Company’s sanction and it made sense to ensure that the Company received a portion of the trade. Therefore, permission was officially granted to the Company’s factors, commanders, officers, and seamen to conduct private trade under the condition that the Company have everything itemized. Upon returning to England, the items would then be sold at the Company auction. Goods allowed for private trade were listed by the Company as ‘indulgencies’ and ‘permission money’ and were required to be paid by the individual conducting the private trade in order to defer any administrative costs of the Company. Private trade was not to infringe on the Company’s own business; to ensure this, it also ruled that goods from private trade could not take up vessel space that was designated for Company cargo. The space allotted each man aboard for his personal effects would include any goods for private trade (Godden 1979:57-59, 60-61).

In the 1690s, the Company reevaluated its private trade policy and adjusted the percentages considered a fair share of the take. This was due, of course, “in consideration of our running the hazard of the sea, general charges of the Company, and disbursements aforesaid of our money in India” and amounted to 20 percent of the private trade profit; in times of war, it amounted to 40 percent (Howard 1994:19). Such
conditions allowed the men the motive, and the proximity to Asian ports and encounters with other vessels provided ample opportunity to trade. This may have manifested itself in at least part of the collection of Chinese porcelain associated with the Port Royal site.

**European Trade Practices in Asia**

A general discussion of the political and economic state of China from the mid to late 17th century lends some perspective to a discussion of European trade practices in Asia, especially the relationship with China.

In the mid 17th century, numerous political and economic events led to the disruption of porcelain production by the Imperial Kilns in Jingdezhen (Figure 6). At the closing of these pottery works, craftsmen had to find work to feed their families. It seems safe to assume that some of these artisans and craftsmen found work at rival and ‘provincial’ pottery works in other parts (provinces) of China, as well as those pottery works in Jingdezhen that continued to produce porcelains for markets other than the Imperial household.

Also during this time, the Chinese restricted trade with the European traders, but there are conflicting reports of how long and how successful these trade restrictions were. Europeans may have been officially restricted in their trade relations with the Chinese, especially inside China, but means were certainly devised to circumvent official restrictions. For instance, the English were barred from direct trade with China from about 1640-1680 (Noël-Hume 1980:257). It seems these restrictions worked in much
Figure 6. Map of Chinese Porcelain Production Centers.
the same way as the English Navigation Acts' protectionist policy, namely, they often
produced opposite the desired effect. Clandestine trade activity in and along the Chinese
cost occurred on an even greater scale than the earlier smuggling which had prompted
the restrictionist policy in the first place (Butler et al. 1990:12-13).

The kilns of Jingdezhen were the major porcelain producing kilns of the country,
producing the Imperial wares, as well as much of the porcelain for the domestic and
export trade. “At the peak of the China trade, thousands of factories and independent
kilns supplied both Imperial and Western requests for porcelain” (Brawer 1992:27).
During this period, the Dutch shifted the emphasis of their trade to Japan, although they
still had shipments of Chinese commodities delivered to Formosa and Batavia by way of
Chinese vessels. The Spanish at Manila traded with Chinese vessels and merchants
because they too did not have direct access to Chinese ports. The Portuguese were still
maintaining a small foothold in Macao (China) and India, and the English, French, Danes,
and Swedes had small trade outposts (factories) in Bantam and India.

The Chinese had been trading with their Asian neighbors, particularly those to the
south and west, for centuries. This trade continued unabated primarily because the
Chinese were extremely adept businessmen. This can be attested by reports sent to Spain
by the envoy in Manila, as well as those sent to the Governors of the VOC and the
merchants of the English East India Company (EIC). All were complaining and advising
the Home Office about the Chinese propensity to take advantage in business dealings
(Schurz 1959:67, 79, 95). To go only by the official edicts of any government of this
time obviously is to ignore the reality of the situation. Wherever there was the
opportunity where money could be made and products sold for a profit with reasonable risk, an enterprising merchant would find a way to do just that. Things have hardly changed in the intervening centuries.

With the advent of large-scale trade between European countries and Asia, specifically China, new and exotic products became much sought-after commodities in Europe and the New World. It must be noted that the trade in highly valued spices, dyes, teas, and silks, were always the main focus; porcelain was merely the extra profit in the minds of European traders (Schurz 1959:32-33, 51; Godden 1982:40, 58). In the recent past, several wrecks of vessels en route to European factories in Bantam and Batavia have been salvaged. These date from the 1640s (the 
Hatcher wreck) to the 1690s (the 
Vung Tau wreck). Thousands of pieces of porcelain have been recovered from these vessels (Christie’s Amsterdam 1984a, 1984b, 1985, 1992; Christie’s Hong Kong 1987, 1988; Shulsky 1997, 1998, pers. comm.).

The supercargoes for the various East India Companies were given instruction from their head offices to order and purchase literally tons of porcelain of a specific form and color for the home market. That thousands of pieces of porcelain were not considered the prime commodity is not inconsistent with the goals of the East India companies. These literal tons of Chinese porcelain were of lesser value when compared to the teas, spices, silks, and other textiles for which Europeans were willing to pay top price. It is also important to realize that vessels were carrying goods meant not just for the European market, but also for other Asian markets as far West as the Persian Gulf.
In 1663, Padre Colín, wrote about the trade in Manila and what passed through to New Spain.

...it is the center to which flow the riches of the Orient and the Occident, the silver of Peru and New Spain, the pearls and precious stones of India, the diamonds of Narsinga and Goa, the rubies, sapphires and topazes, and the cinnamon of Ceylon, the pepper of Sumatra and the Javas, the cloves, nutmegs and other spices of the Moluccas and Banda, the fine Persian silks and wool and carpets for Ormuz and Malabar, rich hangings and bed coverings of Bengal, fine camphor of Borneo, balsam and ivory of Abada and Cambodia, the civet of the Lequios, and from Great China silks of all kinds, raw and woven, in velvets, and figured damasks, taffetas and other cloths of every texture, design and colors, linens, and cotton mantles, gilt-decorated articles, embroideries and porcelains, and other riches and great curiosities of great value and esteem (Schurz 1959:50).

Unlike most of these commodities, porcelain could survive the ocean voyages to the various global destinations in relatively good condition. Porcelain will not get moldy or be spoiled or damaged by salt water. These attributes, as well as its weight, “explains the original main purpose of the china-ware cargo—it acted as a vital form of ballast, or kentledge, that would not be spoilt by the sea” (Godden 1982:59). The lighter, bulkier, more expensive and valuable commodities of teas, silks, and spices would be stowed in the hold on top of the porcelain, reducing the chances of damage by seawater. Typical orders for shipments from China in 1697 and 1699 read as: “20 tons of strong usefull chinaware for Kintlage” (Godden 1982:59-60). In 1699, porcelain was considered a poor commodity by the English supercargo because of its expense; it did, however, serve very well as ballast. The supercargo ordering goods for the Macclesfield, the first English vessel to establish trade at Canton, notes, "...Chinaware of which there is no quantity in ye place at present and such as there is, is likewise very dear, so if there were not a
necessity upon us to buy some for kintlage, we should hardly meddle with any..."
(Godden 1979:35).

The supercargo was complaining about the price of porcelain due to its low
supply and high demand at the particular time he was trying to load his vessel for
England. Part of the reason for the low supply was due to the purchases by members of
the Macclesfield's crew. They had gone into Canton before the supercargo and had
bought up all of the first quality stock available (Godden 1979:56-57). The price of the
porcelain was still relatively low compared to that of the other commodities being shipped
to Europe. It can be assumed that its increased cost at the time ate into the supercargo's
share of the profits, which was his commission. The supercargo not only bought for the
Company's benefit but for his own benefit (private trade) (Philips 1956:27; Godden

The supercargo's 1702 order specified to "first care to provide kintlage
commoditye to stiffen your ship...in our said list innumerated severall sorts of heavy
goods proper for that purpose...chinaware of the usefull sorts especially plates and dishes
which stow close" and also "...these being a kintlage commodity you may procure thereof
10-15 tons." In 1705, the English East India Company's China trade vessel, the Oley,
loaded according to a purchase order: 60 tons Singlo tea, 20 tons Imperial tea, 20 tons
Bohea tea, 20 tons copper, 15 tons quick silver or vermillion, 15 tons wrought silk, 15
tons raw silk, 3 tons china cloth, 2 tons rhubarb and chinaroot, and only 10 tons of
chinaware (Godden 1982: 58-60).
Porcelain, of course, can break. But even the broken pieces still have a value. This can be seen in the journals of the English East India Company - “China ware to be taken with all faults...sold lots of ‘broken China ware;’” in the diary of Barlow “even those porcelain which were damaged during warehousing;” or the decoration of a fountain on the outskirts of Mexico City (Barlow 1934:528; Godden 1979:27; Mudge 1986:84; Lyon 1990:31). With porcelain’s relatively large-scale introduction into Portugal in the late 1500s, and into Holland just after the turn of the 17th century, it became a much sought-after luxury item. By the end of the century, porcelain was in the hands of the upper-class, the newly rising middle-classes, merchants, and petty politicians (Godden 1982:63). As the 18th century progressed, almost everyone had a little porcelain to call their own.

Hornstein (1988:116) indicates that by 1689, the English so dominated smuggling in the Caribbean that the entrepôt of Port Royal had far greater success than her Dutch and French counterparts on Curaçao and Hispaniola. It was due to this city’s reputation that it is not surprising such an exotic luxury commodity would be found here where high-valued inventories were at least as high or even higher than those of contemporaneous Boston or Bristol. This includes the estate of Robert Phillip (total value of £1883:16:4), a common sailmaker (IRO, Wills 1688:Vol. VI, f.53; JPA, Inv. 1695-1701:Vol. IV/V, f.5_; Zahedieh 1986b:220).

This does not preclude that other modes of trade were not used to move Asian goods and particularly Chinese porcelain into Port Royal in the late 17th century. However, it is possible that no conclusive system of movement may ever be determined. It is likely that a combination of methods resulted in the arrival and distribution of
Chinese porcelain in Port Royal. Chapter V summarizes the various ceramics types found in the 1692 context of Port Royal with an eye to the European trade links that are revealed. These links will assist in the analysis of the methods of trade used to bring porcelain to Jamaica.
CHAPTER V

THE CERAMICS OF PORT ROYAL

The excavations at Port Royal uncovered ceramics of numerous types and from a wide array of origins. The study of the Chinese porcelain must thus be placed within the context of the other ceramics as well as the material culture of the entire site. Such an holistic approach allows analysis of the relative value and popularity of the porcelain. It also allows speculation on the porcelain’s distribution patterns within the cultural context of the site. The analysis must, therefore, begin by presenting basic information about all of the ceramics found in Port Royal. This must include the types and amounts of ceramics found, the origins of those ceramics, and the possible trade routes through which they arrived at Port Royal. The probable value ascribed to them is important, as is their general distribution patterns and their possible associations with the Chinese porcelain.

This chapter briefly identifies the ceramic assemblage found in the 17th century context of Port Royal. These ceramics were identified and typed according to Dr. Donny Hamilton’s ceramic typology. This typology is based on the work by Lister and Lister (1982, 1987), Draper (1984), Hume (1985), South (1977), Sussman (1985), and Deagan (1987). It also incorporates types encountered at the site.

One of the land sites excavated in Port Royal was a complex of buildings on New Street in the center of town. One of the buildings in the complex has been identified as a
tavern and this site is discussed in more depth in Chapter VIII. In essence, there are no real discernable differences between the New Street excavations and the underwater excavations, except that the New Street tavern site had more tin-enamel punch bowls or ‘Monteiths.’ This constitutes a significantly larger quantity than the very few specimens from the underwater excavations (Brown 1996:178-183). This may be due to the longer occupation period for the New Street site and the fact that it is a known tavern site. In 1692, the punch or ale house may not have gained its full popularity, or more likely, this type of establishment has not yet been excavated from the submerged area of the city. The New Street site had only one slipware vessel in the tavern occupation level, this being less than the quantity of slipware found in Hamilton’s Queen and Lime streets area of excavation (Brown 1996:172). Much of the New Street artifacts date to the 1703 fire which laid waste to Port Royal (Brown 1996:265-266).

Porcelain

Porcelain is a very high-fired ceramic that is vitrified upon firing. This makes it a non-porous ceramic, and it does not require a glaze in order to allow the vessel to hold liquids. Chinese porcelain is a very old ceramic type, but it has been produced in Europe only since 1709. Indeed, there is no European porcelain in the 17th-century context of Port Royal. If any had been found, it would have been termed intrusive from a later context.
Seven percent, or 268 sherds and intact objects of the total 3,912 sherds excavated by Hamilton (1981-1990) are Chinese porcelain. The history and manufacture of this particular type of porcelain is discussed in the following chapter. The specific types and examples of Chinese porcelain found in the excavations of Port Royal are analyzed in Chapter VII.

Stoneware

Stoneware, like porcelain, is a high-fired ceramic differing only in the clays used. Stoneware vitrifies at temperatures of 1200 °C to 1300 °C, slightly lower than porcelain. At these temperatures, the ceramic produced is "impermeable by liquids even without a glaze...[they are] usually given a salt glaze, made by throwing common salt into the kiln at the height of the firing temperature; the salt vaporizes and is deposited on the vessels as a thin, transparent film, a minutely-pitted surface, and a soft sheen" (Wilcoxen 1993: Sect II, 1). In the 17th century, stonewares were produced primarily in Germany and the Lowlands of Europe, with only limited production in England late in the century. Vessels from these areas show distinctive forms, motifs, clay bodies, and manufacturing idiosyncracies (Wilcoxen 1993: Sect II, 2, 3, 6).

Twelve percent of the total ceramic sherd count of the Port Royal site is represented by 466 stoneware sherds, primarily identified as Rhenish. The most interesting and intact vessels are two small Fröchen, Rhenish or Bartmann jugs (Wilcoxen 1993: Sect II, 16-17). One of these jugs was corked at the time of recovery and
contained the remnants of its liquid contents. This liquid may have been a mixture for medicinal purposes. It includes phytoliths (plant silica crystals) and pollens that have yet to be identified (Bratten 1992, pers. comm.).

There are examples of English mugs of a shape common for tavern drinking vessels and used in the 17th and 18th centuries. In-depth analysis was carried out by Charlotte Wilcoxen but reconstruction has not yet been completed. There are also numerous examples of Rhenish and Westerwald stonewares illustrating the type of trading activities in which people engaged during this period. The documentary evidence does not specifically refer to these wares, but the wares themselves do indicate European trade.

**Refined Earthenware**

This general category of ceramics refers to ceramics with a clay body or paste with virtually no inclusions and fired to a light buff to red color. These wares are glazed on at least one surface and are often glazed on both the interior and exterior surfaces. These ceramics predominate post-1700, but both tin-enamel and slipware entered into use in the 17th century.

**Tin-Enamel/Tin-Glazed Ware**

These ceramics are generally of a soft clay body or paste and a glaze that includes tin-oxide, which produces the thick, white background of tin-glazed ware. Delft from
Delft; delft from England; Faïences from England, France, and Italy; and Portuguese, Spanish, and Italian Majolicas fall into this general category. They differ primarily in the color palette and motifs used as decorative design.

A total of 1,165 tin-glazed sherds, or 30 percent of the total ceramic assemblage, was recovered. Reconstructed and intact artifacts number a minimum of 22 vessels. This includes two large basins, two very elaborate vases, numerous jars of varying shapes and sizes, including very large apothecary jars, tiny ointment jars, and a finely decorated ginger jar. Also found were one posset pot and five cups, two of which were intact, very finely potted, and decorated. The shape of the cups have a very similar shape to that of the Blanc de Chine Appliqué porcelain cups that were traditionally used for wine. They differ primarily in having handles, a European ceramic trait. Coffee, chocolate, and tea were hot beverages gaining popularity, both in Europe and in the colonies. It can be assumed that these vessels would have been used for the consumption of these beverages without particular regard to traditional Chinese usage.

There are at least two reconstructed porringer, two largely reconstructed Chinoiserie plates, and one almost intact salt with ram’s horn finials. Two chamber pots have been reconstructed, and the lids to both plain and finely decorated vessels were also recovered.

**Slipware**

The decoration of slipware is derived primarily from the use of colored slip (liquid clay) applied on to the paste prior to the initial bisque firing of the ceramic. This slip is
usually of a contrasting color to that of the clay body and is manipulated in numerous
cways to produce a number of decorative effects. These effects become prominent once
the ceramic has a lead glaze applied and has undergone the glaze firing. Much of this
ceramic type originates in the Staffordshire area of England.

There are at least six vessels that were reconstructed or were recovered intact.
These include three posset pots, two of which have decorations of large brown dots in the
upper one-third of the vessel and lines in the lower two-thirds with the typical
yellow/green lead glaze. The third posset pot is interesting due to its rather large size and
to the ‘jeweled’ decoration, including the name of Richard Meir, its maker, a well-known
potter in Staffordshire in the 1690s (Draper 1984:16).

Both a reconstructed jug and an intact sugar bowl are fine examples of trailed and
feathered decoration. A straight-sided oval vessel with a drizzled slip and lead glaze,
which has been typed as Mottled was also recovered.

It is interesting to note that there is only a small representation of slipwares (less
than 7 percent) in the Port Royal ceramic assemblage. This is probably due to the fact
that although slipwares appear as early as the late 1500s- early 1600s, Staffordshire
slipware did not gain widespread popularity until 1690-1705. This limits the span of time
in which these ceramics could be purchased and transported from England to Port Royal
prior to the earthquake. Archaeologically, there is a gap from 1692 to 1750-60, and
perhaps as late as 1815. This is primarily because of the earthquake and resulting seismic
waves and the hurricanes that hit Jamaica during that period. These occurrences
deposited a layer of sediment and dead coral over the site. During the latter part of this
period (1814-1817), the British Naval Hospital at Port Royal was constructed opposite the area excavated. Over the years, trash from the hospital and the town was hauled and dumped into the harbor, accounting for the debitage on the site (Hamilton 1994, pers. comm.). In other words, the very short time span that encompasses the popularity of Staffordshire slipware does not coincide with the ceramic stratigraphic sequence found at Port Royal and indicates that sites dating to the early 1690s and earlier are going to have very small percentages of slipware in comparison to sites that date to the early 1700s.

**Coarse Earthenware**

This ceramic type is the most pervasive in the 17th-century context of the site. Coarse earthenware is generally described as having a clay body or paste with significant inclusions and fires to a buff to a light red color. These inclusions can be almost gravel in consistency down to fine frit (broken-up fired clay). The 1,837 coarse earthenware sherds account for 47 percent of all 17th-century ceramic sherds found by the Port Royal Project.

**Borderware**

We have reconstructed and have intact several examples of borderware, both buff and red clay varieties. These include one intact porringer, one tall storage jar, three small three-legged cooking pots, and possibly two chamber pots. One of the chamber pots was
found in association with an area used as a yard and the remains of what are believed to
be a two-hole privy.

English-Made and Yabba

English-made coarse earthenware sherds comprise 23 percent of the site’s sherds; 24 percent are Yabba, or Jamaican or slave made. There are examples of English-made
course earthenwares that include wheel-thrown storage vessels, bowls, basins, and at least
one colander. Most of these artifacts show evidence of lead glaze, either on the interior,
or on the interior and exterior of the vessels. One storage vessel has a flat bottom, has
two small bung holes, and was filled with pitch. When this vessel was excavated, it was
found on its side with a small pool of the still malleable pitch at its mouth. It was found
inside the front door of what is thought to be the front hall of a restaurant or victualer. It
is rather curious why this vessel filled with a rather malodorous (even after 300 years
underwater) pitch would be in this room.

According to Bratten (1992:2, 5), 898 sherds of the 1,837 coarse earthenware
sherds are Yabba; only 237 show evidence of a lead-based glaze and, therefore, a
European influence. The types and sizes of the vessels include large water-storage jars,
and cooking and storage jars and bowls. Based on the number of rim sherds, there
appears to be a minimum vessel count of 95 bowls and 58 jars. The African influence is
evident in some of the decoration, in the rounded vessel bottoms, the hand-coiling
technique, and some surface burnishing. The European influences include the flat
bottoms of some vessels, the lead glaze on the interior and exterior of some vessels, and
the large coiled neck of some storage jars (Bratten 1992:2, 10, 13-15). One of the
distinctive features of the Yabba vessels is the inconsistent quality of the coloring of the
sherds. For example, the color of sherds in a reconstructed large storage jar range from
red to dark grey. Bratten (1992:2-4) notes that the difference in color is a result of the
inconsistent open-hearth firing technique that was used on the vessel. The greater heat
and oxygen in the firing, the redder the paste; the more reduction and lower temperature,
the greyer the paste. Bratten (1992:2-4) found this to be true in many of the sherds,
including the other coarse earthenwares. This differentiation in color can also result from
use (Hamilton 1997, pers. comm.). Bratten (1992:15) also confirms earlier observations
that many of the strictly African-influenced Yabba vessels were found in association with
hearth, as well as the yard areas just outside the hearths. It is entirely logical that the
food cooking and preparation areas were the areas of highest concentration of the Yabba
and English coarse earthenwares, since these wares were used by slaves and servants for
the preparation, cooking, and storage of the food.

Spanish Olive Jars and Storage Vessels

Numerous sherds attributed to Spanish olive jars and storage vessels were found
in the underwater excavations of Port Royal. These vessels have been found in a variety
of North American and European sites. According to Wilcoxen (1993:51-54), they date
to the 16th and 17th centuries. The sherds of the olive jars found indicate they include all
form types of olive jars manufactured during this period. Interestingly, some of the olive
jars correspond in rim form and body shape to the types found in association with the

With the exception of the array of Chinese porcelain recovered, one can surmise from the ceramic assemblage found in the TAMU underwater excavations of Port Royal that this port city was much like any other English colonial port. The varied origins of the ceramics reinforce the idea that a multi-national trade was occurring in England and its colonies in the late 17th century. The port records of England list earthen bottles and German linen, Spanish chests and tables, and Spanish cloths as leaving England, but none appear to be destined for Jamaica. The earthenware and earthenware with glass listed in the same port records do include Jamaica as one of the destinations of the vessels leaving England (PRO London 1681-1682, and Bristol 1681-1582, 1694-1695, Port Records). These commodities are listed in Appendix B of this dissertation together with their destinations and folios. From these records, we know that a healthy trade was conducted with European vessels coming into England, and European goods were being transshipped to the English colonies.
CHAPTER VI

THE MANUFACTURE AND TRADE OF CHINESE PORCELAIN

The presence of Chinese porcelain at 17th-century Port Royal is understandable only through a knowledge of the history of its production in China itself. Trade with other nations began as early as the 10th century A.D., and by the beginning of the 17th century, considerable quantities of the ceramic were being exported to Europe and her colonies. This chapter attempts to follow the movements and role of Chinese porcelain in the European colonial trading network. By so doing, it attempts to place the Port Royal collection in its proper context. The development of European and North American ‘copy cats’ is also briefly examined, as is porcelain’s traditional usage, manufacturing process, and variety of styles. The porcelain at Port Royal is discussed in Chapters VII and VIII.

History of Chinese Porcelain

In the 17th century, the Chinese were far more advanced than the Europeans in the production of high-fired ceramic wares - stoneware and porcelain. The development of these types of ceramics came early in their ceramic history, around 1500 B.C., approximately 3000 years before any European attempt. Indeed, the potter's wheel was in existence in Northeast China by about 2500 B.C., and it was not long before Chinese
potters were masters of the techniques of wheel throwing, molding, incising, and carving clay bodies. Early techniques used molds only to replicate the handles of bronze vases; however, as the Chinese became more skilled, this molding technique became a means of enhancing production. With the early development of the downdraft kiln during the Shang period (1700-1027 B.C.), few changes were made to kiln design until the 13th century. The semi-continuous downdraft porcelain kiln of the area of Longquan and Fujian province began with innovations in design made during the Yuan period (A.D. 1260-1358). Refinements in designs based on the downdraft principle led to the development of the dragon-backed and Japanese climbing kilns of the 17th century (Gray 1982:13-15). These later kilns are those most associated with porcelain production in China and Japan.

During the Sung period (A.D. 960-1279), the Chinese developed and produced the paste that was to become porcelain. Glazes and painted decoration on this ware did not make a strong appearance until the Yuan period and did not peak until the late 15th century. By the third century A.D., the making and glazing of high-fired stonewares were well-advanced in South China, and this was the precursor to porcelain (Gray 1982:11). Ci Qui was a term used early in the trade of Chinese ceramics, and it served to describe stonewares and porcelains interchangeably. Both were generally considered high-fired ceramics; only the actual temperature and clay body distinguished the ceramics (Palmer 1976:13). Porcelain had the higher firing temperatures and was comprised of a special combination of clay and glaze. Circa A.D. 900, early porcelains were traded throughout Asia and reputedly as far west as East Africa, most certainly into Persia and the Middle
East (Gray 1982:11-12; Van der Pijl-Ketel 1982:8). Porcelain was brought to Muslim courts in A.D. 1059, as noted by Muhammed Ibn-al-Husain-Bahaki, “Ali-Ibn-Isa, the governor of Khurasan presented Harum-al-Rashid, the Caliph, twenty pieces of Chinese Imperial porcelain, the like of which has never been at a caliph’s court before, in addition to two thousand other pieces of porcelain” (Cheng 1984:90-91). It is apparent that even at this early stage in the development of porcelain, the production of large quantities of pieces was not a difficulty. For generations, the technology behind the development and production of porcelain was a closely held secret in order to protect the Chinese monopoly. Eventually, China’s only competition in the production of porcelain came from the Japanese. It was not until well into the 18th century when Europeans began to produce porcelain that another source of competition developed.

The influx of considerable quantities of Chinese porcelain into Europe from the beginning of the 17th century by VOC traders increased over the course of the century. Fortunately, the difficulty in dating some porcelains by design or form has been greatly alleviated by the records of the wares that were shipped to Europe. According to Donnelly (1969:53), “with only rare exceptions the wares were hot from the kiln, so that an identifiable record of their shipment or acquisition constitutes good evidence of dating.” The porcelains found in the underwater excavations at Port Royal can generally be given a terminus post quem date of 6 June 1692. This should provide a valuable source of comparative material for future scholars attempting to date porcelains from a less strictly provenanced site. It must be kept in mind that designs continue for long periods, some even to the present.
Over the centuries, European traders had been aggressive towards the Chinese. The Portuguese privateered, the Dutch plundered, and the English fired upon a Chinese fortification; such incidents illustrated to the Chinese the undesirability of dealing too closely with the Europeans.

The Chinese...looked upon all Westerners as Barbarians, calling them yang kuei, “foreign devils.” The Europeans' acts of piracy and privateering and their disregard of the laws and customs of the lands they visited seemed to prove that they were indeed without civilization. As long as the Ming held control, trade other than the concession granted to Portugal was refused. But by the end of the reign of Wan Li central power was dissolving, weakened by wars with Japan, internal mismanagement and civil rebellion. The government lacked the means, if not the inclination, to curb the ever-growing illegal trade. Orders for porcelains in European shapes were filled at Jingdezhen without intervention. The potters found in the export trade a replacement for the domestic market...Imperial potters out of employment set up their own shops and made ceramics to European order (Frank 1969:19-21).

Political and economic upheaval in China in 1657-1683 greatly curtailed sanctioned trading, and the imperial porcelain kilns at Jingdezhen were shut down or destroyed during this time (Mudge 1986:70-72; Butler et al. 1990:3, 18-19). It is believed that one of the reasons for the economic problems was the decline in the amount of silver specie coming into China with the European trade. The merchants in China who financed the “handicraft industries” were bankrupt, and it was not until the 1680s that there was a resurgence in the economy (Butler et al. 1990:13). Following the overthrow of the Ming Dynasty by the Manzhu in 1675, Jingdezhen “was destroyed as a result of the rebellion of the Ming insurgents Wu San Gui and Wu Shin Fan...the kilns were rebuilt in 1677” (Atterbury 1982:28; Cheng 1984:81). It is reputed that most of the city’s population of nearly a million people were potters and associated pottery industry
workers employed at the Imperial Kilns and the private pottery works (Volker 1971:192; Chadhuri 1978:409; Cheng 1984:81). In the 18th century, Jingdezhen had a population “outnumbering all the cities of the world save Constantinople” (Frank 1969:9). Atterbury (1982:28) notes, “this area has the greatest significance for scholars of later Chinese ceramics, as most of the export and domestic ware of the 17th century was manufactured here.” Assumptions have been made by some scholars that with the ‘destruction’ of the city and closing of the imperial potteries, porcelain production was severely curtailed if not ceased altogether. Certainly, there was not enough porcelain produced to satisfy the Chinese domestic market, let alone the export market. This period was also one in which the English were not allowed direct access to Chinese ports; it has been assumed that this too would indicate that no Chinese porcelain was being exported to England and her colonies. Frank (1969:9) and Mudge (1986:70-71) report that there is little basis for this assumption, since other pottery works in Jingdezhen were “commercial capitalistic ventures.” It would seem then that although legitimate trade was curtailed, ample opportunities were available to European merchants and seamen to conduct Company, private, and illicit trade. With the disruption in imperial production, those otherwise unemployed and potentially starving craftsmen found or created work for themselves. These potters produced for the domestic and export markets that did not fall into decline but had, instead, expanded, especially that of European orders and trade. Most of these artisans remained working at the commercial pottery works that were still open in Jingdezhen and some migrated to provincial pottery works. Butler et al. (1990:18-19) confirm that the rebellion of 1675 dispersed some of the craftsmen into the countryside.
It has been supposed that since potters were no longer producing for the Imperial Family, there would have been a relaxation of imperial requirements on ceramic design and form. This relaxation may have adversely affected the quality of work produced, but it also allowed for the impetus for a creative boom in the industry (Mudge 1986:70-71; Butler et al. 1990:13-14). Pottery works throughout China catered to the needs and demands of an extended and changing market (Frank 1969:69; Cheng 1984:94-95, 96-97; Carswell et al. 1985:11). During this period, European demand for porcelain of Chinese motifs, as well as European-influenced and dictated motifs, did not diminish.

In 1680, the new Emperor took a personal interest in the arts, and under its new director, Cang Yingxuan, the imperial pottery factories were rebuilt and improved; production was in full swing by 1683 (Frank 1969:70). Through Yingxuan’s encouragement, the next century became what is known as a very innovative period at the Imperial Kilns. The long-enduring Blue and White type was joined by porcelains with two new overglaze enamel palettes; these became known to Western scholars as famille verte and famille rose (Frank 1969:70).

It must be noted also that many provincial, ‘peasant’ kilns were in operation throughout China at this time. Indeed, these smaller kilns had continued and increased production when the Imperial Kilns had shut down and had capitalized on the gap left in the export market. These wares are generally of excellent quality, as illustrated by the Fujian Blanc de Chine, but ‘seconds’ can be seen in the collections brought to Europe and the New World.
Wrecks from the South African coast and the *Santo Antonio de Tanna* at Mombasa, Kenya, as well as the houses of Port Royal, show excellent examples of late 17th-century high-quality Chinese porcelains produced both by the Imperial Kilns and the provincial kilns. But it has been argued that the design standards of some porcelains appeared to decline in the last quarter of the century as a result of increasing Western demands and the use of Western designs and design influences. These pieces were meant for the 'uncivilized' Western market, and it was assumed there was a distinction between these wares and those meant for domestic and other non-Western markets (Mudge 1986:14-15). Cooper (1988:43) notes that “each object and its arrangement have a meaning in a country where the written language had developed from pictorial symbols.”

In the preceding centuries, these design elements were part of the folklore of China. After the introduction of European themes, these “meanings became lost” (Cooper 1988:44). Cooper (1988:55) also notes that by Chinese potters standards, export wares were of inferior quality. However, as is illustrated later in this discussion, this was not always the case (Cheng 1984:94; Mudge 1986:9,11).

The VOC had wooden mockups painted with the designs they required as illustrations for their orders from the pottery works. From 1604 to 1657, the VOC imported 3,000,000 items, and a conservative estimate has been made that 60,000,000 pieces of porcelain were imported into Europe through all of the East India companies during the 18th century (Cheng 1984:96). By the end of the 17th century, the English were also making special orders of forms and designs for their own markets. With such large quantities of porcelain produced and exported, it is hardly surprising that such an
obviously popular commodity would be in the estates and homes of European colonists in the New World.

The manufacture of such vast quantities of porcelain required that the factories be very large and well-organized. The very organization of the manufacturing process ensured that although some European elements of design would be incorporated into production design, Chinese design could not be lost. Porcelain produced in Jingdezhen was achieved in an assembly line fashion. An artisan specialized in a specific aspect of production and or design. Since numerous hands were part of the process, it would have been difficult to lose the intrinsic Chinese quality of the porcelain even with the inclusion of European motifs. Western motifs on 17th- and 18th-century Chinese porcelain have a distinctly Asian flavor, especially in the depiction of Europeans. Cooper (1988:44) may be correct in indicating that the meaning might change, but this author disagrees that it would be lost to a culture that so devoutly adheres to its ancestral precedents.

_Nien Hao_ (reign marks) on porcelains were essentially the equivalent of Europe's pewter or silver makers' marks. These marks, which generally included six characters, tend to be found on the bottom of objects, or in the case of bowls, within the footrings. These reign marks, as the name implies, were to honor the Emperor in power. They also reflect the time period in which the piece was made, the time period which the piece imitates, the place or person for whom it was made, the occasion which it celebrates, or sayings of good luck (Macintosh 1977:37, 125, 138; Mudge 1986:229-230; Vainker 1991:190). Unfortunately, very few Chinese export porcelain wares have reign marks, since they were usually applied only to imperial porcelains and not to commercial wares.
Moreover, these marks may not always be an indicator of when the piece was manufactured or for whom. Often, pieces were made to copy a design used a century or two in the past as a tribute to the Emperor or the artist of that past era (Vainker 1991:191-192, 200). Sometimes, these copies were almost exact replicas of the original, and often, contemporary forms adopted design elements of these other pieces. For many investigators, this produces confusion and some difficulty in accurately attributing a date to a piece (Lang 1982:29-30). As Frank (1969:52) notes, when the nien hao of a previous period was applied on a piece, there was "no intention to deceive for the pieces on which they appear do not even imitate the earlier styles," and when marks do "appear on extremely deceptive copies, there is none of the onus of forgery involved. Imitations were regarded as the highest achievements of skill and reflected great honor on the potters."

**Development of European and North American Porcelain**

With the exception of 17th-century Japanese porcelain, the various European countries were not successful in reproducing porcelain, and commercially successful porcelain was not developed in Europe until after 1700 in Meisen, Germany (Beurdeley 1962:104,110; Volker 1971:3,19). But even these alternatives could not compete with the lower cost, higher production output and superior quality of the Chinese potteries. It was not until the mid 18th century that the European alternatives were economically viable.
It is suggested that porcelain-producing technology came into existence in Europe in 1709 through the experimentation of the German chemist, Bottger (Volker 1971:3,19). But Beurdeley (1962:104) notes that in 1689, a French glass-maker produced wares to imitate Chinese porcelain. These wares were so well-made that they fooled collectors at the time. Ultimately, however, the glass-maker was not commercially successful. In the 1820s-1830s, William Tucker of Philadelphia successfully produced the first porcelain in the United States. A commercially unsuccessful attempt had been made in the same city 40 years earlier (Curtis 1972:131-132).

Nomenclature

French terms are often used to name or describe the Chinese porcelain because the initial descriptions of these wares were made by French missionaries (Father Le Comte and Père d’Entrecelles) in the 17th and 18th centuries (Le Comte 1697:154-160; Beurdeley 1962:124). This nomenclature has been the accepted form for the description of porcelain types since the 18th century and particularly during the 20th century when treatises have been written on pottery and porcelains. Such authors include Getz (1895), Burton (1921), Hobson (1923), Farley (1933), Bulling (1952), Garner (1954), Honey (1954), Savage (1954), Beurdeley (1962), Mudge (1962, 1986), du Boulay (1963, 1984), Chaffers (1965), d’Argencé (1967), Jourdain and Jenyns (1967), Donnelly (1969), Frank (1969), Cox (1970), Neave-Hill (1975), Medley (1976), Palmer (1976), Arapova (1977), Macintosh (1977), Lion-Goldschmidt (1978), Godden (1979, 1982), Ayers

**Composition of Porcelain**

The unique quality of porcelain is based on a number of elements. The most important of these are the clays from which it is produced. Of secondary importance is the high temperature necessary for the firing process. Porcelain is made of two kinds of clay: *Kaolin*, a white, plastic clay makes up the “flesh” of the porcelain and contains some feldspar, while the *Petuntse* clay comprises finely ground feldspathic stone and makes up the "bones" of the porcelain (Palmer 1976:13). It provides the translucence and resonance to porcelain and is a combination of feldspar and silica. These two components are carefully ground, washed, and refined. In China, this traditionally meant the liquified clay was passed through a fine sieve and through two thicknesses of silk. The refined clay mixture was formed into brick shapes and then shipped from the clay site to the porcelain factory.

At a kiln temperature of 1450°C, these two clays vitrify, and often the distinction between the clay body and the glaze is imperceptible. *Kaolin* tends to remain “white and refractory” upon firing, while *petuntse* becomes glassy and colorless (Frank 1969:10). The amount of feldspar in the *kaolin* can increase its translucency upon firing.
and make the distinction between clay body and glaze difficult to determine. During firing, the amount of oxygen in the atmosphere inside the kiln can influence the clay and glaze. If the environment within the kiln has little or no oxygen, it is called a reduction firing, and any iron oxide (impurities) in the glaze will have its oxygen atoms removed and thus leave a faint green tint in the glaze. If the environment within the kiln has air (oxygen) flowing into it, then it is termed an oxidation firing. An oxidation firing causes the same impurities (iron oxides) within the glaze and the clay body to be affected. In the glaze, the iron oxide gives it a creamy tint, and the surface of the clay body that is exposed to the air turns a rust or orange color. If the kiln is opened to the outside air too soon after a reduction firing the exposed clay body surfaces can still turn orange if the clay body is still chemically unstable (Frank 1969:10). Even in its bisque (biscuit) fired state, the porcelain clay body is not porous, and in essence, the glaze on the finished product is not necessary to make it impervious. The final glaze merely enhances the beauty of the ceramic.

By the end of the 16th century, the kaolin deposits near the imperial potteries of Jingdezhen had almost been depleted, and the other materials necessary for the manufacture of porcelain became difficult to obtain. With the interest of Europeans in porcelain, the Chinese had to go farther afield to obtain their supplies, eventually even taking the flint the English East India Company brought in as ballast as a means of keeping up with the production demands of the European orders and market for stoneware and porcelain (Godden 1982:55).
Manufacture of Porcelain

In general, the more common Chinese vessels were thrown on a wheel (cups, bowls, plates); and the more complicated forms were pressed in a mold (figurines and sprigging for appliqué). These vessels and figurines were decorated by trailing slip, applying molded reliefs, etching, and/or cutting into the leather-hard clay body (Palmer 1976:14).

The early kilns of China were long and horizontal, but by the 18th century, they had been replaced by tall, vertical structures with dome-shaped tops. This semi-continuous downdraft kiln was developed in Fujian Province to produce more controlled heating and more efficient oxygen reduction during glaze firings. This technique produced and enhanced the final colors of the glazes of the wares. The saggars, high sided containers which were used to stack the porcelain in the kiln during firing, also prevented the ash from the wood fire from being drawn into the kiln and on to the porcelain, thereby marring the surface. In the saggars, sand was used to ensure that the pieces would not tip or fall over; often, fine grains of sand are found in the glaze above the edge of the footing of bowls, cups, and plates. In a single porcelain firing, up to 180 loads of wood were burned (Gray 1982:15).
Porcelain Forms

There was a distinction between everyday functional use and display wares. The finest wheel-thrown pieces had a foot ring that was grooved or beaded as if the piece was intended to be placed on a pedestal or stand (Macintosh 1977:73). The finest wares were generally produced for the Imperial Court, while the utilitarian wares were produced for lesser officials and the general populace. However, imperial wares did find their way into the non-imperial market. Porcelain was produced in a multitude of forms: cups, bowls, vases, head rests (pillows), inkstands, ewers, pitchers, plates, saucers, incense burners, and figurines; any of which could be utilitarian or ornamental. With the influence of European orders for great quantities of porcelain to be manufactured, Chinese potters copied from painted wooden prototypes, as well as silver objects brought to China by the various East India companies.

Porcelain Types

Blue and White

*Blue and White* is the traditional term for underglaze cobalt blue decorated porcelains (Figure 7). The Chinese had admired the *Blue and White* decorated ceramic wares produced by the Persians, and during an expansion in trade, they decided to copy this decorated ware. *Blue and White* decorated porcelain was first made by the Chinese in the Ming Dynasty at the beginning of the 14th century, and the cobalt used as the blue
Figure 7. Blue and White Bowl (Port Royal Project).
underglaze pigment was initially imported from Persia. In time, the Chinese found a less expensive source of cobalt in China, although it was not as pure. The cobalt pigment was mixed with water and painted on the greenware (unfired ware) as an underglaze; alternatively, it was painted on an unfired glazed ware as an overglaze, since porcelain, especially Blue and White, requires only one firing to produce a finished product, whether it be glazed or unglazed. The Chinese cobalt pigment, which by itself produced a grey pigment, was mixed with manganese. These two pigments were then mixed, one part to three parts to produce the desired color. This rich blue was called Sumatran or Mohammedan Blue, and this type of ware became a famous export item (Cooper 1988:43, 54). The intensity of the blue decoration on Chinese porcelain varies according to the availability of the foreign cobalt. The blue of Blue and White ware can range from grey-blue to a rich violet to an almost black. These color ranges depend on the purity of the cobalt pigment, as well as the firing conditions.

Some researchers attempt to date Blue and White ware by the intensity or quality of the blue decoration. There are periods when the cobalt used was a greater percentage of native Chinese cobalt resulting in a greyer or less intense blue. It is these fluctuations in color that are used for dating. But the form of the entire piece, as well as the design elements must also be examined. Even with these criteria it may be difficult to date some pieces with certainty. It must be understood that by the end of the 17th century, the Chinese artisans producing porcelains (potters and painters), especially those accustomed to working for the imperial kilns, were experts at the manipulation of their materials and craft. If it were decided that particular pieces would be produced to imitate the work of
an honored previous artisan in form or design, these pieces would not necessarily be exact
reproductions but would be close enough to the original to adequately honor the time or
artisan. Some periods of porcelain production are associated with specific hues of blue in
the design elements. It cannot be assumed that all pieces produced during the period, or
even within a single firing, are identical in hue. Although the artisans producing porcelain
were well-versed in the manufacture of porcelain, strict control can only be maintained
until the firing process. In the kiln, usually drafts, hot spots, and the flow of oxygen can
be regulated, but they cannot be guaranteed. This is where the element of chance can
affect the porcelain being fired. Slight fluctuations at critical points in the firing process
can change the hue from blue to black, from grey to lavender, and numerous variations in
between. Le Comte (1697:156) indicates this in his letter to the Duchess of Bouillon: “as
for blue, they have it most excellent; however, it is very difficult to hit upon the exact
temperature, where it is neither too pale, deep, intense, nor too bright.” The firing
process itself extended over a period of days, during which time itinerant work gangs
stoked the furnaces with wood, maintaining the temperature of up to 1500° C. for the
prescribed time necessary to properly vitrify the clay (Frank 1969:9).

Batavia

During the Ming period (A.D. 1368-1643), some porcelain wares were coated on
the exterior with a brown glaze/wash. These porcelains became popular export wares
into the 18th century. The exterior wash under the glaze ranges from light tan to deep
chocolate brown in color (Figure 8). Usually these wares are called Batavia ware, since
Figure 8. Batavia Tea Bowl (Port Royal Project).
the Dutch shipped much of this ware to Europe through their Eastern Headquarters at Batavia in Java. They are also referred to as *Café au Lait* because of their exterior coloring. The interior decoration of these wares differs greatly depending on the size and purpose of the vessel. All of the tea bowls found at Port Royal show tiny landscapes in the bottom of the bowl. The larger bowls show similar motifs to the larger and heavier *Blue and White* bowls found at Port Royal.

**Overglaze Enamels**

*Overglaze Enamels* in various color families: *verte* (green), *rose* (pink), *noir* (black), and *jaune* (yellow) became very popular after the 1720s. This type of porcelain was influenced by the Japanese *Imari* ware and Western imports and designs. After the initial firing, such *Overglaze Enamels* were applied before the pieces were then refired at a lower temperature. This double-firing technique affixes the overglaze to the ware and is common for most glazed and all overglazed ceramics. Many of these polychrome porcelains are found in archaeological contexts, however, they have lost the overglazed enamel as a result of a multitude of variables. A 'ghost' of the motif remains as a dull and sometimes pitted surface where the overglaze had been. Often this almost invisible surface decoration is ignored or overlooked as one of the porcelain artifact's design elements. This may on occasion account for misidentification of types of porcelains, their purpose, and their time period. This de-enamelizing occurs on high-fired wares, such as Chinese porcelains, and its occurrence is even more likely on ceramics of lower fired clay bodies and glazes on which the adhesion of an overglaze is less secure.
Undecorated White

Undecorated White porcelain was produced throughout the Ming Dynasty (A.D. 1368-1643), and continues to be made today. White ware originally was made for times of mourning, but it later became popular for the furnishing of the Chinese royal residences. Undecorated White produced during the reign of K'ang-Hsi (1662-1722) are exceptional, and the Victoria and Albert Museum in London has several examples (Burton 1921:27; Ayers 1980:56). The Undecorated White porcelain was probably produced by the imperial potteries of Jingdezhen and should not be confused with the white porcelain known as Blanc de Chine.

Blanc de Chine

Blanc de Chine ware was produced in the province of Fujian at the city of Dehua. It differs from the other wares in its lower firing temperature. The paste is highly vitrified, translucent, and milky white in color (Cooper 1988:56-56). Perfection of the Blanc de Chine technique was achieved in the 14th century, with the development of a special plastic clay used for modeling. This plasticity proved to be of great advantage when producing the intricately modeled and molded statuettes like those found in Port Royal that date to the 1680s-1690s. Under perfect conditions, this clay body becomes pure white upon firing. The earliest pieces of true Blanc de Chine date from the 17th century during the Ch'ung-Chen period (1628-1644). Blanc de Chine reached its peak around 1700, but the classical period of the ware was 1640-1740 (Neave-Hill 1975:149-150). Donnelly (1969:61-61) considers that the Dehua kilns reached their zenith of
'artistic creation and output' in the 50 years spanning the last quarter of the 17th century to the first quarter of the 18th century. Donnelly (1969:61) also notes that contrary to previous scholarly research, *Blanc de Chine* form and design elements did not remain static over the centuries. Forms, he notes, may be similar, but details and nuances changed according to tastes. When discussing the difficulty in dating these wares, Donnelly (1969:11) notes that "in general it may be said that the more stoutly potted pieces are older, that relative crudity (where it is not manifestly careless or directed to cheapness) is early....The presence of firing cracks in the bases of the heavier figurines is generally accepted as indicative of at least an 18th-century date." According to Hobson (1923:173), by 1700, *Blanc de Chine* was no longer an expensive item because of its increased popularity and wide distribution. Its popularity in Europe can be seen in the orders for items that imitate the form of European metal wares, e.g., English silver and Dutch figures. The Chinese made what was required by the Europeans, such as deep porringer with flat handles, ewers, and goblets (Beurdeley 1962:32).

Most *Blanc de Chine* wares are decorated with a variety of techniques, including incising, molding, *appliqué*, or carving. Most of these wares were made by molds; "even wine cups and tea cups from Dehua were mostly molded...the clue lies in the rim thickness...a wheel-made cup or bowl is thinnest at the rim" (Donnelly 1969:38-39).

An *Hua*, or secret decoration was produced by a specialized technique. A design was lightly carved into the leather-hard clay body, or a design in white slip was painted on a vessel. The incised lines that create the design are barely visible (Lion-Goldschmidt 1978:46, 79). The vessel was then glazed and fired, and the design could only be seen
under special lighting conditions (Lion-Goldschmidt 1978:92; Cooper 1988:54). The optimum lighting must come from the top, through the wine or tea in the vessel, allowing the refraction of the light to highlight the design. This technique reached its peak in small bowls in 1403-1424. The ‘dragon’ cup and the incised Plum blossom cups of Port Royal and the 1691 wreck on Pedro Bank, Jamaica are examples of the range in complexity of incised designs (Figure 9).

Incised decoration of *Blanc de Chine* wares appears to have been restricted in time and form. According to Donnelly (1969:11), some cups, bowls, and dishes of the late 17th century, and vases of the mid 18th century, have these intricately incised decorations. In the best pieces, the paste and glaze have combined during firing so that it is almost impossible to distinguish between them. This gives the *Blanc de Chine* a distinctive vitrified appearance. The colors of the paste of this ware in time ranged from milky white to a rich cream and sometimes ivory color with a very slight pink blush, but the glaze remained thick and smooth, almost velvety. This ware is thought to be the most perfect and beautiful of porcelains produced (Honey 1953:133; Neave-Hill 1975:150).

The potters of Dehua used a large repertoire of subject matter for their figurines, including Buddhist deities and saints, Taoist or Confucius subjects, as well as animal figures. An example of the latter is illustrated in Figure 10, which shows the *Dog of Fo*, a (lion-dog) figure that acts as a holder for incense sticks to place on Buddhist altars. Donnelly (1969:166) describes these figurines as Buddhist lions. They usually are “in pairs, ...on rectangular plinths and equipped with tubes to hold incense sticks.” The earliest pair dates to 1644, with production continuing throughout the 19th century. This
Figure 9. Blanc de Chine An Hua 'Dragon' Cup.
Figure 10. Blanc de Chine Dog of Fo Figurine.
figure “formed one of the most stable products, and certainly the longest lived,” for Denhua which held a “virtual monopoly of the form” (Donnelly 1969:166). In the late 17th century and into the 18th century, European figures and groups were also represented following the increasing European orders for these types of products.

It is difficult to give precise dates for Blanc de Chine figurines because once the models and the techniques were established, molds were made. If a design became popular and established, the production of the wares continued with little change throughout the 17th and 18th centuries and even into the present. Some designs would have an extended run as long as they were considered popular and profitable. This is especially true of divinity statuettes. Molds would be reused many times before being remade. The most popular character for statuettes was that of the Guanyin, the Buddhist Divinity of Mercy and the feminine form of the Bodhisattva Avalokitesvara, the Benevolent (Lion-Goldschmidt 1978:249). The poses of the character differ, but most often she is depicted standing with a child in her arms. This statuette became very popular with Europeans, especially those of the Catholic faith, because they took her to represent the Virgin Mary with the Baby Jesus (Godden 1979:261; Mudge 1986:75-76; Vainker 1991:171). Godden (1979:61-62) notes that in the sale at Company auction of the cargo the Nassau in 1699 were several items he deems to be private trade goods were evident. These included: “lyons,” small women, small images, Tartarian women, and “10 large Sancta Marias 4s 9 small do.” Cargo from the Dorrill, sold at auction in 1702 listed, “30 Sancta Marias 4s 22 Sancta Marias 1s 14 women each with a child 8s...” Godden (1979:61-62).
According to documentation, the most active potter of Dehua during the second half of the 17th century was Ho Ch'ao-tsung, who placed his seal on the back of his figurines. In fact, frequently the names of potters were carved in the backs of statuettes, but, unfortunately, the glaze filled in the carving during firing has made most of the names illegible (Lion-Goldschmidt 1978:248). The Guanyin statuette found at Port Royal exhibits no hint of a maker's mark (Figure 11).

Because the clay body was sometimes thick, especially on the bases of the figurines, the bases would sometimes develop fissures during the initial drying stage of manufacture. If these fissures were on the back or inside of the figurine, they were left as they were with only an extra amount of glaze in the fissure as a 'repair.' The Dog of Fo and the Guanyin figurines of the Port Royal excavations exhibit these 'repairs.' Most statuettes were molded and then finished with a tool.

Blanc de Chine was thought to be similar in appearance to ivory sculptures and became an inexpensive substitute for ivory (Marchant 1985:4). The plasticity of the Dehua clay body stimulated the development of the Dehua specialty, which was the appliqué molded reliefs on figurines and cups. This became the most common form of decoration on Blanc de Chine wares (Donnelly 1969:11). Honey (1954:135) notes that the favorite relief decoration was that of the Prunus or plum blossom which were separately molded and then applied to the unglazed damp clay body by a technique known as sprigging (Gray 1982:21). Flowers, fish, dragons, animals, and clouds were other motifs used for appliqué design elements.
Figure 11. Blanc de Chine Guanyin Figurine, Marx Excavation.
Donnelly 1969:11). The Port Royal excavation includes several cups with *appliqué Prunus* elements of four different designs (Figure 12).

Like so many aspects of traditional Chinese culture, balance and harmony were the precepts upon which life relied. Porcelains "should be of soft colors," so that the whites of the porcelains compliments the colors, the textures, and aromas of the food and teas served at the traditional meal (Mark et al. 1994:11-15). Often at imperial banquets, the food prepared was never eaten but was a feast for the eyes only (Mark et al. 1994:11-15). Although the utilitarian porcelains found at Port Royal reflect only a few of the forms that existed, they do exhibit the elegance of form and decoration consistent with this philosophy.
Figure 12. Blanc de Chine Appliqué Cup.
CHAPTER VII

CHINESE PORCELAIN IN THE PORT ROYAL EXCAVATIONS: 1981-1990

In order to ascertain the possible trade routes followed by the Chinese porcelain found in Port Royal, this study differentiates between those porcelain sherds found associated with the 1692 context of the site from those sherds that are of a later period. Once this distinction is determined, statements can be made regarding the decorative motifs, vessel forms, and porcelain types found. It is then possible to extrapolate the routes used, based on the general trends seen in the cultural tastes and trade preferences of various European markets. Also taken into consideration is the development of the consumption of hot beverages as a social activity. The types of porcelain, the vessel forms, and their associations in the Port Royal excavations are examined with a view to this new activity.

TAMU/INA/JNHT Port Royal Project Excavations - Hamilton 1981-1990

The 10 years of excavations at Port Royal by Hamilton provide the porcelain collection upon which this study is based (Figure 13). Although the excavations were conducted as summer field school training for underwater archaeology students, the archaeology conducted was always of the highest standards. Dr. Hamilton's guiding hand can be seen in all aspects of the work. At present, the final report is under
Figure 13. Port Royal Site Plan - Hamilton Excavation.
development, with each area of specialization the subject of a research project, thesis, or dissertation.

Two hundred and sixty-eight Chinese porcelain sherds account for almost 7 percent of the total 17th-century ceramic sherd count (3,912 sherds) at Port Royal. Included are a number of intact Chinese porcelain artifacts — one underglaze Blue and White Medallion bowl and five small Batavia tea bowls, three plain cups, three An Hua cups (one has dragon design and two have the floral design); 14 Appliqué cups; and one small Dog of Fo (all Blanc de Chine). These intact pieces, in addition to the various body, base, and rim sherds, account for a minimum vessel count of 47 Chinese porcelain artifacts.

Chinese porcelain from Hamilton’s excavations is significant for it can be dated to a 17th-century context and its restrictive distribution. Except for a few individual sherds and intact cups scattered throughout the site, the majority of the porcelain came from Building 8. Indeed, of the total count of the 17th-century Chinese porcelain sherds 7.5 percent came from Building 1, 2.6 percent came from Building 2, 2.4 percent came from Building 3, 1.5 percent came from Excavation Unit 3, 7.8 percent came from Building 4, 7.1 percent came from Building 5, and 69.05 percent came from Building 8 (Figure 14).

Each porcelain type is examined as to its architectural association in order to derive some insight into the activity involved in these buildings, most particularly Building 8.
Figure 14. Distribution of Chinese Porcelain - Hamilton Excavations.
Stratigraphy in the Excavation

The excavation of Port Royal includes three stratigraphic layers. Layer 1, the uppermost and most recent layer, is comprised primarily of eelgrass and soft sediments. It ranges in depth from just a few centimeters to 20 cm or more. Layer 1 contained 22 Chinese porcelain sherds. Layer 2, comprised primarily of dead staghorn and other corals intermixed with sediments, is similar to Layer 1 in that its thickness differs from area to area; in fact, in some locations, Layer 2 is as much as 60 cm deep. In the area of Queen and Lime streets, however, the two uppermost layers are less deep. This is especially true in the area of Building 8, layers 1 and 2 virtually combine with Layer 3 in an extremely shallow layer. In fact, the upper surfaces of some of the jumbled, fallen walls are exposed, effectively reducing the upper layers to a minimal dusting of sediments. In this area the 1692 context layer is virtually at the surface. However, towards the backs of the buildings, especially those towards Fishers Row, the stratigraphic layers become increasingly deeper. This is due, in part, to the topographical slumping of the sand spit into deeper water and subsequent deposition of Layer 2. In general, Layer 2 includes the post-earthquake and post-earthquake hurricane era (early 18th century) to the 19th century. Forty-six Chinese porcelain sherds were recovered from Layer 2. Layer 3 coincides with a 1692 or earlier context. In areas of the site with intact brick and plaster floors, artifacts within this layer were differentiated as being ‘on the floor’ or ‘under the floor.’ Layer 3 contained 197 Chinese porcelain sherds. Of the
remaining porcelain sherds, two are positively identified as being from dredge piles and one is without provenance.

During the excavation of the site, overburden was removed using a water dredge (underwater vacuum) and this was deposited away from the excavation area. As the work progressed it was necessary to excavate areas on which overburden from previously excavated grids had been deposited (dredge pile). This is especially true of the 1989 excavations of the majority of Building 5. During the 1987 excavations, the overburden was exhausted away from site. As the excavations progressed from 1987 into 1989, the architectural elements of the Building 5/Building 4 complex were followed back from the front wall into the rest of the structure. Of course, this is the general area on which the previous season’s dredge piles were located as well as the piles of bricks (fallen walls removed during excavation). It is in these dredge piles that some artifacts were inadvertently deposited, especially those pieces of white ceramic that somewhat resemble the dead coral in the upper layer matrix. Later, as excavators penetrated this dredge deposition these ceramics came to light and identified as being in Layer 1 and Layer 2. This accounts for the displaced porcelain sherds that eventually were cross-mended on to artifacts from Building 8 and Building 5. This is noted in the discussion of these buildings later in this chapter.
Chinese Porcelain Types Found in the Port Royal Excavations

Blue and White

The recovered 41 Blue and White ware sherds are primarily bowl fragments, but some cup and plate fragments are also evident. The blue decoration varies from pale blue, pale blue to mauve, pale blue to dark blue, pale blue to blue/black, and medium blue to blue/black. The 'fineness' of the potting of the sherds also differs, ranging from heavily potted and glazed to very fine potting and thin glaze. These variations even occur within an individual vessel (Figure 15).

Batavia

The interior motifs of the three small tea bowls excavated at Port Royal are different 'landscape' designs in underglaze blue. The blue varies in hue from very pale to spots of blue/black. The large bowls are decorated with interior motifs of geometric borders and floral/foliate motifs on the sides and/or on the well bottoms. In all there are 33 sherds over and above the three small bowls.

The small tea bowls reflect Chinese tradition. Tea cups were purposely made without handles so that the tea drinker could feel the warmth of the tea through the porcelain. The Chinese poet Lu Yu wrote on the subject of tea and the pleasures derived from drinking the hot beverage (Mark et al.1994:250-251). The consumption of tea as a hot beverage was gaining popularity in England at this time.
Figure 15. Examples of Blue and White Sherds (Port Royal Project).
**Overglaze Enamel**

These wares do not appear in significant quantities (5 sherds) in the 1692 context of the Port Royal excavations. It is not until the turn of the 17th century that these wares become very popular as export wares. The Dutch were trading in Japanese *Imari* wares as well as Chinese porcelains, and if the overglaze enamel has rubbed off the surface of the porcelain, it is sometimes difficult to precisely identify the origin of the overglazed porcelain. However, it is believed that no *Imari* is present in Port Royal.

**Undecorated White**

Some of the 13 undecorated sherds found in Port Royal were part of other vessels that were decorated. After all of the porcelain was reconstructed, some of these sherds remained as separate sherds.

**Blanc de Chine**

This ware exhibits the greatest variation in color and glaze. Typically *Blanc de Chine* ranges in color from absolute white to ivory to cream. The glaze ranges from a hint of blue to a hint of pink. The 176 *Blanc de Chine* sherds from the Port Royal assemblage do exhibit these variations in color but do not range into the pinks in the glaze. Some of these variations may be manifestations of the conditions within the kiln during the firing process, i.e., the oxidizing or reducing atmosphere. It may also reflect the amount of chemical impurities in the clay body or glaze.
It is not remarkable to find porcelains in Port Royal made specifically for the consumption of wines, such as the Blanc de Chine Appliqué cups. Wine was a popular beverage in 17th-century Jamaica. Mark et al. (1994:251-252) note that in China, rice wine has been regarded as stimulating for the body, and today, it is still the most popular and the least expensive wine to produce. A “Taoist Group from the third century called itself ‘the Immortals of the Wine Cup’” (Mark et al. 1994:251-252). Wines and spirits made of other ingredients have always been popular in China. Grapes, long considered exotic in China, have been used for wine since the first were planted at the Imperial Court in 128 B.C. “Wines made from fruits and honeyed wine, like mead, were favored for special festivals and Imperial banquets” (Mark et al. 1994:252). It is unknown, however, if these cups were used for their original purpose.

**Building 1**

A total of 20 sherds are associated with Building 1, which is a typical brick combined row house that consists of at least three separate businesses or activities. Initially, Building 1 consisted of three rooms constructed side-by-side, fronting and opening on to Lime Street. Each of these rooms have brick floors laid in a herringbone pattern. Additionally, each of these rooms have whitewashed plaster interior walls and a door opening on to a paved yard area. Inside two of the rooms (Room 3 and Room 5), built-in base components for a combination stairwell to an upper floor and under-stair storage area are evident. This probably existed in Room 1, but the evidence is no longer
there. An examination of the construction of Building 1 shows that a second building phase added a second set of three rooms at the back; this probably enclosed most or all of the paved yards at the back of each original room. In its present form, each tenement consists of two ground-floor rooms, and it is unknown what precisely was above. It is possible the front rooms facing on to Lime Street had either a loft or, like the back rooms, a full second story.

The northernmost tenement contains Room 1 and Room 2, which were probably used by the occupants for three different business activities. Room 1, with its access to Lime Street, revealed little artifactual evidence of any specific activity. In contrast, a large assortment of leather scraps and shoe soles indicate that a cobbler was repairing shoes in Room 2. A single wood lathe, some planks, and some turned wood indicate that a joiner/cabinet-maker also worked in the rear section of Room 2. The assemblage of cattle and turtle bones, as well as a fish basket indicate that butchering and food preparation was also an activity performed in the room. Hamilton (1989:7-12) believes that Room 1 served as a store front to support the diverse activities of Room 2.

The middle tenement (Room 4 and Room 5) of Building 1 was probably used as a tavern, since this area contained a large number of corked bottles, a tavern table, and other tavern-related artifacts. The assemblage includes pewter balusters, stoneware jugs, and kegs (Hamilton 1989:7-12).

The southernmost tenement comprises Room 5 and Room 6. Due to the direction of the wall fall into Room 5, this last tenement contained significant quantities of onion bottles and the remains of hundreds of unused white clay smoking pipes in situ. It also
contained pewter plates, a charger, a tankard, a baluster, and brass candlesticks. The artifact assemblage of Room 6 echoes that of Room 5 but in smaller quantities. It is surmised that these rooms were used as a wine and pipe shop (Hamilton 1989:7-12).

Distribution

Layer 3 (1692 context) of Room 1 included one Blue and White bowl body sherd and two rim sherds of undecorated Blanc de Chine cups. In Layer 2 of this same room, an undecorated Blanc de Chine footring was recovered but could not be conclusively attributed to the rim sherds found in the same room. The base sherd of a Blue and White plate was also found in Layer 2.

Room 2 of Building 1 contained no Chinese porcelain in the Layer 3 context. Three Blue and White bowl base sherds and a single rim/body sherd of a Batavia tea bowl were recovered from Layer 2. It is very possible that these sherds date from the time of the earthquake. The Batavia tea bowl sherd is very similar in form and quality to the Batavia tea bowls recovered from the Building 8 area of the site. There was no porcelain found in Layer 1.

The 1692 context (Layer 3) of Room 3 included two Blue and White sherds. One of these is the rim/body sherd of a bowl with a brown rim. This rim color is a result of oxidation during firing. The other sherd is that of the body of a plate. There are very few examples of porcelain plates recovered from the 1692 context of the site. No porcelain was recovered from either Layer 2 or Layer 1 in this room.
No porcelain was found in Layer 3 or Layer 2 of Room 4. Only a single Blue and White base sherd of an unknown vessel form is from Layer 1.

On the sidewalk area in front of Room 5, in Layer 3, one body/base sherd of a Blue and White cup with an undetermined motif was recovered. There was no evidence of porcelain in Layer 3 or Layer 2 inside Room 5. A single Blue and White bowl body/base sherd is associated with Room 5, in Layer 1.

A single sherd showing the profile of a Blue and White bowl (rim/base) with a floral motif is associated with the back of the left wall in Room 6 in Layer 3. One Blue and White bowl body sherd with a foliate motif is from the left center area of Room 6, Layer 3. Two Blue and White plate sherds came from the Layer 2 context. One sherd is from a plate base and shows an interior foliate motif. The other is a rim sherd with a brown edge (oxidation during firing). A single undecorated plate body sherd came from Layer 2 of Room 6. One undecorated Blanc de Chine body/base sherd of a wine/tea cup was recovered from the back of the room, in Layer 2. This particular Blanc de Chine sherd is very similar to the wine/tea cups found in both the Building 5 and Building 8 assemblages.

Remarks

Building 1 appears to have no distinct pattern of porcelain finds. Each room, with the exception of Room 2 and Room 4, had a rather limited number of porcelain sherds in the 1692 context. The evidence suggests that one or two types of vessel forms were found in association with the 17th-century context of every tenement of Building 1. It
may be possible to surmise from this evidence that each occupant/family in Building 1 had a restricted number of Chinese porcelain items in their possession at the time of the earthquake.

Building 2

The only cohesive remains of Building 2 are the brick walls along Lime Street and the alley between it and Building 1 and a portion of the plaster floor that was poured directly on to sand (also seen in Building 3, Building 4, Building 5, and Building 8). The rest of the assemblage within the confines of the structure indicate it may also have had a wood floor in one room (Hamilton 1998, pers. comm.). It is probable that Building 2, like Building 1, had additions made on to it as needed by the occupants.

Distribution

Only seven porcelain sherd s were associated with the interior of Building 2. Although several sherd s were recovered from the alley to the north, they have been included in the artifacts associated with the Building 4 complex, since these sherd s are more likely to be associated with Building 4. This is due to of the nature of the destruction of the buildings in Port Royal at the time of the earthquake. It has been determined that waves washed across the site and knocked down walls and flushed objects through streets and alleys generally to the south and west.
Layer 3 had only one Undecorated White plate rim sherd in its assemblage. The base of a Blue and White plate was recovered from Layer 2. The interior of this sherd has a scene with an architectural motif and a half-footring. One Overglaze Enamel bowl body sherd came from Layer 2. It has the ghost image of what appears to have been a very finely detailed overglaze decoration of an undetermined motif. Undecorated White sherds from Layer 2 include a cup handle fragment, a single body sherd of an unknown vessel form, and the rim sherd of a saucer. The base sherd of a Blue and White bowl has been associated with Layer 1. The exterior is undecorated, and the interior has a floral/foliate motif. None of the above noted sherds could be cross-mended on to any sherds from other areas of the site.

Remarks

Building 2 has only one plate sherd that can be attributed to the 1692 context; all but one of the other sherds came from Layer 2 and are of undetermined date. It is possible that one porcelain vessel may have been associated with the occupants of this building.

Building 3

The architectural design of Building 3 is that of an interrupted sill construction. It is apparent that this building was constructed after Building 1, since the mortar of the wall footings adjacent to Building 1 (Room 5) is finished/dressed on the interior surface
only. The exterior wall of the back room of Building 1 (Room 6) did not have its mortar
dressed, which indicates that Building 3 was constructed before the Building 1 back
rooms were added (Hamilton 1989:12-14).

Building 3 consists of two rooms that open on to Lime Street (Room 1 and Room
4) and two small rooms or yards on either side of what is probably a hearth (Room 2 and
Room 3). Rooms 1 and 4 each have crumbled remnants of plaster/mortar floors poured
directly on to the underlying sand (similar to Building 2). Numerous onion bottles,
scales, and weights are associated with this building. A large number of unused white
clay smoking pipes and still corked and monogrammed wine bottles are associated with
Room 2, which was probably a storage space. The function of Room 3 could not be
determined the architectural remains; however, the brick paving may indicate a hearth
between Room 2 and Room 3. The area of Room 4 and the side and back of Room 3
slump away significantly and so were impossible to fully investigate and delineate
(Hamilton 1989:14-19).

Building 3 is a wood-framed construction and not as well-built as Building 1. It
appears to have been only one or one and one-half stories in height. There are only seven
porcelain sherds associated with the building.

Distribution

Layer 3 of Room 1 included only one Undecorated White body sherd of an
unknown vessel form. A Blue and White rim sherd and two Undecorated White sherds
forming a cup profile (rim, base, and handle) were recovered from Layer 1 of Room 1.
Room 2 contained no porcelain in either Layer 3 or Layer 2; a single undecorated *Blanc de Chine* body sherd came from Layer 1 of Room 2. One *Overglaze Enamel* rim fragment was found in Layer 3 of Room 3. This room had no porcelain associated with any other stratigraphic layer. A single *Blue and White* sherd was recovered from the front of Building 3, in Layer 1.

**Remarks**

There appears to be no pattern to the distribution of the porcelain associated with Building 3. The individual sherds found in Room 1 and Room 3 in the 1692 context indicate that the occupants may have possessed at least one porcelain item.

**Excavation Unit 3**

This unit was excavated in order to determine the width of Lime Street directly across from Building 1. It is likely the building in this area was of timber-frame construction possibly set on mortared brick footings; the destructive forces of the earthquake left very little to analyze. "There was no recognizable pattern and right angle arrangements that would allow one to define a definite building alignment" (Hamilton 1989:19). As such, interpretations of activity in the structure are impossible. Only four porcelain sherds are associated with this excavation unit.
Distribution

One body sherd of a Batavia bowl was recovered from Layer 3 in Excavation Unit 3. This sherd is very similar to those associated with Building 8. Two Overglaze Enamel sherds also came from Layer 3. One is a plate rim/body sherd with a portion of a floral motif visible; the other is a body sherd of an unknown vessel form. An Undecorated White bowl body sherd was found in Layer 2; no porcelain was found in Layer 1.

Remarks

It is possible that one porcelain bowl and plate belonged to the occupants of the structure in the area associated with Excavation Unit 3. However, due to the lack of foundations, floors, walls, or windows in this area, it is difficult to delineate the building that may have housed these artifacts.

Building 5

From investigation of the architectural features of Building 4 and Building 5, it has been determined that Building 5 was constructed before Building 4. As such, they are herein discussed in that order.

Building 5 faces on to the alley that served as an extension of Lime Street and was the most intact building complex excavated by Hamilton (1981-1990). This building of at least two stories includes two front rooms, an open hearth with ovens in a kitchen area
(Hearth 5 and Room 4), a probable food preparation area (Room 3), a brick paved yard (Yard 5), a shared brick cistern, and a brick paved front sidewalk. Hearth 7, the hearth for Building 7, which fronts on to Fishers Row, was built against the back of the Building 5 hearth. Associated with Building 5's architecture are the door sills and jambs of the front doors of Room 1 and Room 2, as well as a portion of the front door of Room 2. Elements of windows, including parts of frames, lead caming with the remnants of panes, and the sash of the windows are other architectural elements associated with this building. The door frame and a portion of the door between Room 1 and Room 2 are part of the Room 2 assemblage. Both the door sill for the door between Room 3 and Room 4, and the sill between Room 3 and Yard 5 are in situ. The remains of the stairway up to the second floor of Building 5 are also in situ. The construction of the stairwell is similar to that found both in Room 3 and Room 5 of Building 1. Room 1 has the only plaster floor in the complex, the other rooms and the yard are each bricked in a different pattern. Both Room 1 and Room 2 have plastered walls and ceilings.

Room 1 is speculated to have been used as an eating establishment. It has a separate entrance, plaster floor, and very few remnants of any furniture. Room 2 may have been used as the entrance to the house, the area for the sale of bread (baked in the oven found in the kitchen of Building 5), the storage for the plates for the restaurant, and access to the upper portions of the building. Several weights of specific quantities, which were the requisites for bread production (Smith 1995:113-115), are associated with Hearth 5 in Room 4 (kitchen). Rooms 3 and 4 (kitchen with hearth) and Yard 5 contained artifacts associated with food preparation, including pots, skillets, ceramic
bowls, pewter plates, and even a three-legged *metate* and *mano* carved from igneous rock.

A total of 18 sherds and one intact cup are associated with the Building 5 complex.

**Distribution**

No porcelain was recovered from Room 1 in any of the stratigraphic layers. Layer 3 of Room 2 contained only one rim/body sherd of a *Batavia* bowl and the undecorated body sherd of a *Blanc de Chine* cup. Layer 2 however included a base to a small *Batavia* tea bowl and a rim/body sherd of an undecorated *Blanc de Chine* cup. Both of these sherds from Layer 2 are similar in form, motif, and paste to the *Batavia* and *Blanc de Chine* porcelain found in Building 8. Layer 1 contained the body sherd of a *Blanc de Chine* cup with appliqué motif that was cross-mended on to another sherd from Building 8. All of the porcelain sherds found in Room 2 were recovered during the 1989 excavation season, and it is probable that these sherds from Layer 1 and Layer 2 were remains of, or were washed in from, the 1987 season's dredge pile during Hurricane Gilbert in 1988.

No porcelain was recovered from any of the three layers in Room 3. Layer 3 in Room 4 also did not contain any porcelain. Layer 2 of Room 4 did include the body sherd of an undecorated *Blanc de Chine* cup, while Layer 1 in this area contained no porcelain.
Layer 3 and Layer 2 of the yard area of Building 5 held the largest concentration of Chinese porcelain in its assemblage. One body/base sherd of a *Batavia* bowl and one intact/whole *Blanc de Chine* undecorated cup were found in Layer 3 (Figure 16). An undecorated rim/body sherd of a *Blanc de Chine* cup is also from Layer 3, and was recovered in 1990; it was cross-mended on to a *Blanc de Chine Appliqué* cup recovered from Layer 3 of Building 8 in 1987. Three *Blanc de Chine* sherds of different forms were found in Layer 2: one rim/body sherd of an *Appliqué* cup with four *prunus/plum* blossoms on two stems motif and one molded body fragment of a small *Dog of Fo*. These were found after the removal of a brick pile (temporarily located here from an earlier excavation) and a coral head. One undecorated cup handle, of possibly a post-1700 date was also located in Layer 2.

In the area of the sidewalk in front of Building 5, two *Batavia* rim/body sherds and a base/footring of a *Blanc de Chine* cup were found in Layer 3, during the 1987 season. In 1989, two *Blanc de Chine* undecorated rim/body sherds of a cup were found in the area of the sidewalk. Also at this time, two *Batavia* bowl body sherds and one *Blanc de Chine* molded appliqué fragment of a small *Dog of Fo* were recovered from Layer 2. It is probable that the porcelain recovered from the sidewalk in front of Building 5 was washed in from Building 8. Some of these sherds were cross-mended on to artifacts found in the area of Building 8.
Figure 16. Blanc de Chine Undecorated Cup - Intact.
Remarks

Both Room 1 and Room 3 have no evidence of Chinese porcelain. Sherds of bowls, a cup, and a small Dog of Fo body fragment were found on the sidewalk in front of the building; these were presumably washed in directly from across the alley from Building 8. Several more sherds were found in Room 2 of the same types of vessel forms and motifs found in Building 8. These sherds represent a large bowl, a tea bowl, and two cups. Two more cups are represented by sherds found in Room 4. The Yard 5 assemblage includes sherds of a large bowl, two cups, a body fragment of a small Dog of Fo, as well as an intact cup. When reconstruction of various artifacts was completed, it was determined that many of these sherds were, in fact, originally from Building 8. As has been explained previously in this chapter, these displaced sherds were recovered from upper layers in the stratigraphy which included the remains of the dredge piles from previous areas of excavation on the site. However, at least one porcelain artifact came from Building 5. It can then be assumed that the occupants of Building 5 possessed at least one, and possibly more, piece of porcelain.

Building 4

This building utilized a minimalist approach during its construction, by abutting both the front and back walls against the side wall of Building 5. This building is two tenements with two yards and two hearths. It is obvious from the construction that this structure (Building 4) is the more recent of the two and most likely is an addition or
added tenement to Building 5. Both Building 4 and Building 5, as well as Building 8, front on to the alley, which is an extension of Lime Street that runs on to the parade ground in front of Fort James. The outside wall of Tenement 4b and the wall of Yard 4b delineate the alley that is the extension of Queen Street on to Fishers Row (see Figure 12). This outside wall is the only example of Flemish bond construction seen in the TAMU excavations (Hamilton 1989:19). Building 4 defines the corner of Queen and Lime streets and their extensions.

Tenement 4a, which abuts one abutting Building 5, has the bow of ship in it which was washed down Queen Street during the earthquake. The impact of this ship destroyed the front wall of Building 4 and disturbed the interior wall, separating tenements 4a and 4b and the wall separating the main rooms of each tenement from the rear portion of the building and yard. It also moved the herringbone brick floors of the front rooms of the building. Just as the ship was washed over from the harbor and down Queen Street, it is probable that the debris found in the alley between Building 4 and Building 2 is from the Building 4 complex.

Due to the destruction of the front portion of the Building 4 complex, it is difficult to ascribe a specific activity to either tenements 4a or 4b. The yard and hearth areas of this complex contained an assemblage of artifacts indicative of residence. This assemblage includes barrels, tools, a bucket, a wooden mortar, a large wooden bowl, a table, pewter plates and spoons, iron and brass cooking vessels, as well as ceramics. It can be determined that some butchering and food preparation occurred in Yard 4b close to the hearth as would be expected in this area.
A total of 14 sherds and one reconstructed bowl are associated with the Building 4 complex and the alley between Building 4 and Building 2.

Distribution

Room 1a of Tenement 4a had no porcelain associated with Layer 3. In Layer 2, a single sherd of the body of a small Blanc de Chine Dog of Fo was recovered. There was no porcelain in Layer 1 in this room.

The assemblage of Yard 4a, Layer 3 includes four sherds to make up the profile of a Blue and White bowl. Near Hearth 4a, in Layer 2, five more sherds of the same type of motif and form of bowl were found. These eight sherds were reconstructed to form three quarters of a large bowl. All were found in association with the yard area of Building 4a (four sherds from the area at the back of Room 1a and five sherds from the area between Hearth 4a and Hearth 7) (Figure 17). The interior of this bowl has a double ring at the rim, and another at the bottom of the well surrounding a single chrysanthemum with leaves. The exterior decoration consists of four chrysanthemums linked with leaves and swirls. The footring has double ring on the exterior and interior and shows saggar sand in the glaze on the interior. An undecorated Blanc de Chine bowl body sherd was also found near Hearth 4a.

In Layer 2, in Yard 4a, a body sherd of a Blanc de Chine Dog of Fo was recovered; it was cross-mended on to one small Dog of Fo recovered from Building 8. The location of this sherd is likely the result of dredge exhaust deposition during the excavation of the area of Building 8.
Figure 17. Blue and White Bowl with Interior and Exterior Decoration - Reconstructed.
A single body sherd of a *Blanc de Chine Dog of Fo* was recovered from Layer 3 of Room 1b, of Tenement 4b. As with the one found in association with Tenement 4a, it is cross-mended on to one of the figurines that was recovered from Building 8. No other porcelain was found in this room in Layer 2 or Layer 1.

Layer 3 of Yard 4b included a single base sherd of an undecorated saucer, the base sherd of a small *Batavia* tea bowl, and the body sherd of an undecorated *Blanc de Chine* cup. There were no pieces of porcelain in Layer 2 or Layer 1 in Yard 4b.

In Layer 3 of the area of the alley between Yard 4b and Building 2, one *Blue and White* bowl body sherd with interior and exterior decorative motifs and one *Undecorated White* cup body sherd was recovered. In Layer 2, two sherds of *Blanc de Chine* were found: one is the body sherd of a *Dog of Fo*, while the other is the body sherd of an undecorated cup. The profile of an *Undecorated White* saucer was also retrieved from this area. The rim/body sherd of an undecorated *Blanc de Chine* cup and a single rim/body sherd of a *Blue and White* bowl came from Layer 1.

**Remarks**

The two Building 4 tenements had a number of porcelain vessel forms associated with them. Tenement 4a held two bowls and a plate that were found in the yard. Tenement 4b contained a tea bowl and a cup that are associated with the yard area. In the alley between Building 4 and Building 2, two bowls, a plate, and a cup were found. Associated with each area, particularly the front sections of the tenements and the alley, body fragments of the small *Dog of Fo* were found. It can be assumed that these specific
sherds, from both Layer 3 and Layer 2, were originally associated with Building 8. They may have been washed in from Building 8, but they also may be the remains of a dredge pile. The sherds recovered from the yard areas of the tenements were not located under walls or other heavy debris. It is possible that when the ship rammed into the front of the tenements 4a and 4b, during the time of the earthquake, the contents of the living quarters at the front of the building were subsequently blown out into the yard areas. It can be assumed that some, if not all, of the porcelain sherds found in the yard areas of Building 4 were part of the contents of the building.

Building 7

The only features excavated and identified as being part of the Building 7 complex are Hearth 7, which backs on to Hearth 5 the cistern that is shared with Yard 5 and Yard 6; and the brick paved area in front of Hearth 7. It is surmised that Building 7 fronts on to Fishers Row. Two porcelain sherds were found associated with this area. The other recovered artifacts include large complex encrustations that were found to contain numerous tools, locks, and scrap iron pieces. These presumably came from the stock/junk pile belonging to a blacksmith or tinker, who obviously repaired door locks.

Distribution

Only two porcelain sherds were found in the hearth area of Building 7. One rim sherd of a saucer was found in Layer 3 in association with the hearth belonging to
Building 7. An incised geometric motif is evident on the sherd’s interior. No porcelain was found in Layer 1 and a single *Blue and White* body sherd of a plate was found in Layer 2.

**Remarks**

It is possible that Building 7’s occupants possessed porcelain at the time of the earthquake.

**Building 8**

This building may be the most enigmatic of all of the buildings investigated. Excavation revealed the remains of a plaster floor, which appears to have been separated from the jumble of five sections of fallen walls belonging to the rest of the building. Whitewashed boards, some pieces of timber and several window frame elements were also found. However, there appears to be no evidence of foundations or a clear layout of the structure to which these architectural elements belong. Within the scattered debris of this structure, the largest assemblage of intact porcelain was found. A pewter basin and a pewter candlestick, both of very fine quality, as well as very high-quality tin-enamel ware with *Chinoiserie* motifs, and a Staffordshire Slipware posset pot were associated with the porcelain.
A total of 10 bowls, seven cups, four *Dog of Fo* figurines (intact and reconstructed), and 43 sherds (representing a minimum of 10 more vessels) were recovered from the area of Building 8.

**Distribution**

1. Blue and White

Eight of the 12 *Blue and White* porcelain sherds recovered from Building 8 are of the Medallion motif, making up two partial bowls as well as one intact bowl. The exterior motif of the bowls consists of three medallions - enclosing *shou* characters, or stylized phoenixes (Honey 1954:120). The interior motif of the bowls is a cabbage leaf placed off-center in the well. Inside the footring, within a blue double ring, the chop/reign mark -"made by the kiln (hall) of Hun Xing" is evident (Republic of China Legation to Jamaica 1987, pers. comm.) (Figure 18). One other body sherd of a *Blue and White* bowl with a floral/foliate motif on the exterior was found.

2. Batavia

A number of *Batavia* bowls, both large and small, both intact as well as sherds, were found in Layer 3. These include three intact small tea bowls and a minimum count of four large bowls. The three small tea bowls, have a double ring with a second double ring surrounding a scene (landscape) motif in the interior. Each of the landscapes on these tea bowls is different, but all have the same components: a tree and bushes in the
Figure 18. Blue and White Medallion Bowl - Intact.
foreground and water in the middle ground. Two have clouds at the horizon, the other has mountains. There are no marks in the area inside the footring (Figure 19).

The nine sherds of a large *Batavia* bowl were found in the same area of Building 8. The interior of this bowl has a single ring, geometric border, double ring, and a second double ring floral/foliate motif (Figure 20). The three base sherds belong to a second large bowl with an interior motif of a double ring and floral/foliate design were found in association with Building 8. The motif of this bowl is very similar to that of Figure 20; found in the same area (Figure 21). Three body sherds of a third large bowl with an interior motif of single ring, geometric border, double ring, floral/foliate, double ring and floral/foliate design were found, one of these is from Layer 1. After the sherds were reconstructed, it was found that two sherds from the Building 5 complex (Room 2 and Yard 5 - Layer 3) were part of the same bowl (Figure 22). The author is unable to pinpoint any problems in the archaeology from the field notes. One rim/body sherd, of a fourth bowl, with an interior motif of a geometric border, double ring, and floral/foliate design was also found in association with the same building.

3. **Blanc de Chine**

Perhaps the most interesting porcelain type found at the Port Royal site is the *Blanc de Chine* ware. This type of ware includes undecorated, incised decorated, and *appliqué* cups, a bowl, a plate, and most interesting of all, the figurines. A total of five undecorated/plain cups, four *An Hua* cups, 18 *applique* cups, and a minimum of four figurines are represented.
Figure 19. Batavia Small Tea Bowls - Intact.
Figure 20. Batavia Large Bowl - Reconstructed Profile.
Figure 21. Batavia Large Bowl - Reconstructed Base.
Figure 22. Batavia Large Bowl - Reconstructed.
A total of 11 undecorated rim, rim/body, body, body/base, base/footring, and profile sherds, and one intact Blanc de Chine cup were recovered from Layer 3. One body sherd of a bowl was also recovered from this layer. One intact cup (Figure 23) and one rim/body sherd with an An Hua-incised ‘dragon’ motif were found in association with Layer 3 of Building 8. An intact cup with an An Hua-incised floral/foliate motif was also found (Figure 24). The motif of this cup is very similar to that found on a sherd from the 1691 Spanish wreck excavated by Parrent (1987:Appendix B, artifact 146), on Pedro Bank off Jamaica. Two rim/body sherds of cups were recovered with an An Hua-incised floral/foliate motif similar to the design on a sherd found in 1984 on a wreck on Pedro Bank (Hoyt 1984:108-109, Figure 12).

Four intact/whole Appliqué cup were found in association with Building 8. All have varying forms of the prunus/plum blossom motif. One cup has two blossoms on one stem, one cup has four blossoms on two stems, one cup has four blossoms on a bush (Figure 25), and the last has four blossoms with four stems (Figure 26). The motif is repeated three times equidistantly on each of these cups. Twelve sherds of Appliqué cups with the four blossoms and three branches motif are also associated with this building. Five sherds of Appliqué cups have the four blossoms with two branches motif. Four sherds of Appliqué cups have the four blossoms on a bush motif. Three sherds of Appliqué cups have single stem with an unknown number of blossoms in the motif. All of the Appliqué cups and sherds found in Building 8 were in the same area.
Figure 23.  Blanc de Chine An Hua Incised Dragon - Intact.
Figure 24. Blanc de Chine An Hua Incised Floral/Foliate - Intact.
Figure 25. Blanc de Chine Appliqué Cup - Reconstructed.
Figure 26. Blanc de Chine Appliqué Cup - Intact.
Two sets of *Blanc de Chine Dogs of Fo* figurines, one small and one large, were recovered from Building 8. These figurines appear to be in matched pairs, with each pair comprising both figurines of male ‘dogs’ sitting on a plain stand (plinth) with an upraised paw on a brocade ball and a strip of the brocade in his mouth, and are mirror images of each other. Each figurine also has a joss (incense) stick holder at its side. But are unlike the more traditional male/female pairs in which the female has a cub at or under her paw, Originally the *Dog of Fo* was a Buddhist temple guard made of bronze (Godden 1979:262-263). In 1645 this particular design of the small figurine went into production.

One *Blanc de Chine* small *Dog of Fo* figurine was found intact in association with Building 8 (Figure 27). The other small *Dog of Fo*, which is the mate to the intact figurine, has been reconstructed. The porcelain of these figurines is very white and hard; it also has a hint of blue in the shiny, clear glaze.

Fragments of two large *Dog of Fo* figurines were also recovered from the area of Building 8. One large figurine (Figure 28), which is several times larger than the small one (Figure 29), could almost be completely reconstructed, along with the plinth of the other. The large figurines appear to be of a lesser quality porcelain than the small. They are creamy in coloration almost to pink and have an almost matte finish to the glaze. The cream color may be an indication of a slightly lower firing temperature. The large *Dog of Fo* exhibits flaking of the glaze from its clay body. This is due to the penetration of salts in the areas the glaze was crazed and appears to have occurred primarily at areas where the molded *appliqué* elements were adhered to the figurine’s surface.
Figure 27. Blanc de Chine Small Dog of Fo - Intact.
Figure 28. Blanc de Chine Large Dog of Fo - Reconstruction.
Figure 29. Blanc de Chine Small and Large Dogs of Fo - Comparison (Port Royal Project).
A single body base sherd of an undecorated Blanc de Chine cup, two base sherds belonging to the plinth missing the second large Blanc de Chine Dog of Fo figurine, and five rim/body sherds of a medallion bowl were also found in Layer 2. A single unprovenanced sherd matches the size and shape of the rim of the mouth a joss stick holder/tube of a large Blanc de Chine Dog of Fo figurine, however the quality and color of the sherd is very similar to that of the small Dog of Fo figurine. This may indicate the presence of another large figurine.

4. Overglaze Enamel

One Overglaze Enamel body sherd of a cup was found in Layer 2 of Building 8. This sherd was undecorated on its interior and had an undetermined overglaze motif on the exterior.

Remarks

The large assemblage of Chinese porcelain associated with Building 8 leads to speculation about the kind of specialized activity that would include this kind of material. It is possible that this assemblage could represent either the inventory of a specialty shop or coffee house or just someone’s personal collection. As is shown in Chapter IX, Chinese porcelain collecting, both in England and Europe; was a popular activity, especially among the wealthy. However, it seems equally likely in the face of the entrepreneurial spirit of Port Royal in 1692 that such a collection would be for sale or use rather than just display.
As was discussed earlier in the chapter the upper layers in this area of the site are very shallow in places, barely covering the jumble of fallen walls, which at times appear to have been exposed on the surface. Therefore the differentiation between the stratigraphic layers in some areas is minimal or non-existent.

Architectural Associations and Distribution Patterns

On cursory inspection, the distribution of porcelain in Building 1 through Building 5 and Excavation Unit 3 seem to have a random scattering over these areas of the site. It is interesting to note, however, that when the various vessel types, forms, and decorative motifs are considered, a pattern does appear in all of the buildings. Each building and area excavated produced some porcelain sherds that can be attributed to the 17th century. Moreover, it appears that the occupants of each tenement or building possessed at least one Chinese porcelain item, be it a bowl, a tea bowl, a cup, or a plate.

The pattern in Building 8 is somewhat different, since it contained the most concentrated distribution of porcelain: three Blue and White Medallion bowls, the largest concentration of Batavia ware, small and large bowls, as well as the greatest concentration of all types of Blanc de Chine porcelain. Indeed, the porcelains associated with the area of Building 8 include most of the types of porcelain found in Port Royal as a whole. The most significant aspect of the collection from Building 8 is the obvious sets of bowls, cups, and figurines in this locale.
Other types of ceramics associated with Building 8 include some interesting pieces of tin-enamede wares. For example, a crenelated rim vase with two small handles and scenes of a house and a ship on each side was recovered. This vase is almost intact and is of a very fine paste and glaze. Other ceramic artifacts in this building include approximately one third of a tin-glazed plate on which is the depiction of a *Dog of Fo* (Buddhist lion) between two columns and the Richard Meir Staffordshire Slipware posset pot.

As previously noted and following the evidence as indicated by the direction of the wall falls, the Chinese porcelain was washed from what was probably the main floor of Building 8. The fallen walls of Building 5 indicate a collapse of the building to the south and east, which makes the movement of any goods down from this building's second story, in all probability, also to the south and east. This effectively rules out Building 5 as the origin for the high concentration of porcelain found in the Building 8 area. In contrast, some of the scattered sherds in and about Building 5 appear to have been washed in from north of the building (from the area of Building 8) by the succeeding seismic waves at the time of the original inundation, as well as by later meteorologic and geologic disturbances. The remaining sherds that were found primarily in Layer 1 and Layer 2 in and around Building 4 and Building 5 are the result of their deposition in dredge piles during the excavation of Building 8. It can be seen that many sherds found in the 1989 and 1990 excavations in Layer 1 and Layer 2 were from the locations of the dredge exhaust and were the result of incautious excavation in 1987.
The medallion bowl and the *Blanc de Chine* figurines are associated primarily with the fallen wall across the 'middle' of Building 8. The *Blanc de Chine Appliqué* cups are associated with an area near what is believed to be the front of Building 8. It has not been possible to determine the exact architectural features of this building.

**Land Plats and the Corner of Queen and Lime Streets**

Buildings 4, 5, and 8 are a complex of structures that straddle the alley extension of Lime Street to the Fort James parade ground after it intersects Queen Street and defines the alley extension of Queen Street to Fishers Row. This particular corner had been an enigma to scholars due to the discrepancies found in the various maps made of Port Royal over time (see Figures 30 and 4). The excavations conducted during the 1987, 1989, and 1990 field seasons have finally delineated those alleys.

The concentration of Chinese porcelain in association with one structure obviously requires that an attempt be made to determine the occupant of this particular area. From the land plats (TAMU compilation - Index of Plats) and other documentary evidence, the building in question may have belonged to a Mr. Joseph Jennings at the time of the earthquake. In 1685, the plat that appears to be located at the corner of Queen and Lime streets corresponding to the location of Building 8 was sold by Thomas Bispham to Joseph Jennings (TAMU Index :175, plat 459). In November 1686, this same plat abuts the plats of John Hay (60 ft.), and Thomas Freeman (46 ft.), Lime and Queen Street (60
Figure 30. Section of Map Detailing Queen and Lime Street Intersection. Taken from Philip Morris Port Royal Map, 1827.
ft.), and Lime Street (44 ft.) (Pawson and Buisseret 1975:84, 93). The plat to the north and adjacent to Bispham was owned by Captain Guy.

Directly across the alley (the extension of Lime Street), the plat that was owned by John Man was subdivided and a portion sold to James Galloway in 1665 (Figure 31). Analysis of the artifactual evidence supports the belief that at the time of the earthquake Building 5 was occupied by Jane Cooke. It is also believed that she and her husband, Nathaniel, may have been renting the building, since no records have been found to indicate they purchased the plat. Evidence exists to show that Nathaniel died some time before the earthquake. The stack of pewter plates from the storage cupboard under the stairs are stamped with owner’s initials: ‘\( n^C_i \)’ on the older, worn plates and ‘\( 1c \)’ on the newer, less worn plates. Nathaniel’s initial is not on the new plates, indicating he was no longer there. Nathaniel and Jane Cooke are the only people with these initials known to be in Port Royal prior to the earthquake.

Joseph Jennings’ will written in his own hand and signed 8 September 1692 gives St. Davids Parish, the location of his plantation, as his residence (IRO, Wills 1694: Vol. VIII, f.14). Of course, this is shortly after the earthquake and his building on the Lime Street alley is now underwater. Although Jennings’ will does not list his real estate holdings or any losses he may have suffered due to the earthquake, it does outline a number of bequests to be made after: his outstanding debts and funeral costs have been paid. He bequeaths £100 to his father, a silver basin and silver tankard to his mother, £50 to his brother, Benjamin, £100 to his brother, Nathaniel, £50 to his sister, Ann, £20 to his mother-in-law (Mrs. John Wright), £50 to his executor, Thomas Berman, and the
Figure 31. Port Royal Land Plats at Queen and Lime Streets Prior to 1692.
diamond ring which previously was worn by Jennings’ deceased wife, Mary, to Berman’s wife, Hannah. The rest of Jennings’ estate was to go to Jennings’ brother, Peter, with the stipulation that if Peter should predecease Joseph without heirs then the estate would go to Nathaniell. The exception being that a large emerald ring, a dozen silver spoons, a half dozen of the best silver forks, and £150 in cash, would go to Peter’s wife, Elizabeth. Such a list of bequests suggests that Jennings’ estate was probably large.

Unfortunately, the transactions of 1688 in the Grantors involving Joseph Jennings are illegible and impossible to decipher as to the precise plantation being sold and where, although it does list Jennings as a Port Royal merchant (IRO, Grantors 1687-1688: Vol. XX, f.107-108). Although he is listed as a merchant, there appears to be no indication in any records as to which kind of merchandise he was selling. It does appear, however, that the area of Building 8 at the corner of Queen and Lime streets was owned by Joseph Jennings at the time of the earthquake. If the structure on the alley was his shop and was not leased to someone else, it may be that he was selling fine china and luxury wares from this location. The quantity of porcelain cups and bowls in obvious sets may also be indicative of another activity conducted in Building 8. It is possible that Joseph Jennings was the proprietor of a coffee house at this location. Chapter IX explores the social activities of porcelain collecting and the consumption of hot beverages by investigating the documentary evidence of the period.

The material culture represented in the excavations of Port Royal by Hamilton help define the lifeways of the inhabitants. The variety of types, forms, and decorative motifs of porcelain support the belief that the trade networks that transported these wares
were as discussed in Chapter VI. The porcelain found on the site probably followed multiple routes of varying levels of legitimacy. More cannot be said than that the Spanish, the VOC, and the English each could have had a role in the trade of porcelain into Jamaica.

The Chinese porcelain found throughout the site indicates that almost everyone had a porcelain object. The large concentration of a variety of types associated with one structure indicates that a specialized activity was conducted on those premises. Analysis of the documents add some detail to the possible type of activity, whether it be a retail ‘china’ shop, a coffee house, or a combination of the two. The investigations of the documentary evidence in Chapter VIII outline Chinese porcelain’s influence in England and Europe in the late 17th century and its relationship to Port Royal.
CHAPTER VIII

CHINESE PORCELAIN IN THE PORT ROYAL EXCAVATIONS: PRE-1981

A cursory examination of the form and decorative motifs of Chinese porcelain and other ceramics found in earlier excavations conducted in Port Royal may help to illuminate the probable trade route that transported the porcelain to Jamaica.

Marx 1965-1968

Some intriguing porcelains were recovered by Robert Marx, who in 1965-1966 and 1967-1968 was the first to undertake extensive underwater excavations of the city of Port Royal. Underwater archaeology at this time was in its infancy, and methodologies were still being perfected, but many of the recovered artifacts can be identified to a specific provenance. The Guanyin figurine (Figure 32), a stoneware jar, and a multitude of sherds representing types that were also later found by the Port Royal Project were found during the Marx excavations.

In 1965-1966, Marx found several dozen small sherds and one Chinese brass coin (Marx 1967:59). Some of these were reconstructed to produce a partial, very small ‘eggshell’ cup (Marx 1967:59) that exhibits some of the design qualities of Wanli porcelain and the white of the paste of Jingdezhen porcelain. It also has no equivalent in Hamilton’s excavations. Marx’s notes and maps were more specific and detailed in the
Figure 32. Blanc de Chine Guanyin Figurine - Marx Excavation.
1967-1968, season and artifacts are identified by both symbols and a list of the charts or maps from which they came. For example, in one chart (Marx 1968:86), artifact BB is a Chinese porcelain saucer that measures 4 ½ in. in diameter. In another chart (Marx 1968:68), artifact AQ is a plain Chinese porcelain saucer, also 4 ½ in. in diameter. Artifact G in a third chart (Marx 1968:101) is three-quarters of a porcelain saucer, 5 in. in diameter. It is interesting to note that these saucers do not appear to be similar to any found in the Hamilton excavations. One intact *Blanc de Chine* cup (Marx 1968:109) is very similar to those found in Hamilton’s excavations.

The only artifact from Marx’s excavations that can be accurately associated with a drawing is that of the *Guanyin* figurine. It was found “touching the bottom of the middle of the NW side of wall # 58, not far from the 1722 wreck” (Marx 1968:63). As discussed in Chapter VII, this *Blanc de Chine* figurine is of the same quality and manufacture as the pair of small *Dog of Fo* figurines recovered from Building 8 in Hamilton’s excavations. It is made of a very hard paste covered in a shiny, clear glaze, which appears to have a very slight blue tint. These figurines were very popular trade items by the English at the end of the 17th and into the 18th centuries.

In Figure 33, the porcelains discussed herein are marked with ‘+’ to locate them on the site in general terms.
Mayes 1969-1970

In 1969-1970, Mayes (1972a, 1972b) conducted excavations in the Old Naval Dockyard of Port Royal Old Naval Dockyard, which closed in 1906. This area contained a large cross-section of 17th- through 20th-century material. The 17th-century layer was recorded during the excavation of St. Paul's, 17th-century Church of England church that sank during the fateful earthquake. In 1696, Fort William was constructed over the site, at the edge of a waterway left in the spit by the earthquake. In his report, Mayes (1972a:53, 86) notes that the first porcelains occur at his level 6 (A.D. 1692-1735), and they have the typical characteristics of the 18th century (Figure 34). Blue underglaze decoration is predominant in this porcelain assemblage, though there is evidence also of overglaze polychrome and gilding. There are also some examples of marks on the bottom of the Blue and White ware (Mayes 1972a:53, 84, 86). These marks are typical of the Buddhist and good fortune symbols described by Chaffers (1965). Generally, these Blue and White sherds are not similar to those that were found by Hamilton (1981-1990) excavations. There is also some evidence of Batavia ware, which is very similar to the Batavia sherds from Hamilton’s excavation. Several fragments of plates, bowls, and cups, and one fragment of a Blanc de Chine figurine base were found in the investigations conducted by Mayes (1969-1970). This figurine fragment is very similar in detail to that of the base of the Guanyin figurine recorded by Godden (1979:258, Figure 183). It is, however, a different motif than the one found by Marx. This figurine is standing and holds nothing in her arms. The sherd is of the same quality and color as both Marx’s
Guanyin and Hamilton’s pair of small Dog of Fo figurines.

Priddy 1971-1974

Priddy (Brown 1996) conducted a terrestrial investigation in the center of Port Royal on a small block bounded by New Street, Love Lane, and Dove Lane. This area of the town was very densely populated and has been almost continuously occupied since the founding of Port Royal until the 1950s (Brown 1996:138, 142). Nine houses and their adjacent yards and cookhouses or hearth areas were identified (Brown 1996:136, 139). Two of these houses were identified as a tavern site with yards and kitchens or cookhouses (Brown 1996:137-138, 150). Figure 35 is after Cox’s (1987:56) architectural interpretation of the site. Brown’s (1996) analysis is the most complete report of this particular excavation. It notes that very few porcelain sherds were recovered from the tavern site; the majority of those found were Blue and White, and only one sherd was undecorated. These sherds represent a minimum of five vessels, one of which is definitely from later in the 18th century (Brown 1996:168-169). Some of these Blue and White sherds are similar in motif and porcelain quality to some sherds from Hamilton’s excavation.
Figure 35. Priddy Excavation Site (after Cox 1987:56).
Remarks

When approached as a single assemblage, the porcelain from the earlier Port Royal excavations compliments that which was found in the TAMU underwater excavations. Examples of *Blue and White* are noted in the Marx, Mayes, and Priddy excavations; *Batavia* ware is noted in the Marx and Mayes excavations; *Undecorated White* ware is discussed in the Marx, Mayes, and Priddy excavations; and analysis of *Blanc de Chine* appear in the Marx and Priddy excavations. Although Chinese porcelain was not particularly common in Jamaica in 1692, almost every habitation or building had a porcelain object, or at least porcelain was in use enough for the sherds to be dispersed rather evenly throughout the town. The area of Queen and Lime streets was in the business area of Port Royal at the time of the earthquake, and this is reflected in the building and population density, as well as the Chinese porcelain density (Cox 1992:6). The excavations both by Marx (1965-1968) in the area of Fishers Row and Priddy (1971-1974) in the so-called higher population density lower class area of New Street reveal examples of *Blanc de Chine* figurines that were not utilitarian wares and would typically not be associated with a working-class neighborhood. These pieces of porcelain seem to reinforce the speculation that the better-off inhabitants of Port Royal generally had access to a more diverse array of goods than some of their other English colonial counterparts or less well-off Port Royalists. This similarity in form and type of porcelain from the different excavations, both on land and underwater, indicate there are only the few routes discussed in Chapters IV, and VII available to transport the different examples of porcelain into Jamaica.
CHAPTER IX

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE AND INVENTORY ANALYSIS

The trade in East Asian commodities, such as teas, spices, silks, and porcelain, to New Spain and Europe during the 17th century is well documented. Less well documented, however, is the trade of these commodities into the Caribbean, particularly Jamaica. Although porcelain was considered to be the lesser of these trade goods, it is the one most likely to survive in an archaeological context. It may well be that the Chinese porcelain recovered from in the Port Royal excavations are thus a useful corroboration of the existence of perishable East Asian trade goods in Jamaica. By relating the archaeological data to the extensive archival material, both from Jamaica as well as 17th-century English port records, the trade routes and the pervasiveness of East Asian trade commodities in the New World can be surmised.

From documentary evidence, it is known that London, England had a number of porcelain shops in the early 17th century. Allen (1937:193) notes, "that by 1609 the porcelain trade in London was sufficiently extensive to warrant the existence of shops for its sale." Indeed, it is reputed that from 1711 to 1774, as many as 100 porcelain merchants were active in the City of London (Le Corbeiller 1974:10). Such a large quantity of merchants dealing with this specific commodity indicates a healthy trade in Chinese porcelain at the time. It could be surmised that, by extension, the same might also be true in the English colonies. East India ships packed with Oriental trade goods
came directly into the city, as did vessels from Seville, Lisbon, and Amsterdam, European centers that are known to have extensive trade links with the Far East. Such goods were then legally transshipped to the English New World colonies as the Navigation Acts dictated. Certainly, the archaeological record at Port Royal, as well as the Jamaican inventories, corroborate such activities, but it is interesting to note, however, that English port records reveal that very few Oriental commodities are specifically listed as outbound cargo to the New World colonies. Perhaps, such trade occurred outside the regulations of the English Navigation Acts, and Jamaican merchants gained such goods through trade links with other colonies, associations with trade company personnel, theft, and wreck salvage.

It is not unlikely that a porcelain shop should exist in 1692 Port Royal, described as one of the wealthiest English cities in the New World. Indeed, the archaeological evidence supports this supposition. The artifacts found in association with Building 8, for example, may be part of the merchandise of a shop dealing in luxury, exotic, and Oriental commodities. Excavated tin-enamed ceramics of the Delft or Faience variety manufactured in Holland were also within the same area (Building 8). Similarly, these particular Delftware are of very high quality, both in manufacture and design. Other possible scenarios include the personal collection of the building’s occupant or a coffee house that has some decorative porcelain for use, display or sale.

The capture of Portuguese merchant ships by the Dutch in 1602 and 1603, and the subsequent sale of their goods, led to a large-scale demand for porcelain in Holland (Van Der Pijl-Ketel 1982:9). This popularity grew over the course of the 17th century
and especially during the late 17th and early 18th centuries. As Allen (1937:193) notes, the English at this time, like other Europeans, were also enamored with anything exotic and Oriental. Porcelains were considered so precious and "so highly prized that they were thought worthy of handsome mounts of English silver" (Allen 1937:193).

In his diary entry of 19 March 1652, John Evelyn notes his invitation to supper by Lady Gerrard. The "innumerable" dishes his hostess possessed of the "precious ware" impressed him very much, and he thought she "had the most ample and richest collection in England" (Allen 1937:193). A lady of fashion of the period, Mrs. Montagu, received from her brothers, upon their return from the East Indies, "so many figures and jars that she declared her house looked like an Indian warehouse...she hazarded the opinion that her dressing-room was like the Temple of some Indian god" (Allen 1937:196). After her death in 1687, the Countess of Sheppee's executor, Sir Charles Cottrel "regarded her porcelain of such value that he offered it for disposal by lottery, and felt warranted in advertising in the London Gazette (nos. 2234, 2241) that the china was on exhibition in advance at the Three Sugar Loaves in Pall Mall from four to seven in the afternoon" (Allen 1937:193). Daniel Defoe also commented on the porcelain craze, which he attributed to Queen Mary, who "brought a taste for chinoiserie from Holland," along with "the custom of furnishing houses with china-ware in such profusion that everywhere, on chimney-pieces, the tops of cabinets, and shelves especially constructed for the purpose, porcelain was displayed ostentatiously" (Allen 1937:193).
Prior to 1784 the cities of the East Coast of North America were also receiving a great quantity of porcelain in shipments bought at auction in Europe by China wholesalers.

This commerce had its origin in the...Dutch ships which were trading at New Amsterdam and at the first Williamsburg settlement as early as 1620. Trading by both English and Dutch ships at Boston, New York and up the Hudson River to Albany, and at Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Williamsburg and Charleston had continued throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with social orders being placed by American families as early as 1660; colonial houses in Boston, on the Hudson River, New York and further south have records of such purchases made through merchants in London and Amsterdam (Howard 1994:17).

Mudge (1986:87-89) notes that early in colonial Virginia's history are examples of Chinese porcelain and references to what probably were pieces of porcelain. Some of their pieces “were apparently owned by culturally middle-to-lower-class colonists whose money had come quickly in the early years of tobacco farming. Their possession of porcelain is a symbol not of taste and refinement, as was common in Europe or England, but of a boomtown economy with a precarious future.” She also notes that although both the elite and the lower classes had some porcelain, the upper classes “probably had more of better quality” (Mudge 1986:91).

During the 17th and 18th centuries, the considerable interaction between the English and the Dutch (and other Europeans) is shown in the various industries and social organizations that appeared: white, clay smoking-pipe manufacture, the tin-enamel ceramics industry, pewter manufacture, brass nested-weight manufacture, brass wire manufacture, religion, music, and literature. With such a wide-ranging inter-relationship
over the span of centuries, it is difficult to explain why only the very wealthy in England appeared to own and enjoy Chinese porcelain. In Holland, at this time, porcelain was relatively common and part of the Dutchman's daily life (Mudge 1986:106-107). Similarly, in other European countries, this ceramic was not associated merely with the upper classes. In fact, contrary to general consensus, this author believes, that porcelain at this time was gaining in popularity in England. The East India Company was merely not recognizing the market, or more likely, the market in England was being satisfied, instead, by foreign merchants or traders.

An advertisement of 1705 in the London Gazette reveals that Chinese porcelain was common enough that it could be sold off in a public auction.

A considerable quantity of fine old china-ware, and great variety, late belonging to a person of quality, being divided into several lots, which was to have been exposed to sale by auction on Tuesday the 6th Instant, at ten in the morning, over Exeter Exchange in the Strand, is at the request of some persons of quality, put off till Tuesday the 13th Instant...And any person of quality or others may view the same every day from three in the afternoon till six. Catalogues to be seen on Saturday and Monday before the sale (Allen 1937:195).

This invitation for the viewing of the "china-ware," though directed at "persons of quality," is not limited to that select group. Surely this indicates that the purchase and collection of Chinese porcelain is reasonably widespread and growing and is not restricted to those of a particular social standing. The seller is indicating that he does not believe he can rely solely on the "persons of quality" market to unload all of the porcelain in the collection he is attempting to sell.
English Inventories

With 3,000 probate inventories as the source for her research, Weatherill (1988:20) notes that there was a "tendency for people [in the 17th century] to emulate those of higher rank" or "copy the behavior of the upper ranks." She also remarks that "...the middle ranks were economically, socially, and politically important. Even in the 17th century, the largest market for newly imported goods was among these consumers, and the wealthiest had an impressive range of household goods" (Weatherill 1988:14). The research by Weatherill (1988) also reveals that in the period after 1670, distinct changes in consumption were apparent, as was an increase in the amount of goods purchased (Weatherill 1988:28). For example, from 1675 to 1725, a marked increase occurred in all goods in the inventories; looking glasses and earthenwares alone, for example, doubled during this time (Weatherill 1988:29-30). The equipment for the newly discovered hot beverages of tea, coffee, and chocolate, and their associated china wares, were considered new items in 1675, and although china is still rare in the inventories in 1695, by 1715, normal household equipment includes china (Weatherill 1988:31).

Examining Weatherill's (1988) research further, it is noted that between 1685 and 1695, there is an overall increase in the economy of England, a general distribution of wealth that this is reflected in the economic status of individual households in the "increasing frequency of ownership of most goods" (Weatherill 1988:39). Weatherill (1988:41) states that during the prosperous period of 1715 to 1725 in England, goods acquired through the East India trade were more frequently recorded in inventories.
Howard (1994:34) suggests that in the case of ceramic wares, it was not until the beginning of the 19th century that "the price advantage of Chinese wares deteriorated and fashion swung to European wares." This indicates that the cost of Chinese porcelain was not as prohibitive as has been previously surmised. Weatherill (1988:193) also indicates that for goods during the late 17th and early 18th centuries, there was no mass market per se, but there was a market for those in the 'middle ranks' with an increasing share of disposable income. "...the consumption and ownership of the goods...were not confined to social and economic elites, and so the market for such goods had considerable social depth, as well as geographical extension...the important markets for consumer goods were to be found between the upper gentry and the labourers" (Weatherill 1988:193). In other words, the intermediate classes had access to more in terms of money and goods.

...the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries are often presented as a time of restricted economic and social development, even stagnation, in England. Yet this is a misrepresentation, as many recent detailed studies have shown. The conclusions derived from the sample of inventories also indicate that these were decades of considerable change. Not only did more people own more ordinary things, but they also chose more decorative and expressive household goods, many of them imported from the Far East (Weatherill 1988:197).

Weatherill, like Allen, acknowledges the influences of imported goods from the Far East on the material and intellectual culture both of Europe and England. The social occupations associated with the new crazes of porcelain collecting and tea drinking influenced the literature, language, and even the "domestic decoration, eventually stimulating new products and production methods in industries as diverse as furniture, textiles and ceramics" (Weatherill 1988:197)
Mudge (1986) corroborates this author's observation of the rarity of references in documents to Chinese porcelain in Jamaica, since the English colonial inventories of New England, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the Carolinas also do not contain such information. Mudge (1986) believes that porcelain is included but is listed under other associations or names. She asserts that porcelain often came via contraband trade links and, therefore, came from Spanish or Dutch vessels as they were transporting goods to Europe. If an inventory contains references to Spanish goods (chesents, leather, boxes, or silver coins) or Dutch goods (Dutch case bottles), the earthenwares listed could actually reflect porcelain as well as other fine ceramics (Mudge 1986:91-92, 102,107). It is probable that if porcelain is not referred to by a name that mimics the pronunciation of the word 'china,' then it may be listed in an inventory under the all-encompassing term of 'earthenware.' Mudge (1986:102-107) refers to numerous inventories in different colonies in which this may be true.

Volumes I, II and III of the inventories of Jamaica (JPA, 1674-1675, 1679-1686, 1686-1694) support Mudge's (1986) assertion that porcelain is rarely mentioned. They also reflect numerous inventories that have Spanish items or Dutch goods. Some documents do note plates and dishes, cups and bottles, jars and jugs, but these references are not very descriptive and may or may not include porcelains. Not all of these inventories even mention earthenwares. This appears to be an oversight by the appraisers, either deliberate or inadvertent, or as D.L. Hamilton notes, "just the way things were" (Hamilton 1997, pers. comm.).
Port Royal and the Jamaica Inventories

The trade of contraband goods in the late 17th century was a growing market in the colonies, especially in Jamaica (Zahedieh 1986a:583, 592, 1986b:216). The increased volume of shipping traffic into Port Royal, particularly in the 1680s and 1690s, increased the possibility of ‘exotic’ and ‘luxury’ goods arriving on the island via the Spanish and Dutch colonies and their trade links as well as from English ports (Zahedieh 1986b:217). Zahedieh (1986a, 1986b) notes that the Naval Officer’s Returns in the Public Records Office in England indicate where merchant vessels were coming from and where they may have stopped on their way to Port Royal in the late 1680s. Each stop for provisions or repairs presented the opportunity to trade, often illegally. In 1688, for example, 211 vessels arrived in Port Royal from eight ports of departure, including England, Ireland, Africa, the English West Indies, Spanish ports, North American ports, Curaçao, and Madeira. Some of these ports were also ports of call for those vessels both outbound to and inbound from the Far East (Zahedieh 1986b:217). Unfortunately, clandestine trade is not found in the written records.

Throughout the ruins of 17th-century Port Royal, both on land and underwater, Chinese porcelain has never been found in great quantities. In the Hamilton excavations, it represents only 7 percent of the total ceramic assemblage. In comparison to English coarse earthenware, for example, it is sparse in its distribution. This sparsity is also reflected in the written documents; there are only four direct references to China ware or porcelain in the inventories. Moreover, slipware, which was manufactured in England,
and appears in quantities comparable to the amount of porcelain found at Port Royal, is not mentioned. Even the tin-glazed or tin-enamedled wares - the Delfts, faiences, and majolicas, - and stonewares are rarely recorded by name. Yet, again, they comprise a significant percentage of the ceramics found in Port Royal. It would seem then that for the purpose of inventories, ceramics were not considered to be of enough importance to distinguish individually. It may be simply a matter of cultural convention in categorizing by the inventory takers and the residents of Jamaica. But as Mudge (1986) shows, the same phenomenon is apparent in the documentary record in the English colonies of North America. It is interesting to note that the opposite appears to be the case for the Dutch colonies (Cornelius 1926:38).

Some confusion exists about the terms used in wills and inventories to describe ceramics of specific types. Watkins (1975:290) notes that in the 1670 inventory of Bostonian Eleazar Armitage there is mention of Chinese porcelain - "to pasls of Chany ware" - but his assumption that this must refer to majolica is based on his reasoning that "it is unlikely anybody in Boston had enough porcelain to have it listed in parcels." Watkins assumes that the inventory taker would not have known the difference between majolica and Chinese porcelain. However, Howard (1994:17) notes that trade in, and orders for, porcelain are seen as early as 1660 along the Eastern seaboard. This would indicate that porcelain would not only be known to people in the area but also owned by them, therefore a parcel of porcelain may not be all that unlikely. Thornton (1992:98) also maintains that 'China ware' was not necessarily used to describe only porcelain; tin-enamel wares were often included in this category. Since we do not know how many
pieces comprise a 'parcel' or what access this person may have had to vessels
transporting East Asian goods, it seems premature to summarily dismiss notations
referring to Chinese porcelain as misidentifications.

There is little question that most 17th century Europeans served and ate their food
from some type of vessel, plate, or dish. It would be expected, therefore, that references
would be made to these types of utensils and vessels in the inventories. The limited
references to these objects in 17th century English inventories suggest that the everyday
household goods, trenchers, dishes, plates, and spoons, were not considered of value and
so were not included. Perhaps, instead, these items were so obviously necessary and
common everyday items, they would not need to be included in an appraisal but were,
instead, just assumed to be part of the household. It may be that these types of items
were considered the woman's or wife's property and so were not evaluated. In volumes II
and III of the Jamaica inventories (JPA, 1679-1686, 1686-1694), lists of female
decedents appear to have no significant inclusion of household goods, nor do they exhibit
a significant difference from appraisals of the estates of male decedents. Chinese
porcelains may not have been used for everyday food or drink consumption, but their
intended use would have probably been obvious. With the exception of the Blanc de
Chine figurines, the porcelain pieces found in Hamilton's excavations are all utilitarian
and were probably used for the consumption of hot beverages (tea, coffee, and
chocolate).

Occasionally an appraiser of an estate was not literate; a signature is represented
merely by their 'mark' (JPA, Inv. 1686-1694: Vol. III, f. 300, 317, 350, 358, 367, 378,
This may reflect the appraiser’s ignorance of the names of various types of ceramics and they may then be categorized under one type, earthenware. Additionally, each inventory is not accorded the same degree of itemization. Some are appraised as to group or type, while some list all individual items. Although the latter inventories do not show any more inclination to include the aforementioned household items, they do include everything pertaining to a business, especially a plantation. Is this the explanation that is sought? If the items do not reflect a potential profit, they have little intrinsic value in the appraisal of an estate? Often, pewter, brass, and even iron are identified not by the type of vessel but, instead, by the weight of a group of items (JPA, Inv. 1674-1675: Vol. I, f. 59-61, 139-140, 161; 1686-1694: Vol. III, f. 112-113, 119-200, 276, 277-278). Ostensibly, one would assume this would be for the minimum resale value of those types of objects when sold to the local tinker or smith.

Is it then that most household ceramics have essentially no resale value? Does the lack of references to ceramics reflect the easy availability of the wares, the low cost of the wares, or simply the non-existence of the wares? The archaeological record belies the latter explanation. Can it then be assumed that the former explanations are the more accurate? Perhaps, as Hamilton (1995, pers. comm.) believes, porcelain was considered part of the generic household goods and, therefore, falls under the umbrella of ‘real estate’. Unfortunately, at the time of writing, there is nothing in the Port Royal record that supports or refutes this assertion. The estate of Col. Julines Herring, Esq., lists “a parcell of earthenware as plates, porringer...” with an assessed value of £0:15:0 (JPA,
Inv. 1686-1694: Vol. III, f. 350-352). In an estate valued at £1247:10:0, this reference to ceramics of such a low value is interesting, especially when compared to the assessed value of 117 lb. of pewter in the estate at just over £8. Neither of these household items appear to have been ascribed a high value, yet contrary to the majority of inventories investigated, earthenware is included.

Le Corbeiller (1974:10) notes that in 1704, the supercargoes ordering goods in China for the English East India Company referred to the porcelains exported to England as "Earthenware." It is, perhaps, understandable that the local inventory-taker in Jamaica might refer to porcelain by such a generic name when identifying items in a deceased's estate out of brevity, ignorance, or connivance, but that a supercargo in China would use a similar term may indicate that porcelain had become so commonplace that it had lost some of its value, or that it was included under the generic 'earthenware' umbrella. Perhaps the value placed on porcelain is a result of modern researchers rather than from those living with and exposed to these ceramics in the 17th century. If this is, in fact, the case, then one must reevaluate all of the inventories to reassess the ascribed values to ceramics and investigate the possibility that other items in an inventory, for example Far Eastern commodities, may indicate the inclusion of porcelain in the earthenware category.

During the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, numerous researchers have noted and elaborated on the biases that may be found in probate inventories (Benes 1989; McCusker and Menard 1991: 263; Main 1975:95-96), since inventories generally represent selected segments of the population. Few, if any, probates, are found for servants, slaves and transients, apprentices, live-in relations, or children. The Jamaican inventories, however,

Ironically, some of the wealthy do not have inventories or are not probated, thus leaving no records to examine (Benes 1989:11; McCusker and Menard 1991:263). Of course, there are instances when an inventory is taken because the decedent has died intestate (JPA, Inv. 1686-1694: Vol. III, f. 327-329, 399-400, 409-410, 415-416).

The researchers cited above note that rarely is the complete estate inventoried. This may be due to distribution of personal effects and belongings prior to death (and is not mentioned in the will), or bequests dispersed prior to the estate’s appraisal. The wife’s property may be omitted from the inventory. Real estate was usually not included in Jamaican inventories. The liability and liquid asset accounts are often inaccurate, incomplete, or missing. In volumes II and III of the Jamaica inventories there is frequent mention of “cash in the house,” “in ready money,” “debts outstanding,” and “debts both good and bad.” These particular notations are found more frequently in Jamaica than in other English colonies and may be due to the influx of hard currency into the Port Royal economy and the entrepreneurial activity seen in Jamaica in the late 17th century (Zahedieh 1986a:583). Mention is also made of estate values for some occupations, which appear to be inflated when compared to the same occupations in other colonies. Among these in Jamaica is the inventory for Robert Phillip, a sailmaker, which appears to be of inordinately high value due to the debts owed to him (JPA, Inv. 1695-1701: Vol. IV/V, f. 57). Some inventories may be incomplete through inadvertent or deliberate
omission by the appraisers who may be friends or neighbors of the deceased and thus devalued the estate to reduce taxes levied against the estate.

It has also been determined that the probated decedents may be older than the general population, and as such, had accumulated more wealth (McCusker and Menard 1991: 263; Main 1975:95-96). By this logic, they have also been using their possessions longer and thus may not be in excellent condition or of optimum value. Of course, any appraised value is dependent on an item’s market value and the currency rate at the time of the appraisal, as well as its condition. With an increased supply of any good, product, or commodity, its value will fall in the marketplace.

Oriental Trade Commodities

As noted earlier, during the last half of the 17th century, the market for porcelains and other Oriental commodities in England and Europe was steadily growing throughout the population and not just among the ‘people of quality.’ For example, the drinking of hot beverages, particularly tea, took favor among the English in the mid-1600s. "...from the second half of the 17th century the most important cargoes were tea and gold, but increasingly porcelain was seen as a useful and decorative cargo - for the new drink of tea tasted at its best from chinaware” (Howard (1994:15). During the 18th century, as tea drinking increased in popularity, porcelain achieved everyday status; it is “still felt today that tea tastes better when sipped from a porcelain cup” (Allen 1937:191). Unfortunately, most of the commodities from the Orient were of a perishable or consumable nature, and
it is extremely remote that such items as spices, teas, and silks remain in the archaeological record. As such, it is the documentary record that becomes the corroborating evidence of the highly prized and sought-after Oriental commodities, perhaps, including porcelain. If Port Royal was a ‘hotbed’ of the latest styles and crazes, it seems probable that tea drinking was something in which the inhabitants of Jamaica also participated.

Eating utensils are mentioned only rarely in the Jamaican inventories. These dishes, plates, bowls, and cups are usually of silver or pewter and are most often valued in weight rather than quantity. There are some references to ‘chocolate pots,’ ‘coffe dishes,’ ‘coffe plates,’ ‘cups for tee,’ and a few rare references to ‘Cheney’ or ‘Chyna’ cups. References to other Oriental commodities may prove to be better indicators of the possibility of Chinese porcelain in the estate. Some estates list ‘a parcel of Earth: waire’ (JPA, Inv. 1679-1686: Vol. II, f. 81, 84, 119, 123-124, 135-136, 142, 146-148; 1686-1694: Vol. III, f. 213-214, 262-263, 280-283, 313-314, 316-317, 346-347, 425, 432-434) and the appraised values for these may also provide a clue for the presence of porcelain in the estate.

The Jamaican inventories indicate there were at least two ‘coffee houses’ in Port Royal. The estate of Charles Booker includes “coffe dishes ...coffe plates ...4 pound of Tea ...12 pound of Coffe berreys” (JPA, Inv. 1686-1694: Vol. III, f. 112-113), and the estate of Cap' John Phipps includes a “Coffee House” (JPA, Inv. 1686-1694: Vol. III, f. 600-602). Cocoa, tea cups, and other indicators of the new hot beverages being consumed throughout Europe are also listed (JPA, Inv. 1686-1694: Vol. III, f. 112-113).
A listing of a "Tea engine" exists in the inventory of Michael Baker, a merchant of Port Royal, dated 12 December 1693 and ascribed to the account of "K." In this same inventory, "Crape ...Silke ...India Setting ...Cullard Callico ...Nutmeggs ...Pepper ...cinnamon" are also included in the accounts of various individuals identified only by their initials (JPA, Inv. 1686-1694: Vol. III, f. 602-606). Appendix A of this dissertation illustrates to the reader the different types of goods in volumes II and III of the Jamaica inventories. The inventories have been transcribed and edited to include those items alluding to East Asian trade and trade goods and the rarely mentioned porcelain or earthenwares. The ascribed values are included to provide a frame of reference to the reader, as comparisons are made of rare luxury goods with common English items.

In her analysis of the probate inventories, Thornton (1992:97), discusses the value of ceramics in inventories where ceramics were attributed little or no value and so were often ignored by appraisers. From inference, in the habit of collecting, porcelain would have seldom been used as an everyday utilitarian ceramic. Instead, it would have served a decorative purpose. By virtue of its infrequent use, it also would be less likely to be broken and more likely to be passed along as a small keepsake to family members upon someone's death. Porcelain is easily transportable and, therefore, could easily have been missed by inventory assessors. As happened occasion ally, it could be one of the items sold off prior to the estate assessment and noted only as "money received for goods sold" (JPA, Inv. Vol. II, III).

Volume III of the Jamaican inventories (1686-1694) include goods from the Far East, yet, the English port records do not mention these commodities, which by law were
supposed to be transshipped through England to the New World colonies. This indicates the possibility of the flow of Oriental trade goods into Jamaica from ports other than English ones on the ghostly contraband trail. The availability and close proximity to Spanish colonial ports certainly allows speculation on this route being responsible for some of the East Asian goods arriving in Jamaica through the Manila Galleons and New Spain. Examination of the Jamaican inventories, which include other types of East Indian, East Asian, and Spanish goods such as fabrics, teas, spices, chairs, chests, tables, jars, gold coin, and money, allows for speculation on the probability of Chinese porcelain also in the estate being appraised. The fabrics described include bengal, muslin, silk, gauze, calico, flannel; the spices include cinnamon, nutmeg, cloves, mace, pepper, white pepper, ginger, spice boxes; and of course tea, coffee, and chocolate.

**English Port Records**

It may be possible to relate the appraised value of an item in an inventory to the assigned value of customs for goods seen in the port records both from London and Bristol. The 1681-1682 outbound port records of London and the 1681-1682, 1694-1695 outbound port records for Bristol (PRO London and Bristol) were examined by the author. No mention is made of porcelain or Chinese earthenwares. ‘English’ and ‘English-made’ earthenwares were found, and the vague ‘earthenwares’ and ‘Earthenwares and glasses’ were listed, but in almost every case, the quantity of goods listed and the customs assessment (at 1/20th of the real value) indicate a low value. It
would seem then that this could not include Chinese porcelain, especially if porcelain was
the highly prized and rare commodity conventional wisdom leads us to believe. These
records were also examined in an attempt to find other Asian or luxury commodities that
might indicate value of the vague earthenwares or the existence of some unmentioned,
and therefore, non-assessed export items.

The London and Bristol port records specify a number of commodities and
ascribe an origin or place of manufacture. Appendix B lists these commodities that
moved through these ports according to these records, including dates and destinations
for these goods. This author assumes that 'Eng' denotes 'English' in these reports.
Following this, therefore, the port records specify English wrought silk, English throne
silk, English earthenware, English earthenware and glasses and drinking glasses (as a
combined group of goods), English hard-soap and soap, English linen, and English glass
bottles. There are also Yorkshire cushions, Norwich stuffs, Irish hose, and Irish rugs.
Outside of the realm of 'English,' the other specified goods include East India red earth,
German linen, Spanish cloths, and Spanish tables.

'Wrought silk' or 'manufactured silk' applies to bolts of woven fabric ready for
cutting and fashioning into clothing and draperies. 'Throne silk' or 'throw silk' refers to
the thread or yarn used to sew and embellish clothing, gloves, and purses. The customs
records distinguish between those silks being of English manufacture and others that are
not, but there is no specific origin or place of manufacture for the others. Moreover, it is
almost impossible to determine the quantities and qualities of these other silks.
The port records also include calicoes and muslins. During the 17th century, India was the major producer of these fabrics. As such, it is reasonable to assume that India was the point of origin for these fabrics. Flannel may have come from Canton in China, but there is no verification in the port records. East India red earth is shown to have been shipped to New England out of London, but it is not clear how the earth was used (PRO London 1682: f. 25, entry 20). The only reference in the port records to silk crape (crepe) is that being shipped from London to Jamaica; it probably refers to fabric of Chinese origin but is not specified as such (PRO London 1682: f. 31, entry 26).

The port records specify 'English earthenwares,' but other earthenwares noted are not identified as to place of origin. It is known that earthenwares were used and traded in the English colonies from all over Europe. Various Delft, majolica, faience, slipware, and stoneware came from Holland, Portugal, Spain, Italy, and Germany. Are these then included in the ubiquitous 'earthenwares' category? It can certainly be assumed that all lower fired wares are included in this group, but can the same assumption be made of the fired wares, especially the various Rhenish or Frächen stonewares, and by extension, the porcelain? Earthen bottles are noted as being shipped from London to Antigua (PRO London 1682: f. 10, entry 20); this is probably a reference to Rhenish stoneware jugs (Frächen or Bellarmine).

The Bristol port records list the goods placed on board vessels departing for various ports, including the Caribbean, Virginia, Carolina, New England, New York, and Newfoundland. However, the records for as late as 1695 give little indication of any goods being transported that have an Oriental origin. Included in the records are non-
specified 'parcels' in three distinct categories. The first is the vague 'Parcels Wares,' which are valued at a total amount for an individual parcel in an entry. 'Parcels Several Sorts of Wares' are valued at a total amount for all of the parcels in that entry. 'Parcels Wares not mentioned in ye Book of Rates' are also valued at the total amount for all the parcels in the entry, as well as an ascribed customs rate. These categories of goods may be the closest one comes to a listing of something other than primarily local goods being placed on vessels. In the 1695 port records, occasionally the value of these parcels is comparable to other goods listed, but more frequently, the value is much more than the other goods in a shipment. Of the three categories of parcels, those of the third category appear to be of the greatest values. Without specific information on the make-up of these parcels, it is impossible to analyze the type of goods flowing from England to the New World and Port Royal. It is also impossible to discount the possibility that these parcels included Oriental/Asian goods, such as Chinese porcelains or lacquer-wares, or any other type of commodity.

Such categories of 'parcels of wares' are not listed in the London port records of 1681-1682 (PRO, London 1681-1682). Perhaps, the customs officers in London were better acquainted with all types of merchandise or were more diligent in their record-keeping, and so gave specific names to items on the records. The Bristol port records appear to show an increase in the values ascribed to these 'parcels of wares' between 1682 and 1695. Does this reflect the general increase in wealth and conspicuous consumer consumption, or a general increase in demand due to an increase in population in the colonies? When looking at the purchasing power of the various New World
English colonies, Jamaica and Port Royal do show an increase in both aspects over this period.

A value assessed by the customs officer may or may not indicate origin. It may also describe quality, complexity of design, or even color. Each of these factors must be included in the analysis of the value. Other goods included in the shipment may be an indication of the origin or quality of the commodity. By association, if the other goods are of a specific type, quality, or origin, perhaps, the commodity in question may also be of the same. This is, of course, merely speculation; in essence, this analysis is based not on what is in the records but, rather, that which is absent. It follows that in an analysis of absences, it is necessary to not follow flights of fancy but, instead, qualify each speculation with what is known and try to follow what the record leaves between the lines. But this is a frustrating task fraught with enormous pitfalls, and it is hoped that later scholarship will glean additional information and nuances from other documentary evidence to better reveal the complete history of the trade of Chinese porcelain into the Caribbean, specifically Jamaica, in the 17th century.

Without specific references in the English port records to Chinese porcelain, the association of other goods that may have an Asian origin can be used to build a case for the transport of Chinese porcelain to the New World and Jamaica. Spices are listed in the records, as are wrought and throne silks. The spices include specifically saffron, mustard seed, anise, and the general term, 'Spice,' which has a weight and value. There are, however, no references to pepper, mace, nutmeg, cinnamon, or even tea or coffee, despite the evidence that such items were supposed to go through England as part of their
legal transshipment to the New World colonies. As noted previously, the availability and close proximity to Spanish colonial ports certainly allows speculation that the contraband route was responsible for at least some of the East Asian goods arriving in Jamaica. Again, by referring to Appendix A, one notices the amount of Spanish goods: ‘Spanish hatts,’ ‘Spanish chests,’ ‘Casteele soap,’ ‘ryalls,’ ‘p’ 8/8,’ a ‘Spanish prayer books,’ ‘Spanish jarres,’ a ‘Spanish box & cabinett,’ a ‘Spanish rapier & dagger,’ a ‘Spanish pistoll’ in these inventories. Except for the trade of slaves through the Royal African Company and Spain’s Assiento, there was supposed to be no direct trade with the Spanish, especially amongst New World colonies. To assume that all of these Spanish goods arrived through the Casa de Contratación merchants in Spain is probably unlikely. It is acknowledged that it was far more economically expedient for New Spain and Cuba to trade for goods directly, though illicitly, with other European countries through ‘adventures’ or trade expeditions from other colonial outposts, as well as those countries themselves.

The inventories in Jamaica seem to share the same predilection as the port records to lump together all of these goods with no tangible method of distinguishing between types of earthenwares. Interestingly, the inventory of Joseph Bedow (JPA, Inv. Vol. III: f. 347-348) includes iron with the earthenwares, giving a total value of £0:10:0. Again, it is assumed that this reference is to earthenwares other than Chinese in origin. The archaeological record, therefore, becomes our only means of assessing the types of ceramics imported into Jamaica. Of course, this also means that the port records do not indicate the quantities of each type of ceramic being imported. Perhaps, at least for Port
Royal, most of the porcelain does not come through England. The well-referenced smuggling with Spanish-held territories and the accessibility to other European Caribbean outposts give rise to the notion that Jamaica colonists used other trade routes to get their porcelain.

Other New World Colonies

Port Royal’s cosmopolitan reputation was in part due to its ethnic and religious diversity, which brought with it a range of cultural norms as well as accessibility to foreign commodities. Port Royal was obviously not the only colony in the Western Hemisphere to have porcelain in its inventories. The Dutch colonists in the New Amsterdam (later New York) area, for example, also possessed Chinese porcelain. But unlike the Jamaica inventories, the inventories of the Dutch colonists of New Amsterdam note such ceramics in great detail. For example, the 1685 inventory of former New York mayor, Cornelius Steenwyck, lists “19 porcelain dishes and 2 flowered earthen pots” in the Great Chamber (Cornelius 1926:38). The 1695 inventory of Margharita van Varick, the widow of the minister of the Reformed Dutch Congregation on Long Island, includes “3 East India cups, 3 East India dishes, 3 Cheenie pots, 3 Cheenie pot bound in silver, 2 glassen cases with 39 pieces of small china ware, 11 India Babyes and 126 various chinaware bowls, jugs, flower pots, toyes and images” (Cornelius 1926:38). Indeed, the "possession of 100 pieces of pottery and porcelain was not uncommon for a 17th century New York burgher" (Cornelius 1926:38).
Chinese porcelain was neither commonplace nor rare in Port Royal at the end of the 17th century. In the archaeological context, it is a clear indicator of the accessibility of exotic, and by many standards, luxury items to Port Royal’s inhabitants. This accessibility is manifested because of the location, trade relations, and influx of goods, services, and money into Port Royal. The entrepreneurial spirit of Port Royal in the 17th century was pervasive. Persons of all ‘qualities’ and situations came to Jamaica. Through timing, ingenuity, and manipulation, some found themselves socially and financially well beyond and above their comparable ‘station’ in their homeland. The ‘pirate’ Henry Morgan, for example, made his way to Knighthood, the Lieutenant-Governorship, and considerable land-holdings. It was men like entrepreneur Smyth Kelly who became the epitome of the ever-growing Jamaican intermediate class. His name is listed in numerous documents in various contexts as inventory taker, executor of estates, land leaser and owner, Gentleman, member of the Royal African Company, Esquire, friend and associate of men of ‘means’ and influence. In Volume III of the Jamaica inventories (JPA, Inv. 1686-1694: Vol. III, f. 370-371) he is the administrator/executor of the estate of Ralph Smith, a Port Royal merchant. He is noted as one of the inventory takers in folio 422 of the same volume; in folios 425 and 502, he is responsible for giving the oath to those taking the inventory; in folios 459-460, he took the inventory of Sir Symon Musgrave. Over time, Mr Smyth Kelly rose in the ranks of society and is an example of the mobility possible in English society in the late 17th century, especially in the colonies.
The 1690s were a time of transition in English society and English trade with the world. East Asian commodities were gaining ground in the marketplace, and their availability to the English was steadily increasing. Port Royal was, in essence, the harbinger of things to come in England. The intermediate classes of Jamaica, the steadily growing mercantile community, and the individual small-time entrepreneurs were the vanguards of the changes to be seen in the 1700s. Jamaica presented opportunities to those who would never have had the chance in England. The collection of Chinese porcelain in Port Royal is a reflection of that transition and the growing importance of an expanded world trade in England.

In summary, inventories and other documents are considered part of the story. They indicate cultural assumptions and conventions, as well as the activities of the individuals whose estates they represent. They supplement and complement archaeological data and represent a true cross-section of the material culture and its classification in use during any given period. Further, these written records indicate that the Chinese porcelain found in Port Royal could be the result of trade with the Spanish New World colonies or Dutch traders. In the concluding chapter of this dissertation, the evidence and the absence of direct evidence found in the documents will aid in the formulation of any theories or plausible explanations for the trade of Chinese porcelain into Port Royal in the 1680s and 1690s.
CHAPTER X

CONCLUSIONS

The conventional wisdom of historians has been that Chinese porcelain in the English colonies was rare and only those with considerable disposable income (i.e., gentry and upper classes) would have access to or could afford such a commodity. For many English colonies, this may, indeed, be true and it may also be true of Port Royal. However, all of the excavations at Port Royal, on land or underwater, have recovered Chinese porcelain. Porcelain has been found throughout the TAMU excavations, and the collection associated with Building 8 does not fit snugly into the typical historical account.

The area that the TAMU Port Royal Project excavated is a mere 8-12 ft. below the water's surface, and although the terrestrial sites in Port Royal exhibit continuous occupation in the center of town, the submerged area contains primarily the architectural remains of the town dating 1655 to 1692. During the period 1692 to 1814, there is only incidental archaeological deposition, as represented by trash dumped into the harbor. Following the establishment in 1814 of the Naval Hospital, in the area next to the submerged city, increased deposition of trash continues to the present.

When assumptions are made regarding the quantities of artifactual material found at a site, often the archaeologist is depending on the existence of, or lack of, a type of ceramic to indicate its popularity or its availability to the individual. Obviously, the
existence of a type of ceramic at a site indicates its use. But do the quantities found
accurately reflect its function or popularity? In the case of 17th-century Port Royal,
Chinese porcelain makes up a small but significant percentage of ceramic wares, but what
role did it play in Port Royal society?

Excavations by Donny L. Hamilton and the Port Royal Project uncovered
numerous examples of Chinese porcelain, including bowls, tea and wine cups, and
figurines, many of these intact. This contradicts the surveyed documentary evidence
(JPA, Inv. Vol. II, III), which notes the appearance of porcelain on only four probate
inventories. It is this author’s opinion that there are several logical explanations for this
apparent contradiction.

1. Porcelain was so common in 17th-century Port Royal and Jamaica that those
assessing the value of an estate by an inventory of the property felt it was just
another ceramic type of no outstanding value or importance and so was included
within the ‘earthenware’ category.

2. There was no porcelain in the estate.

3. Porcelain was so uncommon that the assessors were not familiar with this
ceramic type, did not have a specific name for it, and so included it within the
‘earthenware’ category.

4. Household ceramics were considered to be the personal property of the widow,
or a normal part of a household, and so were not included in the appraisal of the
estate or were only included in a general or cursory manner.

5. Porcelain was not particularly common but was included in the general
category of ‘earthenware’ as was the cultural convention of the period.

6. Household ceramics had no resale value and so were not included in the appraisal of the estate.

7. There was no porcelain in the house at the time of the assessment; perhaps, it had been disposed of prior to or immediately after the death of the owner.

The last four (4, 5, 6 and 7) explanations could very well be most appropriate. Even today, there are things taken for granted to be part of a household. Some of these things include equipment necessary for cooking, other than pots or pans, for example ladles, spoons, forks and skewers. Cleaning equipment is also overlooked, like brushes, brooms and mops. In this period, the household was the domain of the wife, or the mistress of the house. All of the items necessary for the maintenance of the household would be under her supervision. It is possible that these necessities were not included in the inventory, simply because they were necessities, which all held in common.

From the study of the inventories, particularly those of Jamaica, it seems it was the English convention of the time to include all ceramics (stoneware, coarse earthenware, and porcelain) under the ubiquitous term of ‘earthenware.’ Only in isolated cases is the convention not followed and some porcelain-related terms are used. The estate of Joseph Bedow of Port Royal, inventoried in March 1690, includes tea, calico and silks, Spanish goods, and “Iron & earthenware £0:10:0” (JPA, Inv. Vol. III: f. 347-348). The estate of Edward Fox includes “a parcel of earthenware £1:8:10½” as well as calicos and a silk quilt (JPA, Inv. Vol. III: f. 280-283). Mary Gubb’s inventory of 1693
includes "21 Earthen Dishes and 7 looking glasses £0:10:0," as well as the calico, bengal and silk listed as "Shopp Goods" (JPA, Inv. Vol. III: f. 469-471). Henry Dawkins was a Jamaican merchant whose inventory in December 1683 was probably the most explicit in its descriptions of ceramics: "1 Houre Glass 2 Lemenado Potts 1 Earthen Salt £0:2:0", "1 Punch bowle £0:2:0", "To some oth\$r Lumb£ £0:5:0", "4 doz\$ & 8 Custerd Cupps £0:9:0", "2 doz" drinking Cupps £0:4:0", "4 Large w' dishes £0:5:0", "2 middle Ditto £0:2:0", "4 Large w' basons £0:6:0", "14 Middle Ditto £0:12:0", "l Large salt & 1 Small £0:1:0", "14 Lemanado Cupps £0:7:0 are all listed as being in the back room (JPA, Inv. Vol. II: f. 29-31).

It is difficult to be certain that these cups, dishes, and basins are anything other than tin-enamel or any common utility earthenware of the day. However, if the assumption is followed that if an estate contained significant amounts of East Asian commodities (spices and silks), it may be safe to surmise that listed ceramics may also include Chinese porcelain. Dawkins' estate includes silk, thread, nutmeg, mace, cloves, cinnamon, black crepe (silk), calico, muslin, gauze, silk, flannel, pimento, and Castile soap. In the 1689 estate of Samuel Lamburne, East India fabrics and spices are listed along with "...Earthenware 15:0:0..." (JPA, Inv. Vol. III: f. 261). In this instance, it is difficult to determine what type of earthenware is included without an indicator of the quantity involved. The value ascribed to the earthenware in this case, however, appears high, as are the values of the East Asian fabrics and spices. Is it safe to assume that there is a strong probability that Chinese porcelain is included with the listed earthenware? With so little data available we can make very few assumptions.
The inventory in 1693 of the estate of the Port Royal merchant, Captain John Phipps, lists goods from East India, England, Europe, and Jamaica, including "a pcell of Dutch Earthenware £0:15:0" (JPA, Inv. Vol. III: f. 600-602). This inventory also states that the appraisement includes a "Coffee House." It is interesting that the appraisers specified that the earthenware in this instance was Dutch (probably Delft ware, although Dutch-imported porcelain is also a possibility) when so often there is little in the way of specific typing of ceramics.

The 1688 inventory of Thomas Waite includes "2 Spanish Jarrs £0:2:6" and also lists "2 Marble Images £0:4:0" (JPA, Inv. Vol. III: f. 238-239). Port Royal merchant John Wells also has images listed in his inventory, as well as white earthenware: "3 Images £0:1:10½...a pcell of white Earthen ware £0:5:0...a pcell of Images £0:2:6" (JPA, Inv. Vol. II: f. 69-75). The sale of the private trade goods of the crew of the Dashwood in March of 1703, in London, included Chinese porcelain figurines: "16 Images £0:1:6...2 Images £0:2:6...11 Images £0:1:6" (Godden 1979:66-68). The consensus is that these 'images' represent Blanc de Chine figurines. The values paid for these images in England indicate that they were probably of different sizes, perhaps of different qualities, and some were noticeably inexpensive. We can extrapolate that figurines would be more difficult to manufacture and, therefore, more expensive than bowls and cups. If some of the figurines or 'images' were sold in London at rather inexpensive prices, it would follow that bowls and cups would also have comparatively low values. If the 'images' listed in Wells' inventory are, in fact, Chinese porcelain, it seems probable that the 'white earthenware' listed is also porcelain, since there is no true 'white earthenware' at this
time other than porcelain and undecorated tin-enamel wares. Since these ceramics are most likely Chinese porcelain, it is interesting to note that their value corresponds closely to the value ascribed to non-porcelain ceramics. Comparative data such as this make the £15 value for the earthenware in Samuel Lamburne’s estate suspect as to what kind or how much earthenware is described.

The sixth explanation, “Household ceramics had no resale value and were not included in the inventory” has some validity. Interestingly, the estate of Daniel Hicks, which has a total value of £17,837:7:4½, lists numerous East Indian and Asian commodities but no ceramics of any kind (JPA, Inv. Vol. III: f. 249-252). This inventory was taken and listed room by room and appears to be very comprehensive yet is lacking in an essential element of the household. Even the inventory of the ‘cookroom’ included only pots, pans, forks and ‘other necessaries’ (these are probably iron goods) and pewter - dishes, plates and other old pewter of a total weight of 143 lb, but no ceramics (see Appendix A).

Charles Jessop’s inventory of 1685 (JPA, Inv. Vol. II: f. 98-102) is also lacking in this element. This Port Royal merchant’s estate was shown by another merchant, and the inventory was taken beginning with the stock of his shop by type and listed numerous East Asian fabrics and spices, but no ceramics of any kind.

The other plausible explanation for the lack of Chinese porcelain in the inventories could be the time lapse between the writing of the Last Will and Testament and the actual death and the subsequent inventorying of the estate. This could take from several weeks up to a year. During that time, any number of people (family, servants, and creditors)
could have had access to various objects in the household, which would not necessarily be included in any inventory. Several times in volumes II and III of the Jamaica inventories, addenda were made to inventories noting the monies from a sale of goods made by the executor/trix or administrator/trix of an estate. These addenda, however, generally did not include an itemized list of those goods. This may be a possible explanation for a limited number of inventories, but not for the majority of the inventories examined.

In the instance of sites in the North American East Coast colonies, porcelains may not have found their way into trash pits (the prime archaeological excavation site) because they represented status. Even if they were chipped or cracked, they would not be thrown away but, instead, repaired or displayed to hide the fault. They would then be passed on through the family, not showing up in an archaeological context until much later. This in itself could lead to misidentification due to the nature of porcelain itself (it does not degrade), as well as the design motifs and forms that are repeated for extensive periods of time. In fact, some motifs are still being produced (Donnelly 1969:8, 11, 25).

From the analysis of the archaeological excavations conducted from 1981-1990 and the ceramic assemblage from the buildings excavated, it can be said that Chinese porcelain was used and owned in Port Royal in the 1690s. Not only did each building include some porcelain in its assemblage, almost every area of occupation or tenement within these buildings also contained porcelain. The corner of Queen and Lime streets in Port Royal may not be representative of the entire town, but it is noted that each of the other excavations conducted on the 1692 context shows the presence of porcelain as
well. Porcelain was not only an item to be found in many homes in Port Royal, it was popular enough as a commodity it was probably sold locally by one or more merchants. There is no evidence for the existence of a shop to sell it, but, as noted earlier, London had numerous shops of this kind and it is not unlikely that one would also be in Port Royal. Building 8 could have been such a shop.

From the Jamaican inventories, there is evidence that the social activity of consuming hot beverages was occurring in coffee houses in Port Royal. Building 8 could also have been a coffee house or even a chocolate house. Heise (1987:92-94) notes that in London, by 1700, there were more than 2,000 coffee houses and they were very popular throughout Europe. Morton and Morton (1986:20-21) discuss the beginning of chocolate drinking and chocolate houses in London in the 1660s and their popularity by the end of the 17th century. Both coffee and chocolate houses were places where the patron could get food, their favorite hot beverage, a game of cards or dice, political discussion, spirits and wine, a room for the night, and depending on the time of day, female company (Morton and Morton 1986:21-22; Heise 1987:92-94) Two contemporary engravings give an indication of the interior decoration of a coffe house of the 1690s. It appears that some establishments had shelves on the wall to hold and display the various bowls or handleless cups (called Koppchen in Leipzig), saucers and pots used to serve and drink the beverage (Heise 1987:41, 92). Coffee houses in England were often a refurbished "commonplace inn or ale-house" with only a name change and an entrance fee of a penny to differentiate it from its previous incarnation (Heise 1987:92)

An engraving by Johann Hainzelmann, published in Paris in 1687, shows trays of
porcelain used to serve coffee. These cups are very similar in form and appearance to the Blanc de Chine plain cups found on the site. A painting by R. Collins, c.1730, shows someone taking tea using bowls very similar in form to the Blue and White Medallion bowls (Plumb 1980:56). It may be that both suppositions are correct. Building 8, like many of the buildings and tenements excavated, represents more than one activity or occupation. It is just as likely that Building 8 is the repository for a personal collection of Chinese porcelain, reminiscent of the collections remarked upon by Daniel Defoe.

At this point, there is no conclusive evidence as to the method through which Chinese porcelain was transported to Port Royal. We have the physical evidence of porcelain without much supporting documentary evidence either in inventories or in ship manifests. The exact route taken by this porcelain remains a mystery. Whether it came along with Spanish plunder, by privateering activities, as salvage of a wreck, as the consequences of theft, as a merchant’s inventory, or a colonist’s personal effects is still anyone’s speculation. Still, it is possible that some porcelain arrived by way of the Spanish trade route, or through the VOC and English East India trade routes past the Caribbean, or along with a colonist. It is well known that Port Royal had a large contingent of Portuguese Sephardic Jews who had been displaced from Brazil and the Leeward Islands. Portuguese tin-enamel ware has been identified in the ceramic assemblage and it is possible that these colonists also brought Chinese porcelain from their own private trade connections.

The assemblage of Chinese porcelain in the TAMU excavations indicates that the occupants of almost every house or tenement had at least one piece of porcelain or at
least that the use of porcelain was widespread enough to distribute the sherds rather evenly across the town. This may not indicate vast wealth for these people, but it does indicate that within their community they had access to a broad array of commodities, including porcelain. The Chinese porcelain assemblage includes a wide variety of types (*Blue and White*, *Batavia*, *Undecorated White*, and *Blanc de Chine*) and forms (cups, tea bowls, medium and large bowls, plates, saucers, and figurines).

The porcelain found in 1692 Port Royal is the harbinger of a trend that was building in strength and popularity in England. In Europe and in its overseas colonies, all things Oriental were stirring the imaginations of the burgeoning middle classes. Literature, the theater, the decorative arts, beverages, medicine and cuisine were influenced by the influx of East Asian commodities. The sale and collection of porcelain was about to take England by storm, and by the middle of the 18th century, nearly everyone would have at least one piece of porcelain to call their own.
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APPENDIX A

SELECTED TRANSCRIPTIONS

These excerpts from the Jamaica Inventories Volumes II and III (Jamaica Public Archives, 1679-1686, 1686-1694) illustrate the types of luxury and 'exotic' goods that found their way into the New World. These inventories serve as the corroborative documentary evidence of this trade commodities to Jamaica. These documents list Spanish goods and money/gold, Dutch, Rhenish, and Chinese goods specifically, and spices and fabrics which do not originate from English or even European ports. The reasoning behind listing these transcriptions is that in order to properly assess the 'exotic' goods it must be done within the context of the inventory examined and the volume itself. These give the flavor of the time and culture of the inventory takers as well as the literal text as it was written. It is necessary to evaluate not just the listed goods individually, but also as part of a whole document within a larger document. Although this listing/evaluation is rather subjective, it may give a better indication of the value of different goods within the period than merely assessing the archaeological material.

The listed inventories are transcriptions of the original documents and therefore also include the idiosyncratic spelling of the seventeenth century. The inventories are listed with their Volume, folio, date, location, and total assessed value. Any notes in the original are listed, for example, how the inventory was taken, i.e., by room, by property, and if the inventory taker signed the document or made his 'mark.' Everything within quotation marks are directly transcribed from the original. A '?' in the body of the transcriptions indicates missing information or an illegibility in the original document. This Appendix is included as an assistance to the reader to better see the different types of goods found in the inventories.
Jamaica Inventories VOLUMES II & III (Jamaica Public Archives)

ATKINS, Aaron
Vol. III, f.443-445 - Port Royal - 1/6/1693
Estate total £65:18:4; Debts partially belonging to Atkins (1/57 of) £566:18:11; Debts in Comp w/??£143:9:0; Debts belonging to Atkins and Pearse (¼ of) £242:12:2; Debts belonging to Atkins, Peare-tree & Pearse (¼ of) £66:8:9 - the mark of one inv. taker

"14 old Muzling necklace £0:10:0," "1 p' Chinch £0:12:6," "1 Sett of Gold buttons and 2 ditto Rings £2:0:0," "5 ounces of broken Silver £1:0:0," "Cash £44:6:3."

ATTERBOREE, Edward
Estate total £397:138½ (inv. taken by room)

"One feather bed, Bolster, three Pillowes, bedstead, and Callicoe Curtaine, one white Blankett, one Chest Drawers, a looking Glass, one Map of the world, one Silver hilted Sword and belt, one violin & Cittorne, one Stuffe Suite, one Close stooole, Case of Empty Bottles, one hat, one Trunck, and one Cane £17:1:0." "Two feather Bedds and Boulsters four Pillowes, one Bedstead, Couter paine, Callicoe vallaines, one Cott, a Spanish Chest, one Small Deske, a Small Chest of Bookes, a Map of Amsterdam, Two Gunnos, a mans Saddles and Bridle, an old Haracoe £11:18:0," "a parcell of Plate a Ring and three Gold Buckles £12:0:0," "13 rems? Of Pepper £2:12:0."

AUSTEEN, Samuel
Vol. III, f.353-354 - St. Mary - Aug 1690
Estate total £110:10:5; Debts £64:17:6

1½ oz. silver, late wife’s clothing, “a chocolatta pot, 2 brass candlesticks, 2 little iron pots & a frying pan £16:0:0,” gold buckles & 2 ear rings. 22ª old pewter, old iron

BAITES, Edmond Sen’
Vol. III, f.467-469 - St. David - 2/24/93
Estate total £615:19:4½

"One Silver Negro Mark £0:10:0," "5 Dishes £2:9:4," "one Doz of Plates £0:16:0," "20ª of old Pewter £0:4:6," "3 Earthen pots and 2 Muggs £0:6:0."

BAKER, Elizabeth Mª
Vol. III, f.398-399 - (inn keeper?) - 4/15/92
Estate total £271:6:9

Silver “weighing in all 133oz 6 £39:18:0... One Silver Tankard of 2 q”, 2 Dª of a q”, 2 doz & one of Spooones, 18 forks, 7 Silver Plate, 6 Salts, 1 old D”, 1 Large D“, 2 Porrengers, a Mustard & Pepper box, 1 old Pepper box, 1 Ladle, 2 Markes, a Jagger, a Grater Shell, 2 Dram Cupps, “3 Coker Nut Shells Tipped with Silver £1:0:0,” "12 doz Glasses of all sorts £3:0:0," "305ª Neat of Pewder £7:12:0," "73 Neat of brass and Some Copper £2:5:7½," “on Old Chocoalet Stone £0:10:0."

BAKER, Michael
Vol. III, f.602-606 - Port Royal - merchant - 12/12/1693
Estate total £1380:11:4½ (inv. broken into groups by initials of accounts) (f.604 accs of “IC”)

"K": "3 p” Garsers 1:3:0, 1 tea Engine 8:0:0 £9:3:0," “Nº1 1 p’ Black Crape, N°2 2 p’ Dº £13:0:0," “Nº4 2 p’ Cloth ditto £11:5:0.”

"CM": "Nº40 8 p’ Silke Galleon £3:0:5."


"IC": "Nº15 4 p’ German Dowlas £7:10:0," "1 p’ India Setting £1:15:0."
"IH": flannel "628 y £47:2:0."
"IC": "I box Nutmegs £10:0:0," "1 Bagg q' 112 pepper £7:0:0," "1 Box q' 26" Cinnamon £13:0:0," "N°2 5 p' Silk Drape £10:0:0," "N°3 40 y' Black Crape £2:10:0."
"TB": "162" Nutmegs £8:5:0," "6° Cloves £3:15:0."
"MB": "1 p' India Setting £1:8:0," "13 1/2 oz dust Gold £52:16:0," "400 p' 3/8 £100:0:0," "1 Silver Watch £7:10:0."
"1 powder horn & powder a Silver Spoon £1:0:7:4," "1 paire Silver Buckles weight 1/2 oz £0:2:9," "1 Silver Tobacco box 8½ oz £0:19:3," "in Cash £19:2:6."

BANKES, James Esq.
Vol. III, f.209-211- 5/12/1688, signed 8/8/1688
Estate total £681:10:8½

"Plate cont. in all 205 ounces £51:8:9: Tankard, Large Salt, 1 small ditto, 2 porringers & 2 Tumblers, 1 dramm Cupp, 22 Spoonses, 3 boates 1 pepper, 1 mustard & 1 sugar box, 1 salver, 1 finite dish, 2 wrought plates, 2 porringers," "4 pillibers & 4 callico Clouthes £0:5:0," "one Large Glasse 2 Stands 1 table 1 dressing box 1 small glasse all of Japan work £12:0:0," "3 Cups tipp With Silver £5:5:0," "1 old Silke sute & 1 Crape ditto £2:0:0," "2 Counter paines East India chints £1:0:0," "6 pewter Dishes & other old pewter £2:10:0," "4 Doz. & 4 pewter plates £1:1:3," "6 Dutch knives £0:1:6," "one small Gold Watch £10:0:0," "one silver Watch £3:0:0," "43 penny weight of Gold £8:11:0," "1 Gold Ring sett with 7 Stones £4:0:0," "2 ditto sett with 1 Stone each £2:0:0," "1 paire buttons set with Stones £1:0:0," "1 paire of Silver Buckles £0:5:0," "2 pearle Necklace 7 Strings each £10:0:0," "1 ditto 3 strings very good £10:0:0," "3 small Cuppes £0:0:6," "1 Earthen port £0:2:0."

BARNES, John
Vol. III, f.316,317 - St. Jago de la Vega
Estate total £413:17:3½

"3½ y' silke £1:10:0," "fabrics, linens, gold in rings & buckles £4:5:0, silver in spoons £3:3:0, "a parcel earthenware £0:7:0," "a parcel of goods £0:3:0," "12 foot rule & hour glass

BARNES, ?
Estate total £379:0:3 Debits good and bad £190:0:8:0 (inv. taken by room)

"3 old chests with Locks, one ditto without a lock and old table a Turkey work Carpet, an old Spanish chaire & joyste stool £1:7:6," "31 Pewter Plates, 3 pewter Sawers, 16 D' Dishes, one pye plate, 1 Bason q' 180° £5:12:6," "a parcel of Brass q' 80° £3:0:0," "a parcel of Odd Earthenware £0:10:0," "sundry pieces Plate q' 1900x 4½ £47:12:6."

BARRE, Charles
Vol. III, f.254-256 - Port Royal - vintner
Estate total £450:4:7½ (inv. taken by building & by room)

at Palisadoes: mahogany furniture
at the Point: "bed, etc., & olivewood chest of drawers £7:0:0," 10 small pictures in lackred frames, a chest £1:12:0;" 
"1 Spanish Elmne scriptore & 2 stands £4:10:0," "1 oval Spanish table, 1 square table with turned frame £1:0:0," "1 bedstead, callyexe curtains & valance & counterpane, 1 bed feather & bolster £2:9:0," "3 leather chairs, 1 small Spanish Elm table, 1 sconce £0:12:0," "silver tankards, basin, plate, caudle cup, trenchers, salt sellers, 3 sug' & pepper boxes, 31 spoons, porringer, 21 forks & ladle £91:2:9," 170 lb. pewter £5:6:3
BEDOW, Joseph
Estate total £2771:13:3


BIGNALL, Henry
Estate total £256:8:5½ List of Debts standing out + £118:0:0

“In mony £100:0:0,” “Cook roome furniture £3:12:6,” “One Case knives trenchers & other old things £0:7:6,” “Two Dutch plates £0:0:7½,” “Thirty Seven ounces 13' wt of Silver £9:17:2.”

BOOKER, Charles
Vol. III, f.112-113
Estate total £208:11:00

“a violin & citterne £1:0:0,” “6 silver spoons £2:0:0,” “gold rings, seals, buttons, buckles £4:10:0,” “English money £1:5:9,” “silver £0:15:0,” “cash £6:0:0,” “5 dozen & 9 Coffe dishes £1:0:0,” “12 Coffe plates £0:3:0,” “4 pound of Tea £4:0:0,” “12 pound of Coffe berreys £1:5:0,” “a brass kettle, coffe potts £2:0:0.”

BOYLES, Alice
Vol. III, f.381 - St. Katherine - widow - 8/23/1690
Estate total £85:0:0

“3 Very Small Gold Rings 2 Eare Rings three Silver Spoones one Small Cup and one Spattula £2:5:0,” “Severall Old Bookes £1:10:0,” “a Small Table one Chest one Case of Drawers a Chyna Cup £1:5:0.”

BRADWAY, Ellenor
Vol. III, f.402-403 - Vere - 8/2/1692
Estate total £2568:8:10


BRISCOE, Beamont
Vol. II, f.135-136 - Port Royal, 1/21/1686
Estate total £166:16:0 (inv. taken by room)

“1 Olive chest of Drawers £2:0:0,” “14' & 12' w' of Silver £3:13:0,” “1' & 2' w' of gold £4:8:0,” “7 pewter Dishes & 1 pye plate & 11 plates q'68p £2:2:6,” “3 old Tubbs & a parcel of Earthen wares £0:7:6,” “143 yards Canvas £7:3:0.”
"Cash in the house total £6:2:9 (English £0:6:6)," "1 Spanish chest with creepers gave Mr. Kallaway £1:5:0," "1 spice box £0:1:3," "1 small Spanish chest with creepers £0:12:6," kitchen equipment & "1 old wooden spice box £0:7:6," addendum - more kitchen equipment & 1 wooden bole punch, 1 Earthen bason all for £0:6:3

BUTLER, George
Vol. III, f.272-273 St. Andrews
Estate total £288:19:9 (inv. taken by room)

"A Pendala clock £5:0:0, "a Spanish Elm chest of drawers £2:10:0," "a Japan dressing box £0:10:0," "an olivewood dressing box & comb box £0:10:0," "1 table, 2 stands Spanish Elm £1:5:0," "earthenware & glasses £1:0:0," "Plate 352 oz £88:0:0," "Buckles gold & stone £2:0:0," "an account of goods that the widow made use of since the death of Mr. Butler amounts to the value of £16:15:9."

CAMPBELL, John
Vol. III, f.502-504 - Port Royal - 7/1/1693
Estate total £537:6:1 Ireland (the mark of one inv. taker)

Silver: "a Salt, 2 plates, 3 Porringer, a Cup, 2 Bodkins, 11 Spoons, 1 fork: weighing 90½ ounces £22:12:6, "Five gold Rings, one set of gold Buttons weighing 23 penny weight £4:6:7½, "in Cash £100:0:0," "1 silk Mantle for a Child £0:15:0," "one Sett of Callico Curtains £1:0:0, "one Sett Ditto £1:0:0, "a pcell of old Pewter £3:2:6, "a pcell of old Brass £1:0:0," "8 small Earthen Cops £0:5:0,"

CARKETT, Stephen Cap
Vol. III, f.493-494 - mariner - 10/23/1693
Estate total £594:5:5

"Spice box, Nutmeg & other Spices £0:2:6, "5 New York hams of bacon £1:0:0," "Cash £76:11:8."

CHUSEMAN, Francis
Vol. II, f.125-127 - 12/2/1685
Estate total £12:5:8½

"A sad Colour fine Cloth Coat lined wth Silke Old £1:0:0," "a Gray Serge Suite lined with Silke old £1:10:0," "2 paires of breeches, 1 of cloth, one of Serge both blew, 2 blew Silke Jackets £1:10:0," "2 old white flannel waste Coates £0:2:0," "2 paires of Callico Drawers £0:2:6," "11 Little Callico Handkercheiftes striped with red, 6 handkercheiftes of Gentish, 12 paires of Muslin ruffles £0:5:0," "1 Jappan Kane with a Silver head £1:0:0," "1 Spanish rapier and Dagger, one Sword with a Silver hilt, 1 Sword with an Iron gaund all at £3:7:6," "3 pieces Indian Silkes £1:10:0," "a Sea Chest with a Lock, a Looking Glass inches broad & _ inches long with a black frame, a strong India Chest with a Lock £1:5:0," "30 paires fine Callico sheetes £18:0:0," "3 pieces of Callico shagged at ends £0:17:0," "3 Callico white curtains, 9 pillowweeres of which one is Callico £0:7:0," "8 Callico aprons £0:8:0," "2 India Painted Carpets £0:10:0," "1 Small Turkey Carpet £0:7:5," "4 Remnants of white Callicoe £0:4:0," "11 Callico aprons £0:11:0," "4 white Callico Curtaines & one white Callicoe sheete £0:6:0," "1 Turkey Silke Sash £0:2:6," "2 dozen and seven blew Callicoe shirts £2:6:6," "1 quilt of Silke and Callicoe wrought with a fringe round about it £2:0:0," "5 guinneys of Gold & 1 Spanish pistol £6:15:0," "7 pcees of 8 & 3 bits £1:16:11¼, "1 large white stone Sett in Silver & plate of Severall Sorts qt 36° £9:18:0," "in Gold all qt ¼ on an Ounce £3:0:0," 2 dozen of small Silver buttons qt 18° w £0:6:6."
COLLINS, Richard
Estate total £577:11:8

Vol. II, f.112-113 - St. Elizabeth - planter, 7/21/1685

"A great Glass bottle 2 Earthen panns 2 Cutlaces £0:11:0," "2 old Dutch Cases w° 21 Case bottles £0:15:0," "2 p' stilliards & 47° pewter £2:4:4," "69 ounces ½° old silver £17:8:4," "an old hammacke 6° a Small pepper pot £0:7:3."

COXEN, Penelope
Estate total £87:9:6 the mark of one inv. taker


"13 old pewter dishes 2 doz° plates 6 porringers £2:10:0," "7 Spoones 2 Porringer 2 Silver Tankards q°97° £24:5:0," "one Gold Bodkin £0:19:0," "one gold Ring 5° Spice box 10° 5 old Tables 2°6° £1:15:0."

CRANSBROUGH, Nicholas
Estate total £573:3:14


"One old Spanish table £0:5:0," "four Spanish Hatts 2 doz" and a half Glasses 4 doz of Mum D° £1:15:0," "one Olive Table 2 Stands 2 looking glasses 1 D° broken 1 Chest Drawers 2 black framed looking glasses £8:0:0," "one feather bed and bolster 1 Pillow a Sackling Cottem bedstead 1 Mattine Camblett Curtains and Vallance and 1 Callico D° w° Curtains redd &c. £8:10:0," "a parcel of Pewter of several sorts q° 291° £10:18:3," "11 paire and 1 Sheets 7 bolster Cases 64 Napkins & Towells 5 pillowberes 14 Tables Clothes Course and fine 1 Sett of White Callico Curtains & Vallance £15:10:0," "Coyned money £0:4:3," "one Spanish jar and 4 small pails 2 Iron Trevets 1 Old Skellett frame severall Old Things &c £1:0:0," "One p° gaws q° 32 y° in 2 Remn° £2:8:0," "One Damnified Poynt Cornet £2:0:0," "three fourths of a Brigantine called y° W° and Sarah £6:5:0," "114 Ounces 6° w° broken Plate £31:8:6," "Ounce Gold 2° w° £8:8:0," "One Gold Ring with a Small Sparkle 1:10:0, One D° with a Yallow Diamond 4:0:0, One D° with a Pale Emrod 2:10:0, One D° with a Deep Emrod 6:10:0, One Gold Watch 5:0:0 - £19:10:0," "Alexander a Madagascar (when found) £20:0:0; "Debts outstanding so much is recovered 150:0:0 and if more to be accountable when rec° £150:0:0."

DARLING, Charles
Estate total £128:5:6

Vol. III, f.422 - 11/16/1692

"87 ounces of Plate £20:13:0:9," "18 p° of Gold £3:12:0," "a parcel of Ragitt pearle £0:10:0," "2 Violins £1:0:0."

DAWKINS, Henry
Estate total £1741:14:10 (inv. taken by shop and room)

Vol. II, f.29-31 - merchant, 12/10/1683

In y° Shopp: "3° of soeing and staining silke £2:5:0," "2°4 of Nutmegs £0:16:0," "1° ¼ of mace £2:6:0," "¼ of Cloves £0:12:0," "1° ¼ Cinnamon £0:15:0," "28 y° of black Crape £1:15:0," "1° of Cullered Callicoe £2:0:0," "¼ y° of Callicoe £0:10:0," "2½ y° of Muslin £0:5:0," "13 y° Gause £1:6:0," "7 y° ¾ Ditto £0:15:6," "2 y° of Striped Silke £0:10:0," "4½ y° persian Silke £1:0:0," "23½ y° Ditto £0:12:0," "1½ y° of white flanmill £0:12:0.

In the Back Roome: "29½ Ounces of Plate £7:14:9," "1 Hour Glass 2 Lememado Potts 1 Earthen Salt £0:2:0," "1 Punch bowle £0:2:0," "To some oth° Lumb° £0:5:0," "4 doz° & 8 Custed Cups £0:9:0," "2 doz° drinking Cups £0:4:0," "4 Large w° dishes £0:5:0," "2 middle Ditto £0:2:0," "4 Large w° basons £0:6:0," "14 Middle Ditto £0:12:0," "1 Large salt & 1 Small £0:1:0," "14 Lemanand Cups £0:7:0," "39° of Coco & Chocolatta £2:0:0," "10° ½ of Black Pepper £0:16:6," "66° of premalto £2:0:0," "12° Sope Casteele £4:0:0," "Cash in y° house £295:176," "In Bonds standing out £378:16:17," "In book Debts Standing out Good & bad £697:14:9"
De FONSECA VALLE, Isaac  
Estate total £95:9:10½

"one cocoa cup tipp with silver £0:10:0," "some earthenware and jars £0:10:0," "a peell of silver plates £7:5:0," Debts standing out £22 +

De LUCENA, Moses  
Estate total £2523:10:6


De LUCENA, Abraham  
Estate total £92:14:4½


DICKIN, William  
Estate total £221:13:6

"6 small Bermudas Chaires £1:0:0," "a parcel of old dishes and plates £1:5:0," "163¼" plate £46:17:3," "a Small Callabash and one Cockter Nutt tipp w8 Silver £1:0:0," "out standing debis £30:0:0," "more of £7:0:0."

EDEN, Thomas and Henry  
Estate total £1183:8:7

"An old Castennet & two fryng pan £0:2:6," "household lumber 1:10:0," "pewter forty eight pound £3:0:0," "one Dansick Desk £1:0:0," "Earthen Ware £0:5:0," "7 ounces 1 halfe of Plate £1:2:6," Debts standing out £228:9:6½

EGLETON, Henry Esq.  
Total estate £ + 603:14:9

"cheeny earthenware and mapps £ 1:0:0," "1 gold, 2 silver watches £10:0:0," "2 gilt pictures, cases, a locket & 5 gold rings £4:0:0," "silver Plate, money, jewelery + £24, "a Fine Rem' Silke & headknots £0:8:9," "Rem° Camblet & Slike £1:0:0," "a Spanish box & cabinet, 2° Tobacco, 3° chacolet, belts, Rem° Serge £3:0:0," "Spanish jares flint glasses £0:10:0," Tubbs, morter and chacolet stone £1:0:0."

ELKIN, Isaac  
Estate total £97:1:7 + £16:12:3

gold and silver £5:10:0, "a parcel of books £1:0:0," "a parcel of earthenware £0:7:6," "a parcel of old Lumber in the house £1:0:0."
ELLIS, John  
Vol. II, f.190  
Estate total approx. £211:16:7½

"A parcel of Plate q' 183 oz £45:15:0," "Cash £10:0:0," "ditto of Gold q' 2¼ oz £11:0:0," "a parcel old Pewter £4:10:0," "50º Castelle saoe £1:11:3," "Money out in Bills & bonds the Greatest part of long standing & very bad valuable £10:0:0," "a parcel of Lumber £2:0:0."

EVANS, Thomas  
Vol. III, f.442-443 - St. Thomas - 4/28/1692  
Estate total £557:14:14  (inv. by type) (the mark of one inv. taker)

"Four ould pewter dishes and 1 dozen of plates £1:10:0," "two Lemonade Cups £0:5:0," "Earthen plates £0:3:9," "Small earthen ware £0:5:0," "one Siluer marker and dram Cup £0:12:0."

EVANS, Thomas  
Estate total £242:12:3

3 grosse pipes & 4 earthen Cupps £0:8:0, "14 cakes of w' Sope £0:8:6," "parcell old pewter & old smoothing Iron £0:10:0," "Remnant old Silk £0:5:0," "Silver porringer w' 6oz £1:10:0," "ready cash in y' house £70:0:0," "Debts Due £26:10:0."

FOX, Edward  
Estate total £2431:2:5½  (inv. listed by group)

"3 sets calico curtains & vallances £1:10:0," "1 sett green curtains & silk quilt £15:0:0," "2 counterpaines of painted calico £1:0:0," "Plate £9:10:0," "a parcel of earthenware £1:8:10½," "1 pewter sugar castor, one peper pott £0:2:6," 1 Lignum Vitae punch bowle £0:3:9."

GENT, William  
Estate total £1183:18:6


GORDON, George  
Vol. II, f.120-121 - St. John - 11/2/1685  
Estate total £935:7:3 +/-

"1 Sett of Calicoe Curtaines and vallence £2:10:0," "6 silver spoones £3:0:0," "Earthenware £0:10:0," "debts standing out £20:0:0."

GRIFFEN, John  
Vol. III, f.473-474 - Port Royal - 2/3/1693  
Estate total £44:1:3

"3 Silver spoons & y' head of a Cane 1 Spanish Chest £1:10:0," "one Table Cloth and 1 p' buckles 1 Neckcloth one Solver Spooone and one p' buckles £0:15:0," "one Seale Ring and one Plain Ring one Morning Ring & 2 Siet of Gold buttons £4:0:0," "1 old Spanish Chest & one Small Trunk £0:15:0."
GUBB, Mary


Estate total £432:3:4 “An Inventory and appraisement of Household goods and Shopp goods &c. Shewed unto us p" y" Hon. Mr. Blackmore Esq on y" goods and Chattles of Mary Gubb Deceased.”

“A parcell of Gold Rings and buttons 10:0:0,” “Coynd Money £55:4:7½,” “a p' of Uncoynd Gold q' 15oz 12" weight £60:10:6,” “a parcell of Plate q' 104oz and 1½ £26:1:3,” “a Chocoletta Cupp tipp with Silver £0:5:0,” “1 Sett of White Callico Curtaines & Vallansee £1:5:0,” “28 Pewter Plates, 2 Sacors, 3 Large & 7 small dishes £3:0:7½,” “2 pewter basons, 1 bedpan one stand £0:6:4½,” “1 pewter Chamber pot 2 galls pots £0:11:6,” “1 half gall" 2 quart 1 pint 1½ pint potts £0:6:3,” “12 ounces Cullard Silke £0:18:0,” “13 ounces light Cullard Ditto £1:5:0,” “a p' of wine Glasses £0:10:0,” “21 Earthen Dishes & 7 looking glasses £0:10:0,” “12 p' of filleting 7oz Light Cullard Silke 14½ £1:12:0,” “Debits Standing out not supposed to be good £113:8:11½”

Shopp Goods: “8 y" Cullard Callico £0:7:6,” “44 y" Remnant of Silke £4:12:0,” “19 y" white Callico £1:0:0,” “6 Yards ¼ Stripes bengall £0:6:6,” “12 fanns, 4 lb of beades 5½ £0:10:0.”

HARRIS, Elizabeth

Vol. III, f.425 - Port Royal - 1/31/1693

Estate total £184:14:0


HEARD, Thomas

Vol. III, f.239-240

Estate total £973:16:6

“1 chocolatta stone £0:7:6,” “cash due +£159:0:0”

HERRING, Julines Esq. Col.

Vol. III, f.350-352 - St. Elizabeth

Estate total £1274:10:0

cash in the house, ready money £21:8:4½, purse & clothing £35:0:0, silver tankard, sugar box, plates, porringers, spoons £54:6:0, “pearl necklace £50:0:0,” “a p' of earthenware as plates, porringers etc. £0:15:0,” “a parcel of soap, pewter. 46½ (plates etc.) £2:5:0, 71½ ordinary £5:15:6; 9 doz. Plates, 4 porringers £2:6:0

HICKS, Daniel

Vol. III, f.249- 252 - Port Royal - May 1688

Estate total £17,837:7:4½ (inv. taken by room)

Cook Roome: pewter 134½ £4:8:1,
unknown room: silver Plate £25:7:½, stone ring £1:0:0.
Store House Chamber: “1 chest, 1p' green curtains & vallins, a parcell of old Indian stuffs, 1 old scrotore, 2 saddles, bridles, 1 p' bootes £4:7:6," “2 cases old knives & forks, 1 Tobacco box tipt with silver, 1 iron bound case £8:0:0,” “7 Rem" of East Indian £2:0:0,” “6 y" silke £0:9:0,” “89 y" silke £4:10:0,” “7 y" ditto £1:1:0,”
Cash found at Mr. Hicks Death: cash in Eng. £1:18:6, 2½ Guinea £1:6:6, in Spanish money £31:15:00??.
Accounts: “a parcell of clouded East India stuffs all moth eaten,”
Negroes: 12 Madagascar women 2 boyes at 11½ each
HILL, Mary
Estate total £121:9:3
Vol. III, f.424-425 - Port Royal - 1/31/1693


HIPERSON, John
Estate total £488:19:9

"M' Ware Received in white mony £49:4:9¾," "in Spanish Gold £12:0:0," "2 paire Gold buckles 1 paire Eare rings, 1 weding Ring £4:4:0," "1 stone Jugg and three old Cases £0:6:6," "4 pewter dishes one bason and one Tankard £1:1:0," "a parcell of Earthenware and four Glasses £0:9:4¼," "3 ounces of Spanish Silke £0:0:7¼," "1 Spanish Chest £1:0:0," "An acc' of the things w' M' Edward Barry had for ye Children's Use - 1 Hammer, Some pins, & Some Ribon for head knotts Some lyning, 1 Silver Dram Cupp & some stripes Lattin 1 Silver Spooone, Left for ye house Use - 1 Gunn and Cauagh box 1 Lampe and 2 Iron Potts 1 Lance 2 old Chaires -no value given-"

HOWARD, Robert
Estate total £1080:1:3½ (inv. taken by room)
Vol. III, f.313-319 - Port Royal - butcher

"4 guns & some earthenware £5:0:0," a punch bowl, callico quilt, Olive wood table & stands, "1 Turkey work carpet & 1 Chintch ditto £2:0:0," inlaid scettore £10:0:0, "1 Spanish wood table & stands £1:5:0," "1 Spanish chest £1:10:0," "table cloth, cracked looking glass, 1 Spanish chest £2:10:0," ready money p' 8/8 £180:0:0, in Rylls £133:12:6, Running cash £14:10:0, money rec'd Lewis £3:10:0, Plate 256¼ oz all sorts £75:5:11, in the Storehouse: white calico curtains, valance etc. £2:10:0

JACKSON, Stephen
Estate total £356:18:9
Vol. II, f.103-104 - 5/19/1685

"7 Gold Rings and 4 gold buckles £9:0:0," "Some broken Silver £0:5:0," "8 Punch Bowles £2:10:0," "13 Silver Spoones 1 dram Cupp £4:0:0," "10 Pewter dishes 2 dozen of Plates £4:0:0," "Some Earthen ware 1 Case of Knives £1:0:0," "3 quart Potts 3 pint Potts 2 halfe pint potts 1 gill pott 2 Chamber potts £1:0:0," "Cash £6:0:0."

JENNINGS, John Capt
Estate total £986:17:8¼
Vol. III, f.64-65 - Port Royal - mariner - 3/29/1688


"Debts Good and bad amounting to £140:0:0."
JESSOP, Charles

Estate total £1478:13:6½ (inv. of stock first by type - shown by another merchant)


KNIGHT, Andrew

Vol. II, f.81i - 3/16/1685

Estate total £1573:16:0 (inv. taken by room)

"One dozen of old Leather Chaires one Couch 2 Tables one Clock 4 old Dutch Tynns one small Pewter Laver & water Jarr £7:10:0," "one Brasse Clock & Case £4:0:0," "200 w° of Pewter one Pewter Lumbeel(?) 2 Iron kettles & 4 Potts one Jack 2 Iron Spits one Trevitt one Gridiron 4 Baking stones one p° of old Stiliards 5 Brass Candlesticks one small Brass Pestill and Mortar, one Copper furnace and one Cassador Mill £29:2:0," "a poel of earthenware glasses and other Lumber (in the Stable) £3:0:0," "Sugar & Cotten Sold £90:0:0," "In Plate £8:15:0," "In Cash £2:0:0."

LAGOE, John

Vol. III, f.102-103 - St. Jago de la Vega - May 1688

Estate total £418:19:0

"One chest of drawers £2:10:0," "some small china waire upon the same £0:10:0," "gold & silver buckles & other small things £2:10:0," "money to receive for several goods sold since his death £53:11:3": money £30:0:0, list of money received and debts owing + £204:0:0

LAMBURNE, Samuel

Vol. III, f.261

Estate total £778:14:10

list of fabrics and spices: "a parcel of flanel and purpetany £5:12:6," "3 p° of Strippet Bengali £3:0:0," "6 p° of Strippet Muslyn £6:0:0," "12° of Mace £9:0:0," "30° white Muslyn £3:15:0," "4 p° Callicoes £4:0:0," "a parcel of stitching and sovering silk £3:0:0," "sinenament, nutmegs and cloves £5:0:0," "a barrel of East India pepper £10:0:0," "candles 7:10, Rum 5:0:0, Earthenware 15:0:0, Tinware 1:10:0 £29:0:0," "a parcel of lumber in the garretts £2:0:0," ready money 100° Debts outstanding £150 £250:0:0."
LAUNCE, William Esq.
Estate total £525:4:7½

"One hare Camblett Coate 1 Black Silke Coate 3 p'. Old Silk hose 1 p'. Old Bootes £2:2:6," "A Peell of Old Daminfied booke of Severall Sorts and Languages £6:0:0," "1 of Gold Buckles for Shirts 1 Gold Ring 5 p'. Gold Caine Broken Silver 3 new 2 Old Spoones 1 Large Silver Tumbler 1 Silver markie 1 Caine with a Silver 1 Old book w' Silver Buckles £12:0:0," "One Drinking Mugg 1 Basin 1 Salt 1 milk pamph all Earthen £0:1:10½," "21 Pewter Plates & dishes 6 poterings 1 Dish 1 Basin both broken Pewter 2 pieses 2 bowleses wooden 3 old brass candlesticks 1 Old Brass Morters 1 pestle 3 small old graters 2 Old Sives £2:0:0," "One Old Lignum Vitae Morter & pestle 1 D' Punch Bowlie 1 Danish Case w' 10 3 pint bottles 1 Dyall Plate 2 p' Sytrup Leathers 1 Cupp one Basking Stone £1:7:6," "money in Several Peells £114:9:0," "Debts out Standing which when received is £33:8:0."

LITTLETON, Elizabeth
Estate total £930:1:0 Debts good and bad standing out £1300:0:0 (inv. taken by room)

"Four old Silver Cups £2:0:0," "One old Small Silver Porringser £10:0:0," "four old Silver spoone £1:5:0," "two Small Silver Salts £0:15:0," "One Silver Sugar box & one pepper box & one mustard box £2:0:0," "one Small Cudle Cup and Cover £2:0:0," "Ninety pound of Old pewter £4:1:0."

LYNCH, Nicholas
Estate total £572:18:0


LYNCH, Thomas Sr
Vol. III, f.447-448 - St. Katherine - 10/27/1692
Estate total £11236:3:4 (inv. taken by room)

"9 Gold Rings & two pair stone buttons £4:10:0," "1 Broken Looking glasse and one Lackerd Sceheon Candlestick £3:0:0," "27 Old Knives, with Silver hafts, much wore and battered Some brooke £6:15:0," "1 Case Ordinary Knives £0:2:6," "9 old broken Chocollet Cups £1:2:6," "A pcell of Plate Vizt 10 Silver dishes, 32 plates, 1 basin, 1 Cudle Cupp, one Beaker, and One Large Salt, 2 Silver Stands, One pepper box, 1 Mustard box, 1 Sugar box, two Small Spoones, 3 Trencher Salts, 4 Candle sticks, 1 Ladle, 26 Spoones, 17 forkes, q' all 1496 oz £361:10:0," "1 Bedstead Mohair Curtains Vallances Quilt 2 Cane Chairs, 1 Broken Spanish Cabinett & one Table £16:0:0," "12 Doz. Drinking Glasses with some Earthen ware £3:0:0," "A Parcell of Old Pewter 1 Copper dish, 1 Chocoleto Pott 1 Sawee Pann 1 Drinking port £3:0:0," "1 Chest with Soape & Candles & Safe £2:10:0," "1 Broken Chocollet stone & Rowling pin & 1 Scutchen Candlestick £0:15:0," "1 Parcell of Lumber £0:15:0," "13 French books £6:0:0," "9 Ditto £2:5:0," "20 Ditto £1:10:0," "a pcell of old Spanish books in Parchment £1:0:0," "23 Books in English £8:0:0," "a Latin Herbal £1:0:0," "a pcell of English books w' some Pamphlets £2:10:0," "1 Bible £0:5:0," "1 Book in Italian £0:10:0," "3 Books of Mapps £5:0:0," "3 old Haockets 1 Dimity Counterpane, 1 Quilted Ditto all Old & much wore, 1 Close Stoole, & 1 wooden Image £2:0:0," "In English money £8:10:6," "6 funeral Scarfes, 1 p' Indian Stuff 1 Remnant Ditto, 2 Remnants Camrick £4:10:0," "1 Sett old fashioned Silver Buttons with other small things £2:0:0." "The following particulars being the remaining part of S' Thomas Lynches Linnen, wearing apparel & were given to his French Gent S'y waited on him: 1 Morning Gowne, 9 Calicoe Shirts, 11 Holland Ditto with other old Linnen Laced and plaine, 5 old Hatts, 1 old velvett Cap and one Hanger, a pcell of old wearing apparel & shoes (no value)." "8 yards stans Indian Silke £0:12:0."

"at the Kings House att Port Royall: 3 pillowbeeres 2 Silke Cushions 1 Table 1 broken Gunn barrel, 1 pewter Dish £1:16."
"In My Ladies Owne Chamber as Paraphernalia: a Parcel of Plate vizt 1 Chocolett pott 1 Tea pott 1 pair Snuffers & Snuff dish, 2 Candlesticks 1 wro' flax to vine plate, 1 small Basin, 2 Tumblers, 1 wro' Cup with Cover, 6 Plates, 2 Silver Dishes, 1 Tankard, 1 Salver, 1 Patch box, 1 Cup, one Basin, & Ewre Gilded, 2 Trencher Salts, 3 Spooones, 3 forks q^s 61† £147:13:0," "6 Chocolett Cupps £0:15:0," "a Gold Snuff box given my Lady by S' Thomas Lynch £10:0:0."

MABL(E)Y, Richard
Estate total £75:10:0 (the mark for 1 inv. taker)

"Pewter & Earthen Ware £0:7:6," "Lumber £0:15:0."

MODYFORD, Charles S'
Estate total £477:1:2:10

the House in Towne - "Cash in ye Scriitore at Towne: in Spanish money £8:16:10; in English money £0:13:0." "fore feather bedd Holland Quilt Silke Quilt two pillowes Damaske Curtaines Vallaines & bedstead £14:0:0." "nine hundred twenty nine Ounces of Silver £232:5:0," "one ordinary feather bed one ordinary Quilt one old Pintado Quilt one Bolster one Pillow one Sett Old Callico Curtaines vallence and Bedstead £3:0:0," "old pewter wy about eighty pounds £0:5:0."

"Att Y" Angells - "youe hundreid & sixty pounds of Pewter more £15:12:8," "one hundred forty eight pounds Pewter £4:18:8," "The Library £20:0:0," "four yards new Callicoe £0:5:0," "six Silke window Curtains Silke Sash & one Waistcoate £4:0:0," "one old Small Spanish Elme Box £0:5:0," "a coffl of Earthen wair £15 1 Silver handle Dagger 10" £1:5:0," "four Turkey Carpets 2° 3 Hamakers at 20° each £5:0:0," "six ounces of Gold in a Tumbler Enammd Ring £21:0:0," "31 ounces of Buttons & broken silver £6:4:0," "an Emerald Ring £10:0:0," "five ounces & 4° of Old Burnt Silver £1:2:0."

att Palmers Glade(?) - "Six Dishes 2 Doz of Plates Old Pewter) £0:15:0," "forty seven pounds of Old Pewter £1:3:6."

att Prospect Plantacon - "Old Pewter about Thirty pounds £0:15:0."

MOHUN, George Gent
Estate total £309:2:2½

"78° of Plate £19:10:0," "4¾ oz of Gold £11:12:0," "112° of Pewter £3:10:0," "a parcell of Earthen Ware £0:5:0," "3½ yd° of Muslin £0:10:6," "Cash taken out of his Pocket £14:6:10," "Cash due from Nedham & Hewit total £4:15:3," "2 Dymond Rings £18:0:0," "3 Emrod Rings £8:0:0," "1 Large Sq' Table Emrod & 2 Smale Sq' Table ditto unsept £0:10:0," "12 yd° Florence Silk £3:0:0," "a book of Mapps £1:0:0."

MOORE, William Major
Estate total £623:1:10½ (inv. by type and room)

MORGAN, Henry S’
Vol. III, f.258-261 - 2/19/1689
Estate total £5263:1:3

"Wrought Plate 496ª £128:2:8", "one Silver Watch £3:0:0," "Two Gold rings wª Ordº Stones £2:0:0," "Two plaine gold Rings £0:10:0," "a sett of Gold buckles and buttons sett wª stones £4:10:0," "some Emeraud droppes & a Lump of Pomander £0:7:0," "one ounce of small pearle £1:0:0," "one ounce & 18 pen: wª wrought Gold £7:0:0," "nine Small Coker Nutts tippt with Silver £7:9:0," "a parcelf of China Tee Cupps and Earthen Ware £1:10:10," "one silke Mohaire suite of Curtaines lined wª Persian with Bedd Coverlidd &c £30:0:0," "one hundred twenty three bound books £50:0:0," "a parcelf of old Maps &c £5:0:0," "Two Silk Night Gowynes £7:0:0," "nine Pictures £35:0:0," "a Clock £10:0:0," "368ª of Pewter £10:5:0," "a Parcell of Soape £2:10:0," "a parcelf of Spice £2:12:6," "a Dantswice Case of Bottles wª a parcelf of bottles & jars £3:10:0," "a parcelf of wooden ware £1:10:0" Debts due to the Estate £150:0:0, £344:12:0, £35:0:0, £60:16:0, £290:0:0."

MUSGRAVE, Symon Esq.
Vol. III, f.459-460 - 5/1/1693
Estate total £1590:12:9¾


NORTH, George
Vol. II, f.84 - 3/4/1685
Estate total £763:16:0 (mark of 1 inv. taker)

"I Small Parcel of earthen Ware & 1 small pcell of Pewr £1:10:0," "I Saddle & a pcell of Bookes £1:10:0," "A pcell of Wooden Bowles £0:5:0."

ORGILL, Andrew Sen’ Esq.
Vol. II, f.177-179 - St. Mary, f.179-181- Port Royal
Estate total for St. Mary £1116:8:2 - for Port Royal £594:1:1

St. Mary: "Eight East India boxes for Carl Naves at 10º yª half is £0:5:0," "forty Earthen Sugar Potts at 50º, yª halfe is £1:5:0," "about 20º Soape & 25º Candles at 22:6 yª halfe £0:11:3," "One pair of Wrought Dimity Curtaines lined with Callicoe £0:2:5," "four Spanish Elme Chest of Drawers at 7º yª halfe £3:10:0," "Two Spanish & three Small Tables at 25º yª halfe is £1:2:6:0," "Two dozen and two pair of glasse Buttons 12 Pair patts in Silver valued at £1:5:0," "One Silver Bowle and two Spoones weighing 14º oz £3:7:8," "One Purse qº Twenty One Pistoles in Gold £21:0:0."

Port Royal: "Debts then Standing out Due to his proper accº £212:0:0," "Debts Standing out Due to himselfe & S’ Charles Modyford in Partnershipp £202:5:8."

ORGILL, Andrew Esq.
Vol. III, f.432-434 - St. Mary - plantation "Nonsuch" - 1/18/1693
Estate total £2811:5:7¾ (inv. by room)

f.434-435 - St. George - plantation "Spring Garden" - 1/20/1693

Estate total £1337:10:4½ (inv. by room)

"44th of old pewter £1:7:0," "outlying debts good and bad £26:1:9," "Cash in the hands of Capl Terry £12:11:10½"

f.435-436 - at the Liguanea office - 3/13/1693

Estate total £269:11:9 "Inventory of goods and cash given in by Coll Peter Beckford belonging to the estate of Capl Andrew Orgill"

PRICE, David  
Estate total £98:2:6  
Vol. III, f.399-400 - Vere - intestate - 4/23/1692

“Cash in the house £11:1:3,” “D* rec’d for rrumm £10:6:6,” “1 Case wª 6 old Raiser(s) (1 hone) 1 Lock 1 Pepper Sweet powder and a Small pcell Nutmeggs £0:10:0,” “Earthen Ware £0:8:1½,” “38* Old Powder £1:3:9,” “6 Punch bowles 1 piggan & Cann £0:10:0,” “2 pª Silver buckles 1 pª Gold buttons £0:15:0,” “debts good and bad not yett rec’d £55:0:4¾”

RABY, Thomas Esq.  
Estate total £1739:15:9 + 12:15:0 (inv. taken by room)  

“A couch six chairs 3 chests of drawers spice box 2 cabinets 2 boxes a larg looking glass & 2 pictures all old £5:0:0,” “4¼ yª of Colbertine lace 4¼ of Holland ¾ yards if Kenting 4½ yards callicoe 1 ¾ª of course garlick 2½ yª of striped linnen 6 yª coloured Buckrum 15 yª bengall a pcell of tread tape & ferret ribon £4:7:0,” “36 ounces of Plate ¾ of an ounce of gold & a pcell of dissected uneven pearle £13:15:0,” “Pewter 150º 3 brass kettles bason pots a skellel frying pan dripping pan 2 spits 5 brass candlessticks a brass chaffin dish 2 brass skimmers a bellmettle mortar 3 iron andirons severall stone jugs galley pots earthen wares a pcell of old iron & lumber all very old £10:13:9,” Credits £12:5:3, “In Cash £115:15:3.”

RAWLINS, Robert Gent.  
Estate total £650:17:6  
Vol. III, f.514-515 - St. Jago de la Vega - 9/16/1693

“Pewter new & old q’ 161º 8:1:0,” “Brass & Copper q’ 49º £4:18:0,” “a Pcell of Necessaries for a Kitchen & buttery £8:0:0,” “pepper q’ 170º £5:5:0,” “Soap q’ 143º £7:5:0,” “Nutmeggs q’ 12º 6:0:0,” “Mace q’ 2º £3:0:0,” “Cloves q’ 3º 1:16:0,” “Cinnamon q’ 3º 1:10:0,” “white pepp’ q’ 10º £1:10:0,” “one japand table 0:5:0,” “a Quantity of picktures £3:0:0,” “a great Quantity of law Bookes & others £50:0:0,” “Sundry Sorts of Musicall Instruments & other Small Conveniences £4:0:0,” “7½ ounces of Plate £23:5:0,” “one gold watch £12:0:0,” “Cash £68:0:0.”

REID, George Colonel  
Estate total £1573:12:½  

“One Spice box £0:3:5,” “3 dozen of Knew plates £1:16:0,” “one dozen of old plates £0:2:6,” “four small puter dishes £0:7:6,” “a parcell of old pewter £0:15:0.”

RIGGS, Edmund Esq.  
Estate total £266:19:6  
Vol. III, f.495-496 - St. Elizabeth -7/3/1693

Cash wª She Rec’d of Herbert Newton £10:0:0,” “She Sold her husbands Cloths for £13:0:0,” “a Debt Due from Christº Fricktoon? & Docº Smilinº Pº Bill £7:10:0,” “1 old Dutch Case wª Bottles & Stand £0:10:0,” “75º old Puter £1:15:0,” “1 Silver Tankard 1 Dº Lamanada Cup 6 Dº Spooones 2 Small Silver Wine Cups 2 Coker Cups tipt with Silver £9:0:0.”

ROBERTS, Richard  
Estate total £255:6:7¼  

“1 Silver Marke £0:10:0,” “2 Lemonadace Potts £0:3:0,” “12 Chocolato Cupps £0:2:6,” “4 Pewter Dishes £0:12:0,” “1 Pewter Bason £0:2:0,” “18 Pewter Plates £0:10:0,” “7 Pewter Porringer New & Old £0:5:0,” “10 Pewter Spooones £0:2:6,” “1 old Pewter Chamber Pott £0:1:0,” “A Small pcell of Earthen Ware £0:6:0,” “Chocolatto Panns & 2 Drippin Panns £0:5:0,” “1 Earthen Pann a Butter Pott £0:2:0,” “Cash in the house £29:0:5:0,” “Debts Standing out £2:10:0,”
ROBINSON, Edmond
Estate total £457:10:2½

“A pcell of Goods Damnified w/ Salt Water £9:0:0,” “1 Yard of old Pinter 20" & 3" Burned Silver £1:15:0,” “2 Coconut Shells tipt with Silver £0:15:0,” “4½ Ounces of Brusd Plate £9:2:3,” “1 Corneniall Ring £0:2:6,” “1 Gould Chaime q’ 10 oz 5/8 at 4£ which was Left M’ Rachail Musgrave by Will £6:8:0,” “Currant Money £286:0:0,” “Debts Not Rec’d £68:13:10½”

ROOKWOOD, William
Estate total £119:16:3½

“1 p’ painted calico £0:15:0,” “2 p’ East India Strips £1:14:0,” “4 p’ ditto £0:10:0,” “1 p’ flowered Calico £0:5:0,” “4 yd¾ narrow Redd Silke £0:9:6.”

Addendum: cash rec’d since his death “Rec’d of Charles Whistle for his p’ of an Adventure in Capt Charles Nevill 99° in pces 8½ & 10°:16:8 in small money w/ advance of y’ pce 8½ 4:19:2 is in all £114:15:10,” “2 Spanish horses & a mule sold Mjr Charles Penhallow as they Rann for 15° £15:0:0” - £273:13:2½ - debts good & bad £240:0:0

ROUSE, Thomas
Estate total £177:11:3½

“His purse and apparell £7:10:0,” “1 Small Case and one Greate Case £0:2:6,” “1 hammock and 19 Cakes of Soap £1:5:0,” “a pcell of old Pewter £0:15:0,” “1 Seive 1 pare of scales & a pcell of Earthen ware £0:3:1½,” “a pcell of Earthenware 1 pistoll £0:7:0,” “His Credits good and bad £41:4:11.”

SALMON, John
Estate total £586:17:10½ (inv. taken by room)

“Fourteen old Plate Candlesicks Seaven Old Dishes £2:0:7½,” “One Punch Bowle £1:0:0,” “Debts standing out £71:7:6,” “Two Cocoa Nutt Shells Adorned with Silver £0:10:0,” “Eleaven Silver Spoons foure porrangers One Large Tankard One Negroe marke two Corrals w/ 74Oz £18:10:0,” “Six Gould Rings w/ 9 ¾ w/ £2:0:0.”

SHAFFORD, John
Estate total £15:15:0

“18 lb Pewter with Brass £0:11:3,” “2 Earthen Cups and a Hatchett £0:1:3,” “2 Chests of Medicines Potts Glasses with old Druggs and Instruments £7:0:0.”

SMITH, Samuel
Estate total £146:13:10½

“His purse and apparell £3:0:0,” “Six plates, 5 Porringers, 2 dishes, 6 Spoons £0:10:0,” “One pcell of Earthen Ware, 1 paile, 1 Tubb £0:7:6,” “One piece of Plaitlimes 3 yrd of Flannel £0:9:0,” “2½ of thread, 1 Sauce pann & pepper box £0:5:3,” “3 Gold rings £1:5:0,” “His Credits good & bad £11:12:1¾”
SMITH, William
Estate total £62:11:½

“Cash in his Chest £48:11:7¾,” “a Silver Studded Casse watch £3:0:0,” “3 pair of aget halfe knives an Old Raizar a Callabash 2 green Silk Handkerchiefs £0:12:6,” “a pair of Shoe buckles a p’ of shirt buttons Silver a Silver Tobacco Stoper £0:5:0,” “a Gold hare Ring £0:6:3.”

SMITH, Ralph
Estate total £299:11:8

“A Silver head Cane £0:10:0,” “a Callabash £0:1:3,” “a Recorder £0:5:0,” “2 p’ W Callico 1:0:0,” “2 Silver Spoons 3 oz £0:15:9,” “a Silver Box and some other things q’ 2 oz 8’ w’ £0:12:0,” “5 Gold Rings and a p’ buttons 14½ £2:18:0,” “a Pearle Necklace £4:0:0,” “Cash £36:15:0,” Debts £176:10:0

SOUTHERNE, John Cap
Estate total £137:3:8

“1 Small trunck with horse Spice £0:10:0,” “1 pewter Dishes & a basin weighing 54’ £3:7:6,” “1 doz old Plates £0:7:6,” “old Pewter 26’ £0:7:6,” “a Set of Pewter pots weighing 14’ £1:1:0,” “a parceld of books £2:0:0,” “Sund’ belonging to a nell £2:0:0,” “5½ oz of plate £12:5:3,” “1p’ Gold Buttons 16’ w’ & ¼ £3:6:0,” “1 Silver Cup 6 Spoons 1 Salt 22¼ oz £5:2:4,” “a pcell Ginger Sold at £26:18:9.”

STYLES, Elizabeth
Estate total £352:13:7

“2 Old Pewter dishes & 4 Old Plates £0:7:0,” “1 pcell earthen ware £0:1:6,” Debts owed £53:4:1, “58 Ounces of Plate £17:0:0.”

TILLEY, Deborah
Estate total £245:0:0

“400½ ounces of fashioned Plate £100:3:9,” “8 y’ of Bengall £1:0:0,” “2 y’ of Persian Silke £0:10:0,” “10 yards of White Callico £1:5:0,” “5 y’ of coarse Muslin £0:15:0,” “191 of pewter £7:3:3,” “9 Cupboard Cloths of Callicoe £1:2:6,” “11 y’ of black Crape £1:2:0,” “2 Silk quilts £6:0:0,” “Spice £1:10:0,” “a punch bowle w’ appurtenances 2 Chargers £1:0:0,” “a Baromudas chest £0:15:0.”

VERBRAACK, Nicholas Cap
Estate total £562:11:5 (inv. done on three dates 4/22, 5/13, 8/11 1685)

“By Cash found in his Chest in a bagg in Small Spanish mony £51:13:9,” “By ditto in English mony £10:1:6,” “By ditto Received for the said Flyboat, Longboate, Yallo Pennant and Poope Lanthorne sold att £64:0:0,” and for the rest of the ship’s appurtenances the whole is a total of £290:15:1, Debts paid and still standing out total £63:18:3, European fabrics - Ozenbrigs, & Hollands £39:1:10, “a Chest of Dutch Glasses q’ 28 doz £3:10:0,” “a Chest of Spanish Soapo q’ near 224’ £7:0:0,” “a Case of Knives q’ 40 doz £4:0:0,” “a Box q’ 14’ near Cinnamon Decayed £2:16:0,” “39 pair wooden shoes £0:6:6,” “a small Runlett of Spice, not valued badly decayed £0:0:0,” “1 ps of Platillas £0:6:0.”
WAITE, Thomas Esq.
Estate total £250:9:7½

"In Money in Gold & Silver £10:0:0," "1 Silver bowle 1 Spoon 1 Porringer 1 Silver Tobacco box & Stopper 32" ½ 8:1:3," "2 Marble Images £0:4:0," "4 Mapps £0:1:10," "5 Old Pictures and one in a Black frame £1:0:0," "1 Large Gold Scale 1 pair of Large Shoe buckles 3 pair of Philligrine Gold Buttons 2 pair of plaine Gold Buttons & 7 Gold Rings q' 3 oz. ¾ £13:0:0," "23 Silver Plate Buttons in the Box 14 upon the Bootes and 104 upon the Coate of 8oz. ¾ & 3° £2:4:6," "1 Small Silver headed Caine £0:7:6," "1 Silver hilled sword £3:10:0," "2 Spanish Jars £0:2:6," "5 pair of Muslin Ruffles and 2 handkerchiefs £0:7:6," "One Silver Scale £0:2:0."

WARNE, Joshua(h)
Estate total £2637:18:8


WATSON, Francis Cap'n Esq.
Estate total £1439:18:9/4


WATTS, Grace
Estate total £127:2:10°

"Cash £16:14:4½;" "brocken Silver and a Silver headed cane £1:19:0," "9 small gold rings £3:0:0," "42 pounds of old pewter £1:16:6," "26 glasses and 6 old punch bowles £1:6:3," "an Earthen lemonado Cup 2 Salts a mustard Cup a pepper box a Standish and tap bore £0:5:0."
Thomas Pattle Acc'd total £17:16:8 - Silver and Jewelry /luxury goods “1 Silver Mouse Trap £0:1:0,” “3 Images £0:1:10/4,” “1 Silver Spoune, forte and knife £1:0:0,” “a pcell of white Earthen ware £0:5:0,” “2 flower pots £0:1:3,” “a pcell of Images £0:2:6,” “a pcell of Glasse things £0:7:6¾,” “6 Globes £0:5:0,” “a pcell of Woode ware £1:15:0,” “3 pcells of glass Toyes £0:16:0.”


John Wells Acc’d - 38 p° Platillioes £12:7:0,” “a Purse with some Spice in it £1:3:0,” “1 doz of rings £0:1:0,” “1 Bible 1 Common prayer booke & 4 others £0:10:0,” “1 Spanish sword and Dager £0:2:6,” “5 Little ditto (silver) boxes w’th household stuffe £0:3:9,” “2 p° Castinets £0:2:6,” “Found in M’ Welles Chest in mony the Summe of £200:5:7¾,” “The lease of two houses Upon Port Royall for eleven yeares and a halfe to come after ye’ date hereof £400:0:0.”

WILLIAMS, Lewis
Estate total £1990:14:0 (inv. taken by property/residence)

Att Luana: “a Spanish Dressing Box and a Spice Box £1:5:0,” “fifty ounces of Plate £12:10:0,” “Three Small Trunks with a pcell of teas and Silke £1:0:0,” “Eight yards of Renes, fustian six yards, painted Callicoe two yards at 3° £1:2:6,” “a Sett of perpetuana Curtaines and Vallance & a Callicoe Quilt £2:10:0,” “a Sett of Callicoe Curtaines with a Bed and boulster £1:7:6,” “a pcell of old pewter £1:10:0,” “a parcel of Bookes £4:0:0,” “a Lease granted by M’ Francis Randolph to M’ Lewis Williams of a house and Land on Port Royal for Seaven yeares begun June ye° 29th 1682 which is now Leased for 50° p° annum there being three yeares to come in June witz £150:0:0.”

Att the Cabarella Plantation: “a pcell of old Jarrs £0:10:0.”

WOOSNAM, Adam (als Woosten)
Estate total £139:4:¾

“11 Old Case knives £0:5:0,” “bed bedstead and Callicoe furniture quilt bolster 3 pillowes and old torn sheets £2:10:0,” “an Old Span Chest a Close Stool and pan £0:11:3,” “a Spice box £0:2:6,” “a Lignum Vitae Tumbler and a Sliding Spice box £0:2:6,” “one Hundred pound and halfe of Old Pewter Brass and Copper £3:2:9¾,” “A Tankard a Salt Seller and 2 Spoones q° 42 ounces of Silver £10:10:0.”
APPENDIX B

ENGLISH PORT RECORDS

The list herein includes those commodities transported outbound from the ports of London (1681-1682) and Bristol (1681-1682, 1694-1695) in England (Public Records Office, London England). The goods are listed individually with the port record entries as to the date on which it was entered into the record, the folio and specific entry number, and the destination of the vessel. The destination may include ‘+’ indicating that the vessel is destined for more than one colonial port. On occasion the list includes a ‘?’ indicating that this portion of the record was illegible or missing. Any abbreviations of destinations have been made in order to make up space within the list, and most are straightforward. These records reflect those goods transported on vessels headed for the New World colonies. It is noted that some commodities appear to be shipped exclusively from one port. The list includes products which are differentiated by name as to being ‘English Throne Silk’ or ‘Throne Silk,’ for example. These designations are from the port records. In the case of the ‘Parcels Wares valued at,’ the list includes the number of parcels described and the value assigned in the record for the set as a whole.

This list may help to indicate the types and quantities of goods being transported to the colonies during the period. It also illustrates the absences of commodities from the records. It is hoped this will serve as a reference for further research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>LONDON 1681-2</th>
<th>BRISTOL 1681-2</th>
<th>BRISTOL 1694-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Throne Silk</td>
<td>1/13/82 f.7/e.10 Jamaica (JA)</td>
<td>8/8/82 f.29/e.1 Carolina (Car)</td>
<td>1/18/95 f.7/e.72 Barbados (Bar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/12 f.40/e.6 Virginia (Va)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/21 f.52/e.9 Ireland/Barbados (Ir/Bar)</td>
<td>11/23 f.63/e.590 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/23 f.56/e.7 Ir/Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/6 f.4/e.1 Nevis/Jamaica (Neja)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/11 f.10/e.2 Ja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/13 f.14/e.6 Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/19 f.18/e.10 Ja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/20 f.21/e.7 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/30 f.36/e.2 Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/30 f.37/e.10 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Wrought Silk</td>
<td>12/30/81 f.1/e.5 Bar</td>
<td>2/22 f.34/e.32 Pennsylvania (Pa)</td>
<td>12/29/94 f.1/e.2 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/31 f.2/e.13 Spain</td>
<td>2/22 f.34/e.33 NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/31 f.3/e.22 Bar</td>
<td>2/22 f.34/e.34 Ja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/4/82 f. 4/e.12 Ja</td>
<td>2/27 f.3/e.29 NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/9 f.5/e.6 India</td>
<td>2/28 f.3/e.25 NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/12 f.7/e.15 Ja</td>
<td>3/20/82 f.55/e.35 Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/13 f.7/e.12 Bar</td>
<td>3/23 f.59/e.41 NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3/82 f.17/e.46 New York (NY)</td>
<td>3/27 f.62/e.46 NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/13 f.25/e.24 Nevis (Ne)</td>
<td>3/27 f.62/e.55 NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/22 f.34/e.32 Pennsylvania (Pa)</td>
<td>3/28 f.63/e.53 NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Linen</td>
<td>1/24/82 f.12/e.20 NY</td>
<td>6/20/82 f.65/e.2 Ja</td>
<td>12/29/94 f.1/e.2 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/28 f.14/e.8 Antigua (Ant)</td>
<td>6/27 f.3/e.9 NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/10 f.24/e.35 NE</td>
<td>6/27 f.4/e.5 NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/11 f.2/e.20 NE</td>
<td>7/7 f.10/e.1 Ne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/13 f.25/e.22 Bar</td>
<td>7/25 f.19/e.6 Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/15 f.28/e.29 NE</td>
<td>8/4 f.27/e.9 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3 f.4/e.50 Ja</td>
<td>8/9 f.73/e.9 Pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/9 f.6/e.25 NE</td>
<td>8/10 f.34/e.1 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/13 f.49/e.22 Va</td>
<td>8/10 f.36/e.7 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/14 f.50/e.43 Car</td>
<td>8/10 f.36/e.10 Virginia/Maryland (Va/Mary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/28 f.63/e.45 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/31 f.66/e.43 Ja</td>
<td>8/10 f.36/e.11 Va/Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/1 f.68/e.30 NE</td>
<td>8/12 f.41/e.6 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Cushions</td>
<td>2/10/82 f.24/e.35 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/9/82 f.46/e.24 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/22 f.58/e.54 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Stuffs</td>
<td>12/3/81 £2/e.17 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3/82 £3/e.5 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 £3/e.7 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 £4/e.12 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/10 £5/e.5 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/26 £1/e.31 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/28 £1/e.8 Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/31 £1/e.18 Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/31 £1/e.19 India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3/82 £1/e.37 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/5 £1/e.44 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/8 £1/e.46 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/6 £1/e.33 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/13 £2/e.24 Ne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/21 £1/e.32 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/6 £3/e.8 Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/4/82 £4/e.35 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/9 £4/e.21 Bannam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/13 £4/e.19 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/13 £4/e.22 Va</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/13 £4/e.23 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/16 £5/e.27 Car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/16 £5/e.28 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/17 £5/e.34 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/17 £5/e.36 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/17 £5/e.39 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/20 £5/e.36 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/20 £5/e.42 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/21 £5/e.44 Boston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/24 £5/e.44 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/27 £5/e.44 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/28 £5/e.42 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/31 £5/e.50 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Earthenware</td>
<td>6/16/82 £6/e.4 Ja</td>
<td>6/15/85 £1/e.232 Ja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/14 £4/e.5 Va/Mary</td>
<td>6/25 £1/e.7 Ne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/25 £5/e.8 NE</td>
<td>7/19 £1/e.184 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/28 £5/e.4 NE</td>
<td>7/19 £1/e.186 Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/20 £1/e.1 Kr/Ja/He</td>
<td>7/26 £3/e.261 Ja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/21 £1/e.15 Ja</td>
<td>10/20 £5/e.498 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/28 £1/e.13 Ja</td>
<td>11/20 £5/e.504 Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/29 £1/e.1 Ja</td>
<td>11/20 £5/e.507 Ne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/10 £3/e.16 Wa</td>
<td>11/23 £6/e.598 Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Earthenware</td>
<td>6/20/82 £6/e.1 Ja</td>
<td>6/25 £6/e.640 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Glasses</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/25 £6/e.657 Ant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Hard Soap</td>
<td>6/20/82 £6/e.1 Ja</td>
<td>11/27 £7/e.734 Ant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(English Soap)</td>
<td>1/10/82 £6/e.6 Ja</td>
<td>7/22/85 £6/e.206 Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/18/82 £5/e.53 Ja</td>
<td>10/24 £1/e.137 Ne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/8/82 £2/e.1 Car</td>
<td>11/20 £5/e.504 Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/8 £3/e.7 Va</td>
<td>1/7/95 £1/e.11 Ne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/10 £3/e.7 Va</td>
<td>1/7 £2/e.4 Bar/Lea Is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/14 £4/e.2 Pa</td>
<td>1/10 £2/e.25 Ne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/18 £5/e.17 Bar</td>
<td>11/20 £5/e.504 Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/17/85 £6/e.2 Pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Glass Bottles</td>
<td>6/8/82 f.55/e.8 Ja</td>
<td>6/12 f.57/e.6 Ja</td>
<td>1/7/95 f.1/e.12 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/13 f.57/e.7 Ja</td>
<td>1/7 f.2/e.19 Bar</td>
<td>1/7 f.2/e.19 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/15 f.59/e.8 Ja</td>
<td>1/9 f.2/e.21 Bar/Lee Is</td>
<td>1/9 f.2/e.21 Bar/Lee Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/15 f.60/e.10 Ja</td>
<td>1/9 f.2/e.22 Bar/Lee Is</td>
<td>1/9 f.2/e.22 Bar/Lee Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/15 f.60/e.12 Ja</td>
<td>1/9 f.2/e.23 Bar/Lee Is</td>
<td>1/9 f.2/e.23 Bar/Lee Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/20 f.65/e.4 Ja</td>
<td>1/10 f.3/e.25 NE</td>
<td>1/10 f.3/e.25 NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/20 f.65/e.5 NE</td>
<td>1/10 f.3/e.27 Bar</td>
<td>1/10 f.3/e.27 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/21 f.66/e.6 NE</td>
<td>1/10 f.3/e.30 Bar</td>
<td>1/10 f.3/e.30 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/26 f.2/e.15 NE</td>
<td>1/12 f.4/e.40 Bar</td>
<td>1/12 f.4/e.40 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Hose</td>
<td>1/5/82 f.4/e.9 Va</td>
<td>6/20/82 f.64/e.1 Ja</td>
<td>1/2 f.9/e.95 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/13/82 f.49/e.22 Va</td>
<td>8/4/82 f.27/e.9 Va</td>
<td>1/2 f.9/e.98 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/16 f.52/e.24 NE</td>
<td>8/7 f.28/e.10 Va</td>
<td>1/2 f.9/e.100 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/16 f.52/e.25 NE</td>
<td>8/8 f.32/e.4 Va</td>
<td>1/2 f.9/e.101 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/15 f.18/e.252 Va</td>
<td>8/10 f.36/e.10 Va/Mary</td>
<td>2/8 f.22/e.252 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Rugs</td>
<td>12/9/81 f.2/e.13 Va</td>
<td>8/10 f.37/e.12 Va/Mary</td>
<td>6/15 f.18/e.252 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/10/82 f.24/e.35 NE</td>
<td>8/12 f.41/e.8 Mary/Va</td>
<td>6/15 f.18/e.252 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/15 f.28/e.29 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/15 f.18/e.252 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/9/82 f.46/e.24 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/15 f.18/e.252 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/9 f.46/e.25 NE/Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/15 f.18/e.252 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/10 f.47/e.37 Car</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/15 f.18/e.252 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/17 f.53/e.34 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/15 f.18/e.252 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/22 f.58/e.54 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/15 f.18/e.252 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/1/82 f.67/e.35 Pa</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/15 f.18/e.252 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought Silk</td>
<td>12/3/81 f.2/le.17 Bar</td>
<td>6/19/82 f.63/e.1 Ja</td>
<td>1/14/95 f.4/e.45 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2/82 f.3/e.7 Bar</td>
<td>6/20 f.65/e.2 Ja</td>
<td>1/18 f.7/e.69 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 f.3/e.5 Ja</td>
<td>6/27 f.4/e.5 NE</td>
<td>1/18 f.8/e.79 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/5 f.4/e.8 Bar</td>
<td>6/30 f.3/e.8 NE</td>
<td>1/18 f.8/e.80 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/7 f.3/e.23 Ja</td>
<td>7/2/82 f.1/e.1 NE</td>
<td>1/22 f.9/e.94 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/10 f.5/e.5 Ja</td>
<td>8/7/82 f.2/e.10 Va</td>
<td>1/7 f.10/e.106 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/10 f.6/e.12 India</td>
<td>8/8 f.29/e.1 Cab</td>
<td>3/6 f.25/e.254 Nfd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/11 f.6/e.22 Ja</td>
<td>8/10 f.36/e.10 Va/Mary</td>
<td>6/17 f.19/e.240 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/12 f.7/e.16 Bar</td>
<td>8/10 f.37/e.11 Va/Mary</td>
<td>1/20 f.53/e.499 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/13 f.7/e.12 Bar</td>
<td>8/12 f.4/e.6 Va</td>
<td>1/20 f.54/e.501 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/13 f.7/e.18 Ja</td>
<td>8/19 f.50/e.7 Va</td>
<td>1/20 f.54/e.504 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/14 f.8/e.14 Ja</td>
<td>8/21 f.51/e.6 In/Ne</td>
<td>1/20 f.55/e.507 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/17 f.8/e.5 Ant</td>
<td>8/21 f.51/e.7 Va</td>
<td>1/21 f.57/e.527 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/18 f.9/e.18 Ne</td>
<td>8/21 f.52/e.9 Bar</td>
<td>1/21 f.58/e.542 Madeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/19 f.10/e.14 NE</td>
<td>8/23 f.56/e.7 Bar</td>
<td>1/21 f.59/e.547 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/24 f.10/e.15 Ja</td>
<td>9/2 f.64/e.1 Bar</td>
<td>1/21 f.59/e.551 NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/24 f.12/e.21 Ja</td>
<td>9/8 f.70/e.4 Ne/Tr</td>
<td>1/22 f.61/e.562 Ant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/24 f.12/e.27 Bermuda</td>
<td>9/8 f.71/e.4 Ne/NE</td>
<td>1/22 f.61/e.570 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/26 f.13/e.35 Bar</td>
<td>9/11 f.73/e.7 Traseras</td>
<td>1/22 f.61/e.571 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/28 f.14/e.8 Ant</td>
<td>9/13 f.74/e.1 Va</td>
<td>1/22 f.62/e.575 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/28 f.14/e.24 Ja</td>
<td>9/13 f.74/e.2 Va</td>
<td>1/23 f.63/e.590 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/31 f.14/e.18 Ant</td>
<td>9/16 f.78/e.1 Va</td>
<td>1/23 f.63/e.591 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/31 f.14/e.19 India</td>
<td>9/26 f.87/e.9 Ja</td>
<td>1/23 f.64/e.596 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/1 f.16/e.33 Ja</td>
<td>10/6 f.4/e.1 Ne/Ne</td>
<td>1/25 f.66/e.610 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/1 f.16/e.43 Ja</td>
<td>10/10 f.3/e.7 Va</td>
<td>1/25 f.66/e.614 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/1 f.17/e.44 Bar</td>
<td>10/11 f.10/e.2 Ja</td>
<td>1/25 f.67/e.621 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3 f.17/e.48 NY</td>
<td>10/12 f.13/e.3 Va</td>
<td>1/25 f.68/e.649 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/4 f.18/e.27 Bar</td>
<td>10/13 f.14/e.6 Bar</td>
<td>1/25 f.69/e.657 Ant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/4 f.18/e.34 NY</td>
<td>10/16 f.15/e.3 Ne</td>
<td>1/25 f.70/e.666 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/6 f.19/e.25 NY</td>
<td>10/19 f.18/e.10 Ja</td>
<td>1/27 f.71/e.683 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/6 f.19/e.27 Ja</td>
<td>10/20 f.19/e.8 Bar</td>
<td>1/27 f.71/e.684 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/7 f.20/e.22 Ja</td>
<td>10/20 f.21/e.7 Va</td>
<td>1/27 f.73/e.697 Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/8 f.21/e.32 Ant</td>
<td>10/20 f.32/e.13 Ne/Ne</td>
<td>1/29 f.78/e.767 Ne+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/8 f.21/e.33 Bar</td>
<td>10/21 f.25/e.13 Ja</td>
<td>1/29 f.78/e.767 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/8 f.22/e.35 Bar</td>
<td>10/23 f.26/e.6 Va</td>
<td>125 f.79/e.795 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/8 f.22/e.39 Ja</td>
<td>10/25 f.28/e.9 Ne</td>
<td>128 f.80/e.806 CVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/9 f.23/e.30 NE</td>
<td>10/30 f.35/e.1 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought Silk</td>
<td>2/18 f.31/e.24 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/18 f.31/e.25 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/18 f.31/e.26 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/18 f.31/e.33 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/22 f.32/e.24 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/22 f.32/e.26 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/22 f.32/e.26 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/20 f.32/e.28 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/21 f.33/e.31 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/21 f.33/e.34 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/21 f.33/e.35 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/21 f.33/e.39 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/21 f.33/e.41 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/21 f.33/e.42 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/23 f.35/e.42 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/23 f.35/e.44 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/23 f.35/e.48 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/25 f.37/e.46 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/25 f.37/e.47 Monseer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/25 f.37/e.51 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/25 f.37/e.52 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/25 f.37/e.54 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/27 f.38/e.28 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/27 f.38/e.33 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/82</td>
<td>f.40/e.58 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>f.40/e.60 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>f.40/e.63 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>f.41/e.42 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>f.41/e.44 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>f.41/e.50 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>f.43/e.30 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>f.43/e.35 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>f.44/e.31 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>f.45/e.12 In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>f.45/e.22 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9</td>
<td>f.46/e.21 Bantam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9</td>
<td>f.46/e.27 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9</td>
<td>f.46/e.28 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>f.47/e.28 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>f.47/e.30 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>f.47/e.31 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>f.47/e.34 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>f.47/e.35 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>f.48/e.33 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>f.48/e.36 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>f.48/e.37 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>f.48/e.39 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>f.49/e.42 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>f.49/e.44 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>f.49/e.8 India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>f.49/e.19 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>f.49/e.23 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>f.50/e.30 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>f.50/e.31 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>f.50/e.32 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>f.50/e.33 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>f.50/e.35 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15</td>
<td>f.51/e.31 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16</td>
<td>f.52/e.27 Car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16</td>
<td>f.52/e.34 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>f.53/e.35 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>f.53/e.38 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought Silk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20 £55/e.36 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20 £55/e.37 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20 £55/e.39 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20 £55/e.42 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21 £56/e.42 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21 £56/e.43 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21 £57/e.46 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21 £57/e.51 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22 £58/e.46 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22 £58/e.47 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22 £58/e.48 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22 £58/e.50 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22 £58/e.56 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22 £58/e.57 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24 £60/e.36 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24 £60/e.44 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26 £61/e.52 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27 £62/e.43 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27 £62/e.53 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28 £63/e.45 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28 £63/e.48 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28 £63/e.49 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28 £63/e.50 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28 £63/e.52 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29 £64/e.26 Madeira/Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29 £64/e.31 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29 £64/e.33 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30 £65/e.30 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30 £65/e.34 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31 £66/e.41 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31 £66/e.42 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31 £66/e.45 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31 £67/e.47 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31 £67/e.48 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/82 £68/e.32 Boston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/3 £70/e.44 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/3 £70/e.46 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/3 £70/e.50 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5 £70/e.26 Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5 £71/e.42 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5 £71/e.44 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5 £71/e.47 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/6 £72/e.38 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk Crepe (Crape)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/82 £31/e.26 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throne Silk</td>
<td>1/31/81 f.3/e.22 Bar</td>
<td>8/21 f.54/e.8 NE</td>
<td>3/9 f.27/e.283 Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/17/82 f.8/e.5 Ant</td>
<td>9/28 f.90/e.3 NE</td>
<td>11/20 f.53/e.499 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/24 f.10/e.15 Ja</td>
<td>10/31 f.40/e.8 Va</td>
<td>11/21 f.57/e.527 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/24 f.12/e.21 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/21 f.58/e.542 Madeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/28 f.14/e.8 Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/22 f.60/e.560 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/31 f.14/e.18 Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/23 f.64/e.593 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3/82 f.17/e.37 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/25 f.66/e.610 NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3/82 f.17/e.44 Bar</td>
<td>11/27 f.71/e.684 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/6 f.19/e.24 NY</td>
<td>11/29 f.77/e.754 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/10 f.23/e.29 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/10 f.24/e.35 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/13 f.25/e.27 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/14 f.27/e.39 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/14 f.27/e.43 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/15 f.28/e.33 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/15 f.28/e.40 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/16 f.29/e.39 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/17 f.30/e.43 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/18 f.31/24 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/18 f.33/e.25 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/18 f.33/e.34 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/21 f.33/e.35 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/25 f.37/e.47 Mon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/25 f.37/e.54 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/27 f.38/e.39 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3/82 f.41/e.42 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3 f.41/e.45 Pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3 f.41/e.50 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/4 f.43/e.35 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/6 f.44/e.31 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/10 f.47/e.31 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/10 f.47/e.34 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/11 f.48/e.39 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/13 f.49/e.8 India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/13 f.49/e.23 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/16 f.52/e.34 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/17 f.53/e.35 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/18 f.54/e.35 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/18 f.54/e.43 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/21 f.57/e.46 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/22 f.58/e.47 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/22 f.58/e.48 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/22 f.58/e.50 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/24 f.60/e.39 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/27 f.62/e.43 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/28 f.63/e.45 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/29 f.64/e.32 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/30 f.65/e.27 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/31 f.67/e.47 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/1/82 f.68/e.44 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/3 f.70/e.47 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/5 f.71/e.42 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/6 f.72/e.40 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuffs with Silk (or Silk Stuffs)</td>
<td>1/5/82 f.5/e.23 Ja 1/11 f.6/e.22 Ja 1/28 f.14/e.24 Ja 2/6/82 f.19/e.33 NE 2/10 f.23/e.25 Bar 2/13 f.25/e.38 Ja 2/13 f.25/e.35 NE 2/14 f.27/e.37 NE 2/14 f.27/e.41 Ant 2/15 f.27/e.25 NE 2/15 f.28/e.28 NE 2/15 f.28/e.39 NE 2/18 f.31/e.31 Ja 2/22 f.32/e.26 NE 2/21 f.33/e.32 NE 2/22 f.34/e.38 Ja 3/3/82 f.41/e.50 Ja 3/9 f.46/e.25 NE Ja 3/10 f.47/e.28 NE 3/11 f.48/e.36 NE 3/17 f.53/e.31 NE 3/18 f.54/e.44 NE 3/20 f.55/e.42 NE 3/28 f.63/e.45 Bar 3/28 f.63/e.50 Ja 3/29 f.64/e.29 NE 4/1/82 f.67/e.35 Pa 4/3 f.70/e.51 NY 4/6 f.72/e.39 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flannel (Canton?)</td>
<td>1/5/82 f.5/e.23 Ja 1/12 f.7/e.22 Be 1/16 f.8/e.9 Ja 1/28 f.14/e.24 Ja 2/5/82 f.17/e.46 NY 2/4 f.18/e.27 Bar 2/4 f.18/e.34 NY 2/9 f.23/e.30 NE 2/10 f.24/e.35 NE 2/15 f.27/e.26 NE 2/16 f.29/e.26 NE 2/16 f.29/e.33 Bar 2/27 f.28/e.31 NE 2/27 f.38/e.33 Ja 3/2/82 f.40/e.58 Bar 3/3 f.41/e.42 Ja 3/3 f.41/e.50 Ja 3/7 f.45/e.32 NE 3/11 f.48/e.34 Bar 3/15 f.51/e.27 NE 3/16 f.52/e.34 NE 3/17 f.52/e.39 NE 3/22 f.58/e.44 NE 3/24 f.60/e.49 NE 3/27 f.62/e.46 NE 3/28 f.63/e.45 Bar 3/28 f.63/e.48 Bar 3/28 f.63/e.56 NE 4/3/82 f.70/e.47 Bar 4/3 f.70/e.51 NY 4/6 f.72/e.39 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/28 f.92/e.17 Ja 10/19 f.18/e.5 Bar 10/30 f.35/e.1 Va 10/30 f.38/e.14 Va/Pa</td>
<td>1/11/95 f.8/e.82 Va 8/3 f.22/e.278 Ja 8/13 f.25/e.329 Bar 10/1 f.2/e.13 Ant 10/8 f.6/e.46 Bar 10/8 f.6/e.48 Bar 10/25 f.16/e.152 Va 10/25 f.17/e.157 Bar 11/6 f.27/e.251 Va 11/8 f.31/e.289 Va 11/12 f.38/e.348 Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/8/82 f.30/e.3 Car</td>
<td>1/18/85 f.8/e.83 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/19/82 f.10/e.12 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/10 f.16/e.207 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/24 f.12/e.20 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/26 f.19/e.234 Ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/26 f.13/e.28 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/25 f.17/e.152 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/31 f.14/e.3 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/12 f.38/e.348 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/4 f.18/e.25 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15 f.49/e.456 Ant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/4 f.18/e.28 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/21 f.57/e.527 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/10 f.33/e.27 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/25 f.66/e.610 NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/17 f.30/e.44 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29 f.77/e.759 NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/23 f.35/e.44 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/25 f.37/e.47 Mon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/27 f.38/e.39 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3 f.41/e.42 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7 f.45/e.27 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/9 f.46/e.25 NE/Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/15 f.51/e.26 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/16 f.52/e.33 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/24 f.60/e.50 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/28 f.63/e.44 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/28 f.63/e.46 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/31 f.66/e.13 Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/31 f.67/e.46 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/3 f.70/e.48 Pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/5 f.71/e.42 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware with glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/3 f.30/e.377 Tr/Ant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/19/82 f.9/e.3 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/9 f.34/e.313 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/4 f.11/e.32 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/22 f.32/e.26 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/23 f.35/e.56 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/25 f.37/e.49 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/28 f.39/e.33 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3 f.41/e.42 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/10 f.47/e.36 Car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/11 f.49/e.46 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/13 f.49/e.21 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/28 f.63/e.45 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/29 f.64/e.35 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Bottles</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/8/82 f.54/e.3 Mon</td>
<td>1/18/95 f.8/e.85 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooden Ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/29 f.20/e.189 Ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/30/82 f.47/e.37 Car</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15 f.49/e.445 NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthen bottles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/20/82 f.10/e.11 Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Linen</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/26/82 f.2/e.16 NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Soap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/11/82 f.6/e.22 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/8 f.9/e.11 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/1/82 f.16/e.32 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/7 f.20/e.27 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/9 f.22/e.25 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/16 f.29/e.39 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/28 f.39/e.27 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/9/82 f.46/e.26 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/13 f.49/e.22 Va</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/1 f.82 f.67/e.32 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests/Tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/25 f.68/e.640 Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Cloths</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/9/82 f.33/e.9 Pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Boxes</td>
<td>1/13/82 £7/e.19 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nest Trunks</td>
<td>1/5/82 £5/e.23 Ja</td>
<td>9/26 £87/e.9 Ja</td>
<td>12/8 £80/e.807 Ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/12 £7/e.22 Bermuda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/24 £12/e.21 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/4 £18/e.26 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/4 £18/e.34 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/6 £19/e.27 Ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/15 £28/e.33 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spices (#1 Saffron, #2 Mustard seed, #3 anise seed/oil)</td>
<td>2/25/82 £37/e.47 Mon</td>
<td>6/13 £59/e.4 NE</td>
<td>7/24/95 £18/e.230 Lr/Ant 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/1/82 £68/e.44 NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Lr.@4:11:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/6 £27/e.250 Ant 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Lr.@1:19:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East India Red Earth</td>
<td>2/13/82 £25/e.20 NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calicoes (India)</td>
<td>8/17 £46/e.3 C.V.1</td>
<td>1/18/95 £7/e.72 Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/23 £56/e.7 Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/31 £63/e.7 Oporto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslin (India)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/17 £11/e.103 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/24 £14/e.137 NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels Wares Valued at:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/30/82 f.52½e.4 Ja :2@ 28:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/82 f.53½e.1 NE :2@ 5:13:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/12 f.57/e.5 Mon :2@ 1:13:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16 f.60/e.1 Ja :2@ 15:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16 f.61/e.3 Ja :2@ 0:4:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16 f.61/e.5 Nfd :2@ 3:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19 f.63/e.3 Ja :2@ 0:1:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20 f.64/e.1 Ja :3@ 2:6:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/22/82 f.18/e.1 NE :2@ 3:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8/82 f.30/e.2 Car :3@ 3:16:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8 f.30/e.3 Car :2@ 10:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8 f.32/e.6 Car :2@ 12:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10 f.34/e.2 Va :2@ 28:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10 f.35/e.7 Va :3@ 8:5:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10 f.37/e.12 Va/Myr:</td>
<td>2@9:2:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12 f.41/e.8 Mary/Va 4@ 5:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/17 f.46/e.2 Pa/Va :2@ 6:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18 f.47/e.2 Va :3@ 9:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18 f.48/e.9 Pa/Va :2@ 2:2:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19 f.49/e.5 Va :3@ 6:4:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19 f.50/e.7 Va :3@ 17:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21 f.52/e.8 Br/Bar 3@ 5:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21 f.71/e.7 Bar :2@ 1:3:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8 f.72/e.7 Bar :2@ 1:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11 f.72/e.1 Va :4@ 6:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14 f.76/e.2 Va :2@ 3:8:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20 f.80/e.2 Bar :3@ 19:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25 f.85/e.4 Ja :3@ 2:8:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27 f.88/e.1 Bar :2@0:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27 f.90/e.16 Ja :2@ 1:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28 f.90/e.1 Bar :2@ 3:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28 f.90/e.3 :2@ 1:4:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28 f.90/e.13 Ja :2@ 2:5:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30 f.2/e.7 Bar :2@6:60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6 f.4/e.1 :3@ 6:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8 f.6/e.4 Bar :3@ 7:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10 f.6/e.7 Va :2@ 2:1:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11 f.12/e.10 Bar :3@ 7:6:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13 f.14/e.10 Va :2@ 4:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13 f.14/e.11 Va :2@ 0:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16 f.15/e.1 Ja :2@ 1:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16 f.16/e.6 Bar :2@ 1:13:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels Wares</td>
<td>10/19 f.17/e.1 Va: 3@ 5:0:0</td>
<td>11/15 f.49/e.457 NE: 3@</td>
<td>11/15 f.49/e.460 Bar: 3@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued at:</td>
<td>10/19 f.18/e.6 NE: 2@ 0:15:0</td>
<td>11/15 f.49/e.460 Bar: 3@</td>
<td>5:0:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/19 f.18/e.11 Ja: 2@ 0:6:14:2</td>
<td>11/15 f.50/e.470 NE: 3@</td>
<td>5:15:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/19 f.19/e.12 Ja: 4@ 0:14:0:0</td>
<td>10:13:4</td>
<td>5:15:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/19 f.19/e.15 NE: 2@ 10:18:4</td>
<td>11/20 f.53/e.499 Va: 3@</td>
<td>10:13:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/20 f.20/e.3 Va: 2@ 2:13:4</td>
<td>11/20 f.55/e.505 Bar: 3@</td>
<td>6:4:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/20 f.21/e.8 Ja: 3@ 0:8:0:0</td>
<td>11/20 f.57/e.528 Va: 3@</td>
<td>19:14:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/21 f.24/e.7 NE: 3@ 0:3:5:0</td>
<td>11/22 f.60/e.560 Va: 3@</td>
<td>19:14:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/21 f.25/e.12 Ja: 2@ 4:1:8</td>
<td>11/22 f.61/e.562 Ant: 3@</td>
<td>2:17:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/23 f.26/e.6 Va: 2@ 0:8:10:0</td>
<td>11/22 f.62/e.573 Va: 3@</td>
<td>3:19:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/24 f.26/e.10 Bar: 2@ 2:0:0</td>
<td>11/23 f.63/e.591 Va: 3@</td>
<td>12:5:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/25 f.28/e.5 Va: 2@ 3:15:0</td>
<td>11/25 f.66/e.614 NE: 3@</td>
<td>11/23 f.65/e.657 Ant: 3@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/27 f.32/e.1 Va: 2@ 0:8:0</td>
<td>13:10:0</td>
<td>13:10:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/27 f.32/e.4 Bar: 4@ 4:17:6</td>
<td>11/27 f.72/e.686 Ne: 3@</td>
<td>3:0:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/27 f.33/e.7 Pa: 2@ 2:5:0</td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.731 Bar: 3@</td>
<td>5:0:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/27 f.34/e.8 Va: 2@ 2:1:8</td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.731 Bar: 3@</td>
<td>5:0:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/30 f.35/e.3 Va: 3@ 0:5:1:8</td>
<td>12:5:0</td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.731 Bar: 3@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/30 f.36/e.7 Va: 2@ 2:3:4</td>
<td>12:5:0</td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.731 Bar: 3@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/30 f.37/e.9 Va: 3@ 2@ 2:11</td>
<td>12:5:0</td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.731 Bar: 3@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/30 f.38/e.11 Va: 2@ 0:5:0</td>
<td>12:5:0</td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.731 Bar: 3@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/30 f.39/e.14 Pa/Va: 3@ 4:10:0</td>
<td>12:5:0</td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.731 Bar: 3@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/31 f.40/e.6 Pa/Va: 3@ 5:1:0</td>
<td>12:5:0</td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.731 Bar: 3@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/31 f.40/e.7 Pa/Va: 3@ 4:10:0</td>
<td>12:5:0</td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.731 Bar: 3@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/31 f.40/e.10 Va: 2@ 1:13:4</td>
<td>12:5:0</td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.731 Bar: 3@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/31 f.40/e.13 Bar: 2@ 3:6:8</td>
<td>12:5:0</td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.731 Bar: 3@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels of Several sorts wares Valued at:</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/16 5/2 f.51e.4 Ja :6@6:1:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/17 f.52e.l Ja :4@4:13:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/17 f.52e.2 Ja :4@12:16:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/23 f.68/e.4 Ja :4@3:16:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/28 f.56e.5 NE :5@61:1:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/11/82 f.12e.2 Madein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7@3:1:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/4/82 f.27e.9 Va :6@ 10:13:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/7 f.28/e.10 Va :9@16:16:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/8 f.30e.1 Car :9@24:13:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/9 f.33e.7 Va :5@2:0:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/9 f.33e.9 Pa :9@14:0:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/10 f.34e.6 Va :4@6:1:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/10 f.36/e.10 Va/May :9@ 11:18:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/10 f.37e.11 Va/Mary :9@ 14:11:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/12 f.41e.6 Va :8@13:4:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/14 f.42/e.3 Va :5@1:15:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/21 f.52e.9 Bar :5@7:1:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/21 f.54e.8 NE :6@3:7:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/22 f.55e.10 Va :5@11:0:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/5 f.65e.2 NE :6@18:16:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/5 f.67e.2 Bar :4@2:2:8:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/7 f.69/e.7 Ne :5@8:6:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13 f.74e.11 Va :9@14:13:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/14 f.76e.3 Va :3@6:0:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.83e.6 Bar :4@14:10:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/10 f.6/e.4 Bar :4@35:5:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/12 f.13e.3 Va :3@13:1:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/16 f.16e.3 NE :6@27:19:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/19 f.18/e.10 Ja :3@10:10:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/20 f.20e.2 Va :5@11:13:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/20 f.20e.4 NE :7@18:11:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/20 f.21/e.7 Va :5@14:5:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/20 f.22/e.13 NEJa :6@ 41:11:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/20 f.23e.16 Va :7@ 15:1:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels of Several sorts Wares Valued at:</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/21 f.24e.1 Va :5@4:6:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/21 f.25e.13 Ja :18@49:16:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/23 f.26/e.2 Va :15@40:5:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/23 f.27/e.8 Bar :6@10:8:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/25 f.29/e.12 Pa :13@19:0:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/25 f.30e.13 Pa :4@8:15:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/26 f.30e.1 Pa :2@6:15:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/27 f.34e.9 Va :8@14:1:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/30 f.35e.1 Va :5@23:3:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/30 f.36e.2 Bar :5@19:6:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/30 f.36e.2 Bar :9@34:0:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/30 f.36/e.13 Va :6@13:6:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/31 f.40e.12 Bar :4@13:1:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/31 f.41e.14 Bar :4@8:11:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels Wares not mentioned in ye book of rates Value:</td>
<td>9/30 f.1/e.1 Ja :4@3:8:4 10/20 f.22/e.14 NE Ja :4@ 5:13:4</td>
<td>1/18 f.95 l7/71 Bar :9@ 21:17:11 1/7 f.10/e.106 Bar :7@ 20:17:1 2/4 f.13/e.120 ?? :9@ 114:18:9 2/12 f.17/e.182 NE :3@ 17:2:6 3/6 f.25/e.264 Nfld :4@ 9:3:4 4/1 f.2/e.14 Ja :4@22:7:1 4/16 f.6/e.63 Nfld :5@4:7:6 6/12 f.17/e.215 Nfld :4@ 220:14:2 6/17 f.19/e.240 NE :3@ 19:17:6 6/29 f.3/e.16 Va :7@ 23:13:10 8/8 f.24/e.305 NE :4@ 15:13:4 8/30 f.28/e.369 Ir/Ant :3@ 2:2:11 9/3 f.29/e.372 NC :4@ 10:4:0 9/3 f.30/e.377 Ir/Ant :3@ 4:14:2 9/9 f.32/e.401 Bar 3@ 12:8:4 9/27 f.35/e.457 Ant :3@ 5:6:8 10/6 f.36/e.422 Va :12@ 74:13:4 10/8 f.36/e.40 Va :5@8:13:9 10/9 f.7/e.53 Va :4@14:5:5 10/15 f.10/e.89 Ja :8@ 13:18:9 10/24 f.15/e.142 Va :3@ 9:15:0 10/25 f.17/e.155 Ant :4@ 9:12:1 10/26 f.19/e.173 Ant :4@ 63:14:2 10/29 f.20/e.180 Va :5@ 18:17:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>LONDON 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1681-2</td>
<td>BRISTOL 1694-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels Wares not mentioned in ye book of rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31 f.23/e.216 Va :5@</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/31 f.23/e.216 Va :5@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2 f.25/e.233 Va :5@ 3:5:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/2 f.25/e.233 Va :5@ 3:5:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6 f.24/e.251 Va :8@ 67:4:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/6 f.24/e.251 Va :8@ 67:4:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6 f.27/e.251 Va :8@</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/6 f.27/e.251 Va :8@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:5:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15:5:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6 f.28/253 Va :3@ 3:1:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/6 f.28/253 Va :3@ 3:1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7 f.20/e.279 Ant :7@</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/7 f.20/e.279 Ant :7@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:10:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8 f.33/e.294 Va :5@</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/8 f.33/e.294 Va :5@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:18:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18:18:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9 f.35/e.314 Ant :4@</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/9 f.35/e.314 Ant :4@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:17:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:17:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9 f.36/e.319 NE :6@</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/9 f.36/e.319 NE :6@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:8:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16:8:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11 f.37/e.332 Ja :3@ 7:8:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/11 f.37/e.332 Ja :3@ 7:8:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12 f.38/e.348 Va :9@</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/12 f.38/e.348 Va :9@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:18:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26:18:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12 f.38/e.351 Va :3@ 5:5:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/12 f.38/e.351 Va :3@ 5:5:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13 f.41/e.373 Va :9@</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/13 f.41/e.373 Va :9@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:15:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14 f.44/e.409 NE :3@ 3:16:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/14 f.44/e.409 NE :3@ 3:16:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14 f.45/e.413 Bar :3@ 4:2:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/14 f.45/e.413 Bar :3@ 4:2:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14 f.47/e.440 Va :4@ 23:5:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/14 f.47/e.440 Va :4@ 23:5:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19 f.52/e.487 Mon :3@ 13:0:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/19 f.52/e.487 Mon :3@ 13:0:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21 f.57/e.527 Va :14@ 90:1:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/21 f.57/e.527 Va :14@ 90:1:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21 f.58/e.542 Madeira :5@ 26:7:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/21 f.58/e.542 Madeira :5@ 26:7:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23 f.63/e.590 Va :4@ 27:8:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/23 f.63/e.590 Va :4@ 27:8:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23 f.64/e.593 Va :3@ 3:3:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/23 f.64/e.593 Va :3@ 3:3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23 f.64/e.597 Bar :3@ 18:4:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/23 f.64/e.597 Bar :3@ 18:4:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25 f.65/e.566 Va :8@ 8:9:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/25 f.65/e.566 Va :8@ 8:9:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27 f.71/e.683 Va :8@ 27:8:4 11/27 f.71/e.683 Va :8@</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/27 f.71/e.683 Va :8@ 27:8:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27 f.74/e.716 Va :4@ 3:3:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/27 f.74/e.716 Va :4@ 3:3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:18:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:18:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.720 NE+ :3@ 4:2:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/27 f.75/e.720 NE+ :3@ 4:2:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29 f.78/e.769 Va :3@ 4:17:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29 f.78/e.769 Va :3@ 4:17:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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