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Figure 1. Cooper-Molera Adobe complex, Monterey, California: a) ca. 1870s. From left to right: John B. R. Cooper house (two story), Manuel Diaz home (with tile roof), Corner Store (signs and shingled roof); b) prior to beginning of restoration work in 1979. Victorian parapet obscuring earlier roof line has since been removed.
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INTRODUCTION

The Cooper-Molera Adobe, in Monterey, California, has long been a prominent local landmark. Built in the late 1820s by J. B. R. Cooper, an immigrant American ship captain and trader who had married into an important local family, this property was soon subdivided and went through a variety of ownerships. Though most of the historical interest in the property has centered on Cooper and his descendants, the longest single occupation involved the household of Manuel Diaz, a Mexican-born merchant who purchased the northwest half of the house and land in 1845. His wife, Luisa, continued to reside there until the turn of the century.

Located at the corner of Polk and Munras (formerly California) Streets in downtown Monterey, the Cooper-Molera property now consists of a series of rambling adobe and frame structures owned by the National Trust for Historic Preservation (Figs. 1, 2,). The adobe is currently the site of a major restoration project, conducted by the Office of the State Architect, which is designed to stabilize the buildings and permit public access and interpretation. The property is operated by the California Department of Parks and Recreation, which since the early 1970s, has sponsored several archeological investigations at the site as part of the restoration effort. This report deals with the excavation and analysis of a single feature, a mid-nineteenth-century privy deposit, associated with the Diaz family.

In our study of the artifacts from the Diaz privy, we have compared the observed patterns of occurrence with those from other sites whose occupants are of known status and ethnic identity. Our purpose was to transcend viewing the artifacts as simply representative examples of British and American industrial production during the 1840s and 1850s and to consider these objects as products of understandable choices by an individual household of consumers in a particular geographic and social setting during a specific historic period.

Archeological work at the Cooper and Diaz Adobes and other historic park structures in Monterey is continuing. The study of the artifacts and social history reported here is intended to provide an initial body of information and an investigative framework which will foster productive analyses and interpretations of other archeological resources recovered during this work.
Figure 2. Plan of the Cooper-Molera Adobe complex, Monterey, showing the Diaz privy (Feature 23) and other archeological features.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:
THE MANUEL DIAZ HOUSEHOLD

The large adobe house at the corner of Polk and Munras Streets was built during the late 1820s or early 1830s by John B. R. Cooper, an American ship's captain and trader who had immigrated to California in 1823 and married into the Vallejo family (Wallace 1975a:2-3; Kirker and Bry 1975a:12; Bancroft 1964:105-106). In October of 1833, Cooper subdivided his original parcel, including the northwestern half of the house itself, and sold that property to Captain John Coffin Jones, a New England merchant and the U.S. Consul to Hawaii (Reese 1972:56). Conditions of the sale of this property (a portion of the house 40 ft across and 48 ft deep, and a yard area 14 varas [38.5 ft] by 35 varas [90.5 ft]) required the new owner to build a kitchen and dig a well. These features were located and excavated in 1974 (Wallace 1975b). Other improvements during Jones' ownership included digging of a "vault for necessary" in 1833 (Wallace 1975a:11). This may be the privy which is the basis of the present archiological analysis (Feature 23), but the supposition is impossible to verify. While the original vault could have been cleaned out periodically, the outhouse may simply have been moved to a new location when the pit was full. Other privies, as yet unexcavated, are present on the property.

In 1836, Jones conveyed the property to Nathan Spear. Spear seems to have operated a store and lived there before moving to San Francisco in 1838. Thereafter, his store was run by William Warren, and the house rented to a series of tenants (Wallace 1975a; Hammond 1951, 1:19-20, 100).

On September 17, 1845, Spear sold the property to its then current renter, Manuel Diaz, who had probably moved there shortly after his marriage in December 1843 (Reese 1972:57-58). This portion of the house was occupied by the Diaz family for the remainder of the nineteenth century.

While much historic documentation is available regarding the Cooper family, we know relatively little about Manuel Diaz. This is probably due both to his declining social and economic status following the American conquest, and to a previous lack of research and interpretive emphasis. Nonetheless, it is clear that Diaz was a prominent figure in Monterey during the late 1840s. In terms of the history of the site itself, the Diaz family is important, as their occupancy spanned a period of at least 55 years, while the adjoining half of the house was the Coopers' primary residence for only about 35 years.

Manuel Diaz was born in Tepic, Mexico in about 1812, to Ysidro Diaz and Maria Josefa Garcia (Elkinton 1980:1). Bancroft (1964:120) writes that Diaz, a "Mexican trader," came to California in 1843 as master of the vessel Trinidad, but notes that he may have visited the province earlier. Thomas O. Larkin, the United States Consul in California from 1843 to 1846, indicated that Diaz had lived in California since about 1838 or 1840 (Hammond 1953, IV:326). Diaz's obituary states that he had come to California in 1840 (Monterey Gazette April 18, 1867:2). The earliest document we have located mentioning his
presence in California is dated September 17, 1842 (Hammond 1951, I:288). Diaz married Maria Luisa Merced Estrada, the 20-year-old daughter of Mariano Estrada, on December 1, 1843 at Mission San Carlos Borromeo, in nearby Carmel. Their only child, Vincente, was born September 6, 1844 (Elkinton 1971:18).

Diaz is most visible in documents and newspapers from 1844-1848. Larkin's "biographical sketch of principle Natives and Foreigners of the present day in California," provided as part of his official 1846 report, includes this description:

Manuel Diaz, Merchant and Alcalde for 1846. Born in San Blas [sic]. Aged about 35 years. A resident of California for six or eight years. Of some property, good general information, advice, note, and influence in Monterey. Quiet and retired. Is aware that his country cannot remain as it is. Prefers the United States to any European Nation (Hammond 1953, IV:326).

While we know of no collection of documents on Diaz's commercial activities, his name appears frequently in other collections. In May of 1844 he is listed among thirty individuals who had pledged a monthly fee for the maintenance of a hospital in Monterey "...during the present illness" (Hammond 1952, II:132). Presumably this is in reference to the smallpox epidemic of that year, reportedly introduced from Mexico by Larkin (Bancroft 1964:214).

During the latter part of 1844 and in 1845, Diaz is mentioned often in conjunction with Larkin's business transactions with the firms of Parrott & Co., Copmann & Lomer, and Barron Forbes & Co., in the cities of Tepic and Mazatlan, Mexico (Hammond 1952, III:19, 26, 42, 135, 143, 144, 163, 212-214; 1953, IV:288, 289, 328). These accounts refer primarily to Larkin's shipment of 717 pounds of dried meat to Copmann & Lomer in November of 1844 with Manuel Diaz aboard the Mexican brig Juan Jose, and to problems with the transfer of funds between these individuals and companies. On June 9, 1845, Diaz arrived back in California aboard the schooner Julia Ann with a $13,000 cargo of his own (Hammond 1952, III:231; Hawgood 1962:23).

In August 1845, Diaz was appointed to a commission "...to appraise the goods and say the duties..." regarding salvage from the wreck of the Star of India, a British schooner wrecked off Point Lobos the previous month (Hawgood 1962:30-31; Hammond 1952, III:298-299). His involvement in local civic affairs culminated in his election as first alcalde of Monterey in December of the same year. He assumed office on January 1, 1846 (Bancroft 1886, 5:636). The responsibilities of the alcalde were many and varied, and included the duties of mayor, sheriff, and judge. As such, the position was one of substantial prestige and authority. Walter Colton, Diaz's American successor to the office, wrote "...such an absolute disposal of questions affecting property and personal liberty never ought to be confided to one man. There is no judge on the bench in England or the United States whose power is so absolute as that of the alcalde of Monterey" (Colton 1860).
One of the earliest extant documents bearing the signature of Manuel Diaz in his official capacity is a request, dated January 15, 1846 to Manuel de Jesus Castro, prefect of the Monterey district, asking to be excused from duties as first alcalde:

...having been named to the Electoral College of Alcaldes for the present year, I would serve this charge with pleasure, if it were compatible with my line of business [giro]. It is well known in the Department that I actually have to begin a journey to the interior precisely on which base rests the system of business which I have established...you ought to consider me as a travelling salesman and not as a local resident; and if I must delay said voyage which I have already prepared for the coming month of February, irreparable damage to me will follow... (Diaz 1846, original in Spanish).

Requests for release from office because of interference with private business concerns were common (Francis 1976:760), but apparently Diaz's petition was denied; he continued to serve in his elected position until he was replaced by Walter Colton immediately following the American seizure of Monterey in June.

As alcalde, Diaz became involved in the Fremont episode of 1846. Although Fremont's real intentions have often been questioned, as a Captain of the United States Topographical Engineers he was ostensibly in charge of an expedition of nonmilitary personnel instructed to survey and map practical cross-country routes from the Mississippi frontier to the California coast. After spending part of the winter of 1845-1846 in northern California, Fremont in March 1846 was ordered to leave by Jose Castro, Commandant General of Upper California. Angered by the order, Fremont refused to obey, entrenched his company in the Gabilan Mountains (now Fremont Peak State Park), and raised the American flag. This action created a tense political situation and occasioned a flurry of official correspondence between Fremont, Larkin, and California officials, including Diaz, regarding Fremont's plans and intentions. Having provided a critical passport permitting a courier to carry messages between Larkin and Fremont, on March 10 Diaz requested and received a Spanish translation of Fremont's rather dramatic response to a communique from Larkin (California Historical Society 1924:282, 286-287). Fremont had stated:

...I am making myself as strong as possible in the intention that if we are unjustly attacked we will fight to extremity and refuse quarter, trusting to our country to avenge our death...if we are hemmed in and assaulted here, we will die every man of us under the Flag of our country (California Historical Society 1924:282).
Larkin, in the accompanying letter to Diaz, explained that he hoped Fremont's message would "contribute to calm the minds, and preserve harmony..." He asked Diaz to propose that Castro meet with Fremont before "proceeding to extremities," and closed begging Diaz to send a copy of the note to Castro. A copy was also sent to Fremont. Unfortunately, the translation itself heightened rather than diminished the tensions. Larkin, in a March 19 letter accompanied by a second translation, notes that the translator:

...had translated 'I will refuse quarter,' into I will not give quarter, this making Captain Fremont's statement the very reverse of what he intended it; the Alcalde Sen Diaz has promised me to send a true copy to the Governor, and recall the one already sent, this he may forget. I therefore wish you to...exchange this one with the Governor (California Historical Society 1924:288).

Fremont, however, remained in his fortified position for only three days and then began withdrawing towards Oregon. The incident therefore ended without direct military consequences, though it may have affected Fremont in his backing of the Bear Flag revolt of American settlers a few months later.

The spring and summer of 1846 marked a major watershed in the history of the state and the lives of its Mexican and Californio occupants. Unknown to the participants in the Fremont-Bear Flag episodes, the United States had declared war on Mexico on May 13, following a series of battles between U.S. and Mexican forces in Texas.

On July 7, 1846, Commodore John D. Sloat, Commander of the Pacific fleet, landed in Monterey and declared United States possession of California (Caughey 1953:233). Sloat immediately appointed Americans to serve as justices of the peace in place of First Alcalde Diaz and Second Alcalde Joaquin Escamilla -- an action that reportedly came as no shock to the two men (Drury 1956:103; Bancroft 1064:131). In a letter to Sloat dated July 8, Larkin planned to visit the commodore aboard ship. He noted that Diaz had been invited, but that "he prefers waiting a few days" (California Historical Society 1924:182).

After the American takeover, Diaz remained a popular figure. In the ballot counts for the office of alcalde for 1847 (Californian Sept. 19, 1846:2), he placed third among seven candidates, with 60 votes, against a total of 68 for the winner, Walter Colton. David Spence, brother-in-law of Luisa Diaz, placed second with 65 votes. The other candidates, including two other individuals with Spanish surnames, received only 32 to 40 votes apiece. Four of the losing candidates, including Spence and Diaz, were appointed consejeros (councilors) to Alcalde Colton.

Diaz was also a member of the first jury summoned in California (Californian, Sept. 12, 1846:2). An interesting aspect of the case is that the defendant was Carlos Rousillon, a name which (under various spellings) is found associated with Diaz several other times between
1846 and 1850. Rousillion, accused of shipping off lumber belonging to Isaac Graham, was cleared of all fraudulent intent, but paid the plaintiff $65. In the same year, one Carlos Rousillion, a French trader from Los Angeles, constructed the schooner Santa Cruz; this vessel was sold to Diaz by mid-1847 (Hammond 1959, VI:239, 241, 273). A Carlos Roucheien (male age 28, clerk, born in California) -- presumably a clerk in Diaz's store -- is listed as a member of the Diaz household in the U.S. Census of 1850 (Table 1). Whether the three references are to the same individual, we do not know. Conceivably the California-born clerk was the son of the French merchant and shipbuilder.

Accounts of the Diaz family for the years 1847 and 1848 are limited and rather mysterious. From November 17, 1847 until July 15, 1848 a weekly advertisement in the Monterey newspaper, The Californian, offered to raffle off the Diaz house. Diaz proposed to sell 270 tickets at $30 apiece, indicating that he valued the property in question at $8,100. The notification stated:

It is useless to recommend this Establishment, all those who have ever visited Monterey, must be aware of its excellent locality, it being without exception the best situation for business in this town... It is a condition of the raffle that the winner of the house shall allow the occupant six months to move, he paying from the day of the raffle until he shall leave the house $50 per month rent.

The notice was given in both Spanish and English, and was retracted without explanation. It is not certain whether the advertisement referred to the existing house at the corner of Polk and Munras Streets, although the tone of the description makes it reasonable to assume so. Diaz owned other property in Monterey, including a lot on Chanate Street and four others near the Customs House. These were purchased from Larkin and his wife for $1,235 on November 26, 1847 (Larkin and Larkin 1847:1079-1082). In light of the close timing of these purchases and the appearance of the advertisement for raffling his house, it is suggested that Diaz may have planned to move to the new property near the Customs House.

Several sources indicate that Diaz's property holdings were considerably more extensive than the city lots mentioned above. He was claimant for the 11-square-league Sacramento Rancho in Colusa County, property granted to him by Governor Pio Pico on May 18, 1846, just before the American conquest of California (Hoffman 1862:appendix, 43). As was the case with many of the eleventh-hour Mexican land grants, this claim was rejected first by the Land Commission in October 1854 and then by the United States District Court in March 1858. Manuel Diaz is also listed as grantee, in 1844, of the Cajon de San Diego Rancho in Monterey County (Cowan 1977:75). The 1850 assessment record lists him as owning "2-1/2 sitios en el Rancho del Mal Paso." No further record of either of these grant properties has been located.
Bancroft indicates that Manuel Diaz purchased the schooner Santa Cruz and moved his family and possessions to Baja California in this ship in 1848 (Bancroft 1964:120; Rowland 1947:50). However, we have not as yet been able to locate any clear primary documentation of this move. It is apparent that Diaz had purchased the Santa Cruz by mid-1847, for he entered an agreement (dated July 28) with T. O. Larkin to haul lumber to Benicia aboard that vessel (Hammond 1959, VI:239, 241, 273).

It is evident that Diaz remained active in the Monterey area throughout much of 1848. In April, Larkin wrote that Diaz had inspected a purported mercury mine in the region and had reported finding no evidence of ore. The owner's denial included the comment that the company had "forwarded to the U.S. certificates of men quite as respectable as Don Manuel Deis [sic], or any other Don...", testifying to the presence of quicksilver on the property (Hammond 1960, VII:232, 236, 240-242). The following September, Diaz was one of six residents (the only one with a Spanish surname) appointed to the school board of trustees (Drury 1956:110). On November 6, 1848, Josiah Belden in San Jose sent money to T. O. Larkin in Monterey by Diaz (Hammond 1962, VIII:30). Thus, it would appear that if Diaz moved to Baja California in 1848, he either left very late in the year or was gone for only a few months.

Diaz, however, may have been absent from Alta California during 1849. No documentation attributable to or referring to his presence in Alta California for the period from November 1848 until 1850 has been found. While this hiatus may simply be the product of limited research or historical accident, it generally corresponds with the timing of the move reported by Bancroft (1964:120), who suggests that Diaz left in 1848 and was back in Monterey by 1851.

In any case, the Manuel Diaz family can be securely placed in Monterey by 1850 through the United States Census, assessment records, and other documents.

The 1850 census shows nine individuals living in the Diaz household (Table 1). In this census, both "dwelling-houses" and "families" are numbered. Interestingly, the Cooper family is numbered separately, but listed within the Diaz "dwelling-house." The nine people listed in the Diaz "family" include both kin and non-kin in addition to the Diaz nuclear family. Maria de Los Angeles, wife of Gabriel Avilla, was a niece of Luisa Estrada de Diaz; Mariano Estrada was her nephew (Elkinton 1971:18). Carlos Rouchien's elusive associations with Diaz have been cited previously. It is not known whether the nine individuals constituted a single household or occupied more than one dwelling on the Diaz property. The presence of two merchants, three clerks, and a carpenter suggests a busy commercial locale.
### TABLE 1
Census Listings of the Diaz Household, 1850-1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Real Estate</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Manuel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Luisa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Attends school</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Vincenti</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teotinia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon, Jose</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon, Maria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celedonia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1850**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Real Estate</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Manuel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Luis [sic]</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Vincenti</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teotinia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon, Jose</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon, Maria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celedonia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1852**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Real Estate</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Manual</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Louisa E.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1860**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Real Estate</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Manual</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Keeping house</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, Rufijia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd, Rufina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>At home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1870**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Real Estate</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Louisa E.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, Rufijia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd, Rufina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1900**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Louisa E.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Head, widow, capitalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girardin, Rufina</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Adopted child, widow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girardin, Adelando</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Boarder, single</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2. 1870 census also lists $500 personal estate for Louisa Diaz.
3. Luisa is not mentioned in the 1880 census; records of the 1890 census were destroyed by fire.
The original manuscript from which the 1850 assessment records of the County of Monterey were prepared, dated June 19, 1850, complements the census information:

List of wealth belonging to Don Manuel Diaz

1 Lot on Cooper street of 65 v [varas] by 25 = 1386 sq. ys. [yards]
1 dwelling House and 1 warehouse on...[said ?] lot
1 Lot on Chanate street 100 v [varas] square = 8611 sq. ys. [yards]
1 " (wood lot) 600 ys. yards square = 74 acres
Goods of commerce 4000$
household Furnishings 100$
2% Sites [sitios] on the Rancho del Mal Paso
1 small wooden House
150 Head of cattle
10 Horses at 25 $[?]
2 Mares
Kinsmen's horses 1500$

I Manuel Diaz do solemnly swear that the preceeding list contains all real estate and liquid assets that I possess in the City of Monterey. So help me God (Hartnell 1850:439, original in Spanish).

This list is the earliest available documentation clearly implying that the parcel now occupied by the Corner Store area of the complex (Fig. 2) was part of Diaz's holdings. The size of the parcel sold by Cooper to Jones, Jones to Spear, and Spear to Diaz was listed as only 40 ft wide. The 1850 assessment indicates that the lot owned by Diaz had been expanded to a width of about 69 ft. This dimension is wide enough to encompass the Corner Store addition to the west end of the Diaz Adobe.

The 1850 assessment record lists a structure presumed to be the Spear Warehouse (Fig. 2). An 1855 deed and the 1850 census suggest that the building may have been used as an inn as well as a warehouse (see below). It is presumed that the woodlot mentioned was located in the hills in the immediate vicinity of Monterey. The term sitio probably refers to property used for cattle ranching. Two units of agrarian land measurement current on the Spanish colonial frontier were sitio de ganado mayor and sitio de ganado menor (Barnes, Naylor, and Polzer 1981:69). The first was a parcel 5,000 varas square, containing ca. 4,316 acres. The latter was smaller (3,333.3 varas square), containing ca. 1,918.33 acres. Unfortunately, we know neither the unit referred to nor the location of Rancho del Mal Paso. It is probable that the small wooden house and livestock listed in the 1850 assessment record were located on the rancho property.

Several other documents refer to Manuel Diaz's financial activities in California from 1850 to 1854 (Castro 1863:40, 54, 59, 117, 210, 211). Meanwhile, the Diaz household had diminished substantially by 1852 (Table 1). Except for Manuel, Luisa, and Vincente Diaz, none of the individuals listed in the 1850 census were still present in 1852. In
place of the six former residents are two Indian women for whom no last names are given, and two young children, Jose and Maria Ramon, who may have been the children of one of the Indian women. No occupations are indicated for the women; we presume that they were domestic servants.

We interpret the altered composition of the household as a product of Diaz's changing economic fortune. Although we have found no clear indication of specific causes for his misfortune, by 1855 Diaz was bankrupt. Possibly the disappearance of the clerks, carpenter, and in-laws prior to the 1852 census foreshadowed this economic decline.

During the middle and late 1850s, California experienced a severe depression (Pitt 1966:195-196). Prices of real estate and commodities, which had been inflated drastically by the influx of population and demand during the Gold Rush, dropped precipitously. American and European speculators were amassing huge parcels of land, often from Mexican-Californio landholders who had mortgaged property and were naive regarding the legal status of their debts and property under the new government. This depression was particularly severe in Monterey, since much of the city's commerce had shifted northward to San Francisco and Sacramento, which provided readier access to the new mining regions. With the declining trade went population, wealth, and political power. It was during this depression that Diaz lost title to his home.

Although the specific reasons are unclear, the Diaz Adobe was sold at auction in a sheriff's sale to David Spence for $1,100 in March 1855 (Elkinton 1971:19). Presumably, the property was auctioned to satisfy a mortgage or tax debt encumbered by Diaz. The official deed transferring title was filed on October 2 of that year, and described the property as:

a dwelling house and store which they (Diaz and wife) then occupied and lived in and now occupy and live in, and the fonda or house then occupied by Augustine Garcia together with the entire lot upon which they the said house and store and fonda or house are built (Elkinton 1980:3).

Here is the first clear documentation of a store (presumably the Corner Store) on the Diaz property, although the building may have been present at least as early as 1850, as noted above. The only other structure identified is that occupied by Augustine Garcia, a fonda or house, which is possibly the one now identified as the Spear Warehouse. The Spanish term fonda can be translated as "inn" or "restaurant," and Augustine Garcia is listed as a hotelkeeper in the 1850 census. He and fifteen other individuals living in the hotel are placed immediately before the Diaz household in the census listing, suggesting that the hotel was adjacent to the Diaz home, as is the Spear Warehouse structure. Garcia is not listed in the 1860 census. By 1860 it might not have been worthwhile to operate a hotel in Monterey because of the declining population and depressed local economy (Elkinton 1980:3).
Although legal ownership of the property had passed to Spence, the Diaz family continued to occupy the house. Their tenancy is not as odd as it might first appear, for David Spence was the husband of Luisa Diaz's sister, Adelaida. Presumably, Adelaida's concern for her sister's welfare prompted this arrangement. It appears that Diaz also continued to operate his store after the bankruptcy. This conclusion is based on an entry in John B. R. Cooper's "House Expenses" account book for July 25, 1856 (Cooper 1856:6):

"to pd at M. Dias Store $3.25"

Presumably, the store was still situated in the Corner Store building, although this is not verified.

We have no other documentation regarding the Diaz family between 1855 and 1860, when their only child, Vincente, died at age 15. With his passing, the Diaz household was reduced to Manuel and Luisa, as shown in the 1860 census (Table 1). The two Indian women and the Ramon children are no longer listed. The value of Diaz's real estate holdings is given as $1,500, compared with $15,000 in 1850. Which real property is referred to here is unknown, but it must include holdings other than the house, which had been sold to Spence five years previously. Diaz's occupation is still listed as merchant; it seems plausible to assume that he was operating the same store listed in the 1855 deed.

Manuel Diaz died in 1867:

DIED

In this city, at 9 o'clock, P.M., April 15th, Don Manuel Diaz, aged 55 years, of dropsy...

Deceased was a native to Tepic, Mexico, in which country he has several brothers residing—one being Bishop of Mexico. He came to this state in 1840, and has resided in this city ever since, a prominent and useful citizen, generally esteemed and respected. His funeral, which was largely attended, took place yesterday (Monterey Gazette April 18, 1867:2).

On May 5, 1868, almost a year after Manuel's death, ownership of the Diaz home again changed hands; David Spence legally deeded the property ("...land, dwelling house, and Stores...") to his wife Adelaida, on the condition that:

...neither Adelaida Estrada de Spence nor her heirs...shall disturb the possession of Dona Luisa Estrada de Diaz...she shall have the same privilege as she had formerly to live and enjoy all the rents from said premises during her natural life... (Elkinton 1971:19).
The Corner Store area of the Diaz Adobe may have been rented in 1868 to Mr. Gerard, who started a bakery, later expanded to a general store (Amelie Elkinton, personal communication). In 1887, the establishment was sold to A. A. Manuel, Gerard's son-in-law. Identification of the business as being located in the Diaz Adobe Corner Store is based largely on a historic photograph, which shows a small "BAKERY" sign on the north face of the building, and a large sign with the words "DEALER IN GENERAL MERCHANDISE, HAY, GRAIN, GROUND BARLEY AND BRAN" on the west (gable) end.

Gerard and a partner, Honoré Escole, had operated a general store in Monterey prior to the establishment of the bakery -- a small account book kept by John B. R. Cooper details purchases there from May 1862 to August 1867. It has been assumed that the store was located elsewhere than the Corner Store, but it is possible that Escole and Gerard's business was operating there even prior to Manuel Diaz's death.

In 1870, the U.S. Census indicates that Luisa Diaz was sharing her home with an Indian servant, Rufijia, and Rufina Boyd, who was to remain a life-long companion to Luisa; Rufina is listed as an adopted child in 1900. Luisa is described as "capitalist" in the 1900 census, which shows that she was the mother of one child, and that she could read but could neither write nor speak English. It seems likely that the boarder listed that year, Adelando Girardin, was the son of Rufina, who had also been widowed by 1900 (Table 1).

Although no other legal documentation regarding this household has been located, Ethel Walter Hyde, a niece of Luisa Diaz, provided this reminiscence:

Luisa was an old lady when Ethel used to visit her as a child in the little house next to Cooper's in the 1890s. She had very little money but had beautiful household goods, fine candlesticks, shawls, Chinese dishes, etc. A woman named Rufina Boyd cared for her for many years. When Luisa became quite ill Rufina took her to another house (on Webster Street) in Monterey where she finally died in 1902. During her last years in the house next to Cooper's, Luisa used to give some of her fine possessions to the church to be sold for the bazaars. If Encarnacion Cooper (J. B. R. Cooper's widow) was here and heard of it she would rush to the church to buy them as she did not have things quite so old and fine. Some of Luisa's fine furniture finally went to Rufina (Elkinton 1980:2).

In 1900, the property at the corner of Polk and Munras Streets was sold by the Spence heirs to Ana Cooper Wohler, daughter of John B. R. Cooper. Mrs. Wohler willed the property to Frances Molera, her niece and Cooper's granddaughter. In 1968, Frances Molera willed the property now known as the Cooper-Molera Adobe to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.
The first controlled archeological excavations at the Cooper and Diaz Adobes were conducted by William Wallace in 1973. These preliminary investigations were followed in 1974 by more extensive historical and archeological studies of the houses and grounds (Wallace 1973; 1975a, b, c). Wallace excavated the fill beneath the floors throughout much of the original adobe structure, stripped plaster from walls to expose subsequent architectural modifications, and uncovered the foundations of a number of outbuildings and courtyard walls. This work is well documented in a series of reports and included a substantial amount of historical research designed primarily to assist in the architectural interpretation of the building. Several more general historical studies of the Cooper family and property have also been prepared for the Department of Parks and Recreation (Kirker and Bry 1975a, b; Napoli 1977; Reese 1972).

Further excavation was conducted under contract with the University of California, Berkeley, in 1977 (Heizer 1977). The primary purpose of these investigations was to address specific architectural questions raised during the planning of the restoration. This entailed the digging of a number of small units and trenches in areas of the building not previously tested. The architectural contribution of this work was limited by the small scale of the excavations. The work was important, however, in that it resulted in the early identification of sensitive archeological resources in areas to be impacted by construction.

Archeological crews employed by the Department of Parks and Recreation have been working intermittently at the Cooper-Molera Adobe since 1979, testing other areas in the yard to be impacted by restoration and recovering data which are to be unavoidably disturbed or destroyed (Motz 1980; Felton and Motz 1982). The success of this effort has been due largely to close cooperation between the restoration and archeological crews; the nature of the job often dictates that we work side by side, each crew responding to the other's differing schedules, methods, and objectives. It was during the course of clearing and recording the foundation of an adobe courtyard wall slated for reconstruction that Feature 23 was identified and recorded.

Feature 23 is a rectangular privy pit (ca. 2.5 ft wide, 6 ft long, and 5 ft deep) located just west of the foundation of the courtyard wall that divides the Cooper and Diaz properties and ca. 60 ft south of the Diaz house (Figs. 2, 3). The most noteworthy aspect of this feature was the density of artifacts in the fill. These were predominantly glass, earthenware, and porcelain, although some objects of metal and other materials were recovered. One exceptionally disappointing class of artifacts is the aluminum "Coors" beer cans, which were scattered in the center of the pit fill from top to bottom. Department of Parks and Recreation employees recall that this feature and the well to the north were both vandalized in the early 1970s, when intruders entered the yard at night with tents and lights. Wallace documented this disturbance and continued the excavation of the well. He recovered artifacts from a shallow "Relic Collectors" pit in the area of
The origin of cuts in the side wall is uncertain, possibly caused by vandals or clean-out openings.

Figure 3. Plan and east-west section, Diaz privy (Feature 23), Cooper-Molera Adobe, Monterey.
Feature 23, most of which have been found to cross-mend with the fragments recovered from the more deeply buried privy itself. It appears that the fill was dug from the pit by the collectors, the whole bottles and/or other "valuable" artifacts removed, and the broken objects and soil pushed back in. Only one intact bottle was recovered; it was standing upside down in the southwest corner of the pit and, apparently because of its position, was missed by the vandals.

After the collection was repaired and cataloged, it was found that the privy deposits had yielded all or parts of at least 118 ceramic vessels, 136 glass and stoneware bottles, 39 pieces of glassware (mostly pressed-glass tumblers), as well as an 1803 Austrian coin, a gun flint, a lead ball, a brass gear, faunal material, and a variety of other artifacts. In spite of the presence of the beer cans, few other twentieth-century artifacts were recovered. In fact, the assemblage was notably different from (and presumably earlier than) most of the mid- to late-nineteenth-century collections with which the writers had previously worked. The most visible difference was the high frequency of colorfully decorated earthenware dishes in relation to the low percentage of the "white ironstone" that had become ubiquitous by the 1850s. Study of the hallmarks present on many of the ceramic vessels confirmed that most of them were manufactured from the mid-1840s through the early 1850s. The tight dating and the fact that it was possible to restore so many of the vessels suggest a fairly rapid primary deposit rather than a long-term, gradual accumulation or secondary deposition of trash representing different locations and time periods. We have hypothesized that the breakage represented in this and other comparable nearby trash deposits may have been the result of one or more of the severe earthquakes that shook the Monterey area in the late 1850s (see Chronology, below).

It is lamentable that the integrity of this feature is compromised, as intact deposits and collections representing this period are rare in California. Interpretation of the collection suffers because we cannot be certain that its contents were all deposited together, nor can we control for the unknown items which were taken by the vandals. These factors certainly weaken the usefulness of the collection and the strength of the conclusions which can be derived from its analysis. The fact that the feature and its contents can be tightly dated and attributed to an identifiable household, however, gives the collection an interpretive and research potential that goes well beyond its value as a representative example of the state of the British ceramic industry. Other researchers have reached similar conclusions when dealing with disturbed deposits, and have argued that the loss of integrity does not necessarily negate the significance and research potential of an artifact assemblage (e.g., Praetzellis 1980(7):69; 1983:27).

Archeological research on the mid-nineteenth century has concentrated heavily on military and urban sites. Discrete collections from small-town sites are not common. Discrete collections from Mexican and Californio households are sufficiently unusual that only one has been reported on (Frierman 1982). Consequently, we think that the present feature and its assemblage are important enough to merit description, and its integrity secure enough to be used in advancing some suggestions about California life in the mid-nineteenth century.
CERAMICS

The Diaz privy collection, containing all or part of at least 118 ceramic table and household vessels, is one of the largest assemblages yet described from early or mid-nineteenth-century California. Because of the completeness of many of the vessels, it is also one of the best-preserved collections from nineteenth-century deposits in the state. We will first review the manufacturers' marks present and then consider the types of wares represented.

Manufacturers

The collection contains marked vessels representing nine identifiable potteries and one importer. Most of the marks are well and closely dated, and some are of particular interest in relation to mid-nineteenth-century trade networks on the Pacific Coast.

William Adams & Sons

Three transfer-printed soup plates were manufactured by William Adams & Sons, Tunstall and Stoke, Staffordshire, England. The printed mark (Fig. 4a) consists of an urn on a pedestal, flowers, and a scroll bearing the words "W. ADAMS & SONS" and "COLUMBIA" (the pattern name). Although the Adams family has been involved in the English ceramic industry since 1650, printed marks bearing this name were in use from 1819-1864 (Godden 1964:21). Adams marks are relatively common in California sites (cf. Praetzellis 1980:36; Praetzellis, Rivers and Schulz 1983:3-6), but presence of the Columbia pattern has not been previously noted here. Two examples, however, were recovered in a feature believed to date from "pre-1851-1895" in Rome, New York (Hanson and Hsu 1971:77).

Copeland & Garrett

In 1833 the firm of Copeland & Garrett attained control of the Spode Works, located at Stoke, Staffordshire. They produced wares bearing the name of the partnership until 1847, at which time W. T. Copeland assumed sole ownership. Thereafter, only Copeland's name was used, often in combination with the term "LATE SPODE" (Godden 1964:171-173, 589-590; Ross 1977:193-194). Copeland & Garrett manufactured at least two of the marked pieces from the Diaz privy. A soup plate decorated with the Camilla transfer pattern bears both a printed and an impressed version of a mark in which the firm's name is written in a circle below a crown (Fig. 4b). The words "NEW BLANCHE" are located in the center of the mark (cf. Ross 1977:194, Mark CG-TP-6, printed, Mark CG-1M-4, with minor differences). The term refers to the body of the vessel rather than to the decoration (Sussman 1979:211). The name of the pattern is not on the plate, but was identified through comparison with published prints from the original engraved copper plates (Ross 1977:199; Sussman 1979:83). An identical but fragmentary impressed mark also appears on an undecorated soup plate from Feature 23.
Figure 4. Ceramic trademarks: a) William Adams & Sons; b) Copeland & Garrett; c) Davenport (anchor date mark = 1844); d) Davenport (anchor date mark = 1856, British Registry date = 1852); e) possibly Davenport; f) J. Heath.
Ross (1977:192) indicates that the majority of the "hundreds of tons of transfer-printed earthenwares imported to Fort Vancouver...for distribution throughout the entire Pacific Northwest" were produced at the Spode Pottery by its various owners. In California, other Copeland and Garrett ceramics have been noted in Old Sacramento (Praetzellis, Rivers and Schulz 1983) and in collections from Sonoma (Farris 1980b; Felton 1976). It is interesting to contrast the relatively large amounts of Copeland Late Spode wares in the Sonoma collections with their low frequency in this and other assemblages from the Cooper-Molera complex. Approximately one-third of all transfer-printed earthenwares recovered during restoration work on the Mexican War-period Sonoma Barracks were decorated with a Copeland - Late Spode Continental Views pattern. Several sherds bore registry marks of October 21, 1845. Most were recovered from a parcel adjacent to the barracks building. This was probably a vacant lot in the 1840s, but was the site of a store and a hotel from the 1850s to the present. These ceramics may also have derived from the Casa Grande of Mariano Vallejo, on the other side of the empty lot.

Davenport

The collection contains 16 vessels bearing the mark of the Davenport pottery at Longport, Staffordshire -- more than can be ascribed to any other manufacturer. These are predominantly transfer-printed cups and saucers of the Amoy and Ruins patterns. A Decagon pattern molded relief plate bears both a Davenport mark and a British registry mark. An additional vessel that may be a Davenport product is represented by a Fig pattern -- a molded relief "Ironstone" design produced by both Davenport and J. W. Wood (Wetherbee 1980:26, 37, 46).

Although the Davenport name was in use at least from 1793 to 1887, some of the wares present can be dated with much more precision, as the marks sometimes incorporate the last two numerals of the year (Godden 1964:189). Presumably these numerals, which are most often situated on two sides of an impressed anchor, represent the year of manufacture. Problems with their use, however, have been pointed out by Praetzellis (1983), who found contradictions between a series of British registry marks, anchor date marks, and digit date (month-year) marks co-occurring on Davenport vessels from Old Sacramento. Only one Feature 23 specimen, a Decagon pattern molded relief plate, bears both a registry date (1B52) and an anchor date (1856) (Fig. 4d).

Among the Davenport transfer-printed wares, the seven Amoy pattern saucers bear anchor dates. Two are unreadable, four are marked "44" (1844), and one "48" (1848). These numerals are incorporated in a small impressed mark with the word "DAVENPORT" in an arch over an anchor.

The Ruins and Amoy pattern vessels are all printed with a rectangular cartouche including the pattern name in the center and the maker's name below (Fig. 4c).
A final vessel that may be attributed to Davenport is an undecorated soup plate with an incomplete basal impressed mark that appears to be an anchor (Fig. 4e). Godden (1964:190) illustrates a similar Davenport mark, and notes that "the anchor alone occurs impressed on porcelains and earthenwares, including fine services of the 1820 period."

Joseph Heath

A platter and three plates from the Diaz privy were manufactured by Joseph Heath of Tunstall, Staffordshire, between 1845 and 1853. These transfer-printed vessels are marked with a vine-covered arch surrounding the pattern name, "ONTARIO LAKE SCENERY," and "J. HEATH" below (Fig. 4f). Although there were several J. Heaths in Staffordshire during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Godden (1964:318) attributes the use of the present mark only to this time period and manufacturer. Atypically, the mark on the platter is printed on the underside of the lip, rather than in the center of the base.

Several examples of this mark and pattern have been previously reported from two features (dated 1839-1860 and pre-1851-1895) in Rome, New York (Hanson and Hsu 1971:74, 81). No Heath marks, however, have been found among the large volumes of ceramics from Old Sacramento (Praetzellis, Rivers and Schulz 1983).

Thomas, John, and Joseph Mayer

Only Davenport products in the Diaz collection outnumbered vessels attributable to "T.J.& J. MAYER" of Burslem, Staffordshire. Twelve of these are Rhone Scenery transfer-printed cups and saucers; two are white plates with panels molded around the rim.

The printed mark associated with Rhone Scenery is a garter with a lion above (Fig. 5b). The maker's name is written in the top of the garter, which surrounds the pattern name. Only the saucers are so marked; the cups have single numerals printed on the bottom. Saucers sometimes also have the characters "FB" and "2" impressed on the base.

The printed mark on the base of one white plate is very similar to the Rhone Scenery mark, except that "IMPROVED IRONSTONE CHINA" rather than a pattern name is printed inside the garter. The maker's name is spelled "MAYER'S" on the ironstone plate (Fig. 5a).

A third T.J.& J. Mayer mark is discussed under Hector Sears (below).

Godden (1964:242) indicates that the firm was manufacturing earthenware from 1843 to 1855. Their wares are abundantly represented in the Old Sacramento collections, and both of the marks described above are present (Praetzellis, Rivers and Schulz 1983).
Figure 5. Ceramic trademarks: a,b) T. J. & J. Mayer; c) T. J. & J. Mayer (manufacturer), Hector Sears (New York importer); d) C. Meigh & Son; e,f) Thomas Walker.
Charles Meigh & Son

A single paneled white earthenware saucer bears an impressed mark containing the words "IMPROVED FELSPAR" and "C. MEIGH & SON" in an oval floral cartouche (Fig. 5d). This and other marks from this Hanley, Staffordshire pottery have been reported from Old Sacramento (Praetzellis, Rivers and Schulz 1983). The company was one of the largest ceramic exporters in Britain in the 1850s; about a third of its wares were exported, the bulk going to the French, German, Indian, American, Australian, and Colonial markets.

Hector Sears

This name occurs in a printed scroll mark (Fig. 5c) on a white paneled earthenware plate. The center of the scroll contains the words "STONE WARE IMPORTED BY HECTOR SEARS 226 GREENWICH ST. NEW YORK," while at the bottom is "T.J. & J. MAYER, LONGPORT," indicating the British pottery which manufactured the vessel (see above). The plate also bears the impressed marks "NS" and "36."

The New York city directory for 1844-1845 lists "Sears Hector, Crockery, 226 Greenwich" (Doggett 1844:310). The same listing occurs in the 1846-1847 and 1849-1850 directories, but the 1850-1851 edition gives "Sears, Hector & Co.," with Henry P. Sears, Crockery noted at the same address (Rode 1850:458). By 1851-1852, the address had become 238 Greenwich. In the directory for 1858-1859 and thereafter, Hector Sears is no longer listed as a crockery dealer, although Henry P. Sears remained in the business at 238 Greenwich until 1872 (Rode 1858:721; Trow 1872:1039).

The presence in Monterey of Staffordshire ware distributed through New York between 1844 and 1851 is not surprising, considering American participation in the hide and tallow, whaling, and Gold Rush traffic. Presumably, much of the merchandise reaching California during this period was trans-shipped via the east coast, as direct contact with California by English ships had diminished substantially by this time. For example, of the 58 foreign and coastwise ships that entered the Port of Monterey during 1845, only four were English; 18 were Mexican; while 27 were American (Hammond 1953, IV:154).

Thomas Shirley & Co.

Eight of the transfer-printed vessels are marked with the initials "T.S. & Co." While the manufacturer attributable to this mark has not been confirmed, Godden (1964:574) suggests that they represent Thomas Shirley & Co., a firm that operated the Clyde Pottery in Greenock, Scotland from about 1840 until 1857.

This company is represented in the present collection by at least six different marks. Four of these (on six vessels) are variants of a motif incorporating a beehive, flowers, an anchor, and the word "WARRANTED" on a scroll (Fig. 6b,c,d,e). Pattern names ("ALEPPO," "MANSION," "RIO," and "SAXON") are printed in an arch above, with the company's initials below. Although the details of the beehive and flowers vary in the patterns, the layout of the elements is constant.
Figure 6. Ceramic trademarks: a-e) Thomas Shirley & Co.; f) unidentified, perhaps Thomas Shirley & Co.
Godden (1964) notes that the "T.S. & Co." mark also occurs as "T.S. & Coy." One of the company's marks found in Feature 23 ("MANSION" pattern) seems to end with "y," although the mark is printed in light blue and is difficult to read (Fig. 6c).

The "T.S. & Co." initials appear in two floral marks in addition to the beehive variants. The White Lily pattern mark includes the pattern name and maker's initials inside a wreath formed by two branches of long, slender leaves (Fig. 6a). There is a small eight-sided star in the center of the wreath. The other mark is fragmentary, but appears to be a shield bearing the pattern name "GOTHIC" and the initials. The shield is centered in a rectangular cartouche bordered by flowers.

Two as yet unidentified marks on large platters resemble the T.S. & Co. beehive marks in that they include a beehive, flowers, and pattern names ("ABBEVILLE" and "PEARL"). The anchor is absent, however, and the scroll contains the words "FLORENTINE CHINA" rather than "WARRANTED" (Fig. 6f). These devices are mentioned because of their general similarity to the presumed Thomas Shirley & Co. marks, although it should be noted that other manufacturers in the British Isles used the beehive emblem.

The presence in Feature 23 of several vessels believed to have been manufactured in Scotland is noteworthy, since Staffordshire wares are typically so dominant in mid-nineteenth-century ceramic assemblages that other sources are easily forgotten. Another element of possible Scottish origin is the "sponge-root stamped" designs on a set of six unmarked hand-painted plates (see Hand-Painted Earthenwares, below). It is possible that part of the unmarked, undecorated earthenware in the collection is also of Scottish origin, although this would be difficult to demonstrate.

Thomas Walker

Ten of the printed earthenware vessels from Feature 23 were probably manufactured by Thomas Walker of Tunstall, Staffordshire (ca. 1845-1851). Only four of these are marked with the manufacturer's name; the others were identified by their pattern (Texian Campaigne; see Transfer-Printed Earthenwares, below). This pattern was produced by other manufacturers, so the attribution of these pieces is not certain. An unmarked Texian Campaigne dish lid, however, fits a marked Walker dish decorated with a different pattern (Tiger Hunt).

The Walker marks are both printed and impressed. The one Texian Campaigne plate has a printed mark with the pattern name inside a symmetrical cartouche that resembles elements of the rim decoration. The letters "TW" are printed below a flower at the bottom of the cartouche (Fig. 5f). This plate also bears the name "T. WALKER" impressed inside a long narrow outline. A plain white soup plate is marked with the same logo.
In most cases, Texian Campaigne pieces discussed in the literature are marked with either "J. B." or "A. SHAW" (e.g., Camehl 1971:270; Cushion 1976:87). Rollins (1983:419), however, reports finding a single example with the same mark as used on the Monterey pieces. She attributes the mark "J. B." to James Beech, who she believes was the first manufacturer of Texian Campaigne earthenwares. In 1845, Beech employed Thomas Walker as manager of the Lion Works pottery; Walker married Beech's daughter the following year and continued to run this plant while Beech established another at a new location. Walker died in 1852 at the age of 29. A. Shaw apparently had no kinship ties with Beech or Walker, but operated a pottery near the Lion Works, and could have copied the pattern or contracted to produce goods for Walker.

The Walker Tiger Hunt pattern mark is a printed garter with a bird above "T. WALKER" on the upper part of the garter and the pattern name in the center. The word "IRONSTONE" is printed below (Fig. 5e).

The relative frequency in the privy of Thomas Walker vessels contrasts with their scarcity in Old Sacramento (Praetzellis, Rivers and Schulz 1983). It should be noted, however, that Walker was only in business from 1845 until 1851, a period compatible with the manufacturing dates of many of the other Feature 23 vessels, but almost over by the time settlement of Sacramento began in 1849.

Enoch Wood & Sons

One incomplete mark on a fragment of a small plate was attributed to Enoch Wood and Sons through comparison with a more complete specimen from another area of the site. This is an impressed mark with the name "E. WOOD" above a rectangular cartouche and "Burslem" below. The words "White Enamel China" are impressed inside the cartouche.

There were several different Woods manufacturing earthenware in Britain in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Godden 1964:682-691, 736). Nevertheless, Godden writes that "The impressed mark 'Wood' usually relates to Enoch Wood of Burslem..." Enoch Wood was a potter and modeler who set up his own pottery works in Staffordshire in 1784. From about 1790 until 1818, the company was known as Wood & Caldwell, and from 1818 until 1846 as Enoch Wood & Sons. We suspect that the Diaz privy example was manufactured after 1818 and is attributable to the later company, but cannot readily explain the absence of the "... & Sons" suffix. It appears that Wood's name alone was being used at least as recently as 1828. In that year, Enoch Wood deposited over 300 vessels in a cache in a church under construction in Burslem; many of these are simply marked with the name "WOOD" (Kingsbury 1978:210-215). Wood's interest in the history of the ceramic industry is well known; apparently, this cache was a time capsule deposited for future generations sharing his interest.

Enoch Wood & Sons exported vast amounts of pottery to North America (Godden 1964:685-686). Larsen (1975:7) wrote that "Wood far outnumbered every other Staffordshire manufacturer in marked
### TABLE 2

Ceramic Assemblage from Feature 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body, Styles, Pattern Name</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>DIS LID</th>
<th>SERVING BOWL</th>
<th>PITCHER</th>
<th>LARGE</th>
<th>SAUCE</th>
<th>CREAMER</th>
<th>SOUP PLATE</th>
<th>PLATE</th>
<th>CUP</th>
<th>SALT</th>
<th>SPICE</th>
<th>SMALL BOWL</th>
<th>EGGCUPS</th>
<th>BASKIN</th>
<th>ROW TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMON POTTERY</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUSTRE</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED WARE, LEAD GLAZED</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARTHENWARE - TRANSFER PRINTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ASBEVILLE&quot;</td>
<td>THOMAS SHIRLEY &amp; CO.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;AMOY&quot;</td>
<td>DAVENPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ALEPPO&quot;</td>
<td>THOMAS SHIRLEY &amp; CO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;CAMILLA&quot;</td>
<td>COPeland &amp; GARRETT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;COLUMBIA&quot;</td>
<td>WILLIAM ADAMS &amp; SONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;GOTHIC&quot;</td>
<td>THOMAS SHIRLEY &amp; CO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;MANSION&quot;</td>
<td>THOMAS SHIRLEY &amp; CO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ONTARIO LAKE SCENERY&quot;</td>
<td>J. HEATH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;PEARL&quot;</td>
<td>THOMAS SHIRLEY &amp; CO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;RIO&quot;</td>
<td>THOMAS SHIRLEY &amp; CO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;RHONE SCENERY&quot;</td>
<td>T. J. &amp; J. MAYER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;RUM&quot;</td>
<td>DAVENPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;SAXON&quot;</td>
<td>THOMAS SHIRLEY &amp; CO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;TEXIAN CAMPAIGN&quot;</td>
<td>THOMAS WALKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;TIGER HUNT&quot;</td>
<td>THOMAS WALKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;WHITE LILY&quot;</td>
<td>THOMAS SHIRLEY &amp; CO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARTHENWARE - HAND-PAINTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED FLOWERS, SPONGE STAMPED</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORAL, SPONGE STAMPED</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TINY LIGHT GREEN LEAVES</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE FLORAL</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE EDGE DECORATED</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOBY JUG</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARTHENWARE - WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;DECAGON&quot; MOLDED RELIEF</td>
<td>DAVENPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;FIG&quot; MOLDED RELIEF</td>
<td>DAVENPORT OR WEDGWOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLDED RELIEF, PANELLED</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANELLED RIM</td>
<td>T.J. &amp; J. MAYER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANELLED RIM</td>
<td>HECTOR SEARS, IMPORTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANELLED RIM</td>
<td>C. MEIGH &amp; SON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAIN</td>
<td>COPELAND &amp; GARRETT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAIN</td>
<td>THOMAS WALKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAIN</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANELLED</td>
<td>FRENCH?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAIN</td>
<td>FRENCH?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAND-PAINTED BLUE FLORAL</td>
<td>CHINESE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER-GRAZE DECORATION, GILDING</td>
<td>EUROPEAN, AMERICAN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLUMN TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
historical American views." While these commemorative prints and accompanying marks are well reported in the literature, little information is available on Wood's hand-painted wares and their marks.

**Body and Decoration**

The Feature 23 ceramic assemblage has been considered in terms of vessel form, body (paste), decorative method/style and pattern name, and manufacturer (Table 2). Because the precise vessel form and pattern were usually identifiable, the collection has not been classified in terms of an imposed typological scheme. The many manufacturers' marks present provide a much more precise dating mechanism than do date ranges for stylistic varieties. The ceramics are discussed below in terms of differences in the clay body employed and in the methods and patterns used in decorating the vessels. Clay body definitions are derived from Rado (1969), and identification is based predominantly on porosity and color.

The vast majority of the almost 1,700 sherds recovered from Feature 23 could be reconstructed into identifiable vessels. In most body groups, however, small numbers of unidentifiable or anomalous sherds remained when the reconstruction and cataloging process was completed. In many cases, these may be fragments of the reconstructed vessel which were simply too small to identify or match with other pieces. In some instances, however, the sherds are obviously fragments of otherwise unrepresented vessels. Given the disturbed nature of the feature, we felt that it would be inappropriate to inflate the minimum vessel counts based on the presence of tiny fragments while the bulk of the specimens are represented by substantial portions of the original vessels. It is possible that these fragments were present in the earth used to fill the pit, either when it was first abandoned or after its disturbance in the 1970s. We have listed below the presence of these seemingly anomalous items, including those from Wallace's 1974 excavations in this area, but have not included them in the summary of the assemblage (Table 2).

**Common Pottery**

Common pottery is low-fire nonwhite ceramic, sometimes referred to as "coloured earthenware." It is distinguished from actual earthenware, which is white or off-white, and fired at a somewhat higher temperature. Substantial fragments of only two common pottery vessels, a small lustre-decorated creamer and a small lead-glazed jar, were recovered from the Diaz privy.

The lustre creamer, or small pitcher, is 3-1/2 in high, of a dark reddish brown body, and is unmarked. A band of cream-colored slip surrounds the vessel. A floral decoration has been hand-applied over the slip, producing a pink lustre pattern. The dark background above and below the slip are also covered with lustre glaze, producing a metallic coppery appearance (Fig. 13g).
Lustre is in fact a metallic coating, formed by applying an acidic solution containing gold or platinum to the vessel before firing. The platinum solution produces a bright silver surface. While the gold solution produces a gold or coppery finish when applied to a dark body, the same solution will produce an iridescent pink when applied to a white body (Laidacker 1954:81), as is the case with the light-colored slip on the Diaz creamer. This combination of dark body and a band of slip, with both copper and pink lustre finishes, was apparently a common mode of decorating jugs and pitchers during the last century (Moore 1903:Fig. 118; Atterbury 1978:248, Fig. 7).

Lustre-decorated ceramics do not appear to have been produced in any quantity in England until about 1800-1805. They seem to have been most popular from about 1810 to 1840 (cf. Atterbury 1978; Moore 1903; South 1972).

Lustre-decorated common pottery appears to be relatively scarce in California sites, although it has been recovered in small quantities at Fort Ross (post-1812) and Sonoma (post-1824). In Monterey, another lustre-decorated vessel, a complete jug somewhat larger than the creamer described above, was recovered by Wallace (1975c) from a feature (the "South Ruin" cellar) located in the Cooper yard just east of the Diaz property. A brief examination of the ceramics from this collection suggests that they are comparable in age to the Feature 23 specimens.

The other common pottery vessel from Feature 23 is a small, incomplete lead-glazed jar, decorated only with incised horizontal lines at the base and shoulder. The body is a dark reddish-brown. Origin of the piece is unknown.

In addition to the fragments of the creamer and jar, 13 common pottery sherds were recovered. These include one piece of blue and white tin-glazed Majolica (Puebla blue on white), four lead-glazed sherds (one with a brown hand-painted decoration), and one unglazed sherd of a fine grey paste decorated with orange and lavender slip or paint. These pieces are probably of Mexican origin; the last may be from the Guadalajara-Tonala area of the state of Jalisco in western Mexico. Two sherds (one of buff body, the other orange) are covered with a thick, bright yellow, Majolica-like glaze; perhaps these are also from Mexico. Other areas of the site have yielded greater quantities of common pottery of Mexican origin; future research should permit more definitive statements on ceramic styles and trade between Alta California and western Mexico.

Other common pottery of probable British or American origin includes two tiny pieces of brown variegated "Rockingham" ware, a fragment of clear glazed "Yellow Ware," and two unglazed flowerpot sherds, one of which appears to be wheel-thrown.
Earthenware

The vast majority of the ceramics from Feature 23 (102 vessels, 86%) are made of white or off-white, porous earthenware. No creamware is present; all of the earthenware appears to fall into the "pearlware-whiteware" continuum typical of most mid-nineteenth-century assemblages.

There has been considerable recent discussion regarding the differentiation of pearlware from other white earthenwares (cf. Price 1979:13-15; Sussman 1977:105-111). Different vessel attributes (vessel form, body composition and thickness, glaze type, decoration) were evolving at different rates during the first half of the last century, making ware definition difficult. Early pearlware vessels varied little from creamware other than that the blue-tinted pearlware glaze replaced the more yellow creamware variety. Although the blue-tinted glaze was retained well into the nineteenth century, the form of the vessels themselves changed substantially to become generally indistinguishable from other white earthenware forms (Sussman 1977:105, 110-111).

Pearlware was most popular from the 1780s until 1830 or 1840, although it was still being manufactured at least as late as 1865 as a moderate-priced ware for ordinary use (South 1977:212; Noël Hume 1978:49). Pearlware sherds representing four vessels have been identified from an 1860s feature in Sacramento. They have darker (blue) glaze in pools and crevices, are of lighter weight, and are less abundant than other types of whiteware in that collection (Praetzellis 1980:7-3).

Many of the Diaz collection vessels demonstrate blue-tinted glaze over both decorated and undecorated bodies. In shape, most resemble typical nineteenth-century forms (Sussman 1977:109-110), although several undecorated soup plates seem to reflect traits more typical of eighteenth-century creamware/pearlware.

No attempt has been made here to differentiate pearlware from other earthenwares, although comments on glaze and vessel form are included in the description of decorative styles and patterns. Manufacturer and pattern identifications are much more precise dating tools than ware identification, making the pearlware/whiteware distinction largely academic. (These considerations are not applicable, however, to the differentiation of creamware from pearlware and other whitewares recovered on California sites; the presence of creamware along with early pearlwares and Chinese export porcelains is a key attribute of pre-1840s ceramic assemblages.)

We have categorized the collection's earthenware vessels by decoration into transfer-printed, hand-painted, and white earthenwares.
Transfer-Printed Earthenwares

The 61 transfer-printed vessels represent just over half of the identifiable ceramics in the collection. Of this sample, 54 specimens can be positively assigned to one of 16 different named patterns (Figs. 7-12). At least six unidentified patterns are also present.

In spite of the large quantity of transfer-printed earthenware present, no single pattern appears on a wide range of vessel forms; that is, no complete settings of any single pattern are present. This finding is compatible with historic mercantile information. An examination of mid-nineteenth-century store records from Monterey reveals that "very few people bought sets of dishes.... Each item for kitchen and table seems to have been purchased...only as needed" (Kneass 1961:18). Journals listing individual items purchased from stores in Yerba Buena (San Francisco) in the 1840s indicate similar purchases (Leese 1838; 1841; n.d.; Spear 1843; Davis 1849). Typical entries list single or small numbers of a particular vessel (e.g., 2 chambers, 1 bowl, 2 dishes), although occasionally items were sold by the dozen (e.g., 2 dozen plates, 1/2 dozen soup plates, 1-1/2 dozen cups and saucers). This pattern appears to be in marked contrast to distribution in the late nineteenth or early twentieth centuries, when an entire set of dishes with the same pattern was often sold as a unit (cf. Montgomery Ward & Co. 1895:526-531; Sears, Roebuck and Co. 1902:788-794). Single vessels of these patterns could be purchased separately, however.

In the present case, only five of the 16 identifiable patterns occur on more than one vessel form. Two of these patterns (Amoy and Rhone Scenery, 22 vessels) are found on matching cups and saucers (Figs. 9a,b, 12a,b). Ontario Lake Scenery pattern is used on three plates and a platter (Figs. 7b, 10c); Tiger Hunt on a platter (Fig. 7d) and a dish; and Texian Campaigne on a dish lid, a plate, and five cups (Figs. 8c, 11a, 12d,e). Although the transfer patterns and colors on the dish and lid differ, both patterns were produced by the same manufacturer, and the Texian Campaigne lid, as noted above (see Manufacturers), appears to fit the Tiger Hunt dish.

Almost 64% (39 vessels) of the transfer-printed vessels are decorated in blue; 16 of these are dark blue, including ten flow blue prints (Amoy). Other colors include dark blue-grey (11 Rhone Scenery cups and saucers), black (7 vessels), brown (2 vessels), and one each purple and pinkish red.

Forty-six of the transfer-printed vessels are landscape patterns (14 patterns), usually with a floral border. Many of these designs incorporate fanciful buildings with towers and have small human figures observing the scene. Regarding Ontario Lake Scenery (Figs. 7b, 10c), Moore (1903:72) comments that this pattern "...must have been left to the fancy of the English potter, who made the lake a river and ornamented its shores with towers and castles and gaily dressed ladies."
Figure 7. Transfer-printed earthenware platters: a) Abbeville (maker unidentified); b) Ontario Lake Scenery (J. Heath); c) Pearl (maker unidentified); d) Tiger Hunt (Thomas Walker).
Figure 8. Transfer-printed earthenware: a) chamber pot, Aleppo (Thomas Shirley & Co.); b) bowl, Saxon (Thomas Shirley & Co.); c) dish lid, Texian Campagne (Thomas Walker); d) chamber pot (pattern and maker unidentified).
Figure 9. Transfer-printed earthenware flatware: a) saucer, Amoy (Davenport); b) saucer, Rhone Scenery (T.J.& J. Mayer); c) soup plate, Columbia (William Adams & Sons); d) soup plate, Gothic (Thomas Shirley & Co.).
Figure 10. Transfer-printed earthenware flatware: a) soup plate, Mansion (Thomas Shirley & Co.); b) soup plate, Camilla (Copeland & Garrett); c) plate, Ontario Lake Scenery (J. Heath); d) soup plate, Rio (Thomas Shirley & Co.).
Figure 11. Decorated earthenware flatware: a) plate, Texian Campagne (Thomas Walker); b) soup plate, White Lily (Thomas Shirley & Co.); c) plate, painted and stamped design (no mark); d) plate, edge-decorated (no mark).
Figure 12. Transfer-printed earthenware cups: a) Amoy (Davenport); b) Rhone Scenery (T. J. & J. Mayer); c) Ruins (Davenport); d) Texian Campagne (Thomas Walker); e) Texian Campagne (interior detail); f) unidentified.
In several transfer prints, human figures are shown as more active: manning a boat (e.g., Rio, Mansion) (Figs. 10a,d), for example, or herding livestock (Ruins) (Fig. 12c). While some of the scenes are presumably European or American as suggested by the architecture and pattern names, others represent more exotic climes. Aleppo (Fig. 8a) is the name of a town in Syria, and other landscapes depicted are oriental or tropical (Amoy, Rio, Abbeville) (Figs. 7a, 9a, 10d, 12a).

A particularly active pattern, Tiger Hunt, shows men on an elephant and horseback who are about to spear a tiger (Fig. 7d). Presumably, this is an Indian scene. A series of Spode prints derived from engravings done by Samuel Howitt to illustrate an 1807 publication entitled Oriental Field Sports (Williams 1978:188-189) and the original engravings bear a general resemblance to Walker's Tiger Hunt pattern. Howitt's Death of the Bear incorporates an elephant, horsemen with spears, dogs, and palm trees, as does Tiger Hunt. Even the placement of these elements and the prey are similar. Certainly, these patterns are in the same decorative tradition if not derived from a single source.

A commemorative series present in the Feature 23 collection, the Texian Campaigne, is of considerable symbolic interest. The designs presumably are meant to depict battles of the Mexican War (1846-1848), which ultimately led to the confirmed American possession of Texas, New Mexico, and California.

A plate decorated in dark blue is impressed “Walker,” with the printed mark, “Texian Campaigne.” The central design shows a commander on a white horse and other horsemen in the foreground, one of whom carries a flag (Fig. 11d). In the right background are a line of soldiers, with buildings on the horizon. Two men, presumably casualties, are slumped in the foreground. A closely similar pattern (varies in detail only) is applied to the exterior of five unmarked black-printed cups (Fig. 12d). The border pattern on these and other vessels is a curvilinear design incorporating military motifs and the figure of a stylized Indian hunter, with a headdress and bow, in front of a deer. This pattern has been described previously (Larsen 1975:192, No. 489).

Another military scene is printed on one side of a dish lid; a detail from this picture is used in the bottom interior of the cups. Four figures, three in uniform, are standing and reclining around what appears to be a fire at the base of a large tree (Fig. 12e).

The scene on the other side of the dish lid does not seem to have been reported previously. It shows a group of infantry men (center) firing at cavalry troops approaching from the right background. There is an arched bridge abutment at the left (Fig. 8c). The border design used on the other vessels is repeated around the bottom of the lid.

Also present in this collection is a single fragment of another blue Texian Campaigne pattern vessel, possibly a dish lid (not included in the vessel count in Table 2). Texian Campaigne sherds are fairly common in the shallow surface deposits in other areas of the Diaz yard.
The Texian Campaigne vessels were obviously designed for their patriotic appeal on the American market during the Mexican War or immediately after the United States' victory. Their occurrence in a deposit attributable to a Mexican-Californio household consequently raises questions regarding the ethnic identification of the people who purchased, used, and discarded these items (see Discussion: Artifacts and Social History, below).

The specific engagements of the Mexican War shown on these dishes are not evident. Several scholars have attempted to identify the sources of the Texian Campaigne scenes in contemporary American lithographs. N. Currier prints, among others, are often cited as possible sources, but the comparisons with the ceramic patterns are not compelling (e.g., Larsen 1975:190-193; Cushion 1976:87). An equally plausible hypothesis as to the battles portrayed was published recently:

It is my belief that the Staffordshire potters, having a very hazy knowledge of American history, a rather relaxed sense of accuracy but a very keen sense of marketing, drew their designs from the most easily accessible battle prints, regardless of what war was involved; entitled the series Texian Campaigne; and shipped the pottery to America (Rollins 1983:418).

Rollins goes on to draw analogies between Texian Campaigne scenes and paintings of the Napoleonic Wars by French artists. She further points out that her research failed to locate any American references to the Mexican War as the Texian Campaigne, and again postulates a French connection based on the spelling of the word "campaigne."

We have looked at the details of the French paintings in Rollins' article, and agree that there are general similarities with the Texian Campaigne scenes. However, we find these similarities little more compelling than those between some of the American prints and the ceramic scenes (cf. Tyler 1973). Thus, a direct source for these transfer-printed scenes has yet to be identified.

While we were no more successful at identifying the source of these prints than others have been, we would like to note the similarity of the previously unreported bridge scene with one shown in a contemporary lithograph. A small print in John Frost's Pictorial History of Mexico and the Mexican War (1848:494) shows the National Bridge, the site of an altercation between Mexican troops and the invading Americans. The location of the bridge is not identified, although it was probably between Vera Cruz, one of the Americans' points of entry, and Mexico City, their objective. The illustration shows the bridge to have at least three arches that are generally similar to the abutment shown on the dish lid. Certainly, such bridges are sufficiently common throughout Europe and America that no strong argument for its identity as the National Bridge can be made; the search for the source(s) of the Texian Campaigne pattern continues.
Forty-four additional transfer-printed sherds not readily attributable to the vessels discussed above were recovered; most (39) of these are blue. While many could be fragments of these vessels, some are otherwise unrepresented and unidentified. Two sherds appear to bear border designs from an unidentified Willow pattern vessel; these are not included in the summary of the assemblage (Table 2).

**Hand-Painted Earthenwares**

Sixteen vessels are hand-painted; some decorations incorporate hand-stamped motifs. None of these have identifiable maker's marks, and except for a single figural mug (Toby jug), none are of named patterns.

The most common pattern (found on six plates) is a floral decoration including a large stylized red flower, bright green leaves, a smudged yellow overglaze bud, and four small stamped purple star-like motifs repeated four times. Narrow red stripes frame the floral pattern; the center of the vessel is plain. All design elements except the stripes and stamped star appear to have been applied freehand with a brush; there is no indication of the use of a stencil. The plate rims are slightly scalloped (Fig. 11c).

These and other hand-painted vessels with stamped motifs may be of either British or Scottish origin. The technique of producing such designs, employing stamps cut from sponge roots, was developed in Scotland. In 1845, the Adamses of Staffordshire imported Scottish workers to teach the art of cutting the stamps, and thereafter cut-sponge decoration flourished in England (Robacker 1978:81).

Wares with designs like these have been the source of considerable terminological anguish. "Sponge," "Gaudy Dutch," "Gaudy Welsh," "Gaudy Ironstone," "Gaudy Staffordshire," and the more clinical "Hand-Painted Polychrome" (Fineline, Sprig Style, Broadline, etc.) are a few of the names which have been applied to differing hand-painted wares. Some pattern names are known, but most designs are unidentified as to name or maker.

Apparently, simple hand-painted wares were relatively cheap and common. An 1855 Scottish price list includes "blue-edged and sponged" 10-inch plates which cost only slightly more than undecorated plates of the same size (Robacker 1978:85-87). Sponge-root-stamped patterns have been described as "...usually forceful in design, and executed on plain but good forms evidently destined for the rank and file of working folks" (Fleming 1923:65). It is not known if the reference is to vessels bearing only stamped designs or combinations of hand painting and stamping. Miller's work, however, shows relatively high values for the few hand-painted plates included on the price lists he examined (Miller 1983:26, 28). It is important to get a clearer idea of the original cost of this type of decoration relative to plain and transfer-printed vessels (see Discussion, below, for relative ceramic values).

One other vessel, a fragmentary straight-sided cup (Fig. 13d), bears a combination of hand-painted and sponge root-stamped decorations. The design includes a large pink flower, bright green leaves, and a dark
Figure 13. Plain and decorated wares: a) earthenware Toby jug; b) earthenware handleless cups, paneled; c) earthenware cup, painted floral elements; d) earthenware cup, painted and stamped design; e) earthenware saucer, paneled; f) earthenware bowl; g) common pottery creamer, lustre glaze; h) porcelain cup and saucer, paneled.
blue star-like stamp similar to those on the plates discussed above. A thin pink stripe circles the inside of the rim. This flower appears to be one of a number of variants identified as "Rose" (Robacker 1978:46).

Five small fragments of hand-painted polychrome earthenware not readily identifiable with the above vessels were also recovered.

A second group of hand-painted vessels is decorated with tiny bright green leaves and black stems; some have light blue or red flowers. A cup and pitcher have light blue flowers; a straight-sided cup has small red flowers (Fig. 13c); a saucer or small plate includes tiny green leaves and green dots, without flowers.

No documentation on these patterns has been encountered. The saucer or small plate has a fragmentary impressed maker's mark ("...CHINA, BURSLEM" inside a rectangular outline). Comparison of this fragmentary mark with a more complete specimen recovered on the Cooper-Molera property to the west shows the mark to read "E. WOOD, White Enamel China, Burslem."

A small straight-sided bowl is hand painted, with an unidentified blue floral pattern on the exterior and a blue rim band.

Three edge-decorated (shell-edge) plates are represented in the Diaz collection (Fig. 11d). A band of blue covers a series of impressed, slightly curved lines on the rim of each plate. The rim is not scalloped, as are many earlier, less stylized shell-edge varieties. The Feature 23 specimens are generally similar to nineteenth-century shell-edged ware illustrated by Sussman (1977:107, Fig. 6), except that the color has flowed into the impressed lines, forming a distinct band. All three plates have a round, impressed asterisk-like mark in the center of the back. One has very small letters ("CK") printed in blue near the foot ring; we have not identified the mark. Seven additional blue edge-decorated sherds were recovered which represent at least two unidentifiable vessels.

Shell-edge was apparently "by far the most common decoration on excavated 18th century pearlware... It continued to be manufactured in great quantities during the 19th century..." (Sussman 1977:106).

The remaining hand-painted vessel from the Diaz privy is a Toby jug (Fig. 13a), a small molded figure of a man seated on a rock(?) and wearing a tricorn hat which forms the tip of the mug. A handle was attached to the back of the vessel, which is 6 in tall. The man has a yellow hat and pants, a blue(?) coat (faded badly), and is holding an unrecognizable bright green object.

A wide variety of Toby jugs (drinking vessels) have been manufactured by English potters since the 1770s (Antiques 1930:488). These were apparently modeled after (and possibly from) a hard-drinking English character known as Toby Fillpot. A poem published in 1761, along with an illustration resembling the later jugs, includes the lines:
Dear Tom this brown Jug that now foams with mild Ale,
(In which I will drink to sweet Nan of the Vale)
Was once Toby Fillpot a thirsty old Soul
As e're drank a Bottle or fathom'd a Bowl,
....
His body when long in the Ground it had lain
And time into Clay ha resolv'd it again
A Potter found out in its Covert so snug
And with part of fat Toby he form'd this brown Jug
.... (Wenham 1947:148)

Toby jugs have been made from the eighteenth century to the present day. Most illustrated in the literature are shown holding very well-defined mugs, unlike our specimen. Although the face on this figure is fairly definite, the body and the jug are less clear. It has been observed that since about 1780, the original, well-executed Toby jugs have been "...carefully copied, variously altered, and eventually degraded by a succession of English potters, good bad and indifferent" (Antiques 1930:488). Two mid-nineteenth-century jugs have been described as "...decadent and lack both the vigor of the eighteenth century forms and the charm of those from the early nineteenth century" (Antiques 1930:490).

A single, tiny annular ware sherd was recovered. This decorative group is otherwise unrepresented in Feature 23.

White Earthenwares

Twenty-five earthenware vessels, approximately 21% of the total recovered from Feature 23, bore no colored decoration (Figs. 13, 14, 15). Only two of these, a plate and a pitcher, bear identifiable molded relief patterns, Decagon and Fig. The first was registered in 1853, and the second in 1856 (Wetherbee 1980:43, 46). A single fragment of a basin rim bears an unidentified molded relief pattern. Eleven other vessels are undecorated except for molded panels (usually 12) around the rim; 12 additional vessels are entirely undecorated.

By the late 1840s, a dramatic stylistic shift in popular British earthenwares had begun which is clearly evident in archeological assemblages from the 1850s in regions as distant as California. The change entailed a decline in the popularity of transfer-printed and other colorfully decorated earthenwares which had predominated since the late eighteenth century, and a rapid rise in the availability of "White Ironstone" style vessels (Miller 1980:4). Although the term "Ironstone" had been applied to some improved earthenware bodies since at least 1813 (Godden 1971:50), we use it here to refer to a distinct stylistic trend, not the technological improvements in the clay mixtures themselves. "White Ironstone" style vessels commonly bear molded relief patterns rather than colored decorations, and have thicker vessel walls than most earlier creamware and pearlware forms. The bodies of some of these pieces are as porous as common earthenwares, while others are more comparable in this regard to stoneware or porcelain. The latter are variously referred to as
Figure 14. Earthenware flatware: a) plate, undecorated; b) plate, Decagon molded relief pattern (Davenport); c) plate, paneled (T.J. & J. Mayer, imported by Hector Sears); d) small plate, paneled (T.J. & J. Mayer).
"semi-vitreous China", "hotel China", and "opaque porcelain." Vessels of this style were sold at high prices when first introduced (Miller 1980:29), although it seems probable that their manufacture was cheaper than that of the more labor-intensive colored decorative styles. Perhaps this shift to less labor-intensive modes of decoration in the late 1840s and 1850s was in part a response by British manufacturers to the growth of labor organizations and legislation that limited work hours and child labor (cf. Hobsbawn 1962:248-257; Rostow 1958:57-63; Mathias 1969:202-207).

The "White Ironstone" style appears to have dominated the middle-class market in the United States from the 1850s to at least the 1890s. These wares ("White Improved Earthenwares" and "Opaque Porcelain") comprise about 70% to 90% of three California collections (dated 1857-1878) reported by Praetzellis (1980:75, Fig. 20).

The British ceramics from the Diaz privy most clearly reflect the earlier, colorful transfer-printed and hand-decorated tradition, even though they were not deposited until the late 1850s or later (see Chronology). Only 8.4% of the collection (10 vessels) exhibit attributes characteristic of mid- and late-nineteenth-century "White Ironstone." Other paneled and undecorated pieces (15 vessels) more closely resemble the earlier eighteenth and nineteenth-century pearlware and creamware forms (bluish glaze, thinner vessel walls, flat bottoms, upcurving rim with beaded lip, and wide, flat rims) (cf. Sussman 1977:109).

Figure 15. Earthenware hollow ware, undecorated: a) chamber pot; b) serving dish.
The largest group of unidentifiable sherds, 174 pieces, is composed of plain white earthenware. While most of these are probably attributable to the 25 vessels described, some may be portions of decorated vessels (e.g., centers of edge-decorated plates) or fragments of otherwise unrepresented whiteware vessels.

Stoneware

Stoneware differs from earthenware in that it is denser, nonporous, and generally a grey or buff shade rather than white. Stoneware clays contain more fluxes than earthenware, and are fired at a somewhat higher temperature, causing the fluxes to vitrify. The nonporous, glassy structure of stoneware makes it useful for storing liquids and foodstuffs.

Except for two ale bottles and a Chinese food jar lid (see Bottles, below), the collection contains only a single stoneware vessel fragment. This specimen, which is covered with a variegated exterior blue glaze, appears to be modern and probably represents a recent intrusion; it is not included in Table 2.

Porcelain

Porcelain is white, translucent ceramic ware, highly vitrified and generally very hard; broken surfaces have a glassy or slightly grainy texture. Fourteen vessels (12%) are of porcelain. These include fragments of a small hand-painted rice bowl (probably Chinese), and seven cups and three saucers of a single pattern, presumed to be European.

The matching cups and saucers are paneled (12 panels per cup; 16 panels per saucer). All show traces of gold leaf around the rim, although most of the gold has been worn away. The cup handles are formed by several sharp curves and angles, and curve upward at the top (Fig. 13h). Handles of similar shape are variously referred to as "common Staffordshire" and "London" shapes (Cushion 1976:149, 152). None of these cups or saucers are marked.

These vessels, as well as an undecorated porcelain plate in the collection, may be of French rather than British origin. French-made "white heavy porcelain" was in great demand in America in the 1840s, and was shipped thereto in large quantities (Fleming 1923:105). At least through the 1860s, most porcelain imported into California was shipped from Bordeaux (Praetzellis 1980:14). The "ironstone china" so common in late nineteenth-century sites began in England as an attempt, eventually highly successful, to provide an earthenware imitation that would capture this market. If the porcelain in Feature 23 is of French origin, the collection would again appear as a typical example of the "pre-ironstone" tradition, as indicated by the high frequency of transfer-printed/hand-painted wares.
Two additional porcelain cup fragments are present in the collection. Both appear to be from large round cups. One has an unidentifiable molded design, on which an overglaze brown color has been applied, and a gilded rim. The second cup fragment has portions of the words "Forget me not" in gold letters on the outside. These may be recent intrusions; both were recovered outside the trashpit proper, but in the context of many sherds which crossmended with artifacts from within the feature.

The porcelain rice bowl noted above has a dark blue, hand-painted linear pattern on a light blue background. Although this vessel is presumed to be of Chinese origin, its design is decidedly not one of the more common late nineteenth-century patterns so abundant in overseas Chinese sites in the American west (cf. Chace 1976; Olsen 1978).

Two sherds in the collection represent a porcelain plate decorated with a blue bamboo transfer-print pattern. It is suggested that the plate may be a late nineteenth or twentieth-century Japanese product. This vessel is not included in Table 2.

Twenty-four unidentified fragments of porcelain were recovered. These appear to represent at least one cup and one saucer in addition to those described. There is also one small fragment of unglazed (Parian) porcelain, possibly part of a figurine.
BOTTLES

A total of at least 135 glass and ceramic bottles is included in the collection from the Diaz privy, all of them typical of containers made and used in the middle and later nineteenth century. Almost all are fragmentary, but the basal and finish portions are generally sufficiently complete so that quantification is not difficult. A few distinctive types are represented by single small fragments and probably represent debris mixed into the privy during the vandalism (see Archeological Background: Feature 23, above). In the following review, we have kept technical terminology to a minimum (for definitions, see White 1978). (A glass canning jar is reported in the Other Artifacts section.)

Liquor Bottles

The privy yielded a minimum of 52 bottles which were used to hold liquor. The most numerous vessel type consists of common black glass bottles (Fig. 16a-c). Most (21) of these bottles are sixths, but 12-oz and 24-oz bottles (two each) are present as well. All have thick bases with moderate push-ups; nine appear to have been made with sand pontils; the remainder lack pontil marks. At least some of these containers were made in three-piece molds; the remainder are too fragmentary for classification, but are either from dip or three-piece molds. Two of the bases are embossed with a four-pointed star, and one with the letter "R" (Fig. 16d, e). One shoulder fragment bears an embossed "...AT...", probably part of the designation "PATENT," a label employed by several British and American glassworks.

Black glass bottles such as these were commonly used to package alcoholic beverages, including ale, port, brandy, whiskey, and bitters. Ordinarily, attribution of specific products to individual bottles is impossible. Among the collection of black glass bottles, however, which were excavated from the hold of the steamboat Bertrand -- a rare circumstance in which many of the contents are known -- all of the larger capacity bottles held hard liquors, while ale is identified only from the 12-oz vessels (Switzer 1974). This apparent size-function divergence is not definitely established, since the contents of many of the 12-oz bottles are uncertain. The difference in packaging seems plausible, however, because bottles of malt beverages are usually consumed at a sitting, and must be small enough to make this practical, while hard liquor containers are often resealed for gradual consumption and so can be retailed in larger sizes.

Wine is represented by four general types of containers (Fig. 17a-c; cf. Schulz et al. 1980). The largest of these, a demijohn of aqua glass, is too badly fragmentary for the original volume or manufacturing methods to be ascertained. Four 32-oz and seven 23-oz bottles are of the strongly shouldered Bordeaux wine style, while nine specimens are 13-oz champagne bottles. All of these vessels are of olive green glass. Rhine wines are represented by fragments of at least two 26-oz bottles of red-brown glass in the tall tapering hock style. All of these bottles seem to have been made in dip molds, but
Figure 16. Black glass liquor bottles from Feature 23: a) black glass bottle with well-formed finish and high kick-up; b,c) finish variants; d,e) embossed bases.
Figure 17. Liquor bottles from Feature 23: a) champagne bottle; b) hock wine bottle finish; c) Bordeaux wine bottle finish; d) case gin bottle finish; e) stoneware ale bottle.
most are too fragmentary for certainty in this regard. Except for one champagne bottle which may have been made using a sand pontil, none are pontil-marked.

While the laid-on band of glass placed just below the lip on the champagne bottles has been, as typically, formed with a lipping tool, the lip itself is merely a sheared surface. This type of finish characterizes the champagne bottles excavated from the storeship Niantic, which burned in San Francisco in 1851 (Mary Hilderman Smith, Maritime Museum, San Francisco, personal communication; cf. Smith 1981), and those from deposits dating to the 1852 fire in Sacramento (cf. Butler 1980). Among the vast majority of the champagne bottles from Old Sacramento, coming from deposits dating between 1860 and the turn of the century, the lip is markedly beveled. The bottles from the steamboat Bertrand, which sank in 1865, apparently exhibit both types of finish (Switzer 1974). The evidence thus suggests that a style change in champagne finishes was underway by about 1860, and that the Diaz bottles were made before that time.

A fragmentary shoulder seal which retains only the letters "...EN/...OC" is clearly from a St. Julien, Médoc label from a Bordeaux-style bottle. Such shoulder seals were common in the Old Sacramento collections (Schulz et al. 1980) and have been found at several other nineteenth-century sites (Smith 1960; Fontana and Greenleaf 1962; Moore 1973). Claret from the township of St. Julien in the Bordeaux region is generally highly regarded, but the wines exported from this township in the last century were so systematically adulterated with mediocre vintages that the label was no guarantee of quality.

A complete shoulder seal, also of dark olive glass, is embossed "VIEUX COGNAC." It is unfortunately broken away from the bottle and conceivably could have come from either a Bordeaux-style or a black-glass container. These seals are also known from Old Sacramento (Schulz et al. 1980) and Johnny Ward's Ranch, Arizona (Fontana and Greenleaf 1962), but these specimens also are no longer attached to bottles. A lead foil cork seal with this embossing was recovered at Sutter's Sawmill site (Fenenga 1948). The appellation was used by many distillers of cognac, and so far as we are aware has no temporal significance.

The remaining liquor containers include two pint stoneware ale bottles (Fig. 17e), fragments of a flask (ca. 12-oz) of amber glass, and pieces of a case gin bottle of about fifth capacity. All that remains of the case gin are a few body sherds and the finish; the latter exhibits the untooled flattened blob top that was typical of these containers from the eighteenth century into the second half of the nineteenth (Fig. 17d). Finally, a tall quart or liter stoneware jug (cf. Switzer 1974:Fig. 11; Schulz et al. 1980:Figs. 4a, 29a) is here assumed to be a Dutch gin container, although these vessels were also used for German mineral water. None of the ceramic containers bear impressed markings.
Food Containers

The 54 retail food containers represent a diverse collection in terms of both style and original contents. The largest of these vessels are three straight-sided, wide-mouthed jars of transparent pale green glass (Fig. 18a). Original capacity of one of these is estimated at 1 qt and that of the other two at 1.5 qt. Jars such as these were used to package preserved fruit. A shoulder seal in the collection, evidently from one of the larger specimens, is embossed "J. FAU/PRUNES D'ENTES/BORDEAUX". Similar seals have been recovered in Old Sacramento and at Fort Vancouver (Schulz 1981b; Ross 1976:1002, Fig. 519). The prune d'Ente was a variety of sweet plum, and Fau was a Bordeaux merchant who in 1837 began packing this fruit in specially designed glass jars and tin cannisters for export. His family remained in the business at least into the 1880s (Issartier 1874:94-97; Bruguiere 1887:139).

A total of 15 smaller wide-mouthed jars, all of clear glass, also doubtless held smaller preserved fruits. Capacities range from 5 oz to 12 oz. All of these jars — like the three first mentioned — have pontil-scarred bases; most were probably blown in dip molds. A final wide-mouthed container is an aqua jar of cathedral style (cf. Switzer 1974:Fig. 69-77) which presumably held pickles. Volume was probably about a quart. Only the finish and shoulders are preserved.

The most numerous group of small-mouthed containers consists of 22 olive oil bottles, tall vessels with high push-ups (Fig. 19a). Eighteen are of pale green glass and held 16 oz of oil. A few smaller (8-oz) bottles of pale green, aqua, and clear glass are included here because of a close similarity in shape. Six of the 22 bases are pontil-scarred. All the bottles are fragmentary. Most are free-blown, but one green and one clear finish are vertically ribbed.

Also present are an 8-oz gothic peppersauce bottle (Fig. 18c), and two 6-oz rectangular, faceted condiment bottles, all of aqua glass (Fig. 18b). One of the latter is vertically embossed "J.W. . . ." on one side, undoubtedly for J. W. Hunnewell & Co., a Boston wholesale firm whose bottles have been found at Old Sacramento and at the Sand Springs Pony Express Station, Nevada (Hardesty 1977; Schulz 1981b). The company was organized in 1853 and operated until 1921, producing yeast powder, various oils, and patent medicines (Hales 1979). All three of these containers are from two-piece molds; except possibly for the Hunnewell bottle, they are pontil-scarred.

Sauces or flavoring extracts were probably the original contents of three round pint bottles of aqua glass. The same is true of an octagonal 8-oz (?) aqua bottle, which bears an embossed "E" on the base. Finally, a series of four tall, faceted, rectangular 8-oz bottles of pale blue glass, and one pint of the same type and color, are classed as extract containers, though conceivably they might have contained medicine.

The only specimen of non-Euroamerican origin is a brown-glazed stoneware lid, 3.4 in in diameter, from a Chinese food jar (cf. Chace 1976:Fig. 3d).
Figure 18. Food bottles from Feature 23: a) Prune d'Ente jar; b) small condiment jar; c) gothic peppersauce bottle.
Pharmaceutical Bottles

Included in this category are five round clear glass bottles (Fig. 19c,d) in volumes ranging from 1 oz to 4 oz. All are too fragmentary for classification of manufacturing method; the only base present is pontil-marked. Vials such as these were commonly used by pharmacists in the last century for bottling pills, powders, and medicinal extracts.

Perfumes and Toiletries

The 18 bottles in this category form a diverse collection. Two oval, footed, pear-shaped bottles of clear glass (0.5-oz and 3-oz capacity) are clearly perfume containers (Fig. 19b), as is the base of a small (ca. 1-oz) oval bottle. Of simpler design are six 4-oz rectangular bottles with inset side panels, an unpaneled 3-oz rectangular bottle, an 8-oz cylindrical bottle, and another of 6-oz capacity with two flattened faces. All these specimens are from two-piece molds. Of the 12 bases present, five are pontil-scarred.

Also of clear glass are two containers that resemble very small (ca. 4-oz) olive oil bottles. Grocery catalogs of the last century do not seem to list olive oil containers this small, and the finish is better made than is usual on such containers, which also are usually of pale green glass. On the other hand, these specimens resemble depictions of bottles (which came in this size) in late nineteenth-century cologne advertisements, and they are so classified here. They seem to be free-blown or blown in a dip mold, and the bases are not pontil-marked.

The other four vessels are unusual (for this collection) in being embossed. All seem to be from two-piece molds. One, a fragmentary square bottle of aqua glass (volume ca. 3 oz), is embossed vertically on one panel "VINAI.../DE JE...". The designation is doubtless for some variation of vinaigre de toilette, but we have no specific information. Equally enigmatic is a rectangular faceted and pontil-scarred bottle (4 oz) of clear glass embossed ".../A/PARIS," a common designation for French perfumers.

More firmly identified is another clear glass bottle -- this one octagonal and of 3-oz capacity. It is embossed on one face "...NA/VISA...MARCHE/CO...GNE" and held cologne produced by one of several firms which used the name Farina. Giovanni Maria Farina moved to Cologne from Italy in the early eighteenth century and in 1725 first marketed eau de cologne. His family continued his perfumery business for several generations. Three separate firms, under German and French variants of Farina's name, were producing cologne by the middle of the last century, and continued to do so into the present century (Poucher 1942, 2:299-300). Bottles similar to this have been recovered at Old Sacramento, Ventura, and Fort Vancouver (Bente 1976; Ross 1976; Schulz 1981b).
Figure 19. Miscellaneous bottles from Feature 23: a) olive oil; b) perfume; c,d) pharmacy.
By the 1830s, if not before, Farina cologne was being widely advertised in the United States (McKearin and Wilson 1978:383). Cologne was reported in use by 1829, though no trade names are mentioned, and it featured prominently in the custom, at weddings and other celebrations, of breaking eggs filled with cologne upon the heads of selected guests (Briones 1891; Californian, Jan. 9, 1847:2; Colton 1860:143-144).

The final specimen is a fragmentary square, .8-oz. bottle of pale aqua glass with a pontil-scarred base. It is embossed "[T]HE [ORIGINAL]/[A]ND [GENUINE]/[R]O[L]/WLA[N]/D/[MACASSAR]/[O][IL]/[N]/O[0.20 H][ATT]ON]/[GA]RDEN/[L]ONDON". Alexander Rowland introduced his Macassar Oil about 1793, and it continued on the market well into the present century (Turner 1953:60). This hair oil was originally advertised as being made from imported Macassar nuts, but an early critic provided an alternate recipe, "believed to be the genuine":

Take three quarts of common oil, half a pint of spirits of wine, three ounces of cinnamon powder, two ounces of bergamot;

Put it in a large pipkin, and give it a good heat. When it is off the fire, add three or four pieces of alkanet root... The commonest oil is used; and when rancid, it is remedied by putting in two or three slices of onion. Not an ounce of Macassar oil is imported from Macassar, or it would be entered at the customs, which it is not (Knight and Lacey 1825:315-316).

Nonetheless, Rowland's Macassar Oil became the leading hair preparation of the early Victorian era. Bottles similar to the present one have been recovered in Old Sacramento and at sites in Minnesota and Georgia (Nystuen and Lindeman 1969; Otto 1976:232; Schulz 1981b). Unfortunately, as a result of the extended popularity of this product, the present container is of no help in dating the collection.

Other Containers

Of the remaining specimens, the only substantially complete one can be categorized as a household container. This is a 1-oz umbrella ink well. It is of aqua glass, made in a two-piece mold, with a pontil-scarred base.

The remaining bottles are represented only by single small pieces, and may well represent later debris mixed into the privy. Three of these are from square bitters containers, probably fifths. Two of them, embossed "...RS" and "...ERS" are of amber and olive brown glass, respectively. The lettering is identical in size to that commonly found on Hostetter's Bitters bottles, which would date them after 1859 (Schulz et al. 1980), but the association is not definite. The final piece, of dark green glass, is embossed "CATA[WB][AW]E[INE]". According
to Wilson and Wilson (1969), Catawba Wine Bitters was retailed in square bottles with this embossing from 1860 until 1866. Bottles have been previously recovered from the Sand Springs Pony Express Station, Nevada (Hardesty 1977).

The only soda water bottle fragments are two blob-top finishes from 8-oz bottles of standard soda water style (cf. Schulz et al. 1980). The finishes are of transparent pale green glass. Bottles of this style were used in America from the second quarter of the last century until the first decade of the present one; transparent glass, however, was seldom used in their manufacture until the 1860s and became increasingly common thereafter.
GLASS TABLEWARE

The collection contains 39 glass tableware and utility vessels, including 32 tumblers, four goblets, two creamers or small pitchers, and a measuring glass. The last -- a conical graduate -- is unusual, since few such items have been recovered archeologically. The present specimen is a narrow funnel-shaped bowl of blown rather than pressed glass resting directly on a goblet foot (Fig. 20a). The graduations, indicating either teaspoons or fluidrams, are etched in the glass and painted gold. Such graduated cones were a standard article of nineteenth-century druggists' ware and seem to have been in common household use for both medicines and cooking (Mercantile Pub. and Adv. Co. 1883:425; Rorer 1886:548).

The remaining vessels are of typical nineteenth-century tableware forms. Most of the tumblers have a series of vertical flutes or facets encircling the sides (Fig. 21a,b), variation in the number of these producing bases which are hexagonal (nine specimens), heptagonal (one), octagonal (eight), nonagonal (four) and 11-sided (two). Four tumblers and one pitcher are round; an equal number of tumblers and the other pitcher are vertically ribbed or crenelated (Fig. 21c,d,e). The goblets are sturdily made vessels with broad feet and decagonally faceted bowls (Fig. 20b). All of these vessels are pressed glass, except two tumblers (one nonagonal and one 11-sided), on which the facets have been produced by grinding.

More important than the forms of the vessels are the methods used in their manufacture. Glass pressing was first introduced to commercial mass production of tableware in the United States in the early 1820s. When English glassworks began to press glass in 1837, they added to the process fire-polishing, the object of which was to give the pressed ware a surface and texture like that of blown glass. Polishing involved the use of a pontil to hold the vessel while it was returned to the furnace and reheated (Watkins 1935). The scar of glass left when the pontil was broken away was ordinarily ground down but is often still discernible on the bases of vessels prepared in this way. By mid-century, the snap-case, which had been introduced for finishing bottles, began to be used for pressed glass as well and rapidly replaced the earlier tool (cf. Weeks 1883:49).

Because of this manufacturing change, frequencies of pontil scars on pressed glassware should be of chronological significance. The numbers of scarred and unscarred pressed vessels from the Diaz privy have been compared with glass tableware from six well-dated mid-nineteenth to early twentieth-century features from Old Sacramento (Table 3). Most of the samples are small, but they should be sufficient as general chronological indicators.

Among the Old Sacramento features, the highest frequency of pontil marking on pressed nonstemmed vessels (55%) is in the earliest (1852) sample. Later samples show no consistent trends (perhaps a result of differences in functional longevity between glassware in commercial and domestic contexts, of which the series provides a mixture), but
all exhibit pontil-mark frequencies of less than one-third that of the 1852 sample. These data therefore support the idea that the shift in fire-polishing tools was underway at mid-century, and that pontil-scarred vessels should be a minor part (15%) of assemblages deposited after about 1860. Since the Diaz collection contains many unscarred vessels, yet has a very high pontil-scar frequency, it clearly dates to a time when the transition was underway -- presumably the 1840s or 1850s.

Figure 20. Stemware from Feature 23: a) glass graduate; b) small faceted goblet.
Figure 21. Tumblers from Feature 23: a,b) faceted style; c,d) round style; e) ribbed style with decorated base.
TABLE 3

Glass Tableware from Dated Nineteenth-Century Deposits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Deposition Date</th>
<th>Stemware</th>
<th>Pontil</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Nonstemware</th>
<th>Ground</th>
<th>Pontil</th>
<th>Nonstemware</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Percent Pontil</th>
<th>Total Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaz Privy</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cothrin Store</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Oyster Saloon</td>
<td>c.1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannan Saloon Privy</td>
<td>c.1866</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruehler Saloon Trash</td>
<td>c.1885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klebitz &amp; Green Saloon</td>
<td>c.1885</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903 Front St. Cistern</td>
<td>c.1905</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1All deposits other than the Diaz privy are in Old Sacramento (cf. Schulz, Hastings, and Felton 1980).
OTHER ARTIFACTS

Of the remaining artifacts (Table 4), only a few are of chronological significance and most are small enough to represent surface debris mixed in with original material when the privy was vandalized. Examples of this are three .22 caliber Winchester cartridge casings and a metal clothing snap closure. The former were first manufactured in 1873 (Foster 1952). The clothing snap is impressed "PA...89/MAOE IN FRANCE." Presumably, the first part of this label indicates a patent date of 1889. If so, the geographical designation in English would be understandable, since labels indicating the country of origin on imports were required by the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890.

Probably from the same era are three base fragments of an aqua glass fruit jar, which bear the circular embossing "PATD 0...17 '61 NOV 4 '6...9 REIS'S SEP 16...69". This embossing is not listed by Toulouse (1969) in his extensive survey of American fruit jars, but December 17, 1861 and November 4, 1862 were both dates of issue for jar closure patents (Toulouse 1969:400). Although the embossed dates are from the 1860s, jar manufacturers continued to use them on their containers for decades afterward.

Even later are the aluminum beer cans and a stamped brass good luck token made in the late 1940s (Arthur Buckeldee, Monterey, personal communication).

The only coin recovered was probably part of the original deposit. This was a well-worn Austrian 20-kreuzer piece showing a bust of Francis II and dated 1803. The source and early date of the coin may appear unusual, but German and Austrian coins -- along with those of many other nations -- circulated freely in California during the Gold Rush, and early nineteenth and even late eighteenth-century coins were in common use at that time (Farris 1980a).

A gunflint of blond chalcedony with some natural whitish discoloration on the heel is also relatively early. It is made in the French method with a rounded heel, and is of a size (21.6 mm long, 18.5 mm wide, 6.1 mm thick) generally associated with pocket pistols -- the smallest size of gunflint (Peterson 1956:228-229). Flintlock weapons were used by at least some American troops stationed in Monterey during the Mexican War (Wise 1949:49) and continued in common but declining civilian use for the following two or three decades. The present specimen, however, may have been used not on a gun but with a fire steel, since the striking edge has been worn into a concave line. The French flintknapping industry, which was the major supplier of flints in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, had reportedly been disbanded by 1837 -- the chalcedony thereafter being exported to England for preparation into flints (Woodward 1960). Since the present implement is made by the French, not the English, method, however, it presumably dates to the earlier continental production era.
Also included in the collection are a marble and several shoe parts. The marble is a common white clay specimen, 21.8 mm in diameter, decorated with six bulls-eye designs in green, red, and dark gray. The shoe parts consist of all or portions of at least five poorly preserved heels. They vary from 2.0 to 2.25 in wide, and one -- apparently a boot heel -- has a discernible height of about 1.25 in.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Classes</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic tableware</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass tableware</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottles</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit jar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamp foot, glass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candleholder(?), glass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doorknob, ceramic and iron</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper strapping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass gear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screw post, brass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead foil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttons, porcelain</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttons, bone</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttons, mother-of-pearl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress fastenings, hook-and-eye</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belt buckle, woman's copper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal clothing snap</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe heel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe button, brass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin, Austrian 20-kreuzer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble, decorated ceramic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doll foot, porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco pipes, ball clay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun flint</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartridge casings, .22 long</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartridge casings, .22 short</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead ball</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good luck token</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer cans, aluminum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Figures indicate minimum numbers of artifacts, not specimens
2 See text for description
The diverse assortment of faunal material collected from Feature 23 includes 144 identifiable specimens of bone and shell, representing at least 16 species (Table 5). Most of this material is from local wild and domestic species, each represented by only a few bones or shells. One interesting aspect of the assemblage is the inclusion of cod, since these fish had to be imported from either the Atlantic or (after 1863) the North Pacific. Salted Atlantic cod were being sold in California by 1848 (Californian Jan. 26, 1848:1), and it is possible that they were brought to Monterey by American ships even earlier.

The most important source of meat, as might be expected, was beef. Cattle bones make up more than half the identified specimens, and derive from the largest food animal represented in the collection. The nature of the cattle remains is also important as evidence of social and cultural change. First, these remains provide clear evidence of a change in butchering patterns from the practice in Spanish and Mexican California. Cattle remains from other earlier features (dating from the 1830s and 1840s) at the site are either whole or chopped and spirally fractured into large pieces. This kind of butchering results from a process of dismembering joints, stripping meat off of bones, and smashing bones for marrow extraction. This latter pattern differed little from aboriginal butchering and seems to have been standard in early Hispanic California (Gust 1982; Schulz 1981a).

The beef (and pork and mutton) bones from the privy, however, do not exhibit this kind of processing at all. Rather, they are cut in a manner typical of middle and late nineteenth-century Euroamerican butchering. Few whole bones are present, most having been systematically cross-cut with hand saws, and evidence of chopping is limited to cleaver cuts across ribs and longitudinally through vertebrae (cf. Lyman 1977; Gust n.d.). Census records indicate that by 1850 an Irish-American butcher was operating in Monterey. Clearly, by the time the privy material was deposited, such immigrant technicians were numbering Mexican-Californio households among their clientele.

The bones from the privy also provide a record of the categories of beef purchased by the Diaz family. The fact that the bones can be identified as deriving from particular cuts of beef allows us to use the relative values of the different cuts, and the frequency with which they are represented, to assess the socioeconomic status of the household (Table 6). Although the sample is small (only 68 specimens are attributable to specific major secondary cuts), comparison of relative frequencies with those from high and low status sites in Old Sacramento (Schulz and Gust 1983b) indicates that the cumulative frequency curve for the privy sample falls between these extremes (Fig. 22). If meat marketing in mid-nineteenth century Monterey followed standard American pricing patterns (Schulz and Gust 1983a) as it followed standard butchering patterns, then the bone sample suggests a middle-class, or perhaps a lower middle-class, standing for the Diaz household.
One aspect of this profile which deserves notice is the relative frequency of bones from the shank and foreshank. These cuts, from the distal end of the legs, contain relatively little meat and were generally considered the cheapest of cuts. Their frequency therefore should ordinarily reflect the dietary of a rather poor family. It is noteworthy, however, that these bones are relatively more common here than in any of the Sacramento deposits, at least some of which derive from the bottom of the social scale -- certainly lower than we should expect of the Diaz family. They are also quite common among remains from American-period deposits (presumably of Mexican-American origin) at Sonoma Mission (Supancic n.d.). Consequently, we might suspect an ethnic influence on the data. Among Californio families, these cuts were regarded (as they are today) as soup bones (Brennan n.d., Folder 7:3). One popular soup in northwestern Mexico, menudo, commonly employs calves' feet as an ingredient (Pain 1976; Clints n.d.), and it is possible that shank cuts were used as a substitute in nineteenth-century California.
TABLE 5

Faunal Remains from the Diaz Privy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Specimens</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOLLUSCS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land snail</td>
<td>Helminthoglypta dupetithouarsi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red turban</td>
<td>Astraea cf. gibberosa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black abalone</td>
<td>Haliothys cracherodii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California mussel</td>
<td>Mytilus californianus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnacle</td>
<td>Thoracica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod</td>
<td>Gadus sp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockfish</td>
<td>Scorpaenidae</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatfish</td>
<td>Pleuronectoidei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIRDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck</td>
<td>Anseriformes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goose</td>
<td>Anser sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>Gallus gallus</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic pigeon</td>
<td>Columba livia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAMMALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat</td>
<td>Rattus sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>Sylvilagus sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6

Diaz Privy: Distribution of Cattle Bones by Beef Cut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Specimens</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Loin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirloin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rump</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Rib$^2$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate$^3$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreshank</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindshank$^4$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 For nineteenth-century price ranking, see Schulz and Gust 1983a
2 Includes short rib
3 Includes brisket
4 Sample includes one phalanx
Figure 22. Beef cut frequencies from the Diaz privy compared with high status (a) and low status (b) assemblages from Old Sacramento, plotted as cumulative frequency curves (cf. Schulz and Gust 1983).
CHRONOLOGY

Two sets of dates are important in understanding and interpreting historic archeological deposits. The dates of manufacture of the artifacts contained within the deposit are of importance in interpreting the artifacts themselves and the human behavior with which they are directly associated. The second time span, that of deposition, often must be inferred from the first in conjunction with other documentary, oral interview, or archeological data. An understanding of the depositional dates and processes can yield insights into historic events which are markedly different in character from the behavioral questions associated with manufacture and usage dates.

A study of these two aspects of the chronology of the Diaz privy remains in light of available recorded history makes possible the interpretation of both the socio-economic identity of the Diaz household and the factors which may have led to the breakage and deposit of what would appear to be a household's entire supply of dishes in a single feature.

Embossed glass bottles, one of the most accurate dating tools for late nineteenth-century archeological deposits, are of little help in dating the Diaz privy. Very little of the glass in this collection is embossed, and most of the bottles are of types in use for very long time spans. We have argued that the high frequency of pontil scars on the Feature 23 glass drinking vessels relative to post-1850 Old Sacramento archeological deposits is indicative of early (1840s-1850s) manufacture dates (see Glass Tableware, above). Specific dates of manufacture of the glass objects or their deposition date, however, are lacking.

Fortunately, many of the ceramics from Feature 23 are marked and highly datable as to period of manufacture. Date ranges for marked vessels show that most of the pieces were produced during the late 1840s or early 1850s (Fig. 23). The terminus post quem for the ceramic collection is established by an 1856 anchor date on a piece produced by Davenport. This suggests a deposition date during the late 1850s at the earliest. A few artifacts that postdate the 1850s, including a canning jar base with an 1860s patent date, rifle cartridges, and beer cans, were recovered. Their presence in this disturbed deposit precludes us from saying with certainty that deposition in the privy ceased in the late 1850s as is overwhelmingly suggested by the ceramic marks. Nevertheless, we believe it is highly likely that these later pieces are the product of disturbance, and that deposition in the pit was substantially completed by the late 1850s.

A mean ceramic date was calculated following South (1972), but counting minimum vessels rather than sherds and using only pieces which are marked or have identifiable patterns. This is simply a matter of averaging the midpoints of each manufacturing range, weighted by the number of examples of each present. The mean ceramic date for the Feature 23 ceramic collection is 1846.5, with a standard deviation of 4.3 years (Fitting 1972).
Figure 23. Dates of manufacture of artifacts recovered from Feature 23. Mean ceramic date = 1846.5 (s.d. = 4.3 years). Ceramic terminus post quem = 1856. More recent artifacts are present in other classes.
This date, if the Diaz privy is at all a representative sample, permits the inference that ceramics of these styles were popular and available during this period. The 1842-1850 date range suggested by the mean date and standard deviation seems to be appropriate for most of the collection, in that colorfully decorated vessels of the type present in Feature 23 had been supplanted to a large extent by "white ironstone" wares by the 1850s (Miller 1980:4). Only ten white ironstone vessels were represented in Feature 23.

The mean date range correlates fairly well with the Diaz family history. Diaz married Maria Luisa Merced Estrada in December 1843. By 1855, he was bankrupt. Thus, it is probable that their purchase of household goods would have begun in about 1843 or 1844, and would have probably diminished or changed in character with their declining economic means in the 1850s. The few datable mid-1850 pieces are "white ironstone."

The fact that the deposit contains what would appear to be an entire room or household supply of dishes, many of which are broken but complete, suggests the possibility that an earthquake or other catastrophic event might be responsible for their breakage and disposal. Pieces of at least 118 vessels were recovered from a single trash disposal feature. To account for this volume of material, it would seem safe to assume that the feature was either open for a long period of time or that the large number of dishes were broken and deposited within a relatively short period of time. The faunal material recovered seems to argue for a relatively short deposition period, since the amount of bone represents only a few weeks' worth of food for a household of moderate size. Furthermore, privies such as Feature 23 were usually moved or cleaned out every few years. Thus, the chances of an actively used outhouse fill deposit representing a long time period are decidedly low, and the available evidence indicates that the Diaz privy was no exception.

Several events could have resulted in the breakage of the Diaz privy glass and ceramics, ranging from a shipping accident (there was a store located in the Diaz Adobe at the corner of Polk Street and Munras Avenue) to a china cabinet tipped over or the discarding of a box of old dishes, to building collapse or earthquake. We believe that the Feature 23 assemblage represents domestic debris from the Manuel Diaz household, and not breakage of commercial stock. We considered the possibility that the ceramics were commodities intended for sale in the store on the property, but have rejected this hypothesis on the basis of the wear patterns present on the vessels. These scars include both utensil cuts and scratches in the glaze on the interior of the flatware, as well as abrasions on the footrings and rims from storage and use (cf. Griffiths 1978; Carpenter 1980). It is more difficult to detect wear patterns on the cups, although footring abrasion is apparent on some of the pieces. It seems safe to conclude that ceramics exhibiting such marks, especially utensil scars, are used rather than new products.
While it may be impossible to unequivocally identify the factor involved in the breakage, a good circumstantial and potentially testable argument can be made for the earthquake hypothesis. An inventory of California earthquakes was consulted (Townley and Allen 1939:1-252). Based on the ceramic terminus post quem of 1856, a major quake in this area in the late 1850s or later was anticipated. A likely candidate is the earthquake of November 26, 1858 (Townley and Allen 1939:33, 38-39), among the most intense ever recorded in the state.

Although there are newspaper accounts of this quake's causing much breakage in stores and homes in San Francisco and San Jose, no specific descriptions of its effects in Monterey have been located. A more systematic search of available contemporary accounts would be required to confirm this hypothesis. This work is restricted by the fact that during this period Monterey had no local newspaper, and papers elsewhere included little detailed coverage of Monterey events.

The earthquake hypothesis can be tested archaeologically by comparison of the datable artifacts from the Diaz privy with others in the Cooper-Diaz yard or other areas of Monterey. The assumption is that an earthquake would have resulted in similar breakage throughout an entire neighborhood or area. Although the material has not all been identified and dated, several other artifact-rich features in the Cooper yard include ceramic marks and patterns present in Feature 23. If terminus dates are found to be comparable for these features and the Diaz privy, the broken vessels might be ascribed to a single destructive event.
DISCUSSION: ARTIFACTS AND SOCIAL HISTORY

Ceramic Analysis:
Economic Scaling and Vessel Form Distribution

Several recent studies have dealt with the relationship between archeological evidence of historic foodways and the ethnic and status identity of the sites' inhabitants (e.g., Otto 1976, 1977, 1980; Baker 1978, 1980; Deetz 1977; Miller 1980). Social identity of the inhabitants was provided by written evidence. The assemblages have been analyzed in terms of ceramic vessel form and decorative style, associated dietary evidence (faunal material) and, most recently, the relative cost of the ceramics present.

Data from the Diaz privy collection have been compared with the findings reported in these ceramic studies. Although the compared sites vary widely in location and in the social identity of the inhabitants, we feel that valid comparisons can be made, as these sites were all firmly integrated into an international economic structure which permitted the worldwide distribution of mass-produced British ceramics. This same economic structure, industrial capitalism, was also a major factor in determining the status realities which we are attempting to discern in the archeological record of nineteenth-century America.

Background

One of the first studies of mass-produced ceramics in which the question of status and ethnicity was closely examined was John Otto's analysis of assemblages from planter, overseer, and slave sites on Cannon's Point Plantation, Georgia (Otto 1976; 1977; 1980). Otto demonstrated that the White planter's tableware consisted predominantly of transfer-printed flatware pieces (plates, soup plates, platters); these made up 62% of all tableware present. Such vessels form smaller percentages of the White overseer and Black slave cabin assemblages (28% and 19%, respectively). In contrast, annular "serving bowls" (for individual servings) occur more frequently in the slave cabin collection than any other decorative/vessel form group. These bowls make up 29% of all tableware in the slave cabin sample, but only 17% and 6% of the overseer and planter tableware (Otto 1977:103).

Otto has correlated the contrast between annular bowls and transfer-printed flatware with status differences reflected in dietary practices. Saw cuts were present on bones from the planter's kitchen "...indicating that animals were carefully butchered to produce roasts for the planter's table, ..." while "...slaves and overseers cleaved open the bones with axes and cleavers and stewed them to obtain more nourishment from their limited meat" (Otto 1977:104). These different diets provide a plausible explanation of the major differences between the ceramic assemblages: bowls for stews, and plates for roasted or fried meats.
Otto's slave cabin data and interpretations have been compared with the findings at another Afro-American site, and a similar status/ceramic/dietary relationship demonstrated. In his study of Black Lucy's Garden, Massachusetts (home of a freed slave, ca. 1815-1845), Baker (1978; 1980) points out that the occupants of Black Lucy's Garden and the Cannon's Point slave sites were both Black and poor, and "...the issue then, is that the patterns visible in the archeological record may be reflecting poverty and not the presence of Afro-Americans ... the similarities in faunal remains and ceramics at the slave and overseer sites may be a function of their shared economic condition..." (Baker 1980:35-36). Otto (1977:100) acknowledges that the relative costs of banded, edged, and undecorated versus transfer-printed earthenwares would provide the most elementary explanation for the difference in wares used by the planter's family and those used by the overseer and the slaves. Deetz (1977:152-153) has also pointed out the difficulty of distinguishing between the influences of poverty and those of cultural preference in the study of historic foodways. Unfortunately, detailed documentation on the relative costs of different nineteenth-century ceramic types was not available at the time of these studies.

A major contribution towards a method for evaluating the relative costs of different nineteenth-century vessel forms and decorative styles has been published recently by George L. Miller. Using a series of price lists representing various points in time, Miller (1980:3) demonstrates that pottery prices were determined by vessel decoration. He calculates index values for vessels bearing different decorations relative to the cost of the same vessel in undecorated creamware ("CC"), the cheapest ware available. For example in 1838, Miller's tables indicate that an 8-inch edge-decorated plate would have cost about one and one-third times as much as an 8-inch undecorated plate. The same plate, if more elaborately hand-painted, would cost two and one-third times as much, and if transfer-printed, about three times as much as the undecorated plate (Miller 1980:26). Further, relative values changed through time, as some styles became less popular, declined in value, and were superseded by other high-priced items. The index values make it possible to calculate average relative costs for the cups, plates, and bowls represented in an archeological assemblage. Miller (1980:36-37) presents an evaluation of the average values of six collections.

In addition to providing a crucial method for the analysis of the relative values of ceramic assemblages, Miller (1980:3) asserts an important theoretical assumption, that "Social status of any commodity is related to how much the object costs." While this simple statement may seem a truism, it is important in pointing to the need for controls on the material factors of commodity costs, availability, and the purchasing power of a site's occupants before more abstract social or personality variables can be demonstrated.
We have compared the Diaz privy ceramics with the assemblages reported by Otto, Baker, and Miller in terms of average index values and vessel form composition (Tables 7-11, Fig. 24). The comparison entailed calculation of average index values for Black Lucy's Garden and the plantation sites as well as the Monterey collection.

As the Diaz ceramics are believed to have been purchased over the period from about 1844 to 1858, index values (Table 7) were derived from several different scales (Miller 1980:26, 30, 33). The 1846 scale was used for most earthenware vessels. Painted plates were not included in this scale, however, and their value was derived from the 1838 list. Index values for "Ironstone" vessels, which do not appear in pre-1850s lists, were taken from the tables for 1856 and 1858. Values for soup plates are those given for 10-inch plates in Miller's "Plates, Twifflers, and Muffins" table. All other plate values used are for 8-inch plates (Miller 1980:27). As no 10-inch transfer-printed plate value is listed in 1846, the 1839 value is used. There is a potential problem in distinguishing plain CC ware (against which costs are calculated) from undecorated "Ironstone or White Granite." For our purpose, only vessels with the color, embossed patterns, paneled rims, and vessel wall thickness characteristic of post-1850 Ironstone are included in the latter group. The remaining plain plates and soup plates, which were assigned CC index values of 1.00, generally have thinner walls than Ironstone, and are similar to pearlware vessel forms (Sussman 1977:109-110). The latter have a slightly bluish cast to the glaze, in contrast to the yellow tint of traditional late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century creamware.

Porcelain and other wares were excluded from calculations when index values for appropriate years were not available.

The Black Lucy's Garden site (Table 8) was occupied about 1815 to 1845 (Baker 1980:31). As the midpoint of this period is 1830, index values for 1833 were used for plates, soup plates, and bowls. As there is no 1833 listing for cups, the 1824 values were used.

In tabulating flatware vessel forms, Otto (1976) lists plates, platters, plates and platters, and soup plates (Tables 9-11). Because of the grouping of plates and platters, it was not possible to render these data directly comparable to the "plates" category presented by Miller, which combines plates and soup plates (George L. Miller, personal communication). We have excluded from the average value calculations the platters which Otto lists separately, but have included the plates and platters group, as well as soup plates. Otto does not indicate whether or not the cups reported were handled; index values for handleless cups were used in our calculations.
### TABLE 7

**Diaz Privy Collection: Average CC Index Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel/Decoration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Index Value/Year (1846 unless noted)</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUPS: (Toby jug excluded; no cost data)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain, Handle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x 1.77</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted, No Handle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x 1.23</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted, Handle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x 1.77</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print, Handle</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x 3.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone, No Handle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x 3.60 (1856)</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, Handle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>x 5.83 (1857)</td>
<td>40.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, Enamel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x 5.83 (1857)</td>
<td>11.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>125.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Index Value = \( \frac{125.67}{35} \approx 3.59 \) per vessel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOWLS: (Chinese porcelain bowl excluded; no cost data)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Plain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x 1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x 1.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Transfer Print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x 2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone, Large Oval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x 2.00 (1858)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Index Value = \( \frac{8.40}{5} = 1.68 \) per vessel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLATES:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x 1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Decorated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x 1.13</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x 2.36 (1838)</td>
<td>14.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted (small)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x 2.10 (1838)</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x 2.63</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x 1.80 (1858)</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUP PLATES (1 porcelain soup plate excluded; no cost data):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x 1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>x 2.20 (1839)</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x 1.69 (1858)</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Index Value = \( \frac{65.26}{34} = 1.92 \) per vessel

Assemblage Average Index Value = \( \frac{199.33}{74} = 2.69 \) per vessel
TABLE 8
Black Lucy's Garden: Average CC Index Values
(Historic Date Range = 1815-1845)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel/Decoration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Index Value/Year (1833 unless noted)</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUPS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00 (1824) =</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.44 (1824) =</td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00 (1824) =</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28.52</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Index Value</strong> = \frac{28.52}{17} = 1.68 per vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 8OWLS:            |    |                                     |         |
| Undecorated       | 10 | 1.00 =                              | 10.00   |
| Mocha, Annular    | 3  | 1.29 =                              | 3.87    |
| Painted           | 2  | 1.71 =                              | 3.42    |
| Transfer Print    | 1  | 2.57 =                              | 2.57    |
| **TOTAL**         | 16 |                                     | **19.86**|
| **Average Index Value** = \frac{19.86}{16} = 1.24 per vessel |

| PLATES:           |    |                                     |         |
| Undecorated       | 4  | 1.00 =                              | 4.00    |
| Edge Decorated    | 9  | 1.40 =                              | 12.60   |
| Edge Decorated    | 2  | 1.40 (1824) =                      | 2.80    |
| (Molded)          |    |                                     |         |
| Transfer Print    | 5  | 3.00 =                              | 15.00   |
| SOUP PLATES:      |    |                                     |         |
| Undecorated       | 2  | 1.00 =                              | 2.00    |
| Edge Decorated    | 3  | 1.29 =                              | 3.87    |
| **TOTAL**         | 25 |                                     | **40.27**|
| **Average Index Value** = \frac{40.27}{25} = 1.61 per vessel |

Assemblage Average Index Value = \frac{88.65}{58} = 1.53 per vessel
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel/Decoration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Index Value (1814)</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUPS (handles not listed; unhandled index values used):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x 1.00</td>
<td>= 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x 1.50</td>
<td>= 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x 3.00</td>
<td>= 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>= 20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Index Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>= 1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOWLS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x 1.00</td>
<td>= 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>x 1.20</td>
<td>= 27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x 1.60</td>
<td>= 6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x 2.80</td>
<td>= 2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>= 41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Index Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>= 1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLATWARE (plates, soup plates, and plates and platters; platters listed separately excluded):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>x 1.00</td>
<td>= 9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Decorated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>x 1.29</td>
<td>= 15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>x 3.43</td>
<td>= 41.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUP PLATES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x 3.33</td>
<td>= 6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>= 72.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Index Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.30</td>
<td>= 2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assemblage Average Index Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>= 1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10
Overseer's House Site, Cannon's Point Plantation: Average CC Index Values
(Mean Ceramic Date = 1820.7; Historic Date Range = 1820s-1860s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel/Decoration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Index Value (1824)</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUPS (handles not listed; unhandled index values used):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Porcelain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Index Value = 29.64 = 1.74 per vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BOWLS:                      |    |                   |         |
| Plain                      | 2  | 1.00              | 2.00    |
| Annular                    | 13 | 1.20              | 15.60   |
| Painted                    | 2  | 1.67              | 3.34    |
| Transfer                   | 1  | 2.50              | 2.50    |
| TOTAL                      | 18 |                   | 23.44   |
| Average Index Value = 23.44 = 1.30 per vessel               |    |                   |         |

| FLATWARE (plates, soup plates, and plates and platters; platters listed separately excluded):     |    |                   |         |
| Plain                                | 16 | 1.00              | 16.00   |
| Edge Decorated                       | 11 | 1.29              | 14.19   |
| Transfer                             | 19 | 3.21              | 60.99   |
| SOUP PLATES:                         |    |                   |         |
| Transfer                             | 1  | 3.22              | 3.22    |
| TOTAL                                | 47 |                   | 94.40   |
| Average Index Value = 94.40 = 2.01 per vessel               |    |                   |         |

Assemblage Average Index Value = \( \frac{147.48}{82} \) = 1.80 per vessel
TABLE 11
Planter's Kitchen Site, Cannon's Point Plantation: Average CC Index Values
(Mean Ceramic Date = 1824.2; Historic Date Range = 1822-1845+)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel/Decoration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Index Value (1824)</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUPS (handles not listed; unhandled index values used):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x 1.00</td>
<td>= 6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>x 1.44</td>
<td>= 11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Transfer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x 3.00</td>
<td>= 6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>x 3.00</td>
<td>= 72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Porcelain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x 4.00</td>
<td>= 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL 107.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Index Value = \(\frac{107.52}{43}\) = 2.50 per vessel

| BOWLS:                                           |
| Plain                                           | 1  | x 1.00            | = 1.00  |
| Annular                                         | 9  | x 1.20            | = 10.80 |
| Painted                                         | 1  | x 1.67            | = 1.67  |
| TOTAL                                           | 11 |                  | TOTAL 13.47 |

Average Index Value = \(\frac{13.47}{11}\) = 1.22 per vessel

| FLATWARE (plates, soup plates, and plates and platters; platters listed separately excluded): |
| Plain                                           | 10 | x 1.00            | = 10.00 |
| Edge Decorated                                   | 12 | x 1.29            | = 15.48 |
| Willow Transfer                                  | 5  | x 2.86            | = 14.30 |
| Transfer                                         | 84 | x 3.21            | = 269.64 |
| SOUP PLATES:                                     |
| Transfer                                         | 1  | x 3.22            | = 3.22  |
| TOTAL                                           | 112|                  | TOTAL 312.64 |

Average Index Value = \(\frac{312.64}{112}\) = 2.79 per vessel

Assemblage Average Index Value = \(\frac{433.63}{166}\) = 2.61 per vessel
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The calculation of average index values for the Cannon's Point Plantation assemblage is further complicated by uncertainty regarding the date of deposition. Otto calculated mean ceramic formula dates ranging from 1816.5 to 1824.2; he acknowledges discrepancies between these dates and the considerably later dates of probable deposition (Otto 1976:75, 90, 96). In the absence of more definitive information, we have calculated average index values using the columns on Miller's tables (1814, 1824) that are closest to the mean ceramic dates reported by Otto. Vessel/decoration groups for which no index values are given in those years were deleted. More accurate dating and inclusion of deleted vessels would probably result in slightly lower average index values, as most of the decorated forms present declined in value relative to undecorated vessels between 1800 and 1850 (cf. Miller 1980:26, 30, 33).

Results

The data and results of average index value calculations for the Diaz privy, Black Lucy's Garden, and Cannon's Point Plantation assemblages have been summarized (Tables 7-11). Separate average index values for cups, bowls, and plates, as well as an assemblage average, are given for each collection. These assemblages, along with data from the six sites reported by Miller (1980:14, 36-37), have been plotted in the order of their average values, with relative frequencies of cups, bowls, and plates indicated (Fig. 24). The data indicate that the Diaz assemblage is the most valuable of those analyzed.

Discussion

Comparison of the value and composition of the Diaz assemblage with those of collections representing other sociocultural groups suggests that both economic and cultural (i.e., both class and ethnic) preferences are reflected in the archaeological record. The high average index values for the planter's kitchen and the Diaz privy material correctly identify the households of individuals known from written records to be members of their local social and economic elite. A marked difference between these two collections is the exceedingly high value of the Diaz teacups and low to moderate value of other Diaz vessels, contrasted with the high values for all planter's kitchen teaware and flatware (Fig. 24).

Diaz was a man of some status in the 1840s, and, at least temporarily, owned a substantial amount of real estate (see Historical Background: the Manuel Diaz Household, above). As alcalde for 1846 and a prominent citizen for at least a few years thereafter, he would in all likelihood have perceived himself and his family as having to maintain a definite social role, with active involvement in the life of the community. Given marketing study precepts that "the kinds of things a person will or will not buy are strongly related to his class membership" (Martineau 1958:121), it is also probable that the Diaz family was anxious to demonstrate its status in terms of the goods they purchased.
The historic records are less than clear as to how Diaz's apparent status and wealth translated into disposable cash income. Many Californios who had owned large tracts of land prior to United States occupation lost their real estate to foreigners through mortgages entered into because of the need for cash. We suggest that the high expenditures represented by the cups in the Diaz collection reflect a concern for maintaining an image befitting a respected merchant and prominent citizen, while the cheaper plates and bowls represent a realistic, frugal family trying to maximize the purchasing power of a limited income by getting by with cheaper, less ornate (but by no means entirely plain) dishes for everyday use. A pattern of expenditure for cups similar to the Diaz vessel pattern is apparent for five of the other assemblages considered, for which the average index values of the cups exceed those of the other vessel form classes shown (Fig. 24).

The Diaz cups are not only costly, but also comprise a substantial portion of the ceramic assemblage (Table 12); 50% of all vessels recovered are classified as "tea and coffee ware." In the Black Lucy's Garden collection, teaware also "...constitutes a substantial 38% of the ceramic assemblage" (Baker 1978:113). The teaware values are weighted, however, as the patterns on many of the saucers match those of the cups; cups and saucers were probably purchased as sets. Comparison of the cup frequencies (saucers excluded) (Fig. 24) shows that cups make up a high percentage of the vessels reported for several other sites in addition to the Diaz privy and Black Lucy's Garden: Frontier Log Cabin, Tenant Farmer (late), and Glass Worker's House.

It is suggested that the Diaz vessel pattern (high average values of tea and coffee wares relative to other vessel forms) represents status spending; high frequencies of tea and coffee wares in some assemblages perhaps indicate high levels of sociability. It is possible that the absence of costly flatware matching the cups and saucers reflects an emphasis on guests for tea rather than for formal dinner parties. The opposite pattern in the planter's kitchen assemblage, where tea and coffee wares occur in lower frequency and costly flatware is heavily represented, may be accounted for by the rural setting of the plantation. It seems likely that guests, coming from greater distances than in an urban situation, would have been invited for complete meals rather than tea alone.

Following Otto's lead, we have compared the relative proportions of plates, soup plates, and bowls in the Diaz collection with these ratios in the other assemblages considered (Table 14). Teaware and table service frequencies have been excluded, to isolate those tableware vessels with a direct functional relationship to the different dietary patterns correlated by Otto with variations in ceramic distribution. In the frequency of bowls alone, the Diaz assemblage appears most comparable to the planter's kitchen material; while the overseer's house, Miller's sites, and the Afro-American assemblages demonstrate successively higher frequencies of bowls. Soup plates, however, are functionally more similar to bowls than to the flatware with which they were grouped by Otto; the same
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Vessels</th>
<th>Slave Cabin</th>
<th>Overseer's House</th>
<th>Planter's Kitchen</th>
<th>Black Lucy's Garden</th>
<th>Oiaz Privy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>(135)</td>
<td>(309)</td>
<td>(113)</td>
<td>(118)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Slave Cabin</th>
<th>Overseer's House</th>
<th>Planter's Kitchen</th>
<th>Black Lucy's Garden</th>
<th>Oiaz Privy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea and Coffee Ware</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Vessels</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Ware</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Ware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and Unidentified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>99%</strong></td>
<td><strong>101%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13
Functional Classification of Feature 23 Tableware by Decorative Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serving Vessels</th>
<th>Platter</th>
<th>Dish, Lid</th>
<th>Large Bowl</th>
<th>Pitcher</th>
<th>Creamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Ware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Wares</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eating Vessels</th>
<th>Soup Plate</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Cup</th>
<th>Saucer</th>
<th>Small Bowl</th>
<th>Eggcup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Ware</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Wares</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transfer Ware 59</th>
<th>Porcelain 14</th>
<th>Other Wares 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
liquid-based food could be served in either a bowl or a soup plate, but not on a dinner plate. The functional breakdown of several assemblages changes dramatically when soup plates are regrouped with bowls (Table 14, Fig. 25).

In the Cannon's Point Plantation assemblages, soup plates make up only about 1% to 3% of this tableware, but in the Diaz and Black Lucy's Garden collections, they form a substantial part of the assemblage. Soup plates comprise about 38% of the Diaz tableware and about 11% of comparable items from Black Lucy's Garden. Unfortunately, soup plates are not itemized by Miller.

The combined frequencies of the functionally similar bowls and soup plates are close for both the Afro-American and the Diaz assemblages (Fig. 25). In these three collections, the combined bowls and soup plates make up 50% to 56% of the tableware (teaware and table service vessels excluded). The major difference between the Afro-American and the Diaz assemblages is the higher frequency of expensive transfer-printed soup plates in the latter (Table 13), with a greater number of cheaper but functionally similar annular bowls in the former. Black Lucy's Garden yielded a higher frequency of soup plates than the slave site, but less than the Diaz privy. Again, the soup plates from Black Lucy's Garden were cheap plain and edge-decorated vessels rather than the expensive transfer-printed ware present in the Diaz collection. We suggest that these three assemblages all reflect in vessel form the dietary similarity of liquid-based meals, with stylistic differences in wares predominantly reflecting the purchasing power and status of the consumers who occupied the sites.

Baker (1980:34-36), Otto (1977:100), and Deetz (1977:152-153), as noted above, have acknowledged the possibility that the patterns they observed among Afro-American assemblages may be the result of poverty rather than ethnic identity. We have found that high concentrations of functionally similar vessels can occur in both low value/low status Afro-American assemblages and high value/high status Mexican-American collections. Evidently factors other than wealth or poverty are involved in this aspect of the archeological record. Cost is of course a basic limiting factor in determining who will be most able to purchase which commodities, but it is obvious that preferences shaped by other social realities are involved in the consumer's decision-making process. Ethnic or class food preferences or the character of the available food resources appear to be key factors in determining variation in the functional (i.e., vessel form) composition of different assemblages. Status, on the other hand, can be reflected in functionally similar assemblages by different decorative treatments, which are closely related to relative vessel costs (cf. Miller 1980:3).

As suggested above, food supply rather than (or in addition to) cultural preferences and cost may account for the observed differences in the assemblages discussed. The availability of and/or changing preferences for professionally butchered meat may have been a factor in determining the plate/bowl-plus-soup plate frequencies. Comparison
TABLE 14
Relative Proportions of Bowls, Plates, and Soup Plates
Ranked by Average Assemblage Index Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Assemblage</th>
<th>Average Index Value</th>
<th>Bowls</th>
<th>Soup Plates</th>
<th>Subtotal: Bowls &amp; Soup Plates</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaz Privy</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>5/12%</td>
<td>15/38%</td>
<td>20/50%</td>
<td>20/50%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planter's Kitchen</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>12/9%</td>
<td>3/2%</td>
<td>15/11%</td>
<td>123/89%**</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker Tavern</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>10/38%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16/62%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Worker's House</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17/28%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>44/72%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseer's House</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>19/27%</td>
<td>1/1%</td>
<td>20/28%</td>
<td>51/72%**</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave Cabin</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>35/48%</td>
<td>2/3%</td>
<td>37/51%</td>
<td>36/49%**</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Factory</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>8/20%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>33/80%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Lucy's Garden</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>21/46%</td>
<td>5/11%</td>
<td>26/56%</td>
<td>20/43%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Farmer (late)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>4/17%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>19/83%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Farmer (early)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>5/38%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8/62%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier Log Cabin</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>8/29%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>20/71%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Soup plates not itemized for six sites reported by Miller (1980); probably included with plates if present.

** Otto's plate counts may include some platters.
Figure 25. Relative frequencies of plates, bowls, and soup plates in five archaeological assemblages reported by: a) Otto 1976, 1977, 1980; and b) Baker 1978, 1980. Miller's 1980 data are excluded because soup plates are not itemized.
of the early and late tenant farmer assemblages shows a shifting emphasis from bowls to plates through time, perhaps indicating increasing availability of saw-cut meat. The frontier cabin site has a fairly high bowl frequency, suggesting low availability of professionally butchered meat.

The faunal material from the Diaz privy seems to indicate traditional Euroamerican sawed meat cuts commonly associated with flatware, rather than the chopped bone that would be expected in light of the ceramics present and studies of other Mexican-Californio faunal collections (Schulz 1981a; Gust 1982). Presumably, the faunal material recovered from the Diaz privy reflects deposition over a relatively short time span, which is tentatively placed in the late 1850s. Much of the ceramic assemblage, however, was manufactured in the late 1840s and early 1850s. We know that an Irish-American butcher was in Monterey by at least 1850, and a "New Butcher Shop" is shown on an 1847 drawing of Monterey, although the owner is not identified (Van Nostrand 1968:76).

We hypothesize that a shift in eating habits over time is reflected by the contrast between the Diaz faunal material and the ceramic vessel forms present, and that this shift is related to the increasing availability of and preference for meat butchered in the Euroamerican saw-cut tradition. The soup plates and bowls are seen as representing the earlier California foodways, while plates reflect newer preferences after saw-cut meat became more readily available. Bowls and soup plates would occur in higher frequencies in earlier years, with an increase in flatware as use of saw-butchered meat became more common. To test this hypothesis, separate mean ceramic dates were calculated for marked soup plates and marked plates. Twelve soup plates and one bowl yielded a mean date of 1845.54 (s.d. = 3.05 years), while the mean date for the seven marked flat plates is about four years later (1849.57; s.d. = 2.94; see Chronology, above, for discussion of calculations). The soup plates would have been among the earliest vessels purchased by the Diaz family, presumably between Manuel's marriage to Louisa in 1843 and about 1850, during which time traditional Californio butchering and eating habits were in common practice in Monterey. The terminus post quem of the marked soup plates is 1845; that is, all of them could have been purchased in 1845 or earlier. The plates are newer on the average, and were being purchased until at least 1856, presumably for use with the increasingly popular and/or available sawed meat cuts.

We have found no historic sources that specifically refer to the use of soup plates by Californios, although frequent references by early travelers to stewed meats, guisado and olla podrida (Wise 1849:61; Simpson 1930:61; Dakin 1939:72; Revere 1947:218; Townsend 1970:110) strongly suggest that bowls or soup plates must have been in common use. The strongest indication that this was the case -- a description of a supper with the Castro family in 1847 -- refers in fact specifically to "plates," but in a context that indicates that deeper vessels must be meant:
At length...several plates were placed, & the smoking [sheep] ribs appeared fresh from the fire. They were divided into small portions & distributed on the plates by the good lady....The mutton was very sweet & the corn delicious, the first I have tasted in the country. When we had done justice to these two dishes, the plates were removed, washed by the landlady & her daughter & sent back filled with a stew of squash, called here Calabasa, which was indeed very excellent; to eat this we had iron spoons. This was followed by a dish of stewed dried pears & the meal closed with coffee in large bowls with large iron spoons (Lyman 1925:228-229).

The shifting emphasis from soup plates to flatware through time observed in the Diaz privy collection seems representative of a trend anticipated previously by Costello (1979:56-57), based on her work at Mission San Antonio de Padua. In discussing platos, "...the deep, carinated 'soup plate' form of the Spanish all-purpose serving vessel," Costello suggests that "...plate forms would increasingly dominate the table wares, and plato and bowl forms would decline in number as the Californios and Native Americans were gradually anglicized during the 19th century...this hypothesized change in table wares may reflect the general cultural transition of Alta California."

In addition to cost and status consideration, the selection of bowls rather than soup plates for similar foods may be related to eating etiquette and available furniture. The wide, shallow soup plates would be difficult to balance without spillage if hand-held; presumably, they were designed for use at a table. Deeper, narrower common bowls would have been easier to hold or carry away from the table. In this, the annular bowl is seen as more analogous to the Chinese rice bowl, held during eating. An early photograph of a British rural scene (Bronowski 1973:260-261) shows a man, woman, and child eating while seated in front of a doorway. The man and the child each hold an annular bowl on their lap with a single large tinware tankard and an earthenware(?) plate on a stool in the doorway behind them. Eating this simply was probably standard for many groups, including the slaves on the Cannon's Point Plantation as well as the British rural poor. Further analysis of historic foodways should take furniture and its availability as well as commodity costs and food preference into consideration.

Artifacts and Ethnicity

Much emphasis has been placed in recent years on the explanation of archeological artifact patterns in terms of the ethnic identity of the site's inhabitants, and apparently artifacts and artifact patterns clearly attributable to the Chinese and possibly to Afro-American ethnic groups can be identified archeologically (e.g., Briggs 1974; Greenwood 1978; Otto 1980; Fradkin 1980; Baker 1980). It is not always possible, however, to discern the ethnic identity of a site's
inhabitants through the remaining artifacts alone, and other anthropologists have pointed with distress at a proliferation of studies of modern American ethnic groups "suggesting a continuing ethnicity...although considerable emerging data indicate the contrary" (Patterson 1979:104). Basham and DeGroot (1977:423) acknowledge that a sense of ethnic identity is real for many modern Americans, but suggest that the importance of ethnicity "seems greatly exaggerated by the recent trend to rush the slightest symbols of ethnic distinctiveness into print to prove that we have not really blended into a common pot." We feel that the question of archeological ethnicity should be approached cautiously, as should the problems inherent in defining and understanding urban "cultures."

In the present study, we have clear documentation of the ethnic identities of the individuals presumed responsible for the deposition of the artifacts considered: Manuel Diaz was a Mexican citizen from the state of Nayarit who moved to Mexican California in the late 1830s. His wife was a California-born resident of Mexican descent. In spite of the certainty with which we can identify the national origin and cultural background of the members of the household, the more obvious characteristics of the artifact assemblage recovered give little indication of the ethnic identity of the inhabitants. Virtually nothing in the collection was clearly of Californian or Mexican origin; most artifacts were of English, French, or United States manufacture. The ceramic vessel forms and styles present are the same ones commonly recovered at middle-class Euroamerican sites of the mid-nineteenth century. In terms of value, the Diaz ceramics represent a fairly high average expenditure, as would be expected for a member of a local social and commercial elite.

The presence of a ceramic pattern, Texian Campagne, commemorating a Mexican military defeat would initially seem to be negative evidence for the presence of a family of Mexican heritage. Acknowledging the possibility that the presence of these vessels may be fortuitous, Larkin's observations that Diaz "...is aware that his country cannot remain as it is," and "prefers the United States to any European Nation" (Hammond 1953, IV:326) make the presence of the Texian Campagne pattern somewhat less incongruous. Many other members of the Californian commercial and bureaucratic elite also favored an American takeover. The presence of the Texian Campagne pattern may reflect a triumph of class interests over more traditional ethnic or national concerns in commodity consumption as well as politics. It is possible, of course, that these vessels had little or no symbolic meaning, or that they were acquired by another member of the household.

Although the most obvious attributes of the Diaz privy collection seem to be more clearly related to class than to ethnic variables, we believe that we have identified discrete aspects that are attributable to cultural factors other than class or wealth alone. We have already suggested that the high frequency of soup plates among the oldest vessels in the collection is reflective of earlier foodways that emphasized the preparation of liquid-based meals, with a shift to professionally butchered meat and the predominance of plates during
the later part of the period. Even this pattern, however, was obscured by factors, such as wealth, which are related to class membership. Soup plates were initially grouped with the costly transfer-printed plates to which they are stylistically similar, effectively masking a strong functional similarity to other assemblages representing comparable foodways but different classes. The reason for the hypothesized change in eating habits is not clear. Perhaps the shift was away from a preferred "traditional" diet to a more "modern" one, stimulated by a desire to acculturate to the customs of the new dominant group. On the other hand, the apparently altered diet may simply reflect a change in food resources: meat butchered in traditional Euroamerican fashion may have become the only readily available meat during the 1850s, with the influx of non-Mexicans to California.

The hypothesized explanations of the observed archeological patterns have dictated a closer look at the realities of class and ethnic identity among the Mexican-Californios of the 1840s and 1850s, and at concepts of socioeconomic class and culture which we believe are vital to understanding the archeological and historical records.

Census Studies

A key source of historic social information is the United States census, and several studies using these data are relevant to an understanding of the Diaz family's place within its socioeconomic milieu. Nostrand (1975) analyzed the 1850 census in an attempt to determine the number, distribution, and migration patterns of Mexican-Americans in the mid-nineteenth century. He found that there were about 9,178 Mexican-Americans in California in 1850, comprising 7.2% of the state's total population. Monterey County was the residence of 1,383 Mexican-Americans, who comprised over 50% of the people living in the region. In the town of Monterey, they made up 73.9% of the population. Only the Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo regions had comparable proportions of Mexican-Americans in their resident populations at that time.

One census study deals specifically with Monterey (Tucey and Hornbeck 1976). This research, which uses both Mexican and United States census data, investigated urban changes as reflected in the occupational structure and the granting of solares (city lots) in Monterey between 1836 and 1850. During this time, the number of merchants grew from 5% to 10% of the labor force. A high percentage of the merchants were born outside the state in both years (1836 = 61%; 1850 = 64%). While Tucey and Hornbeck (1976:3) attribute the increasing occupational diversity they observed to the "...large influx of skilled and professional Anglo settlers after 1836...", it should be noted that Manuel Diaz, a Mexican merchant, would appear to fall in the "Born Out of State" group, which the authors apparently equate with Anglo immigrants. Care should be taken in such assessments, particularly in view of the substantial amount of trade between California and ports on the west coast of Mexico and South America.
Tucey and Hornbeck (1976) also compared the size and number of house lots granted to Anglos and Mexicans between 1835 and 1850. By 1850, Anglos were being granted considerably larger house lots than Mexicans, even though the number of lots issued to each group was similar. "Another dramatic difference was the rate at which Anglo and Mexican residents acquired land, with Mexicans obtaining land at a more gradual rate than Anglos" (Tucey and Hornbeck 1976:5).

The Diaz census data have been compared with information from two other census studies which provide a detailed look at social diversity and change in Los Angeles between 1850 and 1870. This work, by Laslett (1975; 1977), entails a statistical analysis of the correlations between various household types (e.g., "simple nuclear family," "extended family," etc.) with independent social variables (age, sex, ethnicity, real and personal estate values, occupation, and birthplace). Laslett also compares changes in family structure and these variables between 1850 and 1870, and proposes sociological explanations for the observed differences. A more recent census study of Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles uses methods and familial terms which differ slightly from those employed by Laslett (Griswold del Castillo 1979:183-184). In this work, conclusions similar to Laslett's have been reached regarding historic socio-economic trends, although some of these trends are interpreted differently.

While Monterey and Los Angeles are widely separated geographically, both communities were then composed primarily of Mexican-Americans (Monterey 73.9%, Los Angeles 76.4%; Nostrand 1975:389). This is probably due in large part to the fact that both areas were removed from the commercial and population centers that sprang up with the influx of gold seekers. Although use of the Los Angeles studies as a baseline against which to compare the Diaz data is less than ideal, there were enough similarities between the two communities to make this comparison valuable.

Census data are organized in terms of numbered households, with individuals listed in order according to their relationship to the household head. Thus, information on composition of both the family and the larger household (if nonfamily residents are present) is available. Fortunately, the household is also one of the basic analytic units in the study of archeological material, and it is often feasible to attribute a specific archeological deposit to a known period and dwelling unit. The family and household can also be viewed as basic consuming units, with decisions about commodity purchases, which ultimately produce much of the artifactual record, being made on the basis of the needs of the living group as a whole. It is usually impossible to attribute archeological materials to specific members of the households, thus precluding study of the complex internal processes by which those decisions and purchases are made.

In terms of household types, the primary focus of Laslett's work, the Diaz household appears to have changed substantially through time. In 1850, it included the Diaz nuclear family, three additional relatives, and three others (Table 1). In Laslett's classification scheme, this would constitute an example of the complex "extended-family household." In her study, however, only members sharing the last name.
of the household head were so classified; the Diaz relatives would not have been identified from a study of the census alone, as their surnames differed from that of head-of-household.

In interpreting her analysis of the 1850 census, Laslett observes that:

The occupation and value of the land owned by the household head are strongly related to the existence of an extended family household in its unadjusted form. Agriculturalists and farmers are most likely to head such households, as are the wealthiest group of landowners (Laslett 1975:124).

Comparison of the $15,000 value of Diaz's real estate holdings in 1850 with the Los Angeles information clearly affiliates him with the "wealthiest group of landowners" (Fig. 26). In Los Angeles in 1850, only 16% of household heads are listed as owning real estate valued at $3,000 or more (Laslett 1977:274, Note 10; 276). The distribution of Monterey real estate holdings indicates values ranging from nothing to $60,000. Diaz, with holdings valued at $15,000, falls within the wealthiest 6% of household heads listed in the 1850 census.

Figure 26. Values of real estate holdings of heads of households in Monterey, California (from United States Census, 1850). Rural county households, hotels, and military garrison excluded. No real estate holdings indicated for 114 (60.6%) of the 188 heads of households tabulated.
While age and sex of the head of the household are also strongly correlated with extended-family organization, Laslett found that ethnic affiliation is not:

It is also interesting to note that ethnicity is not strongly related to the formation of an extended family household. Whether or not there are differing cultural preferences for varying types of family organization between ethnic groups, it seems that certain conditions must exist for an extended family structure to be a practice rather than a simple preference, and it is only when such conditions exist that extended households are possible (Laslett 1975:125).

White Laslett's work indicates that some measure of wealth is a precondition for an extended family household structure, Griswold del Castillo (1979:99-100) argues that the support system provided by the extended family itself gives its members an economic advantage. The extended family is thus presented in these studies as both a product of and a means to economic success. Although the question of primary causation is difficult to address, the clear association between economic success and family structure emphasizes the importance of the family's standing in determining the individual's expectations and likelihood of success.

The assessment rolls for Monterey County for 1851 (Elliott and Moore 1881:104-105) suggest that Diaz's economic position had deteriorated somewhat even by that time. Manuel Dias (sic) is listed twice, with a combined worth of $10,516. This value is exceeded by about 16.5% of the other listings. Other individuals are also listed more than once, presumably indicating a separation of private and business holdings. Whether the assessment rolls are directly comparable to the census records is open to question. The assessment data provide an independent quantitative indication, however, that Diaz was a member of the upper economic stratum of Monterey County residents in the early 1850s, and suggest that the economic decline which resulted in his bankruptcy in 1855 had already begun by 1851.

The 1852 California state census indicates that the Diaz household had changed to a "simple family plus other" configuration. All previous residents other than the Diaz nuclear family had moved, and had been replaced by four presumably unrelated Indian women and children. Unfortunately, the 1852 census does not include real or personal estate values.

Laslett's study employs anthropological terminology to categorize the resident groupings found in the census. It is important to note that these groupings may reflect a relatively short-term living arrangement rather than a traditional extended family structure. In the Diaz case, although several relatives are listed in the household, their disappearance from the 1852 and subsequent censuses suggests that the
1850 data may simply represent a household of boarders ("simple family plus other"). Housing was in short supply and rents high in Monterey in the late 1840s (cf. Taylor 1850, I:139-140), so temporarily sharing quarters with relatives may have been a short-term convenience rather than a long-term commitment to an extended family kinship structure.

By 1860, only Manuel and Luisa Diaz were listed in the census; the more complex household types indicated in 1850 and 1852 had been replaced by a simple family household. Although the Los Angeles studies do not deal with the 1860 census, Laslett concludes from her study of the 1850 census that:

This type of [simple family] household organization, characterizing the poorer elements of the population in terms of capital attributes or occupational skills, seems to provide empirical confirmation of Goode's observation (1963) that relative affluence is required to organize and maintain more complex as compared with nuclear family households (Laslett 1975:122).

The 1860 census values Diaz's real estate at only $1,500, or one-tenth of its value a decade earlier, and we know he had lost his house and other real property in the interim. Diaz's situation -- allowing for the caveat noted above -- thus seems to reflect Laslett's generalization, with the household structure becoming smaller and less complex as the family's economic stature declined between 1850 and 1860.

The Monterey census data and the framework of Laslett's study provide some sense of the relative position of the Diaz household in terms of composition, structure, and property. The Los Angeles analysis treats ethnicity as a single independent variable, however, making analysis of diversity within different ethnic groups impossible. For example, the proportions of Mexican-Americans heading different types of households are given, but it is not possible to classify the same subpopulation by the value of real estate holdings or by occupation. Using these studies alone, it is not possible to investigate the socioeconomic diversity within the Mexican-American community.

The role of ethnicity in determining "success" rates in San Jose between 1860 and 1870 has been studied by Matthews (1976), with success or failure measured in terms of occupations and property values. Matthews (1976:314) concludes that "For our purposes, the most significant finding is that for every group except the Californios and Latin Americans ethnicity was not relevant to success," but points out that "It would seem that class may have been more salient to their lack of success than ethnicity. The Californios and Latin Americans lacked financial resources, and, for whatever reasons, they were absent from those occupations which provided a ladder of success" (Matthews 1976:317).
Stratification Within the Mexican-Californio Community

Even though some historic records depict a fairly homogeneous agrarian population, other accounts suggest a substantial diversity within the nineteenth-century Mexican-American community. The popular image of the California ranchero is of a patriarch heading an extended family, who was land-rich but generally poor in terms of good business sense. Californios were often viewed as a leisurely, unambitious lot who thrived simply by gathering the fruits of their land. The vision of vast expanses of free land, free Indian labor, the rapid growth of the hide and tallow trade, and the resultant influx of foreign goods, Yankees, and Yankee knowhow into this pastoral scene is a vision of universal prosperity, the "Halcyon Days" of Thomas Larkin (Pitt 1971:14).

On closer inspection, however, it becomes apparent that poverty as well as "gracious living in a good land" (Egan 1969:40) was a part of the California scene in the 1840s. For example, Walter Colton, in his diary entry for January 17, 1847, describes a death scene in "one of the little huts sprinkled around the skirts of Monterey":

On entering, I found on a straw pallet a mother whom disease had wasted to a mere shadow, but whose sufferings were now nearly over... A slight motion drew my attention to another corner of the hut, where I discovered, in the dim twilight of the place, a little boy lying on a mat... Directing the women where to procure grave clothes at the expense of the Alcalde's office, I wended my way home... (Colton 1860:156).

Even earlier accounts of California by foreigners allude to dramatic extremes of poverty and wealth in the lives of different segments of the Californio population. Zenas Leonard, an American trapper who visited California in 1833-1834, described the obviously distasteful way of life of the common Californian in some detail. After discussing the conditions of the poor, he went on to write:

But the wealthy, who it may be supposed, constitute the aristocracy of this country, appear to live at ease, surrounded with all the comforts of `life, are entirely independent and unconnected with the common people (Leonard 1978:167).

The same dichotomy was observed by later American visitors and by upper-class Californios themselves, who went so far as to create a myth of distinct racial origin, attributing to themselves a pure Castillian heritage and to the lower class a mixed Indian and Spanish ancestry (Servin 1973; Hughes 1975; Miranda 1981).
The literature relevant to the history of the Diaz family and particularly to the events surrounding the American takeover of California provides additional references to social stratification within the Californio community (e.g., Arnaz 1878; Dana 1911; Farnham 1947). These are nonquantitative, but demonstrate the conflicting interests of different groups of Californios with reference to the political events of the 1840s and 1850s. We believe that these accounts suggest a well-defined socioeconomic class reality as well as subjective class consciousness on the part of these groups. In some ways, qualitative accounts provide more insight into the realities of class structure than do quantitative property values, in that the concept of social class embodies much more than simply the amount of property owned by an individual or household.

The potential economic benefits of the conquest of California to commercial interests in the United States included acquisition of ports on the Pacific (Graebner 1963:47-54), as well as access to a major source of hides and tallow and a realm for American settlement. A key element among prewar American efforts in the region was the attempt to convince the California ruling class of the beneficial nature of annexation. Who comprised the California ruling class?

Probably the clearest identification and description of the elite of California prior to the United States takeover is found in the "Description of California" submitted to the Department of State in 1846 by Thomas Larkin, the American consul in Monterey. This report contains a brief description of the personalities, occupations, property holdings, and influence of "the principle [sic] persons (Natives and Foreigners) of wealth, information, or influence in California," and specifically evaluates these individuals' feelings with regard to an American annexation of the territory (Hammond 1953, IV:302-334). Larkin's report strongly suggests that he, and presumably at least some of those he discusses, had a clearly formed picture of the socioeconomic hierarchy of California. It is significant that many of these men favored a United States takeover in spite of their own ethnicity or nationality. It seems likely that these responses were based on the economic interests of this class, with ethnicity and nationalism contributing relatively little to the decision-making process.

Although Larkin's biographical sketches deal primarily with the political leanings of the upper class, he was well aware that the Californios did not constitute a homogeneous population, whose interests were identical with those of the "principle persons." Unfortunately, he had much less to say about the feelings of the other nine thousand or so individuals. Larkin wrote that:

> A considerable portion of the Californios are well aware, that the land and property would increase in value, by change of Flags! Some are quietly waiting the result. Some are indifferent on the subject, and others against it (Hammond 1953, IV:307).
And several pages later:

There are many in Office and enjoying a salary, who are convinced that a favourable change would enhance the value of their lands in such a manner that their salary would be a secondary object. Those who have but little or no property would make exertions to continue as they are (Hammond 1953, IV:314).

The final sentence was deleted from a later copy of the report (Hammond 1953, IV:314, note 3).

Earlier, during the Fremont episode, Larkin demonstrated his awareness that the interests of the common people were not as predictable or compatible with those of the United States as were those of the ruling elite. In a letter to Fremont on March 8, 1846, he warned of General Castro's forces and indicated that "many of the common people will join through choice others being so ordered by the General...the expressions of the common people under the passions of the moment, breathe vengeance in every form against you" (California Historical Society 1924:280-281).

Newspaper accounts during the months following the American takeover of the province also allude to the diverse sentiments of Californios to the new political situation and the Mexican War:

There are in California, amongst the natives or Mexican subjects, two different classes of persons as regards their ideas of, and their deportment in the present state of affairs. The first of these classes are those who are in possession of a considerable amount of property, and have a just idea of the great benefits which must result to them on a permanent change of government taking place. The second class consists of all those very depraved characters, who having nothing at present to lose are wreckless [sic] of the future, and are always ready at any moment to join any party that may be got up, either for the purpose of plunder or mere riot.

That for the most part the people here spoken of, in the first class, have not only maintained a commendable neutrality, but that their every word and action has been in favor of the cause of the United States of America is strictly true.

The second class of people here spoken of, as we said before, have nothing to lose, they suffer nothing, they are brought up from their infancy in the camp, and it is well known that even when travelling for pleasure, or away from home on any frivolous [sic] pretext, that they prefer sleeping
under a tree to sleeping in a house, and as long as
they can get a string of fat beef to roast on the
hot coals of a camp fire, they are better satisfied,
than they would be sitting at a table with every
luxury in the world placed before them (The
Californian, Jan. 16, 1847:2; cf. Dec. 5, 1846:2).

Other accounts of the American takeover record similar observations of
the common people's reaction to these political events. According to
a visitor to Monterey in 1849,

I do not believe...that the majority of the native
[i.e., Californio] population rejoices at the
national change which has come over the country. On
the contrary, there is much jealousy and bitter
feeling among the uneducated classes... They
witnessed the immediate extinction of their own
political importance, and the introduction of a new
language, new customs, and new laws. It is not
strange that many of them should be opposed to us at
heart, even while growing wealthy and prosperous
under the marvelous change which has been wrought by
the enterprise of our citizens. Nevertheless we
have many warm friends... The intelligent and
influential faction which aided us during the war is
still faithful, and many who were previously
discontented, are now loudest in their rejoicing...
(Taylor 1850:144-145).

Another writer in the 1870s observed that:

The native [sic] Californians, especially the lower
classes, never took kindly to the stars and
stripes. Their youth were taught from the very
cradle to look upon the American government as that
of a foreign nation (George Beers, cited in Acuña

Although Californio resistance to the American occupation forces is at
times downplayed, some historians have argued that the anti-American
sentiment and resultant active resistance were of greater depth and
breadth than are usually depicted. Both anti-American feeling and
internal conflict within the Mexican-American community during the
late 1850s are discussed by Acuña:

The pages of El Clamor Publico [Los Angeles Spanish
language newspaper, 1855-1859] also reveal a schism
between the Establishment Mexicans and the
lower-caste Mexicans, or cholos. The oppression and
its attendant discrimination was obvious; however
many of the elites continued to work within the
system and cooperated with the Anglo-American to
frustrate, not only resistance movements, but the
Mexicans' justifiable demands... (Acuña 1972:113).
Both qualitative and quantitative sources indicate a substantial social diversity within the Mexican-American population of California. Did this diversity constitute a true socioeconomic class stratification of that society, or are the differing lifeways and attitudes merely based on highly particularistic historic factors? Addressing this question calls for a closer examination of the concept of social class.

While social stratification is universal within modern cultures, concepts of stratification or class used by different analysts have varied widely. In terms of evolutionary perspective, the simplest definition of stratification is that "members of the same sex and equivalent age status do not have equal access to the basic resources that sustain life" (Fried 1967:186). Such a definition, of course, is applicable in both relatively simple and industrial economies:

In complex societies...technological and economic conditions are such that most transactions occur in ways and locations seemingly remote from the production of basic subsistence consumables, but in simple societies the problem is one of getting some kind of access to the sources of food. The obtaining of such access requires payments or labor outputs in excess of those required of people with direct access rights. Indeed, it is precisely at this juncture that the economic phenomenon of exploitation is born as the person with impeded rights of access must buy this right with a share of his labor... (Fried 1967:188-189).

The advantage of such a definition is that it facilitates both diachronic and cross-cultural analysis. Since stratification is defined in behavioral terms, it avoids the historical pitfalls provided by the static and subjectivist approaches to social class common in studies of twentieth-century American society (cf. Coser 1956:24-25; Thernstrom 1964:225-239).

The approach used here, of course, derives from Marx's view that social classes were the product of conflict relationships based on differential access to property, or more specifically, to the means of production, which permits one class to dominate and control another. The resultant "relations of production" rather than physical property itself are thus seen as the key factors in the evolution of social class and class consciousness.

Importantly, Marx points out that the influences of property relations are by no means limited to a narrowly defined sphere of economic behavior:

On the different forms of property and the social conditions of existence a whole superstructure of various and peculiarly formed sentiments, illusions, modes of thought, and conceptions of life is built.
The whole class creates and forms these out of its material foundations and the corresponding social relations (Dahrendorf 1959:14; cf. Marx 1969:47).

If this analysis is accepted, archeologists, to the degree that they attempt to perceive the "sentiments, illusions, modes of thought, and conceptions of life" -- or, more specifically, the resultant behavior patterns -- of a site's inhabitants, must also understand the "material foundations and corresponding social relations" of those same people. In effect, Marx has identified the presence of "class culture," that is, entire complexes of social roles, customs, and institutions shared by individuals drawn together by their common class situation rather than by the more traditional common kinship or ethnic background.

Predictably, Marx's writings, having a political purpose, incorporate both subjective and objective identification of class relationships. Dahrendorf, in discussing class and class conflict in industrial society, quotes Marx as follows:

In so far as millions of families live under economic conditions which separate their way of life, their interests, and their education from those of other classes and oppose them to these, they constitute a class,

and:

In so far as the identity of their interests does not produce a community, national association, and political organization - they do not constitute a class (Dahrendorf 1959:13; cf. Marx 1969:124).

Marx also wrote that:

Individuals form a class only in so far as they are engaged in a common struggle with another class (Dahrendorf 1959:13-14; cf. Marx and Engels 1970:82).

For present purposes, we do not believe it crucial that those deprived be aware of their condition. Nor, since we are interested in class as a reflection of the way in which power is distributed in a society, is conscious "class struggle" an important element of our view. Nonetheless, substantial social and political change was occurring in California in the 1840s and 1850s; we suggest that these changes were in part caused by or resulted in an intensification of the class consciousness of the people involved. Contemporary observations of the American conquest of California, as discussed above, suggest that conflicting class interests were important factors in determining the responses of different groups of Californios and foreigners to the conquest. Since the material record of class behavior is reflected in assemblages such as that investigated here, archeological information both points to the importance of stratification in Californio society, and provides an avenue for the investigation of some aspects of class relationships.
Concluding Comments

We feel that archeological materials, census data, and descriptive historic accounts point to both objective and subjective class realities as key factors in determining consumption patterns, household structural changes, and political events in mid-nineteenth-century California. While we have specifically searched for evidence of ethnicity in the observed patterns, there is little evidence that this variable was a primary determinant of the observed archeological pattern. Even the discrete differences between the vessel form composition of the Diaz collection and other Euroamerican assemblages, which may reflect ethnic preference, could also be explained in terms of changing food resource availability. At most, the background of Hispanic behavior patterns tempered the sophistication with which wealthy Californios adopted Victorian popular culture. We are inclined to view California's position on a geographical (but by no means isolated) frontier as at least as important as ethnicity in the modification of contemporary cultural patterns. Even within the political realm, class interests appear to override ethnic affinity in determining the Californio response to an American takeover, at least on the part of the ruling class. It appears that many of the "principle people" enumerated by Larkin were able to relegate their concern for preservation of their ethnic heritage to a secondary level when confronted with a political decision involving their economic interests.

Consciousness of ethnic heritage, however, seems to have been a factor in the negative response of the "common people" to the American takeover. It can be argued that heavy emphasis on ethnic self-identity is itself sometimes a response to more basic class conflict. Perhaps ethnic pride becomes a stronger force when class identity and relative well-being are weak or deteriorating, producing increased alienation and dissatisfaction. This hypothesis would not necessarily preclude ethnic awareness and pride among relatively contented middle and upper-class citizens, but implies that, in that context, ethnicity often becomes a largely emotional or ceremonial reality, playing a fairly minor role in determining the day-to-day character of the individual's world view and of his interaction with the society at large.

Urban anthropologists have recently suggested that this lessening of ethnic attachment has occurred in some modern American communities, where traditional behavior has taken on a largely symbolic nature while more critical aspects of ethnic culture, such as language and marriage patterns, are rapidly lost through assimilation (Patterson 1979:103-105). In this context, it is notable that Luisa Diaz was listed in the 1900 census as speaking only Spanish. Obviously, there are many aspects of an individual's life and identity that have little chance of ever being reflected in the archeological record.

Much additional historic research will be needed if we are to define more clearly the social realities of which the Diaz household and its contemporaries were products, or further test hypotheses regarding the
roles of particular variables in producing social and political change. Of special importance will be detailed quantitative analysis of census data, tax assessors' records, and other primary sources through which more objective population profiles can be developed. A more exhaustive review of historical literature in order to clarify the importance of class consciousness and decision making based on clearly perceived class interest is also important. It is necessary to investigate not only the behavior and perspectives of the elite, but also, as pointed out by Acuña (1972:119, note 1), those of "the poor Mexicans, who were exploited by the gringos and rich Californios alike."

Finally, further study of archeological assemblages attributable to identifiable households is called for. These should represent both lower and upper-class households, and as wide a range of ethnic groups as possible. Studies of archeological materials must be better integrated into research designs which seek to define the nature of the historic community which included the sites' inhabitants, rather than to concentrate only on collecting specific information about the occupants. This will require use of a broader range of historic documentation and explanatory models than now commonly employed.

Based on our findings, we suggest that considering the archeological materials as well as documentary data in terms of models viewing class structure and class culture as primary causal factors will be more productive in many instances than the currently popular emphasis on ethnic-identity studies. Certainly, the two approaches are not mutually exclusive; the key point is to broaden our theoretical perspective in order to permit us to differentiate significant from nonsignificant variables and to emphasize the more productive lines of inquiry.

Frequently, interpreting the archeological record in terms of the social factors which produced it is a frustrating exercise, offering a poor or vague "fit" between the artifactual and documentary data. Many social historical questions cannot be answered through any amount of statistical manipulation of artifact frequencies. We feel, however, that the formulation of these questions in itself is a valuable product of the analytic effort, even when the questions generated are more efficiently addressed through other sources of information. The Diaz artifact analysis reported here is an example of such a process. Even though a number of studies of the architectural history of the Cooper-Diaz Adobe and the lives of its inhabitants have been undertaken previously, relatively little emphasis was given to the artifacts recovered or to the position of its occupants in the larger social and economic framework of the time. We feel that research and interpretive efforts at the Cooper-Diaz Adobe will benefit from an attempt to address these shortcomings. The Cooper-Diaz property, with resources representing both the rising fortunes of the Cooper family and the diminishing status of Manuel Diaz, presents great potential for interpreting the dynamic social processes that surrounded the American takeover of California and the resulting "decline of the Californios." It points, we believe, to a more productive direction for the archeological and historical study of nineteenth-century California.
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